



**COPTIC ORTHODOX PATRIARCHATE
SAINT MARY'S COPTIC ORTHODOX CHURCH**

388 Ottawa St. S. Kitchener, ON Canada N2M 3P4

www.stmaryscopticorthodox.ca E-mail: athanas@sympatico.ca

Father Athanasius Iskander (519) 740-7627 Fax (519) 621-1444

| | | |
|------------|----------------|----------|
| VOLUME XIX | SEPTEMBER 2008 | NUMBER 1 |
|------------|----------------|----------|

THE LEGACY OF CHALCEDON

In this issue we will examine the Council of Chalcedon from the point of view of two persons that were separated by more than fifteen centuries. The first is Saint John Rufus, who was a contemporary of that Council and who narrated for us the life of Saint Peter the Iberian.

Saint Peter was a prince from the country of Georgia (the same Georgia that was recently in the news), he preferred the monastic life to the throne, and became one of the few saints venerated by both the Chalcedonian Georgian Orthodox Church, as well as the Non Chalcedonian Oriental Orthodox Churches.

Saint Peter the Iberian had many disciples, the most important of whom was John Rufus, who succeeded him as bishop of Mayuma, in south Palestine. The other important disciple was a young law student, who came from Lebanon to visit the Holy land, was convinced by St. Peter to choose the monastic life and train under the guidance of the great saint. That disciple would later on become the non Chalcedonian bishop of Antioch, Saint Severus.

The other view is that of Fr. John Romanides, Greek Orthodox historian and theologian, who took part in the "Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox Consultation", who looks at the legacy of Chalcedon fifteen and a half centuries later.

BIOGRAPHY OF THE HOLY PETER THE IBERIAN, THE VENERABLE BISHOP, ASCETIC AND CONFESSOR

The blessed Peter's fatherland was the renowned country of the Iberians, those northern people who dwell towards the rising of the sun - a land perpetually at war with the Romans and the Persians, because each of these nations was attempting to annex it for strategic reasons. In the language of their count, he first bore the name Nabarnugios, but when he was made worthy to bear a monk's holy garb he was given instead the name of Peter, after that of the first of the Apostles.

He was dispatched [AD. 421] at the age of twelve as a hostage to the God-fearing and Christian king of the Romans, Theodosius the Younger, since his father Bosmarios valued the friendship of the Romans as Christians more highly than that of the godless Persians. He was sent off with great ceremony and pomp, and when he came to the blessed Theodosius he was welcomed affectionately and brought up and loved like a son.

When still living at home with his parents, he had already imbibed the love of God, so that it was like a spark within him. Now therefore he fanned this spark carefully from day to day by feats of pious austerity, until he had made himself into a complete flame of heavenly goodness. Next to his body he wore a hair tunic, on top of which, to hide his virtuous conduct, he wore a brilliant and resplendent robe. His food was that which Daniel and his friends used to eat, and this he took in moderation only once in three or four days, or sometimes only once a week. To subdue the disorderly pleasures of the flesh he resorted to self-chastisement, and the earth served the young and tender prince as a bed.

He had with him the relics of holy martyrs, Persian by nationality, who had died a martyr's death in those days. (Their names are known to us even today from tradition handed down by the blessed Peter, so that we still celebrate their anniversaries and react their acts.) These he had laid with all honour in a coffer in the same room where he performed his pious devotions. There he would sleep before them on the ground and perform sacred rites with candles and incense, hymns and prayers.

Our father and bishop, the venerable Abba Peter the Iberian, used to tell us that he was in Constantinople when Nestorius was still alive

and exercising the episcopate. 'When Nestorius was ending the commemoration of the Forty Holy Martyrs in the church which is called Maria, he rose in my presence to expound the scriptures before all the people. He had a clear and feminine voice. In front of me, he began to blaspheme and say in the middle of his sermon: Thou shalt not be glorified, O Mary, as if thou hadst given birth to God; but O excellent one, thou hast given birth not to God, but to a man, the instrument of God. From then on, most of the townfolk cut themselves off from communion with him, especially the people of the palace, and in particular I myself, although he was very fond of me.'

Now as Peter grew in age and spiritual love, he experienced a compelling urge to retire from the world and its emptiness and undertake a pilgrimage, that most virtuous of enterprises. But though he tried many times to flee away, he could not succeed in doing so. But nothing is stronger than the power of Christ, and nothing warmer than the love of those who love Him uprightly. Christ had loved Peter from his childhood days, and protected him as one of His sheep. So now Peter found a helpmate given by God in the person of his godfather, John the Eunuch, who shared his aspirations and was like him in his longing for the life eternal.

They looked for a ship, and through the help of the martyrs, they found one, and boarded it immediately. But they feared they might be captured if they were pursued, or if they were recognized at the straits of the Bosphorus, so they hanged into shabby slaves' costume. Then by the protection of God, they managed to escape the vigilance of the people who were stationed in the Bosphorus to intercept them.

At this point they left their ship and continued on foot. They went on their way alone through Asia Minor, in company with the holy martyrs, whose venerable relics they carried in a golden casket. In joy and happiness, as if it had been a short excursion, they covered the distinct from the New Rome to Jerusalem. When they had reached the outskirts of the holy city of Jerusalem which they loved, they saw from a high place the lofty roof of the holy church of the Resurrection, shining like the morning sun, and cried aloud, 'See, that is Sion the city of our deliverance !' They fell down upon their faces, and from there onwards they crept upon their knees, frequently kissing the soil with their lips and eyes, until they were within the holy walls and had embraced the site of the sacred cross on Golgotha.

Seeing that they were strangers in the Holy Places, God Himself led them to good hosts, guides and helpers in their holy purpose, namely the blessed Melania, a Roman lady residing there with her husband Pinianus and her mother Albina. Among the senatorial families of Rome, they had occupied the first place, possessing lineage, riches and honor, but since they loved Christ dearly and despised all these things, they had renounced the world and departed to live in prayer at the Holy City. When they had arrived there they built two large monasteries on the Mount of Olives, near the holy church of the Ascension, one for men and one for women, and endowed them for the glory of God.

When Melania heard of the arrival in Jerusalem of the holy youths Peter and John she received them gladly. She remembered that she had once visited Constantinople and seen the blessed Peter there as a young boy when he was being brought up to a king's estate. So Melania welcomed the saints like beloved sons, and they became held in honor for the exemplary life they led in the monastery which she had built. Without delay they received the monk's habit from the renowned Gerontius, who was priest and abbot on the Mount of Olives. This Gerontius enjoyed a great reputation, and lived until the days of the apostasy of the synod of Chalcedon, when he showed the zeal of true witness throughout his bondage and afflictions.

