

REGNUM STUDIES IN GLOBAL CHRISTIANITY

ORTHODOX HANDBOOK ON ECUMENISM
Resources for Theological Education

“That they all may be one” (John 17:21)

Editors

Pantelis Kalaitzidis
Thomas FitzGerald
Cyril Hovorun
Aikaterini Pekridou
Nikolaos Asproulis
Guy Liagre
Dietrich Werner

Volos Academy Publications
(in cooperation with WCC Publications, Geneva, and Regnum Books International, Oxford)
Volos, Greece, 2014

(82) EASTERN ORTHODOX – ORIENTAL ORTHODOX DIALOGUE
– A HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL SURVEY

George Martzelos

Introduction

One of the most comforting and promising ecclesiastical developments in recent years was the success of the theological dialogue between the Orthodox Church and the Non-Chalcedonian Churches of the East, i.e. the Coptic, Ethiopian, Jacobite Syrian, Armenian, and Indian Church of Malabar, which all together have around 60 million Christian adherents. After over 1,500 years of mutual suspicion and dogmatic confrontations since the Council of Chalcedon (451) and despite the differences in Christological terminology and the diametrically opposing positions regarding the Chalcedonian definition, the two ecclesiastical families surprisingly came to an agreement to sign a common dogmatic document stating their shared dogmatic faith and teaching throughout the ages. It should be noted that although many gaps and difficulties remain to be sorted out in this theological dialogue before full communion can be reached between the two Churches, the success even captured the attention of Western theologians, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, who were amazed at such an accomplishment.¹

a. Key Milestones in the Theological Dialogue

The official dialogue was initiated by the Ecumenical Patriarchate at an ecclesiastical level in 1985 in Chambésy in Geneva, Switzerland and lasted until 1993.² This undertaking was preceded by fifteen years of unofficial contact and theological talks between the Orthodox and Non-Chalcedonians (1964-1979), during which both groups became acquainted and realized the proximity between their theological traditions in relation to the Christological dogma.

Significant stages in the official theological dialogue include the second general session of the ecclesiastical representatives of both traditions, which took place in June of 1989 at the Holy Monastery of Anba Bishoy in the desert of Nitria, and also the third general session, which was held in Chambésy in September of 1990. It was during these sessions that the common dogmatic statements, which clearly demonstrate total consensus on the essence of the Christological dogma, were signed. It is significant that the success of these above agreements is not limited to Christology only, but extends to the whole faith of the one and undivided Church of the first five centuries, as well as all the dogmatic teachings of the four Ecumenical Councils following the schism of 451. In other words, the Non-Chalcedonians now accept not only the first three Ecumenical Councils, which

¹ See A. M. Ritter, «Der gewonnene christologische Konsens zwischen orthodoxen Kirchen im Licht der Kirchenvätertradition», in *Logos. Festschrift für Luise Abramowski*, (Berlin - New York 1993), 469 ff. D. W. Winkler, *Koptische Kirche und Reichskirche. Altes Schisma und neuer Dialog*, (Innsbruck-Wien: Tyrolia-Verlag, 1997), 222 ff., 332; also D. Wende-bourg, «Chalkedon in der ökumenischen Diskussion», in *Chalkedon: Geschichte und Aktualität. Studien zur Rezeption der christologischen Formel von Chalkedon*, hrsg. von J. van Oort und J. Roldanus, (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 193.

² For more on the dialogue between Orthodox and Non-Chalcedonians see George Martzelos, 'Ο Θεολογικός Διάλογος τῆς Ὁρθόδοξης Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας μέ τίς Μή-Χαλκηδόνιες Ἐκκλησίες τῆς Ανατολῆς. Χρονικό – Αξιολόγηση – Προοπτικές (The Theological Dialogue of the Orthodox Catholic Church with the Non-Chalcedonian Churches of the East. Timeline - Evaluation - Prospects), in *The Minutes of the 14th Theological Conference of the Holy Metropolis of Thessaloniki with the topic "I Mitir ἰmon Orthodoxos Ekklisia" (Our Mother the Orthodox Church)*» (10-13 November 1993), (Thessaloniki 1994), 293 ff.; *ibid*, Ὁρθόδοξο δόγμα καί θεολογικός προβληματισμός. Μελετήματα δογματικῆς θεολογίας, (Thessaloniki 2000), 247 ff.; Damaskinos Papandreou (Metropolitan of Switzerland), *Λόγος Διαλόγου (On Dialogue) (Ἡ Ὁρθοδοξία ἐνώπιον τῆς τρίτης χιλιετίας/Orthodoxy in the the Third Millennium)*, (Athens: Kastanioti, 1997), 211 ff.(all in Greek).

are common to both traditions, but the dogmatic teachings of the four Councils that followed as well; although, without recognizing them as Ecumenical and equal with the first three.

