

CURRENT THEOLOGY

ORTHODOX ECUMENISM AND THEOLOGY: 1970-78

MICHAEL A. FAHEY, S.J.

Concordia University, Montreal

The difficulties in determining the exact number of Orthodox Christians in the world today are considerable, given the restrictions in some traditionally Orthodox countries that hinder censuses and religious activities. A conservative estimate would be about 122 million. In addition to that number, one should add 12 million other Christians who follow the Eastern liturgical and ecclesiastical traditions, who often were at one time part of Orthodoxy but later entered into full communion with the Church of Rome. On the North American continent, where there are now some four million Orthodox, it is 237 years since an Orthodox priest, Illarion Trusov, assisted by Ignaty Kozirevsky, both companions of the explorer John Bering, first celebrated the Divine Liturgy in Alaska on July 20, 1741. In 1767 the Greek Orthodox set up a temporary colony in New Smyrna, Florida. But even today Orthodox life and its theological traditions are not well known in America. With preparations underway for a forthcoming Pan-Orthodox Great and Holy Council, and with two years of preparatory work completed toward convoking the first international official dialogue between Pan-Orthodoxy and the Roman Catholic Church, perhaps in 1979, interest in Orthodox theology will increase. Exploring this *terra incognita* is no mere curiosity but a search to understand one's own roots.

This survey of Orthodox theological literature is addressed to those trained in theology but with little initiation into Orthodoxy. The survey spans the years 1970 to 1978 but does not include works on Orthodox liturgy except incidentally. Part 1 reports on Orthodox ecumenical dialogues especially with Roman Catholics, non-Chalcedonians, Anglicans, and Protestants, and conversations with Jews. The second section reports on ten theological topics frequently studied by the Orthodox in the last eight years. Naturally the author's own Roman Catholic interests have shaped the material in a way that would differ from an Orthodox theologian's approach.

I

ORTHODOXY AND ECUMENICAL DIALOGUE

Reference Works and General Introductions to Orthodoxy

Because the study of Eastern Orthodoxy is a specialized field, many North Atlantic theologians remain at a loss when they want to gather

general information about the churches of the East. Fortunately, during the period covered by this survey many reliable studies concerning Orthodox theology, history, and church life have appeared. Some of the best work is still being done in German and often by Roman Catholic scholars who devote their lives to interpreting Eastern Orthodoxy for the West. Gone are the days of cruel polemics or misguided assessments; we now have more balanced works to read than those produced only generations ago by men such as M. Jugie, M. Gordillo, and A. Fortescue. Especially valuable today are the theological studies prepared by de Vries, Madey, Heiler, Ivanca, and Kawerau.¹ A highly informative but compendious dictionary relating to theological terms and historical data for the Christian East was recently published by Assfalg and Krüger.² Sources such as these, as well as occasional *Festschriften*,³ provide much accurate information.

In French the most accessible general introduction to the churches of the East is doubtlessly that of Hornus.⁴ Also helpful is a special issue of the journal *Seminarium* prepared by a group of Roman Catholic professors, many teaching in Rome, that contains several interpretative articles and up-to-date information on the Eastern churches.⁵ In that same issue special attention should be given to a critical bibliography of books and professional journals prepared by the Jesuit Charles Indekeu.⁶ A similar critical evaluation of pertinent books was published by the French Dominican H.-M. Legrand (though most of the works analyzed were actually released in the 1960's).⁷

A rough equivalent for Orthodox to the Roman Catholic *Annuario pontificio* is the recently inaugurated *Yearbook of the Orthodox Church*,

¹ Wilhelm de Vries, S.J., "Die getrennten Kirchen des Ostens," in Konrad Algermissen, ed., *Konfessionskunde* (8th ed., new rev. ed. by H. Fries et al.; Paderborn: Bonifacius, 1969) 79-278; Johannes Madey, *Die Kirchen des Ostens: Eine kleine Einführung* (Begegnung mit den Kirchen des Ostens 1; Freiburg: Kanisius, 1972); Friedrich Heiler, *Die Ostkirchen* [revision of *Urkirche und Ostkirche*] (rev. ed. by A. M. Heiler and H. Hartog; Munich: E. Reinhardt, 1971); Endre von Ivanca, Julius Tyciak, and Paul Wiertz, eds., *Handbuch der Ostkirchenkunde* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971); Peter Kawerau, *Das Christentum des Ostens* (Die Religionen der Menschheit 30; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1972).

² Julius Assfalg and Paul Krüger, eds., *Kleines Wörterbuch des christlichen Orients* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1975).

³ E. C. Suttner and C. Patock, eds., *Wegzeichen*. Festgabe zum 60. Geburtstag von Prof. Dr. Hermenegild M. Biedermann, O.S.A. (Würzburg: Augustinus, 1971).

⁴ Jean-Michel Hornus, *Introduction aux églises orientales* (Cahiers d'études chrétiennes orientales 12; Paris: Foi et Vie, 1974).

⁵ *Seminarium* 27, n.s. 15 (1975). The entire issue is devoted to the theme "De oriente christiano."

⁶ P. Charles Indekeu, S.J., "Bibliographie de l'orient chrétien: Choix d'ouvrages et de périodiques," *Seminarium* 27, n.s. 15 (1975) 460-72.

⁷ H.-M. Legrand, "Bulletin d'écclésiologie: Introductions aux églises d'orient," *RSPT* 56 (1972) 661-713.

edited by Alex Proc (available from Athos Verlag, POB 801425; D-8000 Munich 80). Proc gives contemporary descriptions of the separate patriarchates, autocephalous and autonomous churches, with information about hierarchical appointments and organizations. The historical summaries prepared by members of each particular church portray how these groups understand themselves; occasionally, especially for the smaller communities, the description is lyrically one-sided. For North America, one can consult the posthumous volume of Arthur Carl Piepkorn, who painstakingly unraveled the many strands of different Orthodox and non-Chalcedonian jurisdictions in North America.⁸ For instance, the book will differentiate the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in the U.S.A. from the Ukrainian Autocephalic Orthodox Church in Exile. It contains also useful theological assessments and a general history of Orthodoxy in North America.⁹

Another readable work on Orthodoxy in general and especially in Great Britain appeared this year under the authorship of Margaret Doak.¹⁰ An older but somewhat reworked guide for nonspecialists in English is the small book by the Redemptorist C. Englert.¹¹ The work by E. Finn, S.J.,

⁸ Arthur Carl Piepkorn, *Profiles in Belief: The Religious Bodies of the U.S. and Canada 1: Roman Catholic, Old Catholic, Eastern Orthodox* (New York: Harper & Row, 1977).

⁹ It is beyond the scope of this survey to narrate the history of Orthodoxy in North America. For detailed information consult Michael A. Fahey, S.J., "De Orthodoxie in Noord-Amerika," *Christelijk Oosten* 30 (1978) 77-98; *Orthodox America 1794-1976: Development of the Orthodox Church in America*, eds. C. J. Tarasar and J. Erickson (Syosset, N.Y.: Orthodox Church in America, 1975); Archimandrite Serafim [Surrency], *The Quest for Orthodox Unity in America: A History of the Orthodox Church in North America in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Sts. Boris & Gleb Press, 1973); Joseph Hayden, *Slavic Orthodox Christianity in the United States: From Culture Religion to Sectarian Church* (Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York, 1973); John E. Rexine, "Fifty Years of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese in America," *Diakonia* 12 (1977) 189-91; *Encyclicals and Documents of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America Relating to Its Thought and Activity: The First Fifty Years (1922-1972)*, ed. D. J. Constantelos (Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Institute, 1976); Vasile Hategan, *Fifty Years of the Romanian Orthodox Church in America* (Jackson, Mich.: Romanian Orthodox Episcopate of America, 1959); *A History of the Russian Church Abroad and the Events Leading to the American Metropolia's Autocephaly* (Seattle: St. Nectarios Press, 1972). For an account of the "meaningful storm" which broke out in 1970 when the Moscow Patriarchate declared, against the wishes of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, that the "Orthodox Church in America" (formerly the Russian Metropolia) was henceforth autocephalous, see Alexander Schmemmann, "A Meaningful Storm: Some Reflections on Autocephaly, Tradition and Ecclesiology," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 15 (1971) 3-27; Panagiotis Nikolaou Trempelas, *The Autocephaly of the Metropolia in America*, tr. G. S. Bebis et al. (Brookline: Holy Cross Press, 1973).

¹⁰ Margaret Doak, *The Orthodox Church* (Oxford: Pergamon, 1978).

¹¹ Clement C. Englert, C.S.S.R., *An Appreciation of Eastern Christianity* (rev. ed.; Ligouri, Mo.: Ligouri Press, 1972).

although described as a study of the forthcoming Pan-Orthodox Council, is really a general introduction suitable for parish discussion clubs.¹²

One often-neglected area of Eastern Christianity is that of the ancient churches located in the Middle East amid the Arab-speaking populations. A French Catholic priest who has lived for many years in the Levant has corrected that notable lacuna with his remarkable account of the common heritage among Christians living in the Arab world.¹³ He illustrates how cultural and national identities often overcome in practice the theoretical distinctions separating Ancient Orientals, Orthodox, and Roman Catholics in the Middle East.

In the last decade Orthodox writers have not produced many monographs of a general nature on Orthodoxy. The ecumenically sensitive work of N. Patrinos is a notable exception.¹⁴ As ecumenical officer for the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America and participant in the U.S. Orthodox-Catholic Bilateral Consultation, he has recently proposed in the *Orthodox Observer* (March 1, 1978) the establishment of a National Orthodox and Catholic Council in the U.S.A. to co-ordinate the religious, social, and theological work of the sister churches.

A second Orthodox assessment of contemporary Orthodoxy especially in the diaspora is found in the essays collected for the commemorative volume published in honor of Archbishop Iakovos.¹⁵ Neither of these two recent Orthodox publications will replace the earlier and still reliable and standard studies by Timothy Ware and by Ernst Benz (both published in 1963).

Among historical introductions to the Byzantine religious world intended for general readers, the works of Magoulias and Runciman are recommended.¹⁶ More technical are the collected essays of D. M. Nicol and the late Francis Dvornik, for so many years the dean of Byzantine religious history.¹⁷ But probably no single volume on the history of the relationship between East and West can match in perception the study by the Jesuit professor of church history at the Pontifical Oriental

¹² Edward Finn, S.J., *Brothers East and West: A Catholic Examines for Catholics the Proposed Pan-Orthodox Synod* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1975).

¹³ Jean Corbon, *L'Église des arabes* (Rencontres, n.s. 2; Paris: Cerf, 1977).

¹⁴ Nicon D. Patrinos, *The Individual and His Orthodox Church* (New York: Orthodox Observer Press, 1970).

¹⁵ A. J. Philippou, ed., *Orthodoxy: Life and Freedom. Essays in Honour of Archbishop Iakovos* (Oxford: Studion, 1973).

¹⁶ Harry J. Magoulias, *Byzantine Christianity: Emperor, Church and the West* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1970); Steven Runciman, *Byzantine Style and Civilization* (London: Penguin, 1975).

¹⁷ Donald M. Nicol, *Byzantium: Its Ecclesiastical History and Relations with the Western World* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1972); Francis Dvornik, *Photian and Byzantine Ecclesiastical Studies* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1974).

Institute, W. de Vries.¹⁸ At the invitation of Yves Congar, de Vries gathered his previously published series of articles in German on the first seven ecumenical councils and had the separate essays collected into book form and translated into French. Congar felt that this work would help overcome something that he has consistently lamented: the neglect of Eastern church life in most books on ecclesiology written in the West. Other works that make interesting reading are the study on the "sibling" Western and Byzantine cultures by the well-known Orthodox Byzantinist at Yale University, D. J. Geanakoplos, and the work of Yale's church historian J. Pelikan.¹⁹

Surveys of Contemporary Orthodox Church Life

The day-to-day activities of Orthodox church life, its consultations, congresses, ecumenical meetings, theological conferences, etc., are well documented in various specialized theological journals. Especially valuable surveys for the last ten years were separately researched by Kahle and Spuler.²⁰ These chronicles can be complemented, especially for North American Orthodoxy, in the yearly surveys published in *Diakonia*, the New York journal devoted to Eastern Christianity. These chronicles were initiated by Prof. T. Bird of Queens College (CUNY) and have been more recently continued by the Jesuit T. Sable.²¹ Most of the theological journals specializing in Orthodoxy, such as *Ostkirchliche Studien*, *Irénikon*, *Istina*, *One in Christ*, but also the *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, etc., provide surveys of current Orthodox activities and even abstracts of articles appearing in recondite journals. Unfortunately, this material is rarely organized systematically, and wading through it can try one's patience. Another useful annual, obtainable from the Pontifical Oriental Institute (Piazza S. Maria Maggiore 7; I-00185 Rome) is the *Acta Pontificii Instituti Orientalium Studiorum*, which includes a listing of "scripta professorum."

¹⁸ Wilhelm de Vries, S.J., *Orient et occident: Les structures ecclésiales vues dans l'histoire des sept premiers conciles oecuméniques* (Paris: Cerf, 1974).

¹⁹ Deno J. Geanakoplos, *Interaction of the "Sibling" Byzantine and Western Cultures in the Middle Ages and Italian Renaissance 330-1600* (New Haven: Yale, 1976); Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition 2: The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600-1700)* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1974).

²⁰ Wilhelm Kahle, "Die Erforschung der orthodoxen Kirchen und der Kirchen des Ostens," *Theologische Rundschau* 32 (1967) 118-47; 32 (1967) 237-68; 33 (1968) 344-65; 34 (1969) 342-57; 35 (1970) 307-26; 36 (1971) 321-45; 38 (1973) 26-53; Bertold Spuler, "Die orthodoxen Kirchen," *Internationale kirchliche Zeitschrift* 59 (1969) 245-77; 60 (1970) 5-18; 205-30; 61 (1971) 1-32, 121-49; 62 (1972) 1-28; 129-63; 63 (1973) 2-34, 195-227; 64 (1974) 85-117, 210-43; 65 (1975) 89-119, 213-45; 66 (1976) 65-98, 198-223.

²¹ Thomas Bird, "Survey of Eastern Christianity," *Diakonia* 5 (1970) 16-41; 6 (1971) 17-57; 7 (1972) 150-81; 8 (1973) 102-36; 9 (1974) 157-87; 10 (1975) 131-67; Thomas Sable, S.J., "Survey of Eastern Christianity," *Diakonia* 11 (1976) 17-33; 12 (1977) 31-45.

The Secretariate for the Promotion of Christian Unity (SPCU) publishes a yearly report by the Secretariate's president, Cardinal Willebrands.²² The SPCU likewise publishes its own *Service d'information* in French and English editions which occasionally will include addresses, letters, and other documents related to Orthodox and Roman Catholic dialogue.²³ Also, the Orthodox Center of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Chambésy-Geneva²⁴ publishes in Greek and French editions a bimonthly bulletin *Episkepsis* (37 chemin de Chambésy; CH-1292 Chambésy-Geneva). From France one can consult a *Service orthodoxe de presse*, which has appeared ten times a year since 1975 (14 rue Victor Hugo; F-92400 Courbevoie). For statistical, sociological, and cultural information about Orthodoxy in Greece, the reader is referred to the special dossier prepared by the international Pro Mundi Vita organization in Brussels as well as to the research by the Centre de Recherches Socio-Religieuses in Louvain.²⁵ A similar sociological study of religion in the Soviet Union has just been published this year.²⁶

Preparations for the Pan-Orthodox Council

Two of the most important events in modern times related to Orthodoxy have been the preparations for a forthcoming Pan-Orthodox Great and Holy Council and the announcement of the beginning of international "official" dialogues with the Roman Catholic Church, with the goal of eventually resuming full communion with the sister church.

