



Durham E-Theses

The canons of the orthodox church and the application of 'economy' to current infringements

Hulbert, Martin Francis Harrington

How to cite:

Hulbert, Martin Francis Harrington (1962) *The canons of the orthodox church and the application of 'economy' to current infringements*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/9775/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a link is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

THE CANONS OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH AND THE
APPLICATION OF 'ECONOMY' TO CURRENT INFRINGEMENTS

being a Thesis submitted by

The Reverend Martin Francis Harrington Hulbert
(Bachelor of Science)

towards the degree of Master of Arts

in the

University of Durham

June 1962

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

THE CANONS OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH AND THE
APPLICATION OF 'ECONOMY' TO CURRENT INFRINGEMENTS

CONTENTS

<u>Section I</u>	<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	P.1
<u>Section II</u>	<u>Brief Summary of the History of the Orthodox Church</u>	P. 7
(a)	The Councils of the Early Church: the sources of the Canons.	P.7.
(b)	The Schism.	P.14.
(c)	Relationships with the Church of England.	P.20.
<u>Section III</u>	<u>The Importance of the Canons in Orthodox Thought</u>	P. 28.
<u>Section IV</u>	<u>A Definition of 'Economy' as Applied to the Canons.</u>	P. 36.
<u>Section V</u>	<u>Doctrinal Variations Underlying the Disciplinary Canons</u> (Economy, by definition, being inapplicable)	P. 42.
(a)	The Validity of Orders	P. 44.
(b)	The Thirty Nine Articles	P. 50.
(c)	The Number and Authority of Ecumenical Councils	P. 56.
(d)	The Number and Doctrine of Sacraments	P. 60.
(e)	The 'Filioque' Clause in the Nicene Creed	P. 67.
(f)	Orthodox Spirituality: (Icons Reliques and Prayers for the Dead)	P. 73.
<u>Section VI</u>	<u>A Suggested Classification of the Canons</u>	P. 82.
<u>Section VII</u>	<u>Class A, Canons in Agreement with Anglican Position</u>	P. 89.

<u>Section VIII</u>	<u>Class B, Canons of Historical Interest Only</u>	P. 91.
<u>Section IX</u>	<u>Class C, Canons in which the Differences are not Serious</u>	P. 97.
<u>Section X</u>	<u>Class D, Canons in which the Differences are more Serious, But the Orthodox might apply Economy to Anglican Infringement</u>	P. 99.
(a)	Baptism and Confirmation	P. 101.
(b)	The Eucharist and the Epiclesis	P. 107.
(c)	Clergy	P. 112.
(d)	Marriage	P. 121.
(e)	Sex	P. 128.
(f)	Spirituality	P. 134.
(g)	Monks and Nuns	P. 138.
(h)	Jews and Heretics	P. 140.
(i)	Interest on Money	P. 143.
(j)	Date of Easter	P. 145.
(k)	Canon of Scripture	P. 146.
(l)	Miscellaneous	P. 154.
	Supporting Canons	P. 156.
<u>Section XI</u>	<u>Some Topics Arising from the Canons OF particular importance to Anglicans</u>	P. 158.
(a)	Communion to the Dying	P. 160.
(b)	Treatment of Converts	P. 161.
(c)	Manner of Administration of Communion	P. 162.
(d)	Heresies	P. 163.
(e)	Factions within the Church	P. 164.
(f)	Abortion	P. 165.
(g)	Virginity and Marriage	P. 166.
(h)	Baptism and Confirmation	P. 167.
(i)	The Eucharist	P. 169.
(j)	Clergy	P. 171.
(k)	Re-marriage	P. 172.
(l)	Spirituality	P. 174.
<u>Section XIII</u>	<u>Conclusion</u>	P. 175.

Appendix I The Complete Classification of the Canons P. 182.

Appendix II The 199 Canons of Class D in the order
found in the "Rudder", and the sub-sections
to which they are allocated. P. 192.

Appendix III Some notes on Orthodox Detail P. 205.

Acknowledgements P. 208.

Bibliography P. 209.

Section I

I N T R O D U C T I O N

"The Rudder (in Greek 'Pedalion') of the Metaphorical Ship of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of the Orthodox Christians", is the title of an English translation of the book of the Orthodox Canons.

(Cummings title page). To think of the Church as A Ship is perhaps strange to Western Christians even though a ship is used as the symbol of the World Council of Churches. The word "Nave" (latin navis, a ship) is also still in use, and the baptised are received into "the ark of Christ's Church" (the Book of Common Prayer).

The Orthodox Church carries the symbolism further for to them "the Ship's Keel represents the Orthodox faith in the Holy Trinity; its Beams and Planks the dogmas and traditions of the Faith; its Mast represents the Cross, while its Sail and Rigging represent Hope and Love". Our Lord Jesus Christ is the Master of the vessel, His hand upon the Helm. The Mates and Sailors are "the Apostles and their successors and all secretaries and notaries and occasional teachers"; the Passengers comprise all Orthodox Christians and the Sea symbolises this present life. A gentle zephyrlike

breeze signifies the Holy Spirit wafting the vessel on its course: Winds, on the other hand, are temptations baffling it. The Rudder whereby it is steered straight forward to the heavenly Harbour is the above-named handbook of the sacred Canons. (Cummings VI). It is this "Rudder" which is the basis of the present study.

Section II of this dissertation summarises the history of the Eastern Orthodox Church and the historical background of this book of the Orthodox Canons called the Pedalion or "Rudder". Section III deals with the importance of the Canons in Orthodox thought. "Economy" as understood in the Orthodox Church, and the limitations in its application, have been discussed in Section IV, before the classification of the Canons (Section VI), because an understanding of "Economy" is fundamental to this classification. Similarly some understanding of "Economy" illuminates the doctrinal differences between Anglicanism and Orthodoxy which are dealt with in Section V.

The classification set out in Section VI has been so designed that the Canons have been divided into four groups each of which has a particular relevance for Ecumenical studies. Those with which Anglicans are in full agreement are contained in Class A (Section VII). But where there is considered to be any possibility of divergence between the Orthodox Canons and the views of Anglicans, the Canons are graded into three classes B, C, and D (Sections VII, IX and X), ranging from a lesser to a greater degree of difficulty in resolving such divergence. This leads to an investigation as to how far Anglicans infringe or disobey these Orthodox Canons and as to whether Economy can be applied in such cases, for if it could be applied to all disciplinary differences then only doctrinal differences would remain to divide us, and obviously such a reduction in the area of disagreement would be of Ecumenical importance.

The Orthodox Church supports all Western Christian denominations at some points but opposes them at others, never completely identifying itself with any one Western

division but linking many, with a reconciling power which is being increasingly recognised in the West. (Chitty, Zernov 1951 page 126). For example, Orthodoxy supports the Baptist Church against Rome by insisting on triple immersion at Baptism, but supports the Roman Church against the Baptist by baptising infants.

The ways in which Orthodoxy is like Catholicism and like Protestantism is shown by the following quotation from the Encyclopedia Britannica 14th edition Volume 16 page 939, Article "Orthodox Eastern Church" adapted from G.B. Winer:

"The Church of Christ is the fellowship of all those who accept and profess all the Articles transmitted by the Apostles and approved by General Synods. Without the visible church there is no salvation. It is under the abiding influence of the Holy Spirit and therefore cannot err in matters of faith. Specially appointed persons are necessary in the service of the church, and they form a threefold order, distinct 'jure divino' from other Christians, of Bishops, Priests and Deacons. The four Patriarchs of

equal dignity have the highest rank among Bishops, and the Bishops united in a general Council represent the Church and infallibly decide, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, all matters of faith and ecclesiastical life.
All ministers of Christ must be regularly called and appointed to their office, and are consecrated by the sacrament of orders. Bishops must be unmarried, and Priests and Deacons must not contract a second marriage.
To all Priests in common belongs, besides the preaching of the Word, the administration of the Six Sacraments: Baptism, Confirmation, Penance, Eucharist, Matrimony, Unction of the Sick. The Bishops alone can administer the Sacrament of Orders. Ecclesiastical ceremonies are part of the divine service, most of them have apostolic origin, and those connected with the Sacrament must not be omitted by Priests under the pain of mortal sin".

(Red underlining indicates differences from Roman Catholic doctrine and green from "Protestant" doctrine.)

Zankov (page 155) also discusses how Orthodoxy is like Roman Catholicism and like Anglicanism at some

points but also unlike both at others. It is Protestant in its emphasis on Scripture, its denial of Papal Authority, and its horror of justification by works. It is with the conviction that Orthodoxy has much to offer to, as well as much to learn from, Western Christianity that this dissertation is offered as a contribution to modern Ecumenical understanding.

Section II

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE HISTORY OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH

- (a) The Councils of the Early Church: the sources of the Canons
- (b) The Schism
- (c) Relationships with the Church of England

The Orthodox Eastern Church, described officially as "The Holy Orthodox Catholic Apostolic Eastern Church", is the historical representative of the Churches of the Ancient East. It consists of (a) those churches which accepted all the decrees of the first seven General (Ecumenical) Councils and have remained in full communion with one another, and (b) such churches as derived their origin from these by missionary activity, or by abscission without loss of communion.

(a) The Councils of the Early Church; the sources of the Canons.

As here considered, the history of the Early Church is drawn from the records of those Councils and those Divines which put forth disciplinary canons; in fact, from the sources of the 'Pedalion', the book of the Canons. Acts XV v. 24 describes the first Council of the Christian Church, which produced recommendations but no statements which could be called Canons.

The sources of the Canons contained in the Pedalion or "Rudder" may be divided into four groups:-

- (1) The Apostolic Constitutions (or Apostolic Canons), a body of disciplinary material which had accumulated over the first four centuries A.D.; and was later adopted by the Ecumenical Councils, so attaining equal authority with them.
- (2) The Seven Ecumenical Councils were meetings open to representatives of the whole Christian world of their day; at most of which both East and West were present: the decisions arrived at attained supreme authority. After the "Great Schism" in the ninth century no such all-embracing meetings could be held, and no more Councils could be called Ecumenical.
- (3) The Regional Councils, as the name implies, were gatherings of representatives of more restricted areas. Such gatherings had occurred from the earliest times and their decisions were later ratified by Ecumenical Councils. The two which took place in 861 and 869 came after the seventh and last Ecumenical Council: their decisions have since been accepted as of equal authority with those of the earlier Regional Councils.

(4) Various Writings of Early Eastern Divines, (known collectively by the Orthodox as The Holy Fathers) dating from earliest times to the last Ecumenical Council at Nicea and accepted by it. Post-Nicene writings are of course not truly Ecumenical and strictly do not form part of the "Rudder" (see page 1). Details of these sources are summarised in the following table.

TABLE I The Sources of the Canons in the Rudder

Council	Place	Date	Bishops	No. of Canons	Main Points
			East/West		
<u>Apostolic Constitutions</u>					
<u>Ecumenical Councils</u>					
1st.	Nicea I	325	318	5	20 Arianism
2nd.	Constantinople	381	150	0	7 Apollinarianism
3rd.	Ephesus	431	200	5	8 Nestorianism
4th.	Chalcedon	451	630	0	30 Eutychianism
5th.	Constantinople	553	168	few	3 Chapters
6th.	Constantinople	680	330	2	102 Monothelitism
7th.	Nicea II	787	350	2	22 Iconoclasm
<u>Regional Councils</u>					
1st. & 2nd.	Constantinople	861	318	4	17 Iconoclasm
Temple of Holy Wisdom	Constantinople	879	383	2	3 Photian
Carthage	Africa	256	71	1	Re-baptism
Ancyra	Galatia	314	18	0	25 persecution
Neocaesarea	Cappadocia	325	23	15	marriage
Gangra	Asia Minor	340	30	1	asceticism
Antioch	Syria	341	97	0	25 church rules
Laodicea	Phrygia	364		60	heretics
Sardica	Illyrica	343	376	300	20 Athanasius
Constantinople	Asia Minor	394	20	0	2 episcopate
Carthage (under Aurelius)	Africa	419	217	141	Roman claims

TABLE I (continued)

	Date	No. of Canons
<u>The Holy Fathers</u>		
Dionysius the Alexandrian	d. 254	4
Gregory of Neocaesarea	213 - 270	12
Peter the Martyr	d. 296	15
Athanasius the Great	296 - 373	3
Basil the Great	d. 279	92
Gregory of Nyssa	330 - 395	8
Gregory the Theologian	329 - 389	1
Amphilocius of Iconium	340 - 395	1
Timothy of Alexandria	d. 477	18
Theophilus of Alexandria	d. 412	14
Cyril of Alexandria	d. 444	5
Gennadius	d. 471	1
John the Faster	d. 595	35
Tarasius	d. 806	1
Nicephorus the Confessor	758 - 829	37 + 7
Patriarch Nicholas	d. 1084	11

(The dates of some Councils and Holy Fathers are those in the Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, the others are those in the Rudder.)

From this table it can be seen that all the Regional Councils except two took place before even the Fourth Ecumenical Council at Chalcedon. These

two though latest in date, are traditionally placed first in the lists. A majority of the writings of the Holy Fathers also appeared before Chalcedon. Also clearly demonstrated in the table is the overwhelming majority of Eastern Bishops at almost all Councils. Most of the Holy Fathers are of Eastern origin; these facts may explain why the authority of the Canons is so much greater in the East than in the West.

There remains the question of the formation of the "Rudder". Like the Canon of Scripture it grew as ecumenical recognition was given to different writings and Councils. Fifty Canons from the Apostolic constitutions for example, were translated into Latin by Dionysius (died 254) and these became part of Western canon law, while in the East the Regional Council of Trullo 692 secured their recognition. (Cummings, p. 41v)

The Greek book of the Canons (Pedalion), in English "The Rudder", has accumulated over many centuries. John Zonaras (1118) a monk of St. Glyceria, who was the first known person to attempt to gather all

the Canons together, defined a canon as a symbolic "piece of wood, a rule, which workmen use to get the wood or stone which they are working on straight". (Cummings, Liv). The Canons are rules made by the ecumenical church to keep Christians "straight". Zonaras wrote an interpretation for each canon and these were added to by many later canonists: Alexius Aristenus (1166), Theodore Balsamon (1204) and many others in later years. (Cummings p. XLvi)

The present handbook, "The Rudder", was first published in 1860 in Leipzig, and the first English translation in 1908 in Athens; the version used here is that of D. Cummings published in 1957 in Chicago by the Christian Education Society. In order to have a concord giving all canons dealing with the same problem, these later canonists "garnered also the canons of the rest of the Fathers", which had not been confirmed by an Ecumenical Council: this means those of St. Nicephorus (758-829), of Nicholas the Patriarch of Constantinople (1084) and the canons of John the Faster (d. 595). (Cummings, XLviii). These

Canons not having/^{been} accepted by an Ecumenical Council,
have not the same authority as the others.

(b) The Schism

After the Councils the next important event in the history of the Orthodox Church was the Schism. It is difficult to escape the conclusion of Dr. N. Zernov (a Russian lay theologian, now Spalding Lecturer in Eastern Orthodox Culture in Oxford), that the Schism between Eastern and Western Christians is one of the greatest calamities in the history of the Church. It encouraged the excessive growth of the Papal power in the West, and this over-centralisation of Church government resulted in abuses and provoked widespread discontent. The Reformation itself was one of its consequences, and the present divided state of the Christian Church is a direct result of the old Schism between East and West. (Zernov 1942 p.6).

Dr. Zernov also shows how the Orthodox Church in Russia came to see itself historically as the one true guardian of "the faith once delivered". It even

regarded the Greek Church as possibly tainted with Latin influence. (Zernov 1937 p. 66, also Spinka p.102). Russians even more than Greeks, (though this is true of all Orthodox) see the Pope as an arch-Protestant and consider "Latins" as idolaters who worship the Pope, and Protestants as still worse since they elevate the Book to a position which should be occupied by Christ alone. (Zernov 1956 p.19). The same author remarks "Orthodoxy looks upon Romanism and Protestantism as two aspects of the same error, that error being the rejection of the Authority of the Universal Church under the influence of Rationalism, and the substitution in its place of authority more or less controversial". (see also Lectures on the Russian Church p. 35)
"All Protestants are born out of Rome and are crypto-papists". (Birkbeck p. 67).

Since so much is claimed by the Orthodox Church to result from the Schism, it is worthwhile to consider briefly what led up to it. Until the end of the Eighth Century both Rome and Constantinople were part of the same political organisation and this perhaps was

the main reason why a serious split did not occur until the Ninth Century, meanwhile divergences in belief and practice were beginning to emerge. An immediate cause was the irregular appointment, by the Emperor Michael III in 858, of Photius as Patriarch of Constantinople while he was still a layman, in place of Ignatius who was deposed. But the split was deepened by the political conflict which occurred in 880 when Charlemagne restored the Western Roman Empire. (Zernov 1956 p.12). Greek Christians believed that the Pope should never have consented to crown the barbarian Charlemagne. The Byzantine emperor never fully recognised the intruder as his brother sovereign: rival political powers were set up, which led in the Fifteenth Century, to the fall of the Byzantine empire and its Church.

Photius, appointed by the Emperor, was consecrated by Gregory Asbestas, Archbishop of Syracuse, whom the regular Patriarch of Constantinople had himself deposed. The first task of the new Patriarch was to list heresies in the part of the

Church owing allegiance more particularly to the Pope or Bishop of Rome. These included :-

- (1) Fasting on Saturdays in Lent.
- (2) Beginning Lent on Ash Wednesday instead of on a Monday.
- (3) Disapproval of married priests.
- (4) Objection to confirmation administered by a priest, rather than by a Bishop.
- (5) The unlawful addition to the Creed of the phrase "and the Son" (in Latin the "Filioque").

The Western Church of course replied with a list of Eastern heresies, the main differences can be summarised as follows :-

- (1) The Filioque.
- (2) The belief in Purgatory as distinct from Hell.
- (3) The use of Leavened or of Unleavened Bread in the Eucharist.

This first breach under Photius was however healed for a time, and peace reigned until 1054, when the papal legate excommunicated Michael

Cerularius, the patriarch of Constantinople, as a result of a dispute over the control of Latin monasteries in Constantinople. Such an excommunication was doubly irregular since not only was the matter at issue not one of doctrine, but the papal throne was vacant at the time, Pope Leo IX having died a few weeks before. Rome has never confirmed this excommunication of the Orthodox. (Zernov 1961 p.99). It is easy to see why the Orthodox feel the Western Church bears the responsibility for the Schism. (Zankow p.155). Constantine IX (1042-1055) tried to appease the quarrel, but the political wound was kept open by the Normans who attacked the territories of the Eastern Empire in the name of the See of St. Peter.

Believing that the sword should never be used except for defence, and having from the start had doubts about the Crusades, the Eastern Church found in the Crusaders of the following century a fresh obstacle to friendship with the West. This was

made worse because the Crusaders had no regard for the Orthodox Churches in the cities which they captured, so that the Orthodox suffered more under their fellow-Christians than under the Moslems.

"The Crusaders tried to convert the Orthodox Christians to Latinism, confiscated their Churches and buildings, imprisoned their clergy and treated them as though they professed a wholly alien religion". (Zernov 1956 p.18). The sack of Salonika in 1185 and of Constantinople in 1204 caused wounds which went even deeper: the latter date is usually given for the end of fellowship between East and West.

It is clear that the split was caused not primarily by quarrelsome theologians or ambitious prelates, but by the greed and lust of those men who in the name of the Prince of Peace, had embarked upon a war leading to aggression and conquest. At Lyons in 1274 and at Florence under Pope Martin V in 1439, apparent reconciliation was achieved between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople, but only a paper agreement resulted because the East could not forgive the offenders.

Since the Filioque clause had been added to the Nicene Creed at a time when East and West were still in fellowship, its existence cannot be, as has been sometimes alleged, the real cause of the Schism: that arose from a growing alienation between the Christian East and West, fostered by political competition and jealousies, and kept alive by an unforgiving spirit.

(c) Relationships with the Church of England,

After the final hardening of the Schism there was little or no contact between East and West for nearly four hundred years. The story of growing amity between the Orthodox Church and the Church of England is much more pleasant to record. (It has been suggested that there was a close doctrinal affinity with the Celtic Church, as evidenced by the writings of the Venerable Bede. (Bede p.180).)

It was however the Caroline Divines who revived the links between the Church of England and the East at the end of the Sixteenth Century. Archbishop Laud (1573-1645) and Bishop Lancelot Andrews (1555-1626) were

among those who were deeply interested in the Eastern Church. (Zernov 1942 p.75). Great interest was also taken between 1716 and 1725 by the Non-jurors (who were of the High Church party and had conscientiously objected to swearing allegiance to William and Mary). (Williams p.8). They wrote letters to the Eastern Church mentioning twelve points of agreement and suggesting five steps to make agreement more possible. These five steps were:-

- (1) The elevation of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem to the Primatial See of a reunited church.
- (2) The restoration in the Church of England of the ancient discipline and liturgy.
- (3) The erection in London of a Church as a monument of reconciliation.
- (4) The celebration of the Orthodox Eucharist once a year in St. Paul's.
- (5) Regular prayers to be offered for the Sister Church at public services.

(Some advances have been made along the lines suggested by the last three of these steps.)

There were however also five points of divergence which the Non-jurors wanted to settle before unity could be achieved. They could not accept:-

- (1) The equal authority of the Ecumenical Councils with that of Holy Scripture.
- (2) The type of veneration offered by Eastern Christians to the Mother of God.
- (3) The direct invitation of the Saints.
- (4) The adoration of the consecrated elements at the Eucharist.
- (5) The use of Icons.

The Non-jurors were thus unyieldingly loyal to the Anglican position, even though they were schismatic from it. Since all these points arise directly from the Thirty Nine Articles they are discussed in Section V. Many modern Anglicans would take very similar positions to the Non-jurors over these points. (See the Report of the Anglo-Russian Theological Conference, Moscow 1957).