Now that they were living in peace in the monastery of which Gerontius was abbot they deposited there the venerated relics of the holy martyrs, side by side with those of the renowned Forty Martyrs of Sebastia, over whose interment the righteous and blessed Cyril, archbishop of Alexandria, presided [AD. 438-39]. For when Cyril was requested by the pious Empress Eudocia to come and inter the relics of the protomartyr Stephen and to consecrate the beautiful temple which she had built outside the northern gate of the city, he accepted the invitation with gladness. After he had arrived with a company of bishops from all Egypt, he also acceded to the request of the holy Melania to celebrate the interment of the Persian martyrs together with the Forty Martyrs of Sebastia in the smaller temple on the Mount of Olives, which had also been splendidly restored by the Empress Eudocia, as is commemorated by an inscription on one of the walls there.

At this time, the holy city of Jerusalem was still lacking in inhabitants, as well as being deprived of walls, since the former walls

had been destroyed by the Romans. As the bishops residing in Jerusalem wanted to increase the number of citizens, they gave free permission to anyone to take whatever site he liked gratis, and build there a dwelling place. Accordingly the blessed Peter chose a place on the north side by the holy church of Sion near the so-called Tower of David, and built there a cloister which is called to this day the Abbey of the Iberians, and lies to the left when you go from the second door of that tower towards the holy church of Sion.

As they were living by themselves and still had some money left out of what they had brought from Constantinople, they decided to perform good works by welcoming and refreshing the pilgrims and poor folk who came from all sides to pray at the Holy Places. They laid in a supply of provisions, and invited in pilgrims in such numbers that it often happened that they had ten tables in one day, especially on high feasts.

However their residence there was not fated to be of long duration. The Empress Eudocia, consort of the pious Emperor Theodosius the Younger, heard of the zeal of the afore-mentioned Melania, and likewise conceived the desire for the calm and tranquillity of the Holy City, to worship and be near the scene of the Passion which Christ, the King of Glory, suffered for us. In pomp and ceremony she passed through various towns, and arrived at the Holy City for which she longed. When she heard that Father Peter lived there she was anxious to see him, since she had brought him up with a mother's tender love at the royal palace. At first, he begged that he might be excused from leaving his cell, since he regarded this as a temptation. But since she insisted, he came out on one occasion to talk to her. She observed with attention his great meekness and wisdom and said, 'Blessed are you, my son, for you have chosen the good thing! Remember me in your holy prayers!' But he rejoined, 'What benefit can a sinner's prayers bring?' But she replied, 'May your sins be upon my head, my son.' And so he returned to his cell in peace.

But when she again insisted on seeing him, he hastened to the holy Zeno, the hermit and prophet, a pupil of the great and renowned Silvanus, and revealed his thoughts to him, as he was accustomed to . From him, Peter received the counsel, 'Save yourself and flee.' Accordingly, he left the holy city of Jerusalem, handing over his cloister to a group of men who had likewise renounced the world, and went to

stay in the monastic community which is situated between Gaza and the small town named Mayuma which is by the seaside. It was divine providence which guided his wandering to this place, thus providing for this most Christian town a high priest and bishop particularly suited for this time of apostasy, at which there was need for a man who could be at once an inspirer of reverence and a preacher, a custodian of the orthodox faith and an intercessor for our souls.

While he was living in this community he used constantly to go with his cell-mate John to visit the holy Zeno who then lived in the village of Kefr-Seartha fifteen miles from Gaza. The blessed Peter used to relate in after years, 'Once when I came to him, the holy Zeno was standing in prayer. And he turned to me and said, Pray! This he repeated three times. In astonishment I said to him, Forgive me, reverend Father, but do you not know that I am a layman and a sinner? Then he said, Yes, yes. Forgive me. He himself completed the prayers and sat down.' And seven days later Peter was himself ordained!

A.D. 445. How this came about we must not pass over in silence. When Peter was still living in the Holy City, Juvenal, who was then its bishop, sought many times to ordain him, but could not succeed in doing so, for God was Peter's protector. Now at this time when Peter was residing in the vicinity of Mayuma, Juvenal's nephew, Paul, was bishop of that place. On the commemoration day of the glorious martyr Victor¹, when an assembly of many bishops was in session, Paul drew one of these aside and persuaded him to carry out the ordination. This bishop took with him as his assistant the blessed father superior Irenaeus, who was on good terms with these holy men, and caught Peter and John by surprise. and ordained them to the priesthood under duress in spite of their struggles and resistance. Then Peter recognized the foreknowledge and prophetic wisdom of the holy Zeno.

A.D. 451. After he had thus received the laying on of hands, Peter refused obstinately for seven years to carry out the priestly offices, until it fell to him to be raised to the episcopate in the time of the transgression of Chalcedon. It was then that the apostasy of all those schismatic bishops, sanctioned by the godless Tome of Pope Leo, and attended by the adoption of the scandalous doctrine of Nestorius,

¹Commemorated in our church on 5th day of Koiahk

resulted in Dioscorus, chief of the bishops of Egypt and a zealous fighter for truth, being driven into banishment, while Juvenal, who bore the tide of bishop of Jerusalem, signed the act of apostasy and thereby assumed the role of the traitor Judas.

A.D. 452. When this became known to the clergy and monks of Palestine they came out into the streets before Juvenal and implored him to remember his promise to eschew godlessness and fight for the true cause. When he refused to yield they assembled in the Holy City and elected the blessed Theodosius, a man devoted from his youth to the monastic way of life and imbued with the fear of the Lord, and who had distinguished himself even at the godless synod by his championship of the orthodox faith, and they made him pastor of the Holy City of Jerusalem. Afterwards Theodosius chose pious men from among the monks and bearers of the cross to consecrate them as bishops and confessors of the faith. Then the citizens of Maya which belongs to Gaza, who knew the blessed Peter to possess every' virtue, hurried to the spot where he was living in tranquillity and carried him off by force, although he bolted the door against them. A crowd of prominent burghers and clergy and common people bore him to the Holy City, so that they might receive a pastor and bishop from the hands of the chief of the priesthood.

On the seventh of August, he arrived at the holy church of Mayuma and was borne inside and seated on the throne amidst general rejoicing. He remained some six months in his holy church, during which time the people of Mayuma joyfully celebrated all the religious festivals, rejoicing in the protection of God who had granted them such a pastor, whom they cherished as an angel with love and affection. Then there arose the devil, that prince of renegades and arch-counselor of apostates, who was unable to endure the sight of such great glorifying of God and salvation of men. Accordingly he entered into the monarch who now held the reins of government, the Emperor Marcian, who readily listened to the devil's commands and he incited him to issue a decree deposing the righteous bishops who had been appointed throughout the towns of Palestine by the apostolic Patriarch Theodosius. In case of resistance, they were to be forcibly expelled from their sees and killed, while the Patriarch Theodosius was condemned to

death.¹ They all chose to go into exile, as the Patriarch Theodosius himself advised, since he deemed it more pleasing to God for the preachers of truth to be saved, rather than that they should perish and deprive the orthodox folk of comfort and support.

