THE PEMPTOUSIA JOURNAL FOR THEOLOGICAL STUDIES
VOLUME 09 | 2020

Anelogia

Ecclesial Dialogues:
EAST AND WEST I

"The Church of God is forever and remains one and unique."

(Nicolas Afanassieff, Una Sancta)

Πεμπτουσια
Ορθοδοξία Πολιτισμός Επιστήμες
www.pemptousia.gr

Guest Editors
Sotiris Mitralexis & Andrew Kaethler

NOTE
FROM THE SENIOR EDITOR

The beginning of the Roman Catholic/Orthodox Theological dialogue during the 20th century raised to some high hopes for an imminent canonical unity between the two Denominations, and this, though premature, is not of course to be blamed; it is impossible for any contemporary Christian theologian not to suffer from the division within this very womb of the ontological unification of all things, which is the Church of Christ—precisely because this division gives to many the impression of a fragmentation of the Church's very being and subsequently weakens her witness. However, indeed, it is the Church that matters, beyond any political, sociological or historical 'necessity', which perhaps has ensouled some Church leaders' wishful thinking, over the centuries, for such an imminent canonical unity. And that means that the unity is a matter of Theology. I think that this was precisely the underlying motive of the organisers of the Syros Conference, the fruits of which are published in this two-volume publication of Analogia. As the Senior Editor of this Journal, but also as a participant in the Syros Conference, and in the ongoing academic dialogue between the Orthodox and the Roman Catholics, I wish to thank both the organisers, and the two Guest Editors, who did their best and put significant work into this enterprise; I hope that this publication will be a particular opportunity for this theological communication, which wishes to build a wiser reciprocal dialogue upon a deeper mutual fathoming.

– ***Nikolaos Loudovikos,*** Senior Editor

EDITORIAL

We are overjoyed that *Analogia*'s issues 9 and 10 are dedicated to *Ecclesial Dialogues: East and West*—that is, to peer-reviewed and revised versions of papers first presented at the international conference exploring this subject and convened in the island of Syros, from the 10th to the 14th of June 2019. This conference would not have materialised without the generous support of Loyola Marymount University's Revd Professor Cyril Hovorun and the generous support of the University of Winchester (which provided the conference's academic aegis) and our co-convenor, Revd Reader Andreas Andreopoulos; we extend our cordial gratitude to these individuals and institutions, as we remain with the hope that a particular *vision* (or rather, *perspective*) was articulated during those days in Syros, rather than merely yet another ecumenically-oriented scholarly gathering.

The guest editors deem it important that this conference (and the *Analogia* issues stemming therefrom) did *not* form part of any level of official ecclesial dialogue and exchange but consisted in a bottom-up scholarly endeavour at ecclesial enquiry, exploration and discovery. The reader shall be spared the guest editors' theological musings in this editorial note (yet these musings shall return vengefully in the guest editors' respective papers). We have opted for one introduction to both issues, so that the interested reader will be made aware of the contents of the other issue, apart from the one you are currently holding in your hands.

Ecclesial Dialogues: East and West I (i.e., *Analogia* 9) opens with Dr Sotiris Mitralexis' (Orthodox, University of Winchester & University of Athens) 'A Spectre Is Haunting Intercommunion', an introduction to the conference's problematic. Professor Edward Siecienski's (Orthodox, Stockton University) paper follows, entitled 'Unity of the Churches—An Actual Possibility: The Rahner-Fries Theses and Contemporary Catholic-Orthodox Dialogue', highlighting from a contemporary perspective the eight theses that Karl Rahner, SJ and Heinrich Fries proposed in 1983, in the hope of healing Christianity's many divisions. Revd Professor Thomas O'Loughlin (Catholic, University of Nottingham) then proceeds in his 'The Origins of an Ecumenical Church: Links, Borrowings, and Inter-dependencies' to examine the ecclesiology of early churches as *nodes* within a network, established and maintained by constant contact and by those who saw it as part of their service/vocation to travel between the churches; this culture of links, of sharing and borrowing, could perhaps form a model for a practical way forward today towards a renewed sense of our oneness in Christ. In 'Crusades, Colonialism, and the Future Possibility of Christian Unity', Professor George Demacopoulos (Orthodox, Fordham University) presents the historical conditions more extensively laid out in his recent monograph *Colonizing Christianity: Greek and Latin Religious Identity in the Era of the Fourth Crusade* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2019) in order to develop a more constructive theological argument regarding the ecumenical implications of that his-

torical work. Revd Professor Andrew Louth (Orthodox, Durham University) focuses in his 'Eucharistic Doctrine and Eucharistic Devotion' on comparing the Western Rite of Benediction, Exposition of the Host and adoration, with the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts in the East; the nature of Eucharistic devotion expressed in these two rites is in most ways strikingly different, and this leads Revd Professor Louth to highlight differences that are rather rarely discussed in ecumenical discussions. Revd Dr Manuel Gonçalves Sumares (Orthodox, Catholic University of Portugal, Braga) centres on the late Fr Alexander Schmemann (and Sergius Bulgakov, among many others) in his 'Schmemann's Approach to the Sacramental Life of the Church: its Orthodox Positioning, its Catholic Intent'. Revd Professor Adam AJ DeVille (Catholic, University of Saint Francis) offers an Eastern Catholic perspective in his 'Approaching the Future as a Friend Without a Wardrobe of Excuses', including moral questions around marriage and divorce, historiographical and liturgical-hagiographical questions centred on the canonization and commemoration of saints in one communion who left and/or were used in conciliar debates and liturgical texts to condemn the sister communion; and questions of synodal organization and structures in both Catholicism and Orthodoxy in the face of centralizing tendencies. The first issue concludes with a rich Anglican perspective presented by the Rt Revd Jonathan Goodall, Bishop of Ebbsfleet and Archbishop of Canterbury's Representative to the Orthodox Church: in his 'Anglicans and the Una Sancta', Bishop Jonathan stresses the Anglican self-understanding as '*part* of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church'.

Ecclesial Dialogues: East and West II (i.e., *Analogia* 10) starts with the Senior Editor of Analogia, Revd Professor Nicholas Loudovikos (Orthodox, University Ecclesiastical Academy of Thessaloniki, University of Winchester, IOCS Cambridge, Orthodox Secretary of the 'St Irenaeus' Joint Catholic-Orthodox International Working Group) and his paper on 'Christological or Analogical Primacy: Ecclesial Unity and Universal Primacy in the Orthodox Church', according to which 'the only way Christ makes himself *analogically* present as the head of his Church, through a universal Primate, is as manifestation of a *consubstantializing Synodality*'. Professor Andrew TJ Kaethler (Catholic, Catholic Pacific College), in his 'Manifesting Persons: A Church in Tension', begins from a theological notion of personhood in order to provide a broad framework or an imaginative construct to conceive of Church unity, in light of Joseph Ratzinger's and Romano Guardini's respective theologies. Kaethler suggests that the East and West will, perhaps, most flourish in a united tension, a coming together of difference rather than a complete dissolving of our respective distinctions. Following this, Professor Jared Schumacher (Catholic, University of Mary) formulates 'An Ignatian-MacIntyrean Proposal for Overcoming Historical and Political-Theological Difficulties in Ecumenical Dialogue', focusing on three difficulties in achieving practical unity: the recognition of plurality, the problem of synthesis or integration, and the problem of orientation implicit in any synthesis.

