



FROM THE FATHERS

“IT IS AFTER the dignity of adoption [Baptism] that the devil plots more vehemently against us, pining away with envious glance, when he beholds the beauty of the new-born man, earnestly tending towards that heavenly city from which he fell; and he raises up against us fiery temptations, seeking earnestly to despoil us of that second adornment, as he did of our former array. But when we are aware of his attacks, we ought to repeat to ourselves the Apostolic words, *As many of us as were baptized into Christ were baptized into His death* (Rom. 6:3). Now if we have been conformed to His death, sin henceforth in us is surely a corpse, pierced through by the javelin of Baptism, as that fornicator was thrust through by the zealous Phineas (see Num. 25:7-8). Flee therefore from us, ill-omened one! for it is a corpse thou seekest to despoil, one long ago joined to thee, one who long since lost his senses for pleasures. A corpse is not enamoured of bodies, a corpse is not captivated by wealth, a corpse slanders not, a corpse lies not, snatches not at what is not its own, reviles not those who encounter it. My way of life is regulated for another life. I have learnt to despise the things that are in the world, to pass by the things of earth, to hasten to the things of Heaven, even as Paul expressly testifies, that the world is crucified to him, and he to the world (Gal 6:14). These are the words of a soul truly regenerated; these are the utterances of the newly-baptized man, who remembers his own profession, which he made to God when the mysterion was administered to him, promising that he would despise, for the sake of love towards Him, all torment and all pleasure alike.”

SAINT GREGORY OF NYSSA, + C. 395 A.D.

Ecumenism and “Baptismal Theology”

The Protestant “Branch Theory” of the Church in a New Form

Source: *Orthodox Tradition*, Vol. XVII, No. 1 (2000), pp. 2-11.

IN A PREVIOUS ISSUE of the periodical *Orthodoxos Enstasis kai Martyria* (Nos. 22-23 [January-June 1991], pp. 266-267), in exposing what occurred at the Seventh General Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Canberra, we made reference to the presentation by Metropolitan John of Pergamon [who belongs to the Holy Synod of the Œcumenical Patriarchate—*Translators*]; characterizing it as “mediocre, poor, timorous, and in many ways unclear,” we concluded our observations as follows: “Having some years ago branded the Immaculate Bride of Christ, the Holy Orthodox Church, as ‘*narcissistic*,’ referring to ‘the Church of Christ *in her totality*’ and ‘no longer [to] Orthodoxy *alone*,’¹ Metropolitan John thereby sinned very gravely and ‘grieved’ the Holy Spirit. Naturally, as a result of this, he is incapable of giving an Orthodox witness.”

But the views of Metropolitan John concerning an “inclusive” ecclesiology and a “Church” broader than the boundaries of the Orthodox Church are certainly nothing new to him.

On February 13, 1985, while he was still a layman, he addressed a joint audience of Orthodox and Anglicans at St. Basil’s House, in London, on the subject of Orthodox ecclesiology and the ecumenical movement.²

We will neither analyze this speech nor recount it in detail. A brief citation therefrom is sufficient, for now, to demonstrate that His Eminence is truly a “veteran ecumenist,” a stranger to Patristic Orthodoxy.

The speaker examines the extent to which participation by the Orthodox Church in the ecumenical movement is consistent with Her ecclesiology, and concludes: “And yet, in spite of what some very conservative Orthodox would say, I think that the Orthodox Church cannot

drop out of the ecumenical movement *without betraying its own fundamental ecclesiological principles*”!

The speaker makes reference to the “boundaries” of the Church and confronts the “dilemma” of choosing between the rigid ecclesiology of St. Cyprian of Carthage (the Holy Spirit is present only within the bounds of a canonical community—the Orthodox Catholic Church) and the different—and more novel—ecclesiology of St. Augustine (the gifts of the Holy Spirit and the Holy Mysteries exist also outside the Church).

Indeed, Metropolitan John appears to accept the [subsequently disavowed] opinion of Protopresbyter Georges Florovsky, that “*there are saints outside the Orthodox Church*” and that the canonical boundaries of the Church “*are important, but at the same time, are not absolute.*”³

And in finding a “balance” in understanding these “boundaries” as not constituting impediments or divisions between the Church and the rest of the world—and, in particular, the heterodox—, Metropolitan John proposes a theology of “baptismal unity.”

What does “baptismal theology” confess? - “Baptism does create a limit to the Church.” Baptism, Orthodox or otherwise, delimits the “Church,” which includes Orthodox and heterodox. There exist “baptismal limits in the Church,” and “outside baptism there is no Church.” On the contrary, “within baptism, even if there is a break, a division, a schism, you can still speak of the Church.”

On this point, Metropolitan John, desiring heretics to be within the Church, shows himself to be more daring than Father Florovsky, who wrote: “Perhaps we should not say that schismatics are still within the Church; in any case, such an expression would not be precise and would sound ambiguous.”⁴ [The Greek translation, here, does not precisely render, in secondary translation, the original English text (see note 3), which reads: “It may not follow, perhaps, that we should say that schismatics are still in the Church. In any case, this would not be precise and sounds equivocal” — *Translators.*]

According to “baptismal theology,” heresy, as a falling-away from the catholicity of the Faith handed down by the Apostles, is simply

and solely “a break in communion,” which “does not mean that one falls outside the realm of the Church.”

In the past, this “state of division” between Orthodox and heretics or schismatics, between “baptized Christians,” occurred “because of a lack of love which is now, thank God, disappearing”!

* * *

The “baptismal theology” of the Metropolitan of Pergamon—how far, we wonder, is this from the “branch theory” of the Church?—literally overturns Orthodox Patristic ecclesiology: it greatly pleases the heterodox, because it recognizes their non-existent baptism and, at the same time, confirms them in their heresies, since it regards these as a matter of simple division arising from a lack of love.

However, the reception of heretics by œconomy and without Baptism never betokened acceptance by the Orthodox of heterodox baptism. As long as the correct form is maintained in a baptism performed outside the Orthodox Catholic Church, *and as long as heretics come in repentance to the One, True Church*, She “perfects and vivifies” the “ineffectual and invalid” mysteries that were “not inculpably performed” outside Her, and “frees them from every deficiency and culpability through the bestowal of Chrismation and the gifts of the Spirit that are imparted thereby.”⁵

There is, therefore, a “correction” when heretics return to the Church, and it is presupposed that those who return have “preserved the form and substance of Baptism indistinguishably from that of the Orthodox and were Baptized according to the formula of the Catholic Church,”⁶ if, we emphasize again, œconomy is to be applied.

