



E.C.N.L.

THE JOURNAL OF THE
ANGLICAN AND EASTERN
CHURCHES ASSOCIATION

New Series No. 10
Spring 1980
£1.00 to non-members.

ISSN No.
0012-8732

Cover design by David Tutill

The Anglican and Eastern Churches Association

founded in 1864

Orthodox Patron: The Oecumenical Patriarch

Anglican Patron: The Archbishop of Canterbury

Anglican President: The Bishop of Basingstoke

Orthodox President: Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain

Chairman of Committee: The Revd. H. EMBLETON, M.A.
The Vicarage, 17 Victoria Drive,
Bognor Regis, West Sussex, PO21 2KH

General Secretary: The Revd. A. T. J. SALTER, A.K.C.,
87 Richmond Avenue, London N1 0LX

Assistant Secretary: The Revd. DOM CUTHBERT FEARON, O.S.B.,
Nashdom Abbey, Burnham, Bucks. SL1 8NL

Treasurer: SIMON BREARLEY, ESQ.,
9 Emperor's Gate, London SW 7

Editor of E.C.N.L.: H. GRAHAM FLEGG, M.A., D.C.AE., C.ENG.,
The Open University, Walton Hall,
Milton Keynes MK7 6AA

Contents

	Page
Editorial	1
The Chairman's Notes	2
The General Secretary's Notes	3
The Assistant Secretary's Notes	7
News Items	10
Reports and Communiqués	13
Book Reviews	25
Reviews of Recorded Music	33
Vocations to Ministry	36
Unity in Differentiation	40
Towards the Great and Holy Council: Part 1	42
Notices	48
Letter to the Editor	49

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

Eastern Churches News Letter

EDITORIAL

Reference to the inside of the front cover of this issue of *ECNL* will show that there have been several changes in the Officers of the Association. Our previous President, the Bishop of St. Albans, is now, as Archbishop of Canterbury, to be our Patron. We now welcome the Bishop of Basingstoke as our new Anglican President. The death of Archbishop Athenagoras has necessitated a change in Orthodox President also, and we welcome Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain as his successor. Finally, *ECNL* has a new Editor who is currently facing the difficult task of maintaining the very high standards set by his predecessor.

There is no intention to change the overall policy for the *News Letter*. Its main purpose, as its title indicates, is to provide news of the various Eastern Churches, and this will certainly rank high in its continuing programme. Room will continue to be found for review articles and for shorter reviews of books, and it is intended to include extracts from books and other publications which can make a contribution to Anglican-Orthodox dialogue. A new feature will be reviews of Eastern Church music, including recordings, and 'Letters to the Editor' will be considered for publication. Theological articles of a suitable standard of content and English will still be welcome, but intending contributors should bear in mind the aims of the Association which *ECNL* is intended to serve.

We are now facing the aftermath of the shocks given to Anglican-Orthodox relations by the worst excesses of Anglican liberal theology and the ordination of women in America and elsewhere. This is therefore a time for prayerful reflection on the aims of the Association and on the order of priority which should be given to the different means of achieving those aims. It should be a time of continuing friendship and mutual encouragement despite apparent setbacks. Indeed, it is essential that Anglicans and Orthodox deepen their understanding of the problems which they face individually and together. The realization that these are problems which man cannot solve by himself will do much to ensure that we remain open to the working of the Holy Spirit within the world. It may in the long run be for the best that the progress towards Anglican-Orthodox visible unity has been temporarily halted, perhaps to proceed in the future within a wider ecumenical context.

Meanwhile the Association has a continuing important role to play, along with the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius. The two bodies have distinct and complementary aims, but it is important that they maintain close mutual contact and support. Fortunately,

there is some overlap within the governing bodies of these organizations and much overlap within the overall membership. Care must be taken to ensure that this situation continues. The special character of the Fellowship helps to keep the wider ecumenical perspective to the fore within a more informal context, whilst the Association provides the prime forum for formal matters particularly concerned with Anglican-Orthodox relations.

We enter a new decade facing both spiritual and material problems which seem more formidable than any which have been experienced and overcome so far in man's history. The message of all Christian Churches to the world must be that any attempt to solve the material problems apart from the spiritual is doomed to failure. In particular, development of modern technology, however advanced, cannot provide any hint of an answer to the question of how that technology ought to be used. What man should do with the resources of intellect and materials which God has entrusted to him is a moral and hence spiritual matter. The Churches can speak to the world, however, only from a solid base of the unchanging truths revealed by God through Scripture and Tradition. It is essential that all Christians ensure, first of all, that they are themselves thoroughly grounded in their Faith. Theological speculation has its proper place as a way of being open to what the Spirit would teach us, but if it is conducted without intellectual humility or in a glare of irresponsible publicity, its overall effect will be to undermine the message which has been entrusted to the Church and to destroy the basis upon which that message rests.

We must be reminded in these difficult days that the Christian message is above all a message of hope. This hope is not merely to do with our future, it is a hope that permeates the whole of man's history, for God has never ceased to love his creature. The Incarnation represents that special moment in time from which the visible transfiguration of all creation takes its beginning. That transfiguration will be fully realised at the Parousia, which is never far away from us however desperate and dark are the times in which we live. Christians must interpret these times against this context of the Divine activity within the world.

H.G.F.

THE CHAIRMAN'S NOTES

B. S. Benedikz

For the past six years Benedict Benedikz has borne the load of editing the *News Letter*; for the eight years before him that duty was mine. Indeed it was my departure to the NATO Supreme Headquarters in 1972 that led directly to Benedict's taking over the task—and he has beaten me by a whole year!

Every editor leaves his mark on a publication; if he did not, he would have been a failure. In our case, the *News Letter* is now a journal, whereas I left it as a comparatively slight quarterly. There

is, therefore, a stronger base for the new Editor's scope. Such growth is what should happen in the good God's creation.

As Chairman, now, I should like to extend to Benedict the Association's heartfelt gratitude for his services over the past years; at the same time, I should like to assure him that we do not look upon this juncture as an end in our relations but simply as a transition.

To Benedict Benedikz, our warmest valedictions; to his successor, our sincere good wishes.

Harold Embleton

THE GENERAL SECRETARY'S NOTES

The death of our Orthodox President, Archbishop Athenagoras of Thyateira and Great Britain, has left a great gap in the life of the Orthodox Churches and also of the Church of England. His encouragement when I first became General Secretary is something for which I shall always be grateful. Many tributes have been paid to him, but I would like to place on record in the archives of the Association his immense interest in the ordinary parish life of the Church of England. He was always willing to turn out for patronal festivals in down-town parishes, and took as much trouble over his visits to them as he did over great occasions of State when he represented the Greek community in Westminster Abbey or St. Paul's Cathedral.

He had a great love for the Church of England, and the controversy over the ordination of women in other parts of the Anglican Communion caused him great personal pain. As an Orthodox Christian he could not understand this sudden un-Anglican tendency to act unilaterally. This he felt was very 'Roman' of us. He understood (and it gave him great satisfaction) the saving, as he saw it, of Apostolic Order in the Church of England by the second order of the Sacred Ministry in General Synod, as Catholicity had been saved by the third order in the person of Saint Athanasius the deacon.

As soon as I heard of His Eminence's death I wrote to His All Holiness at the Phanar offering the sympathy of the Association at the bereavement of the Great Church. A prompt reply was received from the Oecumenical Patriarch expressing his warm thanks for our concern for the Archdiocese of Thyateira at that sad time.

Many members of the committee attended the funeral in Hagia Sophia. Father Beal and I took flowers for Miss Irene Kokkinakis, the Archbishop's sister, to Thyateira House.

The funeral service was given nation-wide television and press coverage, and it would have given His Eminence immense satisfaction

that the Church for which he had worn himself out should have been regarded at his death as part of the British scene and worthy of national attention. This will be his memorial.

As I write these notes I have received a letter from the new Archbishop, His Eminence Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain, agreeing to the invitation of the committee that he should become our new Orthodox President. He comes to us from Axsum, the 'Canterbury' of Ethiopia, where Christians are being severely tested at this time. He is, however, no stranger to the United Kingdom as he ministered to the well-established Greek community in Manchester at the Church of the Annunciation of the Mother of God in Higher Broughton. His Eminence has degrees from the Universities of Manchester, Athens and Munich. We wish His Eminence many years ministry among us.

The Archbishop of Canterbury retires in early 1980, so we lose our Anglican Patron. Dr. Coggan has continued the ecumenical and irenic work of his two immediate predecessors, visiting Pope Paul VI and the Oecumenical Patriarch Demetrios I, the Patriarch of Moscow and the Catholikos of Armenia. He has been a courageous fighter for human rights behind the Iron Curtain and elsewhere. The emigre communities looked to him as a good friend not only at Canterbury but also during his time as Bishop of Bradford, a city in which there are many Ukrainian, Byelorussian and Serbian immigrants. At Lambeth and at Canterbury His Grace has welcomed many of our brethren from the East and has re-newed the top-level visits to this country of Orthodox and Pre-Chalcedonian Patriarchs. We wish Dr. Coggan and Mrs. Coggan every happiness in their retirement and thank them for all that they have done in their ministry for our friends and fellow Christians from Eastern Europe.

The announcement that Dr. Runcie, the Bishop of St. Albans and our Anglican President, was to become the next Archbishop of Canterbury was greeted with great pleasure by our members. Dr. Runcie brings a unique understanding of the Orthodox Churches with him to the throne of St. Augustine. Recently he has completed a tour of all the Eastern Patriarchs during his sabbatical. He has taken a very keen interest in our work during his time as Anglican President and we know that this interest and encouragement will not be diminished now he has become, along with the Oecumenical Patriarch, our new Patron.

It is hoped that the Association and the Nikaeian Club will be able to arrange a reception for the delegates from Foreign Churches who will be coming to Canterbury for the Enthronement on 25th March 1980. Our prayers will go with the Archbishop elect as he prepares for his translation to Canterbury.

Our new Anglican President is Bishop Michael Manktelow, Bishop of Basingstoke in the Diocese of Winchester. Bishop Manktelow

has been a very keen member of the Association for many years. His church of St. Wilfrid in Harrogate always received a dozen copies of the Eastern Churches News Letter during his incumbency. We look forward very much to working with him. Needless to say the announcement of his appointment at the Annual General Meeting was greeted with prolonged applause.

In the summer I visited Archbishop Mikalay of the Byelorussian Church in Canada, who was in the United Kingdom visiting his flock. He asked many questions about the Association and agreed to become a member. I gave him a parcel of back-numbers of the *News Letter*, which he was very pleased to receive. Dr. Hugh Richards and I attended a reception given for the Archbishop by the Apostolic Visitor for Byelorussian Catholics, Bishop Ceslaus Sipovitch, Titular Bishop of Marianne and Superior of the Byelorussian Catholic community at Marian House, North Finchley. The Uniate and Orthodox Byelorussians work very closely together and produce a very scholarly bi-annual, *The Journal of Byelorussian Studies*.

Our sister journal, *Sobornost*, has now merged with the Uniate/Orthodox journal *The Eastern Churches Review*. This is also a very well-produced journal and can be obtained from St. Basil's House, 52 Ladbrooke Grove, London, W.11.

The Annual Festival saw a very large turn-out for the Solemn Pontifical Liturgy at St. Savva's Serbian Church in Lancaster Road. It was a day to have delighted Bishop Velimirovitch, Bishop Buxton and Canon J. A. Douglas, as the Serbs were out in large numbers to welcome their Anglican guests. His Royal Highness Prince Tomislav of Yugoslavia, Mr. Pavlovitch and Mr. Petrovitch were among the leading lay members of the community present. Bishop Lavrentije and Father Milun Kostic were the principal celebrants of the Liturgy, with Father Cherney of the Latvian Orthodox Church also concelebrating. Representatives of the Greek or Constantinopolitan jurisdiction were present (including the Great Archdeacon of the Oecumenical Patriarch, Fr. Cyril), of the Romanian Church, the Bulgarian Church, the Polish Orthodox Church (Bishop Matthew), and the Byelorussian Church. A guest of honour from the Mar Thoma Church of South India (Metropolitan Chrysostom) also attended. Father Shenouda of the Coptic Church was present for the last time to represent the Coptic community. The same evening I attended his farewell party at Allen Street Coptic Centre, where he was given a tremendous send-off on his return to Egypt after two years amongst us. We wish his wife and daughter and himself well in their new home. His time in London has brought the Coptic Church very much into the fore and he leaves behind a vigorous and young congregation. The Annual Festival Sermon was preached by the Bishop of St. Albans, who also presided with the Bishop of Basingstoke at the Liturgy.

Serbian hospitality to the distinguished guests meant that the meeting was somewhat late in starting, but Christians East of the Danube do not let punctuality steal their time. Apologies are due if people had other engagements, but most people found the opportunity for conversation and the renewing of old friendships and the making of new ones welcome. The film made under the direction of Bishop Lavrentije on Church life in Serbia was fascinating, as was the talk on their experiences in the Coptic monasteries of Upper Egypt by the Cambridge students. We are sorry if too much was packed into one day and hope that those who did stay all afternoon did not miss their trains. Our thanks are due to Father Kostic and his congregation for all the hard work they put in to make this year's festival such a full and happy one.

To be entertained by the Romanians is always a pleasure, and the Romanian party held this year at St. James', Sussex Gardens, lived up to its usual standard of excellent food and company. This year we were entertained by a group of musicians and a singer who were over here from Romania. It was good to see so many Anglican clergy supporting the Romanian congregation again this year.

As readers may now know, I have become Priest-in-charge of St. Dunstan's-in-the-West in Fleet Street. I hope that the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association will regard this as the Association's home and a place of meeting for Eastern and Western Christians not only of the Anglican and Orthodox traditions but of the Lutheran and Reformed traditions, and the Oriental Churches both pre-Chalcedonian and Assyrian. The vision of St. Dunstan's was that there should be altars for the Armenians, Romanians, Old Catholics, Lutherans and Roman Catholics. The first three of these Communion already have altars there. I hope that the rest of the vision may be brought to fruition; this would make St. Dunstan's unique outside the Holy Land.