Returning *ad fontes*, Professor Christos Karakolis (Orthodox, University of Athens) examines the character of Simon Peter in the narrative of John's Gospel in his 'Simon Peter in the Gospel According to John: His Historical Significance according to the Johannine Community's Narrative', in order to help us better understand the biblical foundations of the theological debate on the papal office. Fast-forward to the 6th century with Professor Anna Zhyrkova's (Catholic, Akademia Ignatianum, Krakow) 'The Scythian Monks' Latin-cum-Eastern Approach to Tradition: A Paradigm for Reunifying Doctrines and Overcoming Schism', which presents the historical case study of the Scythian monks, who united Western and Eastern traditions, seeing both traditions as one and not hesitating to address problems simultaneously of concern to both Rome and Constantinople, putting forward a solution based on a synthesis of Augustine's and Cyril's theologies. Escaping doctrinal differences *per se* and turning our attention to aesthetics —a perspective rarely addressed in East-West dialogues—, Professor Norm Klassen (Catholic, University of Waterloo) offers in his 'Beauty is the Church's Unity: Supernatural Finality, Aesthetics, and Catholic–Orthodox Dialogue' an understanding of beauty vis-à-vis the nature/grace question, *inter alia* via a reference to Rowan Williams' thought. The conference's co-convener Revd Reader Andreas Andreopoulos (Orthodox, University of Winchester) proposes in his 'Ecumenism and Trust: A Pope on Mount Athos' a hypothetical scenario, an exercise in imagination, an ecumenical *Christian-fi* in the manner of *sci-fi*, according to which a particularly humble Pope of Rome visits Mount Athos, the bastion of Orthodox asceticism, in search of unity and in an ecclesial version of the famous 1971-72 dictum 'only Nixon could go to China'; the point is that it is necessary to recognize the multitude of levels and dimensions of dialogue and the question of the reunification of the East and the West, well beyond the remit of joint theological commissions, and that establishment of mutual trust among clergy, monastics and laity on both sides is the first necessary step. Remaining on Mount Athos and its attempted Catholic equivalent, Dr Marcin Podbielski (Catholic, Akademia Ignatianum, Krakow) shares in his philosophically-informed 'God's Silence and Its Icons: A Catholic's Experiences at Mount Athos and Mount Jamna' his 'bewilderment [that] there seems to be almost no room in contemporary Catholic spirituality for silence and isolation' and presents Athos and Jamna as two different realizations of an icon given to us by Christ himself, as human instruments which we create to point to true participation in the Divine presence of the New Jerusalem. Whereas the Catholic experience tries to bring everyone into participation in the life of the New Jerusalem, the Orthodox Athos, in its silent uniqueness, testifies to a unique and ineffable transcendence. Returning to more mainstream themes in East-West dialogue, Revd Dr Johannes Börjesson (University of Cambridge) offers in his 'Councils and Canons' a Lutheran perspective on the Great Schism and the 'Eighth Council' via Lutheran ecclesiology. From a 'Radical Orthodox' perspective within Anglicanism and beyond, Professor John Milbank

(University of Nottingham) argues in his 'Ecumenism done otherwise: Christian unity and global crisis' for a connection of ecumenism to politics, and suggests that any relevant dialogue should theologically assume that Church unity already exists but has been obscured and obfuscated—with our task being to recover and disclose this unity. Completing our *Analogia* issues, Professor Marcello La Matina (Catholic, University of Macerata) offers the closing thoughts of this collective endeavour from the perspective of a scholar of the philosophy of language in his paper 'Concluding Reflections on Mapping the Una Sancta: An Orthodox-Catholic Ecclesiology Today', proposing an understanding of the schism *as the stage of the mirror*, as Jacques Lacan would have it.

In closing this editorial note, we would like to thank the following institutions and sponsors: again, Loyola Marymount University and the University of Winchester, for making the conference possible; Catholic Pacific College and the Municipality of Syros for their support, as well as His Excellency J. Michael Miller, CSB, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Vancouver. We are filially grateful to His All-Holiness Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew, His Beatitude Ieronymos II, Orthodox Archbishop of Athens and All Greece, to His Eminence Dorotheos, Orthodox Metropolitan of Syros, Tinos, Andros, Kea and Milos, and to His Excellency Petros Stephanou, Catholic Bishop of Syros, Milos, Santorini and Apostolic administrator of the Diocese of Crete, for their kind permission and blessing of the conference. Revd Professor Nikolaos Loudovikos has kindly proposed the publication of the Syros papers in *Analogia* following successful peer-review; we are most thankful to him for this invitation. We remain with the hope that this collective endeavour forms the *beginning*, rather than the *completion*, of an attempt at seeing ecclesial dialogues between East and West from a particular and hopefully fresh perspective.

– Dr Sotiris Mitralexis & Dr Andrew Kaethler, Guest Editors

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Crusades, Colonialism, and the Future Possibility Christian Unity

GEORGE E. DEMACOPOULOS
Professor of Theology, Fordham University

Why does interpreting the Fourth Crusade as a colonial encounter usefully recalibrate our understanding of the rapid escalation of Orthodox/Catholic animus that occurred during the thirteenth century and what are the ecumenical implications of this reorientation? Scholars have long since identified the Fourth Crusade as a pivotal moment in the history of Orthodox/Catholic estrangement so, why, one might ask, do we need to view the crusades as colonialism per se in order to chart the history of Orthodox/Catholic estrangement? And why do we need the theoretical resources of postcolonial critique to explain something we already know?

In a recent book, *Colonizing Christianity: Greek and Latin Religious Identity in the Era of the Fourth Crusade* (Fordham, 2019), I argued that the religious polemics, both Greek and Latin, that emerged in the context of the Fourth Crusade should be interpreted as having been produced in a colonial setting and, as such, reveal the political, economic, and cultural uncertainty of communities in conflict; they do not offer theological insight.[1] Given that it was in the context of the Fourth Crusade—and not the so-called Photian Schism of the ninth century, the so-called Great Schism of 1054, or any other period of ecclesiastical controversy—that Greek and Latin apologists developed the most elaborate condemnations of one another, I argued, it behooves historians, theologians, and Church leaders alike to reconsider the conditions that give rise to the most deliberate efforts to forbid Greek and Latin sacramental unity in the Middle Ages and to ask whether those arguments are theologically revealing or whether they simply convey animosity in the guise of theological disputation. This essay begins with a summary of these historical conditions and then develops a more constructive theological argument regarding the ecumenical implications of that historical work.