The Eastern reply of course mentioned the problem of the Filioque and insisted that all the customs,

traditions and usages of the East must be accepted by the Non-jurors. The response to this is most interesting since the Non-jurors showed great scholarship in proving that the Eastern Church had itself departed just as far from the tradition of the early centuries as the East was suggesting that the West had done. There was no other important result of this correspondence.

A long period followed during which no further advances were made, the next being that of members of the Oxford Movement in the Nineteenth Century, particularly the Reverend William Palmer. His personal contact resulted in a request to receive communion at the Russian Eucharist, and forced the Orthodox to consider the question of union. They made an attempt to decide what they required of a person or church before inter-communion would be possible: what parts of teaching and practice could be regarded as local customs legitimate in themselves, but having no claim to divine authority and whose acceptance therefore was not obligatory for Western Christians asking for union. This is in fact the

subject of the present study.

Palmer received the reply that an individual must conform to all the usual rules and could not ask for concessions, because there was at that time no authority to make concessions, the higher canonical organs having ceased to function in the Russian Church since the reforms of Peter the Great (1676-1725). (Zernov 1937 ch. 4). Nowadays Anglicans like other Christians living in Orthodox countries, are allowed by the exercise of Economy, to receive communion at the Orthodox Eucharist. Some Orthodox, on the other hand, occasionally communicate in Anglican Churches, especially in the United States. (Zernov, private communication).

In 1864, M.R. Young, a member of the American Episcopal Church, desired to enter into communion with the Russian Church. He had an interview with Metropolitan Philaret who required satisfactory solutions to the following five questions before communion could be established. (Zernov 1942 p.85).

The five questions were:-

- (1) The place of the ThirtyNine Articles in the theology of the Church of England.
- (2) The addition of the Filioque clause.
- (3) The uninterrupted succession of Anglican orders.
- (4) The Anglican attitude to Church tradition.
- (5) The seven.. sacraments.

These five points, it will be noticed, resemble those produced by the Non-jurors one hundred and fifty years earlier.

Other contacts were made at this time by Fr. Vassiliev and Dr. Pusey, Fr. Denton in Serbia, Nicholas Damalas in London, Alexander Lycurgos in Liverpool and others. In 1869 Dr. Tate, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Gregory the Sixth, Ecumenical Patriarch, Archbishop of Constantinople, agreed on inter-burial. All these and other contacts culminated in the Bonn conference of 1874-1875 which failed, apparently "due to the lack of any real knowledge of Anglicans by the Eastern Church". (Zernov 1942 p.87). Both sides agreed that the difference arising from the addition of the Filioque

to the creed did not necessarily imply a difference in teaching on the Holy Trinity.

In the Twentieth Century the Ecumenical Movement has resulted in numerous contacts. Official Commissions have been held at:- Bonn 1932, Bucharest 1935, Moscow 1956, and other places. Contacts have also been maintained through the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association and the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius. It has been suggested that political reasons prevented the Russian Orthodox Church from joining the World Council of Churches at the beginning, but in 1961 they did so. (Spinka p.142).

Over four hundred years without contact were thus followed by four hundred years of negotiations, but up to this time no agreement has been reached as to what are the main causes of disunity between East and West. At first it was the Filioque, later the Thirty-nine Articles, still later Orders, Eucharistic doctrine and the Communion of Saints. All these are considered in Section V. It is quite obvious that these

doctrinal differences are not the only ones, and this dissertation is concerned mainly with the disciplinary differences, in the hope that these non-theological factors may be overcome and the real doctrinal differences exposed.

Section III

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE CANONS IN
ORTHODOX THOUGHT

Orthodox Christianity offers the whole of Christendom a particular concept of church authority and of tradition. (Douglas p.121 Lassky 166). It is this concept which gives rise to the esteem in which the Canons are held as part of the Holy Tradition of the Church, and this high esteem for the Canons in turn gives rise to most of the differences from Anglicanism. In other words the varying concepts of the "Church" held by the two bodies are the prime origins of the divergences between them.

The Orthodox see the Church primarily as a Eucharistic community and not as an institution - as a living organism rather than as an organisation. (Birkbeck p.192). Though the Church in the West would agree with this truth, from the Eastern standpoint most Western Churches tend towards institutions, bound perhaps by different legalisms and finding their authority in a person or a book rather than in a community. It has been suggested that this is exemplified by the fact that while both East and West refer to the Church as the Body of Christ, the West uses the Latin word "corpus" which means both an organic body and a legally established

institution, while the East employs the Greek word "soma" which can only be used of a living organism. (Zernov 1956 p.73).

This view of the Church as a living organism results in the source of authority for the Eastern Church being not in a person or a book, but in "the Holy Spirit speaking and acting through the whole body of believers". The Holy Spirit in this capacity is the guardian of the truth. Hence the decrees of the Ecumenical Councils are accepted by the Eastern Church, not because many bishops were gathered at the Councils, nor for any reason such as the presence there of representatives of the Bishop of Rome, but because their decisions were approved by the Holy Spirit through the unanimous acceptance by the body of the Church, of the Canons which the Councils promulgated. (Zernov 1956 p.76). "Ecclesiastical Hierarchy is not the guardian of dogma but the whole people of the Church" (Birkbeck p.84). The authority of the Councils "does not depend on the presence of the legates of the Pope nor his recognition" (as shown by the Second Ecumenical Council, the Canons

of which were accepted although the Pope was not represented at it) "nor does it depend on or require confirmation by the state authorities" as most Protestant canonists think, (the authority of the Robber Council of 499 is accepted though the state took no cognisance of it), "nor on the participation of all the local churches" (the main Ecumenical Councils by their composition were councils of the Eastern half of the Roman Empire only), nor even on immediate recognition of a council as Ecumenical by all the individual churches. Only one thing is requisite for acceptability of a council, namely "that at the council the truth which is contained in the whole Orthodox Church" shall have been expressed. This can only be ascertained by a long historic process. The very life and history of the church print this seal on the councils. (Archpriest V.M.Borovy Moscow 1956 p.47). It will be seen that the authority of the Canons for the Orthodox has a similar foundation to that of the Canon of Scripture for Anglicans.

This source of authority was not of course available after the Schism because the Church was no longer one.

The Orthodox Church has remained so firmly loyal to this position that it is still bound only by the Councils which were held before the Schism, after which authority to change doctrine or discipline no longer existed.

In 1948 an attempt was made (Spinka p. 137) to call an Ecumenical council of the autocephalous Orthodox Churches to examine their canons and to discuss :-

- (1) The Repudiation of papal authority.
- (2) The Validity of Anglican Orders.
- (3) The Kalendar.
- (4) The Ecumenical Movement.

The Orthodox would admit that this was not a true Ecumenical council, (it did not include Western Christendom), but these four points are seen to be under discussion in Orthodoxy. (The validity of Anglican Orders ~~and~~ is discussed in Section Vb.) Orthodox doctrine is unchangeable without an Ecumenical Council. (Lectures p.34). This is not because a

Council is infallible but because the Holy Spirit is believed to work through the unanimous acceptance of the decisions of an Ecumenical Council.

The disciplinary Canons of the "Rudder" were accepted by the whole body of the Church and have therefore the same authority as Holy Tradition of which they form part, and should be universally obeyed. (Moscow p.31 46 Douglas p.27). Tradition has been defined by Professor G. Florovsky as "the witness of the Holy Spirit, His unceasing revelation and preaching of the Good Tidings. For the living members of the Church it is not an outward historical authority but the continual eternal voice of God." (Zernov 1956 p.78). It is this sort of authority which the disciplinary Canons have, arising as they do from the Ecumenical Councils and Regional Councils accepted by the whole Church and from the Saints who have demonstrably lived in communion with the Holy Spirit.

Though these canons are called "Disciplinary" it is to a great extent an unreal distinction. Just as

the Thirty Nine Articles are not wholly doctrinal so the canons of the "Rudder" are not wholly disciplinary, for example those concerning the Filioque (See Section V).

There is a further practical reason to account for the reverence in which the "Rudder" is held. In Russia there were at one time so few books in existence that almost all were either Bibles, writings of the Saints, or copies of the "Rudder". On the view of authority already explained it is not difficult to see how under such conditions all writings came to be referred to as Holy Scriptures. (Zernov 1937 p.52). For these reasons the Disciplinary Canons are regarded as having the authority of the Holy Spirit of God. Orthodox Christians revere the Canons as much as Evangelicals revere the Bible. They cannot understand why Anglicans hold as "necessary to salvation" only what can be proved from the Scriptures, deliberately excluding other parts of Holy Tradition.

In spite of their supreme authority, a brief look at the Canons will be sufficient to show that even

if all are considered valid, (Rodzianko, private communication) they cannot all be considered binding today. The regulations for the movement of clergy, or the strict rules against heretics (Apostolic Constitutions 65: forbidding prayer with them, 34 of Laodicea : forbidding fraternising), may have been useful in the Early Church, but if observed nowadays would seriously limit the activity of the Church. Again, early canons which in their earliest forms forbade clergy to enter a tavern (Apostolic Constitutions 54, and 24 of Laodicea) and later canons which permitted entry only for shelter and not to eat or drink (47 of Carthage), show how the Early Church had to modify its originally more severe canons. Many of them would appear to be of little more than historical interest. They were probably drawn up against heresies or local irregularities of the time.

The extent to which the Canons have become obsolete is still more apparent as the classification used in

this study is set out and discussed in detail in Sections VI - X. Though in theory all the Canons are part of inviolable Holy Tradition, in practice many are treated as obsolete even though they have never been officially declared to be so. One of the reasons why such a declaration has not been necessary, is the existence of the principle of "Economy" to which we now turn.

Section IV

A DEFINITION OF 'ECONOMY' AS APPLIED TO
THE CANONS

Although Economy is practised in Anglicanism the principle has never been defined as part of Anglican theology nor is the Orthodox theory well known in the Church of England. An appearance of inconsistency, slackness, or vagueness in Anglican discipline may arise from this lack of any definition of Economy as part of Anglican theology.

Economy is the relaxing of the Canon law of the Church in cases where to insist on it would imperil the salvation of a soul. Examples within the church of England are numerous: those only "ready and desirous to be confirmed" are allowed to receive communion. Again in certain cases free Churchmen are allowed to receive communion from Anglican altars in spite of the fact that they are not even ready and desirous to be confirmed. Divorced persons according to the strict law cannot receive communion, as they are violating the rule of the Church, yet after a period of time, preferably by permission of the Bishop, (the Anglican equivalent of Economy) they may be allowed to receive it for the sake of their salvation and that of any children.

An example in the secular sphere is that though in theory Oxford University does not recognise degrees of other Universities, in fact a graduate of, say, Durham University may by special permission take a higher degree of Oxford.

Economy is a relaxation of the strict man-made rule in obedience to the divine law of love. It is not granted as a right to those who have fallen short of the required discipline, it is a concession in love. St. Basil (d. 279) defined Economy as "the carrying out of the spirit rather than the letter of the law in order to meet cases of emergency where the welfare of the individual soul or the advance of Christ's kingdom is concerned". (Kephala p. 113).

St. Cyril (d. 444) states "Economy does not displease an intelligent mind" (Douglas p. 55). Modern Orthodox churchmen have agreed that Economy "is the turning aside from the strict law in certain circumstances but always subject to the general support of the church. The deflection from the strict letter

of the law would always be in order that the spirit of the law might be better kept". (Joint Doctrinal Commission p. 62). It can be used on "matters of advantage to the church upon condition that it does not clash in any way with the fundamental ground of faith". (Joint Doctrinal Commission p. 49).

Unity of Christendom is without doubt a "matter of advantage" for the church and the means to "the advance of Christ's kingdom on earth", and for this reason it is hoped that in so far as Anglicans disobey Orthodox Canons, Economy may be used to assist unity between Anglican and Orthodox Churches.

It is difficult to discover how far Orthodoxy can allow Economy to be used to overcome disciplinary differences if there is no unity of faith. However even though Anglicans violate the Orthodox Canons concerning ordination, Anglican orders would be recognised as fully valid if there ever were unity of faith. (Spinka p. 141) (This is fully discussed in the following section). Anglican baptism and

confirmation have also been accepted in spite of the fact that our practice infringes their Canons.

A certain degree of inter-communion can also be allowed. Economy is being applied in all these cases. (Palmer p. 22, Joint Doctrinal Commission p.6, Bucharest Conference p. 15).

These are all formal declarations of the use of Economy but there are also many cases where it is used without any previous consultations. Women have acted as interpreters at the Eucharist in Orthodox Churches in violation of Canon 20 of the Sixth Council. Anglican priests, in spite of the fact that their orders have not been recognised as fully valid, have been allowed inside the sanctuary and even to celebrate the Anglican Liturgy at Orthodox Altars, in violation of Canons 19, 33 and 34 of the Council of Laodicea. There has not been a formal application for Economy on each of these separate occasions. Orthodox themselves apply Economy to their own infringements of their canons without any formal application for it. This makes it difficult to be sure whether the frequent

infringement of any canon reveals it to be of historical interest only (not for centuries considered to have been binding), or whether Economy has been applied (perhaps for some period of time), to a canon which is still assumed to be generally obligatory.

For example, the rules of fasting are no longer strictly observed, but it is not clear whether the Orthodox regard the canons concerned with these rules as obsolete, or whether they are applying continuous Economy to them. (Lowther Clarke p. 255). Economy is regularly used to solve the problem facing the parish priest who is left a widower: According to the Orthodox Canons and doctrine of Marriage no priest can re-marry, therefore if the wife of a parish priest dies he strictly has no alternative but to become a monk. By the application of Economy he is allowed to remain a parish priest though unmarried. (French p. 157).

The strict method of applying for Economy is to

consult a Bishop on whose conscience the granting of it rests. In many countries particularly in Russia infringement occurs, and hence Economy is required, without a Bishop's being consulted. There is no accurate way of knowing exactly which Canons require the application of Economy when disobeyed by Anglicans, so there cannot be a definite number of occasions on which Anglicans need to apply for it. What has been attempted here is to discover as many as possible of the Orthodox Canons which Anglicans may transgress and to discuss the possibility of the application of Economy to these divergences. Many Canons however are based on doctrinal differences which will still exist even if Economy can be applied.

Section V

DOCTRINAL VARIATIONS UNDERLYING THE DISCIPLINARY CANONS

(Economy, by definition, being inapplicable)

- (a) The Validity of Orders.
- (b) The Thirty Nine Articles.
- (c) The Number and Authority of Ecumenical Councils.
- (d) The Number and Doctrine of Sacraments.
- (e) The 'Filioque' Clause in the Nicene Creed.
- (f) Orthodox Spirituality: (Icons, Reliques and the Dead)

Divisions between Churches can arise from Doctrinal or disciplinary causes, but the Canons cannot be neatly separated into these two categories, so that although the present dissertation is primarily concerned with differences in discipline, the main doctrinal differences have to be outlined. The latter are more important than the disciplinary ones because Economy cannot apply in doctrinal matters. But the chief reason for the importance of the doctrinal differences is, that for the Orthodox, Unity involves the holding of a common faith. Hence even if all disciplinary disagreements were resolved, the resulting agreement would not of itself ensure Unity.

An example of a doctrinal difference underlying the disciplinary Canons is the addition by the Western Church of the 'Filioque' ("and the son") to the Nicene Creed. This addition both violated the "Supporting canons" (Canon 1 of Carthage in particular) and also, the East believe, led the West into error of doctrine. The disciplinary background of this

doctrinal difference is dealt with in Section X. In the sphere of Orthodox Spirituality also, the Canons differ from Anglican theology in doctrine as well as in discipline. (Section V (f)).

Anglican methods of trying to find an essential minimum of belief which all can hold in common is foreign to the Orthodox way of thinking. Union cannot be understood by the Eastern Churchmen otherwise than as a consequence of a complete harmony or a complete unity of doctrine. (Birkbeck p. 6, French p.165). Thus the Orthodox view of the Church determines its concept of Unity and this in turn is inseparably linked with the doctrinal differences between East and West. The view of the Church and the concept of Unity give rise to the differences, and until the latter are resolved the former (either Unity or an agreement as to what the Church is) is not possible. That is to say that "until all Anglicans hold Orthodox views union is not possible, nor are Anglican orders valid" (Birkbeck p. 70). "Unity of rites being very desirable indeed but unity of dogma is the only 'sine qua non'" (Birkbeck p. 80).

(a) The validity of Orders

The Orthodox view of validity of orders illustrates the way in which almost all doctrinal differences arise directly from the doctrine of the Church, and the way in which Orthodoxy may be a reconciling factor in Western divisions. Since the Orthodox view of the church involves the belief that "a complete harmony of doctrine" is necessary to unity, and since this does not exist between Anglicanism and Orthodoxy there can be no unity nor can Anglican orders at present be recognised as valid by the Eastern Church.

Again East and West have different concepts of what constitutes validity and this fact is the source of further difficulty. In the West there are two divergent doctrines of orders. Catholics believe that the Apostolic Succession requires that a priest must receive a commission from a correctly consecrated Bishop to make his orders valid. Some Protestants repudiate this doctrine and insist on an inner

conviction as the only requirement; the laying on of hands being a blessing which the Church on earth gives to its Ministers to strengthen their resolve. Other Protestants pursue a middle course, they deny the need for Bishops but insist on a "properly" conducted ordination as an indispensable part of the call to the Ministry. Anglicans insist on three things needful before a valid ordination can take place: (a) a candidate's inner call, (b) the local church's opinion of his character and learning, and (c) a Bishop's decision to ordain.

As a result of the Orthodox view of the Church, the Apostolic Succession is understood as a living bond between successive generations of Church members. An Eastern Bishop, as an individual, has no special powers to make priests or deacons, his role is to sanction in the name of the Universal Church, the ordination performed by the Holy Ghost acting through the decision of the whole Church. (Zernov 1956 p.78). As always, the East emphasises the work of the Holy

Ghost through a body of believers: in the case of ordination by the need for a congregation and a Bishop: in the Eucharist by the need for a congregation and a priest at the Epiclesis (Section X (b)): and by the fact that the authority of the Canons depends on the unanimous acceptance of a Council's decisions by the Church. (Zernov 1956 p. 67). It would be interesting to discover whether Protestants were suspicious of this sort of "Bishops in Presbytery": (i.e. a Bishop powerless without a worshipping community) if they were not, the reconciling power of the Holy Spirit would be evident working through the example of the Orthodox Church. As has been shown, the Orthodox preserve the place of the local Christian Church, as is done by Congregationalists, and also the link with the universal Church as do Roman Catholics.

It follows that validity for the Orthodox is not primarily an historical concept such as the necessity for episcopal ordination, nor is it a personal concept such as the call of the individual,

nor is it manifested by evidence of divine blessing. It is based on the historical conception of a living worshipping local Church presided over by a Bishop who symbolises its unity in faith and doctrine with the Church both past and present.

Ever since the time of the Caroline Divines (p.20) some members of the Church of England have looked to the East for support for the validity of their orders, and increasingly so after the Papal refusal to recognise Anglican orders in 1896. This historical approach for recognition of their orders was unofficial. (Douglas pps. 58-64). The first official pronouncement by a Church was made in 1922 by Melètius, Patriarch of Constantinople, when in the name of his Synod he declared Anglican orders to be of the same nature and validity as those of the Roman Church. The Eastern Churches of Jerusalem and Cyprus approved this, and later when Meletius was elected to the See of Alexandria, he recognised Anglican orders in the name of his new Patriarchate. (Joint Doctrinal Commission p. 46).

In 1935 the Bucharest Conference (Report p.10) recognised Anglican orders as valid and in 1936 an Anglican delegation to Rumania persuaded a Committee of Rumanian theologians to recommend to their Synod that they should recognise Anglican orders, but war prevented the official confirmation of this. The Russian Church has never made any declaration on the validity of Anglican orders.

The words of the pronouncement of Meletius are important. To say that "Anglican orders are of the same nature and validity as those of the Roman Catholic Church" satisfied those who had been told by the Roman Catholics that they were not valid. Because of their doctrine of the Church, the Orthodox still maintain that all orders are equally valid or invalid while the church is divided. Orthodoxy recognises Anglican orders to the extent that "if union were to come on the strength of total and complete agreement of doctrine then Anglican re-ordination would not be necessary". (Sobornost Winter 1961 p.162). Again

"Economy would allow complete validity if there were a formally expressed unity of faith". (Spinka p.141). Economy would have to be applied to Canon 68 of the Apostolic Constitution which declares invalid the ordinations of heretics. Since Anglicans are considered to be in error of doctrine they could be officially classed as heretics and therefore require Economy.

Anglicans nowadays are realising the irrelevance of their plea for recognition of their orders in the light of the Orthodox view of the Church, and are admitting that no orders can be fully valid while the Church is divided. Validity of orders is taking on a new aspect in the West with the formation of the Church of South India and the possible formation of the Church of North India and Ceylon. The appeal by the Orthodox to unity of faith as a criterion of validity is becoming better understood in the West.

(b) The Thirty Nine Articles

Since the Thirty Nine Articles are the historical confession of the Church of England, the Orthodox view of them reveals most of the doctrinal differences which exist between the two churches and underlie the Canons.

The Orthodox see the Anglican Articles "as distinguished by extreme incompleteness and vagueness. Aiming at uniting people of different points of view, the authors of the Thirty Nine Articles tried to reach their aim by adopting a conciliatory attitude in the sphere of belief itself and by vague ambiguous formulations. An altogether different attitude was adopted by the Orthodox Church which set itself in establishing the creeds to find a formula for the expression of one point of view or other of the Christian faith which had become a matter of dispute. Anglicans, in the Thirty Nine Articles seem almost to like vagueness, while Orthodoxy prefers clarity, precision and completeness in the setting out of

its doctrine in the creeds". (Prof. A.I. Ivanov
Moscow p. 64).

Anglicans would of course be careful to point out that the Thirty Nine Articles were never intended to supersede the creeds, the clarity and completeness of which Anglicans value as much as do the Orthodox. Frequent misgivings have been expressed by the Orthodox about the Calvinistic influence apparent in the Thirty Nine Articles (Joint Doctrinal Commission 1932 p. 39). A full discussion of the problem was not undertaken until 'Moscow 1956' at the Anglo-Russian Theological Conference, when the Orthodox classified Anglican Articles in five groups.