The possibility of the opening of a truly Pan-Orthodox synod or council (the Greek uses *synodos* for both English words) in our own day presents exciting prospects. Amazingly, a church dedicated to the synodal principle has operated for centuries without a major council. Wars, persecutions, national crises, lack of leadership, all have contributed to this anomalous situation. The man most responsible for the move toward conciliarity is the late Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, Athenagoras I, who served as patriarch from 1948 until his death in 1972. He was responsible,

²² Jan Cardinal Willebrands, *Documentation catholique* 67 (1970) 883-91; 68 (1971) 612-20; 69 (1972) 516-26; 70 (1973) 764-71; 72 (1975) 67-78.

²³ *Secrétariat pour l'unité des chrétiens*, "Relations avec les églises d'orient," *Service d'information* no. 27 (1975) 16-21; no. 29 (1975) 4-6; no. 31 (1976) 1-11; no. 33 (1977) 12-19; no. 35 (1977) 1-5.

²⁴ Damaskinos Papandreou, "Das Orthodoxe Zentrum des oekumenischen Patriarchates in Chambésy bei Genf: Entstehung, Aktivitäten, Perspektiven," *Internationale katholische Zeitschrift/Communio* 4 (1975) 323-30.

²⁵ *The Church in Greece*, in *Pro Mundi Vita Dossiers*, November 1976, 34 pp.; "Sociology of Greek Orthodoxy," Special Issue of *Social Compass: International Review of Socio-Religious Studies*, ed. Centre de Recherches Socio-Religieuses, Université Catholique de Louvain [116 Vlamingenstraat; B-3000 Leuven] 22 (1975) 5-147.

²⁶ Christel Lane, *Christian Religion in the Soviet Union: A Sociological Study* (London: G. Allen, 1978).

too, for the re-emergence in our own day of the prestige of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, a see often beset with persecutions and troubles.²⁷ It was Athenagoras who organized the first Pan-Orthodox Conference held at Rhodes, Sept. 24–Oct. 1, 1961, one of the highlights of his patriarchate. That conference was the most representative Orthodox assembly since the eighth century. Out of this first conference among Orthodox from the various patriarchates, autocephalous and independent churches, came plans for greater inter-Orthodox co-operation. After the First Pan-Orthodox Conference three additional ones were held: at Rhodes in 1963 and 1964, and at Chambésy in 1968. From these conferences came the idea for calling a Pan-Orthodox council, although the idea was not totally new. In our own century, for instance, the First Congress of Orthodox Theology meeting in Athens in 1936 called for just such a council.²⁸ It is interesting to read the addresses from then to see how many of the same preoccupations have persisted: calendar reform, marriage questions, fasting, church and society, all were topics that were to re-emerge in the present decade.

The Pan-Orthodox Conference, after its decision in 1968 to move toward convoking a council at an undetermined date, listed six topics for the agenda: the sources of revelation; revisions concerning fasting; participation of the laity in church life and liturgy; impediments to marriage; the church calendar; and the principle of "economy" (*oikonomia*): the church's ability to depart, especially in regard to the sacraments, from strict application of the canons, somewhat analogous to the Western concept of *dispensatio*. Work on the agenda topics was divided up among the different Orthodox jurisdictions. In 1972 the Interorthodox Preparatory Commission published the initial reports.²⁹ These proved to be of uneven value. The reports seemed hastily conceived; Scripture and patristic texts were cited facily as proof-texts. The publication of this

²⁷ Maxime [Christopoulos] de Sardes, Metropolitan, *Le patriarcat oecuménique dans l'église orthodoxe: Etude historique et canonique*, tr. J. Touraille (Théologie historique 32; Paris: Beauchesne, 1975). See review, A. de Halleux, *Revue théologique de Louvain* 8 (1977) 65–68. English: Maximos [Christopoulos], Metropolitan of Sardis, *The Oecumenical Patriarchate in the Orthodox Church: A Study in the History and Canons of the Church*, tr. G. McLellan (Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1976); Richard Potz, *Patriarch and Synode in Konstantinopel: Das Verfassungsrecht des ökumenischen Patriarchates* (Kirche und Recht 10; Vienna: Herder, 1971); Basile Th. Stavridis, "Histoire du patriarcat oecuménique," *Istina* 15 (1970) 131–273. The present difficulties experienced by the small Orthodox minority in Istanbul in the operation of the Patriarchate of Constantinople have been widely reported in the press. See *Time*, Apr. 3, 1978.

²⁸ *Procès verbaux du premier Congrès de théologie orthodoxe à Athènes, 29 Nov–6 Déc 1936*, ed. H. S. Alivisatos (Athens: A. Pirsos, 1939). Résumé in *Irenikon* 14 (1937) 21–41.

²⁹ *Towards the Great Council: Introductory Reports of the Interorthodox Commission in Preparation for the Next Great and Holy Council of the Orthodox Church* (London: SPCK, 1972).

tentative agenda, although it would be modified in 1976, stimulated enormous interest among Orthodox and even Roman Catholic theologians.³⁰ For instance, the U.S. Orthodox-Roman Catholic Bilateral Consultation spent two years studying the preliminary report on *oikonomia* and then published one of its few consensus statements in reaction to a questionable concept of "economy" outlined in the report.³¹ One can consult numerous studies on *oikonomia* that were occasioned by the Pan-Orthodox preliminary agenda.³²

An important meeting took place at Chambésy, Nov. 21-28, 1976, of the First Pan-Orthodox Preconciliar Conference.³³ The delegates reassessed the agenda topics in a democratic fashion by agreeing to choose only those topics at the end that were recommended by a significant number of various Orthodox jurisdictions. At the conference nationalistic tensions, especially between the Patriarchates of Moscow and Constantinople, were overcome. Delegations at the preconciliar conference were present from all the Orthodox local churches (the Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Moscow, Serbia, Romania,

³⁰ Antonios Alevisopoulos, "Die heilige Grosse Synode der Orthodoxie," *Kirche in Osten* 15 (1972) 177-89; Ion Bria, "L'Espoir du grand synode orthodoxe," *Revue théologique de Louvain* 8 (1977) 51-4; Robert Hotz, "Panorthodoxes Konzil zwischen Wunsch und Wirklichkeit," *Orientierung* 41 (Aug. 15-31, 1977) 165-68; A. Kallis, "Op Weg naar een panorthodox Concilie," *Christelijk Oosten* 27 (1975) 172-90; John Panagopoulos, "The Orthodox Church Prepares for the Council," *One in Christ* 13 (1977) 229-37; Wilhelm de Vries, S.J., "Das künftige Panorthodoxe Konzil," *Orientierung* 37 (Oct. 31, 1973) 225-29.

³¹ The text appears in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 13 (1976) 512-14; also in *Diakonia* 11 (1976) 296-97. See semi-official commentary on text by one of the principal drafters: Michael A. Fahey, S.J., "Ecclesiastical 'Economy' and Mutual Recognition of Faith: A Roman Catholic Perspective," *Diakonia* 11 (1976) 204-23.

³² B. Botte, "Oikonomia: Quelques emplois spécifiquement chrétiens," in *Corona gratiarum: Miscellanea patristica, historica et liturgica Eligio Dekkers, O.S.B. XII lustra complenti oblata* 1 (Bruges: St. Peter's Abbey, 1975) 3-9; Yves Congar, "Propos en vue d'une théologie de l'économie dans la tradition latine," *Irénikon* 45 (1972) 155-206; K. Duchatelez, "L'Économie dans l'église orthodoxe: Exposé critique du rapport préconciliaire," *Irénikon* 46 (1973) 198-206; K. Duchatelez, "Le principe de l'économie baptismale dans l'antiquité chrétienne," *Istina* 18 (1973) 327-58; Jérôme Kotsonis [Hieronymos Kotsônēs], *Problèmes de l'économie ecclésiastique*, tr. P. Dumont, O.S.B. (Gembloux: Duculot, 1971); Pierre L'Huillier, "Économie et théologie sacramentelle," *Istina* 17 (1972) 17-20; A. Nihal, "Sacraments—An Insight from the Orthodox Church," *Chicago Studies* 14 (1975) 252-59; Pierre Rai, "L'Économie dans le droit canonique des origines jusqu'au XI^e siècle: Recherches historiques et canoniques," *Istina* 18 (1973) 260-326; Pierre Rai, "L'Économie chez les orthodoxes depuis 1755," *Istina* 18 (1973) 359-68; Demetrio Salachas, "Il principio di 'Oikonomia' e di 'Akribeia' nella Chiesa ortodossa," *Oriente cristiano* 12, no. 3 (1972) 101-12; 12, no. 4 (1972) 59-63; 14, no. 1 (1974) 51-7; Dumitru Staniloae, "The Economy of Salvation and Ecclesiastical 'Economia,'" *Diakonia* 5 (1970) 115-25, 218-31; E. C. Suttner, "'Ökonomie' und 'Akribeia' als Normen kirchlichen Handelns," *Ostkirchliche Studien* 24 (1975) 15-26.

³³ Frans Bouwen, "Première conférence panorthodoxe préconciliaire—Chambésy (Genève), 21-28 novembre 1976," *Proche orient chrétien* 27 (1977) 95-130.

Bulgaria, together with the Churches of Cyprus, Greece, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Finland). The only church not present was the Church of Georgia (Soviet Union) because of "technical reasons." At the conference delegates continued to refine the agenda for the forthcoming council. They also agreed to the importance of furthering relations with other Christian churches and of co-operating to serve mankind through social justice.

Of the original six topics for the synod, three were dropped: regrettably the topics of revelation and of the role of the laity in the Church, but mercifully discussion about the principle of sacramental "economy." The new agenda contains ten topics:³⁴ the diaspora (i.e. Orthodox living in countries not traditionally Orthodox, such as France or the USA); autocephaly (canonical independence of certain churches); autonomy of churches and the way to promulgate it; the diptychs (i.e., the order of commemorations in the celebration of the Divine Liturgy); calendar reform; marriage impediments; adaptation of fasting regulations; relations of Orthodox churches with the rest of the Christian world; Orthodoxy and the ecumenical movement; finally, the contribution of the local Orthodox churches to the realization of Christian ideals such as peace, liberty, fraternal charity, and the suppression of racial discrimination. At the meeting considerable discussion took place about revising the date of Easter so as to achieve a common date for all of Christianity.³⁵

The themes chosen are eminently pastoral. Some might wish that additional theological themes had been slated for discussion. However, as a matter of fact, even to broach certain practical questions as fasting will require re-examination of the meaning and origins of canonical traditions which still have such force in Orthodoxy and which are often barriers between Orthodox and other Christians. Furthermore, it is not impossible that, as at the beginning of Vatican II, the actual agenda might depart from a fixed plan outlined by the preparatory commission, once the council gets underway. The US Orthodox-Roman Catholic Consultation prepared a confidential reaction to the proposed agenda at the request of Archbishop Iakovos, who in turn forwarded the study to the planning committee of the projected Pan-Orthodox Council.

Toward International "Official" Dialogue with Roman Catholicism

Of all the agenda items listed, the one that may have greatest impact refers to relations of the Orthodox churches with the rest of the Christian world. As this relates to Roman Catholicism, one year earlier this com-

³⁴ Agenda for the forthcoming Pan-Orthodox Council is given in the official communiqué published in *Documentation catholique* 74 (1977) 91-92.

³⁵ Timothy Kallistos Ware, "A Common Easter—How Soon?" *Eastern Churches Review* 8 (1976) 79-81.

mitment to dialogue was dramatically announced on Dec. 14, 1975, when Metropolitan Meliton, personal representative of the Ecumenical Patriarch Demetrios I, announced to Pope Paul VI in the Sistine Chapel the Pan-Orthodox decision to establish a special inter-Orthodox theological commission, the purpose of which was to prepare, for the Orthodox side, formal theological dialogue with Roman Catholics. Pope Paul, it is recalled, greeted the news with the stunning gesture of falling to his knees and kissing the feet of Metropolitan Meliton, who conveyed the good news, thereby evoking St. Paul's words citing Isaiah in Rom 10:15: "How beautiful are the feet of those who preach the good news!" That gesture of reconciliation and joy, together with Paul's historic amplexus of Patriarch Athenagoras in January 1964 during his visit to Jerusalem, may well be regarded as the high points of Pope Paul's pontificate.

The emphasis in this Orthodox announcement was on the word "official." Earlier the Pan-Orthodox Conference in Rhodes in 1964 had declared that the time was not yet opportune for "official" dialogue, though much unofficial exchange was encouraged and did in fact take place. The decision of the Orthodox is quite remarkable in light of its decision to boycott Vatican II. Despite various ecumenical initiatives of Patriarch Joachim III in 1902, his patriarchal encyclical of 1920 on ecumenism, the early co-operation of the Orthodox with the Life and Work section of the World Council of Churches, and the Orthodox entry into the World Council of Churches beginning in 1960, still Orthodoxy decided to remain officially absent from Vatican II much to the distress of many. Nine of the fifteen churches voted to oppose official participation in Vatican II. Athenagoras himself was thus prevented from attending, though such was probably his wish. Eventually the Moscow Patriarchate did attend Vatican II, but always "unofficially." Patriarch Athenagoras in turn arranged to have his own personal representative, Romanian theologian Fr. Scrima, in attendance. Scrima commuted back and forth to Istanbul to keep the Patriarch informed of the proceedings. Another Orthodox presence at the Roman Catholic Council was the Rector of the Institute of St. Sergius in Paris, Msgr. Cassian, who also attended unofficially.³⁶ On this official absence from Vatican II Yves Congar commented very harshly in a recent interview: "Orthodoxy, in my opinion, missed an absolutely unique historical opportunity for rapprochement. It bears a very serious responsibility for that."³⁷

Relations between Rome and Constantinople began to improve starting with the meeting in Jerusalem in January 1964 between Paul and Athenagoras. A second action that had widespread ramifications was effected

³⁶ Damaskinos Papandreou, ed., *Stimmen der Orthodoxie zu Grundfragen des II. Vatikanums* (Vienna: Herder, 1969).

³⁷ *Jean Puyo interroge le Père Congar* (Paris: Centurion, 1975) 146.

simultaneously in Rome and Istanbul on December 7, 1965, by the mutual lifting of the anathemas of 1054. The two churches decided to bury in oblivion the memory of the mutual excommunications of 1054, when anathemas were leveled against Patriarch Michael Cerularius and two other persons by the personal legates of Pope Leo IX under Cardinal Humbertus, legates who then became the object of a similar sentence pronounced by the Patriarch and the Synod of Constantinople. These anathemas had been personal excommunications and did not address the two churches as such. The removal of the anathemas in 1965 was clearly intended to have a symbolic more than a canonical effect.³⁸ As is often noted today, Rome and Constantinople had been estranged culturally for centuries, long before the textbook date of 1054 that appears as the point of rupture.

