

EASTERN CHURCHES

News Letter

*A quarterly publication of the
Anglican and Eastern Churches Association*

No. 58. WINTER 1970/71

PRICE 12½ p TO NON-MEMBERS

CONTENTS

Editorial

Orthodoxy in America

News and Causerie

Towards Church Unity in the East

*No responsibility can be accepted either by the General Committee or by the Editor
for the views expressed by contributors*

THE ANGLICAN AND EASTERN CHURCHES
ASSOCIATION
founded in 1864

Orthodox Patron:

The Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras I

Anglican Patron:

The Archbishop of Canterbury

Anglican President:

The Bishop of London

Orthodox President:

Archbishop Athenagoras of Thyateira

Chairman of Committee:

The Revd. H. R. T. BRANDRETH, O.G.S.

General Secretary:

The Revd. P. J. MASON,
The Rectory, Stoke Newington Church Street, London N16 9ES

Treasurer:

J. S. ULLMER, ESQ.
32 Chiltley Way, Midhurst Road, Liphook, Hants.

Editor of News-Letter:

The Revd. HAROLD EMBLETON, R.N.

IN MEMORIAM

His Beatitude, The Patriarch of Antioch

On 19th September 1970 H.B. the Patriarch Theodosios VI died in Beirut, at the age of 84: ever since he suffered a cerebral haemorrhage in November 1966 the Patriarch had remained paralysed and physically helpless, and for some long time he had been living in a monastery in the Lebanon, rather than in his Patriarchate at Damascus. These circumstances contributed in no small measure to the stresses and troubles of this venerable See in recent years; but the latter should not obscure the achievements and successes of earlier years.

Born at Beirut in 1886, the late Patriarch pursued his theological studies at the Theological School at Halki. He was Metropolitan of Tyre and Sidon, and subsequently of Tripoli, before his election to the Patriarchal Throne in 1958.

During the late Patriarch's reign there has been a notable revival in the Church: outstanding has been the increasing activity and importance of the lay and youth movements, and also the revival in the religious life. Many young intellectuals have been attracted to the monastic life, and newly-founded monasteries are now flourishing.

The funeral took place in Damascus, all due respects and facilities being afforded by both the Syrian and the Lebanese Governments.

* * *

Bishop Lauriston L. Scaife, 1907-1970

The death of Laurie Scaife, as he was affectionately known, at the early age of 63, deprives the Anglican Communion of one of its most deeply respected and widely loved experts in Orthodox affairs. In the United States he, with Dr. Paul Anderson, his devoted colleague of many years, was an outstanding leader in all efforts for Anglican-Orthodox rapprochement. But throughout the Anglican Communion his advice was constantly sought in connection with all forms of Anglican-Orthodox encounter. He was a member of the Anglican Theological Commission for Joint Doctrinal Discussion with the Orthodox and was able to attend its preliminary meeting at Oxford in 1968, but ill-health prevented him from being present at its full meeting at Jerusalem in 1969; but he was able to take an interest in its working to within a few days of his death. At the 1968 Lambeth Conference he was chairman of the subcommittee on Relations with the Eastern Orthodox Church.

After studies at Gottingen and Harvard Graduate School Lauriston Scaife started his ministry as curate of St. Thomas's Church, New York, after which he was successively Rector of Trinity Church, Newport, and Calvary Church, Pittsburgh. In January 1948, he was unanimously elected on the first ballot as Bishop of Western New York. If the Church outside his diocese remembers him as a distinguished ecumenical leader, his own clergy and people will remember an outstanding pastor who was able to love them in a way it is not given to every bishop to do. I remember him once in Paris being wracked with emotion when speaking of one of his clergy who had gone wrong.

Bishop Scaife's concern for Christian Unity was by no means confined to the Orthodox Churches. He had the most cordial relations with the Polish National Catholic Church and the Polish National Catholic Bishop of Buffalo, Mgr Zielinski, now Primate of that Church, on several occasions acted for him as *locum tenens* when he was absent from his see. A tribute to his relations with the Roman Catholic Church came in 1967 when, on the occasion of the consecration of Bishop Harold B. Robinson as his Coadjutor, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Buffalo extended an invitation to hold the ceremony in his own new cathedral. Bishop Scaife's ready acceptance of the offer not only set a precedent, but also raised to a higher level Anglican-Roman Catholic relations in America.

He resigned his see in May 1970, and died on 19th September. May he rest in peace.

Henry R. T. Brandreth, o.g.s.

AN INTERNATIONAL THEOLOGICAL CONFERENCE

An international Conference of Orthodox theologians was held on the campus of Hellenic College in Brookline, Mass., from 7th to 11th September 1970. It was the first such conference since 1936 when a similar conference was held in Athens, Greece, with the prominent Orthodox theologians of that time attending. This Conference was very well attended by over 100 persons, including seven Orthodox bishops, many members of the local clergy, students of theology, and a number of distinguished non-Orthodox observers.

The Conference was sponsored by the Orthodox Theological Society in America, which is a professional society constituted primarily by Orthodox theologians, both clergymen and laymen, who teach in the Orthodox schools of theology or in other institutions of higher education. The idea of the Conference was conceived over a year ago. It immediately received enthusiastic support and became a major project of the Orthodox Theological Society in America.

In selecting the speakers, an effort was made to include prominent names who would be representative of the various segments of the Orthodox world, and who would also be able to make a vital contribution to contemporary Orthodox theology. Even though some of the people invited were not able to attend the Conference at the last minute, the Conference was, nevertheless, very representative of the Orthodox world both in this country and in Europe.

