

- 4) historical factors and the terminology of the synod of Chalcedon (451): Prof. Dr Vlassios Phidas, Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria;
- 5) interpretation of christological dogmas today: Metropolitan Georges Khodr, Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch;
- 6) interpretation of christological dogmas today: Bishop Mesrob Krikorian, Armenian Apostolic Church of Etchmiadzin.

The six papers and the two sub-committee reports, along with the “summary of conclusions” of the fourth unofficial conversations at Addis Ababa (1971) which was appended to the report of the theological sub-committee, formed the basis of our intensive and friendly discussion on the issues and actions to be taken. A drafting committee composed of Metropolitan Georges Khodr, Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios, Archbishop Keshishian, Archbishop Garima, Rev. Prof. John Romanides, Metropolitan Matta Mar Eustathius (Syria), Prof. Ivan Dimitrov (Bulgaria) with Prof. V. Phidas and Bishop Krikorian as co-secretaries, produced the draft for the second agreed statement and recommendations to churches. Another drafting committee composed of Prof. Papavassiliou (Cyprus), Bishop Christoforos (Czechoslovakia), Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios and Liqaseltnanat Habtemariam (Ethiopia), with Fr Dr George Dragas as secretary, produced the draft for the recommendations on pastoral issues.

The following is the text of the unanimously approved second agreed statement and recommendations:

Second Agreed Statement and Recommendations to the Churches

The first agreed statement on Christology adopted by the joint commission of the theological dialogue between the Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox churches, at our historic meeting at the Anba Bishoy Monastery, Egypt, from 20 to 24 June 1989, forms the basis of this second agreed statement on the following affirmations of our common faith and understanding, and recommendations on steps to be taken for the communion of our two families of churches in Jesus Christ our Lord, who prayed “that they all may be one”.

1. Both families agree in condemning the Eutychian heresy. Both families confess that the Logos, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, only begotten of the Father before the ages and consubstantial with him, was incarnate and was born from the Virgin Mary Theotokos; fully consubstantial with us, perfect man with soul, body and mind (*νοῦς*); he was crucified, died, was buried, and rose from the dead on the third day, ascended to the heavenly Father, where He sits on the right hand of the Father as Lord of all creation. At Pentecost, by the coming of the Holy Spirit, he manifested the church as his body. We look forward to his coming again in the fullness of his glory, according to the scriptures.

2. Both families condemn the Nestorian heresy and the crypto-Nestorianism of Theodoret of Cyrus. They agree that it is not sufficient merely to say that Christ is consubstantial both with the Father and with us, by nature God and by nature man; it is necessary to affirm also that the Logos, who is by nature God, became by nature man, by his incarnation in the fullness of time.

3. Both families agree that the hypostasis of the Logos became composite (*σύνθετος*) by uniting to his divine uncreated nature with its natural will and energy, which he has in common with the Father and the Holy Spirit, created human

nature, which he assumed at the incarnation and made his own, with its natural will and energy.

4. Both families agree that the natures with their proper energies and wills are united hypostatically and naturally without confusion, without change, without division and without separation, and that they are distinguished in thought alone (*τή θεωρία μόνη*).

5. Both families agree that he who wills and acts is always the one hypostasis of the Logos incarnate.

6. Both families agree in rejecting interpretations of councils which do not fully agree with the horos of the third ecumenical council and the letter (433) of Cyril of Alexandria to John of Antioch.

7. The Orthodox agree that the Oriental Orthodox will continue to maintain their traditional Cyrillian terminology of “one nature of the incarnate Logos (*μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη*)”, since they acknowledge the double consubstantiality of the Logos which Eutyches denied. The Orthodox also use this terminology. The Oriental Orthodox agree that the Orthodox are justified in their use of the two-natures formula, since they acknowledge that the distinction is “in thought alone” (*τή θεωρία μόνη*). Cyril interpreted correctly this use in his letter to John of Antioch and his letters to Acacius of Melitene (PG 77,184-201), to Eulogius (PG 77,224-228) and to Succensus (PG 77,228-245).