I began the book by asking the reader to consider with me how treating the Fourth Crusade as a colonial encounter might alter our interpretation of Orthodox/Catholic hostility, which first took its mature form in that context. Four of the

[1] George Demacopoulos, *Colonizing Christianity: Greek and Latin Religious Identity in the Era of the Fourth Crusade* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2019).

book's six chapters examine Western texts that supported the Crusade in one way or another.[2] Rather than pursue a traditional historical account, I interrogated those texts for ways in which they reveal a colonial 'discourse': For example, I asked how these texts authorized the subjugation of Byzantium and subsequent rule over Greek East? I sought to understand the ways in which they presented the 'Greek Christian' as someone so 'other' that his or her standing as a fellow Christian could be ignored. I asked whether and how these texts understood 'religious difference' to provide authorization for colonial violence, settlement, or resource extraction. Similarly, I tried to understand how the vicissitudes of Latin power in Byzantium for the generations after 1204 might have changed the presentation of Greek Christians and then led to new authorizations for violence against them. Finally, I asked how the prolonged exposure to Greek Christianity might have transformed for Western authors the narration of their own identity over time.

I also, of course, examined Eastern Christian texts from the same period and similarly interpreted those texts through the lens of a colonial encounter. Two of my six chapters examined Greek authors writing to other Greek Christians about Latin Christians.[3] Importantly, these chapters also look carefully at the way these authors spoke about other Greek Christians who held favorable views of Latins in order to understand the ways in which the experience of colonial subjugation at the hands of Western armies not only led to new condemnations of Latin Christians but also introduced sharp fractures within the Greek community. I observed that it was in this context that some Greek Christians first began to exclude other Greek Christians from the sacramental community on the basis of their political, economic, or liturgical association with Latin Christians. But I also noted that the effort to impose sacramental restrictions among Greeks was more aspirational than enforceable and that the desire to impose these restrictions was just one of many Greek responses to Latin Christians in Byzantium.

In addition to setting an interpretive gaze upon the Fourth Crusade from the vantage point of a colonial encounter, my book proposes that some of the theoretical insights of the scholarly apparatus known as postcolonial critique illuminate key aspects of this period and, therefore, are also applicable to understanding the broader transformations of Orthodox/Catholic identity formation, which derived from it. For example, following the lead of Edward Said, I argue that Latin Christian statements about Greek Christianity and Greek Christians functioned largely as a construct of the Western Christian imagination.[4] Those statement might offer intriguing insights into a thirteenth-century Western Christian *mentalité* but they do

[2] These include Robert de Clari's first-hand account, Gunther of Pairis' hagiography of 'sacred pillage', the letters of Pope Innocent III, and the *Chronicle of the Morea* (Chapters, 1, 2, 3, and 6 respectively).

[3] Chapter 4 examines the canonical rulings of Demetrios Chomatianos and Chapter 5 analyzes the chronicle of George Akropolites.

[4] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (reprinted New York: Vintage Books, 1994).

not offer a reliable account of who Eastern Christians were, what they thought, or what they did. Also following Said, I explored the connection between colonialism and sexuality, not only in terms of the ways in which Western authors used examples of sexual domination and homoerotic innuendo to narrate their ascendency over Eastern Christians but also with respect to the ways in which multiple authors were forced to deal with the reality of Frankish/Greek marriage and the production of mixed-race children in the wake of the colonization of Byzantium.[5] Indeed, Greek authors especially articulated sharply different responses to the production of hybrid children. This, in fact, offers one of the best examples of the extent to which Frankish settlement in the East produced community-dividing responses between Greek Christians.

In a pair of chapters, I offered extended engagements with some of the more complex insights of postcolonial scholarship in an effort to understand the unique dimensions of the transformations of religious identity in this period. In Chapter Three, I turned to Homi Bhabba's notion of 'ambivalence', which emphasizes an inherent reality/desire split in colonial discourse, to explain the dissonances in papal correspondence, particularly as they relate to the assertions of papal authority vis-à-vis Greek Christians.[6] In Chapter Six, I engaged the postcolonial concept of 'hybridity' to analyze the ways in which Greek terms, customs, and even religious practices were gradually appropriated by the Frankish aristocracy that ruled the Peloponnese.[7] Bhabha's application of 'hybridity' is an especially pertinent analytic framework because it helps us to understand both the slippages and desires that are often encoded within colonial writing, thus revealing the subtle ways in which the colonizing community is itself transformed by the encounter with the colonized.

Perhaps one of the most surprising things that we learn from the texts of this period is that the boundaries between the Greek and Latin sacramental communities were extremely porous in the lead up to 1204, despite the Schism of 1054. In the months before the siege, Frankish soldiers communed in the churches of Constantinople and many of monasteries of Mt. Athos still had Western monks who worshipped alongside their Eastern counterparts. Even after 1204, some areas of Latin colonial activity enjoyed remarkable co-existence and mutual influence—the Frankish controlled Peloponnese offering the best example. Of course, the boundary between the Greek and Latin sacramental communities did begin to harden in the wake of 1204, prompting several calls for the cessation of communion between the two. Nevertheless, the efforts to exclude the Greek or Latin from the sacramental community never reflected a universal position and were most often directed po-

[5] On this score, the work of Robert Young is also significant. See Young, *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture, and Race* (London: Routledge, 1995).

[6] See Homi Bhabha, 'Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree outside Delhi, May 1817', in *Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994), 145–74.

[7] For a summary of the origins of hybridity in postcolonial critique, see Robert Young, *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2001), esp. 337–59.

lemically against internal, not external, audiences who failed to see the threat posed by the Christian other.

Why 'Colonialism' Matters

So why does interpreting the Fourth Crusade as a colonial encounter usefully recalibrate our understanding of the rapid escalation of Orthodox/Catholic animus that occurred during the thirteenth century and what are the ecumenical implications of this reorientation? Scholars have long since identified the Fourth Crusade as a pivotal moment in the history of Orthodox/Catholic estrangement so, why, one might ask, do we need to view the crusades as colonialism per se in order to chart the history of Orthodox/Catholic estrangement? And why do we need the theoretical resources of postcolonial critique to explain something we already know?

To answer these questions, I begin with the historian's first principle: context matters. The Fourth Crusade was not simply an episode of medieval warfare, it was not simply an event of political opportunism, nor was it simply an example of conquest and plunder. To be sure, it was all of these things; but from the perspective of Christian history, it was also much more. And it is precisely, this 'more' that we need to interrogate if we wish to interpret adequately the texts that were produced to narrate, justify, and/or condemn actions and responses connecting the Fourth Crusade to religious superiority.

Let us begin, for example, with the fact that siege of Constantinople and the formation of the Latin Empire of Byzantium, which followed from it, completely transformed the way that the papacy and many elite Western churchmen engaged the possibility of Greek/Latin unity. In the wake of 1204, Innocent III and subsequent Popes abandoned all efforts at reconciliation through councils or theological arguments. To their mind the possibility of reunion was no longer a disjointed argument over papal privilege or the legitimacy of the *filioque*. From a Western Christian perspective, from the thirteenth century until the modern era, the pursuit of Christian unity was both understood and pursued through the political and economic subordination of Eastern Christians.

