

KOINONIA



*The Journal of the
Anglican & Eastern
Churches Association*

New Series No. 52, Trinity 2007
ISSN No. 0012-8732

THE ANGLICAN & EASTERN
CHURCHES ASSOCIATION
Founded 1864

Orthodox Patron: The Ecumenical Patriarch
Anglican Patron: The Archbishop of Canterbury

Orthodox President: The Archbishop of Thyateira and Great Britain
Anglican President: The Bishop of London

Chairman of the Committee:

The Revd William Taylor
St John's Vicarage
25 Ladbroke Road
London W11 3PD

General Secretary:

Janet Laws
The Bishop of London's Office
The Old Deanery
Dean's Court
London EC4V 5AA
Tel. 020 7248 6233
email: janet.laws@btopenworld.com
or bishops.secretary@londin.clara.co.uk

Treasurer:

Mr David Powell
32 Westminster Palace Gardens
Artillery Row
London SW1P 1RR
Tel. 020 7222 3604
email: dp@dpcca.co.uk

Koinonia

THE JOURNAL OF THE ANGLICAN &
EASTERN CHURCHES ASSOCIATION

Editorial

THIS issue of *Koinonia* is dedicated to an analysis of the *Cyprus Agreed Statement* of the International Commission for Anglican-Orthodox Theological Dialogue, *The Church of the Triune God*. This report is a remarkable document on any number of levels: its size and theological depth; the way it goes back to theological first principles and puts theological understanding and openness at the heart of the healing that needs to happen within and between our churches; the evidence of the profound trust and communion built up between the dialogue partners over many years and through many challenges. We are fortunate indeed to be able to share here the expert assessment of three Anglicans steeped in Orthodoxy. Colin Davey and Hugh Wybrew, both long-serving veterans of the Dialogue, put the report into its historical and wider ecumenical contexts respectively, and Charles Miller brings a deep familiarity with contemporary Orthodox theology to his cogent analysis of its contents. I hope a future number of this Journal will provide an opportunity for parallel Orthodox reflections and responses.

A matter of the greatest concern for our Association must be how the fruits of this Dialogue may be received in our churches. It would be a tragedy if the riches of this gift did not somehow seep into the life-blood of the Church. But reports of this kind do not attract a wide readership, and the opportunities for ordinary parishioners to learn about its contents are few and far between. It needs to be asked as well how many clergy are in a position to assess the report, given how rarely in their formation for ministry they are given any foundation in the patristic and early Byzantine theology that is at its heart. On top of this, both Anglicans and Orthodox are preoccupied with tensions within their own communities. The report provides a rich soil for the growth of unity, but the labourers' attention is elsewhere.

I hope, then, that this assessment will encourage you to read the report for yourselves and to share its contents with others. It isn't an easy read, but it is a profoundly pastoral and encouraging document, addressing many of the concerns of ordinary Christian believers as well as those of theologians. Clergy will find it a mine of inspiration for preaching. All may find in it resources for reflection and prayer. May it be a means for all the churches to rediscover that unity which is our Lord's gift to His Church.

—PETER DOLL

Contents

- Some Observations on Anglican/Orthodox Dialogue, 1966-1984
Colin Davey p. 3
- The Church of the Triune God: Its Wider Relevance*
Hugh Wybrew p. 20
- The Church of the Triune God: Theological Observations*
Charles Miller p. 32

Contributors

The Revd Dr COLIN DAVEY has held a number of college, parish, and ecumenical staff posts, serving as Secretary of both the Anglican/Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Discussions and the Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission. He is the author of *Pioneer for Unity: Metrophanes Kritopoulos (1589-1639)* (BCC, 1987).

The Revd Dr CHARLES MILLER is Team Rector of Abingdon and a specialist in seventeenth-century English theology. His books include *Toward a Fuller Vision: Anglicanism and the Orthodox Experience* (1984) and *The Gift of the World. An Introduction to the Theology of Dumitru Staniloae* (2000).

The Revd HUGH WYBREW has served as Dean of St George's Cathedral in Jerusalem and Vicar of St Mary Magdalen, Oxford. He is author most recently of *The Orthodox Liturgy* (SVS, 2006).

Some Observations on Anglican/Orthodox Dialogue, 1966—1984

The Revd Colin Davey

THE history of Anglican/Orthodox relations and of Anglican/Orthodox Dialogue is a long one and it has already been recorded at length and in detail.¹ My purpose in this paper is therefore not to re-tell this history, but to make a number of personal observations on the agenda, aims, attitudes and experiences of the participants in the Anglican/Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission, of which I was appointed a member in 1966 and which I served as Anglican Secretary from 1974 to 1984.

Preparations for Dialogue: Separately or Together?

There are advantages and disadvantages to having a long history of inter-church dialogue. Certainly, when Archbishop Michael Ramsey and the Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras I agreed in 1962 to 'take the first steps toward setting up a Joint Commission which will examine agreements and differences in matters of doctrine between the Anglican and Orthodox Churches',² there was already in existence a valuable and substantial record of earlier conversations in the 1920s, 1930s, 1940s and 1950s to work on, rather than starting from scratch with a blank sheet of paper as happened with the parallel dialogue between

¹ V.T. Istavridis, *Orthodoxy and Anglicanism*, SPCK 1966; Archbishop Methodios Fouyas, *Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism and Anglicanism*, Oxford University Press 1972; Judith Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox: Unity and Subversion 1559-1725*, Gracewing 2003; Peter M. Doll ed., *Anglicanism and Orthodoxy 300 years after the 'Greek College' in Oxford*, Peter Lang 2006; and the Introductory sections of *Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: The Moscow Agreed Statement 1976*, SPCK 1977 pp 4-81 and *Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: The Dublin Agreed Statement 1984*, SPCK 1985 pp 1-7.

² *Church Times*, 11 May 1962.

Anglicans and Roman Catholics.³ The disadvantage was that unlike the Anglican/Roman Catholic Dialogue, which began with a *Joint* Preparatory Commission, whose members discussed the question 'Where should Dialogue begin?' and established priorities *together* in a programme for future work agreed by both sides, preparations for Anglican/Orthodox Dialogue began *separately* and continued that way from 1966 to 1972.⁴

The Anglican members were appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1966 on the nomination of the Metropolitans of ten of the Provinces of the Anglican Communion. They hoped, after preliminary consideration of earlier documents, to meet with the Orthodox that autumn. However, the Third Pan-Orthodox Conference at Rhodes in 1964, which had authorised the formation of an Inter-Orthodox Theological Commission to meet with the Anglicans, had also accepted as the agenda for the forthcoming discussions a list of subjects drawn up by the Ecumenical Patriarchate, including both those already discussed in earlier conferences and those which had arisen in relations between the two churches. It had also decided that the Orthodox members should meet first on their own to prepare 'a common theological position on the subjects under discussion'. When the Orthodox members first met in Belgrade in 1966, they completed *their own* list of priorities for the agenda by adding to it four matters which 'must be examined at the opening of the dialogue', concerning Anglican intercommunion with Old Catholics, Lutherans and others; the Anglicans' understanding of 'union in Faith with the Orthodox'; the way decisions are binding on the whole Anglican Communion; and the Thirty-Nine Articles. The Lambeth Conference of 1968 warmly welcomed the proposed resumption of Pan-Orthodox/Pan-Anglican discussions, and expressed the wish that the *Filioque* Clause in the Nicene Creed and the Anglican understanding of Comprehensiveness should be added to the agenda. A later Orthodox meeting at Helsinki in 1971 considered the subjects already agreed but also, as a foretaste of things to come,

³ Alan C. Clark and Colin Davey, *Anglican/Roman Catholic Dialogue: The work of the Joint Preparatory Commission*, Oxford University Press 1974.

⁴ *The Moscow Agreed Statement 1976* 'Preparations for Dialogue (1966-72)' pp. 24 ff., on which the following paragraph is based.

looked at an Orthodox paper on 'Contemporary Problems of the Anglican Church'.

In retrospect it is easy to see that this whole approach put the Anglicans at a disadvantage. For they were invited to comment on and react to an agenda and to reply to questions proposed to them by the Orthodox, as opposed to their taking part in a *joint* setting of the agenda. Certainly they eventually recommended that the dialogue should include 'questions of a pastoral, liturgical and spiritual nature' as well as 'the urgent and difficult questions involved in the presentation of the faith in the world today'. They also asked the Orthodox to present papers on 'the nature of Christ's redemptive work' and on 'the Holy Spirit as Interpreter of the Gospel and Giver of Life'. But this whole method of working not only meant that the preparatory phase took six years to complete (I vividly recall the American Bishop Jonathan Sherman arriving at the first meal at one of the Anglican preparatory meetings, gazing round the room and exclaiming: 'But where are the Orthodox?'). It also created the impression, which would be reinforced later, that this was not to be a dialogue 'on equal terms' (as the Orthodox had demanded would be a necessary condition of their dialogue with Roman Catholics⁵), but one in which the Orthodox would be examining the Anglicans to see whether they were still heretics or whether they had enough common faith with the Orthodox to be accepted by them.

Once the first full meeting of the Anglican/Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission had taken place in Oxford in 1973, a greater coherence was given to the agenda by a process of meeting in three sub-commissions which worked on subjects agreed as priorities by both Anglicans and Orthodox together. The full Commission meeting in Moscow in 1976 reviewed, revised and agreed their documents on 'The Knowledge of God', 'The Inspiration and Authority of Holy Scripture', 'Scripture and Tradition', 'The Authority of the Councils', 'The *Filioque* Clause', 'The Church as a Eucharistic Community', and 'The Invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist'.

⁵ Rev Colin Davey, 'Orthodox-Roman Catholic Dialogue' in *One in Christ* 1984/4 p. 347 and 1991/1 p. 29 quoting the decision of the 1964 Third Pan-Orthodox Conference at Rhodes in *Orthodoxos Parousia*, Vol 1, nos. 3-4, p. 261.

Sharing in Worship

In their Preface to the *Moscow Agreed Statement* the Co-Chairmen, Bishop Robert Runcie of St Albans and Archbishop Athenagoras of Thyateira and Great Britain, wrote that 'we have discovered in these years a deepening of fellowship between us, nourished by our experience of sharing as far as possible in the liturgical and spiritual traditions of our several members'.⁶ The 1976 Moscow Conference gave its participants many opportunities for sharing in, and being moved by, the quality and depth of Orthodox Liturgical Worship, both in Moscow itself and afterwards, when we were sent off in groups to be the guests of the Russian Orthodox Church in different parts of the Soviet Union. In this way we were given an insight into how the Orthodox Church, despite its many restrictions under Communism, was still able to demonstrate the power of its faith and commitment to Christ. I was invited to go with Archbishop Basil of Brussels and Canon Donald Allchin to Smolensk, a city the size of Birmingham, in which only four churches were then allowed to remain open. I shall always remember the slow, prayerful, totally committed singing of the Liturgy in the crowded Cathedral there. Beforehand, it was easy to pity Orthodox Christians in Russia for the conditions imposed upon them by the state. Afterwards, in the light of the cost which they were willing to pay for their faith, and the depth of devotion which they therefore lavished on the Liturgy, I came rather to pity us in the West for the shallowness of our spirituality and the lack of commitment in our church life. For, as one of the Greek Orthodox Professors commented on the congregation in one of the Moscow churches we attended, 'It's as if you took the five strongest Christians from each church in Athens and put them all together in one place'.

Eastern and Western Theological Traditions

One comment on the nature of the Dialogue which is worth recalling at this point was made after the Moscow Conference by Bishop Richard Hanson of the Church of Ireland. In a newspaper article he wrote:⁷

⁶ *Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: The Moscow Agreed Statement 1976* p.2.

⁷ *The Times*, 23 October 1976.

One phenomenon which the Anglicans encountered and which caused some of them surprise (though perhaps it should not have done so) was that the points of theological disagreement did not mostly occur over Protestant or Reformation doctrine. The main difference was between the Western Latin and the Eastern Greek theological traditions. The Anglicans found themselves defending St Augustine and St Thomas Aquinas more often than Luther or Calvin or Cranmer. In fact at times they felt it was honestly their duty to defend the doctrine or practice of the Roman Catholic Church. Some of us felt, in short, that we were Western Latins, much though we no doubt have to learn from the Eastern Church.

The Bible

Bishop Hanson was also involved in the following exchange of views over the Moscow Statement's reference to 'scholarly research concerning the Bible'.⁸ In reply to Archbishop Basil's contention that 'we must not make concessions to the modernistic and liberal interpretation of the Bible' he said:

Surely the Orthodox do not wish to reject wholesale all the findings of the critical study of the Bible in Europe and America over the last 200 years. As Anglicans we are not ashamed to share in this movement of the intellect, and we are confident that such sharing can be combined with orthodoxy of belief.

To this Archbishop Stylianos of Australia replied that they did not reject all critical study of the Bible, but in it 'there have been tendencies which are indeed liberal and modernistic'.

