



**E.C.N.L.**

Cover design by David Tuthill

**THE JOURNAL OF  
THE ANGLICAN AND EASTERN  
CHURCHES ASSOCIATION**

New Series No. 21 Autumn 1985  
£1.50 to non-members

ISSN No.  
0012-8732

## The Anglican and Eastern Churches Association

founded 1864

*Orthodox Patron:* The Oecumenical Patriarch

*Anglican Patron:* The Archbishop of Canterbury

*Anglican President:* The Bishop of Basingstoke

*Orthodox President:* The Archbishop of Thyateira and Great Britain

*Chairman of the Committee:* The Revd. H. EMBLETON, M.A.,  
Skirwith Vicarage, Penrith,  
Cumbria CA10 1RQ

*General Secretary:* The Revd. A. T. J. SALTER, A.K.C.,  
St. Dunstan-in-the-West,  
184 Fleet Street, London EC4A 2EA

*Assistant Secretary:* DEACONESS V. HORNBY-NORTHCOTE  
St. Dunstan-in-the-West (see above)

*Treasurer:* SIMON BREARLEY, ESQ.,  
54K Cornwall Gardens, London SW7 4BG

*Pilgrimage Secretary:* The Revd. PHILIP WARNER  
St. Martin's House,  
6 Edinburgh Road, Brighton BN2 3HY

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

## Contents

	Page
Editorial	1
The General Secretary's Notes	2
The Assistant Secretary's Notes	11
An Orthodox Response to the "Lima Document"	12
The Indian Orthodox Syrian Church	17
St. Cyril and St. Methodios, Apostles of the Slavs	25
Bishop Matthew of Aspendos 1894-1985	29
Antiochene Christianity, Islam and Arab Nationalism—III	34
Book Reviews	45
Notices	52
Letter to the Editor	56

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

## Eastern Churches News Letter

### EDITORIAL

There is an increasing tendency today, even amongst committed Christians, to suggest that the ethical problems presented by the explosion of knowledge and the corresponding advances in technology of the last half-century cannot be resolved by reference to traditional Christian teaching alone. This attitude is also extended to social and economic aspects of modern life, where it often seems to be assumed that a religion cradled in the first centuries of this era is not adequate to cope with twentieth-century life, and that therefore new principles have to be sought which will provide the necessary ethical basis upon which a largely post-Christian society can be built up. This approach to the problems of today is, of course, an extremely dangerous one. What inevitably happens is that principles are shaped to conform to society as it actually is rather than society being persuaded to transform itself according to the principles laid down by the Incarnate Son of God and proclaimed by the Apostles, the Fathers, and the Church throughout the centuries. It is simply not true to imagine that we are faced today or shall ever be faced with issues which are outside the compass of the traditional Christian Faith.

Whilst it seems incredible that any Christian can condone abortion or experimentation with human embryos, there are other aspects of medical practice today which ought also to be causing considerable concern to all Christians and which need serious theological study. Immense strides in medical knowledge and technology have been and are being made, and current research suggests that we are on the verge of facing much greater ethical problems than we face at present, serious though some of the present problems are. It is very important that all Christians should be aware of current possibilities, and that Christian medical practitioners and researchers should use their influence to try to ensure that present and future medical activities are in conformity with Christian principles in a country which still makes some sort of claim to be largely Christian. Amongst current medical practices which do not seem to have had adequate theological investigation is the practice of "spare-part" surgery. Such surgery has had wide publicity and commendation from society at large and especially from the media. The public are encouraged to donate the organs of their bodies for use in such surgical work on the seemingly highly commendable grounds that lives of others may be saved if organs are more readily available as transplants. It is, however, doubtful if the principles involved in or implied by this kind of surgery have ever been adequately considered.

One of the principles which "spare-part" surgery seems directly to imply is that the human body is a disposable object, a temporary casing for a human personality which can be disposed of by its "owner" as he or she wishes, and whose fate after death is simply a matter of convention or convenience. This is certainly not the teaching of Holy Scripture, which clearly proclaims a much more significant status for the body. Indeed, the Christian Faith proclaims

an eternal destiny for the human body when it shall put on incorruption at the last day. Christians should seriously question by what right can any individual dispose of his or her body in any way which fails to take account of its true status.

Christian witness to the Biblical teaching on the nature and destiny of the human body, so badly needed in this age of confusion, has been seriously weakened by the failure of the Churches to witness adequately to the eschatological teaching of the Bible and by the widespread adoption of the pagan practice of cremation—a practice which specifically reflects the principle that the body, having no eternal destiny, can be appropriately destroyed by fire after death. St. Paul's warning to those who heedlessly destroy the body needs to be noted carefully! It can, of course, be argued that in a multi-faith society it is no longer appropriate that Christian principles should be of overriding concern. Be that as it may, those who claim to be Christian must continue to witness to the teaching of Christ and His Church, however unpopular that witness may be in a society which seems to have no criterion other than expediency. The Christian witness to the dignity of the human body is unique and is desperately needed today to guide those who profess to serve the body away from paths which violate that dignity and may lead to an ultimate total disregard for humanistic let alone Christian values. The debt which society owes to science and to medical science in particular is very great, but it is important to remember that there is some knowledge which mankind in its fallen state is simply unfit to acquire and which is intended by God to remain hidden. The pursuit of knowledge irrespective of the cost and in disregard of the dignity of the human person should not have the support of any society, be it Christian or non-Christian.

#### THE GENERAL SECRETARY'S NOTES

##### *Visit to Cyprus and the Holy Land*

On 9th February Fr. Royston Beal (a member of our Committee), Mr. Jonathan Bolton-Dignam (a Church of Ireland member of the Association) and I set out from Heathrow for Limassol airport in Cyprus. After a long wait at London Airport while the plane was de-iced, we then had to fly to Manchester Airport and on to Cyprus, and thence to our apartment in Paphos. The Cyprus countryside was ablaze with carpets of marigolds, hibiscus, anemones and wild cyclamen; cherry and peach blossoms were in full bloom, and the orchards heavy with lemons and oranges. It was through this colourful countryside that we drove on deserted roads to visit the shrine of St. Neophytos and the little cave and chapel where this 12th-century monk had spent much of his life. A few days later found us venerating the tomb of a local saint, Hagios Hermogenes, whose shrine is situated on a lonely beach between the British Sovereign bases of Episkopi and Agrotiri.

We had not realised how widespread the Anglican Church is in Cyprus, with its own Bishop and Archdeacon and its main church in Nicosia. But even in Paphos we discovered an exquisite little 10th-century church, dedicated to St. Anthony of Egypt, which had been handed over to the Anglicans and which was in regular use, being shared with the local Latins.

On 15th February we drove through some wild country to the village of Panhagia, the birthplace of Archbishop Makarios III. In the village a slight blizzard was blowing, but we managed to visit the statue of the Archbishop-Ethnarch and to look at the outside of his birthplace, a tiny cottage in the centre of the village. Before darkness overtook us we attended *Esperinos* (Vespers) at the local monastery of Chryssoriatissa, left some Constantinople lectures and *ECNLs* with the monks, admired the spectacular view of the foothills of the Troodos mountains, and drove back to Paphos before nightfall.

The next night we set sail from Limassol for Haifa where we disembarked and caught an Israeli 'bus which was to take us to Jerusalem. It was some twenty-two years since I had seen Mount Carmel and about a decade since I last visited the Holy Land. Twenty-two years ago Carmel seemed positively rural, but now it is entirely urbanised, the headquarters of the Carmelite Order bristling with radio masts and TV aerials as it presumably keeps in touch with a great number of Carmels around the world. Israel was covered with orange groves and lemon orchards as far as the eye could see, and swarming with soldiers of both sexes hitch-hiking back to camp as yesterday was *Sa'bat*. Our route took us through what was once Philistine territory. These Philistines seem to have come from the sea. In *circa* 1,500 BC clay tablets were written about the sea people who tried to invade the Pharaoh's empire and then turned their attention to the coasts adjoining Israel. Judge Samson, of course, fought them and then married one, Delilah, who was to be his downfall. We began our long climb, like the pilgrims of old, to Jerusalem passing through Ashkelon, where Samson was born, Ashdod, and the sites of other Philistine towns, thence to the valley where Joshua fought the Amalekites, praying for the sun not to set and the moon not to rise until he had won the battle. Passing through the mountains of Judaea we came to Emmaus, settled some 150 years ago by Muslim Arab bedouin who were allowed to come in from the desert by the Ottoman Turkish rulers. The village is known as Abu Bosh after their leader. The ancient Latin Crusader church became a mosque, but it is used annually for a music festival as its acoustics are said to be the best in Israel. Every inch of this land is drenched with history—on our left as we left Emmaus there was the tomb of the last Judge in Israel, the Prophet Samuel, whose inauguration of the monarchy brought to an end some 220 years of rule by the Judges. Ahead of us rose the New Jerusalem with fourteen new quarters, mostly high-rise flats and a population which has doubled in sixteen years. By law every new building in Jerusalem has to be built of stone so that the new city has a rather mellowed look.

Of interest to the Orthodox pilgrim on this road is the ancient Monastery of the Cross, which according to tradition is built over the site of the tree from which the Holy Cross was taken. For many years it was in the hands of the Latins, perhaps changing hands during one of the Crusades, but it is now a Greek monastery of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. Near this monastery is the traditional site of Lot's home in the orchard of which he planted three trees, one of which may have provided the wood of the True Cross. Legend has it in this valley that the three trees planted here spread their seedlings throughout Palestine. It was the Ottoman Turks who denuded the landscape and turned the country into a dust bowl when they took all the timber for

building projects in their Empire. Since the state of Israel was created some 40 million trees have been planted, so that today there are orchards and plantations stretching for miles in almost every direction.

Our first place of pilgrimage was to be Bethlehem, so we whisked through the outskirts of Jerusalem and soon found ourselves in the Church of the Nativity, now largely in the hands of the Greek Patriarchate except for the actual site of the Saviour's birth, which is marked by a silver star and a Latin inscription that on this site was born Jesus Christ of the Virgin Mary. It is said that the theft of this star by the representative of the Tsar of Russia helped to spark off the Crimean War. The atmosphere is still somewhat eclectic; a group of American ladies sang "Away in a Manger" whilst the Greeks upstairs prepared to begin *Esperinos*, and the Armenians in the side chapels were already singing Vespers happily oblivious of the rest of Christendom.

We drove back through the drizzle having presented Bishop Michael Ramsey's First Constantinople Lecture to an eager young Greek monk, who went off to read it immediately. In a few minutes we were back in Jerusalem, Bethlehem having become in the last few years a suburb of the City. We made straight for the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, known by the Greeks as the Church of the Resurrection. We joined the line of pilgrims waiting to venerate the tomb of Christ, and I found myself behind two elderly English soccer fans who spent the minutes queuing debating whether a player called Woolley would make a good centre forward for Lytham St. Anne's. In the tomb an Orthodox monk leaned forward collecting all the known currencies of the world. At the back of the tomb a Coptic monk appeared out of the shadows selling rosaries and pressed wild flowers from the fields around Bethlehem, whilst under the rotunda an Armenian monk invited me to see the Armenian Patriarch's new throne room and vestry. Our devotions on Calvary were less interrupted, but time was running out and we made our way through the old city past the Latin, Greek, Melkite and Armenian Patriarchates and the Headquarters of the Russian Church Outside Russia, the only Christian community not to duplicate the various hierarchies in that it has not established a bishopric there but canonically and correctly has placed its churches and convents under an Archimandrite. This Church has done a noble piece of work in rescuing so many Arab children during the troubled years since 1948; many of the girls taken in by the Russian nuns have now swelled the ranks of the religious communities. There were many more Ethiopian monks in Jerusalem since my first visit, and these are obviously refugees from Ethiopia.

By 19th February we were back in Cyprus and visiting the Trooditissa Monastery in the mountains. It was here that I met a monk who knew our editor, Fr. Columba Flegg, and allowed us to venerate the famous icon of the Mother of God and to light candles for the members of the Association. Foolishly, as it turned out, we drove on through the snow-covered peaks to the monastery where Archbishop Makarios III had been a monk before his elevation to the Ethnarchy and Archbishopric of Cyprus. Night was falling and there was a roaring gale when we reached the monastery, and we had arrived too late to see the church. We drove on and got hopefully lost on ever

worsening and narrowing mountain tracks, trying to find our way ahead in the darkness and doing our best to avoid the huge boulders which strewn the road. Eventually, having travelled several miles in the wrong direction, we arrived at a village where we ate at a taverna and were directed by the innkeeper onto the road for Limassol. It is not wise to travel in the Troodos Mountains at that time of year without a guide who knows the terrain. The next day we were up and on our way to Nicosia before day-break in good time to reach the Archbishopric by 10 am, but we had not reckoned on part of the motorway being under repair. This delayed us for some time. However, Fr. Beal drove like Jehu and we arrived at the Archbishop's Palace only five minutes late. Archbishop Chrysostomos received us very warmly and we handed to him a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury. His Beatitude has certain Byzantine privileges given to his predecessors by the Graeco-Roman Emperors. One of these is to sign his name, as did the Emperors, in red ink; another is the use of a long sceptre surmounted by a ball and cross in lieu of a crozier. He wore an Imperial purple rason and violet patches on the ends of his veil. His enkolpion was the crest of Byzantium, the double-headed eagle. His residence is very close to the Green Line, the border between what are now two spheres of government on the Island, i.e. that of Nicosia and that of Turkish-occupied Cyprus. The frontier, which is heavily guarded, is as far from the Archbishop's home as St. Thomas's hospital is from Lambeth Palace. His Beatitude spoke of the ancestry of the so-called Turkish Cypriots, who do not seem overtly fond of their Turkish liberators. He believed these ethnic minorities were the descendants of the Byzantines, the Venetians and the Latins, etc. who converted to Islam at the time of the Turkish Conquest of the Island. These people, although Moslems, lived in villages named Hagia Barbara and Hagia Nicholas, indicating Christian ancestry. I told the Archbishop that I had witnessed a similar situation in Ephesus, where Moslem villagers make the pilgrimage to the house of the *Theotokos* and call the dwelling *Panya Capul*, *Panya* obviously being a local adaptation of the Greek *Panagia*—All-Holy One, i.e. Our Lady. The Archbishop had visited London during the time that Archbishop Makarios III was in exile after the attempt on his life, and he told us that he hoped that the Archbishop of Canterbury would visit Cyprus. He then called for coffee, the eastern signal that the audience was almost over, and then allowed us to take photographs. The audience had lasted forty minutes. He bade us Godspeed and presented each one of us with a photograph of himself, which he signed in red ink as is his Byzantine privilege.

We drove to the British High Commission to try and get a permit to visit the Occupied Territories, but the office had closed just two minutes earlier. Here again the building is right on the Green Line, and it reminded us of the partition which once divided Jerusalem and still divides Berlin. One could not but reflect on the fact that, though man could fly to the moon, it was still impossible for a Greek family to travel to Famagusta from Nicosia—sobering thoughts for those who pray and work for the unity of the Holy Churches of God, for we do so in a terrifyingly divided world of which poor Cyprus is a microcosm. We thought that we ought to make further contacts with other Christian communities in Nicosia, so we made our way on foot to the

Chancery of the Holy See and the Latin Church next door. The latter is half inside the Turkish zone, but the front door opens into the unoccupied territory. Both places were closed and, as we were not sure of the status of the soldiers with guns glaring at us from the top of the walls, we rapidly made our way down a side street and visited the Maronite church. This church too was closed, but across the small square was a Maronite club where one of the members knew Father Elie, one of the Maronite priests in London. We were soon shown the church and warmly entertained to coffee and raki by Maronites who had fled from the Turkish army of invasion. We gazed at the modern and rather garish mosaics on the walls of the Maronite church and thought how tolerant were the Greeks to allow the rather provocative text *Ubi Petrus : Ibi Ecclesia* to remain undamaged and unaltered by graffiti! It reminded one of the mosaic over the Waldensian church near St. Peter's in Rome which proclaims that it is *Lux luceat in tenebris*, and of the priest at the Latin church on the island of Mykonos, who, surrounded by 365 Greek Orthodox churches, preached to the tourists in his congregation on the text *Extra Ecclesia Romana nulla salus est*, which one could not help feeling were not exactly in the unprovocative spirit of Vatican II! Back in Limassol we were invited to lunch by John Samuels, a member of the Anglican Church in Cyprus, who told us something of its life and work. We left the Island very impressed with the friendship for the British which the Cypriots have, and we hope and pray that this may be as fully reciprocated here in the United Kingdom as it is in Cyprus, and that some way may be found with British help to once again unite the Island under one government.

#### *The Archbishop of Canterbury's Unity-Week Party*

For some time now the Archbishop of Canterbury has entertained the heads of Foreign Churches resident in the United Kingdom to a party at Lambeth Palace. The party is always preceded by Choral Evensong. The Metropolitan of Transylvania was amongst the visitors from overseas who were present, together with Bishop Constantine of the Russian Church Outside Russia, Exarch Bishop Hornyak of the Ukrainian Catholic (Uniate) Church, the Archdeacon of the Assyrian Church of the East, the Armenian Bishop, the Chorepiscopus Kuriakose of the Syro-Indian Church, many representatives of the Eastern European Roman Catholic Church, and Reformed and Lutheran Pastors from the Baltic States and Eastern Europe.