Further cordial relations developed in 1967, when Pope Paul visited Patriarch Athenagoras in Istanbul and then in turn received the Patriarch as his guest in Rome. There was a further interesting exchange of letters in 1971 between Rome and Constantinople about a "common sacramental cup" to which they both aspired. The history of this remarkable turnabout in relations between the Vatican and the Phanar (the section of Istanbul where the Patriarchate is located) has been documented in the *Tomos Agapis* published in Greek and French.³⁹ More and more Rome uses the term "sister church" to describe Orthodoxy; Constantinople is called affectionately the "new Rome." All these events have occasioned a vast amount of theological reflections.⁴⁰

³⁸ Christophe J. Dumont, "La levée des anathèmes de 1054 (7 décembre 1965) et sa signification dans la conjoncture oecuménique contemporaine," in *The Ecumenical World of Orthodox Civilization: Russia and Orthodoxy 3: Essays in Honor of Georges Florovsky*, ed. A. Blane and T. Bird (The Hague: Mouton, 1974) 193-214; V. Pheidias, "Anathèmes et schisme: Conséquences ecclésiologiques de la levée des anathèmes," *Istina* 20 (1975) 75-86; Joseph Ratzinger, "Anathématique: Les conséquences ecclésiologiques de la levée des anathèmes," *Istina* 20 (1975) 87-99; Demetrios Tsakonas, *A Man Sent by God; The Life of Patriarch Athenagoras of Constantinople*, tr. G. Angeloglou (Brookline, Mass.: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1977) esp. 60-64, "Revocation of the Excommunications"; D. Savramis, "De Invloed van de niet-theologische Factoren op de Scheiding tussen Oost en West," *Christelijk Oosten* 25 (1973) 112-31. On historical background see Enzo Petrucci, *Rapporti di Leone IX con Constantinopoli 1: Per la storia della scisma del 1054* (Roma: Elia, 1975); "Après 7 siècles: Orient et occident à Lyon 1274-1974," *Unité chrétienne, Pages documentaires* 37 (Feb. 1975).

³⁹ *Tomos Agapis: Vatican—Phanar (1958-1970)* (Rome: Vatican City Press, 1971).

⁴⁰ Maximos Aghiorgoussis, "Ortodossia e Cattolicesimo oggi: Un punto di vista Ortodossa," *Unitas* 32 (1977) 9-22; Frans Bouwen, "Vers le dialogue théologique entre l'église catholique et l'église orthodoxe," *Proche orient chrétien* 26 (1976) 105; Charles Boyer, S.J., *Eglise catholique romaine et église orthodoxe: Pour leur complète communion* (Rome: Gregorian University, 1976); Louis Bouyer, "Réflexions sur le rétablissement possible de la communion entre les églises orthodoxe et catholique: Perspectives actuelles," *Istina* 20 (1975) 112-15; C. J. Dumont, "Dix années bien employées (7 décembre 1965-14 décembre

The dialogue of charity underway during the last fifteen years has radically modified the mentalities of the two churches. This explains the pace of progress. In October 1976 a Roman Catholic Technical Preparatory Commission met in Rome to draw up a possible agenda for the official dialogue. Attending from the U.S.A. was Rev. J. Peter Sheehan of the Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs (BCEIA). In the following year, 1977, the corresponding Orthodox preparatory commission met twice in Chambésy. By common agreement the two groups then set up a joint co-ordinating group to examine the work already accomplished on both sides. This joint group met from March 29 to April 1, 1978, and included among the Orthodox theologians I. Bria and J. Zizioulas and from the Catholics P. Duprey, J. Long, and E. Lanne.

1975," *Istina* 21 (1976) 118-32; Pierre Duprey, "Aspects de l'oecuménisme," *Proche orient chrétien* 22 (1972) 3-17 (English: "Aspects of Ecumenism," *One in Christ* 9 [1973] 319-36); Michael A. Fahey, S.J., "Reconciliation between Orthodoxy and Catholicism: A Roman Catholic View," *Diakonia* 10 (1975) 4-23; Stylianos Harkianakis, *Orthodoxe Kirche und Katholizismus: Ähnliches und Verschiedenes* (Munich: Kösel, 1975); Vasil T. Istavridis, "New Tendencies of the Roman Catholic Church in Relation to the Orthodox Churches," *Diakonia* 8 (1973) 206-19; Vasil T. Istavridis, "Orthodoxy in the Ecumenical Movement," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 20 (1975) 71-80; Vasil T. Istavridis, "The Ecumenicity of Orthodoxy," *Ecumenical Review* 29 (1977) 182-95; P.-P. Joannou, "Die Einheit der Christen in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart," *Ostkirchliche Studien* 19 (1970) 112-34; I. Juhász, "Die Bedeutung der Begegnung mit der Orthodoxie: Ein Beitrag zur ökumenischen Kirchengeschichtsschreibung," *Communio viatorum* 19 (1976) 233-39; Georges Khodr, "Perspectives de rencontre entre l'orient et Rome," *Proche orient chrétien* 25 (1975) 46-50; A. Palamas Koumantos, "Orthodoxy and Ecumenism," *One in Christ* 13 (1977) 304-20; M.-Vincent Leroy, O.P., "Note sur l'unité de l'église catholique et orthodoxe," *Revue thomiste* 71 (1971) 528-49; Robert Murray, S.J., "What Does a Catholic Hope from the Dialogue with Orthodoxy?" *Eastern Churches Review* 3 (1970) 178-81; Damaskinos Papandreou, "Quelques réflexions sur les relations entre orthodoxes et catholiques romaines après le IIe concile de Vatican," *Proche orient chrétien* 20 (1970) 225-37; Michel van Parys, O.S.B., "La rencontre du frère, dimension dernière du projet oecuménique," *Irenikon* 49 (1976) 3-22; Vlássios Pheidias, "Pré-supposés fondamentaux pour un dialogue théologique officiel entre l'église orthodoxe et l'église catholique romaine," *Proche orient chrétien* 26 (1976) 220-29; Edmund Schlink, "Die Bedeutung der Orthodoxen Kirche für die ökumenische Bewegung," *Theologia* 44 (1973) 685-97; Emilianos (Timiadis), Metropolitan of Calabria, "Dégager la voie," *Proche orient chrétien* 26 (1976) 3-15, 193-208; Cezar Vasiliu, "Le relazioni tra la chiesa cattolica e la chiesa ortodossa nel periodo post-conciliare (1966-1970)," *Oriente cristiano* 11 (1971) 4-55; "Prospettive di dialogo tra la chiesa cattolica ed ortodossa," *ibid.* 56-72; C. Vasiliu, "Relations between the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church from the Announcement of the Second Vatican Council (Jan. 1959) until December 1970" [in Rumanian], *Ortodoxia* 28 (1976) 51-234; Wilhelm de Vries, "Die Einigung der Kirchen aus der Sicht der römisch-katholischen Kirche," *Theologia* 45 (1974) 559-75; Wilhelm de Vries, S.J., "Orthodoxe und ökumenische Bewegung," *Stimmen der Zeit* 192 (1974) 663-71; Jan Cardinal Willebrands, "L'Unité des églises catholique et orthodoxe," *Documentation catholique* 68 (1971) 67-69; Nicolas Zernov, "Rome and Orthodoxy: Is Reunion Possible?" in *Pluralisme et oecuménisme en recherches théologiques. Mélanges P. Dockx, O.P.* (Paris: Duculot, 1976) 237-44.

These delegates drew up a possible plan for an official opening of dialogue, and this is now being considered by the two churches. The Roman Catholics met from May 8 to 12, 1978, to prepare a formal reaction. Although the proposed agenda remains confidential, it is possible to conclude from two separate sources what will be the main focus of discussion: the unifying common vision of sacramental life in the two churches. This can be concluded from the letter that Paul VI wrote to Demetrios on November 24, 1977, and the speech given by Cardinal Willebrands in the presence of Demetrios on November 30, to which the Patriarch responded favorably.⁴¹ A second indicator that leads one to presume the importance of sacramental life for the upcoming official dialogue is the recent publication by a team of Roman Catholic and Orthodox theologians (although not an official agency) of a working draft concerning a theology of ordained ministry.⁴² This seems to indicate a common preference for sacramental themes as the point of departure for dialogue. Such a discussion will try to avoid the old controversies that were linked to Scholastic sacramental theology. Orthodoxy has strong negative feelings toward Scholastic sacramental theology, especially as it is unaware of the amount of plurality even within the Scholastic systems.⁴³ Much can be said by way of criticism of the working paper on ministry recently prepared for discussion, but these criticisms will be mentioned in Part 2 of this survey, when we address specific theological issues such as priesthood. Still, the text provides a beginning and will doubtlessly be refined in the years ahead. The U.S. Orthodox-Roman Catholic Consultation will study this text at its next meeting in December 1978.

When official dialogue formally begins, perhaps in 1979, the delegates will be able to draw upon many pioneering works and studies organized for Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism by the Pro Oriente Foundation in Vienna, which has sponsored several symposia on conciliarity (1970), the Petrine ministry (1970), Christ and his Church (1971), and, most impor-

⁴¹ *Documentation catholique* 75 (1978) 79-81.

⁴² *Origins* 7 (1978) 702-4. Original French text in *Documentation catholique* 75 (1978) 262-65.

⁴³ For a typical example of an Orthodox misunderstanding of Scholasticism, see the following article which subsequently occasioned a flood of negative reactions: Christos Yannaras, "Orthodoxy and the West," *Eastern Churches Review* 2 (1970-71) 286-300 (also published in *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 17 [1972] 115-31). Responses: Robert Murray, "A Brief Comment on Dr Yannaras's Article," *Eastern Churches Review* 3 (1970-71) 306-7; Gerald Bonner, "Christianity and the Modern World-View," *ibid.* 5 (1973) 1-15; Kallistos Ware, "Scholasticism and Orthodoxy: Theological Method as a Factor in the Schism," *ibid.* 5 (1973) 16-27; N. A. Nissiotis, "Orthodoxy and the West: A Response," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 17 (1972) 132-42; Chrysostom Konstantinides, "Orthodoxy and the West: A Response," *ibid.* 17 (1972) 143-66; Christos Yannaras, "Scholasticism and Technology," *Eastern Churches Review* 6 (1974) 162-69.

tantly, the Church as a communion (*koinonia*) (1974).⁴⁴ A similar interesting series of congresses has been the work of the Society of Canon Law of Oriental Churches, which met in 1971 and 1973 to discuss the authority of canons, councils, and local traditions.⁴⁵

Orthodox-Roman Catholic Dialogue in the U.S.A.

Another source that the international group can draw upon when it meets is the work of the U.S. Orthodox-Roman Catholic Consultations established in 1965 by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs and the Ecumenical Commission of the Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in the Americas (SCOBA).⁴⁶ At its inception this consultation had no counterpart anywhere in the world. It was given the mandate to investigate theological issues and pastoral problems of common concern to both Catholics and Orthodox. The membership is made up of two groups, each chaired by an archbishop. Archbishop Iakovos has served from the beginning as the chairman for the Orthodox and William Cardinal Baum of Washington, D.C., succeeded Bishop Bernard Flanagan of Worcester, Mass., as Catholic chairman in 1973. Since its organization the consultation has met eighteen times. The nineteenth meeting is scheduled for New York on December 7-8, 1978. To date six published consensus statements have appeared: on the Holy Eucharist (1969), Mixed Marriages (1970), Respect for Life (1974), the Church (1974), Pastoral Office in the Church (1976), and the Principle of "Economy" (1976).⁴⁷ A new prepared document on the sanctity of marriage has been composed and will be ready for publication shortly.

In terms of published statements, the Orthodox-Roman Catholic documents have been modest in length and in frequency, especially when

⁴⁴ *Konziliarität und Kollegialität als Strukturprinzipien der Kirche* [1. Theol. Konferenz, March 6-7, 1970]; *Das Petrusamt in ökumenischer Sicht* [2. Theol. Konferenz, Nov. 13-14, 1970]; *Christus und seine Kirche: Christologische und ekklesiologische Aspekte* [3. Theol. Konferenz, April 23-24, 1971], ed. Pro Oriente Foundation (Innsbruck: Tyrolia, 1975); *Auf dem Weg zur Einheit des Glaubens* [First Ecclesiological Colloquium between Orthodox and Roman Catholic Theologians on "Koinonia," Vienna, Apr. 1-7, 1974] (Innsbruck: Tyrolia, 1976); French text in *Istina* 20 (1975) 1-160. See also Michael Lehmann, *Österreich und der christliche Osten: Begegnungen in Gegenwart und Vergangenheit* (Vienna: Wiener Dom, 1971).

⁴⁵ *Kanon: Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für das Recht der Ostkirche*, eds. M. W. Plöchl and R. Potz (2 vols.; Vienna, Herder, 1973-74).

⁴⁶ Michael A. Fahey, S.J., "Orthodoxes et catholiques romains en Amérique du nord," *Eglise canadienne* 11 (Nov. 17, 1977) 179-80; Edward J. Kilmartin, S.J., "Orthodox-Roman Catholic Consultation in the USA," *New Catholic World* 220 (July/Aug. 1977) 179-86.

⁴⁷ The six texts of the U.S. Orthodox-Roman Catholic Bilateral Consultation have been published in *Diakonia* 5 (1970) 72; 6 (1971) 396; 9 (1974) 209; 10 (1975) 184; 11 (1976) 293-95, 296-97.

compared with the statements published by the Lutheran-Catholic and Anglican-Catholic dialogues. But in this particular consultation much preliminary work was necessary to overcome stereotypes and long-standing misconceptions. Indeed, tensions within American Orthodoxy itself gave the meetings, especially in the first years, a particular ambiance. Other topics have been treated at the consultations so as to clarify theological views and canonical regulations. Among such topics have been the nature of ecumenical councils, the agenda of the future Pan-Orthodox Council, and the practical problems about the religious education of children in mixed marriages.

It is not possible here in this survey to summarize the consensus statements, even though they are usually only short declarations, never more than two or three printed pages. What does emerge in these statements is repeated reference to "our remarkable and fundamental agreement" and "our common Christian tradition." It is true, one statement notes, that "our two traditions of viewing the Church are not easily harmonized. Yet we believe the Spirit is ever active to show us the way by which we can live together as one and many." Important theological conclusions of major interest can be drawn from the joint statements, especially those on the Eucharist, the Church, pastoral office, and marriage. Furthermore, several creative ways for greater mutual pastoral cooperation have been foreseen.

Contacts with the Non-Chalcedonian Churches

Another international development in the last fifteen years has been the dramatic dialogues between the Orthodox churches and the so-called Ancient Oriental (Orthodox) churches, the "non-Chalcedonian" churches. These churches are a group of national churches in ancient Syria, Egypt, Ethiopia, and Armenia that did not accept the Christological definition formulated at the Council of Chalcedon in 451. Half of the Patriarchate of Antioch, almost the entire Alexandrian Patriarchate, the entire Armenian and Ethiopian Churches repudiated the Council and have not changed their attitude to this day. The East Syrian Church of Persia hardly took note of the Council. The churches that comprise this group today are the Syrian Orthodox Church, the Armenian Orthodox Church, the Coptic Orthodox Church, and the Ethiopian Orthodox Church.⁴⁸ (The terminology is confusing because these churches sometimes use the word "Orthodox" to describe themselves, although they are not Orthodox in

⁴⁸ Karekin Sarkissian, *The Witness of the Oriental Orthodox Churches: Recovery, Rediscovery, Renewal* (2nd rev. ed.; Antelias, Lebanon, 1970); Paulos Grégorios [Verghese], "Priorités oecuméniques: Point de vue oriental orthodoxe sur le mouvement oecuménique d'aujourd'hui," *Irénikon* 50 (1977) 204-9; see also his "An Eastern View of Ecumenism," *America* 137 (1977) 400-401; Karekin Sarkissian, *A Brief Introduction to Armenian Christian Literature* (Bergenfield, N.J.: M. Barour, 1974 [first printing, 1960]).

the usual sense, meaning those who follow the decisions of the seven councils of the Great and Undivided Church.)

