



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

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

**New Series No. 11  
Autumn 1980  
£1.00 to non-members.**

**ISSN No.  
0012-8732**

*Cover design by David Tuthill*

## The Anglican and Eastern Churches Association

founded in 1864

*Orthodox Patron:* The Oecumenical Patriarch

*Anglican Patron:* The Archbishop of Canterbury

*Anglican President:* The Bishop of Basingstoke

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

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

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

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

*Treasurer:* SIMON BREARLEY, ESQ.,  
9 Emperor's Gate, London SW7

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

## Contents

	Page
Editorial	1
The General Secretary's Notes	2
The Assistant Secretary's Notes	6
News Items	9
Reports and Communiqués	12
Book Reviews	29
Towards the Great and Holy Council: Part II	37
Suggestions for Solutions to the Problems of the Orthodox Diaspora	47
Notices	63
Announcement of Pilgrimage to Iona	loose

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

## Eastern Churches News Letter

### EDITORIAL

In a talk given to the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius shortly after the announcement of his appointment as Archbishop of Canterbury, the Association's Anglican Patron, Dr. Robert Runcie, reaffirmed his belief in the importance of continuing the dialogue between the Anglican and Orthodox Communion despite the recent difficulties arising from the ordination of women. He expressed his confidence that each Communion could continue to benefit from sharing the experiences of the other and that no setback or temporary disagreement, however serious it might appear at the time, ought to prevent friends from meeting and talking together both at the official and the unofficial level. Such thoughts, coming as they do from the Head of the world-wide Anglican Communion, should be welcomed by all the Orthodox jurisdictions, and it is to be hoped that by a sharing in dialogue of the various problems which they face both separately and together the two Communion will continue to move forward to that closer unity to which the Association is especially dedicated.

One of the problems which the Archbishop singled out in his talk as a special area of Anglican experience and expertise is the question of the setting up of local independent indigenous Churches. The Anglican Church has been singularly successful in this, as indeed has been the Orthodox Church in times past. Today, however, Orthodoxy is faced with the peculiar complication of its diaspora, and the seriousness of this complication is evidenced by the importance accorded to it in the plans for the forthcoming Great and Holy Council. Clearly, it is a matter of great importance for the witness of Orthodoxy that it should speak with one voice wherever that witness is being presented to the world. A plurality of jurisdictions in one and the same area inevitably tends to blur Orthodox witness, is extremely confusing for those of other Communion who are seeking closer relations with the Orthodox, and ultimately lays the Orthodox Church open to the charge of philetism. However, the problem is clearly not one that is open to simple solutions; the histories of different nations are involved along with the traditions of different cultures, and these give rise to understandably deeply felt emotions as the various jurisdictions claim, often with some real justification, that their peoples have particular pastoral needs which can be met only within their own cultural environment.

It may be felt by some that the problem of the Orthodox diaspora is entirely an internal affair for the Orthodox Communion. This would be true, however, only if Orthodoxy stood aloof from the ecumenical movement. At the local level in particular, participation in ecumenical



menical activity creates an ever increasing pressure for close collaboration between the various Orthodox jurisdictions despite possible difficulties associated with differences of language and culture. Difficult as the problem may seem, the sharing of a common Faith ought to transcend all else. If it does not do so, there must be some doubt on the part of others as to what are the real priorities of the Orthodox themselves. It was presumably this very problem which the Archbishop of Canterbury had in mind when referring to the expertise of the Anglican Church in the matter of setting up local indigenous Churches, for it is the reluctance of parent Orthodox Churches to allow their children the independence necessary for the formation of such local Churches that lies at the heart of the matter. This point is particularly well made in the article on the Orthodox diaspora by Archbishop Paul of Finland which appears elsewhere in this issue of *ECNL*.

It is not immediately apparent, however, in what way Anglican experience and expertise can help to resolve this Orthodox problem since certain facets of it are peculiar to Orthodoxy. A local Anglican Church formed from an amalgam of geographically adjacent missionary dioceses has not had to face the problem of ethnically distinct parallel jurisdictions, nor has Anglicanism anything which is the equivalent of the canons which give the Ecumenical Patriarch rights of ecclesiastical government over the 'barbarian' tribes. Nevertheless, the suggestion that Anglican experience might be able to help Orthodoxy with what is one of its most pressing problems should not be dismissed lightly; only the foolish reject offers of friendly advice made with the best of Christian intentions. Perhaps the inclusion of Archbishop Paul's paper in this issue of *ECNL* will stimulate an Anglican response in the next issue as well as that promised by the Association's Orthodox President.

H.G.F.

#### THE GENERAL SECRETARY'S NOTES

On the 27th March I addressed the members of the Christian Institute in Brighton on the subject: "The Mother of God in the Eastern Tradition". The meeting was held in the lovely Fisherman's Vestry of St. Paul's in West Street, a Church which has, during Fr. Milburn's incumbency, worked and prayed for the realization of the aims of the Catholic League, i.e., the corporate reunion of the Provinces of Canterbury and York with the Holy See. St. Paul's stands today as St. Magnus-the-Martyr, by London Bridge, stood in the days of our former General Secretary, Fr. Fynes-Clinton, for the Anglican Papalist tradition. St. Paul's has kept its doors open to all sorts and conditions of men and women and to all those who pass through London-by-the-Sea. In the porch there is a plaque recording the fact that during the period when the Ethiopian Imperial Family were in exile during the last war, Princess Aida Desta, who was nursing in Brighton, found a spiritual home at St. Paul's.

I managed to sell a number of copies of our Eastern Churches News Letter to the members of the Institute, one or two of whom have now joined the Association.

Several of our members attended the most interesting lecture given by Archimandrite Kallistos to the Nikaeon Club and its guests at Lambeth Palace in the spring. In his paper Fr. Kallistos pointed out that in the search for Anglican-Orthodox unity we had still a long way to go before we actually arrived at what were the *fundamentals* of the Catholic Faith and what were the points on which we were agreed—which were not at all clear at the moment. He cited as an example of this how the opening chapter of St. Luke's Gospel might be received amongst the Regius Professors of two of our older provincial universities and how that same work might be received amongst the monks of a Romanian monastery!

The Chairman, together with other committee members and myself, attended the splendid Nikaeon Club dinner at the University of Kent following the enthronement of the Archbishop of Canterbury. We had ample opportunity to meet the delegates from the Eastern Churches. Fr. Embleton had travelled to Canterbury earlier and had made contact with the delegates before the enthronement.

On the following evening, Wednesday, 26th March, Fr. Embleton sang Solemn Evensong at St. Dunstan's-in-the-West, Fleet Street, in the presence of our Anglican President, the Bishop of Basingstoke, and the Archimandrite-Secretary to our Orthodox President, Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain. Bishop Antonie of Buzau of the Romanian delegation led the singing of the *Doxologia* assisted by Fr. Moraru of the Romanian Church (studying at St. Stephen's House) and Archimandrite Kallistos. Also present were Bishop Gregory of the Greek jurisdiction, Metropolitan John (Rinne) of Helsinki, Bishop Vassily of Washington of the Greek Catholic Church of North America (formerly Father Vladimir Rodzianko), and Fr. John Pierkarski of the Byelorussian Autocephalic Church in Exile. His Royal Highness Prince Tomislav of Yugoslavia was also present in the congregation together with Mrs. Jane Jenkins and Miss Sylvia Freck of the Counsellors for Foreign Relations. After the services members and their guests adjourned to Dr. Hugh Richard's flat for supper.

Western Easter coinciding with Eastern Easter made it very difficult for Anglicans to join in the worship of the Orthodox Churches this year, but two members of our Committee, Dom Cuthbert Fearon, O.S.B., and Fr. Royston Beal, managed to attend the Vigil in the Greek and Russian Patriarchal Cathedrals as representatives of the Association.

Immediately after Easter Fr. Beal and I flew out to Bucharest, meeting on the way at Heathrow the Bishop of Sherborne and Fr.



Hugh Wybrew. We were received in audience by His Holiness Patriarch Justin at the lovely and homely Patriarchate. His Holiness asked many questions about the work of the Association and said that he hoped St. Dunstan's would grow as a spiritual centre for both Eastern and Western Christians. Whilst at the Patriarchate we were shown over the very impressive printing press where all the liturgical books and journals are printed. One could not help reflecting that under an atheistic government the Church could print its own liturgy whereas in England, where the Church has no printing press of its own, we are bedevilled by copyright if we wish to reproduce our own liturgy!

After the very thorough tour of the printing press we were then shown over the Romanian equivalent of Mowbray's, which seemed to have sold out all its goods as Easter presents. After a great many photographs had been taken we bade farewell to the Patriarch and received his blessing, but not before we had met Fr. Sylviu-Petre Pufelele who was named as the successor of Fr. Constantin Alecse as Priest-in-charge of the Romanian congregation at St. Dunstan's-in-the-West, Fr. Constantin having been appointed to look after a Romanian Church in Detroit, U.S.A..

Whilst in Bucharest we were taken to see the monastic church from which the ikonostasis now in St. Dunstan's was taken. The eighteenth-century Gothic screen has been replaced by a much older one. At the monastery we had an audience with Bishop Vassily, the Patriarch's Assistant Bishop, whom I had last met at the Romanian Exarchate in Jerusalem some two years ago when he was the Archimandrite in charge of the church. The same afternoon we were taken on a very long car journey to have lunch with Bishop Antonie of Buzau, who had not long returned to his diocese after representing the Patriarch at the Enthronement of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Bishop Antonie has built up (and is still building up) an excellent library for the use of the seminarians. He is anxious to obtain works of modern British theologians. After lunch he took us over the Seminary, where there were three dormitories with, I believe, about forty seminarians to a room. The beds were so closely packed that it was difficult to see how any student could possibly reach his bed without trampling on at least half the other members of the dormitory. As in most countries under Communist rule there seem to be more candidates than places in the Seminary. The Position at Buzau was aggravated by the commandeering of the larger seminary by the Government.

After Bucharest and Buzau we made our way north-eastwards, stopping a night at Pietra Neamt and two nights at Brasov. The cultural high-light was the visit made to the lovely painted churches of Bukovina, but even this delight paled before our visit to the convent of Varatec where the Abbess, Mother Nazaria, and her nuns had laid on what was euphemistically described as "some refresh-

ments". In fact the meal was a banquet and ran into several courses so that we had to cancel lunch at the local hotel. The Abbess and the community have very close ties with the Convent of the Incarnation, Fairacres, and the Sisters of the Love of God. The Abbess was very much looking forward to attending the Conference of European Churches in Edinburgh in September this year.

The week passed all too quickly ranging as it did from visits to the remote convents of Suceavita and Moldavita on the Russian border to the Castle of Vlad the Impaler, alias Dracula, in Transylvania where we saw the tiny chapel containing the heart of Queen Marie, and to the winter sports in the Carpathian Mountains. During that time, however, and under the patient leadership of our guide, Mr. Harry McCormick, we managed to build on the special relationship of our oldest ally in Orthodoxy with the Church of England—or, rather, with the Anglican Communion, for the party contained representatives of the Church in Wales (Fr. David Williams), the Church of Ireland (Mr. Jonathan Bolton-Dignam) and the Province of the West Indies (Mr. Leo MacDonald-Hughes, Mrs. Elizabeth Chambers and Mrs. Oliver Henry).

St. Dunstan's is a Church with special responsibility for the Romanians and their relations with the Church of England. Many Orthodox of other jurisdictions visit St. Dunstan's but not all Easterners who visit it are necessarily Christian. Two charming Buddhist nuns from Japan, who are in the United Kingdom to build a Peace Pagoda at Milton Keynes, called to see us recently. They were seeking accommodation and the Sisters of St. Margaret at St. Saviour's Priory, Haggerston, have kindly given them shelter. This community was founded by Dr. John Mason Neale, a great pioneer of Anglican-Orthodox relations.

Chloe Obolensky has now published her photographic history of Holy Russia and has used two of the slides from the archives of the Association. It is now on sale at £9.95.

A rather sharp attack appeared in *The Old Calendarist* on the fact that at the Association's Annual Festival Liturgy a "Non-Chalcedonian" Metropolitan occupied a seat of honour next to the Bishop of St. Alban's in the Serbian Church of St. Sava. To set the record straight, the Metropolitan is the Primate of the Mar Thoma Church which fully subscribes to the Council of Chalcedon.

I hope that all subscriptions for 1980 have now been sent in. Even at £2 per annum we still have to underwrite a loss on the News Letter; hence gifts of money over and above the basic annual subscription are always most welcome.

We have sponsored several students travelling to Orthodox centres over the last few years and I have received many letters of gratitude from them for the help which the Association has given.



Please note the time, place and date of the 1980 Annual Festival which appear on the back cover, and do your best to support us.

John Salter

#### THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY'S NOTES

"Your Kingdom Come" is to be the theme of the World Missionary Conference to be held in Melbourne from 12th to 25th May, 1980, a conference organized by the Commission on World Mission and Evangelism of the World Council of Churches. It will follow a long tradition of ecumenical meetings on the subject of "Mission and Unity" which began in Edinburgh in 1910, the effective date of the founding of the modern ecumenical movement. This conference can be termed "ecumenical" because there will be delegations from all the Orthodox Churches, the Eastern Orthodox Churches, the Anglican Communion and the Reformed Churches which are members of the WCC. The Roman Catholic Church is sending observers. Delegates from the Church of England are to be led by the Bishops of Winchester and Ripon and will include one representative from USPG and one from CMS. In all there will be 500 participants. The issues confronting this 1980 conference are very different from those which confronted the first conference in 1910.

The theme of "Your Kingdom Come" has a particular significance today for the witness of all Christians. Only the proclamation and invocation of the Kingdom as a new reality of the Gospel can engage the Churches in a truly apostolic struggle for the truth. It was for this reason that the CWME invited a group of Orthodox theologians to reflect on the link which exists between the mission of the Church and the biblical message of the Kingdom from within the missionary context. The Orthodox group gathered at the St. Serge Institute of Orthodox Theology in Paris from 25th to 28th September, 1978, discussing just two main aspects of their theme: "proclaiming and manifesting in the power of the Holy Spirit" and "bearing witness to the Kingdom of God in the struggle for God's truth and justice on earth". One principal intention is that a debate should be opened at diocesan and parish level on the apostolic vocation of the Church within the perspective of the Kingdom of God. The Bishop of Ripon will be giving a report on the conference to the General Synod of the Church of England and it is hoped that the Synod will then refer the report to all Diocesan and Deanery Synods so that parishes and PCCs can discuss it and the whole Church of England then take a common action. Conferences and commissions can do little if the people of God do not respond and take action. We need to remind ourselves here that mission is rooted in the fact that God has sent forth His Son into the world and that the Son has commissioned the Church to proclaim the Gospel so that all creation may be renewed by the power of the Holy Spirit. If there is no mission in

which the Church goes forward to meet the people with the good news that Christ has come and that in Him we have life, then men and women cannot be set free to become by grace the children of God in the life of the Risen Lord. The Church must look outwards and not inwards, otherwise it will die.

There will be a four-part division of the conference theme "Your Kingdom Come". Participants will spend much of the time exploring these four sections: (1) "Good News to the Poor", (2) "The Kingdom of God and the Struggles of the World", (3) "The Church's Witness to the Kingdom", and (4) "The Crucified Christ Challenges Human Power". A new door in the ecumenical movement has been opened in that the Orthodox Churches have been able to put forward recommendations on the monastic life and its witness within the life of the Church today:

Our Churches are certainly aware of the importance of the monastic life and its witness within the life of the Church. We can only recommend that they take to heart this theme of monasticism and its role, and that they plan research on this subject, giving special importance to the writings of the Fathers and the monastic texts of the Church and to their translation into modern languages and also to their publication.

It is desirable that CWME in collaboration with other sub-units in the WCC plan the formation of a pan-Orthodox group for study and reflection on the relations between the monastic community and the parish community, inviting their delegates to the working group.

The consultation recommends that CWME take the necessary steps to produce a preparatory study on "The Monk as Witness to the Kingdom" in view of the World Missionary Conference in Melbourne in May of this year.

Summary leaflets on the four sections of the conference are available from Revd. James Wikie, 2 Eaton Gate, LONDON SW1W 9BL. These would be useful for group study in parishes. A book has been published by the WCC Commission on World Mission and Development dealing with the Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox Churches. This is concerned with the missionary dimension of monasticism in these Churches. Today there is a growing interest in the monastic life of Orthodoxy on the part of young people. We hope that it will be possible to publish a review of this important book at a later date.

There is in the modern world a terrible rejection of divine truth as well as a great indifference to it. The task of unity amongst Christians is inseparable from that of bringing the everlasting Gospel to the nations. The Church must face the needs of man at this present



time, and there are non-Christian religions with which it is essential that Christians have contact today. The Church must reach out to the suffering men and women of this world because they are the children of God; Christians have to show love to those who seem unwanted because in so doing they are showing love to Christ our Lord. At the end of the Liturgy the priest says "Go forth in peace to love and serve the Lord". The Liturgy is thus the beginning; the Christian must take Christ in his heart out from the Liturgy and by his actions show Christ to all whom he meets.

At this important moment in the history of the Church we welcome our new Archbishop of Canterbury into this great movement of mission and unity—this movement of the Holy Spirit. His Grace said that he wished to speak to those who do not come to church so that the whole people of God might be led to follow Him—we pray "Your Kingdom come" and this involves all men. No Archbishop of Canterbury has come to his office with such an understanding of Orthodoxy as our present Archbishop has, having visited all the Orthodox Churches last year. We pray that God will bless him in his ministry to the Church. May he have many years of health to lead the Church into unity, peace and love.