The third general session mentioned above essentially fulfilled the purpose of the theological dialogue between the two committees as far as the Christological discussion was concerned; this being the main purpose of the dialogues. There remained, however, basic practical issues, which would need to be resolved in order to achieve full sacramental communion and unification between the Orthodox and the Non-Chalcedonians. Such issues include the recognition on the part of the Non-Chalcedonians of the last four Ecumenical Councils as holy and Ecumenical, the theological question of whether or not the Orthodox tradition allows the reversal of anathemas which were issued against certain people and Synods and which ecclesiastical authority would have the power to do so, and also the measure to which pastoral economy could be implemented in matters of liturgical and ecclesiastical administration for the realization of sacramental communion and unification between the two ecclesiastical families. Once more, the Ecumenical Patriarchate took the initiative to address these issues. A plenary session of the Mixed Theological Committee of the dialogue was convened in Chambésy in November of 1993 which, after meticulous considerations, drafted a mutually accepted text, which included specific proposals to both groups for the lifting of the anathemas and the restoration of full communion between them. Although this document does clearly define the way in which the anathemas could be lifted (taking into account the resulting ecclesiastical consequences) and specifically addresses the pastoral and liturgical issues of sacramental unification, it fails to mention the validation of the last four Ecumenical Councils as a presupposition for the sought after sacramental communion.

Having achieved the above-mentioned dogmatic agreements, the dialogue was then completely devolved from the Theological Committee to the level of the local Churches of both sides. Besides the signatures of ecclesiastical leaders who had taken part in the dialogue, the Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Romania on the side of the Orthodox and by the Coptic, Jacobite Syrian, and Syro-Malabar Churches on the side of the Non-Chalcedonians upheld the dogmatic agreements with synodal decisions. The fact that the Non-Chalcedonians approved the agreements has especial dogmatic significance since with this action they recognized all the teachings of the seven Ecumenical Councils and the Church Fathers as completely Orthodox.

b. Problems Facing the Theological Dialogue

Despite the astonishing success of this dialogue as far as the Christological aspects were concerned, (which, as mentioned, drew the attention of Western theologians) it must be acknowledged that many obstacles still remain to be overcome before a full sacramental communion can be achieved between the two groups. Although the Non-Chalcedonians had recognized the orthodoxy of the teachings of all the Ecumenical Councils and Church Fathers, as attested to by the signed declarations, they had still not recognized the last four councils as Ecumenical and equal to the first three. This is the most fundamental problem that needs to be resolved before the goal of communion can be realized.

In order to overcome these obstacles, two subcommittees have been created, one for pastoral issues and one for liturgical matters, which meet from time to time, seeking out mutually acceptable solutions to the issues that arose from the success of the aforementioned dogmatic agreement. Specifically, these problems exist because of a lack of awareness regarding the successful dogmatic agreement. There are also steps that still need to be taken to guide us smoothly and certainly to full communion and unification. Regarding the issue of awareness of the proceedings, it must be mentioned that the plenary session of the Mixed Theological Committee confronted this topic during the fourth general assembly (November 1993) and decided that it was necessary for the two vice presidents of the committee to take the following actions: on the one hand they needed to visit the primates of both churches to fully inform them of the results of the dialogue, and on the other hand to collaborate with the two secretaries of the assembly to see to the drawing up of suitable documents that could explain the content of the dogmatic agreement, both at a scientific level and in a context understandable to laypeople, so that any potential misunderstandings could be avoided.