The First group

1. Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.
3. Of Christ's going down into Hell.
4. Of Christ's Resurrection.
7. Of the Old Testament.
8. Of the Three Creeds.
14. Of Works of Supererogation.
15. Of Christ alone without Sin.
16. Of Sin after Baptism.

- 18. Of obtaining Salvation by Christ.
- 24. Of Speaking in the Congregation.
- 26. Of Unworthiness of Ministers.
- 30. Of Both Kinds.

This first group consists of twelve Articles the contents of which fully support Orthodox doctrine.

It is of interest that, at least in the cases of Articles 15, 24 and 30, the doctrine expressed is supported by the Orthodox against the Roman Catholic doctrine with respect to the Immaculate Conception, the Liturgy in Latin, and Communion in one kind.

(see also Canons 19 and 25 of Laodicea in Section X (b)).

The Second group

- 2. Of Christ the Son of God.
- 9. Of Original or Birth Sin.
- 10. Of Free-Will.
- 11. Of the Justification of Man.
- 12. Of Good Works.
- 13. Of Works before Justification.

These six Articles contain nothing discordant with the views of Orthodox Churchmen, while to them exhibiting certain shortcomings mostly derived from

their different concept of Original Sin. There are no relevant canons, and hence no discussion here.

The Third Group

6. Of the Sufficiency of Scripture.
17. Of Predestination or Election.
19. Of the Church.
20. Of the Authority of the Church.
21. Of the Authority of the General Councils.
23. Of Ministering in the Congregation.
25. Of the Sacraments.
27. Of Baptism.
28. Of the Lord's Supper.
29. Of the Wicked which eat not of the Body of Christ.
31. Of Christ's One Oblation.

This group consists of eleven Articles which are considered vague, permitting various interpretations. Unless corrections are made these Articles can hardly be acceptable to Orthodox understanding. The slight divergence between Orthodox doctrine and that expressed in Articles 6 and 21 is discussed in Section V (c). The differing concepts of the Church and its Authority has been discussed in Sections II and III and these are the causes of the divergences in 17, 19 and 20.

A discussion concerning the questions raised by Articles 25, 27, 28, 29, and 31 will be found in Section V (d).

The Fourth group

- 5. Of the Holy Ghost.
- 22. Of Purgatory.

These two Articles bluntly state doctrines opposed to those of the Orthodox Church. Article 5 raises the 'Filioque', and Article 22 (concerning worshipping and adoration, as well of Reliques as of Images, and also the Invocation of Saints; all problems of Spirituality) is discussed in Section V (f).

The Fifth group

- 32. Of the Marriage of Priests.
- 33. Of Excommunicate Persons.
- 34. Of the Traditions of the Church.
- 35. Of Homilies.
- 36. Of Consecrating of Ministers.
- 37. Of Civil Magistrates.
- 38. Of Christian men's Goods.
- 39. Of a Christian man's Oath.

"The last eight Articles possess no dogmatic character and thus, despite the departure of some of them (32 and 37) from the practice of the Orthodox Church there need be no difference of opinion on them." (Moscow p. 65). Since they are not of a doctrinal character they can form no theological bar to unity. Article 32 is discussed further in Section X (d).

Since all the problems raised by the Thirty Nine Articles are discussed elsewhere in this study there is no need for further consideration here. However, the Orthodox view of the Articles has revealed all the major doctrinal differences between Anglicanism and Orthodoxy which will now be discussed in the following Sections.

(c) The Number and Authority of the Ecumenical Councils

Holy Tradition accepts seven Ecumenical Councils. The Anglican Article 6 states that "Holy Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation so that whatsoever is not read in them nor may be proved by them is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an Article of Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation". The Orthodox go further than this and state "conjointly with the Holy Bible the teachings of faith and sacramental and holy rites are preserved by the Church by means of Holy Tradition which is a part of divine revelation. Tradition is therefore a trustworthy and unerring guide in expounding the Holy Scriptures and a voice of the Ecumenical Church". (Bishop Sergii of Staraya Russa, Moscow p. 31).

The Seven Ecumenical Councils form part of Holy Tradition which has been defined in the Catechism of the Russian Orthodox Church as:- "when real believers

in the Faith and in God, by word or example convey one to another, from ancestor to offspring, the teaching of the faith, religion and the sacramental and Holy rites". (A full discussion of the Orthodox view of Holy Tradition can be found in the report of the Moscow Conference 1956 pps. 31 - 36). Ecumenical Councils are for the Orthodox, part of unerring Holy Tradition, whereas Article 21 says General Councils "may err and have erred, even in things pertaining to God," and also states that they are "an assembly of men whereof . . . all be not governed by the Spirit and Word of God". For Anglicans the Councils are subordinate to Holy Scripture whereas for the Orthodox they are co-equal parts of Holy Tradition.

However, a look at the Canons will show that they do err (Bicknell p. 271), and the Councils themselves change and alter previous Canons. (No. 1 of the Fourth Ecumenical Council and nos. 8, 16, 25 and 29 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council). Evidence of error is more fully considered in Section X.

Believing the Councils to have erred Anglicans hesitate to accept their doctrinal formulations. They believe it is sufficient to insist on the Holy Scriptures and the Ecumenical Creed. The Church of England has nowhere defined which Councils it accepts. Some Anglicans appeal to seven, some to four, the reason being that some of the subjects of the Fifth and Sixth Councils and even the Seventh do not fit the historical situation of the West. (For instance the Sixth Council deals with the Monothelite heresy in a manner unknown ⁱⁿ the west.)

Dr. Ramsey, Archbishop of Canterbury, has given his personal opinion as follows:- "I accept the first four as being undoubtedly congruous with the faith of the 'homoousion' (the Son "being of one substance with" the Father) ; the fifth deals with a technicality of which I have insufficient knowledge; the sixth I accept but would need to expound in a totally different manner in England; and the seventh I accept as far as I understand it". (Moscow p.100). This sort of

statement appeared to clear any doubts which the Orthodox may have had of the Anglican view of the Councils. A further paper on the Orthodox view of the Councils can be found on pages 45-47 of the Moscow Report, and the Anglican view on pages 80-85 of "The Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern Orthodox" by Douglas.

(d) The Number and Doctrine of Sacraments

The Anglican Article 25 states "there are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation,^{Penance}, Orders, Matrimony and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly from the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible signs or ceremony ordained of God".

Anglican teaching therefore makes a clear distinction between Baptism and Holy Communion on the one hand and all other Sacramental rites on the other because:

- (1) The Church of England desires to be faithful to the most primitive tradition of all, (Holy Scripture),

and this records that these two Sacraments alone were explicitly ordered by our Saviour Christ and are therefore "Sacraments of the Gospel".

(2) These two rites alone are necessary for the salvation of all men at all times. Other rites are for special purposes.

(3) The number of Sacraments has never been fixed authoritatively either by primitive tradition or by decision of an Ecumenical Council. Different numbers have been accepted at different times.

St. John Damascenus says two, others five, or even more than seven in some cases. (Alivisatos p.7). Not until the sixteenth century in the Roman Church and the seventeenth in the Orthodox was the number fixed.

As to the other Sacraments:

- (1) Their outward and visible signs were not ordained by Christ himself.
- (2) Most Anglicans would agree that grace is given in these rites.

(3) The phrase in Article 25 which suggests that some of these rites have grown from the "corrupt following of the Apostles" is an unfortunate one and may be misleading. At the time when the Articles were composed the Church of England was faced with corrupt forms of Penance. Some Anglicans believe that it was not intended to declare that all forms of Penance are corrupt following of the Apostles. (Moscow p. 110).

In spite of all this it may be true that the Article was written as a compromise and is an example of Anglican vagueness, for it is nowhere stated that Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony and Extreme Unction are not Sacraments, it is only stated that they are not "Sacraments of the Gospel".

In any case it is certain that in the Liturgical practice of the Church of England, Confirmation, Penance, Orders and Matrimony are indeed means of grace and clearly treated as Sacraments in the Prayer Book. The Convocation of Canterbury in 1935 approved a form

for the administration of Unction in which the Sacramental principle is maintained. It is important to note that it is Unction and not Extreme Unction (the Last Rites) which is approved by Anglicans, (Moscow p. 104) and this is in agreement with Orthodox practice (Kephala p. 39) but contrary to that of the Roman Catholic Church. The Orthodox view of all seven Sacraments can be found in the Anglo-Russian Theological Conference Report (Moscow) p. 53.

In the case of Confirmation however Anglican practice is in agreement with that of the Roman Catholic Church, although the rite is administered at a different age, while the Orthodox have a rite of anointing infants with Chrism (consecrated oil), which is only vaguely equivalent. Here the West infringes Canon 48 of Laodicea. This divergence was also discussed at the Anglo-Russian Theological Conference (Moscow p.103-106).

The Orthodox insist on the importance of anointing infants with Chrism and also of infant Communion, because of our Lord's statement "of such is the Kingdom

of Heaven", (Mark Chapter 10 v. 14) a text which Anglicans apply to infant Baptism only. Father Ruzhitsky said he could not consider that the Anglican practice of Confirmation was based on sufficient grounds: but Bishop Michael of Smolensk has pointed out that the Orthodox churches have accepted confirmed Roman Catholics who have come to the Orthodox Church after rejection of the errors of Roman Catholicism without requiring Chrism. Consequently Confirmation was taken to have had the same effect as the administration of Chrism.
(Moscow p. 106).

Another point at which it is important to know whether the Orthodox support the Anglican or the Romish doctrine of a Sacrament concerns transubstantiation in the Eucharist (Articles 28, 29 and 31). The Orthodox insist on the doctrine of the Real Presence and Anglicans hoped that this would be covered by the question and answer in the Catechism:

'Q. What is the inward part or thing signified?
Ans. The Body and Blood of Christ which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper'.

They also hoped the Orthodox would agree that the Real Presence was also implicit in the words of Administration and of the Prayer of Humble Access. It was eventually agreed that the Orthodox do not accept the Latin medieval philosophy of "substance and accidents" required by a belief in transubstantiation. They completely rejected St. Thomas Aquinas, but accepted the opinion of the Early Fathers particularly of St. John Damascene, who did not find it necessary to formulate specifically the manner in which the Holy Gifts are sanctified at the Eucharist. (Moscow p. 108). This is perfectly acceptable to and in agreement with Anglican doctrine, and repudiates the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation.

Penance in the Orthodox Church is also different from that in the Roman Catholic Church and perhaps more acceptable to Anglicans (Orthodox Spirituality p. 46). Instead of the words "I absolve thee", the Orthodox have the words "let God absolve" (Zernov 1956 p. 63).

Anglicans therefore accept the seven Sacraments of the Orthodox Church but emphasise those "of the Gospel": this view is acceptable to the Orthodox.

(e) The 'Filioque' Clause in the Nicene Creed

Article 5, "Of the Holy Ghost", introduces a subject which has probably inspired a greater volume of writing than any other issue between East and West. It is both a disciplinary and doctrinal question. Anglicans have infringed the disciplinary Canons which say that the decrees of the Ecumenical Councils shall remain unchanged: and the Orthodox hold that we are also in error of doctrine by the addition of the 'Filioque' ('and the Son') to the Nicene Creed.

A full history of the addition of the words 'and the Son' to the phrase 'the Holy GhostWho proceedeth from the Father.....', can be found in many sources. (Bicknell pps. 122 - 124, Birkbeck p.25-25, Zernov 1942 p. 92-97). The Nicene Creed was unanimously agreed by the Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D. to be the Ecumenical Creed, and it was agreed that no further alterations should be made. in the Sixth Century Spanish Bishops added 'and the Son' to this Creed. At the request of Charlemagne the Council of

Aix gave it official sanction in 809. Since then it is indeed true to say that "the controversy about the Holy Spirit has been conducted in an atmosphere lacking in love and actuated by the Spirit of Schism: it has therefore been a pointless dispute. The doctrinal disagreement about the Holy Spirit was lacking in 'Spirit' and therefore resulted only in emptiness and futility". (Bulgakov p. 184). Khomyakov has said that the difference is of no real doctrinal significance, but involves a great moral issue in that it is a breach of mutual trust and love which are indispensable conditions of good church life. ("Orthodox Spirituality" p.64).

The fact that the 'Filioque' has lost its place of priority in the list of doctrinal differences between Anglicans and Orthodox is a sign of the victory of love over the forces of disintegration. (Zernov 1942 p.97, Stanley p.95). However the Orthodox claim—that we are in error of doctrine—must be examined. Some Orthodox (Macrakis p. 105) would say that the 'Filioque'

is contrary to St. John Chapter 15 v. 26: "The Paraclete whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth which proceedeth from the Father". On the other hand the rudiments of the 'Filioque' are present in The Epistle to the Romans Chapter 8 v. 9: "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his".

Most Orthodox would go so far as to say that the loss of the Epiclesis (the invocation of the Holy Spirit at the consecration of the Eucharist) and the doctrine of Papal infallibility, are both results of the innovation of the 'Filioque'. It must be admitted by the Western Church that it has not so well developed the theology of the work of the Holy Spirit as the Eastern has, and that it does tend to speak more, of the priest as representing Christ at the altar, and (in the Roman church) of the Pope as Christ's Vicar. Orthodox divines prefer to speak of the Holy Spirit working through the body of the Faithful, both at the Eucharist and at an Ecumenical

Council. There seems to be some ground for the accusation of the Orthodox that the introduction of the 'Filioque' followed by the Schism, resulted in errors of emphasis in the West, (on the words of Institution in the Consecration Prayer, and therefore in exaltation of the priestly office:) which led ultimately to the development of Papal authority.

In the face of these criticisms the Church of England has admitted that it had no authority to add the words "and the Son" to the Nicene Creed, but also claims that they make no difference in the doctrine. (Moscow p. 93). Orthodox fear that by stating "the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Son" rather than "from the Father" alone, the West believes in or implies (perhaps accidentally) two independent Sources in the Godhead, thus breaking the Unity within the Trinity. It is thought to imply two co-equal first sources of the Holy Spirit and to impair the supremacy of the Father. (Loseky p. 57). The Western Church claims to repeat the phrase in the

Orthodox sense to mean the same as the Orthodox, that is, the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father through the Son, and argues that to omit the 'Filioque' now would be to risk appearing to deny its truth. (Bicknell p. 122). The Archbishop of Canterbury has shown the value "of the emphasis laid by the 'Filioque' on the co-eternal unity of the Father and the Son, and on the truth that the Son participates in all that the Father does" in the face of the western heresies of Socinianism, Unitarianism and extreme Liberalism which reduced the status of the Son of God. (Moscow p. 96, see also Report of the Joint Doctrinal Commission p. 14, 31 and 72.).

For these reasons the Church of England claims to hold the Orthodox doctrine of the Holy Spirit, admits the lack of Authority for the introduction of the 'Filioque', but wishes to avoid its removal from the Creed which it has used for centuries. Members of the Church of England agree to recite the Nicene Creed without the 'Filioque' at all joint services

of Eastern and Western Christians. For example, in 1925 at the time of the Nicean commemorations the Creed was recited in both its versions in Westminster Abbey. (Zernov 1942 p. 97).

(f) Orthodox Spirituality
 (Icons, Reliques and Prayers for the Dead)

The only other of the Thirty-Nine Articles in complete opposition to Orthodox practice is Article 22 which states "the Romish doctrine of Purgatory, Images, Reliques, and also the invocation of Saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but plainly repugnant to the Word of God". Certain Anglicans would point out that it is only the Romish doctrine of worshipping images ... and not the Orthodox, that is condemned. Others (admitting that those who formed the Thirty-Nine Articles intended at the time to forbid all worship of images and invocation of Saints) would prefer the Article to be read in its historical context - in the light of the protest of the time against what the Orthodox would almost certainly have agreed were the abuses of Rome.

This Article raises the whole problem of Orthodox Spirituality such as the worship of Icons, of the Saints and of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Some aspects of these

issues also arise from the Orthodox Canons (e.g. 73 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, 7 of the Seventh Ecumenical Council and 20 of Gangra). The disciplinary aspects of these Canons are discussed in Section X (f). For the Orthodox, the worship of Icons, and of the Saints, arises not only from the Canons but also from the doctrine of the Church in which the Church Militant and the Church Triumphant are inseparably linked.

Anglicans are often unfamiliar with Orthodox Spirituality and thus find it difficult to think of these issues without being, possibly unconsciously, affected by the disputes of the Reformation. Anglican suspicion of the apparent worship of idols, prayers to the Saints and to the Blessed Virgin Mary, arises from our Western heritage including the Reformation which so firmly opposed the abuses of the Roman Church. (Moscow 1956 p. 117). It is necessary to discover what the Orthodox think of Icons as idols or graven images, (contrary to the Second Commandment), and of the Blessed Virgin Mary as a Second Mediator in the

place of Christ. Not having been involved in the disputes of the Reformation, do the Orthodox also repudiate these errors?

Anglican unfamiliarity with Orthodox Spirituality is particularly true in the case of Icons, where they are not often familiar with good ones, but only with the later Westernised Icons which it has been suggested are mere charming portraits of individuals, not deeply sincere renderings in paint of abstract religious faith. (T.D. Rice 'Russian Icons'). True Icons are not intended to be portraits as Westerners often think nor is the doctrine behind them that which most of them fear.

The analytical Western mind draws a sharp line of demarcation between the object and its name, between a person and his portrait, between spirit and body: while the East sees both as interdependent. Zernov argues that a piece of rough marble and a statue made from it, though materially identical, are not the same thing: The stone is now a vehicle of a new spiritual

power capable of influencing other people. If so much can be done by an artist, the prayers of the Church and divine grace can affect matter more profoundly, so that the Icon becomes a source of help and inspiration to these who see it. (Zernov 1956 p. 82). Other defences of Icon worship could be quoted. (Moscow p. 20, Palmer p. 260, Orthodox Spirituallity p. 35). Orthodox Christians are perturbed by Anglican fears that it is idolatrous, (Moscow 1956 p. 116) because they are aware of this danger and are sure that they avoid it. "For there is not one of them that knows that we are forbidden by God's Law to worship stocks and stones" (Palmer p. 42). As has been remarked, the Russian Church found it easier to express its ideas and ideals through art, particularly pictorial art, than by speech or written word. (Zernov 1937 p. 18).

It is important to realise that the word for 'worship' is 'proskunesis' in the case of the worship of Icons, but 'latria' in the worship offered to the Trinity as was defined at the Seventh Ecumenical

Council. (Hammond p. 34). It may be thought that such a distinction may be excellent on paper but very difficult to observe in practice. (Bicknell p. 290). This indeed may be true for the western mind but the Eastern sees the use of Icons in the light of the truth of the Incarnation, which revealed the organic unity between the divine and the created. The Orthodox feel that to deny the use of Icons is to suggest that matter is evil and unclean, which in the final analysis is to deny the Incarnation. (Zernov 1956 p. 83, Baynes p.90).

Worship of Icons is most important to Orthodox Spirituality, "no veneration of reliques or images in the West can convey any adequate notion of the veneration for Icons in Russia. It is the main support and stay of their religious faith and practice - it is like the rigid observance of Sunday to a Scotsman, or the singing of hymns to a Methodist". (Stanley p.292).

Westerners notice, however, that the Orthodox appear to have fallen into error over veneration, by allowing such practices as Icons being used as

Godparents. (Baynes p. 89). The theory is that an Icon is a stylised symbol, a sign, an abstract scheme and not a resemblance, and this it must be admitted by the Orthodox has been violated in practice. (French p.130).

Worship of the saints and of the Blessed Virgin Mary is closely linked with the worship of Icons which represent them. As in all Orthodox Spirituality, it is the view of the Church as a living organism, in which past and present are united, which gives rise to the practices observed. Prayers are therefore offered to and with those who have died. But here again the doctrine is not the same as the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. There is an important difference of emphasis, the Orthodox praying in unity with, not primarily for, the dead. The East praise the Blessed Virgin Mary but the Roman Catholic ask favours of her. (Leeming p. 84 and 172).

The Orthodox have no doctrine of purgatory and do not pray for the Spiritual growth of the dead, nor

have they made any official pronouncements about the state of unbaptised infants. (Kephala p. 43).

Orthodoxy has in many ways a more extensive cult of devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary than the Roman Church has, and yet they are sure that they do not regard the Saints or the Blessed Virgin Mary as Mediators opposed to the one Mediator, Christ. Most would deny the Immaculate Conception, (Stanley p.82), but there are Churches dedicated to the Assumption.

Thus in spite of the fact that Orthodox Spirituality differs from the Roman Catholic, it is still a big stumbling block to most Anglicans. It is a most difficult 'theological', and ^{also} /'non-theological' factor dividing the Orthodox and Anglican Churches. It is 'theological' in that it arises from the Thirty-Nine Articles and from the basic doctrine of the Church. There is ground for hope that although the practices may be unusual and even offensive to Anglicans, yet they are based on this doctrine of the Church, which is not contrary to Scripture nor "repugnant to the Word

of God", nor do the practices result in what Protestants believe to be the errors of Rome. It is 'non-theological' in that even if the underlying doctrines of Orthodox Spirituality, (i.e. the living Church) are understood and accepted by Anglicans, the Orthodox practices are not likely to be accepted by Anglicans, and so Economy will be necessary for the Anglican infringement of Orthodox Canons.

The differences which have been discussed in the whole of this Section V, have been shown to be very important, and the more so because, in so far as they are doctrinal, Economy cannot be applied. But the fact that only two Articles, nos. 5 and 22, appear to the Orthodox, essentially in need of revision, gives ground for hopes of unity even in doctrine. Further the Orthodox realise that the Thirty-Nine Articles are a product of Western controversies, and the Church of England no longer holds them binding on all members as was the case a hundred years ago: the Lambeth Conference of 1888 having admitted that they were not

to be imposed on new converts. In general, Anglicans now see the Articles in their historical context arising from disputes of the Sixteenth Century. (Zernov 1942 p.97). There are however some who would uphold them in toto (e.g. the Parker Society at Oxford). Having mentioned the point at which Economy could not be used on disciplinary differences, the Orthodox Canons must now be considered to find out for how many disciplinary differences Economy may be required for Anglican infringement.