We pray at this time for the forthcoming theological discussions which will take place at the Monastery of St. John the Theologian on Patmos between the two largest Churches of Christendom, the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church. Let us also remember our own theological discussions with the Orthodox Church this summer. Let prayer be offered by the whole Church unto Christ our High Priest for peace and brotherhood among all peoples and for the leading of all Christians into the unity of love and truth in Christ.

We invite all our friends to the Annual Festival on Saturday, 25th October, at St. Dunstan's-in-the-West. We shall be welcoming our new Orthodox President, Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain, who will be preacher at the Anglican Liturgy. We shall also be welcoming our new Anglican President, the Bishop of Basingstoke, so we look forward to having good numbers again as we had last year. St. Dunstan's has three altars within its walls, an Orthodox altar, an altar for the Oriental Orthodox and our own Anglican altar. This reminds us that the Orthodox Church is now living with us, so we should make ourselves known to Orthodox whenever we can. Surely, this leads us back to our search for the sources of our theological, liturgical and spiritual Tradition. This great Tradition came from the East, and so in this church of St. Dunstan we join with our Eastern Christian brethren in prayer for the unity of the Holy Churches of Christ.

We express our deepest sympathy to Bishop Christopher and his people at the Greek Orthodox Cathedral of the Nativity of the

Mother of God in the great sorrow through which they have passed through the death of Fr. Lazarus, killed whilst guarding the church building to which he was so devoted, being a monk. Never has such an evil action happened within our Country before within living memory. May God grant to him peace and joy in His Kingdom. We pray for the mother of Fr. Lazarus in her sorrow at the death of her only son; may Mary, the Mother of God, and all the Saints pray for her. May the one who killed our beloved brother-in-Christ be pardoned for his sin and find a place in the Kingdom of Love.

Over the last few months I have spoken in parishes and in religious communities on the monastic consultation. I attended the Divine Liturgy with the Blessing of the Waters on 6th January, the festival of the Epiphany, which the Orthodox keep as the celebration of the Baptism of Christ. In the evening I attended the Christmas Liturgy in the Coptic Church. The Copts observe Christmas on 6th January and the Epiphany on 7th January, and, like the Orthodox, they celebrate the Baptism of the Lord at Epiphany as do all the Oriental Orthodox Churches. I attended Easter Vespers at the Cathedral in Camberwell, and it was a great honour to be invited to read the Holy Gospel in English. I also attended the Easter Vespers at All Saints, Camden Town, when His Eminence the Archbishop of Thyateira and Great Britain concelebrated with his four bishops and a good number of his priests. It was said that there were about 5,000 people present; they had to stand right on to the road. This reminded me of the Bible Service in the Coptic Cathedral in Cairo, held every Friday evening, at which the Patriarch speaks on the theme of "the Gospel" and which is attended by some 8,000 people. Let us all pray for the coming of the Kingdom.

May 1980

Dom Cuthbert Fearon

#### NEWS ITEMS

##### News from Finland

In an extraordinary assembly of the Finnish Orthodox Church on 27th January, Mr. Pertti Rantala was elected to succeed Bishop Leo (appointed as Metropolitan of Oulu at the end of 1979) as the new Assistant Bishop to Archbishop Paul. Mr. Rantala, at the time of the election, was still a layman. His appointment was confirmed by the President of Finland on 22nd February. The new Bishop, under the name of Aleksis, was tonsured a monk in Valamo, and was ordained deacon and priest and then finally bishop on 2nd March. Such an election of a layman as bishop is a rare event in the Orthodox Church; it was the first event of its kind in Finland. It is now expected that the Finnish Orthodox Church will seek autocephalous status.



#### News from Romania

An Exarchate for Western Europe has been established by the Romanian Orthodox Church, headed by Metropolitan Nicholas Corneanu of Banat. The new Exarch visited Paris towards the end of last year. Jurisdiction is exercised over a small Western-Rite community (formerly under the Russian Church) known as "The Orthodox Catholic Church of France", and there are several Romanian parishes under the Romanian Patriarch in Paris.

#### News from Yugoslavia

The WCC Commission on World Mission and Evangelism is sponsoring a consultation on "Preaching and Teaching the Christian Faith Today" to be held at the Monastery of Zica, Kraljevo from 20th to 25th September, 1980. The purpose of the meeting is to think afresh about the ministry of the parish priest as teacher and preacher of the Christian Faith within the worshipping community in the cultural context of society today. The consultation is taking place at the invitation of Patriarch German and will receive the hospitality and the support of the Serbian Orthodox Church. This is the last of the series of such Orthodox consultations, reports of previous meetings having been partially published in the book *Martyria—Mission* (edited by Professor Ion Bria), WCC Geneva 1980.

#### News from America

Fr. Basil (formerly Vladimir) Rodzianko was ordained Bishop of Washington DC on 12th January, 1980, in St. Nicholas Cathedral. The new Bishop is well-known to the Orthodox in Britain for his work in both the Russian and Serbian jurisdictions. He preached on "the Transfiguration" during the inaugural meeting of the Orthodox Fellowship of St. John the Baptist (reported in *ECNL*, Spring 1980) and this address will be long remembered. He has the prayers and best wishes of the Association in his new sphere of ministry.

#### News from Greece

The problem of the Uniate Churches is proving a difficulty in the talks between the Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches. It has been reported that this matter was raised initially during the visit of the Pope to the Phanar (reported elsewhere in this issue of *ECNL*). Some Orthodox theologians see a settlement of the Uniate question as a pre-requisite to serious theological discussion between the two Churches. Orthodox reaction has not been helped by such matters as the Pope's letter in 1979 to the Ukrainian Cardinal Joseph Slipij,

attempts by the Vatican to change the status of shrines in the Holy Land and an alleged secret agreement to establish a joint centre of worship with Jews and Muslims in Egypt. It would seem that some gesture by Rome over the matter of the Uniates is essential if the hope, expressed by both the Pope and the Oecumenical Patriarch for closer relations between the Churches, is to be realised.

Orthodox Church leaders in Greece have taken a firm stand over the matter of nudity on holiday beaches. Whilst this battle seems to have been largely lost elsewhere, it would seem that in Greece it is only just beginning.

#### News from Great Britain

The omission of the *Filioque* at the enthronement of the present Archbishop of Canterbury has been welcomed by Orthodox Church leaders but has received some adverse criticism from within the Church of England as has also his leading of the annual Walsingham Pilgrimage. The Archbishop's outspoken criticism of the Moscow Olympics has been generally supported though it would seem that it led to some reduction of the delegation from the Moscow Patriarchate at his Enthronement. Considerable concern has been expressed over the apparent increase of arrests and other harassments of Christians in Moscow prior to the Olympics. A petition to the Soviet Ambassador has had the support of a number of Anglican bishops, including the Archbishop of York. The receiving by Keston College of official Soviet documents on the restriction of Orthodox Church life has lent support to those who claim that difficulties being experienced by Christians in the Soviet Union are increasing rather than diminishing in the run-up to the Olympics. However, Archbishop Pitirim, head of the Moscow Patriarchate's publications department, and Metropolitan Alexey of Tallinn and Estonia have denied that Soviet citizens are being arrested purely for religious or ideological convictions.

The second conference of the Orthodox Fellowship of St. John the Baptist, to be held from 31st July to 4th August, 1980, has had to be transferred from Durham University to Oxford. It will now be based at the Oxford House of St. Gregory and St. Macrina. It seems likely that some change in the constitution of the Fellowship will be necessary because of inter-jurisdictional problems affecting the priest-members. It is hoped to include a fuller report in the Spring 1981 edition of *ECNL*. The 1980 conference will have the theme "The Practice of Prayer".

The Commission on Anglican/Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Discussions met in July 1980 at St. Michael's College, Landaff. Delegates were discussing "The Church and the Churches", "The Saints



and the Departed" and "The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity" as well as ways in which the special contributions of the two Churches to the ecumenical debate can better be communicated. The Commission now has two new Chairmen, Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain (Orthodox) and the Canadian Bishop Henry Hill (Anglican). It is hoped to present a report on the progress of the discussions in the Spring 1981 edition of *ECNL*.

Fr. Lev Gillet, for many years Orthodox Chaplain of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, passed to his rest at St. Basil's House, London, on 30th March, 1980, in his 88th year. The Funeral took place at the Greek Cathedral, Moscow Road, the address being given by Metropolitan Anthony (Bloom) of Sourozh. The Fellowship are establishing the "Father Lev Gillet Archive" and a possible scholarship fund in his memory. The Secretary would be very pleased to receive personal letters about Fr. Lev together with any written material either by or to him. Special letters of tribute to his far-reaching influence and life will be gratefully received. Donations and written contributions to the Archive should be sent to St. Basil's House, 52 Ladbroke Grove, London W11 2PB. The Association offers its sincere sympathy to the Fellowship at this loss of a dearly-beloved friend and pastor.

A new Orthodox publication, entitled *The Shepherd* has made its appearance. Essentially it is a pastoral letter of the London Russian (Church in Exile) Parish, Baron's Court, which is intended to include quotations from the Fathers, teachings on the feasts and fasts of the Orthodox Church, and some background to Orthodox worship. Further details can be obtained from 14 St. Dunstan's Road, London W6.

#### REPORTS AND COMMUNIQUE

##### The WCC Conference on Mission and Evangelism

Five hundred Christians from a variety of Churches all over the world converge on Melbourne in May 1980 for the Conference on Mission and Evangelism organised by the World Council of Churches. This is the latest in a series of world conferences stretching back to 1910, when a great gathering of missionary leaders met and accepted the challenge of "the evangelisation of the world in this generation". 1910 marks the beginning of the institutional expression of the ecumenical movement. Since then there have been many changes both ecclesiastical and theological, not to mention the tremendous political, technological and social changes that have occurred since then.

Ecclesiastically two factors are noteworthy. The first is the way in which the Orthodox Churches have come into the ecumenical

movement and the increasing participation of the Roman Catholic Church. Orthodox representatives will be present as full members at the Melbourne meeting, and there will be a number of distinguished Roman Catholics present as observers. The other noteworthy factor is that the balance of membership has changed from being mainly white European to a majority of Asian, African and American representatives.

Theologically the changes are just as vast. Edinburgh could use the word "evangelization" and there would be a clear idea of what was meant by it. Now there is theological diversity and a variety of understandings of mission in our time. The last world conference on Mission and Evangelism at Bangkok showed this diversity, and indeed, a hostility at times between those of different viewpoints. In particular, the meaning of salvation was understood in widely different ways—some understanding it as the experience of salvation in Christ by the proclamation of the Gospel, some understanding it in much wider terms as including every experience by which human life is enriched whether Christ is named or whether he remains anonymous in that enrichment. It is likely that this diversity will be expressed equally strongly at Melbourne. The participants will each bring with them their own understanding of the way in which Christ has been at work among them. In particular, the Conference is likely to be dominated by the theme of "the poor" whether this is understood in economic or political terms or whether it is understood as referring to those who know their need of God.

There will be many other themes also at Melbourne. The theme of relations with those of other faiths has run through these conferences ever since 1910, and although the preparatory material has not revealed this as a major theme at this moment, there are many participants who will be wanting to raise it again at Melbourne. For others, their main concern will be spirituality, and the presence of Orthodox representatives will ensure that the place of the monastic community as a centre of spirituality is to the fore in discussion. There will be yet others who will be asking how spirituality is to be expressed in the modern urban community, so often a wilderness in which community is lacking, interior understanding is shallow, and theological understandings seem of no account in the immediate problems which beset so many people.

Participants from elsewhere in the world will each bring their own particular concerns. What is important is that there should be a genuine sharing and a genuine learning and understanding within which our diversity of situation and of response can be held in the framework of a common commitment to Christ.

(Communicated by the Bishop of Ripon)



#### The Visit of Pope John Paul II to the Oecumenical Patriarch

Pope John Paul arrived by special plane at Ankara Airport from Rome on Wednesday 28th November, 1979 for an official three-day visit to Turkey. As Head of the Vatican State, the Pope was welcomed at the airport by Mr. Fahri Koroturk, the President of the Turkish Republic. The Pope was entertained at the Presidential Palace of Cankaya, where he was entertained by the President, by the Prime Minister, Mr. Demirel, and by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Erkman. During this meeting of heads of state, views were exchanged on the international situation in general and on the establishment of fraternal links between men. In the afternoon, the Pope visited the Mausoleum and paid homage to Atatürk founder of modern Turkey.

The next day, before leaving for Istanbul, the Pope attended a celebration in the Roman Catholic Church of the Italian Embassy. Addressing the numerous Christians assembled for the occasion the Pope declared that the time has come to reinforce the links between Christians and Muslims, both of whom are monotheists. After this celebration the Pope returned to the Presidential Palace and subsequently flew to Istanbul, accompanied by the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Vatican delegation.

On arrival at Istanbul Airport, the Pope was greeted by the Ecumenical Patriarch, His Holiness Dimitrios I, accompanied by Metropolitan Meliton of Chalcedon and Metropolitan Chrysostom of Myra. In the afternoon, the Pope went to the Patriarchate with his suite where he was solemnly received according to protocol and attended the Doxology celebrated in his honour in the Patriarchal Church at which there were also many Orthodox churchmen from abroad who had come specially for the occasion in addition to the Hierarchs of the Oecumenic Throne and members of the Holy Synod. Amongst those present were Bishop Philotheos of Meloa representing the Archbishop of America, Metropolitan Spyridon of Rhodes, Metropolitan Meletios of France, Metropolitan Chrysostom of Austria, Archbishop Timothy of Crete, Metropolitan Irinaios of Germany, Metropolitan Emilianos of Silivri, Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain, Archbishop Stylianos of Australia, Metropolitan Damaskinos of Tranoupolis, and Metropolitan Panteleimon of Tyroloi and Serention. Also present were representatives of the Diplomatic Corps, prominent Greeks of the city, pilgrims, representatives of the press and other media, and numerous Orthodox and Roman Catholic faithful.

During the celebration the Pope and the Patriarch gave thanks to God, recited the "Our Father" together, and exchanged words of formal greeting. The Patriarch addressed the Pope in the following words:

Very dear Brother,

In thanking God we receive you today in this town of the Mother of God where stands this Church of her Son, our common Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—this Church which for many centuries has been a sacred centre of the formulation, preservation, confession and evangelization of the Christian Faith. Your coming to us, full of charity and Christian simplicity, has much significance beyond a simple meeting between two local Bishops. We consider it as a meeting of the Churches of the West and of the East. It is for that reason that the joy which we experience from this exceptional and historic visit of Your Holiness, the Pope of Rome, is limited neither to this Church nor this day. Our meeting stands in the universality and in the eternity of the divine redemption of mankind. The meeting is realised here but is bound geographically—according to ecclesiastical formulation, to all the East and the West—according to the contemporary formulation of the Oecumen, and also to the North and South.

The meeting realised today is linked to past days, to the days of the common Apostles, common Fathers, Martyrs and Confessors of the Oecumenic Councils, of concelebration on the same altar and Communion in the same Chalice. It is also linked to the recent past of our great predecessors, Pope Paul VI and the Patriarch Athenagoras I. In addition, today's meeting is destined for the future in God; a future which will maintain anew the unity, the common Confession and the full communion in the divine Eucharist. Considering this historic visit in this perspective, local and temporal, we recognise the greatness of this step and we thank you for it.

We believe that at this moment the Lord is present amongst us here, and that the Paraclete is upon us, that the brothers Peter and Andrew rejoice with us, that the spirit of our common Fathers and Martyrs look down on us and inspire us, that before us and our responsibilities are the anxious expectations of divided Christians, the anguish of man without God and without Christ, the misery of all men without recognised human rights, liberty, justice, food, medicines, education or peace.

It is for that that we consider the blessed presence of your Holiness here and our meeting as an expression of the Will of God, a provocation and an invitation by the world to which we must respond. It is for that that this doxological Church welcomes you in this Doxology. This meeting is a rare divine light; it aspires to the Glory of God, the Peace of God with man and that of man with man, and the reign of goodwill amongst all men of this world.



"Glory to God on high and on earth peace to all men of goodwill" (Luke 2, 14). Welcome Holy Brother.

The Pope then addressed the following salutation to the Oecumenic Patriarch:

Holiness,

May the Lord be blessed, Who has accorded us the grace and joy of this visit here to your Patriarchal See! It is with deep affection and fraternal esteem that I salute you, Holiness, and the Holy Synod around you, and through you I salute all the churches which you represent. I cannot hide my joy at finding myself on this land of very ancient Christian traditions and in this city rich in history, civilisation and art, which causes it to figure amongst the most beautiful in the world today as yesterday. For Christians of the whole world used to reading and meditating on the writings of the New Testament, these places are familiar as are the names of the first Christian communities of numerous cities which are found today in the territory of modern Turkey.

"Christ is our peace", wrote St. Paul to the first Christians of Ephesus (Eph. 2, 14) and added "God who is rich in mercy, out of the great love with which He loved us, even when we were dead through our trespasses, made us alive together with Christ (by grace you have been saved) and raised us up with Him . . ." (Eph. 2, 4-6). This proclamation of the Faith in the divine economy for the salvation of men resounds on this earth, re-echoes and is renewed from generation to generation. It is destined to extend to the extremities of the earth.

The fundamental dogmas of the Christian Faith, of the Trinity and of the Word of God Incarnate, born of the Virgin Mary, have been defined by the Oecumenic Councils held in this city or in neighbouring cities (cf. Decree Unitatis redintegratio, n. 14). The formulation of our profession of Faith, the Creed, took place in these celebrated Councils at the same time for the East and for the West. Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon are names known to all Christians. They are particularly familiar to those who pray, study and work under different forms for the full unity between our sister churches. Not only have we had in common these decisive Councils which are points of pride in the life of the Church, but during a millennium these two sister churches have grown together and articulated their great vital traditions.

