

Orthodox and Evangelicals: Cooperation or Confrontation?

PAUL NEGRUȚ

Emanuel University of Oradea

The issue concerning the relation between Orthodox and Evangelicals is very complex due to the fact that neither the Orthodox, nor the Evangelicals represent monolithic churches that speak with one universally recognized voice. Additionally, the nature of the relationship between them is significantly different in the Orthodox Diaspora than in Orthodox countries.

Within the limits of this paper, it is impossible to explore all possible relations between all Eastern Churches and all Evangelical Churches with their distinctive theologies, missiologies and practices. The alternative, then, is an over-generalized approach which does justice neither to the Orthodox, nor to the Evangelicals due to the fact that it overlooks exactly the specific aspects of the Orthodox-Evangelical relations in each country. Aware of the risk of such an approach, I will explore in this paper the Orthodox-Evangelical relations from a threefold perspective: methodological, theological, and sociological.

The Methodological Perspective

From the patristic period, the East and the West have adopted distinct theological paradigms. Generally speaking, while the West follows the creation-fall-redemption approach, the East follows the creation-deification model. In other words, if the West considers that the Christ-event deals primarily with the problem of sin in order to secure redemption for sinners, the East sees the Christ-event as

An ineffable descent of God to the ultimate limit of our fallen human condition, even unto death, a descent of God which opens to men a path of ascent, the unlimited vistas of the union of the created beings with the Divinity.¹

Lossky believes that the patristic sentence: "God made Himself man, that man might become God" sums up the essence of Christianity for the Orthodox Church.²

Cataphatic and Apophatic Approaches

In order to explain the difference between the Eastern and Western approaches to theology, Lossky introduces two pairs of concepts: firstly, *katabasis* and *anabasis* and secondly, *oikonomia* and *theologia*.³

Oikonomia and *Katabasis*: *Oikonomia* describes God's movement man-wards, which is a movement of descent (*katabasis*). *Oikonomia* is, according to Lossky, the "work of the will [of God], while Trinitarian being belongs to the transcendent nature of God."⁴ Consequently, *katabasis* is not a way of knowledge, but only the means whereby "essential goodness, natural sanctity, and royal dignity flows from the Father, through the Only-Begotten, to the Spirit."⁵ Moreover, Lossky argues that in the very immanence of His economy, which leads to the incarnation, God remains unknowable.⁶

Theologia and *Anabasis*: In order to know God, one has to follow the way of *theologia*, which is *gnosis* "of God considered in Himself, outside of His creative and redemptive economy." The appropriate methods for *gnosis* are contemplation and silence: contemplation because it is "an exit to the state of a future age, a vision of what is beyond history, a projection of eschatology into the instant", and silence because it "constitutes the language of the world which is coming."⁷

Following Pseudo-Dionysius, Lossky affirms that *gnosis* is a way of spiritual ascent (*anabasis*) beyond all perceptive and rational faculties "in order to be able to attain in perfect ignorance to union with Him who transcend all being and all knowledge."⁸ The purpose of this way is not to develop a positive theological system but to attain union with God (*theosis*). This leads us in turn to the distinction between apophatic and cataphatic theologies.

Apophatic and Cataphatic Theologies

Kataphasis

Corresponding to the two movements of God towards man (*katabasis*) and of man towards God (*anabasis*), Lossky affirms that there are two approaches to theology.⁹ Cataphatic theology, or positive theology, leads us to some knowledge of God, albeit in an imperfect way. In the words of John of Damascus:

All that we can say cataphatically concerning God does not show forth His nature but the things that relate to His nature... God does not belong to the class of existing things – not that He has no existence, but that He is above all existing things, nay even about existence itself. For if all forms of knowledge have to do with what exists, assuredly that which is above knowledge must certainly be also above essence – and, conversely, that which is above essence will also be above knowledge.¹⁰

Affirmative theology begins with the loftier, more congruous comparisons and then proceeds “down” to the less appropriate ones or, as Lossky explains, “a descent from the superior degrees of being to the inferior.”¹¹ In the same vein, Pseudo-Dionysius contends that the imperfection of positive theology resides both in its method and content. Methodologically, “when we made assertions we began with the first things, move down through intermediate terms until we reached the last things.”¹² Likewise the cognitive content has a descending character due to the link between concepts and the “level” of theological reflection. In his book *The Mystical Theology*, Pseudo-Dionysius claims that he had analysed this way of theologising in other writings (some of which were either lost or are fictitious):

