

**Chapter 1 : Debating Orthodox Judaism: A Tale of Two Rabbinical Seminaries - Jewish Action**

*Get this from a library! An interorthodox theological debate. [Athenagoras T Kokkinakis] -- A translation of Theologikai syzeteseis, published Athens, , with an additional chapter on the Anglican theory of comprehensiveness.*

History Debating Orthodox Judaism: Irving Cutler Ninety years ago, in September , two yeshivot came together to debate the future of Orthodoxy in America. The young men took the competition quite seriously. Months earlier, the Chicago yeshivah held a tryout and then organized a regimen of practice sessions for the four chosen HTC debaters. Once considered the prime method of Americanization, public schooling and afternoon Talmud Torah education had lost some luster in these traditionalist locales. Drawing upon this, and sporting a refined rhetorical form, the New Yorkers triumphed, much to the chagrin of the local supporters. Founded in , HTC had ordained just about two dozen rabbis, but aspired to install its modern-thinking and tradition-clinging men throughout the Midwest. By the lates, the school had secured the needed funds and commenced construction of a new campus in Washington Heights. In the recent past, the Manhattan students had struggled to obtain pulpits against the fierce competition of the nearby Jewish Theological Seminary. The new, fashionable school site offered more than a modicum of hope that the situation would be different in the near future. Moreover, it was a religious fervor that sprang from the minds of young people, the usual demographic responsible for awakenings in American Judaism. The embrace of open and organized discussion on marquee matters and the public attention paid to these forums confirmed all this. In truth, the debates and the interwar religious awakening were ephemeral. Orthodox Judaism would wait another two decades before undergoing a lasting revival in American Jewish life. Yet, the emergence of the debates signaled a kind of public discourse that later Orthodox leaders seized upon; and ones that might serve as models to engage present important discussions. The success of the inaugural match inspired another bout. The rabbinical schools scheduled their second debate in December , at the New York Seminary. The theme of all of these initiatives was a harmonization of American life and Jewish tradition. Sidney Guthman alternate , Wilfred Gordon chairman. Courtesy of Rabbi Zev Eleff The debaters also recognized the significance of the moment. The event did not disappoint. To endow this second debate with all-due import, the New Yorkers arranged for three judges: Two thousand people, with their curiosity piqued, filled the grand auditorium. Emanuel Rackman, Moses Mescheloff alternate. David Rubin and Max J. Courtesy of Rabbi Zev Eleff We took the debate very seriously, and researched the background thoroughly. I was to deal with the historical background of the Zionist movement and the concept of Statehood in Jewish history. So I spent a good deal of time in various libraries studying ancient as well as modern sources, as did my colleagues. We had adopted the negative side of the question, and, therefore, had the more difficult case to argue; it was also less popular. It sparked pleasant conversation and accrued valuable cultural currency. That young people had accomplished all this provided boundless hope for the future of Orthodox Judaism in the United States. Nonetheless, the third debate took place amid a good degree of caution. The schools postponed the next disputation to July Still, rather broke, and unable to cover other valuable operational expenses, the leaders of both schools were unwilling to cancel the arrangement, despite the considerable costs. The students, however, were hardly of one mind on the matter. Some were very far from sanguine. Still, other young men parted company with the pessimists. This offered ample cause for a third round. Yet, something missed the mark this time. In all, about people attended the debate; a considerable figure but much less than the number that attended the previous two matches. Perhaps, much too overwhelmed by the nationwide economic situation and mounting political conditions overseas, the local press neglected to cover the event and report the winner. Likewise, pained by a paucity of resources, and hindered by the increasing rise of the Conservative Movement, Orthodox Judaism started to regress and enter a troubling period of religious depression. It was therefore the final debate between the Chicago and New York yeshivot. In the s, young Orthodox Jews searched for a way to jumpstart a revival. Instead, the sentiment resonated for another decade or so. In the s, young and inspired day school graduates assumed an integral role in the long-lasting revival in Orthodox Jewish life. Through educational initiatives such as NCSY and the intercollegiate Yavneh organization, as well as Yeshiva University and later

incarnations of Jewish higher education, young people reemerged as the prominent voices for sophisticated conversation on meaningful issues. They routinely debated Jewish education, scholarship, the modern synagogue and Vietnam. Of course, it was a formula of discourse put into action long beforeâ€”and one that can stimulate a renaissance once again. Israel Tabak, *Three Worlds: A Jewish Odyssey* Jerusalem, , Many thanks to Chaim Reich for pointing out this valuable source to me. My thanks to Simcha Freedman for helping me retrieve this source. This article was featured in Jewish Action Fall

**Chapter 2 : Athenagoras (Kokkinakis) of Thyateira and Great Britain - OrthodoxWiki**

*Enter your mobile number or email address below and we'll send you a link to download the free Kindle App. Then you can start reading Kindle books on your smartphone, tablet, or computer - no Kindle device required.*

Is conversion a matter of divine grace or human free will? Are theological disputes to be arbitrated by appeals to the Bible or to church tradition? These sorts of questions expose a traditional line of demarcation from which Catholics and Protestants generally break in opposite directions. Yet in none of these cases do Eastern Orthodox Christians feel obliged to choose sides. Orthodoxy has deeply influenced some of the most important Protestant theologians working today. It is difficult now to do serious theological work without extensive reference to ancient and modern Orthodox sources. Perhaps the most important dualism never foisted on the Orthodox is that between academic theology and worship. Theology is certainly an intellectual endeavor for the Orthodox, but it is more pronouncedly doxological. Theology is a loving word of praise to the God who first speaks his Word to us in Christ and by the Spirit draws us into the church. This is how Orthodox believers view their dynamic continuity with the ancient church and scripture. Orthodox theology is anything but individualistic. As theologians in the West have sought to recover a view of Christian community as more than a conglomeration of individuals, they have often turned to the work of John Zizioulas, a Greek Orthodox bishop and theologian. In his highly influential *Being as Communion* he argues that the inter-relationship of the three persons of the Trinity should serve as a model for human relationships. A vision of persons acting in self-emptying ways toward one another is deeply appealing in such a setting. Many of the Orthodox bridges across Western intellectual divides would not have been built without the cataclysmic political events of the early 20th century. Westerners encountered Orthodoxy in the flesh when a wave of theologians and church leaders left Russia following the revolution. Other Russians fled farther west. George Florovsky first went to Paris, but went on to lead St. The archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams wrote his dissertation on Lossky. Bulgakov is now being translated at a furious pace. Orthodox intellectual life in America has long been centered at St. Kallistos Ware, Olivier Clement, Alexander Gollitzen and Verna Harrison are other theologians and church leaders whose influence goes beyond Orthodox circles. Many English-speaking theologians have encountered Orthodoxy through the ecumenical movement. Ancient orthodoxy has provided a starting point on which all parties in the ecumenical conversation could agree, and current Orthodoxy of the Orthodox churches has presented an incarnation of the ancient church from which all parties could learn. Further, the liturgical renewal of the past half-century has made Protestant worship more similar in form and in spirit to the ancient liturgy that the Orthodox champion and purport to continue uninterrupted. The Orthodox have reminded Western churches of other key portions of Christian identity. It was British church leaders who translated Greek patristic figures like Athanasius and John Chrysostom alongside Augustine and Gregory the Great in the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers collection, a series still much in use in seminaries and beyond. Another Augustinian teaching, born of his clash with the Pelagians, is that salvation rests on the grace of God alone, not at all on the exercise of human freedom. When Catholic or Arminian or Calvinist theologians accuse the Orthodox of having it both ways, the Orthodox simply agree, and insist that God is mystery, beyond our knowing. Indeed, a reliance on negative theology, an insistence on the human inability to know the God who is mystery, has remained central to Orthodox thought and practice. Nor can any words come up to the inexpressible Good, this One, this Source of all unity, this supra-existent Being. Mind beyond mind, word beyond speech, it is gathered up by no discourse, by no intuition, by no name. For all that the Orthodox have taught or retaught Protestants, there are potential problems in this rediscovery of Orthodoxy. To read Orthodox texts without much interaction with actual Orthodox believers and their churches, schisms and political difficulties can lead to an unrealistic view of Orthodox life. Orthodox confidence or potential complacency on this point is captured in a joke: A Protestant, a Catholic and an Orthodox are discussing what Jesus would be upon his return to earth. Protestant and Catholic theologians decided that they needed help in adjudicating their disputes. They decided to ask the Orthodox for advice. The two parties journeyed to the east and met with an Orthodox theologian. They explained their disagreements

over faith and works, the location of church authority, the relation of scripture and tradition, and so on.