However, while the joint vice presidents were very active in organizing the visits to the primates of both churches, very few steps were taken to create texts explaining the outcome of the dialogue. The texts and publications that did circulate were the result of people who took a personal interest and not due to an organized joint effort on the part of the Orthodox and Non-Chalcedonians. Besides this, these publications did not have the widespread impact that was needed to adequately and responsibly inform people regarding the outcome of the dialogue. Naturally the lack of proper and systematic reporting on the results - at least in the Greek Orthodox milieu - led to misinformation. If one excludes paragraph eight of the second joint declaration from 1990 (which needs clarification and better wording to avoid potential misinterpretations and to stop the doubts projected onto it by those who object), the fact remains that certain points of the dogmatic agreement that are indisputably orthodox and patristic in character were deliberately expressed in a vague manner with a clear dogmatic minimalism. This was allegedly done to facilitate a meretricious dogmatic agreement and an ecclesiastical union at the expense of the Orthodox faith.³ There were, of course, documented responses to these highly critical and largely unwarranted assessments.⁴ However, this created confusion in theological and ecclesiastical circles regarding the accomplishments and goals of the Theological Dialogue. In certain instances there were attempts to revive the past and the Fathers of the Church were being interpreted partially and at will in order to bring a halt to the continuation and success of the dialogue. Some considered any further continuation of the dialogue as cause for a split in Orthodoxy.⁵ Within the context of these objections, the harmful instances of Orthodoxy digressing into fanaticism were, unfortunately, extremely disappointing. To avoid the reoccurrence of similar deplorable instances, not only is an efficient process of informing needed, but also productive inter-Orthodox deliberations and dialogue within the local Churches so as to create the

³ See Th. Zisi, *Η “Ορθοδοξία” τῶν Ἀντιχαλκηδονίων Μονοφυσιτῶν (The “Orthodoxy” of Antichalcedonian Monophysites)*, (Thessaloniki: Vryennios, 1994). Ibid, *Τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἐκκλησίας (The Boundaries of the Church). Οἰκουμενισμός καὶ Παπισμός (Ecumenism and Papism)*, (Thessaloniki 2004), 104-125. Holy Monastery of Osios Gregory, *Εἶναι οἱ Ἀντιχαλκηδόνιοι Ὁρθόδοξοι; Κείμενα τῆς Ἱερᾶς Κοινότητος τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὄρους καὶ ἄλλων ἁγιορειτῶν Πατέρων περὶ τοῦ διαλόγου Ὁρθοδόξων καὶ Ἀντιχαλκηδονίων (Μονοφυσιτῶν) (Texts of the Holy Community of Mount Athos and other hagiomite Fathers on the dialogue between Orthodox and Antichalcedonians (Monophysites)*, (Mount Athos 1995). Holy Community of Mount Athos, *Παρατηρήσεις περὶ τοῦ Θεολογικοῦ Διαλόγου Ὁρθοδόξων καὶ Ἀντιχαλκηδονίων (Ἀπάντησις εἰς κριτικὴν τοῦ Σεβ. Μητροπολίτου Ἐλβετίας κ. Δαμασκηνοῦ), Observations on the Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox and Antichalcedonians (Responses in critique of his Eminence Damaskinos Metropolitan of Switzerland)*, (Mount Athos 1996). S. N. Bozovitis, *Τὰ αἰώνια σύνορα τῆς Ὁρθοδοξίας καὶ οἱ Ἀντιχαλκηδόνιοι (The Eternal borders of Orthodoxy and the Antichalcedonians)*, (Athens: Brotherhood of Theologians «O Sotir», 1999). A. N. Papavasileiou, *Ὁ Θεολογικὸς Διάλογος μεταξὺ Ὁρθοδόξων καὶ Ἀντιχαλκηδονίων*, τόμ. Α (The Theological Dialogue between Orthodox and Antichalcedonians), vol. Α', (Lefkosia: Center of Studies Holy Monastery of Kykkou, 2000). J. - C. Larchet, «Τὸ Χριστολογικὸ πρόβλημα περὶ τῆς μελετωμένης ἐνώσεως τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῶν Μή-Χαλκηδονίων Ἐκκλησιῶν: Ἐκκρεμοῦντα θεολογικά καὶ ἐκκλησιολογικά προβλήματα» (The Christological problem on the planned union of the Orthodox Churches and non-Chalcedonian Churches: outstanding theological and ecclesiological problems), in *Theologia* 74.1 (2003): 199-234; 74.2 (2003): 635-670; 75.1 (2004): 79-104 (all in Greek).

⁴ See Damaskinos Papandreou (Metropolitan of Switzerland), «Ἀπάντησις εἰς τὸ Γράμμα τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὄρους περὶ τοῦ Θεολογικοῦ Διαλόγου πρὸς τὰς Ἀρχαίας Ανατολικὰς Ἐκκλησίας» (Response to the Letter of the Holy Mountain on the theological dialogue to the Ancient Eastern Church), in *Episkopsis* 521 (1995): 7 ff. ff. and in *Synaxi* 57 (1996): 69 ff. Ibid, *Λόγος Διαλόγου (Ἡ Ὁρθοδοξία ἐνώπιον τῆς τρίτης χιλιετίας)*, (On Dialogue. Orthodoxy in the the Third Millennium), (Athens: Kastanioti, 1997), 237 ff. See also K. Papadopoulou, «Ὁ διάλογος μετὰ τοὺς Ἀντιχαλκηδόνιους», (The Dialogue with the Antichalcedonians), in *Synaxi* 57 (1996): 43 ff (all in Greek).