#### *Visit of the Primate of Czechoslovakia*

Metropolitan Dorothei, Primate of the Orthodox Church of Czechoslovakia, was entertained by the Nikaeen Club at S.P.C.K. headquarters in Marylebone on May 10th. Our Anglican President, the Bishop of Basingstoke, and I were invited to the luncheon. His Grace was visiting several Anglican centres and communities during his visit.

#### *Nikaeen Club's Annual Dinner*

The dinner was held in the guardroom of Lambeth Palace on 25th June, and members and guests enjoyed a splendid meal and a chance to renew old friendships. Unfortunately the guest of honour, His Holiness the Catholicos-Patriarch of the Great House of Cilicia of the

Armenians, was unable to leave the Lebanon, where the Holy See of Cilicia is located, due to the sealing off of the eastern highway to the airport. His Holiness felt that owing to the highly volatile situation in his country at this time he ought to remain with his flock. He sent a warm greeting to the Archbishop of Canterbury and to the Nikaeen Club and their guests.

#### *Dr. Methodie Kusseff*

Dr. Kusseff is a popular figure with Bulgarians of all political persuasions or none, and he and his wife, Kit, keep an open house to all of their compatriots where Bulgarians and their Anglican friends are always warmly welcomed. The Bulgarian Ambassador invited many of Methodie's friends to the Bulgarian Embassy in June where we were entertained to a superb little recital by one of the Bulgarian musicians now resident in the United Kingdom and to a spectacular display of Bulgarian folk dancing by a troupe from Sofia. Dr. Methodie is well-known in Anglican circles and studied for some time at Kelham. His uncle was a Metropolitan in the Bulgarian Orthodox Church in the days of the monarchy.

#### *Dr. Faoud Megally*

The Committee are pleased to announce the appointment of Dr. Megally, a Copt and lecturer in Arabic in London University, to the Committee membership.

#### *Father Tosko Kasakin*

We also welcome to the Committee Father Kasakin the Priest-in-charge of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church in the United Kingdom. Father Kasakin will be helping to set up the itinerary for the Association's pilgrimage to Bulgaria in 1986. The Bulgarian Orthodox congregation use St. Basil's House for the Sunday Liturgy.

#### *Dr. Vassily James*

Please remember in your prayers Dr. Vassily James of the Romanian congregation in St. Dunstan-in-the-West, who is ill.

#### *Professor James Haney*

Those who went on the pilgrimage to Serbia will remember James who is a Pastor in the Lutheran Church in the U.S.A. He recently visited St. Dunstan's with a party of some twenty young pilgrims who were on their way to the Patriarchate of Moscow and the Catholicosate of Etchmiadzin in Armenia. I was able to arrange, through the kindness of Miss Mary Cryer, a tour of Lambeth Palace for the party, and later took them to Choral Evensong at Westminster Abbey.

#### *Mother Maria*

Again those who went to Serbia will not have easily forgotten Mother Maria. It was good to see her again at St. Dunstan's in late June and she spent an afternoon telling me of her plans and hopes for the future. Please keep her and her Serbian Orthodox sisters in your prayers as they work on restoring their convent.

#### *St. Basil's House*

Members of the Association will know that St. Basil's House, the London headquarters of the Fellowship of SS. Alban & Sergius, has

launched an appeal for the restoration of the property. Some of our members were present at the concert given at Leighton House on 24th June in aid of St. Basil's.

#### *Exchanging Populations*

A great deal of publicity has been given in recent weeks to the number of Anglicans supposedly leaving the Church of England for the Roman Catholic Church in England. A study of the statistics would point to rather more Roman Catholics joining the Church of England than traffic in the other direction. The tendency has been for the Roman Catholic press to give far more publicity to converts to Rome and, in the past, to arrange some rather ostentatious window dressing on the reception of such converts. One rather important novelist priest was greeted by trumpets on his reception as though he had joined the ranks of the Church Triumphant! This sort of thing, plus the fact that those who leave the Church of England have the unfortunate habit of slamming the door very loudly behind them on exiting to make the point that that they have gone—the noise attending their departure being a form of spiritual suicide note—is good for the press.

However, many of the bishops and priests of the Church of England have to cope with the spiritual problems of those who find the grass no greener on the banks of the Tiber or the Bosphorus than they did on the banks of the Thames, and at the time of writing I have had to deal with two such who have not found what they thought they were looking for in the Orthodox community, even though in one case jurisdictions have been changed within Orthodoxy. Even more numerous are those who having had bouts of Holy See-sickness, "Pope" and then return, often with indecent haste, on a sort of religious away-day return ticket to Canterbury!

Myths have always abounded about numbers in ecclesiastical circles and heads counted which are not of this fold or any other. Rome until recently tended to count all the Irish, Polish, and Italian immigrants to these shores as though they were indigenous Anglicans or English who had been converted to her ranks. The so-called "second spring" of Roman Catholicism in England was really brought about by the coming of the railways and the influx of Irish navvies to build them. The vast majority of Anglicans remained untouched by Catholic Emancipation or the setting up of the hierarchy in Ashley Gardens. So, too, there has been a similar inclination to count all Cypriot Greek immigrants as Englishmen, who have joined the Orthodox Church; whereas the reason some score of churches were opened in the last twenty-five years in the Thyateira jurisdiction was not to accommodate a mass conversion of Londoners to Orthodoxy, but rather to provide spiritual homes and sustenance to those who opted for British nationality at the time of Cypriot independence or at the time of the Turkish invasion.

In Canada a great deal of research has been done on this spiritual exchange of population, and there the conclusion was reached that it was the Anglican Church which had gained a considerable number of converts from, particularly, Slav Orthodoxy and Ukrainian Uniatism, the second and third generations of immigrants from Eastern Europe seemingly wishing to identify with a culturally indigenous Church. This survey was done by the Uniates. On a

smaller scale there has been a similar trend amongst some of the Orthodox in the United Kingdom, and there are to my knowledge three or four priests in the Church of England who are of Orthodox families. Some Orthodox also receive Holy Communion in both their own Church and at Anglican altars, on the one hand not wishing to lose family links with the Church of their ancestors, whilst on the other hand wishing for spiritual links with the Church of their adopted country. This is, of course, happening on a far wider scale amongst Roman Catholics who communicate in both Churches, Roman and Anglican.

The proselytizing of one group of Christians by another is always unedifying and smacks of ecclesiastical racialism, and, whereas Christians will fight valiantly for racial equality, there are few who do not practise ecclesiastical superiority. The result is that many who have had unstable backgrounds anyway are tempted to cross so many Church frontiers and jurisdictions that they find themselves lonely, desolate and afraid in a spiritual wilderness. Proselytizing can so often amount to irresponsibility for the spiritual and cultural well-being of others, for to step from a Western Church into an Eastern Church or vice-versa is to step from one culture to another and is not merely a liturgical change, and to worship in a setting which is culturally alien can be spiritually very distressing for some. Such methods of conversion should always be discouraged, particularly by an Association such as our own, which could so easily become a fishing pool for converts.

Anglicans, Romans and Orthodox have all got their work cut out in bringing back their own *lapsi* from the shires, if the Davies report on rural Anglicanism is a reliable guide, the inner-city Irish ghettos, and the increasingly secularised populations of the Cypriot areas of Islington, Kentish and Camden Towns. There is little time to spend plucking brands from the burning of other Christian Churches in these Islands, but if we feel our ministry lies along those lines we should make ourselves aware of the tremendous responsibility of taking practising Christians from one culture to another and one form of spirituality to another. It is not a task any priest should undertake lightly.

#### *Top-heavy with management*

Just before its decline and collapse the Byzantine Empire and Church were top-heavy with management, and time-consuming ceremonial at court served to mummify the Basileus so that he became caught in the web of protocol, officialdom and the bureaucracy so that the autocracy fell before the onslaught of the fully mobile Turk in 1453. Since 1953, some half a millennium after the destruction of Graeco-Roman Christendom, a similar if less spectacular build-up of management has taken place in the Church of England. In thirty years or so there has been an increase in the number of suffragan bishops by about a score. Bishops it would seem are not subject to the Sheffield Report, an Anglican document which offers guidelines on the deployment of the clergy. What has this cost the Church in financial terms? Why, when the Anglican population is on the rapid decline not only in the inner cities but also in the country parishes, do we need more bishops to preside over and oversee these apparently dwindling congregations? shall we soon be creating Anglican bishops

in *partibus infidelium*, who act as glorified filing clerks or typists as the Latin Patriarchs of Constantinople did in the Vatican until Pope John XXIII abolished the title. It strikes an increasing number of Anglicans in the pews as distinctly odd that there should be this increase of manpower at the top at a time of financial crisis and when incumbents cannot afford curates and ordinands cannot get titles. The Church of England's strength has always been in the parish priest in the parish, and many Anglicans feel that it is in that direction that money should be made available and not in the increase of the episcopal bench, who really ought to be getting down to the serious task of getting their house in some sort of doctrinal order and not merely increasing their membership. Churches with too many chiefs and very few Indians are not signs of healthy growth, and history has shown that they are eventually wiped off the map of Christendom. The Church of England needs to make the episcopate relevant and meaningful, and it could do this inexpensively by giving *episcopate* to Area Deans, who are the only overseers that most clergy in the parishes see regularly and meaningfully. Bishops, or some of them, could be made Metropolitans on the Orthodox model. Chorepiscopi in the Church of England would make episcopacy a living, everyday reality instead of its being exercised at a remote distance by a remote figure weighed down by a work-load due to a "paper church" with which no human being can ever adequately cope.

#### More Bad News from Romania

Exiled Romanians and holidaymakers in London from Romania bring reports of the worsening situation there. The fighter for human rights and for the defence of the Helsinki Agreement, Father Gheorghe Calciu Dumitreasa, is again under the strict surveillance of the *Securitate*, the Romanian equivalent of the Gestapo. In August 1984 Father Calciu was released from a ten-year imprisonment after serving five years of his sentence. He had been imprisoned for criticising the constant stream of atheist propaganda from the government and for his protests against the systematic closure and demolition of many of Bucharest's old churches, the destruction of which began in the spring of 1984 and continues unabated. It is thought that the aim of the Ceausescu regime is to destroy all vestiges of Romania's Christian past. Even the Cotroceni Monastery which serves as the Patriarchal residence is to be replaced by a vulgar monument on the Mussolini style dedicated to "The Social and Political Unity of the Entire People around the Communist Party". Observers of this wholesale vandalism believe that not only is this symptomatic of the paranoia of Nicolae and Elena Ceausescu and their heir apparent—Nicolae now dresses in robes reminiscent of Royalty and carries a sceptre—but is part of the ongoing Cultural Revolution which has devastated Albania and China, until at last, in the case of the latter, reason has begun to return. Meanwhile, apart from the destruction of the ancient centre of Bucharest, the regime is speedily reducing the economy of a once prosperous nation to the level of a banana republic. An out-moded Stalinist economy resulted last winter in misery particularly for the aged, who could not heat their homes because of the cut-back on fuel consumption. Prison and torture await anyone who dares to criticise the Ceausescu clan. The youth of Romania are all dreading being involved in the International Youth

Year 1985 promoted by Nicu Ceausescu, the President's playboy son. The work projects are little more than forced labour. It is not generally known in the West that for eight years 46,000 young people have worked virtually as slaves on the seven miles section of the Danube Canal which links that river with the Black Sea. This is how so many Romanian students must pay for their "free" education! Food grows ever scarcer, and this is having its effect on the children growing up under these shortages, some of whom have been reduced to begging in the streets. Meanwhile the President's family enjoy a luxurious life-style; but the writing may be already on the wall for Romania's rulers, as more and more Western democracies begin to re-think their attitude towards this highly repressive regime, and even the United States may be having second thoughts on the "most favoured nation" status of Romania now that her Ambassador, David Funderburk, has resigned in protest at the gentleness of the White House towards Ceausescu. He has described the dictatorship as "sneaky, crafty and wheeler-dealer". It is against this background that the Orthodox Church struggles to minister spiritually to the Romania's rulers, as more and more Western democracies begin to prayers she can get from Western Christians.

John Salter

#### THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY'S NOTES

During the Spring and Summer we have begun work on the card index. It now seems as if it may be a rather longer and more complicated job than at first anticipated. So we would be very grateful if members of the Association could be patient if the occasional mistake slips through during this re-organisation. We hope that when it is completed there will be fewer problems.

One feature that has emerged is that subscriptions are paid by several different methods. I am therefore sending out a second form with the Newsletter asking if you would be so kind as to indicate how you pay at present and also how you would like to pay in future. It would clearly simplify the work of the secretariat considerably if as many people as possible could pay by banker's order. I am sorry that you are being asked to complete a second form but it is only as the earlier replies have come in that we have realised the need for a reorganisation of the method of collecting subscriptions.

Having dealt with the practicalities, perhaps I can turn to the more spiritual side of things. For me one of the highlights of the Spring was attending the Coptic Liturgy at St. Mark's Coptic Church in Kensington to mark the release of Pope Shenouda from house arrest. As I listened to the Liturgy I was struck by the way in which we can enter into the minds of those of a different tradition from our own by sharing in their worship.

Today there is a great emphasis in all walks of life on the intellectual exchange of ideas so that, sometimes, the simple sharing of experience is neglected. But, as St. Francis of Assisi made clear in his own life, it is so often the simple, expressive gesture which has real impact. And in that he was following on the pattern of the Old Testament prophets who so often made their point with a piece of dramatic action.

So, as I see it, one of the most valuable aspects of belonging to the Association is the opportunity it gives us to worship with one another, and so come to understand more fully the spiritual tradition which lies behind our theological statements. I hope, therefore, that as many of you as possible will come to the Annual Festival. I shall look forward to meeting some more of you then.

In an old commonplace book of mine, I discovered the following prayer which was quoted in the book *Corrymeela—the Search for Peace* by Alf McCreary: "Let not the past ever be so dear to us as to set a limit to the future". It seems to me that the Scottish theologian who wrote those words had something important to say to all of us in the Association.

Vivien S. Hornby-Northcote

#### AN ORTHODOX RESPONSE TO THE "LIMA DOCUMENT"

Eastern Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox hierarchs and theologians from throughout the world met at the Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology in Brookline, MA, in June for an Inter-Orthodox Symposium dealing with ecumenical concerns. The purpose of the historic symposium was to clarify a number of questions which might arise for the Orthodox Churches when they consider the document *Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry* produced by the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches. Considered one of the most important statements produced by the ecumenical movement, this text was produced by a group of Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Protestant theologians in 1982. It is the product of over 50 years of ecumenical dialogue and study. Translated into over 25 languages, it is being studied by Christians throughout the world.

The participants in the symposium produced a report which urges the Orthodox Churches to study and discuss the document. "Reception of the *BEM* document," says the report, "means that we recognise in the text some of the common and constitutive elements of our faith in the matter of baptism, eucharist, and ministry so that we may stand together as far as possible to bear witness to Jesus Christ in our world and to move towards our common goal of unity."

His Eminence Archbishop Iakovos, head of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of the Americas, formally welcomed the members of the symposium together with guests from other Christian Churches and theological schools at the opening session on 12th June. He is a former co-president of the World Council of Churches. The symposium was chaired by Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Myra, a member of the Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. At the opening of the symposium, His Eminence said: "We must deal with the future of the *BEM* document from the Orthodox perspective and its relationship to the two theological studies programmes of the Faith and Order Commission: *Toward the Common Expression of the Apostolic Faith Today* and *The Unity of the Church and the Renewal of the Human Community*." The participants heard an address by Dr. Emilio Castro, the General Secretary of the World Council of Churches in Geneva. Dr. Gunther Gassmann, Director of the Faith and Order Commission, also addressed the gathering. The symposium was organised by the Orthodox Task Force of the WCC in consultation with the Faith and

Order Commission. The Greek Archdiocese of America served as the host of the historic gathering. Revd. Dr. Alkiviadis Calivas, Dean of Holy Cross, acted as coordinator of the symposium. The support staff included Revd. Thomas Fitzgerald, Revd. Illia Katre of Holy Cross; Revd. Prof. Ion Bria, Revd. George Tssetsis, and Revd. Dr. Gennadios Limouris of the WCC; Artemis Gyftopoulos and William Gushes of the Malietos Cultural Centre; Carol Thysell of the National Council of Churches Faith and Order Commission; and Catherine Keeches and Savas Zembillas of the staff of Holy Cross. The list of speakers included Revd. Dr. Gennadios Limouris and Dr. Gunther Gassmann of the Faith and Order Commission; Prof. Nikos Nissiotis of Athens; Bishop Nerses Bozabalian of the Armenian Apostolic Church; Archbishop Kirill of Smolensk of the Russian Orthodox Church; Metropolitan Anthony of Transylvania of the Romanian Orthodox Church; the Revd. Dr. Theodore Stylianopoulos of Holy Cross School of Theology; the Revd. Dr. K. M. George of the Orthodox Syrian Church of the East; Revd. Dr. Thomas Hopko of St. Vladimir's Seminary, and Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Myra.

The Orthodox church leaders were largely enthusiastic in the wake of their first extended discussion of the *BEM* document. Archbishop Iakovos led his colleagues in unveiling the Orthodox hierarchs' first official reaction, which mixes praise with criticism. The document was said to signal "a new stage in the ecumenical movement. After centuries of estrangement, hostility and mutual ignorance, divided Christians are seeking to speak together on essential aspects of ecclesial life". Metropolitan Chrysostomos praised the document as "the most important statement ever produced by the World Council".