After the celebration of the Divine Liturgy on Tuesday morning, the participants were welcomed by Fr. L. C. Contos, President of Hellenic College. The Conference itself began with an address by the Revd. Dr. D. J. Constantelos, President of the Orthodox Theological Society in America. Among other things, Fr Constantelos stressed the urgent need for closer co-operation among the Orthodox Churches all over the world, and indicated that the Orthodox Theological Society in America is dedicated to this cause. Fr Constantelos added that the theological topics for discussion at the Conference are of vital importance to Orthodoxy and to Christianity in general, because they seek to express the historic Christian Faith with the framework of contemporary problems of theology and church life. Fr Constantelos concluded his address by stating that the task of the Orthodox Theological Society is to challenge contemporary Orthodoxy into a kerygmatic proclamation of the historic Christian Faith, and he identified this task with that of the Conference.

Before the first topic was introduced, H.E. Metropolitan Chrysostomos Konstantinidis, of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, conveyed the blessings and paternal greetings of His Holiness the Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras I.

The first topic was "Unity and Diversity in Orthodox Theology", presented in the afternoon by Fr Boris Bobrinskoy of St Sergius Orthodox Theological Institute in Paris and by Fr Livery Voronov of the Theological Academy in Leningrad, U.S.S.R. The discussion which followed touched primarily on the problems of Christian unity.

The second topic was "Biblical Studies in Orthodox Theology". The subject was introduced in the evening with a paper prepared by Professor Savas Agouridis of the University of Athens. Professor Veselin Kesich of St Vladimir's Orthodox Theological School in Tuckahoe, New York, and Fr. Theodore Stylianopoulos of Holy Cross Orthodox Theological School of Theology in Brookline, Mass., responded critically to the paper and aroused substantial discussion on the nature and extent of biblical criticism.

On Wednesday morning the third topic entitled "Canons: Continuity and Reform" was introduced with a brief paper prepared by Fr Damaskenos Papandreou of the inter-faith monastic community at Taize, France. Fr John Meyendorff of St Vladimir's Orthodox Theological School and Vice-President of the Orthodox

Theological Society, and Fr Maximos Aghiorgoussis, Dean of Faculty of Holy Cross Orthodox School of Theology, responded critically to the paper, presented other aspects of this critical topic, led the discussion, and answered specific questions which followed.

The afternoon of the same day the fourth topic on "Liturgy and Theology" was introduced by Fr Alexander Schmemmann, Dean of St Vladimir's. Fr Athanase Yievtich, representing the Orthodox Church of Serbia, and Dr George Bebis of Holy Cross responded critically to the paper. Interesting discussion followed which touched on many problems related to the spiritual crisis in parish life today.

On Wednesday evening the participants enjoyed a musical programme by the Byzantine Chorus of Holy Cross under the direction of Professor Savas Savas.

On Thursday morning the fifth topic on "The Church and the Secular World" was introduced by Fr Stanley Harakas of Holy Cross. The respondents to this paper were the Revd Victor Angelescu of Lawrence Institute of Technology in Southfield, Michigan, and Dr David Evans of St John's University in New York. Some very contemporary and crucial problems were raised. In the presentation, the responses and discussion which followed some steps were taken in the direction of certain solutions.

On Thursday afternoon the sixth and final topic was introduced by Dr Christos Yannaras, a young Greek theologian from Athens, whose topic on "Orthodoxy and the West" drew rather long responses from Dr Nikos Nissiotis, Director of the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey, Switzerland, and Metropolitan Chrysostomos Konstantinidis of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople.

On Thursday evening a banquet was enjoyed by all the registered participants at the Conference, at which time Archbishop Kiprian greeted the participants and extended his blessings to them, while the Archbishop Iakovos addressed the participants for a fine exemplary conference and commended the efforts of the Orthodox Theological Society in America, and pledged his constant support.

On Friday morning a hierarchical Divine Liturgy was celebrated by H.E. Archbishop Iakovos, accompanied by many of the clergymen attending the Conference.

A final session was held after the Divine Liturgy to raise and discuss topics of general interest and to make suggestions for future conferences.

The Conference was very enthusiastically received by the speakers and the many participants, including the local clergy and interested non-Orthodox observers. There was a general appeal to convene such conferences more often. The Orthodox Theological Society in America plans to publish the papers, the responses and the discussions of this conference, and hopes to sponsor another such conference in the near future.

Peter A. Chamberas
Secretary, Orth. Theol. Soc.

GREEK ORTHODOXY IN AMERICA

The Archbishop's Keynote Address

At the opening of the 20th Congress of the Greek Archdiocese of the Americas, in New York on 27th June, Archbishop Iakovos of America delivered his Keynote Address to the assembled clergy and lay delegates. After a brief report on the state of his Church today, and after referring to questions of finance, liturgical reform and education, His Eminence concluded as follows:

With this introductory statement we come to the great question: Does our Church follow the road which will lead to its perpetuation, or should it chart a new course? Can it live unto itself, without dependency upon a Mother Church, or without interdependency upon the other Orthodox Churches in America? If we should take into serious consideration the reality here, how many and what manner of readaptation should it undergo in order to be considered a serious factor in the creation of a religious life in America?

The appropriate Committee submitted for your consideration in the Workbook certain observations which, although brief, they nevertheless take a most vivid and challenging form. As the person responsible on this subject, I offer you certain thoughts, with the hope that this subject will have your serious consideration this week as well as during the two years between this 20th and the forthcoming 21st Clergy-Laity Congress. I am encouraged in this hope by the fact that there are many individuals as well as Parishes, who have already expressed their opinions on this question. I am also encouraged in my hope by the added fact that we find ourselves already faced with certain accomplished facts. Among these I shall enumerate the main ones, not only as a matter of information, but to challenge you to a dialogue, which I am initiating on this subject, effective today.