Section VI

A SUGGESTED CLASSIFICATION OF THE CANONS

Now that the importance of the Canons in Orthodox thought and the principle of Economy and its limitations have been established, the stage is set for a study of the Canons themselves. In the task of classifying the eight hundred and sixty nine Canons in the "Rudder", care is taken to try to be as objective as possible. Also, as has been mentioned in Section I, an attempt has been made to give each class a particular significance for Ecumenical studies.

The Canons are divided into the following four classes:-

Class A ... Canons which are in full agreement with Anglican usage or custom. (Section VII).

Class B ... Canons which are most unlikely to be found to differ from the Anglican position but which are of obvious historical interest. (Section VIII).

Class C ... Canons which differ, but not seriously, usually only in the severity of the punishment. (Section IX).

Class D ... Canons which differ, but as to which the Orthodox might apply Economy to infringements by Anglicans. (Section X).

Finally from all these classes certain Canons of particular interest to Anglicans are selected and studied in more detail. (Section XI).

The classification can be thought of as a descending scale of agreement, or better as an ascending scale of difficulty in resolving any disagreement.

The method of allocating a canon to a particular class is as follows:

Those Canons to go in class A (as acceptable to Anglicans) are to some extent obvious. Canons are put in class B if it is obvious to an uninstructed Anglican that they are of historical interest only; for example, those dealing with the early heresies can be immediately assigned to B. / Only if there are very strong reasons for regarding a difference as not serious is a Canon put in class C rather than class D. As a

result of this strictness, class D, those whose infringement requires the exercise of Economy, is larger than might be expected. Class D also includes many Canons which are almost certainly regarded as obsolete by the Orthodox themselves (but not so certainly obsolete that they could be put in class B).

It was necessary to find out which Canons in class D are regarded as obsolete by the Orthodox. This was difficult, because few Orthodox priests or laymen in this Country are prepared to say on their own authority that any particular Canon is obsolete, (Rodzianko. Private Communication) the decision is usually left to the Bishop, but even Bishop Anthony Bloom in London regards the matter as "too technical" for him. (Private Communication).

There is therefore no one in authority in England prepared to make a decision as to which Canons are obsolete and even if they were, because they have been living in exile, they might not know which Canons are considered binding at the present time in Orthodox

Countries; even this may vary from Country to Country. Professors of Canon Law living in Orthodox Countries it was thought, might be best able to answer the problem, but Professor Beneshevich at a recent congress of Byzantine scholars in Sophia suggested that the problem of obsolescence is "still a task for the future" (Private Communication). Professor Troitzky of Belgrade also regards obsolescence as "a problem for our Theology and Canonists". Thus even the Orthodox themselves have not yet decided which Canons are obsolete. However Professor Zernov was prepared to say which he thought could be^{so}/regarded, and these are bracketed in the lists. His opinion is of course in no way authoritative.

It is not claimed that the classification is completely objective, but confidence is felt that any other worker using the same category headings, would with few exceptions assign the same Canons to the same classes. Indeed, as a test, the sorting process was repeated after an interval of twelve months, without

reference to the previous work, and in consultation with another person. At this second cataloguing only 16 of the 869 Canons were displaced by as much as two classes, and fewer were moved into the next neighbouring class to that of the original placing. To some extent, of course, distribution must be dependent on personal outlook. For instance Canon 25 of Carthage, forbidding the administration of the Eucharist to the dying, though acceptable to most Anglicans (and it was therefore put into class A), might not be allocated to this class if a High Churchman were making the selection. Meanwhile there are some Canons assigned in this selection to class A (full agreement), which some other classifier though being in full agreement with them in principle, might prefer not to have to accept as law.

The only change of classification which would invalidate the arguments put forward in the following sections, would be a change which involved putting more Canons into class D than the 199 here assigned to it. As this study is an attempt to discuss all Orthodox

Canons which are, or might be, transgressed by Anglican belief or practice, great care was taken to include in this class D all Canons over which there was any doubt whatsoever. It is now felt confidently that no other classifier would be likely to include any extra Canons in class D which would raise difficulties of any consequence. The full classification of all the Canons is given in Appendix I but a summary follows in Table 2.

TABLE II A Summary of the distribution of the Canons
in classes A to D

	Total	A	B	C	D
Apostolic Constitutions	85	16	20	21	28
Ecumenical Councils	189	41	74	17	57
Regional Councils	330	49	171	32	78
The Holy Fathers	265	57	93	79	36
	869	163	358	149	199

(A description of the classes is given on page 82).

This table shows the total number of Canons in each class, and how this total is made up from the different sources found in the 'Rudder'. The 85 Canons

of the Apostolic Constitutions are fairly evenly allocated to the ⁴classes. The Ecumenical Councils' lists contain many canons of historical interest only, dealing mainly with early heresies. Many of class D come from these and from the early Regional Councils. Few Canons of class D come from The Holy Fathers. In class B the total of 358 Canons may appear high as may also the 199 in class D (though the latter contains many which are later seen to be obsolete Canons). Perhaps the fact that only 163 Canons are to be found in class A, and therefore in agreement with Anglican practice, may appear surprising. These figures result from the policy of putting a Canon in a lower class B, C or D, if there was the least uncertainty as to where it should go. Detailed results of the classification are reviewed in the following Sections: A in VII, B in VIII, C in IX and D in X.

Section VII

CLASS A, CANONS IN AGREEMENT WITH ANGLICAN
POSITION

Most of the Canons in class A reinforce the accepted Anglican position. But some Canons support the legal position of Anglicanism against the extremes. Not all Canons which are in agreement with Anglican law are obeyed by Anglicans because some of them are not clear as to what is the lawful authority which an Anglican must obey. Only internal discipline in the Anglican Church will overcome this.

Allocation of a Canon to class A in most cases is obvious. For example, "Persons belonging to the Church must not carelessly and unconcernedly give their children in marriage to heretics". This would be difficult to enforce but is accepted by most Anglicans. Again "We wish those who attend church for the purpose of chanting, neither to employ disorderly cries nor to foist anything not becoming and proper to a church, but on the contrary, to offer such psalmodies with such attentiveness and contriteness to God who sees directly into everything that is hidden from our sight,

'For the sons of Israel shall be reverent' (Lev. XV 30) the sacred word has taught us". This Canon reads rather like a quaint extract from an imaginary "Rules for Churchgoers".

These Canons are examples of the whole class which is enough to show that no infringement is likely and therefore these Canons are relatively unimportant for the purpose of this dissertation.

Section VIII

CLASS B, CANONS OF HISTORICAL INTEREST ONLY

Of the total of 869 Canons, 350 have been allocated to class B (by far the largest group), Canons which are unlikely to cause conflict with modern Anglicanism but which are of historical interest. It is in this section that the likelihood of a purely personal selection is great.

Canons referring to heresies of history, such as Donatism or Pelagianism (Carthage Canons 81 - 130) for instance, are easily seen to be class B. They might almost have been put into class A, except that the penalties for lapsing, into Pelagianism for example, would not now be enforced in the Church of England so that Anglicans cannot be said to be in full agreement.

It was more difficult to place some of the Canons into this class since what might be obviously 'historical' to those with a good knowledge of the Orthodox Church might not appear so to anyone without such knowledge. For example, Apostolic Constitutions 54, forbids Orthodox Clergy to eat in a tavern where intoxicating drink is sold, and although those who are familiar with

modern Orthodox practices would realise that this Canon is obsolete, most Anglicans would not know whether or not it was still obeyed. Anglicans without special knowledge of Orthodoxy disagree with some Canons, and yet are still in doubt as to whether they are still observed because the principle they uphold appears to have some bearing upon modern conditions. In such cases the Canons were not put in class B but in class D in case Economy were required for possible Anglican infringement.

By this means the classification is kept as objective as possible, for the distinction between Canons differing from Anglicanism in cases where there was any doubt about whether they were still obeyed in Orthodoxy or not, was left to arise within class D. In this class D, Dr. Zernov (a person with a good knowledge of Orthodoxy) decided which Canons were 'obsolete' in his opinion. The advantage of this is that should the subjective definition of 'obsolete', (made for the purposes of this dissertation), be

questioned in the case of any particular Canon, it can remain in class D, for which Economy is required, rather than change class from D to B. Class B thus contains only those Canons which are obviously of historical importance to any Anglican, while D contains those over which there is any doubt.

The only alternative would have been to assume a full and complete knowledge of modern Orthodox practice in the classifier, who would thus be able to put all Canons no longer observed, unerringly into class B; but in fact even an Orthodox Christian would have no such knowledge regarding the whole of the Orthodox Churches to-day.

A few examples of class B Canons must be given. Canon 65 of the Fourth Ecumenical Council states: "We commend that the bonfire lit by some persons on the occasion of the new moon in front of their own workshops or houses, and over which some persons even leap in accordance with ancient custom, it is fabled, be done

away with*. Such a Canon is obviously only of historical interest in Britain, (unless it is argued that it forbids the celebrations of November 5th!).

Many of the Canons of Carthage (61 etc.) are concerned with petitions to Emperors while others are concerned with ecclesiastical courts (68 etc. and 138 etc.). These have been put in this class~~B~~as irrelevant to the modern Anglican position.

All but two (3 and 4) of the Canons of Gregory of Neocaesaria and all those of Peter the Martyr are concerned with the historical situation caused by the barbarian invasion.

Canon 88 of Basil forbids bishops to have housekeepers. It could be argued that the principle of married bishops is at stake (or the celibacy of some clergy) and therefore the Canon should be put in class D because Anglicans disagree with the principle. On the other hand it is fairly obvious that the Canon was intended to prevent bishops having mistresses, a

principle surely approved of by Anglicans. The Canon was very probably promulgated to prevent laxity in the Early Church and the view taken here is that it is only of historical interest to Anglicans, and is fittingly allocated to class B rather than to D. It may appear to be important, but is really historical.

The opposite case from the previous one is Apostolic Constitutions 30; a Canon which might at first be thought to be of historical interest only, but which on further consideration appears otherwise. This forbids Bishops to employ secular rulers to obtain office. The change of view occurs because of the light thrown by concordant Canons. If 'employment of secular rulers' means payment of money, as appears from Canons 2 of the Fourth and 5 of the Seventh Ecumenical Councils, Anglicans would concur in condemnation of what is of course 'simony'. (Acts Chap. 8 v. 10 and a denial of John chap. 1 v. 16). On the other hand if 'employment of secular rulers' means appointment by civil authorities as Canon 3 of the Seventh Ecumenical Council suggests, then the Church of England

whose Bishops are appointed by the crown, will require exercise of Economy for infringement. (Russian Orthodox Bishops, as it happens, also owe their appointments to civil rulers). Hence the Canon in question is assigned to class D rather than to class B. Other examples could be given but it is hoped that these typify the group.

Section IX

CLASS C, CANONS IN WHICH THE DIFFERENCES
ARE NOT SERIOUS

There are Canons of interest not purely historical, and therefore not of Class B, which have no great difference from the Anglican position, and yet do not entirely agree with it for a variety of reasons and so do not fit into class A. By far the majority of these differ only in that Anglicans would not punish so severely for infringement although both Anglicans and Orthodox would agree that there is an offence. Often there is no official Anglican policy on a certain point covered by an Orthodox Canon, and though individuals might be prepared to agree with it, perhaps not every Anglican would be able to do so.

The best examples of the problems dealt with in this section of the classification arise out of the Canons of St. Basil the Great. His canon 55 deals with manslaughter, for which the Orthodox penalty is to be refused Communion for three years. It could be argued, and perhaps would be by some Anglicans, that manslaughter is not a sin if it occurs as the Canon implies, in the course of self-defence. Therefore the

Canon might go in class D (Canons differing in principle) rather than in class C (Canons differing in the penalty). Such Anglicans are questioning the principle behind the Canon which infers that man-slaughter is a sin. The view taken here however is that this is a straightforward case of the severity of the penalty being the only point of difference, and it is not a serious difference.

Penalties for sexual sins are often much greater in the Orthodox Canons than the Anglican Church would require (Canons 58-80 of St. Basil the Great). The fornicator is excluded from Communion for seven years, the adulterer for fifteen years, he who commits incest for the same length of time as a murderer. In some cases the principle behind the Canon seems to be at stake, so that Canon 70 of St. Basil the Great, forbidding a Deacon even to kiss a woman, was put in class D rather than in class C. If there was any doubt whether the difference from Anglicanism was important the Canon was put in class D.... Thus 149 Canons were left in this class C.

Section X

CLASS D, CANONS IN WHICH THE DIFFERENCES ARE
MORE SERIOUS, BUT THE ORTHODOX MIGHT APPLY
ECONOMY TO ANGLICAN INFRINGEMENT

- (a) Baptism and Confirmation
- (b) The Eucharist and the Epiclesis
- (c) Clergy
- (d) Marriage
- (e) Sex
- (f) Spirituality
- (g) Monks and Nuns
- (h) Jews and Heretics
- (i) Interest on Money
- (j) Date of Easter
- (k) Canon of Scripture
- (l) Miscellaneous

Supporting Canons

The Canons in class D apply to practices which differ from those of the Church of England. Consequently Anglicans do not conform to these Canons, yet it is possible to hope (for reasons discussed later) that the Orthodox might apply Economy to infringements.

Class D contains all those Canons with which Anglicans disagree, excluding those which could be classified as of historical interest only (class B), or as differing only in the severity of punishment (class C), which have been discussed in the previous two sections.

This large and important class D (199 Canons) contains many which are no longer expected to bind the Orthodox themselves, but great difficulty was encountered in finding a satisfactory authority who was prepared to say which Canons in class D are now obsolete, either from disuse or from the continuous application of Economy (see p. 84 above). Those which in the opinion of Dr. Zernov may be considered obsolete are bracketed in all the lists. A table of the complete class D is given in Appendix II but they have been sub-divided under the following headings in the ensuing tables.

TABLE III The Groups within the 199 Canons of
class D.

<u>Group</u>	<u>Subject Matter</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Number requiring Economy</u>	<u>Number Obsolete</u>
a	Baptism and Confirmation	11	6	5
b	The Eucharist and the Epiclesis	18	12	6
c	Clergy	60	12	48
d	Marriage	20	20	0
e	Sex	20	12	8
f	Spirituality	15	9	6
g	Monks and Nuns	8		8
h	Jews and Heretics	17		17
i	Interest on Money	7		7
j	Date of Easter	3		3
k	Canon of Scripture	7		7
l	Miscellaneous	7		7
	Supporting Canons	6	6	0
		199	77	122

The first six sections (a - f) contain both obsolete Canons and those which Anglicans may infringe, and therefore for which Economy may be required. Sections (g - l) following however, contain only obsolete Canons. The most important Canons are the 77 which may require Economy.

(a) Baptism and Confirmation

The relevant 11 Canons are:-

Apostolic Constitutions 46, 47, 50 and 53; 31 and 59 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council; 12 of the First and Second Regional Councils; 1 of Carthage; 45 and 48 of Laodicea; and 2 of Timothy.

A paraphrase of the subject matter of the Canons

1. Clergy who accept heretics' baptism to be suspended
2. Baptism by heretics unacceptable
3. Clergy performing one not three immersions at baptism to be deposed
4. As number 3 above
- (5. No baptism in a private house without Bishop's permission)
- (6. No baptism in an oratory of a private house)
- (7. No baptising in a home)
8. Baptism by heretics and schismatics unacceptable
- (9. No candidates for baptism to be accepted after two weeks of Great Lent)
10. The illuminated after baptism must be anointed with chrism
- (11. A person possessed by demons not to be baptised except when dying)

(The Canons in brackets are obsolete, (Zernov's opinion) and the Canons underlined may require Economy for Anglican infringement).

A summary of the subject matter of these CanonsEconomy Required 6

- | | |
|-----------|-----------------------|
| 1, 2, & 8 | Heretics Baptism |
| 3 & 4 | Triple Immersion |
| 10 | Anointing with Chrism |

Obsolete 5

- | | |
|-----------|--------------------------------|
| 5, 6, & 7 | Baptism in private houses |
| 9 | Time of Baptism |
| 11 | Baptism of the Demon-possessed |

The administration of Baptism in the Eastern Church differs little perhaps from that of the Western Mediaeval Church but quite markedly from modern Anglican practice. The Liturgical Commission, set up by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, however, seems to be restoring some of the things to be found in the Eastern rite, for example the linking of Baptism and Confirmation, more closely than at present. (Baptism and Confirmation Report 1958).

In the Eastern Church the water is blessed, and exorcisms and anointing with oil are part of the rite. (Lowther Clarke p. 842, Zernev 1956 p.61). The words

OF administration are not "N. I baptise thee ..." but "The servant of God N. is baptised..." which emphasises the corporate nature of this as of every other sacramental action in the Eastern Church. (Zernov 1956 p.60)

Following the ancient church the East practices total immersion (as does the modern Baptist Church) symbolising death with Christ and resurrection to life with Him. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptised into Jesus Christ were baptised into His death? Therefore were we buried with Him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the Glory of the Father even so we also should walk in newness of life". (Romans chapter 6 v.34, see also Galatians chapter 3 v.27). (Orthodox Spiritual^{ity}p.57, Calinicos p.29, Kephala p.40). Other biblical references to support immersion are: St. Matthew chapter 3 v.16 & the Acts of the Apostles chapter 8 v.33.

The fact that the Anglican Church does not baptise by triple immersion means that we infringe the Apostolic

Constitutions 50 and 53. The Roman Church also has never used immersion, except at Milan Cathedral. (Stanley p. 77). As a result of this, between the time of Michael Cerularius (Patriarch of Constantinople) 1043, and the Council of Florence 1438-45, the Greeks often regarded Latin Baptisms as mere nullities (Palmer p.107).

Birkbeck gives the full history of the way Western baptisms are thought of in the Eastern Church, up to the present time when the Greeks do not accept them but the Russians do. This disparity caused great consternation to the Reverend William Palmer when he wanted to join the Orthodox Church in the last century. (Birkbeck p.109).

Another reason for the Eastern Church's not accepting Latin Baptism may be that heretics baptism is declared null and void by Apostolic Constitutions 46 and 47 and 1 of Carthage (1, 2, and 8 above). The question of the necessity of re-baptism of those who have received only "heretics baptism" began with St. Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258) and the early heresies, but may not apply to modern Anglicanism.

However, the fact that the Russian Church does exercise Economy and accepts modern Western Baptisms would suggest that this difficulty is no longer so important as in the third century, or even the nineteenth, and unlikely to constitute a great barrier between Anglican and Orthodox. It is hoped that this will also be true of the difference arising from anointing with Chrism, and Confirmation.

The practice of anointing with Chrism, an equivalent to infant confirmation, is unknown in Anglicanism and this may be thought to violate Canon 48 of Laodicea (10 above), which states that "the illuminated after baptism must be anointed with Chrism". It does not say at what age but since Anglicans do not use Chrism at all they infringe the Canon. It is to be hoped that Economy may be invoked here.

Obsolete Canons require less discussion though it is true that Anglicans often administer the sacrament of baptism in a home (contrary to 5, 6, and 7 above) which is

also known in the East. Canon 45 of Laodicea (9 above) would appear to come from the time in the early Church when all baptisms were at Easter. Refusal to baptise those possessed by demons seems also to be the product of an age when mental and physical illness were not thought of in the same way; a view becoming more common nowadays. Since physical deformity is no bar to baptism, neither should mental deformity be. (see section f on Spirituality for another Canon concerning madness.)

(b) The Eucharist and Epiclesis

The relevant 18 Canons are :-

Apostolic Constitutions 8 and 9: 18 of the First:

29, 52, 56 and 70 of the Sixth: 2 of Antioch: 19,
 21, 25, 49/and ⁵⁰ 50 of Laodicea: 48 and 56 of Carthage:
 35 of John the Faster: and 13 of Nicephorus.

A paraphrase of the subject matter of the Canons

- (1. All clergy must communicate if present at Eucharist)
- (2. All faithful must communicate if present at Eucharist)
3. Deacons not to give Eucharist to Presbyters
4. Priest celebrating at Eucharist must be fasting
5. Only the Liturgy of the presanctified on all days of Great Lent
6. Even eggs and cheese may not be eaten when fasting
- (7. Women must not talk during Mass)
- (8. All Layty must communicate)
9. The celebration of the Liturgy must follow the pattern prescribed
10. Servants must not enter sacristy, nor touch vessels
11. Servants must not give bread or Chalice
12. Liturgy not to be celebrated in Great Lent on weekdays
13. Priest at Eucharist must be fasting (as 4)
- (14. Liturgy not to be celebrated in private houses)
15. Priest at Eucharist must be fasting (as 4)

- 16. Eucharist not to be administered after breakfast
- (17. Vomiting after Communion means none for forty days)
- 18. A Priest must not celebrate without hot water

A summary of the subject matter of these Canons

Economy required 12

3, 10 and 11	The place of Deacons and Servants
4, 5, 6, 12, 13,	
15 and 16	Fasting before the Eucharist
9 and 18	No deviations from the Liturgy

Obsolete 6

1, 2 and 8	All present at the Eucharist must communicate
7	Women must not talk during Mass
14	Eucharist not in private houses
17	Vomiting after communion

Although there are 18 which are not observed in Anglican practice, many of them are concerned with minor issues and 6 are not considered binding by the Orthodox themselves.

Anglicans infringe 3 and 10 above by allowing non-communicating Masses and possibly also 8 but the Orthodox also infringe these Canons.

By allowing Readers to administer the chalice, perhaps even to a bishop as well as to a priest, Anglicans infringe Canon 18 of the First, number 3 above. Canons 21 and 25 of Laodicea (10 and 11 above) are also infringed by Anglicanism but they were probably drawn up to prevent laziness and slackness in the early Church. It is possible that the Orthodox might consider these infringements important.