The Byzantine Orthodox Church and the Ancient Oriental churches have already held four "unofficial" conversations at Aarhus (1964), Bristol (1967), Geneva (1970), and Addis Ababa (1971). The full proceedings of these meetings in English have been published.⁴⁹ There is general agreement that the differences in faith are not substantial.⁵⁰

In a similar way the Roman Catholic Church, under the sponsorship of the Pro Oriente Foundation, has held three "nonofficial" dialogues with the Ancient Eastern churches in 1971, 1973, 1976, all in Vienna. Again the papers, addresses, and resolutions of these meetings have been published in English by *Wort und Wahrheit*.⁵¹ Some valuable theological commentaries on these meetings have been prepared by the Catholic professors de Vries, Grillmeier, and de Halleux.⁵²

⁴⁹ The publications have appeared in the *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 10 (1964-65) [Aarhus]; 13 (1968) [Bristol]; 16 (1971) [Geneva and Addis Ababa]. These dialogues, as well as those with Catholics, have been summarized and evaluated by Archbishop Methodios Fouyas, *The Person of Jesus Christ in the Decisions of the Ecumenical Councils* (Addis Ababa: Central Press, 1976) 212-80. See also J.-M. Garrigues, O.P., "Vers la réconciliation entre les églises non-chalcédoniennes et l'église orthodoxe," *Istina* 17 (1972) 27-35.

⁵⁰ World Council of Churches, Faith and Order, "Le Concile de Chalcédoine: Son histoire, sa réception par les églises et son actualité," *Irénikon* 44 (1971) 349-66; Mesrot Ashjian, "The Acceptance of the Ecumenical Councils by the Armenian Church with Special Reference to the Council of Chalcedon," *Ecumenical Review* 22 (1970) 348-62; Robert Butterworth, S.J., "Has Chalcedon a Future?" *Month* n.s. 10 (1977) 111-17; Jean Coman, "The Doctrinal Definition of the Council of Chalcedon and Its Reception in the Orthodox Church of the East," *Ecumenical Review* 22 (1970) 363-82; Maria Cramer, *Koptische Liturgien: Eine Auswahl* (Sophia 11; Trier: Paulinus, 1973).

⁵¹ [First] *Non-Official Ecumenical Consultation between Theologians of the Oriental Orthodox Churches and the Roman Catholic Church*, Sept. 7-12, 1971, Vienna, published in *Wort und Wahrheit*, Supplement No. 1 (Vienna; Herder, 1972); *Second Ecumenical Consultation between Theologians of the Oriental Orthodox Churches and the Roman Catholic Church*, Sept. 3-9, 1973, published in *Wort und Wahrheit*, Supplement No. 2 (Vienna: Herder, 1974); *Third Ecumenical Consultation between Theologians of the Oriental Orthodox Churches and the Roman Catholic Church*, Vienna-Lainz, Aug. 30-Sept. 5, 1976, *Wort und Wahrheit*, Supplement No. 3 (Vienna: Herder, 1976).

⁵² André de Halleux, "Approches des églises anciennes orientales: Troisième consultation oecuménique non officielle entre théologiens des anciennes églises orientales et de l'église catholique romaine, Fondation Pro Oriente, Vienne-Lainz, 30 août-5 sept 1976," *Irénikon* 49 (1976) 486-90; Alois Grillmeier, S.J., "Auf der Suche nach Einheit: Zum Stand der Gespräche mit den altorientalischen Kirchen," *Theologie und Philosophie* 52 (1977) 242-57; Johannes Madey, "Zur Gegenwartsfrage der Orientalischen Kirchen," *Oriens christianus* 59 (1975) 169-84; Wilhelm de Vries, "Die Konsultationen zwischen Theologen der altorientalischen Kirchen und der römisch-katholischen Kirche (in Wien 1971, 1973, 1976)," *Der christliche Osten* 31 (1976) 22-25; Margot Schmidt, "Die orientalische Kirche als Brücke zwischen den Kulturen von Ost und West. II: Symposium Syriacum in Chantilly/Paris vom 13.-17. Sept. 1976," *Münchener theologische Zeitschrift* 28 (1977) 69-77.

Orthodox Contacts with Anglicans and Protestants

In August 1976 the International Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission published its conclusions in a so-called "Moscow Statement."⁵³ For many this was the first time they even knew that such a consultation existed. But in fact Orthodoxy and Anglicanism have enjoyed a special relationship since the time of the Reformation.⁵⁴ This was fostered in part because of similar attitudes in the two churches toward papal jurisdiction, but also more profoundly because of the predilection of many Anglican reformers for Greek sources in the elaboration of their theology and liturgical reforms. During the last one hundred years there have also been numerous explorations about the possibility of mutually recognizing the ordinations that take place in the two churches. A special cordial relationship continues to exist between the Romanian Orthodox Church and the Anglicans.⁵⁵ In London the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, dedicated to the promotion of mutual Orthodox and Anglican understanding, is now celebrating its fiftieth anniversary. Located at St. Basil's House (52 Ladbroke Grove, London W11 2PB) this fellowship has provided not only an important center for information and co-operation but also one of the finest bookstores on Orthodoxy in the world, specializing in volumes published even in Greece, Bulgaria, Ethiopia, Romania, etc.

Relations between Anglicans and Orthodox have been strained especially in Great Britain and the U.S.A. because of serious disagreement regarding the ordination of women. The reaction of the Orthodox to the decision of the Episcopal Church of the U.S.A. at its general assembly in Minneapolis in 1976 has been sharply critical. This issue of Orthodox reactions to the ordinations of women will be critical at the next Lambeth Conference scheduled to meet in 1978.

With European and American Protestantism Orthodoxy has also held a variety of consultations. The Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople held three important meetings with the Evangelical Church of Ger-

⁵³ *Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: The Moscow Statement Agreed by the Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission 1976*, ed. K. Ware and C. Davey (London: SPCK, 1977).

⁵⁴ Colin Davey, "Anglican-Orthodox Relations during the Patriarchate of His All Holiness Athenagoras I (1948-1972)," in *Athenagoras Oikoumenikos Patriarchês Ho Êpeirôtês* (Ioannina, Greece: Etaipeias, 1975) 411-36; Methodios Fouyas, *Orthodoxy, Catholicism and Anglicanism* (London: Oxford University Press, 1972). For the period up to 1960, consult V. T. Istavridis, *Orthodoxy and Anglicanism*, tr. C. Davey (London: SPCK, 1966).

⁵⁵ *Romanian Orthodox Church and the Church of England* (Bucharest: Biblical and Orthodox Missionary Institute, 1976); Alf Johansen, "Rumanian Contributions to Ecumenical Theology," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 8 (1971) 66-89; *De la théologie orthodoxe roumaine des origines à nos jours* (Bucharest: Editions de l'Institut biblique et de Mission Orthodoxe, 1974) and review by E. C. Suttner in *Ostkirchliche Studien* 24 (1975) 340-45.

many in 1969, 1971, and 1973.⁵⁶ The Moscow Patriarchate in turn has met three times in this decade (1970, 1972, 1974) with the same Evangelical Church of Germany to discuss successively baptism, the resurrection of Jesus, and the Eucharist.⁵⁷ These latter consultations are paralleled by a series of meetings taking place between the Moscow Patriarchate and the Roman Catholic Church. To date four formal meetings have been held: Leningrad (1967), Bari, Italy (1970), Zagorsk, U.S.S.R. (1973), and Trent (1975). General accounts of these meetings between the Roman Catholic Church and the Moscow Patriarchate are available.⁵⁸ All this has led to a revived interest in the ecumenical role of Moscow for today.⁵⁹

⁵⁶ *Dialog des Glaubens und der Liebe: Theologisches Gespräch zwischen dem ökumenischen Patriarchat von Konstantinopel und der evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland vom 16.-19. März 1969*. Mit einer Einführung von Adolf Wischmann (Stuttgart: Evang. Missionsverlag, 1970); *Christus, das Heil der Welt: Zweites theologisches Gespräch zwischen dem ökumenischen Patriarchat Konstantinopel und der evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland, vom 4. bis 8. Oktober 1971*, ed. Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland, Aussenamt (Stuttgart: Evang. Missionsverlag, 1972); *Das Bild vom Menschen in Orthodxie und Protestantismus: Drittes theologisches Gespräch zwischen dem ökumenischen Patriarchat und der evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland vom 2. bis 5. Oktober 1973 in Chambésy/Schweiz*, ed. Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland, Aussenamt (Stuttgart: Evang. Missionsverlag, 1974).

⁵⁷ *Taufe—Neues Leben—Dienst: Das Leningrader Gespräch über die Verantwortung der Christen für die Welt zwischen Vertretern der evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland und der russischen orthodoxen Kirche*, ed. Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland, Aussenamt (Witten: Luther Verlag, 1970); *Der auferstandene Christus und das Heil der Welt: Das Kirchberger Gespräch über die Bedeutung der Auferstehung für das Heil der Welt zwischen Vertretern der evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland und der russischen orthodoxen Kirche*, ed. Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland, Aussenamt (Witten: Luther, 1972); *Die Eucharistie: Das Sagorsker Gespräch über das hl. Abendmahl zwischen Vertretern der evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland und der russischen orthodoxen Kirche*, ed. Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland, Aussenamt (Bielefeld: Luther Verlag, 1974). See also *The Orthodox Church and the Churches of the Reformation: A Survey of Orthodox-Protestant Dialogues*, ed. N. Ehrenström et al. (Faith and Order Paper 76: Geneva: WCC, 1975); N. Ehrenström and G. Gassmann, *Confessions in Dialogue: A Survey of Bilateral Conversations among World Confessional Families 1959-1974* (3rd ed; Geneva: WCC, 1975); Ernst Benz, *Wittenberg und Byzanz: Zur Begegnung und Auseinandersetzung der Reformation und der östlichorthodoxen Kirche* (Munich: W. Fink, 1971); Carnegie Samuel Calian, *Icon and Pulpit: The Protestant-Orthodox Encounter* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968); Robert Stupperich, "Protestantismus und Orthodxie im Gespräch," in *The Ecumenical World of Orthodox Civilization: Russia and Orthodoxy 3: Essays in Honor of Georges Florovsky*, ed. A. Blane and T. Bird (The Hague: Mouton, 1974) 139-53.

⁵⁸ For accounts of the Catholic dialogue with Moscow, consult *Diakonia* 3 (1968) 41-42, 74-75 [Leningrad]; *ibid.* 6 (1971) 21-22, 74-75 [Bari]; *ibid.* 9 (1974) 95-104 [Zagorsk]; *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 12 (1975) 467-68 [Trent].

⁵⁹ E. Bryner, "Moskauer Patriarchat und ökumenische Bewegung von 1948 bis zur Gegenwart," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 32 (1976) 14-24; B.-D. Dupuy, O.P., "L'Orthodxie sur les voies de son unité," *Istina* 16 (1971) 37-44; Helene Iswolsky, "Ecumenical Trends in the Russian Orthodox Church in the U.S.S.R.," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 10 (1973) 369-74; Alf Johansen, "The Writings of Theologians of the Moscow

In the World Council of Churches the Orthodox Churches have had considerable impact even in the actual formulation of declarations. In this past decade there have been evaluations of Orthodox contributions especially to the Uppsala and Nairobi General Assembly meetings of the World Council of Churches.⁶⁰

Orthodoxy in the United States opened dialogues with the Protestants through two separate consultations. The Lutheran-Orthodox Consultation met in 1967 and 1969 and was to have continued in 1970 before being cancelled in favor of a wider dialogue. A similar consultation was established by SCOBA and the North American area of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, which met three times between 1968 and 1970. Many of the papers for these Orthodox-Reformed conversations were published in book form under the title *The New Man*.⁶¹ In 1973 agreement was reached to broaden this consultation and to combine it with the Lutherans. During the first three years of its new and altered format the Orthodox-Protestant dialogue discussed the role of the Bible, history and confessional principles, and the Christian gospel in contemporary North American society. To date no statements have been published.

In recent years the Orthodox in North America have been relying on a remarkably perceptive and open document prepared as basic guidelines for ecumenism.⁶² The author was the Orthodox priest Robert Stephanopoulos, who distinguished himself by writing a useful doctoral dissertation at the Boston University School of Theology on Orthodox ecumenical activities in recent times. It is regrettable that this document is generally

Patriarchate on Ecumenical Themes," *ibid.* 12 (1975) 29-53; James D. Moss, "The Russian Orthodox Church 1972-1974," *Diakonia* 10 (1975) 215-32; Antoine Paplauskas-Ramunas, *Dialogue entre Rome et Moscou: Vladimir Soloviev, porte-parole du mouvement oecuménique en Russie* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa, 1966); Anon., "Relations with the Orthodox: Conversations between Representatives of the Roman Catholic Church and the Russian Orthodox Church," *Chrysostom* 3 (1971) 6-10; Dimitry Konstantinow, *The Crown of Thorns: Russian Orthodox Church in the USSR 1917-1967* (London, Ont.: Zaria, 1978). A second volume covering the 1970's is now being translated.

⁶⁰ Ion Bria and Constantin G. Patelos, *Orthodox Contributions to Nairobi*. Papers compiled and presented by the Orthodox Task Force of the World Council of Churches (Geneva: WCC, 1975); A. Burg, "De oosterse Kerken in Nairobi," *Christelijk Oosten* 26 (1976) 188-202; Robert G. Stephanopoulos, "Reflections on Orthodox Ecumenical Directions after Uppsala," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 9 (1972) 301-17; Vasil T. Istavridis, "The Orthodox Churches in the Ecumenical Movement 1948-1968," in *A History of the Ecumenical Movement 2: 1948-1968*, ed. H. E. Fey (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970) 287-309.

⁶¹ John Meyendorff and Joseph McLelland, eds., *The New Man: An Orthodox and Reformed Dialogue* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Agora, 1973).

⁶² Robert G. Stephanopoulos, *Guidelines for Orthodox Christians in Ecumenical Relations* (New York: SCOBA, 1973). See also his unpublished *A Study in Recent Greek Orthodox Ecumenical Relations 1902-1968* (Ph.D. dissertation for Boston University School of Theology, 1970).

unknown, although at least one Roman Catholic scholar has studied the text in some detail.⁶³

Orthodox Conversations with North American Jews

In January 1972 a distinguished group of Greek Orthodox and American Jewish scholars met in New York City to participate in the First National Colloquium on Greek Orthodox and Jewish Relations.⁶⁴ The meeting was described as a continuation of one of the oldest dialogues in civilization. The meetings were marked by serious examination of critical issues in theology, history, liturgy, and social concern. What was emphasized was that both Jews and Greeks are Mediterranean peoples, that there has been a physical continuity of Jewish settlements in the Greek world, that both have lived through the upheavals of living in diaspora and in persecutions, and that there is a significant blending of national feeling or ethnicity and religion in both histories. Many parallel beliefs were noted about God's relationship with the world, the nature of a worshiping community as the basic authority in the tradition, the role of mysticism, and eschatology. It is only regrettable that this dialogue did not also include some Orthodox whose roots were originally in Russia or in the Middle East.