8. Both families accept the first three ecumenical councils, which form our common heritage. In relation to the four later councils of the Orthodox church, the Orthodox state that for them the above points 1-7 are the teachings also of the four later councils of the Orthodox church, while the Oriental Orthodox consider this statement of the Orthodox as their interpretation. With this understanding, the Oriental Orthodox respond to it positively.

In relation to the teaching of the seventh ecumenical council of the Orthodox church, the Oriental Orthodox agree that the theology and practice of the veneration of icons taught by that council are in basic agreement with the teaching and practice of the Oriental Orthodox from ancient times, long before the convening of the council, and that we have no disagreements in this regard.

9. In the light of our agreed statement on Christology as well as of the above common affirmations, we have now clearly understood that both families have always loyally maintained the same authentic Orthodox christological faith, and the unbroken continuity of the apostolic tradition, though they may have used christological terms in different ways. It is this common faith and continuous loyalty to the apostolic Tradition that should be the basis of our unity and communion.

10. Both families agree that all the anathemas and condemnations of the past which now divide us should be lifted by the churches in order that the last obstacle to the full unity and communion of our two families can be removed by the grace and power of God. Both families agree that the lifting of anathemas and condemnations will be consummated on the basis that the councils and fathers previously anathematized or condemned are not heretical.

We therefore recommend to our churches the following practical steps:

A. The Orthodox should lift all anathemas and condemnations against all Oriental Orthodox councils and fathers whom they have anathematized or condemned in the past.

- B. The Oriental Orthodox should at the same time lift all anathemas and condemnations against all Orthodox councils and fathers, whom they have anathematized or condemned in the past.
- C. The manner in which the anathemas are to be lifted should be decided by the churches individually.

Trusting in the power of the Holy Spirit, the spirit of truth, unity and love, we submit this agreed statement and recommendations to our venerable churches for their consideration and action, praying that the same Spirit will lead us to that unity for which our Lord prayed and prays.

Signatures of the second agreed statement and recommendations to the churches, Chambésy, 28 September 1990

Metropolitan Damaskinos

Metropolitan Bishop

Co-president, Ecumenical Patriarchate Co-president, Coptic Orthodox Church

Recommendations on Pastoral Issues

The joint commission of the theological dialogue between the Orthodox church and the Oriental Orthodox churches, at its meeting at the Orthodox Centre of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, in Chambésy, Geneva, from 23 to 28 September 1990, received a report from its joint pastoral sub-committee which had met at the Anba Bishoy Monastery in Egypt from 31 January to 4 February 1990. The report was the starting point for an extended discussion of four types of pastoral issues:

- I. Relations among our two families of churches, and our preparation for unity.
- II. Relations of our churches with other Christian churches and our common participation in the ecumenical movement.
- III. Our common service to the world of suffering, need, injustice and conflicts.
- IV. Our cooperation in the propagation of our common faith and tradition.

I. Relations among our two families of churches

1. We feel as a joint theological commission that a period of intense preparation of our people to participate in the implementation of our recommendations and in the restoration of communion of our churches is needed. To this end we propose the following practical procedure.

2. It is important to plan an exchange of visits by our heads of churches and prelates, priests and laypeople of each one of our two families of churches to the other.

3. It is important to give further encouragement to exchange of theological professors and students among theological institutions of the two families for periods varying from one week to several years.

4. In localities where churches of the two families co-exist, the congregations should organize participation of one group of people—men, women, youth and children, including priests, where possible from one congregation of one family to a congregation of the other to attend in the latter's eucharistic worship on Sundays and feast days.

5. Publications:

- a) We need to publish, in the various languages of our churches, the key documents of this joint commission with explanatory notes, in small pamphlets to be sold at a reasonable price in all our congregations.