As a personal postscript to the Moscow discussion of the Bible, I would like to add the following story. By an extraordinary coincidence I was asked a year later, as Vicar of St Paul's Church in South Harrow, Middlesex, to conduct the funeral of a woman who lived in that parish and who had recently arrived in Britain from Moscow with her two daughters. She had got stuck in Russia in 1939 while visiting a relation there, and had married a British army officer who had become a Communist and had moved to the Soviet Union. Her two daughters, who had grown up bi-lingual, worked for the Moscow Patriarchate Foreign

⁸ *Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: The Moscow Agreed Statement* pp. 52 and 83.

Relations Department as translators, and had been involved in the preparations for the 1976 Anglican/Orthodox Moscow Conference. They talked with me about the way interpreters were always provided for such conferences both from the Church and from the State, so that the latter could report on the former, without visiting Anglicans knowing which was which. They also told me that the person to whom I had given my Bible in English was one of the State interpreters!

The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood

Before leaving Moscow, members of the Anglican/Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission agreed a pattern of working again in sub-commissions, but these were to meet in the same place each time rather than in separate locations. The subjects to be studied were: 'The Church and the churches'; 'The Communion of Saints and the departed'; and 'Ministry and priesthood'.⁹ However, they also passed a resolution on the ministry of women in the Church which 'draws attention to the existence of a grave problem, but does not enter into the theological question as such'.¹⁰

The Orthodox members of the Commission wish to state that if the Anglican Churches proceed to the ordination of women to the priesthood and episcopate, this will create a very serious obstacle to the development of our relations in the future. Although the Anglican members are divided among themselves on the theological principle involved, they recognize the strength of Orthodox convictions on this matter and undertake to make this known to their Churches.

The 1977 meeting in Cambridge began as planned. But I shall never forget the session when Bishop John Howe, Secretary General of the Anglican Communion, addressed the Full Commission on the subject of how far the several provinces of the Anglican Communion had gone or were intending to go in ordaining women to the priesthood. The atmosphere in the room got heavier and heavier as the Orthodox members – some of whom had been more aware of the Church of England than of the Anglican Communion as a whole – 'realised with

⁹ *Moscow Agreed Statement* p.78.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* p.76.

regret', as the Communiqué from the Conference declared, that the ordination of women was 'no longer simply a question for discussion but an actual event in the life of some of the Anglican churches'. They therefore asked themselves 'how it will be possible to continue the dialogue, and what meaning the dialogue will have in these circumstances'. It was therefore agreed that the 1978 meeting would take place 'before the Lambeth Conference, in order, by expounding the Orthodox position, to enable their Anglican brethren to come to what, in their view, would be a proper appreciation of the matter. For the Orthodox the future of the Dialogue would depend on the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference'.¹¹

It is fair to say that the 1978 Athens Conference was the least pleasant experience of all the Anglican/Orthodox meetings I ever attended. Almost all the Bishops of the Greek Orthodox Church boycotted the Sunday Liturgy in Athens Cathedral at which members of the Commission were present. The physical arrangements of the Commission's meeting were such that members sat in rows, as in a classroom, and were addressed by the Co-Chairmen and by the speakers in turn from the 'teacher's desk'. The bulk of the Conference was devoted to setting out the Orthodox and Anglican positions on the Ordination of Women to the Priesthood. The Report of the Conference was in separate sections. 'The Orthodox position' included the following:

We see the ordination of women, not as part of the creative continuity of tradition, but as a violation of the apostolic faith and order of the Church... By ordaining women Anglicans would sever themselves from continuity in apostolic faith and spiritual life.

It also declared:

The ordination of women to the priesthood is an innovation, lacking any basis whatever in Holy Tradition. The Orthodox Church takes very seriously the admonition of St Paul, where the Apostle states with emphasis, repeating himself twice: 'But if we, or an angel from heaven, preaches to you anything else than what we have preached to you, let him be anathema. As we have already said, so I say to you now once more: if anyone

¹¹ *Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: The Dublin Agreed Statement 1984* p. 2.

preaches to you anything else than what you have received, let him be anathema' (Gal. 1. 8 - 9).¹²

It was an extremely unpleasant experience to be anathematized twice by those we had seen as friends and colleagues.

'Anglican Positions on the Ordination of Women to the Priesthood' distinguished between those who believe that it is 'in no way consonant with a true understanding of the Church's catholicity and apostolicity, but rather constitutes a grave deformation of the Church's traditional faith and order'; those who see it as 'a proper extension and development of the Church's traditional ministry, and a necessary and prophetic response to the changing circumstances in which some churches are placed'; and those who 'see no absolute objection to it' but 'regret the way the present action has been taken and believe that the time was not opportune nor the method appropriate for such action'.¹³

The minutes of the 1978 Athens Conference added that 'those Anglicans who in principle oppose the ordination of women do so for the reasons advanced by the Orthodox'; while those who advocate it believe that 'this is a true development, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, of the patterns of ministry to which God has been calling some Churches... The vocations of women who offer themselves for the priestly ministry require therefore to be tested'.¹⁴

Change of Direction

The 1978 Lambeth Conference was willing to 'respect and take account of the deep feelings expressed by the Orthodox'¹⁵ in *The Athens Report 1978*. But at the same time it proceeded to pass Resolution 21 on the Ordination of Women, which recognised¹⁶

the autonomy of its member Churches, acknowledging the legal right of each Church to make its own decision about the appropriateness of admitting women to Holy Orders.

¹² The Athens Report 1978 Section III in *The Dublin Agreed Statement 1984* pp. 58 - 60.

¹³ *Ibid.* Section IV pp. 60 - 61.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 61 - 62.

¹⁵ *The Report of the Lambeth Conference 1978* p. 109.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* pp. 45 - 47.

In the light of this decision, some argued that the Dialogue should continue 'but as an academic and informative exercise, and no longer as an ecclesial endeavour aiming at the union of the two churches'.¹⁷ Others felt there was no need to change the standing of the talks, and it was eventually agreed that the Full Commission should resume its work, but with a different approach to the dialogue. The Steering Committee met in 1979 and declared:¹⁸

The ultimate aim remains the unity of the Churches. But the method may need to change in order to emphasise the pastoral and practical dimensions of the subjects of theological discussions. Our conversations are concerned with the search for a unity in faith. They are not negotiations for immediate full communion. When this is understood the discovery of differences on various matters, though distressing, will be seen as a necessary step on the long road towards that unity which God wills for His Church.

The Commission resumed its work at Llandaff in 1980 and welcomed as its new Co-Chairmen Bishop Henry Hill of Ontario, Canada (following the appointment of Bishop Robert Runcie of St Albans as Archbishop of Canterbury) and Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain (following the death of his predecessor Archbishop Athenagoras). After further meetings in Geneva and Canterbury, it went to Odessa in the Soviet Union in 1983.

The Odessa Conference 1983

The Odessa meeting illustrated the hazards and benefits of keeping faith with our fellow-Christians at a time of international tension. Shortly before the Commission was due to travel to the Soviet Union, the Russians shot down near Sakhalin Island a Korean Airlines passenger plane, which had veered off course towards the site of some top-secret Soviet military installations. All 269 people on board were killed.

¹⁷ Archbishop Athenagoras, the Orthodox Co-Chairman took this view. *The Dublin Agreed Statement 1984* p. 3.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* pp. 3 - 4.

As part of the international protests about this incident, most Western airline pilots refused to fly to Russia.

There was a brief meeting in London to consider whether the Odessa conference should be cancelled. The American members of the Commission were particularly concerned over whether they should go along with the USA advice against travel to the Soviet Union, or keep to the arrangements made with our Russian Orthodox hosts, as a sign that fellowship in Christ transcended the politics of the Cold War. The decision was eventually made for us by our Travel Agents, who said that if we cancelled, we would have to pay; but if they cancelled, they would; though if they could get us to our destination, by whatever route, they would do so. And they did, because Austria and Austrian Airlines always remained neutral in any East-West conflict or tension.

We therefore travelled by a zig-zag route from London to Vienna, then from Vienna to Moscow, and from Moscow to Odessa. At the very empty Moscow airport, the Customs authorities said that, as we were an official delegation, they did not need to look at our luggage. They added that, as a formality, they would just look at one item – the Secretary's brief-case. I was immediately embarrassed and anxious, as they of course found the three Bibles in Russian that I had brought with me to give away in Odessa. 'What are these for?' the Customs official demanded. 'This is an international conference', I replied quickly, 'and we need to look at the Bible in the different languages of our participants.' To my intense relief, they left it at that. Archbishop Methodios told me I should have put the Bibles in my suitcase, as the rest of them had. But this incident meant that when we arrived in Odessa, where we stayed in a Monastery and met for our sessions in the adjacent Theological Seminary, the Orthodox Secretary, Fr George Dragas, arranged for me to meet outside one day at a given place to hand over these much needed Bibles to one of Orthodox Seminarians, without others knowing.

On the Sunday during our stay in Odessa the Anglican and Orthodox members of the Commission all attended the Liturgy at the Russian Orthodox Cathedral. At the end of the service, it was announced that we were there, and that we had come, despite the international situation, to keep our appointment with our Orthodox fellow-Christians. This was warmly applauded, and as we left the cathedral, we 'ran the gauntlet' of welcoming worshippers, who grasped

and shook our hands, as we exchanged the Easter Greeting 'Christ is risen: He is risen indeed'. It was an extremely moving and emotional experience.

Two other memories of Odessa stand out for me. One was the demonstration of the world-wide nature of Anglicanism when Bishop Samir Kafity of the Episcopal Church in Jerusalem and the Middle East celebrated Holy Communion in Arabic for us. The other was the day when the 'Church' interpreters asked Fr Dragas and myself to meet quickly with them in one of the spare conference rooms, without the 'State' interpreters being present. When we got there, they asked us to make it known, when we returned home, that, in accordance with Mr Gorbachov's new policy of *glasnost* (openness), the Russian Orthodox Church would be given back the Danilovsky Monastery in Moscow to mark the forthcoming 'Millennium' celebrations in 1988 of a thousand years of Christianity from the 'Baptism of Rus' in 988, when Prince Vladimir of Kiev adopted it as the religion of his state. This splendid and extensive site was duly restored to its former glory after many years of neglect and vandalism in time for these celebrations five years after our visit to Odessa.¹⁹

Dublin: Dialogue of equals or between 'ideal' and 'real' Churches?

In 1984 the Commission met at Bellinter House in County Meath, north of Dublin. On arrival, tired and slightly disorientated, and before the Conference proper began, the Orthodox tried to insist, while the Anglicans resisted this, that the Agenda should include questions to do with the opinions on the Incarnation and Resurrection allegedly held by the then Bishop of Durham, the Rt Revd David Jenkins. (I felt personally bothered by this, partly because the Orthodox took their information from not always accurate press reports,²⁰ and partly because Dr Jenkins had taught me as a student at Cuddesdon Theological

¹⁹ *Introducing the Millennium: A thousand years of Christianity in the Eastern Slav Lands and the Soviet Union*, British Council of Churches 1988 pp.1–2, 16–17; *Uncertain Hope: Religion in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe Today*, British Council of Churches 1989 p. 14.

²⁰ For a full account of all this see: David Jenkins, *The Calling of a Cuckoo*, Continuum 2002, pp. 23–61.

College, and I found his Doctrine Lectures the most helpful and inspiring I had ever heard.) The matter took a long time to resolve, and it was eventually agreed that these subjects should appear on the Agenda of a future meeting of the Commission.

At the same Conference, discussion of a seemingly (to Anglicans) innocuous sentence revealed an unexpected point. We wished to begin the first chapter on 'The Mystery of the Church' by setting Christian disunity in the wider context of divisions in the world. So we began:²¹

We live in a deeply divided world. We are aware that Christian disunity, as well as being contrary to the will of God and a sin against the very nature of the Church, has often contributed towards the divisions of the world. We know that the Church is entrusted with a message of reconciliation. This drives us to seek unity amongst ourselves, in order to contribute to the healing of the divisions of humankind, as well as to stand together as Christians who face difficulties and pressures, and who witness to Christ's truth in a hostile or indifferent world.

However, we wanted to emphasise our corporate failure, not just our failure as individuals. So the original draft of the next sentence read:

We know the temptation for the Church to avoid this challenge.

To this the Orthodox objected, since for them, any theological statement is talking about the Church as the perfect and sinless bride of Christ, which 'as his Body is not and cannot be divided',²² and which cannot be tempted either. So they asked for this sentence to be deleted or, at most, for it to read:

We know the temptation for Christians to avoid this challenge.

This did not satisfy the Anglicans, who wanted a sense of the churches' corporate, institutional responsibility to be emphasised. This was achieved through the compromise which appears in the final text:

We know the temptation for Christian communities to avoid this challenge.

²¹ *Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: The Dublin Agreed Statements* 1984 p.9.

²² *Ibid.* p. 11.

When we put these two episodes together, they revealed that this dialogue was *not* being conducted on an equal basis. We felt as if we were in a law court, where the 'perfect' judge, the Orthodox, was examining the *real* state of day-to day Anglican life, Anglican teaching and practice, Anglican work and thought, to see whether or not it came up to the *ideal* standard of perfect Orthodoxy. At the same time Anglicans could not take the Orthodox to task for any questionable pastoral practice or political pronouncements at the behest of the state or power struggles within or between the Orthodox Churches, since it was only the *ideal and perfect* Church that we were allowed to discuss.