1. It is a fact that our Church is already considered by the ecclesiastical and civil leadership in the United States, Canada and South America, as a Church having its own entity, with a mission similar to theirs, which is to work for the spiritual and moral wellbeing of the people, while also working for the elimination of social injustice, illiteracy, poverty, crime and war.

2. It is a fact that our Church has two countries and two loyalties. Its two countries are Greece and America. Its two loyalties are to its tradition and to the American reality. It is common knowledge that this cannot be continued indefinitely.

3. It is a fact that its synthesis from the standpoint of its human constituency is constantly undergoing change. These changes are due to two factors: mixed marriages and the prevailing social cultural and political conditions. It is a fact that we are embracing

new ideas and new traditions. Our Church is slowly but surely becoming an indigenous Church.

4. It is a fact that our Church demands, more and more, a native-born clergy; one that is of our ethnic and religious background, but nevertheless native-born. It demands a clergy well educated in the English language. It will tolerate one with an imperfect Greek education, but he must be native-born. The clergy must be, for the most part, married, articulate, energetic, able to represent and to interpret the Church's spirit, its faith and its tradition with excellent theological preparation, with true missionary consciousness and without fanaticism or extremism.

5. It is a fact that our Church is being led, sooner or later, to a condition of autonomy, in the example of every American Church. The conditions prevailing in this land and in the countries which our Archdiocese encompasses, demand some sort of autonomy. Its needs cannot be met and appreciated from afar. The growing responsibilities placed upon the Archdiocese do not permit it to remain unresponsive or denied the strength which comes from the opinion of its clergy and laity in determining the decisions which would serve its future.

6. It is a fact that we have, already, an autocephalous Church in America, and, therefore, a new situation, which by its very nature creates dangers for the existing unity of the Orthodox as well as for the continued normal development of our ecclesiastical affairs. Only one Church which would include all Orthodox jurisdictions could properly serve these interests.

7. It is a fact that our Church is young from the standpoint of its life in America. It is a Church which numbers among its members scientists and technologists, politicians and industrialists, artists and athletes, wealthy and poor, and in every respect free people. People who themselves determine the measure and depths of their personal ties with the Church. People whose ties are established with conviction, and whose conviction becomes toil, and whose toil becomes sacrifice as long as this is not forced upon them from the outside.

8. It is a fact that our Church is uniquely governed at the Parish level by the laity who believe that they must also regulate even the religious activities of the Parishes, since this right is given them by the Charter granted by the State, which is structured on the basis of charters granted to other organisations.

9. Finally, it is a fact that our Church does not live in isolation, but rather in constant contact and relationship with other Churches—Orthodox and non-Orthodox—together with whom it works and co-operates to solve the important moral and social problems of our

times, and is developing an ecumenical conscience of its Christian obligation, inspired by the theology of reconciliation and love.

In view of the peculiarity of our situation, we are forced to responsibly and analytically discuss these facts. For I am afraid that if we clergymen and laymen fail to control their development, they may lead us ultimately to undesirable and disastrous consequences. In this spirit I submit for your consideration certain thoughts and recommendations which, when they are studied, modified and further developed, would perhaps eventually serve as those presuppositions which would prove our Church to be a viable institution and a contributing factor to the growth and expansion of our Church in the American scene.

My first thought in respect to the future of our Church in this land is that, when it is seen in the light of the decade 1970-1980, it projects nothing certain, particularly if we continue to indefinitely postpone vital solutions and readaptations. I recommend, therefore, that this Clergy-Laity Congress seriously concern itself with the immediate study of our particular situations and conditions, as they are reflected in the list of accomplished facts which I have enumerated for you, and that it proceed to freely offer its own recommendations to the chair.

My second thought which I offer for your further study and analysis is my personal conviction that it is not possible to tie together isolationism and intolerance as a viable position. Rather, we must stretch our wings, and we must believe that the open horizons invite us to the evangelism of Orthodoxy, and that we can better succeed in this effort with a united rather than a divided position and spirit.

My third thought is that our Church, without ceasing to be racially rooted in Greece and religiously in the Phanar, must believe that America is the place in which God intended it to grow and bring many more into its fold, and that it has an obligation, without compromising in matters of faith, to adapt itself to the existing conditions and needs, changing in the final analysis even the language, but never its spirit or ethos.

My fourth thought is that without a re-examination and perhaps the restructuring of our liturgical texts, and a scientific translation of them, it will be impossible to accomplish a conscientious and meaningful participation of our faithful in the worship and the spiritual life of the Church. For this reason I recommend that this Congress accord the work of the Liturgical Committee chaired by His Grace Bishop Timotheos, its full confidence and economic support.

My fifth thought and recommendation is in reference to our relationship as individuals and as Parishes, to our Institutions. These belong to all and they serve all. We are the only self-supporting Orthodox Church in the world. Let us not give this honour up, at

any price. The retention of our youth within the framework of Greek Orthodoxy is our responsibility. With this kind of resolute consideration of our debt we should not fear assimilation. It should fear us.

My sixth thought, which I submit to you my beloved co-workers in the Lord, is that we throw off our hesitancy and fear in terms of the preparation and quality of our clergy, which we need. If you believe that college training is unnecessary, then the Hellenic College must be abandoned. If you consider it necessary, then it must be supported and encouraged with all our strength. Theological education was never one-sided—it has always had two aspects: the secular and the religious.