Dr. Gunther Gassmann, of Geneva, Switzerland, the German Lutheran who directs the WCC's Faith and Order Commission, told reporters that the symposium at Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology was remarkable for its broad representation of both Eastern and Oriental Orthodoxy, leaders from all 19 of the tradition's Patriarchates and most of its "autocephalous" (independent) Churches being present. The week-long series of talks at Brookline among Orthodox leaders was important not only for clarifying the Orthodox position vis-a-vis other Christian traditions but also for contributing to contacts and cooperation between the various Orthodox churches. Orthodox, along with other churches, will be using *BEM* as "a tool of adult Christian education" to reflect on what baptism, eucharist and ministry mean to them in their own tradition. "On the Protestant side, there has been much curiosity and expectation as to how the Orthodox churches will respond to this document," said Dr. Gassmann. The WCC official noted a "strong Orthodox influence detectable" in *BEM*. "Out of 120 members of the Faith and Order Commission, there were 25 Orthodox theologians—the largest single confessional group in Faith and Order."

Metropolitan Anthony, of the Romanian Orthodox Church, told reporters that the *BEM* document could have a significant impact on ongoing bilateral dialogues between Catholics and Orthodox. "Last year in Crete, we discussed sacraments of initiation," he said. "Next year, the proposed theme is the priesthood."

A main point of several papers presented at the Brookline conference, said Metropolitan Chrysostomos, was the concept that

*BEM* can help the Orthodox in a "critical self-examination" of elements in their current practices.

But the Orthodox also had criticism for *BEM* itself, though they were reticent about singling out any particular section of the document as most problematic. Orthodox differ from other Christian bodies on such questions as participation of baptised children in the Eucharist (they are virtually the only church that serves communion to infants); linkage of baptism to "chrismation" (confirmation); ordination of women (they strongly oppose ordaining women to the priesthood); the apostolic succession; and the threefold ministry of bishop, presbyter (priest) and deacon. The Orthodox report recommends that *BEM* be translated into the languages of all Orthodox churches, and that the document be studied in both clergy and lay groups. One of its functions is to stimulate renewal of church life, said the statement. The formal "recommendations" now follow.

#### Symposium Recommendations

##### *The significance of BEM and the responsibility of the Orthodox*

1. It appears to us that we, as Orthodox, should welcome the Lima document as an experience of a new stage in the history of the ecumenical movement. After centuries of estrangement, hostility and mutual ignorance, divided Christians are seeking to speak together on essential aspects of ecclesial life, namely baptism, eucharist, and ministry. This process is unique in terms of the wide attention which the Lima document is receiving in all the churches. We rejoice in the fact that Orthodox theologians have played a significant part in the formulation of this document.
2. In general we see *BEM* as a remarkable ecumenical document of doctrinal convergence. It is, therefore, to be highly commended for its serious attempt to bring to light and express today "the faith of the Church through the ages" (Preface to *BEM*, p. x).
3. In many sections, this faith of the Church is clearly expressed, on the basis of traditional biblical and patristic theology. There are other sections in which the Orthodox find formulations which they cannot accept and where they would wish that the effort to adhere to the faith of the Church be expressed more accurately. As often stated in the document itself, in some areas the process needs to be continued with more thinking, further deepening, and clarification.
4. Finally, there are sections in which a terminology is used which is not that to which the Orthodox are accustomed. However, in some such cases, beneath the unfamiliar terminology, one can discover that the meaning is in fact close to the traditional faith. In other parts of *BEM* we notice a terminology which is familiar to the Orthodox but which can be understood in a different way.
5. We also think that the Orthodox Churches have the duty to answer responsibly the invitation of the Faith and Order Commission mainly for three reasons:
  - (a) because here we are concerned with a matter of faith—and it has been the insistence of the Orthodox Churches for some time that the World Council of Churches should focus its attention especially on questions of faith and unity;
  - (b) because the Orthodox have fully participated in the

preparation of the text from the beginning and made a substantial contribution to it;

(c) because it is important to have the response of all the Orthodox Churches, and not just some of them.

#### *Response and reception*

1. Both at the Sixth General Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Vancouver (1983) and at the last meeting of the Central Committee (1984) of the WCC the Orthodox undertook to respond to *BEM* as a matter of obligation and commitment with a view to furthering the ecumenical movement.
2. We would like to distinguish between the immediate response of the individual Orthodox member Churches of the World Council of Churches to the *BEM* document and the long-range form of the reception of the text in the orthodox tradition. We hold that the notion of reception of the *BEM* document here is different from the classical Orthodox understanding of the reception of the decrees and decisions of the Holy Councils.
3. Reception of the *BEM* document means that we recognise in this text some of the common and constitutive elements of our faith in the matter of baptism, eucharist, and ministry so that we may stand together as far as possible to bear witness to Jesus Christ in our world and to move towards our common goal of unity. Thus reception at this stage is a step forward in the "process of our growing together in mutual trust . . ." towards doctrinal convergence and ultimately towards "communion with one another in continuity with the apostles and the teachings of the universal Church". (Preface to *BEM*, p. ix).
4. Reception of the *BEM* document as such does not necessarily imply an ecclesiological or practical recognition of the ministry and sacraments of non-Orthodox churches. Such a recognition would require a special action of the Orthodox Churches.
5. As an initial step towards this kind of reception we would wish to see official action on the part of the Orthodox churches to facilitate the use of the *BEM* document for study and discussion on different levels of the Church's life so that the Church evaluates the document with a view to the ultimate unity of all churches.
6. In this process of discernment, the Orthodox churches should be sensitive to the similar process of evaluation of the text and of the process of bilateral dialogues in the member churches of the WCC and the Roman Catholic Church. Thus our evaluation will be fully informed of the ecumenical reflections and experiences stimulated by this text.

#### *Some points for further clarification*

1. We Orthodox recognise many positive elements in *BEM* which express significant aspects of the apostolic faith. Having affirmed this initial appreciation of *BEM*, we offer some examples among the issues which we believe need further clarification and elaboration. There are also issues which are not addressed in the text.
2. In the section on *Baptism*, we note:
  - (a) the relationship between the unity of the Church and baptismal unity (para. 6);

- (b) the role of the Holy Spirit in baptism and consequently the relationship between baptism and chrismation (confirmation), linking water and the Spirit in incorporating members into the Body of Christ (para. 5;14);
  - (c) the role of exorcism and renunciation of the Evil One in the baptismal rite (para. 20);
  - (d) the terms "sign", "sacramental sign", "symbol", "celebrant" (para. 22), "ethical life" and other terms throughout the text.
3. In the section on *Eucharist*, we note:
- (a) the relationship of the eucharist to ecclesiology in the light of the eucharistic nature of the Church and the understanding of the eucharist as "the mystery of Christ" as well as "the mystery of the Church" (para. 1);
  - (b) the relationship between participation in the eucharist and unity of faith;
  - (c) the role of the Holy Spirit in the eucharist, with special reference to *anamnesis* in its relation to *epiclesis* (para. 10;12);
  - (d) the relationship between the eucharist and repentance, confession, and reconciliation to the eucharistic congregation;
  - (e) the meaning of sacrifice (para. 8), real presence (para. 13), ambassador (para. 29), and the implications of "for the purpose of communion" in regard to the reservation of the eucharistic elements (para. 15);
  - (f) the participation of baptised children in the eucharist.
4. In the section on *Ministry*, we note:
- (a) the link between ordained ministry today and the ministry of the apostles and apostolic succession (para. 10; 35);
  - (b) the distinction between the priesthood of the entire people of God and the ordained priesthood, especially in light of Pauline teaching on the different functions of the members of the one Body of Christ (para. 17 & commentary);
  - (c) issues related to the ordination of women to the priesthood (para. 18), including the way in which the problem is formulated in the text of *BEM*;
  - (d) the relation between bishop, presbyter, and deacon;
  - (e) the relation between *episcopo*, the bishop, and the eucharist.

#### Tasks facing the Orthodox Churches

In view of future work in connection with *BEM*, we offer the following considerations and recommendations.

1. Steps should be taken to enable translation and distribution of the *BEM* document in the languages of all Orthodox Churches.
2. Orthodox Churches should see to it that the *BEM* document is studied and discussed in clergy and laity groups, theological faculties and seminaries, clergy associations, as well as in interconfessional groups.
3. Orthodox Churches should be open to reading *BEM* and to responding to it in a spirit of critical self-examination, particularly in the area of current practices in churches and parishes. They should also use this process as a stimulus and encouragement for the renewal of their life.
4. In studying and evaluating *BEM*, the Orthodox should move beyond the theological scholasticism of recent centuries by reappropriating the creativity and dynamics of biblical and

patristic theology. This will enable them to move towards broader perspectives and to think more deeply about certain issues.

5. In their ongoing bilateral conversations, Orthodox Churches should take *BEM* into account.

#### Perspectives for future Faith and Order work

In view of the future work of the Faith and Order Commission and the WCC as a whole, we recommend the following perspectives for a proper interrelationship between *BEM* and the Faith and Order study projects "Towards the Common Expression of the Apostolic Faith Today" and "The Unity of the Church and the Renewal of Human Community".

1. The process of an ecumenical reappropriation of the apostolic faith and tradition as it was begun in the *BEM* document should be consciously continued in the two other study projects.
2. There should be a clear understanding that baptism, eucharist, and ministry are essential elements of the apostolic faith and tradition. At the same time, they are fundamental expressions of the witness and service of the Church for today's world and its needs, its concerns, and its renewal. Renewal of both the life of the Church and of the world cannot be separated from the liturgical and the sacramental life of the Church nor from its pastoral responsibility.
3. These two other projects should also be open to insights and suggestions expressed in the responses of the churches to *BEM* and profit from them.
4. The Lima document highlights the important relationship between the "rule of faith" and the "rule of prayer", to which the Orthodox are so deeply committed. Therefore we hope that in the two other study projects of Faith and Order this significant insight is seriously taken into account as well.
5. We further recommend that one important point in future work of the Faith and Order Commission in relationship to *BEM* should be the clarification of theological terminology and of linguistic problems in translations. This seems to be necessary in view of the heading "Ministry" of the third section of *BEM* and terms such as "sign", "reception", and "believer's/adult baptism".
6. Starting from a clarification of the vision of the Church which undergirds *BEM*, the future work of Faith and Order should concentrate on ecclesiology by bringing together the ecclesiological perspectives in *BEM*, in the responses of the Churches to *BEM*, and in the other study projects of Faith and Order.

We, the participants in the Symposium, experienced this meeting as an occasion for exchanging our views and clarifying common perspectives. We saw in it also an important means for further contacts and cooperation among the Orthodox Churches and thereby promoting our conciliar spirit.

(Condensed from *The Orthodox Church*, August 1985)

#### THE INDIAN ORTHODOX SYRIAN CHURCH

##### Introduction

The Syrian Church in India was founded by the Apostle St. Thomas in the 1st century. The Church was not under any foreign domination

from the beginning. Seven Bishops had been consecrated by the Apostle, and they had been instructed, as in all Apostolic Churches, how to choose and consecrate their successors. For a thousand years, this Church remained as a small Christian community, like an island in the vast sea of Hinduism. The Church, originally under the East Syrian Rite, is known to have come under the jurisdiction of the Catholicos of Selucia-Ctesiphon in Persia. "The Persian Catholicos of the East then restored authority to the Indian Church by bringing it under a Metropolitan of India, who was an Indian." It was able to preserve its faith essentially intact, together with many interesting liturgical and social customs, which gave it a basic Indian character. The history of the Malankara Church, otherwise known as the Malabar Church (the Indian Orthodox Syrian Church), from the 16th to the 19th century, is mainly the effect of the coming of the Portuguese, Dutch and the British Missionaries and the relationship between the Malankara Church and the Syrian Church of Antioch. The Malankara Church experienced a lot of suffering at the hands of those who came to help the Church. At first, Churches from abroad entered into communion with the Syrian church on friendly terms. But, later, they wanted to convert the Malankara Church to their tradition and belief. This caused untold miseries and misfortune to the Church, besides division. It is needless to add here that, these influences were responsible for the relatively slow growth of this ancient Church.

#### *The struggle with the Portuguese*

In the year AD 1498, the Portuguese came to Malabar as traders. The Syrian Church was under fire from the local Rajah at this time and the Christians were social outcasts. The added opposition to the Church by the Portuguese resulted in the exploitation of the pepper trade with the latter by the Muslims; the Church thus lost the opportunity of attaining economic viability as well.

The Bishops from Persia were catering to the spiritual needs of the Church, which was under the rule of an Archdeacon and the Church was following the Syrian way of worship then. The Portuguese proceeded to latinise the church and to subject the Syrian Church and its followers to Latin Bishops, thereby rocking its very foundations. They had forgotten their "Christian mission" and were concentrating on the imposition of Papal authority over the Syrian Church. Mar Jacob, the last of the five Nestorian Bishops, who was at the Malankara Church at that time, submitted to the pressures of the Portuguese, but was deserted by his people.

The Portuguese indulged in all kinds of practices to bring the Malankara Church under the Pope. Goa was the capital of their settlements in Asia and a Bishopric was established here. The Franciscans started a seminary at Malabar to train local people for the priesthood and to propagate the Roman doctrines. They taught Latin and rituals of the Roman Church, hoping to eliminate Syriac and Eastern Rites from Malabar, but met with failure and resistance from the local Christians. So, the Jesuits started another seminary at Vaipin Cotta in Malabar, where Syriac and East Syrian liturgy were taught and Syrian customs were permitted.

The Portuguese controlled the sea around India and in order to cut off the relationship between the Malankara and Persian Churches,

they prevented the entry of foreign Bishops to India. Mar Abraham, who was from the Catholicos, and not in communion with Rome, was shipped away by them. He later returned after accepting Papal supremacy and with Papal authority to administer the Malankara Church. The Portuguese insisted that Mar Abraham should attend the Goan Council. "The reason is that the Portuguese, by virtue of the Padroado Rights granted to the King of Portugal by the Pope in appreciation of the missionary zeal of the Portuguese, had the power of Ecclesiastical Control over the churches founded by them, and that the King could submit to the Pope the names of candidates for bishoprics". The Goan Council decided that the Syrian candidates for priesthood from the Malabar Church were not to be ordained without the permission of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Cochín and that their appointments to the Church should be in its hands. The Council decided that the Syrian books should be handed over to Fr. Fracis Roz, a Jesuit, for "correction". Mar Abraham refused to do so; he died in 1597 leaving the administration of the Malankara Church in the hands of Archdeacon Gearge. The Archbishop of Goa, Alexis de Menzes, wanted to appoint a Jesuit as the Bishop of the Malankara Church and to substitute Latin for Syriac. However, fearing the resentment of local Syrians, he gave up the idea, and offered the bishopric to the Archdeacon on the condition that the latter should profess the Roman Catholic faith. The Archdeacon agreed to this initially, hoping that he could satisfy the Archbishop and gain control over the Church. But, realising that it was unwise to do so, he declared publicly that his original agreement with the Archbishop to profess the Roman Catholic faith was wrong.

#### *The Synod of Diamper (Udayamperur) AD 1599*

Archbishop Menzes understood that the Archdeacon was not to be relied upon for spreading Roman Catholicism in Malabar, so he came down to Malabar himself, influenced the local Rajah, and with the Rajah's help started visiting the churches around. He won the local people by various means and ordained 38 men at Diamper. Since the Archbishop was under the protection of the local Rajah, the Archdeacon could not put up any more resistance to the pressures of the Archbishop. He finally submitted himself to the Archbishop, co-operated with him in calling the Synod of Diamper, and made the decisions of the Archbishop binding on the Malankara Church. The Archbishop ordained 50 more priests, so that the new clergy outnumbered the old. By the decisions of the Synod, held in 1599, the Malankara Church was completely cut off from the Persian Church and came directly under the Pope and the Portuguese Bishops. The Synod was a high-handed and unscrupulous action for the complete Romanisation of the Malankara Church. The local Syrians, because they were without a bishop and because they had no hope of getting one from Persia, submitted to this. The people who were not trained properly in the rites and doctrines of the church were attracted to Roman teaching. "If they submitted, they had solid advantages, and if not, it meant division in the Church and continued persecutions".

#### *The Coonan Cross Revolt AD 1653*

The Archdeacon and the people were waiting for an opportunity for liberation from Roman supremacy after the Synod of Diamper. At



*The Very Rev. Fr. Kuriakose, Cor-Episcopa, St. Gregorios Indian (Malankara) Orthodox Church, London.*

this time, a Syrian Bishop, Ahatalla, came from the Jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Antioch. The Portuguese arrested him, and are said to have deported him; but the people believed that he was drowned by the Portuguese. This infuriated the Syrian Christian population and they gathered at Mattancherry, near Cochin, in 1653 with ropes tied to the Holy Cross as an expression of the attitude of Portuguese missionaries. They took an oath declaring that they would not have any connections with the Roman Church henceforth. The Carmelite Missionaries of the Roman Catholic Church influenced many Syrians later to return to the Roman Church.