Fasting seems to be the main point of difference in this section, and involves Orthodox Spirituality which is discussed in section V (f) above. It is well known that the Orthodox take fasting very seriously, and practice it with a rigour unknown in the West. (Dawkins in 'The Monks of Athos', Kephala p. 33, Kidd p.129, 165 and 470). The modern Greek Church and presumably the Russian too, do not practice fasting with such stringency as in the past, although it is quite probable that the pre-Eucharistic fast is still almost universally observed. (Kephala p.82).

In the West, particularly among non-Roman Catholic communions, the value of fasting is not well known and is often ignored. Evening Communions and Family Communions (often after breakfast) are becoming more popular and make fasting, as the Orthodox understand it, objectionable to many if not all Westerners. If the Orthodox were unable to apply Economy at this point, a serious difference could arise.

Two contrasting points arise from Canon 19 of Laodicea (9above) which regulates the conduct of the Eucharist. The fact that Anglicans, (unlike Roman Catholics) use the vulgar tongue means that they do not infringe this Canon at this point. On the other hand Anglicans may infringe it when they omit the Epiclesis (the invocation of the Holy Spirit on the Elements) from some of their Liturgies, the emphasis thus being on the Words of Institution. Such emphasis, the Orthodox feel, stresses the work of the priest at the expense of the work of the Holy Spirit alive and active in the worshipping community. To the Orthodox it is the Holy Spirit, not

Christ through the celebrant, who is the real source of the miracle of the Body and Blood. This is a view different from that of Anglicans, and possibly the rediscovery of the work of the Holy Spirit emphasised by the Epiclesis could reconcile the divergent views of the Eucharist within Western Christendom. It is unlikely that the other deviation from the Orthodox Liturgy (that we do celebrate without hot water) contrary to Canon 3 of Nicephorus (18 above) is important.

The Canons insisting that all present must receive Communion have already been mentioned, and the other three obsolete Canons raise minor points. It is known that in the fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, Anglicans (heretics?) attend the Orthodox Liturgy celebrated in private houses where a woman has been known to interpret (violating Canons 7 and 14 above). It is unlikely that vomiting after Communion involved the penalty prescribed for long after the Canon was issued.

(c) Clergy

The relevant 60 Canons are:-

- 1 - 10 Apostolic Constitutions 6, 20, 30, 51, 54, 63, 68, 69, 81 and 83
- 11 - 20 15 and 16 of the First: 2 of the Second: 3 of the Fourth:& 5, 7, 10, 15 and 20 of the Fourth: and 7 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council
- 21 - 30 14, 19, 20, 24, 40, 77 and 78 of the Sixth: 2, 3, and 15 of the Seventh Ecumenical Council
- 31 - 40 11 of the First and Second Regional Councils: 14 of Ancyra: 11 and 13 of Neocaesarea: 3 and 21 of Antioch: 5, 12, 20 and 24 of Laodicea:
- 41 - 50 30, 36, 46, 54 and 56 of Laodicea: 1 and 2 of Sardica: 17, 18 and 21 of Carthage
- 51 - 60 24, 30, 40, 43, 45, 47, 57, 79 and 98 of Carthage: and 35 of Nicephorus.

A paraphrase of the subject matter of the Canons

- (1. Clergy must not undertake worldly cares)
- (2. Clergy who give surety to be deposed)
- (3. Bishops who obtain bishoprics by employing secular rulers to be deposed)
- 4. Clergy who abstain from marriage, meat, & wine, not as a matter of mortification, but out of an abhorrence thereof to be deposed.

- (5. Clergy must not eat in a tavern where intoxicating drink is served)
- (6. Clergy must not eat meat in the blood of its soul)
- 7. Second Ordination, except of heretics, forbidden
- 8. Clergy who fail to fast all the forty days of Lent to be deposed
- (9. Clergy must not lower themselves into public offices)
- (10. Clergy who hold both civil and sacerdotal offices to be deposed)
- (11. Clergy not allowed to go from one city to another)
- (12. Clergy who leave own church must return or be refused Eucharist)
- (13. Bishops not to leave own diocese)
- (14. No Bishop to farm an estate)
- (15. No movement of Clergy)
- (16. Clergy or monks must not join army or obtain secular dignity)
- (17. Clergy not to be titled to two churches at the same time)
- (18. Deaconesses not to be ordained before forty and to stay single)
- (19. Clergy must not move from one parish to another)
- 20. Deacons must not sit down before a Bishop
- (21. Priest not to be ordained before thirty, Deacon before twenty five and Deaconess before forty)
- 22. Clergy not to interpret the Bible other than as the Church says.

- (23. Bishops not to teach publicly in a city not of their See)
- (24. Clergy or monks not attend horse races)
- (25. Deaconess not to be ordained before forty)
- (26. Clergy ought not to bathe in public baths with women)
- (27. Clergy must listen to learners every Thursday)
- 28. A Bishop shall by all means know the psalter
- (29. Appointment by civil rulers shall be void)
- (30. No clergyman to be attached to two churches)
- (31. Clergy must not accept secular offices or farm)
- 32. Clergy who abstain from meat must touch and taste it
- (33. Presbyter not to be ordained before thirty)
- (34. Village priests cannot conduct Liturgy in city church)
- (35. Clergy who move from one parish to another and refuse to return to be deposed)
- (36. Bishops shall not go over from one diocese to another)
- (37. Ordination must not be performed in the presence of listeners)
- (38. Bishops to be appointed by votes of surrounding Bishops)
- 39. A Deacon must not sit down ahead of a Presbyter
- (40. No clergy must enter a tavern)
- (41. Clergy must not bathe with women or laymen)
- 42. Clergy must not be magicians, enchanters, numerologists, etc.
- (43. Learners must recite to clergy every Thursday)
- 44. Clergy must not witness shows at suppers or weddings
- 45. Presbyters must not enter or sit down before Bishop

- (46. Bishops must not move from a small city to another city)
- (47. Similar to previous Canon)
- (48. Children of priests not to give any mundane shows
nor see them)
- (49. Clergy shall not become farmers)
- (50. Deacon not to be ordained before twenty five)
- (51. Ordinands must have the pronouncements of the Councils
"dinned into their ears")
- (52. Clergy shall not leave legacy to non-Orthodox
Christians)
- (53. Clergy who acquire property must dedicate it to
their own church)
- (54. Ordinands not to be ordained until all their own
family are Orthodox Christians)
- (55. Celibate clergy shall not visit widows or virgins)
- (56. Clergy shall not enter taverns to eat or drink
but only for shelter)
- 57. No second ordination allowed.
- (58. No Bishop shall appropriate any other church)
- (59. A lector, even only once, if ordained must return
to the same church)
- 60. Fornicators cannot be priested.

A Summary of the Subject Matter of the CanonsEconomy required 12

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 4 & 32 | Clergy not to be vegetarian or teetotal |
| 7 & 57 | No second Ordination |
| 8, 42 & 44 | Asceticism required |
| 20, 39 & 45 | Seating order of clergy |
| 22 | No private interpretation of Scripture |
| 28 | Bishops must know the psalter |

OBSOLETE 48Asceticism no longer required

- | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1, 9, 10, 14, 16, | |
| 24, 31 & 49 | Worldliness |
| 5, 40 & 56 | Taverns |
| 26 & 41 | Bathing with women |
| 2 & 6 | Others |
| 3 & 29 | Appointment by civil rulers |
| 11, 12, 13, 15, 19, | |
| 23, 34, 35, 36, 46 & 47 | Movement of clergy |
| 17, 30 & 58 | No plurality |
| 18, 21, 25, 33 & 50 | Age of Ordination |
| 27, 37, 38, 43, 48, | |
| 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, | |
| 59 & 60 | Miscellaneous |

This section covers by far the greatest number of Canons which Anglicans may infringe. They come mainly from the earlier councils and therefore it is not surprising that 48 of the 60 Canons have been suggested to be obsolete by Professor Zernev. The most important of the obsolete Canons deal with the movement of clergy, the age of ordination, and regulations concerning ban on asceticism. The movement of clergy was violated very early in history when Eusebius of Nicomedia was moved to Constantinople in 339 (Stanley p. 153). Bede has recorded many regulations similar to these Canons which were observed in the Celtic Church (e.g. Bede p. 210).

Those Canons which are not obsolete but conflict with Anglican practice fall under six headings for which possible infringement will require Economy. Fasting is a problem which has already been discussed in Section X (b) page 109 above. The knowledge of the psalter required of a Bishop and the order of seating of clergy would not appear to be sources of much difficulty.

There remains the vegetarian or teetotal priest, second ordinations, and the private interpretation of Scripture. These problems can be much more difficult, but it is hoped that the Orthodox would be prepared to employ Economy on the first in the same way that the Anglican church employs tolerance towards people who believe that they are right to practice vegetarianism and teetotalism, even though these are not taught by the church, and might perhaps be considered to be contrary to Scripture. (I Timothy Chapter 4 v. 3 and chapter 5 v. 23).

Second ordination is not practiced in the West except by the Roman Catholic Church. However, this point may be important in the future in connection with the reaction of the Orthodox Church to schemes of the union of Episcopāl and non-Episcopāl ministries by a single "ordination" service, as suggested for the proposed reunion for the church of North India.

The private interpretation of Scripture may be more serious still, particularly in view of the dislike

of the Orthodox for the views of Modernism, typified by such people as the late Bishop Barnes. That such a person should have remained a Bishop while definitely interpreting the Bible otherwise than as the Church says, is incomprehensible to the Orthodox. The difficulty here is partly due to the form of the Establishment of the Church of England. By the "parson's freehold", unless a parish priest is :-(a) a certified lunatic, or (b) morally unsound, or (c) fails to conduct the statutory services, he cannot be deposed.

This situation can hardly be regarded with favour by the Orthodox, and even if Economy could be used in some cases they might insist on greater safeguards against the private interpretation of Scripture. Canon 19 of the Fifth and Sixth Ecumenical Councils states that "all clergy must teach the laity words of truth out of the Holy Bible, not deviating from the definitions already laid down or the teaching derived from the God-fearing Fathers, and also if the discourse

be one concerning a passage of Scripture, they must not interpret it otherwise than as the luminaries and teachers of the Church in their own written works have presented it; and let them rather content themselves with these discourses than attempt to produce discourses of their own". If strictly observed this would prohibit most Anglican sermons. The Canon is however based firmly on the Orthodox view of Holy Tradition (see Section III) and would appear to have been drawn up in the days of widespread ignorance among the clergy, in the same way as the books of Homilies referred to in the Anglican Article 35, and can be considered obsolete in the days of an educated clergy. At least this Canon apparently was not used to limit or excommunicate such a revolutionary thinker as Berdyaev (1874-1948) and hence it is hoped that neither would it be invoked to excommunicate Anglicans for holding what seem less revolutionary ideas.

(d) Marriage

The relevant 20 Canons are:-

Apostolic Constitutions 17,18 and 26: 3, 6, 12, 48 and 53
 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council: 10 of Ancyra: 1, 7 and 8 of
 Neocaesarea: 1, 52 and 53 of Laodicea: 3 and 19 of
 Carthage: 12 and 50 of Basil the Great: and 2 of
 Nicephorus.

A paraphrase of the subject matter of the Canons

1. Whoever has entered into two marriages cannot be a bishop.
2. NO one can be a clergyman who has taken as wife a widow, divorced woman, harlot, housemaid or actress.
3. Of bachelor clergy only anagnosts may marry.
4. Any one who has two marriages cannot be a bishop, or who has taken a harlot or actress to wife.
5. Deacons may not marry after ordination .
6. Bishops must not keep their wives after consecration.
7. Wives of intending bishops to enter a convent.
8. Nobody may marry their Godchild's parent.
9. If a Deacon vowed to celibacy marries, let him be deposed
10. Presbyters who marry to be displaced, who fornicate to be ousted from office.
11. No presbyter to dine at second marriage celebrations
12. Husband of adulteress cannot be ordained.

- 13. Second marriages penitential though legal
- 14. Weddings and birthdays not to be celebrated in Great Lent
- 15. Christians attending weddings must not waltz or dance
- 16. All clergy must be continent with their wives
- 17. Anagnosts (readers) must either take wife or vow celibacy
- 18. Men who have married twice may not be clergy
- 19. Third marriages preferable to fornication though considered to defile the church
- 20. Second marriage not to be blessed with crowns

A Summary of the subject matter of these Canons

Economy required 20

1, 2, 4, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19 & 20	Second and third marriages
3, 5, 9, 10, 17	Celibacy after ordination
6 & 7	Celibacy of bishops
8	Spiritual relatives
14 & 15	Wedding celebrations
16	Continence of clergy

Obsolete None

Most of the serious differences between Orthodox and Anglican discipline occur in this section.

Legislation about the ban on the twice married and the strict penalties for priests marrying divorced women

harlots or adulteresses, arise mainly from the Orthodox doctrine of marriage (Palmer p. 40). It is only in the light of this doctrine that these Canons can be understood.

The Orthodox believe that marriage is for ever, (Orthodox Spirituallity p. 93, Zernov 1956 p.68) not only "until death us do part", based on Ephesians chapter 5 v. 22 - 33, where marriage between man and wife is likened to the marriage between Christ and His Church, (as also in the marriage service of the Prayer Book). The link between Christ and His Church is binding through life and death in eternity, so the Orthodox feel that human marriage is of eternal significance and not broken by death. (The Orthodox interpretation of Our Lord's answer to the Sadducees in St. Matthew chapter 20 v. 22 - 33 is not known^{to the writer}). Thus the Orthodox have a very much more demanding view of marriage even than the strictest in the West. For example for a widow to re-marry is a penitential state. (supported by I Timothy chapter 5 v. 9.)

However, the Orthodox allow "divorce", and "re-marriage" (Kephala p. 38, Orthodox Spirituality p. 48) in church, but the use of these words must be guarded because the second "marriage" is not called a marriage in the Eastern Church. It is a penitential state and there are no crowns for the bride, and the ceremony is only permitted by the exercise of Economy. It is^{also}/recognised by the Eastern Church that two people may not be able to live together in harmony, and separation is essential in some cases if only for their growth in faith. In their separated state (or perhaps in the widowed state) continence is expected of both, but temptation may be so great that "it is better to marry than to burn" (I Corinthians chapter 7 v. 9), i.e. better to re-marry than to commit adultery. The Orthodox apply this text to re-marriage whereas the West apply it to the unmarried only. Thus the Orthodox allow a second union but it is penitential. If separation is permitted to two Orthodox on the grounds of adultery, then the one person whom the separated may not marry is the correspondent. Thus the sanctity

of marriage is upheld, the temptation to adultery considerably reduced, and divorce made less attractive or desirable.

Perhaps the most important document referring to this problem is "Marriage and divorce in accordance with the Canon Law of the Orthodox Church" by Professor H.S. Alivisatos. This book deals with the historical aspect, the reasons for allowing divorce, the mechanism of divorce, and the fact that a second marriage is only a renewal of the sacramental bond and not a new sacrament.

It is because re-marriage is a penitential state that a person who has entered upon it cannot be made a bishop. (Zernov 1956 p. 69). Thus the Orthodox take literally 1 Timothy chapter 3 v.v. 2 and 12 and Titus chapter 1 v. 6 as forbidding not only bigamy but all second marriages of bishops, priests and even deacons, even after the first wife's death. The West interprets these ~~verses~~ as forbidding bigamy

to bishops, priests and deacons, for example "let deacons be the husbands of one wife", forbids bigamy, but is not thought by the West to refer to second marriages after the death of the clergy's wife as it is interpreted by the East. The East, believing that marriage is forever, not "until death us do part", see this text as supporting their view that second marriages even after death are not desirable. The West not having this doctrine of marriage do not interpret this text as forbidding widowed clergy the right to re-marry.

Only in the East must an ordinand have decided before ordination whether to marry or not, as no marriage is allowed after ordination. (French p.156, Hammond p. 32). In the West; all Roman Catholic bishops, priests and deacons are celibate, but all other denominations, including the Old Catholics, allow them to be either married or unmarried without making the decision at ordination. In the East, parish priests must be married but bishops are

normally monks, as in the Celtic Church. (Moorman p.8, Palmer p.35, Stanley p. 95 and Zernov 1956 p.26).

The Canonical ban on marriage to the parent of a Godchild or to other 'spiritual relations' was adhered to by the Western Church between the sixth and fifteenth centuries. (Bainton p.55, Neil p.575).
/Anglicans do not look with favour on weddings in Lent, but they are not forbidden. It is uncertain how far the infringement of this and of the Canon forbidding dancing at weddings, may be considered important.

Canon 16 commanding clergy to be continent with their wives is almost certain to be obsolete, since at the council of Nicea (in 325) a proposal to compel all clergy to give up cohabitation with their wives was rejected. (The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church).

The vital differences over the doctrine of marriage which give rise to the discrepancies in discipline, it is hoped could be overcome by Economy.

(e) Sex

The relevant 20 Canons are:-

Apostolic Constitutions 67: 10 of the Fifth: 18 of the Seventh Ecumenical Council: 44 of Laodicea: 4 and 33 of Carthage: 2 of Dionysius: 18 and 70 of Basil the Great: 5, 6, 7, and 13 of Timothy: 6, 7, 17, 19 and 22 of John the Faster: 36 and 37 of Nicephorus.

A paraphrase of the subject matter of the Canons

- (1. Fornication must stop or end in marriage)
- (2. No pornographic pictures to be made)
- (3. Women dwelling in a bishop's house or monastery forbidden)
- (4. Women must not enter the sacrificial altar)
- (5. Men who handle sacred articles to abstain from women)
6. Clergy who attend Eucharist to abstain from wives
7. Menstruous women not to communicate
8. Widowhood is inferior to virginity
9. If a deacon even kiss a woman he has sinned but not badly
10. Man nor wife should communicate on morning after coition
11. Women cannot be baptised if menstruous
12. Women cannot communicate if menstruous

- 13. Sexual intercourse not allowed on Saturday or Sunday
- 14. No communion on morning after emission
- 15. No communion for seven days after emission if awake
- 16. Menstruous women must not communicate for seven days
- 17. A boy violated by a homosexual not to be a priest
- (18. A woman who has had a miscarriage to do penance for a year)
- (19. No eating with an open fornicator)
- (20. If a baby has to be baptised before five days old another baptised woman must suckle it)

A Summary of the subject matter of these Canons

Economy required 12

Sexual impediments to communicating:

- | | |
|------------------|---------------------------------|
| 6, 10 and 13 | Intercourse |
| 7, 11, 12 and 16 | Menstruation |
| 14 and 15 | Emission of semen |
| 8 | Widowhood inferior to virginity |
| 9 and 17 | Points concerning clergy |

Obsolete 8

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 and 19 | Laws concerning fornication |
| 2 | Pornography |
| 3, 4, 5, 18 and 20 | Other points |

These Canons show how far the modern view of sex differs from that of the early church, and it is not surprising that 8 of the 20 are considered obsolete. The Canons concerning emission of semen and menstruation have direct parallels in Bede (p. 78-98) and yet surprise modern minds with their rigour.

The Eastern view of sex is based on that of St. Paul who fairly certainly repudiated marriage because he expected the early return of Our Lord. Thus St. Paul implies that marriage may be blessed but virginity is superior. (I Corinthians chapter 7 particularly v. 8). The Book of Revelation goes further and suggests the basically non-Christian view that marriage is defiling as only virgins are praised in Revelation chapter 14 v. 4.

The exaltation of virginity was carried even further by gnostic influence in the Fathers like Tatian, (Bainton p. 27) and St. Jerome followed

in the line. (Bainton p. 30). As this process continued, such disciplines as the celibacy of clergy or the abstinence from sex relations before celebration and the rules noted in Bede were enforced.

Thus in the days of the early church, and up to the Middle Ages the prevailing view of sex was disparaging, hence it is not surprising to find such Canons in this section. It may not be long before the Orthodox Church decides that even more of them are obsolete. Abstinence from sex relations before communion or for a period of time such as Lent, may indeed be an aid to self-discipline and a spiritual value if it is by mutual consent, but it loses its point if imposed by the church. It is of course recommended by St. Paul in I Corinthians chapter 7 v.5, and is practised by the Orthodox Church. It is thought that the West would be reluctant to enforce as law any of these Canons concerning sexual impediments to communicating and therefore Economy will be required for infringement.

Canon 18 of Basil the Great (8 above) exalting virginity is in agreement with modern Orthodoxy (Orthodox Spiritual City p. 6) but is not thought to be very important. It is hoped that Canon 70 of Basil the Great (9 above) forbidding a deacon to kiss a woman would not be required of Western deacons even if it is observed by Easterns. Canon 19 of John the Faster (17 above) forbidding a boy violated by a homosexual to be a priest, would need to be enforced so rarely, that it is hoped / be unimportant.

The Obsolete Canons 1 and 19 above concerning fornication are good examples of 'borderline' Canons they could have appeared in class C but they were placed here in case the Orthodox still attempt to enforce them and it was thought that Anglicans would not attempt to do so though they disapprove of fornication of course. Although censorship of pornography can be argued to be a Christian's responsibility to his brother, the practical difficulties of carrying it out adequately and effectively in the modern world

appear insuperable. The other obsolete Canons, apart from revealing the ancient idea of sex as unclean raise no important points.

(f) Spirituality

The relevant 15 Canons are:-

Apostolic Constitutions 79: 20 of the First: 69, 73, 76, 89 and 90 of the Sixth: 7 of the Seventh Ecumenical Council: 20 of Gangra: 51 of Laodicea: 92 of Carthage: 91 of Basil: 10 and 1 of the second series, of Nicephorus: and the 1st of the "Eleven Questions".