**Chapter 3 : The Doctrine of the Orthodox Church: The Basic Doctrines**

*The Faith Schools Debate. An Interorthodox Theological Debate. By Athenagoras Kokkinakis. Leighton Buzzard, The Faith Press, 1 November 1964. Scottish Journal of Theology.*

The Metropolia straw vote was a turning point in the history of Orthodoxy in North America. In 1947, a lengthy series of public and private negotiations were begun in yet another attempt to resolve the outstanding differences between the Metropolia and the Russian Church. In 1948, during a brief period of Soviet-American detente, the Russian Church dropped its former demands. Mother and daughter churches reconciled. How can the world accept and believe our claim to be the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, of having kept in its fulness the Orthodox faith, if we ourselves are divided? We have the same faith, the same Tradition, the same hope, the same mission. We should then constitute one Church, visibly, organically, fully. There can be no excuse for our jurisdictional divisions, alienation from one another, and parochialism. The removal of such divisions and the organic unity of all Orthodox in America is the goal of our Church. We invite you to become part of the unity. But we also know and fully acknowledge that we have come from different backgrounds and have been nourished by various traditions within the same and unique Orthodox Tradition. We firmly believe that this variety constitutes the richness of American Orthodoxy and that what is true, noble, inspiring, and Christian in our various customs and practices ought to be fully preserved, and if possible, shared. Therefore although we insist that the One Orthodox Church here must be the home of all, we equally stress that there must be no loss of our respective national and cultural heritages and certainly no domination of any group by any other group, but a full equality, total trust, and truly Christian brotherhood. Soon after autocephaly the Albanian Church in America, the Bulgarian Diocese in America, as well as several individual parishes of the Russian Orthodox Patriarchal Church in North America petitioned to join the new body. Some, such as the Antiochian and Romanian Patriarchates, continue to withhold official comment. The issue remains in dispute. In recent years, however, discussions between the OCA and the Ecumenical Patriarchate have resumed, and the resolution to the chaotic ecclesial situation in America is high on the agenda of world Orthodoxy. Tikhon Monastery, October 1970, at which autocephaly was ratified by delegates representing the entire Church. For the patriarchates abroad, the creation of an American church threatened to weaken cultural ties to the ethnic homelands, as well as diminish much-needed financial support. As such, the OCA was seen by many in North America and abroad as a challenge to the very existence of the ethnic churches. Only the intervention of the Greek-American Archbishop Iakovos prevented a full break between the OCA and the Ecumenical Patriarchate immediately before and after autocephaly. While relations between the OCA and the Greek Archdiocese continue to be strained at times, recent meetings between the Ecumenical Patriarch and the Metropolitan Theodosius, Primate of the Orthodox Church in America, suggest the two may be moving towards an accommodation. The Emerging American Mission Whatever hopes or disappointments the creation of the Orthodox Church in America engendered, its very existence changed the terms of reference for all Orthodox in North America. Since autocephaly in 1970, the Orthodox have increasingly reflected both on the fact, and the meaning, of their continuing existence in North America. Each jurisdiction has been forced to face the future, rather than the past. Unity, conciliarity, spiritual renewal, evangelization, and social witness, not ethnicity, have become central concerns. Although most clearly visible in the OCA, the American Mission is an orientation increasingly evident in all the ethnic churches as well. The emerging American Mission is predicated on the re-establishment of Orthodox canonical unity in North America. Such efforts have dramatically increased each decade since 1970. In the narrow environment of ethnicity, ethnarchy, and cultural hibernation after 1945, there was little communication between Orthodox jurisdictions, and even less consciousness of Orthodox community. Once the war ended, however, the organization quickly languished. It was the first successful inter-Orthodox project on a national scale. Despite initial enthusiasm and success, not one of these movements ever fulfilled the hopes attendant upon their creation. The OCEC continues to exist on paper, but its work has been increasingly superceded by the jurisdictional departments of education. By far the most successful of these early inter-Orthodox attempts was the Campus Commission. Between 1945 and 1970, an entire

generation of Church leaders was energized by its annual student conferences as well as its national student magazine, Concern. In the course of the autocephaly debates, however, the Greek Archdiocese withdrew its financial support. The movement eventually collapsed. In an era of ethnic churches controlled by ethnarchs, inter-Orthodox cooperation could not thrive on an institutional level. Guest speakers in center: As a result, most attempts to promote Orthodox unity since have been para-ecclesial, issue-oriented, and led by laity. Continual growth of new inter-Orthodox groupings, both local, regional, and national, indicates that the jurisdictional solution is unraveling psychologically, if not administratively. Whatever their jurisdictional ties, or lack of same, the new inter-Orthodox groups have laid, and continue to lay, a broad-based, multi-ethnic, and serious foundation for the American Mission. The Emerging American Mission: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow. Whereas the ethnic churches formerly met in celebration of their heritage, such meetings have become less common, and indeed, peripheral. Spirituality, in some form, is now the central theme of all meetings of Orthodox peoples, ethnic or otherwise. Frequent and regular communion, once a novelty, is increasingly the norm. Retreats, prayer groups, Bible studies, youth gatherings, mission studies, all previously unknown, are now common. Increasing appreciation for the theological and spiritual meaning of icons has led to a recent resurgence in the number and quality of iconographers in America. Orthodox literature in English, limited to less than 10 titles in and printed mainly in England, now numbers well over titles from six Orthodox publishing houses in the United States alone. Orthodox monasticism, an integral part of any authentic Orthodox spirituality, has experienced a unique renewal in the last 25 years as well. Since, an unprecedented twenty Orthodox monasteries eight female, twelve male have been established throughout the United States and Canada. However, these new monasteries are generally small typically numbering only one to three monastics, and financially insecure. In truth, Orthodox monasticism in North America has always encountered difficulties. Immigrant generations were reluctant to encourage their children to renounce the material culture of America. Likewise, ethnic Orthodox clergy encouraged monastic-minded Americans to seek their vocations not in America, but in the various homelands or on Mount Athos in Greece. Thus the Greek Archdiocese, for example, established its first and short-lived monastery in America only in, and its second only in. Some groups—the Russians, the Romanians, and the Serbs—did establish monastic communities in America. The Romanians have been the most active in supporting female monasticism in North America. Under the leadership of Mother Alexandra, the former Princess Ileana of Romania, a large English-speaking community in Ellwood City, Pennsylvania, and a smaller Romanian-speaking community in Rives Junction, Michigan, have been established. Nevertheless, a hostile cultural environment, continuing ecclesiastical divisions, and the perpetual temptation of monastic life abroad, has clouded, and continues to cloud, the future of Orthodox monasticism in North America. Yet the very fact that monasteries are being created demonstrates a continuing profound commitment to mission in America. Indeed, the perennial lack of monastic vocations in North America has had effects beyond the cloister. Lack of monastic vocations has led to a severe shortage of candidates for the episcopacy, since bishops have traditionally been selected from among monks or widowed clergy. From time to time, this has led to calls, on the part of priests and laity, for the restoration of a married episcopate. Evangelization Ethnic churches may be gradually losing members, or at best holding their own, but the American Mission is experiencing slow and steady growth. Since, the Antiochian Archdiocese and the Orthodox Church in America have led in the effort to establish new, multi-ethnic, or non-ethnic, Orthodox communities where none previously existed. In the past twenty years more than new Orthodox parishes have been established by all jurisdictions, the majority in areas previously underserved the South, West, and Midwest. For the first time since the turn of the century, large numbers of adult converts, and not only those resulting from mixed marriages, are entering Orthodoxy. Recently, the Antiochian Evangelical Orthodox Mission, at the invitation of the Romanian Orthodox Church, conducted a series of Orthodox revivals throughout Romania. Their enormous success in filling stadiums led to invitations to hold similar Orthodox evangelical revivals throughout Russia. A third aspect of the emerging American Mission is increased Orthodox concern for a credible social witness. This includes social services, ecumenical endeavors, and Orthodox participation in the wider culture of America. Unable to support even one seminary between, the Orthodox community was, by American standards slow in creating educational institutions.