Unity and Disunity

Nevertheless, some very good and positive things are included in the *Dublin Agreed Statement*. In the section on 'The Marks of the Church' the following passage speaks of unity and disunity:²³

We find ourselves in an abnormal situation. We are a disrupted Christian people seeking to restore our unity. Our divisions do not destroy but they damage the basic unity we have in Christ, and our disunity impedes our mission to the world as well as our relationships with each other. Anglicans are accustomed to seeing our divisions as within the Church: they do not believe that they alone are the one true Church, but they believe that they belong to it. Orthodox, however, believe that the Orthodox Church is the one true Church of Christ, which as his Body is not and cannot be divided. But at the same time they see Anglicans as brothers and sisters in Christ who are seeking with them the union of all Christians in the one Church.

The 'Introduction' to the *Dublin Agreed Statement* emphasises the easier, more positive and more prayerful way of working which the Commission had established:²⁴

Some of the pressures of the past have gone. We are not required to solve outstanding problems (such as the ordination of women) as a condition of continuing the dialogue. Nor are we trying to produce too quickly materials that might be used as the basis for early decisions to enter into a new stage of relationships between our Churches. Instead, the Commis-

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 5-6.

sion is more free to explore together and understand better the faith we hold and the ways in which we express it. It is also noteworthy that far more consideration has been given to prayer and spirituality than is usual in inter-church encounters of this type. If we accept that Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue is still in the *first* stage of exploring each other's faith and seeking co-operation in mission and service, then it can perhaps be seen that much good work is being done by this particular bilateral conversation to help bridge the ancient divide between the Eastern and Western Churches.

An Alliance against Rome?

Fr Pierre Duprey, then Under Secretary of the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, expressed to me his disappointment at the section in the *Dublin Agreed Statement* on 'Wider Leadership in the Church'. This contained the declaration:²⁵

The ecumenical Patriarch does not, however, claim universal jurisdiction over the other Churches, such as is ascribed to the Pope by the First and also the Second Vatican Council; and Orthodox see any such claim as contrary to the meaning of seniority, as this was understood in the early centuries of the Church.

It also stated:²⁶

Both Orthodox and Anglicans consider that infallibility is not the property of any particular person within the Church. [See the *Moscow Agreed Statement* IV paras. 17 – 18.] It is significant that the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission has stated clearly: 'This is a term applicable unconditionally only to God, and ... to use it of a human being, even in highly restricted circumstances, can produce many misunderstandings' [*The Final Report* of ARCIC, SPCK/CTS 1982 p. 97].

This illustrates the need for all concerned to avoid any impression that Anglican/Orthodox Dialogue might become 'an Alliance against Rome', as happened in the early days of Anglican/Orthodox contacts and relations.²⁷ It also means that everyone will look forward eagerly to the hoped-for publication in due course of the Report of the Ortho-

²⁵ Ibid. p.18.

²⁶ Ibid. p.19.

²⁷ See the books referred to in footnote 1 above.

dox/Roman Catholic Joint Commission on 'The theological and canonical consequences of the sacramental structure of the Church: conciliarity and authority in the Church', which will be examined at three levels: local, provincial and universal. Work on this was begun in 1988, and a first draft prepared for a meeting of the Full Commission at Freising, Munich, in 1990, but this 'was overtaken by events', with the re-emergence of Catholic Churches of the Byzantine Rite in Eastern Europe, and the Orthodox/Roman Catholic Commission devoted the next few years to the theological and practical questions involved in the consequences of this.²⁸ However, the Communiqué from the recent meeting of that Commission in Belgrade in September 2006 announced that the 1990 draft will now be revised by a Sub-Commission in the light of its discussion and then brought to the next meeting of the Full Commission in 2007.²⁹

Problems overcome

The *Dublin Agreed Statement 1984* contained sections on 'The Mystery of the Church', 'Faith in the Trinity, Prayer and Holiness', and 'Worship and Tradition' together with an 'Epilogue' noting points of agreement and disagreement and matters requiring further exploration. But the Statement nearly never happened! For just before the final day of the meeting at Bellinter House, the Commission – as was customary at most of its conferences – had a day off and went on an excursion. First to Clonmacnoise, the site of an early Christian monastic settlement, and then to the Church of Ireland Cathedral at Killaloe by the river Shannon. There we were given the most excellent fresh salmon supper, despite the fact that we arrived nearly an hour late, since the then state of the Irish roads and the slow progress of our bus conspired to defeat the optimistic timetable drawn up for the day. On our eventual return to Bellinter House, one of the sisters in the community who ran it said to us 'I hope you don't mind, but your computer seemed to be making a lot of noise, so I turned it off'. This was in the early days of

²⁸ Colin Davey, 'Clearing a path through a minefield': Orthodox-Roman Catholic Dialogue 1983-1990 (2) in *One in Christ* 1991/1 pp. 26–28. Colin Davey, 'The Successors of Peter and Andrew' in *Sobornost* 18:2 1996 pp. 52–66.

²⁹ *Episkepsis* No. 668, 31 December 2006 pp. 22–23.

computing, and the machine had been specially brought from the Anglican Consultative Council office in London. But it meant that the secretariat had to work all through the night, page by page, retrieving, correcting, saving and printing each section, in order to recover the penultimate draft of the complete text for consideration by the Commission the next day!

I hope that the above observations — on the way in which the agenda was drawn up, the changing aims of the Dialogue, and the attitudes and experiences of the participants in this phase of the work of the Anglican/Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission — goes some way towards explaining the comment on it in the Co-Chairmen's Preface to *The Church of the Triune God: The Cyprus Agreed Statement 2006* that³⁰

the work so far, while impressive in both quantity and quality, appeared to lack a central focus and that the time had come for the commission to organize its work more systematically.

The Process of Reception

'We have learnt how to speak to one another,' said the Bishop of St Albans in Moscow in 1976, 'but not yet how to speak to our Churches.'³¹ By this he meant that so long as the agreements remained only resolutions on paper, they would have little effect. Study and discussion of the Commission's work should be promoted, not only through the publication of its Agreed Statements with introductory and supplementary material, but through action by both official bodies within the Provinces of the Anglican Communion and by unofficial bodies concerned with Anglican/Orthodox relations. This was underlined by the 1978 Lambeth Conference³², which was aware of the need

to bridge the gap between the official discussions and the fragmentary relationships between the Anglicans and Orthodox in different parts of the world,

and which requested the Commission

³⁰ *The Church of the Triune God: The Cyprus Agreed Statement of the International Commission for Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue 2006*, The Anglican Communion Office 2006, p.9.

³¹ *The Moscow Agreed Statement* p. 78.

³² *The Report of the Lambeth Conference 1978* p. 51.

to promote regional groups for theological dialogue which would bring to the Commission not only reactions to their work, but also theological issues arising out of local experience.

Anglican Consultative Council Meetings in 1979, 1981 and 1984 endorsed the 1978 Lambeth Conference's Resolution (35:3) requesting 'that all member Churches of the Anglican Communion should consider omitting the *Filioque* from the Nicene Creed',³³ as requested in the Moscow Agreed Statement. By the time of the 1998 Lambeth Conference it was reported that³⁴

The Episcopal Church in the USA has decided to remove the *Filioque* clause in future Prayer Books, as have the Scottish Episcopal Church, the Anglican Church of Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia, the Anglican Church of Canada, the Church of the Province of Central Africa, and the Anglican Church in Wales. The Church of England has agreed that in all future publications of revised Eucharistic rites the original form of the creed will be recommended for use on appropriate occasions.

The Church of England General Synod in July 1985 held a full debate on a Report from its Board for Mission and Unity on Anglican/Lutheran, Anglican/Reformed and Anglican/Orthodox Dialogue. There have been examples of increased contact, co-operation and exchanges at local, national and international levels. But, as the Preparatory Report to the 1998 Lambeth Conference emphasized:³⁵

The process of reception of the work is a constant concern. The *Moscow* and *Dublin Agreed Statements* of 1976 and 1984 await the completion of reception, response and decision. There needs to be commitment that agreed statements of the Commission will receive serious consideration by both the Churches if they are to be faithful to the goal 'which is that visible and sacramental unity which Christ wills for his One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church'.

³³ *Ibid.* pp. 51–2.

³⁴ *The Report of the Lambeth Conference 1998* p. 253.

³⁵ *The Agros Report (1997)* para 151.

The Church of the Triune God: Its Wider Relevance

The Revd Hugh Wybrew

THE publication of the *Cyprus Agreed Statement* at the end of January 2007 marked the conclusion of the third phase of the Anglican-Orthodox international theological dialogue. That phase was in several respects different in character from the earlier phases, of which Colin Davey's observations have given an excellent account. It should perhaps be noted that after the publication of the *Dublin Agreed Statement* in 1984 the dialogue was not immediately resumed. A rather difficult few years ensued. An Executive Committee was set up, and met in 1986 to consider the agenda for the next stage of the dialogue. It began somewhat stormily, because the Orthodox wished to protest about the alleged views of the Bishop of Durham, David Jenkins. It took a rare outburst of anger from the Anglican participants to produce a reasonable atmosphere in which discussion could proceed. A meeting of the full Commission was planned for 1987, but was postponed at the last minute by the Orthodox co-chairman, Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain. Archbishop Methodios' enthusiasm for the dialogue had distinctly cooled. The following year the Ecumenical Patriarchate replaced him by John Zizioulas, Metropolitan of Pergamon. The new appointment transformed the atmosphere in which the third phase of the dialogue would be conducted.

When the full commission met at New Valaamo in 1989, the two co-chairmen, Metropolitan John and Bishop Henry Hill, presented a working paper proposing that the principal topic for future discussion should be ecclesiology. Within that context other topics would be considered, including the question of the Church's ordained ministry and who could be ordained to it. After a full discussion, the Commission accepted the proposals of the working paper and agreed a plan for its implementation. Together with a fresh start, the commission received a new name: the International Commission for the Anglican-Orthodox

Theological Dialogue. ICAOTD took up the baton where A/OJDD had left off. When it met in Toronto in 1990, the Anglican side too welcomed a new co-chairman, Bishop Mark Dyer. Bishop Henry Hill had for some years patiently endured much gainsaying and born the brunt of much discord. He greatly welcomed the new and positive atmosphere created at New Valaamo, which prevailed throughout the eighteen years of the dialogue's third phase. At the launch of the *Cyprus Agreed Statement* in 2007 Bishop Mark Dyer paid warm tribute to Metropolitan John Zizioulas for the immense contribution he had made to the Commission's work. 'The Church of the Triune God' owes a great deal to the Orthodox co-chairman.

The agenda for third phase of the dialogue had been discussed and agreed by the whole Commission. There was therefore no longer the feeling on the Anglican side, well described by Colin Davey, that we were responding to an agenda determined by the Orthodox. Nor was there any sense that the Anglicans were in effect on trial for the orthodoxy of their faith. Instead we were together engaged in a genuine theological discussion of matters important for both sides. Throughout the eighteen years 1989-2007 the Commission has worked in a friendly atmosphere, free from accusation and recrimination. The result is an agreed statement which, while considerably longer than most, reflects the contribution of both sides to the issues discussed.

The contents of the *Cyprus Agreed Statement*, given final approval by the Commission at its meeting at the Monastery of Kykkos in 2005, are analysed in Charles Miller's article. Here I would like to make some observations on its wider relevance, in particular to dialogue with the Roman Catholic Church and to the situation within the Anglican Communion itself.

Primacy in the Church

The question of primacy in the Church is a crucial one in ecumenical discussions. It has been prominent in Anglican-Roman Catholic dialogue, and has become a significant issue within the Anglican Communion. *The Church of the Triune God* amplifies what the *Dublin Agreed Statement* had said on the subject, and re-iterates the Orthodox

and Anglican view that the local church embodies the fullness of the Catholic Church.

The Orthodox emphasis on the local church is consistent with the Lambeth Quadrilateral's call for episcopacy to be locally adapted. Such a qualification excludes the suppression of legitimate local diversity. The Anglican and Orthodox Churches share too a eucharistic understanding of the local church. In this sense, 'eucharistic' must be understood in its widest sense: it includes the proclamation of the word and pastoral ministry, and presupposes the sacrament of baptism (V.26.)

The Report stresses that primacy at any level should never diminish the standing of the local church. It must always be exercised in the service of the local church, and not as domination over it.

The theological argument for primacy begins with local and moves on to regional and global leadership. Primacy thus receives increasingly wide expression through episcopal representation of the Church's life. This ensures a proper balance between primacy and conciliarity; and the primate is first among equals in synods of bishops. Primacy should not be seen as the prerogative of an individual, but of a local church. In the case of the universal primacy this would mean the primacy of the Church of Rome (V.21.)