My seventh thought is that if this Congress approves, our Church must submit to the Great Church of Christ, the Ecumenical Patriarchate, the request that the Holy Synod concern itself promptly with the developing situation in America in view of the creation of the Autocephalous Orthodox Church of America. Any apathy in this regard would contribute to the deterioration of Orthodox unity in America.

My eighth and final thought, suggestion and exhortation which I offer to all, is that time waits for no one! The personal intensive living of our Orthodoxy offers the only possibility of its survival in America. That in our various discussions, deliberations and meetings we must be wary of him who would prove to be "the one who would spoil us through philosophy and vain deceit" (Col ii 8). That we must not forget the fact that today's crisis has its roots in St. Paul's statement that "we wrestle not against flesh and blood but against principalities, against powers, against rulers of the darkness of this world" (Eph vi 12). And finally, that the words of our Lord must ever echo vividly in our souls, "Behold, I make all things new" (Rev xxi 5), and that there is no more sacred duty to God, to history and to ourselves than to "be transformed by the renewing of our mind" (Rom xii 2).

A PROTESTANT COMMENT ON THE 20th CONGRESS

The following article, translated from the German, was circulated by the World Council of Churches' "Ecumenical Press Service":

ROOTED IN GREECE BUT SERVING IN AMERICA

The discussion began last summer at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York. At stake was the future of Greek Orthodoxy in the USA. Its representatives – under heavy pressure from "the American

reality" – showed themselves unexpectedly eager for reform, and so sparked off a controversy in which the last word has by no means been spoken.

Champions of the proposed reforms applauded them as an "exodus from the ethnic ghetto", opponents denounced them as a "betrayal of their Greek heritage". The latter were, however, in the minority at the Waldorf-Astoria.

The overwhelming majority of the 1000 delegates—both priests and laity—at the 20th Congress of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America favoured:

- the use of English and other vernacular tongues (especially Spanish) throughout the entire liturgy;

- the first comprehensive reform of liturgical texts since the fall of Constantinople in 1453;

- a greater degree of "autonomy" vis-a-vis the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, the Archdiocese's ecclesiastical superior since its formation in 1921.

"Our Church is slowly but surely becoming an indigenous church", commented 58-year-old Archbishop Iakovos, head of the Archdiocese, when opponents accused him of "separatist tendencies" and a section of the press in Athens termed even the partial use of the vernacular in church services a "national betrayal", which would cause the national consciousness of the Greeks in America to die out.

At a press conference in Athens, Archbishop Iakovos stressed that the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America wished, by means of the reforms, to take account of changes due to the extensive assimilation of American Greeks. Although the liturgical reform was principally to enable congregations—especially young people—to take a more active part in church services, the gradual introduction of the vernacular (wherever priests considered it appropriate) acknowledged that many young people, and others who had become Orthodox Christians through mixed marriages, did not understand Greek.

At the New York Congress, Iakovos had stressed that divided loyalty represented a serious problem for the Church in America, which could not be continued indefinitely. In fact, fewer and fewer young people could understand the strong desire, felt predominantly by the older generation, to preserve the Greek heritage—history, culture, language and folk dances. Undoubtedly conscious of their tradition, many young people shared the view expressed to the Congress by a college student that the Orthodox faith must take primacy over cultural heritage. He said that if the Church did not take appropriate action, "we are going to have children who are neither Greek nor Orthodox". Other youth delegates said linguistic diversity in the ecumenical age is a stumbling-block to union with other Orthodox Christians in the USA.

But the decisive word in the debate remains with the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. Its answer to the proposed reforms was interpreted by some to be a flat refusal: to others it appeared to be a compromise formula. At any rate, it hardly meets the high hopes of those Greeks in America who feel that the reforms are essential.

On the use of the vernacular, the letter from the Patriarchate states that the measures adopted in 1964, at the Congress of the Archdiocese in Denver, remain in force. That is, the use of English (or the appropriate vernacular) in sermons, Scripture readings and certain prayers, the rest of the liturgy to be in Greek as before. Greek therefore remains the official language of the Church.

The findings of the American committee presently working on a revision of the liturgical texts should, according to instructions from the Patriarchate, be submitted for approval to the next Great Pan-Orthodox Council announced some time ago. This means delaying a definite decision for an unspecified period.

As to the question of autonomy, the Holy Synod of the Patriarchate noted that, according to its constitution, the Archdiocese is under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate in all church and administrative matters. Any misunderstandings which had arisen as a result of incomplete or distorted press reports regarding these and other matters could, according to the Holy Synod, be cleared up by referring to the constitution.

It should be added that while the New York Congress approved the principle of greater autonomy, no one in the USA at the present time expected such autonomy immediately; nor was the Patriarch asked to grant it. Archbishop Iakovos had told the Congress: "our Church is being led, sooner or later, to a condition of autonomy by the example of every American Church". And he added, "without ceasing to be rooted racially in Greece and religiously in the Phanar our Church must believe that America is the place in which God intended it to grow and bring many more into its fold. It has an obligation, without compromising in matters of faith, to adapt to existing conditions and needs, changing in the final analysis even the language but never its spirit or ethos".

The urgency of the matter is clearly evident, however, from these words by the Archbishop: "the conditions prevailing in this land and in the countries which our Archdiocese encompasses, demand some form of autonomy. The need cannot be met and appreciated from afar".