Space forbade my asking more than a hundred to the licensing, but I ask for your prayers as I begin my work in that Church which stands at the junction of East and West London, and, by its Romanian presence under Father Constantin Alece, at the meeting place of Eastern and Western Christendom. It is appropriate that the Romanians should be the Orthodox who have the regular use of the church for, I suppose, that ecumenically speaking they are our oldest Orthodox ally.

Father Gabriel of the Ethiopian Church tells me that there may be an opportunity of his people using the Anglican church of St. Thomas in Acton. We hope that they may find a home where they can settle and provide a centre for the Ethiopian diaspora—who remain cheerful and gentle after the ordeal which has affected all their families and friends without exception. Happily Sister Askte, who has been living here at the Anglican Convents of Fairacres and St. Mary-at-the-Cross, Edgware, has now been allowed to join her community in Ethiopia.

John Salter

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY'S NOTES

The 115th Annual Festival of the Association was celebrated at the Serbian Orthodox Cathedral, Lancaster Road, on Saturday October 13th, 1979. The Cathedral was full; people were standing right out to the West doors.

Our President's message of thanksgiving and joy in the Divine Liturgy set the whole theme of the Festival, which was particularly significant for being held at the close of the 70s and looking forward to the 80s. The Church must face the 80s in the power of the Risen Christ for whom mankind is looking in this day and age.

The Serbian Orthodox Church has had very close relations with the Church of England, and also with our Association since the days when we had a house in Oxford for Serbian students. We were very pleased to welcome so many members of other sister Orthodox Churches in this Country joining us in a communion of prayer and fellowship in Christ, praying for the day when the members of our two Churches will be able to receive the Holy Communion at each other's altars. For this we must continue to pray and work.

In these notes, I wish to put before you some thoughts on the reports on confessing Christ through the liturgical life of the Church. These reports are from the consultations at Etchiazine, Armenia (16th to 21st September, 1975) and Bucharest (June 1974). They led to the consultation on the place of the monastic life within the witness of the Church today, the report of which came before our Annual General Meeting in October. (A summary of the main conclusions appears elsewhere in this News Letter.) I would ask you to read the account of these reports and to pray about it because of its importance for the life of the Church today.

Witness and Worship

1. Throughout the history of the Church worship has been the expression and the guardian of Divine revelation. Not only has it expressed and represented the saving events of Christ's life, death, resurrection and ascension, but it has also been for the members of the Church the living anticipation of the Kingdom to come. In worship the Church, being the Body of Christ enlivened by the Holy Spirit, unites the faithful as the adopted sons and daughters of God the Father.
2. Liturgical worship as an action of the Church is centered around the Eucharist. Although the sacrament of the Eucharist, from the very origin of the Church, was a celebration closed to outsiders and full participation in the Eucharist remains reserved for the members of the Church, liturgical worship is an obvious form of witness and mission.
3. The human person, through membership in the worshipping community, through spiritual poetry, through church music and

iconography, actively participates with body and soul (1 Cor. 6, 20) in the gifts of grace. This involvement of the entire human nature, and not only of reason, in glorifying God is an essential factor of Orthodox worship. It must be preserved and developed as a powerful means of Christian witness.

4. The involvement of the whole man in liturgical action presupposes that sanctification can reach not only man as an individual but his entire environment also. The reverse is also true; we should take account of the fact that each Christian who actively participates in worship can bring to it his own cultural heritage and personal creativity. The process presupposes a selection based on Christian and moral values. Not everything in all cultural forms known in the unredeemed world is qualified to serve as a vehicle of meaningful liturgical expression. However, at all times in the cultural evolution of the various nations, the Church has succeeded in finding and adopting cultural forms which, through their richness and variety, were able to communicate the Gospel to people in a manner akin to their mental and historical traditions.

5. The fact that Orthodoxy readily embraced the various national cultures and used them as powerful tools for mission does not mean that the unity of the Church, a God-established mark of the Body of Christ (Rom. 12, 5), can be sacrificed to values belonging to ethnic cultures (Col. 3, 10-11; Gal. 3, 28).

6. Worship is the centre of the life of the Church, but it should also determine the whole life of every Christian. "Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. Thus you will know them by their fruits. Not every one who says to me 'Lord, Lord' shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven." (Matt. 7, 20-23). The realization of these words of Christ has a great significance for the success of Christian mission.

All this touches at the very heart of the monastic life because it is a life of prayer and liturgical worship. Monasticism in its depth seeks total purity for the sake of unity through the Lord, hence it will bring forth the fruits. The real fruits of the Spirit are love, peace, long-suffering, goodness, faith, meekness and temperance (Gal. 5, 22-23). The road to unity through the Lord involves reaching the life of continuous prayer and contemplation ("praying always"), achieving detachment from everything and clinging to the One. The Coptic Church defines monks as 'heavenly people' or 'earthly angels'. Monasticism arises from the desire of God's children to start the life of the Kingdom of Heaven in the flesh; the anchorites are counted in the Church among the seven heavenly orders (hosts). That is why monastic living as a realization of the prayer "Thy Kingdom come" is the deepest test of Christian behaviour. When the pastoral work of the Church weakens, the spiritual life also weakens and Christians become busy with worldly things. A feeble desire to devote one's life to Christ does not look to eternal things

but to the world, and so there are no new novices. It is within the local worshipping community, the parish, that the change has to take place. There, the holy people of God have to live out the life of the Risen Christ which comes to them at the Eucharist. It is there that vocations to the monastic life and to the priesthood have to be fostered, and family life has to find its true meaning through living out the Christian life. The great spiritual rebirth of the Coptic Church and of Orthodoxy in general finds its roots in the Liturgy—in the Church at prayer. Thus men and women must open their hearts to the Holy Spirit in order that He can work through us the will of God. If this Country is to become truly Christian, we must all become living members of Christ's Body the Church through our partaking of His life in the Eucharist.

Today we pray to God for the soul of a great Christian pastor and a faithful monk in the person of our beloved Archbishop Athenagoras. He did indeed first seek the Kingdom of God. He was a great theologian; to him theology was living in worship and prayer, living out the truth in his own life. The Archbishop was a person of vision. We see this today in the Archdiocese of Thyateira and Great Britain with its four assistant bishops and its great number of parishes with their own parish priests. There are monastic houses also within the Archdiocese. The late Archbishop made contact with Christians of other churches. He worked both for pan-Orthodox unity and for the unity of the whole of Christendom. He has made a great impact upon the whole movement for Christian unity. He worked for closer relations between the Holy Orthodox Churches and the Church of England and our sister churches within the Anglican Communion. When he came to this Country in 1964 his first public occasion was the celebration of the Divine Liturgy in the Greek Cathedral of the Holy Wisdom for the centenary celebration of the Association. As our Orthodox President he was ever ready in giving advice and willing assistance. He attended our festival in 1978, little knowing that this was to be his last. He prayed and worked for the unity of our two Churches with zeal and love. He was deeply interested in the consultation on the place of the monastic life within the witness of the Church today. Archbishop Athenagoras taught his people to live the sacramental and liturgical life and how to express it in their daily lives.

These notes represent what Archbishop Athenagoras has always taught about the Eucharistic life and its importance within the total life of the Church. May we share in his prayers together with those of all the blessed saints and all the faithful Christians who have now entered into that union in Christ our God. May our prayer be for the coming of the Kingdom of God here on earth for which the Archbishop prayed and worked.

Please note that Easter in both East and West will be celebrated on Sunday, April 6th, 1980.

Dom Cuthbert Fearon

NEWS ITEMS

The Enthronement of the new Archbishop of Thyateira and Great Britain

Sunday, November 4th 1979, opened a new page in the history of the Greek Orthodox Church in Great Britain and for Anglican-Orthodox relations. The Greek Archbishop of Thyateira and Great Britain is Apokripolitan of His All Holiness the Oecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. The enthronement of Archbishop Methodios as the fourth Archbishop and Apokripolitan was therefore an important event for Anglicans and Orthodox alike. The appointment of Archbishop Methodios is to be welcomed as he has been a long-standing friend of the Church of England. He served in Manchester for two years, and it was during this time that the Greek Orthodox Church in Manchester invited the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association to celebrate a Northern Festival which proved to be an event of outstanding importance. The Association has had connections with the Greek Orthodox in Manchester and Liverpool since their early days in this Country, and their priests have played a significant part in the work of the Association and in Anglican-Orthodox relations locally. The same support for the work of the Association as from his predecessors is to be expected from Archbishop Methodios. The Association extends to the Greek Orthodox community and to His Eminence its warmest greetings, praying that God will enrich and bless the life of their Church and grant to His Eminence many years of health and happiness in this Country.

The enthronement was attended by the Chairman of the Committee of the Association, the Reverend Harold Embleton, by the Assistant Secretary, Dom Cuthbert Fearon, and by Mr. Donald H. Hayes, a member of the Committee, who also represented the Byelorussian Church of St. Nicholas, Manchester. May the prayers of the Holy Mother of God and all the Saints uphold the Greek Orthodox Church in Great Britain and its new Archbishop.

Opening Conference of the Fellowship of St. John the Baptist

The newly-founded Orthodox Fellowship of St. John the Baptist held its opening conference at Chislehurst, Kent, on 2nd-6th August 1979. The conference was attended by about fifty people, including members of the Greek, Russian, Serbian and Polish Orthodox dioceses in Britain, and also Orthodox from Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland and the U.S.A.

The aim of the Fellowship of St. John the Baptist is to encourage personal contacts between the Orthodox of different parishes and dioceses in Great Britain and Ireland. It hopes to provide opportunities for prayer, discussion and study in common. Until now there has been no organization in Britain for Inter-Orthodox cooperation. The new Fellowship received the blessing of Archbishop

Athenagoras of Thyateira and Great Britain (Oecumenical Patriarchate), Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh (Russian Orthodox Church), and Bishop Lavrentije (Serbian Diocese for Western Europe).

The theme of the inaugural conference was 'Church and Eucharist'. The main speakers were Fr Kallistos Ware ('The Unity of the Church in the Eucharist'), George Dragas ('The Eucharistic Life in the Fathers'), Theo van der Voort ('The Parish and the Eucharist'), and Fr. Basil Osborne ('The Bishop in the Eucharist'). Fr. Lev Gillet gave a scriptural meditation on 'Dialogue with Christ', and Fr. Basil Rodzianko preached on 'The Mystery of the Transfiguration'. Bishop Timothy of Militoupolis, representing Archbishop Athenagoras of Thyateira, spoke on youth work in the Greek archdiocese. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, who had planned to speak on 'Diaspora and Mission', was at the last moment prevented by illness from attending.

The Divine Liturgy was celebrated each morning, and Vespers or the Vigil Service each evening.

This is the first time an inter-Orthodox conference of this kind has been held in Britain. A continuation committee has been appointed and a programme for 1980 is now being planned. Members of the Fellowship are asked to pay a minimum subscription of £1 annually. Further details may be obtained from the Treasurer, Fr. Kyril Jenner, St. Nicolas Orthodox Church, Grange Park Road, Manchester M9 2AN, England.

News in brief from Cyprus

History may perhaps have been made on Sunday evening, 17th June 1979, when Bishop Leonard Ashton of Cyprus and the Gulf and Archdeacon Douglas Northridge of Cyprus attended the annual certificate-giving ceremony of the Orthodox Seminary in Nicosia. In the presence of President Kyprianou, Archbishop Chrysostomos and all the Cypriot Bishops, the Principal of the Theological College, Fr. Dionysios, welcomed the Anglican representatives in a speech in English.

On a very much sadder note, on 13th June Bishop Ashton represented the Anglican Church at the funeral at Kykko Monastery of the Abbot of Kykko, Abbot Chrysostomos.

News in brief from Finland

The Very Revd. Archimandrite Kallistos Ware of Oxford University was the guest speaker at the annual convention of the clergy of the Finnish Orthodox Church held at the Seminary, Kuopio, from 24th-26th September 1979. The themes of his five lectures to the clergy were:

1. Patristic foundations of the Orthodox doctrine of the Church

2. The Church in modern Orthodox theology
3. Ecclesiastical structures of the Orthodox Church and problems connected with them (parish, diocese, local church, autonomy, autocephaly)
4. The role of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Orthodoxy
5. The Orthodox Church in England

In addition Fr. Kallistos gave a public lecture with the title 'the Orthodox world today'.

Visit of His Beatitude the Catholicos Patriarch of Georgia to the Oecumenical Patriarchate

His Beatitude Eliya II, Patriarch of Georgia, arrived at Yesilkoy Airport on Wednesday, 2nd May and attended a *Te Deum* (Doxology) at St. George's Patriarchal Cathedral, followed by an official reception by His All-Holiness Patriarch Demetrios I surrounded with the Hierarchy. In the evening His Beatitude attended a family dinner given by the Oecumenical Patriarch. In his reply to the formal welcome from the Oecumenical Patriarch, he stressed the long history of close relations between the Georgian Orthodox Church and Constantinople. He said that he looked forward to the Assembly of the Orthodox Churches currently being planned but it was important that existing problems between individual Orthodox Churches be settled so that the Assembly could truly be the symbol of Orthodox unity. His Beatitude also commented on the extent of Protestant influence in the ecumenical movement and on the need to strengthen the ecumenical witness of Orthodoxy.

On the following day there were visits to the Governor and the Mayor of the city of Istanbul, followed by an official luncheon at the Patriarchate, and a visit to the Armenian Patriarch completed the day's programme. On the Friday, following a visit to historical sites, discussions were held at the Patriarchate. His Beatitude then stayed overnight at the Holy Trinity Monastery on Halki, and on the Saturday visited Kadikoy (Chalcedon) and later attended a reception given by His Eminence Meliton in his Archdiocese.

His Beatitude concelebrated with the Oecumenical Patriarch and members of the Holy Synod at the Patriarchal Monastery of the Life-giving Water at Balikli, after which there were further speeches of greeting and the exchange of gifts. In the early evening, His Beatitude attended a reception given by the Consul General of the Soviet Union.