The Report registers agreement between Anglicans and Orthodox on the fundamental importance of synodality to the being of the Church, and refers to a similar stress on the inseparability of primacy and synodality in ARCIC I. It goes on to affirm that 'both Anglicans and Orthodox emphasise the significance of the local bishop with his community as the primary expression of church life', and adds: 'Any form of primacy has to take this into account' (V.20.).

There remains a significant difference of emphasis on this point between the Anglican-Orthodox and Anglican-Roman Catholic dialogues. Colin Davey has pointed out that the *Dublin Agreed Statement* was understood in some quarters to reflect an Anglican-Orthodox alliance against Roman Catholic claims. While there may have been a joint wish in the 1984 Statement to reject Roman Catholic claims, not least with regard to the practice of papal primacy, the agreement registered in *The Church of the Triune God* is intended to be a theological affirmation with no polemical intent. It reflects the ecclesiological fact that the Anglican and Orthodox Churches are organized on a different basis

from the Roman Catholic Church. As the *Dublin Agreed Statement* affirmed, 'the Ecumenical Patriarch does not ... claim universal jurisdiction over the other Churches, such as is ascribed to the Pope by the First and also the Second Vatican Council; and Orthodoxy sees any such claim as contrary to the meaning of seniority, as this was understood in the early centuries of the Church (DAS I.27).' The *Cyprus Agreed Statement* says that 'for Anglican Churches a similar seniority has come to be ascribed to the See of Canterbury'. Again quoting the *Dublin Statement*, it continues. 'But this seniority is understood as a ministry of service and support to the other Anglican Churches, not as a form of domination over them.... Thus, even though the seniority ascribed to the Archbishop of Canterbury is not identical with that given to the Ecumenical Patriarch, the Anglican Communion has developed on the Orthodox rather than the Roman Catholic pattern, as a fellowship of self-governing national or regional Churches' (V.1.). The *Cyprus Statement* records Anglican and Orthodox agreement that 'the primary way of ecclesial being is the local church' and affirms the Reformation in the Church of England as 'a reassertion of the national or local church's right to govern itself within its conciliar relationship with the worldwide Church' (V.2.). It is worth recalling that the relationship between the universal church and local churches has been a matter of recent debate within the Roman Catholic Church itself.

The Church of the Triune God recognizes that a role of universal primacy belongs to the Church of Rome, but says no more about it. Wider primacy has become an immediate issue for the Anglican Communion, preoccupied as it is with its own internal unity. If the question of the ordination of women to the presbyterate and episcopate is not longer one which threatens to split to Communion, the question of human sexuality not only threatens to do so, but has already resulted in that peculiarly Anglican situation of 'impaired communion'. The Windsor Report attempts to deal with the situation by proposing an Anglican Covenant and a Council of Advice for the Archbishop of Canterbury. Its text reaffirms the autonomy of the member churches of the Anglican Communion, while defining the latter as 'a community of interdependent churches'. It seeks to strengthen the Communion's 'instruments of unity', and make provision for dealing with contentious communion issues. The Archbishop of Canterbury 'may issue such guidance as he sees fit or, as appropriate, refer the matter to the Coun-

cil of Advice for guidance and, if necessary, the Primates' meeting, the Anglican Consultative Council, or the Lambeth Conference to resolve the issue having regard to the common good of the Communion and compatibility with this covenant' (Article 26.3).

It is not clear how this relates to the draft's affirmation of the desirability of diversity, and of the greatest possible liberty of each autonomous church to order its life appropriately to its cultural context, and the illicit character of any external intervention in the life of an autonomous church. *The Church of the Triune God* offers no specific guidance in this respect. It does, however, insist on the fundamental character of synodality to the being of the Church. Each bishop is bishop in the context of his own community, and the primate at every level is first among equals in synods of bishops. Anglicans and Orthodox agree that bishops are an integral part of their respective churches, and do not form an apostolic college apart from and above the local churches. The primates of the Anglican Communion might take note of the Report at this point: they seem to be claiming increasing powers for themselves, and not all are noted for consulting the bishops, let alone the clergy and laity, of their respective Provinces. But Anglicans are not alone in subordinating theological considerations to ecclesiastical politics.

Primacy at all levels is a key issue in the renewed Orthodox-Roman Catholic dialogue. At its meeting in Belgrade last year the Commission for the theological dialogue between the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church considered a document on conciliarity and authority at the local, regional and universal levels. The Commission will consider a revised version of the document in Ravenna in October 2007, and will go on to consider the much more complex issue of universal primacy. It will be interesting to see how different that Commission's conclusions may be from those of ICAOTD.

Christology and Inculturation

The Windsor Report's reference to the ordering of each Anglican church's life appropriately to its cultural context has its parallel in *The Church of the Triune God*. In its Section III, 'Christ, Humanity and the

Church: Part I' there is a finely balanced treatment of the need to express the gospel in terms appropriate to the relevant culture, while ensuring that each culture is challenged by the gospel. Having referred to the tendency in the past for 'evangelization to involve a policy of replacing so-called primitive cultures with so-called advanced ones' (III.29.), the Statement goes on to say that 'Inculturation means proclaiming the Gospel in terms of people's own culture, so that it may permeate their personal and social life' (III.30.). It continues with a paragraph concerned with inculturation and unity:

Christianity has taken root in many different cultures, and this has been reflected in various forms of theological expression within the Church. This could be seen as threatening the Church's unity, in which case Christians ought to resist the attempt to express the Gospel in a variety of ways in different cultural situations. But inculturation might equally be seen as entirely legitimate. In this case cultural diversity need not signal a threat to unity. The search for Christian unity can then be seen not exclusively as one for common formulations of the faith, but also as an attempt to discern the unity-in-diversity, where it exists, of different cultural expressions of the Gospel. We may affirm the unity of the Church, to which the historic creeds of the Ecumenical Councils bear witness, as a unity-in-diversity, not as a begrudged necessity but on the basis of positive theological conviction (III.31.).

The Statement has in mind primarily theological diversity and unity. But it is relevant to the current Anglican debate on moral issues. Anglicans, like many other Christian families, live in widely varying cultural situations. In Africa some Anglicans, under cultural and social pressures, have been known to defend polygamy, and have suggested that Anglicans elsewhere opposed to polygamy do not understand their cultural situation. Other Anglicans live in cultures of Anglo-Saxon origin where there is widespread and growing social and legal acceptance of same-sex relationships. They might well be justified in taking view with regard to same-sex relationships similar to the view of some Africa Anglicans with regard to polygamy.

The question is at the least an open one. In its conclusion to Section III, the Statement affirms that '...cultures affect the articulation of the Gospel and Christology, and may prompt the Church to listen afresh to the Gospel, and perhaps hear it in new ways. That does not mean that culture will determine the meaning of Jesus Christ. It is vital

to engage with the Scriptures and the living tradition of the Church, in order to ensure that faithfulness to Jesus Christ accompanies inculturation, and that cultures themselves are transformed' (III.36.).

The Ordination of Women

That paragraph is relevant to the question of the ordination of women to the presbyterate and episcopate. This controversial topic had not been discussed in the dialogue since the Commission's inconclusive meeting in Athens in 1978. But it was clearly essential to deal with it as a theological issue if the dialogue were to make any progress. From the outset the question of the ordination of women to presbyterate and episcopate was in the Commission's mind, but it was agreed that it should be discussed in the context of the theological understanding of the Church.

The *Cyprus Agreed Statement* marks a significant shift in Orthodox attitudes since the meeting in Athens in 1978. The general view among the Orthodox then was that there was nothing to discuss: the ordination of women was simply unthinkable. A quarter of a century later, the Statement regards it as an open theological question. Anglican and Orthodox members agree on the inclusive nature of Christ's humanity, and on the transformation of gender in the new life of the kingdom. The Anglican members therefore conclude that 'many Anglicans hold that there are compelling theological reasons for ordaining women as well as men to the priestly and presidential ministries of presbyter and bishop, or at the very least there are no compelling theological reasons against doing so' (VII.36.). The Orthodox members, while they 'subscribe fully to the biblical and patristic teaching that the salvation Christ offers to humanity through the Incarnation is extended equally to male and female', decline to draw the same conclusion, distinguishing such inclusive salvation from the ministerial and especially eucharistic service of the Church. The eucharistic president acts *in persona Christi*; sociological considerations should not be allowed to take precedence over theological and ecclesiological considerations; and the negative impact of such an innovation on ecumenical relations outweighs any pastoral benefits to those churches which have decided to ordain women. But 'the Orthodox think that the theological dimension

of this matter remains open, and deserves further and deeper consideration and study in ecumenical dialogues' (VII 37.iii).

That Orthodox conclusion offers a remarkable contrast with the statement at Athens. There the Orthodox members affirmed that the Church had only ever ordained men to the priesthood, and that 'in this constant and unvarying practice we see revealed the will of God and the testimony of the Holy Spirit, and we know that the Spirit does not contradict himself' (Athens III.(3)). In this respect *The Church of the Triune God* also offers a remarkable contrast with the official Roman Catholic view, that the ordination of women to the priesthood cannot be contemplated, and should not even be discussed. There is an interesting contrast between the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches in this regard. While Rome disallows discussion of the matter, many Roman Catholic theologians and considerable numbers of laity are in favour of the ordination of women. While the Orthodox members of the Commission affirm it an open question, there are relatively few Orthodox theologians and lay people in favour of such ordination. The *Cyprus Agreed Statement* has opened the way for further theological consideration of the issue between Anglicans and Orthodox.

Under the heading 'Issues for further discussion' the Report makes a number of important points. It may be worth quoting this section, VII 38, in full:

Given the extent of our agreement on the role of women in the Church in general, and on the ordination of women as well as men to the diaconate, we need to reflect further on the issues involved in our disagreement on the priestly ordination of women in particular.

i. Earlier in our statement we agreed that the issue of Christ and culture is relevant to our dialogue (cf. III.6). In the light of what we said there, we need to consider to what extent our respective decisions to ordain, and not to ordain, women to the ministries involving eucharistic presidency are influenced by culture. We need also to ask by what criteria we accept or reject cultural influences in this particular case.

ii. Further reflection is needed on the theological reasons for our disagreement on the ordination of women, and the place of canon law in this regard.

iii. Given that there is no conciliar teaching on the priestly ministries of women, we need to consider the extent to which our differences on this matter constitute heresies which justify divisions among Christians. The Orthodox must tell Anglicans whether or not the priestly ordination of women is heretical, in the sense that the Montanist practice of ordaining

women was condemned as heretical. If the Orthodox consider it heretical, they must explain why. We need first, however, to define carefully what we mean by heresy, what constitutes a heresy, and the consequences of heresy for communion.

iv. If the ordination of women does not constitute a heresy, we need to ask to what extent the ordination, or non-ordination, of women affects our communion with one another. If our differences on this matter can be contained within Christian communion (koinonia), then we must ask what might be the next steps along the path to unity between Anglicans and Orthodox.

The Commission's approach to this matter is relevant not only to Anglican-Roman Catholic dialogue, but also to inter-Anglican discussions and dissensions. The same questions *The Church of the Triune God* asks with regard to the ordination of women might well be asked with regard to homosexuality and same-sex relationships. Both issues involve the relationship of church life to culture, and of both it has to be asked whether they are truly departures from essential Christian teaching and consequently matters affecting communion. To both therefore is relevant Section VIII of the Statement, 'Heresy, Schism and the Church'.

Heresy and Schism

This topic was included in the Commission's programme because, as an Orthodox member of the Commission pointed out, the Orthodox frequently accuse one another of heresy. In fact Christians in all churches are far too apt to make the accusation of anyone with whom they disagree. Anglicans are not exempt: an Archbishop of Canterbury once dubbed opponents of the ordination of women heretics, and absurd charges have been leveled against North American Anglicans of inventing a new religion because they take a non-traditional view of certain aspects of human sexuality. The Report suggests that 'current imprecise and imprudent uses of the word "heresy" may lead to the perception that the word is more of a problem than a help in dealing with emerging theological restatements or reconsideration' (VIII.6.). Only in the classical sense may it be helpful in the present situation of Christians. The Report's definition of that sense of the word is:

In the classical sense, heresy is a denial of the apostolic faith, and a betrayal of the existential reality of the Church as a community of faith. The self-revelation of God, in the prophets and in Christ, to which the Scriptures and Tradition bear witness, cannot be understood in isolation from the community in which it is received. The ecclesial reality can only be expressed in fidelity to the ways in which it has been expressed from its beginning in the apostolic witness, namely the canonical Scriptures and the Tradition as articulated in the Rule of Faith, culminating in the dogmatic teaching of the Ecumenical Councils. Any teaching or practice which denies the doctrinal truths they express must therefore be considered as heretical. These criteria, then, place significant limits and conditions on the use of the term heresy (VIII.7).

Of this considered view Anglicans, and members of other churches, would be well advised to take note.

Reception

No less relevant to current Anglican issues is the Statement's final section on 'Reception in Communion'. It sets the reception of new ideas and practices within the context of the continuing and continuous reception by the Church of the message of Christ, and the love of God which it proclaims. It emphasizes that in its classical understanding reception takes place within the community of the Church. Since the Church is a eucharistic community, this means that reception takes place within the context of the Eucharist; the episcopal ministry is therefore central to the process.