From this information about modern ecumenical and interreligious contacts of Orthodoxy one can gain a deeper appreciation of its contemporary vibrancy. The extent of Orthodox ecumenical activities is all the more remarkable when one realizes the limited number of Orthodox theologians either lay or cleric, especially in comparison with the large number of Roman Catholic, Anglican, or Protestant theologians. Furthermore, many Orthodox live in countries where their activities are severely limited by the government. Added to this is a language barrier. The Orthodox have to take the initiative to master the languages of Western Europe, since few Western theologians have labored to master Greek, Russian, Romanian, or Arabic.

II

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL CONCERNS

Many Roman Catholics have only a sketchy idea of what theological interests are prominent within Orthodox writings today. The long-stand-

⁶³ Philip Timko, "Orthodox Ecclesiology and Ecumenical Practice: Guidelines for Orthodox Christians in Ecumenical Relations," *Worship* 50 (1976) 137-45.

⁶⁴ "Orthodox Christian-Jewish Dialogue," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 13 (1976) 517-672; also published in *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*. See especially Zvi Ankori, "Greek Orthodox-Jewish Relations in Historic Perspective: The Jewish View," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 13 (1976) 533-73; Demetrios J. Constantelos, "Greek Orthodox-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective," *ibid.* 522-32; Seymour Siegel, "Judaism and Eastern Orthodoxy: Theological Reflections," *ibid.* 579-85.

ing *quaestiones disputatae* with the West about the Roman primacy, the *Filioque*, and the epiclesis have not been the major theological preoccupations in the past decade. The second section of this survey of contemporary Orthodoxy will concentrate on ten major theological issues: the differing character of theology as conceived by East and West, the Blessed Trinity (especially as reflected in Palamite thought), ecumenical councils, Petrine ministry, relations with Eastern Catholics ("Uniates"), the Church and Eucharistic ecclesiology, the Eucharist and intercommunion, marriage, the ordained ministry, and sacramental life and prayer. Although my main focus is on what has dominated Orthodox theology, I will naturally include a number of works by non-Orthodox theologians.

The Character of Theology

A number of recent studies have addressed the question, what differentiates Orthodox, Eastern theology from its Western counterpart? The basic characteristics of Orthodox theology are seen to be its liturgical, mystical, patristic inspiration, its insistence upon the apophatic, and its strong sense of the pneumatic, synodal character of the Church. These at least are highlighted by the leading Romanian theologian, D. Staniloae, as particularly Orthodox.⁶⁵ In this regard some analysis has also taken place about the meaning and origin of the word "orthodox."⁶⁶ Quite specifically, how Orthodox approach theology can be deduced from Koumantos' survey of the present theological scene in Greece.⁶⁷ Two Roman Catholic scholars have reflected on the specific ways that East and West differ in theological methodology, although today both are seen as using theology ecumenically to verify the identity of faith in both churches.⁶⁸

One manual of theology that continues to be widely consulted and which displays a distinctive way of doing dogmatic theology, often schematic and simplifying, is the English translation of J. Karmiris' standard work.⁶⁹ Far more enlightening and reliable, although not totally above

⁶⁵ Dumitru Staniloae, "L'Orthodoxie: Quelques traits caractéristiques," *Présence orthodoxe* no. 26 (1974) 10-25. German text: "Einige charakteristische Merkmale der Orthodoxie," *Kyrios* 10 (1970) 8-24.

⁶⁶ M. Sesan, "'Orthodoxie': Histoire d'un mot et de sa signification," *Istina* 15 (1970) 425-34.

⁶⁷ Anthony Koumantos, "An Outline of the Present Theological Situation in Greece," *Sobornost*, series 6, no. 9 (1974) 663-70.

⁶⁸ André de Halleux, "La théologie orthodoxe," *Mysterium salutis 4: La réponse de l'homme à la révélation de Dieu* (Paris: Cerf, 1969) 253-61; Pierre Duprey, "La théologie et le rapprochement entre les églises catholique et orthodoxe," in *Le service théologique dans l'église* (Cogitatio Fidei 76; Paris: Cerf, 1974) 37-50.

⁶⁹ John Karmiris, *A Synopsis of the Dogmatic Theology of the Orthodox Catholic Church*, tr. G. Dimopoulos (Scranton: Christian Orthodox Ed., 1973).

criticism, is the balanced and highly readable synthesis of Byzantine theology by John Meyendorff of the Orthodox Church in America.⁷⁰ By comparison with the West, Orthodox theology has not been deeply affected by modern historico-critical biblical methodology, and Orthodox biblical scholars are less active in the major international biblical associations. One initial step toward showing how the contemporary biblical scholarship of the West is compatible with Orthodoxy is the pointed study by E. Oikonomos.⁷¹ Another study, collected essays on Orthodoxy and the death-of-God theology, produced by the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, exemplifies Orthodoxy's cautious reaction to secularization.⁷²

Although not specifically a theoretical analysis of theology, still the attempt undertaken by the Archbishop of Thyateira and Great Britain, Athenagoras, to re-express in contemporary language the Orthodox creed is a good example of how traditional Orthodox categories can be rethought for contemporary pastoral needs.⁷³ The same archbishop has also published the chronicle of a fiery debate he had with C. Mouratides, an Orthodox professor of canon law at the University of Athens, who accused Athenagoras of panheresy, partly because of his ecumenical involvements with Catholics and Anglicans.⁷⁴ That volume is a useful commentary on the role of theology in service of the Church.

Trinity, Christology, Pneumatology

Among Orthodox, especially among those influenced by later Palamite theology, and among Roman Catholics schooled by turn-of-the-century theologians such as Theodore de Regnon and M. Jugie, it was widely concluded that the Trinitarian theologies of Byzantium and the West are sharply irreconcilable. The research of theologians such as B. Lonergan and A. Grillmeier has helped Catholics to see more clearly that the different formulations in Trinitarian theology are not at the level of faith but rather of theological conceptualization and articulation. The unity in diversity can be documented by two presentations on Trinitarian theology in East and West by the present writer and J. Meyendorff as the First

⁷⁰ John Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes* (New York: Fordham, 1974).

⁷¹ Elias Oikonomos, *Bibel und Bibelwissenschaft in der orthodoxen Kirche* (Stuttgarter Bibel-Studien 81; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1976).

⁷² *Orthodoxy and the Death of God: Essays in Contemporary Theology*, ed. A. M. Allchin (Studies Supplementary to Sobornost 1; London: Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, 1971).

⁷³ Athenagoras Kokkinakis, *The Thyateira Confession: The Faith and Prayer of Orthodox Christians in English and Greek* (Leighton Buzzard, Beds., England: Faith, 1975).

⁷⁴ Athenagoras Kokkinakis, *An Interorthodox Theological Debate* (London: Faith, 1973).

Patriarch Athenagoras Memorial Lectures in 1977.⁷⁵ Several specific historical studies on Eastern Trinitarian theology have removed further misconceptions.⁷⁶

Orthodox writing about the divinity is mostly dominated today by Palamite theology, largely because of the renewed interest in Palamas initiated by Meyendorff. According to St. Gregory Palamas (1296–1359), principal spokesman for Hesychast theology (*hesychia* meaning “silence” or “contemplation”), God is totally inaccessible to us in His essence not only during our lifetime but even in paradise. By grace man contemplates, even in eternity, only God’s energy. Palamas’ distinction between God’s essence and His energy is commonly held by contemporary Orthodox theologians as a way of expressing God’s inaccessibility. Besides his texts on Gregory of Palamas, Meyendorff has recently published a collection of studies on Byzantine Hesychasm important for our understanding of Orthodox Trinitarian theology.⁷⁷ A lengthy survey on Palamite theology published in 1972 shows the phenomenal impact that this later Father of the Eastern Church has had.⁷⁸ Roman Catholics have shown only a sober enthusiasm for Palamas as a theologian, as illustrated by the collected essays that appeared in *Istina*, which devoted an entire fascicle to a Roman Catholic evaluation of Palamite thought.⁷⁹ Interest among Catholics for Russian Hesychasm, a later mystical development, can be noted.⁸⁰ Some Roman Catholics would feel that Palamite theology, despite its canonical approbation by the Orthodox, has received disproportionate prominence in Byzantine theology, just as a certain brand of Thomism was overstressed earlier in this century in Roman Catholicism. Both Orthodox and Roman Catholics need to be continually invited to reappropriate the best of their wider theological traditions. Because of its recent dialogues with other churches of the West, Orthodoxy has come

⁷⁵ Michael A. Fahey and John Meyendorff, *Trinitarian Theology East and West: St. Thomas Aquinas—St. Gregory Palamas*, Patriarch Athenagoras Memorial Lectures (Brookline, Mass.: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1977).

⁷⁶ Gerassime Zaphiris, *Reciprocal Trinitarian Revelation and Man’s Knowledge of God according to St. Athanasius* (Thessalonica, 1974); Richard Haugh, *Photius and the Carolingians: The Trinitarian Controversy* (Belmont, Mass.: Nordland, 1975); Christos Yannaras, *De l’absence et de l’inconnaissance de Dieu d’après les écrits aéropagiques et Martin Heidegger*, tr. J. Touraille (Paris: Cerf, 1971).

⁷⁷ John Meyendorff, *Byzantine Hesychasm: Historical, Theological and Social Problems* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1974).

⁷⁸ Daniel Stiernon, “Bulletin sur le palamisme,” *Revue des études byzantines* 30 (1972) 231–341.

⁷⁹ *Istina* 19 (1974) 257–349. See articles by J. Ph. Houdret, J.-M. Garrigues, J.-S. Nadal, and M.J. Le Guillou.

⁸⁰ George A. Maloney, S.J., *Russian Hesychasm: The Spirituality of Nil Sorskij* (The Hague: Mouton, 1973).

to appreciate the amazing pluralism that existed even in Western medieval Scholasticism. Within Orthodoxy there are signs of a move away from monastic Palamite Hesychasm in order to draw upon other authentic currents of Eastern thought.

Most Orthodox Christological reflection in the past decade has been preoccupied with the formulation of Christology agreed to at the Council of Chalcedon, namely, that Jesus Christ is one person in two natures. This recent theologizing has been particularly occasioned by renewed contacts with the non-Chalcedonian churches. The Ancient Oriental Archbishop of Aksum (Ethiopia), M. Fouyas, has summarized these Christological explorations and has shown that Chalcedon did not add anything to or subtract anything from the tradition but only contributed new modes of understanding more profoundly what nonetheless remains the mystery of God made man.⁸¹ The Roman Catholic theologian Piet Schoonenberg has shown that the Monophysitic and Dyophysitic languages about Christ are rooted in the New Testament.⁸² Apart from this renewal of interest in the meaning of the Chalcedonian formulation, recent Orthodox theology has explored the meaning of the Lordship of Christ in this present world.⁸³ This question was also the focus of the two separate dialogues initiated by the Patriarchates of Constantinople and Moscow with the Evangelical Church in Germany to which we have earlier referred (cf. nn. 56–57 above).

The central place given to the Holy Spirit in Orthodox theology is well known. But the Orthodox have far broader interests in pneumatology than merely opposing the insertion of the *Filioque* into the Creed. Orthodox have recognized the increased interest among Roman Catholics since Vatican II in the role of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church. This new emphasis has eased earlier Orthodox apprehensions that the West takes a simple "Christomonistic" perception of revelation and Church. Staniloae has prepared a handy summary of how Orthodoxy describes the Holy Spirit.⁸⁴ His own dependence on the Russian theo-

⁸¹ Methodios Fouyas, *The Person of Jesus Christ in Decisions of the Ecumenical Councils: A Historical and Doctrinal Study with the Relevant Documents referring to the Christological Relations of the Western, Eastern and Oriental Churches* (Addis Ababa: Central, 1976). See review article by E. R. Hardy, *Sobornost* 7 (1977) 309–13.

⁸² Piet Schoonenberg, "Monophysitic and Dyophysitic Languages about Christ," in [First] *Non-Official Ecumenical Consultation between Theologians of the Oriental Orthodox Churches and the Roman Catholic Church*, Sept. 7–12, 1971, Vienna, published in *Wort und Wahrheit*, Supplement No. 1 (Vienna: Herder, 1972) 154–66.

⁸³ Nikos A. Nissiotis, "The Lordship of Christ in the World," *Diakonia* 7 (1972) 32–48.

⁸⁴ Dumitru Staniloae, "Le Saint Esprit dans la théologie et dans la vie de l'église orthodoxe," *Contacts* 26 (1974) 227–56. English: "The Role of the Holy Spirit in the Theology and Life of the Orthodox Church," *Diakonia* 9 (1974) 343–66.

gian Paul Evdokimov is easily documented.⁸⁵ The role of the Holy Spirit has also been recently studied by a theologian outside the Byzantine tradition, specifically in the Syrian Church.⁸⁶

Surprisingly little has been written in the last few years about the *Filioque* (the doctrinal formulation expressing the procession of the Holy Spirit from God the Father *and from the Son* which the West added to the Nicene Creed). It is now generally admitted even by Roman Catholics that the *Filioque* was inserted into the Creed in a way that failed to respect the authority of an ecumenical council and which neglected proper respect for verifying a truly catholic consensus. One may find the *Filioque* a legitimate way—some would say the best way—of thinking about the procession of the Holy Spirit. But many will argue that it has no place in the Creed intended to express the common *faith* of East and West and not a particular theologoumenon. The delicate question remains how Western Christianity without acting separately along confessional boundaries could agree to omit the *Filioque* addition. Occasionally, in a spontaneous gesture, church leaders will omit the controversial expression; even the Bishop of Rome on the occasion of praying the Creed in the presence of Eastern Christians has in recent years publicly omitted the addition. The eminent church historian F. Dvornik has shown that there were other reasons than theology that contributed to inflating the *Filioque* controversy beyond its proper bounds. On this whole question two particularly illuminating articles can be noted: one which explores how the Holy Spirit was described in the Latin tradition of the first millennium, and a second contribution that proposes an ecumenical consensus.⁸⁷

Ecumenical Councils

The experience of Vatican II and the announcement of a forthcoming Pan-Orthodox Council have contributed to a revived interest among Catholics and Orthodox in the doctrinal nature of ecumenical councils. Here some extraordinary developments have often gone unnoticed.

Roman Catholics, often with an eye to specific Orthodox interests, have analyzed what are the real requirements that make a council ecumenical. The question is complex. The Italian church historian G.

⁸⁵ Paul Evdokimov, *Présence de l'Esprit Saint dans la tradition orthodoxe* (Paris: Cerf, 1977); Paul Evdokimov, *La nouveauté de l'Esprit: Etudes de spiritualité* (Spiritualité orientale 20; Bégrolles, France: Abbaye de Bellefontaine, 1977).