⁵ See Th. Zissis, *Η “Ορθοδοξία” τῶν Ἀντιχαλκηδονίων Μονοφυσιτῶν (The “Orthodoxy” of the Antichalcedonian Monophysites)*, (Thessaloniki: «Bryennios», 1994), 9ff. Ibid, *Τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἐκκλησίας. Οἰκουμενισμός καὶ Παπισμός, (The boundaries of the Church. Ecumenism and Papism)*, (Thessaloniki 2004), 108ff. S. N. Bozovitis, 171 ff. J.-C. Larchet, «Τὸ Χριστολογικὸ πρόβλημα περὶ τῆς μελετωμένης ἐνώσεως τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῶν Μή-Χαλκηδονίων Ἐκκλησιῶν: Ἐκκρεμοῦντα θεολογικά καὶ ἐκκλησιολογικά προβλήματα» (The Christological problem on the planned union of the Orthodox Churches and non-Chalcedonian Churches: outstanding theological and ecclesiological problems)», in *Theologia* 75.1 (2004): 100 (all in Greek).

greatest possible convergence and consensus between the ecclesiastical representatives in dialogue and the rest of the Orthodox flock. Without the greatest possible consensus, the sought after sacramental unification of the two ecclesiastical families poses a danger of creating internal splits among the local Churches, which would be the worst possible outcome.

Concerning the steps that still need to be taken to achieve sacramental unification between the two Churches in dialogue (besides the resolution of the liturgical matters, which the appointed liturgical subcommittees have responsibility for), we have the opinion that the most fundamental obstacle that needs to be surpassed is the question of the Non-Chalcedonians accepting the last four Ecumenical Councils and especially the Council of Chalcedon (451), which was the impetus for the schism in the first place. As was previously highlighted, the Non-Chalcedonians already fully accepted the dogmatic teaching of the last four Ecumenical Councils with the dogmatic agreement included in the common declarations. However, the Non-Chalcedonians have yet to recognize these Councils as Ecumenical and equal with the first three. This position of theirs, especially concerning the Council of Chalcedon, is due just as much to their traditional stance towards the definition of the Council and Pope Leo's Tome, which it approved (they considered the definition and the Tome to have Nestorian traits in the Christology due to the dyophysite wording), as it was to the condemnation by the Council of Dioscorus of Alexandria, whom they honor as a great Father of their Church.

Concerning the definition of Chalcedon, we must highlight the fact that modern academic research has proved very clearly that the theological nature of the definition not only is not Nestorian, but also is Cyrillian.⁶ Indeed, the basis of the Dyophysite formula of the definition of Chalcedon has been proven outright to be not Leo's Tome, but the Christology of St. Cyril of Alexandria⁷; something which is acknowledged even by eminent Roman Catholic theologians,⁸ who, as one can see, would have every reason to support the opposite opinion. Consequently, it must be understood by the Non-Chalcedonians that, based on modern theological scholarship, their reservation to accept the definition of Chalcedon is unjustifiable as long as they claim to be faithful adherents to the Christology of St. Cyril.

Also, regarding Leo's Tome, we must underline the fact that the Tome was accepted by the Council of Chalcedon, which is already apparent from the minutes of the Council, but only after they proved the orthodoxy and full agreement of the Tome with the epistles of St. Cyril and especially with the third epistle to Nestorius, after the well known intense challenges against its orthodoxy on the part of hierarchs from Eastern Illyricum