The question of reception is important because 'There is a growing consensus that reception involves relating the Gospel to the actual needs of humanity, and not simply applying juridical norms to new situations. Anglicans and Orthodox agree that this requires us to receive Scripture and Tradition with attentiveness to contemporary needs and with respect for different cultural backgrounds' (IX.14.i.). The Report recognizes that the Tradition is a charismatic principle, and that reception 'seeks to respond to new demands of human culture in faithfulness to what has been transmitted from the past' (IX.14.iii.).

But the Report properly distinguishes between the reception of new ideas and that of new practices. New doctrines or interpretations of doctrines can be debated among Christians for a long time before

being accepted or rejected by the Church as a whole. Until this process is completed, disagreement does not justify or necessitate a break in communion. New practices, however, affect the life of the Church immediately. Some do not affect the Church's basic structure and so do not pose problems for communion. Others, of which the Report mentions developments in the papal ministry, do affect the basic structure of a church, and create obstacles to reception and so to communion. The ordination of women, particularly to the episcopate, poses a similar problem to the reception of one church by another, since such reception is through the bishop. The Report does not deal with ethical issues, though within the Anglican Communion some hold the recognition of same-sex unions to come into the same category.

Anglicans often claim that the ordination of women is still in process of being received in the Anglican Communion. A similar claim might be made for the recognition of same-sex unions, although in the latter case the process is at an earlier stage than in the former. But practice does not preclude debate, which continues on both subjects. The Report makes a valuable point when it says that

The Church's life in the Spirit is not focused on the propagation of an ideology but is rather deeply dialogical; and true dialogue requires the expression of contrary views for its progress and development. Yet the question remains, at what point partners to such dialogue might cease to engage with each other. The fact that different parties to the debate about the ordination of women are still in dialogue is itself a hopeful sign. It leaves open the question as to what kind of issue this is: one which involves a denial of essential Christian wisdom, or one where in time the accumulation of historical precedent may help to shape a new consensus. Meanwhile, we cannot avoid the need for careful theological investigation of the issue, in order at least to see whether there are convincing arguments for or against the ordination of women. Until this point has been reached, and there is broad agreement on the resolution of the question, we should not seek to close the debate (IX.25).

That might well be applied to the question of same-sex unions; and we might well regret that the eirenic spirit of *The Church of the True God* is not more evident in debates within the Anglican Communion, some of whose members seem more eager to break communion than allow that views other than their own might be justifi-

able. The Report is clear that the process of reception can be a gradual one, and should not be cut prematurely short:

While the process of reception continues, the theological debate remains open. In this process critique, affirmation or rejection are all possible. Discussion of proposed new doctrine or practice will address two concerns. One is whether what is being proposed in response to the demands of culture contradicts what has already been received as the rule of faith. The other is whether the challenges posed by culture relate to genuine existential human needs, or spring from motives which are not in accord with the Gospel. Reception is a complex and creative process, which can be completed successfully only by the guidance of the Holy Spirit (IX.19.v).

The Church of the True God, like all such statements, has the authority only of the Commission which drew it up. It is now submitted to the Anglican and Orthodox Churches for their considered judgement. That process of reception will no doubt be a lengthy one, and its outcome cannot be predicted. But meanwhile there is much in the *Cyprus Agreed Statement* on which members of both Anglicans and Orthodox might reflect with profit. It is of course concerned with relations between the two Churches, but it contains much of relevance to the internal life of each Church.

The Church of the Triune God: Theological Observations

The Revd Dr Charles Miller

A theological assessment of the Cyprus Agreed Statement can be done under five headings: 1. the broad shape of the statement; 2. its style; 3. key influences upon it; 4. particular theological issues; and finally 5. future trajectories.

The Broad Shape and Style of the Report

Both Colin Davey's 'Observations' and Hugh Wybrew's discussion of the report's 'Wider Relevance' make clear that the approach and pattern of work which resulted in the Cyprus Agreed Statement differed from the previous two rounds of discussions and the respective reports that issued from them. The co-chairmen's agreement to explore ecclesiology and to consider other topics in relation to that theme offered scope for a degree and depth of coherent joint exploration which previous discussions had lacked. The resulting report, twice as long as the *Dublin Agreed Statement* of 1984, evidences just such coherence, at least when compared with its predecessors, arising out of what Hugh Wybrew has called a 'new and positive atmosphere' that was 'free from accusation and recrimination'.¹ Therefore the text is less a series of short statements of agreement or disagreement on specific points² (though an element of that remains), and more an extended, structured exposition beginning from first principles and moving outward toward matters of mutual concern in light of what has preceded.

¹ The *Moscow Agreed Statement* of 1976 was only nine pages long.

² For instance, the *Dublin Statement* takes up 'The Mystery of the Church', 'Faith in the Trinity, Prayer and Holiness', 'Worship and Tradition', followed by an 'Epilogue' on matters such as the knowledge of God and scripture and tradition. The *Moscow Statement* is similarly constructed.

Of course the content of that 'movement outward' is by no means abstract, for it is driven by the commission's awareness of various matters, practical and theoretical, that have impeded theological consensus, even at times willingness to dialogue, between the two churches. One such matter is the issue of the nature of theological language, a point to which I will return below. Another is the ordination of women to the episcopate and presbyterate. The commission has laboured to prepare the ground for a co-operative approach to the latter issue in contrast to the rigourist postures that emerged during prior discussions and that prevented open theological exploration and assessment. All of the report's components can be seen to enable such an approach. So, from one angle the *Cyprus Statement* could be thought of as a *livre de circonstance*. But the history of theology is full of just such productions which quickly transcend their immediate context and offer insights far more enduring. This report has something of that potential in it.

The report, then, is a rather tightly argued series of nine 'sections', or chapters, which can profitably be divided into three parts. First, in an attempt to establish first principles, comes consideration of 'The Trinity and the Church', and from that basis an exploration of Christology in relation to Pneumatology and its implications for ecclesiology. In the second part the Christological insights so far gained are applied to anthropology. So what I describe here as the first and second parts of the Report (sections 1-4) draw a clear line from the 'immanent Trinity' to the salvation of the human person *via* an integrated vision of Christ, the Spirit and the Church.

With its fifth section the Report's third part takes up disputed areas: 'Episcopate, Episcopos and Primacy'; 'Priesthood, Christ and the Church'; 'Women and Men, Ministries and the Church'; 'Heresy, Schism and the Church'; and, finally, 'Reception in Communion'. Sections 1-4 account for a full third of the text; the applied sections 5-9 two thirds. Before commenting on each of those sections in turn a brief remark on influences lying behind the report is in order.

Influences

On the occasion of the publication of *The Triune God* the Anglican co-chairman Bishop Mark Dyer stated that those who wrote the report

drew inspiration first and foremost from the shared inheritance of Greek and Latin patristic theology.³ Those sources forcefully guide the expositions of parts 1 and 2, and continue less pervasively through part 3. Greek sources predominate and the Orthodox are clearly at home in such sources, the Greek ones anyhow. Anglicans of an older generation, steeped in the patristic appeal of 'classical' Anglicanism, generally will be too. But there is a growing gap between such sources' theological conceptions and language and the theological sensibilities of more and more Anglican clergy whose training no longer exposes them thoroughly and reliably to the patristic tradition. This will hinder discussion and slow reception of the report.

In sections 1-4 where Trinitarian theology, Christology and Pneumatology are analyzed, the influence of the Cappadocian fathers Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory Nazianzen and above all Basil the Great, is paramount. Augustine is cited as a counter-point, but the sources driving the exposition are Greek and Cappadocian, representing an area where patristic study not least among the Orthodox themselves in recent decades has been especially fruitful.⁴

A further influence, which takes us into the early Byzantine sphere, is Maximus the Confessor (c. 580-662). He is cited a few times in the text itself. However, his prominence in the interpretation of the evolution of eastern theology from the impetus of Cappadocian thought by Metropolitan John (Zizioulas) cannot be underestimated. That raises another question: the extent to which Anglicans are actually equipped to assess and welcome the Maximian tradition.⁵ Despite the significant expansion of interest in Maximus, and admitting his position as a seminal 'pre-division' theologian, the fact remains that he is

³ Akin to the appeal by Pope Paul VI and Archbishop Michael Ramsey to found the ARCIC dialogue on the Gospels and 'the ancient common tradition' (*The Common Declaration* [March 24, 1966]).

⁴ Actually this trend is very much part of the trajectory represented by Fr. George Florovsky's 'neo-patristic synthesis'. The interest in exploring and capitalizing on Cappadocian thought is wide, as seen in the works of Vladimir Lossky, Boris Bobrinsky, Zizioulas himself, to name but a few well-known theologians.

⁵ It should be noted that Anglican Commission member William Green has a documented interest in Maximus' thought; see his essay 'Maximus the Confessor: An Introduction' in W. Green and M. L'Engle, ed., *Spirit & Light. Essays in Historical Theology* (New York, 1976), pp. 75-96.

foreign to most Anglicans whose study of the 'ancient common tradition' does not take them into the early Byzantine period.⁶

That fact points up the huge influence on the *Cyprus Report* of the Orthodox co-chair himself, Metropolitan John (Zizioulas) of Pergamum. Among the Orthodox there is no contributor of equal theological weight. Those who wish to delve into the theological hinterland of the report need venture no further than Zizioulas' two magisterial studies, *Being As Communion. Studies in Personhood and the Church* (1985) and, most recently, *Communion and Otherness* (2007), and a cadre of articles Zizioulas had published previously.⁷ More will be said below about the specific contribution these studies make to the report. Here, though, it is important to register the extent to which the report as a whole is informed by the theological vision of the Orthodox co-chair. More particularly, readers need to be aware of the degree to which Zizioulas has shaped the interpretation both of the Cappadocians and of Maximus the Confessor.⁸ In receiving the report the Orthodox churches will in effect be assessing Metropolitan John's take on 'Orthodoxy'. Anglicans too must be aware of the dominance of that voice as they determine the extent to which the report represents pan-Orthodox views and an interpretation of the early shared tradition which forms the report's starting point. However that may be evaluated, the influences referred to, and others, combine to provide rich theological perspectives on the matters under discussion.

Issues in the Particular Sections

Section 1: 'The Trinity and the Church'

The Cyprus Statement is distinguished from its predecessors on account of its exposition of 'first principles'. The opening section es-

⁶ Among Orthodox theologians Zizioulas develops the trajectory of revived interest in Maximus which extends as far back as the 1930s when the Romanian Nichifor Crainic lectured on Maximus in Bucharest.

⁷ I have commented on some of them in an article 'The Divine Trinity in Contemporary Orthodox Thought. A Case Study' in *The Harvest*, vol. 7, no. 1 (1997): 11-16; and in an emended reprint in *The Anglican*, vol. 27, no. 1 (January 1998): 14-18.

⁸ The Cappadocian aspect is apparent in Zizioulas' many articles (see note above); I am struck by Zizioulas' reliance on Maximus in key chapters of *Communion and Otherness*.

establishes the theological ground upon which it will present its ecclesiological vision. The writers' unabashed embrace of a full-blown *theological* basis for their considerations is a long-overdue tonic for those at sea amidst ecumenical institutional 'negotiations'. Under the inspiration of 1 John 1.2-3 and the 'fellowship' (*koinonia*) it describes, they declare:

All our theology of the Church presupposes the eternal priority of this mystery of communion in the life of God. If God were not eternally a communion of love, the *koinonia* of believers would not be what it is, a real participation in the divine life, a *theosis* (p. 13).

For this reason, they argue, 'The communion manifested in the life of the Church has the Trinitarian fellowship as its basis, model, and ultimate goal' (p.13). Within the framework of the argument emphasis is placed on the priority of the divine Persons as 'irreducible hypostatic realities, exiting in their relation to each other' over against a (Augustinian) 'prior divine essence' (p. 13). Psychological and social analogies are eschewed; the former because it tends to dissolve hypostatic reality into mere relations within a substance (as in Augustine's psychological analogy); the latter because it fails to stress the consubstantiality, 'the simultaneity of threeness and oneness' (p. 13) within the divine life. Along those same lines, the Losskian distinction between 'individual' and 'person' is embraced with the result that 'the person exists not in possession of its own nature in opposition to others, but in giving itself wholly into the life of others' (p. 13).

This first section then gives a kind of précis of subsequent sections and thus sketches the web of connections within this Trinitarian view that the report will expound. So Christology is tied closely to this Trinitarian theology. 'Christ the eternal Son ... reveals and opens to us the communion of the life of the Holy Trinity' (p. 14). Ecclesiology directly follows, since Christ does this through his mystical body the Church which is 'created to be an image of the life in communion of the Triune God....' (p. 15). 'The mystery of this communion of believers with the Triune God and among themselves is the essence of the Church as the Body of Christ and the temple of the Holy Spirit' (p.15).