There exists but one very small Orthodox undergraduate institution, Hellenic College, affiliated with Holy Cross Seminary. A few, largely Greek, parochial schools have been established, the vast majority in New York; but they remain the exception rather than the rule. It is not to education but to charity that Orthodox have turned since. Although the ethnic churches have always generously collected monies to support countrymen in times of trouble, such as aid for displaced persons after World War II, Greek earthquake reconstruction efforts, Lebanese war relief, or assistance for Romanian orphans, since the trend has been towards inter-Orthodox assistance. IOCC has generated strong support from all the Orthodox and fostered new avenues for inter-Orthodox cooperation at all levels. Orthodox Christians are a visible presence in anti-abortion demonstration in Washington, DC. It is on the parochial level, however, that Orthodox social services, jurisdictional and inter-Orthodox, have really blossomed since. Through food banks, ministries to the elderly, homeless, and imprisoned, homes for elderly, hospital chaplaincies, etc. Orthodoxy has also been visible in the wider Christian community through its ecumenical participation. Ecumenical participation, however, has not been without controversy. Proponents, on the other hand, cite evidence of the blessings ecumenical participation has brought to the Orthodox in North America, including refugee aid, educational opportunities, financial assistance, the chance to publicly explain and defend the teachings of the Church, and not least, constant encouragement for inter-jurisdictional cooperation. Affiliated with the Orthodox Church in America, the home has provided for spiritual as well as physical needs of the elderly since. On a secular level, the symbols of Orthodoxy are increasingly visible as well. Recent changes in Russia, the Lebanese Civil War, the Bosnian conflict, and presidential candidates of Greek descent have made the beards, black robes, and tall hats of Orthodox prelates favorites of photojournalists. Inexpensive Byzantine icon reproductions may be seen in trendy American shops, while traditional iconography is increasingly collected and displayed by major art museums. Orthodoxy is still foreign and exotic to much of America, but increasingly less so in major urban areas. Michael Oleksa front row, 2nd from left was one of the main speakers. Bishop Nicholas of Presov center hosted this international gathering. Although the jurisdictional solution continues and ethnicity still plays an important role in the lives of most Orthodox in North America, it is possible since to see an American Mission emerging out of the ethnic churches. Unlike earlier periods in Orthodox history in North America, institutional developments and individual personalities are less important in this new era of an emerging American Mission than general theological, psychological, and sociological changes.

*The HTC-RIETS debates, then, represented a revitalized spirit and confidence in the prospects of Orthodox Judaism. Moreover, it was a religious fervor that sprang from the minds of young people, the usual demographic responsible for awakenings in American Judaism.*

Gregory Palamas in the 14th century. Finally, it recognizes itself as the bearer of an uninterrupted living tradition of true Christianity that is expressed in its worship, in the lives of the saints, and in the faith of the whole people of God. In the 17th century, as a counterpart to the various "confessions" of the Reformation, there appeared several "Orthodox confessions," endorsed by local councils but, in fact, associated with individual authors. None of these confessions would be recognized today as having anything but historical importance. When expressing the beliefs of his church, the Orthodox theologian, rather than seeking literal conformity with any of these particular confessions, will rather look for consistency with Scripture and tradition, as it has been expressed in the ancient councils, the early Fathers, and the uninterrupted life of the liturgy. He will not shy away from new formulations if consistency and continuity of tradition are preserved. Truth appears as a living experience accessible in the communion of the church and of which the Scriptures, the councils, and theology are the normal expressions. Even ecumenical councils, in the Orthodox perspective, need subsequent "reception" by the body of the church in order to be recognized as truly ecumenical. Ultimately, therefore, truth is viewed as its own criterion: Because of this view of truth, the Orthodox have traditionally been reluctant to involve church authority in defining matters of faith with too much precision and detail. This reluctance is not due to relativism or indifference but rather to the belief that truth needs no definition to be the object of experience and that legitimate definition, when it occurs, should aim mainly at excluding error and not at pretending to reveal the truth itself that is believed to be ever present in the church. The Greek Fathers of the church always implied that the phrase found in the biblical story of the creation of man Gen. Thus, the concept of sin implies separation from God and the reduction of man to a separate and autonomous existence, in which he is deprived of both his natural glory and his freedom. He becomes an element subject to cosmic determinism, and the image of God is thus blurred within him. Freedom in God, as enjoyed by Adam, implied the possibility of falling away from God. This is the unfortunate choice made by man, which led Adam to a subhuman and unnatural existence. The most unnatural aspect of his new state was death. In this perspective, "original sin" is understood not so much as a state of guilt inherited from Adam but as an unnatural condition of human life that ends in death. Mortality is what each man now inherits at his birth and this is what leads him to struggle for existence, to self-affirmation at the expense of others, and ultimately to subjection to the laws of animal life. The "prince of this world" is. From this vicious circle of death and sin, man is understood to be liberated by the death and Resurrection of Christ, which is actualized in Baptism and the sacramental life in the church. Hence, in the West, the aim of the Christian is justification, but in the East, it is rather communion with God and deification. In the West, the church is viewed in terms of mediation for the bestowing of grace and authority for guaranteeing security in doctrine ; in the East, the church is regarded as a communion in which God and man meet once again and a personal experience of divine life becomes possible. Together with the Latin Church of the West, it has rejected Arianism a belief in the subordination of the Son to the Father at Nicaea , Nestorianism a belief that stresses the independence of the divine and human natures of Christ at Ephesus , and Monophysitism a belief that Christ had only one divine nature at Chalcedon. The Eastern and Western churches still formally share the tradition of subsequent Christological developments, even though the famous formula of Chalcedon, "one person in two natures," is given different emphases in the East and West. Jesus is thus always seen in his divine identity. Similarly, the liturgy consistently addresses the Virgin Mary as Theotokos the "one who gave birth to God" , and this term, formally admitted as a criterion of orthodoxy at Ephesus, is actually the only "Mariological" doctrine of Mary dogma accepted in the Orthodox Church. Cyril of Alexandria 5th century , does not imply the denial of his humanity. The anthropology doctrine of man of the Eastern Fathers does not view man as an autonomous being but rather implies that communion with God makes man fully human. Thus the human nature of Jesus Christ,

fully assumed by the divine Word, is indeed the "new Adam" in whom the whole of humanity receives again its original glory. The theopaschite formula "God suffered in the flesh" became, together with the Theotokos formula, a standard of orthodoxy in the Eastern Church, especially after the second Council of Constantinople. This theology of redemption and salvation is best expressed in the Byzantine liturgical hymns of Holy Week and Easter: Christ is the one who "tramples down death by death," and, on the evening of Good Friday, the hymns already exalt his victory. What Christ accomplished once and for all must be appropriated freely by those who are "in Christ"; their goal is "deification," which does not mean dehumanization but the exaltation of man to the dignity prepared for him at creation. Paul called the "body of Christ," each individual Christian enters through Baptism and "chrismation" the Eastern form of the Western "confirmation" when the priest anoints him saying "the seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit. Orthodox saints such as Seraphim of Sarov died described the entire content of Christian life as a "collection of the Holy Spirit. This role of the Spirit is reflected, very richly, in a variety of liturgical and sacramental acts. Every act of worship usually starts with a prayer addressed to the Spirit, and all major sacraments begin with an invocation to the Spirit. The significance of this invocation in Greek epiklesis was violently debated between Greek and Latin Christians in the Middle Ages because the Roman canon of the mass lacked any reference to the Spirit and was thus considered as deficient by the Orthodox Greeks. The Greek Fathers saw in Gen. Thus, all the decisive acts of God are accomplished "by the Father in the Son, through the Holy Spirit. In the West God was understood primarily in terms of one essence the Trinity of Persons being conceived as an irrational truth found in revelation ; in the East the tri-personality of God was understood as the primary fact of Christian experience. The Cappadocian Fathers Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Basil of Caesarea were even accused of being tri-theists because of the personalistic emphasis of their conception of God as one essence in three hypostases the Greek term hypostasis was the equivalent of the Latin substantia and designated a concrete reality. For Greek theologians, this terminology was intended to designate the concrete New Testamental revelation of the Son and the Spirit, as distinct from the Father. Modern Orthodox theologians tend to emphasize this personalistic approach to God; they claim that they discover in it the original biblical personalism, unadulterated in its content by later philosophical speculation. Polarization of the Eastern and the Western concepts of the Trinity is at the root of the Filioque dispute. Later, however, the addition became an anti-Greek battle cry, especially after Charlemagne 9th century made his claim to rule the revived Roman Empire. The addition was finally accepted in Rome under German pressure. It found justification in the framework of Western conceptions of the Trinity; the Father and the Son were viewed as one God in the act of "spiration" of the Spirit. The Byzantine theologians opposed the addition, first on the ground that the Western Church had no right to change the text of an ecumenical creed unilaterally and, second, because the Filioque clause implied the reduction of the divine persons to mere relations "the Father and the Son are two in relation to each other, but one in relation to the Spirit". For the Greeks the Father alone is the origin of both the Son and the Spirit. Patriarch Photius 9th century was the first Orthodox theologian to explicitly spell out the Greek opposition to the Filioque concept, but the debate continued throughout the Middle Ages. This conception of God is connected with the personalistic understanding of the Trinity. It also led to the official confirmation by the Orthodox Church of the theology of St. Gregory Palamas, the leader of Byzantine hesychasts monks devoted to divine quietness through prayer , at the councils of and in Constantinople. The councils confirmed a real distinction in God, between the unknowable essence and the acts, or "energies," which make possible a real communion with God. Far from being monolithic, Byzantine theological thought was often polarized by a Humanistic trend, favouring the use of Greek philosophy in theological thinking, and the more austere and mystical theology of the monastic circles. The concern for preservation of Greek culture and for the the political salvation of the empire led several prominent Humanists to adopt a position favourable to union with the West. The most creative theologians e. The 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries were the dark age of Orthodox theology. Neither in the Middle East nor in the Balkans nor in Russia was there any opportunity for independent theological creativity. Since no formal theological education was accessible, except in Western Roman Catholic or Protestant schools, the Orthodox tradition was preserved primarily through the liturgy, which retained all its richness and often served as a valid substitute for formal schooling. Most doctrinal