For example, when the initial efforts to force ecclesiastical reunion on papal terms proved unsuccessful in the months after the capture of Constantinople, neither Pope Innocent III nor his successors made any effort to return to pre-1204 mechanisms for Christian reconciliation. Instead, the Roman Church doubled-down on the colonial occupation of Byzantium by calling for more troops and non-military settlers in the East and—critically—by escalating the rhetorical justification for the subjection of Greek Christians to Latin hegemony. It was precisely this colonial context in which we find the first sustained papal accusations that all Greeks are heretics.[8] Thus, by

[8] See Demacopoulos, Chapter 3, 'Innocent's Ambivalence' in *Colonizing Christianity*.

situating the Latin Empire of Byzantium within the context of pre-modern colonialism, we better understand the interplay between the vicissitudes of political power on the one hand and the transformations of religious policy on the other.

Viewing the Fourth Crusade as colonialism does more than help us to understand the link between geopolitical forces and papal policy, it also helps us to understand the recalibration of religious identities. Indeed, the discourse of Latin/Greek difference underwent a profound (if uneven) transformation in the wake of the 1204. Texts like Robert de Clari's *Conquest of Constantinople* or Gunther of Pairis' *History of Constantinople* do more than narrate medieval war and pillage; they employ paradigms of cultural and moral superiority to authorize the conquest, settlement, and resource extraction of Christian Byzantium. Like Western European colonial texts of a later period, these texts encode a variety of 'orientalisms' to make their narratives more enticing, justifiable, and fantastic. And like colonial literature of a later era, they employ sexual conquest and sexual innuendo (including homoerotic taboo) to convey the superiority of Latin power and to fantasize about the conquest of Greek bodies.

By situating these texts within a colonial context, we not only gain a fuller understanding of these dimensions of their narrative, but we also gain a fuller appreciation for the internal slippages, dissonances, and ambivalences that these texts contain. Indeed, it is precisely because of their colonial context that we understand that passages that might otherwise appear as internal contradictions are, in fact, efforts to offer ideological consistency in a context where the very ground of cultural identity is shifting.

I would like to propose, however, that the more important contextual payoff for investigating the Fourth Crusade/Latin Empire as an episode of colonialism concerns the analysis of Greek texts produced in the thirteenth century. It is only when we situate texts like the canonical verdicts of Demetrios Chomatianos or the historical chronicle of George Akropolites within the context of a colonial encounter that we see the profound ways in which these texts not only function as a response to that encounter but evince deep fractures within Greek Christianity as a result of it. Indeed, Chomatianos and Akropolites represent alternative elite voices searching in their own way to narrate what it means to be Byzantine and Christian in the wake of the devastation of the Fourth Crusade. This devastation is not merely an example of medieval warfare, not merely an example of temporary political chaos, but represents a cleavage in the ideological underpinnings of their cultural and theological world-view. The Latin occupation of Byzantium was so destabilizing to the Eastern Christian epistemic outlook that it became virtually impossible for Eastern Christians in the centuries that followed to narrate Christian identity or teaching in a way that did not account for the hegemonic Latin Christian.[9]

[9] For the ways in which these conditions continue to dominate Orthodox discourse in the twenty-first century, see Demacopoulos, '"Traditional Orthodoxy" as a Postcolonial Movement', *Journal of Religion* 97

While historians of Christianity have, for generations, chronicled and analyzed the growing hostility between Greek and Latin Christians in the Middle Ages, there has been no effort to situate or analyze Greek anti-Latin polemic as de-colonial or postcolonial discourse. But doing so not only helps us to contextualize and understand the erosion of East/West Christian unity, it also enables us to interpret with more clarity the corresponding chasm within Byzantine ecclesiastical literature between pro-union/anti-union campaigns. Indeed, by attending to the colonial and de-colonial forces at play, we understand that this inter-ecclesiastical polemic, in fact, maps directly onto the political fracturing of the Greek aristocratic community between those who were and those who were not willing to work within the structures of Latin power in the East.[10] It is only then that we come to understand the profound ways in which the militaristic, political, and economic consequences of the Fourth Crusade directly transformed theological and cultural discourse. In the wake of 1204, the very definition of what it meant to be an Orthodox Christian—to be a member of the sacramental community—was now increasingly defined in terms of one's attitudes toward Latin Christians living in the East. If we want to understand modern Orthodox Christianity, we need to begin with the fact that Orthodox Christians from the thirteenth century to the present have responded in different ways to the question of whether or not the Latin Christian is a Christian. What is more, for many Orthodox Christians, the principle enemy has not been the Latins themselves but other Orthodox Christian who answers this question differently.

One of the most important insights of this study, I believe, is that there was no monolithic Greek Christian view of Latins, nor a single Latin Christian view of Greeks. A French knight like Robert de Clari may have been perfectly happy to authorize the seizure and looting of Constantinople on the basis of Greek treachery and effeminacy, but he had virtually nothing negative to say about the content of Greek theological teaching or practice.[11] This, of course, contrasts sharply with a German monk like Gunther of Pairis, who authorized the looting of religious treasure almost exclusively on the basis of Greek theological error.[12] A figure like Pope Innocent is, perhaps, even more interesting. Even though he repeatedly warned the Crusaders in the months before the siege of the city that they should not interfere in the affairs of the Greeks, precisely because they were fellow Christians, in subsequent years, when the Latin Empire began to falter, the pontiff explicitly called for violence against Greeks and for the expansion of Latin settlement of Byzantium on

(2017): 475–99.

[10] Although she does not connect it to inter-ecclesiastical dispute or to the theoretical resources of post-colonial critique, see Teresa Shawcross's examination of the fracturing of the Greek aristocratic class in the Peloponnese. Shawcross, *The Chronicle of the Morea: Historiography in Crusader Greece* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

[11] Robert de Clari, *Conquest of Constantinople* trans. by Edgar Holmes McNeal (New York: Columbia University Press, reprinted 2005).

[12] Gunther of Pairis, *Hystoria Constantinopolitana* trans. by Afred Andrea (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997).

the basis of Greek heresy. Indeed, Innocent was the first pope to extend the blanket remission of sins for Crusaders to non-soldiers who would be willing to move to the East as colonists.[13]

Clearly, it is not just the Greeks who held radically opposing views of the proximate religious other—Latin attitudes towards Greeks during could be just as mixed. And it is precisely because these attitudes are so mixed that we should understand anti-Greek invectives like those contained in Gunther and Innocent as both evincing internal Latin debates and constituting a sharp ideological position in those debates. Indeed, much of the religious polemic in the wake of the Fourth Crusade was directed at internal audiences (Latin to Latin; Greek to Greek) as a means of justifying broader ecclesiological and cultural interactions/restrictions between Greek and Latin Christians.