⁸⁶ Emmanuel-Pataq Siman, *L'Expérience de l'Esprit par l'église d'après la tradition syrienne d'Antioche* (Théologie historique 15; Paris: Beauchesne, 1971).

⁸⁷ J. M. Garrigues, O.P., "La procession du St Esprit dans la tradition latine du premier millénaire," *Contacts* 23 (1971) 282-309; M. Edmund Hussey, "An Ecumenical Look at the *Filioque* Question," *Diakonia* 7 (1973) 49-61.

Alberigo has studied the question afresh and set the stage for new formulations.⁸⁸ Other Catholics have warned against an overly mechanistic understanding of councils and their decrees.⁸⁹ Several others, including Yves Congar, have argued for some sort of a requirement that a council find "reception" by the faithful, in terms that sound strangely Orthodox.⁹⁰ Congar has provided useful data about the slow development in Western Christianity about what ecumenical councils had been, indeed could be.⁹¹ For many the results of his research will come as a surprise. Congar's general approach to councils has been further developed by the present rector of the Institut Catholique de Paris.⁹² This research has had a practical, ecumenical result, as we shall shortly explain.

Three Orthodox bishops from France, Finland, and Belgium have studied much of the same theological and historical data and reached similar conclusions.⁹³ Dvornik, Meyendorff, and others have explored what constitutes the ecumenicity of a council and what are the dogmatic implications of such world-wide gatherings of believers.⁹⁴ Councils are said to exemplify the catholicity of the Church of Christ; they give fitting

⁸⁸ G. Alberigo, "For a Christian Ecumenical Council," in *Toward Vatican III: The Work That Needs to Be Done*, ed. D. Tracy (New York: Seabury, 1978) 57-66.

⁸⁹ Luis M. Bermejo, "The Alleged Infallibility of Councils," *Bijdragen* 38 (1977) 128-62.

⁹⁰ Waclaw Hryniewicz, O.M.I., "Die ekklesiale Rezeption in der Sicht der orthodoxen Theologie," *Theologie und Glaube* 65 (1975) 250-65; Yves Congar, "La 'réception' comme réalité ecclésiologique," *RSPT* 56 (1972) 369-403.

⁹¹ Yves Congar, "1274-1974: Structures ecclésiologiques et conciles dans les relations entre orient et occident," *RSPT* 58 (1974) 355-90. English: "Church Structures and Councils in the Relations between East and West," *One in Christ* 11 (1975) 224-65.

⁹² M. Poupard, "Ruptures ou crises de croissance: Les conciles dans la vie de l'église," *Documentation catholique* 74 (1977) 362-71.

⁹³ Pierre l'Huillier, "Le concile oecuménique comme autorité suprême dans l'église," in *Kanon: Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für das Recht der Ostkirchen* 2 (Vienna: Herder, 1974) 128-42; Jean (Rinne), Metropolitan of Helsinki, "Autorité des conciles oecuméniques," *Messenger de l'exarchat du patriarche russe en Europe occidentale* 22, nos. 85-88 (1974) 54-62; Basil (Krivoshein), Archbishop of Brussels, "L'Autorité et l'infaillibilité des conciles oecuméniques," *ibid.* 63-70.

⁹⁴ F. Dvornik, "Which Councils are Ecumenical?" *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 3 (1966) 314-28; John Meyendorff, "What is an Ecumenical Council?" *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 17 (1973) 259-73. See also René Metz, "L'Institution synodale d'après les canons des synodes locaux (topiques): Etude des sources et application actuelle," in *Kanon: Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für das Recht der Ostkirchen* 2, ed. W. M. Plöchl & R. Potz (Vienna: Herder, 1974) 154-76; Donald M. Nicol, "Byzantine Requests for an Oecumenical Council in the Fourteenth Century," *Annuaire historique conciliorum* 1 (1969) 69-95; Stylianos Papadopoulos, *Athanasios the Great and the Theology of the Ecumenical Synod* [in Greek] (Athens, 1975). See review in *Scottish Journal of Theology* 30 (1977) 74-77 by G. D. Dragas; Dumitru Staniloae, "Dogmatische Grundlagen der Synodalität," *Ostkirchliche Studien* 20 (1971) 3-16; Christopher Walter, "Le concile dans l'ensemble des rapports entre l'empereur et le clergé," in *L'Iconographie des conciles dans la tradition byzantine* (Archives de l'orient chrétien 13; Paris: Institut Français d'Etudes Byzantines, 1970) 123-50.

expression to the communion (*koinonia*) of the Spirit that unites geographically separated Eucharistic communities. Councils give expression to the Church's conviction that the Spirit remains active in the Church, inspiring especially those who hold pastoral office to address vexing doctrinal and disciplinary problems. It is seen today with growing lucidity that, because councils have usually been held at times of crisis to overcome tensions and to address very limited issues, they may not indeed focus on the center of revelation. For this reason the conciliar decrees need always to be read in light of the Scriptures, liturgical prayers, and patristic writings produced in less troubled times. Orthodox and Roman Catholics alike are aware of the dangers of seeing conciliar "canons" as absolute, irrevocable decisions that would eliminate our present responsibility to rearticulate the faith for the here and now.

Some Roman Catholics, including Vatican officials, stress that in fact there is no list numbering the ecumenical councils that has been imposed with dogmatic authority. True, Rome refers to councils held in the West (Trent, Vatican I, Vatican II) with a specific number and with the description "ecumenical." But this attribution is not a dogmatic pronouncement; it simply reflects a common popular usage that needs to be further examined. The usual Roman Catholic enumeration of the ecumenical councils is traceable to the work of Robert Bellarmine in his *De controversiis* (1586). But as late as 1595, Roman consultors including Bellarmine were debating whether the Council of Florence because of the Greek participation should not be considered the *eighth* ecumenical council instead of the *sixteenth* council.

Under the leadership of Pope Paul VI, a recent important initiative of the See of Rome took place. The Pope was intending to popularize the notion that there are two sorts of councils in the patrimony of the West: the early ecumenical councils of the Undivided Church and the later general synods of the West. Thus, in an important letter dated October 5, 1974, in which he addressed Cardinal Willebrands on the occasion of the seventh centenary of Lyons II (1274), a council that had attempted somewhat clumsily to achieve union with the Greeks, Paul VI wrote: "This Council of Lyons counted as the sixth of the general synods held in the West."⁹⁵ This terminology suggests that Catholic theology is willing to accept the notion of varying levels of councils, what Congar calls a *hierarchia conciliorum*. If this were the case, the anathemas pronounced against those who did not accept their canons would be softened. This would have considerable import, since Orthodoxy, in the event of estab-

⁹⁵ French text in *Documentation catholique* 72 (1975) 63-7. See also Henri Boelaars, "Oekumenische Konzilien oder westliche Synoden?" *Theologie der Gegenwart* 18 (1975) 108-11; V. Laurent and J. Darrouzès, *Dossier grec de l'Union de Lyon (1273-1277)* (Archives de l'orient chrétien 16; Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1976).

lishing full communion with the See of Rome, would not be asked to accept the Western medieval councils as "ecumenical" but only as legitimate general councils of the West. As such, these councils would be seen as addressing specifically Western concerns, and for the Orthodox the canons of Trent or Vatican I, for example, would not per se have absolutely binding force. By this admission Western councils could not be thoroughly disregarded by the Orthodox but they could be historically relativized.

Petrine Ministry

The effort to comprehend Rome's own present self-understanding of papal primacy is part of Orthodoxy's own agenda. Obviously, the traditional doctrine of papal primacy of jurisdiction and infallibility remains a critical disputed point between Orthodox and Roman Catholics, as indeed between Catholics and all other Christians. The Orthodox, to be sure, recognize the changes that have been taking place in Roman Catholicism, not only in the way that papal ministry is exercised but also in the dedication to relate papal ministry to episcopal collegiality. The Orthodox do not have problems with the idea of a certain Roman primacy; the theory of a pentarchy in the Church's administration is part of their own understanding. What they do oppose is the Roman explanation of the pope's universal primacy of jurisdiction, especially as outlined in Vatican I, and also the claim about the pope's ability to reach "infallible decisions." The views of Orthodox on Roman primacy have been conveniently summarized by Falconer.⁹⁶ This survey can be supplemented in turn by Felmy's study.⁹⁷ Several historical investigations have helped Orthodox and Roman Catholics to appreciate better the gradual development in the West's perception of Roman primacy.⁹⁸ In his contribution to the volume *A Pope for All Christians*, John Meyendorff has admitted the possibility that the Orthodox could assent to a specific, limited primacy, especially if it were practiced in a less triumphalistic and more synodal fashion.⁹⁹

⁹⁶ Alan D. Falconer, "Contemporary Attitudes to the Papacy: Protestant and Orthodox Perspectives," *Furrow* 27 (1976) 3-19.

⁹⁷ Karl Christian Felmy, "Petrusamt und Primat in der modernen orthodoxen Theologie," in *Das Petrusamt in der gegenwärtigen theologischen Diskussion*, ed. H. J. Mund (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1976) 85-99.

⁹⁸ E. Lanne, "L'Eglise de Rome 'a gloriosissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo Romae fundatae et constitutae ecclesiae,' *Adv Haer* III,3,2," *Irénikon* 49 (1976) 275-322; August Leidl, "Die Primatsverhandlungen auf dem Konzil von Florenz als Antwort auf den westlichen Konziliarismus und die östliche Pentarchie-theorie," *Annuario historiae pontificiae* 7 (1975) 272-89.

⁹⁹ John Meyendorff, "Rome and Orthodoxy: Authority or Truth?" in *A Pope for All Christians: An Inquiry into the Role of Peter in the Modern Church*, ed. P. J. McCord (New York: Paulist, 1976) 129-47.

One recent Orthodox biblical study investigates the role that Peter seems to have exercised in the New Testament community.¹⁰⁰ But, as de Vries points out, Roman primacy is still the number-one stumbling block between East and West.¹⁰¹ Part of the Orthodox hypersensitivity to papal jurisdictional powers is its justifiable suspicion or apprehension about dangerous Romanization tendencies from which the East naturally wishes to protect itself.¹⁰² One cannot forecast how the Orthodox will react to further Roman efforts at self-articulation.

The Orthodox and Eastern Catholics

Until recently the term "Uniate" was commonly employed to identify those Eastern Christians who had entered into full communion with the Roman Church. The term is now widely eschewed as uncomplimentary and polemic. In recent years statistical information about these Eastern Catholics with Byzantine traditions has become available.¹⁰³ E. Lanne, Benedictine scholar and consultor to the Roman Congregation for the Eastern Churches, in a provocative *prise de position* has noted the theological problems connected with understanding the status of these churches.¹⁰⁴ He points out that Vatican II published on Nov. 21, 1964, two separate decrees which enshrined contrasting views on the status of Orthodoxy and indirectly on the status of Eastern Catholics. The decree *Orientalium ecclesiarum* on Eastern Catholic churches and *Unitatis redintegratio*, the decree on ecumenism, reflect different attitudes. In the first decree the Orthodox are asked "to join themselves to the unity of the Catholic Church" (no. 25), whereas in the second the Orthodox Churches are referred to as "sister churches" (no. 14). A lack of consistency haunts the two decrees which may be related to Rome's tendency to regard Eastern Catholic churches as "bridge churches." Yet, argues Lanne, whatever individual contributions might be performed by Eastern

¹⁰⁰ Emilianos Timiadis, "Saint Pierre dans l'exégèse orthodoxe," *Istina* 23 (1978) 56-74. A second installment will treat the question of Peter in Orthodox ecclesiology.

¹⁰¹ W. de Vries, "Der Primat als ökumenische Frage," *Ostkirchliche Studien* 25 (1976) 273-84.

¹⁰² Jacob Vellian, ed., *The Romanization Tendency* (The Syrian Churches Series 8; Kottayam, Kerala: K. P. Press, 1975).

¹⁰³ *Oriente Cattolico: Cenni storici e statistiche* (4th ed.; Vatican City: Sacra Cong. per le Chiese Orient., 1974).

¹⁰⁴ Emmanuel Lanne, O.S.B., "Églises unies ou églises soeurs: Un choix inéluctable," *Irénikon* 48 (1975) 322-42; English: "United Churches or Sister Churches: A Choice to be Faced," *One in Christ* 12 (1976) 106-23; Emmanuel Lanne, O.S.B., "L'Orient chrétien au Concile Vatican II et dans la période qui a suivi le Concile," *Seminarium* 27, n.s. 15 (1975) 316-35; Johannes Madey, ed., *Die katholischen Ostkirchen: Hindernisse oder Brücken auf dem Weg zur Einheit der Christen?* (Freiburg: Kanisius, 1973); P. J. Roche, S.J., "Die Bedeutung der katholischen Ostkirchen," *Kyrios* 13 (1973) 203-8.

Byzantine Catholics, it is hard to see how *as churches* these can operate as "bridge churches" for Orthodoxy that is already a "sister church."

Here the Vatican faces a delicate pastoral problem. The Eastern Catholic churches have been deeply committed in their communion with the See of Rome and deeply involved in the unhappy results of division from their Orthodox brothers and sisters. They must always receive from Rome full ecclesial recognition and be given greater support to help them recover their spiritual, liturgical, theological, and disciplinary traditions, all the more so since they have suffered much because of their union with the Roman See. At present, however, these churches are in an anomalous position. Upon eventual recognition of full communion between the Orthodox and Roman Catholics, in some instances these churches might well retain their autonomy but in other instances more naturally they would seek the traditionally appropriate bonds of union with their Orthodox counterparts. A certain "malaise" is correctly diagnosed in these churches.¹⁰⁵ Hence the multiplication of articles and books about the "meaning" of Eastern Catholic churches: what does it mean to be a Ukrainian Catholic,¹⁰⁶ or a Melchite Catholic?¹⁰⁷ The recently published biography of Bishop Michel d'Herbigny, a Jesuit used by the Vatican to assist in promoting Catholic presence in the Orthodox Soviet Union during the earlier part of this century, besides providing fascinating reading, also raises questions of principle about the relationship of Uniate and Orthodox.¹⁰⁸ Here, too, specialized historical monographs about specific reunification attempts in the past are helping to shed light on the present situation.¹⁰⁹

The Church and Eucharistic Ecclesiology

Since this century has been aptly described as the century of ecclesiology, it is not surprising to see a large amount of theological writing among Orthodox and non-Orthodox on the nature of the Church. One can categorize several different kinds of works on ecclesiology. The first might

¹⁰⁵ Robert Hotz, "Das 'Malaise' der Unierten," *Orientierung* 42, no. 2 (Jan. 31, 1978) 16-18.

¹⁰⁶ George Maloney, S.J., *What Does It Mean to Be a Ukrainian Catholic?* and *Ukrainian Catholic Autonomy* (Weston, Ont.: St. Demetrius Ukrainian Catholic Church, 1973).

¹⁰⁷ Joseph Nasrallah, *Eglise melchite et union des églises* (Paris: Centre d'Etudes Istina, 1977).

¹⁰⁸ Paul Lesourd, *Le jésuite clandestin entre Rome et Moscou, Mgr Michel d'Herbigny* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1976). For a synopsis see B. R. Brinkman, "Rome and Moscow: The Bishop Who Went into the Cold," *Month* n.s. 11 (Mar. 1978) 90-97.