statements of this period, issued by councils or by individual theologians, were polemical documents directed against Western missionaries. After the reforms of Peter the Great died, a theological school system was organized in Russia. Shaped originally in accordance with Western Latin models and staffed with Jesuit-trained Ukrainian personnel, this system developed, in the 19th century, into a fully independent and powerful tool of theological education. The Russian theological efflorescence of the 19th and 20th centuries produced many scholars, especially in the historical field e. Klyuchevsky, died; V. Bolotov, died; E. Golubinsky, died; N. Independently of the official theological schools, a number of laymen with secular training developed theological and philosophical traditions of their own and exercised a great influence on modern Orthodox theology e. Khomyakov, died; V. Solovyev, died; N. Berdyayev, died, and some became priests P. Florensky, died; S. A large number of the Russian theological intelligentsia e. Florovsky emigrated to western Europe after the Russian Revolution and played a leading role in the ecumenical movement. With the independence of the Balkans, theological schools were also created in Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria, and Romania. Modern Greek scholars contributed to the publication of important Byzantine ecclesiastical texts and produced standard theological textbooks. Orthodox theologians reacted negatively to the new dogmas proclaimed by Pope Pius IX: In connection with the dogma of the Assumption of Mary, proclaimed by Pope Pius XII, the objections mainly concerned the presentation of such a tradition in the form of a dogma. In contrast to the recent general trend of Western Christian thought toward social concerns, Orthodox theologians generally emphasize that the Christian faith is primarily a direct experience of the Kingdom of God, sacramentally present in the church. Without denying that Christians have a social responsibility to the world, they consider this responsibility as an outcome of the life in Christ. This traditional position accounts for the remarkable survival of the Orthodox Churches under the most contradictory and unfavourable of social conditions, but, to Western eyes, it often appears as a form of passive fatalism. This page was retrieved from www. This page was originally created by monks at Decani Monastery in Kosovo. It has been slightly edited for inclusion on this site.

**Chapter 5 : Looking East: The impact of Orthodox tradition | Annunciation Greek Orthodox Cathedral**

*Ecumenical news / Aktuelles The Global Ecumenical Theological Institute - a forum for theological debate and inter-generational dialogue, 25 th October - 9 November , Seoul & Busan, South Korea.*

This is the simple and redemptive message of the Gospel: Yet, this was neither the case in Apostolic Times nor is it the case in the present. The former emerging from within the monastic circles of piety and the latter emanating from the universities and seminaries. Occasionally, we have seen the adherents of both come to loud discord and sadly in some circumstances ecclesial schisms. In both circumstances, either of these two positions carried to their extremes are not within the historic Apostolic Tradition. Throughout Church history, we find countless examples of conflicts within the Church. Both Apostles Peter and Paul argued bitterly over the issues of adherence to Old Testament Judaic practices for the fledgling first century Christian communities both Jewish and Gentile. Basil the Great and St. Gregory Nazienzen came into conflict over matters of what is proper engagement of and discharge of church governance in the fourth century. In spite of these divergences, the unity of faith found in the Person of Jesus was never questioned by these saints of God. We do not worship a creed, doctrine, church, book, philosophy or theology. To say that one follows exclusively an ascetic no matter how pious is wrong. To say that one follows exclusively a professor no matter how erudite is equally as wrong. We worship a Person – Jesus Christ. Orthodox Christianity is best expressed in its fullness when the monastic charismatic spirituality guides the ethos of the heart and the academic intellectual theology guides the head. Without this balance, it has become increasingly clear that the Church today will not find itself true to Her Apostolic calling and will be relegated to increasing irrelevance and marginalization in the greater culture. Symeon the New Theologian understood this balance in the 11th century. Symeon was an erudite theologian who taught that theology of the head without theology of the heart was empty. The Holy Spirit within the life of the Christian as well as the theologian was crucial to authentic spiritual life. The Church was facing deep secularizing influences during that time similar to what the Church is facing today. Archbishop Stephanos had an excellent theoretical understanding of theology, but it was devoid of actualized spiritual experience. The Synod and condemned into exile; he was abandoned by the hierarchy without food in the midst of winter. Symeon at the hands of his enemies in the Church, was ultimately his greatest opportunity for witness. Athos and throughout the Byzantine Empire. Symeon the New Theologian continues to this day. In speaking of this Patristic theological fronima, the late theologian John S. There is, however, another kind of faith, the faith of the heart. It is referred to in this way because this kind of faith is not found in the human reason or intellect, but in the region of the heart. This faith of the heart is a gift of God that you will not receive unless God decides to grant it. When someone has noetic prayer in his heart, which means the prayer of the Holy Spirit in his heart, then he has inner faith. Through this kind of faith and by means of prayer, he beholds things that are visible. When someone has this kind of vision, it is called theoria. Theoria, in fact means vision – this inner faith i. If the contemporary Orthodox theologian is to acquire objectivity, he must rely on the experience of theosis. At once, it is all diminished as a straw-man argument within the context of Orthodoxy. In Orthodox Tradition, there is only that what has been handed down from the Apostles. To be sure, in 2, years, there have been arguments, schisms, developments, changes in practice, but what remains the same is: That is all that matters. That is what we should be vigilant to call to mind. No monastic, professor, hierarch, clergy or layman alone has the corner on Truth. Christ can reveal Himself to the humblest of uneducated fishermen such as the Apostles Peter, James and John. Christ can also reveal Himself to the most well-educated scholars such as Sts. John Chrysostom and Basil the Great. The same Jesus is Lord of all. Who are we to think that we can create such artificial dichotomies such as we have? The reality is that the charismatic needs the academic and the academic needs the charismatic. The two are not mutually exclusive, but rather they are complementary and symbiotic. It is crucial today more than ever that the 21st century Church seeks this balance in the monastery, parish, university, seminary, and most importantly in the home. It is not an option, but rather a matter of spiritual stewardship. Most appropriately, it is only His love, mercy and grace which can give us the strength for the difficult tasks which await us on the journey ahead. Symeon the

New Theologian: The Discourses Paulist Press, p. Krivocheine, Basil; Gythiel, Anthony P. In the Light of Christ: Saint Symeon the New Theologian The Epistles of St. Symeon the New Theologian. Oxford University Press, pp. A Patristic Greek Reader. Turner , pp. Parakatatheke Publications and Uncut Mountain Press , pp. The Greek Ascetic Corpus. Praktikos and On Prayer. Faculty of Theology, John G. Panagiotou is a graduate of St. He can be reached at johnpan gmail.