In the earlier books my argument travelled downward from the most exalted to the humblest categories, taking in on this downward path an ever-increasing number of ideas which multiplied with every stage of descent.¹³

Thus, in *The Theological Representations*, Pseudo-Dionysius argues that positive theology begins with God’s oneness and proceeds down into the multiplicity of affirming the Trinity and the Incarnation.¹⁴ Further, *The Divine Names* affirms the more numerous designations for God which come from mental concepts such as good, existence, life, wisdom, power, and whatever other things pertain to the conceptual names for God.¹⁵ Finally, *The Symbolic Theology* “descends” into the still more pluralized realm of sense perception and its plethora of symbols for the deity such as:

The images we have of him, of the forms, figures, and instruments proper to him, of the places in which he lives and of the ornaments he wears. I have spoken of his anger, grief, and rage, of how he is said to be drunk and hangover, of his oaths and curses, of his sleeping and waking, and indeed of all those images we have of him, images shaped by the working of the symbolic representations of God. And I feel sure that you have noticed how these latter come much more abundantly than what went before, since *The Theological Representations* and a discussion of the names appropriate to God are inevitably briefer than what can be said in *The Symbolic Theology*.¹⁶

Further, Pseudo-Dionysius asserts that positive theology originates in the Scriptures which contain the divine truth revealed by God in his man-wards movement of economic descent:

Let us therefore look as far upward as the light of the sacred scriptures will allow, and, in our reverent awe of what is divine, let us be drawn together toward the divine splendor. For, if we may trust the superlative wisdom and truth of scripture, the things of God are revealed to each mind in proportion to its capacities, and the divine goodness is such that, out of concern for our salvation, it deals out the immeasurable and infinite in limited measure.¹⁷

However, the concepts or the words of Scripture do not describe God as he is in Himself since He is always beyond everything that exists. For Pseudo-Dionysius, in the words of Scripture “the Transcendent is clothed in the terms of beings, the shape and form of things which have neither, and numerous symbols are employed to convey the varied attributes of what is an imageless and supra-natural simplicity.”¹⁸

Similarly, Lossky argues that whilst God reveals Himself (intelligible attributes) as wisdom, love and goodness, His nature remains unknowable in its depth and therefore our concepts must be always prevented from being enclosed within their limited meaning.¹⁹ In fact, Lossky, following Gregory of Nyssa, argues that “the ladder of cataphatic theology” which discloses the divine names drawn primarily from Scripture are not intended to become rational concepts whereby our minds construct “a positive science of the divine nature”, but are rather images or ideas intended to guide us for contemplation of that which transcends all understanding.²⁰

Apophasis

Lossky affirms that man’s proper response to the economy in which God reveals Himself in creating the world and becoming incarnate, is to confess the transcendent nature of the Trinity in an ascent of thought according to the way of apophatic theology. The negative way of the knowledge of God is an ascendant undertaking of the mind that progressively eliminates all positive attributes of the object it wishes to attain, in order to culminate finally in a kind of apprehension by supreme ignorance of Him who cannot be an object of knowledge.²¹

On the lower steps there are images drawn from the material objects least calculated to lead spirits inexperienced in contemplation into error. It is indeed more difficult, argues Lossky, to identify God with stone or with fire than with intelligence, unity, being or goodness. What seems obvious at the beginning of the ascent, that “God is not fire, He is not stone”, becomes less and less obvious as one attains to the height of contemplation, when one has to affirm that “God is not being, He is not good.”²² At each step of ascent one has to guard oneself against the danger of making these loftier images or ideas “an idol of God”. Once the heights have been attained, then speculation gradually gives place to contemplation, knowledge to experience, “for in casting of the concepts which shackle the spirit, the apophatic disposition reveals boundless horizons of contemplation at each step of positive theology.”²³ Consequently, apophatic theology refuses any attempt to form concepts about God and to organize them in a systematic construct according to human ways of thought. On the contrary, by pointing to mystical union with God, apophatic theology is “an existential attitude, which involves the whole, man... a criterion: the sure sign of an attitude of mind conformed to the truth.”²⁴