The Byzantine (Greek) Patriarchate of Antioch

Patriarch Elias IV of Antioch and All the East was called to his rest at the age of sixty-five in Damascus on 21st June 1979 following a heart attack. On 2nd July the Holy Synod of the Greek Antiochian

Patriarchate elected Metropolitan Ignatios Hazim, Archbishop of Latakia, Syria, as his successor. He will be known as Patriarch Ignatios IV. The new Patriarch is a president of the Middle East Council of Churches and a member of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches.

Visit of the Syrian Patriarch of Antioch and All the East to Lambeth Palace

At a dinner given in his honour at Lambeth Palace in June 1979, His Holiness Mar Ignatius Yacoub III, Syrian Patriarch of Antioch and All the East, recalled the many happy associations enjoyed with the Anglican Church throughout the world. He referred to discussions held in the time of Patriarch Ignatius Elias III with Bishop Gore and Canon J. A. Douglas, and also to the important influence exercised by the present Archbishop of Canterbury in his role as World President of the Bible Society. His Holiness stressed the need, in this present period of greater ecumenical cooperation, for a recognition of the importance of the indigenous Churches of the East in the Divine plan for that part of the world, especially in the light of the resurgence of non-Christian religions. "The Middle East", he said, "has been important in Our Lord's scheme of salvation and it is important even now." His Holiness concluded by expressing the hope that the Syrian and Anglican Churches would draw closer to each other in every way and work together as members of the One Body of which Our Lord Himself is the Head.

REPORTS AND COMMUNIQUES

Report: The Orthodox Consultation on The Place of the Monastic Life Within the Witness of the Church Today

Some 40 delegates from 14 Eastern and Oriental Orthodox Churches which are members of the World Council of Churches, and several observers from other churches and monastic communities, met from April 30th to May 5th, 1979, to reflect on "the Place of the Monastic Life within the Witness of the Church Today".

The consultation was organized by the Commission of World Mission and Evangelism (WCC) and hosted by His Holiness Shenouda III, Pope of Alexandria, Patriarch of the See of St. Mark (Head of the Coptic Orthodox Church), who not only offered hospitality in one of the oldest monasteries of the Egyptian desert but also inspired all participants with his memorable keynote address.

The following represents a summary of the main conclusions about the specific nature of the monastic vocation and some recommendations regarding the role of the monastic communities in relation to the mission of the Church and the renewal of spiritual life in the Churches.

I. Identity of the Monastic Life

1. There is no definition of the monk that would be fundamentally different from that of a Christian. To be a true monk or nun is also to be a true Christian. Monastic life, as also the Christian life in general, remains a mystery; it is a mode of existence in the communion of faith and the love of God. However, in Jesus Christ, many different ways and diverse charismata co-exist in the life of the Church itself (1 Cor. 12, 4-31), a diversity which the Orthodox Church has always encouraged.

2. The presence of a monk in the world can only be a paradox. He is a pilgrim (1 Peter 1, 1; 2, 11), who does not belong to this world, but nevertheless finds himself within it (2 Cor. 5, 6-7).

3. We have sought to define, as far as possible, the vocation of a monastic community in today's world as also in the life of our churches today. The monastic vocation has existed germinally in the life of the Church from its very beginning; its current forms, however, have an historical origin and are rooted in particular cultures and traditions. There have been periods in the history of several local churches when they have existed without an organized or powerful monastic group, even as the Church has existed for long periods without ecumenical councils. However, even a glance at the history of the Church is sufficient to convince us of one fact: at least in the Orthodox Churches, the life and witness of the monastic communities have shaped the worship, the theology, the spirituality, and the pastoral and apostolic ministries of the Church through the centuries. In accordance with its needs and possibilities, each local Church has developed diverse forms of monastic life, which she has integrated into her pastoral, missionary and spiritual work through the ages.

4. Each period of renewal in the spiritual life of our churches has been marked by a corresponding renewal in the life of the monastic communities. In the Orthodox churches, we are convinced that the renewal of spiritual life today should begin with a revitalization of our monastic communities, both of monks and of nuns.

5. The life of the monastic communities serves the life of the Churches in many ways. It is from this source that the churches receive spiritual fathers and mothers, as well as disciplined and devoted labourers in the Vineyard of the Lord. But the *raison d'être* of monastic life and monastic communities cannot be limited to the function of furnishing effective workers for the Church. To so limit the function of a monastic community would be to misunderstand its profound significance and to reduce it to a training centre.

6. Whatever definition one advances for the monastic vocation, it is bound to be criticized. Monastic life is called an *askesis*, but it is not an automatic mechanism for ensuring the salvation of souls. Of course the monk or nun practices asceticism, one of the natural

dynamisms of human nature; monastic life cannot however be reduced to asceticism. On the contrary, that life is realized in a divine-human synergy, in a loving cooperation with the grace of the Holy Spirit. The monastic vocation does not create another superior state within the Church. On the contrary, the monk is inclined to confess always and anew that "Jesus Christ is come into the world to save sinners of whom I am chief" (1 Tim. 1: 15). The monk is a man of the Gospel; this means that he is a human being who thirsts for salvation in the resurrected Christ. The roots of the life of a monk are in repentance and faith, in a perpetual *metanoia* wherein he lives the reality of the fall of human nature, as also the new reality of the salvation in Christ, in which he participates as a living and active member. In faith and in humility, he lives this continuous *metanoia* as a renewal of the baptismal gift, as a "growth in God" (Col. 2, 1a) a growth towards one and only one goal—the union with God in Christ. In fact, the whole Christian life is rooted in the grace of baptism. Even if its character as "responsible conversion" is not fully realized, the monk recovers the grace and the water of baptism in the tears of "sorrowful joy", as St. John Climacus says. It is a truly evangelical life of children of God, the life in Christ, life in the Spirit, life in the community of faith, in the community which seeks the realization of the love of Christ.

7. But the monastic community has a particular vocation within the community of faith. First of all it is a sign, a paradigm, an anticipation and foretaste of the Kingdom. This is particularly true since, throughout history, churches have been too easily tempted to make compromises with the world, to assure themselves a secure and comfortable place in society, guaranteed by the authorities, and thus to seek to escape the necessary tension between history and the Kingdom of God. It is in such situations that the monastic community has the task of proclaiming the Kingdom and of living as a sign of the coming Kingdom—a paradigm of the Parousia.

8. The Apostle Paul exhorts all Christians not to be conformed to the spirit of the age (Rom. 12: 1-2). The vocation of each Christian is to refuse to be shaped by the patterns of this world, but rather to take responsibility for it, in order to transcend it and transfigure it by the renewal of the mind. The monastic community responds to this appeal for liberation from conformism and for inner transformation in a more disciplined, more communitarian and more radical manner.

9. At the heart of the monastic discipline is the sanctification of time and the renewal of the inner man by unceasing prayer. It is in concentrating upon God in prayer and in seeking at the same time to embrace the creation in love and intercession, that the monastic community opens the channels for the Spirit of God to transform both the individual and the community from within. It also thus enables him to resist the pressures of vanities. Through his direct experience of the world, as also by his gift of discernment, the monk

can also help to go beyond a superficial understanding of the world and help Christians to have a contemplative attitude to history and the created order. The discipline of prayer—all the way from the eucharistic Liturgy through the canonical daily offices to the perpetual prayer and invocation of the name of Jesus—can undoubtedly also be practised by a lay person. But, in general, monastic life makes better provision for practising the discipline. All vows and commitments—whether it be to chastity, poverty and obedience, to silence and solitude, or to fasting and self denial—can only be ancillary to the principal task, the life of prayer, which is the foundation of all monastic life. As this central principle of prayer becomes rooted in faith and in love, all other things are added to it.

10. The phenomenon of monasticism takes up again in the Church the witness of the martyrs of the early centuries. By the principles of non-attachment and availability for God and one's fellow human beings, the monk or nun bears witness to the eschaton inside the Church, and thus exercises a truly prophetic ministry, in showing forth the Gospel's way of the Kingdom. It is the radical faithfulness of the martyrs which assures that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church. On the other hand, by its insistence on renunciation of the world and on the eschatological dimension of history, the monastic community runs the risk of becoming an escapist movement which seeks to run away from the major problems which preoccupy the minds of other members of the Church who live in society. It is the duty of the monk, as part of his task of spiritual direction, to help the faithful to fulfil their responsibilities in society in full liberty and with discernment.

11. We are convinced that the discussion about the identity of the monastic life today raises also the question of the identity both of the Christian and of contemporary man. One should not forget that the name of the man of the spirit is "beauty" (*kalogeros*), that beauty which saves the world, and that his science, his ardent longing to know virtue, is called "the love of beauty" (*philokalia*).

II. Monasticism, Mission and Renewal

1. The Christian in the World:

Some Christians live in affluent and secular societies. They are unable to find in them spiritual values upon which they can regulate their lives. Sensing this secular vacuum, they look to the monasteries. Indeed all the faithful can find spiritual good in the monastic life. Many young people, ignorant of Christian monasticism, have wandered away to follow various forms of Asian, non-Christian ascetic practices. These expressions of certain pseudo-mystical life-styles often have religious bases, but they are also often foreign to the Good News of Jesus Christ. Some who seek that "peace from above" confuse it with a quiet return to nature. It is our belief that by reaffirming, clarifying and setting forth our ancient Christian

monastic ideals, we are presenting an authentic Christian life-style to those seeking peace and integrity of life.

2. The Church under Stress

The Church which is the Body of Christ in the world, existing and acting in the present social context, is itself in need of the contributions of a strong monasticism. She needs to remind herself of this great treasure of witnessing. It is also from monasticism that the Church will continue not only to live but also to grow, revitalize and perfect herself in the spirit of the Gospel. Given this authentic, living example of the life of sacrifice and self-denial, as witnessed to by monastic communities, the Church has a real and valid touchstone by which to measure and re-align her actions.

In some areas of the world, the joy of living together in the Lord is absent from the community. The weight of individual effort is borne without the Christian expression of oneness in fellowship. This communal unifying experience of sharing is well expressed in monastic communities as a sign for all.

3. Monasteries: A Christian Witness in the World:

Monasteries have and can continue to offer their special and unique experiences to benefit the entire believing community. Retreats held under the care of the monasteries for both clergy and laity offer possibilities for profound renewal and rededication to Christ. In a spirit of monastic praise and calm, lay clerical consultations would take on deeper meaning and be of far greater benefit to the Church.

Where it is beneficial, tracts dealing with and giving guidance for specific daily problems could be made available through the efforts of monastic publishing facilities. Today, as throughout the past, spiritual fathers are available from within the monastic ranks. Confession, discussion and solid scriptural direction, personal to the need of each, is the particular gift of monastics to their brothers.

We recommend that in private and corporate worship, monks ought to make mention of the specific needs of the Universal Church, thus to be in touch with the everyday needs of the rest of the Christian community. Specifically, *we recommend* that monastic communities ought to pray for unity and for the spreading of the kingdom of God.

Taking advantage of modern means of communications, monastics can and ought to exchange letters telling of spiritual experiences, spiritual direction and visits. Further extended visits to the brethren of other monasteries would be useful to all concerned. To facilitate this, *we recommend* that a directory of Orthodox monastic communities be published and distributed through the offices of the World Council of Churches in cooperation with the Orthodox Churches. We suggest that a committee be set up which would integrate, encourage and facilitate the execution of these suggestions.

While exhorting that the doors of the monasteries ought to be open wide to all, we also want to make clear the real danger of possible negative influences from outside which could be detrimental to the spiritual integrity of the community. Among these we are concerned with the growing number of tourists who come to monasteries on sight-seeing tours. *We recommend* that touristic visits should always have a definite spiritual dimension. They should be conducted in such a manner as not only not to upset the life of the monastic community but also as an expression of pastoral concern for the visitors. Monasteries should train guides to fulfil the task adequately. The monasteries should be aware that maintaining their spiritual integrity is the necessary condition for fulfilling this ministry.

Without altering past monastic forms, but in the hope of utilizing talents, we suggest that specific monasteries consider becoming definite centres of service to specific Orthodox needs. Such subjects as music, iconography, research and study of the Scriptures and of the Fathers would draw together like talents and would strengthen and broaden growth in these fields. As monasteries have often been guardians of the Faith, so too they can extend to become repositories for manuscripts, artefacts and treasures particular to each tradition. The presence of such articles would be an open invitation to the faithful and to all serious persons interested in taking advantage of Christian culture displayed in its original setting.

We recall, finally, that in other eras some monasteries were centres from which missionary activities went out. Today, other monasteries may be in similar positions to aid in the mission of the Church. We encourage those who are in such situations to act in love for the extension of the Kingdom of God.

Amba Bishoy Monastery, Egypt
May 1979

**Communiqué:
Interorthodox Commission for Dialogue
with the Ancient Oriental Churches**

The Orthodox Church, continuing her untiring efforts on behalf of cooperation and unity among the Churches in general, undertook in 1971 to prepare carefully for a theological dialogue with the Ancient Oriental Churches. For this reason, the Interorthodox Commission for Dialogue with the Ancient Oriental Churches convened at the Orthodox Centre of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, in Chambésy, February 7th-11th, 1979, with nearly all of the delegations of the Orthodox Churches present.

This conference had the honour and the joy at the opening of its work to receive, to address and to listen to useful thoughts for the dialogue, which were expressed to it by His Holiness the Patriarch of the Copts, Shenouda III. This visit offered the opportunity for both sides to underline once again, and in a responsible way, the

necessity for dialogue and for cooperation between the Orthodox Church and the Ancient Oriental Churches. This conference of the Commission was significant and decisive for the dialogue.

The Orthodox wanted with this conference to achieve two objectives: on the one hand to increase the pace of the dialogue and to formulate the procedure for the next stages, and on the other hand to propose concrete thoughts and proposals to the other party engaged in the dialogue.