The visit which I make today also has the meaning of a meeting in the common Apostolic Faith, to go forward together towards this full unity broken by sad historic circumstances during the second millennium. Why not express our firm hope in God that there will soon be a new era?

For all of these reasons I am happy, Holiness, to be here to express the deep consideration and the fraternal solidarity for the Orthodox Churches of the East. I thank you for the warmth of your welcome.

The ceremony ended with wishes of long life for the two Primates, their embracing each other and their blessing of the faithful. To the applause of the crowd the Pope and the Patriarch left the church and the Pope, after saluting the Patriarch, left the Patriarchate with his suite.

On the afternoon of the same day, the Oecumenical Patriarch, accompanied by Metropolitans Meliton of Chalcedon and Chrysostom of Myra, were present at the Mass celebrated by the Pope in the Roman Catholic Cathedral of the Holy Spirit. During this Liturgy, the Pope, having come to the centre of the nave, exchanged with the Patriarch the accolade of charity to the applause of the faithful. Then the Pope gave the following address:

Very dear Brothers in the Lord,

Peace and love with faith from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ (Eph. 6, 23). May this greeting of the Apostle Paul to the Christians at Ephesus also be mine to you.

I address myself first to the Oecumenic Patriarch, His Holiness Dimitrios I, and towards the Armenian Patriarch, His Beatitude Shnorhik Kalustian, venerated brothers who have united in this celebration and so honour us and all our local community. I express my profound gratitude.

I salute you cordially, brothers and sons of the Catholic Church, Bishops, Priests, religious, laymen belonging to the different Catholic communities of this city and different rites, and I salute also through you all the Catholics of this great country. I thank you for your warm and filial welcome and the joy you give me. I also wish to give my warm thanks to all who have made this journey possible, particularly to the authorities of this land who have welcomed me with so much courtesy. My meeting with you, brothers and sisters in the Lord, fills me with immense joy. I appreciate your active presence in this splendid historic city, rich in so many admirable Christian witnesses. And how can one forget that the essential points of our faith have found their dogmatic formulation in the Oecumenic Councils held in this city or in neighbouring cities which henceforth have borne their name: Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon? How can one not mention with emotion the Fathers of the Church of the East, Pastors and Doctors, who were born in this region where they have exercised an Apostolate without compare, leaving us illuminated writings which are today nourishment and reference for all the Church in the West



as in the East? I think particularly of St. John Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople, whose courage, clarity, depth and eloquence have been the model for the pastor and the preacher. I think of all the contemplative life which flourished here throughout the centuries in the school of spiritual masters; I think of the fidelity of the faith across many trials. Dear Brothers and Sisters, today you inherit in some way from this treasure and these examples which must bear fruit in your souls. I am happy to see you profess this faith with conviction and perseverance in the spirit of sacrifice. In different fields and different ways you render an appreciated service to the Church and to this land. As you act directly in the ecclesial field in giving yourself to more general cultural activities, the education of youth and charitable works, you express your faith as a servant always of man, created in the image and likeness of God (cf. Gen. 1, 26-27) and in contributing to construct the Church of God built on the foundation of the Apostles and the cornerstone which is Christ (cf. Eph. 2, 20).

Brothers and Sisters, I wish to celebrate with you this Holy Liturgy, particularly on this happy circumstance of the Feast of the Apostle St. Andrew, the first called to follow Jesus. "Come and see" said the Lord (John 1, 39), and John followed Him and stayed beside Him that day. And not only that day, he followed Him during His whole life; he saw Him perform miracles, cure the sick, forgive sinners, make the blind see, resurrect the dead; he experienced His sorrowful passion and His death and he saw Him resurrected. And he continued to believe in him until the final testimony of martyrdom.

The celebration of a Saint's Day recalls us to our proper location and holiness. St. Peter, the brother of Andrew, recalls us in a stimulating way, in his letter written to the Christians of Asia Minor: "But as He who called you is holy, be holy yourselves in all your conduct" (1 Peter 1, 15).

The Christian vocation is sublime and exacting and would be unattainable for us if the spirit of God did not give us the light to understand and the necessary power to act. But Christ has also assured us of his assistance: "Here am I with you always, until the end of the world" (Matt. 28, 20).

Yes, the Christian vocation is a vocation for perfection, to improve the body of Christ "until we attain, in the unity of faith and knowledge of the Son of God, to the state of perfect man in accordance with the stature and fullness of Christ" (Eph. 4, 13). Strong in the faith may we grow in every way of "holding the truth in love" (Eph. 5, 16).

Let us now enlarge on our meditation on the mystery of the Church. St. Andrew, the first-called, patron of the Church of

Constantinople, is the brother of St. Peter, the leader of the Apostles and founder with St. Paul of the Church of Rome and its first Bishop. On the one hand this recalls to us a drama of Christianity, the division between the East and the West, but it also recalls to us the profound reality of the communion which exists notwithstanding all differences between the two Churches, as it causes us to thank the Lord for having made to arise during the last decades enlightened pioneers and tireless workers for unity such as the Patriarch Athenagoras of blessed memory and my great predecessors Pope John XXIII, whom this city and church remember with honour, and Pope Paul VI who came to meet you before me. Their action has been fruitful for the life of the Church and for the search for full unity between our Churches which rely on the only corner-stone who is the Christ and are built on the foundations of the Apostles.

The more intensive contacts of these last years have caused the re-discovery of the fraternity between our two Churches and the reality of communion between them even if it is not perfect. The spirit of God has also shown us yet more clearly the requirement which is imposed to realise full unity in order to render a more effective witness for our time. My visit to the Oecumenic Patriarch and my pilgrimage to Ephesus, where Mary was proclaimed "Theotokos", Mother of God, has the aim of serving—as much as I can and the Lord will allow—this holy cause. I thank providence for having guided my steps in these paths.

We are on the eve of opening theological dialogue between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church. It is another important phase of the process towards unity. This dialogue will be called, starting from what we have in common, to identify, to confront and resolve all the difficulties which inhibit us from full unity. Tomorrow I shall take part in the celebration for St. Andrew's day in the Church of the Oecumenic Patriarchate. We shall not be able to concelebrate. That is the most sorrowful sign of the misery introduced into the one Church of Christ by division. But, thanks to God, we nevertheless celebrate together for several years the feast of the protectors of our churches as a gauge and effective will of full con-celebration; in Rome we celebrate the feasts of St. Peter and St. Paul in the presence of an Orthodox delegation, and in the Oecumenic Patriarchate the feast of St. Andrew is celebrated with a Catholic presence.

The communion in prayer will conduct us to full communion in the eucharist. I dare to hope that this day is near. Personally I would wish it very near. Have we not already the same eucharistic faith and true sacraments in common by virtue of



the Apostolic Succession? Let us wish that total communion in faith, notably in the ecclesiastical field, will soon permit this full *communicatio in sacris*. Already my blessed predecessor Pope Paul VI had desired to see this day as also had Patriarch Athenagoras I. He also said, in speaking of this soon before his death, that always he summarised his feelings in one sole and supreme hope: that of being able with us to "drink from the same chalice" i.e. to celebrate together the eucharistic sacrifice, synthesis and crowning of the common ecclesial identification with Christ. "We have also so much wanted that. Now this unrealised desire must remain our heritage and our obligation" (Angelus of 9th July, 1972). For my part, in taking up this heritage, I ardently share this desire that the time and progress in union is gaining life.

I know that you Catholics of this city and of all Turkey are conscious of the importance invested in the search for full unity among Christians. I know that you pray and work to this end and that you have fraternal contacts with the Orthodox Church and with other Christians of your city and of your land. I am deeply conscious of it. I know also that you seek relations of friendship with the other believers who call on the name of the one God and that you are active and loyal citizens of this land where you are in a minority. I encourage you in this with all my heart. May God bless you! May He bless your communities, your families and you individually, especially those who suffer and for whom I have a special intention. May he always give you what you are in need of to render in your life an ever faithful witness.

And now, dear Brothers and Sisters, I invite you to pray fervently during this Eucharistic Sacrifice for the full communion of our Churches. Progress in unity will depend on our efforts, on our theological works, on our repeated steps and especially on our mutual charity; but at the same time it is grace from God. Let us beseech Him to remove the obstacles which until now have held back progress towards full unity. Let us beseech Him to give to all who work for rapprochement His Holy Spirit which will conduct them towards the full truth which will widen their love and make them impatient for unity. Pray also for ourselves, pastors of the sister Churches, that we may be the best instruments of His design whom providence has chosen in this hour of victory to govern these Churches, i.e., to serve them as the Lord wills and also to serve the one Church which is His Body. During the second millennium our Churches were as dead in their separation. Now the third millennium of Christianity is at our doors. May the dawn of this new millennium break on a Church which has rediscovered its full unity, the better to witness amidst the exacerbated tensions of this world the transcendent love of God manifest in his Son, Jesus Christ.

God alone knows the times and the moments. Let us watch and pray in hope with the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, who does not cease to keep watch on the Church of her Son as he has kept watch over the Apostles. Amen".

At the end of this Mass the Patriarch and his suite went to the residence of the Vatican Delegation where, in the presence of the Cardinals and other dignitaries of the Vatican, cordial meetings took place between the Pope and the Patriarch.

The next day, Friday, 30th November, the Feast of the Apostle St. Andrew, the first-called, during which the Patronal Feast of the Oecumenic Throne is celebrated, the divine Patriarchal and Synodal Liturgy took place according to tradition. The Pope, accompanied by Metropolitan Meliton of Chalcedon, came with his Suite to the Patriarchate to attend this celebration.

On his arrival, the Pope was welcomed by Metropolitans Evangelos of Perge and Joachim of Melitini, Grand Vicar of the Patriarchate, and Archimandrite Philippe, Secretary of the Holy Synod, who escorted him in procession to the church where he was met by the Patriarch. The two Primates entered the church together and the Pope took up his position on a specially installed throne from where he followed the whole Liturgy. At the point of pronouncing "let us love one another" the Pope and the Patriarch exchanged the kiss of peace in Christ to the applause of the assembly. The Pope gave the Dominical Prayer in Latin. At the end of the Liturgy the two Primates took up their positions before the royal doors of the church surrounded by members of the Holy Synod of the Patriarchate.

The Pope, speaking first, said the following words in Greek:

"Behold how good and pleasant it is when brothers dwell in unity!" (Psalm 133, 1). These words of the psalmist spring from my heart on this day when I am with you. How good and pleasant it is to be brothers all together.

We are reunited to celebrate St. Andrew, the first-called of the Apostles, the brother of Peter, corypheus of the Apostles. This circumstance emphasises the ecclesial significance of our meeting today. Andrew was an Apostle, i.e., one of the men chosen by Christ to be transformed by His Spirit and sent into the world as He had been sent by his Father. They had been sent to announce the good news of the reconciliation given in Christ to call men to enter by Christ in communion with the Father in the Holy Spirit and to come together; thus men become children of God in a great people of brothers. All are reunited in Christ to the praise and glory of God. Such is the mission of the Apostles and also the mission of those who after them were also chosen and sent; such is the vocation of the church.



We celebrate today an Apostle, the first-called of the Apostles, and this Feast recalls to us this fundamental exigency of our vocation, the vocation of the church. This Apostle, the patron of the illustrious church of Constantinople is the brother of Peter. Indeed, all the Apostles were linked by the new fraternity which unites those whose heart is renewed by the spirit of the Son and to whom is entrusted the ministry of reconciliation, but that does not suppress the particular ties created by birth and education in the same family. Andrew and Peter were brothers, and in the bosom of the Apostolic college a greater intimacy must have bound them, a stricter collaboration must have united them in the Apostolic task. Again, today's celebration recalls to us that between the Church of Rome and the Church of Constantinople particular ties of fraternity and intimacy exist and a stricter collaboration is natural between these two Churches.

Peter, the brother of Andrew, is the corypheus of the Apostles. He has, thanks to the Father's inspiration, completely recognised in Jesus the Christ the Son of the Living God; because of this faith he received the name of Peter, for the church is founded on this rock. He has been charged to assure the harmony of Apostolic preaching. Brother among brothers, he received the mission of confirming them in the faith. He was the first to have the responsibility of guarding the union of all assuring the symphony of the holy Churches of God in the fidelity "to the faith which was once for all delivered to the Saints" (Jude 3).

It is in this spirit, moved by these sentiments, that the successor of Peter has come today to visit the Church which has St. Andrew as its Patron, to its revered Pastor, all its hierarchy and all its faithful. He has come to participate in its prayer. This visit to the first seat of the Orthodox Church clearly shows the will of the entire Catholic Church to go forward in the progress towards the unity of all and also its conviction that the re-establishment of full communion with the Orthodox Church is a fundamental stage in the decisive progress of the whole ecumenical movement. Our division perhaps has not been without influence on other divisions which followed it. My step is in a direct line with the overture realised by John XXIII. It takes up and prolongs the memorable measures of my predecessor Paul VI who went to Jerusalem, where, for the first time the moving accolade and the first aural dialogue with the Oecumenic Patriarch of Constantinople took place, at the very place where was accomplished the mystery of the Redemption for the reunion of the scattered children of God, then the meeting made here a little over twelve years ago, until the Patriarch Athenagoras came in turn on his visit to Paul VI at his seat in Rome. These two great figures have not left us in

being re-united with God: they have completed their ministry, each reaching towards full communion and impatient to realise it during their lifetime. For my part, I do not wish to delay any longer coming to pray with you; among my apostolic journeys already realised or projected this had in my eyes a particular importance and urgency. I also dare to hope that we will pray together anew, His Holiness Patriarch Dimitrios I and myself, and this time at the tomb of the Apostle Peter. Such steps express before God and the whole people of God our impatience for unity.

During almost a whole millennium the two sister Churches have grown side by side as two great vital and complementary traditions of the same church of Christ, keeping not only pacific and fruitful relations but the solicitude of the indispensable communion in the faith, prayer and charity, which they would not at any price put off in spite of different sensibilities. The second millennium on the contrary has been darkened, apart from a few bright periods, by the distance which these two Churches have moved from each other with all its disastrous consequences. The wound is not yet healed. But the Lord can cure it and He enjoins us to prepare for it at the soonest possible time. We are now at the end of the second millennium; would it not be the time to hasten towards the perfect fraternal reconciliation in order that the dawn of the third millennium may find us standing side by side in full communion to testify together to salvation before the world whose evangelisation awaits this sign of unity?

On the definite level, today's visit also shows the importance that the Catholic Church attaches to the theological dialogue about to begin with the Orthodox Church. With realism and wisdom conforming to the wish of the Apostolic See of Rome and also the desire of the pan-Orthodox conferences, it has been decided to renew between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church relations and contacts which would permit them to recognise each other and to create the necessary atmosphere for a fruitful theological dialogue. It was necessary to draw up again the context before trying together to draw up the subjects. This period has been rightly called the dialogue of charity. This dialogue has allowed the re-appraisal of the deep communion which already unites us and causes us to regard each other and treat each other as sister Churches. Much has already been realised but it is necessary to continue the struggle. It is necessary to draw on the consequences of this rediscovered reciprocal theology; everywhere Catholics and Orthodox live together. It is necessary to overcome the habits of isolation in order to collaborate in all fields of pastoral action where such collaboration is made possible by the almost total communion which already exists between us. It is not necessary to be afraid to



reconsider on the one hand or the other and in consultation the one with the other canonical rules established while the knowledge of our communion—even though incomplete—was still obscured, rules which no longer correspond perhaps to the results of the dialogue of charity and to the possibilities which they have opened up. It is important for the faithful on both sides to take account of the progress accomplished and it would be desirable for those who are about to be charged with the dialogue to have this preoccupation to deduce the consequences in the life of the faithful of the progress to come.

This theological dialogue which is about to commence will have the task of overcoming the misunderstandings and disagreements which exist between us if not at the level of faith, at least at the level of theological formulation. It must be developed not only in the atmosphere of the dialogue of charity, which must be expanded and intensified, but also in an atmosphere of adoration and detachment. It is only in adoration with a sharp sense of the transcendence of the inexpressible mystery "which surpasses knowledge" (Eph. 3, 19), that one will be able to place our divergencies and "lay no greater burden than these necessary things" (Acts 15, 28) to re-establish communion (c.f. Decrees Unitatis Redintegratio, No. 18). Indeed it appears to me that the question which we must ask ourselves is not so much of knowing whether we can re-establish full communion but rather whether we have still the right to remain separate. This question we must ask ourselves in the very name of our fidelity to the will of Christ and His church to which an incessant prayer must make us both still more disposed to the course of theological dialogue.

If the Church is called to re-assemble men in the praise of God, St. Irenaeus, Great Doctor of the East and the West, recalls to us that "the glory of God is living man" (adv. Haer IV 20, 7). All in the Church is ordained to permit man to live truly in this full liberty which it provides by its communion with the Father through the Son in the Spirit. St. Irenaeus continues thus: "and the life of man is the vision of God"—the vision of the Father manifested in the Word. The church cannot fully respond to this vocation except in witnessing by its unity the novelty of this life given in Christ: "I in them and thou in me, that they may become perfectly one, so that the world may know that thou hast sent me and hast loved them even as thou hast loved me" (John 17, 23). Sure that our hope cannot be deceived I say to you again, dearly beloved brethren, finding myself amongst you gives me great joy and with you I give thanks to the Father from whom all perfect gifts come.

The Oecumenic Patriarch then gave the following address:

"How beautiful are the feet of those who preach good news" (Rom. 10, 15).