The Ecumenical Implications

Upon closer inspection, we discover that the erection of a sacramental boundary between Greeks and Latins in the wake of 1204 had little to do with theology. There was no new theological insight; there was no new rejection of a prior orthodoxy. There is very little that is theologically innovative about any of the sources that seek to exclude Greek or Latin from the sacraments. In fact, none of the theologically polemical authors in the era of the Fourth Crusade offers any fresh theological criticism in their condemnations of the religious other that had not been articulated by previous polemicists. Even Pope Innocent, whose accusations of theological error grew more hostile over time, simply appropriates anti-Greek invectives that pre-date him. In short, the hardening of the religious boundary between Greeks and Latins between the Orthodox and the Catholics that occurred in some circles in the wake of the Latin conquest of Byzantium was the result of a colonial encounter rather than the result of new ecclesiastical factionalism.

Like other colonial encounters, the trauma for Greek Christians was not merely one of political or economic loss but, more importantly, in the rupture of ideological assumptions. After 1204, elite Greek Christians could no longer define what it meant to be a Christian, or even a loyal Byzantine, without some recourse to a hegemonic Latin Church. Eastern Christian theology had not changed, nor had its Western counter-part. But the political, economic, and cultural conditions in Byzantium had changed radically and in ways that profoundly reshaped how Eastern Christians understood what it meant to be a Christian. While they may not have responded to this new situation with a single voice, there is no doubt that they were all forced to respond. And the discourse of Orthodox Christian theology has been profoundly transformed ever since.

[13] Innocent, *Register* 8.70.

For the Christian who cares about the cause of Orthodox/Catholic unity, there is much in the preceding discussion that is depressing. But I would like to propose three reasons why I believe that a careful examination of the Greek/Latin encounter of the thirteenth century might actually offer some cause for ecumenical hope. First, as we have just reviewed, Greek and Latin Christians were not nearly as divided prior to 1204 as is generally assumed. Indeed, it is clear that antagonism between the Roman and Constantinopolitan sees—even centuries of smoldering polemical accusations—had not prevented sacramental intermingling between Greek and Latin Christians. In fact, there are a multitude of examples to suggest that Greeks and Latins inter-communed and married one another despite the Schism of 1054, and this evidence forces us to differentiate between what the consequences of the Schism were in the Middle Ages versus what many today falsely assume those consequences to have been. Even though the Fourth Crusade played an instrumental role in the ultimate sacramental separation between the Orthodox and Roman Catholic communions, it did not do so immediately and—as my book demonstrates—there were authors and communities who resisted the call for sacramental isolation for centuries. In fact, there is evidence of sacramental co-mingling between Greeks and Latins well into the seventeenth century.[14]

Second, because the rupture between Orthodox and Catholics that did occur as a consequence of the Fourth Crusade was primarily the result of political, economic, and cultural alienation, rather than the result of new theological developments, the possibility for a theological common ground remains a viable possibility. In the eyes of most medieval Christians, there was nothing theologically insurmountable about East/West theological difference. Even in those settings, like the colonization of Byzantium, where political and cultural conflict gave rise to theological polemic and increasing calls for sacramental isolation, both elite and ordinary Christians continued to cross the Greek/Latin boundary to commune, baptize, and marry with one another. My sense is that this occurred precisely because those who were advocating for sacramental isolation failed to develop theological justifications for that isolation that could satisfy those who believed otherwise.

Finally, let me return once again to something I mentioned only briefly in my first section, which is concerns the extended encounter between Franks and Greeks in the Peloponnese during the thirteenth century. What is so remarkable about the Frankish dynasty in Southern Greece during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is that we find an experience of Catholic/Orthodox religious cohabitation, appreciation, and appropriation, even if the two Christian communities remained largely independent of one another. Historically, this coexistence occurred because both the Frankish lords and their Greek aristocratic subjects refused to use religious identity as a means of subordination or resistance. And, what is perhaps most unique in this

[14] Ware, *Eustratios Argenti: A Study of the Greek Church Under Turkish Rule* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1964).

respect was the extent to which the Frankish and Greek rulers in the Peloponnese largely sought to set their own policies with respect to the Christian other, rather than adhere to the instructions issued in Rome or Constantinople or elsewhere. While the experiment of a Frankish/Greek Peloponnese may be something of a historical anomaly (somewhat like the situation today on the Greek island Syros), it does challenge a number of our assumptions about Orthodox/Catholic difference and the possibilities for fruitful coexistence in the wake of 1204.[15] Perhaps, the next experience of an authentic Orthodox/Catholic mutual dependence will first occur in a similar setting, where local leaders prioritize the realities and sacramental needs of the local community in all of its messiness rather than adhere to a set of boundaries that exist more in the imagination than in real experience. I am told that this intercommunion is already occurring in certain settings in the Middle East, where the future of Christianity is so grim. I suspect that it will also increasingly occur quietly in parishes across the United States, where the demographics of intermarriage—like those of the Peloponnese in the thirteenth century—are simply too large for the institutional church to control.

[15] The Greek island of Syros came under Venetian control during the Fourth Crusade but unlike nearly every other region of Greek culture in the Eastern Mediterranean, it never passed to the control of the Turks. As a consequence of Western Christian political influence that lasted until the twentieth century, Syros' population remains to this day majority Roman Catholic.

Approaching the Future as a Friend Without a Wardrobe of Excuses[1]

ADAM A.J. DEVILLE
Associate Professor and Director of Humanities,
University of Saint Francis

This paper touches on some issues having virtually no place in official Catholic-Orthodox dialogue, including moral questions around marriage and divorce; historiographical and liturgical-hagiographical questions centred on the canonization and commemoration of saints in one communion who left and/or were used in conciliar debates and liturgical texts to condemn the sister communion; and questions of synodal organization and structures in both Catholicism and Orthodoxy in the face of centralizing tendencies. It proposes a model of 'gradual' and localized sacramental communion inspired in part by the work of several contemporary Orthodox scholars—Staniloae, Bordeianu, Plekon, Arjakovsky, inter alia.

Introduction:

I began my official involvement with the ecumenical movement in high-school in 1988, assisting a local chapter of the Anglican-Roman Catholic dialogue in south-western Ontario. Then, in 1990, I became involved with the Canadian Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches whose seventh assembly in Canberra, Australia I attended, followed by seven years of working for the WCC during which I crossed the globe to many gatherings on five continents.

I learned immediately after returning from Australia in 1991 that the over-whelming majority of Christians had never even heard of the WCC, and had little clue as to what the word 'ecumenism' or its cognates even meant, and, more alarming still, they seemed completely uninterested in learning more. Worse still, those tiny few who actually were aware of the WCC were almost uniformly hostile, picketing our worship tent in Australia every morning with Pauline proof-texts ('be ye not yoked together with unbelievers!') or later taking to the pages of that august and venerable journal of theological scholarship, *Reader's Digest*, to denounce the WCC as a vehicle for advancing what a contemporary Canadian crank, fondly imagining he has invented the phrase, calls 'cultural Marxism'.

While depressing, this realization that the vast majority of people knew little and cared even less about ecumenism was sobering and helpful when we would get

[1] My title is a paraphrase of a line from W.H. Auden's 1940 poem 'In Memory of Sigmund Freud'.

bogged down and spend hours in meetings trying to craft a statement on anything from the First Gulf War to dyophysite Christology. I always resented the time wasted on such things for I knew that almost nobody would ever read those statements, much less pay head to them.