¹⁰⁹ Josef Macha, S.J., *Ecclesiastical Unification: A Theoretical Framework together with Case-Studies from the History of Latin-Byzantine Relations* (Orientalia christiana analecta 198; Rome: Oriental Institute, 1974); "Rencontres avec l'orthodoxie," *Unité chrétienne, Pages documentaires* 46-47 (May-Aug. 1977).

be described as works that compare the similarities and dissimilarities in the Eastern and Western concepts of Church.¹¹⁰ Numerous works, especially by Orthodox such as Zizioulas and Nissiotis, are examining the pneumatological dimension of the Church.¹¹¹ These studies are important, for they show the natural theological relationship between the presence of God and the community. This "pneumatic ecclesiology" helps the Orthodox to explain how there can be continuity with apostolic origins amid structural changes and developments in the Church.

Eastern ecclesialogists have also explained the synodal nature of the Church, the Church seen as an ongoing *synodos endēmousa*.¹¹² More recently, several contributions have asked how Church and world are interrelated, a question very much in the fore among Roman Catholics since the publication of *Gaudium et spes*.¹¹³

¹¹⁰ Joseph W. Thomas, "The Ecclesiological and Ecclesiastical Development in the East and West," *Diakonia* 6 (1971) 3–16, 135–46; Johannes Madey, ed., *Die Kirche in der Sicht der Christenheit des Ostens und des Westens: Ein orthodox-katholisches Symposium* (Paderborn: Bonifacius, 1974); Louis Bouyer, "Orthodoxes et catholiques," in *L'Eglise de Dieu* (Paris: Cerf, 1970) 629–34; Konstantinos E. Papapetrou, *Über die anthropologischen Grenzen der Kirche: Ein philosophisch-theologischer Entwurf zum Thema Simul iustus et peccator aus orthodox-katholischer Sicht* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte und Theologie des Luthertums 26; Hamburg: Lutherische Verlagshaus, 1972); Gregor Larentzakis, *Die Kirche als Koinonia und ihre Präexistenz in katholischer und orthodoxer Sicht* (Innsbruck, 1969); Jerzy Klinger, "La koinonia comme sacramentelle: Perspectives actuelles," *Istina* 20 (1975) 100–111.

¹¹¹ S. Harkianakis, "Die Entwicklung der Ekklesiologie in der neueren griechisch-orthodoxen Theologie," *Catholica* 28 (1974) 1–12; J. D. Zizioulas, "The Pneumatological Dimension of the Church," *Communio/International Catholic Review* 1 (1974) 142–58 (German in *Internationale Katholische Zeitschrift/Communio* 2 [1973] 133–47); J. D. Zizioulas, "Les groupes informels dans l'église: Un point de vue orthodoxe," in *Les groupes informels dans l'église* (Strasbourg: Palais Univ., 1971) 251–72; Nikos A. Nissiotis, "Pneumatological Christology as a Presupposition of Ecclesiology," *Oecumenica: Annales de recherche oecuménique* 1967 (Neuchâtel, 1967); Nikos A. Nissiotis, "Ekklesiologie und Veränderung: Das pneumatologische Kirchenverständnis in einer sich ändernden und nach Einheit strebenden Welt," *Theologie und Glaube* 64 (1974) 217–22; Nicolas A. Nissiotis, "The Theology of the Church and Its Accomplishments," *Ecumenical Review* 29 (1977) 62–76; Waclaw Hryniewicz, O.M.I., "Der pneumatologische Aspekt der Kirche aus orthodoxer Sicht," *Catholica* 31 (1977) 122–50.

¹¹² Pierre Duprey, "La structure synodale de l'église dans la théologie orientale," *Proche orient chrétien* 20 (1970) 123–45 (English: "The Synodical Structure of the Church in Eastern Theology," *One in Christ* 7 [1971] 152–82); Hermenegild Alfons Biedermann, "Die Synoden des 4. und 5. Jahrhunderts und das orthodoxe Verständnis der Ortskirche," in *Ortskirche; Weltkirche*, Festgabe Julius Kardinal Döpfner, ed. H. Fleckenstein et al. (Würzburg: Echter, 1973) 284–303; H. Biedermann, "Einige Grundlinien orthodoxen Kirchenverständnisses," *Ostkirchliche Studien* 19 (1970) 3–18; Karl Christian Felmy, "Die Grenzen der Kirche in orthodoxer Sicht: Orthodoxes ekklesiales Selbstverständnis und die Gemeinschaft mit den Kirchen des Westens," *Evangelische Theologie* 37 (1977) 459–85; Stanley S. Harakas, "The Local Church: An Eastern Orthodox Perspective," *Ecumenical Review* 29 (1977) 141–53.

¹¹³ A. J. van der Aalst, "Kerk en Wereld in het oosters Christendom," *Christelijk Oosten*

The Church's prototype, reason Orthodox theologians, lies in the Blessed Trinity, wherein there is a distinction of persons but unity based on love.¹¹⁴ Hence the Church needs to recall that its unity is based on love and not on external law. The Church's continuity with its origins is grounded on the Holy Spirit, the source of love in the Church. The Spirit's presence is found to have visible expression in such historical forms as Scripture, the sacraments, and pastors ordained in apostolic succession. These historical forms are expressed in the concrete, local church, the community that gathers around its bishop and ministers is truly Church.¹¹⁵

Especially in this century Orthodox theology has popularized a concept of the Church known as "Eucharistic ecclesiology," a relatively recent development derived particularly from the Russian émigré archpriest and theologian Nicholas Afanassieff (1893–1966).¹¹⁶ The impact of his teaching extended far beyond the Institute of St. Sergius in Paris.¹¹⁷ Theologians

28 (1976) 94–111; Dumitru Staniloae, "The Foundations of Christian Responsibility in the World: The Dialogue of God and Man," in *The Tradition of Life: Romanian Essays in Spirituality and Theology* (Supplement to *Sobornost* 2; London: St. Alban, 1971) 53–73; Alain Riou, *Le monde et l'église selon Maxime le Confesseur* (Théologie historique 22; Paris: Beauchesne, 1973); Stanley S. Harakas, "Orthodox Church-State Theory and American Democracy," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 21 (1976) 399–421; Steven Runciman, *The Orthodox Churches and the Secular State* (Auckland: Auckland University, 1971).

¹¹⁴ André Borrély, *L'Homme transfiguré: L'Instinct d'orthodoxie* (Paris: Cerf, 1975) esp. chap. 7: "L'Eglise, icône de la Trinité."

¹¹⁵ Emmanuel Lanne, "L'Eglise une," *Irenikon* 50 (1977) 46–58; "L'Eglise une dans la prière eucharistique," *ibid.* 326–44; 511–19; P. A. Chamberas, "Some Aspects of the Ecclesiology of Father Georges V. Florovsky," in *Heritage of the Early Church: Essays in Honor of G. V. Florovsky*, eds. D. Neiman and M. Schatkin (Orientalia christiana analecta 195; Rome: Oriental Institute, 1975) 421–36; Olivier Clément, "Orthodox Ecclesiology as an Ecclesiology of Communion," *One in Christ* 6 (1970) 101–22; Demetrios J. Constantelos, "The Evangelical Character of the Orthodox Church," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 9 (1972) 544–55; J. Darrouzès, *Documents inédits d'ecclésiologie byzantine, textes édités, traduits et annotés* (Archives de l'Orient Chrétien 10; Paris: Institut Français d'Etudes Byzantines, 1966); Second International Conference of Orthodox Theology, Sept. 25–29, 1972, "The Catholicity of the Church," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 17 (1973) 1–186.

¹¹⁶ Nicolas Afanassieff, *L'Eglise du Saint Esprit*, tr. M. Drobot (Cogitatio Fidei 83; Paris: Cerf, 1975); M. Edmund Hussey, "Nicholas Afanassiev's Eucharistic Ecclesiology: A Roman Catholic Viewpoint," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 12 (1975) 235–52; Michael Kaszowski, "Les sources de l'ecclésiologie eucharistique du P. Nicolas Afanassieff," *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 52 (1976) 331–43; Olivier Clément, "The Eucharist in the Thought of Paul Evdokimov," *Eastern Churches Review* 7 (1975) 113–24; J. D. Zizioulas, "The Eucharistic Community and the Catholicity of the Church," *One in Christ* 6 (1970) 314–37; Jerome J. Holtzmann, "Eucharistic Ecclesiology of the Orthodox Theologians," *Diakonia* 8 (1973) 5–21.

¹¹⁷ Alexis Kniazeff, *L'Institut Saint Serge: De l'Académie d'autrefois au rayonnement d'aujourd'hui* (Point théologique 14; Paris: Beauchesne, 1974); Nicholas Zernov, "The

such as Zizioulas, Nissiotis, Meyendorff, and Schmemmann can be seen as inheritors of his thought.

According to this theology, the independent existence of the local church is seen best expressed in the Eucharistic celebration, where the Church most profoundly manifests and realizes itself. The local church is viewed as interrelated to other Eucharistic communities, since they all possess the same Spirit of Christ. But this communion of local churches does not exclude the fundamental equality of all churches. Vatican II would agree with this emphasis. But some of the formulation of Eucharistic ecclesiology is strangely outdated, inasmuch as it was articulated in reaction to a pre-Vatican II Roman Catholic theology of Church. Afanassieff distinguished schematically between two types of ecclesiology: "universal" and "Eucharistic." The first, "universal" ecclesiology, is seen as viewing the Church as a world-wide organism wherein local churches are mere parts of the reality, essentially subordinate to the universal Church. This juridical, "Cyprianic" view of the Church is that of Roman Catholicism. He preferred a Eucharistic ecclesiology in which local church enjoys perfect autonomy and independence, since it is endowed with the gift of being the Church of God in fulness. Such a Eucharistic ecclesiology, for Afanassieff, would necessarily exclude the idea of a primacy of one church over another and would also exclude the idea of one bishop taking primatial initiatives in other churches. Some of these very expressions used in this ecclesiology are difficult to reconcile with certain Orthodox practices at the heart of its own life.

In my judgment, Eucharistic ecclesiology is also vulnerable because it does not sufficiently take into consideration the possibility that an individual local church can become isolated from other churches and hence be deficient in *koinonia*. Also, some formulations of Eucharistic ecclesiology even today tend to lend a disproportionate weight to the role of the local bishop in Eucharistic celebrations, resulting in a sort of exaggerated episcopalism. Much more could be written about this important Orthodox concept of Church, part of which is closely allied to the ecclesiology of Vatican II. If Eucharistic ecclesiology becomes one of the discussion topics for the projected "official" dialogues between Orthodox and Roman Catholics, then both shall need to rearticulate what basically could be a fruitful model for the Church.

Significance of the Russian Orthodox Diaspora and Its Effect on the Christian West," in *The Orthodox Churches and the West*, Papers read at the 14th summer meeting and the 15th winter meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society, ed. Derek Baker (Studies in Church History 13; Oxford: Blackwell's, 1976) 307-27; Françoise Fichet and Djuro J. Vrga, "The Appearance and Growth of Orthodoxy in France," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 22 (1977) 214-26; Olivier Clément, "Avenir et signification de la diaspora orthodoxe en Europe occidentale," in *Documents épiscopats: Bulletin du secrétariat de la conférence française* No. 3 (Feb. 1978) 1-10.

The Eucharist and Intercommunion

Recent Orthodox studies make clear that there is no fundamental disagreement between Orthodox and Roman Catholic understanding of Eucharistic celebrations.¹¹⁸ Orthodox writers, as well as Roman Catholics, emphasize the need for a bishop or priest ordained in apostolic succession for celebrating the Eucharist. The Eucharistic sacrifice is seen as involving the active presence of Christ the High Priest acting through the Christian community, drawing it into his saving worship. In a Eucharistic celebration believers not only commend themselves and one another and their lives unto Christ but at the same time accept the diaconal mandate of the gospel to mediate Christ's salvation to the world. In the Eucharist God the Father sends the Spirit to consecrate the elements to be the body and blood of Jesus Christ and to sanctify the faithful.

Little debate exists today on the importance of the epiclesis or about its apparent absence in some Roman Eucharistic prayers. Roman Catholic liturgical reforms and rubrical changes about the proper function of the words of institution in the Eucharistic prayers have shown that in the Roman Catholic tradition there is indeed an invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the community and upon the sacred species. Variant theological and liturgical traditions are not dogmatic dividing points. Still, there are differences between Orthodox and Roman Catholic understanding of the Church of Christ and differences about Eucharistic discipline and pastoral practices. The Orthodox Church by and large takes a dim view of official Eucharistic sharing between Orthodox and other Christians. Intercommunion is strictly forbidden for Orthodox and even unofficially is not practiced except in the rarest of circumstances. Whereas the Roman Catholic Church expressed its willingness at Vatican II and later in directories to offer the sacrament of the Eucharist to Orthodox who approached the altar under specific conditions, the Orthodox did not reciprocate. Orthodox writers are not convinced that the whole range of essentials related to Christian community life or "full communion" is sufficiently realized between Roman Catholics and Orthodox to warrant Eucharistic sharing.

Against this background we can realize the widespread amazement that ensued when the Moscow Patriarchate announced on December 16, 1969, that it was allowing a measure of intercommunion for Roman

¹¹⁸ Maximos Aghiorgoussis, "The Holy Eucharist in Ecumenical Dialogue: An Orthodox View," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 13 (1976) 204-11; "Catholic Response by E. J. Kilmartin," *ibid.* 211-12; Edward J. Kilmartin, S.J., "The Orthodox-Roman Catholic Dialogue on the Eucharist," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 13 (1976) 213-19; "Orthodox Response by M. Aghiorgoussis," *ibid.* 220-21; J. D. Zizioulas, "Vérité et communion dans la perspective de la pensée patristique grecque," *Irenikon* 50 (1977) 451-510, esp. 501-10, "L'Eucharistie comme lieu de la vérité."

Catholics. Patriarch Alexis and the Holy Synod of Moscow announced: "In cases where Old Believers [a Russian schismatic group dating from 1666] or Catholic faithful approach the Orthodox Church in order to receive the sacraments, they should not be refused."¹¹⁹ In the following February the Synod of the Orthodox Church of Greece voiced its "surprise, wonderment, and sorrow" at this decision by the Moscow Patriarchate. The reasons for Orthodox objections to the practice of intercommunion have been studied in the last decade by several authors.¹²⁰

Marriage

Another sacrament that has received considerable theological attention in Orthodox ecumenical dialogue is Christian marriage.¹²¹ For Christians of both Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches, marriage is seen as a sacrament. The prayers and action of their wedding liturgies express belief in the presence of Christ in the Spirit uniting man and woman in a life of mutual love.¹²² Orthodox, as Roman Catholics, affirm the permanent character of Christian marriage: "What God has joined together, let no man put asunder" (Mt 19:6). But the Orthodox Church, out of consideration of the human realities, permits divorce and tolerates remarriage in order to avoid further human tragedies.¹²³ The Roman

¹¹⁹ *Documentation catholique* 67 (1970) 293. For the response of the Church of Greece, see *ibid.* 398.