Metropolitan John obviously does not speak in the manner of the Fathers. The Saints of the Church instruct us in a different way. The question is: Do heretics have Baptism, the Eucharist, and Priesthood? For these three Mysteries cannot be thought of separately, and certainly not outside a correct ecclesiological context.

Since, in the case of schismatics and heretics, we have a break in love, unity, and catholicity, and consequently a “departure” from the “ob-

servable limits of the Church,” outside which Divine Grace cannot generate “living flames,” how is it possible for us to talk about Mysteries and Saints outside the Church?

If it is the Great High Priest Who celebrates the Mysteries in the Church, is it possible for the Same to celebrate the mysteries of those who have fallen away from love, unity, and Catholicity?

It is, assuredly, impossible for us to speak about salvation through the mysteries of heretics, thereby violating a basic ecclesiological principle: that *salvation is accomplished within the context of communion in Christ*, that is, within the Body of the Church as a charismatic and therapeutic organism, in which the Head—Christ—finds fullness in the entire Body and the entire Body finds fullness in the Head: “The fullness of Christ is the Church. And rightly, for the complement of the head is the body, and the complement of the body is the head.”⁷

If the isolation of some member of any organism whatever spells doom for that member, how can we speak about the Church if, in the end, one does not experience, either as an individual or as a community, this unique life of the Theanthropic Body, with its complementary relationship of Head and Body?⁸

Let it be clearly established that “Grace in truth acts, but is not salvific outside catholicity”;⁹ though it acts, it does so not by effecting Mysteries and producing Saints, but by mystically prompting those outside the Church to repent and return to the Truth and catholicity of the One Church.

In conclusion, there really is an indisputable “boundary” whereby the “definitive contour” of the Body of the Church is delineated and which reveals the “ultimate limits” of the Church: *the correctness of Faith, of which the Mysteries are an expression.*

The Holy Hieromartyr Hippolytos of Rome is quite clear in stating that “the Apostles, having received the Holy Spirit bequeathed to the Church, have transmitted Him to those who rightly believe.”¹⁰ The Holy Spirit “was bequeathed” to the Apostolic Church at Pentecost, and since then “has been transmitted to those who rightly believe.”

Let us see in brief what the Holy Tradition of the Orthodox has to say:

- Heretics are “*alien to God*.”¹¹
- “Those who have been baptized or ordained by such (heretics) *can be* neither members of the Faithful *nor* of the clergy.”¹²
- “Heretics do not have Priesthood, and so the rites performed by them are *profane and devoid of sanctifying Grace*.”¹³
- “Quite simply, the baptisms of all heretics are *impious and blasphemous* and have nothing in common with the Baptisms of the Orthodox.”¹⁴
- If, in general, “those supremely Divine Names (‘Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit’ [Matt. 28:19]—*Author’s note*) are *idle and inefficacious* when uttered by the mouths of heretics,”¹⁵ how much more are they “idle and inefficacious” for the polyonymous heretics of the West, who have “*distorted, or rather, totally corrupted the Tradition*” and theology “regarding Baptism”?¹⁶
- The Saints of our Church reject the baptism of heretics, since “consecrating Grace has left them”; they characterize it as “completely useless and vain”; they consider it, rather, a “drowning,” because heretics “*have baptism, but not illumination*.”¹⁷
- In the *Constitutions of the Apostles* the following strict commandment is given:
 ‘Be ye likewise contented with one Baptism alone, that which is into the death of the Lord; *not that which is conferred by wicked heretics*, but that which is conferred by blameless priests, “in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit”; *and let not that which comes from the ungodly be received by you, ’for those that receive polluted baptism from the ungodly will become partners in their opinions. Indeed, they are not Priests’; ’nor are those that are baptized by them initiated, but are polluted, not receiving the remission of sins, but the bond of impiety.*’¹⁸
- At the Seventh Œcumenical Synod, “John, the Right Rev’d Legate of the Apostolic Throne of the East, said: ‘Heresy separates every man from the Church.’ The Holy Synod declared: ‘This is abundantly clear.’”¹⁹
- St Theodore the Studite, writing about a heretical bishop, says that “it is impossible for those whom he ordains to be truly ministers of God.”²⁰

Metropolitan John of Pergamon stands condemned and guilty of accepting the baptism of heretics, for “not making a distinction between true and false Priests,”²¹ and for failing to apply the Patristic injunction that: “Heretics should be reprovved and admonished by Bishops and Presbyters, in the hope that they might understand and return from their error.”²²

This “veteran ecumenist,” Metropolitan John, is a classic example of an Orthodox Christian whose ecclesiology has been corrupted by his participation in the so-called ecumenical movement and who has, for this reason, forgotten that heresy means “*a cessation of communion with the Church and is alien to the Heavens*,”²³ that “*heresy is hateful to God*,”²⁴ and that it entails “*the ultimate fall of the soul*.”²⁵

When, then, does one betray the “fundamental ecclesiological principles” of the Orthodox Church? The case of Metropolitan John of Pergamon demonstrates incontrovertibly that this comes about by way of active participation in the ecumenical movement, despite what the fallen Metropolitan says to the contrary.

Metropolitan John of Pergamon far exceeds the heretical Anglicans in dogmatic syncretism and minimalism, since they, on the basis of the “Lambeth Quadrilateral” (1888), restrict the “essential signs of the Church” to four *Vestigia Ecclesiae*: Holy Scripture, the Symbol of Faith, Baptism and the Eucharist, and the Episcopacy^{25a}, while he reduces them to one, and only one: Baptism!

* * *

In the meantime, the doctrines of so-called “baptismal unity” and “baptismal theology” are gaining ground and have become officially accepted by the World Council of Churches (WCC).