⁶See Th. Šagi-Bunić, «'Duo perfecta' et 'duae naturae' in definitione dogmatica chalcedonensi», in *Laurentianum* 5 (1964): 203 ff. Ibid, «*Deus perfectus et homo perfectus*» a Concilio Ephesino (a. 431) ad Chalcedonense (a. 451), (Romae - Friburgi: Brigg. - Barcinone, 1965), 205 ff. A. de Halleux, «La définition christologique à Chalcédoine», in *Revue Théologique de Louvain* 7 (1976): 3ff., 155 ff., 155 ff. G. D. Martzelos, *Γένεση και πηγές τοῦ Ὁροῦ τῆς Χαλκηδόνας (Origin and sources of the Definition of Chalcedon). Συμβολή στήν ιστορικοδογματική διερεύνηση τοῦ Ὁροῦ τῆς Δ' Οἰκουμενικῆς Συνόδου (Contribution to the historic dogmatic investigation of the definition of the 4th Ecumenical Council)*, (Thessaloniki 1986), 141ff., 197ff. (in Greek). See also A. M. Ritter, «Patristische Anmerkungen zur Frage "Lehrverurteilungen-kirchentrennend?" am Beispiel des Konzils von Chalkedon», in *Oecumenica et Patristica. Festschrift für Wilhelm Schneemelcher zum 75. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von D. Papandreou - W. A. Bienert - K. Schäferdiek, (Chambésy-Genf 1989), 269ff.

⁷For this subject see G. D. Martzelos, 172 ff. *ibid*, *Ἡ Χριστολογία τοῦ Βασιλείου Σελευκείας καί ἡ οἰκουμενική σημασία τῆς (The Christology of Basil of Seleucia and its Ecumenical Significance)*, (Thessaloniki 1990), 235ff (in Greek). G. D. Martzelos, «Der Vater der dyophysitischen Formel von Chalcedon: Leo von Rom oder Basileios von Seleukeia?», in *Orthodoxes Forum* 6.1 (1992): 21ff. and in Ysabel de Andia / Peter Leander Hofrichter (Hsg.), *Christus bei den Vätern. Forscher aus dem Osten und Westen Europas an den Quellen des gemeinsamen Glaubens*, Pro Oriente, XXVII, Wiener patristische Tagungen 1 (PRO ORIENTE - Studientagung über „Christus bei den griechischen und lateinischen Kirchenvätern im ersten Jahrtausend“ in Wien, 7.-9. Juni 2001), (Innsbruck - Wien: Tyrolia-Verlag, 2003), 272 ff.

⁸See Th. Šagi-Bunić, «'Duo perfecta' et 'duae naturae' in definitione dogmatica chalcedonensi», in *Laurentianum* 5 (1964): 325ff. *ibid*, «*Deus perfectus et homo perfectus*» a Concilio Ephesino (a. 431) ad Chalcedonense (a. 451), (Romae-Friburgi; Brigg.-Barcinone, 1965), 219 ff. M. van Parys, «L' évolution de la doctrine christologique de Basile de Sélucie», in *Irénikon* 44 (1971): 405 ff. A. de Halleux, 160 ff. A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, Bd. 1, (Freiburg - Basel - Wien 1982), 758.

and Palestine and the explanations given by the papal legates to the Council relating to the meaning of the dyophysite phrases in his Tome.⁹ As a result, in this case, the reservations of the Non-Chalcedonians concerning the acceptance of the Leo's Tome are not justifiable with the commonly proposed argument that its acceptance by the Fourth Ecumenical Council allegedly entails violation of the Christology of St. Cyril.

In other words, the definition of Chalcedon, just as much as Leo's Tome, were accepted by the Council under the condition of their full dogmatic accordance with the Christology of St. Cyril, which means that in that aspect the theological character of the Council was absolutely in line with St. Cyril's theology. The Christological wording of St. Cyril comprised for the Council the highest dogmatic criteria both for the formulation and acceptance of the Definition and for the acceptance and signing of the Tome by the overwhelming majority of the Fathers of the Council. No reservations about the Cyrillian character of the Council of Chalcedon can be established scientifically based on the facts of modern historical theological research.¹⁰

Finally, regarding the question of the condemnation of Dioscorus of Alexandria at the Fourth Ecumenical Council, it is also clear from the minutes of the Council that Dioscorus was condemned not for dogmatic, but canonical reasons which are nevertheless real and incontestable.¹¹ As a result, the issue of his reinstatement, on which the Non-Chalcedonians insisted, can only be resolved in the context of the pastoral dispensation of the Church, and as such, the responsibility for this issue lies completely in the jurisdiction of the Church itself. The only thing which we must note from a theological perspective is that the imposed ecclesiastical punishments are first and foremost of a pastoral character with the aim of either correcting the faithful, or their preservation from the danger of heresies and, as such, these punishments are valid in the history of the Church through the principle of economy. Besides, in order for the Church to fulfill its ecumenical calling, it cannot be captive to historical occurrences and people when the truths of her faith are not affected by those historical occurrences. The examples of the great Fathers of the Church who confronted issues of a similar nature show the way in which even this matter can be approached. So, based on these facts, the acceptance of the Council of Chalcedon, and by extension the next three Ecumenical Councils, on the part of the Non-Chalcedonians should not constitute a problem.