The Trinitarian basis of ecclesiology, rooted in God's *koinonia*, leads to a key role for the sacraments of communion (*koinonia*), baptism and the Eucharist, as means of access and growth in this experience of

divine life. The Church is meant to offer an experience of 'the unity of God's kingdom'. When the Church is an authentic witness to that then her 'true nature' is manifest. The report implicitly acknowledges the tension, even the gap, between the institutional church's life *in via* and its 'true nature' as an experience of the triune life of God in space and time. This represents progress in so far as Anglicans have sometimes felt in conversations with the Orthodox that Anglican realism has been weighed in the balance with Orthodox idealism and has been found wanting. The report may have opened a door through which the institutional and historical actualities on *both* sides can stand before a jointly embraced ideal.

The report's concern to root ecclesiology in affirmations related to the 'immanent Trinity' brings the chronic dispute over the *filioque* ('and from the Son') phrase in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed into the discussion. The thrust of the discussion is to clarify the relationship between the 'many' and the 'one' first in God's own life and, second, in the church in its historical form of existence. Drawing on conceptual breakthroughs pioneered by St Basil the writers argue that 'divine existence and life spring from and are caused by a Person, the Father, rather than an impersonal *ousia* ...' (p. 19). The Cappadocian insistence on a personal rather than a natural cause of the Son and the Spirit means that such causation is a *free act*. Two main consequences follow for ecclesiology. First, there is no substance 'church' which precedes actual churches. Second, just as 'cause' and 'source' in God are personal, and so relational acts, so all primacy in the church is relational. The writers are confident that the actual structures of the Orthodox and Anglican churches accord with this posture since both credit the local church with full catholicity in itself, and both rely on relational forms of primacy in which the communion between churches is free. However, it must be questioned on the Anglican side at least how much inherited praxis is the intentional result of the kind of theological rationale the report offers. Having said that, though, the report offers a rich rationale well worth growing into.

Section 1 ends with an account of theological language, especially language about God. The discussion seeks to legitimize the language of 'Father', 'Son' and 'Spirit' by reference to their revealed status in describing the divine persons' identity and relations. At the same time the writers insist, 'Any anthropomorphic understanding of gender-specific

language in relation to the Holy Trinity must be rejected' (p. 23). The discussion of theological language such as analogy and metaphor usefully highlights strengths, weakness and indeed dangers in all human discourse about God. The report advocates 'iconic' language as distinct from analogies and 'illustrative metaphors'. Such 'iconic' language has two features: first, it is 'given' by revelation, and, second, its meaning is grasped only within the texture of theology woven 'within the ecclesial body' (p. 22). The theme of communion bears on this issue in that the experience of communion transforms the subject-object relationship and thus opens up new possibilities of understanding. Lest that suggest a static and self-referential circle, the writers make a useful distinction between the changeless divine names that express personal identity, and imagery in scripture and tradition that illumine 'the loving activity of God' and 'may help some more deeply to appropriate their salvation' (p. 23). Here they refer, for instance, to feminine imagery. I find the discussion of this important area tantalizingly brief, but suggestive for further exploration. I find it helpful how the report advocates a necessary tension between *apophysis vis-à-vis* the divine nature, 'given' language to be humbly received and used regarding the divine Persons, and imagery as applied to divine action in the world.

Section 2: Christ, the Spirit and the Church

The strong Trinitarianism of the first section is carried over into the soteriological concerns of section 2 where the question 'Who saves us?' is addressed. 'Soteriology requires', they argue, 'the involvement of all three Persons of the Trinity in and through the Son, who is "one of the Trinity"' (p. 25). Again, the personalist thrust is strong so as to avoid any de-personalization of the Spirit.⁹ Descriptions of the personal dynamic of Trinitarian life in terms of personal self-gift—'God's life is a dynamic, eternal and unending movement of self-giving' (p. 26)—evoke some of Dumitru Staniloae's expositions of Trinitarian relations and

⁹ Interestingly, the Report does not take up the matter of describing the Spirit as 'she'—clearly an issue directly related to the prior point about theological language in section 1.

represent a rich field for further reading by those who find this aspect of the Report inspiring.¹⁰

But the strength of this section is the heightened Pneumatology which it presents. Several aspects stand out. First, the role of the Spirit is strictly tied to what we might call the Christological centre of soteriology. 'The Spirit of God works to draw all humanity into the Trinitarian life' (p. 27), the writers assert, and does so by 'filiation' (*huiothesia*; see Romans 8.15 and 23). 'Here the Spirit forms the believer in the likeness of Christ.' They go on:

The crucial link is made in Galatians 4.6: 'And because you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying "Abba, Father!" God gives us the Spirit of Jesus, who is the Son of God. Our ability to use the language of Jesus in calling God 'Abba' is the sure hope of the transformation of the whole of our creatureliness, the whole of our relatedness to each other and the rest of creation... Since it is the Spirit who communicates to creatures the possibility of calling God 'Abba', we may speak of the Spirit as the outpouring into that which is not God of the divine relationship of gift and response shown to us in Jesus' relation with the Father (p. 27).

One of the interesting features of that description is that while such an approach historically has often used impartationist language and thereby evoked 'Protestant' suspicion, these writers speak rather of creatures graciously sharing in a quality of 'divine relationship of gift and response'. It will be important for Anglican Evangelicals to take note of this style of discourse and to comment on it.

The theme of gift and response is applied to humanity's relationship to the world. Taking inspiration from Maximus the Confessor, the Spirit-given 'divine relationship of gift and response' is spoken of in terms of humankind's liturgical role on behalf of the whole cosmos. 'God gives to the new humanity in Christ the freedom and power to relate to the whole cosmos in a new way, so that the material creation may be seen as speaking of God and giving glory to God' (p. 27). Here the report implicitly acknowledges the ever-growing concerns of 'green theology' and gives it in firm theological roots.

Second, this section advocates a 'synthesis' of Christology and Pneumatology. There is an awareness of what some have called the

¹⁰ See, for instance, Staniloae's essays two essays on the Trinity in his *Theology and the Church* (Crestwood, USA, 1980), pp. 11-44 and 73-108.

'Christomonism' of the West and a desire to address it. Equally, the writers seem to want to clarify and resolve some issues about the relationship of Christology and Pneumatology among the Orthodox themselves. The second matter focuses on the propriety (nor not) of speaking about an 'economy' of the Son and about an 'economy' of the Spirit also. The Report seems to take aim chiefly at Vladimir Lossky whose ground-breaking study *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* of 1944¹¹ explores in two full chapters 'The Economy of the Son' and 'The Economy of the Spirit' respectively. While the report is insistent in rejecting the language of two such 'economies', it is unclear, to my mind at least, the real basis of the writers' issue with Lossky's terminology. Is it, for instance, Lossky's claim, 'The operation of the Holy Spirit in the world before the Church and outside the Church is not ... the same as His presence in the Church after Pentecost? Or is it Lossky's distinction between the eternal procession of divine Persons (*scil.* Son and Spirit) as 'the work of [divine] nature' and their temporal mission as 'the work of the [divine] will which is common to the three hypostases'¹² On the second point Zizioulas and Lossky are at odds, it seems to me, since Zizioulas stresses the (for lack of a better phrase) processional life of the Trinity both eternally and temporally as the result of the Father's prior Personal will as 'Father'.¹³ Zizioulas' view is a key part of his larger project of relating 'communion' and 'otherness' and it is not surprising that he would wish this ecumenical statement to embrace what he regards as a conceptual keystone. Orthodox and other readers need to be aware, though, that behind the report's discussion of 'economy' lies a complex and important matter of interpretation both of Cappadocian thought as well as of alternate interpretations of the

¹¹ First published in English in 1957.

¹² Pp. 157-8.

¹³ Zizioulas writes elsewhere: 'The decisive point in Cappadocian theology concerning our subject is the association of divine *monarchia* in its ontological sense with the person of the Father *and not with divine substance*. Equally decisive was their attachment of the notion of ontological causality to divine personhood *and their rejection of causality at the level of substance*' (*Communion and Otherness*, p. 34); see also his third chapter in the same volume for an extended exposition on the matter of divine causation as related to person, will and substance.

relation of divine 'person' and 'substance' within the subsequent patristic tradition and the sphere of recent Orthodox thought.¹⁴

This second section tracks Zizioulas' earlier explorations in Christology-Pneumatology by applying it to anthropology and more particularly to the concern of 'person'. Christ's humanity, because it is constituted by the Spirit as relational, sets the pattern and goal of our humanity: it overcomes individualism and individualization. 'By being communion (*koinonia*) the Holy Spirit transcends the self and subjectivity, and enables humanity to reach out to meet the other' (p. 33). In this regard the report offers a brief but suggestive comment on the relationship between eschatology, baptism and forgiveness.

With the relationship between Christ, the Spirit and humanity explored, the end of section 2 reaches ecclesiology. It sees the church as the outcome of Christ's Spirit-filled Personal life, one that comprises the one (Christ's own divine personhood) and the many (all created personal existence). In response to the concern 'How do believers actually relate to Jesus Christ?' the report states that '... Christ transcends individualism and individualization by being personal.' 'We need to recover', it continues,

an understanding of Christ as a person who includes us in himself, who is 'one' and 'many' at the same time... So the gap between the Christ of the first century and ourselves is filled through Christ's relational being, which in his grace and love and true personhood reaches out to include us in himself. It is the Spirit that makes the Church what it is, the Body of Christ. As such the Church is an indispensable part of Christ's identity (p. 36).

There then is the ecclesiological ground, universal and indeed cosmic in scope, out of which issues about 'church' can be discussed. It is a firm yet generous starting place. A western reader might only wish that this strong affirmation could have been enriched with insights from Augustine's language of 'the whole Christ, head and body'.

¹⁴ Lossky takes his cue in his discussion on the two economies from John of Damascus (p. 158). Have Cappadocian and Damascene thought been compared on this point?

Section 3: Christ, Humanity and the Church

This section acts as a kind of bridge between the theological bedrock fashioned in the two prior sections and those that follow. The section's title is slightly misleading since the subject of discussion is not theological anthropology *per se* but rather culture. As such, the section moves quickly through the issues of Christianity and culture in general, Christology and culture, and then Christology and inculturation. Needless to say, the relationship of the Gospel to human cultures is a perennial issue. It is very much to the fore in ecumenical dialogue since there is often insufficient awareness of the cultural divides that precede and imperil fruitful theological discourse. It is all the more an issue since the contexts in which conversation occurs are experiences of ecclesial life enmeshed in particular cultures.

The report sees culture as an inevitable and positive aspect of being human, and therefore an issue related to Christian anthropology, Christology and ecclesiology. 'Culture is related to the creativity given to human beings by God' (p. 40), derived from the privilege of *cultivating* the garden in Genesis 2, of naming the animals, and the call to be fruitful. From a theological angle, then, human flourishing involves both the overt progression towards 'fuller participation in the life of God' and—here is the related *cultural* task—to engage actively with the human environment 'seeking to consecrate it in God's name and by God's help' (p. 41).

But the relationship between humanity's spiritual goal and the unavoidable cultural *milieu* is 'dialectical' (p. 44). The report talks about this in the transformational language familiar to readers of Richard Niebuhr and George Florovsky.¹⁵ So the positive evaluation of the phenomenon of culture is balanced by an awareness of forms of cultural 'bondage' even 'tyranny' (p. 43), contemporary forms of idolatry. Within such settings Christians' challenge is to name the limitations of any particular cultural setting. For this they need the church as Gospel witness. Yet the report recognizes that the relationship between culture and church is neither simple nor pure. 'Sometimes churches

¹⁵ Both theologians were influenced by the Barthian phenomenon of the early twentieth century in which the easy relationship between Christianity and its various European cultural settings was challenged.

become identified uncritically with a prevailing culture' and as a result 'they too stand in need of the Gospel's corrective critique' (p. 43). Yet even in the relation between Gospel and culture there will be elements of 'affirmation', of 'calling into question' and pointing to 'the possibilities for transformation' (p. 43).

Changing tack in the sub-section 'Christology and culture' the writers explore the possibility of cross-cultural communication. They point to the New Testament itself as 'the principal illustration of how a particular witness to Jesus Christ speaks across cultural boundaries' (p. 46) and it affirms the same of the Christological definitions of the ecumenical councils. Picking up a theme of the *Dublin Statement* this document refers to the work (economy?) of the Holy Spirit as the 'charismatic memory' of the Church that 'brings to life for us the words of the Christian past that shaped the Church's historic understanding of God in Christ' (p. 47).

As a counter-poise to that they address 'inculturation'. The report describes inculturation as 'an attempt to translate the essential meaning of Christianity from the terms of one cultural milieu into those of another' (p. 47). It affirms the importance of this process and suggests on that basis that 'the search for Christian unity can then be seen not exclusively as one for common formulations of the faith, but also as an attempt to discern the unity-in-diversity, where it exists, of different cultural expressions of the Gospel' (p. 49). Here is a chief outworking of the Christological concept of 'the one' and 'the many' which the previous section of the Report articulated.