A paraphrase of the subject matter of the Canons

1. A madman is not allowed to pray with the faithful
2. Prayers are to be offered standing
- (3. No layman allowed within the Sanctuary)
4. The vivifying cross ought to be adored
- (5. No merchandise to be set up in the sacred precincts)
6. The faithful celebrating Holy Week must fast
- (7. Bending the knee in prayer on Sundays is forbidden)
8. Any temples consecrated without relics must now have them
9. People who dislike gatherings in honour of Martyrs to be anathema
10. No birthdays of Martyrs to be celebrated in Great Lent
11. Churches without relics to be destroyed
12. Prayers to be offered standing
- (13. No genuflections during Pentecost)

- (14. One ought not to walk abroad on Sunday unless necessary)
- (15. One does not bend the knee on Sunday and at Pentecost)

A Summary of the subject matter of these Canons

Economy required 9

1 and 6	Miscellaneous
2 and 12	Standing to pray
4	Adoration of the Cross
8 and 11	Adoration of reliques
9 and 10	Martyrs

Obsolete 6

3	No layman in the Sanctuary
5 and 14	Religious behaviour
7, 13 and 15	No genuflection

Of these 15 Canons at least 6 are thought to be obsolete. The problem in Apostolic Constitutions 79 (1 above) arises from the fact that madness was thought to be linked with demon possession, an idea foreign to modern thought. (See section X (a) p.106). Thus this Canon may be obsolete as is the one concerning baptism, but if it is not then Anglicans may infringe it, particularly if epilepsy is regarded as madness.

Whether Economy will be required for Anglican infringement of Canon 89 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council (6 above) depends on what is understood by fasting as discussed in section V (f). / The practical reason for standing to pray is that there are no pews in Orthodox Churches, (French p. 115, Hammond p. 19) while the doctrinal reason is that, Sunday being the day of Our Lord's Resurrection and therefore a day of victory and rejoicing, kneeling seems unsuitable to the Orthodox who regard it as an attitude of penitence. However the Russians kneel more than the Greeks do. (Kephala p. 85). (2 and 12 above)

It is doubtful whether the Orthodox would condemn us as infringing their Canons when Anglicans kneel to pray and genuflect on Sundays all the year round. Probably Economy has already been exercised in this field. Should an Orthodox worshipper attend an Anglican service on a Sunday he would probably genuflect without feeling that he had disobeyed the Canons, so that this point is not important.

The rest of this group is concerned with other aspects of Orthodox Spirituality such as Icons, prayers to the Saints and Martyrs, and adoration of the Cross and reliques. Orthodox Spirituality has already been discussed in section V (f), and seen there to be both a disciplinary and doctrinal issue based on the doctrine of the Church. This is an important difference and it is hoped that Economy may be applied. Canon 73 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council (4 above) is observed and the Orthodox do kiss the Cross. (Orthodox Spirituality p. 87).

The obsolete Canons raise no important points and Canon 76 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council (5 above) forbidding merchandise to be sold in Church is obsolete since candles are sold in Orthodox churches. Had it not been obsolete the bookstalls in many Anglican Churches would infringe this canon.

(g) Monks and Nuns

The relevant 8 Canons are:-

46 of the Sixth: 20 of the Seventh Ecumenical Council:

6 of the First and Second Regional Councils:

16, 19, 22, 24 and 34 of Nicephorus.

A paraphrase of the subject matter of the Canons

- (1. Nuns must not step nor sleep outside their convent)
- (2. No double monastery to be made, no monk to look into a nunnery)
- (3. Monks ought not to have anything of their own)
- (4. Monks must not do any farmwork in Great Lent)
- (5. Monks must only eat once a day in Great Lent)
- (6. A young Monk must not communicate Nuns)
- (7. A lapsed Monk not to be welcomed into a home)
- (8. A lapsed Monk who marries to be anathematised)

A Summary of the subject matter of these Canons

ALL OBSOLETE

- | | |
|------------|---------------------------------|
| 1, 2 and 6 | Regulations to enforce chastity |
| 3, 4 and 5 | Ascetism required |
| 7 and 8 | Lapsed Monks |

All Canons in this section have been declared obsolete,
but since they do not appear to be only of historical

interest at first sight, they have been included here rather than in class B. They throw light on possible dangers of unchastity in the early Church and on rigours of fasting which are not observed nowadays, even in the Eastern Church which is more rigorous in this respect than the West.

(h) Jews and Heretics

The relevant 17 Canons are:-

Apostolic Constitutions 45, 65, 70 and 75: 11 and 72
of the Sixth Ecumenical Council: 6, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37,
38 and 39 of Laodicea: 29 of Carthage: 41 of Basil
the Great: and 9 of Timothy.

A paraphrase of the subject matter of the Canons

- (1. Clergy who join in prayer with heretics to be deposed)
- (2. Praying with Jews and heretics forbidden)
- (3. Clergy who fast with Jews or go on holiday with them to be deposed)
- (4. As a witness against a bishop no heretic to be accepted)
- (5. No one may eat the unleavened bread of Jews or call on them in sickness)
- (6. No Orthodox man may marry heretical women or vice versa)
- (7. Heretics must not come into the house of God while remaining heretics)
- (8. No one must marry a heretic or give ones children in marriage to them)
- (9. No one must accept the blessings of heretics)
- (10. One must not join in prayer with heretics or schismatics)
- (11. No Christian must fraternize with heretics)

- (12. One must not celebrate holidays with Jews)
- (13. One must not participate in the impieties of Jews)
- (14. One must not join heathen in the celebration of holidays)
- (15. Children of clergy shall not marry heretics)
- (16. A widow may not marry a heretic)
- (17. Heretics must not be present at Eucharist)

A Summary of the subject matter of these Canons

ALL OBSOLETE

1, 2, 7, 9, 10, 13 and 17	Prayer
3, 5, 11, 12 and 14	Fasting or holidays
4	Witness against a bishop
6, 8, 15 and 16	Marriage

In this section of Canons dealing with Jews and heretics, those concerning baptism (Apostolic Constitutions 46, 50 and 53, and 1 of the Third Ecumenical Council) are not included here as they have already been discussed under "Baptism and Confirmation" (Section X (a)). These Canons are concerned mainly with prayer or fasting or holidays or marriage with such people. They come mainly from two sources, The Apostolic Constitutions and the Regional Council of Laodicea, and probably dealt with local problems so that it is not surprising that

they are obsolete. Some of them seem almost un-Christian in their attitude particularly to Jews, and in any case deal with what nowadays might be thought of as such harmless occupations as calling upon them in sickness or going on holiday with them. Perhaps the Canons forbidding marriage to heretics were never able to be enforced for long and never intended to be more than pious hopes!

(i) Interest on money

The relevant 7 Canons are:-

Apostolic Constitutions 44: 17 of the First: 10 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council: 4 of Laodicea: 5 and 20 of Carthage: and 31 of Nicephorus.

A paraphrase of the subject matter of the Canons

- (1. Clergy to cease from demanding interest)
- (2. Anyone receiving interest to be deposed)
- (3. Clergy who take interest to be deposed)
- (4. Clergy must not lend out money or take interest)
- (5. Clergy must not charge interest)
- (6. If clergy lend money they must take no interest)
- (7. A priest must not communicate those who charge interest, or eat with them)

A Summary of the subject matter of these CanonsALL OBSOLETE

All concerning interest on money.

It is of course a truly biblical principle not to charge interest, (Nehemiah chapter 5 vv. 7 and 10 for example) but it was usually permissible for a member of the Old Israel to exact interest from a stranger. (Deuteronomy chapter 23 v. 20).

Our Lord could be said to condone interest in the parable of the Talents (St. Matthew chapter 25 v. 14 following, particularly v. 27) or of the Pounds (St. Luke chapter 19 v. 12), but it is fairly certain that the early Church did not charge interest (Acts of the Apostles chapter 2 v. 44, chapter 4 v. 32 etc.). To enforce the above Canons in the modern situation would be to undermine the whole of the capitalist system of business, and the Orthodox Church in Western Europe, Greece and America would seem to regard them as obsolete. It is possible that these Canons may be considered important in the future by the Russians and there are even people among Anglicans who question some of the activities of the Church Commissioners on the Stock Exchange.

(j) Date of Easter

The relevant 3 Canons are:-

Apostolic Constitutions 7: 1 of Antioch: and 3 of Carthage.

A Summary of the subject matter of these Canons

ALL OBSOLETE

All concerning the date of Easter.

Controversy over the date of Easter was one of the main reasons given for the Schism (see Section II (b) p.14), but it is unlikely that this would be regarded as a source of any serious difficulty nowadays. (Zernov 1956 p.12). It has never been mentioned at length, if indeed at all, in the reports of recent Anglo-Orthodox Conferences. (For example Moscow 1956.). It is hoped that Anglican infringement of these Canons could be overcome by Economy.

(k) Canon of Scripture

The relevant 7 Canons are:-

Apostolic Constitutions 85: 59 and 60 of Laodicea:
 32 of Carthage: 3 of Athanasius: 1 of Gregory the
 Theologian: and 1 of Amphilius.

A Table of the subject matter of these CanonsTable 4

Deviations from the Western Canon of Scripture						
Canon	Date	Excluded from O.T.	Added to O.T.	Apocrypha (if any)	Excluded from N.T.	Added to N.T.
No. 1	96?	Lamentations	1,2 & 3 Maccabees	Wisdom of Sirach	Revelation	2 Epistles & Injunction of Clement
No. 2	364	(supports the above Canon)				
No. 3	364		Baruch & Epistle of Jeremiah		Revelation	
No. 4	419	Lamentations Ruth	Wisdom of Solomon Tobit & Judith			
No. 5	296- 373	Esther	Baruch Epistle Jeremiah	some books & Didache & Shepherd.		
No. 6	370	Lamentations Esther			Revelation	
No. 7	340- 395	Lamentations Esther			II Peter II & III John, Jude Revelation	

A Summary of the subject matter of these CanonsALL OBSOLETE

All concerning the Canon of Scripture, particularly the Apocrypha.

The following points arise from the books which are "venerable and sacred" in Apostolic Constitutions 85:

1. The Old Testament includes 1, 2, & 3 Maccabees but Lamentations is omitted if it is not included in the Book of the prophet Jeremiah.
2. "It is permissible for you to recount (in addition to the Old Testament) the wisdom of the very learned Sirach by way of teaching younger folks".
3. "Our own books" (i.e. The New Testament) includes the Epistles of Clement, and "the Injunctions addressed to you bishops through me, Clement" in eight books. The Book of Revelation is omitted.
(3 Maccabees is now only found in the Canon of the Syriac Church).

If as quotation 3 above suggests, Clement was the

author of this Canon, it must date from before the Fourth Century, in fact from about A.D. 96. If this was the true date the inclusion of Revelation is not to be expected since it was not written at the time, or only in the process of being written in Patmos, while Clement was probably also writing from exile in the Tauric Peninsula by decree of the tyrant Domitian.

Canon 59 of Laodicea merely supports the Apostolic Constitutions 85. It states that private psalms must not be recited in Church, nor uncanonical books, but only those canonical books of the Old and New Testaments. Uncanonical books are those not included in the list in Apostolic Constitutions 85, i.e. Revelation and most of our Apocrypha, so that the reading of these is forbidden by this Canon. The "Rudder" contains a note that 'private' psalms refers not to the psalms of Paul of Samosata etc. mentioned by Eusebius, but to the psalms inserted in the Old Testament other than in the Book of Psalms.

Canon 60 of Laodicea gives a full list of "all the books that are to be read": the Old Testament includes Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah, and the New Testament excludes Revelation.

Canon 32 of Carthage includes the Wisdom of Solomon, Tobit and Judith but excludes Lamentations and Ruth from the Old Testament. Revelation is included in the New Testament.

Canon 3 of Athanasius gives warnings against the "apocrypha" and states that "the total number of the books in the Old Testament is 22, for as I have been told such is precisely the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet". To arrive at this number Kings is counted as two books because 1 and 2, and 3 and 4 are each counted as one. 1 and 2 Chronicles is likewise counted as one book, as are Esdras, (Ezra and Nehemiah), the twelve minor prophets, Ezekiel and Daniel, Baruch, Lamentations and the Epistle of Jeremiah. These together with the rest of the

western Canon of the Old Testament except Esther, add up to 22 Books.

Having detailed the western Canon of the New Testament exactly, including Revelation, Athanasius adds "for the sake of greater exactness ... there are also other books than these.... though not all canonically sanctioned ... to be found formerly prescribed by the Fathers to be read to those who have just joined and are willing to be catechised with respect and words of piety", viz. :- Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), Esther, Judith, Tobias, The Didache of the Apostles and the Shepherd of Hermas. Briefly, Athanasius includes some of the Books of the Apocrypha, though avoiding the name and using the word Anaginoskomena(i.e. books to be read). He adds the Didache and the Shepherd.

St. Gregory the Theologian writes in verse, later confirmed by the Sixth Ecumenical Council. Assuming that Ezra includes Nehemiah, and Jeremiah includes

Lamentations, then the Old Testament only excludes Esther and the New Testament only excludes Revelation. In other writings of his Gregory the Theologian accepts as genuine and God-inspired the Book of Revelation of John.

St. Amphilochius who was present at the Second Ecumenical Council also writes in verse. Assuming again that Jeremiah includes Lamentations, his only difference from the western Canon is his statement "some approve Esther" without definite inclusion in the Canon. Concerning the New Testament:

"Well, what about the Epistles Catholic? Some say there are seven of them and some only three. We must accept that of James as one, That of Peter as one, of those of John, one, Though some say that there are three of them And in addition thereto they account the two of Peter And that of Jude as the seventh. As for the Book of Revelation of John, again Some approve it, but at least a majority call it spurious.

These Canons obviously do not agree as to the acceptable books, and hence illustrate the development in the formulation of the Canon of Scripture. Much

has been written on the formulation of the Canon of Scripture and can be found in standard works, these could be related to their historical background in this formative period of history, but this is not relevant to the Anglican view of the Orthodox Canons. Since they are self-contradictory however, it is probable that the Orthodox already regard these Canons as of historical interest only, and this may be a situation where the Orthodox apply Economy to their own infringement of the Canons.

Concerning the Bible itself, the West regard the Book of Revelation as part of the Canon though it is not included in the majority of the Orthodox Canons and Anglicans will need Economy if they continue to read Revelation.

Concerning the Apocrypha, the Orthodox do not recognise the following books:-
The third and fourth book of Esdras, the Song of the three children, the Story of Susannah, Bel and the Dragon, and the Prayer of Manasses.

But the Orthodox do recognise in different Canons:-
Tobias, Judith, rest of Esther, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus,
1, 2, and 3 Maccabees, Baruch, Epistle of Jeremiah,
Didache of the Twelve Apostles, and the Shepherd of
Hermas.

The Anglican view of the Apocrypha is based on St. Jerome as quoted in Article 6, "the Church doth read" (the Apocrypha) "for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet it doth not apply them" (the books of the Apocrypha) "to establish any doctrine". This view is one reason why this Article is unsatisfactory from an Orthodox point of view (see Section V (b) p. 53). It is hoped that Economy may be available for us to read the whole of the Apocrypha, even though the loss of that part of it not recognised in the East would not be serious to most Anglicans.

(1) Miscellaneous

The relevant 7 Canons are:-

50, 51, 64 and 67 of the Sixth: 22 of the Seventh:
Ecumenical Council: 17 of Gangra: and 55 of Laodicea.

A paraphrase of the subject matter of the Canons

- (1. Nobody is permitted to gamble)
- (2. The Council prohibits pantomimes and dancing on the stage)
- (3. A layman must not publicly make a speech or teach)
- (4. No blood of an animal to be eaten)
- (5. Take food for nourishment and not for enjoyment, no songs or dancing)
- (6. Any woman who cuts her hair to be anathema)
- (7. No Christian must hold banquets by contribution)

A Summary of the subject matter of these CanonsALL OBSOLETE

- | | |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | Gambling |
| 2, 4, 5 and 7 | Pantomimes, dancing, banquets, etc. |
| 3 | The place of the laity |
| 6 | Women who cut their hair |

Gambling may be a social evil but Canon 50 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council (1 above) is impracticable at the present time and probably always was.

The Canons concerning pantomimes, dancing, banquets, etc. seem to be from early puritans and it is fortunate that they are now obsolete. Canon 57 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council is based on Acts chapter 15.

Readers often make a speech and teach in Anglican Churches, and this would be forbidden by Canon 64 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council (3 above) if it were not obsolete. Since the Canons are obsolete none of the differences are important, but they might have been had they not been obsolete.

Supporting Canons

The relevant 6 Canons are:-

6 of the Third: 1 of the Fourth: 1 and 2 of the Sixth: 1 of the Seventh Ecumenical Council: and 1 of Carthage.

A paraphrase of the subject matter of the Canons

1. Those who wish to alter anything enacted at Ephesus to be deposed
2. The Canons of each and every Council shall continue in full force
3. Nothing is to be removed from or added to what has been decreed
4. The 85 Canons to be retained and left firm
5. "We anathematise whomsoever they anathematised"
6. The Nicene Creed in its original form shall be kept

A summary of the subject matter of these CanonsALL REQUIRING ECONOMY

All these Canons support previous Canons which Anglicans may infringe.

These supporting Canons provide a real source of difference between Anglicanism and Orthodoxy. Strictly

if the Orthodox use Economy on any part of their Canon law, they must at the same time do so on these "supporting Canons", which are primarily reinforcements of Canon law. If they regard some original Canons as obsolete then presumably the corresponding supporting Canons become obsolete also. It is hardly likely that the supporting Canons would be appealed to nowadays to retard obsolescence.

It is plain however that the addition of the Filioque to the Nicene Creed being a direct contravention of the supporting Canons (in particular 1 of Carthage), is so serious that the supporting Canons have been appealed to in defence of the original form of the Creed. The problem of the Filioque has been discussed in section V (e) p. 67. The Anglican Church has admitted its violation of the Ecumenical Canon, and recites the Creed without the controversial phrase at joint meetings of Anglicans and Orthodox. It is hoped that Economy may... be allowed to operate here until the Church becomes united and the Filioque is accepted or rejected by the Ecumenical Council then held.

Section XI

SOME TOPICS ARISING FROM THE CANONS OF PARTICULAR IMPORTANCE TO ANGLICANS

- (a) Communion to the Dying
- (b) Treatment of Converts
- (c) Manner of Administration of Communion
- (d) Heresies
- (e) Factions within the Church
- (f) Abortion
- (g) Virginity and Marriage
- (h) Baptism and Confirmation
- (i) The Eucharist
- (j) Clergy
- (k) Re-marriage
- (l) Spirituality

It has been noted in Section X that at some points, Marriage for instance, the Orthodox views have much to recommend them. Anglicans may come to accept them. But because Anglicans have hitherto been very reluctant to do so, the Canons referring to such questions have been allocated to class D where it was hoped that the Orthodox might employ Economy. It is now necessary to consider those points where there is a chance that Anglicans may accept the Orthodox position, or at least take it into consideration in discussions.

It is not intended to suggest that all the Canons discussed in this Section should be accepted by Anglicans, merely that these Canons are considered to be relevant to subjects under discussion in Anglicanism. In the selection of Canons to be discussed in this Section it is obviously impossible to be other than subjective. An attempt has been made to remain near the main stream of Anglican opinion in so far as this is known. For example the suggestion of more prayers

for the dead (section XI (l) below) might not be welcomed by Low Church members; on the other hand High Church members might dissent from the Orthodox opinion that celibacy is a calling no higher than that of marriage. (Section XI (j) below).

Canons in this section have been selected from all the four classes A, B, C and D. Canons with which the mainstream of Anglican opinion is in agreement, but for which there is no well-defined law, are suggested from class A. Class B contains no Canons which are of modern interest unless one of the early heresies, such as Pelagianism, were to become important once more. Canons from class C might be valuable to Anglicans when they agree with the Orthodox condemnation of some wrong or evil over which Anglicans have grown slack in discipline.

Should the Orthodox find themselves unable to apply Economy on any of the points mentioned in Class D, and discussed in Section X above, such points would have to be considered in future discussions for acceptance by Anglicans, as in this Section XI.

(a) Communion to the dying (from class A)

Canon 83 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council and
Canon 25 of Carthage.

1. "Let no-one impart the Eucharist to the bodies of the dying, for it is written 'Take, eat' (St. Matthew chapter 26 v. 26) but the bodies of dead persons can neither take nor eat anything".
2. Word for word as above

In these two Canons 'dying' fairly obviously means 'dead', or so nearly so that a person cannot 'take, eat'. Most Anglicans would agree that to administer Communion in such cases where the person cannot eat would be wrong. It is not likely that the Canons intend that those who are seriously ill, but not at the point of death, should be refused Communion if they desire it. It is known that the Orthodox do reserve for the sick who are usually communicated direct from the Liturgy. Hence the effect of the Canons is in line with current Anglican practice, though possibly not with Roman Catholic practice. Anglicans might value these Canons in Anglican Canon Law.

(b) Treatment of Converts (from class A)

Canon 7 of Laodicea.

"Concerning the need of refusing to accept persons from heresies until they have anathematised every heresy and particularly that in which they have been captivated".

This is a good example of a Canon the discipline of which would in the opinion of some Anglicans be valuable as law in the Church of England, whereas others consider that details like this are better left to the discretion of the receiving priest. The purpose of the Canon is quite explicit.

(c) Manner of Administration of Communion (from class A)

Canon 101 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council.

"The Host to be taken in the hand".

In the Orthodox Church home-baked leavened bread is used after the example of the early Church, and symbolises the unity between our worship and our daily work and life. (Kephala p. 44 and 57). In the early Church the consecrated bread at Communion was administered into the hand of the Communicant as this Canon shows, but the modern Orthodox Church uses the method of intinction in a spoon. (Zernov 1956 p. 54, French p. 121). The laity thus receive 'in both kinds' at once, and the symbolism of the common cup is maintained.

The Canon is included here to show the Seventh Century precedent for the Anglican rubric "then shall the Minister first receive the Communion in both kinds himself... and after that to the people in order into their hands". A few Anglicans receive direct on the tongue, so that this Canon would unify Anglicans if accepted.

(d) Heresies (from class B)

canons concerning ancient heresies should be considered by the Church of England if these heresies arise again in modern guises at some future time and so become relevant. Anglicans might then value as law some of these ancient Canons. For example the Canons concerning Pelagianism (120 of Carthage) should this heresy become important in present day Britain.

(e) Factions within the Church (from class C)

Canon 18 of the Fourth, and Canon 34 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council.