Conclusion - Prospects

Taking this brief overview of the theological dialogue between the Orthodox and Non-Chalcedonians, we must emphasize in conclusion that despite the problems presented by this Theological Dialogue, its prospects for the realization of sacramental unification of the dialoguing Churches after the achievement of the dogmatic agreement are clearly favorable; provided that dialogue for the sake of dialogue is avoided and of course also provided that they do not simply seek out a hasty and fragile unification which would lead to internal divisions and further problems than they are already seeking to solve. To achieve this goal, both sides need to take sensible

⁹ See VI, 972 ff.· VII, 9 ff.· ACO II, 1, 2, 81 [277] ff.· 94 [290] ff. See also J. S. Romanides, «St. Cyril's "One physis or hypostasis of God the Logos Incarnate" and Chalcedon», in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 10.2 (1965): 88. P. Galtier, «Saint Cyrille d' Alexandrie et Saint Léon le Grand à Chalcédoine», in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, (Würzburg 1973), 354. G. D. Martzelos, *Γένεση και πηγές του Όρου της Χαλκηδόνας (Origin and sources of the Definition of Chalcedon)*. Συμβολή στην ιστορικοδογματική διερεύνηση του Όρου της Δ' Οικουμενικής Συνόδου (*Contribution to the historic dogmatic investigation of the definition of the 4th Ecumenical Council*), (Thessaloniki 1986), 44ff.

¹⁰ See G. D. Martzelos, 197 ff. *ibid*, *Η Χριστολογία του Βασιλείου Σελευκείας και η οικουμενική σημασία της (The Christology of Basil of Seleucia and its Ecumenical Significance)* 1990, 140 ff., 146 ff (in Greek).

¹¹ See G. D. Martzelos, 'Η επιστημονικότητα μιάς "επιστημονικής κριτικής" στη διδακτορική διατριβή του Ήλ. Κεσμίρη, "Η Χριστολογία και η εκκλησιαστική πολιτική του Διοσκόρου Αλεξανδρείας" (The scientific approach of a "scientific review" in the doctoral thesis of IL. Kesmiri, "Christology and the ecclesiastical policy of Dioscorus of Alexandria", Thessaloniki, 2000», in *Grigorios o Palamas* 86 (798), Παντελεήμονι τῷ Β', τῷ Παναγιωτάτῳ Μητροπολίτῃ Θεσσαλονίκης, Τεῦχος ἀφιερωτήριον ἐπί τῇ εἰς Κύριον ἐκδημία αὐτοῦ (Panteleimon the 2nd All-holy Metropolitan of Thessaloniki, issue dedicated to his passing away), (Thessaloniki 2003), 598ff (in Greek).

and methodic steps based on the luminous examples of the great Fathers of the Church who overlooked all that was secondary and trivial as long as they saw that the unity of the faith was intact. The Fathers should not be perceived only as “canons of faith” and sure criteria of orthodoxy, but also as “canons” of pastoral prudence and ecclesiological behavior in confronting similar problems of broken ecclesiastical unity. Only in this way can we properly understand the introductory phrase of the Definition of Chalcedon: “We, then, following the holy Fathers...”, and what it means for us.