I. The “Final Assembly Report” at Canberra asserts that “as members of the body of Christ, *we are already united by our common baptism*, and the Holy Spirit is leading us to a communion founded on the life of the Holy Trinity.”²⁶

II. In addition, the Anglican Primate, Archbishop George Carey of Canterbury, during...[an]...official visit to the headquarters of the WCC in Geneva (June 2-3, 1992), said in his address, there, that “the theology

of baptism is what unites us” and that “in our search for visible unity we have taken too little from that common baptism in which we all share.” The Anglican Primate then continued: “It is my strong conviction that, as churches, we still have to face up to the implications of baptismal theology. If we believe that baptism in the name of the Trinity unites us with God himself and makes us members of his family, what does this mean for the churches separated eucharistically?”²⁷

III. It is also well known that Roman Catholics have fully accepted the doctrines of St. Augustine concerning the validity of mysteries performed outside the Church, doctrines which were subsequently developed by Scholastic theology.

The Papists teach that those in heresy who have been baptized by heretics according to the correct formula have received the Baptism of the true Church, in line with the decision of the Council of Trent, which decrees: “*Baptismum ab hæreticis datum cum intentione faciendi quod facit Ecclesia, esse verum Baptismum*” (“A Baptism which is administered by heretics, with the intention of doing what the Church does, is a true Baptism”) (First Period of the Council, Session VII, Canon 13).²⁸

However, these doctrines of St. Augustine, and subsequently those of the Papists, “place excessive emphasis on the external form of the mystery at the expense of the right Faith that endows it with life, of which this form must always be the practical expression, and run the risk of lending *a kind of magical efficacy* to the formal celebration of the mystery,”²⁹ and for this reason, “the sacramental theology of St. Augustine was not adopted either by the Eastern Church in antiquity or by Byzantine theology.”³⁰

Indeed, St. Athanasios the Great is very clear on this subject, for he regards right Faith as a *sine qua non* for the performance of a genuine and salvific Mystery:

On this account, therefore, the Saviour also did not simply command to Baptize, but first says, ‘Teach’; then thus: ‘Baptize in the Name of Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit’; that the right faith might follow upon learning, and together with faith might come the consecration of Baptism. There are many other heresies too, which use the names only,

but not in a right sense, as I have said, nor with sound faith, and in consequence the water which they administer is unprofitable, as deficient in piety, so that he who is sprinkled by them is rather polluted by irreligion than redeemed.³¹

* * *

The indirect exhortation by the General Secretary of the WCC, that the Orthodox “*take the risk of being more deeply influenced by the ecumenical encounter,*”³² finds a full response in Metropolitan John of Pergamon, even though the basic preconditions for the participation of the Orthodox Church in ecumenical dialogue are always violated by the ecumenists.

What are these preconditions?³³ On the one hand, that the content of the Orthodox Faith be made known to the heterodox, that they might be aided in the discovery of their own identity; and, on the other hand, that the self-identity of Orthodoxy should be preserved. Rather, the opposite occurs: our Church comes to as much harm as the heterodox, who are supposedly searching for the genuine Apostolic Faith.

It is all too obvious that the self-identity of Orthodoxy is corrupted by so-called “baptismal theology,” which is generally accepted by Orthodox ecumenists as a natural consequence of their “being more deeply influenced” by “the ecumenical encounter.”

Indeed, the depth of this “influence” is so great that another “veteran ecumenist,” who also departs from Patristic theology, declares:

The Church is one and unique and united before the Triune God, *in Whose name all her members are baptized, thus attaining their justification, independently of which Confession they belong to, united with Christ and with each other in one body, which cannot be divided into a plurality of bodies!*³⁴

The fall goes on: *The division that now exists between churches derives from external and earthly factors and not from internal and heavenly ones; it derives from human beings, from their imperfections and sins. It diminishes as we ascend higher and practically disappears in the sight of God, from Whom, conversely, derives the internal mystical unity*

of the Church!³⁴

And to cap it all: *‘All of us Christians are sacramentally and ineffably united with Christ and with each other through the sacramental Grace of Holy Baptism,’ ‘and subsequently through the communion of the Divine Eucharist’!*^{34A}

Such is the significance of “baptismal theology” for ecumenists, that the anti-Orthodox patriarchal Encyclical of 1920 takes it as one of its presuppositions:

For this reason the Œcumenical Patriarchate did not hesitate to address its famous proclamation of 1920 ‘to the Churches of Christ everywhere,’ *characterizing the Christian confessions as ‘Churches,’* and emphasizing ‘that it is above all imperative that love between the Churches be rekindled and strengthened, *and that they not regard each other as foreign or distant, but as kith and kin in Christ, as fellow-heirs and of the same body, [and partakers of] the promise of God in Christ’* (cf. Ephesians 3:6).³⁵

Unfortunately this Encyclical, which the ecumenists never cease to praise as a bedrock and the “Founding Charter” of the so-called ecumenical movement, is reckoned a “Dogmatic and Credal Monument of the Orthodox Catholic Church”! *What a downfall!*

Footnotes

1. *Ekklesia* [in Greek], No. 7 (May 1, 1988), p. 267a. Metropolitan John spoke thusly as the speaker of the day appointed by the Holy Synod (of the Œcumenical Patriarchate) at Vespers in the Stavrodromion Church of the Entry of the Theotokos (in Constantinople), on the occasion of the celebration of the millennium of the Christianization of Russia, February 27, 1988, in the presence of Œcumenical Patriarch Demetrios, the Synod of Metropolitans of the Œcumenical Throne, pan-Orthodox representatives, a delegation from the Holy Mountain, and official representatives from the entire spectrum of the heterodox. • How could the Athonites have tolerated this blasphemy? “*Silence is, indeed, in part assent*” (St. Theodore the Studite, *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XCIX, col. 1121A). • See, in this regard, Professor Andreas Theodorou, “Narcissism or Love of Orthodoxy?” [in Greek], *Orthodoxos Enstasis kai Martyria*, Nos. 24-25 (July-December 1991), pp. 319ff.

2. “Orthodox Ecclesiology and the Ecumenical Movement,” *Sourozh*, No. 21 (August 1985), pp. 16-27. • For a fuller grasp of this talk by the Metropolitan of Pergamon, we should add by way of clarification that St. Basil’s House is the centre of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, which was founded in 1928 by Russian Orthodox and Anglicans; it has proved to be “an important unofficial forum for relations between Orthodox and Western Christians” and has had

wide influence on ecumenical activities. By means of this inter-confessional fellowship, a climate of “mutual trust” has been fostered, while “a spirit of true friendship and respect has been *the fruit of the Eucharistic union* which the members of the Fellowship discovered”! (See N. Zernov, *The Russians and Their Church* [in Greek] [Athens: Astir Publications, 1972], pp. 193-194. Also see *The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate*, No. 2 [1984], p. 65: “The Ecumenical Movement and the Russian Orthodox Church Before She Joined the W.C.C.”)