*The Relation Between The Malankara Syrian Church and The Church of Antioch*

After the Dutch came into power, with their help and at the request of the Malankara Church, the Patriarch of Antioch sent Mar Gregorios to Malabar in AD 1665. Thus the Malabar Church was connected to the Antiochian Church. Archbishop Mar Gregorios provided the Indian Christians with the traditional forms of West Syrian faith and worship, which is different from both the Roman and the Nestorian. Some of the Syrian Bishops who followed Mar Gregorios to India were not of the same high calibre as Mar Gregorios himself. Despising the individuality and independence of the Malankara Church, they wanted to bring it completely under the authority of the Syrian Patriarch. This was the fundamental reason

for the quarrels between the Malankara and Antiochian Churches which led to disaster within the former.

It is one of the tragedies of Church history that the two Syrian Churches, the Eastern and Western, were separated in the 5th and 6th centuries. The cause for separation was the controversy over the "two natures" in Christ as defined by the Council of Chalcedon. The chief theologian of the East Syrian Church was Theodore of Mopsuestia. He followed the teachings of Nestorius, while the West Syrian Church, following St. Cyril of Alexandria and his successors, came to be known as Monophysite, each holding to one "nature" in Christ. "But, it is now generally recognised that these divisions were due not so much to differences in theology, which were largely verbal, as to national and cultural differences, which tragically separated the Churches of Asia and Africa from Byzantium with its Greek culture and imperialism." "It is significant that it was after the separation from 'Orthodoxy' that the Syrian Church began to spread right across Asia and to develop an authentic oriental Christianity. Its value today is that it remains as the finest example of a Christian cultural expression which is neither Latin nor Greek, but belongs to the ancient semitic world of the Middle East."

Jacob Bourdona, known as Bardaeus, was chiefly responsible for the organisation of the West Syrian Liturgy. It was after him that the Church of Antioch came to be known as "Jacobite"; it was under him that, the Liturgy was translated from Greek to Syriac and the present Liturgy, as practised in the Malankara Church, came into being. "But, at the same time, this Liturgy drew largely on the traditions and customs of the Syriac speaking East Syrian Church, together with the hymns and chants of St. Ephrem and his successors. This Liturgy continued to grow from the 7th to the 12th century, borrowing not only from the East Syrian Liturgy but also, through Jerusalem, from the Byzantine tradition. Thus, there gradually grew up, a Liturgy of incomparable splendour and beauty, richer in its hymnody not only than the Latin but also than the Greek."

There are five Oriental Orthodox Churches, namely, the Coptic, Armenian, Syrian, Indian and Ethiopian. "The Oriental Orthodox Churches are sometimes wrongly called 'Monophysite', based on the Western misunderstanding that these Churches believe only (in Greek, 'monos' means 'only' and 'physis' means 'nature') in one divine nature of the Incarnate Lord Jesus Christ. They are also misnamed 'Jacobite', again on the misconception that they were started by Jacob Bardaeus (c. 500-575). They are rightly called 'Ancient Oriental Churches' in so far as they have been faithful to the tradition of the Church as it was before its super-hellenisation in the Byzantine Empire, and also called 'pre-Chalcedonian' since they refuse to acknowledge the Council of Chalcedon as an Ecumenical Council."

It was during the period from 1663 to 1795, that the Indian Christians, fearing all three Western powers (Portuguese, Dutch and British), sought an alliance with the Syrian Church. The Dutch, who were fighting the Portuguese in the Indian sub-continent, helped to bring the Syrians to India.

"It was during the British colonial period that there was another brutal incursion into the autonomy of the Church in India. In 1875, little more than a hundred years ago, the Syrian Patriarch Peter III

came with the letters of authority from the British, having paid a visit to Queen Victoria in England before coming to India. He dominated the young Indian Metropolitan (below 40 years of age) who was scared of the British, and forcefully, in an action very similar to that of Portuguese Archbishop Menzes at the Synod of Diamper in 1599, drove the non-Roman Christians into a Syrian Obedience at the chaotic Mulanthuruthy (in Kerala) Synod in the year 1876. He wanted all Churches here to execute bonds, pledging age-long obedience to him. Very few Churches did that; some of the descendants of those who did, are in the forefront of the new revolt which the Syrians have engineered since 1970."

#### *British Missionaries in India*

The changing political situation of India has influenced the course of events in the Malankara Syrian Church. The British captured Malabar from the Dutch; the Malankara Church was in a pathetic shape at that time, and was willing to accept help in any form from any quarter for its survival. The British, on the other hand, were happy to have some kind of union with any non-Roman church.

The first British Resident, Col. Macaulay, was a friend of the Malankara Church. During his time an amount was deposited in the Madras Treasury, called "Vattipanam", for the use of charitable purposes in the name of the Metropolitan of the Church, who was its Bishop. Col. Munro, who succeeded Col. Macaulay, was appointed Dewan of Travancore. He helped to start a seminary at Kottayam, and the CMS missionaries from this seminary were invited to teach English and other languages at the local educational institutions. The first of these missionaries was Rev. Thomas Norton. He gave assurances that their mission was meant only to strengthen the Malankara Church and not make it Anglican. Rev. Benjamin Bailey set up a printing press and translated the Holy Bible and other books into Malayalam, which is the language of Kerala. Henry Baker started a number of schools in Kerala. They all encouraged worship in the vernacular. The Church was thus enormously benefited by the work of these Anglican missionaries.

The CMS missionaries came from a strongly Protestant and anti-Catholic background; they could not appreciate the ancient doctrines and Eastern customs of the Orthodox Church. "The missionaries, knowing only the Roman and Protestant Churches, though of as evils that had crept in from the Roman Church whatever they found as not consistent with their Protestant traditions." A crisis came when the old missionaries were replaced by young and relatively inexperienced ones from the Evangelical circle. They were outspoken about their misgivings, and they encouraged the people to revolt against the old customs. Bishop Daniel Wilson came from Calcutta for negotiations with the warring segments within the Church and to solve the crisis. His proposals, which favoured the revolutionaries, were rejected by the Synod of Mavelikkara (in Kerala) in 1863; the Synod was formed by the Malankara Church.

#### *The Formation of The Anglican Church and the Separation of The Marthoma Church*

Unfortunately, the Anglican missionaries did not respect the decisions of the Synod of Mavelikkara. On the contrary, they

encouraged the Syrian Christians to join the Anglican Church, much against the interests and welfare of the Malankara Church. Bishop Dionysius IV, who was the Metran of Malankara then, shifted his residence from the seminary with the Protestant views and also forbade the deacons from studying in the seminary.

Through the influence of Anglican missionaries over some priests under the leadership of Abraham Malpan (who revised the Liturgy of St. James on the lines of the Western Protestant Reformation), the Marthoma Church was formed and separated from the Malankara Church as a Reformed Church in 1875. Thus, the missionaries did much harm to the Malabar Church ultimately as against their initial acts of help by creating division and confusion and disbelief in the doctrines and practices of the Church.

In 1930, the Orthodox Bishop Mar Ivanios became reconciled with Rome and the Catholic Syro-Malankara Church was formed with another Bishop and a few followers, following the same liturgical rites and customs as in the Malankara Church. So both Catholics and Orthodox are following the same West Syrian Liturgy in Kerala, while the Malankara Church maintained its separate, independent identity and character.

#### *The Catholicate in India*

"The title and rank of Catholicos developed outside the Roman Empire, and is much more ancient than the title of Patriarch in the Christian Church. The title and rank of Patriarch developed first in the Roman Empire around the 4th and 5th centuries and was later copied elsewhere. There were three Catholicates in the early centuries before the title Patriarch came to be recognised in the 5th century. The Catholicos of the East, of Armenia and of Georgia. In the year 1912, the Catholicos of the East, which had become defunct in Persia, took rebirth in India. In a ceremony at which the Syrian Patriarch of Antioch, Moran Mar Abdel Meshiha, officiated, an Indian Catholicos was set up by the Indian church. In 1912, the Indians reasserted their autonomy and got the ancient Catholicate of the East, associated with the name of St. Thomas the Apostle, established in India. Till 1958, a group of Indians resisted submitting to the autocephalous authority of the Catholicos, preferring to owe allegiance to some of the bishops in India, who were obedient to the Syrian Patriarch."

The Supreme Court of India, in the year 1958, recognised the validity of the Catholicate of India. After this judgement, the Syrian Patriarch also recognised the full authority of the Catholicos in India. All the Orthodox Christians in India came to acknowledge the authority of the Catholicos and the Church functioned harmoniously as per the constitution of the Malankara Church. The present Catholicos of the Indian Orthodox Church is H. H. Baselios Marthoma Mathews I, and under his leadership the Church is progressing, both in spiritual and social aspects.

The Orthodox Church of India, now a fully autocephalous Church, is in communion with the four other Oriental Orthodox Churches. The Church is active in the educational, social, economic and humanitarian fields and is running a number of schools, colleges, industrial training centres, orphanages and hospitals. Our Church has produced great Saints, scholars and social workers, such as St. Gregorios of

Parumala. St. Gregorios was a man of prayer, to whom God was more real than all the visible realities of the world and he reflected the glory of God in his brief span of life. The first Woman President of the World Council of Churches was Miss Sara Chacko, who later served the WCC as its First Secretary for the Dept. of Cooperation between Men and Women; she was a member of the Indian Orthodox Church. Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios, Metropolitan of Delhi and the North, of the Indian Orthodox Church served the WCC as Associate General Secretary when he was Fr. Paul Varghese, and he is now serving as one of the Presidents of the WCC. Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios is a theologian of depth and scholar of international fame. He has delivered innumerable lectures in India and abroad on Faith, Religion, the Impact of Science on Faith, etc. and he is acknowledged for his power of penetration and depth of analysis.

There was perfect harmony between the Indian Orthodox and the Antiochian Syrian Churches from 1964 to 1970. "Tension began in 1970 when the Syrian Patriarch began to reclaim authority from the Indian church and to engage in many uncanonical actions listed elsewhere. But, even in that situation, he recognised the judgement of the Supreme Court of India. The only way he could interfere was by enthroning a rival Indian Catholicos, who, on behalf of the Patriarch, could take over the Indian church." The history of our Church proves clearly how hard our people have worked and how much we have suffered in the last so many years for preserving the Indian character and culture that is the foundation of the Indian Orthodox Syrian Church. The conflict between this Church and the Syrian Church of Antioch is only about power of control of the Church and has nothing to do with its faith. The past has been a period of severe torment and test for our great tradition. Now, the Orthodox Church of India is a fully autocephalous Church in communion with all sister Churches over the world.

The Orthodox Church in India, in cooperation with other Churches, must take necessary steps urgently to solve the spiritual and material problems in the day-to-day life of man. We have to present the Christian Faith in a more appealing manner; here comes the relevance of educated and devoted missionaries. The lives of the missionaries must themselves be good sermons. The liturgical tradition of the Church must be continued and developed according to the Indian context. The priestly and prophetic functions of the Christian Church must be made more meaningful. "Only through a fruitful coordination of the head (intellectual confrontation), heart (meditation and worship), and hard labour (manual labour) can Christian mission acquire a meaning and theology acquire a basis." The Indian Christians must seriously consider the following questions:

- How to preach the Gospel in unfavourable conditions?
- What is the relevance of Christian worship in the Indian context?
- How to face the atheists and materialists?
- How to maintain dialogue with other religions and ideologies?
- How to avert moral degradation and promote moral and religious values?

Every nation has its particular contribution to make to the interpretation of Christianity and India is no exception. In all probability, this is the reason behind the right attitude of handing

over absolute authority to the Church of South India by the Anglican Church. The religious genius of India is the richest in the world. The Indian must remain an Indian so that his expression of Christianity will essentially be Indian. This does not mean that Indian Christianity will be isolated from the rest of the world. "Let noble thoughts come to us from all directions" is an old Indian saying which is worth recalling in this respect.

The reason why the Indian Christians have not been able to make many contributions to theology is that they have been, on the whole, trying to think through foreign brains; this is totally irrelevant to the practice of Christianity in India. But now that the Indian Christians are awakened and self-conscious, they are aware that "self-help is the best help, and God helps those who help themselves". There are Indian Christian theologians and scholars, and they are making their contribution to Christianity as evidenced by their brotherly relationship with Churches all over the world.

Fr. O. C. Kuriakose  
Cor Episcopa  
Vicar, St. Gregorios Indian  
(Malankara) Orthodox Church  
London

#### ST. CYRIL AND ST. METHODIUS, APOSTLES TO THE SLAVS

For well over a millennium the radiant legacy of Saints Cyril and Methodius has moulded much of the spiritual and intellectual pattern of Europe. The alphabet, originally conceived by them and admirably attuned to the sound complexities of the Slav languages, has spurred the blossoming of theological subtleties and cultural identities. It is therefore right and proper that UNESCO should decide to honour their memory on a world-wide scale, all the more so because so little is known about them outside the ambit of Eastern Orthodoxy.

The two Holy Brothers were born in Salonika in the early 9th century, the sons of a high ranking Byzantine official. Contemporary sources describe them either generically as "Slavs" or, more specifically, as "Slavs of Bulgarian origin". By birth and by upbringing, they both seemed destined to follow in their father's footsteps. But destiny had greater things in store for them: they became "Servants of the Spirit and Missionaries of the Mind". The intellectual brilliance of the younger brother Cyril and the encyclopaedic span of his interests have long been given their due by eminent scholars, somewhat to the detriment of the achievements of his elder brother Methodius. It is only fair to attempt to put right this imbalance, particularly now that we are commemorating the 1100th anniversary of his death.

The "Double Eulogy" of the brothers, written by their outstanding disciple St. Clement of Okhrid, retraces the first decade of Methodius' activity as military commander and civil administrator of a predominantly Slav province in the Byzantine Empire: "in war he was terrifying like Samson", writes St. Clement. But he hastens to add that "in peace he was wise like Solomon" and that "learned men sought his company" because "he excelled in marvellous parables



St. Cyril and St. Methodius—Bulgarian icon in St. Petka Church, Sotira.

and sound advice". But, at the peak of his lay career, Methodius—so his "Extended Life" tells us—forsook "all vain earthly deeds because he did not want to trouble his soul with things transient". He withdrew to a monastery on Mount Olympus and was soon joined there by his younger brother Cyril. There, and subsequently in the Polychronion Monastery on the Aegean coast, they humbly submitted to the strict monastic rule with its fasts, vigils and devotions. Yet it would be erroneous to assume that this intense contemplation had estranged the two brothers from active life in the service of their fellow men. Already in the bygone days of his deep involvement in regional administration, Methodius had written to his brother: "It is hard to govern good people plunged in the dark abyss of pagan fallacies. Those already converted to Christianity do not understand

the Divine Service or the Holy Scriptures, as only a few of them have a vague inkling of Greek". The only way of bringing the word of Christ to pagans and Christians alike was to embody it in their Slav languages. But these languages had no alphabet of their own and the characters of other alphabets, patently unsuited to Slav phonetic peculiarities, would only hamper the progress of the Slav-speaking tribes to speedy literacy and, through literacy, to salvation. In the calm of their monastic retreat, the two brothers took upon themselves the gigantic task of producing such an alphabet that would be congenial, as Pope Adrian II was to declare in years to come, to the inhabitants "of all Slav provinces".

The secular powers of the day were quick to realise the potential of this original alphabet, known as "Glagolitic", from which in due course evolved the "Cyrillic" alphabet still in current use in Bulgaria, Eastern Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union. What is more, the two brothers who conceived it were men of impressive erudition and exceptional diplomatic ability. Realising their talents, the Byzantine Emperor Michael III entrusted them with the mission of bringing the untractable Eastern Slav tribes into the fold of the Orthodox Church. Even the powerful Khazars in Southern Russia were impressed by the mastery with which the two brothers debated with theologians of different persuasions.

Another bloodless victory of no mean historic relevance was their triumph in Venice over the most eminent supporters of the trilingual heresy. Summoned by Pope Adrian II, they went to Rome where they successfully pleaded for the right of all Slavs to Divine Services in their own language accessible to the masses. Pope Adrian was so impressed by the brothers that he not only ordained their disciples but entrusted them with a new mission to Great Moravia (present-day Czechoslovakia). St. Cyril and St. Methodius were active there from 863 to 867, preaching in Slav vernacular, translating the fundamental liturgical manuals and organising a literary school which attracted an ever increasing number of students. Then, as their fame had reached Rome, they were summoned in the presence of the Pope to defend themselves, as the unrelenting adversaries of Slav literacy had violently attacked their newly translated Slav versions of the Holy Scriptures and the Fathers of the Church. Cyril and Methodius emerged once again victorious, but their success was marred by the sudden death of St. Cyril, who passed away on the 14th February 869 and was buried in Saint Clement's Church. St. Methodius continued on his own, and in 870 he was ordained Bishop of Pannonia, a region including the present day territories of Pannonia, Slovakia, Moravia and a part of Croatia. This assertion of their Slav essence was strongly opposed by the German Bishops of Salzburg, Passau and Freising. St. Methodius was brought to court on trumped-up charges of heresy and promptly sent to prison where, as it is clearly stated in the Papal letters to Methodius' main adversaries Paul of Ancona and Hermanrich of Passau, he was "manhandled" and "left unattended in rain and frost". He ensured such harsh treatment for nearly three years. Finally, the Pope managed to secure his release, because the Moravian Prince Svetopulk had expressly requested that Methodius should head the mission about to be sent to his country. Undaunted by his ordeals, St. Methodius resumed his work in 873 and, despite the hostility of Svetopulk's Court, led with courage and

dignity the newly founded Moravian Church which, by the time of his death, counted well over two hundred priests, all officiating in their Slav idiom. Furthermore, he converted to Christianity the ruler of the neighbouring Czech tribes Borzivoi and his wife Lyudmila—an historical event of considerable import, amply documented in Medieval Czech sources. Hard-pressed by the German clergy and his own advisers hostile to the enlightenment of the Slav population, Prince Svetopulk succumbed to the cabal against Methodius, and in 879 he sent an emissary to Rome with a vicious report accusing him of conducting the Divine services in a “barbaric” language, i.e. in Old Bulgarian, and deviating from the canons of the Roman Church. Once again, Methodius was summoned to Rome, where Adrian II not only dismissed all charges against him and confirmed his high rank in the ecclesiastic hierarchy but immediately sent him on a difficult diplomatic mission to Constantinople.