The question is of particular interest due to the Moscow Patriarchate's recent action creating an independent autocephalous in America which seeks to unite the various ethnic Orthodox groups under its umbrella. This forces the other Churches to reconsider their own positions. Said Iakovos to the Congress: "we now have an autocephalous Church in America and therefore a new situation

which creates dangers for the existing Orthodox unity as well as for the continued normal development of our ecclesiastical affairs. Only one Church which would include all Orthodox jurisdictions could properly serve these interests".

The diversity of the ethnic jurisdictions—the result of emigration—contradicts the Orthodox notion of *one* (local) church in *one* place. Nor is the desire for greater cohesion new in the USA. In 1960 Archbishop Iakovos and other high Orthodox officials summoned a Standing Conference of Orthodox Bishops as an instrument of co-operation and a pioneer of living unity. In 1968 the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese voted for a "united Western Synod" under the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

Now, with the creation of the autocephalous Orthodox Church of America, the idea of a "provisional Synod" has again been put forward. The Standing Conference sent a written request to all the old-world Orthodox Patriarchs asking that a date be set for the planned Pan-Orthodox Council, so that it could vote on the proposal for forming a provisional Synod. According to Archbishop Iakovos, this could lead to a regular Synod as the general organ of all Orthodox Christians in the USA, and finally to the creation of a single autocephalous (i.e. independent of all jurisdictions) Orthodox Church.

In the present situation this may be the only alternative to joining the "Orthodox Church in America", a solution which would certainly be rejected by the majority of Greek Orthodox Christians. This would, however, push the decision on the amalgamation of American Orthodoxy further into the future. It is safe to predict that the discussion on the immediate concerns of the Archdiocese, i.e. including its right to administrative self-determination, will make fresh headlines sooner or later.

A REACTION BY METROPOLITAN IRENEY

Metropolitan Ireney, Primate of the Orthodox Church in America (formerly the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church in America), in a letter to the Archbishop Iakovos of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, has commented on certain decisions taken at the 20th Archdiocesan Congress.

The use of the vernacular in the services of the Church would bring the Greeks into line with the general practice of the other Orthodox in America, some of whom have been doing so since the turn of the century. But he expresses serious reservations about the projected "liturgical reforms", similar to those which have taken place recently in the Roman Catholic Church. Such changes are not within the competence of any individual Archbishop, not even

party's veneration of certain teachers who have been condemned or anathematised by the other. Quite possibly it may not be necessary formally to lift these anathemas, nor for these teachers to be recognised as saints by the side which condemned them. But the restoration of Communion clearly implies, among other things that the formal anathemas and condemnation of teachers venerated by the other side should be terminated—as in the cases of Leo, Dioscoros, Severus and others.

“(c) It is recognised that jurisdiction ought not to be considered simply as an administrative question, but that it also bears on the question of ecclesiology in some ways. The traditional model of territorial autonomy or autocephaly can be justified on grounds pragmatical as well as theological. In the first centuries, the outward sign of local unity was the possession of a bishop, with a college of presbyters joining in a single Eucharist. In later times, however, pragmatical considerations made it necessary in certain circumstances to have more than one bishop and one Eucharist in a city; but it is important that the norm demanded by the nature of the Church was maintained, at least in principle, and expressed in Eucharistic Communion and in local conciliar structures.

“The Church's universal Tradition does not require uniformity in every detail of doctrinal formulation, way of worship and canonical practice. But the bounds of pluralist variations should be made more explicit, in the realms of worship, credal terminology, spirituality, canonical practice, administrative and jurisdictional forms, and other structural or formal expressions of tradition, wherein are contained the names of the Church's teachers and Saints.

Towards a declaration of reconciliation

“We reaffirm the proposal made by the consultation at Bristol that one course for our two families of Churches is to set up an official joint commission to examine those matters which have divided us in the past, to discuss our mutual agreements and disagreements, and to see whether the degree of agreement is sufficient to justify the drawing up of an explicit statement of reconciliation: this would not have the status of a confession of faith or of a dogmatic definition, but it could serve as the basis from which our Churches could set their course necessary to unite us in a Common Eucharist.

“We have directed attention to certain questions which demand an official decision in such a declaration of reconciliation. Its fundamental content would be, naturally, the common Christological agreement: it would be made clear that there would be no innovation from either side, but rather an explicit statement of what had been preserved by both sides through the centuries, as attested by the liturgical and patristic documents. The common

understanding of Christology is the fundamental basis for the Church's life, orthodoxy and unity.

“Such a declaration of reconciliation could be made up from the theology of St Cyril of Alexandria as well as from the formulations used in the Formula of Agreement of 433 between St Cyril and John of Antioch, the terminology used in the four later Councils, and the patristic and liturgical texts of both sides. Such a terminology would, not be used ambiguously in order to conceal a real disagreement, but rather as a help to demonstrate the agreement already existing.”

NEWS AND CAUSERIE

ECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE

In the last weeks of 1970, the Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate elected no less than eleven new Bishops.

The Great Protosynkellos (i.e. Chancellor) Agapios Ioannidis the Great Archdeacon Evangelos Galanis, the Patriarchal Deacon Kallinikos Alexandridis, the Abbot Stylianos Harkianakis of the Vlatodon Monastery at Thessaloniki and Archimandrite Damaskenos Papandreou (director of the Orthodox Centre in Geneva) were all made Titular Bishops with the titles of ancient and illustrious sees.

In England, Archimandrite Grigorios Theocharous (Chancellor of the Archdiocese of Thyateira) becomes Bishop of Tropaion and Archimandrite Chrysostomos Mavroyiannopoulos (Rector of S Andrew's London) becomes Bishop of Kyaneaia, both to serve as Assistant Bishops to the Archbishop of Thyateira.