The time that has passed to date was perhaps long, but it was productive from every perspective. More than ever before there exists today in the regions of the Eastern tradition a consciousness of the necessity for the existence of one united expression of this tradition to all the Christian world. The Interorthodox Commission, realizing this general expectation, tried to respond accordingly.

The work of the conference involved:

1. the evaluation of the preparatory work done thus far for the dialogue;
2. the sharing of the work and the decisions taken together or separately by the two Sub-Committees working on the various aspects of the dialogue;
3. the reception and acceptance of the background papers submitted on the first topics of the dialogue, which were chosen and assigned by the Sub-Committees (dealing primarily with Christology); and
4. the decision to begin officially the continuation of the dialogue.

There were positive proposals and comments. The Interorthodox Commission accepted and analysed these, and then decided to communicate to the Churches, in the appropriate manner, the next stages for the dialogue which it proposes on its behalf.

This communication will be followed, of course, with the appointment by the Ancient Oriental Churches of their representatives, who will constitute the corresponding Inter-Oriental Commission of the dialogue. From the moment that the two Commissions convene, at a place and date to be determined by their Presidents, the dialogue *de facto* and essentially will have begun. The Interorthodox Commission believes that establishing such a procedure, positive and brief, is an appropriate response to the corresponding desire of the respected Ancient Oriental Churches, whose most appropriate persons have expressed orally the desire and decision of their Churches to enter into dialogue with the Orthodox Church. This means that both sides are determined to contribute decisively to confronting any obstacles to cooperation, to building up the unity between them, and also to establishing peace more firmly throughout their regions.

Chambésy
February 1979

Report of the Inter-Orthodox Preparatory Commission for the Theological Dialogue with Lutherans

Mandated by the holy churches we, the members of this Inter-Orthodox Preparatory Commission for the Theological Dialogue with Lutherans, came together to continue our work of discussing the procedure for the preparations of the coming Inter-Orthodox/Inter-Lutheran theological dialogue, which in the grace of the Holy Trinity has begun at Sigtuna, Sweden in November 1978. In a spirit of concord and fraternal love we had our meeting at the old and well-known Lutheran monastery of Amelungsborn, September 15th-21st, 1979, as guests of the Lutheran World Federation and the Lutheran Churches in Germany.

On Sunday, September 16th, following the Divine Liturgy which was concelebrated by Metropolitan Emilianos together with other members of the Commission, the delegation was received by the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Hanover and the German National Committee of the Lutheran World Federation. We were also granted an audience with the Lord Mayor of Hanover and, after a sightseeing tour of the city, the delegation was warmly received in the Greek Orthodox Centre in Hanover and the Serbian Orthodox Centre in Hildesheim. On Monday, we were welcomed by the President of the VELKD, Dr. Günter Gassmann, by members of the Convent and the Familiaritas of the Amelungsborn Monastery, and by various parishes in the neighbourhood of Amelungsborn.

The consultation was chaired by Metropolitan Emilianos of Silybria (Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople) and had as Secretary Metropolitan John of Helsinki (Finnish Orthodox Church). It was a great joy to have Professor Kretschmar and Dr. Martensen present at this meeting as consultants. Their presence greatly contributed to the success of the meeting.

One of the main tasks of this second preparatory meeting was to evaluate the past Orthodox/Lutheran contacts both of the early stage of Protestantism and of the bilateral dialogues of the past few decades. The main papers were presented on theological contacts and dialogues between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and Lutherans in Germany from the 16th century up to the present time by Professor Nikolaou and Dr. Basdekis, on the history of the Orthodox/Lutheran dialogue in Russia from the sixteenth century to the early twentieth century by Igumen Augustin Nikitin, and on the contemporary dialogue between the Russian Orthodox Church and various Lutheran churches by Professor A. Osipov. Finally a paper on Orthodox/Lutheran relationships in Romania since the Reformation was read by Professor Ica. These papers not only gave a historical survey of the relationships between the churches but also a critical investigation and an comprehensive summary of the main theological issues which have emerged. The papers refer to the great values of the results of the past bilateral dialogues, which give a wide range of specific and valuable material for the future dialogue.

The work of the Commission was greatly helped by two introductory papers given by Metropolitan Emilianos of Silybria and Metropolitan John of Helsinki at the beginning of the meeting. On a deep theological level both papers reflected problems raised by the past experience of dialogue and some of the achievements of these conversations. The papers pave the way for the future by giving worthwhile guidelines.

Practical Steps

1. This Inter-Orthodox Preparatory Commission feels that more preparatory work needs to be done before entering into a joint dialogue. On the other hand it is not advisable that our preparatory material for the dialogue be worked out in separation from each other for a great length of time. Therefore we encourage the sub-committee, which was appointed in Sigtuna, to implement the plans for a meeting of the Inter-Orthodox Preparatory Commission for the Theological Dialogue with Lutherans.

2. It is the Sub-Committee's responsibility to further develop common documentation so that all the relevant material from the past dialogues will be available for the actual dialogue. This task should be done in close collaboration with the respective Lutheran World Federation representatives.

3. In our opinion the next preparatory meeting for the dialogue should take place in Autumn 1980. It is our wish that the meeting would possibly be convened in a Scandinavian country, September 6th-12th.

4. The formal dialogue is expected to begin after the above-mentioned meetings, and the Inter-Orthodox Preparatory Commission regards it important that the same representatives of the Orthodox Churches, who have already been preparing the dialogue, will accordingly be appointed to be the delegates of the Churches in the main dialogue. It is also important that in our future meetings all Orthodox Churches be represented.

5. We see it as important that the dialogue would also be of benefit to ordinary church life in parishes, especially those in a diaspora milieu. Therefore, we recommend and encourage the studying of the spiritual heritage and liturgical practices of other churches, and also possibilities for practical co-operation.

Theological Considerations

1. Our Commission believes that we need to proceed carefully on both sides in our theological work, if we want to have a clear mutual understanding. A contextual approach will be of great use. The study of the Lutheran documentation presupposes that we do not evaluate only the confessional books, officially recognized by the Lutheran churches, but also the modern Lutheran theological

evaluation and interpretation of this material. The Lutheran doctrine is not static but dynamic, and has a continued development in formulation.

2. A general agreement of our Commission was that the dialogue must be understood as a continuation of the dialogue interrupted in the past (16th century), but in a spirit which corresponds to the new realities and the progress being achieved in our times, i.e. in deepening the understanding of the mystery of our division, and in the light of this to elaborate a new expression of our views, our common dissatisfaction for possibly unfair evaluations, rather in a dynamic than in a static way. In addition, the formulations of the future must not be abstract, but implemented in our respective liturgical life and in the whole spiritual style of our life.

3. A general agreement was also that we need a new perspective in the procedure of our dialogue. The differences between Orthodox and Lutherans, which have been pointed out in our discussion, must be articulated as expressions of the fact of the dogmatical differentiation between Orthodoxy and Lutheranism.

4. The basis of the historical differentiation between the Orthodox and the Lutherans has been the different conception on the work of the Holy Spirit in the Church. The themes, which have been proposed in our last meeting to be discussed in the dialogue, can be seen under the perspective of the presence and work of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church, so that we can begin our dialogue with a combination of pneumatology and ecclesiology. We, therefore, might formulate the first topic of our dialogue in the following way: Participation in (methexis—Leben) the Mystery of the Church —(1) The Mystery of the Church, (2) Presuppositions of Participation in the Mystery of the Church.

5. In perspective of the future work of the Commission it is important that the work of the Commission continues in a specific way. First of all it is necessary to make a synthesis of the historical and doctrinal results of all bilateral meetings in the name of our Commission. This report should include also topics which have not been discussed in the past in bilateral dialogues, and express the agreement of our Commission on these themes. Before starting the official dialogue it is necessary to reach an agreement in doctrinal terminology which will facilitate the future discussion between the dialogue partners.

Amelungsborn,
September, 1979.

**The Message of the Finnish Orthodox Church
to Other Churches on Her 800th Anniversary**

Thanks be to God, the Finnish Orthodox Church had a dual celebration on the 26th of November 1978. One anniversary, "60

years as an autonomous archbishopric", reminds us of the times we lived two generations ago. Another, "the coming of the Orthodox Faith to Karelia", takes us back to the origins of our Faith centuries ago.

The historical events that our Church has experienced are closely related to the circumstances of several other Sister-Churches and to world-renowned historical events. This is why we wish in this message of our Church to give you, brothers and sisters in other Churches, an illustration of our own historical experience, and of God's providence in this experience. In this way we hope to share with you our celebration, "rejoicing with those who rejoice", and ask you to pray for us. Better knowledge of each other would extend and strengthen our awareness of the Christian Church as the nation of God in this world.

It was 60 years ago that the Finnish State was granted her independence, and this date also marked the origins of the Finnish Orthodox Church as a separate Church. Many changes in societies and national ideologies were carried out after World War I. The East and the West were divided. Our own country and nation remained part of the Western world. It was under those circumstances that our Church began her life as a national autonomous archbishopric under the Ecumenical Throne of Constantinople.

The origins of Orthodox Christianity in our country 800 years ago coincide with the era when both the East and the West extended their cultural and spiritual influence over Europe. As for Finland, Orthodoxy had to settle down between the two traditions in Karelia. For centuries our Orthodox Christianity has had to live with the agonies caused by our situation on border territory. Now the wars are over, and our situation between the East and the West has been experienced as a challenge for constituting a most valuable bridge between the two cultural heritages.

Related to what has been said above, the Finnish Orthodox Church has, within her own sphere, for a long time lived up to the spirit that those connected with present-day culture and politics like to call the spirit of Helsinki. The Finnish Orthodox Church has traditionally had strong ties of brotherhood to the Mother-Church of Russia, to which she will forever remain grateful for the deep spiritual heritage that is still today a source of stimulation for the whole Church. In the same brotherly spirit, ties have been built to all directions, both to the older Christian Churches and to the American Churches; and during the past decade we have been establishing active cooperation with the South, and have extended our activities even to East Africa.

Through the experience of our own situation, we have become convinced of the truth of the Apostle's words:

"There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3, 28).

We have been granted continuous evidence of the truth that the Christian faith breaks the barriers between languages, cultures and races, and that it is not bound to any particular social order or political structure.

What then is the essence of Christianity? The Apostle gives us an answer: "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ" (Gal. 3, 27). These words are repeated over and over again throughout our Easter liturgy. The existence of the Christian Church is based on the central events of the history of salvation: the death and atonement for the life of the world on Great Friday and the Resurrection, the faith of Easter, that gives a bright and universal direction to the life of the Church.

In what way have we lived up to the ideals of our faith and how have we witnessed our faith? Amidst the material wealth and social security we have not been able to produce enough good harvest within the context of spiritual life. But even in our infirmity, we do not give up our hope. "you also helping together by prayer for us" that Thanksgiving would be offered for the grace we have been given (2 Cor. 1, 11).

On the other hand, we must be thankful for our small numbers, as we have not had any temptation to try and rule, in the name of our Christian Faith, the world and society wherein we live. We have as a Christian Church always been granted the understanding that it is our duty to serve this society and all the people we meet, and we found our work on our Christian *Weltanschauung* and Eucharistic experience.

The Finnish Orthodox Church lives side by side with the majority Lutheran State Church. We express our thanks to the Finnish government for having shown great consideration to our minority Church as the second National Church in this country. Our Church has had the opportunity of receiving from the State all the material and spiritual support that we have needed in the reconstruction work after both World Wars in order to serve the scattered Orthodox population in the best possible way. We have accepted this support with heartfelt gratitude. On the other hand, we have made it completely clear that the standing or falling of the Christian Church can never depend on the support of the secular society.

The Finnish Orthodox Church is thankful for the stable and clear position which she has gained as an Orthodox Church in the Western cultural milieu. In our own country we live in a brotherly co-existence with the Protestant Church. We wish that our living within the same area would gradually grow into a living together and into a dialogue of love with other Christian brothers and sisters.

The Church continues to live from the charisma of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, she feels a strong challenge when facing people's fear,

anxiety, search and hope in the present-day world. As the Western people and communities of today are looking for a new economic order and a new world order and, related to this, new trust and strength in life, we, as an Orthodox Church, see this as a special challenge and invitation which has been addressed to us. This means an invitation to participate deeply and more sincerely than previously in the charisma of the Holy Spirit in the world, which continues to be the battlefield between good and bad.

We recognize that our world is thirsting for the Orthodox Faith. In our own experience, we see a hundred thousand Finnish and foreign visitors visit our Valamo Monastery every year. The Orthodox Church and its culture are well presented in the Finnish mass-media. This interest in and inquiry about the Orthodox Church does not take place because our Church would proclaim the continuing city and the visible city of God to be possible in this world. Rather, it happens because our Church has, by leaning on the original foundation of her faith, regarded it as her task to witness that we have no continuing city, but we are searching for one to come. And, at the same time, we have managed to voice the original philosophy of life of the Church of Christ, especially in the context of liturgical life.

In the present times people are in transition. Some have doubts about the possibility of knowing God, some people have a distant God of the Cosmos, some study the mysticism of the Far East, some are seekers within the Christian tradition. They are all seeking a stable and lasting foundation for their lives, a hope that would not fail. We Christians in all Churches have been called upon to witness by our lives what Saint Paul speaks on Areopagus:

"And he made from one every nation of men to live on all the face of the earth, having determined allotted periods and boundaries of their habitation, that they should seek God, in the hope that they might feel after him and find him. Yet he is not far from each one of us, for in him we live and move and have our being" (Acts 17, 26-27).

Kuopio
November 1979

† Paul
Archbishop of Karelia and All Finland

BOOK REVIEWS

R. B. Betts: *Christians in the Arab East*. London, SPCK 1979, £4.95

The author of this work sets out to examine the position of the Christians and their several communities in each country of the Arab East at a time when this part of the world is witnessing considerable economic, social and political change. The Middle East is presently witnessing an extraordinary phenomenon, and religious affairs are once more in the limelight. Islam is in a stronger position than at any time since the end of the seventh century and Muslims

are reasserting their national and religious pride. Thus the purpose of this work is to look at the indigenous Christian of the Arab East today in the light of his fascinating past: his habitat, his social and religious institutions, and the role which he plays in all facets of the predominantly Islamic society that has been his environment since the advent of Islam.