So the blessed Peter departed into Egypt and arrived by God's will at the city of Alexandria, where the rebel Proterius was now patriarch. Peter went into hiding and afforded encouragement and solace to the orthodox. Celebrating the divine service in secret, he did not allow their zeal and faith to be quenched.

It was granted him to see a fearsome vision in the following circumstances. While all the townsfolk were watching a play in the theatre the faithful believers were filled with zeal and suddenly shouted out, 'Up with Dioscorus and the orthodox ! Burn Proterius' bones! Throw out the Judas !' They demanded the return of the pious Dioscorus from his unjust exile, and the expulsion of the ravening wolf and anti-Christ Proterius, the new Caiaphas. The authorities brought in a troop of armed soldiers who surrounded the theatre and menaced the people with slaughter, so that they fled outside and threw each other down in the narrow passages of the theatre many of them losing their lives. At that time the blessed Peter was celebrating the holy sacrament in secret. In an ecstasy he saw many souls being carried up by the angels into heaven. When people came from the city and told him what had occurred, it transpired that the number of those who had perished by violence in the crush and confusion was the same as that of the blessed souls that he had seen in his vision.

At last the blessed Peter could no longer conceal himself from the godless Proterius, who was eager to deal him a mortal wound and send murderers in the night to seize and kill him. But he succeeded in escaping from them, for our Lord revealed the plot to him. When the emissaries approached and knocked on the door of his hiding-place, they pretended to be some of his friends among the orthodox and begged him to baptize a little boy whom they pictured as being in a critical condition. But a divine voice said to him, 'Do not open, these are scoundrels!' So he and the brethren with him shouted out loud,

¹Saint Theodosius was locked up in a room filled with limes and left there to die of starvation.

'Father in heaven, look down! Robbers! Help!' When the neighbors and others nearby heard this they came running and drove off the villains. After they had thus been delivered from the snares of the hunters they departed and wandered in the upper regions of the Thebaid until they arrived at the town of Oxyrynchos. There Peter stayed, being cared for by one of the notables of the town, Moses by name. Oxyrynchos was a great and rich town of the Thebaid, in which the grace of God prevailed to such an extent that all the inhabitants were Christians, and the number of monks in the monasteries round about reached ten thousand.

A.D. 457. Later the blessed Peter left Oxyrynchos and returned to Alexandria. Now when the news of the death of Marcian, the leader and arch-inciter of all these evil deeds, reached Alexandria, the God-fearing populace breathed again and gave thanks to our Redeemer Christ. By unanimous resolve they sent into the wilderness to fetch the holy Timothy, that renowned and true confessor, and brought him to the city, right into the church which is called the Kaisarion, to consecrate him as high priest and champion of the faith. But they could find only one of the orthodox bishops, namely Eusebius of Pelusium, the others having hidden themselves from the persecution. Learning that the blessed Peter was also there, the people hurried to the spot where he was living and carried him on their shoulders to the Kaisarion, where the populace was assembled. And the blessed one together with that other bishop carried out the consecration of Archbishop Timothy, the grace of God being with them.

Seeing himself menaced, the wicked and unprincipled Proterius¹ was even further incensed. So he bribed the authorities with much gold, and notably an officer called Dionysius, a choleric and murderous individual, whom Proterius roused to such a pitch of frenzy that he hastened with an armed troop of brutal soldiery into the holy church of God and murdered many laymen, monks and nuns. Since the multitude could not endure this, they were inflamed with the zeal of martyrdom and daily resisted the soldiery with all the bloodshed of civil war. Then the civic authorities were afraid that this royal city would be altogether

¹Proterius was the renegade "Melchite" Patriarch appointed by the emperor instead of the rightful Patriarch chosen by the Orthodox.

mined. When the news of the accession of the new Emperor Leo reached them, they decided to remove Proterius from the city until instructions were received from the sovereign. While Proterius was being escorted out by the soldiers one of them lost his temper and killed him, twenty days after the consecration of the blessed Timothy. They left him lying in the road like a pig or a dog, which he resembled in his manners and ferocity.

A.D. 457-74. After this, Peter went about Alexandria and the monasteries nearby in secret, and visited many other towns and villages of Egypt, edifying the hosts of true believers like a second Paul and providing for all an exemplary model of pious ardour. The wonders and great miracles and deeds of healing which he performed there we have not the power to describe in full detail.

When all this came to the ears of the orthodox brethren in Palestine it awakened their love towards their holy father and bishop. Many saintly men came to him and entreated him to visit his flock in Palestine also, now that they had been so long deprived of his spiritual care. So he returned to the land of Palestine. When he reached the town of Ascalon, he received a joyous welcome from the brethren there, and stayed in a village called Pelaea, ten stades from the town. While he was there many people came from all sides to see him, some of whom he confirmed in the faith, while others he enlightened and brought into the fold of the orthodox Church. For this purpose he made frequent journeys, now through the region of Gaza and Mayuma, now through that of Caesarea and Jerusalem, as far as the borders of Arabia.

Now in the city of Gaza there lived a pious scholastic called Dionysius, who was filled with love towards the saint. And he begged Peter to stay in his village, which was called Magdal Tutha, to the south of Gaza nearby the temple of the holy Hilarion, the great ascetic. After he had built a splendid residence for the saint he kept him there for three years.

At this time the blessed Isaiah the Egyptian, that great anchorite and prophet, was living in the neighborhood, in the village of Beth Daltha, four miles from Father Peter. We must marvel at the trust and love which these saints showed towards one another. Every day the blessed Peter used to send Father Isaiah some victuals suitable for an aged man who was abstemious and frail in body namely the sort of Gaza bread he used to eat, a bunch of parsley and leeks, cleaned and washed, and two

little fishes. In exchange, the other used to send him three cakes.

A.D. 485. While they were living in this way, the Emperor Zeno learnt of the virtue and powers of those saints. As he wanted to receive their blessing, he sent the eunuch Cosmas, one of his favorite chamberlains, with letters to induce them to come to him, promising to let them go again without delay. When he heard of this the blessed Peter was very distressed and fell on his face in front of the holy altar and said Lord, deliver me from the outrages of mankind ! And he decided to travel into the borders of Phoenicia and hide there until he had sent a petition to tell the emperor of his enfeebled state and persuade him to excuse him from so great an exertion-which indeed came to pass, since our Lord supported the saint's petition.

Then after Whitsun we traveled to Azotus, a place situated on the coast, for the Holy Spirit summoned the saint there for the comfort of those who lived in that town. Though many begged the venerable saint to take up his residence in the middle of the town, he refused and settled down in a narrow and wretched shed by the sea, shorn of any sort of bodily comfort.