However, if negative theology begins by denying the appropriateness of the human mind and language to knowing God, then one may inquire

concerning the role of Scriptures and dogmas, since these are themselves expressed in concepts. To answer this question, Lossky borrows from Gregory of Nazianzus' metaphorical interpretation of Moses ascent on Mount Sinai and affirms that there are different levels in theology, each one appropriate to differing capacities of human understanding which reach up to the mysteries of God.²⁵ Gregory of Nazianzus writes:

God commands me to enter within the cloud and hold converse with Him; if any be an Aaron let him go up with me, and let him stand nearer, being ready, if it must be so, to remain outside the cloud. But if any be a Nadab or an Abihu, or of the order of the elders, let him go up indeed, but let him stand afar off... But if any be of the multitude, who are unworthy of this height of contemplation, if he be altogether impure let him not approach at all, for it would be dangerous to him; but if he be at least temporarily, let him remain below and listen to the voice alone, and the trumpet, the bare words of piety, and let him see the mount smoking and lightening... But if any be an evil and savage beast, and altogether incapable of taking in the matter of contemplation and theology, let him not harmfully and malignantly lurk in this den amongst the woods, to catch hold of some dogma or saying by a sudden spring... but let him stand yet afar off and withdraw from the moment, or he shall be stoned.²⁶

In this multi-level theological construct the words of Scripture and of dogma serve primarily as starting and guiding points in an ever-ascending process of contemplation which has deification as its final goal. Thus, Lossky concludes, theology will never be abstract, working through concepts, but contemplative: raising the mind to those realities, which pass all understanding.²⁷

From an Evangelical perspective, the apophatic approach to theology raises serious questions regarding the nature of knowledge that is beyond words and logical categories. The encounter with God described by Pseudo-Dionysius as “plunging into the truly mysterious darkness of unknowing”, or “one is supremely united by a completely unknowing inactivity of all knowledge, and knows beyond the mind by knowing nothing”,²⁸ does hardly make sense to an Evangelical. For Evangelicals all theological knowledge is based on revelation. For instance, John Stott argues:

Evangelical Christians begin their thinking with a recognition of the obvious, logical reasonableness of the revelation. Since God is our Creator, infinite in his being, while we are finite creatures of time and space, it stands to reason that we cannot discover him by our own researches or resources. He is altogether beyond us. And since in addition he is the all-holy God, while we are fallen, sinful and under his judgement, there is a chasm between him and us which we from our side could never bridge... We could never know him unless he should take the initiative to make himself known.²⁹

Evangelicals believe that God made himself known through general and special revelation. While general revelation was made through nature, special revelation was made through inspiration and incarnation. The

climax of God's revelation was the Word made flesh, the incarnate Son. However, Evangelical believes that the only authentic Christ is the biblical Christ. Stott contends:

What Scripture has done is to capture him [Christ] in order to present him to all people at all times in all places. The climax of God's revelation should be described as the historic, incarnate Christ and the total biblical witness to him.³⁰

In God's special revelation, event and words went together; or in other words, God's revelation is both personal and propositional. Evangelicals also believe in the double authorship of the Bible: divine and human. The Bible is equally the Word of God and the word of man. Because of the kind of book the Bible is, we must approach it in two distinct yet complementary ways. Because it is the word of God, we must read it as we would read *no* other book: on our knees, in a humble, reverent, prayerful and submissive frame of mind. But because the Bible is also the word of men we must read it as we would read *every* other book, thoughtfully and in a "critical" frame of mind.³¹ In their approach to theology, Evangelicals submit the authority of Scripture who stands above tradition, experience and human reason.

From the survey of the apophatic and cataphatic approaches to theology it can be observed that they operate with different methods and categories. Thus, the apophatic approach focuses on a direct encounter with God beyond historical realities and consequently uses categories such as essence, energies, mystical union and *theosis*. Alternatively, the Evangelicals speak about knowing God in his self-revelation in Christ to whom Scriptures bears witness. Consequently, categories such as revelation, inspiration, illumination, interpretation and obedience receive a prominent place.

In conclusion, the answer to the question of cooperation or confrontation between Orthodox and Evangelicals must bear in mind the fact that we speak about two distinct worlds. Distinctive theological methods lead to distinct theologies. This becomes clearer when we look at the Orthodox and Evangelical theological perspectives.