3. These paradoxical ideas of Father Georges Florovsky are developed in his article, “The Limits of the Church,” in [Protopresbyter] Georges Florovsky, *The Body of the Living Christ: An Orthodox Interpretation of the Church* [in Greek], trans. J.K. Papadopoulos, 2nd ed., in *Theological Essays*, Vol. III (Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1981), pp. 129-148. The article was...[originally written in English and]...published in Russian...and French, and the [Greek] translation was made from the French version, entitled “Les limites de l’Église,” which appeared in the *Messenger of the Exarchate of the Russian Patriarchate in Western Europe*, Vol. X, No. 37 (1961), pp. 28-40. [Let us note, here, that Father Florovsky offered his comments in this inchoate and rather incoherent article, written very early on in his career (1933), in a heuristic spirit. Its subsequent reprinting in a number of different publications was, in fact, a cause of concern for him later in life. After serving in the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad in Serbia, where he was awarded the gold pectoral Cross and where he embraced a more cautious and conservative ecclesiology, he went on, as one of the founders of the World Council of Churches, to argue rather vociferously for the primacy of the Orthodox Church and to insist that Her ecumenical witness be clearly defined in terms of Her sole claim to the legacy of the Apostolic Church. Not only did he write ensuing articles that expressed this far different and more conservative ecclesiology, but he publicly expressed his regrets about his earlier views, drawn from the doctrines of St. Augustine, as well as about the general course of the ecumenical movement, at a Patristic symposium at Princeton University in 1975. His original English article on the limits of the Church appeared in *The Church Quarterly Review*, Vol. CXVII, No. 233, pp. 117-131. Readers should consult Constantine Cavarnos, *Father Georges Florovsky on Ecumenism* (Etna, CA: Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 1996), for a clearer understanding of Father Georges’ overall understanding of the rôle of the Orthodox Church in the ecumenical movement (see “Publications” at the end of this issue)—*Translators.*]

4. Florovsky, *The Body of the Living Christ*, op. cit., p. 144.

5. P.N. Trembelas, *Dogmatic Theology of the Orthodox Catholic Church* [in Greek], Vol. III [Athens: 1961], p. 56.

6. St. Nicodemos the Hagiorite, *The Rudder* [in Greek], p. 54.

7. St. John Chrysostomos, *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. LXII, col. 26 (*Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians*, Homily 3, § 6).

8. Cf. N.A. Matsoukas, *Dogmatic and Credal Theology* [in Greek], Vol. II (Thessaloniki: P. Pournaras Publications, 1985), p. 428. Worthy of study with regard to the subject under discussion are pp. 425-428.

9. Florovsky, *The Body of the Living Christ*, op. cit., p. 145.

10. St. Hippolytos, *Bibliothēke ton Ellenon Pateron kai Ekklesiastikon Syngrapheon*, Vol. V, p. 199, ll. 15-17 (*Refutation of All Heresies*, Book I, Prologue).

11. Canon XXXIV of the Council of Laodicæa.

12. Canon LXVIII of the Holy Apostles.

13. St. Nicodemos the Hagiorite, *The Rudder*, p. 91.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 305. 15. *Ibid.*, p. 56. 16. *Ibid.*, p. 589.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 52, note on Canon XLVI of the Holy Apostles, with references to St. Basil

the Great, St. Athanasios the Great, St. Gregory the Theologian, St. John Chrysostomos, St. Leo, and St. Ambrose.

18. *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. I, col. 948AB (Book VI, ch. 15: “That we ought not to re-Baptize or to receive that baptism which is given by the ungodly, which is not Baptism but a pollution”).

19. *SMPS*, Vol. II, p. 733a (First Session).

20. St. Theodore the Studite, *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XCIX, col. 1057A (*Epistle I.40*: “To Navkratios, His Spiritual Child”).

21. Canon XLVII of the Holy Apostles.

22. St. Nicodemus the Hagiorite, *The Rudder*, p. 51.

23. St. Athanasios the Great, *Patr. Græca*, Vol. XXV, col. 689A (*Epistle to Serapion*); *Bibliothèque ton Ellenon Pateron kai Ekklesiastikon Syngrapheon*, Vol. XXXIII, p. 178, ll. 38-39.

24. St. Athanasios the Great, *Bibliothèque ton Ellenon Pateron kai Ekklesiastikon Syngrapheon*, Vol. XXXI, p. 241, l. 22 (*Epistle to Monks*). • Concerning the “heresiology” of St. Athanasios, see the marvellous article by Barbara Kalogeropoulou-Metallinos, “Heresy and How to Deal with It on the Basis of the *Discourses Against the Arians* by St. Athanasios the Great” [in Greek], *Koinonia*, Vol. XXX, No. 2 (April-June 1987), pp. 183-208. • Also very illuminating with regard to the Baptism of heretics is the work by Protopresbyter George D. Metallinos, “*I Confess One Baptism...*”: *An Interpretation and Application of the Seventh Canon of the Second Œcumenical Synod by the Kollyvades and Constantine Oikonomos (Contribution to the Historico-Canonical Evaluation of the Problem of the Validity of Western Baptism)* [in Greek] (Athens: 1983). The *Kollyvades* to whom the work refers are Neophytos Kavsokalyvites, St. Nicodemus the Hagiorite, and Athanasios Parios.

25. St. Gregory of Nyssa, *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XLIV, col. 504A (*On the Titles of the Psalms*, Book II, ch. 5).

25a. See P.N. Trembelas, *Semi-Official Documents on the Ecumenical Movement and Theological Dialogues* (Athens: *Ho Soter* Publications, 1972), p. 30.

26. “Final Report,” in *The Seventh General Assembly of the World Council of Churches, Canberra, February 1991: Chronicle, Texts, Remarks* [in Greek], ed. George N. Laimopoulos (Katerine: Tertios Publications, 1992), p. 136.