St. Methodius returned to the Byzantine capital almost twenty years after he had left it and was received with all the pomp and ceremony due to his rank by Patriarch Photius, the very dignitary who had sent him on his first mission abroad. His present task was to act as a mediator between the heads of the two rival Churches in an attempt to reconcile their conflicting aspirations to gain exclusive ecclesiastic control over Great Moravia and Bulgaria. It was all to Methodius' credit that he succeeded in securing the assent of both Photius and Adrian II for his work in Great Moravia, where he returned in great spirits, eager to complete the task to which he and his brother had unselfishly devoted their outstanding talents. But only a few months later, in 885, he was dead. This was a bleak day for all Western Slavs. They were deprived of the right to attend religious services in their native tongue. Two hundred priests, disciples of St. Methodius, were banned from the country, harassed and even sold as slaves in Venice. Three of the most eminent scholars formed in Methodius' Moravian School, Clement, Naum and Anguelary, wandered down the Danube, striving to reach Bulgaria in the hope of finding there “the peace for which their tormented souls were longing”. By the grace of God, their expectations were fulfilled. The Bulgarian Prince Boris, who had been converted to Christianity in 865, received them with open arms and wholeheartedly supported their work. In no time the cities of Preslav and Ohrid became important centres of spiritual and intellectual enlightenment. Their theological and philological standards were so high that only a few decades later Bulgarian culture came to rank third in Europe, immediately after that of the lands benefiting from the Greek and Latin legacy. It was indeed from Bulgaria that Slav literacy spread not only to the rest of the Balkans but also to Russia.

Today, with the wisdom of hindsight, not only the direct beneficiaries of these epoch-making achievements but also the world at large can properly evaluate the far-reaching repercussions of the spiritual and cultural change brought about by Saints Cyril and Methodius. The impact of their vision has spread far beyond the Golden Age of Old Bulgarian culture and has conferred a firm spiritual identity upon all Slav-speaking nations.

Fr. Tosco Kazakin

#### BISHOP MATTHEW OF ASPENDOS 1894-1985

Bishop Matthew (Siemaszko) of Aspendos, formerly of Wilno, was born on the 22nd October/3rd November 1894 in Balice, a village in the region of Bilgoraj; his baptismal name was Konstantin. He emphasised that his family name Siemaszko stems from his Ukrainian ancestry. After a good general education he started to study theology, aiming to become a priest. Having successfully completed his studies, he met and married a girl called Anna Karpik, and in 1922 Konstantin Siemaszko was ordained to the diaconate and later in the same year to the priesthood. He was thus originally a married priest, Father Konstantin. His intention, obviously, had been to be a married parish priest, just a good pastor to his flock, a caring husband to his wife and father to his family, and to live the comfortable life of a married man. To this young priest and his wife was born, on the 29th June 1922, a daughter who was baptised Irena. Sadly though, his wife died and the ambitious young priest became a widower with a little girl. After some time, while he struggled to the best of his ability to be a good shepherd to his parishioners and a caring father to his child, he found the many tasks of a single parent looking after especially a daughter not a boy, washing, cooking, and later teaching, almost beyond his power. He received advice from many quarters and followed the most feasible, which was to entrust a convent boarding school with his little daughter's care and later education. Since an Orthodox convent school was not available in Poland, the girl went to a Roman Catholic establishment. Soon afterwards Father Konstantin took monastic vows and was given the monastic name Matthew.

Metropolitan Deonisy, at that time the Head of the Polish Orthodox Church, saw in Father Konstantin a candidate most suitable to become a Bishop, and he was elected and consecrated as Vicar Bishop of Wilno. The consecration of the new Bishop by Metropolitan Deonisy with the assistance of other bishops took place in the St. Alexander Newsky Cathedral in Warsaw in 1938 on his namesday, the Feast of St. Matthew, 16/29th November.

Bishop Matthew had very little time to act as Vicar Bishop of the Diocese of Wilno (which at that time was Polish, whereas after the war the city became part of Lithuania), since in Summer 1939 the German forces occupied Poland. Quite unaware of Bishop Matthew's decision to leave, another Bishop, Sawa (Sowietow) of Grodno, decided to do likewise and, severally, both of them left just in time before the Soviet forces arrived in part of Poland and in the Baltic States. Bishop Matthew made his way through Riga to France, crossing the French border on the 8th November 1939. Both Bishops were now refugees. Each of them, quite independently though, joined the Polish armed forces abroad as Chaplains General to become Spiritual Fathers to the combatants who were set on fighting the occupiers of their country.

While in Paris, at one time Bishop Matthew helped Metropolitan Evlogiy, the Head of the Russian Orthodox Church (Metropolia of Western Europe under the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople) with some church services. It seems that he did considerable social work among those who suffered as a result of the war. The French authorities recognised and highly valued his labour. They honoured him by awarding and decorating him with the Order of the French



*Bishop Matthew of Aspendos (1894-1985) wearing the Panagia presented by the Romanian Patriarch.*

Legion. In Paris lived also his married sister whom he later visited several times after he had moved to London. It is assumed that she died in 1978.

Towards the end of the war the Polish armed forces abroad were gathered together and moved from France to Great Britain and were stationed in Scotland. Bishop Matthew came to Britain with the armed forces on the 31st December 1944, performing his duty as Chaplain (Protopresbyter) and holding the military rank of Colonel in the 1st Corps of the Polish forces. In the H.Q.'s Officers' Register he was listed under number A 07599 until 1948. The second Bishop, Sawa, also arrived in Britain at the same time but was by now already elevated to be Archbishop. He was the Senior Bishop in the Polish armed forces abroad, with residence in London, whereas Bishop Matthew was assigned to the North, with residence in Edinburgh. After the death of Archbishop Sawa in 1951 Bishop Matthew was the only Bishop representing the Polish Orthodox Church in the West, and he became the Head of the Polish Orthodox Church Abroad, with residence in London.

At that time, there were several Polish Orthodox priests under Bishop Matthew's jurisdiction. In Great Britain there was a small parish in London; others were in Bristol, Leeds and Edinburgh. It is true to say that it was very difficult indeed to organise regional parishes since most of the Polish Orthodox people constantly moved from one place to another to find work and to settle, or else they emigrated. Small parishes existed also in West Germany, in Ulm, Stuttgart and Heidelberg. One or two parishes were also in Australia and in other places in the Free World. Of those, however, information is lacking. Bishop Matthew was often approached with the request to talk about his early life, but he never said much about it, waving such requests aside with a smiling "later on" or "nobody would be interested in my person".

Apart from his pastoral work, Bishop Matthew in his early years in Great Britain had to care for his daughter who now lived also in the West and studied in Oxford. She later married an American scientist, Clayton Frank Holoway, and they lived in the United States with their son Theodore.

Bishop Matthew occupied himself exclusively with work for the Church. He was by now getting older and, following established routine, would have required an assistant to help him in the organisation of the Church. However, since he was the only Bishop of the Polish Orthodox Church Abroad he had to shoulder the entire burden alone and, consequently, the parishes suffered greatly. With advancing years his health deteriorated and he became deaf. To take a decision became a complicated issue and probably vital problems were, due to his deafness, rather more misunderstood than solved! Probably there were people who took advantage of this situation or misinterpreted the Bishop's wishes.

The Almighty has granted Bishop Matthew a long life, though greatly troubled by losing his wife so early and living through two world wars and their consequences, finally losing his own country. A refugee all these many years, he faithfully served only his canonical Polish Orthodox Church Abroad under the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, and his Orthodox people. He was the spiritual shepherd of his flock. He did not acquire worldly riches or material wealth. He lived very modestly, not to say poorly. All his life was dedicated to labour for and to serve the Church of Christ. However, he did save a small sum to ensure that his funeral would be paid for when he died, so that nobody would be burdened with such an expense. This money he entrusted to the "Polish Orthodox Church Abroad (Independent) Trust Committee", according to his Pastoral Letter at the beginning of Great Lent in March 1984.

Some people have understood him and valued his efforts, others may not have done so. But those who valued his endeavours awarded him in recognition of his achievements several high-class decorations. In this context are to be mentioned the Polish Government in Exile when the "Kancelarz Orderu Odródnienia Polski" decorated him on the 7th February 1977 with the "Kryż Komondorski" (Commander Cross), the highest recognition of civil service; and long before, the Polish government awarded him the "Kryż Zasługi" (Cross for Achievements) of the highest class. He also received several war medals, and in 1955 a memorable Panagia from Patriarch Justinian of Romania. In August 1978 he was approached and asked to become

the Spiritual Head and Grand Almoner of the Sacred Order of the Orthodox Hospitallers, a duty which he accepted and carried out until he died.

As a spiritual father he was there when he was needed, not only to perform baptisms, weddings or funerals, but also to train new clergy, to ordain deacons and priests, or to bestow elevations granted by the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople. When asked, he was ready for the task. Nothing was too much for him—when his people needed him, they knew where to find him and how to approach him. They knew how to achieve his favour.

In May 1955 Bishop Matthew of Wilno, by the order of His All Holiness the Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras I of Constantinople, was accepted as Assistant Bishop to the Archdiocese of Thyateira and Great Britain, his task being to care for the Polish Orthodox people in the diaspora, who, until 1951, had been under the care of Archbishop Sawa of Blessed Memory, also within the Archdiocese of Thyateira and Great Britain. For practical and canonical reasons the Ecclesiastical Authority suggested and advised, in 1977, that Bishop Matthew of Wilno should in future be named Bishop of Aspendos. Early in 1978 this title and his position were approved by the Holy Synod of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and he became known as Bishop Matthew of Aspendos.

After the death of Archbishop Sawa in 1951 some property was left to the Polish Orthodox Church in the form of two houses: 7 Penywern Road, SW5, and 95 Finborough Road, SW10. These premises involved Bishop Matthew in much trouble in order to legalise the ownership of the Polish Orthodox Church. He was successful in that the ownership of the Church was recognised for one of the houses, 95 Finborough Road, SW10. For the management of this property a "Polish Orthodox Church Abroad (Independent) Trust" was established on 1st September 1959; the Deed of Trust was registered with the Charity Commissioners under number 255518 and signed by Bishop Matthew (and other members), the Bishop becoming Chairman Ex Officio of the Trust.

In July 1981 Bishop Matthew was informed by his daughter that her husband had died and that she was now a widow with a grown-up son, Theodore. In November of the same year Bishop Matthew fell down in the street in front of his house and was taken to hospital with an injured leg and arm. After about four weeks he was sent home and took up his lonely monk's life once again. In February 1982 he was taken a second time to the hospital. This time he needed a stomach operation, after which he was still gravely ill. Some time later and under hospital care his health improved, but now his age started to show and he could not regain his strength. It became obvious that he needed constant care and was no longer able to live on his own. He could just sit and walk short distances in the ward. It became difficult for him to write, but he could read books and newspapers, dictate and sign letters. He showed remarkable memory and logic. His faculties were perfect. With time however it became clear that he would not be able in the foreseeable future to act as Chairman of the Polish Orthodox Church Abroad (Independent) Trust. He therefore sent out a circular letter dated 26th September 1983 entitled "Declaration and Recommendation" with the following text: "Due to my prolonged illness and general bad health, and taking into account my

age, I feel that I am no longer able to fulfil effectively the tasks connected with the position of Chairman of the above Trust, i.e. to cope with the demands of the administration of the property 95 Finborough Road, SW10," and further: "I should like to resign under the condition . . ." followed by his recommendation and drawing attention to action in accordance with the Deed of Trust dated the 1st September 1959. When he learnt that a new Trust Committee had been formed, Bishop Matthew had the bank account of the "Polish Orthodox Church" and his own savings transferred to this new Committee. At the beginning of 1984 his health slowly deteriorated. When Great Lent started in March he had a circular letter sent out on the Sunday of Forgiveness, humbly bowing to his countrymen and asking his flock for forgiveness: "Dear Brothers and Sisters, for the past two years, due to my illness and confinement to a hospital bed, I have been unable to send you my regular Pastoral Letters at Easter (Pascha) or at Christmas time. We now approach a very important time in the Christian calendar, the GREAT LENT, important to every Christian and to us Orthodox in particular. The Sunday of Forgiveness (4th March) has already passed. I call on all of you to consider with all mindfulness and sincerity of heart the last part of the Lord's Prayer: *AND FORGIVE US OUR TRESPASSERS, AS WE FORGIVE THEM THAT TRESPASS AGAINST US*. That is our Christian promise. Therefore, I, as your Bishop, first bow in front of you and ask you: Brothers and Sisters, forgive me all my trespasses against you, as I forgive every one of you." The letter ended with: "Only God knows whether this may not be my last Pastoral Letter to you. Even to wait until Holy Pascha may be too late. I have chosen to send it now, at the beginning of Great Lent, as being an appropriate time when Our Lord wants us to examine our lives, to ask for forgiveness and to learn to forgive others. I pray that our Gracious Lord may give His Blessing to all of you."

That was indeed his last Pastoral Letter to his flock. His health markedly deteriorated over the year, and on the 10th March 1985 he said to a Priest who visited him: "Father, I will die next week". Sure enough, on 12th March the hospital 'phoned to say that the Bishop was getting very weak. Bishop Christopher of Telmesos visited Bishop Matthew on the same day and gave him Holy Communion. He was still able to sit. However, the next morning, at 3.00 a.m. on 13th March, he fell peacefully asleep. A Requiem Service (Panikhida) was held the same day. Bishop Matthew's body was placed in the Cathedral of the Nativity of the Mother of God in Camberwell in the afternoon of 21st March and prayers were said. On 22nd March at 10.00 a.m. the Cathedral filled up rapidly with worshippers who had come to pay their last respects to, or ask for forgiveness from their spiritual shepherd as he lay in his coffin, and some of them remembered him with warmth and affection in their hearts. After the Liturgy there followed the Burial Office and then the interment in Brompton Cemetery. The very dignifying services were celebrated by Bishop Christopher with clergy from the Greek, Polish, Serbian, Latvian and Byelorussian Autocephalous Orthodox Churches assisting.

As is known, the lives of the two Bishops, Matthew and Archbishop Sawa, were closely connected in many ways. Archbishop Sawa died early and Bishop Matthew took his place as the Head of the Polish

Orthodox Church Abroad. But now, after many years, they will be united once again forever in the Eternal Life while their earthly remains will rest together peacefully in Brompton Cemetery (grave Br. No. 197617—Comp 2 West) in London, SW10, far away from their own country and place of birth, *May the Almighty establish the soul of his departed servant Bishop Matthew where the righteous repose. Memory Eternal!*

Fr. Alexander Cherney

#### ANTIOCHENE CHRISTIANITY, ISLAM AND ARAB NATIONALISM—III

##### The Shaliach Sha'ul, Rabbinical Judaism, Hellenism and Hellenisticism

The greatest impulse towards the ecumenical and, eventually, extra-ecumenical, dissemination of fulfilled Messianic Judaism, through the vehicle of *Koiné* Greek, was furnished by its great advocate, the Rabbinical student Sha'ul, former disciple of the great Rabbi Gamaliel I, Head of the *Beth Hillel*, the Jerusalem *Yeshiva*, Academy of *Torahnic* Study, founded by the famous Babylonian-born Rabban Hillel (70 BC-10 AD) whose grandson Gamaliel was. Sha'ul had been the *Shaliach*, plenipotentiary, of the Great *Synedrion*, Sanhedrin in Jerusalem. He became the *Shaliach* of the *Mar Mashiah*, *Jeshua ben Yosef*, the Lord Messiah, Jesus son of Joseph. Rabbi Gamaliel I was known as "Elder" or "the Elder" because he was a member of the Jerusalem Sanhedrin and, according to tradition, its *Nasi*, *primus inter pares*, President. He was said to be of Davidic descent.