The problems involved, the breadth of the scene, and the nature of the evidence encouraged the division of the book into five main areas of study: a history of Christianity among the Arabs and Arabicized peoples of Egypt and the Fertile Crescent; the religious demography of Egypt and the Fertile Crescent; Christians and the present-day social structure of the Arab East; politics and Christianity and the participation of Christians in the secular political life of the Arab East; evaluation and future assessment. These five basic chapters are accompanied by a short introduction reflecting the question which many Christians in the Arab East have raised in the last two decades: "is a Christian Arab possible?" Two useful maps and an appendix (listing official population figures by religion in selected Christian centres in the Arab East) complete the contents of the book.

In the first place the author sets the scene by a well-defined and coherent study of the historical background. Beginning with the pre-Islamic era, he takes the reader through thirteen centuries well into the prelude to independence and the second half of the twentieth century. The changes which have taken place in the Christian communities and their relations with both the Muslim communities and the ruling class are underlined for the periods both before and after the era of the crusades. The *dhimi* system (which was scarcely different from the *millet* system of the Ottomans) or the special status of the majority of the Christians who came under Islamic protection was far better than it had been under either Byzantine or Persian rule. It placed in the hands of the Oecumenical Patriarch jurisdiction over all Christians (save the Armenians). But as the Ottoman power declined in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the conditions of the Eastern Christians worsened progressively. Consequently, the picture of Christianity in the Arab East on the eve of its 'rediscovery' by Europe in the nineteenth century was one of internal strife and increasing weakness. The revival of Christianity in the Arab East started with Napoleon's Near-Eastern adventure which was followed by Muhammed Ali's policy of tolerance and equality which had characterized his relations with the Copts in Egypt and was extended to the various Christian communities in Syria. This revival was furthered by direct and indirect Western influence. Close behind the French were the British and the Americans, who by the end of the nineteenth century were established in nearly every corner of the Arab World. But during the first world war, many Christian communities suffered, notably the Armenians, Jacobites, Nestorians and Chaldaeans in eastern and southern Anatolia, the Maronites on Mount Lebanon, and to a lesser extent

all Eastern Christians subjected to the ruthless wartime administration of Jamal Pasha. Consequently, the great majority of Christians and their religious and lay leaders looked to France to assist them in guaranteeing the autonomy of a Christian Lebanon and the security of all indigenous Christians elsewhere in the Fertile Crescent. For the Maronites, their rallying cry, "truly France is our benevolent mother", had proved to be more than a hopeful invocation. The establishment of Greater Lebanon was achieved just as the clouds of Zionism began to darken the horizon and strident Arab Nationalism began to take shape.

The religious demography of Egypt and the Fertile Crescent underwent many changes throughout these thirteen centuries. By the eve of Arab independence there existed a number of gaps in the formerly unbroken chain of Christian settlements from Aswan to Basra. This was brought about by the gradual demographic decline which had characterized all the Christian communities in the face of Arab immigration, and a steady loss through conversion to Islam in every generation. Only in Eastern Anatolia, once a home to large numbers of indigenous Eastern Christians, have the Christians all but disappeared. Each Christian community in the Arab East recognizes the leadership of its patriarch, with the exception of the Protestants; and as there are twelve Christian groups and only four patriarchates, rivalries obviously exist. The Author's demographic survey of the Christians throughout Egypt and the Fertile Crescent is significant, but much of the data employed is out of date. The official census of 1960 in Egypt cannot provide a workable percentage for the late 1970s. There is reason to believe that the Christian birth-rate must have changed after the 1960 census following a deeper change in the social and economic structure of Egyptian society. The whole issue is so sensitive that neither the Copts nor the Muslims are satisfied with any given figures.

If one examines in greater depth the Christians in the context of the contemporary social structure of the Arab East, it will be easy to realize that the communal solidarity which the *dhimi* and *millet* systems created within the individual minority groups was a strong barrier to the growth of modern nationalism, since it precluded concern for, or even interest in, any people but those of one's own religious community. It has created a dual conflict within each individual Christian in the Arab East, between the desire to identify with his own minority community and on a wider scale the Christian West on the one hand, and on the other hand a seemingly contradictory effort to establish his Arab identity as a justification for his presence in a predominantly Muslim society. Many Muslims resented the role of intermediary between East and West which the Arab Christian had carved out for himself, because it raised the question of where Christianity ends and Western interests begin.

Because the Christians of the Arab East had a significant desire to compensate for their insecurity as a minority, they worked hard and

produced prominent figures in the political, economic and social fields. Their involvement (as individuals) in the internal politics of Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq and even Israel, both within and outside the accepted governmental framework, has been a feature of the Arab East since independence, and this involvement can be traced back over a century to the first stirrings towards Arab Nationalism. In fact the rise of the cause of Arab nationhood witnessed many expressions of Christian-Muslim co-operation and solidarity. Christian commitment to the liberation of Palestine manifested itself without interruption from the establishment of the state of Israel, both among political leaders and the indigenous Christian Arabs themselves.

As to the political involvement of religious leadership, it remained a tradition of long standing in the Middle East. The political importance of the patriarchal office continued in its traditional role of representing the needs and wishes of the Christian population before the Muslim establishment and the secular state. Endowed with many powers, the Patriarch has enormous authority in his religious community to define and apply ecclesiastical canons. As the very visible head of his community, the Patriarch is supremely conscious of his own political role and is sensitive to any action taken by the secular state. The Middle-Eastern Christians see in any official slight, however small and unintentional, a possible indication of a change in government policy which might directly affect their precarious minority status. But, while the ecumenical trend within the Christian churches, Orthodox and Catholic alike, has had a great effect in broadening the Christian outlook, and has forced Christians to regard their Muslim neighbours in a less hostile light, the Christian Arab has resisted the intellectual forces operating either to deny his faith a proper role in the modern world or to neutralize its Eastern character through the adoption of Roman Catholic and Protestant traditions. In identifying with Eastern forms of his faith, the Arab Christian has affirmed his intention to remain in the Arab World and to become a more integral part of its levels of national life.

Inevitably, a book such as this must leave a number of problems untreated. But on the whole, it is an excellent and lucid analysis of a sensitive complex of religious, social, economic, political and cultural changes, which has developed over more than thirteen centuries, an understanding of which is essential to any attempt to appreciate the present condition of the Christian Arab in the Middle East.

The volume is an important contribution to research in Christian-Muslim relations, and should provoke valuable debate and discussion.

W. A. Farag

Bishop Alexander (Semenoff Tian-Chansky): *Father John of Kronstadt, A Life*, London and Oxford, Mowbrays 1979, 197 pp., £4.25

The gift of sanctity is offered to the Church in every age, sometimes in surprising circumstances. John of Kronstadt brought it to the Russian Church on the eve of its great trials, and surprised a church which expected sanctity to be monastic when it flourished in the life of a married priest in a busy town. Married, but with a vocation to prayer and work which prevented normal family life, it took some time for his wife to agree that "There are many happy families, Lisa, enough without us . . . you and I will dedicate ourselves to the service of God" (p. 16). Kronstadt was, and is, an important naval base in the Gulf of Finland. John Sergiev's ministry, however, was not to the navy, which had its own chaplains, but in the town with its extremes of wealth and poverty. His career has much in common with such Anglican contemporaries of his as Dolling and Stanton; like the latter he spent his priesthood in the parish to which he was ordained (1855-1908), though in due time he became its Archpriest. His earlier career was devoted to such works as the Home of Constructive Labour, and to teaching religion in the local schools, more it seems in an evangelical than an academic spirit. Later his character as a "genius of prayer", as G. P. Fedotov has called him, won him a ministry to crowds and individuals which made him indeed the "pastor of all-Russia". As a lover of the Liturgy he urged frequent communion when few of the Russian laity went beyond their Easter duties. The crowds necessitated public services of penance—not merely the recitation of forms, but prayer and exhortation which called forth tears of penitence and justified the gift of absolution. John's gift of healing extended to both body and soul, though he neither healed nor converted everyone he dealt with. As in the Gospels, some of his healings are capable of psychological description, others not.

The life before us is by one who began his own life in the Russia of John's time and ended it as an Assistant Bishop in Paris. Based on Russian biographical sources as well as on Father John's famous devotional diary, it gives the reader, as Fr. Schmemmann says in his preface, a true encounter with its subject. John Sergiev brought to the modern world an experience of ancient spiritual power, coming in part at least from his youth in a still traditional Northern province. In his last years he lost some of his popularity, inside and outside Russia, because of his conservative, even reactionary, position in politics. To one whose earlier memories were of the Tsar Liberator it was natural to look for progress from the throne. John was aware of the needs of the masses, but did not consider a godless revolutionary movement a suitable way of meeting them. In retrospect it is not entirely obvious that he was wrong. Popular recognition has confirmed his sanctity, although its formal proclamation by the right-wing Synodical Church Outside Russia may impede its canonical acceptance elsewhere. Be that as it may, we may hope that his prayers are still with us.

Two minor points: it was of course silk cassocks, not "surplices" that John felt obliged to accept from his admirers (p. 186); and it seems unfortunate that a respectable publisher should issue a book without indication of date of publication or, in this case, details of translation. We are only told that the Russian text was published in New York in 1955, and Schmemmann's preface seems to be addressed to American Orthodox, for whom the translation was presumably first made. However, while this will be a puzzle for library cataloguers, it need not limit the value of a book both fascinating and, in the best sense of the word, edifying.

E. R. Hardy

Guigo II: *The Ladder of Monks and Twelve Meditations* (translated with an introduction by Edmund Colledge, O.S.A. and James Walsh, S.J.), London & Oxford, Mowbrays 1978, 157 pp., £3.95

The author of the two short Latin works translated in the present volume was the ninth prior of the Grande Chartreuse, founded by Saint Bruno in 1086. Little is known of Guigo's life, nor is it known exactly when these two works were written. They belong, however, to the great movement of monastic reform which was flourishing in Western Europe during the second half of the 12th century and were originally intended for cloistered contemplatives. Union with God is, in fact, the subject of the *Ladder*, and in it Guigo speaks of various aspects of the path upwards through 'reading', 'meditation', 'prayer' and 'contemplation'. Throughout this work, and in the twelve *Meditations* as well, great emphasis is placed upon the understanding and interpretation of scripture. Scripture is treated as a sacramental reality which must be broken, eaten and inwardly digested if it is to become fully part of us and communicate to us its peculiar savour. At the same time, however, Guigo underlines that this form of illumination through the scriptures can only be given to us 'from above'. The way in which the author is so obviously immersed in the sacred texts, whose phrases become his own and add resonance and depths to all that he says, is particularly appealing. The scholarly introduction is a revised version of that published in French by the same editors a few years ago in *Sources Chrétiennes*.

Basil Osborne

(Ed.) Sister Thekla: *Mother Maria. Her Life in Letters*, Darton, Longman & Todd 1979, xlvi+144 pp., £4.95.

This is an immensely important book, which needs to be read and re-read. Many will be familiar with Mother Maria's writings already, and so will have discovered in her a style of Orthodox thinking absolutely free from self-consciousness, antiquarianism and ethnic quaintness. She has the luminous directness of the greatest classical writers of her tradition, and a rare willingness to listen to other

Christian voices carefully and critically and appreciatively. Sister Thekla has given us, in *Mother Maria*, a larger window into the mind and soul of this exceptional woman. In an excellent biographical introduction, we are shown something of the road by which the young Swiss Protestant, Lydia Gysi, was led towards Orthodoxy and monastic life, how her involvement in both practical works of compassion and intense philosophical reflection brought her to the central hard truth of the need to 'die' into Christ in her monastic profession. And we see, especially in the later letters, how she is driven further and further away from the conventional supports and 'successes' of religious life into the unromantic truthfulness of the desert. 'Only in their death are the monks the challenge to the world' (p. 61).

Monasticism is to do with truth, and so to do with the painful death of illusory securities: it means a certain 'homelessness', an acceptance of the provisional. 'The truth is in the uttermost poverty' (p. 111), and in the folly of the prophet and the monk (pp. 20, 97, 111, 138, etc.) Mother Maria's reflections from the cancer ward of a Leeds hospital in her last years show her clearly as what Margaret Masterman has called a 'death-cell philosopher'—like Bonhoeffer, Simone Weil, Edith Stein and others in our day, one whose reasoning is done on the edges of human survival, for whom reason itself is not a tool to control the world but a discipline undertaken so as to meet death and God in humble and clear-sighted acceptance. Reason is inseparable from contradiction, thought and lived; 'Humility is an attitude of *mind*' (p. 21) before the mystery that stirs up conflict and fear and hope in us. 'The philosophers are those who suffer most keenly the limitations of reason' (p. 10), and true reasoning (which meant, for her, reasoning in the Platonic tradition) is 'a way of life . . . a total renunciation of presumption' (p. 12), inseparable from the purifying pain of 'non-achievement', selflessness in the whole of life.

It is impossible to convey the flavour of this book at second-hand. One can only testify to the depth of its authenticity. 'Orthodoxy', she writes, 'is the living bread for thousands . . . It is not a theory or a museum-piece! I know of no recent book in English which testifies so richly to this faith.

Rowan Williams

Archbishop John Maximovitch: *The Orthodox Veneration of the Mother of God*, St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood 1978, 56 pp., £1.

In this book the Author gives an account of the Orthodox teaching relating to the Mother of God, the emphasis being on the spiritual rather than on the academic aspects of Orthodox belief. He begins with the tradition of apostolic times and then describes the various attacks on the veneration of the Mother of God both from within and without the Church. Particular attention is paid to the Nestorian heresy and to the iconoclastic debate, but the main weight of the

book is devoted to a careful refutation of the Roman Catholic dogma of the Immaculate Conception, which is seen as a denial of all those virtues for which the Church has venerated the Mother of God over the centuries. The discussion is reinforced by many scriptural references and by quotations from the writings of the great theologians of both West and East. Archbishop John is highly critical of some twentieth-century Orthodox theological writings and especially of some of the ideas to be found in the works of Bulgakov. A final chapter expresses traditional Orthodox teaching positively, clearly distinguishing between the veneration due to Her who is "more honourable than the Cherubim and beyond compare more glorious than the Seraphim" and the worship which is due to God alone.

