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In 1990, the second Forum of representatives of the Oriental Orthodox Churches and the Churches of Anglican Communion, meeting at the Monastery of St Bishoy in Wadi el Natroun, Egypt, was able to produce the following statement:

*God, as revealed in the life, teaching, passion, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ calls His people into union with Himself. Living by the Holy Spirit, His own people have been given authority to proclaim this Good News to all creation.*

The Forum was also able to suggest that an agreement on Christology between the Oriental Orthodox and the Anglican Communion was now possible, taking note of the detailed theological work done by representatives of the two families of Orthodoxy between 1964 and 1971 resulting in the Agreed Statements of 1989 and 1990, the work done in the unofficial Pro Oriente conversations, and of the history of convergence in Christology between the Churches of the Anglican Communion and the Oriental Orthodox Churches. To this must now be added the Agreed Statement on Christology of the Reformed-Oriental Orthodox Dialogue (Driebergen, Netherlands, 13 September 1994).

Our first meeting as the Anglican-Oriental Orthodox International Commission was held in Holy Etchmiadzin, Armenia, 5–10 November 2002, following the meeting of the Preparatory Committee in Midhurst, England, 27–30 July 2001. It produced an Agreed Statement on Christology. This text was sent to the participating Churches following this meeting and again following the second meeting of the Commission held in Woking, England, 3–7 October 2013. The third meeting of the Commission, held in Cairo, Egypt, 13–17 October 2014, reviewed these responses and made slight revisions to the text. All this work has been done in a spirit of service of the Risen Christ and of the human race whom He came to save. Our work recognizes the presence of Christ with those who suffer in the tragic history of humanity. It expresses both the hope of a new humanity and the hope of glory wherein we will partake in Christ’s holiness. With the will for unity-in-Christ within us it has been our privilege in this work of exploration and collaboration to handle the understanding of the person of Christ Jesus (1 John 1.1) together.

We have been able to agree on the following statement.*

*This Introduction is a part of and signed with the Agreed Statement*
Agreed Statement on Christology

1 We confess that our Lord, God and Saviour Jesus Christ is the Only-Begotten Son of God who became incarnate and was made human in the fullness of time for us and for our salvation. We believe in God the Son incarnate, perfect in His divinity and perfect in His humanity, consubstantial with the Father according to His divinity and consubstantial with us according to His humanity, for a union has been made of two natures. For this cause we confess one Christ, one Son and one Lord. [Based on the Formula of Reunion, AD 433.]

2 Following the teaching of our common father Saint Cyril of Alexandria we can confess together that in the one incarnate nature of the Word of God, two different natures, distinguished in thought alone, (τῇ θεωρίᾳ μόνῃ tê theôria monê) continue to exist without separation, without division, without change, and without confusion.

3 In accordance with this sense of the unconfused union, we confess the holy Virgin to be Theotokos, because God the Word became incarnate and was made man, and from the very conception united to himself that perfect humanity, without sin, which he took from her. As to the expressions concerning the Lord in the Gospel and in the Epistles, we are aware that theologians understand some in a general way as relating to one single person, and others they distinguish as relating to two natures, explaining those that befit the divine nature according to the divinity of Christ, and those of a humble sort according to his humanity.

[Based on the Formula of Reunion, AD 433.]

4 Concerning the four adverbs used to qualify the mystery of the hypostatic union: ‘without commingling’ (or confusion) (ἀσυγχύτως asyngchytōs), ‘without change’ (ἀτρέπτως areptōs), ‘without separation’ (ἀχωρίστως achôristōs), and ‘without division’ (ἀδιαιρέτως adihairetōs), those among us who speak of two natures in Christ are justified in doing so since they do not thereby deny their inseparable indivisible union; similarly, those among us who speak of one incarnate nature of the Word of God are justified in doing so since they do not thereby deny the continuing dynamic presence in Christ of the divine and the human, without change, without confusion. We recognize the limit of all theological language and
the philosophical terminology of which it makes and has made use. We are unable
to net and confine the mystery of God’s utter self-giving in the incarnation of the
divine Word in an ineffable, inexpressible and mysterious union of divinity and
humanity, which we worship and adore.