Other new Assistant Bishops are Archimandrite Jeremias Kalligeorgis (for France), Archimandrite Gennadios Zervos of Naples (for Austria) Archimandrite Christodoulos Kaloyerakis (for America), and Archimandrite Panteleimon Sklanos (for Australia).

ALEXANDRIA

A complete translation of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom into Swahili has been published in roneotype by Archimandrite Chrysostomos Papasarantopoulos who has spent the last ten years working as a missionary in Uganda and Kenya. It was used first, by the translator, on 2nd August 1970 in the township of Mkutani in the Kongwa district of Tanzania.

ANTIOCH

On 25th September 1970, the Holy Synod met in Damascus to elect as their new Patriarch the Metropolitan Elias of Aleppo. Some of our members will recall that the new Patriarch visited England officially in 1952: the Editor remembers it well since he had the

of the Ecumenical Patriarch; for they come under the realm of doctrine, thus precluding the possibility of mutation.

With reference to the question of Orthodox jurisdictional unity in America, Metropolitan Ireney wrote that an autocephalous Orthodox Church already exists in America, and that it was the practical way to achieve such unity. Without, however, wanting to force anyone into this canonical unity, the Orthodox Church in America retains normal relations with other Orthodox groups there, through its membership of the Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in the Americas.

CONTACTS BETWEEN ORTHODOX AND NON-CHALCEDONIANS

INTER-ORTHODOX JOINT COMMISSION

The Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate has decided to summon, during the first ten days of January 1971, the Inter-Orthodox Commission for Dialogue with the Oriental non-Chalcedonian Churches. Originally Alexandria was chosen as its venue; but later, with the Emperor's approval, it was decided to hold the meeting in Addis Ababa, capital of the country with the largest non-Chalcedonian Church.

In line with the findings of the Pan-Orthodox Conferences especially the Fourth held at Chambesy in 1968, the Commission's task will be:

- (1) the clarification of common points of faith; and
- (2) the definition of "dogmatic, canonical, liturgical and other differences . . . especially those to do with the Christological dogma, the authority of the Seven Ecumenical Councils and the possibility of the coexistence of several Patriarchates in the same territory".

These Oriental Churches, of course, have not recognised the Fourth Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon in 451, which dealt with the Christological question, i.e. the two natures, divine and human, in Jesus Christ.

The non-Chalcedonian Churches comprise:

- (1) "the Coptic Orthodox Church of Alexandria"—3,500,000 members, under Patriarch Cyril, who resides in Cairo;
- (2) "the Orthodox Church of Ethiopia"—14 million members, under Patriarch Basil, who resides in Addis Ababa;
- (3) "the Armenian Orthodox Church"—3 million members, under Catholicos Vazgen I, who resides at Etchmiadzin, in Soviet Armenia;

- (4) "the Syrian Orthodox Church"—200,000 members, in the Middle East and in Western countries, under Patriarch Ignatios Yakub;
- (5) "the Syrian Orthodox Church in India"—1,250,000 members under Catholicos Basil, who resides in Kottayam, India.

CONTACTS IN RUMANIA

In March and April 1970, the Director of the Theological Seminary at Kottayam (Fr Paul Verghese) was the guest in Rumania of Patriarch Justinian. He gave two lectures to the Bucharest and Sibiu Institutes, on "Christology, the mystery of the Incarnation" and "Towards unity in the Eucharist". He also met members of the Orthodox theological commission for unity with the non-Chalcedonian Churches.

In early May, Bishop Karekin Sarkissian was also the guest of the Rumanian Patriarchate. He delivered three lectures to the students of the Bucharest Theological Institute: "Witness and contribution of the Oriental non-Chalcedonian Churches to the ecumenical movement", "The problem of bringing together the two groups of Eastern Churches (Byzantine and non-Chalcedonian)", and "Christian Armenia's role in Eastern Christianity".

On 7th May, Bishop Sarkissian attended a lecture given by Fr Coman, Professor of Patrology, on accepting the Councils: afterwards he expressed his deep satisfaction at finding that Rumanian theologians were systematically studying relations with the non-Chalcedonian Churches.

UNOFFICIAL DISCUSSIONS

Although the meetings in Addis Ababa in January 1971 will be the first to be held by the Inter-Orthodox Commission for Dialogue with the non-Chalcedonian Churches, there have been already three sets of meetings between theologians from both sides: at Aarhus in 1964, at Bristol in 1967, and at Geneva in 1970.

At the latter meeting, the subjects for discussion and the papers read were as follows:

- (1) an analysis of historical developments before and after the Council of Chalcedon (Prof. V. C. Samuel and G. Konidaris);
- (2) the distinction between Definitions and Canons, and its significance in accepting the Council of Chalcedon (Prof. J. Karmiris and N. Chitescu);
- (3) ecclesiological problems for Orthodox and non-Chalcedonian Churches (Prof. Fr Paul Verghese and Dr J. Zizioulas);

(4) canonical problems (Pierre l'Huillier, Bishop of Chersonese);

(5) historical-theological study of the Armenian Church's anathemas against the Fourth Ecumenical Council (Archimandrite Dr. D. Papandreou).

The discussions served to underline both the agreements and the differences between the two traditions; and this will assist materially the impending official discussions in Addis Ababa.

The conclusions of the Genevan meeting is here reproduced in full.