Very dear Brother,

It is with these prophetic and apostolic words that we salute the historic coming of your very venerable Holiness to our Holy Church, servant of the Orthodox East, and your important presence at this feast of the pious memory of the holy and glorious Apostle Andrew, the first-called, and at the Divine Liturgy celebrated on its altar.

Your coming from Rome to us is truly the coming of the angel of peace and goodwill, not only—as we are sure—to us and all the holy Orthodox Church, but also to this great land and beyond. It is the expression of a new journey by your Holiness towards the image of God, man, and towards the value of his person today put to the test. It is a journey for these values and for these good reasons which constitutes the very *raison d'être* of humanity and justifies the profound sense of his existence on earth.

In such a large and extended framework, considering and judging your visit to our land, bridge between the East and the West, to this city, cradle of great civilisations, of important religious ferments and Christian formations, and to our Church, we are convinced that we express the vision that the Church of Christ has of the world and of man. At the same time we recognise the fact that, since your advent to the throne of Rome, all your journeys and trips outside of your See have exactly this significance. So, valuing according to the impenetrable ways of the Lord the talent of liberty which has been given to you, you emerge from your ramparts and you travel evangelizing all without distinction in peace and goodwill. Yes, "how beautiful are the feet of those who preach the good news".

Very holy Brother—Yesterday we received you in our humble See as the one full of goodness who brings the good news of peace, the peace of Christ, and the good that it supplies. It is the peace and bounty that we desire and also seek for the Church as much as for the world. It is in this holy common cause that we meet. It was for this same purpose that our great predecessors of happy memory met at Jerusalem, here, and at Rome. It is for this purpose our two Churches have gone out from their isolation and alienation—not to say their hostility—to take the way of encounter and reconciliation. It is to this purpose the anathemas between you and us have been raised, and it is to this end that believing in the will of the Lord the Master and Father of peace that we may be one, (John 17, 21) but at the same time, armed with courage, patience, wisdom and hope, having dialogue in charity, we have achieved together in a relatively short time a long road and have been led



to today's position. During this march the resurrected Christ was present, travelled with us and guided us, conducting us to the breaking of the bread. Having therefore this full communion in the breaking of the bread in view, we have journeyed together up to this point and from today we commence by your symbolic presence in this liturgical synaxis of the church of Constantinople an extremely important new stage.

Very holy Brother—The two Churches represented by us, the Roman Catholic and Orthodox churches, the other Christian Churches and Confessions, the other religions and the world in general, are waiting to learn the firm stage which this meeting today has achieved in our march towards Christian unity and realised after so many efforts on your part. Glory to God, for we are both in a position to reply to this question and to say today that we enter a new phase of our fraternization, a serious and important phase whose issue will influence our aim, i.e., unity. We enter into the phase of official theological dialogue between the two churches, Roman Catholic and Orthodox.

After having prepared the terrain in the dialogue of charity by mutual efforts and also by ecclesiastical manifestations and acts, and having prepared the theological dialogue by works and special commissions on the one hand and the other, we are happy today, both the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox, to announce that we have both officially designated two theological commissions which, under the form of a joint theological commission and on the basis of an agenda prepared and approved in common by the two Churches for the first phase, will soon undertake the dialogue. Our meeting today here is therefore to announce this firm fact.

The Christians of other churches and confessions will perhaps wonder if this dialogue between the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches, whose debut today we bless, is our final aim. To this question we would both reply "no", and we would add immediately that our ulterior and principal aim is not only the unity of the two Churches, but the unity of all Christians in one same Lord and in one same chalice.

To those non-Christians who wonder what significance Christian unity would have for them, and if it constituted a coalition and front of Christians against non-Christians, we would reply that the Christian unity sought after is turned against no-one, but that it rather constitutes a positive support and service for all men independent of sect, race, religion, social class; and this according to the fundamental Christian principle that "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free,

there is neither male nor female" (Gal. 3, 28). Very dear brother —It is in this theandric embrace of humanity by the Church of Christ that today we embrace your Holiness and the Roman Catholic Church in this sacred centre of Orthodoxy.

Indeed, different obstacles rise up before us. First we have the serious theological problems concerning the essential chapters of the Christian faith for whose solution we engage in theological dialogue. At the same time, there are the obstacles coming from mistrust, irresponsibility, laxity—like that of the disciples in the Garden of Gethsemane—non-theological factors concerning Christian differences, of intolerance and fanaticism which set Christians and religions against each other, in a word, all the arms of Lucifer. Besides, it is Lucifer who provides all heresies and divisions and all opposition by man to God and man against man.

We live and work for the accomplishment of the will of God and for the evangelisation of love, unity and peace at a critical hour of the history of mankind and a time where the person and spirit of evil, Lucifer, tempts humanity above his strengths. Indeed, Holiness, we are in front of a great exaltation of temptation and of malicious activity in the world in all fields, religious, social, cultural, political, to such a point that we see before us one sole victim, man, the image of God. We find ourselves before a phenomenon, a sign of the times which can be qualified as a return to an era of religious fanaticism, wars of religion, self destruction of men and their faith, and always in the name of God. Before this image of humanity which appears before us in its stark reality and all its tragedy when we are threatened by devilish anarchy, your Holiness comes to us so that we can evangelize together peace and bounty in all directions.

According to a very old and pious tradition of the church, the brother of Peter the protocorypheus, the Apostle Andrew, the first-called, was crucified on a cross forming the monogram of Christ. It is this cross which has been from that time his throne and the throne of his successors. It is from this throne that we salute you to give witness with you to the whole world of charity, peace and salvation. Amen.

Presentations were then exchanged on both sides. The Pope presented the Patriarch with a great ikon, a reproduction of the famous Virgin of Tehestohova, Patroness of his birthplace, Poland, and the Patriarch presented the Pope with an ancient pallium, which the Pope immediately put on. While the choir sang the hymn *Ad multos Annos* the Pope and the Patriarch embraced each other and together blessed those present. Then the two Primates went to the Patriarchal residence, knelt together in the Patriarchal chapel, giving thanks to



God, and then went to the Patriarch's office where they had meetings in the presence of Cardinal Augustini Caseroli, First Minister of the Vatican, Cardinal Jean Willebrands, President of the Secretariat for the unity of Christians, and Revd. Fr. Pierre Duprey, on the Catholic side, together with Metropolitan Meliton of Chalcedon, President of the Synodal Commission for Dialogue with the Roman Catholic Church, and Metropolitan Chrysostom of Myra, a member of the same Commission on the Orthodox side. At the end of these special meetings and after the mutual presentations the hierarchs of the throne and the Pope's suite together said the "Our Father" and exchanged presents.

The following common declaration was made public:

We, Pope John Paul II and the Oecumenic Patriarch Dimitrios I, give thanks to God for allowing us to meet to celebrate together their Feast of the Apostle Andrew, the first-called, and brother of the Apostle Peter. "Blessed be God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has blessed us in Christ with every Spiritual blessing in the heavenly places" (Eph. 1, 3).

It is in searching the single glory of God for the accomplishment of His will that we confirm anew our steadfast will to do all possible to hasten the day when full communion between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church will be re-established and we can celebrate the Divine Eucharist.

We recognise our predecessors Pope Paul VI and the Patriarch Athenagoras I and all that they have done to reconcile our Churches and to help them progress towards unity.

The progress accomplished in the preparatory stage permits us to announce that theological dialogue is about to commence, and to make public the list of members of the joint Catholic-Orthodox Commission which will be charged with it.

This theological dialogue aims not only to progress towards re-establishment of full communion between the sister Churches, Catholic and Orthodox, but also to contribute to the multiple dialogues which will develop therefrom in the Christian world in its search for unity.

The dialogue of charity rooted in a complete fidelity to the one Lord, Jesus Christ, and to His will for His church, has opened the way to a better understanding of the reciprocal theological positions and from there to new approaches of theological work and to a new attitude vis-à-vis the common past of our Churches. This purification of the collective memory of our Churches is an important product of the dialogue of charity and an indispensable condition for the progress to come. This

dialogue of charity must continue and increase in the complex situation which we have inherited from the past and which constitutes the reality in which today our effort must evolve.

We wish that the progress in unity may open new possibilities of dialogue and collaboration with the believers of other religions and with all men of goodwill so that love and fraternity may remove hatred and opposition among men. We hope thus to contribute to the coming of true peace in the world. We ask this gift of Him who was, who is, and is to come, Christ our Lord and our true peace.

So ended the official visit of His Holiness Pope John Paul II to the Oecumenic Patriarchate. Accompanied to the airport by His Holiness Patriarch Dimitrios I and Metropolitans Meliton of Chalcedon and Chrysostom of Myra, the Pope left by plane for Izmir.

After visiting Ephesus, where the Third Ecumenical Council met, and the last stage of his official visit to Turkey, the Pope took off for Rome, and on his arrival at the Vatican addressed the following telegram to the Oecumenic Patriarch:

Scarcely returned to Rome and still moved by the experience of the celebration in your Cathedral, I have gone to the tomb of the Apostle Peter to give thanks to God for our fraternal meeting and to ask the Apostle to guide us in this new and decisive stage of our march towards unity. I must also thank with all my heart Your Holiness and the Holy Synod for your warm welcome and assure you anew of my resolute will for close collaboration and of my sentiments of indefectible fraternal charity.

Ioannes Paulus pp II  
(From *Episepsis* No. 221)

#### BOOK REVIEWS

G. A. Barrois: *The Face of Christ in the Old Testament and Scripture Readings in Orthodox Worship*, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press 1977, 172 and 197 pp., each £3.

Georges Barrois is a professor at St. Vladimir's Seminary, New York, the celebrated seminary of the (Russian) Orthodox Church in America. His two books, *The Face of Christ in the Old Testament* and *Scripture Readings in Orthodox Worship*, are excellent examples of biblical scholarship applied to the needs of the ordinary reader. The Author, like all good Orthodox, is devoted to tradition—that is, to the teaching of the Fathers and the Trinitarian and Christological decisions of the seven ecumenical councils—but his expertise is in biblical studies. He emphasises this fact in the latter volume, explaining that it is not a study in liturgical history but simply



proceeds from the developed calendar and lectionary of the Orthodox Church showing what the readings mean and how they apply to the season. In choosing the readings, he points out, the Church often employed methods of biblical interpretation (allegorical and other) which are unfashionable today, but which proceeded from the conviction that Scripture was the Word of God, and were integral to patristic theology. Although Professor Barrois is well versed in the modern historical study of the Bible, and gives priority to the original sense, his attitude to patristic exegesis is none the less decidedly favourable; and though he thinks that some of the interpretations of Old Testament passages even in the New Testament are popular accommodations, he has no doubt that the messianic application was often part of the original sense and was not infrequently the primary sense, which is a striking conclusion for so sober a writer to draw.

Since the Orthodox calendar and lectionary are by no means identical with the Western or Anglican, *Scripture Readings in Orthodox Worship* is bound to be mainly interesting to Orthodox readers. *The Face of Christ in the Old Testament*, however, is equally interesting to non-Orthodox readers. Unlike the other title, it is not concerned with the public but with the private reading of the Bible, and particularly of the Old Testament. Characteristically, he stresses the original Hebrew text and canon, but without despising the Septuagint or the Apocrypha. He is eloquent about the unity in Christ of the two Testaments, and is refreshingly self-critical about the neglect of Bible reading, and particularly reading of the Old Testament, among the Orthodox, reminding them of the teaching of Chrysostom on this matter. He writes: "Nothing can take the place of a direct contact with the Word of God, the word inspired by the Holy Spirit, the word of life, the word we read and hear . . .". His criticisms are equally directed at Roman Catholics and Protestants, however, and especially at the counter-Reformation discouragement of Bible reading and at modern Protestant unbelief. What is wrong with the modern historical approach to the Bible, he holds, is not that it is historical but that it is unbelieving. He quotes Schmemmann: "Orthodox theology has never felt at home in modern Biblical scholarship and has not accepted as its own the Biblical problems as formulated within the western theological development . . . One can predict that a revival will consist, first of all, of a deep reassessment and re-evaluation of Western biblicism". Much the same was implied in the Moscow report of the Anglican-Orthodox Commission (para. 6). If the Orthodox can help Christendom to recover an attitude of faith in the application of scientific biblical study, they will have granted it an inestimable boon and will have done more towards the reunion of Christendom than could perhaps be done in any other way possible.

R. T. Beckwith

Paul Gregorios: *The Human Presence: An Orthodox view of nature*, WCC Geneva 1978, 104 pp., £2.95.

The Syrian Orthodox Metropolitan of Delhi is well placed for analysing the world's social, cultural and economic predicament and bringing Orthodox spirituality to bear upon it. He points out that cultures which have lost any sense of dependence upon God isolate nature as simply the non-human part of the universe; if, reacting against exploitation and pollution, they attempt a return to nature, the mischief remains as long as God, the source of all created reality, is ignored. In face of such notions the Metropolitan, expressing his indebtedness chiefly to the fourth-century Greek Father, Gregory of Nyssa, insists that all elements in the universe, including the human, are directly dependent upon God and totally interlinked with each other. Man, made in the image of God to enjoy both the divine and the terrestrial, can be open to the entire universe. Through him matter is to be redeemed. It is on account of man's unique mediatorial position in the created order that Christ, in coming to save the world, assumes man's human nature. Humanity then is called to be the priest through whom God manifests himself to the whole creation. (This is the significance of the Human Presence in the universe.) Man's sense of mastery over the created order must be held in tension with the sense of the mystery of God and of all things. Mastery of the universe is like mastery of the human body. It is not for our advantage but so that we may give nature "as our extended body" into the hands of the loving God. This involves a "reverent-receptive" attitude to the created order, not as alternative to the "scientific-technological" but as its necessary concomitant. Moreover, we must abandon our static picture of the world for a vision of it as a flowing, moving, directed process whose potentialities are to be gauged, not simply in terms of science and technology but also with reference to parapsychology, psycho-kinesis, clairvoyance, telepathy and extra-sensory perception. The essential truth about man's relationship with the rest of creation is that he is part of creation, made in God's image and—through his sacramental incorporation into Christ, the Son of God made man—himself God's son.

The Metropolitan pleads, first that we should correct our world picture in accordance with these insights, second that a Christian community of "mature, charismatic persons" be gathered, expressing together this corrected world picture and shewing where it leads in terms of religious, cultural, political and economic activity. Such a community would exhibit a freedom from attachment to property, sharing in productive activity and above all in what is called "diagonal" activity, closely identified with the struggles of the society in which it is set.

It will be clear that this slim paper-back is not in any other sense light-weight. If the Metropolitan is naturally at home with the Greek



Fathers, he is at ease also with Whitehead and Teilhard de Chardin and with many interpreters of the contemporary scene. (He does not commend the patristic world view because he has no appreciation of any other.) The pages abound with technicalities and other strange words ("orientated" consistently appears a syllable short), not all of them explained. Thus he is difficult to read. His exciting vision of what might be prompts the question: "Yes, but how?" It is well to lay down that the technology of the new community he pleads for "be kind to nature, non-polluting, resource-conserving", but no human device can be totally without unwelcome side-effects. Again, such a community might be unable to survive—even if it be true that "property is a fundamentally dehumanizing way by which man relates himself to external reality"—without the society in which it is placed and against which its life style is a protest. The stress on true poverty strikes a chord with us all, but the creation of wealth is the condition of its distribution, whatever form that distribution may take.

I find no mention of death, nor of the inherent unsatisfactoriness of this life. The phrases in the old Anglican Burial Service, "the burden of the flesh", "the miseries of this sinful world", are far removed from what *The Human Presence* so compellingly sets before us. But is there not something still in the old phrases, derided as they generally are? But all praise to the Metropolitan for what he has done. He modestly says that his pages "will not restore the eyesight or dispel the fog", but he does help to renew our vision, restoring the cosmic dimension to our understanding of the Gospel, giving us hope that the outrages and injustices which scar our consciences are neither inevitable nor incurable.

Samuel Cutt

John B. Dunlop: *Staretz Amvrosy*, Mowbray's, London and Oxford 1975, 176 pp., £1.95.

John Dunlop, an American Orthodox scholar, will be known to some readers for his invaluable work on contemporary *samizdat* literature in the USSR. In *Staretz Amvrosy* he explores some of the pre-revolutionary background of the present spiritual renaissance in Russia with a biographical study of one of the most significant and influential personalities of 19th-century Russian monasticism. Amvrosy, effectively the last in the remarkable succession of "elders" at the monastery of Optino, was certainly one of the models Dostoyevsky had in mind in delineating the figure of Father Zosima in *The Brothers Karamazov*: there is a moving account here, quoted from Anna Grigorievna Dostoyevskaya's memoirs, of the novelist's meeting with the staretz, shortly after the death of the Dostoyevskys' youngest son (pp. 59-60). Tolstoy also made the pilgrimage to Optino, and was evidently impressed by Amvrosy. And that tortured and ambiguous figure, Leontiev, was among Amvrosy's penitents. The staretz, then, was in touch with some of the major

cultural currents of the day in Russia; but his major work was the care and direction of the thousands of pilgrims who flocked to him for healing and counsel, from all classes and backgrounds, from all parts of Russia and beyond. When one considered the chronic ill-health from which he suffered—the account of a "typical day" in Ch. IV is nightmarish—did Tolstoy, I wonder, learn from his visit to Amvrosy some of the understanding of the desperate exhaustion of a staretz' existence which plays so central a part in his powerful novella, *Father Sergius*? His correspondence, to seculars and religious alike, shows him to have been a lucid and sensitive expositor of the classic teachings of the *Philokalia*, especially on the subject of "thoughts" (distracted and undirected mental activity) and temptations; and it is interesting to know that he read and approved the little books of the anonymous Pilgrim, so popular again in recent years.