**Chapter 6 : The Impact of Orthodox Theology – Religion Online**

*There is no doubt that the whole issue is a theological one and it is greatly linked to Anglican theology and ecclesiology. That discussion has an impact on a) the inter-Anglican relations and, b) inter-Christian dialogues.*

George Hancock and from Dr. Roland Werner, a well-known Protestant theologian, philologist and philosopher, who has written over forty books. He went to a cemetery together with his family, and there heard a sermon from a priest about the future resurrection of all of our loved ones. He praised the Orthodox Easter vigil, and said that it is the most beautiful church service which he has seen in his life. Then he turned to the question of the influence of the Church fathers on the Reformation. He emphasized that St. Augustine had the greatest influence on Martin Luther and Jean Calvin. Augustine was in error, and if St. Augustine was in error, then St. Paul was also in error. Even if he agreed with Augustine theologically, Calvin did not want ordinary people to be weighed down by his wordiness, which could be difficult to understand, and therefore he simplified it when writing his own theological teachings. On the other hand, having noticed that students often only read what someone else has written about earlier writings, Professor Hancock appealed to them to read the original writings of the Church fathers, theologians from the Middle Age, and the Reformers, which will enable them to notice differences and learn more. Professor Werner gave a bigger picture of the beginnings of the Reformation and the life of Martin Luther who, October 31, , nailed his 95 theses to the door of the church in Wittenberg, and thereby changed world history. As a Catholic monk and a German as well, Luther was a perfectionist, who took both religion and the Bible very seriously, which can be seen from his belief that the Bible was too holy for him to teach to others. However, as a member of the clergy, he was required to. The more he studied the Bible, the more he noticed aspects of the teachings and practices of the Catholic Church that were not in line with the Bible. For instance, that the Pope is the head of the Church, and that priests are not allowed to marry. In the Bible it says that an elder should be husband of one wife Titus 1: Another thing that Luther and the Orthodox Church agree on is that Catholics are wrong in their teaching on Purgatory. Luther did not want to bring anything new to the Catholic Church or to start a new Church, rather he wanted to reform the Church and return it to its healthy roots. Professor Werner shared factors that were very important in the Reformation: The invention of the printing press. The fall of Constantinople when many Orthodox Greeks went West, bringing with them the Greek New Testament, which enabled the translation of Scriptures into other everyday languages from the original Greek language, and not only from the Latin, which was the only translation available in the West. Rediscovery of the mother tongue, following the example of the Eastern Church, whose members read the Bible in their own native languages. And in the end he reiterated that the goal of every Christian should be to learn from one another and to discover the wealth of truth to be found in each Church. This will help them grow close to God and to one another.

**Chapter 7 : Orthodox Christians in North America - Chapter 9 - Orthodox Church in America**

*interorthodox theological debate, derecho de autor el debate de hoy, eisenhower versus montgomery the continuing debate, north americas lost decade the munk debate on the north american economy, whats the worst that could happen a rational response to the climate change.*

The issue of the ordination of women as deaconesses in the first place and as priests and bishops later on troubles the Anglican Communion since the previous century. Studying official statements of the Anglican Communion, Ass. There is no doubt that the whole issue is a theological one and it is greatly linked to Anglican theology and ecclesiology. That discussion has an impact on a the inter-Anglican relations and, b inter-Christian dialogues. The paper moves on with a critical evaluation of the debate itself and its impact on the bilateral Anglican-Orthodox theological dialogue from an Orthodox viewpoint. The dialogue is going on with extremely significant, from a theological point of view, achievements. Last, she concludes in an evaluation of the whole discussion from an Orthodox viewpoint, taking this chance to pose critical questions for the Orthodox concerning previous decisions on encouraging ordination of deaconesses; and reopen these issues vis a vis the needs of the Orthodoxy in lands of mission and Orthodoxy in Diaspora nowadays. I would like to express my deep gratitude to the former Rector and current Emeritus Professor of the Faculty of Theology of the University of Athens, Evangelos Theodorou, for his valuable contribution to the discipline of Theology and his diakonia in the Orthodox Church. The emergence of the position of women in the Church is largely due to his persistent and strenuous efforts and erudite studies; and it is important that this Conference is held in his honor. A critical evaluation from an Orthodox viewpoint". Orthodox Theology and Ecumenical Movement is my specialization and my discipline in the Department of Theology in the University of Athens where I serve and I will stay in this theoretical framework. These developments in the Anglican Communion are a subject of interest from an Orthodox viewpoint, as it is part of the broader family of Christianity, counting more than eighty-five million believers. This interest is related to the bilateral theological dialogue between Orthodox and Anglican and its future prospects. It is a genuine theological dialogue that has its roots centuries ago, namely in the 17th c. Prominent Greek theologians have been involved and participated as representatives of the Orthodox Church, such as the deceased professors Alivizatos, Karmiris, Trempelas, father Romanidis and Skouteris. The emeritus professor Galitis has been another one. Since and onwards, the representative of the Church of Greece in the bilateral theological dialogue between Orthodox and Anglicans is Prof. At that time, a brief study of mine, named "The ordination of women: Since then, many things have changed as the ordination of women at all levels of priesthood has been largely accepted within the Anglican Community. At that time however, groups of dissident Anglican faithful, clergy and laity, a abandoned their churches and b joined mainly the Roman Catholic Church and less the Orthodox Church. The following paradox was happening: To date, the ordination of women remains a thorny issue within all the Anglican Churches, in the relations between Orthodox and Anglicans but also, and more widely, in the ecumenical movement. The following clarifications are necessary: Some of them, in fact, are named Episcopal Churches. Together they make up the Anglican Communion and are in communion with the Archbishop of Canterbury. The term Anglican Communion began to be used in the midth century, when, the believers had spread beyond the boundaries of the United Kingdom, around the world. The first conference was held in and since then it is held every ten years. The establishment of the Community of Saint Mary the Virgin [1] in and the Community of Saint Andrew in , in the area of London in the midth c. Spiritually related to the Oxford movement and originating from the Anglo-Catholic tradition, the sororities were dealt with disbelief. Despite the objection that their actions bore features that originate from Roman Catholic orders, their work has been carried and was officially recognized by the Lambeth Conference and the Anglican Communion [3]. At the same time, there was a request for the revival of the order of the deaconesses as a return to the tradition of the period of the New Testament and the early Church. This was not just a request of the females, but a desire of the Anglican Communion, which, despite the initial reaction, was positively expressed in at the Conference of Lambeth. It is recorded in the minutes that "The time has come when, in the interests of the Church at large, and in

particular of the development of the ministry of women, the diaconate of women should be restored formally and canonically, and should be recognized throughout the Anglican Communion" [4]. In the following years, however, bewilderment prevailed, as male officers faced particular difficulties to understand how the deaconesses could be integrated within the broader framework of the liturgical life of the Church and how they, themselves, could consort with them. Still, there were questions about whether the role and duties of deaconesses would be like those of deacons, that is, whether they would belong to the ranks of the clergy or not [5]. Ten years later, the next Lambeth Conference replied that the ministry of deaconesses is different from that of the deacons. The institution of deaconesses was designated as one of its kind and it was clarified that it should not be linked to the ordination of priests or deacons. However it is integrated within the Church [6], which means that it is a "sui generis" [7] office. However, other questions remained unanswered, such as, for example, what exactly were the liturgical duties of deaconesses and whether or not they should be unmarried. Eventually, it is officially recorded that the first deaconesses began in the Church of England in [8]. In fact, women developed an active role in the liturgical life ever since the First World War [9], ministering even as readers. At this point, we should point out that women in fact, had to assume the service of liturgical needs and preaching. The factor that emerged the female participation in the liturgical life of the Church as a necessity was the absence of men due to their participation in the two world wars. Inevitably, women were found to be deaconesses, readers, to engage in missionary work and coordinate the parish work in general [10]. At the same time, changes in the society of England signaled the changing role of women in general. These developments had an impact on the Church, which gradually "recognized that the Holy Spirit has endowed women with charisma, to use it in officially recognized offices of the laity in the Church of England" [11]. However, the official recognition of women in the position of the reader in the same way as men was made by the Church of England only in [12]. The ordination of women as priests in the Anglican Communion in the 20th and 21st c. More rapid were the developments in Churches of the wider Anglican Communion beyond the boundaries of Great Britain. These developments were not simply about ordination of women as deaconesses, but also as priests. The Church of England was negative and its reactions were intense. This happened during the Japanese occupation so that the faithful would not deprive, due to the absence of male priests, the liturgical life and mysteries of the Church [14]. But that was not the only reason. Ronald Hall himself believed in the charisma and abilities of Florence Li Tim Oi and also that her contribution would be better exploited in a position of responsibility, such as the one of the priest. The reaction of the Church of England was initially expressed by the Archbishops of York and Canterbury, but the outcry was general. In fact, the ordination of Florence Li Tim Oi was described as ultravires, an excess of power [15]. The first female priest retired from her office after the war, in order to avoid tension and confrontations, but without losing her ordination [16]. Officially, the eighth Pan-Anglican Lambeth Conference in , declared that the ordination of women was contrary to the Anglican tradition and order and warned that it "could gravely affect the internal and external relations of the Anglican Communion" [17], which means that it would be detrimental to the unity of the Anglican Communion as well as to its relations with the Churches that participate in the ecumenical movement. Under the pressure of national and local churches, the Conference decided to hold a consultation among the Anglicans. For that purpose, it set up the "Anglican Consultative Council" [19] to which the churches were required to address to before deciding to ordain women [20]. The "Anglican Consultative Council" with the participation of bishops, clergy and laity from all over the Anglican Communion, gathered relevant studies from each province. That was the time when Florence Li Tim Oi was officially recognized as the first woman priest, while two more female priests were ordained in Hong Kong. Soon, despite the reactions, the practice of ordination of women was followed by other Churches of the Anglican Communion. However, they did not have the official approval of the Episcopal Church, but it was soon released. A year later the Episcopal Church approved the ordination of women not only as priest but as bishops too [22]. Almost simultaneously, in , the Anglican Church of Canada approved the ordination of women and in proceeded to the first ordination. These developments were consistent with the eleventh Lambeth Conference which was positive to the ordination of women and resulted in the recognition of the right of each province to follow its own practice either for or against the ordinations [23]. More general,