27. *Ecumenical Press Service*, No. 16 (92.06.04): “Anglican Leader Visits WCC, Meets Leaders of Ecumenical Bodies” [*emphasis ours*]. See also *Enemerosis*, 8-1992/6, pp. 3-4. Archbishop George Carey of Canterbury was accompanied, apart from others, by his wife, Lady Carey.

28. Trembelas, *Dogmatic Theology, op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 333, n. 54. The Papist Council of Trent (Tyrol, Northern Italy, 1545-1563) is regarded by the Latins as the Nineteenth Œcumenical Synod and was anti-Protestant in nature.

29. Trembelas, *Dogmatic Theology, op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 48, n. 42 [*emphasis ours*].

30. Florovsky, *The Body of the Living Christ, op. cit.*, p. 145.

31. St. Athanasios the Great, *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XXVI, col. 237B (*Second Discourse Against the Arians*, §§ 42-43).

32. *Episkepsis*, No. 332 (March 15, 1985) p. 9 [in Greek] [*emphasis ours*]. Cf. *Ho Soter*, No. 1140 (April 24, 1985), p. 249 [in Greek]: “Where is the WCC Going to Lead Us?” • This concerns statements by the then new General Secretary of the WCC, Dr. Emilio Castro, in the newspaper *The Orthodox Church*, in the USA. The General Secretary, among other things, said the following: “*In the framework of the WCC, the Orthodox Churches must be recognized as one of the main branches of the Christian Church as a whole. It is true that they represent a family, a spiritual outlook, and a separate set of teachings.*” He put forward similar views during his visit to

the Church of Greece (February 1, 1985). Are the views of Pastor Castro indeed very far removed from those of Metropolitan John?

33. See Apostolos B. Nicolaidis, *Interpretations and Misinterpretations in the Realm of Theology: Credal Theology and its Apologetic Aspects* [in Greek] (Athens: 1990), pp. 234-238.

34. John N. Karmiris, *Dogmatic Theology*, Part V, "Orthodox Ecclesiology" [in Greek] (Athens: 1973), pp. 241, 242, 243 [*emphasis ours*].

35. *Ibid.*, p. 243 (note) [*emphasis ours*]. • In a detailed study, Professor Basil N. Giannopoulos endeavours to provide a foundation for these erroneous views of John Karmiris by appealing to the Seventh Œcumenical Synod, in an attempt, indeed, to refute what Father George Metallinos correctly put forth in his aforementioned work, "*I Confess One Baptism....*" (See B.N. Giannopoulos, "The Reception of Heretics According to the Seventh Œcumenical Synod: 'How Those Coming from Heresies Are To Be Received,'" *Theologia*, No. 3 [July-September 1988], pp. 530-579). Basil Giannopoulos' conclusions, especially regarding the Ordination of heretics (see especially pp. 574ff. and footnotes 85 & 76), demonstrate confusion and an inability to understand the prism through which the Holy Synod examined the whole issue. It is truly a very distressing phenomenon that academic theology should attempt, in a variety of ways, to present the Seventh Holy Œcumenical Synod as concurring with its errors, to say nothing of "baptismal theology."



BOOK REVIEW

SAINT GERMANUS OF AUXERRE
BY HOWARD HUWS,

PUBLISHED BY ORTHODOX LOGOS PUBLISHING, 2012;
ISBN 978-90-811555-8-8

THIS book should be a welcome addition to any Orthodox library, especially for those of us who live in the British Isles. It is published in soft back and comprises 280 pages, divided between eight principal chapters, with an extensive bibliography, a time line and an appendix. The heart of the book is a Life of Saint Germanus, who, though a Bishop in Gaul, visited Britain to counter the spread of the Pelagian heresy here, and is thus one of the saints to whom we are greatly indebted. This life is written in a refreshingly lucid and lively style, and avoids the somewhat turgid 'eclesiasticalese' of so many religious works. It is followed by a history of the "Life," an important chapter explaining Pelagianism in simple terms, another on the Saints connected with St Germanus and one

on the locations associated in some way with him. At the end of each chapter there are copious notes, carefully sourcing the statements made. Mr. Huws has not shunned respectful criticism of some of the “traditions” concerning the saint which have accrued over the generations, but this has been done in a way to establish the truth, rather than crudely to demythologize. We have some quibbles, though minor ones. First: a notice that the rather fine icon on the cover was “written” rather than painted. This silly usage seems to derive from poor translations from the Russian *ikonopisanie*, itself a translation of the Greek *eikonografia*, and to have been given a “theological” spin by the Neo-Orthodox. If adopted generally, we would have to say that all our depictions, all our graphics, even Caravaggio’s *Judith Beheading Holofernes*, were “written”! Second: the presentation is somewhat spoiled by a few minor typographical mistakes, but it appears that the book was published in the Netherlands, and so perhaps these were missed by people whose first language is not English. Third: especially in the chapter dealing with the places associated with St Germanus, many of which are in Wales - something for which the Welsh can be justly proud - the present reader would have found it helpful if a phonetic transliteration of these names had been given, knowing that the values of the letters in the alphabet as used by the Welsh differs markedly from Anglophone usage. These quibbles aside, this is a valuable book, obviously a work of scholarship and of love, and we hope soon to be able to have it available on our church bookstall.

A.A.



“FROM the days of John the Baptist the Kingdom of heaven suffers violence and the violence take possession of it; for he who has imposed repentance upon sinners, what has he done but taught them to do violence to the Kingdom of heaven?”

SAINT GREGORY THE GREAT, POPE OF ROME, + 603 A.D.

The Coming Month

THE GREAT FEAST of the **Theophany, the Baptism of Christ**, is the principal celebration in January. It falls on the sixth of the month and is kept with a four-day pre-festival, the last day of which is kept as a fast day, - the first since Christmas Day. The second day of the feast is observed as the Synaxis of St John the Baptist, and the feast itself is kept until the fourteenth of the month. This year the feast itself falls on a Saturday, and so St John's Synaxis will coincide with the Sunday after the feast, on which special Apostle and Gospel readings are appointed.