While we were living in this shed the saint happened to fall sick. As soon as this came to the ears of Elias the Tribune, who had been the confidant of the Empress Eudocia and now resided in Jerusalem, he was impelled by his anxiety to go down and see Peter. And Elias took him and led him to a place on the outskirts of the town of Yamnia, which lay near the sea, and was excellently suited to the saint's invalid condition. This he did because the resort was crown property, and had once been the residence of the Empress Eudocia.

When we were here, there came round the commemoration day of John the Eunuch, who had been the cell-mate of Father Peter, and had passed away on the 4th of December. According to his custom, Peter invited many people to this festival, especially from the mountain regions round about, and gave orders to buy quantities of fish from the sea nearby. Now it happened that winter came on so suddenly that sea-fishing had to be completely abandoned. We were troubled because we could not entertain the brethren as the saint had instructed. But suddenly shortage turned to plenty. During the night so much rain fell that the river which flowed near us flooded its banks and inundated the vineyards round about. In the morning such shoals of fish were picked up that the local people said they could never remember such a prodigy,

and we could not cope with all the fish who had come to attend the commemoration feast of that holy man.

Now the time was drawing near for the blessed one to find rest and be called to Jesus whom he loved—a time to us unknown and unexpected, but to him long announced in advance; for us, an event grievous and painful, for him a cherished moment awaited with joy, since he yearned to reach that goal which is the crown of God's heavenly call. He made his will, in which he named four heirs: John the Deacon, known as the Qanopite, and with him, his cell-mates Zacharias and Andrew, as well as the scholastic Theodore of Ascalon. He bid us remain fast until death in the orthodox faith and to shun and curse all heresies, namely the synod of Chalcedon and the godless Tome of Pope Leo. - "In addition to steadfastness in the faith, take care to attain purity of soul and body, without which no man can see the Lord, and love towards one another, and the concord which comes from the heart and flows from a clear conscience and untarnished belief. Beware of indiscreet talk either with men outside or amongst yourselves, for unrestrained frankness inflames the passions. Meditate on the writings of the saintly bishop Basil concerning the ascetic life, and model your manners and conduct according to his holy precepts. For these writings were brought into being by divine grace for the inculcation of virtue and the edifying of monastic communities everywhere.'

All that day we fasted, and we remained until evening in heavy sorrow and grief, while the blessed one was now preparing himself for his end and holding converse with the Lord. When evening came we sat down at table to eat. In the middle of the meal, Euphrosynus, an honored monk whom the saint loved and who was by his side looking after him, cried out, 'The father is dying! Come and receive his blessing!' Then we sprang up from table and hurried sorrowfully to his bedside. So that we should not hurt the blessed one, who was breathing his last, Euphrosynus took the saint's right hand and gave it to each one to kiss and receive the benediction. When the blessed one in happy tranquillity had entrusted his spirit into the hands of God, who even now was near him and bore him away, it was Father Gregory who closed his eyes for the last time.

We shrouded the saint's body according to the custom and laid it before the holy altar, so that the holy sacraments might be celebrated in his memory. Afterwards we, his heirs, hastened to take his body and

lay it to rest in his old cloister which lies in the neighborhood of Mayuma by Gaza. For we feared that if the townspeople of Gaza and Mayuma came to hear of it beforehand, they might be impelled by the great trust and love they bore him to carry off his sacred body and inter it in one of the churches in those towns. So we carried away the body of the pious departed. After spending a short time in a monastery on the outskirts of Ascalon, we went on all night and came before daybreak to the saint's old cloister. Now while the blessed one was still living here in quietness, he had erected three burial urns, into the middle one of which we now laid to rest his sacred body. In the right-hand urn reposed the holy relics of Father John the Eunuch, and on the left, those of Father Abraham, a pious hermit from Athribis.

When morning came the townspeople of Mayuma and Gaza heard of the death of the blessed one and the interment of his body. They hurried in a crowd to the cloister and fell down and prayed beside his sacred urn and kissed and embraced it like children bereaved not only of a father, but also of a teacher, guide and pastor. They remained assembled for seven days, holding vigil over him to the sound of hymns and liturgies, and seeking consolation for the grief they felt at his departing.

Our blessed father and bishop Peter died on the 1st of December¹, as Sunday was about to dawn, on the third day of the commemoration of Peter, the great martyr and archbishop of Alexandria, and five months after the passing of Father Isaiah the ascetic. And a year later, we reinterred his body in the crypt beneath the altar of the monastery church. The span of his life on earth was about eighty years. We celebrate his memory during three days: the first being the anniversary of the translation of his relics to the crypt beneath the altar, the second, that of the assembly of the people, and the third, the day of his burial in the earth and his committal into the hands of Christ Jesus, our Lord, God over all things, to whom be praise, honor and power to all eternity, AMEN. *(The biography was condensed)*

¹Our Coptic church celebrates his departure on Koiahk 1, (December 10)

ORTHODOX AND ORIENTAL ORTHODOX CONSULTATION FR. JOHN ROMANIDES

This is not a paper about the technical question about how one lifts anathemas, either those of Dioscorus and his followers by the Chalcedonians, nor those of Leo and the Chalcedonians by the Oriental Orthodox. What we are here concerned with is the evidence already presented by this writer as far back as 1959-60 and especially 1964 that both Leo and Dioscoros are Orthodox because they agree with St. Cyril Of Alexandria, especially with his Twelve Chapters, even though both had been considered heretical by the other side here represented. We do not intend to present new evidence in this matter, but to review aspects we already presented at Aarhus in 1964. But we intend to present the issues at stake in such a way as to throw light on the problem before us with the expectation that specialists in cannon law may find the way to lift anathemas pronounced by Ecumenical or/and local Councils without provoking a controversy.

It is unfortunately also possible to take a clear distinction between the Fathers of the 5th and following centuries of both sides and their nominal followers today. This is so because the modern Orthodox on both sides have officially agreed with doctrinal statements they participated in producing along with Latin and Protestant scholars in the WCC. We will make some observations on this question in the second part of this paper. We will do this in the light of the fact that we are in the process of re-uniting, not necessarily with the Fathers themselves of our respective traditions, but 1) with what has perhaps incompletely survived of these traditions or 2) with what may be even a distortion of what were up to a point in our histories Biblical and Patristic Traditions. On the Chalcedonian side much effort has been expended for some time now in getting rid of the non Biblical Franco-Latin Augustinian presuppositions which found their way into its theology and sometimes even in practice, especially because of the so-called reforms of Peter the Great. However, there are indications that something similar has crept into the Oriental Orthodox tradition also, if one may judge by WCC doctrinal documents like BEM and Confessing the One Faith and by papers produced in other dialogue contexts. This writer is not aware of official rejections of such WCC statements except those made by the late Prof. Gerasimos Konidaris of

the Church of Greece. We will divide this paper into the titles "I. The Fathers" and "II. Today's descendants of the Fathers."