however, was the concern of a possible schism in the body of the Anglican Communion. For this reason, the Conference hastened to explain that "the holding together of diversity within a unity of faith and worship is part of the Anglican heritage" [24], that, in other words, the decision is based on the theology and ecclesiology of Anglicanism. That means that the various differences on the issue of ordination of women were officially recognized; that it was considered as possible to preserve the unity of faith and worship, and that the communion among the faithful and among the Churches of the Anglican Communion might not be disturbed [25]. This statement, however, was understood differently by the bishops, as others had the impression that the problem was solved and others that it was not solved [26]. At the same time, fears about the consequences of this decision on the relations with the Orthodox Church, the Roman Catholic and the Old Catholics, were expressed [27]. At the same time, and rather unexpectedly for European standards, let alone for those of the Orthodox Church, the first enthronement of a female bishop took place, that of Barbara Harris, in Boston. This cleared the way for the enthronement of other female bishops in New Zealand and in other Anglican Churches of the USA [28]. The claim of the request for ordination went on along with writing books, articles and studies inside the broader framework of the "Movement for the Ordination of Women" which was established in 1968. It is realized that the issue of the ordination of women was developed not individually, but in function, and as a part of a broader thematic about the position of women in Church, the participation of women in priesthood, the ordination in relation to the gender of Christ, women in the Bible and church tradition, gender stereotypes in Church and society, the role of the clergy and laity, etc. Inevitably, in the discussion, references about the Trinitarian doctrine and particularly in Christology, in anthropological issues in relation to the Creation and the Fall as well as questions in soteriology and ecclesiology were made. In other words, the issue of the ordination of women has raised a number of theological and particularly ecclesiological issues that the Churches were called to respond to and communicate with each other and that was not easy. It is understandable that this thematic occupied the member-Churches of the WCC in an attempt to overturn stereotypes and restore the position of women in church life [29]. Finally, after many discussions at an ecumenical and local level, the General Synod of the Church of England, in 1992, accepted the ordination of women in the first degree of priesthood, the diaconate, just as it applies to men. Many years of discussions, disagreements and confrontations followed until the Church of England approved the ordination of women to the order of priest. The decision was made only on the 11th of November, but remained on paper for two more years until it was ratified by the head of the Anglican Church, Queen Elisabeth February 24, 1992, and was applied in practice [30]. The year was the twentieth anniversary of the first ordination of woman in the Church of England [31]. The procedures for the acceptance of women to the rank of bishop were slower, mainly in the Church of England. If in the US the first female bishop assumed office in 1989, in the Church of England, the 21st century had to change to create the appropriate conditions. Management of the crisis in the Anglican Communion It is certain that the issue of the ordination of women caused tremors both within the Anglican Church and in the ecumenical dialogues. To treat this problem, the Anglican Church moved at two levels: The Lambeth Conference of 1990 introduced a specific method for the acceptance of the new practice of ordination of women on behalf of the believers. This method is the introduction of an open and continuous dialogue 1 among the members of the Anglican Communion, 2 between Anglican faithful who had opposing views while receiving parallel pastoral care, and 3 between the Anglican Communion and the other Churches [32]. In other words, an "open process of reception" [33] was launched to achieve the highest possible degree of communion with those who had a different view [34]. The conference established a committee to prepare pastoral directive in order to avoid tensions or breakaways of believers from the Church. The next step was the formal acceptance of the different practices which applied to the ordination of women. The goal was always to avoid schisms and to ensure the unity and communion [35]. In an ultimate effort the Lambeth Conference of 1998 was led to the following decision: There is no doubt that the acceptance of this novel practice of the ordination of women has not been easy. This was found by the next Lambeth Conference in 2000, while patience was recommended, because the acceptance of the practice of the ordination of women is a "long and spiritual process". The need for unity had to be emphasized, but also the confirmation that both sides, the proponents and the opponents of the ordination of women, are equally good faithful Anglicans. For pastoral reasons, a

fairly original solution was adopted, that of the institution of the Provincial Episcopal Visitor, also known as "flying bishop", who ministers in wherever female priests are not accepted. These are assistant bishops who are determined by the bishops.

**Chapter 8 : Panorthodox Synod : EASTERN ORTHODOXY AND INTER-FAITH DIALOGUE IN A SECULAR**

*Primacy in the Church: The Office of Primate and the Authority of Councils (Volume 1) PRIMACY IN THE CHURCH is a careful and critical selection of historical and theological essays, canonical and liturgical articles, as well as contemporary and contextual reflections on what is arguably the most significant and sensitive issue in both inter-Orthodox debate and inter-Christian dialogue—namely.*

Print The Boundaries of the Church: An Orthodox Debate Rev. Emmanuel Clapsis Jesus prayed that his disciples might be one as he and his Father are one John He wished them to be one flock under one shepherd John By participation in the life of Jesus, Christians are reconciled to God and become one in Christ Eph. This unity is so intense that there is in them neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor freeman, male nor female Gal. For St Paul, the followers of Christ constitute his body and thus cannot be divided since it is impossible for Christ to be divided cf. Faithful to biblical and patristic Tradition, Orthodoxy strongly believes that there can only be one Church of God since we know only one Lord, one faith, and one baptism Eph. Church unity leaves room for diversity among local churches but excludes a plurality of rival churches and conflicting denominations. What, then, is the ecclesial reality of those Christian communions and churches, which are not in communion with each other or the Orthodox Church? If the Orthodox Church is indeed the manifestation and embodiment of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church, how do the Orthodox appreciate the ecclesial nature of the other Christian churches? They also claim, after all, to be the embodiment of the same reality. One result of Orthodox ecumenical involvement and daily encounter with people of other Christian churches and denominations is that this question has become urgent. The ecumenical theology of the last hundred years has made serious attempts to explain both the professed unity of the Church of Christ and the actual division among those communities that lay claim to the Christian name. In his articles on "The Church, the Churches and the Catholic Church", Avery Dulles discerns five types of suggested solutions to this ecumenical problem. A second attempt to resolve the ecumenical problem distinguishes between two spheres: This view implies that all Christians are one in Jesus Christ in that they belong to a single pneumatic koinonia as opposed to the institutional church which is the external expression of the Church within the hearts of the believers. A third approach suggests that the true Church is not simply identical with any existing denomination. It posits that the Church comes into existence, momentarily and transiently, when the Holy Spirit actively transforms the local, gathered community through word and sacrament. If one accepts this view, then the Church becomes a series of disconnected happenings. The biblical view, however, regards the Church as a divine human fellowship realized in a real visible community existing continuously in world history. A fourth approach advocates that the true Church should exist in hope and in promise rather than in actual realization. Within history no existing community or combination of communities can claim to be, even momentarily, the Church of Christ, though such communities may well be places where the Church is fully actualized and revealed insofar as they are being continually converted to the gospel of Christ. In my view, premature recourse to the consolation of eschatology may have the effect of actually perpetuating present divisions among Christians; it removes the motivation to struggle against them. Additionally, the unity of the Church must not be understood only eschatologically, but as a present reality, which is to receive its consummation on the Last Day. Finally, a fifth approach suggests that the separation of Christians in their confessional statements and sacramental worship is not ultimately decisive, that the Church is most realized when Christians act together, even across denominational lines, in service towards their fellow men. The adherents of this approach suggest that the best way to promote unity is for Christians to work in solidarity, as though they were in fact members of a single believing community. As they grow together through collaborative efforts, the barriers of suspicion and misunderstanding will melt away. This approach is often accused of emphasizing the horizontal or human dimension at the expense of the vertical or the divine, and of subordinating the truth of dogma to the practicalities of ethics and politics. In my view, however, these constitute the most significant attempts to solve the dilemma of the Church and the churches. Each approach provides a solution connected with a definite ecclesiological stance. The first ecclesiology looks at the Church primarily in terms of its societal or