In many ways, Amvrosy is of course a man of his time and place: he is capable of a rather uncritical puritanism (about the theatre, for instance), of a distressingly moralistic attitude to suffering, even in children, and of a rigorous disapproval of the theology and practice of non-Orthodox Christians. But none of this is unusual or surprising: far more striking and memorable is the impression of a man being crucified daily by the demands of his flock, yet responding with consistent tenderness and wisdom. This book is a welcome introduction for English-speaking readers to a still relatively unknown world; it is a splendid digest of a very wide range of literature in Russian. The author's attitude to Amvrosy and all he represents is unashamedly uncritical, and not all his judgments will be congenial to the non-Orthodox reader; but this is only to say that he writes with sympathy and commitment. This is a book which will be indispensable to all students of Orthodox spirituality. One caution: the transliteration of Russian words follows a system familiar to American readers, but rather eccentric to others.

Rowan Williams

Johann Christoph Hampe: *To Die is Gain: The Experience of One's Own Death*, Translated by Margaret Kohl, Darton, Longman & Todd 1979, 145 pp., £3.25.

In this book we are encouraged to use the experiences of people who have gone through "clinical" death and yet returned to life, not as a substitute for faith, but in order to modify our attitudes and our prejudices in the face of death. Having himself experienced just such a return, the Author, a Lutheran pastor, set out to collect accounts of similar journeys in the lives of others. This material forms the first part of the book. It makes a striking contrast with the atmosphere that surrounds the dying in our hospitals today. Within, the consciousness of the dying person opens out into a new awareness of self, an acceptance of the past as subject to judgement,



but in some deep sense good, and into a new freedom in the face of an as yet unknown future. Without, the family, doctors, nurses—perhaps even the clergy—turn aside from someone whom they can no longer help and to whom they can no longer relate. The author presents clear evidence for the way in which, while from without consciousness appears to dim and disappear, within it reaches new levels of insight and clarity.

Perhaps the fundamental lesson to be learned from this book is that death, for the living, must be integrated into life. We must come to accept death as part of our destiny, willed by God. And we must come to see that with this will there comes a call, a "voice coming from the other side". For man, death is not and cannot be a "natural" event. It is a mystery to be lived through with God and in God. While death is the judgement of God on man, it is also an expression of his love. "Mercy and truth are met together: righteousness and peace have kissed each other" (Psalm 85, 10). In death the wrath of God becomes our sister. This is a perceptive and illuminating book.

Basil Osborne

Father Kallistos Ware: *The Orthodox Way*, London, Mowbray's 1979, 195 pp., £1.50

Happily we of the Western Church have been blessed with a long succession of great scholars and writers who, having looked deeply into the Orthodox tradition, have then recorded for their fellows and for posterity the results of their perception; and within the last hundred years, as a result of the Diaspora, Orthodox themselves have produced books of theology in the Eastern tradition but in our Western languages. Fr. Kallistos, however, is one of that select number who know both traditions from the inside and who thereby stand out as interpreters of the first rank. This author's earlier paperback, *The Orthodox Church* (Pelican 1963), became a classic almost upon its publication; as an introduction to Orthodoxy it has not been bettered—and it is not easy to see how it could be. Now has come another paperback (after some intervening "weightier" tomes) designed to share the spiritual insights of Orthodoxy with English readers.

*The Orthodox Way* is precisely what it is entitled—the unfolding of a map which shows us "the path of life" leading to God's "presence . . . the fullness of joy and . . . pleasure for eternity" (Ps. 16, 12). This book is simply but profoundly about God and "the things of God", about *theology* literally, the knowledge and the science of God, the nature and the activity of God and our privilege of union with Him "according to energy" (p. 168). Fr. Kallistos keeps us firmly and squarely grounded upon the basic Christian dogmas of the Trinity and the Incarnation, and he proceeds to draw out for us the full implication of this faith for our hearts, our minds and our

bodies as it has been prayed and studied and lived by the great cloud of witnesses, the Fathers of the Church, both ancient and modern. Memorable sayings of the Fathers are to be found on every page, but especially at the beginning and the end of each chapter; it is as if the Author has invited us to share his "commonplace book", which reveals the extraordinary range of his reading.

Your reviewer has long been an admirer of Fr. Kallistos' style with both the written and the spoken word: there is a clarity but also an economy of language which others would do well to emulate. His writing seems to me to have a quality not unlike that of the holy icons: uttered as the product of prayer and contemplation, heart speaks to heart through the starkness of the printed word. This probably accounts for the fact that the Printer's few omissions of a word, here and there, in no way obscure the author's communication. The Epilogue, "God as Eternity", is a brief discourse on the "Last Things", with a restatement of the Second Coming which so often seems to be glossed over by modern man in his spiritual discomfort. Fr. Kallistos reiterates the Christian Creed: "I am waiting for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the Age to come". "In the 'new earth' of the Age to come there is surely a place not only for man but for the animals: in and through man, they too will share in immortality, and so will rocks, trees and plants, fire and water" (p. 183). "This resurrection kingdom . . . shall have no end" (*ibid.*). This is a splendid devotional book for the individual; it is also excellently suited for study groups and prayer groups.

Harold Embleton

C. G. Patelos (Ed.): *The Orthodox Church in the Ecumenical Movement: Documents and Studies 1902-1976*, WCC Geneva 1979, 360 pp., £6.25.

This is an important and worthwhile historical work and it can fairly be called "essential reading" for students of the Ecumenical Movement in the present century. It falls into four parts. Part 1 contains the official letters of the Orthodox Patriarchs in relation to the rest of Christendom. Part 2 consists only of four pages, and gives the text of resolutions passed by the Pan-Orthodox Conferences at Rhodes in 1961 and at Chambésy in 1967. Part 3 gives the statements submitted by the Orthodox delegates to a number of important conferences. Part 4 is by far the longest and includes a variety of personal statements made by Orthodox divines within the period. Together the documents tell a story from within.

The story begins with the approaches made by Orthodox leaders in the early years of the century as Orthodoxy felt called to speak to the rest of Christendom and to speak to itself in search of common counsel in its ecumenical approach. We read the Encyclical of the Patriarch of Constantinople, 1920, which stirred many hearts by its freshness and vision. Two later documents tell of the frustrations



which were to come. Thus in 1952 we find the Patriarch giving warning to Orthodox delegates about possible misunderstandings of their participation in the worship of other Christian bodies, and in 1973 Constantinople and Moscow joined in a plaintive letter to the WCC about its tendency to emphasize "horizontal" rather than "vertical" Christianity. Meanwhile the Orthodox participants in ecumenical conferences often issued their own statements about the issues under discussion. At Evanston in 1954 there was a powerful Orthodox document upon the main theme of the conference, "Christ the Hope of the World", a document of spiritual and theological depth on lines rather different from the conference's general approach. I remember myself the indignation which I and others felt when this document was virtually ignored by the conference. Another mystery of history is why the Orthodox statements at New Delhi in 1961 were not included in the published proceedings. The story however moves. While at first the Orthodox tended to be edgy in a World Council which seemed to be overwhelmingly Protestant in character, there grew a greater mutual appreciation, the Orthodox valuing the outlet which the WCC gave them and the WCC increasingly appreciating the role of Orthodoxy in relation to the unity of West and East. If in the later years the relationship has not been as fruitful and creative as it might, the reason may be that the sheer political complexities of Orthodox participation has hindered the spiritual and theological potentialities.

In the last section of the book we have a splendid collection of personal statements on a large number of theological and ecclesiastical themes, and these give something of a *speculum* of what is involved in the meeting of Orthodoxy and other traditions. The names of Bulgakov, Florovsky, Lossky, and Alivisatos suffice to make the collection very valuable. It might have been more valuable still to have included some quotations of Orthodox teaching in the background, apart from ecumenical exchanges, on such themes as "tradition", "the communion of saints", and "the sacraments", so as to show more clearly what lies behind the problems and the opportunities of East and West dialogue. Readers are likely to lay down this book very conscious that ecumenism has meant something wider and deeper than the activities of the WCC while the WCC and its precursor, the faith and order movement, have notably served its possibility and its progress.

+Michael Ramsay

St. Cyril of Jerusalem (Ed. F. L. Cross): *Lectures on the Christian Sacraments*, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press 1977, 83 pp., £1.95.

This re-edition of F. L. Cross' 1951 introduction to and translation of a fourth-century Palestinian bishop's Lenten and Bright Week instructions to his neophytes is a welcome one not only because this classic is available with the original Greek text, but also because of the useful historical and theological introduction which Cross wrote

for it. The role which St. Cyril's text played in the developing of the historical basis for liturgical theology is documented with appropriate quotes from Dix and a rather brief discussion of such major questions as the date of the introduction of the institution narrative and the transition from what is characterized as an historical and no longer an eschatological interpretation of redemption. But what is really interesting to both Canon Cross and ourselves is St. Cyril's text—what simplicity and brevity! He goes directly to the heart of the mysteries. For example, on Baptism, St. Cyril (II, 5; p. 61) has no need to go on at length to differentiate between the typological value of Old Testament prophesies using images of what is to come and the New Testament sacraments where "our imitation was but a figure (*εἰκων*), while our salvation is in reality". The only things which spoil an American reader's pleasure in meditating on this text is Cross's occasional use of quite obsolete nineteenth-century language distracting one from the otherwise rewarding reading of St. Cyril.

Stephen C. Headley

*Note:* Because of shortage of space a number of book reviews and the whole of the section devoted to reviews of recorded music have had to be deferred to the next issue of *ECNL*—Ed.

## TOWARDS THE GREAT AND HOLY COUNCIL: PART II

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

In compliance with the unanimous decision of the whole Orthodox Church, the 1st Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference was convened by His Holiness the Ecumenical Patriarch Dimitrios, in accordance with the ecclesiastical order, at the Orthodox Centre of the Ecumenical Patriarchate at Chambésy, Geneva. The work of the Conference was terminated on November 28th.

Participating in this Conference were the delegations of all the local Orthodox Churches, except the Georgian Church, which could not come for technical reasons.

The purpose of the Conference was to further the preparation of the Great and Holy Council of the Orthodox Church. In the perspective of the convocation of the Council in a possibly short time, and in compliance with the decision taken earlier on a pan-Orthodox level, and taking into account the result of the pan-Orthodox deliberations, the agenda of the Conference included the following points:

- (a) Review of the catalogue of themes for the Great and Holy Council.



- (b) Consideration of the methodology of the preparations for the Council concerning its themes.
- (c) General review and evaluation of the relations and dialogues of the Orthodox Church with other Christian Churches and Confessions, and with the World Council of Churches.
- (d) Discussion on the common celebration of Easter by all Christians on a fixed Sunday.

With regard to its first theme, the Preconciliar Conference unanimously decided that the Great and Holy Council should deal with the following ten themes:

1. The Orthodox Diaspora.
2. Autocephaly and the way in which it should be proclaimed.
3. Autonomy and the way in which it should be proclaimed.
4. Diptychs.
5. The question of a common calendar.
6. Impediments to marriage.
7. Adaptation of the ecclesiastical ordinances regarding fasting.
8. Relations of the Orthodox Church with the rest of the Christian world.
9. Orthodoxy and the Ecumenical Movement.
10. Contribution of the local Orthodox Churches to the triumph of the Christian ideals of peace, freedom, fraternity and charity among peoples, and to the elimination of racial discrimination.

As regards the list of themes given above, we would like to make the following observations:

1. The postponement of the convocation of the 1st Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference turned out to be truly providential, if one considers the amount of preliminary work done in depth to galvanize the faithful, and that this work led the Church to crystallize the most serious of its conciliar vital problems. In this way, it has followed the advice of the Patriarchal and Synodical Letter sent by the Ecumenical Patriarch, which specified that the catalogue of themes "both in its content and in its outreach should correspond to the basic needs of our Orthodox Church and lead to a shortening of the process for convening the Great and Holy Council". Since the faithful flock of the Church are expecting exceptional spiritual help from the Great and Holy Council—inasmuch as it should be a major historical event for the Church, possibly even for mankind, and a privilege of our generation—it has been considered judicious, on the Pan-Orthodox level, to draw up a catalogue of those themes which gravely preoccupy the Church, that is, themes important for

the life of the Church and its smooth running, not themes, the solution of which would hardly cause a ripple on the surface of its life but merely be set down in the text containing the decisions. After a while, apart from a few specialists, nobody would know such decisions, let alone the themes of the Council—a Council mentioned, possibly, in just a few specialized manuals of church history.

2. A notable trait is the unanimous wish to spare the Council the task of dealing with all the themes listed under the heading "Faith and Doctrine" in the catalogue of Rhodes. "Doctrinal themes shaking Orthodoxy and leading the faithful flock into heresy, such as, in the past, over the Trinity, Christ's nature and icons, do not, I believe, trouble the Orthodox faithful today . . ." (22), observes Prof. G. Galitis, and George Wagner, Bishop of Eudokias, agrees with him in maintaining that there exists no isolated dogmatic theme today capable of exciting the same interest as did certain themes during the times of the Ecumenical Councils (23). We feel that we ought to mention here the near-unanimity of opinion and reaction among the Orthodox theologians over the document on Sacred Tradition produced by the Inter-Orthodox Preparatory Commission on the Great and Holy Council in 1971. In their opinion, it would be futile and maybe risky to have the Council take a decision on a theme which threatens the Orthodox Church today neither with heresy nor with schism. Nor would ancient conciliar practice uphold such a step. Why should such a thing occur today? Apart from a handful of dogmatic theologians, particularly interested in that theme, are there any believers feeling the need for such a formulation? Has an Ecumenical Council ever been convened to solve theological questions unless the people of the Church have shown some prior interest in them—whereas, in this case, they are perhaps utterly ignorant of their very existence? Throughout the first eight centuries, Ecumenical Councils were called "in dire need and for good reason", that is to say, to solve problems that had matured and were truly a thorn in the side of the Church. The doctrinal definitions of the first Creeds are anything but cold, rational forms of conciliar statement; they are a living, glorifying, hymnal expression of faith, based on the baptismal formulae in use in the various Churches. Taking them into account, the late Prof. P. Trembelas recommends (24) the avoidance of a complete re-statement of doctrine, necessarily prolix and "in imitation of the decrees of the new Vatican Council", and that preference be given instead to our own ancient, shorter, more concise and limpid form of statement. Sacred Tradition, he continues, "contains, notably in the *Consensus Patrum*, the definitions of the Ecumenical Councils, ancient liturgical practices and the ancient creeds in vigour". Likewise Profs. P. Bratsiotis, P. Trembelas, K. Mouratidis, A. Theodorou and N. Bratsiotis, in their memorandum to the Holy Synod of the Church of Greece (25), point out that ". . . it is meaningless for Orthodox Councils to busy themselves with theoretical problems of



no import and of no immediate relevance for the Holy Church of Christ militant in the world".

3. On the Pan-Orthodox level, theological doubts were expressed on the themes grouped together under the heading "Divine Worship" of the catalogue of Rhodes. None of them were retained on the Council's agenda. This was because the Orthodox Church has no basic need of a liturgical reform. Of course, in order to stay alive, liturgical life is constantly in need of new impulses. In the history of Eastern liturgies, these were always given by one or the other spiritual centre, such as the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, or the Convent of St. Sabbas near Jerusalem, the Monastery at Studium, or the Great Church in Constantinople. The ordinal of these centres was taken as a model by the other Churches. No Ecumenical Council has ever interfered "from above" with the live course of liturgical history. Why must we adopt new methods today? (26). The liturgical revival, so long as it does not desacramentalize the sacraments, is not at loggerheads with tradition, provided, of course, that it does not break up the continuity of the handing-down of Truth.

4. The gravest and most urgent problems listed on the agenda are seen to be those related to Inter-Orthodox unity and figuring in the catalogue of Rhodes under the heading "Relations of Orthodox Churches with one another"; these are: 1. Orthodox Diaspora, 2. Autocephaly and the way in which it should be proclaimed, and 3. Autonomy and the way in which it should be proclaimed. The judgment of History upon the Council under preparation will depend on the Pan-Orthodox solving of these questions upon the basis of sound Orthodox ecclesiological and canonical criteria.

5. Also of major importance are those themes on the Council's agenda which deal with the relationship of the Orthodox Church to the rest of the Christian world, and that of Orthodoxy to the Ecumenical Movement. The gravity of these questions can be seen from the fact that the 1st Preconciliar Pan-Orthodox Conference made a complete review of the evolution of the relations and dialogues of the Orthodox Church with the other Christian Churches and Confessions, as well as with the World Council of Churches, and took the following decisions:

I. "The theological dialogues started between the Orthodox Church and (a) the Anglican Church, (b) the Old Catholic Church, (c) the Ancient Oriental Churches are to be furthered, with greater emphasis on the dialogue with the Ancient Oriental Churches, and with Christian unity as their main target".

II. "The Inter-Orthodox Technical Commission for dialogue with the Roman Catholic Church, having been established, should begin functioning as soon as possible" (27). Putting this decision into

practice, the Inter-Orthodox Technical Commission of Theologians met three times at the Chambésy Orthodox Centre of the Ecumenical Patriarchate (firstly July 21st-24th, 1977; secondly November 14th-18th, also in 1977, and thirdly June 25th-27th, 1978). Between the second and third meetings, a meeting was held in Rome (March 29th-April 1st, 1978) of the Joint Co-ordinating Group between the two Technical Commissions of Theologians to prepare the theological dialogue between the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox Church. In this manner, the technical side of preparing the theological work was carried out, so that the official theological dialogue between the two Churches could be begun as soon as possible.