The Theological Perspective

From an Orthodox viewpoint the Western Churches, both Catholic and Protestant, have a similar theological frame of reference. For instance, Khomiakov asserts that:

All Protestants are Crypto-Papists... To use the concise language of algebra, all the West knows but one datum "a". Whether it be preceded by the positive sign "+", as with the Romanists, or with the negative sign "-", as with the Protestants, the "a" remains the same.³²

Benz considers that the West developed its theology along the lines of a legal relationship between God and mankind out of which came the doctrine of justification. This legal approach was further extended to ecclesiology, and in the Catholic tradition, also to the doctrine of the ministry, to the role of dogmatic definitions and of canon law.

The Orthodox Approach: Theosis

For the Orthodox, theology is only a means towards an end, that is union with God, or *theosis*. Consequently, the emphasis lies not on developing positive theological systems, but on the mystical aspect of this union. The whole purpose of theological epistemology and ecclesial practice is to help the faithful to attain to deification, or mystical union with God.

In order to explain the nature of this union with God, the Orthodox follow Palamas' ineffable distinction between three aspects of God's being: 1. the permanently unnamable and imparticipable divine essence (*ousia*), then 2. the three divine persons (*hypostaseis*) Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and finally 3. the uncreated energies (*energeiai*) or divine operations, forces proper to and inseparable from God's essence, in which He goes forth from Himself, manifests, communicates and gives Himself.³³

The mystical union with God according to essence is impossible; if the creature *could* participate in the divine essence, the creature would *be* God, or *homoousios* with God. Thus, Lossky argues:

If we were able at a given moment to be united with the very essence of God and to participate in it even at the very last degree, we should not be what we are, we should be God by nature. God would then no longer be Trinity, but a myriad of hypostases for He would have as many hypostases as there would be persons participating in His essence.³⁴

Only the three Persons of the Trinity are united to each other in the divine essence. Even though we share the same human nature as Christ and receive in Him the name of Sons of God, we do not ourselves become the divine hypostasis of the Son by the fact of incarnation. We are unable, therefore, to participate in either the essence or the hypostases of the Holy Trinity.³⁵ Union with God according to energy is a *real* participation of creature in the divine life.³⁶ Lossky argues that,

In the Church and through the sacraments our nature enters into union with the divine nature in the hypostasis of the Son, the Head of His mystical body. Our humanity becomes consubstantial with the deified humanity, united with the person of Christ.³⁷

It is true that by postulating this distinction between essence, person and energies, Palamas was attempting to hold together two claims: firstly, that *theosis* is real, and secondly, that God remains totally *other*. However, such a distinction raises some major theological questions. Ontologically, in spite

of the Palamites' claims to the contrary, this distinction within the being of God runs the risk of compromising the principle of the "unity and simplicity" of the divine essence. To affirm that God's energies interpose between God's essence and the creation leads to the conclusion that there is a duality in God; a "lower" part in which one can participate, and an "upper" part which is totally inaccessible. Or, from another perspective, the idea that within God there are two distinct realities can lead (if pressed toward its logical conclusion), to the implication that there are two gods related to each other in some mysterious way. Meyendorff dismisses both charges arguing that for Palamas "in virtue of the simplicity of His being, God is wholly and entirely present both in His essence and in His energies" and on the other side, "no multiplicity of divine manifestations could affect the unity of God, for God is beyond the categories of whole and parts and while in His essence always remaining unknowable, reveals Himself wholly in each energy as the Living God."³⁸

Additionally, it raises the question of the ontological status as well as that of the intra-Trinitarian role of each category (aspect) of God's being. On the economic level, the main problem is to maintain a Trinitarian soteriology, that is, a personal relation with God, whilst affirming that God communicates himself through *non-hypostatic* beings such as the uncreated energies.

The Evangelical Approach: Justification by Faith

From an Evangelical perspective the relation between God and man has to answer the question "How can a lost and guilty sinner stand before a just and holy God?", John Stott argues that,

This sense of our sinfulness, of the blinding holiness of God, and of the absolute incompatibility of the one with the other, is an essential evangelical characteristic, without which our understanding of the necessity and the nature of the cross is bound to be skewed.³⁹

By stressing the reality and horror of sin, Evangelicals point to the cross of Christ as the only way of acceptance with God. The words of the Apostle Paul: "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us" (Gal. 3: 13) affirms that the only way we can be redeemed from the curse of the law is that Christ bore it on our place. This is called "penal substitution." J. I. Packer considers it "a distinguishing mark of the worldwide evangelical fraternity."⁴⁰ Likewise J. Stott contends that:

The cross was a multifaceted achievement, and has many different meanings. It is the ultimate revelation of God's love and justice. It is the decisive conquest of evil. It is the ground of our salvation. It is the supreme example of self-sacrifice. It is the most powerful inspiration to Christian devotion. Moreover, the salvation won by the cross is illustrated in the New Testament by a variety of metaphors

like propitiation, redemption and reconciliation. But evangelical Christians have always insisted that the richest model is justification.⁴¹

Some contemporary evangelicals argues that justification by Faith appears to us, as it does to all evangelicals, to be the heart and hub, the paradigm and essence, of the whole economy of God's saving grace.⁴² Justification is a legal word, borrowed from the court of law. John Stott continues:

When God justifies sinners, he declares a verdict, in anticipation of the last day, that he has not only forgiven all their sins but has also granted them a righteous standing acceptance in his sight.⁴³

Further on, Stott argues that while insisting that "to justify" means "to declare" and not "to make" righteous, Evangelicals emphasize that justification is always accompanied by regeneration. Moreover, this new birth leads inevitably to a new life, this justification to sanctification. Sanctification begins the moment we are justified, but then it grows as the Holy Spirit transforms us into the image of Christ (2 Corinthians 3:18).⁴⁴

In conclusion, deification and justification by faith are two distinct ways to salvation. One focuses on mystical union through the uncreated energies, while the other deals with the legal aspect of the relationship between God and man.

The Sociological Perspective

The historical circumstances during the period which followed the Council of Calcedon (451 AD) placed Byzantium in a pre-eminent and, to some degree, a self-sufficient position, from which it was to develop its theological tradition. Byzantium maintained its Christological commitment to the Council of Chalcedon, and for several centuries kept bridges toward the West intact, in spite of all tensions, political and doctrinal. During this period, however, neither the councils nor the theologians would show particular interest in positive theological systems. According to Meyendorff, with few exceptions, the conciliar statements assume a negative form; they condemned distortions of the Christian truth rather than elaborate its positive content. The greater part of the theological literature was either exegetical or polemical, and in both cases the Christian faith was assumed as a given reality upon which one comments or which one defends.⁴⁵

From another perspective, Hopko argues that although the formal break between the Christian East and West occurred in 1054, from as early as the fourth century AD the Christians of the East had very little contact with the Christians from the West. The Turkish rule, which extended almost over the entire Orthodox world since the fifteenth century (with the fall of Constantinople in 1453) and lasted until the end of the nineteenth century, further estranged the two churches. Consequently, political and cultural exchanges between East and West had been dramatically reduced, and due

to this fact the ideas of the Renaissance, Protestant Reformation and the Enlightenment, which are considered to represent the genesis of modern Western culture, stopped short when they reached the borders of the Turkish Empire.⁴⁶

During these centuries of political and theological separation, Hopko argues that the faith and the practice of the Orthodox Church have been preserved unaltered since apostolic times. Whatever our earthly conditions and temporal circumstances, we Orthodox Christians live in the same ecclesial and spiritual world. We identify with the same tradition of faith and life. We worship the same God through the same Christ. We are inspired by the same Spirit in the same church. We celebrate the same liturgy, participate in the same sacraments and say the same prayers. We meditate upon the same scriptures, which we believe to be God's Word inspired by God's Spirit, interpreting them within the same hermeneutical context. We accept the same councils and are guided by the same canons. We recognize the same teachers and venerate the same saints. We teach the same doctrines defend the same dogmas, and employ the same symbol of faith. In our theology as well as in our worship, we use the same words and images, which we affirm to be "adequate to God" and proper to the experience which we share within God's covenant community and identify in history from the time of Abraham.⁴⁷

According to the Orthodox belief, the uninterrupted continuity with the Apostolic Church is the mark of the true Church. There can be only one church founded by our Lord, and in that Church can be but one single Faith. This one Church is the Orthodox Church; the one Faith is the whole Orthodox doctrine.⁴⁸

Further on, the Orthodox affirm that the Apostolic Tradition can be found today only in their Church, which is the only true church of Christ on earth. Consequently, no appeal to tradition other than the tradition of the Orthodox Church is acceptable. The Eastern Tradition is not one of the regular forms of Tradition, but it is the Holy Tradition of the Church of Christ itself.⁴⁹