In the early Church, this feast celebrated a wider spectrum of events in the earthly life of our Saviour, which were manifestations of Him as God - Theophanies. First the coming of the Wise Men, by which He was revealed to the people of the nations, the Gentiles; then the Baptism in the Jordan; the Miracle of the changing of the water into wine at the wedding in Cana of Galilee, and, in the African Church, the feeding of the Five Thousand - events which revealed our Saviour's Divine power and pointed to the Mysterion of the Eucharist. Christians of the Western denominations now see this as a feast of the Adoration of the Wise Men (Epiphany), whereas the Orthodox include that in the Nativity feast, and concentrate on the Baptism of Christ, which is both a revelation of the Mystery of the Most Holy Trinity and the inauguration of our own Baptism, through which we are given the possibility of becoming gods by Grace. The dismissal hymn (*troparion*) of the feast is chanted in tone one:

*When Thou wast baptized in the Jordan, O Lord,
the worship of the Trinity was made manifest;
for the voice of the Father bare witness to Thee,
calling Thee His beloved Son.*

*And the Spirit in the form of a dove
confirmed the certainty of the word.*

*O Christ our God, Who hast appeared and hast enlightened the world,
glory be to Thee.*

And during the Vigil of the feast we chant:

*Today the Creator of heaven and earth
cometh in the flesh unto the Jordan,
and He Who is sinless asketh for Baptism,
that He may cleanse the world from the error of the enemy.*

*The Master of all is baptized by a servant,
and granteth the race of man cleansing through water.*

Unto Him let us cry:

O our God, Who hast appeared, glory be to Thee.

During the services of the feast we often hear the prophetic psalmic verses: The sea beheld and fled, Jordan turned back (Ps. 113:3) and What aileth thee, O sea, that thou fleddest? And thou Jordan that thou didst turn back?" (Ps. 113:5). These verses, of course refer back to the crossing of the Red Sea by the Children of Israel (Ex. 14:10-31), and their crossing of the Jordan as they entered the Promised Land (Jos. 3:14-17), but they also prophesy the present feast and our passing over as the New Children of Israel into the Promised Land. Even today, by the mercies of God and as a sign of His blessing, when the Patriarch and clergy bless the waters of the River Jordan on this festival, the waters are seen miraculously to turn back, an event which has now been recorded many times on camera and posted on You-Tube.

In January we celebrate many of **the greatest of the monastic fathers** (see calendar insert). After His Baptism, our Saviour went into the wilderness and fasted for forty days before beginning His ministry, and by celebrating the monastic fathers in January, immediately after the Theophany, it is as if the Church were reminding us of the importance of asceticism.

The **Holy Apostle Timothy** (22nd January / 4th March) was from the Lycaonian city of Lystra in Asia Minor. He is known to Christians throughout the world because two epistles sent to him by St Paul are included in the New Testament. When the Apostles Paul and Barnabas first visited the cities of Lycaonia in the year 52, St Paul healed one

crippled from birth. Many of the inhabitants of Lystra then believed in Christ, and among them was the future St Timothy, his mother Eunice and grandmother Lois (Acts 14:6-12; 2 Tim. 1:5). The seed of faith, planted in St Timothy's soul by the Apostle Paul, brought forth abundant fruit. He became St Paul's disciple, and later his constant companion and co-worker in the preaching of the Gospel. The Apostle Paul loved St Timothy and in his Epistles called him his beloved son, remembering his devotion and fidelity with gratitude. He wrote to Timothy: "You have followed my teaching, way of life, purpose, faith, long-suffering, love, and patience" (2 Tim. 3:10-11). The Apostle Paul appointed St Timothy as Bishop of Ephesus, where the saint remained for fifteen years. Finally, when St Paul was in prison and awaiting martyrdom, he summoned his faithful friend, St Timothy, for a last farewell (2 Tim. 4:9). St Timothy ended his life as a martyr. The pagans of Ephesus celebrated a festival in honour of their idols, and used to carry them through the city, accompanied by impious ceremonies and songs. The Apostle, zealous for the glory of God, attempted to halt the procession and reason with the spiritually blind idol-worshipping people, by preaching the true faith in Christ. The pagans angrily fell upon him, beat him, dragged him along the ground, and finally stoned him. St Timothy's martyrdom occurred in A.D. 93. In the fourth century, during the reign of the Emperor Constantius, the holy relics of St Timothy were translated to Constantinople and placed in the church of the Holy Apostles near the tombs of St Andrew and St Luke.

The Venerable Xenophon and Maria, and their sons Arcadius and John (26th January / 8th February): Xenophon was a renowned senator during the reign of the Emperor Justinian. His wife, Maria, bore him two sons named John and Arcadius, both of whom shared with their parents Christian piety. It was decided that the sons complete their studies in Beirut, then one of the most prestigious schools in the Empire. However, in a sudden storm their craft was shipwrecked. Both John and Arcadius managed to cling to separate pieces of timber and were parted by mounting swells and swirling currents that eventually placed them miles from each other. John was eventually washed ashore near the town of Melphythan, not too far removed from the ancient city of Tyre. Meanwhile, Arcadius was carried to a point of land several miles south of

the city of Tyre. Both brothers presumed that the other had been lost at sea. John, barely alive after his ordeal, was nourished back to health by the monks of a desert monastery. They so impressed him that, after fully recovering, he decided to take up the monastic yoke. Two years elapsed before Arcadius, who had a spiritual assurance following his recovery that somewhere his brother was alive and well, began a search for his brother. During his search Arcadius also came under the influence of some monks and entered a monastery, ultimately demonstrating the same complete dedication to the Saviour as his brother had done. An itinerant monk happened to visit Constantinople where he sought out Xenophon and Maria. The monk suggested to them that the survivor of a shipwreck known to him as Arcadius, whom he had met in the Monastery of St. Sabbas of Jerusalem, might be their lost son. Xenophon and Maria immediately set out for the Holy Land, and by God's all-merciful providence at about this time their other son, John, decided to visit the Holy Land to pray at the tomb of our Saviour. An unseen hand led all four members of the family to the Tomb of Christ where they met in tearful but joyful reunion and knelt in prayer together after long months of doubt and misgivings. After visiting the Garden of Gethsemane for further prayers in praise of the Lord and his blessing upon them, the family went as a group to the monastery where Arcadius had served, and each told of what had transpired in the intervening years. In thanksgiving for finding the sons whom they had presumed to be lost at sea, Xenophon and Maria decided to dedicate their lives to the Lord in the monastic discipline. Xenophon resigned from the Senate and appointed an executor to see that his entire estate be given to charity. He then undertook to become a monk in deep old age. Maria, willingly chose to follow the example of her husband and sons, and with greater joy than she had ever known, entered the service of Christ in a convent not far from the Monastery of St. Sabbas where her husband and sons were to serve. Thus, all four ended their lives in the angelic habit, and, after the end of this temporal life, were numbered among the saints in the everlasting Kingdom.