I. THE FATHERS

We take Leo of Rome as representative of the problems of unity between us which were created on the Chalcedonian side and Dioscoros as representative of what had been done on the Oriental side. It is around these persons that the central events revolved which produced the final division which we have inherited between us. The point in history where we seem to be at present is that of the lifting of the anathemas against Leo and the Council of Chalcedon, which means the cleaning of the slate on the Chalcedonian side, with the same holding true about Dioscoros and his followers on the Oriental Orthodox side.

To clear Dioscoros of doctrinal error should mean the clearing of the slate for those of his followers to be rehabilitated also, as far as the patristic period is concerned. Leo of Rome has no followers so to speak of on the Orthodox side in need of being cleared. It would also seem that agreement that both Leo and Dioscoros were doctrinally Orthodox would then put the problem of their restoration on a non-Christological doctrinal plane, but on a canonical plane. In such a case the reversal of condemnations by Ecumenical and local Councils can be dealt with as canonical, rather than doctrinal problems.

However, whether this covers today's Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox is a separate question. That this is so is due to the fact that there are strong indications that today's Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox have doctrinal positions which are not those of the Fathers of neither the first Three, nor of the Seven Ecumenical Councils.

The keys to clearing up historical misunderstandings between us are the facts 1) that on one side Dioscoros supported Eutyches, who was finally realized to be a heretic by Dioscoros himself on the Oriental Orthodox side, and 2) that on the other side the fact that Leo supported Theodoret whose Christology is indeed heretical and at the same time not that of Leo himself which sufficiently agrees with the Twelve Chapters of St. Cyril.

LEO AND THEODORET:

Theodoret's heretical Christology is especially clear in his attacks against Cyril's Twelve Chapters. These attacks were indeed considered

heretical by all the fathers of the Fourth Ecumenical Council except by the legates of Pope Leo of Rome. This is clear from the fact that the fathers of Chalcedon accepted Theodoret's condemnation by the Council of Ephesus 449 in spite of Leo's refusal to accept it. The Fathers of the Council of Chalcedon paid no attention to Leo's opinions on the matter and refused to seat Theodoret as a member of the Council since he was still under the condemnation of Ephesus 449. He was allowed to sit only as accuser of Dioscoros. The Council of Chalcedon lifted Theodoret's excommunication of 449 only when he finally anathematized Nestorius, accepted the Third Ecumenical Council and the Twelve Chapters of St. Cyril at session VIII. Ibas of Edessa was also likewise cleared of his condemnation at sessions IX and X.

Here we are faced with a Pope Leo who knowingly or willfully or unknowingly supported a heretical and yet unrepentant Theodoret of Cyrus. Theodoret was allowed by unknown means to quietly manifest his "repentance" for the first time, even though attending the Council only as an accuser, by becoming a member of the committee which was appointed to examine the Tome of Leo to see if it indeed agrees with the Twelve Chapters of St. Cyril. The list of the opinions of the members of this committee are recorded in the minutes and they unanimously found on close examination that the Tome of Leo agrees with Cyril's Twelve Chapters. Among the names listed is that of Theodoret. In other words Theodoret finally found that Cyril agreed with Leo his patron and vice versa. He was latter re-united to the Church as just mentioned.

As this writer pointed out in his paper at Aarhus in 1964, Ephesus 449 was still part of Roman Law and had to be dealt with item by item, i.e. by not only rejecting certain of its decisions, but also by accepting certain of its decisions. The refusal of the Pope of Rome to accept Ephesus 449 and the request of some bishops that the emperor be asked to strike out this Council in toto from its legal standing was rejected by the imperial commissioners. Two of the items of Ephesus 449 which were accepted at Chalcedon were the condemnation of both Theodoret of Cyrus and Ibas of Edessa.

It was understood that John of Antioch's reconciliation with Cyril of Alexandria and his acceptance of the Third Ecumenical Council with the Twelve Chapters was done on behalf of all bishops of the

Patriarchate of Antioch. However, after the death of John in 442, his successor Domnus allowed Theodoret to lead a revolt against the Third Ecumenical Council especially after the death of St. Cyril in 444. Thus it fell to his successor Dioscoros to lead the defense of Orthodox doctrine against Theodoret and his Nestorian companions. Pope Celestine had died right after the Third Ecumenical Council in 432, succeeded by Sixtus III, who was in turn succeeded by Leo I in 440. Leo rejected the condemnations by Ephesus 449 of not only Flavian of Constantinople and Eusebius of Dorylaeum, but also of the Nestorian Theodoret of Cyrus. Failing to distinguish between the two Orthodox bishops and the Nestorian Theodoret Leo seems to have used the occasion to assert the authority of his see. But by doing this he reduced doctrine to a lesser level than the papal authority of Rome. Dioscoros in like manner also asserted the papal authority of Alexandria.

It is important to note that Theodoret's profession of the faith of Cyril and the Third Ecumenical Council at session VIII of the Council of Chalcedon was accompanied by much hesitation on his part and Episcopal cries of " Nestorian" against him. This is a clear proof that had Dioscoros accepted to appear before the Council and face Theodoret his accuser, he would have certainly been cleared in his fight against this Nestorian enemy of Cyril. He would have been found at least doctrinally, if not canonically, excusable for his excommunication of Leo for his support of this Nestorian. Dioscoros and his bishops excommunicated Leo upon approaching Chalcedon and learning that the legates of Pope Leo were insisting that Theodoret must participate as a member of the Council. Leo insisted upon this in spite of the fact that Theodoret had never yet accepted the Third Ecumenical Council, the Twelve Chapters of Cyril, the condemnation of Nestorius, nor the re-conciliation of 433 between John of Antioch and Cyril of Alexandria. It seems that the Chalcedonian Orthodox must let these facts sink into their heads and take them seriously.

This is why the Council of Chalcedon upheld the excommunication of Theodoret by the Ephesine Council of 449. Therefore, Dioscoros was legally and canonically correct by excommunicating Leo for his support of Theodoret before the Council of Chalcedon. Ephesus 449 was still before the Council of Chalcedon a part of Roman Law in spite Leo of Rome. From a purely doctrinal viewpoint the Pope of Rome was guilty of supporting a Nestorian and a vigorous enemy of the Twelve

Chapters, which were the basis of the doctrinal decision of the Third Ecumenical Council. John of Antioch and his own Third Ecumenical Council of 431 had condemned and excommunicated the Cyrilian Third Ecumenical Council because its doctrinal decisions were summarized in Cyril's Twelve Chapters. But then in 433 John and his bishops accepted the Third Ecumenical Council with the Twelve Chapters and condemned Nestorius. Therefore before the Council of Chalcedon in 451 Theodoret was under condemnation by the Roman Laws of both Ephesus 431 and 449. Ephesus 449 was not yet in the process of being repealed or accepted as was finally done item by item. Thus Chalcedon did not repeal the condemnations of Theodoret and Ibas by Ephesus 449. On the contrary Chalcedon enforced these decisions against both and required that both must repent for their actions against Cyril and the Third Ecumenical Council, accept Ephesus 431 and their own condemnation by Ephesus 449, and to ask forgiveness. In other words Chalcedon completely supported Dioscoros on these questions.