FINDINGS OF THE CONVERSATIONS AT GENEVA

"We have reaffirmed our agreements, at Aarhus and Bristol, on the substance of our common Christology. In the essential Christological dogma, in spite of fifteen centuries of separation, our two Churches continue to find themselves in complete agreement with the universal tradition of the one, undivided Church. We both affirm St Cyril's teaching on the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ, although we use different terminology in order to explain this doctrine. We both teach that He who is consubstantial with the Father as regards His divinity also became consubstantial with us as regards His humanity through the Incarnation; that He who was begotten of the Father before all ages was born in these latter days of the Holy Virgin Mary, for us and for our salvation; and that in Him the two natures are united in the one person (i.e. *hypostasis*) of the Divine Logos, without confusion, change, division or separation. Jesus Christ is perfect God and perfect man, with all the properties and faculties which belong to Divinity and humanity.

"The human will and energy of Christ were neither absorbed nor suppressed by His divine will and energy, nor were the former opposed to the latter: they were both united, in perfect accord without division or confusion. He who wills and acts is always the one *hypostasis* of the Incarnate Word. The one is Emmanuel, God and Man, our Lord and Saviour, whom we adore and to whom we give worship, who is also one of us.

"We are convinced that our agreement goes beyond Christological doctrine to embrace other aspects of the authentic tradition although we have not discussed all the questions in detail. But in visiting one another, and in studying each other's liturgical traditions and theological and spiritual writings, we have rediscovered, with a feeling of gratitude towards God, our mutual agreement within the common Tradition of the One Church on all the important points—liturgy and spirituality, doctrine and canonical practice—in our understanding of the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, the

Person and Work of the Holy Spirit, the nature of the Church as the Communion of Saints with its ministry and sacraments, and on the life of the world to come when our Lord and Saviour will come in all His glory.

"We pray that the Holy Spirit may lead us together to find our unity fully within the one Body of Christ. Our mutual agreement is not merely verbal or intellectual: it is a deep agreement which can demand of our two Churches that they achieve union by reuniting two lines of tradition which have been separated the one from the other for so long, for historical reasons. We are working in the hope that our Lord will grant us complete unity so that together we may celebrate this unity in the Common Eucharist. That is our ardent desire and our final aim.

Some differences

"In spite of our agreement as to the substance of Tradition, the long period of separation has led to certain differences in the formal expression of this tradition. They have to do with three fundamental matters of ecclesiology: (a) the implications and the place of certain Councils in the life of the Church, (b) the anathematising or the canonising of certain controversial teachers in the Church, and (c) jurisdictional questions which relate to the manifestation of the Church's unity at the local, regional and universal levels.

"(a) Some theologians in the Orthodox Church have drawn attention to the fact that for them the Church teaches that the Seven Ecumenical Councils, which they recognise, have an internal coherence and continuity which makes them a single and indivisible complex; and this must be taken into account as part of the sum of dogmatic definition. However, some theologians of the Oriental Orthodox Church (i.e. non-Chalcedonian Churches *Ed.*) consider that the authentic Christological tradition has long been preserved by them on the basis of the Three Ecumenical Councils, complemented by the Church's liturgical and patristic tradition. We hope that further study will lead to a solution of this problem by decision of our Churches.

"As for the Councils and their authority for tradition, we are all agreed that the Councils could better be seen as charismatic events in the life of the Church, than as an authority set over the Church: where some Councils have been recognised by the Church's tradition as being true Councils, whether ecumenical or local, their authority should be seen as deriving from the Holy Spirit. A distinction must be made not only between doctrinal definitions and canonical regulations as made by a Council, but also between its real intention in defining dogmatically and the particular terminology in which that is expressed—the latter having less authority than the intention.

"(b) The reunification of the two traditions, which possess their own separate continuity, raises some problems with regard to one

privilege of being his host at Wimbledon during the Archbishop's stay in London.

His election was received with great satisfaction in Orthodox circles where he is a popular personality. Having been at the head of the delegations of the Church of Antioch to the Pan-Orthodox consultations, His Beatitude is better placed than others to make a greater contribution on the part of the Church of Antioch to all forms of Pan-Orthodox collaboration and to the preparations for the Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church which is the dominant theme in Orthodoxy in these days.

In his Eirenic Letter to the Ecumenical Patriarch, Patriarch Elias IV of Antioch stressed his resolve to do all in his power to ensure that the local Orthodox Churches would work together to resolve Orthodoxy's pressing problems, in order that she might afford her vital witness to the modern world.

"We have an imperative duty", he said "whatever the cost or the sacrifice demanded, to fill the vacuum which now exists in the hearts of men, especially the young: to fill it with the myrrh which our Holy Church has in the seven sacraments. May she be preserved from any limitation of herself to external matters from satisfaction with outward splendour and from any self-reduction of her mission within the confines of a purely theoretical dogmatism".

* * *

During October the Holy Synod at its regular meetings, decided to set up five Commissions, each under a Metropolitan. They would be consultative commissions for the study of many problems in various fields, and they would pass on the fruits of their work either to the Holy Synod or to the Patriarch. Each chairman would have authority to co-opt or to consult any expert person, be he bishop or priest or layman. Under the chairmanship of Metropolitan Ignatios (Hazim) of Lattakia (and Rector of the Balamand Theological Faculty), the Ecumenical Commission has already begun its meetings.

SERBIA

In 1970 the Serbian Orthodox Church celebrated the Jubilee of the re-establishment of its Patriarchate. In March 1920 the Ecumenical Patriarchate had recognised "the declared union of the autocephalous Churches of Serbia, Montenegro and Karlovci, as well as the two dioceses in Dalmatia" and hence recognised "the united Autocephalous Church of Serbia". After its canonical recognition as autocephalous and united, the Holy Synod of the Hierarchy solemnly proclaimed the Serbian Patriarchate at Sremski Karlovci on 12th September 1920: it had been abolished in 1766.