POINTS FROM CORRESPONDENCE

“WELL, I did try to find on the Internet an information about the wonder-working icons of the Mother of God which ones were revealed in Britain but actually did not find any proper information. I shall be very grateful Your Very Reverence if You kindly will find a time and opportunity to write me about the visitations of Virgin Mary in ancient Britain and Her wonder-working icons.” - Y. K., Russia

..... IN THE Middle Ages, there were so many shrines of the Mother of God that England was called the Dowry of the Virgin, but this seems to be a post-schism appellation. It is extremely difficult to ascertain, because records are lost, which of those shrines were pre-schism. And because of the destruction at the time of the Reformation, none of the ancient images of the Mother of God survive. Among the Roman Catholics and High Church Anglicans, in the last century or so, some of these shrines have been restored to an extent.

Undoubtedly the most ancient shrine to the Mother of God here is Glastonbury in Somerset. Nobody is sure when it was founded. There are legends that its foundation dates back to Apostolic times. Certainly from the early sixth century there is mention of the veneration of the Mother of God there. Some time ago an icon was painted of our Lady of Glastonbury, but whether it bears any resemblance to the original we cannot know, and unfortunately in style it is rather weak.

In Evesham, the Mother of God appeared in the earliest years of the eighth century, probably 702 A.D., and that also became a great place of pilgrimage for her [see our December issue, Saint Egwin, page 16-17]. Abingdon also has ancient roots, and certainly in the late Saxon period the Mother of God was already widely venerated there.

Walsingham is now the premier shrine of the Mother of God in this country, and the Mother of God is reported to have appeared there in 1061 A.D. Although this is strictly post-schism, it predates the Norman Conquest and the majority of the Orthodox in this country accept it as a genuine shrine, and indeed for many years now there has been an Ortho-

dox Chapel within the Shrine Church there, and there are two Orthodox communities nearby, one in Great Walsingham and one in Little Walsingham. Again an icon has been painted of Our Lady of Walsingham.

There are records of pre-schism shrines of the Theotokos in Tewkesbury, Canterbury, Willesden (the region of London where our Convent is now situated), Ely, Coventry and York, but there is scant information about their pre-schism history. Most of the other shrines are definitely post-schism Medieval foundations. Oddly enough in recent years there have been a couple of attempts to paint icons of Our Lady of other towns and villages, among some of the convert Orthodox. We have not been tempted to commission an Our Lady of Brookwood!

I am sorry that I have perhaps not added much to your stock of knowledge on this subject, but hope this will help you a little. Please keep us in your holy prayers and have us commemorated at the Divine Liturgy.



NEWS SECTION

Patriarch of Antioch Reposes

HIS BEATITUDE Patriarch Ignatius IV of Antioch and All the East reposed on 5th December, 2012, at St. George Orthodox Hospital in Beirut, Lebanon, after having suffered a stroke earlier that week. He was born in 1920 in the village of Muharda, near the city of Hama, Syria. In 1936, he moved to Beirut, where he became an altar server. Years later, upon taking monastic vows, he became a hierodeacon. In 1945 he graduated from the American University of Beirut, and from 1949 to 1953 studied at the Saint Sergius Theological Institute in Paris. On his return to Lebanon, the young theologian with a master's degree was ordained hieromonk. In 1942, he became one of the founders of the influential Orthodox Youth Movement in Lebanon and Syria. In 1953, His Beatitude became an organizer of Syndesmos the worldwide Brotherhood of Orthodox Youth. In 1961 he was ordained Bishop of Palmyra and Patriarchal Vicar, and in the following year, he was sent to the monastery of Balamand as superior and as dean of the Theological Seminary founded there, which in 1988

was transformed into an Orthodox University, the first in the Middle East. In 1970, he was appointed Metropolitan of Latakia (Laodicea), and on 2nd July 1979, he was elected Primate of the Church of Antioch and enthroned on 8th July. On one of his visits to London, he invited the sisters of our Convent of the Annunciation to the house where he was staying to meet him and talk with him. The funeral service for the late Patriarch, who had led the Church of Antioch for 33 years was chanted on 9th December. *May he find rest with the Saints.*

On 16th December, at a meeting of 20 Hierarchs at Balamand Monastery, **Metropolitan Youhanna al-Yaziji** was elected as the new Patriarch. He will be styled **Patriarch Youhanna (John) X**. He was born in Latakia, Syria in 1955, and received his school and university education in Syria. After obtaining a degree in theology in 1978 from the St. John of Damascus Faculty of Theology at the Balamand University, he was granted a doctorate in theology in 1983 from the Aristotle University of Thessalonica. He was ordained a deacon in 1979 and a priest in 1983. In 1981 he took up the teaching of liturgics at St. John of Damascus Faculty of Theology at the Balamand University. He assumed the position of dean of the faculty from 1988-1991 and 2001-2005. He became the head of the Our Lady of Balamand Monastery from 2001 to 2005. In 2008 he was elected as the Metropolitan of Western and Central Europe.

ATTEMPT TO DESECRATE REVERED ICON

A VANDAL threw pots of black paint at the renowned Czestochowa icon in the **Jasna Góra Monastery** in southern Poland on 9th December, reports ITAR-TACC. The icon is held in great veneration by both Orthodox Christians and Roman Catholics as miracle-working. Monastery guards apprehended the man and turned him over to the police. His motives are unknown. He has been questioned and is expected to undergo psychiatric evaluation. He may be charged with offending religious sentiment, an offense punishable by up to two years in prison. The monastery has assured the faithful that the icon was not damaged. A protective glass covering prevented the paint from soiling the revered image. According to a local tradition, the Czestochowa icon of the Mother of God, known by many Western Christians as the “Black Madonna”, was painted by the Holy Apostle and Evangelist Luke and brought to Constantinople from Jerusalem by St. Helen. However, art historians believe the icon of Czestochowa was initially a Byzantine icon of the Hodigitria type,

dated from between the sixth and ninth centuries. It appears that it was first recorded as being in Poland in the late fourteenth century. During a 15th century restoration in Krakow, it was painted anew, which probably accounts for its rather untraditional appearance. In A.D. 1656, **King Jan II Kazimierz** pronounced the icon the “Protectress of Poland.”