institutional endowments. The fourth accentuates the provisional and promissory character of everything given in the present life. And the fifth views the Church primarily as a healing or transforming agent in the world. That brings us to the question of how Orthodox theology understands the problem of the oneness of the Church and its apparent divisions. Despite its participation in the ecumenical movement, Orthodoxy has never surrendered its belief that it constitutes the "one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church". This task demands theological reflection: Moreover, is it possible to recognize the validity of the sacraments of those Christian churches, which are not currently in communion with the Orthodox Church? If the response on this issue is affirmative, then the Orthodox Church must enumerate the criteria for such recognition. The tradition of the Orthodox Church on the matter of recognizing the validity of the sacraments of other communities is complicated and imprecise. Yet there are occasions in which the Church has suggested the complete absence of grace in any "schismatic" Christian communities. These extreme and contradictory positions were formulated early in the life of the Christian Church as it confronted a variety of threats against its unity and purity of faith. As early as the 3rd century, Cyprian of Carthage advocated that every schism was a departure from the Church, from that sanctified and holy land where it alone uses the baptismal spring, the waters of salvation. Later, Augustine disagreed; he suggested that the Holy Spirit and the charismata of the Spirit can be found outside the canonical limits of the Church. Depending on the circumstances, the Church has essentially advocated either one of these two positions. Contemporary Orthodox theology has not reflected rigorously on this issue and its implications for relations with other Christian churches. The issue has not, however, been totally neglected nor can it be ignored indefinitely. As theological dialogues progress in their task of overcoming the divisive issues of the past, and as they increase our knowledge and respect for the faith and the piety of other Christian churches and communions, the issue of recognizing the ecclesial reality of other Christian communions will be raised with an increasing degree of urgency. Fr Georges Florovsky, in an article on "The Limits of the Church", [5] discussed the issue of the boundaries of Church and the validity of the sacramental life of those Christian communities which exist "outside" of the canonical limits of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church. He stated that, although Cyprian was right to suggest that the sacraments of the Church are accomplished only in the Church, he defined this "in" hastily and too narrowly. Florovsky suggested that the theology of Augustine on this matter is helpful and therefore should be taken seriously by Orthodox theologians struggling with this problem. When the will and thirst for commonality and unity will finally burst into flame. He considers this concept, rather, to be an exhortation to safeguard the unity of the Church against schisms and heresies; he suggests that it should be studied in its historical context. Thus, the members of these churches who have been baptized and who live a just life may be saved; there may even exist people of God who are or will be saved, although they are not recognized as Christians. This should be done of course wherever possible and should lead into eucharistic communion which presupposes unity in the faith and church structures of the apostolic tradition. His remarks, here, are particularly significant for ecumenism. Towards this goal, he thinks that it would be helpful if the bilateral dialogues develop models of unity for the greater advancement of the Christian Church unity. Metropolitan John Zizioulas of Pergamon believes that Orthodox theology yet lacks a satisfactory solution to the problem of Church limits and of the implications for those individuals and communities who exist outside of these limits. There are saints outside the Orthodox Church. How can we understand that theologically? How can we account for it without saying that the canonical limits of the Church are not important? He further suggests that baptism creates a limit to the Church and that "within this baptismal limit it is conceivable that there may be divisions, but any division within those limits is not the same as the division between the Church and those outside the baptismal limit". But "this break does not mean that one falls outside the realm of the Church". By contrast, soon after the schism the Roman Catholics created their own churches in Orthodox areas by appointing new bishops. Orthodox and Roman Catholic ecclesiology holds that if there are two bishops of the same place only one of them can be bishop of the true Church. This implies that the Church has recognized some form of ecclesiality in those Christian communities outside of its canonical boundaries. These categories are not easily determined: The Holy Spirit dispenses the divine grace only within the body of the Church. A reassessment of Orthodox patristic tradition concerning the work of the Holy Spirit in relation to the boundaries of the

Orthodox Church will be a "further development" of the orthodox fundamental ecclesiological teaching on this issue. They recognize that God is not limited by the canonical boundaries of the Orthodox Church in his work for the salvation of all. Other Christian churches, therefore, and even other religions [21] may embody his saving will to the extent that they share at least something of the nature and functions of the church of God. To qualify as a "church" in the full theological sense of the term, a community must be apostolic in its faith, sacraments and ministry. These criteria may be modified according to the attitudes and the theological sophistication that prevail at particular moments in the life of the Church. For example, on the basis of a more flexible view of apostolic succession, Orthodox and Catholic theologians have recently been taking a more positive attitude towards the ministries and the sacraments of Anglicans and Protestants. The ecumenical movement provides the context in which baptized but separated Christians can meet to examine whether they can love one another and confess the same faith with a view to eucharistic communion. For Orthodox, the eucharist is the expression of the very nature of the Church in its fullness, and what is required for the eucharist is union in love and faith. Without this, it is not possible to speak of eucharistic communion. They have become so conscious of being Orthodox, or Roman Catholic, or Anglican, or Lutheran, that they are all threatened by the ecumenical movement. Finally, contemporary Orthodox theologians seem to agree that, while the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church is the Orthodox Church, this does not mean that other Christian churches and communions are void of ecclesiological significance to the extent that in their lives church structures and aspects of the catholic faith have been preserved. The irenic interpretation of the first type of solution of the ecumenical problem that Dulles suggested has thus been currently adopted by Orthodox theologians.

*Oikonomia* and the churches In the preparatory commission of the Great and Holy Council of the Orthodox Church produced a document on the issue of *oikonomia* in the Orthodox Church. It affirmed that "the Holy Spirit acts upon other Christians in very many ways, depending on their degree of faith and hope. These Christians confess that, through hope, they possess Christ, the common Lord, along with all Christians, because the confession of Christ unites us all, he being our common Lord and the hope of our final salvation. It suggested that the Church may proceed to recognize their validity through economy based on a number of criteria. First, by the degree of closeness shown by them to the faith, doctrine and sacramental grace of the Orthodox Church. Second, by the evaluation of their feelings towards the Orthodox Church. Third, by the zeal, which they have displayed for their incorporation into the body of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church. And finally, by whether these communities have baptized their members in the name of the Holy Trinity. At the same time, however, it emphatically emphasized that the principle of economy can only rightly be applied where dogma is not in jeopardy. The document expressed the desire that the Orthodox Church will apply with liberty and generosity the principle of economy in its relations with other Christian churches Oriental Orthodox, Roman Catholicism and churches of the Reformation when fitting, and until the various Christian churches unite themselves into the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church. Understandably the document did not state the exact nature of those ecclesial communities, which lack apostolic succession. Can the Orthodox exercise economy in regard to the recognition of the validity of the ministry of churches, which lack the fullness of apostolic succession? Does the interruption of the continuity of apostolic succession constitute a matter of doctrinal difference? Despite these, this statement is the first in its kind in the life of the Orthodox Church. From the beginning of its ecumenical involvement, and as early as the first Faith and Order conference at Lausanne in , the Orthodox Church advocated that the principle of economy cannot be applied in the process of recovering the *communio in sacris* of divided Christendom. Upon the publication of this report, five professors from the theological school of the University of Athens [28] submitted a memorandum to the holy synod of the Orthodox Church of Greece and the preparatory commission of the Great and Holy Council of the Orthodox Church. They denounced this document for the destructive and divisive consequences which it would have upon the Orthodox Church if it were adopted as official teaching. In such cases, the Orthodox Church, through the exercise of economy, may recognize the Trinitarian baptism and ministries of other Christian communities, provided that the totality of these communities are in the process of becoming Orthodox in doctrine, faith and life. Generally, they stated, the Orthodox Church cannot move to recognize the ministry and the sacraments of these communities without their prior commitment to the recovery of the unity

of the one Church.