Bratsiotis considers that the church would have ceased to be the Church if it had departed from the Holy Tradition. It is the very historical continuity with the Apostolic Church that marks the Orthodoxy as the true faith.⁵⁰ Hence the conclusion that *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*.⁵¹ George Florovsky asserts that "outside the Church there is no salvation because *salvation is the Church*."⁵² Similarly, Lossky argues that:

In the Church and through the sacraments our nature enters into union with the divine nature in the hypostasis of the Son, the Head of His mystical body. Our humanity becomes consubstantial with the deified humanity, united with the person of Christ.⁵³

Consequently, if one does not belong to the Orthodox Church, he or she is not saved due to the fact that the life giving Spirit does not operate outside the canonical boundaries of the Orthodox Church. Bulgakov argues that,

The Church, in her quality of the Body of Christ, which lives with the life of Christ, is by that fact the domain where the Holy Spirit lives and works. More: the Church is life by the Holy Spirit because it is the Body of Christ.⁵⁴

This exclusively institutionalised ecclesiology leaves little space for co-operation with other churches. Moreover, in the Orthodox countries, the Orthodox Church is also part of the national myth; that is, the Church is associated with national survival, the protection of the culture and identity. Subsequently, religious and national identities are overlapping realities. For example, in order to be a good Romanian one has to be a Romanian Orthodox.⁵⁵ Some Orthodox theologians go as far as to argue that nationhood (ethnicity) is a divine principle for the canonical organization of the Church.⁵⁶ The outcome of such views is clearly seen in those regions affected by ethnic conflicts. Ethnic cleansing and religious cleansing go hand in hand. Some ultra-nationalist Orthodox advocate one nationhood and one religion within the same national state.

Conclusions

Some Orthodox theologians are aware of the theological problems posed by a purely apophatic approach to theology and consequently attempt to realize a *synthesis* between *apophasis* and *kataphasis*. This new approach creates space for a wider use of the Bible in the life of the Orthodox believers. Thus Timiadis argues:

To a certain extent the dissatisfaction expressed at the use by the early Fathers of Aristotelian terms, and notably the desire to make less use of terms such as “essence” and “energies”, is very understandable. Whatever arguments may be advanced in their favour, they still risk being misunderstood on account of their impersonal character. It might be better to use more intimate and personal expressions, such as “communion with the Holy Spirit”, more in line with those of the Old Testament and more connected with the historical Jesus. All modern anxiety about the absence of personal communion in human life with God, could thus be overcome, reassuring man in his loneliness and anguish that he can be visited and sustained, not by vague, immaterial, heavenly forces, but above all by God’s personal intervention. A God who is reluctant to be with us, who sends us alternative powers and energies, contradicts the very sense of Christ’s Incarnation.⁵⁷

Consequently, there is a shift from exaggerated mysticism to a more Bible-study oriented Orthodox communities. Thus, Kesich affirms that:

The interest in Biblical research is definitely linked to what is going on in Orthodox parishes. In many Orthodox communities Bible studies are organized and held regularly as church activities... This is a challenge to Orthodox scholars and teachers, to translate their research and to convey in clear terms an

Orthodox perspective within which the people would be able to use, to judge and evaluate new ideas which are appearing so frequently in our pluralistic societies... Revival of interest in the Bible accompanies theological awakening. A theological revival will not occur without genuine interest and active participation in Biblical research.⁵⁸

This is an important point of convergence between Orthodox and Evangelicals in the area of theological methodology.

Regarding *theosis*, the Orthodox way of salvation, Evangelicals must pay the price to study Orthodoxy and unveil from within the theological problems posed by this approach. Already, there are Orthodox theologians, who believe that,

Exaggerated mysticism could lead to the conclusion that God is so far removed from humanity that disparate efforts are required to obtain his intervention. We are then far from the Old Testament promise to make us God's people, the New Israel, the redeemed heirs of His Kingdom, endowed with Pauline *paresia*, brothers of one another by grace and bearers of the Spirit (*pneumatophoroî*) incorporated into Christ's Body and enjoying all the spiritual gifts that membership of the Church provides.⁵⁹

Regarding the Orthodox exclusive ecclesiology, which identifies the canonical boundaries of the Church with the sphere where the Holy Spirit operates, there are disagreements among Orthodox theologians concerning those who do not belong to the Orthodox Church.