Sha'ul was an important official. One wonders whether he might himself have been an ordained *Zaken*, Elder, and therefore one of the "wise judges" who formed an official "professional" class, the *Zakenim*. Generally, a *Zaken* was not ordained under the age of forty and it may be that Sha'ul was too young to have yet been so honoured when he underwent the greatest spiritual revelation of his life on the road to Damascus as a consequence of which he ceased to act as an inquisitor of the Pharisees and Sadducees of the Temple Establishment and became, instead, a lifelong ambassador of the Christ. He had been born in Tarsus in Cilicia. Tarsus, a former Greek *Polis*, City-State, claiming Perseus and Heracles among its mythical founders, was an ancient human settlement going back to Neolithic times. It was rebuilt by the Assyrian King Sennacherib (705-681 BC). The armies of Xenophon and Alexander of Macedon passed through its gates. It was absorbed into the Roman province of Cilicia in 67 BC. It continued to preserve a measure of local autonomy and was raised to full Free City-State status as a *Municipium*, a "chartered Burgh". It was always an important city, one-time Metropolis of the three provinces of Cilicia, Isauria and Lycania. It was more than a merely Hellenistic centre, it was a distinguished cultural and academic centre of Hellenic civilisation, graced by a famous Academy of Philosophy in the Stoic tradition, held to be scarcely inferior to those of Alexandria and Athens. Indeed, Strabo (c. 63 BC) claimed that it was a more educated city than either. It boasted distinguished teachers of the eminence of Nestor and Athenodorus. The permanent principle

of Stoic philosophy was that of the brotherhood of man obliterating all distinction of nationality (*Politeia*) enunciated by Zeno (c. 334-262/261 BC), a Phoenician born in Citium in Cyprus, Founder of the Stoic Philosophy, who taught in the Stoa Poikile, the Painted Porch, at Athens.

The City was set in the great Gulf of Iskanderün, named after Alexander the Great. It was simultaneously a centre of industry, an agricultural market and a commercial trading transit centre, on the trade routes both by land and sea, between Europe, Africa, Asia and the further East. Its prosperity was based on agriculture, the linen industry and the tent-making industry. Tarsian bedouin-type tents were famous. The tent-makers wove *cllicium*, tent cloth woven from the long-haired goats, herds of which were kept in the Taurus mountains.

Rhegma, the inland lake and harbour of Tarsus, was one of the great ports and anchorages of the ancient world with wharves, warehouses and arsenals to house all the varied merchandise of its commerce. Lying at anchor were triremes and galleys—their painted sails lowered or raised as they prepared to weigh anchor—ships of Egypt, Phoenicia, Greece and Rome. Despite the steamy heat of summer, January in Tarsus (and Antioch) could be sharply cold and the mountains capped with snow. And although the Roman engineers kept the channels clear, maintained jetties, retaining walls and pipe systems, it was a region where malaria lurked, to which Sha'ul was to be afflicted (or so seems likely) all his life.

The marble City was home to a substantial Jewish community of long-established settlement. All Tarsian Jews were of the least but toughest of the Tribes of Israel, the Tribe of *Ben Yamin*, Benjamin, "Son of the Right Hand" (or "Son of Good Fortune"). Historically, they had been located North of Bethlehem, a tribe of soldiers, skilled in ambush, expert in the use of slings and as bowmen. Traditionally, they were ambidexterous. From amongst them, the last of the Judges, Samuel, had chosen another Sha'ul to be anointed the first "King" of Israel in 1040 BC. David too was of the same Tribe, whose name has also been said to mean "People of the South". Thus Sha'ul, Paulos, St. Paul, was of the same Tribe as the first two Kings of Israel and of the King Messiah whose *Malkuth*, Kingdom, was "not of this world" (*John* 18:36).

The Jewish community was possessed of a defined official character, as a *Politeumata*, a recognised corporation of free immigrant or expatriate "foreigners", permitted to live under the Jewish laws appertaining to the *Torah*, the God-given way of life of the People of the Covenant. Among the Jewish community were some who had gained Tarsian and even Roman citizenship, the family of Sha'ul, known as "Paulos" to his Greek-speaking associates, included among them. Perhaps it was the grandfather of St. Paul who first gained the proud status of *Civis Romanus*.

The conquest of the Italian peninsula and the spread of the domain of Roman rule, of the *imperium Romanum*, was the achievement of the soldier-farmers of the ancient rural "City" of Rome, whose civic duty it was to serve, without pay, and to furnish their own arms and equipment (an approach to part-time military service echoed in the old English Yeomanry regimental tradition). To bear arms was one of the privileges of a free citizen, not extended to slaves. What was to

become the imperial achievement of Rome, remained, not only in legal fiction, but in terms of the fundamental psychological disposition of the great Empire, as it was to become, the achievement of the great City. The British Empire was the achievement of the British "race": the Roman Empire was the achievement of the citizens of Rome. It was a civic empire in formation and a civic empire it remained, even in the days of its autocratic grandeur. The proud logogram inscribed on the standards of the legions (originally a "levy", "gathering": *Legio*, of the soldier-farmers), *SPQR*, epitomises the spirit of Rome and all that was Roman, standing, as it does for an encapsulation of the Roman Constitution itself—*SENATUS POPULUSQUE ROMANUS*, where *Romanus* means "Roman", not as "British" means "British" but as "Londonish" would mean (if such a word existed) "appertaining to a Londoner", a citizen individually, or "to the citizenry collectively of London".

To be a *Civis Romanus*, whether, like the Holy Apostle Paul, by proud descent or by purchase, was to be a Citizen (a Freeman) of the City of Rome itself, *Civitas Romanae, Romae*. Unlike becoming a Freeman of the City of London, that gave *ipso facto* to the fortunate bearer of the title an almost aristocratic prerogative status (similar but grander than the new style "UK Citizenship" accorded to some of us more fortunate British Subjects). Perhaps the further one was from the actual City, the greater the aura that surrounded Roman Citizen status. (After all, even an English Duke is only another Member in the Upper Chamber of the Houses of Parliament and, in some situations, even full Colonels can find themselves little more than messenger boys!). Thus, to be a Roman Citizen in the Eastern Provinces of Rome, whether or not possessed of official Office, having great wealth or none, wide estates or quite landless, was to be someone surrounded by the Imperial Protection of the Great City, and in later times of its embodiment, the Emperor. A man, not of the Roman race, who could claim to be a Citizen was especially proud of the privilege. Such a man was Paul.

A serious measure of irregularity spread in Tarsus, and Augustus, who had been a pupil of Athenodorus, authorised the latter to carry out major reforms in the *Municipium*. Only men of wealth and standing in the community were to be retained on the Burgess Rolls of the City. The fact that the status of St. Paul's family remained inviolate indicates that his was truly a family of some substance. It is usually assumed that his family was strictly observant of the detailed rules of the Pharisaic Tradition (the precise details of which remain somewhat conjectural and may involve some backward projection into the first century of post-Akhiban Rabbinical Judaism). This does not follow implicitly from the fact that young Paul was destined or showed an inclination towards a Scribal career (any more than that a nineteenth-century Scots merchant, in Glasgow say, encouraging his son to become a Minister of the Kirk can be assumed by that fact alone to have been himself a strictly practising Calvinistic Christian). And it would seem likely that young Paul's family were prosperous manufacturers and merchants, probably in the *Cilicium* trade. At most times, and in most societies, success in business enterprise tends to involve some measure of social intercourse, at least between males, including the taking of food and drink together. In such a meeting between Jew and Gentile it would have been virtually impossible to

keep, for example, the *Kosher* rules, the dietary requirements and food restrictions.

In his earliest years, indeed from the age of three, the young Paul would have been put to the "Church School", the *Cheder*, at the Tarsian Synagogue (or one, the principal one probably, of them). It is a very ancient Jewish Tradition that scholars earn their livelihood by means outside the pursuit of Torahnic knowledge and understanding. Right down to the days of the Russo-Polish Pale this tradition went on. Scholars and rabbis had a craft at which they worked for one third of their day, devoting the remainder, liturgical and private prayer, eating and sleeping aside, to study. The young Paul observed this tradition and learned the craft of a tentmaker, a weaver and worker in *Cilicium*. In course of time, perhaps at the age of thirteen or fourteen, he was taken or sent by his father to the *Yeshiva*, Torahnic Academy, of Rabbi Gamaliel I (of the benign and anti-revolutionary tradition of Hillel) in the Holy City and world-centre of Judaism, Jerusalem. He "sat at the feet of Gamaliel" (cf *Acts* 23:3). This intellectual disciplining was of the greatest importance in "forming" the future Apostle. As Bishop A. C. Headlam wrote in *St. Paul and Christianity*: "A distinctive feature of St. Paul is that he interpreted Christianity according to the method of thought which his Rabbinical training had given him". Whatever his contacts with Hellenism and with Hellenistic Judaism in Tarsus (and, as I have suggested above, he was probably in his early teens when he moved to Jerusalem), the dominant influence upon him was that of the highest form of Palestinian Judaism. As Headlam put it: "... his whole cast of thought was Palestinian, and not Alexandrian". "The new influence, then," writes Headlam, "brought by St. Paul into Christianity, apart from all that came from his character and personality, was that of his Jewish training in the Rabbinical Schools of Jerusalem. That is, he was an educated theologian of the day. Here lies the contrast with the popular and simpler Judaism of the Galilean disciples".

Clearly, St. Paul knew both Aramaic and Hebrew, but his vision of the great enterprise of proclaiming the Advent of the Messiah soared beyond the confines of *Yehuda*, beyond Aramaic-speaking Syria. It reached out to the furthest borders of the Graeco-Roman *Oecumene*, to the limits of the *Imperium Romanum*. His vocation he saw as being to the great Hellenistic Jewish world of the *Diaspora*, the "Scattering". This was the world of *Koiné* Greek, the Greek of the market place. From his earliest days of speech, Greek had been his mother tongue (although he probably grew up as bi-lingually as any Swiss). But if his medium of communication was to be Greek, in Headlam's words: "His ideas are expressed in Hebrew and not in Greek categories". It is not a "Greek" and "Aryan" Gospel that the Holy Apostle Paul preaches; it is a "Hebrew-Aramaic" and "Semitic" Gospel. And this is not a "reasonable" philosophy but the all-demanding proclamation of the Word of God, of that *Logos* (as St. John has it) Who became Flesh and dwelt among us.

All his grown life, Paul the Tarsian was an *Angelos*, an *Apostolos*, a herald and a messenger, first as the *Shaliach* of the Great Sanhedrin under the Presidency of his old Teacher, Gamaliel, and later of the great *Malik Mashiah*, the King Messiah, the *Kyrios*, the *Basileus* the *Christos*. The Office of a *Shaliach* was referred to by Prof. F. Gavin in the 1927 Chapman Lectures, which he later expanded in his book

*The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments* (1928) and was the subject of an article in the *ATR* IX.3 (1927) "Shaliach and Apostolos". Dom Gregory Dix OSB based his theory of the nature of Apostolic Succession upon it in the Anglo-Catholic volume of essays on the subject: "The Apostolic Ministry" (1976).

In purely linguistic terms certainly, Hellenistic Judaism was not confined solely to the lands of the Greek Diaspora; there were Greek-speaking synagogues throughout Palestine, fewest probably in *Yehuda*, Judah (Judea), but several at least in Jerusalem. The contentious issue is: beyond the use of the Greek language, what does "Hellenisation" signify? Certainly any thoroughgoing Hellenisation of Palestinian Judaism was arrested by the Maccabees and the reaction against the Hellenising excesses of Antiochus IV. Epiphanes (175-164 BC). In *Eretz Yisrael*, the Land of Israel, therefore, Hellenisation was limited and restrained. In the Diaspora, the term covered a wide range of cultural and social penetration of Jewish personal, family and communal life. Probably the most Hellenised Diasporic community was that of Alexandria.

Within the Jerusalem Nazarene "school" and fellowship within Judaism, there was a group which was to some degree, including and principally in language, "Greek". These folk, including St. Philip and the Deacon Proto-Martyr St. Stephen, had probably been members of one or other of the Greek-speaking synagogues in Jerusalem. It was they who carried the Good News of the fulfilment of the Messianic Promises to the synagogues of the Greek cities in the Holy Land, to the slack and even non-conformist Jews of the Galilee and to those other ostracised Children of the Covenant, the Samaritans. But it was left to the little red-headed, balding, big-nosed, short and bandy Tarsian, *Paulos*, already widely-travelled, educated, learned, possessed of much savoir faire, passion, strong personal charisma, and the unmatched advantage of Roman citizenship to set up his campaign base in the great Provincial and Diocesan (Civil) Capital City of Antioch and mount a series of great evangelising expeditions through the key cities of Asia and into Europe. The vocation extended to St. Paul (as recorded in *Acts* 9:15) was, as Ananias, a follower of the Lord in Damascus was told by God in a vision, that he should "bear my name before the Gentiles, *Ethnōn*, (lit. 'the nations'), and kings and the sons of Israel". On recovering his sight at the hands of Ananias, he preached in the Damascene synagogues that *Jeshua ben Yosef* is the Son of God and the *Mashiah* of the Jewish Expectation.

The Cypriot Jew, St. Barnabas, of that ancient Jewish community eventually totally annihilated in a Roman punitive expedition, befriended the newly-converted persecutor of the Church and witnessed to the Jerusalem Church how St. Paul had preached the Lord Messiah in the Damascene synagogue and was truly of the Household of Faith. In the Holy City he witnessed for Christ and disputed with the Hellenists (presumably in their synagogues). His life being threatened, the Brethren brought him away to Caesarea and then sent him home to Tarsus.

In his encounter with Cornelius, a centurion of the Italian Band, a "God-fearer" (*Foboúmenos*), St. Peter had had his first social contact with a Gentile, who was added to the Companions of the Way. His action initially gave concern to the Brethren of the Circumcision in

Jerusalem, but he succeeded in convincing them that what had been accomplished had been the Will of God.

Meanwhile, after the persecution that arose about St. Stephen, the Hellenistic Nazarenes dispersed to, among other places, Antioch, preaching "only to the Jews" (*Acts* 11:19). They preached to the Hellenistic Jewish community or so in the light of the above we should interpret *Hellenas*, "Hellenes", "Greeks" in verse 20. "And a great number believed and turned unto the Lord" (*Acts* 11:21). On hearing of this the Jerusalem Church sent as its "Apostle", St. Barnabas, i.e., one with the authority of a *Shaliach*, to confirm their faith. His ministry increased further the strength of the Antiochene Church. St. Barnabas considered that the situation was one in which the distinguished convert *Paulos* could make an important contribution. He went to Tarsus to fetch him. They worked together a full year in Antioch where it was that, for the first time the disciples were called "Christians", abusively by those among the Jewish community who resisted the Good News of the Lord Messiah. Having completed a relief mission to the Church in Jerusalem, Saints Paul and Barnabas returned to Antioch where they were commissioned to carry the Gospel to Seleucia "and from thence they sailed to Cyprus" (*Acts* 13:4).

Having preached in the synagogues of Damascus, (presumably) Jerusalem, and Antioch, in the some fifteen or so years following on AD 45, St. Paul pursued a very clear-headed campaign through the synagogues of the key cities of the Hellenistic world. During that time, he preached in Salamis and Paphos in Cyprus, Tarsus, Antioch in Pisidia, Ephesus and Iconium (Konya) in Lycaonia in Asia Minor, Philippi (the first place he visited on the European continent), Thessalonica and Berea in Macedonia, Athens and Corinth in Greece, and Tarraco (Tarragona) in the Province of Tarraconensis in Hispania, Spain (according to the Musatorian Fragment: *To Termā Tās Oúseos*, "the limit of the West").

It is clear that the great Apostle of the Gentiles was impelled by the inherent logic and careful consideration of the logistics of the human and institutional situation of the Diaspora within the Graeco-Roman world to make two decisions: to direct his mission to key—and exclusively to key—cities and strategically placed towns on important lines of trade and communication, i.e., to places which would themselves become natural centres of secondary propagation of the Message, and to conduct his work through—apparently exclusively through—the Greek language. The urban centres he selected were preferably such as had at least the designation *Conventus*, a town of "Assize" or "County town" stature, exercising a natural radiatory influence upon a larger area beyond its municipal boundaries.

St. Paul's Graeco-Roman conditioning would have predisposed him almost instinctively, to concentrate on towns, for Graeco-Roman civilisation was very specifically an urban civilisation, whilst as an experienced Jewish "intellectual" of the Diaspora he would have been well aware that the Jewish communities dispersed through the *Oecumene* were urban-based too. And it was to those communities and to their central institution, the synagogue, that he first and primarily directed his mission. Only when he was rejected by or ejected from the synagogue did he turn increasingly directly to the Gentile Hellenist or Hellenistic populations of the Graeco-Roman world.

It is curious that he appears never to have visited that Mecca of Greek culture and home of the largest Jewish community in the Diaspora, Alexandria. Could it have been because Egypt had already been "appropriated" by the *Koryphaeos*, leader of the [Apostolic] Chorus, St. Peter, as a zone to which he would assign an Evangelist, to wit St. Mark, who, pace the problem of the "Alexandrian Presbyteral College", remains the traditional Founder of the Alexandrian episcopate?

In Alexandria, Hellenism proper, as well as Hellenisticism, had permeated Judaism to varied, including considerable, depth (hence the many literary endeavours aimed at reconciling Greek and Jewish philosophy/religious ideas and the adulteration of both Judaism and Egyptian Christianity by Gnostic influences linked with the Egyptian and other Mystery Cults). Cultural assimilation had gone so far among some wealthy and sophisticated Jews that their view of religion and of life, like that of some modern Liberal Jews, was essentially "Greek" rather than "Hebrew" or "Semite" i.e., their views divided life into aspects or categories rather than accepting it as an integrated totality in accordance with the authentic tradition of *Torah*. Antioch, also a city of specifically Hellenist foundation, contained substantial Hellenic (mainly Macedonian-derived) and Hellenised native Syrian Gentile elements in the population, both bond and free. Only fifty per-cent of the population are thought to have known Greek—at any level of mastery. The remainder spoke various regional languages and most of them would have had Aramaic, either as a first or second language.