**Chapter 9 : Inter-Faith Dialogue :: World Jewish Congress**

*An interorthodox theological debate, Faith Press, [ISBN ] The Thyateira confession: The faith and prayer of Orthodox Christians, Faith Press, [ISBN ] Succession box.*

Our society is characterized by religious pluralism, i. In order to properly understand this phenomenon from an Orthodox Christian perspective and objectively assess the possibility of their contribution, despite the opposite starting points and the different agendas between religious and secular institutions, it is necessary to briefly refer to the contrast and the successive stages of pre-modernity, modernity and post-modernity. After the Enlightenment, i. The ideal of modernity in the western world was the separation of the Church from the state, and if possible its marginalization in the society at large, its relegation to the private or personal realm, and the declaration of the public realm as secular, in other words free from any religious influence. That is why Christianity was always reserved, if not hostile, to the principles and values of modernity. This is more evident in the Eastern Christian world. Post-modernity is an ambiguous term used to denote first of all a time of transition in history. It is important to underline that post-modernity had its beginnings in the emergence of the social sciences, namely the science that at its earlier stages undermined the authority of religion and their public presence, and contributed to the secularization of society. When, however, the same methodological principles of sociological and historical criticism were finally applied to science itself, including the social sciences, it was discovered that there was no scientific knowledge without a possible alternative or counter knowledge, and in some cases some previously considered uncontested conclusions were to a certain extent also imaginative interpretations of the world. For some, this affirmation was as shocking as the discovery that the earth was not the centre of the universe. This made people aware that their respective modern views of the world could not automatically be assumed to be objective descriptions. Having said all these, it is important to reaffirm what sociologists of knowledge very often point out, i. The rationalistic sterility of modern life, has turned to the quest for something new, something radical, which nevertheless is not always new, but very often old recycled: If today this encounter is possible, and even desirable this is because of the undisputed transition of our culture to a new era, the post-modern era that brought with it the resurgence of religion; and this is undoubtedly both a threat and a hope. It is a threat if the fundamentalists assume uncontrolled power. However, it is a hope if religion is willing, or allowed, to exercise its tremendous potential and power to bring back moral values, and if recreate, and originate new images of what it means to be human in a just, peaceful and sustainable universe. The Orthodox Church since the Synaxis of her Primates had indirectly endorsed this encounter: The principle of a secular state can be preserved; however, it is unacceptable to interpret this principle as a radical marginalization of religion from all spheres of public life. It was there that ecumenical Christianity replaced the negative assessment to modernity by a more positive one. Since then most of the earlier models of evangelization of the whole world, with so many negative effects in history, most notably in the tragic events of the Crusades, [9] were completely abandoned, at least within the ecumenical circles. Locally and globally Christians are engaged with people of other religions and cultures in building societies of love, peace and justice. Plurality is a challenge to the churches and serious commitment to inter-faith dialogue and cross-cultural communication is therefore indispensable. And in its Encyclical declared: The explosions of fundamentalism within religious communities threaten to create the view that fundamentalism belongs to the essence of the phenomenon of religion. A true Christian, following the example of the crucified Lord, sacrifices himself and does not sacrifice others, and for this reason is the most stringent critic of fundamentalism of whatever provenance. Honest interfaith dialogue contributes to the development of mutual trust and to the promotion of peace and reconciliation. And later in the document: Unfortunately, there was no theological foundation of the interfaith dialogue. And the participants of the Council “ except for minor details “ did not listen to the recommendations of 15 Orthodox missiologists, [14] who in their point 4 wrote: It would, therefore, be more theologically sound if the relevant sentence read as follows: According to the biblical Magna Charta Mt 25 , God judges humanity with criteria other than the conventional religious ones. This openness toward the faithful of other religions is also reinforced by the unique Orthodox

anthropology, expressed in such terms as theosis or deification. The human nature is not a closed, autonomous entity, but a dynamic reality, determined in its very existence by its relationship to God. On the contrary, the inter-faith dialogue and co-operation are necessary, exactly because the various religious traditions are different and promote different visions of the reality. After all, this is the ultimate goal of the divine economy, as it is clearly stated in the Christian Bible cf. Looking at the ambivalence of modernity many Christian theologians and activists insist that there must be a criterion to judge what should be saved from the values and achievements of modernity and what should be overcome. On the basis of the old principles of modernity, the present world economic system is increasingly falling back into totalitarian trends. It is for this reason that from all religious quarters we speak of liberation of modernity. In view of the expected breakdown by the U. The people of faith nowadays believe that the values and principles that form part of a common world ethic need not only be publicly declared, they also require an international legal endorsement; they should be more effectively integrated into the work of the UN system and major international legal institutions, even if integrating such values and principles requires significant reforms to leading organs and agencies of the UN. The inter-faith document, Faith, Shared Wisdom, and International Law, produced by the most serious global movement initiated in Asia, with strong Muslim participation, called: And the document goes on: One of the most fervent proponents within the ecumenical movement in the Christian world for such a declaration of human responsibilities is the Russian Orthodox Church. The struggle, however, of Christians and faithful of other religions to promote a Universal Declaration of Human Responsibilities is not just a diplomatic initiative aiming at introducing in the world agenda moral values at the expense of the values of modernity and the democratic achievements of the Enlightenment. It came out of pressure by prophetic and charismatic figures and theological movements for social and ecological justice from a faith perspective. Long before a universal concern political, scientific etc. This interrelatedness is in line with a similar conviction in the ecumenical movement, which for almost half a century had been examining justice and peace as inseparable entities, even at a time when the superpowers during the cold war stubbornly were prioritizing them in differing and opposite ways. They cannot be treated separately anymore. Far-reaching market liberalization, deregulation, and unrestrained privatisation of goods and services are exploiting the whole Creation and dismantling social programs and services and opening up economies across borders to seemingly limitless growth of production. This program critically challenges the well established in society tradition of wealth accumulation as an evil, being the offspring of the deadly sin of greed, placing at the same time first in its agenda the safeguarding of the ecological integrity. Basic principle in the program is the understanding that Poverty, Wealth, and Ecology PWE as the program was called are integrally related. The PWE program engaged in on-going dialogue between religious, economic, and political actors. Needless to say that faithful from all religions must join forces to this end, and not fight one another. Hostility between them is a betrayal of religion. And the battle for achieving a legally established Universal Declaration of Human Responsibilities cannot be won unless it is fought by a united front of people of faith, through an honest inter-faith dialogue. If all religious leaders take actions similar to the ecological initiatives of Patriarch Bartholomew, a new and better world will certainly rise. Both in the Bible and in the Patristic tradition, the conference affirmed, there are elements that present the other religions as human constructions, but there are also other testimonies that while recognizing Christ as the unique saviour of the world and his church as the ark of salvation, they accept the saving presence of God beyond the boundaries of the Church. From a theological perspective, and especially within the frame of the Orthodox tradition, it was argued that a synthesis of the two positions is possible; after all they constitute equally substantial elements of our Christian faith. For this reason any Orthodox formulation of a theology of religions should be based on the catholicity of the Christian tradition and not on selective elements that in most cases reflect personal phobias and ideological conservative or liberal perceptions. The Challenge of Orthodoxy, Akritas: Athens ; and Unity and Witness, Epikentro Publishing: Thessaloniki both in Greek. Boston ; and Jacob Neusner ed. The Historical Imagination in 19th c. The enduring dream of modernity should not be minimized or dismissed out of hand, and the many achievements it has realized, such as a concern for universal human rights, a concern for justice and equality, all deserve commendation and praise from religions. Politics is the theory of an on-going exercise of power, of coercion that includes legitimized

violence. Politics also addresses religious issues and makes religious statements. But on the other hand, religions very often take up political stance and engage in political action. People expect from religions not only private views, but also final solutions to shared problems. This expectation means that they anticipate from them some sort of acts of power, not only affirmations of conscience. After all, almost all religions integrate the private and the public. Sociologically speaking religion produces political consequences, shaping attitudes and ideas that make an impact on issues of public policy. Obviously, this happens because it comprises what people do together, not just what they believe in the privacy of their hearts. In other words religions functions socially. What I mean is that all churches on the institutional level are coping in one way or the other with the questions of many contexts, many religions, many cultures and systems of values – what we call pluralism or the effects of globalization. Geneva , , is an attempt to correctly interpret the classical missionary terminology. A comprehensive presentation of the present state of the debate in J. In Greek see in printed form Ioannis Lotsios ed. In a shorter version see in <https://www.wcc-coe.org/en/what-we-do/our-work/interfaith-dialogue-and-cooperation>: In this gathering, again in Chicago, the person who gave the keynote addresses, and prepared the famous document: *Towards a Global Ethic: Economy of Life, Justice, and Peace for All: A Call for Action*. Hinkelammert, *Transcending Greeding Money*. Also by the same authors, *Property for People, Not for Profit: Alternatives to the Global Tyranny of Capital*, From this perspective, he said, the WCC, other faith-based organizations and a broad coalition of non-governmental organizations are calling on the HRC to establish a Special Rapporteur on human rights and climate change. Also available electronically at academia.