Bibliography

- Galtier, P., «Saint Cyrille d' Alexandrie et Saint Léon le Grand à Chalcédoine», in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, (Würzburg 1973), 345-387.
- Grillmeier, A., *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, Bd. 1, (Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1982).
- Halleux, A. de, «La définition christologique à Chalcédoine», in *Revue Théologique de Louvain* 7 (1976): 3-23. 155-170.
- Ieras Koinotitos tou Agiou Orous Atho (Holy Community of Mount Athos), *Αγίου Όρους Άθω, Παρατηρήσεις περί τοῦ Θεολογικοῦ Διαλόγου Ὁρθοδόξων καί Ἀντιχαλκηδονίων (Ἀπάντησις εἰς κριτικὴν τοῦ Σεβ. Μητροπολίτου Ἐλβετίας κ. Δαμασκηνοῦ) (Observations on the Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox and Antichalcedonians, Responses in Critique of his Eminence Damaskinos Metropolitan of Switzerland)*, (Mount Athos 1996) (in Greek).
- Holy Monastery of Osios Gregory, *Εἶναι οἱ Ἀντιχαλκηδόνιοι Ὁρθόδοξοι; Κείμενα τῆς Ἱερᾶς Κοινότητος τοῦ Ἁγίου Όρους καί ἄλλων ἁγιορειτῶν Πατέρων περί τοῦ διαλόγου Ὁρθοδόξων καί Ἀντιχαλκηδονίων (Μονοφυσιτῶν) (Texts of the Holy Community of Mount Athos and other hagiomite Fathers on the dialogue between Orthodox and Antichalcedonians (Monophysites)*, (Mount Athos 1995) (in Greek).
- Larchet, J.-C., ‘Τό Χριστολογικό πρόβλημα περί τῆς μελετωμένης ἐνώσεως τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας καί τῶν Μή-Χαλκηδονίων Ἐκκλησιῶν: Ἐκκρεμοῦντα θεολογικά καί ἐκκλησιολογικά προβλήματα’ (The Christological problem on the planned union of the Orthodox Churches and non-Chalcedonian Churches: outstanding theological and ecclesiological problems), in *Theologia* 74.1 (2003): 199-234; 74.2 (2003): 635-670; 75.1 (2004): 79-104 (in Greek).
- Martezlos, G. D., *Γένεση καί πηγές τοῦ Ὁρου τῆς Χαλκηδόνας. Συμβολή στήν ἱστοριοδογματική διερεύνηση τοῦ Ὁρου τῆς Δ΄ Οἰκουμενικῆς Συνόδου (Origin and sources of the Definition of Chalcedon. Contribution to the historic dogmatic investigation of the definition of the 4th Ecumenical Council)*, (Thessaloniki: Pournara, 1986) (in Greek).
- *Ἡ Χριστολογία τοῦ Βασιλείου Σελευκείας καί ἡ οἰκουμενική σημασία της (The Christology of Basil of Seleucia and its Ecumenical Significance)*, (Thessaloniki: Pournara, 1990).
- Ὁ Θεολογικός Διάλογος τῆς Ὁρθόδοξης Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας μέ τίς Μή-Χαλκηδόνιες Ἐκκλησίες τῆς Ἀνατολῆς. Χρονικό-Ἀξιολόγηση-Προοπτικές’ (The Theological Dialogue of the Orthodox Catholic Church with the Non-Chalcedonian Churches of the East. Timeline - Evaluation - Prospects), in *The Minutes of the 14th Theological Conference of the Holy Metropolis of Thessaloniki with the topic “Ἡ Μητέρα ἡ Ὁρθόδοξη Ἐκκλησία” (Our Mother the Orthodox Church)» (10-13 Νοεμβρίου 1993)*, (Thessaloniki 1994), 293-319 (in Greek).
- *Ὁρθόδοξο δόγμα καί θεολογικός προβληματισμός. Μελετήματα δογματικῆς θεολογίας Β (Orthodox Dogma and Theological Questions. Essays in Dogmatic Theology 2)*, (Thessaloniki 2000) (in Greek).
- Ἡ ἐπιστημονικότητα μᾶς “ἐπιστημονικῆς κριτικῆς” στή διδακτορική διατριβή τοῦ Ἡλ. Κεσμίρη, “Ἡ Χριστολογία καί ἡ ἐκκλησιαστική πολιτική τοῦ Διοσκόρου Ἀλεξανδρείας (The scientific approach of a “scientific review” in the doctoral thesis of IL. Kesmiri, “Christology and the ecclesiastical policy of Dioscorus of Alexandria”, Thessaloniki, 2000», in *Grigorios o Palamas* 86 (798), Παντελεῆμονι τῷ Β΄,