The Hellenistic Jewish Antiochene community predominated over the "Hebrew" community (i.e., Aramaic speaking and sometimes acquainted with Hebrew also) within the overall Jewish colony. But, unlike the situation at Alexandria, Antiochene Hellenistic Jewish religion, culture and civilisation was still authentically Semitic, Judaic and at least broadly, Torahic, i.e., truly envelopingly religious. The Antiochene community mostly only used Greek as a medium of expression and communication. And that is why it is extremely important in its rôle as "Mother of Churches": it was (in its Nazarene "Remnant" aspect) still a Hellenistic Jewish Church, differing and increasingly diverging in ethos from its own "Mother Community", the Hebrew (Aramaic-speaking) Jewish Jerusalem Church, in contrast with the Alexandrian Church which, being so Hellenised in its original Jewish cadre, on incorporating large numbers of Gentile Greek and Egyptian converts soon became, in large measure, inherently Gentile and "Greek" in ethos and outlook. The distinction between "Hellenist" and "Hellenistic" is important for later developmental trends in Christian theological emphasis as between the two principal Christian Schools. From Antioch, Nazarene Judaism or Judaeo-Christianity was virtually relaunched in Hellenistic (Koiné-Greek) guise across the Jewish Diaspora and out into the wider Graeco-Roman world.

"Christianity is essentially Jewish", so wrote Prof. John MacMurray in *The Clue to History* (1938). The failure to recognise and accept this fact has led to much confusion, misunderstanding and actual or incipient heresy. "The continuity of action can only be defined with relation to its starting point . . . If Christianity were either a body of truth merely, or merely a process of religious development, the

question of origins would be irrelevant for all practical purposes . . . But because it is a continuity of action the question of its origin is decisive, since it is determined and can only be understood in the light of the intention which set it going and in terms of which alone it has a significant continuity . . . the intention which defines [Christianity] has its source completely within the experience of the [Semitic] Hebrew people. The Old Testament . . . is the classical literature of the Jewish people. The New Testament is based upon it, was written mainly, if not entirely, by Jews, and its central figure is a Jew". MacMurray writes also that "the ancient Hebrews present us with the only example in history of a specifically religious civilisation . . ." and " . . . the inner history of the Hebrew people is the history of the development of religion".

Aspects of human social life—art, science, philosophy, morality, law and politics—tend in the course of history to become separately autonomous, often disconnected, and frequently conflicting spheres of value and activity. In the only truly religious civilisation, the Hebrew and (pre-modern secularist) Jewish civilisation, these spheres of principle and practice remain aspects of religion. "Religion, thus, never becomes a particular sphere of human activity, but remains the synthesis of all . . . In consequence, Jewish culture is integral in a sense that no other culture has been". (Hence the problem in the secularised State and society of modern Israel of how to separate "Jewish" culture from "Jewish religious" culture. The sole historical tradition of Jewish culture is wholly religious. Again, the question is often debated: what is a Jew? It receives no satisfactory answer because it is ultimately impossible to produce a definition "emancipated" from the religious dimension).

The conflict of Pope and Emperor, between the spiritual and temporal power, in the Western Mediaeval period expresses the essential dualism of Western Christianity (as does current criticism of the "intrusion" of Anglican and Latin Bishops in the sphere of political, social or industrial policy) never converted fully or au fond from the pragmatic materialism of pagan Rome or the intellectual-contemplative materialism of Periclean and neo-Periclean Greece and the Hellenist *Oecumene*. "The Hebrew form of thought rebels against the very idea of distinction between the secular and the religious aspects of life. It demands the synthesis of action and reflection. For the religious form of consciousness, religion is a way of living the whole of life, and consequently, as part of this, a way of thinking and understanding the world" (MacMurray). The great Russian Christian Philosopher, Nicolas Berdyaev wrote in *Christianity and anti-Semitism* (1952) " . . . Christianity, in its human origins, is a religion of messianic and prophetic type, the spirit of which, as utterly foreign to Graeco-Roman spiritual culture as to Hindu culture, was introduced into world religious thought by the Jewish people".

When Pastor Martin Niemöller (d. 1984), in a perhaps apocryphal encounter, responded to Adolf Hitler's question: Why will you, a patriotic German with an outstanding record in the First World War as a U-boat commander, not acknowledge me as your Fuehrer? "The reason I cannot take you as my Fuehrer is that God alone is my Fuehrer", he expressed the eternal, inescapable position of the truly religious man. True religion is always absolutist and total in its

demands and compass. However, we should try to avoid calling it "totalitarian" because totalitarianism is the enemy of true religion precisely because it is based upon the exercise of coercive power to achieve conformity and uniformity, and exposes most completely the nature of the State as the enemy of the Freedom of the Sons of God. Religion is "totalist" because it gives form and expression to the unity and essential interdependence of creation itself. "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof", "The Lord JHVH reigneth", "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel from everlasting to everlasting" (i.e., in this world and the next), and the response "Blessed be the name of the glory of His Kingdom for ever and ever" (the formula of conclusion of all Temple and synagogue Benedictions), like the Orthodox liturgical formula "Blessed be the Kingdom of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit", all serve to proclaim and remind the worshipper of the unity of the Kingdom of God under the Lord, the All-Ruler; "Now and for ever and unto the ages of ages" also ratifies the eternal permanence of God's rule. The proclamation of the *Mal'kuth*, the Kingdom, by Christ Himself, the *Malek*, the *Mashiah*, is both a reassertion of the legitimacy of the reign and rule of *Elohim* (the Divine Lords of the Trinity) and the restoration of their actuality in and through His own Person as the totally Obedient and Perfect Man.

In "this world", the world of pragmatism, the incompatibility of religion with it was obscured in respect of its pre-Christian Jewish manifestation by the exclusivity and self-sufficient character of Jewish communalism, although even then its adherents were generally disliked by the pagan world. Once the social walls of partition were dismantled by Hellenistic Nazarene Judaism or "Christianity" and Gentiles, including Roman citizens, drawn into the New Israel in ever-increasing numbers, the threat to the entire Graeco-Roman way of life and imperium was viewed with growing alarm and met with increasingly punitive (and intrinsically defensive) measures by the Imperial authorities. Persecution and martyrdom became the order of the Christian day and was only persistently sustained by the suffering Church because it was buoyed up by the sure expectation of an imminent *Parousia*, the Second Coming of the Lord in Glory, to judge all, close the age, and inaugurate the Millennium.

Amidst the throes of the interchange of polemic between Nazarene and Rabbinical Judaism, i.e., between Christianity and Judaism, the apologists of the New Israel took a stand which, whatever its usefulness in debate, was to encourage a distortion in understanding of the Biblical tradition. The nature of the stand was contained in the assertion that the Old Testament Prophets were the ancestors of the New Israel and not of the contemporary "Jews". In the process, there was a disposition to ignore or reject the whole development of Judaism after the period coincident with the closing date of the Old Testament Canon. This tends to reduce the historical "realism" of Christianity and to detach the story of Israel and the Prophetic tradition from the realities of history. The whole issue of exactly what "Canonical" implies beyond and beneath the objective facts of Rabbinical "admissibility" of certain Books as embodying the *Torah* and the rejection of others as being in varying degrees defective in this regard is a large subject in itself into which I do not propose venturing at this time. The Old Testament Canon was stabilised only in AD 90,

and then confirmed in AD 118 by the Council of Rabbis at Jamnia (Jamne). It is significant that this decision in the matter, despite the late date, was accepted by the Christian Israel, the Sub-Apostolic Church, without demur.

To a considerable extent, the very important period of Jewish history following the return of the relatively few, perhaps even the minority, of the Exiles, from Babylon to the Land of Israel, Judah and Jerusalem, is little known among Christians. There is a great void in the knowledge and understanding of our spiritual genealogy which is occasioned quite simply by the absence in our Bibles of any writing (leaving aside the Apocrypha and Pseudiographa, which are not usually bound with the two Testaments and are little read) between the close of the Canonical Old Testament with the Book of Malachi and the beginning of the New Testament with the Gospel According to Matthew. There is too a dearth of surviving written material of the period. Without some knowledge of the evolution of understanding of the nature of the Covenant relationship, and, in all humility, of the attitude of God towards His Creation, which matured between the Testaments, the relationship of the teaching of the New Testament to the teaching of the Old, apart from and deeper than the purely allegorical, cannot be understood, nor the importance of the Old Testament as the record of God's dialogue with Man through His Chosen People, His Israel, of which the Renewed Christian Israel is heir, appreciated. There is no real "Dark Age" between the Testaments, but, because people think there is, it is easy for them to think of Christianity as having nothing to do with Judaism and to suppose that the religion of the New Testament is altogether different from that of the Old and to see—as the Gnostics so often did long ago—the God of Love, the "Good" God, of the New Dispensation as altogether "other" than the God of "Vengeance", the "Bad" God (the Devil-Demiurge, the Creator of Matter) of the Old. This is mistaken, sad, and truly tragic. Dualism is amongst the greatest enemies of true religion.

For the Jews, the *Torah* was itself the very embodiment of religion. To be religious—obedient to the Will of God—was to live under and be enveloped by *Torah*, under the very Wing of the *Shekinah*, the overshadowing of the Divine and Life-giving Spirit. As the late Archimandrite Lev Gillet wrote in *Communion in the Messiah* (1942): "The Greek word *nomos*, 'law', always used by Paul and so loaded with judicial meaning, is no equivalent of *Torah*. The term *Torah* is less precise and more dynamic than *Nomos* [let alone the Latin *Lex*]. It means 'instruction' and also 'direction'." He goes on to say, very perceptively, that, for Jews, the *Torah* was something very different from a legal code: "It was the revelation and coming down of God to man, the communion of God with man, the very expression of God's nature". I favour the translation of the word "*Torah*", with its quick and dynamic signification, as "Creating Tradition" or, at least, "Living Tradition". However, although St. Paul had, perforce, to use the word "*Nomos*" normally, he gave it a full Hebraic value. It is not so much how he intended it as how his later readers interpreted it that is faulty. The late Dr. James Parkes, one of the pioneering Judaologists of his day (and a scholar of truly Renaissance ranging of interests), spoke of it as an "Incarnation" of the Divine. R. Travers Herford put it succinctly: "It is near to the truth to say that what

Christ is to the Christian, *Torah* is to the Jew". The holiness of *Torah* was such that, to preserve it from violation and defilement, the Scribes and Rabbis began an exercise, spread over a very long period of time, of "building a fence around the *Torah*" to protect it, a process much accelerated after the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple cult. A superstructure or "cosy" of secondary precepts and prohibitions was fashioned within which the Pentateuchal *Torah* was enshrined. The original *Torah* was termed the "Written *Torah*"; the Code of commentary, definition, interpretation and rulings added to it being termed (although it was in due course recorded and is the essence of *Mishnah* and *Talmud*) the "Oral *Torah*". By observing all the subsidiary and external prescriptions and proscriptions, a devout Jew would seek to obey the fullness of the ultimate *Torah*, the "Written *Torah*". But "*Torah*" came to mean the whole Tradition, *Talmud-Torah*, in later use and parlance, and it was this extension of the meaning and obligation of *Torah* which had already transformed life "under the *Torah*" to something so burdensome by the time of the Lord Jesus and his *Shaliach*-Apostle, Sha'ul-Paul. It was as if the Latin concept of "venial sin" were to be formulated into a vast code and all offences at that level accorded the status of "mortal sin" with all breaches of it treated with comparable severity. Rab Jeshua ben Yosef was truly the Lord Messiah. But he was more. He was our Passover Who was slain and *Who Rose Again*. But he was something else too: He was (and is) the Way, the Truth and the Life. He came to fulfil the *Torah*, not just to be the end of the Messianic Expectation, not even to live, alone and perfectly, the life of *Torah*. The manner in which He fulfilled *Torah* was to be Himself the very embodiment of *Torah*. At His Baptism, the very Father spoke from Heaven, the Holy *Shekinah* overshadowed Him in the shape of a Divine Dove. What took place was a showing forth: an Epiphany, of the Triune God and the Word, expressed in *Torah* and witnessed to by *Torah*, was revealed as having taken Flesh and to have been already in secret dwelling among us. All Glory be to the Holy One of Israel for ever!

Andrew Midgley

(To be continued)

## BOOK REVIEWS

Jillian Becker: *The PLO: The Rise and Fall of the Palestine Liberation Organisation*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 303 pp, illus., index, bibliography, £12.50.

"A Palestinian, Abbas al-Haj, told a reporter from the Israeli newspaper Ha'aretz (20 August 1982) that after the Israeli planes had dropped leaflets on his camp telling the civilians to leave, 'the PLO would not let anybody out. My neighbour, Saleh, tried to escape. They shot him in the back and tied him up in the square until he bled to death. Three hundred people were killed in our camp. Who is to blame for their death? Write it down—the PLO'." Jillian Becker records this story on page 280 (note 10) of her book. There are others, as gruesome, as revealing of the cynical indifference to human life of the PLO, even the lives of those of whom it is ostensibly "the sole legitimate representative".

Yet it is not stories like this upon which the world's indignation has been fed since the Israeli invasion in 1982. The PLO has been well protected by its journalist allies in the western press, who have consistently represented them to be the chief victims of the conflict. This habit of believing in the PLO has led to gross misrepresentations of recent Lebanese history. For example, we were not informed that the vast majority of Lebanese, Christian and Muslim (including Palestinians), welcomed the Israeli invasion. At last, they felt, something was being done! But about what? The Lebanese conflict since 1976 had not attracted much attention. Consequently, when the fury broke over Israel's actions, most people were unprepared to resist the calumnies, unacquainted with the true story of Lebanon. Jillian Becker's book tells for the first time the complete story of the fate of Lebanon under the PLO heel. She makes the essential point that the victims of this tragedy are the Christians of Lebanon and the Palestinian refugees themselves, kept in fief to their self-appointed overlords, the warlords of the PLO.

As the sub-title indicates, this is primarily the history of the rise and fall of the PLO. Yet, because that fall took place over more than a decade in Lebanon, the book is also the story of the Maronite Christians and their attempts to maintain a foothold of dignity and integrity in a hostile Islamic world. It is the story of how militant Islam, with or without a Marxist veneer, tries to jeopardise that attempt, and how the PLO appeared on the field of battle as the main agents of disruption, leading to the present precarious situation. The PLO are out of the way, but power has definitely come into the hands of the Muslim factions, backed by Syria, who are increasingly able to dictate terms to the Christians which they must accept or perish. This book is an indispensable guide to understanding the background to the present impasse.

It is also the most damning indictment of the PLO, and by implication of all those in the West—government leaders, church and civic leaders—who have tried to accommodate the PLO and have insisted that any peace process must include the PLO. Mrs. Becker shows, conclusively and with horrifying examples, a truth that many in the Middle East had understood long ago: that where the PLO goes, there is no peace. Israel cannot be expected to negotiate with an organisation who have publicly and often promised that the end result of any dealings with Israel will be the destruction of the Jewish state

and the annihilation of its inhabitants. Israel will not let this happen, neither to her Jewish citizens nor to those Arabs who are under Israeli protection. As far back as 14th October 1976 Sheik Muhammad Ali al-Jaabari of Hebron stated in the Israeli journal *Yediot Aharonot* (the quotation is from another source, not Mrs. Becker's book): "As long as there is a body called the PLO which believes in the way it does, there will be no solution to the Palestine Question. I think that the Arab people of the West Bank should be brave enough to admit this, courageous enough to know what is in its true interest . . . The PLO wrought havoc in Jordan and now it is destroying Lebanon. It would do the same thing here, given the chance".

The fate of the Christians of Lebanon is symbolised in the attack upon the village of Damour, not because its fate was unique—it was only one of many savage butchering of Christians—but because its name is similar to an Arabic root meaning "destruction". Mrs. Becker recounts the story of this destruction through the words of the village priest, Father Mansour Labaky. On the 9th January 1976 the PLO surrounded the village of 25,000 people and began shooting and shelling. The siege lasted fifteen days. Father Labaky attempted to get politicians of every persuasion to intervene, but to no avail. In desperation he tried to contact Yasser Arafat; he was told by one of Arafat's aides "Father, don't worry. We don't want to harm you. If we are destroying you it is for strategical reasons". Throughout 1976 the destruction of towns and villages went on, thousands of innocent civilians were killed and homes, whole villages, abandoned to PLO looters—such was PLO strategy.

When the PLO first went to Lebanon in 1968, it was barely four years old. The creation of President Nasser, it served a double purpose: as a commando force for raids into Israel, and as a political-military instrument with which to force "reactionary" Arab states into line with "revolutionary" Egypt. It was composed of dissident and conflicting political elements, mercenaries from elsewhere in the Islamic world bent on violence and its spiritual rewards, and criminals taking refuge from the law in the holy cause. With such a composition, it could hardly fail to turn out to be a monstrosity, a sort of Arabian "Frankenstein", unleashed on its creators, and yet in a precarious state of subservience to its paymasters. Its first base had been Jordan, and here it tried to establish a mini-state, ruled by the gun, imposing its will on the Jordanian citizens. In 1970 King Hussein had had enough, and after the notorious Black September massacres, finally drove the PLO from his country and into the more volatile Lebanon. Here the refugee camps were turned into military training camps, the Palestinians in them virtually prisoners of their "representatives". From these bases, situated mostly round Beirut, it gradually spread its power into southern Lebanon, terrorising businessmen, land-owners and farmers.