This is a useful book in that an area where there is a radical difference in the teachings of the Eastern and Western Churches is explored with a characteristic clarity and without compromise, and yet always with a view to preserving the best of the tradition of the undivided Church. 'The Orthodox Veneration of the Mother of God' is the ninth of the St. Herman of Alaska publications, and further extracts from Archbishop John Maximovitch's writings are promised in the future. The book is in a simple and economic format, but it includes a photograph of the Author taken in 1927 and a considerable number of black-and-white reproductions of icons of the Mother of God.

Archbishop Athenagoras Kokkinakis: *The Liturgy of the Orthodox Church*, Mowbrays 1979, 261 pp., £3.25.

This book includes (in parallel English and Greek texts) the Services of Preparation before the Divine Liturgy including the concluding prayers of Matins, the Divine Liturgy itself, and the Gospel readings for Sundays throughout the liturgical year. These are prefaced by an introduction to the Liturgy written by the late Archbishop Athenagoras of Thyateira and Great Britain presenting in simple terms traditional Orthodox eucharistic teaching, presumably for the benefit of non-Orthodox. His introduction deals with "the Mystery of Christ and the Mysteries of His Church", "the Mystery of the Holy Eucharist", "the Historical Background of the Holy Eucharist", and "the Eucharistic Doctrine of the Orthodox Church". This material is also presented in both English and Greek. For the most part the English translation of the Liturgy is in line with English texts which are available elsewhere, though the words *Theotokos*, *Logos* and *Pantocrator* are retained. The Doxology, the Lord's Prayer and other prayers conclude with "now and ever", the phrase "and unto ages of ages", which appears in the majority of English translations, being omitted. The traditional "Thee", "Thou", etc. of the Book of Common Prayer are retained in preference to the "You" of Anglican 'Series Three' and the uniat 'Byzantine Daily Worship', though there is some inconsistency in the use of the initial capital letter. The Archbishop makes a number of

useful comments on the translation of specific Greek words and expresses the hope that other translators will further improve the accuracy of translation.

This edition of 'The Liturgy of the Orthodox Church' is beautifully produced and most reasonably priced. The rubrics are printed in red and, most helpfully, the exclamations of the priest are printed in capitals. There is a full-page black-and-white reproduction of an icon of St. John Chrysostom and there are diagrams showing how the lamb and the particles are arranged on the paten. All this makes the book especially valuable for persons from English-speaking countries who attend the Liturgy in Greek churches in England or abroad.

Now that the Liturgy is being celebrated in English in various Orthodox jurisdictions, it is to be hoped that a definitive translation will be approved in the not-too-distant future, if only for the benefit of the music arrangers for whom the existence of the many different English texts in use at the moment must present considerable difficulties. This is a task which calls for inter-Orthodox collaboration on both sides of the Atlantic. The new English translation by Archbishop Athenagoras will, no doubt, prove of considerable value to any committee which may be set up to prepare an agreed English text to be used widely in the future.

Graham Flegg

REVIEWS OF RECORDED MUSIC

Chants Orthodoxes: Nikola Ghiuzelev (bass) with Male Voice Choir directed by Krustiu Marev. Harmoni Mundi (France) HM 133.

Les Liturgies de l'Orient: Various choirs. Harmoni Mundi HMU 520.

These two Harmoni Mundi recordings are welcome additions to their lists of Eastern Church music. The *Chants Orthodoxes* consist of six works in four of which Ghiuzelev joins the Choir as soloist. These four are: Hristo Manolov's setting of the Creed, Ivan Sapojnikov's *Tebe poem* ("To Thee we sing"), Nikolai Strokín's *Nine otpuchtaiechi* (the Prayer of St. Simeon), and a setting of the Lord's Prayer by the Director of the Choir. All these are fitting musical vehicles for Ghiuzelev's magnificent voice which has been vividly recorded—at times, it must be said, at the expense of the Choir. The imbalance is most obtrusive in the Creed and the Prayer of St. Simeon, though the overall sound is never unmusical. The two works sung by the Choir alone are: *Preslavnaia dnes* (from the Pentecostal stichera) set by Stepan Degtiarev and *Na rekah Vavilonskih* ("By the waters of Babylon") by Artemi Vedel. These both allow the Choir to display its undoubted excellence. In particular, impressive contrasts of dynamics are achieved without

imbalance between the voice parts, without trace of the harshness which can sometimes disfigure fortissimo singing, and without loss of clarity of diction. Indeed, these two pieces for choir alone may be preferred on the grounds that the singing is more liturgical in character and less operatic than that which includes the soloist. The overall recording is of a high quality and there is a pleasant absence of the surface noise which, unfortunately, mars so many recent pressings. Sleeve notes by Stefan Lazarov are provided in French and English. Here, it is disappointing that more information on the music is not provided. This would have been preferable to the lengthy advertisements for other Ghiuzelev recordings. It would also have been preferable to have titles in English rather than in Latin in the English notes.

The record entitled *Les Liturgies de l'Orient* is of particular interest for the contrast of musical traditions included. There is a lengthy extract from the Matins for the Feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, and this is followed by Nikolai Kedrov's setting of *Otche nash* ("Our Father") and Pavel Tchesnokov's *Spassi, Boja, lioudi tvoia* ("O Lord, save Thy people"), both from the Liturgy. The reverse side is devoted to a number of Maronite, Armenian, Chaldean and Syrian chants, and ends with a Litany sung in Greek. The singing of the Matins extract by a choir of Benedictine monks is accurate but somewhat uninspired. It is not helped by the lack of ambience in the recording. The two items from the Slavonic Liturgy are ably sung by the Bulgarian choir "Svetoslav Obretenov" directed by Georgi Robev with an unnamed bass soloist taking the priest's part. These are taken from the Balkanton *Orthodox Slavonic Liturgy* recorded in the Alexander Nevsky Cathedral in Sofia. The singing is well balanced but the recording quality is variable; some of the louder passages suffer from apparent over-recording. The items on the reverse side from various Eastern Churches are sung by a vocal ensemble directed by Trajan Popesco. The contrasting styles of the different traditions have been well captured. The final Greek Litany provides a suitable conclusion to an interesting selection of chants and brings us back to something closer to the familiar Western musical idiom. It is a great pity that the notes on the music are so inadequate and that three of the items described on the sleeve as Maronite are in fact Armenian.

Harmoni Mundi are performing a highly useful function in making Eastern Church music more widely available although the records are not always easy to obtain and requests for the German and French catalogues can seldom be met. The sleeve notes in the two recordings reviewed above, as in the case of other records not reviewed here, are less than satisfactory, however, both in the detailed coverage of the music performed and in factual accuracy. The recordings themselves are certainly to be recommended and are usually of a higher quality than most recordings of Orthodox Church music available elsewhere.

Liturgy (Steven St. Mokranjac): Kolegium Muzikum, Belgrade, directed by V. Ilic. Serbian Orthodox Church, Belgrade LPV 2406.

The music of the Serbian Church seems to be less well-known than Russian liturgical music. This recording of the setting of the Liturgy by Mokranjac goes some way towards redressing this situation. The music itself is very fine indeed, being full of contrast and containing many interesting modulations. The Choir presents these most effectively while maintaining throughout the ethos of a liturgical celebration. Not all the Litanies are sung in full, the parts of the priest and deacon being very much curtailed. One or two items are omitted altogether so as to accommodate the Liturgy to two sides of one record. In one case the harmonies are slightly changed from those in the most recent edition of the music score, but this is to good effect. A sense of mystery is captured by the very beautiful legato singing which seems to be accomplished entirely without intake of breath. Other and more robust parts of the setting are performed with an enthusiasm which is always both musical and liturgical. The recording quality is not as good as that of many modern recordings; a more faithful reproduction over the full frequency range would have done greater justice to both the music and the singers. This is, however, a record very much to be recommended, not least because the Mokranjac music captures faithfully the best of Serbian musical tradition.

Graham Flegg

Liturgie de Saint-Jean Chrysostome (Tchaikovsky, Op. 41): Svetoslav Obretenov Choir, directed by Dimitre Rouskov. Harmonia Mundi HMU 138.

Grand Liturgy. Svetoslav Chretenov Choir, Sofia, directed by Georgi Robev. Harmonia Mundi HMU 1C (065-99 675)

These two records were originally Balkanton recordings from Bulgaria. The Tchaikovsky work has reached the English list of Harmonia Mundi records via their French list, whilst the other recording comes from their German list. This explains why the information, such as it is, on the Tchaikovsky sleeve is in French whilst the other is in German, and one is left confused about the transliteration of the names.

It is generally agreed that Tchaikovsky's one essay into Church music is not particularly satisfactory, and this recording is very rough and the choir not well balanced. It probably dates back to the days when the Balkanton engineers had not learned how to deal with the cavernous spaces of the huge dome of the Alexander Nevsky Church at Sofia. Tchaikovsky set fifteen movements of the Liturgy in 1878. Five of these were based on traditional chants and the others were entirely original compositions. Perversely, this recording is confined to the ten movements which he composed

entirely on his own and they have little of Orthodox feeling in them. These movements consist of the Introduction to the Great Litany, the Second Antiphon, the Cherubic Hymn, the Nicene Creed, the *Sursum Corda*, *Sanctus*, etc., the Hymn to the Mother of God, the Our Father, and the Psalm after the Prayer before the Throne.

The second of these discs is much more satisfactory. It too consists of nineteenth-century works, when Church music had travelled far from its traditional roots, but some of the items (by various composers of the period) are musically good as well as being well known, and they retain some of the Russian feeling of the Traditional chants. The same choir as that on the Tchaikovsky disc is much more lively as well as more sonorous under a different conductor. Amongst the items there is the whole of a Great Litany by Christov (a Bulgarian composer) (1), the well known Creed by Gretchaninov very well sung (4), Kedrov's Our Father (7), a 'concerto' version of Psalm 41 by Archangelski (8), and a Hymn by Chesnokov (10).

If one likes this rich music and is still thrilled by growling Slavonic basses, this record will satisfy. For myself, I commend with greater enthusiasm another disc from the same company, Harmonia Mundi HMU 641. On this the choir from the St. Alexander Nevsky Church sings a relatively complete Liturgy to traditional chants. The only pity is that the translation of the words (into French) on the sleeve is a Uniate one. The indication of change of sides comes in the wrong place, but the *filloque* is not sung nor is the Pope of Rome prayed for.

Basil Minchin

VOCATIONS TO MINISTRY

To a man saying "I feel called to become a priest" most Christians respond approvingly; to a woman saying "I feel called to become a priest" some but far from all Christians would make a similar response; but to anyone saying "I feel called to become a bishop" all Christians would I imagine, react unfavourably. Why this difference? An enquiry into the reasons for it may help to clarify thought concerning ministry and vocation in general, and may also indirectly shed a little light on the issue of the claim of some women to be admitted to the priesthood and episcopate.

If Christians would be shocked by the lack of humility displayed in a man's speaking of his call to become a bishop, why is it that they feel otherwise about a claim to have a vocation to the priesthood? Indeed, since at any rate in 'catholic' thinking the priest's most characteristic function is to celebrate (or preside at) the Eucharist, there would seem to be the grossest presumption in asserting that one feels called to an office which primarily involves standing at the Lord's Table as an icon of Christ and pronouncing with one's own unsanctified tongue His words "This is my Body . . . , This is my

Blood . . . ' At the same time it should be noted that in the Anglican Ordinal the bishop-elect is indeed asked "Are you persuaded that you be truly called to this Ministration, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the order of this Realm?"—to which he must reply "I am so persuaded".

The position, then, is confused: a candidate for episcopal orders should not speak of his vocation in normal circumstances, but it is tolerable, indeed necessary for him to do so within the ritual of consecration; on the other hand, not only are those to be ordained as so-called 'inferior clergy' similarly questioned (twice in the case of aspiring deacons), but we have also seen that it is acceptable for candidates for the priesthood to speak of their calling both within the ordination service and in general conversation. The same, no doubt, is true of those who feel called to the permanent diaconate. So we must ask what there is in Christian terms about a bishop that confers on him even greater prestige than belongs, as we have seen, to a priest and, as we shall shortly observe, to a deacon.

The obvious answer, of course, is "the higher the fewer". Humanly speaking any one may aspire to the 'normal' ministry of priesthood, preceded by a probationary diaconate, but it is clear that only a few can expect preferment to the superior office of bishop. Because bishops are not only fewer in numbers than priests but also hierarchically above them, it naturally would appear both presumptuous and ridiculous for any man to state openly that he felt called to the episcopate. (Inner thoughts and unexpressed desires are, we admit, a different matter!)

Christianity, however, is not supposed to be about status in the worldly sense. Our Lord, whose words at the Last Supper the priest repeats, is recorded as also having said "He that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve . . . I am among you as he that serveth (the verb from which 'deacon' comes)"—St. Luke 22, 26-7. There is, therefore, for Christians no ministry more prestigious than the diaconate, and it is good in this connection to recall that the Pope describes himself amongst other titles as "servant of the servants of God". That the aspiring Anglican deacon should twice be questioned about his vocation in the ordination rite may be taken as a mark of the exalted status of what paradoxically in the same service is also termed "this inferior office".