However, Chalcedon would have required that Dioscoros explain his actions in regard to Leo's excommunication and may have either accepted or rejected the action or else at least appreciated a good reasoning behind them. We will never know since Dioscoros refused to argue his case against Leo and Theodoret before the Council. Had he done so he may have come out on top, especially since most of the bishops were Cyrilians. However, Dioscoros could not be exonerated from his condemnations of Flavian of Constantinople New Rome and Eusebius of Dorylaeum for not accepting in Christ "from two natures one nature" which was the "Orthodox" tradition of Alexandria, but not that of all the Churches as Cyril himself explained in his letters to his friends when explaining that by speaking of two natures in Christ one may distinguish them in thought alone. In any case both Flavian and Eusebius were finally justified in their actions against Eutyches by Dioscoros, his bishops and all Oriental Orthodox.

The question is now raised whether there were substantial grounds for Dioscoros' excommunication of Leo of Rome. It would further seem possible to argue that this excommunication was somewhat like that of Cyril's excommunication of Nestorius when the latter refused to subscribe to the Twelve Chapters. Cyril did this with the full support of the Pope Celestine of Rome. But in the case before us in 451 we have Pope Leo of Rome himself who is being excommunicated by Pope

Dioscoros of Alexandria. The reason behind this is the simple fact that Pope Leo was in reality repudiating His predecessor's support of Cyril's Twelve Chapters by supporting a fanatic enemy of Cyril and his Twelve Chapters.

The realization of the implications about Leo's support for Theodoret are interesting indeed in view of those who support Franco-Latin Papal theories about the magisterium of their medieval papacy.

THE CRITERIA:

In 1964 I pointed out that the fundamental criterion of Orthodox Christology was the acceptance of the fact that the Logos Who is consubstantial with His Father became Himself consubstantial with us by His birth as man from His mother, the Virgin Mary. In contrast, the Nestorian position was that Christ is a person who is the product of the union of the two natures in Christ. For Nestorius and Theodoret (up to 451) it is not the Logos Himself Who became by nature man and consubstantial with his mother and us. For both of them the very idea that the Logos could be united to His human nature by nature meant that He was united by a necessity of His divine nature. Thus for Nestorius and Theodoret the one nature of the Logos is consubstantial with the Father and the created nature of the Logos is consubstantial with us. The Logos did not become man and son of Mary by nature and the Virgin Mary did not become the mother of the Logos incarnate. The Basic question was not whether one accepted two natures or one nature in Christ, but whether one accepted that the Logos Himself, Who is consubstantial with His Father, became Himself consubstantial with his mother and us without confusion, change, separation, division, etc. Neither Nestorius nor Theodoret accepted that the Logos Himself became consubstantial with his mother and us and was born and died as man.

DIOSCOROS AND EUTYCHES:

Theodoret was a heretic before Leo got involved with him and he remained a heretic all the time that he was being supported by Leo. Just after Chalcedon Leo wrote in a letter to Theodoret about their common victory they had won at the Council of Chalcedon, yet in the very same letter complained about Theodoret's tardiness in rejecting

Nestorius. In other words Leo supported Theodoret during all the time that he had not one confession of the Orthodox faith to his credit. The first time that he came close to a confession of the Orthodox faith was when he became a member of the committee, we have already mentioned, which found that Leo's Tome agrees with Cyril's Twelve Chapters. Evidently he was made a member of this committee in order to create grounds for satisfying Leo's insistence that he must have his way about Theodoret or there will be no Council of Chalcedon.

Now we compare Leo's support for Theodoret with Dioscoros's support of Eutyches.

1) Theodoret not only showed no sign whatsoever that he agreed with the Third Ecumenical Council before Chalcedon, but on the contrary rejected it and continued to fight against its Twelve Chapters of St. Cyril and refused to condemn Nestorius.

2) On the contrary Dioscoros supported Eutyches on the basis of his confession of faith that " Christ is consubstantial with his mother." Whether this confession is genuine or not, or in reality an act of penance, the fact remains that Dioscoros defended a Eutyches confessing a Christology which was not exactly that for which he was condemned. This writer brought this confession to light in his paper at Aarhus in 1964. This corrected or perhaps falsified confession of faith was the basis on which Dioscoros accepted to defend Eutyches against false accusers. In any case this means that Chalcedon did not condemn the faith of Dioscoros. He was condemned only because he excommunicated Leo and refused to appear before the Council to defend himself. It is within this context that Anatolius of New Rome Constantinople opposed the effort of the imperial commissioners to have Dioscoros condemned for heresy. Anatolius clearly declared that, " Dioscoros was not deposed because of the faith, but because he excommunicated Lord Leo the Archbishop and although he was summoned to the Council three times he did not come."

It has been pointed out that what Anatolius is perhaps only saying here is that Dioscoros' faith had not been examined and for this reason he had not been condemned for his faith. But it seems that Dioscoros' faith was possibly proven by the confession of faith by which he restored Eutyches to communion. Eutyches had been condemned as denying

that Christ is consubstantial with us. Flavian two times confesses to the emperor that Christ is consubstantial with his mother. Now it is supposedly proven that Eutyches is in agreement with Flavian who had him condemned.

After his condemnation by the Home Synod of 448 Eutyches appealed to the emperor, Rome, Alexandria, Antioch and Thessaloniki. He argued among other things that the acts had been falsified. By order of the emperor the Review Council of 449 was convened to examine Eutyches' contentions. There we find among other things the following in the minutes: The Presbyter and Advocate John told the Patrician and examining magistrate Florentius that when in 448 he was sent to summon Eutyches to the Synod in order to testify, Eutyches told him that " Christ is consubstantial with his mother even though not with us." Florentius said that " this is not to be found neither in you memorandum nor in your report." John answered " This he told me while speaking only with me, that he does not have a consubstantial flesh with us, but with his mother." Then the Patrician said, " did you forget what you heard, and for this reason this is not to be found in the memorandum which you composed." John answered, " because the most reverend deacons with me did not hear what was told to me in private. for this reason I did not put it in the memorandum."

On the face of these remarks it could be argued that Eutyches agreed with Flavian. But this Patriarch is not recorded as ever denying that Christ is not consubstantial with us, although there could be the possibility that he believed this. But Eutyches had confessed that, although Christ is not consubstantial with us, his mother is. In the case of Eutyches we end up with a contradiction. Since Christ is consubstantial with His mother and His mother is consubstantial with us, it would stand to normal reason that Christ should be consubstantial with us also. It seems that behind such contradictions are either a forgery or an unbalanced personality.

The backbone of the Orthodox tradition is the fact that the Logos became consubstantial with us. There can be no doubt that Dioscoros agrees with this fact and so could never be accused of being a monophysite along with Eutyches.