Readers might wish this section to have gone further in assessing the dynamic, current in 'the West' since the social revolution of the 1960s, where the secular sphere is seen as the *milieu* of the Spirit out of which the Spirit challenges the churches' own fidelity to the Gospel. Racial and sexual liberation movements, for instance, when they sought Christian justification at all, did so on such terms, and it remains a powerful aspect of the 'Western' Christian mindset. Here we could use more help from the report.

Section 4: Christ, Humanity and the Church

This brief section is an interesting and very important exploration of the theology of Trinitarian derivation from sections 1 and 2 within the

context of the cultural problem, at least in the European and North-American scene, of gender language as applied to God. The report has already insisted on the necessity of the given names of 'Father', 'Son', and 'Spirit'. Here it develops this issue specifically with regard to Christology and then the Church as Christ's body. The writers are careful to strike a theologically accountable balance between three elements in Christology: the terminology of 'Son', the male gender of the incarnate Word, and the universality of the salvation which he achieves for humanity as a whole.

The report takes as its starting point the patristic insistence that 'God is known and worshipped in the Church as wholly without gender: he is neither male nor female, nor any combination of the two.' 'Strictly speaking,' it continues, 'we cannot even say that God is beyond gender, since we cannot compare him with anything creaturely' (p. 52). How do we account, then, for the language of 'sonship'? This is not gender language, the report asserts; rather, it is the language of 'ontological derivation'. That is, the term 'Son' refers to the Son's derivation of being from the Father and only—though 'only' is hardly apt since this is the prime revelational truth about the incarnate Son—to that derivation. 'By confessing Jesus Christ as the "Son" of the "Father", we acknowledge that the Son is distinct from the Father, and yet is Son by nature.'¹⁶ The term 'Son', as 'Father' and 'Spirit', is not metaphorical, analogous or symbolic. Rather, it is 'iconic', as defined earlier in the Report.

Both New Testament and patristic theology strive to maintain a tension between, on the one hand, the male gender of the Incarnate Word, and, on the other, his possession of full human nature so that his salvific work is universal in scope. The discussion could be more expansive here since this is precisely where there is commonly a tangle. We seem to be in an area where the concept of the 'one' and the 'many' is working behind the text—the oneness of Christ's male humanity in salvific communion with the 'many', both male and female, who constitute humanity.

Yet the writers stress that while distinctions of maleness and femaleness are abolished neither in Christ nor in redeemed humanity as a

¹⁶ This, of course, is the point of the term *homoousios* in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed.

whole, destructive polarities arising out of the 'passions' are overcome. So resurrection life involves transcending the 'polarities' of sexual life, but not sexual distinction *per se*: '...participation in the divine life brings our male and female nature to the final destiny God has always intended for it' (p. 55).

The section ends with 'The Risen Christ and the Church' where a number of rich themes related to ecclesiology are mentioned but are undeveloped: the Pneumatological grounding of the Church's resurrection life; the 'iconic' designation of the Church as Christ's 'Body' and as his 'agent or instrument in the world' (p. 56); baptism as entrance into a 'eschatological community' and into 'an arena of conflict between the old age and the new'; and the Church as an apostolic community gathered around its Lord at the messianic banquet of the Eucharist. The two pages in which that array of themes appears can do no justice to them,¹⁷ though the outworking of some of them appears in the sections 5 through 9 that follow.

Section 5: *Episcopate, Episcopos* and Primacy

With this fifth section the report turns to topics customarily thought of as ecclesiological concerns properly speaking. Certainly the sections that follow take up disputed questions in a way the preceding four sections do not. This section is comprised of historical analysis of the 'ancient common tradition' and of exploration of issues related to *episcopate*, in particular, conciliarity, primacy and synodality. The influence of various chapters of Zizioulas' *Being As Communion* is determinative in the treatment.

In a rapid tracing of historical developments of '*episcopate* and *episcopos*' to the fourth century the report acknowledges, 'The picture is one of gradual development from various forms of an *episcopate* always present, into a pattern of one bishop in each local¹⁸ church, who functioned at a local level without any centralized control' (p. 60). Following Zizioulas'

¹⁷ Many, even most of those themes are developed in Zizioulas' *Being As Communion, passim*.

¹⁸ The report should define 'local' church; presumably it refers to a single diocese—what in Roman Catholic ecclesiology is often called the 'particular' church. Anglicans, though, will usually think of the 'local' church as the parish church.

take on this period of evolution, the report thrusts the burden of continuity within the period of transition between the apostles and the mono-episcopate to the local community itself, not to a centrally-coordinated structure of missionary delegates¹⁹, with its celebration of the Eucharist and the president's handing on of the apostolic tradition as the heart of the process. Here we have the essence of the argument which prefers an eschatological rather than a linear-historical origin to the mono-episcopate. The thrust of this approach is to establish that in the eucharistic celebration according to apostolic tradition the 'eschatological community' is 'present in its fullness' (p. 61) and reflects this in its arrangement of the participants in this eschatological community. 'Theologically,' they say, 'this can be understood to entail a parallel between God and the president of the Eucharistic assembly, surrounded by presbyters' (p. 61). Those familiar with Ignatius' letters will find this presentation full of the images of the eucharistic assembly that Ignatius describes; indeed, the Zizioulan analysis of this matter relies heavily on the evidence of Ignatius' letters. The upshot is this 'We should not think of a juridical caste handing on power over the church or indeed creating the church' (p. 61).

The report then quickly plots the beginning of the disintegration of this dynamic eschatological vision after the *pax ecclesiae* and the bishop's gradual change into a figure of juridical significance. In fairness to Ignatius, the bishop is not simply an eschatological liturgical president; his letters testify too that the bishop is a teacher and an overseer with at least proto-judicial sway. I think the report's vision of this growth of episcopacy tends to extract it from the 'rough and tumble' of the pastoral context where *episcopus* is as much about keeping a flock in good, healthy order as it is about authentically passing on the apostolic tradition or imaging the eschatological community.

¹⁹ Some seventeenth-century Anglican ecclesiological texts interpreted the scriptural and early Christian evidence differently. The Jerusalem church was seen as the pattern and the college of apostles there the guide, Jerusalem church was seen as the pattern and the college of apostles there the guide, promoter and, through their representative apostles and then bishops, the nurturer of new communities elsewhere. Such interpretations could acknowledge too a degree of variance in the earliest forms of *episcopus* in such communities. See, for instance, Herbert Thorndike's *Of the Primitive Government of the Church. A Discourse Pointing at the Primitive Form*, LACT (Oxford, 1844) vol. I, pt 1, pp. 1-26.

In moving out from the historical analysis the report argues, as other ecumenical documents have before it,²⁰ that apostolic succession 'is best regarded as a succession of communities represented by their bishops, rather than as a succession of individuals with power and authority to confer grace apart from their communities' (p. 63). The writers see the 'clear eschatological note' in the apostolic and sub-apostolic period as a challenge to all churches in their role as critic of the social order. This is surely a sound and welcome rationale for the church's concern for society and culture. It also sees in its presentation a call to reclaim an overt sense of the local bishop as the primary eucharistic president.

A very interesting issue is raised with regard to the place of the laity in synodical structures. While the report only refers to this question, enough is said to highlight a major divergence of view with regard to the bishop and synodality. Whereas the Orthodox view the bishop in synod as representing his whole community, Anglicans give place to a representative laity which can speak for itself. Within the Anglican setting, the question surely arises: for whom does the bishop speak? In effect the Anglican system seems to have become a structure of estates (bishops, clergy, laity), each of which speaks for itself. The report is right, in my view, to state that such a difference in approach needs further consideration to see whether it is one where there can be legitimate diversity. Does the Anglican system in effect make the bishops a caste representing no one but themselves?

This section of the report turns finally to primacy and conciliarity. It views primacy as an aspect of ecclesiology that moves upward from the local level and only then on to regional and global leadership. It also presents conciliarity as one of primacy's important complements, again holding in tension the theme of the 'one' and the 'many' referred to already. That important issue in Anglicanism over the past two decades, reception, is mentioned. It is taken up in a fuller way in Section 9.

²⁰ For instance, the Anglican-Lutheran *Porvoo Common Statement*, cited in this text.

Sections 6 and 7: Priesthood, Christ and the Church; Women and Men, and Ministries in the Church

Given that so much of *The Church of the Triune God* sets the stage for a fruitful discussion of priesthood, almost twenty-five pages of the report are given over to the issues of priesthood and ministry. The discussion notes divergences in view between the churches, but by and large it is a collaborative exploration of some of the pertinent issues surrounding ministry.

The report locates three forms of priesthood. First and foremost stands the priesthood of Jesus Christ himself, at once 'unique' and 'expiatory' (p. 68). Its concise presentation of Christ's priesthood in paragraphs 5 and 6 are imbued with the theology of the Letter to the Hebrews. The Church is 'derived' from Christ's unique self-offering and, in the Eucharist chiefly, offers herself gratefully with Christ in an eschatological act of worship that draws her into the life of the Triune God. Indeed, the report is strong in relating Christ's priesthood to the Trinitarian theology found earlier in the report. 'Priesthood is ... a Trinitarian reality,' it says.

The Father bestows his grace through the work of the Son, and that grace shows itself in the praise and thanksgiving offered through the Son by those who have been fed by the living bread from heaven. Both the feeding and the thanksgiving are made possible by the Spirit, who is sent into the world by the Son. (p. 70)

Second is the priesthood of the Church. The whole Church is 'taken into the movement of Christ's self-offering and his eternal praise of the Father'. By baptism a particular individual enters into that movement and is 'configured' to the priesthood of Christ.²¹ Inspired by 1 Peter 2.9 the report declares that 'the whole church is priestly' (p. 70). It avoids here phraseology often used, namely, that the church 'shares in the priesthood of Christ', and that is salutary since it is a phrase full

²¹ The Report often uses the verb 'to configure', giving the impression that it is a theological term *per se*. If it is so used a definition should be given. If it simply means 'to shape' or 'to be shaped according to the pattern of...', then why not put it like that?

of unhelpful ambiguity.²² The report emphasizes the priestly aspect of the Christians' sacrificial service in the world as the expression of Christ's priestly life lived out in his ecclesial Body.

Third, between the two, stands the 'ordained priesthood'. This discussion begins with the ministry of the bishop since it is insisted here, as later in the discussion, that the bishop first, and presbyters only by derivation, have a ministerial priestly role. The fact of all priestly ordinations within the Eucharistic rite means that 'the priesthood belongs to the Eucharistic community. Priesthood exists for the community... The people of God, gathered together in the Eucharistic communion, constitutes the basis for ordained priestly ministry' (p. 72). Broadly this is a view we should accept, but I think the phrase 'constitutes the basis for...' needs clarification. Is the point that ministerial priesthood derives from in the sense that it is a mere further articulation of baptismal ministry and witness? Or does the 'basis' in the eucharistic community mean that that community is the context in which and the object for which ministerial priesthood is exercised? The stress on the community-related and accountable character of ministerial priesthood makes a reader sense that issues are being addressed behind the text. If so, what are they?

With regard to the ordained priesthood the report does use the term 'participate' to describe its relationship to the priesthood of Christ. Indeed, through the epiclesis in the ordination rite, it affirms, 'Christ's own priesthood is offered to them [the ordained], and so remains alive and effectual within the ecclesial body' (p. 73). This expresses a high doctrine of ordained priesthood indeed. How does it relate, though, to the earlier assertion that Christ's priestly sacrifice is 'unique and expiatory'? More needs to be said about how Christ's priesthood relates to his priestly sacrifice. If the priestly sacrifice is unique, are other aspects of his priesthood repeatable *as priestly acts*? And what of Hebrews' term '*aparabatos*' (7.24)?

It is somewhat curious, I find, that following on from the assertion of concrete sharing in Christ's priesthood, the report then emphatically criticizes the notional indelibility of 'priestly character'. Admittedly,

²² See my essay 'The Theology of the Laity: Description and Construction with Reference to the American Book of Common Prayer', *Anglican Theological Review*, vol. 84, no. 2 (Spring 2002), especially 224-226.

the notion is open to abuse. But the report's argument takes no account of contemporary reinterpretations of the notion by theologians like John Macquarrie. Nor does the report give the reader enough conceptual basis to grasp why a deposed priest does not remain a priest and yet can be readmitted to the office without ordination again. Does the ordination confer something or not? I think it is possible to argue for something objectively conferred without allowing what the writers seem to fear, 'an autonomous power above the Church itself...' (p. 73). Again, I sense that we readers are only slightly overhearing a larger conversation happening elsewhere.

Those concerns stated, this section of the report ends with the clear encouragement to 'consider priesthood on the basis of an ontology of relation'. 'Priesthood should be considered, not in and for itself, but rather as a relational reality. To arrive at an adequate understanding of priestly grace, it should be seen in its Eucharistic context and in its connection with ecclesial communion' (p. 75).