¹²⁰ Raymund Erni and Damaskinos Papandreou, *Eucharistiegemeinschaft: Der Standpunkt der Orthodoxie* (Freiburg: Kanisius, 1974); Jerzy Klinger, "Le problème de l'intercommunion: Point de vue d'un orthodoxe," in Max Thurian, Jerzy Klinger, and J. de Bociocchi, *Vers l'intercommunion* (Eglises en dialogue 13; Paris: Mame, 1960) 69-118; Jacques Leblanc, *Le problème de l'intercommunion et ses présupposés ecclésiologiques dans la perspective de l'orthodoxie* (M.A. thesis, St. Paul's University, Ottawa, 1971).

¹²¹ John Meyendorff, *Marriage: An Orthodox Perspective* (New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1970); D. Constantelos, "Practice of the Sacrament of Matrimony according to the Orthodox Tradition," *Jurist* 31 (1971) 614-28; Demetrios Constantelos, *Marriage, Sexuality and Celibacy: A Greek Orthodox Perspective* (Minneapolis: Light & Life, 1975).

¹²² Giuseppe Ferrari, "Il matrimonio nella tradizione patristica liturgica orientale," *Oriente cristiano* 12, no. 1 (1972) 46-58; 12, no. 2 (1972) 41-55; 12, no. 3 (1972) 44-54; 12, no. 4 (1972) 47-58; K. Ritzer, *Le mariage dans les églises chrétiennes du I^{er} au XI^e siècle* (Paris, 1970). (German original: *Formen, Riten und religiöses Brauchtum der Eheschliessung in den christlichen Kirchen des ersten Jahrtausend* [Münster, 1962]); A. M. Stavropoulos, "La conception du mariage dans l'église orthodoxe," *Messenger orthodoxe* no. 58 (1972) 6-14; Theodore Stylianopoulos, "Toward a Theology of Marriage in the Orthodox Church," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 22 (1977) 249-83.

¹²³ N. Kühn, "Die Ehetrennung im Kirchenrecht der orthodoxen Kirchen des byzantinischen Ritus," *Ostkirchliche Studien* 26 (1977) 3-27; Luigi Bressan, *Il divorzio nelle chiese orientali (Ricerca storica sull'atteggiamento cattolico)* (Bologna: Dehoniane, 1976); see review by T. J. Green, *TS* 38 (1977) 821-22; Gregor Larentzakis, "Ehe, Ehescheidung und Wiederverheiratung in der orthodoxen Kirche: Der theologische Dialog zwischen der orthodoxen und der katholischen Kirche," *Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift* 125 (1977) 250-61.

Catholic Church, on the other hand, has generally attempted to resolve the personal and pastoral issues of failed marriages by an inquiry to uncover some initial defect in the marriage covenant. Once the Catholic Church had declared an annulment, stating that no sacramental covenant had actually existed because of some defect, it would permit a subsequent marriage.

In the teaching of the Orthodox Church, sacramental marriage requires both the mutual consent of the believing Christian partners and God's blessing imparted through the ministry of the Church. The discipline of the Orthodox Church accepts as sacramental only those marriages sanctified in the liturgical life of the Church by being blessed by an Orthodox priest. But the Orthodox now admit that diversities in its own practice and theology existing between itself and the Roman Catholic Church pertain more to the level of secondary theological reflection rather than to dogma. What is essential to a Christian sacramental marriage is said to be the ecclesial context in which marriages take place. Finally, Orthodoxy has been particularly concerned about the pastoral problems connected with mixed marriages in the diaspora, especially the problem of how to decide to provide religious education to children of such marriages.¹²⁴

The Ordained Ministry

Orthodox theology concerning the ordained ministry stresses that in the rites of ordination the ordinand is given a commission by the Holy Spirit to build up the Church on the cornerstone of Christ and the foundation of the apostles.¹²⁵ Presiding at the Eucharist can be permitted only to such persons who have been ordained. Ordination effectively

¹²⁴ Jean Petritakis, "Le droit matrimonial dans l'église orthodoxe grecque: Les mariages mixtes," *L'Année canonique* 20 (1976) 67-86.

¹²⁵ (Patriarch) Sergius Stragorodsky, "The Significance of Apostolic Succession in the Non-Orthodox Faiths," *Diakonia* 6 (1971) 147-62, 272-84; J. Madey, "Das apostolische Sukzession in der Sicht der Orthodoxie," in *Amt im Widerstreit*, ed. K. Schuh (Berlin, 1973) 46-51; J. Madey, "Das Charisma des apostolischen Amtes im Denken und Beten der Ostkirchen," *Catholica* 27 (1973) 263-79; J. D. Zizioulas, "Apostolic Continuity and Orthodox Theology: Towards a Synthesis of Two Perspectives," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 19 (1975) 75-108 (French: "La continuité avec les origines apostoliques dans la conscience théologique des églises orthodoxes," *Istina* 19 [1974] 65-94); J. D. Zizioulas, "Ordination et communion," *Istina* 16 (1971) 5-12; C. Vogel, "Chirotonie et chirothésie: Importance et relativité du geste de l'imposition des mains dans la collation des ordres," *Irénikon* 45 (1972) 7-21; 207-35; Charles de Clercq, "Ministre et sujet des sacrements dans les anciens canons et aujourd'hui," in *Kanon: Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für das Recht der Ostkirchen* 1 (Vienna: Herder, 1973) 54-58; B. Schultze, S.J., "Zur Frage der Einheit des Lehr- und Hirtenamtes katholischer und orthodoxer Bischöfe gestern und heute," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 98 (1976) 293-315; Lewis J. Patsavos, *The Entry into the Clergy during the First Five Centuries* [in Greek] (Athens, 1973).

proclaims that ministry is an essential element of the sacramental reality of the Church. By sacramental ordination the person is claimed permanently for the service of the Church and so one cannot be reordained. In the exercise of his office the ordained person is distinct but not separated from the community of believers. Nor is the ordained person dependent on his subjective capabilities for the exercise of his service, inasmuch as he receives in ordination the special bestowal of the Spirit.

Orthodox theologians affirm the traditional practice of excluding women from ordination to the priesthood and base this, among other reasons, on the necessity of the iconic representation of Christ in the person of the bishop or priest.¹²⁶ Among Roman Catholic theologians a clear consensus on the question of excluding women from ordination does not exist, because they interpret in a variety of ways the biblical data, traditional practice, theological and anthropological explanations.

Here is not the place to propose a detailed critique on the suggested working paper on ministries (mentioned earlier in this survey) prepared by a joint group of Orthodox and Roman Catholic theologians.¹²⁷ It will not be surprising if that proposed text receives some sharp theological criticism despite its many useful orientations. Some will find that the text suffers from the defects of Eucharistic ecclesiology, from an overemphasis on the episcopal office, from an ecclesiocentrism, from a neglect of the community's function in the celebration of the mysteries.

Sacramental Life and Prayer

My final section is devoted to the sacramental life and to prayer as described by some recent Orthodox writers and by Catholics outside the Eastern traditions. Sacramental life seems to be a term preferable to reception of the seven sacraments, since many present-day Orthodox, except for convenience when talking with the West, do not speak of seven mysteries or sacraments. A Western theologian might be inclined to explain this by saying that Orthodox do not distinguish between sacraments and sacramentals. Thus, a crowning ceremony at weddings, the use of *myron* unction at baptism, the burial service, the distribution of bread in church, even fasting are "sacramental." Just when more and more Catholic theologians such as Kilmartin and Schillebeeckx are stressing the need to understand the sacramental principle that impregnates all Christian living, it would be unfortunate if Orthodoxy were to

¹²⁶ Michael A. Fahey, S.J., "Eastern Orthodoxy and the Ordination of Women," in *Women Priests: A Catholic Commentary on the Vatican Declaration*, eds. L. Swidler and A. Swidler (New York: Paulist, 1977) 107-13; Emilianos Timiadiis, "The Concern for Women in the Orthodox Tradition," *Diakonia* 12 (1977) 8-23; Joseph Ledit, *Marie dans la liturgie de Byzance* (Théologie historique 39; Paris: Beauchesne, 1977).

¹²⁷ "Orthodox-Roman Catholic Reflections on Ministries," *Origins* 7, no. 44 (Apr. 20, 1978) 702-4. Original French text in *Documentation catholique* 75 (1978) 262-65.

restrict its use to the formula of seven. For Orthodoxy, the sacramental is participating in divine life through many activities, some of which outsiders might regard as simply community or family customs resonant of ethnic folklore. Symbols, signs, gestures, attitudes, matter itself are seen as having a sanctifying quality. The volume of Stavropoulos on aspiring to partaking in the divine life¹²⁸ and the contribution by Schmemann on sacramental life¹²⁹ are useful orientations. Some of the differences in the Western and Eastern ways of celebrating sacraments have been described by the Franciscan priest J. M. Izzo.¹³⁰ One especially promising work by a Roman Catholic theologian that indirectly invites the West to assume a more Eastern perspective on sacraments has been published by J. Villalón, professor of theology at World University, Puerto Rico.¹³¹ For the history of some specific sacramental rites, one can consult with profit the work by Madey on East Syrian practices and by Riley on early Christian initiation ceremonies.¹³²

Sacramental life is closely related to liturgical life in the Orthodox tradition. Although, as mentioned, it is beyond the scope of this survey to investigate works on the liturgy, still several books have direct pertinence for what they teach us about the sacramental life and prayer. Harakas speaks of the necessity of living the liturgy from a perspective of faith¹³³ and Tyciak sees the liturgy as an expression of "theology in hymns."¹³⁴ Two authors from the Pontifical Oriental Institute, Mateos and Taft, have been trying to achieve for the Byzantine liturgy what Jungmann accomplished in historical research into the liturgy of the Roman rite.¹³⁵ The quality of their research is impeccable and the

¹²⁸ Christoforos Stavropoulos, *Partakers of Divine Nature*, tr. Stanley Harakas (Minneapolis: Light & Life, 1976).

¹²⁹ Alexander Schmemann, *For the Life of the World: Sacraments and Orthodoxy* (New York: St. Vladimir's, 1973).

¹³⁰ Januarius M. Izzo, O.F.M., "A Comparison of Some Sacramental Doctrines and Practices of the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches," *Diakonia* 10 (1975) 233-43; 11 (1976) 42-51.

¹³¹ José R. Villalón, *Sacraments dans l'Esprit: Existence humaine et théologie existentielle* (Théologie historique 43; Paris: Beauchesne, 1977) esp. 371-444.

¹³² Johannes Madey and Georg Vavanikunnel, *Taufe, Firmung und Busse in den Kirchen des ostsyrischen Ritenkreises* (Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1971); Hugh M. Riley, *Christian Initiation: A Comparative Study of the Interpretation of the Baptismal Liturgy in the Mystagogical Writings of Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuetia and Ambrose of Milan* (Studies in Christian Antiquity 17; Washington: Catholic University of America, 1974).

¹³³ Stanley S. Harakas, *Living the Liturgy: A Practical Guide for Participating in the Divine Liturgy of the Eastern Orthodox Church* (Minneapolis: Light & Life, 1974).

¹³⁴ Julius Tyciak, *Theologie in Hymnen: Theologische Perspektiven der byzantinischen Liturgie* (Sophia 10; Trier: Paulinus, 1973).

¹³⁵ Juan Mateos, S.J., *La célébration de la parole dans la liturgie byzantine: Etude historique* (Orientalia christiana analecta 191; Rome: Oriental Institute, 1971); Robert F.

pertinence of their studies for understanding prayer is undeniable. Less exact in many respects, but still useful and accessible to a nonspecialist, are two works on the Byzantine liturgy by Ukrainian Catholics: Solovey and Kucharek.¹³⁶

One of the ways that Orthodoxy blends daily life with a liturgical cycle is through fasting. Four major fasts are celebrated each year: Lent (seven weeks before Easter), the Apostles' feast (the second Monday after Pentecost to June 28), the fast of the falling asleep of the Theotokos (Aug. 1-14), and the Christmas fast (Nov. 15 to Dec. 24). Schmemmann's study of the theological and religious aspects of the Lenten fast is helpful.¹³⁷ Also, we now have a reliable monograph on the practice of fasting in the Byzantine Church from the beginnings to the eleventh century.¹³⁸

The Eastern traditions of prayer and of searching to participate in the life of grace have begun to attract Western Christians in greater numbers during the last decades. This is especially true of Hesychasm with its system of meditation, contemplation, quieting of the body and mind, and the use of particular body positions through which the believer aspires to seeing the uncreated divine light that enveloped Christ at his transfiguration and thereby to achieving bliss. Interest has been shown also in the Jesus prayer. A useful anthology of Orthodox prayers in English was edited by Timothy Ware.¹³⁹ In French, the Abbey of Bellefontaine has produced a study of Orthodox spirituality and asceticism.¹⁴⁰ Because of Orthodoxy's long tradition of monasticism, it is not surprising that monks of East and West would be invited to share in the effort of mutual understanding. The Orthodox-Cistercian Symposium held in 1973 at Oxford brought to light profound insights that Eastern monasticism can offer the West.¹⁴¹

Taft, S.J., *The Great Entrance: A History of the Transfer of Gifts and Other Preanaphoral Rites of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom* (Orientalia christiana analecta 200; Rome: Oriental Institute, 1975); Robert F. Taft, S.J., "How Liturgies Grow: The Evolution of the Byzantine 'Divine Liturgy,'" *Orientalia christiana periodica* 43 (1977) 355-78.

¹³⁶ Meletius Michael Solovey, O.S.B.M., *The Byzantine Divine Liturgy: History and Commentary*, tr. D. E. Wysochansky (Washington: Catholic University of America, 1970); Casimir A. Kucharek, *The Sacramental Mysteries: A Byzantine Approach* (Allendale, N.J.: Alleluia Press, 1976).

¹³⁷ Alexander Schmemmann, *Great Lent* (rev. ed.; New York: St. Vladimir's, 1974).

¹³⁸ Joachim Herbut, *De ieiunio et abstinentia in ecclesia Byzantina ab initiis usque ad saec. XI* (Corona Lateranensis 12; Rome: Lateran, 1968).

¹³⁹ *The Art of Prayer: An Orthodox Anthology*, compiled by Igumen Chariton of Valano, ed. T. Ware (London: Faber, 1966).

¹⁴⁰ Tito Colliander, *Le chemin des ascètes: Initiation à la vie spirituelle* (Spiritualité orientale 12; Bégrolles, France: Abbaye de Bellefontaine, 1976).

¹⁴¹ *Theology and Prayer: Essays on Monastic Themes Presented at the Orthodox-Cistercian Conference, Oxford, 1973* (Studies Supplementary to *Sobornost* 3;

Although North America cannot claim a center for East and West dialogue of the stature of Chevetogne, Chambésy, Centre Istina, St. Sergius (Paris), St. Alban and St. Sergius (London), or Rome's Oriental Institute, still contacts here are frequent and fruitful. This survey can give us a sense of the extent of Orthodoxy's conversations with other Christians not only in North America but throughout the world. Given this exchange of faith, is it utopian to dream that before 1999 Orthodox, non-Chalcedonians, and Roman Catholics shall enter again into full *koinonia*, a communion which respects and requires separate liturgical, theological, and ecclesiastical traditions but which recognizes a true reflection of the orthodox faith in different mirrors?

London: Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, 1975); *One Yet Two: Monastic Tradition East and West: Orthodox-Cistercian Symposium, 26 August-1 September 1973, Oxford*, ed. M. Basil Pennington (Cistercian Studies 29; Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian, 1974).