On 11th September 1970, Bishop Aimilianos of Timok, in eastern Serbia, died at the age of 84. Consecrated to Timok in 1921, he remained there until his death; and he was the oldest Bishop of his Church.

RUMANIA

Professor Athanasios Negoitza, of the Bucharest Orthodox Theological Faculty, recently proposed the creation in Jerusalem of a "Biblical Institute supported by all the Orthodox". He points out that other Christian denominations maintain schools for Biblical Studies in the Holy Land, but that Orthodoxy has had nothing comparable since the First World War.

"What are we proposing? That the theological Academy in the Convent of the Holy Cross be re-established as soon as possible to become an Institute of higher Biblical Studies for the Orthodox Church. All future teachers of Biblical subjects in Orthodox theological faculties should be obliged to have studied there for at least two years".

BULGARIA

On 10th July 1970, the Patriarch Cyril of Bulgaria was elected a Fellow of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, in recognition of his many published contributions to the history of the Bulgarian Church and nation.

* * *

Bishop Stefan of Glavinitsa, who was also the General Secretary of the Holy Synod of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, died on 20th August 1970.

FINLAND

Our correspondent in Helsinki writes: The General Ecclesiastical Assembly of the Orthodox Church of Finland, which meets every five years, met for some ten days in August 1970. Much of the business was of an economic nature, but noteworthy also were matters which concern many important activities of our Church.

Bishop John Lapland was elected by the Assembly to be the new Bishop of Helsinki, where he had been *locum tenens* already for several months. The Archbishop of Finland has confirmed the appointment, and Bishop John has also received a letter of authority for his new see from the President of the Finnish Republic. The new Bishop was born in 1923 and has studied in Finland, Britain, USA, Greece and USSR.

H.E. Archbishop Paul of Karelia and all Finland made a journey during the summer to USA, where he was present at the canonisation of Fr Herman, a Russian monk who went to Alaska in 1793 and spent the rest of his life there as a missionary.

In June, Bishop John spent four weeks in Greece, where he met some of the Greek Bishops and stayed for several days at the Monastery of St John the Theologian in Patmos, to whose Brotherhood he belongs. Earlier in the year he made two visits to Leningrad at the invitation of Metropolitan Nikodim.

In Helsinki there are plans for a new small monastery (a *skete* of the venerable Monastery of Valamo) to be built near the city. On the one hand, this would represent the traditional monastic life, i.e. prayer, devotion and meditation: on the other hand, some of its activity would be directed outwards. The monastery would also contain the Bishop's home and office. It would also accept, for short stays, people who need a few days' retreat in a monastic atmosphere. The question of sufficient funds for the realisation of the plans still remains open.

ETHIOPIA

H.B. the Abuna Basilios, Patriarch of the Ethiopian Church, died in mid-October: in the last years of a very long life he had been long bedridden. The *locum tenens* of the Patriarchal Throne is the Abuna Theophilos, Archbishop of Harar.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Editor acknowledges gratefully the various items of information, and the generous permission to reproduce them, which he receives from *Episkepsis*, the news-sheet published by the Orthodox Centre in Geneva, as well as from the Orthodox journals published in America, and from the WCC's *Ecumenical Press Service*.

AIMS OF THE ASSOCIATION

The Association exists to raise members of the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches for the following objects:

- (a) The principal object for which the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Association is established is the advancement of the Christian religion, in particular by means of fostering the members of the Anglican Church and those of the Eastern Orthodox Church the doctrinal worship and way of life of the other.
- (b) The Association exists also to raise members of the two Churches to prayer and work in order to advance the spiritual object with a view to promotion of better unity between them.

SOME METHODS OF HELPING THE WORK

1. By joining the Association and giving others to help.
 2. By arranging for a meeting in the neighbourhood where a lecture may be given on the Eastern Churches and their work and the objects of the Association.
 3. By asking the Parochial Authorities to provide a regular collection every year either in the service or otherwise in the church.
 4. By sending in local courses for the study of Eastern Churches, their work and for instruction for laymen.
- Lectures - with or without visual aids - can be arranged by writing to the General Secretary.

SUBSCRIPTION

The minimum annual subscription is £1, but none will be expected solely on account of inability to pay this amount, which it is hoped that those who can afford to pay more will do so.

All members receive the *Eastern Churches Week Letter*, which is published quarterly.

AIMS OF THE ASSOCIATION

The Association exists to unite members of the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches for the following objects:

- (a) The principal object for which the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association is established is the advancement of the Christian religion, in particular by means of teaching the members of the Anglican Church and those of the Eastern Orthodox Church the doctrine, worship and way of life of the other.
- (b) The Association exists also to unite members of the two Communion in prayer and work in achieving the principal object, with a view to promotion of visible unity between them.

SOME METHODS OF HELPING THE WORK

1. By joining the Association and getting others to join.
2. By arranging for a meeting in the neighbourhood, when a lecture may be given on the Eastern Churches and Reunion, and the objects of the Association explained.
3. By asking the Parochial Authorities to promise a Sunday collection every year either in the service or afterwards at the doors.
4. By uniting in local centres for the study of Eastern Christendom, and for Intercession for Reunion.

Lectures – with or without visual aids – can be arranged by writing to the General Secretary.

SUBSCRIPTION

The minimum annual subscription is £1, but none will be excluded solely on account of inability to pay this amount, while it is hoped that those who can afford to pay more will do so.

All members receive the *Eastern Churches News Letter* which is published quarterly.