1. "Any Clergyman found guilty of the crime of conspiracy or faction shall forfeit rank".
2. As above

If this is taken to cover groups within the Church which definitely try to change the thought of the Church, for example the Oxford Movement, or the Simeonites, many Anglicans would regret the acceptance of these Canons. On the other hand acceptance of them would support Bishops in cases where groups of churchmen unite to defy their Bishop's wishes in such a way as to disrupt the Church. The value of these Canons therefore depends upon elucidation of what constitutes a faction, and also upon the value put upon pressure groups working outside the norm of Anglicanism. Some feel that such groups have done good rather than harm while others feel Anglicanism is too tolerant of extremes which these Canons suppress.

(f) Abortion (from class C)

Canon 91 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council.

"Women who furnish drugs for abortion are to be made subject to the penalty of murderesses".

This is an example of a topic not at present covered by Anglican Canon Law, but of obvious interest. Most Anglicans are willing to leave the decision in any particular case to the medical profession. The Canon reveals what the early Church thought of abortion, which is of interest to present day theological consideration of this problem, and some Anglicans would support this Canon.

(g) virginity and Marriage (from class C)

Canons 9 and 10 of Gangra.

1. "Anyone who remains a virgin through abomination of marriage and not for the good standard of virginity to be anathema".
2. "Virgins who regard married persons superciliously to be anathema".

These Canons are included here to show that the Orthodox do not in fact regard virginity as a higher state than marriage, as might be suggested by other Canons (see Section X (e) p. 128). Most Anglicans would agree with these Canons even if they had doubts about the penalties, but there may be some who feel that celibacy is a higher calling, which would be against the spirit of these Canons. For this reason the Canons would be accepted by most, though not all Anglicans.

(h) Baptism and Confirmation (from class D)

Canon 50 of the Apostolic Constitutions and
Canon 48 of Laodicea.

1. "Clergy must perform three not one immersion".
2. "The illuminated after Baptism must be anointed with Chrism".

Immersion is directed in the rubric in the Book of Common Prayer, "He shall dip it in the water discreetly and warily", and further "but if they certify that the child is weak it shall suffice to pour water upon it". Triple immersion is however not enjoined. There seems no theoretical objection to Anglicans adopting the Orthodox practice, at this point in conformity with that of the early Church.

Anglicans are at the moment reconsidering their doctrine and Liturgy of Baptism and Confirmation with a view to a closer link between the two. There has been no suggestion of infant Confirmation and Communion

which is the Orthodox practice. (Zernov 1956 p.59-63)

"Anointing with Chrism" that is with oil blessed by a Bishop, is taken to imply &rite equivalent to our Confirmation immediately after Baptism, so that even infants are 'Confirmed' in the Orthodox Church.

The Gospel appointed for the Baptismal Service in the Book of Common Prayer, "whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein" (St. Mark chapter X v. 15), could serve equally well for infant Confirmation. The practice of 'Confirmation' with oil blessed by a Bishop rather than by the direct laying on of hands has some practical advantages. Infant Communion would have the further practical advantage of enabling the whole family to receive together at a 'Family Communion', and hence would favour a continuous life as a communicant. The movement in the Church of England towards a parish Communion may influence its attitude towards this aspect of Orthodoxy.

(i) The Eucharist (from class D)

Canons 8 and 9 of the Apostolic Constitutions
and Canon 2 of Antioch.

1. "All clergy must Communicate if present at Eucharist".
2. "All laity must Communicate if present at the Eucharist".
3. All laity must communicate.

These Orthodox Canons concerning the Eucharist are obsolete, probably because they demand too much by insisting that all present at the Eucharist should communicate. However, the spirit of them is observed within Orthodoxy in that celebrations at which only the priest communicates, "non-communicating masses" as they are called, are unknown in the Orthodox church. Similarly, strict observance of the rubrics in the Prayer Book requires a communicating congregation, though there is no direct insistence that all must receive Communion. Most Anglicans agree with these rubrics, though some Anglo-Catholics when fasting communicants are lacking, would prefer

a celebration at which only the priest receives communion for a non-communicating congregation, to allowing non-fasting reception. Thus, Anglo-Catholics excepted, these three Canons are acceptable to the Church of England. The growth towards a single 'Family or Parish Communion' each Sunday in the Church of England, approaches the Orthodox practice which permits each priest to celebrate, and each altar to be used, only once a day. (Hammond p. 58).

(j) Clergy (from class D)

Canon 19 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council.

"Clergy must not interpret Scripture otherwise than as the Church says".

Orthodox concern over what they feel to be the Anglican disregard of the purpose of this Canon has been discussed in Section X (c) (p. 118). For those who appeal to "Scripture, Tradition and Reason", this Canon seems to pay insufficient attention to the last of these three - Reason. Acceptance of this Canon might be welcomed by those who feel that others (modernists) appeal too much to Reason. It might also be welcomed by those who feel that some Anglicans (fundamentalists) interpret Scripture otherwise than as the Church says. Apart from the difficulty of enforcing the Canon the problem is to decide what the Church says, since few would want to appeal to the Thirty Nine Articles, and yet probably could not agree where else to find "what the Church says". Thus clergy are reminded to teach doctrines accepted by the Church.

(k) Re-Marriage (from class D)

Canons 17 and 18 of the Apostolic Constitutions; 3 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council; 7 of Neocaesarea; 12 and 50 of Basil the Great; and 2 of Nicephorus.

1. "Whoever has entered into two marriages cannot be a bishop."
2. "No one can be a clergyman who has taken as wife a widow or a divorced woman...".
3. "Any one who has two marriages cannot be a bishop..".
4. "No presbyter to dine at a second marriage feast".
5. Twice-married men not to be clergy.
6. Third marriages, though they are a defilement to the Church, are preferable to fornication.
7. Second marriages are not to be blessed with crowns.

Acceptance of the Orthodox doctrine of marriage is discussed in Section X (d) (p. 121) and involves the recognition of all second marriages even after the death of the first partner as penitential, as is shown by the Canons above (second marriages are not to be blessed with crowns). Since no one in a

penitential state may hold orders, these canons forbid the re-marriage of clergy after the death of a first partner, while permitting it to the laity even after divorce. A ban on re-marriage of clergy would not commend itself to Anglicans though the permission for laity to re-marry after divorce might appeal to some. Both regulations, since they depend on the Orthodox doctrine of marriage, would have to be accepted or both rejected if Anglicans came to accept this doctrine.

(1) Spirituality (from class D)

Canon 73 of the Sixth and 20 of Gangra.

1. "The vivifying Cross ought to be adored".
2. "People who dislike gatherings in honour of martyrs to be anathema".

These Canons typify the problem of Orthodox Spirituality which is one of the main points of division. It is discussed more fully in Sections V (f) and X (f), where it is noted that the Orthodox view of prayers to the dead, martyrs and reliques differs from that of the Roman Catholic Church. It is hoped that the Orthodox view of Spirituality may be a unifying factor among Anglicans since Evangelical Brethren fear prayers for the dead mainly because they fear that they imply a belief in purgatory. The Orthodox, while not believing in purgatory, still pray to the dead. Only when the importance of their Spirituality to the Orthodox is more fully understood by Christendom will its influence on the Ecumenical Movement be realised.

C O N C L U S I O N

In this dissertation the 869 Canons of the 'Pedalion or Rudder' of the Orthodox Church have been considered from an Ecumenical, and in particular from an Anglican standpoint. They have been classified with this consideration in mind. Those which raise points of difference have been discussed in greater detail than those which are less important to Anglicans, and an attempt has been made to see how far the application of Economy may be expected to overcome the difficulties involved.

The key to many, if not all, the difficulties raised by the Canons lies in the differences in the doctrine of "the Church" held in the East and in the West. These differences as to the nature of the Church give rise to the differing doctrines of Holy Tradition, and it is only this which raises the problem of the authority of the Canons. If the Canons were not held in such reverence, or could be discarded, the problems they raise would be of less importance. This reverence for Canon Law, unusual

to western minds, and the reason for it in the doctrine of the living Church, underlies the importance of the Canons.

It is not difficult to show that it is again the doctrine of the Church which is behind the doctrinal problems raised in Section V. Anglican orders can only be recognised as valid by the Orthodox when the two Churches are in complete harmony of doctrine and practice, in fact in one Church. The Churches must be living together in unity of doctrine, not merely agreeing together as organisations, before Anglican orders can be accepted.

Again the Thirty Nine Articles are not acceptable to the Orthodox because they were not agreed by the whole Church. Only in so far as they conform to Ecumenically agreed doctrine can they be accepted. This is why such questions as Anglican use of the Apocrypha for example arouse missgivings in the Orthodox mind.

The number and authority of the Ecumenical Councils, and the number and doctrine of the Sacraments, only ~~rises~~ raises problems because the Orthodox fear that Anglicans are deviating from the Ecumenical doctrine and practice. This fear is justified in the case of the Filioque, and it is because the Filioque has not been accepted Ecumenically by the whole living Church that it is a great problem to the Orthodox. By changing the Ecumenical Creed without Ecumenical authority the Western Church changed the whole concept of what the Church is and does. Only when the Western Church realises and acknowledges its guilt in this matter, and sees that it has indeed changed the doctrine of the Church from a community living in charity to an organisation capable of making rules or altering them, will the full impact of the Filioque problem be felt.

In a rather different way Orthodox Spirituality is also a direct result of the belief that the Church is a living community uniting the living and the dead.

It is only if the Church is no more than an organisation on earth, that prayers for the dead become meaningless. For the Orthodox the Eucharist is not merely a group of individuals obeying Our Lord's command, or remembering His Passion. It is nothing less than the whole Church, Militant and Triumphant, uniting on earth to worship God Almighty. Few western churchpeople have this understanding of the Eucharist in spite of the words "therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of Heaven, we laud and Magnify thy glorious Name". But this affirmation of the living unity of the Church is the doctrine which is the source of almost all Orthodox Spirituality.

Returning to a consideration of the Canons themselves: little space has been devoted to those which are in agreement, or merely of historical interest, or where the difference is not serious, because this dissertation is mainly concerned with those which raise problems of Ecumenical significance and for

which Economy may be sought. Such Canons are considered more fully under separate sub-headings in Section X. There are six groups of Canons which show important differences from Anglican doctrine and practice. These are concerned with:—

- (a) Baptism and Confirmation
- (b) The Eucharist and the Epiclesis
- (c) Clergy
- (d) Marriage
- (e) Sex
- (f) Spirituality

Within these groups there may be several points/which Economy would be required for Anglicans if the Canons remain in force and the Anglicans make no change in their practices. It is the doctrine of the Church again which makes our Baptism questionable, because triple immersion and anointing with Chrism were practiced before the Schism and these are still important to Orthodoxy. In marriage, it is because the doctrine of the Church emphasises the link between the living and the dead that marriage is for ever and not "til death us do part".

A selection is given here of Orthodox Canons which might be further considered by Anglicans. . . . These Canons refer mainly to those topics not covered by Anglican Canons, and in which it is possible that Anglicans might wish to support Orthodox Canons by law as well as in principle. The Orthodox solution to the problem of divorce and re-marriage is also advanced as important to Anglicans, as is the possibility of infant confirmation and Communion. Other points discussed include Canons supporting the majority view of the Church of England against Anglicans of the extremes. This Section is of course based on personal views.

The overall picture is that the Orthodox differ from Anglicans by very many Canons, not all of which are observed by the Orthodox themselves. The differences summarised in the six main points above should provide nothing which prevents the Orthodox from allowing Economy to the Anglican Communion at these points. Anglicans can ask that this concession (not a right), be employed by the Orthodox to the Anglican infringements.

Even if Economy were granted it must be realised that this is not a panacea and deals only with the disciplinary side of the differences. All the doctrinal problems, arising mainly, it has been suggested, out of the differing views of the doctrine of the Church, would remain. These doctrinal differences are the only real ones which divide us and this would be seen even more clearly if the disciplinary differences could be overcome so as to reveal the doctrinal ones. Even the latter, will not prove insuperable, by the grace of God.

APPENDIX ITHE COMPLETE CLASSIFICATION OF THE CANONS

The Canons have been classified in the manner suggested in Section VI as follows:-

Class A ... Canons which are in full agreement with Anglican usage or custom. (Section VII).

Class B ... Canons which are most unlikely to be found to differ from the Anglican position but which are of obvious historical interest. (Section VIII).

Class C ... Canons which differ, but not seriously, usually only in the severity of the punishment. (Section IX).

Class D ... Canons which differ, but as to which the Orthodox might apply Economy to infringements by Anglicans. (Section X).

APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS

<u>Canons</u>	<u>Class to which Canon is allocated</u>										
1 - 10	A	A	B	B	A	D	D	D	D	C	
11 - 20	C	C	C	A	C	C	D	D	A	D	
21 - 30	B	B	B	B	A	D	C	C	C	D	
31 - 40	B	A	B	A	B	C	B	A	B	B	
41 - 50	B	A	C	D	D	D	D	A	A	D	
51 - 60	D	A	D	D	C	C	C	C	B	B	
61 - 70	C	C	B	C	D	C	D	D	D	D	
71 - 80	B	B	C	B	D	A	A	B	D	A	
81 - 85	D	B	D	C	D						

ECUMENICAL COUNCILSThe First Ecumenical Council

<u>Canons</u>	<u>Class to which Canon is allocated</u>										
1 - 10	B	A	B	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	
11 - 20	B	B	A	B	D	D	D	D	B	D	

The Second Ecumenical Council

1 - 7	A	D	A	B	A	B	B
-------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

The Third Ecumenical Council

1 - 8	B	B	B	B	B	D	B	B
-------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

The Fourth Ecumenical Council

<u>Canons</u>	<u>Class to which the Canon is allocated</u>									
1 - 10	D	C	D	A	D	A	D	B	B	D
11 - 20	B	B	A	B	D	C	B	C	A	D
21 - 30	A	A	B	B	B	B	C	A	B	B

The Fifth and Sixth Ecumenical Councils

The Seventh Ecumenical Council

REGIONAL COUNCILSThe First and Second

<u>Canons</u>	<u>Class to which the Canon is allocated</u>									
1 - 10	B	A	C	B	B	D	B	B	A	C
11- 17	D	D	B	A	B	A	A			

The Council held in the Temple of Holy Wisdom

1 - 3	B	B	C
-------	---	---	---

Carthage

1	D
---	---

Ancyra

1 - 10	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	D
11 - 20	B	B	A	D	B	C	C	B	C
21 - 25	C	C	C	C	B				

Neocaesarea

1 - 10	D	C	B	A	C	A	D	D	C	C
11 - 15	D	C	D	B	A					

Gangra

1 - 10	C	C	B	A	A	A	C	C	C	C
11 -21	C	B	C	C	C	C	D	C	B	D

Regional Councils (continued)Antioch

<u>Canons</u>	<u>Class to which the Canon is allocated</u>									
1 - 10	D	D	D	C	A	B	B	B	A	A
11 - 20	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	A	B
21 - 25	D	A	A	B	B					

Laodicea

1 - 10	D	A	A	D	D	D	A	B	B	A
11 - 20	B	D	A	B	A	A	A	B	D	D
21 - 30	D	B	B	D	D	A	B	B	A	D
31 - 40	D	D	D	D	B	D	D	D	D	A
41 - 50	B	B	B	D	D	D	A	D	D	D
51 - 60	D	D	D	D	D	D	B	D	D	D

Sardica

1 - 10	D	D	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
11 - 20	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B

Constantinople

1 and 2	A	A
---------	---	---

Regional Councils (continued)

Carthage (under Aurelius)

THE HOLY FATHERSDionysius the Alexandrian

<u>Canons</u>	<u>Class to which the Canon is allocated</u>			
---------------	--	--	--	--

1 - 4	B	D	A	A
-------	---	---	---	---

Gregory of Neocaesarea

1 - 12	B	B	A	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
--------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Peter the Martyr

1 - 10	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
--------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

11 - 15	B	B	B	B	B
---------	---	---	---	---	---

Athanasius the Great

1 - 3	A	A	D
-------	---	---	---

Basil the Great

1 - 10	B	A	A	C	B	A	B	A	A	B
--------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

11 - 20	C	D	C	A	B	B	B	D	C	B
---------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

21 - 30	C	B	B	B	C	C	B	A	B	B
---------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

31 - 40	A	A	C	C	A	A	A	C	A	B
---------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

41 - 50	D	A	C	B	C	A	B	C	B	D
---------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

51 - 60	A	C	B	B	C	C	C	C	C	C
---------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

The Holy Fathers (continued)Basil the Great (continued)

<u>Canons</u>	<u>Class to which the Canon is allocated</u>										
61 - 70	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	D
71 - 80	C	C	C	A	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
81 - 90	B	C	C	A	A	B	B	B	B	A	
91 and 92	D	A									

Gregory of Nyssa

1 - 8	B	B	C	B	C	C	C	C		
-------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	--

Gregory the Theologian

1	D									
---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Amphilocius of Iconium

1	D									
---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Timothy of Alexandria

1 - 10	A	D	B	A	D	D	D	A	D	A
11 - 18	A	C	D	C	B	A	A	A		

Theophilus of Alexandria

1 - 10	B	B	B	B	B	B	A	B	C	D
11 - 14	B	B	B	B						

The Holy Fathers (continued)Cyril of Alexandria

<u>Canons</u>	<u>Class to which the Canon is allocated</u>				
1 - 5	B	B	B	B	B

Gennadius

1	B
---	---

John the Faster

1 - 10	C	A	C	C	C	D	D	C	C	C
11 - 20	C	C	C	C	C	C	D	C	D	C
21 - 30	C	D	C	C	C	C	C	A	C	C
31 - 35	C	C	C	C	D					

Tarasius

1	B
---	---

Nicephorus the Confessor

1 - 10	B	D	B	B	A	B	B	A	A	D
11 - 20	A	B	D	A	A	D	B	B	D	B
21 - 30	C	D	B	D	A	B	C	C	A	B
31 - 37	D	B	B	D	D	D	D			

Second series

1 - 7	B	A	A	B	C	A	A
-------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

The Holy Fathers (continued)Patriarch Nicholas

<u>Canons</u>	<u>Class to which the Canon is allocated</u>										
1 - 11	A	D	B	B	A	A	A	A	B	B	B

This Appendix I has been summarised for inclusion in
the dissertation on page 87 as Table II.

TABLE II A Summary of the distribution of the
Canons in classes A to D.

	Total	A	B	C	D
Apostolic Constitutions	85	16	20	21	28
Ecumenical Councils	189	41	74	17	57
Regional Councils	330	49	171	32	78
The Holy Fathers	265	57	93	79	36
	869	163	358	149	199

The 199 Canons of Class D in the order found in the "Rudder"
and the sub-sections to which they are allocated.

The sub-sections are as in section X.

- a. Baptism and Confirmation.
- b. The Eucharist and the Epiclesis.
- c. Clergy.
- d. Marriage.
- e. Sex.
- f. Orthodox Spirituality.
- g. Monks and Nuns.
- h. Jews and Heretics.
- i. Interest on Money.
- j. Date of Easter.
- k. The Canon of Scripture.
- l. Miscellaneous.
- S. Supporting Canons.

(The Canons in brackets are obsolete.)

A Paraphrase of the subject matter of the Canons:

(28 Canons of the Apostolic Constitutions: 6,7,8,9,17,18,20,26,
 30,44,45,46,47,50,51,53,54,63,65,67,68,69,70,75,79,81,83,& 85.)

<u>Sub.</u>	<u>No.in</u>
<u>Section</u>	<u>Sub.sec.</u>

- 6 (1 Clergy must not undertake worldly cares.)
- 5 (1 Date of Easter).
- b (1 All clergy must communicate if present at Eucharist)

<u>Sub. Section</u>	<u>No.in Sub.Sec.</u>	
b	(2	All faithful must communicate if present at Eucharist
d	<u>1</u>	Whoever has entered into two marriages cannot be a bishop.
d	<u>2</u>	No one who has taken widow,divorced woman,harlot, housemaid or actress as wife may be on sacerdotal list
c	(2	Clergyman who gives surety shall be deposed).
d	<u>3</u>	Of bachelor clergy, only anagostic allowed to marry
c	(3	Bishops who obtain bishoprics by employing secular rulers to be deposed).
i	(1	Clergy to cease from demanding interest on money).
n	(1	Clergy who join in prayer with heretics to be suspended).
a	<u>1</u>	Clergy who accept heretics' Baptism to be suspended
a	<u>2</u>	Baptism by heretics unacceptable.
a	<u>3</u>	Clergy who perform one not three immersions at Bap.to be deposed.
c	<u>4</u>	Clergy who abstain from marriage,meat,wine,not as a matter of mortification,but out of abhorrence, to be deposed.
a	<u>4</u>	As Ap.Cons.No.50.
c	(5	Clergy must not eat in tavern where intox.drink sold).
c	(5	Clergy must not eat meat in the blood of its soul).
h	(2	Praying with Jews or heretics forbidden).
e	(1	Fornication must stop or end in marriage to the same girl).
c	<u>7</u>	Second ordination,except of heretics,forbidden.

<u>Sub.</u> <u>Section</u>	<u>No.in</u> <u>Sub.Sec.</u>	
c	8	Clergy who fail to fast throughout Lent to be deposed.
n	(3	Clergy who fast with Jews or holiday with them to be deposed.)
n	(4	No heretic accepted as a witness against a Bishop).
f	1	A madman not allowed to pray with the faithful.
c	(9	Clergy must not lower themselves into public offices).
c	(10	Clergy in both civil and sacerdotal offices to be deposed).
k	(1	Canon of Scripture.

ECUMENICAL COUNCILS

(5 Canons of the 1st Ecumenical Council: 15,16,17,18,20)

c	(11	Clergy not allowed to go from one city to another)
c	(12	Clergy who leave own church must return or be refused communion).
i	(2	Anyone receiving interest on money to be deposed).
b	3	Deacons not to give the Euch. to presbyters.
f	2	Prayers to be offered to God while standing. (Canon 2 of the second Ecumenical Council)
c	(13	Bishops must not leave their own diocs.). (Canon 6 of the Third Ecumenical Council)
s	1	Those who wish to alter anything enacted at Ephesus to be deposed.