But perhaps the double enquiry has something further to suggest to us. The candidate is asked "Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this Office and Ministration . . . ?" and then "Do you think that you are truly called, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the due Order of this Realm . . . ?" The phrase occurring in the second question, "truly called", is found in the rite for each of the three orders. We have so far assumed that it relates to an inward sense of

vocation and have noted that the idea which it represents is generally acceptable when expressed by candidates for the diaconate or the priesthood, but only tolerable on the lips of a bishop-elect when uttered in church in the course of an ancient ritual. But it could be maintained, whatever exactly Cranmer had in mind, that it is legitimate to take this question as referring mainly if not solely to a sense of having been duly called by the Church, Christ's Body on earth. Its meaning could be "Do you believe that the Church has properly tested your fitness for this Office, and have you co-operated in that testing by not seeking to hide material information and by not pretending to qualities or qualifications which you do not really possess?" In this sense, whether it concerns the episcopate or any order of ministry, there is no arrogance in affirming, either during a service or in conversation, that one is convinced of having been truly called. Indeed, before ordination or consecration, whether prestige in either Christian or secular estimation is or is not involved, a candidate ought to be convinced that he has been legitimately called to the office he is about to assume.

Pursuing the same line of thought, we might stress the fact that it is only on first entering the ranks of the ordained ministry as a deacon, with the lofty Christian status this involves, that the candidate is unequivocally questioned about his inner sense of vocation: "Do you think in your heart . . .?" Here it must be remembered that for the Prayer Book Ordinal there are simply three orders of ministry in Christ's Church, the diaconate being invariably the first to be conferred. It might not then be unfair to regard this question to the ordinand as referring to his inner conviction of being called to ordained ministry of any kind, while the subsequent enquiry which alone is repeated before a man becomes priest or bishop can be taken as relating primarily to his assurance that his call has been properly legitimated by the Church.

To-day we are learning that the threefold ministry, in spite of its historic and continuing importance, is not the last word on the subject of Christian service. Important as ordination is, ministry is not restricted to bishops, priests and deacons, and we are using increasing numbers of men and women as duly authorised lay ministers in the Church. The residual survival of minor orders in the Roman and other communions is a witness from another angle against the monopoly of episcopacy, priesthood and diaconate, and it is possible, I suppose, for the Church to institute new orders to meet new needs. We are aware, in any event, of the diversity of functions undertaken at different times and in different circumstances by those ordained to the three ranks of the traditional ministry.

In the light of all this, the ideal would be that a candidate should have an inward assurance of a call to ministry in general and offer himself or herself to the Church accordingly. It would then be for the Church, in response to the volunteer's gifts, potentialities and opportunities for service, and after taking account of its own

needs, to direct him, after testing his vocation, to some particular ministry, ordained or unordained, stipendiary or self-supporting. Testing by the Church would include doing everything possible in order to discover that the candidate was truthful in claiming to be inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost and was not the victim of self-deceit, acting under the impulse of a mere passing whim or some worldly motivation. Further testing would indicate the training needed and the particular ministry that a candidate, initially or later, should be called to undertake. As a result of these processes, a person might with both humility and assurance assert that he had been truly called to whatever ministry he was assigned, whether it carried much or little prestige in the eyes of Church people or of worldlings.

This, then, is the conclusion to which we have been moving: a Christian has the right to claim that he has been "inwardly moved" to undertake ministry in general, but not any particular form of ministry. The latter is something which the Church, if satisfied that the call is genuine, ought to work out in conjunction with the candidate, taking account both of its own needs and of his actual and potential abilities, which it should be not infrequently better qualified to judge than he himself. All this, one might suppose, is not unlike what happens when someone enters a religious order—and what is the Church if not *the* religious order for all Christians?

It might be objected that while every Christian, in virtue of his baptism, ought to feel called to ministry in the sense in which we have been developing the phrase, it would be both intolerable and impracticable for the Church to determine the career of each and all its members. In reply, the analogy of the religious orders may now prove helpful from a different angle. *All* disciples of our Lord are meant to sit lightly on money and possessions, to try to uphold Christian standards of sexual behaviour and to discover and submit themselves to the will of God; *some* disciples only are called to vow themselves to poverty, chastity and obedience in the religious state. Similarly, *all* Christians are called to be Christ's "faithful soldiers and servants"; only *some* Christians are "inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost" to offer themselves for that form of ministry to which the Church, Christ's Body, may decide to call them.

With regard to women and the priesthood, one corollary is surely obvious: the Church cannot deny that a female Christian may genuinely be called to ministry no less than a male; but no female Christian, any more than a male, can claim the right to decide to what particular ministry the Church should call her. Doubt is therefore cast upon the argument of those who urge the rightness of women priests because some women insist, no doubt sincerely, that they feel called to the ministry of priesthood.

Furthermore and finally, without abandoning the threefold ordained ministry, the Church ought urgently to consider whether within this,

or in new and additional forms, it can make better and fuller use of all whom the Holy Ghost is calling. Prestige and status must be ignored or, better still, put into a Christian perspective. So, a middle-aged candidate with the right gifts might find himself unordained, serving as a non-stipendiary deanery *staretz*, perhaps in company with a woman who had been for years a parish worker or a deaconess, while a comparative youngster, whose abilities pointed in that direction, might after a little experience of ministry be consecrated bishop of a diocese. One can imagine countless possible variations, but the Church would be rewarding no man or woman with what the world understands by 'superiority', for all whose vocations were authenticated would be no more and no less than ministers of Christ.

H. J. M. Turner
Chaplain, St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden

UNITY IN DIFFERENTIATION

The nineteenth-century Russian theologian Khomiakov stated that the church is one, because God is one. This suggests that, in order to understand the oneness of the church, we must first consider the oneness of God. Christianity is not, after all, the only monotheistic religion—there are others that hold that God is one. What is distinctively characteristic of Christianity is that God is understood as one-in-three, as the Holy Trinity. God is one "not in number, but in nature", as Evagrius puts it¹. Unity does not preclude trinitarian distinctions and relations, but is actually enhanced by them. This is to be linked with the Christian understanding of God as personal and as love. If God were one in a merely unitarian sense, he would be neither personal nor the creator of persons, in that personality implies relationship, as indeed love implies relationship. The Christian faith is a faith of 'trinitarian monotheism': the unity of God is not an undifferentiated oneness.

This in turn has implications for our understanding of humanity. Man was created in the image of the trinitarian God; and the church, as the focus of God's new creation, is to grow in this image and likeness. However, if the church is to be one as God is one, it must learn the meaning of 'trinitarian unity'. What does it mean to be one?—and what does unity not mean? The perennial temptation is to overstate oneness, to stress it at the cost of true differentiation. The theological danger here is that we may be interpreting oneness in a unitarian way. But if our model for Church unity is unitarian rather than trinitarian, it must be considered highly unsatisfactory, and deserves to fail as a model for either growth or action. Our God is the blessed Trinity, not an isolated monad. If Church union were to be achieved on the basis of a unitarian pattern, God in his mercy would surely break it up again.

Speaking more positively, of what unity may rightfully mean, we may turn to a statement of Teilhard de Chardin. He says: "Union in the personal differentiates"². It is this unity-in-differentiation that is characteristic of trinitarian unity.

Differentiation is vitally important and yet difficult to achieve. It tends to be either unduly subordinated to unity or else stressed in such a way as to disrupt unity. In reality neither unity nor differentiation should be neglected, and each is essentially complementary to the other. How, in practice, are we to deal with differentiation? What is to be our attitude to differences of various sorts—indeed, to the sheer 'otherness' of the other person? Or—to press the point further—how are we to cope with actual disagreement? One needs to be able to handle disagreement realistically, without denying that it is there. Otherwise, there may be pressure to conformity, which is a straightforward attempt to deny that there are any differences. Or there may be expulsion, or voluntary separation, which mark the regretful acknowledgment that differences have not been resolved. There may of course be differences that are fundamentally incompatible with unity, but all the same we have not begun to realise the full meaning of unity in differentiation. Symptomatic of this is our nervousness about differences generally, also our lack of means for coping with differentiation, let alone encouraging it!

This again proves important for our understanding of personality. Man was created to be interdependent. But *interdependence* requires *independence*. Independence does not mean isolation, but is simply the state of someone who is no longer dependent. Dependence, of its very nature, marks a greater or lesser degree of lack of differentiation. The purpose of a dependent relationship is to provide the support needed for a person to become truly himself or herself, to achieve an autonomous identity, and thus to reach the mature state of differentiation. It is proper and necessary for a child to be dependent on its parents, but, if he remains dependent beyond a certain age, this is unfortunate, even tragic. Dependence has failed in its own purpose if it does not lead on to independence. Independence marks the capacity for mature relationships with other people, as between equals. To cling to a person because one is afraid to be separate from them may give an appearance of unity, but is in fact a model of false unity.

"Union in the personal differentiates". What we seek is a visible unity, but such visible unity must be truly the manifestation of unity, not the mere semblance of it. The appearance of unity may or may not express the truth of a situation. It is sometimes said that we should forget our differences. Strictly speaking, this is the one thing that we must not do. We must not forget our differences, we must not neglect or minimise our concern for differentiation, since without this genuine unity cannot be achieved. Our unity must be truly trinitarian. For God is one, not as rationalists conceive of oneness, but as God has revealed Himself to us—as Father, Son and Holy Spirit, Trinity one-in-substance and undivided.

Elizabeth Moberly
Guest Member of Lucy Cavendish
College, Cambridge

1. St. Basil, Letter 8. The author of the letter was actually Evagrius Ponticus.

2. *Human Energy*, p. 104.

TOWARDS THE GREAT AND HOLY COUNCIL: PART I

After a long period of Pan-Orthodox conciliar inactivity, the Orthodox Church is moving towards the convocation of its "Great and Holy Council". Although this Council is being summoned as Ecumenical, when it came to choosing between the two traditional terms, "Ecumenical Council" and "Great and Holy Council of the Orthodox Church", the second of the two was finally, and rightly, preferred, as it was thus that the early Church councils, convened as ecumenical, normally called themselves. Whilst in the Church's history councils have been summoned as "ecumenical", their ecumenicity was a feature attributed to them, finally, by a common accord of the faithful (*consensus fidelium*). So it came about that councils convened as ecumenical were recognized only as local, in the Church's judgement, and vice versa. Take the Council of Sardica, for instance (called in 343 A.D.): it was meant to be ecumenical, but turned out to be local; the same thing happened at Rimini in 359. On the other hand, you have the Council of Constantinople in 381: called by the Emperor Theodosius as a council of the eastern portion of the Empire, it was recognized as ecumenical 150 years later by the 4th Ecumenical Council!

So it is that a council is not necessarily ecumenical because certain conditions laid down by the early Church in the course of its history have been observed. There is no, so to speak, absolute yardstick by which to judge whether a Council is Ecumenical or not. The main criterion is its Truth, that is, its soteriological importance for the faithful, and that cannot be ascertained beforehand.

Setting aside the history of Church councils, we shall merely note that they were eventually called by the Ecumenical Patriarchate². Thus, by common agreement with the heads of the local Orthodox Churches, the late Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras 1st convened the first Panorthodox Conference in Rhodes in 1961 with a view to laying down the themes of the Council. These themes are too well-known to be mentioned here; they cover virtually the whole spectrum of Orthodox doctrine, practice and life, and come under eight headings³ without any particular theological or ecclesiological order.

My paper deals with the preparation for the Great and Holy Council, in two stages:

A. From the 4th Pan-Orthodox Conference to the 1st Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference.

B. From the 1st Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference to the present day—Summing up, reflections and prospects.

A. From the 4th Pan-Orthodox Conference to the 1st Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference.

The 4th Pan-Orthodox Conference, held 8th-15th June 1968 at the Chambésy (Geneva) Orthodox Centre of the Ecumenical Patri-

archate, is an important landmark in the preparation of the Council. It selected six sub-themes from the Catalogue of Rhodes, viz. as follows:

1. From Chapter I "Faith and Doctrine", under heading B: The Sources of Divine Revelation:
 - (a) Holy Scripture:
 1. Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture.
 2. Authority in the Orthodox Church of the Old Testament Books known as *Anaginoskomena*.
 3. Critical edition of the Byzantine text of the New Testament.
 - (b) Sacred Tradition (definition of its meaning and range).
2. From Chapter II "Divine Worship", under heading C: Full participation by the laity in the worship and life of the Church.
3. From Chapter III "Church Government and Order", under heading E: Adaptation of the ecclesiastical ordinances regarding fasting to meet present-day needs.
4. From the same Chapter, under heading G: Impediments to marriage. A study of the present-day practice in the various local Churches and of the ecclesiastical procedure employed; also a means of securing, as far as possible, uniformity of practice on this matter throughout the whole of the Orthodox Church.
5. From the same Chapter, under heading I: The Calendar question. A study relating the question to the decision of the First Ecumenical Council concerning Easter and seeking a way to re-establish a common practice among the Churches.
6. From Chapter VII "Theological issues", under heading A: Economy in the Orthodox Church.
 - (a) Meaning of the terms *Akribeia* and *Oikonomia* in the Orthodox Church.
 - (b) *Oikonomia* (Economy):
 1. In the sacraments within the Church and outside it.
 2. In the reception of heretics and schismatics by the Orthodox Church (some by baptism, some by anointing with Holy Chrism, some by a fresh confession of faith, some by a special form of prayer).

As well as selecting these themes, the 4th Pan-Orthodox Conference laid down the process by which these were to be worked over and submitted to the future Pan-Orthodox Council, and also set up the machinery for this process. It was decided that each of the six themes should be entrusted to one or more local Churches for study and reporting on. Thus the first theme, which deals with the sources of Revelation, went to the Church of Constantinople; the second, on lay participation, to the Church of Bulgaria; the third, on fasting, to the Serbian Church; the fourth, on impediments to marriage, to

both the Russian and the Greek Churches; the fifth, on the Easter tables, likewise; whilst the sixth, on "economy", to the Church of Rumania⁴.

After allotting these themes, the 4th Pan-Orthodox Conference decided to set up an Inter-Orthodox Preparatory Commission to coordinate and work on the various studies farmed out (then and in the future) to the local Churches, and to formulate a single Orthodox standpoint on each of the themes. The Commission was made up out of one ordained representative for each of the local Churches, assisted by an ordained or lay theologian as councillor. The Secretariat for the Preparation of the Council—another decision taken by the 4th Pan-Orthodox Conference—was to have as its headquarters the Chambésy Orthodox Centre of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

The procedure for preparing the Council was to be as follows: The local Churches, mandated by the Conference to take a first serious look at the six chosen themes, were to be allowed six months to draft their report, which the Secretariat would then despatch to the Churches. Following that, the Inter-Orthodox Preparatory Commission would meet to formulate a single Orthodox standpoint on each of the chosen themes.

