

mostrated the existence of Byzantine originals for the earliest Slavic melismatic chants and showed how the Byzantine models are transformed in the Slavic poetry and music.—Finally Professor Francis Dvornik examined mainly from the historian's point of view the 1948 *Archaeological Discoveries in the Territories of Great Moravia* and connected some of the findings with the Byzantine mission or with Byzantine influence in general.

Some of the papers (summaries of which were distributed in advance to the participants of the Symposium) are to be published in the next issue of the *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*.

Alexandria, Virginia

JOHN DEMUS

### THE 3rd PANORTHODOX CONFERENCE AT RHODES

At the 3rd Panorthodox Conference at Rhodes representatives of fourteen separate, independent Churches were assembled. The Churches were: The Oecumenical Patriarchate, the Patriarchates of Alexandria, of Antiochea, of Jerusalem, of Moscow, of Serbia, of Roumania, of Bulgaria, and the Archdioceses of Cyprus, of Greece, of Poland, of Georgia, of Czechoslovakia and of Finland.

After a series of meetings (1-15 Nov. 1964) with closed doors, the Conference reached historic decisions on the three main points of its agenda. Concerning the *dialogue* with the Anglican Church it was decided to set up a Committee of Orthodox representatives. It is well-known that the first contacts between the Orthodox and the Anglican Churches date from the early XVIII century, but proved fruitless at their start. Subsequently they were rendered more frequent, especially within the last forty years, and gradually proved more rewarding, isolated and incidental though they were. The committee that will now be set up will undertake officially and in the name of the whole body of Orthodoxy the duty of the preparation of talks by means of the study of symbolic, dogmatic and liturgical books, as well as of data referring to previous meetings and will open talks with the relevant committee of the Anglican Church.

At the Conference it was decided that a similar Committee of Orthodox representatives be formed to start official talks with a relevant Committee of the Old Catholic Church. At meetings held ninety years or so ago, shortly after the founding of the Old Catholic Church, some kind of rapprochement had been achieved with the Orthodox Churches. It was then that the Old Catholics as a gesture of good-will deleted the word *filioque* from the

Creed. It can be foreseen that from now on the progress of talks with the latter will be faster.

The decision for the beginning of talks with the Roman Catholic Church does not suggest the appointment forthwith of a Committee for this purpose but is all the same an important move in itself. Its main points of importance are three:

First the basic recognition of the need for a dialogue, a recognition which is a basic element of Orthodoxy.

Second the recognition of the need for a necessary preparation and creation of suitable conditions for the starting of the talks. Hesitations expressed in reports are understandable and justified in view of the fact that no other discussions with the Roman Catholic Church have preceded. On the other hand serious reasons are attached to the reservations and hesitations of many an Orthodox leader for the prospective dialogue. These are, shortage of specialist theologians who can be entrusted with the carrying out of the talks; the age-long burdening of the consciences of the two Churches in the course of nine centuries of separation; the fear of the *Unia* which is especially present in the Churches of Central Europe where the Orthodox live in the midst of preponderant Roman Catholic populations; lack of appreciation of the other Churches' claim to equality of status by certain authorities at Rome; also adverse political conditions in some countries.

Hints by newspaper reporters on rivalry between the Churches of Constantinople and Moscow which were repeated concerning the prospective dialogue, are baseless: The Oecumenical Patriarch has no primacy of authority but only of honour and this is recognized by all Orthodox at all occasions. His primacy gives him the right and charges him with the duty of taking up initiative and responsibility in the dealing with and settling of the main problems that concern the whole of Orthodoxy. Such action is at all times sanctioned by the free expression of opinion of all local Churches and a direct result of this was the manifestation of the Unity of Orthodoxy at the three Panorthodox Conferences at Rhodes.

Third comes the recognition to the various Orthodox Churches of the right to maintain friendly relations with the Roman Catholic Churches, co-operate with them in the social and practical fields and join with them at unofficial meetings as was formerly done with the Anglicans and the Old Catholics. Certainly in the last few years a common representation of Orthodoxy was achieved in matters of such importance, a representation which through many centuries, historic conditions had rendered impossible. Now it may be thought that this decision leaves a door open for a likely return of the Churches to the older tendencies of separatism. Such an assumption should be un-

founded, for the Orthodox system of organization includes in it the concepts of both independence and unity. It is, therefore, anticipated that what has earlier been done with the two other Churches will be now materialized concerning the Roman Catholic Church. Private contact will effect the necessary preparations that is indispensable for future co-operation and this it is hoped will occur at a time not quite so distantly remote.

University of Thessaloniki

P. C. CHRISTOU

### L'ACTIVITÉ DE L' «INSTITUT HELLÉNIQUE DE VENISE»

Nous n' allons pas donner ici encore une fois l'histoire de la fondation de l' "Institut hellénique d'études byzantines et postbyzantines de Venise" ni l'histoire de la "Confrérie de St. Nicolas ou Nation grecque," vu que tout cela a déjà été traité dans le guide de notre Musée d' Icônes du Campo dei Greci, dans la Préface du livre de M. Manolis Chatzidakis "Icônes de Saint-Georges de Venise et de la collection de l'Institut," de même lors de différentes conférences tenues à Athènes, à Thessaloniki, à la Canée et encore dans une communication faite à Paris, à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres (Comptes rendus des séances de l'année 1960). Nous citerons seulement quelques dates pour rappeler à l'esprit de nos lecteurs certains faits qui expliquent la présence d'une fondation d'études supérieures grecques à Venise et son activité depuis 1959.

La "Confrérie de Saint-Nicolas ou Nation grecque" a été fondée en 1495 et a connu des siècles de gloire pendant lesquels on peut dire qu'elle a fait de Venise, pour la nation subjuguée, une espèce de capitale. Elle n'a périclité qu'au moment où, grâce à la Révolution de 1821, un Etat grec indépendant a été fondé. Quand en 1948, après la seconde guerre mondiale, le gouvernement grec permettait à celui d'Italie la réouverture à Athènes de la *Casa d'Italia* et de l'*Ecole italienne d'archéologie*, il acquerrait à son tour le droit d'organiser à Venise un Institut d'études byzantines et post-byzantines (Accord Sforza-Capsalis).

En 1951 le roi Paul signait un décret (*Gazette Officielle* du 19 avril) par lequel une personne de droit public était créée sous le nom de : "Institut hellénique d'études byzantines et post-byzantines." Le directeur, nommé par décret royal provoqué par le Ministre de l' Instruction publique et celui des Affaires Etrangères, devait être "un savant de valeur reconnue, spécialisé dans les études byzantines et postbyzantines" et proposé par l'Académie d'Athènes. Le regretté Gérassime Messinis, né à Leucade, alors président de la Con-