(7 Canons of the Fourth Ecumenical Council: 1,3,5,7,10,15 & 20.)

s	2	Canons of each and every council continue in force
c	(14	No Bishop to farm an estate).

<u>Sub. Section</u>	<u>No. in Sub.Sec.</u>	
c	(15	Number 15 of the 1st to be enforced. No movement of clergy).
c	(16	Clergy or monks must not join army or obtain secular dignity).
c	(17	No clergy to be entitled of two diff.churches at same time).
c	(18	No woman to be ordained deaconess before 40 years and to remain single after).
c	(19	Clergy must not move from one parish to another).
<u>{35 Canons of the 5th & 6th Ecumenical Councils: 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 19, 20, 24, 29, 31, 40, 46, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56, 59, 64, 67, 69, 70, 72, 73, 76, 77, 78, 89, 30, 100, 100}</u>		
s	3	Nothing to be removed or added to what has been decreed.
s	4	The 85 canons to be retained and kept.
d	4	Anyone who has two marriages cannot be a Bishop, or who has taken a harlot or actress to wife.
d	5	Deacons cannot marry after ordination.
c	20	Deacons must not sit down before Bishop.
i	(3	Clergy who take interest on money to be deposed).
h	(5	No-one may eat the unleavened bread of Jews or call on them in sickness.
d	6	Bishops must not keep wives after their consecration.
c	(21	Presbyter may not be ordained before age 30, deacon, 25, deaconess 40).
c	(22	Clergy must not interpret Bible otherwise than as Church says).
c	(23	Bishop not to teach publicly in city not belonging to his see).
c	(24	No clergy or monks to attend horse racing.)
b	4	Celebrating priest at Eucharist must be fasting.

<u>Sub. Section</u>	<u>No.in Sub.Sec.</u>	
a	(5	No Baptism in private house without Bishop's permission).
c	(25	Deaconess not to be ordained before 40).
s	(1	Women enrolled in convent must not step outside not ever sleep outside).
d	<u>7</u>	Wives of intending Bps. must enter convent.
l	(1	Nobody to gamble, clergy deposed- lay excomm.)
l	(2	The Council prohibits pantomimes, dancing on stage, etc.)
b	<u>5</u>	Only the Litany of the presanetified on all days of great Lent.
d	<u>8</u>	Nobody may marry their godchild's parent.
b	<u>6</u>	Even eggs and cheese may not be eaten when fasting
a	(6	No Baptm. allowed in oratory of private house).
l	(3	Laymen must not publicly make speech or teach).
l	(4	No blood of animal may be eaten).
b	(3	No laymen allowed in sanctuary).
b	(7	Women must not talk during Mass).
h	(6	Orthodox man may not marry a heretical woman or vice versa.)
b	<u>4</u>	The vivifying cross ought to be honoured and adored.
b	(5	No merchandise to be set up in sacred precincts).
c	(26	Clergy ought not to bathe in public baths with women).
c	(27	Learners must recite to the clergy on every Thursday.)
b	<u>6</u>	The faithful must fast when celebrating Holy Week.
b	(7	Bending of the knee (in prayer) on Sundays is forbidden.

<u>Sub. Section</u>	<u>No.in Sub.Sec.</u>
-------------------------	---------------------------

- c (2 No pornographic pictures to be made.)
(8 Canons of the 7th Ecumenical Council:
1,2,3,7,15,18,20 & 22.)
- s 5 All those whom old Councils anathematised to be confirmed in this anathema.
- c 28 A Bishop must know the psalter and canons.
- c (29 Appointment of clergy made by civil rulers to be void.)
- b 8 Temples consecrated without relics must now have them.
- c (30 No clergyman to be attached to two churches.)
- c (3 Women dwelling in a bishopric or monastery is forbidden.
- s (2 No double monastery to be made, no man to look into a nunnery.)
- l (5 Food to be taken for nourishment not for enjoyment, no songs or dancing.

REGIONAL COUNCILS

(3 Canons of the 1st and 2nd Regional Councils: 6,11 and 12.)

- g (3 Monks ought not to have anything of their own.
- c (31 Clergy must not accept secular offices or worldly cares, or farm.)
- a (7 No baptizing within a home.)
(Canon I of Carthage.)
- a 8 Baptism administered by heretics and schismatics is unacceptable.

(2 Canons of Ancyra: 10 & 14.)

- d 9 Deacon vowed to celibacy; if he marries, let him be deposed.
- c (32 Clergy who abstain from meat must touch and taste it

(5 Canons of Neocaesarea:
1,7,8,11 and 13.)

<u>Sub.</u>	<u>No.in</u>	<u>Sub.Sec.</u>
-------------	--------------	-----------------

- d 10 Presbyter who ~~marries~~ to be displaced . . .
 who fornicates to be ousted from office.
- d 11 No presbyter to dine at a second marriage.
- d 12 If a layman's wife commit adultery he cannot
 be ordained, if a priest's, she must be
 divorced.
- c (33) No man may be ordained presbyter before 30.)
- c (34) Village priests cannot conduct liturgy in
 large city church.)
 (2 Canons of Gangra:17 & 20)
- l (6) Women who cut their hair to be anathema.
- b 9 People who dislike gatherings in honour of
 martyrs to be anathema.)

(4 Canons of Antioch:
1,2,3 & 21.)

- j (2) Date of Easter.)
- b (8) All laity ~~must~~ communicate.)
- c (35) Clergy who move to another parish and refuse
 to return, to be deposed.)
- c (36) Bishops not to go over from one dioc. to
 another.

(34 Canons of Laodicea:1,4,5,6,12,19,20,21,
24,25,30,31,32,33,34,36,37,38,39,44,45,46, 48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55,56,58,59,60,
d 13 Second marriages penitential even though
 legal.

- i (4) Clergy not to lend money for interest.)
- c (37) Ordinations not to be performed in presence
 of listeners.)
- h (7) Heretics not to come into house of God while
 remaining heretics.)
- c (38) Bishops to be appointed by vote of surround-
 ing bishops.)

<u>Sub. Section</u>	<u>No.in Sub. Section</u>	
b	<u>9</u>	Celebration of liturgy must follow pattern described.
c	<u>39</u>	Deacon must not sit down ahead of a presbyter.
b	<u>10</u>	Servants not to enter sacristy or touch the vessels.
c	(40	No clergy must enter a tavern.)
b	<u>11</u>	Servants must not give Bread or Chalice.
c	(41	Clergy must not bathe with women or laymen.)
n	(8	No one must intermarry with heretics, or give his children to such marriage.)
n	(9	One must not accept the blessings of heretics.)
n	(10	One must not join in prayer with heretics or schismatics.
n	(11	No Christian must fraternize with heretics.)
c	<u>42</u>	Clergy must not be magicians, enchanters, numerologists, etc.
n	(12	One must not celebrate holiday along with Jews.)
n	(13	One must not participate in the impieties of Jews.
n	(14	One must not join the heathen in celebration of holidays.
c	(4	Women must not enter the sacrificial altar.)
a	(9	No candidates for Baptm. after two weeks of great Lent.)
c	(43	Learners must recite to clergy every Thursday.)
g	<u>10</u>	The illuminated after Baptm. must be anointed with chrism.
b	<u>12</u>	Liturgy not to be celebrated on weekdays in Lent.
b	<u>13</u>	Priest at Eucharist must be fasting.

<u>Sub. Section</u>	<u>No.in Sub. Section.</u>	
c	<u>10</u>	No birthdays od martyrs to be celebrated in great Lent.
d	<u>14</u>	Weddings and birthdays not to be celebrated in Lent.
d	<u>15</u>	Christians attending weddings must not waltz or dance.
c	<u>44</u>	Clergy must not witness shows at suppers or weddings.
c	(7	No Christian may hold banquets by contributions.)
c	<u>45</u>	Presbyters must not enter or sit down before a Bishop.
b	(14	The Liturgy must not be celebrated in private houses.)
k	(2	The Canon of Scripture.)
k	(3	The Canon of Scripture.)
		2 Canons of Sardica: 1 & 2.
c	(46	A bishop must not move from a small city to another.)
c	(47	Similar to above canon.)
		{25 Canons of Carthage: 1, 3, 4, 5, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 29, 30, 32, 33, 40, 43, 45, 47, 48, 56, 57, 79, 81, 91, & 98}
s	<u>6</u>	Nicene creed to be kept in original form.
d	<u>16</u>	Clergy must be continent in all things with wives.
c	(5	Men who handle sacred articles must abstain from women.)
i	(5	Clergy must not charge interest.)
c	(48	Children of priests shall not give any mundane spectacles or see them.)

<u>Sub. Section</u>	<u>No.in Sub. Section.</u>	
c	(49	Clergy shall not become farmers.
<u>d</u>	<u>17</u>	Anagosts (Leaders) must either take a wife or vow celibacy.
i	(6	A cleric who lends or gives money must not take interest.)
c	(50	Deacons not to be ordained before the age of 25.)
c	(51	Ordinands must have the pronouncements of the Councils "dinned into their ears.")
<u>h</u>	<u>15</u>	Children of clergy must not marry heretics.)
c	(52	Clergy shall not leave legacy to non-Orthodox Christian.
k	(4	The Canon of Scripture.)
<u>e</u>	<u>6</u>	All clergy who attend to the Mysteries must abstain from their wives.
c	(53	Clergy who acquire property during office must dedicate it to the church in which they hold office.)
c	(54	Ordinands not to be ordained before all their family are Orthodox.)
c	(55	Celibate clergy shall not visit widows or virgins.)
c	(56	Clerics not to enter taverns for food or drink but only for shelter.)
<u>b</u>	<u>15</u>	Eucharist to be celebrated only by men who are fasting.
<u>b</u>	<u>16</u>	Eucharist not to be administered after breakfast.
<u>c</u>	<u>57</u>	No reordination or movement of clergy.
d	(58	No Bishop shall appropriate any other church.)
j	(3	Date of Easter.)
l	(11	Churches without relics to be destroyed.)

Sub. No.in Sub.
Section. Section.

c (59) Anyone who has acted even once as a Lector in church shall not be accepted as an ordinand in any other church.)

THE HOLY FATHERS.
(Canon 2 of Dionysius)

c 7 Menstruous women must not communicate.

(Canon 3 of Athanasius.)

k (5) The Canon of Scripture.)

(6 Canons of Basil:
12,18,41,50,70 & 91.)

d 18 Twice-married men not to be clergy.

e 8 Widowhood is inferior to virginity.

h (16) A widow may not marry a heretic.)

d 19 Third marriages preferable to fornication though considered to defile the church.

e 9 A deacon who kisses a woman has sinned but not badly.

f 12 Pray standing.

(Canon I of Gregory the Theologian.)

k (6) The Canon of Scripture.)

(Canon I of Amphilochius.)

k (7) The Canon of Scripture.)

(6 Canons of Timothy:
2,5,6,7,9 & 13.)

a (11) A person possessed by demons cannot be baptised except when dying.)

e 10 Neither man nor wife should receive communion on morning after coition.

<u>Sub. Section</u>	<u>No.in Sub. Section.</u>	
e	<u>11</u>	Women not to be baptised when menstruating.
c	<u>12</u>	Women cannot communicate when menstruating.
h	(17	Heretics must not be present at Eucharist.)
c	13	Sexual intercourse not to be allowed on Sat.or Sun.
		<u>(6 Canons of John the Faster.</u>
		<u>6,7,17,19,22 & 35.)</u>
c	<u>14</u>	An emission of semen means no communion next morning
c	<u>15</u>	An emission when awake means no communion for 7 days
c	<u>16</u>	Menstruous women not to communicate for 7 days.
c	<u>17</u>	Boy who has been violated by a homosexual cannot be a priest.
e	(18	Woman who has had a miscarriage must do penance for a year.)
b	(17	Vomiting after communion means none for 40 days.)
		<u>13 Canons of Nicephorus: 2,10,13,16,19,22,24,31,34,35,</u>
		<u>(1 of second series.) 36 & 37.)</u>
d	<u>20</u>	Second marriage not to be blessed with crowns.
f	(13	No genuflections during Pentecost.)
b	<u>19</u>	A priest must not celebrate without hot water.
g	(4	Monks must not do farm work in great Lent.)
g	(5	Monks must eat only once a day in great Lent.)
g	(6	A young monk must not give communion to nuns.)
g	(7	A monk who has discarded his habit must not be admitted into a home or greeted.)
i	(7	A priest ought not to communicate those who charge interest or to eat with them.)

<u>Sub.</u> <u>Section</u>	<u>No. in</u> <u>Sub.Section</u>	
g	(8	Lapsed monk who marries to be anathematized.)
c	(60	Fornicators cannot be priests.)
c	(19	One must not eat with an open fornicator.)
e	(20	If a baby has to be baptised before 5 days old another baptised woman must suckle it.)
f	(14	One ought not to walk abroad on Sundays unless necessary.) <u>(Canon 2 of Patriarch Nicholas)</u>
f	(15	One does not bend the knee on Sunday at Pentecost.)

This Appendix II has been summarised for inclusion in the dissertation on page 100 as Table III.

TABLE III The Groups within the 199 Canons of Class D.

<u>Group</u>	<u>Subject Matter</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Number</u> <u>requiring</u> <u>Economy</u>	<u>Number</u> <u>Obsolete</u>
a	Baptism and confirmation	11	6	5
b	The Eucharist and the Epiclesis	18	12	6
c	Clergy	60	12	48
d	Marriage	20	20	-
e	Sex	20	12	8
f	Spirituality	15	9	6
g	Monks and Nuns	8	-	8
h	Jews and Heretics	17	-	17
i	Interest on money	7	-	7
j	Date of Easter	3	-	3
k	Canon of Scripture	7	-	7
l	Miscellaneous	7	-	7
s	Supporting Canons	6	6	-
		199	77	122

APPENDIX IIISOME NOTES ON ORTHODOX DETAIL

Western Christians normally first experience Orthodoxy in its WORSHIP, and this is apposite because Orthodoxy can mean 'right worship.' However, few people are fortunate enough to experience this in the normal Orthodox Church, whose doors are always open, and whose interior is very different from a Western church: there are no pews, pictures or statues. The services are always long, the choir unrobed and out of sight, no hymns or organs. The altar, or as we should say, the sanctuary, is cut off from the rest of the church by the Iconostasis, a high sanctuary screen covered with icons. The worshippers, who regard it as a privilege rather than a duty to come to church, stand rather than kneel to pray, often so close that there is inevitably a great sense of the corporateness. This is further assisted by the large part the laity take in the service. This is particularly true in the central act of worship, the EUCHARIST, which is celebrated only once on any one Sunday, or on any one altar, or by any one priest. Leavened bread and mixed chalice are used, and administration is in both kinds by intinction, and with a spoon (to the people standing). The Epiclesis is regarded as important, as are vestments, which are of a characteristic appearance. The sacrament is not just a remembrance, it is a reality and a sign. Reservation is practised but often only in one kind for the sick direct from the liturgy. The reserved element

are not venerated as much as the gospels. All the seven sacraments are used, but the two of the gospel are regarded as greater.

INFANT BAPTISM is by triple immersion with exorcisms, oil, etc. CONFIRMATION is immediately after baptism by the priest with chrism, i.e., blessed oil. Infant COMMUNION is therefore administered. CONFESSION is normal before Holy Communion. PUBLIC PENANCE is required by canon law for: idolatry, murder and adultery. PRIVATE PENANCE is different from Roman in that absolution is given in the words "Let the Lord Absolve." The confession is mainly for counsel. Tears are regarded as an expression of extreme penitence, and a laudable thing. The Confessors are made by the laying on of hands and may be priests or lay monks who are sufficiently advanced in the spiritual life. Since the Orthodox have no concept of an intermediate state, there is no need for indulgences.

MARRIAGE is not only 'till death us do part,' it is for ever. Separation and a second union are allowed if chastity is not possible. Bishops must be single, and therefore, monks. No marriage is allowed after ordination. ORDINATION is performed singly, and the congregation have the power to 'veto', they being as important as the Bishop. The diaconate is not just a step to the priesthood, but is often an order for life. Beards are worn by all priests.

HOLY UNCTION is not only for the dying. There are different burial services for: Bishops, Priests, Monks, etc.

Appendix III (Contd.)

The Eastern Orthodox Concept of the church is different from the West's, papal Authority is repudiated. As a result of this concept of the Church, prayers are offered for, with, and to, the dead, Canonisation of saints is by popular acclaim. The Virgin Mary is chief, and many ICONS are painted of her. These icons are worshipped in a different way from the worship offered to the Trinity. They are stylised symbols, supposedly with no human features and painted by Monks. Monks form no orders in the East, and lead very ascetic lives. Severance from the world is regarded almost essential to salvation. Monks and parish priests say the daily office at which the psalter is the framework (recited once a week). The Gloria is said only after each stasis, or group of psalms. The Collects are longer and short hymns celebrating the event or the saint commemorated in the office for the day (called troparia) are used. Prayers are oft repeated, Preaching is less common than in the West, sometimes by 'heralds' who move around and are often laymen. The services and the Kalendas, not preaching, have been the main evangelising force. Epiphany is more important than Christmas, and there is no Trinity Sunday or Advent, whilst every day is some saint's day.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to record my appreciation of the encouragement of Professor N. Zernov of Oxford and Professor H.E.W. Turner of Durham without whom this dissertation would never have been started.

Bishop Anthony Bloom, and Fr. Vladimir Rodzianko in London, and Professor Troitzky of Belgrade assisted by Private Communications in ascertaining the Orthodox view of the Canons.

Many others including D.J. Chitty and M. Pierce have assisted and encouraged this work at various times by word or deed, and to them I express my most sincere thanks.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A Monk of the Eastern Church 1957 Orthodox Spirituality (S.P.C.K.)
- A.S. Alivisatos 1948 Marriage and Divorce (in accordance with the Canon Law of the Orthodox Church (Faith Press)
- R.H. Bainton 1958 Sex, Love and Marriage (A Christian survey) (Collins - Fontana)
- N.H. Baynes 1925 The Byzantine Empire (Thornton & Butterworth)
- Bede 1955 A History of the English Church and People (Penguin Classics)
- E.J. Bicknell 1955 A Theological Introduction to the 3rd. Ed. Thirty Nine Articles (Longmans, 1919)
- W.J. Birkbeck 1895 Russia and the English Church (during the last fifty years) (Rivington)
- S. Bulgakov The Comforter (Y.M.C.A. Press, Paris)
- C. Calinicos 1918 The Greek Orthodox Church (Longmans)
- D.T. Chitty 1947 Orthodoxy and the Conversion of England (The Fellowship of St. Alban & St. Sergius)
- E.L. Cross 1957 Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church (Oxford University Press)
- W.K. Lowther Clarke 1932 Liturgy and Worship (S.P.C.K.)
- D. Cummings 1957 The Rudder (The Orthodox Christian Education Society Chicago 13)

- R.M. Dawkins 1936 The Monks of Athos (Allen & Unwin)
- J.A. Douglas 1921 The Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern Orthodox (Faith Press)
- G.P. Fedotov 1952 A Treasury of Russian Devotion (Sheed & Ward)
- R.M. French 1951 The Eastern Orthodox Church (Hutchinson's University Library)
- " 1954 The Way of a Pilgrim (S.P.C.K.)
- D. Hammond 1956 The Waters of Marah (Rockcliff)
- F.J. Foakes-Jackson 1902 A History of the Christian Church to A.D. 461 (Cambridge: J. Hall & Son)
- E. Kephala 1930 The Church of the Greek People (Williams and Norgate)
- B.J. Kidd 1927 The Churches of Eastern Christendom (Faith Press)
- B. Leeming S.J. 1960 The Churches and the Church (Darton, Longman & Todd)
- B. Lossky 1944 The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church (James Clarke)
- Makrakis 1946 The Divine and Sacred Catechism (Hellenic Christian Educational Society, Chicago)
- " 1947 A Memoir on the Nature of the Church of Christ (Christian Brotherhood of Zealots of Orthodoxy, New York)
- J.R.H. Moorman 1953 A History of the Church in England (A. & C. Black)

C. Neil & J.M. Willoughby	1912	The Tutorial Prayer Book (Church Book Room Press, 3rd Impr.)
A. Oakley	1958	The Orthodox Liturgy (Mowbrays)
W. Palmer	1853	Dissertations on subjects relating to the Orthodox or Eastern Catholic Communion (Joseph Masters)
T.D. Rice	1947	Russian Icons (Penguin)
C.C. Richardson	1953	Early Christian Fathers (S.C.M.)
A. Riley	1917	Birkbeck and the Russian Church (S.P.C.K.)
V. Rodzianko	1961	Private Communication
P. Sherrard	1959	The Greek East and the Latin West (Oxford University Press)
M. Spinka	1956	The Church in Soviet Russia (Oxford University Press, New York)
A.P. Stanley	1907	Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church (Dent & Sons Ltd.)
Prof. Troitzky	1961	Private Communication
G. Williams	1868	The Orthodox and the Non Jurors (Rivington)
S. Zankov	1929	The Eastern Orthodox Church (S.C.M.)
N. Zernov	1937	Moscow the Third Rome (S.P.C.K.)
"	1947	The Church of the Eastern Christians (S.P.C.K.)
"	1951	The Christian East (S.P.C.K.)

N. Zernov	1961	Eastern Christendom (Weidenfield & Nicolson)
"	1961	Private Communications
REPORTS:		
	1932	Report of the Joint Doctrinal Commission appointed by the Ecumenical Patriarch and the Archbishop of Canterbury for consultation on the points of Agreement and the points of Difference between the Anglican and the Eastern Orthodox Church (S.P.C.K.)
	1935	The Bucharest Conference (Church Assembly Church House)
	1958	Anglo-Russian Theological Conference, Moscow 1956 (Faith Press)
	1960	Liturgical Commission Report on Baptism and Confirmation (S.P.C.K.)