I mention all this because, after thirty years of involvement in some form or other with the search for Christian unity, I find myself, in response to all three questions asked of me here—what is overlooked in the official dialogues, what issues would arise were the major doctrinal issues to be solved, and what would sacramental unity look like?—returning to the answer of the real estate agents: location, location, location. Thus, in answer to all three questions, I shall argue that we must begin to focus on local communities and the pressing issues and experiences found therein rather than on more abstract national or international structures and concerns.[2]

What Is Not Discussed:

What is not discussed, of course, is not thereby dead. In fact, in good Freudian fashion, I am tempted to claim that what is not discussed in official ecumenical dialogues is sometimes more interesting and more dangerous than what is discussed. Typical dialogue and discussion safely take place around texts—e.g., the Nicene creed and its troublesome interpolation (*filioque*), or *Pastor Aeternus* of Vatican I, or *Ut Unum Sint* of John Paul II.

But what if we move from the lecture hall or conference room to the bedroom? I have thought for some time that issues such as marriage and divorce, contraception and abortion, are hugely problematic within churches, and rarely discussed between them. If Orthodox-Catholic unity is ever to happen, these are the issues that will very likely be uppermost in the minds of many people because of their concrete and daily experience and application.

Similarly, one massive and glaring area of concrete and regular experience that nobody talks about is liturgy. I am thinking here in two ways in particular: first, general liturgical culture in Orthodox and Catholic parishes, about which more in a moment; and second, particular liturgical issues (e.g., hymnody in which the 'heretics' of one side are condemned while that same side's 'saints' are lauded). Here one can think of the Orthodox Church of American feting Alexis Toth, or the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church (and indeed the entire Catholic Church) feting Josaphat Kuntsevych.

Perhaps even more intractable: two popes, both canonized by their respective churches, not least for their opposition to each other: Leo I of Rome and Dioscorus I of Alexandria. The latter excommunicated the former, and this excommunication,

[2] I argued something similar about the primacy of the local parish in speaking to and of Russian Byzantine Catholics in San Felice del Benaco in 2017, a lecture that was published as 'Remembering, Repeating, and Working Through', *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 59 (2018): 245–262.

combined with several other factors surrounding the politics of the council led to Dioscorus being deposed by Chalcedon and exiled. If a Coptic Christian today were to start commemorating Leo as a saint, what would he do with Dioscorus's excommunication of the same? In seeking deeper unity with the Coptic Church, beyond the modern Christological agreement of 1973[3], would the Catholic Church have to officially incorporate Dioscorus into her own sanctoral calendar and set aside a feast day for him? In addition to these two individuals, would Orthodox and Catholic churches of the Byzantine tradition have to adjust our own hymnody for the month of July to downplay our exultation of the triumph of Chalcedonian Orthodoxy and denigration of others as when, for example, we sing in the third *sticharion* at Vespers,

> O glorious Fathers of the Councils,
> you demonstrated that Pyrrhus, Sergius, and Onuphrius,
> Dioscorus, and Nestorius were in error
> concerning the doctrines of Christ.

These issues could admit of relatively straightforward solution as authorities allow those really wedded to such commemorations to keep them in certain areas without requiring their universal observance. It could also be made clear that quietly removing certain texts from annual or universal liturgical usage is not a threat to, for example, Chalcedon's Christology.

But what about general liturgical culture and sacramental practices in parishes? Here we may be facing a thicket of issues unacknowledged by anybody serious. I am thinking, for example, of widely divergent practices even within Roman Catholic parishes when it comes to the sacraments of initiation.[4] A lack of unity within one church is considerable enough, but if Catholics and Orthodox are suddenly facing each other on this question, what is one to do? I happen to think the only coherent arguments are in favour of the age-old practice which the East (including, happily, Eastern Catholics such as myself) has maintained of baptism-chrismation-eucharist. But the Latin practice of delaying reception of the Eucharist until, usually, somewhere around the age of seven has allowed to develop an entire infrastructure in Catholic schools, as well as an entire mythology around some so-called 'age of reason' that cannot be easily vanquished—to say nothing of the cottage industry that makes money each year selling all the gloriously tacky dresses and accoutrements for 'First Communion' parties.

More seriously, I think a major concern here comes from liturgical culture, which is most likely the single biggest variance people will encounter, often for the

[3] The text is here: http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/anc-orient-ch-docs/rc_pc_christuni_doc_19730510_copti_en.html.

[4] For the vexed issue of Confirmation/Chrismation, see the superlative study of the Orthodox scholar Nicholas Denysenko, *Chrismation: A Primer for Catholics* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2014).

first time. Liturgy, as we all know, and especially the idea of any changes to it, can often be a minefield of controversy, and yet this is nowhere dealt with in official ecumenical dialogues between East and West. It should be, at least so far as ensuring some kind of uniformity in liturgical recitation of the Nicene Creed *sans* the *filioque* clause if full communion is re-established.[5]

Beyond that, we may be in for some pleasant surprises if my students are any indication (and I have been sending, on average, 100 of them a year to an Orthodox Byzantine liturgy as a course requirement). They are overwhelmed (in a good way) with and by the sensory extravaganza of a Byzantine liturgy, and the Roman Catholic students among them have, with ever increasing frequency over the years, been expressing open and serious envy at that liturgical tradition in comparison to which they find their own massively impoverished, desiccated, and banal. There is, moreover, something of a generational injustice perceived here, as students today increasingly feel that the generation who implemented liturgical changes at and after Vatican II inflicted some serious deprivations on the rest of the Latin Church, leaving many students feeling seriously shortchanged. In this light, then, the liturgical culture of Orthodoxy would be welcomed by many younger Catholics at least.[6]

Other Issues:

Without doubt, the single greatest issue comes down to canonical administration, and is tied into the problem-cum-possibility of papal power as it is worked out via various pieces of legislation, including those enshrined in the two codes of canon law. In the apostolic constitution by which he promulgated the 1990 *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches,* the late Pope John Paul II made it plain that everything in there was provisional and subject to reform once unity with Orthodoxy had been achieved. This is an invitation that should be proleptically exploited to maximum effect.

As we all know, the universal jurisdiction claimed by the bishop of Rome for his office at and after Vatican I remains a very grave problem, but as David Bentley Hart remarked more than a decade ago, the beauty of Catholic conciliar pronouncements up to and including Vatican I is how very spare they are, allowing for a variety of interpretations.[7] Notwithstanding that fact, for 150 years now the Catholic Church has essayed a disastrous maximalist interpretation of Vatican I in its canonical legis-

[5] In my own lifetime the bishops of my own UGCC have required the removal of the *filioque* in all liturgical celebrations and this change has been accomplished with no serious complaints of any sort.

[6] Some older and scholarly ones, too, would welcome it. See, for example, Aidan Nichols' comments on how much Orthodox liturgical culture could contribute to Latin Catholic renewal in his 1999 book *Christendom Awake* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).