In two admirable chapters, 16 and 17 ("A State of Precarious Order" and "Brothers and Fratricides"), Mrs. Becker gives a succinct account of the development of Lebanon as a refuge for Christians, and shows vividly why Lebanon was unable to withstand the onslaught of the PLO as Jordan had. Although a constitutional formula had been worked out carefully to take full account of the Christian claims and giving a share in government to both Christians and Muslims, the peaceful solution to the Christian-Muslim dispute

seemed doomed from the start. Muslim groups began to contest, on theological grounds and population statistics, the Christian rôle in government. The Christians claimed a parity of population, the Muslims claimed that they, the Muslims, were in the majority, and hence the Christians were wielding a power out of proportion to their true status. But, as for Muslims, true Christian status is inferior regardless of numbers, the stage was set for "solutions" to the problem in the time-hallowed Islamic way—violence. Lebanon degenerated into cliques, factions and families with private militias, and the official Lebanese forces, themselves riven with ideological struggles, were rendered powerless. Into this fractured country, with one civil war already fought in 1958, politically unstable, torn apart by theological struggles and constant sniping, came the PLO terrorist army, funded by oil-rich Arab states, chiefly Libya and Saudi Arabia, and armed by the Soviet Union. They dug themselves in, and took over.

The first source of conflict with the Lebanese government was over the border raids into Israel. Each raid brought swift reprisals. Government forces were too weak to keep the Israelis out, but could do nothing against the PLO within. Conflicts with Lebanese forces soon degenerated, and it was only a matter of time before the situation exploded. That happened when in 1975, one April Sunday, Christians attending the consecration of a new church were shot at and four were killed. Although news of the shooting had spread all over the city, that afternoon a bus full of Palestinians came past the church where the Christians were ready for another attack. They took the bus for such an attack and fired on it. Whether this clash was intentional, or yet another accident of the terrible situation in Lebanon, is hard to determine. But it was sufficient to begin the civil war.

During the following days, the PLO heavy artillery bombarded Christian East Beirut, and their fighters, Shi'a Muslims and Communists, overran Christian suburbs. The destruction of Lebanon had begun. It was to last six savage years.

When the Israeli army went in in 1982, they went to do what the Lebanese police, the Lebanese army, the Arab League and all its summits, and the special UN forces had been unable to do. Within days of success, within days of at last bringing about conditions fruitful for peace, the Israel Defence Forces were stopped by the interference of western governments, grossly misled by their media. The PLO was given temporary lease of life, which it used to turn in upon itself in the final butchery of Tripoli; but it also brought back Syria into the picture and gave her back a place that, under the impact of the Israelis, she had been losing. Just how dangerous the new situation is for the Christians, even with the PLO out of the way, will be understood by reading this book. Nevertheless, the Christians do have a strong ally in Israel.

One of the more moving stories in this book is that of the gradual friendship that grew up between the Christians of southern Lebanon and the Israelis. It began when the wounded from a village near the border turned to the Israelis for help, unable to get medical assistance at home. The border became known as "the Good Fence", and the Israelis supplied medicine, food and arms. Those more severely wounded were taken into Israeli hospitals. There is in this story

something epoch-making. After the centuries of disability and persecution in Christian Europe, the Jewish people have returned to their ancient home and become strong. For the first time Jewish strength has come to the aid of needy Christians. It is this significance that makes the Christian silence in the west more damaging. It was after all in the summer of 1982 that the Pope chose to interview Yasser Arafat—yet he said not a word about the Maronite communities that Arafat's men had been slaughtering for years.

That at least is now ended. The PLO is finished. This is Mrs. Becker's conclusion, and she is right. The PLO have never had a case: never representative, never prepared to negotiate except for strategic purposes, never peaceful. And now it is dead. The fact that the western media hardly covered the débâcle in Tripoli makes it marginally easier to maintain the fiction that it is still alive. But it was finished by the Israeli attack upon its bases in Beirut. Arafat's loyalists, a few thousand men, are in camps in Yemen, and the government there has taken severe measures against them, forbidding them to use arms. The remnant in Lebanon is now merely a function of the Syrian military. A lone Arafat treks round the world, looking up old friends like the Chinese, but this is simple showmanship.

The demise of the PLO is not a popular thesis. That is perhaps one reason why Mrs. Becker's book has been ignored by those in the media responsible for the lies about Lebanon. But her book is well-researched, and extremely well-written. It makes a difficult and harrowing subject comprehensible. Beginning with a sketch of the history of the Mandate, which set the tone for all that followed and which Arab violence ignored or condoned (thus giving the most intransigent elements their head), it moves on to the detailed history of Lebanon outlined above. It contains few photographs, but enough. And do not neglect to read the notes: they contain much valuable information on sources, and many eye-witness stories. Mrs. Becker travelled much in Lebanon, speaking to many from all parties to the conflict, and she has read widely in the literature, checking written accounts against spoken ones, assessing a mass of difficult and conflicting evidence. Her's is a conscientious book, written with great sensitivity towards the victims and her readers. She does not overburden us with atrocity stories: her restraint compels our attention, and her facts are left to speak for themselves. The whole book is an eloquent testimony to the truth of words spoken by King Hussein (again in 1976 and again from another source) in an interview with Newsweek—words that are a fitting epitaph for the PLO: "The Palestine Liberation Organisation has weakened, perhaps irreparably, its argument that Jews, Muslims and Christians could live in harmony, side by side, in a future greater Palestine. It can be seen that Arabs themselves, citizens of the same country, not only cannot coexist but collide day and night".

Mark Rogers

Allan Boesak: *Walking on Thorns—The call to Christian Obedience*, WCC (Risk Book Series), 65pp, no price given.

This book is well worth reading for the very clear insight it gives into the spiritual anguish and struggle which is going on in South Africa today.

Dr. Boesak's series of seven sermons are well thought out and a challenge to all of us in their scope. He draws extensively on the Old Testament to illustrate his picture of South Africans suffering today under apartheid as the subjugated people did in Old Testament times.

There is one paragraph which we could all do well to think about carefully: "Not that the unity of the church is not a legitimate concern. But we are also concerned with the truth without which the church cannot live. We are concerned not so much about a common mind in the church as about the faithful obedience to the Lord of the church. If the unity of the church is not built upon the passion for truth, the desire for justice, the faithful obedience to the Lord whatever the cost, then it is not unity. Unity that is dictated by the powerful is not unity. Unity at the cost of the poor and the oppressed, at the cost of the integrity of the gospel, is not unity".

However, I would sound a note of caution: Dr. Boesak puts into the same category both Hitler and President Reagan. I consider that in so doing he diminishes the strength of his other arguments. Whatever one may think of current American foreign policy, it can hardly be likened to the Nazi regime in Germany. This sweeping and inaccurate statement does however alert the reader at once to the very complex political problems in South Africa where a Christian desire for human justice is in danger of being exploited by groups whose motives are far more dangerous.

Dr. Boesak is a minister of the Dutch Reformed Mission Church in South Africa and President of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches. He is therefore a man whose opinions should be considered carefully as being based on a very real experience of the problems of South Africa. But this book should be read with a critical awareness of the complexity of the situation in that troubled country.

Vivien S. Hornby-Northcote

#### Short Notices

*Note:* Inclusion under the heading "Short Notices" does not necessarily imply that a further review will not appear in a later issue of *ECNL*.

Nicolas Uspensky: *Evening Worship in the Orthodox Church*, St. Vladimir's Press 1985, 248 pp, £11.95.

This book comprises three articles formerly published in Russian in *Bogoslovskie Trudy* but now translated into English by Paul Lazor. The first article (Chapter I of the book) is a liturgical history of the service of Vespers. The second article (Chapter II) covers the history and practice of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts. The third Article (Chapter III) describes the "collision" between the underlying Eastern theology of the Presanctified Liturgy and the sacramental theology of Western scholasticism with particular reference to liturgical revisions in Russia under Patriarch Nikon in the 17th century. This last chapter also includes a discussion of how the "collision" of the two theologies is reflected in differences between the Russian and Greek rites for the Sacrament of Penance. *Evening Worship in the Orthodox Church* is a most important work, for, though the history discussed is that of Eastern Christianity, the principles raised are of crucial significance to Eastern and Western Christians alike.

*Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: The Dublin Agreed Statement* 1984, SPCK 1985, 73 pp. £2.50.

For a discussion of the content of the *Agreed Statement* readers are referred to the article by Fr. George Dragas in *ECNL*, Spring 1985, pp 30-32. The official text has now been published by SPCK, together with two useful appendices: "The Moscow Agreed Statement 1976" and "The Athens Report 1978". This book deserves close study by all Orthodox and Anglican clergy and laity alike, and it is to be hoped that it will be given as much attention nationally and in the parishes as has the ARCIC Final Report.

Archimandrite Vasileios: *Hymn of Entry*; Georgios I. Mantzaridis: *The Deification of Man*, St. Vladimir's Press 1984, 137 and 138 pp respectively, \$5.95 and 6.95.

These are the first two volumes in a new series being published by St. Vladimir's Press under the general heading of "Contemporary Greek Theologians". *Hymn of Entry*, translated by Dr. Elizabeth Briere, reflects the Athonite attitude to modern ecumenism within the wider context of theology as a whole. It presents a fresh vision of the Church and the world that is an antidote to much of the sentimentality of the West. *The Deification of Man*, translated by Liadain Sherrard, is a study of the theological and anthropological bases for "deification" as expounded by St. Gregory Palamas. Of particular importance is the emphasis on the body as "Spirit-bearing" and hence on the unity of the physical and the spiritual—a much needed corrective to modern Gnostic tendencies. Both works have a foreword by Bishop Kallistos of Diokleia setting them in their historic and contemporary contexts. We can expect much from this new series.

Rosemary Radley: *Mystical Heart*, published by the Author 1985, 38pp, £1.50.

This is a book of some thirty short poems on various religious and mystical themes. They have a deceiving simplicity on first reading, but a return to them reveals increasingly a spiritual depth providing ample food for meditation. *Mystical Heart* has been printed by a community of handicapped Roman Catholic nuns, the Congregation of Jesus Crucified. The poems are dedicated to "the work and witness of the Church in South and South-East London" and all profits go to Southwark Cathedral, whose Provost, the Revd. David L. Edwards, provides a brief preface.

The following poem, taken from *Mystical Heart* is reproduced here by kind permission of the Author.

#### BREAD OF ANGELS

Most great and holy Virgin,  
Mother of God,  
And all the holy angels,  
Bring me  
Unto the heavenly banquet  
Wherein I might behold the glory  
Of the mystical Lover of my soul,  
To be nourished and sustained  
And eternally enhanced  
With the soul's celestial Food,  
The Body of Christ,  
True Bread of Life.

O, to be consumed  
By that sweet mystery of Love;  
To encounter  
In the sanctuary of my heart  
The Presence of the Divine;  
And with that great company  
Of all God's saints,  
To be mystically fed  
By the heavenly Host  
On the Bread of Angels,  
Jesus Christ,  
The Beloved.

May He who is our Host,  
Giver, yet mystically given,  
Living Bread of Heaven,  
Whom in eucharist  
We mystically receive,  
Clothe me  
With the mantle of holiness,  
That I joyfully embrace  
The kingdom within.

O, to be fulfilled by the grace of God  
When I consume the Bread of Angels  
At the eternal banquet,  
Partaker with the saints in glory  
Who adorn the worshipful Presence  
Of Jesus Christ,  
The Lord.

Mother of the Word incarnate,  
Pray for me.

## NOTICES

### Editor's Note

The Editor very much regrets that, due to his recent illness, this issue of *ECNL* is appearing late and does not include the usual short "News Items". Some book and record reviews have had to be held over due to lack of space.

### Subscriptions

Members are asked to note that 1986 subscriptions are due on 1st January. The present subscription of £3 represents the absolute minimum, and all those who can afford it are asked to make a donation to the Association over and above this minimum. In addition to membership the subscription includes payment for two issues of *ECNL* (post free). Cheques should be made payable to the Association and sent to the Assistant Secretary at St. Dunstan-in-the-West.

### 1986 Pilgrimage

The 1986 Pilgrimage to the monasteries of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church is planned for 20th to 30th August 1986. Details have not yet been finalised. Please see page 56 for further information.

### The Fifth Constantinople Lecture

The Fifth Constantinople Lecture will now be given by the Rt. Rev. and Rt. Hon. the Lord Bishop of London, and not by the Archbishop of Canterbury as previously announced. Please see inside rear cover for details. A further announcement will be made in the *Church Times*.

### The 1985 Annual Festival

The 1985 Annual Festival of the Association will be held in St. Dunstan-in-the-West. Please see the rear cover for details. Additional information will be provided by means of an announcement in the *Church Times*.

### Note to Contributors

Articles and other material for publication in *ECNL* should be sent to the Editor at the Open University. They must be in typescript, on A4 paper, and with at least one-inch margins on both edges of the paper. Reviewers are particularly asked to observe the "house style" and set out their material accordingly. *All material for the Spring 1986 issue must reach the Editor by mid-January.*

### Membership of the Association

Membership of the AECA is open to all communicant members of "canonical" Anglican, Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox Churches, and Churches in communion with them. Meetings, lectures and pilgrimages sponsored by the Association are open to all interested, irrespective of the Christian Communion to which they belong. Enquiries about membership (including enquiries from individuals interested in the work of the Association but not strictly entitled to full membership, and from organisations and institutions) should be addressed to the General Secretary.

### Change of Address of Members

Changes of address and enquiries about the non-recipient of *ECNL* should be addressed to the General Secretary *and not to the Editor please*. *ECNL* is distributed from St. Dunstan-in-the-West, not from the Open University.

### Additional Copies of *ECNL* and Back-Numbers

Additional copies and back-numbers of *ECNL* may be obtained on application to the General Secretary.

### Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius

Enquiries about the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius should be made to St. Basil's House, 52 Ladbroke Grove, London W11 2PB. Readers of *ECNL* can often obtain books reviewed in this Journal from the Fellowship. When ordering, *ECNL* should be mentioned.

### Nicolas Zernov Memorial Lecture 1985

The 1985 Nicolas Zernov Memorial Lecture will be delivered by Fr. Boris Bobrinsky (Paris) in the Examination Schools, Oxford, on Monday 4th November at 5 p.m.

### Orthodox Christmas Cards

Orthodox Christmas cards can be obtained from St. George Orthodox Information Service, 64 Prebend Gardens, London W6. This year's new design features an icon of the Mother of God in full colour. The cards cost £1.65 for ten, inclusive of packing and postage. Special discounts are available for parish bookstalls.

---

**ADVANCE NOTICE**

# **1986 PILGRIMAGE TO BULGARIA**

**20th-30th August**  
(provisional dates)

led by  
**THE BISHOP OF BASINGSTOKE**  
(Anglican President)  
and  
**BISHOP KALLISTOS OF DIOKLEIA**  
(Orthodox)

Please note that the numbers for this Pilgrimage must be limited. Enquiries should be addressed to the Association's Pilgrimage Secretary:

**The Revd. Philip Warner,**  
**St. Martin's House,**  
**6 Edinburgh Road,**  
**Brighton BN2 3HY**

Membership of the Association

The itinerary is not yet fixed, but it is hoped to visit as many monasteries as possible and to spend the weekend of the Pilgrimage in Sofia.

---



#### LETTER TO THE EDITOR

S/R—With reference to the letter from The Revd. Basil Minchin in the Spring 1985 issue of *ECNL*, I should like to point out that the word for one of the eight tones (or whatever they may be called) is ἦχος not ἦχον. The latter means (1) "echo" (in modern Greek also) though it can also (2) mean "ringing sound". The former (ἦχος) means "sound", "noise", though there is one instance (from Aristotle) where it means "echo". So, translating ἦχος in the musical sense as "echo" would seem to introduce fresh confusion.

Archimandrite John Maitland Moir  
24 Brougham Place  
Edinburgh EH3 9JU

(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.)

Printed in England by **Newnorth-Burt Limited**, Kempston, Bedford.

## 5th Constantinople Lecture

Thursday, 28th November, 1985

by

THE RT. REVD. AND RT. HON.  
THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON

following

CHORAL EVENSONG IN  
LAMBETH PALACE CHAPEL

at 6.30 p.m.

*Lecture and Reception: £1, due in advance to the General Secretary—  
cheques payable to "A.E.C.A."*

---

# **Annual Festival**

**Saturday, 26th October, 1985**

**at**

**St. Dunstan-in-the-West  
184 Fleet Street, London EC4**

**11.30 DIVINE LITURGY (Orthodox)**

**2.00 A.G.M. and LECTURE  
(Speaker: Fr. Sylviu-Petre Pufulete)**

Please bring your own luncheon.  
Underground: Chancery Lane (Central Line) or Temple (Circle Line)  
Buses: 4, 6, 9, 11, 15, 171

---