- τῷ Παναγιωτάτῳ Μητροπολίτῃ Θεσσαλονίκης, Τεῦχος ἀφιερωτήριον ἐπὶ τῇ εἰς Κύριον ἐκδημίᾳ αὐτοῦ, (Panteleimon the 2nd, All-holy Metropolitan of Thessaloniki, issue dedicated to his passing away), (Thessaloniki 2003), 595-618 (in Greek).
- Martzelos, G. D., «Der Vater der dyophysitischen Formel von Chalkedon: Leo von Rom oder Basileios von Seleukeia?», in *Orthodoxes Forum* 6.1 (1992): 21-39 and in Ysabel de Andia / Peter Leander Hofrichter (Hsg.), *Christus bei den Vätern. Forscher aus dem Osten und Westen Europas an den Quellen des gemeinsamen Glaubens*, Pro Oriente, XXVII, Wiener patristische Tagungen 1 (PRO ORIENTE - Studientagung über „Christus bei den griechischen und lateinischen Kirchenvätern im ersten Jahrtausend“ in Wien, 7.-9. Juni 2001), (Innsbruck-Wien: Tyrolia-Verlag, 2003), 272-295.
- Bozovitis, S. N., *Τὰ αἰώνια σύνορα τῆς Ὁρθοδοξίας καὶ οἱ Ἀντιχαλκηδόνιοι (The Eternal borders of Orthodoxy and the Antichalcedonians)*, (Athens: Brotherhood of Theologians «O Sotir», 1999) (in Greek).
- Papavasileiou, A. N., *Ὁ Θεολογικὸς Διάλογος μεταξύ Ὁρθοδόξων καὶ Ἀντιχαλκηδονίων, τόμ. Α' (The Theological Dialogue between Orthodox and Antichalcedonians)*, vol. A', (Lefkosia: Center of Studies Holy Monastery of Kykkou, 2000) (in Greek).
- Papadopoulos, K., «Ὁ διάλογος μέ τούς Ἀντιχαλκηδόνιους» (The Dialogue with the Antichalcedonians), in *Synaxi* 57 (1996): 43-53 (in Greek).
- Papandreou, Damaskinou (Metropolitan of Switzerland), «Ἀπάντησις εἰς τό Γράμμα τῆς Ἱερᾶς Κοινότητος τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὄρους περί τοῦ Θεολογικοῦ Διαλόγου πρὸς τὰς Αρχαίας Ανατολικᾶς Ἐκκλησίας», (Response to the Letter of the Holy Mountain on the theological dialogue to the Ancient Eastern Church), in *Episkepsis* 521 (1995): 7-18, and in *Synaxi* 57 (1996): (in Greek).
- *Logos Dialogou (On Dialogue) (I Orthodoxia enopion tis tritis chiletias/Orthodoxy in the the Third Millennium)*, (Athens: Kastanioti, 1997) (in Greek).
- Parys, M. J. van, «L' évolution de la doctrine christologique de Basile de Séleucie», in *Irénikon* 44 (1971): 493-514.
- Ritter, A. M., «Patristische Anmerkungen zur Frage "Lehrverurteilungen – kirchentrennend?" am Beispiel des Konzils von Chalkedon», in *Oecumenica et Patristica. Festschrift für Wilhelm Schneemelcher zum 75. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von D. Papandreou - W. A. Bienert - K. Schäferdiek, (Chambésy - Genf 1989), 269-279.
- «Der gewonnene christologische Konzens zwischen orthodoxen Kirchen im Licht der Kirchenvätertradition», in *Logos. Festschrift für Luise Abramowski*, (Berlin - New York 1993), 452-471.
- Romanides, J. S., «St. Cyril's "One physis or hypostasis of God the Logos Incarnate" and Chalcedon», in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 10.2 (1965): 82-102.
- Šagi-Bunić, Th., «'Duo perfecta' et 'duae naturae' in definitione dogmatica chalcedonensi», in *Laurentianum* 5 (1964): 3-70, 203-244,
- «*Deus perfectus et homo perfectus*» a Concilio Ephesino (a. 431) ad Chalcedonense (a. 451), (Romae - Friburgi: Brig. - Barcinone 1965).
- Wendebourg, D., «Chalkedon in der ökumenischen Diskussion», in *Chalkedon: Geschichte und Aktualität. Studien zur Rezeption der christologischen Formel von Chalkedon*, hrsg. von J. van Oort und J. Roldanus, (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 190-223.
- Winkler, D. W., *Koptische Kirche und Reichskirche. Altes Schisma und neuer Dialog*, (Innsbruck-Wien: Tyrolia - Verlag, 1997).
- Zisis, Th., *Ἡ "Ὁρθοδοξία" τῶν Ἀντιχαλκηδονίων Μονοφυσιτῶν (The "Orthodoxy" of the Antichalcedonian Monophysites)*, pub. «Bryennios», (Thessaloniki: «Bryennios», 1994) (in Greek).
- *Τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἐκκλησίας (The Boundaries of the Church). Οἰκουμενισμός καὶ Παπισμός (Ecumenism and Papism)*, (Thessaloniki 2004) (in Greek).

(translated by Stephanos Salzman)