III. "Given that the decision of 4th Pan-Orthodox Conference, to prepare on a local Church level dialogue with the Lutherans, had led to satisfactory progress, thanks to a number of individual studies and unofficial theological encounters at university level, an Inter-Orthodox Commission for theological dialogue with the Lutherans should be set up on similar lines to those existing for dialogue with the other Churches". We are happy to be able to inform you that this Commission has been formed. On its side, the World Lutheran Federation has summoned a meeting of its own Preparatory Commission at Chambésy during May 1st-4th, 1978, following on a visit of representatives of the Federation to the Ecumenical Patriarchate during March 13th-16th, 1978 (28).

IV. "Expressing the wish of the Orthodox Church to work for inter-religious understanding and co-operation, and through it for the liquidation of any kind of fanaticism, for the reconciliation of peoples, and for the triumph of freedom and peace in the world to the benefit of mankind, whatever his race or religion, the Conference resolves that the Orthodox Church should co-operate in this task with the non-Christian religions".

V. "The Orthodox Church, continuing its traditional role of pioneer in the formation and development of the Ecumenical Movement as a founding member of the World Council of Churches, is to strengthen its organic contribution to the Council and, without co-operating less in, or contributing less to the horizontal dimension, should pay special attention to strengthening the vertical dimension, i.e., the theology of Church unity. To serve this purpose, it is considered necessary for a fair number of Orthodox theologians to be admitted on the high-ranking staff of the World Council of Churches—the Faith and Order Department in particular—so that Orthodox theological and ecclesiological opinions may find their proper place during the drawing up of WCC documents". As for the relationship of the Orthodox to other Christian Churches, one should note the ecclesiological importance attached by the Orthodox Church to the bilateral dialogues—without necessarily underestimating the multi-lateral conversations—being held within the World Council of Churches.



Characteristic interest was aroused among non-Orthodox by the following extract of the draft report on Economy, prepared by the Inter-Orthodox Preparatory Commission: "It therefore follows that our Holy Orthodox Church, conscious of the significance and importance of the present-day structures of Christianity, not only recognizes—though being herself the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church—the ontological existence of all these Christian Churches and Confessions, but also positively believes that all her relationships with them are founded on the quickest and most objective clarification possible of the whole ecclesiological question and of their doctrinal teaching on sacraments, grace, ministry and the apostolic succession" (29). What does this mean? Certain non-Orthodox theologians are asking themselves this question. On what grounds does the Orthodox Church see herself as the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, and how, consequently, does she conceive her relationship to the other Churches? What is the ecclesiological criterion for distinguishing, moreover, between Churches and Confessions, both in the Rhodes catalogue and in the above statement of the Inter-Orthodox Preparatory Commission? In speaking of "Churches" outside the Orthodox Church, how can one speak of "One, Holy, . . . Church" without falling into contradiction? In other words, are we not justifying the existence of many Churches alongside the One, possibly even their separation, by granting them an amnesty and considering the Orthodox Church simply as one of several "confessional Churches"? Whilst in current speech we may abuse the term, we do not by any means identify the "Churches" with the One Church, by adhering to theories such as "branch theory" or "comprehensiveness", unacceptable to the Orthodox conscience (30). In all events, can one particular Church, when identifying its limits with those of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, accept a similar self-identification on the part of other Churches without relativizing its own continuity and logicity? What is, finally, the ecclesiological basis for the Orthodox to maintain efforts at unity with other Churches confessing the same faith in Jesus Christ as Saviour and Redeemer of the world?

These are exceptionally delicate and imperative questions, leading up to a qualified re-evaluation of our positions. Personally, I believe that the existence of a Church outside the Church, in the full sense of the word, is a recognizable possibility in those areas where unity of faith is perceived, both in terms of the ancient creeds of the Ecumenical Councils and of unbroken apostolic succession with respect to this faith.

6. Concerning the fourth point of the agenda, i.e., "Common Celebration of Easter by all Christians on a Fixed Sunday", the 1st Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference decided that: "Taking into account, on the one hand, the wish in the Orthodox Church for a common celebration of Easter by all Christians, and, on the other hand, the pastoral difficulties prevalent in certain local

Churches, as well as the necessity of considering the pastoral needs of Orthodox pastors in the West, a balanced approach to the question without any haste in the presenting of a Pan-Orthodox judgment is essential, so we recommend that the subject be substantially and thoroughly studied. With this purpose in mind, the Secretariat for the Preparation of the Great and Holy Council should be asked to convene, as soon as possible, a Conference of responsible pastors, canonists, astronomers, historians and sociologists, with the results of its work to be presented through the Secretariat to the next Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference" (31). The Secretariat summoned this Congress at the Orthodox Centre of the Ecumenical Patriarchate at Chambésy from June 28th to July 3rd, 1977 (32). After hearing the reports of canonists, of historians, of astronomers, of those responsible for pastoral matters and of sociologists, and in the presence of observers from the Vatican, the World Council of Churches and the Anglican Church, the consultation arrived at the following:

I. It is known that there have been proposals concerning the celebration of Easter on a fixed Sunday. The two most noteworthy proposals have been that in favour of the second Sunday of April and that in favour of the Sunday following the second Saturday of April. Although some Churches were in favour, pastoral concern has prevailed in dismissing this two-fold proposal, which would risk provoking schisms in certain Orthodox Churches, seeing that such a proposal betrays the letter of Nicaea's intentions and the entire Orthodox tradition, which maintains that Easter be celebrated on the Sunday following the first full moon after the vernal equinox.

II. The present computation of Easter, based on the old Julian calendar, has become inexact in our day; in fact, that calendar has already reached a thirteen-day lag with respect to solar time; the vernal equinox, which ought to fall on March 21st, falls only on March 8th on that calendar. Likewise, it is a fact that, in the lunar tables for the Paschalia which are still in effect for the determination of the full moon, the date of the full moon is determined with a lag of five days. It must also be noted that this lag will increase with time. For this reason the consultation unanimously recommends to the next Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference that a commission of astronomers be entrusted with the determination, for as long a period as possible, of the Sunday after the first full moon following the vernal equinox. The consultation sees in this initiative on the part of the Orthodox Church a contribution to the universal determination of the date of Pascha for all Christians.

III. The question of the relation between the Jewish Passover and the Christian Easter was raised. It is asserted that Nicaea's formula for the determination of the date of the Christian Easter, without referring explicitly to the Jewish Passover, mentions it indirectly by fixing the full moon after which the Sunday following ought to be



the Christian Easter. Thus it must be noted that the Jewish Passover ought to fall on the vernal full moon following the equinox, and that the Christian Easter most assuredly comes afterward.

IV. The problem of the Diaspora and of Orthodox minorities also was placed before the members of the consultation. They believe that a minority situation does not in itself justify taking exceptional positions in order to conform to the practice of the majority in a given place. That would strike a blow to the cohesion of the Orthodox Church taken as a whole.

V. The consultation, in line with the report of the Council's Inter-Orthodox Preparatory Commission which gathered at the Orthodox Centre of the Ecumenical Patriarchate at Chambésy in 1971, believes that it is most desirable to study the above-mentioned questions in collaboration with all Christians who are interested in them.

After study of the Acts of the Congress, His Eminence the Senior Metropolitan Meliton of Chalcedon, as President of the 1st Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference and with reference to his recommendation to the next Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference, viz., to instruct a Commission of Astronomers to designate, with minimum time-lag, the Sunday after the first vernal full moon, notes with satisfaction in a letter to the head of the Secretariat for the Preparation (23rd September, 1977) that "this resolution of the Congress is a happy one, giving substantial aid to a future consideration of the whole question". As interpreter of the spirit of the 1st Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference, he goes on to say that "there is no reason for a Commission of Astronomers, as specified, to be set up by the next Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference. Simply, the 1st Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference gave the Secretariat responsibility for summoning the Congress held to examine the question, whilst emphasis on the astronomical side of it is a pure technicality, to be seen as an appendix to the overall work of the Congress, and therefore a responsibility of the Secretariat. In regard to this", he continues, "the Secretariat would do well to summon without delay such a Commission, made up of eminent astronomers, to investigate the astronomical side of the question". Following this, the Secretariat for the Preparation of the Great and Holy Council made contact with a large number of astronomers, who then submitted their views and lists of exact tables of the Sunday after the first vernal full moon. (Astronomical Council of the Academy of Sciences of U.R.S.S.—Prof. E. R. Mustel; Astronomisches Recheninstitut—Prof. W. Fricke; U.S. Naval Observatory; Athens University Astronomical Observatory —Prof. George Kontopoulos) (33).

7. Concerning the method of preparing the Council, the 1st Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference noted "that the procedure established by the 4th Pan-Orthodox Conference be continually

applied at all stages of elaboration of the themes, with the exception of the first stage; during this stage, the Churches are to present the results of their individual work on the themes for further pan-Orthodox consideration, not as the official view-point of a particular Church, but rather as the outcome of a purely scholarly study, so as to ensure the free course of dialogue at pan-Orthodox level (34).

The Secretariat is pleased to announce that, to date, it has received and passed on to the local Orthodox Churches the following studies on the ten themes of the agenda of the Council, as entrusted to the various Churches:

(a) Patriarchate of Alexandria: studies on "Orthodox Diaspora", "Autocephaly and the way in which it should be proclaimed" and "Autonomy and the way in which it should be proclaimed". These were edited and submitted to the Secretariat by His Eminence Metropolitan Methodios of Aksum.

(b) Patriarchate of Antioch: studies on "Orthodox Diaspora", "Readaptation of the ecclesiastical ordinances on fasting" and (from the general theme "Relations of the Orthodox Churches with the rest of the Christian world") "Relations between the Orthodox and Ancient Oriental Churches". After discussion and sanction by the Holy Synod of the Church of Antioch, these drafts were edited and submitted to the Secretariat by His Eminence Metropolitan Ignatius of Lattakia.

(c) Patriarchate of Moscow: studies on "Orthodox Diaspora", "Autocephaly and the way in which it should be proclaimed", "Autonomy and the way in which it should be proclaimed" and "Orthodox Diptychs".

(d) Patriarchate of Romania: studies on "Orthodox Diaspora", "Autocephaly and the way in which it should be proclaimed" and "Autonomy and the way in which it should be proclaimed".

(e) Patriarchate of Bulgaria: studies on "The calendar and the Paschalia", dealing both with the question of a common calendar and the question "Examination of the joint celebration by all Christians of Easter on a fixed Sunday". The Church of Bulgaria also produced a study on the extraneous question of Orthodox Monasticism.

(f) Church of Poland: studies on "The question of a common calendar" and "Readaptation of the ecclesiastical ordinances on fasting".

(g) Church of Czechoslovakia: studies on "Contribution of the local Orthodox Churches to the triumph of the Christian ideals of peace, freedom, fraternity and charity among peoples, and to the elimination of racial discrimination".

It should be noted that the Church of Serbia maintains its study on



"Readaptation of the ecclesiastical ordinances on fasting" previously submitted to the Secretariat. This study was mostly drawn on in the draft report of the Inter-Orthodox Preparatory Commission.

The Secretariat for the Preparation of the Great and Holy Council, responsible for maintaining the preparatory procedure decided on at the pan-Orthodox level, has not forgotten to send a reminder to those Churches which have not yet sent in their studies on the prescribed themes. The spirit is that of service to the Churches and respect for the decision of the 1st Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference to convene at the earliest possible date the Great and Holy Council so hopefully awaited.

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

#### NOTES

22. George Galitis: Themes of the Great Council. Athens, 1977, p. 19 (in Greek).
23. "Episkepsis", No. 82—22.8.1973; No. 83—4.9.1973 and No. 84—18.9.1973.
24. In a personal letter to the head of the Secretariat for the Preparation of the Council.
25. *Economy in the Church*, Athens, 1972, p. VI (in Greek).
26. George Wagner: *Op. cit.*
27. 1st Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference. Acts & Documents p. 190 (in Greek).
28. "Episkepsis", No. 185—15.3.1978.
29. Inter-Orthodox Preparatory Commission . . . p. 126 (in Greek).
30. George Galitis: *Op. cit.* p. 49.
31. 1st Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference. Acts & Documents p. 191 (in Greek).
32. "Episkepsis", No. 172—15.7.1977; cf. St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 21 (1977), 4, 224-228; cf. also the well-known joint Orthodox statement on the common celebration of Easter at the 5th General Assembly of the WCC at Nairobi:  
We, the delegates of the Eastern Orthodox Churches, members of the World Council of Churches, present at its Fifth Assembly, expressing the unanimous decision of our respective churches, and after conferring here in Nairobi on the issue of a fixed date for a common celebration of the Resurrection of the Lord by all Christians, declare:  
1. We greet with joy the initiative of the World Council of Churches and of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity of the Vatican to bring this matter before this Assembly and to the attention of all Christian churches.  
2. We remind all Christians that the wish to have a common celebration of Easter and a common witness of the resurrection of our Lord at the same day was expressed years ago by the Eastern Orthodox Church, and we are happy that this issue has been a matter of serious consideration by the World Council of Churches and the Vatican.  
3. Although we recognize and respect the efforts of the United Nations toward a common Easter by all Christians and we acknowledge the importance of the social and economic considerations behind these efforts, we nevertheless wish to give priority to the sacredness of the celebration of the resurrection of our Lord in accordance with the tradition of the ancient Church.  
4. It is on these grounds that our respective churches, after correspondence on this matter, have decided that no individual Orthodox Church may take any position on this issue without a general Pan-Orthodox decision.  
5. In accordance with and in consequence of the above-mentioned initiative of the Orthodox Church for the common celebration of Easter, we declare that, since this subject has already been put under examination before the Eastern Orthodox Church in its entirety, it is left to us to suggest to our churches that this subject be examined and decided upon in one of the forthcoming Pan-Orthodox meetings.  
6. We are asking the head delegate of the Ecumenical Patriarchate to make this declaration before the Assembly.  
*Breaking Barriers*, Nairobi, 1975, p. 194.
33. "Episkepsis", No. 191—15.6.1978.
34. 1st Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference. Acts & Documents p. 194 (in Greek).

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR SOLUTIONS TO THE PROBLEM OF THE ORTHODOX DIASPORA (1)

##### Orthodox Diaspora

As is well known, the traditional name of the Eastern Orthodox Church is no longer literally relevant since a considerable number of Orthodox people have moved to all parts of the world, especially during this century. This is particularly true of Western Europe and America where numerous congregations, dioceses and ecclesiastical organizations have grown up outside the areas of the original and historical Orthodox local churches.

In this way the Orthodox Church has become better known than before in the countries of the Western hemisphere. However, the Orthodox witness has been seriously weakened by the fact that the Orthodox in their new environments, and in some places already for generations, have lived divided into groups according to nationalities and ecclesiastical jurisdictions which have, in most cases, none of the unity which is the qualification of Orthodox oneness, not to mention co-operation. This has successively been reflected in the relations of and between the mother churches in Europe and the Near East. In this way the "dispersed" (John 7, 35) Orthodox or the Orthodox diaspora has become a problem unto itself, to its own national mother church and to the whole of Orthodoxy, a complete tangle not easily unravelled, and which causes amazement to the members of other creeds, retards the rooting of the apostolic message of Orthodoxy in these new countries and causes deep sorrow among the Orthodox who love their church and see how the disunity of the Orthodox turns especially the younger generations away from the Orthodox tradition and makes them open to influences alien to their own religion.

##### The Issue of Diaspora as the Solution of the Council

The importance of the issue of diaspora is expressed by the fact that it has been placed first on the agenda of ten topics we have accepted for consideration and decision in the forthcoming Orthodox Council, referred to as the Great and Holy Synod. The study and clarification of this topic has been assigned to five churches, the Patriarchates of Constantinople, Antioch, Moscow, Romania and the Church of Greece (*Episkepsis*, number 163-1.3.1977).

From the above-mentioned churches the Patriarchates of Antioch, Moscow and Romania have prepared papers as they have been requested and they have in this way expressed their views. In addition, the Patriarchate of Alexandria has submitted a paper on the same subject.

As the diaspora is the most important and the most difficult issue that the Council will deal with, it is essential that the preparatory



material concerning it shall become generally known also to the diaspora with which it is concerned. While waiting for the time when the preparatory material for the Council will be published in full we must be satisfied with the summaries which have been made available of the documents on the Orthodox diaspora that have been prepared by the churches mentioned above.

As we cite and review the documents we use only the initials of the Patriarchates: Antioch (AN), Moscow (M), Romania (R) and Alexandria (AL). (2)

All the papers concerning the issue of diaspora admit that diaspora is, at the moment, the most important problem facing the whole Orthodox Church and that it demands a solution, since it is "a threat to Orthodox oneness and it obscures even the foundations of Orthodox ecclesiology" (M).

Alexandria and Moscow review the development of the diaspora, the former from the year 1453 and the latter from the 1920s. Romania, without touching upon the actual historical conditions and facets of the diaspora, puts forward matters of principle on diaspora from the canonical and organizational viewpoint. In the documents of all the Patriarchates there are also more or less concrete suggestions for the solution of the problem of the Orthodox diaspora.

First of all we study the contents of the documents of the Patriarchates of Antioch, Romania and Alexandria, and after that we will study the suggestions of the Patriarchate of Moscow on how to resolve the diaspora.

#### The Antioch Report

The Antioch report has been made in the form of a communication addressed to the General Secretary of the Conference preparing the Great and Holy Pan-Orthodox Synod, Metropolitan Damaskinos. It can be cited in its entirety as an introduction of this paper:

As is known to you, the Antiochian See considered it its responsibility to express thoughts and suggestions concerning the problem of the diaspora. Allow me to pass on to you the ideas and proposals which I was able to collect from our Synodical organization.