Once this was done by the Preparatory Commission, its President was to inform the Ecumenical Patriarch that its task had duly been carried out. The Patriarch, after consultation with the heads of the local Churches, would convene the Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference. The Commission's drafts were to be transmitted to the local Churches for their information.

The Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference was to review and examine the Preparatory Commission's drafts, and to produce a final dossier on each of the themes, to be remitted by the Ecumenical Patriarch to the future Great and Holy Council, being deposited in the archives of the proper Bureau⁵.

Some two years after the 4th Pan-Orthodox Conference did its work at Chambésy, that is to say on July 16th, 1970, the Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate met and decided to propose to the other Orthodox Churches to summon the Inter-Orthodox Preparatory Commission for the Great and Holy Council of the Orthodox Church. The Commission met July 15th-28th, 1971, at Chambésy, some three years after the 4th Pan-Orthodox Conference and at the same place.

During this meeting, the Inter-Orthodox Preparatory Commission reached a two-fold conclusion. First, it completed its mandate to build up a corpus of material on the six themes. Of this, the integral text of the draft reports was published by the Secretariat, in Greek⁶, then, also in Greek, in a booklet containing the minutes of the Inter-Orthodox Commission⁷. The Secretariat also provided for a

Russian edition of these documents⁸, and for their appearance in French (minus the draft on the first theme, Divine Revelation and salvation)⁹, English¹⁰, Italian¹¹ and partially in German¹².

Secondly, this Commission unanimously recommended that the 1st Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference revise the catalogue of themes drawn up by the 1st Pan-Orthodox Conference of Rhodes (1961), and finally, expressed to the Ecumenical Patriarch the wish that, after consulting the heads of the local Churches, he should convene the 1st Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference for the first half of June 1972¹³.

Taking, however, into account the draft reports of the Commission, the Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, presided over by the late Patriarch Athenagoras, came to the conclusion that this call for a rapid convocation of the Preconciliar Conference was, in practice, out of the question¹⁴. As was announced to the local Orthodox Churches and, later, to the Press (May 16, 1972) by the head of the Secretariat for the Preparation of the Council, the Ecumenical Patriarchate was led to conclude on the catalogue of themes of Rhodes that some preparatory work needed to be done by the local Churches, and that this work could not foreseeably be done prior to the brief July 1972 deadline. Therefore the 1st Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference would have to be summoned later. There was, however, confidence that the interim would be profitable, not only because it would give the ecclesiastical authorities time for a conscientious study of the themes of the Great Council, but also because they would have an opportunity of expressing the opinion of Orthodox theologians in general—a representative opinion, in conformity with the age-old custom of the Orthodox Church, of the overall judgement of the Orthodox faithful believers.

This postponement turned out, in fact, to be a milestone in the progress of the Orthodox Church towards the Great Council. The dimensions of the task, begun with such enthusiasm, were allowed to sink in, in all their breadth and with all their inherent difficulties. Contacts between theologians and local Churches were given a chance to continue, intensify and broaden in an attempt to awaken a full consciousness of what the Council entails. These may, briefly, be listed as follows:

1. From December 26th-31st, 1972, an official meeting of Orthodox theologians was held at Chambésy under the aegis of the Secretariat for the Preparation of the Council¹⁵. Having also reached the conclusion that the prescribed catalogue of themes corresponded neither to a norm of inner coherence, nor even to the demands placed upon the Church by the times and the needs of the faithful, they proceeded to draw up a new list of themes.
2. From September 22nd-28th, 1973, the Head of the Secretariat visited the Patriarchate of Romania at its behest, with the

object of informing the various departments of the Church of Romania on progress towards the Council, and to exchange views and information on its prospects¹⁶.

3. From October 9th-13th, 1973, the Secretariat for the Preparation of the Council organized an unofficial consultation for a group of theologians at the Orthodox Academy of Crete; its main task was to pinpoint the most urgent problems met with in the life of the Orthodox Church and arising—according to the participants—out of the immediate experience of Orthodox believers today. They could be summed up as follows: "The Church and the world, or the assumption of the world by the Church and the danger of its becoming secularized"¹⁷.
4. From October 13th-18th, 1974, at the invitation of His Beatitude Mgr. German, Patriarch of the Serbs, the head of the Secretariat visited the Patriarchate of Serbia. During this visit, (a) the need for awakening a consciousness of the necessity of convening the Great Council was stressed; (b) satisfaction was expressed regarding the necessarily slow but steady and conscientious preparation of the Council, inasmuch as it affords a possibility of doing the preliminary work in depth, so as to galvanize the faithful; (c) it was said that convening a Council could be justified on theological grounds, even if it were only to solve one painful question; (d) the particular gravity of the themes relating to the ecclesiological relations of the Orthodox Church with the other Churches was stressed, as was the fact that these questions can only be solved through a combined pan-Orthodox effort; finally it was observed that throughout the world there exists a yearning for a conciliar message of salvation, according to the crisis of the moment, so that Orthodoxy is faced today with an important mission¹⁸.
5. From April 26th to May 31st, 1976, all the local Orthodox Churches were visited, one after the other, by the Special Envoy of the Oecumenical Patriarchate, His Eminence the Senior Metropolitan Meliton of Chalcedon, who was accompanied by the head of the Secretariat for preparing the Council, and by the Very Reverend Great Protopresbyter George Tsetsis. This had as its happy outcome the summoning of the 1st Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference¹⁹.

It is not our purpose here to dwell on the abundant theological literature produced on the subject of the Council, nor on the spiritual stirrings observed, notably in Orthodox circles, many of which were dutifully provoked by the Secretariat. At the time, their discordant chorus—hardly a rare phenomenon in such cases of disagreement—appeared to put a brake on the direct progress towards the Council. But in fact, they should be regarded as affording precious guidance to the Orthodox Church on its still difficult path towards the Council²⁰.

We shall also forego summarizing the opinions expressed on the six special themes designated at Chambésy in 1968, and their elaboration in 1971 by the Inter-Orthodox Preparatory Commission. An overall picture of these opinions has been submitted by us to the 1st Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference²¹.

In winding up this first part of our paper, we would like simply to express a doubt as to whether the theological literature grown up round the Council really reflects the corresponding participation of wider Church circles in an event, the importance of which will depend on its saving power or, in other words, on the ability of the Orthodox Church to strengthen the belief of those, to whom it addresses itself, that it is true to itself, as the Living Church—able to clothe the Evangelical message with the garment of History, without any hiatus in historical continuity. The importance of this event will likewise depend on the whether the Orthodox Church thereby proves itself worthy of its name, its tradition, its calling and its wider significance for the whole of the modern Christian world.

Damaskinos, Metropolitan of Tranoupolis
Head of the Secretariat for the preparation of the Great
and Holy Council

NOTES

1. Athanasios Yevitch: Tradition and Renewal in the institution of the Ecumenical Councils (in Greek). "Synodika" 1, p. 104.
2. Acts & Documents of the 1st Pan-Orthodox Conference, Rhodes, September 24-October 1, 1961. Ecumenical Patriarchate, 1967, p. 116 ff. (in Greek).
3. Acts & Documents of the 4th Pan-Orthodox Conference, Chambésy, June 8-15, 1968. Ecumenical Patriarchate, 1968, p. 82-83 (in Greek).
4. *op.cit.* p. 81.
5. Damaskinos Papandreou: Prospects and Problems concerning the future Council, (in Greek). "Synodika" 1, p. 33-34.
6. *Πρός τὴν Μεγάλῃν Σύνοδον. I. Εἰσηγήσεις τῆς Διορθόδοξου Προπαρασκεαστικῆς Ἐπιτροπῆς ἐπὶ τῶν ἐξ θεμάτων τοῦ πρώτου σταδίου, Σεπτέμβριος Γενεύης, 1971.*
7. *Διορθόδοξος Προπαρασκεαστικὴ Ἐπιτροπὴ τῆς Ἁγίας καὶ Μεγάλῃς Συνόδου, 16-18 Ἰουλίου 1971. Σεπτέμβριος Γενεύης, 1973.*
8. Towards the Great Council (Russian Edition). Chambésy-Geneva, 1971.
9. Saint et Grand Concile de l'Eglise Orthodoxe. "Contacts", supplément au No. 80, 4ème trimestre 1971.
10. Towards the Great Council. Introductory reports of the Interorthodox Commission in preparation for the next Great and Holy Council of the Orthodox Church. London, SPCK, 1972.
11. I sei documenti preparatori verso il concilio panortodoso. "Il Regno-Documenti", 1.1.1973.
12. Report on Economy. "Una Sacta", 2/1973. Cf. Metropolitan Damaskinos Papandreou: Die Vorbereitung der Panorthodoxen Synode—Aktuelle theologische Fragen und Überlegungen, in: Auf dem Weg zur Einheit des Glaubens, Pro Oriente, Tyrolia Verlag, 1974.
13. Acts of the Inter-Orthodox Preparatory Commission. July 16-28, 1971. Chambésy-Geneva, 1973, p. 147 (in Greek).
14. Patriarchal Letter, Ref. 273/20.4.1972.
15. "Episkepsis", No. 86—16.10.1973.
16. *Op. cit.*
17. *Op. cit.*
18. "Episkepsis", No. 111—5.11.1974.
19. "Episkepsis", No. 146—1.5.1976; No. 147—15.5.1976 and No. 148—1.6.1976.
20. Cf. "Contacts" No. 73/74 (1971); "Episkepsis", No. 26—2.3.1971.
21. Métropolit Damaskinos de Tranoupolis: "Rapport sur la préparation du Grand Concile". 1ère Conférence Panorthodoxe Préconciliaire, 21-28 Novembre 1976. Edition du Secrétariat pour la Préparation du Concile, 1976. Annexe I, p. 170-215. (Exists also in Greek).

NOTICES

Appeal

The Russian Student Christian Movement appeals for books on theology, philosophy and liturgics, for magazines such as *The Messenger* (Vestnik) and *The Eternal* (Vechnoye), for works on the Christian understanding of life (by Frank, Berdyaev, etc.), and for similar publications. Books and money for the purchase of books should be sent to: A.C.E.R., 91 rue Olivier-de-Serres, 95015 PARIS. Parcels should be marked "Livres religieux".

Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius

Events at St. Basil's House, 52 Ladbrooke Grove, London W11 2PB

The *Orthodox Liturgy* is celebrated every Saturday in the Chapel at 8 a.m., except that on the last Saturday of the month it is at 10.30 a.m.

Prayer and meditation, conducted by Fr. Lev Gillet, takes place every Monday at 7 p.m. in the Library.

Thursdays with Metropolitan Anthony: The last three meetings of the 1979-80 session will take place on 13th March, 17th April and 8th May. The meetings are preceded by Vespers at 7.30 p.m.

The *Annual General Meeting* of the Fellowship will take place at 3.00 p.m. on 22nd March 1980. It will include a lecture and be followed by tea.

There will be a buffet supper on 15th May 1980 at 7.30 p.m. For further details please contact the Secretary.

Events elsewhere

The *Annual Liturgy* at St. Alban's Cathedral will be celebrated at 11.30 a.m. on 28th June, 1980. The Liturgy will be that of the Coptic Orthodox Church, and will be followed by prayers at the shrine of St. Alban. Please book in advance for the buffet lunch.

The *Fellowship Retreat* at Pleshey will be held from 4th to 7th July 1980 and will be conducted by the Reverend Colin Davey, Joint-Secretary of the Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission.

The *Fellowship Conference* will be held at High Leigh, Hoddesdon, from 4th to 11th August 1980. Details may be obtained from the Secretary. Early booking is advised.

Glastonbury Abbey Annual Pilgrimage

Saturday 28th June 1980

The programme includes:

The *Holy Eucharist* celebrated in the Undercroft at 8.00 a.m.

The *Divine Liturgy* of the Orthodox Church celebrated in the Undercroft at 9.00 a.m.

The *Holy Eucharist* solemnly sung in the Nave of the Abbey Church at Noon.

Procession from St. John's Church to the Abbey Grounds for *Solemn Evensong* at 3.30 p.m.

Enquiries and bookings to: The Secretary,
West of England Pilgrimage
Association,
Parish Office, High Street,
Glastonbury,
Somerset BH6 9DR

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

SIR—I fear that in trying to clarify the confusion caused by the existence of two Russian Churches in London you have perpetrated a historical error. After the Russian Civil War contact between the Moscow Patriarchate and Russian clergy abroad was almost impossible and so the Higher Church Administration was set up. Originally, it included all the bishops who were outside Russia under the Chairmanship of Metropolitan Anthony of Kiev. There was, however, a split between Metropolitan Anthony and Metropolitan Evlogy of Paris in 1927. It was then that the Russian congregation in London, using the old St. Philip's Church in Buckingham Palace Road, divided into two groups and began holding services on alternate Sundays. In 1943 the Soviet Government allowed the election of a new Patriarch and appeals were made to Russian Orthodox Christians scattered throughout the world to recognise him and submit to his authority. It was thus that a separate parish of the Patriarchate of Moscow was established in London at the end of World War II. The sharing of a building continued until St. Philip's Church was demolished in 1955. After this the two parishes moved into separate premises.

Andrew Bond
243 Regent Street
LONDON W1R 8PN

(Note: The Editor reserves the right to make minor editorial changes in letters and articles received and, where necessary, to reduce their length provided that this does not change the sense of the material communicated. All intended contributions should be typed with double spacing on A4 paper.)

Printed at the Press of Frank Jukes Limited,
Stratford St. North, Camp Hill, Birmingham B11 1BY.

ANNUAL FESTIVAL 1980

SATURDAY, 25th OCTOBER

at

ST. DUNSTAN'S-IN-THE-WEST, LONDON