5 Both families agree in rejecting the teaching which separates or divides the human
nature, both soul and body in Christ, from his divine nature, or reduces the union
of the natures to the level of conjoining and limiting the union to the union of
persons and thereby denying that the person of Jesus Christ is a single person of
God the Word. ‘Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today and forever’ (Hebrews
13.8). Both sides also agree in rejecting the teaching which confuses the human
nature in Christ with the divine nature so that the former is absorbed in the latter
and thus ceases to exist. Consequently, we reject both the Nestorian and the
Eutychian heresies.

6 In the Anglican tradition in the 16th century, the Thirty-nine Articles and the
theologian Richard Hooker witness to the continuing relevance of these concerns.
Article II affirms ‘that two whole and perfect Natures, that is to say, the Godhead
and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided.’ In the fifth
book of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, section 5e, Hooker emphasizes the
necessary mystery of the person in Christ. ‘It is not man’s ability either to express
perfectly or to conceive the manner how (the incarnation) was brought to pass.’
‘In Christ the verity of God and the complete substance of man were with full
agreement established throughout the world, until the time of Nestorius.’ The
church, Hooker contends, rightly repudiated any division in the person of Christ.
‘Christ is a Person both divine and human, howbeit not therefore two persons in
one, neither both these in one sense, but a person divine because he is personally
the Son of God, human, because he hath really the nature of the children of men’
(Laws 52.3). ‘Whereupon it followeth against Nestorius, that no person was born of
the Virgin but the Son of God, no person but the Son of God baptized, the Son of
God condemned, the Son of God and no other person crucified; which one only
point of Christian belief, the infinite worth of the Son of God, is the very ground of
all things believed concerning life and salvation by that which Christ either did or
suffered as man in our belief’ (Laws 52.3). In the following consideration of the
teaching of St Cyril, Hooker maintains both the importance of St Cyril’s insistence on the unity of the divinity and humanity in the single person of Christ, while repudiating any Eutychian interpretation of that unity. Hooker quotes with approval Cyril’s letter to Nestorius: ‘His two natures have knit themselves the one to the other, and are in that nearness as uncapable of confusion as of distraction. Their coherence hath not taken away the difference between them. Flesh is not become God but doth still continue flesh, although it be now the flesh of God’ (*Laws* 53.2). Anglicans continue to hold this tradition as normative today.

7 The term ‘monophysite’, which has been falsely used to describe the Christology of the Oriental Orthodox Churches, is both misleading and offensive as it implies Eutychianism. Anglicans, together with the wider oikumene, use the accurate term ‘miaphysite’ to refer to the Cyrilline teaching of the family of Oriental Orthodox Churches, and furthermore call each of these Churches by their official title of ‘Oriental Orthodox’. The teaching of this family confesses not a single nature but one incarnate united divine-human nature of the Word of God. To say ‘a single nature’ would be to imply that the human nature was absorbed in his divinity, as was taught by Eutyches.

8 We agree that God the Word became incarnate by uniting His divine uncreated nature, with its natural will and energy, to created human nature, with its natural will and energy. The union of natures is natural, hypostatic, real and perfect. The natures are distinguished in our mind in thought alone. He who wills and acts is always the one hypostasis of the Logos incarnate with one personal will. In the Armenian tradition in the 12th century St Nerses the Graceful (Shenorrhali) writes: ‘We do not think that the divine will opposes the human will and vice versa. We do not think either that the will of the one nature was different at different times, sometimes the will was divine, when He wanted to show His divine power, and sometimes it was human, when He wanted to show human humility.’

9 The perfect union of divinity and of humanity in the incarnate Word is essential to the salvation of the human race. ‘For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, so that everyone who believes in him may not perish but may have eternal life’ (John 3.16), and ‘In Christ God was reconciling the world to himself’ (2
Corinthians 5.19). The Son of God emptied himself and became human, absolutely free from sin, in order to transform our fallen humanity to the image of His holiness. This is the Gospel we are called to live and proclaim.

10 We submit this revised statement to the responsible authorities of the Oriental Orthodox Churches and the responsible authorities of the Anglican Communion for their consideration and action.
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