We have made ourselves familiar with the articles that were published a few years ago concerning this problem. We have also studied the correspondence concerning the diaspora between the different Orthodox Sees. Discussion with personalities who are in charge of the Orthodox diaspora has to a great extent made us understand the viewpoints which previously

appeared to us very difficult or impossible to comprehend. All this as well as the frequent reports on the condition of Orthodoxy in Europe, America, Australia and elsewhere gave us a basis for putting forward the following conclusions and convictions:

1. The Orthodox diaspora has reached such a maturity that it is necessary to consider it from a new viewpoint and in such a way that it leads to resolution.
2. We must see it as the vocation of the Orthodox diaspora not only to preserve the past for the present, but to become a dynamic and a creative element in its own environment.
3. To preserve the wholeness of the Church and to strengthen the Orthodox witness, it is necessary to accomplish the Orthodox oneness in the various fields of the diaspora.

From these points we reach the following conclusions:

1. It is desirable that the Synod should recognize all the Orthodox churches of the diaspora provided there is no serious cause not to do so.
2. It is desirable that local synods should be created comprising the bishops of the Orthodox churches of the area in question as their members. This should be realized especially in Europe, America, Australia, and also elsewhere as far as necessary.
3. Autocephaly should be granted to all the churches of the countries mentioned above. The local synods of the autocephalous mother churches should decide on it and determine its boundaries.
4. The traditional apostolic and catholic regulations of the Orthodox Church should be followed so that in each city there would be only one bishop, and in each province there would be only one metropolitan.
5. The relationships between the mother churches and the diaspora churches are to be kept brotherly and cordial, as is natural to the Orthodox spirit and to the extent that all is for one and one is for all.
6. Within the parishes there should be preserved the cultural, linguistic and other national elements, in so far as they do not disrupt the unity of the local church or the wholeness of the local diocese.
7. While the autocephaly is carried into effect it is desirable that the other Christian denominations of these areas be respectfully recognized so that our diaspora would not in its own existence forget the higher goal, the oneness of the whole Church, and that they would not become a hindrance to that unity.



The report of Antioch is clear in its brevity. The condition mentioned in its fourth point concerning the residence of one bishop in each city might not be adaptable as such in present-day cities, of which some are greater than the whole population of the Byzantine Empire was in its own time. The main points of Antioch are clear: diaspora has become mature enough to be developed into new churches, which should be recognized as autocephalous and governed by local synods of bishops. This is naturally dependent on the degree of maturity in each case.

#### The Romanian Viewpoint

The document of the Romanian Patriarchate emphasizes the right of each autocephalous mother church to direct its own diaspora and states that on the whole the existence of national churches is in accord with the catholicity of Orthodoxy. In opposition to that, it sees overemphasized nationalism as destructive to the oneness of Orthodoxy. By this it refers to the aim of one jurisdiction to govern the diaspora of another autocephalous church.

Further, Romania emphasizes that contacts between the mother church and other diaspora groups strengthen Orthodoxy in general. While speaking of the dependence of the diaspora on its mother church and of the necessity to retain contact with it, Romania gives special place to a diaspora created as the result of missionary work.

Those Orthodox diasporas which have been born as a result of missionary work of one autocephalous church should be regarded in a special way just as Orthodox communities that have been formed within a country which does not have a national Orthodox church, and:

(a) The diasporas which are the result of missionary work retain close contact with the autocephalous Orthodox church which has fostered them.

The fact that the members of this kind of diaspora belong to a different nationality than the members of the missionary church naturally gives them a reason as soon as it is possible to achieve autonomy and especially autocephaly.

The national autocephalous Orthodox churches engaged in missionary work see this pursuit as positive and support it to the extent they are convinced that the diaspora church has attained proper maturity and is capable of self-government.

(b) Orthodox communities which exist in countries without a national autocephalous Orthodox church may turn to an autocephalous Orthodox church which has been better organized (outside the mentioned country) with the request that they be taken under its spiritual guidance in order to achieve the realm of the universal church under easier conditions.

In answer to this kind of devoted request, the national Orthodox church should give all the possible help it can in the name of common faith and brotherly love.

#### The Alexandrian Solution

After Romania we turn to the document produced by the Patriarchate of Alexandria. Therein is a simple and straightforward comment on the solution of the problem of diaspora: all geographical areas that lie outside the borders of the autocephalous churches belong to the government of the See of Constantinople, and hence the whole diaspora of the world is within the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and belongs to the canonical guidance of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. As an exception, it is mentioned in passing that a diaspora which is the result of missionary work belongs to the guidance of the church which has done the missionary efforts. The fact that diaspora churches have been, and still are, under the guidance of those autocephalous churches from which the members of the diaspora have come, has been, in the Alexandrian opinion, "a position which is uncanonical even though possible in practice".

Then Alexandria asks: "On what grounds has the Orthodox diaspora been submitted to the Ecumenical Patriarchate as far as church government is concerned?" And it answers:

The 28th canon of the Fourth Ecumenical Council gives to the Ecumenical See the right to govern the Christians of the barbarian areas and of foreign tribes, and to ordain bishops for "the people of other tribes".

According to the general interpretation, everyone who does not speak Greek is described as "a barbarian", and everyone who does not live within the borders of the Byzantine Empire. The same is described in the 30th canon of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, which understands that "the barbarian churches" are the churches of other tribes.

After the schism of the Roman Church, the Ecumenical Patriarchate assumed the government of those countries and those areas which had formerly belonged to Rome.

Further, Alexandria explains:

The rules concerning the government of the church are concerned with the geographical boundaries and not with the faithful residing within them; hence, in this sense, the diaspora is understood as a geographical dimension which has Orthodox people living outside the boundaries of the autocephalous churches.



Alexandria supports its theory by asking the question: "What did prominent Orthodox hierarchs and theologians think of this problem of Orthodox diaspora?"

As their witness they bring into use the opinions of three Russian bishops who had become part of diaspora. We quote here the first one:

Metropolitan Platon of the Russian Orthodox Church, who has lived in America, has long been concerned about the condition of Orthodoxy in America and expressed his opinion as follows: "Having observed that the close uniting spirit is lacking from the relationships of the autocephalous churches, I have already followed for a long time the thought that the Ecumenical Patriarchate should be given such rights that it would become the Vatican of Orthodoxy."

Because this is a document meant for the preparation of the Great and Holy Synod, the views of an individual hierarch under exceptional circumstances (in 1919), which are introduced to support the Alexandrian theory that the whole earth belongs to the jurisdiction of Constantinople, cannot have real significance, when compared to what the other Orthodox churches today say in their official positions on the same topic.

Yet we will see what else the Alexandrian statement includes, before we study what the other autocephalous churches have to say on the Alexandrian theory.

On the ground of the view mentioned above, Alexandria thinks all the diaspora groups in Europe, of whatever nationality they may be, should be translated to the well-organized hierarchy of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. In America there could be independent dioceses which would recognize the exarch of the Ecumenical Patriarchate as their leader. These views are also supported by a statement that distances do not mean very much today, and therefore there is no reason to raise the question of new autocephalous churches.

The document of the Alexandrian Patriarchate is mysterious as Alexandria was not included in those churches to whom the study of the diaspora was assigned. While on the other hand the reports of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Greek Church have not been given to us, it remains unclear whether we should regard Alexandria as the representative voice of these churches also.

The Alexandrian Theory from the Viewpoint of the Other Churches  
It is now time to study the opinions of the churches of Antioch, Romania and Moscow on the Alexandrian theory stating that the See of Constantinople has authority over all the diaspora.

As we noticed in the Antioch paper, there is not the slightest reference to the privileges of the Ecumenical Patriarchate over the diaspora of the whole world. On the contrary, it contains the view that the ties of diaspora churches to their own mother churches are natural until diasporas are granted autocephaly, full independence.

There are a lot of material and references to the canonical structure of the Orthodox Church in the documents of the Patriarchates of Romania and Moscow, which point out that "the principle of belonging to a definite nation is also a natural foundation to the right of each autocephalous Orthodox church to build and to guide its own diaspora. This is a principle which the church fulfills from the early origins of its canonical existence and which is a cornerstone of autocephaly" (R:4).

This right of each autocephalous Orthodox church, to govern its own diaspora, expresses the legal equality of all Orthodox autocephalous churches, equality which is not dependent on the size, age or primacy of their sees. This right is founded on the spirit of the Gospel and on the canonical traditions of the Orthodox Church. This tradition has been confirmed in the following regulations:

The 6th canon of the Sixth Ecumenical Council requires the equality of all autocephalous churches. The 2nd canon of the Second Ecumenical Council regulates that diaspora must be governed according to the established tradition (which is, by those bishops who have been the authority from the beginning). The 28th canon of the Fourth Ecumenical Council grants, exceptionally and with limitations, the right to the See of Constantinople to establish bishops for the provinces of Pontus, Asia and Trakheia, which shows that the canons mentioned above do not refer to the whole and do not reach all the diaspora (R:2).

The document of the Patriarchate of Moscow interprets, in agreement with Romania, that the 28th canon of the Council mentioned above only means and refers to the three provinces which belonged to the civil jurisdiction of the area of Constantinople and to the barbarian areas connected with them, and the Archbishop of Constantinople was granted the right to ordain metropolitans in those provinces. This is totally different from the government of the diaspora of the whole world. In addition, the document of the Russian Church deals largely with the interpretation of other canons upon which the Ecumenical See bases its demands for privileges in its relationships with the other autocephalous churches, and beyond that primacy which it has traditionally cherished as *primus inter pares*.

The Romanian Church describes why the spirit of the unity of



Orthodoxy has become weakened. This is due to:

the tendency of some Orthodox churches to govern others with the pretence of under-rating the ecclesiastical order which is based on nationalism. But actually in this effort particularly, there is present an over-emphasized nationalism, i.e., philetism, which influences Orthodoxy in an utterly corruptive way. The defending of the identity and national freedom of each autocephalous Church in accord with the Orthodox unity is something totally else.

The reason for the weakening of the unity of Orthodoxy is national chauvinism which tends, in the pretext of Christian universalism, to interfere in the equal rights of other churches to guide their own diasporas (R:7).

From these statements we notice that the Patriarchates of Antioch, Moscow and Romania strongly oppose the Alexandrian theory on the authority of Constantinople over all the diaspora, and that that theory remains an anachronism, as far back from the modern age as the year 451 of the Fourth Ecumenical Council is from the Twentieth Century.

#### The Solutions of Moscow

Last of all we come to the document of the Patriarchate of Moscow; its special merits lie in its practical and detailed suggestions for the solution of the problem of the diaspora, in addition to the comments included on the principles.

As a guiding principle, Moscow suggests among other things the following:

Because of the best interests of Holy Orthodoxy and in the name of the unity, the churches should not think about what is necessary and useful unto themselves, but rather, what is good for Holy Orthodoxy in the countries of the diaspora as a whole.

The Orthodox churches of the diaspora, whether they have been born as a result of missionary work of some local Orthodox churches or by the activities of its numerous immigrants, must gradually receive the opportunities to grow into new local churches and to receive autocephaly (or, initially, autonomy) from their own mother churches, and the same to be recognized by the other sister churches (M:70).

The Patriarchate of Moscow suggests further that the Council, or the Great and Holy Synod, would create, for the practical solution of the diaspora problem, not only general guidelines but also a program which all churches thereafter could follow in their relationships to their own diasporas (M:71).

By following this course of action the scheme for the new developments of Orthodoxy in the diaspora could comprehend three areas in its details: 1. Orthodoxy and the Orthodox diaspora in America; 2. Orthodoxy and the Orthodox diaspora in Western Europe; 3. Orthodoxy and the Orthodox diaspora in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America (M:72).

We shall now study each of these areas separately:

#### 1. Orthodoxy in America

First the document explains the origins of Orthodoxy in America as the result of the missionary effort of the Russian Church in America from the end of the 1700s until the beginning of the 1900s, when there was already a local church in America, a church of four dioceses, over fifty churches and more than 500 chapels, a theological seminary, and a group of faithful who had come to Orthodoxy from the Aleuts, the Eskimos, and the Indians; it also included different nationalities such as Russians, Byelo-Russians, Greeks, Serbians, Bulgarians, Romanians, Ukrainians, Albanians, Syrian Arabs and former Uniates.

As early as 1905 Archbishop Tikhon made a proposal to the Russian Church that the American church should be granted autocephaly. The conditions in America changed when in 1922 the Patriarchate of Constantinople founded a Greek archdiocese in America.

Further, the document states that in 1970 the Russian Church granted autocephaly to its own American daughter church. It says:

By taking this action, the Russian Church operated within its canonical jurisdiction without interfering in the matters of other churches governing their own diasporas (dioceses and parishes). In so doing, the Russian Church in no way reduced the rights of others nor threatened their jurisdictions because it envisioned the future Pan-Orthodox decision of the founding of the one local Orthodox church in America (M:74).

The Moscow document presents three alternatives for the solution of the problem of Orthodoxy and the Orthodox diaspora in America.

#### Alternative I:

(a) All local (autocephalous) churches recognize the autocephaly of the "Orthodox Church in America" in its present form, taking into consideration that this is an autocephaly of one part of America, the one previously called the "Metropolia".

(b) The other parts of American Orthodoxy are not autocephalous as they are canonically dependent on the mother churches in Europe or the Near East; or they exist depending



on no church, declared independent by their own authority, a situation which is not autocephaly.

(c) A step forward would be the recognition of autocephaly by the See of Constantinople of its own Greek Archdiocese, which has a considerable Orthodox ecclesiastical organization in the North American continent.

(d) Even though there are events in history where within one country there have existed two autocephalous churches, it is definitely to the benefit of Orthodoxy that these two American autocephalous churches should be united into one church. In that kind of church national plurality would give place, gradually, to the one nationality to be. The negotiations and the union of these two churches should be granted solely to their own activity and competence. No other church should interfere with it from without. This should only be the affair of the American Orthodox.

(e) Once the united American autocephalous church has been created, the other Orthodox autocephalous churches should recognize this union by which two similarly canonical American autocephalous churches have become one common autocephalous church. This would not be a new granting of autocephaly nor a recognition because the mother churches of Moscow and Constantinople would already have granted it to them. It would only mean recognizing the fact that they have become united and instead of the two there would now be only one autocephalous church.

(f) The other national church communities would gradually enter this autocephalous church, naturally with the blessing of their own mother churches, and where there exists independence by individual right this should happen by the decision of the faithful.

(g) When this union of all the Orthodox, or of the majority of the Orthodox, in America occurred and there was one autocephalous church, its leader could be granted the title of Patriarch.

(h) After these arrangements the issue of Orthodoxy and of the Orthodox diaspora in America would have been solved and the sorrowful events of the first half of this century would pass into history from the life of the Orthodox in America and from the mutual relationships of the sister churches. This would be to the benefit not only of the whole Orthodox Church but also to the benefit of the witness of Orthodoxy in the Western hemisphere (M:75).

#### Alternative II:

The second procedure which could be used to solve the problems of American Orthodoxy and its diaspora would be the formation of a

special Pan-Orthodox commission to deal with the diaspora issues for the preparation of the Great and Holy Synod. Representatives of all local churches would take part in this commission, and also representatives of the diaspora itself from all the different jurisdictional and national groups, and also from the different church organizations.

This commission would negotiate in plenary sessions or in working groups which would represent different parts of the world and different countries which have diaspora communities.

The commission would then discuss the proposals of the working groups and receive opinions from all whom the matter concerns. When agreement was reached the matter would be passed through the preparatory pre-Synod for final decision and confirmation of the Synod (M:76).

A condition essential to this kind of procedure would be the desire of all churches and jurisdictions to bring to the commission all their problems of diaspora and that they all would, in the same way, have equal rights in dealing with these issues, and that they be ready to accept the results of this kind of Pan-Orthodox negotiations. In practice this would mean that the actions and policies of all Orthodox churches related to their diasporas and to each other would be brought into the sphere of Christian consideration and consultation (M:77).

#### Alternative III:

As the third alternative for the solution of the problems of American Orthodoxy, the Patriarchate of Moscow mentions the possibility that the diaspora issue would be considered seriously and immediately in the session of the Great and Holy Synod. But there is a very serious remark attached to this:

To bring the issue of the Orthodox diaspora directly into consideration in the Synod without previous consideration in Pan-Orthodox commissions or preparatory meetings of the pre-Synod would mean taking the risk of failure both in settling the issue and to the Great and Holy Synod itself.

This kind of procedure is poorly adapted to its purpose, not only in the solution of the diaspora problem of American Orthodoxy but also in the solution of the diaspora problems in other parts of the world as well. It is the task of the Great and Holy Synod—taking into consideration the different circumstances of the various parts of the world—to solemnly declare its decision on the Orthodox diaspora after the matter has been carefully prepared beforehand. Otherwise a detailed analysis of this issue would require a long period of time in the Synod (M:78).



## 2. Orthodoxy in Western Europe

"Western Europe is a classical area of Orthodox diaspora." This is how the document of the Moscow Patriarchate begins its analysis of the diaspora problem of Western Europe.

The historical starting point for the diaspora of Western Europe is the founding of the first Russian church in London in 1616, then in Sweden in 1617, in Berlin in 1718, in Paris in 1720, and in Vienna in 1764. This starting point has, however, in practice lost its significance since in this century there are Orthodox of different nationalities who have in tens and hundreds of thousands moved to Western industrialized countries. Without going into the details of this historical development we could simply state that the jurisdictions of various local churches now cover the whole of Western Europe, from Scandinavia to the Mediterranean, like a tangled net. Each autocephalous church aims to guide its own diaspora by their natural rights, whether governed by exarchates, metropolitanates or dioceses.