[7] See Hart's essay in F. Murphy and C. Asprey, eds, *Ecumenism Today: The Universal Church in the 21st Century* (London: Routledge, 2008).

lation. I think (and certainly hope!) that era is starting to end, though not without a fight whose end nobody can foresee.[8]

It would, if one may speak frankly, be useful to have Orthodox partners in this fight even at this stage. What needs to be made clear—as the late Ukrainian Orthodox Archbishop Vsevelod of Scopelos was so helpful in doing regularly and with refreshing bluntness—is that Orthodoxy will in nowise be prepared to live with the absurd restrictions Eastern Catholics contend with today as a result of attempting to shoe-horn quasi-synodal governance into a papal monarchy.[9] The independence of Orthodox synods to govern their internal affairs must be argued for in a full-throated and unapologetic manner. Why must they do so?

Consider that my own Church, the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic (UGCC), is allowed synodal election of new bishops in and for Ukraine only according to its 1991 geopolitical borders. When UGCC eparchies fall vacant in Argentina, America, Australia, Canada, Western Europe or anywhere else, the synod is only permitted to propose a *terna* of names to Rome, which then makes the selection. This practice is premised upon the claim—which only Rome takes seriously, the rest of us finding it incoherent on its face—that every other bishop and patriarch in the world is territorially limited, but the bishop of Rome and erstwhile 'patriarch of the West' is in fact not limited to 'the West' but has limitless territory and thus enjoys global 'jurisdiction' (a word so vague that nobody has ever been able to define it, and it is precisely this lack of definition and clarity that allows Rome to get away with many things[10]). This makes no sense, of course, but it is at least relative progress from the pre-Vatican II era.

The Catholic Church needs to move beyond this grudging acceptance of partial synodal governance to seeing the virtues of full synodal governance, as I have been arguing for years.[11] But the big fear here holding some Catholics back—and shamefully used by other Catholic 'apologists' against Orthodoxy and 'ecumenism'—is the messiness and divisiveness that sometimes one finds in Orthodoxy as a result of having *only* synodal governance, that is, from having no serious primate with some real authority to rise above petty territorial squabbles (e.g., Qatar) and patriarchal rivalries (e.g., Moscow vs. Constantinople) which have, as we all know, imperilled such long-standing and much hoped-for events as the 2016 council in Crete.

[8] It seems to me the newest statement of the International Theological Commission—a semi-official body of Catholic scholars with a loose relationship to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith—on synodality, released with almost no fanfare in March of last year, is laying a good deal of groundwork for a much less papally centralized Church. The text very much rewards close reading: http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/cti_documents/rc_cti_20180302_sinodalita_en.html

[9] See my necrology and review essay of Vsevelod in the *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 49 (2008)L 1-12 and 152-57.

[10] See Giuseppe Alberigo, 'Juridiction: remarques sur un terme ambigu', *Irénikon* 49 (1976): 167–80.

[11] See, for example, 'A Short Defense of Authentic Synodality', *Catholic World Report* 10 December 2018: https://www.catholicworldreport.com/2018/12/10/a-short-defense-of-authentic-synodality/

I take it as axiomatic that Met. John Zizioulas is right when, as he has repeatedly said for decades, there can be no coherent conciliarity/synodality without primacy.[12] Archbishop Vsevelod, whom I quoted in my first book on papal primacy, was even more blunt in denouncing this primate-less situation within Orthodoxy. If we need reforms in the Catholic Church encouraging fuller synodal governance, then Catholics need to see reforms in Orthodoxy on the question of a primate. If, speaking bluntly, Orthodox cannot agree among themselves on the need for a primate from among their own hierarchs, how serious ought Catholics to consider them in seeking unity with the Catholic primate and pope of Rome?

What Would Unity Look Like?

It seems to me the most straightforward way to deal with all the issues I have sketched here is to consider the nature of the unity we seek. I began by noting that my official involvement with the World Council of Churches started in 1991 in Australia, where for the first time I began hearing the curious phrase 'differentiated consensus', which seemed to me then and seems to me still to be a way of recognizing that the previous mid-century dreams of full structural-organizational unity of all churches in one institutional framework were now recognized as illusions in the strict Freudian sense.

Two decades later, I was on a panel with the late Robert Taft and Met. Kallistos Ware at the 2011 Orientale Lumen conference in Washington, DC, and I well recall thinking Taft absolutely right when he said that Orthodox-Catholic unity will consist simply, and only, in our being able to share the Eucharist together. He rubbished—and rightly—the idea that unity implies or requires absolute structural-hierarchical unity all down the line, with everyone dutifully reporting to the pope of Rome and having some kind of homogenous canonical administration. I think what Taft meant—he gave this as a very brief aside to another question—is that Orthodox-Catholic unity would bear some resemblance to the current arrangements between the Latin and Eastern Catholic Churches: we are in communion with one another, but have, in most instances, very separate lives. Orthodox synods would, then, continue to elect, discipline, and depose their own bishops with, at best, minimal involvement with the bishop of Rome, perhaps as an appellate court not unlike what seems to have been envisaged at Serdica.[13] Orthodox parishes would function as they do today and much of life would continue without necessarily requiring or even

[12] I sum up his views in my *Orthodoxy and the Roman Papacy: Ut Unum Sint and the Prospects of East-West Unity* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2011).

[13] See Hamilton Hess, *The Early Development of Canon Law and the Council of Serdica* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003); and, more recently, Christopher Stephens, *Canon Law and Episcopal Authority: The Canons of Antioch and Serdica* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2015).

desiring significant or noticeable changes in the areas sketched above—and likely many others.

To the extent that this unity would be visible, it would be seen in, for example, the practice of hierarchs visiting each other's churches, especially on patronal festivals, as the Ecumenical Patriarch has often done by going to Rome on June 29th, and as the pope of Rome has sometimes done by going to the Phanar on November 30th. This time, though, the full Eucharist would be celebrated by both and shared by both. In addition, as I proposed in *Orthodoxy and the Roman Papacy*, an international permanent ecumenical synod would require regular participation of Orthodox primates with the pope of Rome in governing a united Church.

How Would We Get There?

If we wait for official dialogues—especially now that Russia, with typical puerile petulance, has suspended its participation in the official dialogue with the Catholic Church in order to draw further attention to its farouche complaint about the welcome grant of autocephaly to Ukraine by the Ecumenical Patriarch[14]—to proceed with any of these proposals or many others, then of course we and our descendants to the thousandth generation will all be dead, and their descendants will still be waiting. As Hart said in the essay cited earlier, Christian division now feeds on itself to perpetuate itself for no other reason than the perverse force of habitual sin—very clearly an example of what Freud called the 'repetition compulsion' which forms part of the death drive.[15]

What, then, are we to do? It is precisely Orthodox scholars—Radu Bordeianu, Lev Gillet, Michael Plekon, Antoine Arjakovsky, *inter alia*—who have persuaded me to abandon my previous conservative position that held, as both Catholic and Orthodox churches still officially do, to the requirement that all outstanding issues be resolved before full eucharistic communion is resumed. I now think this is an artificial and unhistorical standard likely impossible of fulfilment. Certainly among some vocal fringes, there is clearly set up an infinite regress of 'issues' requiring resolution, which is of course a shell-game designed never to achieve unity. Let us not play that game.