Within that conceptual trajectory the report turns to the ordination of women to the episcopate and presbyterate. For the Orthodox it is important to set that discussion within the context of other ministries in which women and men share. It allows the framers of the report to stake out wide areas of consensus before moving into an area where difference remains.²³ The report does not seek to resolve the dispute over this question. Rather, it begins by 'wondering' whether the differences on this matter stem from fundamental diverging or flawed views of the Trinity, Christology, Pneumatology, anthropology, or of the relationship between Christ and culture, ecclesiology or the doctrine of priesthood itself. Its aim, then, is to 'understand' the various views on this disputed question, to assess whether or what deeper theological divisions exist, and to assess whether such differences of practice are such as to justify the division of the two churches.

The discussion begins with a rehearsal of the Christological discussion in earlier sections of the report, emphasizing again the tension between the fact that Christ's humanity is specifically male, yet in his salvific work his common humanity is emphasized. Reference is made to the resolution of sexual polarity in the eschatological experience of

²³ The Orthodox acknowledge that 'a small but not negligible minority of Orthodox' are in favour of the ordination of women or see no theological reason against it (p. 83).

the kingdom as an argument for an inclusive ordained priesthood as a 'compelling theological ground' for Anglican views (p. 87).

The Orthodox, while accepting the above, distinguish the significance of Christ's humanity in his saving work from the role of ordained priesthood within the context of eucharistic presidency. In the latter case, where the president acts '*in persona Christi*', the Orthodox wish to explore further how or whether Christ's specifically male human nature is relevant. Other hesitations are listed on the Orthodox side (many of them concerns which some Anglicans still have). But the Orthodox concerns gravitate around the significance and role of the ordained priest in eucharistic presidency.

In the concluding 'issues for further discussion' the report points to the relationship of Christ to culture, and the place of canon law. It seems clear to me that other areas need discussion:

1. The relation of history and eschatology needs to be clarified further especially in regard to the Eucharist. It is ironic that in this matter of eucharistic presidency the Anglicans, whose eucharistic theology has been signally un-eschatological through most of Anglican history, root their practice on a strong eschatological sense of the eucharist; while the Orthodox, whose liturgical tradition is strongly eschatological (this is why many westerners are attracted to it!), argue that the historical instantiation of human nature in Christ, as male, is of significance.
2. The issue of maleness and femaleness *vis-à-vis* humanity needs to be further developed. The patristic discussion of the relation between the concept of humanity²⁴ and the experienced fact of humanity as male and female needs to be developed further.
3. The iconic aspects of the Eucharist need to be explored. Anglicans inherit, and one might argue possess, a different set of visual expectations from the eucharistic liturgy; how is that relevant?
4. Is the relationship between revelation and history an issue here? In what way, if any, does the matter of a given sacrament articulate the historical rootedness of the sign as well as the eschatological presence of the thing signified?

The writers notably state: 'Given that there is no conciliar teaching on the priestly ministries of women, we need to consider the extent

²⁴ We never experience 'humanity' as such; we can only experience male and female humanities.

to which our differences on this matter constitute heresies which justify division among Christians' (p. 88). Can or cannot this difference be 'contained within Christian *koinonia*'? (p. 89).

Sections 8 and 9: Heresy, Schism and the Church; Reception in Communion

The references to heresy and division at the conclusion of Section 7 provide the starting point for a short excursus on the meaning of 'heresy' and schism' as well as on the criteria for and discernment of them within the life and body of the church. The writers are conscious of the way in which such terms are often loosely used, especially with reference to the ordination of women to the presbyterate and episcopate.

Working from the practice of the church since the time of Irenaeus, the report defines heresy as a departure from the apostolic faith within the church; schism, which often accompanied heresy, is a willful departure from the communion of the church. It highlights how in the view of some patristic writers 'schism was often considered a more serious matter than heresy'. "Nothing angers God so much as division in the Church..." (Chrysostom; quoted, p. 93). This is two-edged sword. For while it is a teaching that Anglicans in particular need to heed among themselves, it is equally significant for the Orthodox to note how separation is weighed higher than adherence to a strictly construed 'orthodoxy'.

What criteria can be used, then, to determine heresy? The report identifies 1. the canonical Scriptures and 2. the Tradition 'as articulated in the Rule of Faith, culminating in the dogmatic teaching of the Ecumenical Councils'. 'Any teaching or practice which denies the truths they express must therefore be considered heretical' (p. 93). The reference to the 'Rule of Faith' in point 2 may be clearer to Orthodox than it is to today's Anglicans. Does it refer to the Apostles' Creed or to the irreducible baptismal confession of the Trinity? And what practices would be included? Which 'sacraments' and customs (e.g. the sign of the cross, veneration of icons, the invocation of the saints)? Some help in clarifying the content of the *regula fidei* is given when the report speaks of the Church's inviolable 'existential reality':

...the creative love of God, God's truth, grace and self-revealing action in the history to which the Church belongs; redemption in the crucified and risen Christ, the forgiveness of sin, new life in the Holy Spirit, and the hope of an everlasting inheritance (p. 94).

Is that, then, the *regula fidei*, or is there more? Despite those ambiguities, the report's discussion lays out 'significant limits and conditions on the use of heresy' (p. 93) and that cannot but help the business of ecumenical discussion.

Finally, the writers underline that the discernment of heresy is an act not of individuals but of communities. It can occur in a community that is structured to include the charisms of both reception and rejection so that innovation can be properly assessed in relation to the apostolic faith. In the exercise of that gift the exercise of *episcopate* is literally critical. Such oversight exists, they say, in various 'modalities'; chief among them is the *episcopate* exercised by the local bishop. The process of discernment then moves outward to regions; in the end, the report insists, '...it is only an Ecumenical Council, whose decisions are received by the whole Church, that can declare a teaching heretical' (p. 95). That whole process is seen, helpfully, as one by which local churches are enabled to live and profess the faith 'in love and unity'. (Some readers will recall Augustine's phrase, 'the sovereign law of charity'.) The chief expression of this love and unity is at the Eucharist itself, where the bishop presides. Perhaps that insistence accounts in large measure for the acute challenge posed by the ordination of women to the priesthood, which has a direct impact on the church's eucharistic heart.

The final section, 9, proves to be a far richer and more interesting one than its prosaic title suggests. 'Reception in Communion' is, they admit, 'a vast and complex topic', and this discussion builds on pointers in the *Moscow Agreed Statement* of 1976. I find most helpful how the writers wish us to view reception through a wide angle.

Ever since the time of Christ and the Apostles, the Church has constantly received and re-received the message of her Lord. Jesus Christ himself, in receiving our humanity, received his mission from the Father. He received to the history and Scriptures of the people of Israel to which he belonged as man. (p. 97)

So, 'the process of reception precedes the Church, which herself can be seen as a product of reception' (p. 97).

Of course the term has a more exact technical sense by which teachings are accepted or not as consonant with the apostolic witness. But the report stresses that in the end it is not ideas that are received but church communities themselves. We all are called not only to 'receive from' one another but to 'receive one another' (p. 97). With that goal in mind the writers argue that the 'classical' view of reception can be of use to the contemporary church in its search for organic, sacramental unity.

'Receiving' and 'welcoming' are actions that permeate the New Testament, though we often overlook them. The Christian experience of God is one of being received and welcomed, and this is seen as an existential ideal for the Christian community as a whole. The historical record of Jesus Christ is the absolute statement of 'God's gift of love to us' (p. 100), the means of God's receiving us back to himself. The Church's life is defined by that fact, so that, 'The Church does not receive and transmit ideas or doctrines as such, but the very life and love of God for humanity' (p. 100). As a result the Church—every local Church (*sc.* diocese) and the parishes of which it is made—is to be 'the gift of God's love to the world in each place...' (p. 100). This part of the report, in fact, vibrates with positive energy; it transforms the technical term 'reception' into a Gospel word.

That creative tone to this section continues when the report enumerates four features of a 'renewed classical model of reception':

1. In reacting to texts churches begin a process of receiving one another.
2. All churches constantly need to question their own tradition and re-receive it, to discern if it still accords with the original apostolic community.
3. Final decisions are made by churches not by individuals, and 'churches' means 'communities structured for the sake of communion' (p. 104).
4. Scripture and tradition have to be received, and while in some instances that process has been completed, 'transmitting what has been handed on is a continuous process' (p. 104). The openness of the process simply honours the historical reality with which churches work.

At this point the earlier discussion of inculturation returns since, the writers insist, '...there never has been and never can be reception of the Christian faith without inculturation' (p. 105). That inevitably in-

volves 'some kind of change in the original expression of faith' so that we should expect 'considerable diversity of forms of new life and teaching in the Church' (p. 105). That is the living Tradition of the Church, the 'constant abiding' of the Spirit (p. 106).

The integrity of this process of living Tradition is marked by some key characteristics, which, the writers believe, are faithful to the patristic concept of reception:

1. Continuity with accepted dogmas is essential.
2. 'Revolutionary innovator' and 'conservative formalist' are both 'wrong and dangerous' in the way they handle the interaction between continuity and change, fidelity to what is received and inculturated.
3. Assessment of fidelity to the past (continuity) requires a distinction between 'formal' and 'essential'; essential continuity requires understanding the soteriological concerns that underlie received definitions or proposed inculturated forms.
4. The process in 3 requires a discerning prophetic ministry in and from the Church; the process requires not just an exercise of academic theology but discernment within the community of faith.
5. While reception/discernment goes on, the theological debate remains open.
6. The process is a Pneumatic one: no one can presume the Spirit's will in the matter, nor can the outcome of the process be prejudged. Throughout Christians must remember the 'dialogical' character of the process.

The report differentiates between reception of an idea—a doctrinal formulation, say—and the reception of an ecclesial practice, like the ordination of women or the consecration of a practicing homosexual. In both instances sheer facticity within a community's ecclesial life is seen to short-circuit the receptive process. Such actions not only affect the 'basic structure' of the Church; they inhibit the Church from honouring the dynamic of reception that is such a foundational aspect of its life.

Some General Comments

Each section ends with a 'conclusion'; the Statement itself ends with a very brief half-page 'Conclusion'. Here the writers make very clear that the chief obstacle between our churches is not in the sphere of faith but in that of 'structure and ministry'. What the report has done is re-

locate ministry and structural issues—like the ordination of women, conciliarity and reception—within an overt theological framework. For Anglicans, at least, this is a decisive step toward coherent discussion amongst ourselves since, in my view, we tend to see issues of structure and ministry in empirical, practical terms and seek a theological rationale after the fact. Aside from its specific insights, the Cyprus Statement challenges that approach.

Given the density of *The Triune God*, it is hard to see how it will make its way into the blood-stream of our respective churches' clergy and laity. How, for instance, might the Lambeth Conference bishops engage both its assumptions and its implications? This challenge applies to the Orthodox as well, as one Greek participant in the discussion freely admitted in conversation. So, that task of appropriate dissemination and fruitful reflection awaits both churches.

Criticisms and concerns aside, though, I think *The Triune God* represents a milestone in Orthodox-Anglican relations. It is encouraging indeed that the Statement's Conclusion includes the statement that 'the particular problems facing our dialogue are more concerned with structure and ministry *than with faith*' (p. 113, italics mine). For this we should be grateful and feel enormously encouraged. In 1846 William Palmer published his *Harmony of Anglican Doctrine* to show only the possibility of doctrinal consensus between the Orthodox Catechism and Anglican sources.²⁵ In the Cyprus Agreed Statement we see not only an extraordinary degree of consensus, but one that is the result of common study by Orthodox and Anglicans together in a spirit of joint exploration. How far things have come.

Future Trajectories

I have suggested in earlier parts of this review some lines of further exploration for this dialogue. Two major areas of discussion could help take the concerns of this Statement and the dialogue as a whole forward, and would offer a substantial contribution to both churches as they both 're-receive' the tradition of faith.

²⁵ See the chapter on the subject my *Toward a Fuller Vision. Orthodoxy and the Anglican Experience* (Wilton, USA, 1984), pp. 61-102.

First, we would benefit greatly from an in-depth exploration of theological anthropology. Enough has been said in this report in regard to Christology, culture and the ordination of women to reveal how central this matter is. Particular issues of 'human nature', gender and sexuality need to be earthed in a theological foundation that honours Christian revelation and tradition yet is accountable to contemporary psychological and scientific insights. Certainly the Anglican Church would benefit much from this in-put as it, with so much of 'the West', wrestles with the issues of human sexuality.

Second, I think the two churches should tackle head-on the issue of St Augustine and his inheritance. While at one level it is a more properly academic concern, both churches could grow in significant ways by a joint exploration and assessment of the Augustinian inheritance. It would also have an impact on Orthodox-Lutheran and Orthodox-Roman Catholic discussions in a useful way.

However that may be, we have enough in *The Triune God* to study, explore, critique and embrace for years to come. Let us see that our two churches make the most of this opportunity and gift.

Pilgrimage Secretary:

The Revd David Bond
6 Denton Close
Maidstone
Kent ME15 8ER
Tel. 01622 202239
email: dwbond@blueyonder.co.uk

Editor of Koinonia:

The Revd Dr Peter Doll
39 The Motte
Abingdon OX14 3NZ
Tel. 01235 520297
email: peter.doll@ntlworld.com

The views expressed in Koinonia do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editor or of the Committee of the Association.

www.aeca.org.uk