It seems that Eutyches was trying to follow the fathers in his own way, but was not doing a good job. Then some like Dioscoros undertook to guide him, but to no avail. But neither Dioscoros himself

nor any other of the Oriental Orthodox Fathers every followed Eutyches the way Leo followed Theodoret like a pet on a leash.

FLAVIAN AND EUSEBIUS:

At Ephesus 449 both Flavian and Eusebius accepted Cyril's One nature of the Logos incarnate, the Third Ecumenical Council and its Twelve Chapters of Cyril. Dioscoros accused them of contradicting themselves and Cyril by using this formula wrongly by speaking about two natures after the union instead of one. So they were condemned because they insisted that when the uncreated nature (or also hypostasis in Cyrilian usage) of the Logos became by nature flesh or incarnate, the two natures out of which Christ was composed, became one nature (or hypostasis). In this natural and hypostatic union, according to Cyril, the human nature or hypostasis of the Logos was neither suppressed, absorbed nor changed and became united by nature to the logos without separation, division and change. In Cyrilian usage the two natures or hypostases are distinguished into two in thought alone. In contrast the Orthodox traditions of Rome, of New Rome and of Antioch used the two natures out of which Christ in composed in the incarnation exactly like Alexandria, but speak about two natures distinguished in thought alone. In other words both traditions agree on what the incarnate Logos is constituted of, created and uncreated natures, the uncreated being from the Father and the created nature from the Theotokos. In other words whether one says two united natures distinguished in thought alone, or one nature out of two natures distinguished in thought alone, on is professing the same reality.

In 433 Cyril accepted that both sides were saying the exact same thing. However, Dioscoros came to the conclusion that Theodoret was escaping from a just condemnation for his real heresy by hiding it behind the possibility of not only saying two natures, but of thinking of two separately acting natures which he had been also doing. However, the key to Theodoret's heresy was not this, but the fact that for him, for Nestorius, for Theodore of Mopsuestia, for Arius, for Lucian, and for Paul of Samosata (the philosophical great-grandfather and grandfather of all the former) God is united to the creature only by will and energy and never by nature. For all of those just mentioned that which is related or united by nature does so by necessity and not by the freedom of will.

One may conclude that Dioscoros can be defended in his actions against Leo. He is to be fully complimented for his fight against Theodoret. His actions against Flavian and Eusebius can be explained as primarily motivated by his desire to defend the faith against Nestorianism to such a point that he came at least very close to abandoning Cyril's reconciliation of 433 with John of Antioch. The use of the Alexandrian formula "One Nature or Hypostasis Incarnate" by Flavian and Eusebius were technically wrong as such, since they used it not in its correct historical context. However, from the viewpoint of the 433 reconciliation between Cyril and John, this formula could also be used as was done by Flavian and Eusebius, but only so long as its original usage is made clear also. Neither Flavian nor Eusebius understood this and this is what got Dioscoros hot under the collar. He was correct when he protests that both contradicted themselves when using this formula. But he could have let them use it also in the light of 433.

CHALCEDONIANS AND SEVERIANS AT NEW ROME 531/3.

At this conference the Severians supported that Eutyches was indeed a heretic and that Dioscoros accepted him as one repentant and finally confessing the faith that Christ is consubstantial with his mother. They seemed not troubled that Eutyches had denied that Christ is consubstantial with us. They defended Dioscoros' action against Flavian and Eusebius because they contradicted themselves when saying "One nature of the Logos Incarnate" and at the same time insisting on "two natures after or in their union." Hypatius, the spokesman for the Chalcedonians, was exasperated at the logic of the Orientals by which they justified Dioscoros' defense of the supposedly penitent Eutyches, but refused to accept the Orthodoxy of Flavian and Eusebius. The conference deteriorated into a fundamentalistic debate about which tradition had the correct terminology, a sanctified tradition of debate which reached right up to Aarhus 1964. The Severians insisted that "from two natures" was only correct and that "in two natures" is only wrong. The Chalcedonian side claimed that both are correct.

But the main cause why misunderstandings could never be resolved was the fact that neither side of this meeting had ever read and studied the minutes of Chalcedon. The Severians accused Chalcedon of not accepting Cyril's letter to Nestorius with the Twelve Chapters. Hypatius

answered that Chalcedon had accepted it as part of the Third Ecumenical Council. But the reason why Chalcedon supposedly did not use this letter was because Cyril speaks of two hypostases especially in Chapter 3. In other words oral traditions about Chalcedon had begun replacing the minutes of the Council on both sides so that arguments began to be formulated on the basis of heresy.

This opened the way to the position that the Tome of Leo had supposedly become the standard of Chalcedonian Orthodoxy. This was followed by the position that the Fifth Ecumenical Council returned to Cyril's Twelve Chapters in order to please the Non-Chalcedonians. Having studied at Yale University under specialist in the History of Dogma, one may appreciate the shock this writer had, while preparing for Aarhus 1964, when he saw in the minute's of Chalcedon the debate about whether the Tome or Leo agrees with the Twelve Chapters of Cyril. Hypatius' claim that Chalcedon supposedly avoided the use of Cyril's Twelve Chapters because it uses hypostasis as synonymous with physis, obliges one to realize that Chalcedon did no such thing, since Cyril became the judge of Leo's Orthodoxy. So Chalcedon both accepted the Alexandrian tradition of terms, but also that of Rome, Cappadocia and Antioch. It is important that every effort should be made to get rid of the historians of doctrinal history being caused by the so-called Neo Chalcedonianism of the Fifth Ecumenical Council.

II. TODAY'S DESCENDANTS OF THE FATHERS

One must emphasize that acceptance of the Three or Seven Ecumenical Councils does not in itself entail agreement in faith. The Franco-Latin Papacy accepts these Councils, but in reality accepts not one of them. In like manner there are Orthodox, since Peter the Great, who in reality do not accept the soteriological and Old Testament presuppositions of these Councils. On the other hand those of the Oriental Orthodox, who have not been Franco-Latinised in important parts of their theology, accept the first three of the Ecumenical Councils, but in reality accept all Seven, a fact which has now become clear in recent agreements.

The determining element in the above fluctuations is the fact that the Carolingian Franks learned to interpret the first two Ecumenical Councils through the eyes of Augustine. Then the rest of the Seven became wagons of the same train drawn by the same locomotive. The

bishop of Hippo had neither the lightest understanding of the Arian, Eunomian and Macedonian positions about the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, nor of the Fathers who opposed them. Neither he nor the Franco-Latins ever realized that each heresy condemned by the Seven or Nine Ecumenical Councils was an attack on the Biblical experience of illumination and glorification. In each case fallen man was imagined to be instructed and saved by a creature: a) either by a created Logos, b) or by a created Spirit's created energies, or c) by a created Spirit/Angel. But Augustine's salvation by created grace, i.e. by his created glorifications in the Old and New Testaments or by his created Pentecostal tongues of fire, or by his fires of hell and outer darkness or by created heavenly glory, are all the same pagan realities. Indeed all these Augustinian creatures which reveal and save in both the Old and New Testaments come into and pass out of existence after each of their specific tasks has come to pass. The Council of 1341 condemned these teachings in the person of Barlaam the Calabrian not knowing that this tradition was initiated by Augustine and was accepted by the Franco-Latin tradition. It was continued by the Reformers and is to be found in Bible Commentaries today.