JOINT COMMUNIQUÉ
**by the Committees for Dialogue Between the Holy Synod
of the Church of the True Orthodox Christians of Greece and
the Holy Synod of the Orthodox Ecclesiastical Community
in Resistance**

ON SEPTEMBER 12/25, 2012, a meeting took place at the Chancery of the Holy Metropolis of Piræus between the representatives of the Church of the True Orthodox Christians of Greece (G.O.Ch.) and the representatives of the Orthodox Ecclesiastical Community in Resistance, for the purpose of assessing the dialogue conducted at an informal level between the two sides four years ago and of exploring the possibility of renewing the dialogue, this time at an official level. In a spirit of coöperation, the representatives evaluated—as objectively as possible—the positive and negative aspects of the [informal] dialogue, and endeavoured to explore the causes of its unsuccessful outcome. They then discussed ways in which the dialogue might be restarted under more propitious preconditions, namely, through the adoption of a mutually agreed procedure, on the basis of which they will discuss in detail the differences that exist between the two sides, with the ultimate aim of settling these differences and ending the regrettable situation of division. During the time that followed this meeting, both sides remained in continual communication and were able to exchange viewpoints, such that a mutually agreed procedure was indeed formulated, put in writing, approved by both sides, and, finally, signed at the Monastery of Sts. Cyprian and Justina, Phyle, Attica, on Monday, November 6/19, 2012, by the two chairmen of the Committees for Dialogue. The committee representing the Church of the True Orthodox Christians of Greece consists of His Grace, Bishop Photios of Marathon and the lay theologians Messrs. Zeses Tsiotras and Konstantinos Panos. The committee representing the Orthodox Ecclesiastical Community in Resistance consists of Their Graces, Bishops Cyprian of Oreoi, Ambrose of Methone, and Klemes of Gardikion, as well as three Priests, viz., Archimandrite Glykerios Hagiokyprianites and the Reverend Fathers Angelos Mourlas and (Dr.) Jiří Ján. The mutually agreed procedure, which bears the

title “Joint Document by the Committees for Dialogue,” (Parts I and II, in 26 sections), prescribes, in broad outline, that the discussions be conducted on the basis of written proposals, which will be thoroughly scrutinized during the joint deliberations, and that joint communiqués, as well as other particulars regarding matters of procedure, be made public. We will soon make arrangements for the first joint deliberation, at which the agenda will be determined and the dialogue will be officially inaugurated, invoking the Grace of God, through the intercessions of the Theotokos and all of the Saints, and also fortified by the prayers of the entire Body of the Orthodox Church.

From the Chancery of the Holy Synod in Resistance, Phyle [Fili], Attica
November 23/December 6, 2012



SIR-UK NEWS

TWO BISHOPS' VISITS

HIS GRACE, **Bishop Sofronie of Suceava** came to Saint Edward's, just after Vespers for the Great Martyr Catherine, on Friday 24th November / 7th December and baptised **Maria**, the infant daughter of **Constanin and Elena Lorena Ungurianu**. Maria's uncle, **Florin Ungarianu** stood as her sponsor. May Maria ever remain steadfast in Holy Orthodoxy and grow in the Faith. To her and her sponsor and parents: *Many Years!*

On the following Sunday, the feast of St Alypius the Stylite, His Grace celebrated the **Divine Liturgy at Saint Edward's Church**, assisted by the Brotherhood clergy. The service was conducted largely in English and Romanian, with some parts in Greek and Church Slavonic. At the end of the service Bishop Sofronie preached to the faithful, and then heard confessions and blessed cars before making his way back to London in readiness for his return to Romania. While staying in London, he tended to many of the pastoral needs of the Traditionalist Orthodox Romanian community there.

Over the last weekend in the civil year, **His Grace Bishop Ambrose of Methoni** paid a brief visit to England, and celebrated the Divine Liturgy at the **Convent of the Annunciation** on the Sunday of the Holy Forefathers.

ORTHODOX AID FUND

THE TOTAL given to various ecclesiastical, humanitarian and environmental charities by our Brotherhood's **Orthodox Aid Fund** in the (new) calendar year 2012 was **£8,904.59**. None of this was given to charities immediately connected with our Brotherhood. When payments were made in foreign currencies, we recorded the gifts in the Sterling equivalent on the day the gift was made. These gifts were made possible through the donations received from our *Shepherd* readers for the fund, and especially by two particularly generous offerings made towards the missions in Africa. God bless all of those of you who have thus helped us and the beneficiaries of the fund.

BROOKWOOD CEMETERY CHANGES HANDS

AFTER a very protracted court case, the greater part of the Brookwood Cemetery has changed hands. On Monday, 15th October, judges at the Civil Court of Appeal in London upheld an earlier ruling to award ownership of the cemetery to Diane Holliday, the former partner of the late owner, Ramadan Guney, and to their son Houssain. Sir Nicholas Wall, sitting with Lords Justice Lloyd and Sullivan, dismissed the appeal from five of Mr Guney's children. The handover became effective towards the end of November, though the former managing director of the Cemetery, Erkin (Egg) Guney, and his family have moved into The Lodge (the house opposite the entrance to Saint Cyprian's Avenue), and from the local press it appears that there may be further challenges to the decision. About the time of the handover, on 18th November, there was a serious fire and an explosion in the cemetery offices at Glades House, and we understand this has caused some difficulties for the new administration. Our own property at Saint Edward Brotherhood is a freehold one with the necessary rights of way for access, and the change-over has not caused us any disturbance or in any way disrupted our established way of life.

PRACTICAL TIP: WHEN collecting your Theophany Water from the church, make sure to bring clean bottles, either screw-topped or with firm corks; remember you have to take them home. Keep them reverently at home in your "holy corner" or with the icons, and remember that you should always take the Theophany Waters fasting, so first thing when you get up. Of course, if you are going to partake of the Holy Mysteries that day, you do not drink the Theophany Waters and so break the complete pre-Communion fast.