Firstly, there is a "rigorous group" who hold that "since Orthodoxy is the Church, anyone who is not an Orthodox cannot be a member of the Church." This view seems to be consistent with the Orthodox teaching that *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, because the Church mediates the saving grace of Christ through the Holy Spirit. This view leads to strong institutionalism and does not provide space for co-operation with other churches.⁶⁰

Secondly, the "moderate group" holds that it is true to say that Orthodoxy is the Church, but false to infer from this that those who are not Orthodox cannot possibly belong to the Church. This view allows for a little more space for the freedom of the Spirit to operate outside the canonical boundaries of the Church, but it does not clarify the relation between the Spirit and the institution, between the believer and the institution and between the believer and the Spirit. Thus far, the preparatory commission of the great and holy Council of the Orthodox Church has produced a document on the *oikonomia* in the Orthodox Church, in which it is affirmed that "the Holy Spirit acts upon other Christians in very many ways, depending on degree of faith and hope."⁶¹

Thirdly, a group that could be described as "open ended institutionalism" renders a more favourable attitude for co-operation with those whom do not belong to the Orthodox Church. Zizioulas contends:

It is certainly not easy to exclude from the realm of the operation of the Holy Spirit so many Christians who do not belong to the Orthodox Church. There are

saints outside the Orthodox Church. How can we understand that theologically? How can we account for it without saying that the canonical limits of the Church are not important?⁶²

Evangelicals should identify these trends within Eastern Orthodoxy and build bridges that allow for theological discussions. Alternatively, those Evangelicals who live in Orthodox countries dominated by exclusive ecclesiologies and religious nationalism should be ready to pay the price for their faithfulness to the Gospel and the Great Commission. While affirming their identity, Evangelicals should explore all the doors that lead to co-operation with the Orthodox Church. Alternatively, when the situation demands it, Evangelical should be ready serving Christ in a hostile world. We are not only to stand firm in the Gospel ourselves but to fight for it in the public arena as well.

Notes

- ¹ V. Lossky, *In the Image and Likeness of God* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985), 97.
- ² See Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, v; Athanasius, *De incarnatione verbi*, 54; Gregory of Nazianzus, *Poema dogmatica*, 10, 5-9; Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio catechetica magna*, 25.
- ³ V. Lossky, *In the Image*, 15, 97.
- ⁴ V. Lossky, *In the Image*, 15.
- ⁵ V. Lossky, *In the Image*, 16.
- ⁶ V. Lossky, *In the Image*, 15.
- ⁷ V. Lossky, *Orthodox Theology* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1978), 14.
- ⁸ V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (London, 1973), 27.
- ⁹ Lossky borrows this distinction from Pseudo-Dionysius and John of Damascus. See Pseudo-Dionysius, *The Mystical Theology* I. 1, 1000A, in Pseudo-Dionysius, *The Complete Works* (London: SPCK, 1987), 135-141; John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa* I.4, vol. IX, 34.
- ¹⁰ John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa*, 1,4.
- ¹¹ V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology*, 28.
- ¹² Pseudo-Dionysius, *The Mystical Theology* II, 1025B, in *CW*, 138.
- ¹³ Pseudo-Dionysius, *The Mystical Theology* III, 1033C, in *CW*, 139.
- ¹⁴ Pseudo-Dionysius, *The Mystical Theology* III, 1032D-1033A, in *CW*, 138-139.
- ¹⁵ Pseudo-Dionysius, *The Mystical Theology* III, 1033A, in *CW*, 139.
- ¹⁶ Pseudo-Dionysius, *The Mystical Theology* III, 1033A-1033B, in *CW*, 138-139.
- ¹⁷ Pseudo-Dionysius, *The Divine Names* I.1, 585B-588A, in *CW*, 49.
- ¹⁸ Pseudo-Dionysius, *The Divine Names* I.4, 592B, in *CW*, 52.
- ¹⁹ V. Lossky, *Orthodox Theology*, 33.
- ²⁰ V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology*, 40. See Gregory of Nyssa, *Con. Eunom* (PG XLV 939-941).
- ²¹ V. Lossky, *In the Image*, 10.
- ²² V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology*, 40.
- ²³ V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology*, 40.
- ²⁴ V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology*, 39.
- ²⁵ V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology*, 40-41.
- ²⁶ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio XXVIII {theologica II}*, 2 in *NPNF*, 2nd edn, vol. VII, 289.
- ²⁷ V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology*, 41-42.
- ²⁸ Pseudo-Dionysius, *The Mystical Theology*, 167.
- ²⁹ J. Stott, *Evangelical Truth*, 44.
- ³⁰ J. Stott, *Evangelical Truth*, 48.
- ³¹ J. Stott, *Evangelical Truth*, 61.