The reality of the matter is that the difference between Augustine and Ambrose, who baptized the former, became the difference between the Franco-Latin and the Roman traditions, both East and West.

The basic difference between the Franco-Latin and Orthodox traditions is that not only illumination or justification takes place in this life, but also that glorification or theosis does so also. The today's Orthodox must return to the Fathers who see both these stages of cure already in the Old Testament and completed in Christ and Pentecost. This would be the essential patristic basis for our going forward in our coming into organic union since this is a fundamental presupposition in the Bible accepted and clearly expounded by our the Fathers, especially by those of the Three and Seven Ecumenical Councils.

Illumination/justification and glorification/theosis in both the Old and New Testaments have nothing to do with mysticism. The Fathers reject spiritualities based on the soul's so-called liberation from earthly copies of transcendental realities and its quest for union with non-existent universals in the essence of God. The Fathers clearly reject universals and condemn efforts to unite with them as figments of the imagination and tricks of the devil. Here is a basic patristic foundation

for agreeing with those Protestants who agree with Luther's revolt against Franco-Latin monasticism. Many Orthodox assume that Luther's revolt against monasticism was an attack on Orthodox spirituality. To understand this reality is the main key to our participation in such efforts as the WCC.

Luther's rejection of *analogia entis*, i.e. universals, made the Bible the only basis of speaking authoritatively about God. But the Fathers go further by rejecting *analogia fidei*, the identity of the words and concepts about God, even in the Bible, with God Himself. The inspiration of the Bible does not make it revelation itself, but a guide to glorification which is revelation. Even the words of Christ themselves are guides to and not themselves glorification or revelation. Christ prays that his disciples and their disciples may see His Glory (John 17), but He does not describe his glory. The foundation of heresy is the confusion of the Bible with revelation whereby one tries to understand God by meditation and speculation on Biblical texts. Since all of one's words and concepts are from one's environment, such meditation and speculation ends up being a closed circle within createdness. Only by accepting the witness of the prophets that there is no similarity between the created and the uncreated and that "it is impossible to express God and even more impossible to conceive Him" that one submits to the cure of purification, illumination and glorification.

This raises the question about the validity of Systematic or Dogmatic Theology and its distinction from Pastoral Theology and the relation of both to so-called Christian Ethics. Within the context of the cure of purification and illumination of the heart and glorification these theological disciplines do not really exist. The very fact that one's spirit must return to the heart emptied of both good and bad thoughts in order to be occupied only with prayer that the intellect may be occupied with its normal activities does not allow such divisions of labor. What is left is cure of oneself in communion with others as expressed in the gospel of Christ with which He Himself inspired in His friends even before His incarnation.

Such documents as "Confessing the One Faith" are distortions of our Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed in its present form. It must be completed by the fact that "God, whom no one has ever seen" (John 1:18), has indeed revealed Himself to the prophets of the Old Testament in His uncreated Messenger even before His incarnation. To

see the Angel of the Lord is to see God Himself Who sends Him. " The only begotten Son, He Who is in the bosom of the Father, He reveals." As the prophets saw and heard God in His Messenger, so now also he who sees and hears His incarnate Messenger sees and hears God Himself. She who gave birth to Christ gave birth to God's Logos in the flesh. They who crucified Christ crucified the Logos Himself in the flesh. " He who believes in me does not believe in me but in him who sent me, and he who sees me sees him who sent me." (John 12:44-45). " Lord, show us the Father... He who sees me has seen the Father." (John 14:8-9). This identity between the uncreated Messenger of God in the Old Testament and the incarnate Logos in the New Testament is the key to a correct appreciation of the Three, Seven and Nine Ecumenical Councils (879, 1341) of the Orthodox Church.

From the viewpoint of both the Old and New Testaments and the Fathers correct faith in the Lord of Glory is not a religion, but the rejection of religion. Religion is a sickness which confuses words and concepts taken from one's environment with God and transforms them into the idols that they are. This is exactly what most so-called theologians, pastors and faithful do. The faithful who are not at least in the state of illumination may seem better than members of other religions, but may be even morally worse. Such evaluations may be to the point within the context of the negative role religions seem to be playing today. A discussion and agreement about the dangers of analogia entis, analogia fidei and the fanatics they tend to breed within Christianity and other religions may be a helpful and useful corollary to our work together.

It would seem that we must train ourselves patristically to be ready to examine with our Protestant and Latin friends whether Sola Scriptura and Sola fide want to say what may be described as the Patristic Sola Pentecoste. Each theosis, i.e. glorification, is the extension of Pentecost in the lives of our saints to which nothing can be added and improved upon.

The basic question which we must ask ourselves is whether we are descendants of our fathers in Christ, or have we become part of the Augustinian tradition? Who are and what are the so-called Orthodox who no longer identify Christ with " He Who Is" Who appeared to Moses in the burning bush and the " Angel of Great Council" Who appeared to Isaiah?

I have not once come across a document of the WCC in which the Orthodox have made known Who Christ is in the Old Testament. I tried to do this at the Rhodes meeting on " Confessing the Crucified and Risen Christ in Social, Cultural and Ethical Context today" 4-11/1/88. I explained that no one has the right to explain and comment on the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed without reference to the reasons why the Fathers composed the Creed and how they explain the Creed. I insisted that both the Arians and Eunomians agreed with the Fathers that Christ in the Old Testament is the Angel of the Lord, the Angel of Great Council, etc. who appeared to the prophets; that the difference was that for the fathers the Logos/Angel is uncreated and that for these heretics he was created. Augustine rejected this identity of this Angel of the Lord with the Logos, thinking that only the Arians believed that the Logos was seen by the prophets and that his visibility was the main argument by which they proved that the Logos is created. I presented the meeting with patristic texts. The participants voted the approval of my suggestions. But subsequently nothing appeared in the New Revised Version. But that the Lord of Glory of the Old Testament was born as man from the Theotokos [5] and was crucified is the foundation of all the doctrinal decisions of all our Ecumenical Councils. Who in God's name are running the Orthodox show in the World Council of Churches?

If we believe as our Fathers that Christ is the Lord of Glory Who appeared to the prophets and made them His friends, and if we are supposed to also see His Glory and become his friends, as clearly prayed for by Christ in John 17, only then do the lifting of anathemas have some meaning.

This article represents the views of the writer and not necessarily the views of the editor of this magazine.