Instead of going into a historical review in this connection, it is more important to see what practical procedures Moscow suggests for the solution of the diaspora scene of Western Europe. The document states that the situation has become inflamed and requires canonical decision, and then it continues:

As a beginning to the right solution of the issue would be the establishment of an Orthodox Bishops' Conference of Western Europe. Relationships between jurisdictions and ties to the mother churches would remain the same, but in all purely internal matters, which could include education, teaching, diakonia, Orthodox witness, ecumenical relationships on the local level, pastoral practice, etc., the Bishops' Conference would serve in joint effort as one whole unit and autonomous in its relationship to the mother churches. The mother churches would recognize the internal independence of the Bishops' Conference of this kind and the canonical right of the autonomous co-operation of the Conference. This Conference would elect a chairman for itself and the necessary common executive organs. Election would take place either in order of precedence or by the election of persons for a set period of time. This election, meaning an "internal service", would not require confirmation on the part of the mother churches.

As time passes the kind of circumstances could be created and developed that the Bishops' Conference would be mature enough to become the Bishops' Synod of the local Orthodox Church of Western Europe (M:87).

Further it is stressed that the jurisdictional area of the local churches would reach only to the Orthodox, and it should not raise suspicions

on the rights of local non-Orthodox churches in whose areas the Orthodox live.

The Orthodox in Western Europe should always feel that they live on the historical ground of the people of another creed. And if the union of Christians were to take place with the effect of the creation of one holy catholic and apostolic church, then the Eastern Orthodox in Western Europe would join into this single church as congregations of the Orthodox rite, congregations which would form one canonical unit together with the brothers of the Western rite of the local Western churches (M:87).

## 3. The Diaspora in Other Parts of the World

The document of the Moscow Patriarchate presents the following thoughts on the diaspora in other parts of the world:

In those parts of the world where the situation of the Orthodox diaspora has not yet matured to the level of a local church it is necessary to retain the existing jurisdictional structures. No church should attempt to extend its authority to the diasporas of another church.

In order to encourage also in these parts of the world the creation of normal local churches it should be worked so that groundwork is laid even now in that direction. Therefore, between all jurisdictions of such areas there should be convergence and co-operation (M:89).

Finally, it is hoped that the Pan-Orthodox Commission, which would possibly be established to discuss the diaspora issue, would develop concrete proposal for the diaspora of different parts of the world.

The document of the Moscow Patriarchate ends as follows:

It is important to have the vernacular of each area in use in church services, sermons, church teaching, education and in official church publications. It is natural that for the older generation, and for those people who are only temporarily in diaspora, their own natural language would be preserved in the church services. Yet, this can be done only for pastoral reasons. The normal aim instead should be gradual development to the position of a local church, which has its own local language and culture (M:90).

## How Does the General Situation of the Diaspora Look?

What kind of thoughts do the statements and solutions of these four local churches awaken about the Orthodox diaspora?



The most significant conclusion is that the suggestion of the three patriarchates, Antioch, Moscow and Romania, are in agreement in principle. But the view represented by the Patriarchate of Alexandria differs from the other reports to the extent that those three others regard it important, just as they did earlier, to forestall it on the grounds that it is against the Orthodox tradition. This gives the impression that the Alexandrian theory about the special rights of Constantinople to govern the whole diaspora is not simply a theory or an academic disputation on canons, but also as a matter of fact, a topic of discord, which has already been experienced in practice.

Although Constantinople has not at this stage itself presented any demand of its special rights, it is a clear reality that in practice the hierarchs of Constantinople appear to act just as if that theory had already been recognized by all and as if "the Vatican of Orthodoxy", which Alexandria presents as its ideal, had already been established.

I personally recognized this during my visit to Sweden on 5th May, 1979. Sweden is a typical Scandinavian diaspora country belonging to the Western culture. It is today the residence of several hundred thousand immigrants. Among the Orthodox the majority are Serbians, 26,000; then Greeks, 18,000; Finns, 6,000; Romanians, 2,000, etc. Altogether about 60,000 people. In particular the Serbians, Greeks, Romanians and Finns all have their own church activities.

I went to Sweden on the invitation of Saint Anna's Congregation in Eskilstuna. This congregation functions under authority of the Patriarchate of Serbia; and therefore, I had the blessing of the Serbian bishop to celebrate the Liturgy in that parish. As I travelled through Stockholm I paid a visit to the Metropolitan of the Greek diaspora who lives there. In answer to my complimentary call, he thought it his business to remind me that I had come into his diocese without previously requesting his permission.

This is how I came face to face with the Alexandrian theory in practice. Sweden, as "a barbarian country of an alien people", had been made a Greek diocese under Constantinople!

In other parts of Western Europe, where there have been wide diaspora groups of the various autocephalous churches for a long time, it has apparently been more difficult "to found" Greek dioceses.

As to these "Greek dioceses", the document of the Romanian Patriarchate states that the Patriarchate of Constantinople recognized in 1908 the jurisdictional right of the Greek autocephalous church to all Greek communities living in the diaspora. But in 1922, by the agreement between the Synods of the Greek Church and Constantinople, all the Greek diasporas were given again to the government of Constantinople. Even though this occurred by mutual

agreement, it is in principle the cutting-off of the natural rights of an autocephalous church. Therefore, it is deplorable that in diaspora countries, such as in Sweden, the Greek nation and Greek nationality become an instrument and symbol of the philetism which the hierarchy of Constantinople exercises.

#### Synod and Diaspora

What kind of hopes can we expect from the Pan-Orthodox Council, or the Great and Holy Synod, as an institution which could solve the diaspora problems?

Everyone seems to agree that the issue of the diaspora is the most important of the problems which the Council should solve, because if it remains unsolved it disrupts Orthodox oneness and unity. But it should now be asked: In what way has a solution to this problem been prepared?

Many Pan-Orthodox commissions have been established to prepare and conduct dialogues with other Christian bodies. But the preparation and meeting of the dialogues within the Orthodox Church itself are delayed. Where are such meetings where Orthodox local churches would sit down to negotiate together especially on the principles and practical problems attached to the diaspora, and would seek a right solution for them? And when would a dialogue start between the old historical churches and the churches and communities of the diaspora itself?

Rationally speaking the study and discussion of the inflamed diaspora issue would apparently mean the failure of the whole Council, if unanimity has not been reached in negotiations before the meeting of the Council. Therefore one should put the question, whether there actually is any real intention to hold a Council. The question is justified since there do not exist any other signs of preparation of the most important issue, other than the opinions of four local churches related above. Do we really believe the issue of the diaspora would be solved in the same way, "in academic order", as for example, the questions concerning the calendar or fasting? Surely the issue is in an entirely different way essential to life, even though it has already become a chronic disease within the body of the Church of Christ!

If three authoritative autocephalous churches, judging by the existent and above-related documents, consciously oppose the Alexandrian theory on the supremacy of Constantinople over all the diaspora, can we expect from the Council itself anything else but that all autocephalous churches would also condemn it as philetism?

Is that what awaits us—perhaps for another thousand years!



#### The Situation Should be Normalized Prior to the Council

By taking into consideration what has been said previously, there should be ways to proceed and alternatives to enact, medicines, which would help towards a quick recovery of the illness of the body of the church.

The See of Constantinople has here, as in other preparations for the Council, an important function: that of initiating new procedures. The following action might lead to the desired strengthening of Orthodox oneness, peace and love:

1. Constantinople should relinquish the Alexandrian theory on the supremacy of the Ecumenical See over the whole diaspora and reject its talk of "the barbarians areas of other tribes" as an anachronism.

2. Constantinople should return, at least formally, the jurisdictional rights over the Greek diaspora groups to the autocephalous Church of Greece.

3. In this way, the position of the honour of the Ecumenical See, *primus inter pares*, would be grounded in the witness of the right and pure faith, and not to captured areas or to the submission of other parts of the church.

4. When the Ecumenical See, by its own acts, removes all doubts which have been related to it and gives an example of humility first, there would grow up equal diaspora groups in Western Europe and elsewhere. This would renew an atmosphere of peace and love between them. And this would also create the possibility for episcopal co-operation and in that way the gradual birth of new local churches.

This would be real preparation for the Great and Holy Synod, steps of advance that would help to normalize the situation and to make it again follow the canonical order. Then it would also be possible to negotiate without pain on open questions, in such a way that no one would aim for individual benefit, but would only desire what is to the advantage of the Church of Christ and to the credibility of its message.

If we acted in this direction, it would also bring new hope to the diaspora, whose many local problems could then be solved in the unity of love. Then faith and trust in the energy of life and in the apostolic mission of the Orthodox Church within the whole of Christendom would come again to the hearts of thousands of people.

The Sunday of Orthodoxy is represented iconographically by a scene from the last Ecumenical Council, the Seventh. In the chairman's seat we do not see Rome—not the first, nor the second, nor the third

—but rather the Gospel of Christ. It reminds us in our own time of the fact that it is Christ and his holy Word which guides the Church.

The Great and Holy Synod, the Ecumenical Council of the Orthodox Church, would be able to convene only after we "have been renewed in the spirit of our minds" (Eph. 4, 23) or, by confessing our sins, have become meek enough to say, "for it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us" (Acts 15, 28).

+ Paul  
Valamo 1979  
Archbishop of Karelia and All Finland

#### NOTES

1. A response to this article by Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain has been promised for a future issue of *ECNL*—Ed.
2. The shortest paper is that of Antioch consisting of only two pages; Alexandria, five pages; Romania, seven pages; and Moscow, forty pages. The text of Alexandria has been drafted by Metropolitan Methodios of Aleksun, dated Addis Ababa, 6th February, 1978. The Antioch paper has been submitted by Metropolitan Ignatios of Laodicea, dated Syria, 16th November, 1977. The Romanian paper does not cite the name of its author or the date of its drafting. The Moscow text has been prepared by the Commission on Christian Unity and Inter-church Relationships of the Holy Synod of the Patriarchate of Moscow and has been signed by the chairman, Metropolitan Juvenaly of Krutitsy and Kolonna.

#### NOTICES

##### Change of Address

All notifications of change of address should be sent direct to the General Secretary (whose name and address appear on the inside front cover) and *not to the Editor please!*

##### Note to Contributors

Contributors of articles for *ECNL* and reviewers are requested to submit material in typescript (double-spaced with at least 1 in. left- and right-hand margins) on A4 paper.

##### Membership of the Association

Membership of the Association is open to all communicant members of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches and Churches in full communion with them. Enquiries about membership should be made in writing to the General Secretary.

##### Orthodox Contacts in Britain

A list of Orthodox contacts throughout Britain (i.e., those who have offered to provide information about local Orthodox services and functions) has been published by the St. George Orthodox Information Service. Any Orthodox willing to act as a local 'contact' should



inform the Editor, Mr. Andrew Bond, 243 Regent Street, LONDON W1R 8PN. The list will be updated periodically.

#### Letters to the Editor

Letters to the Editor are encouraged and will be considered for publication in *ECNL*. (The Editor's address is given on the inside front cover). Preference will be given to letters on subjects of direct concern to members of the Association, but letters of a more general nature will also be welcome.

#### Pilgrimage to Iona

There will be a joint Anglican/Orthodox Pilgrimage to Iona in the Summer of 1981. Details appear enclosed with this issue of *ECNL*. If this venture proves successful it is hoped to organize similar pilgrimages to other sacred places of the Celtic Church in future years. Early application is essential as the number of places available is strictly limited.

#### Purchasing of Books

All books reviewed in *ECNL* can be obtained from the Fellowship of SS. Alban and Sergius, 52 Ladbrooke Grove, LONDON W11 2PB. When ordering from the Fellowship, please mention *ECNL*.

(Note: The Editor reserves the right to make minor editorial changes in letters and articles received and, where necessary, to reduce their length provided that this does not change the sense of the material communicated.)

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

## THE ANGLICAN AND EASTERN CHURCHES ASSOCIATION

announces

# A JOINT ANGLICAN/ ORTHODOX PILGRIMAGE

to

## IONA

31st AUGUST—4th SEPTEMBER 1981

Chaplains: The Very Revd. Fr. Kallistos Ware  
(Orthodox)

The Revd. Fr. Royston Beal  
(Anglican)

BECAUSE OF THE ARRANGEMENTS FOR BOOKING  
ACCOMMODATION, REGISTRATION FOR THE PIL-  
GRIMAGE MUST BE COMPLETED BEFORE THE END  
OF JANUARY 1981

All enquiries to: THE IONA PILGRIMAGE SECRETARY,  
20 CLAPHAM ROAD, BEDFORD MK41 7PP  
(s.a.e. please)



## **ANNUAL FESTIVAL 1980**

**SATURDAY, 25th OCTOBER**

at

**ST. DUNSTON'S-IN-THE-WEST,  
FLEET STREET, LONDON EC4**

*(Buses: No. 11 from Victoria and Nos. 4, 6 and 171 from North and South London. Underground: Temple or Blackfriars stations)*

**11.45**

### **SOLEMN CONCELEBRATED EUCHARIST**

**Preacher: HIS EMINENCE ARCHBISHOP METHODIOS  
OF THYATEIRA AND GT. BRITAIN  
Orthodox President of the Association**

*Buffet lunch: please bring sandwiches*

**2.15**

### **ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING**

**(Speaker to be announced)**

A further notice will appear in the *Church Times*  
two weeks previously



THE ANGLICAN AND EASTERN CHURCHES  
ASSOCIATION

announces

**A JOINT  
ANGLICAN/ORTHODOX  
PILGRIMAGE**

to

**IONA**

**31st AUGUST—4th SEPTEMBER 1981**

**Chaplains: The Very Revd. Fr. Kallistos Ware  
(Orthodox)**

**The Revd. Fr. Royston Beal  
(Anglican)**



## PROGRAMME

Assemble at Oban on the morning of Monday, 31st August, 1981, for the final stage of the journey to Iona by boat and bus, arriving on Iona during the afternoon.

There will be daily Anglican and Orthodox services. At some time during the Pilgrimage there will be a celebration of the Orthodox Liturgy in the Abbey Church.

There will be daily devotional addresses, but plenty of time will be allowed for walking on the Island in groups.

On Wednesday, 2nd September, there will be the usual special pilgrimage round the Island organized from the Abbey.

The Pilgrimage will end after the morning Services on Friday, 4th September.

### Accommodation

The Pilgrimage will be based on Bishop's House, a small residential centre of the Scottish Episcopal Church, with overflow accommodation at the Abbey, or at one of the two hotels on the Island. Some talks may be held at the Abbey.

It is not possible to forecast the precise cost of the accommodation. Special terms are being offered, however, and as a rough guide the cost could vary from £30-£50 depending on the accommodation taken.

It is possible to camp on the Island.

Extended stay on the Island can be arranged with the Wardens of Bishop's House and the Abbey or with the Proprietors of the Argyll and St. Columba Hotels.

### Travel

The possibility of running a special coach departing from London and with various pick-up points on the way is being investigated.

It may be possible to arrange special terms for travel by British Rail. It would be particularly helpful if those travelling by car would offer lifts to fellow-members of the Pilgrimage.

**BECAUSE OF THE ARRANGEMENTS FOR BOOKING ACCOMMODATION, REGISTRATION FOR THE PILGRIMAGE MUST BE COMPLETED BEFORE THE END OF JANUARY 1981**

All enquiries to: **THE IONA PILGRIMAGE SECRETARY,  
20 CLAPHAM ROAD, BEDFORD MK41 7PP**  
(s.a.e. please)

(For convenience an application form appears on the back of this leaflet)

## JOINT ANGLICAN/ORTHODOX PILGRIMAGE TO IONA 1981 (31st August-4th September)

*Chaplains:* The Very Revd. Fr. Kallistos Ware (Orthodox)  
The Revd. Fr. Royston Beal (Anglican)

### PILGRIMAGE BOOKING FORM

I wish to be a participant in the 1981 Iona Pilgrimage and I enclose a deposit of £5.00. (Cheques, etc., should be made payable to the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association).

I understand that in the event of my withdrawal from the Pilgrimage, my deposit (less an administrative charge) will be returned only if an alternative participant can be found.

I agree to pay the balance of accommodation charges as and when requested to do so.

### Accommodation (Delete as appropriate)

I wish to be accommodated in Bishop's House. (It may be necessary to arrange for an overspill at the Abbey).

I wish to be accommodated in one of the two hotels. (These are the Argyll and the St. Columbia, both near to Bishop's House and the Abbey).

I am prepared to share a room. (This reduces the price in the hotels).

I have the following special dietary needs:.....

I intend to camp on the Island.

I am making my own accommodation arrangements.

### Travel (Delete as appropriate)

I shall make my own way to Oban.

I can offer.....seat(s) in my car to Oban from.....  
(and return).

I wish to be sent details of any hired coach arranged by the Association with times and places of pick-ups.

I wish to be sent details of any special arrangements made with British Rail.



Notes

The Pilgrimage will assemble at Oban by Noon on the morning of 31st August. Participants will then travel by ferry and bus to Iona. The Pilgrimage will end after the morning Eucharist and breakfast on Iona on 4th September. Anyone wishing to stay in Iona beyond these dates should make their own arrangements direct with the Warden, Bishop's House or the Abbey, or with one of the hotels. Priests are requested to bring cassocks and robes as appropriate. Camping on the Island is possible.

(Signature) .....

(Name and Address  
in block letters) .....

(Delete as appropriate) Orthodox / Anglican / Old Catholic /  
Priest / Male / Female.

Send with deposit to: THE IONA PILGRIMAGE SECRETARY,  
20 CLAPHAM ROAD,  
BEDFORD MK41 7PP

TO ARRIVE NOT LATER THAN 31st JANUARY, 1981  
(s.a.e. please).