- ³² A. Khomiakov, in a letter to an English friend, which was printed in W. J. Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church*, 67, quoted in T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1985), 9.
- ³³ Gregory Palamas, *Capita physica, theologica, moralia et practica*, 79, PG 150, 1173B; III, PG 150, 1197A; *Triads*, III.1, 26 in J. Meyendorff (ed.), *Gregory Palamas. The Triads* (New York: Paulist Press, 1983), 607.
- ³⁴ V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology*, 69-70.
- ³⁵ V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology*, 70.
- ³⁶ V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology*, 71.
- ³⁷ V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology*, 181.
- ³⁸ J. Meyendorff, *St. Gregory Palamas and Orthodox Spirituality* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974), 125-126.
- ³⁹ J. Stott, *Evangelical Truth*, 86-87.
- ⁴⁰ A. McGrath, *To Know and Serve God: A Biography of James I. Packer* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1977), 205.
- ⁴¹ J. Stott, *Evangelical Truth*, 92.
- ⁴² R. T. Beckwith, G. E. Duffield and J. I. Packer, *Across the Divide* (Marcham: Manor Press, 1977), 58.
- ⁴³ J. Stott, *Evangelical Truth*, 93.
- ⁴⁴ J. Stott, *Evangelical Truth*, 95.
- ⁴⁵ J. Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1974), 3-5.
- ⁴⁶ T. Hopko, *Meeting the Orthodox* (New York: The Orthodox Church in America, 1972), 5. See also T. Ware, *Eustratios Argenti: A Study of the Greek Church under Turkish Rule* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964).
- ⁴⁷ T. Hopko, "God and Gender: Articulating the Orthodox View" in *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 37/2-3 (1993), 141.
- ⁴⁸ F. Gavin, *Some Aspects of Contemporary Orthodox Thought* (Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1923), 259.
- ⁴⁹ C. Konstantinidis, "The Significance of the Eastern and Western Traditions within Christendom", in C. Patelos (ed.), *The Orthodox Church in the Ecumenical Movement* (Geneva: WCC, 1978), 226.
- ⁵⁰ P. E. Bratsiotis, "The Fundamental Principles and Main Characteristics of the Orthodox Church", in A. I. Philippou (ed.), *The Orthodox Ethos* (Oxford: Holywell Press, 1964), 24ff.
- ⁵¹ Cyprian of Cartage, *Epist.* 71.2.
- ⁵² G. Florovsky, "Sobornost: the Catholicity of the Church", in *The Church of God*, 53. Cf. T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 351.
- ⁵³ V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology*, 181.
- ⁵⁴ S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 2.
- ⁵⁵ See D. Maltin, *A General Theory of Secularization* (Oxford: Blackweell, 1978), 9-10; M. Elliot, "For Christian Understanding Ignorance is not a Bliss", in *East-West Church and Ministry Report* 1/3 (Summer 1993), 1-4.
- ⁵⁶ See I. Ivan, "Etnosul-Neamul: Temei Divin și Principiul Fundamental Canonic al Autocefaliei Bisericești", in N. Corneanu (ed.), *Ortodoxia românească*, 20-34.
- ⁵⁷ E. Timiadis, "God's Immutability and Communicability", in T. F. Torrance (ed.), *Theological Dialogue between Orthodox and Reformed Churches*, vol. 1 (Edinburg: Scottish Academic Press, 1985), 46.
- ⁵⁸ V. Kesich, "The Orthodox Church and Biblical Interpretation", in *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 37/4 (1993), 351.
- ⁵⁹ E. Timiadis, "God's Immutability", 47.
- ⁶⁰ T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 315-317.
- ⁶¹ *Towards the Great Council. Introductory Reports of the Inter-Orthodox Commission in Preparation for the Next Great and Holy Council of the Orthodox Church* (London, 1972), 45.
- ⁶² J. Zizioulas, "Orthodox Ecclesiology and the Ecumenical Movement", in *Sourozh* 21 (1985), 22-23.