Instead, having come to a common mind on the *filioque,* and without needing to come to a common mind right now on the papacy, let us begin celebrating the

[14] A decision I have cheered: 'Union of Orthodox Churches in Ukraine a Cause for Rejoicing', *Catholic World Report* 5 January 2019: https://www.catholicworldreport.com/2019/01/05/union-of-orthodox-churches-in-ukraine-a-cause-for-rejoicing/.

[15] See his *Beyond the Pleasure Principle,* J. Strachey, ed. (New York: Norton, 1990 [orig. 1920]). Two recent and important studies have revived this most controversial of Freud's ideas. See Benjamin Fong's fascinating book, *Death and Mastery: Psychoanalytic Drive Theory and the Subject of Late Capitalism* (Columbia: Columbia UP, 2018); and M.A. Holowchak and M. Lavin, *Repetition, the Compulsion to Repeat, and the Death Drive: An Examination of Freud's Doctrines* (Lexington Books, 2018).

Eucharist together wherever two communities wish to do so. This will be messy and inconsistent, but so what? Let people do as their consciences guide with the clear understanding that while none must celebrate together, all may do so, and none may be condemned for doing so.

If the requirement for maintaining or resuming full communion seems historically to have been for Christians to recite the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed together, as Catholics and Orthodox can and have done for decades now at, for example, the above-mentioned patronal festivals, then we should insist on nothing more or other than this. This is both necessary and sufficient grounds for celebrating the Eucharist together. Demanding homogenous and uniform practice, and trying to assert, and then presumably measure, mass adherence of nearly two billion Orthodox and Catholic Christians to some doctrinal standard beyond this is impossible—or do we expect Catholic and Orthodox clergy to do what clergy in Scotland were still doing in the interwar period when my grandmother was growing up? There the minister of the kirk had to visit her and her family and all people in his district desirous of receiving communion to examine them on both faith and morals before giving them a card with his check-mark on it to be presented at church the following Sunday without which they would be denied the sacrament.

Let us instead resume celebrating the Eucharist together, for if the excommunications were lifted in 1965, as they were by Pope Paul VI and Patriarch Athenagoras, there is no real reason not to. Let Catholics go to Orthodox priests for Confession if they wish, and vice versa. Let them be married in either parish. Let families in mixed marriages attend either or both churches and commune freely in both. Let Orthodox and Catholic bishops work out arrangements for joint sharing of buildings where this is necessary, and let their clergy work interchangeably in the other's parishes, schools, etc. where needed. Let every form of cooperation blossom on 'social' issues, but let our common *diakonia* in service to justice be consummated around the one table of the Lord—*today*.

Anglicans and the Una Sancta

JONATHAN GOODALL
Bishop of Ebbsfleet (Church of England),
Archbishop of Canterbury's representative to the Orthodox Church

The Church of England, which in origin is two separated provinces of the Western Latin Church, became formative of the Anglican Communion worldwide. However, it has never in those years of separation considered itself wholly separated in the sense that it has always asserted its connectedness and incompleteness as '*part* of the one holy catholic and apostolic Church', independent in polity, interdependent with other Anglicans and other churches, especially those ordered in the historic episcopate. More recently, asserting its legitimate patrimony, it has sought ecclesial unity without simply being absorbed into the polity of those with a more exclusive claim to identity with the Una Sancta, causing Anglicans to wrestle with the legitimate terms of communion in the Una Sancta. This journey has been at its most complex and rewarding with the Roman Catholic Church, especially in relation to the terms of communion focused on the papal office.

'Those who do not smart from the wounds of Christ's body
are not nourished by the Spirit of Christ'

Non vegetate Spiritu Christi
qui non sentit vulnerabilis corporis Christi

Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Cluny

A part not the whole

'The Church of England *is part* of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, worshipping the one true God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit.' Thus begins the preface to the Declaration of Assent, approved through a process involving the Lambeth Conference of 1968, which all deacons, priests, and bishops in the Church of England have for nearly fifty years had to affirm publicly at their oath-taking either when they are ordained and on every new appointment. It is increasingly used in ecumenical discussion as the definition of the Church of England's position. For example, in the English bishops' response to the papal encyclical *Ut unum sint,* it was quoted in relation to the use of the verb 'subsistere in' at the Second Vatican Council: not only in *Lumen gentium* (to affirm that *all* the elements of sanctification and truth can be found in the *Catholic* Church), but also in *Unitatis redintegratio* to say

that among the separated communions 'in which catholic traditions and institutions continue *to subsist* the Anglican Communion has a special place'.[1] This openness of the episcopate in the Roman Catholic Church to the presence of elements of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church *outside* the bounds of their own communion is, say the English bishops, an 'ecumenical tool of great usefulness', and if 'this implies a refusal by the Council simply to identify the one, holy catholic and apostolic Church of the Creed with the Roman Catholic communion then the possibility is opened up for substantial agreement about the nature of the Church. We too accept that the Church subsists in the Roman Catholic Church, but also believe that its subsisting is not exclusively confined to those under the Roman obedience. … If an exclusive interpretation of the phrase '*subsistit in*' is in fact the intention of the Council then a major ecumenical obstacle remains'.[2] All Anglicans agree that no *part* of the Church is exclusively identifiable as the whole. The sense is brilliantly captured in a passage near the end of Michael Ramsey's seminal 1936 book *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*: 'while the Anglican church is vindicated by its place in history, with a strikingly balanced witness to Gospel and Church and sound learning, its *greater* vindication lies in its pointing through its own history to something of which it is a fragment. Its credentials are its incompleteness, with the tension and the travail in its soul. … It is sent not to commend itself as "the best type of Christianity", but by its very brokenness *to point* to the universal Church.'[3]

I hope that this is an illuminating place to begin because even at its most robust and insular (say, at the restoration of the monarchy and episcopate between 1660 and 1662) Anglicans never regarded their Church as the only true Church; and since the disruptions of the sixteenth century they have searched for ways of articulating its theological consensus with other communions, first through the Reformed 'conciliarity' of international discussion among Protestant experts, and, in other and

[1] Similar formulae are found in some other Anglican churches. Its phraseology can be related to that found in Pius XII's 1943 *Mysici Corporis Christi*: 'out of which the One Catholic Church exists *and is composed*' (emphasis mine), and causes Anglicans to have a particular interest in the debate sparked by the publication (in 1992) of a letter to Catholic bishops by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 'On some aspects of the Church understood as Communion'. The following passage (§9) is of particular interest: 'From the Church, which in its origins and its first manifestation is universal, have arisen the different local Churches, as particular expressions of the one unique Church of Jesus Christ. Arising *within* and *out of* the universal Church, they have their ecclesiality in it and from it. Hence the formula of the Second Vatican Council: *The Church in and formed out of the* churches *(ecclesia in et ex ecclesiis) (44)*, is inseparable from this other formula: *The churches in and formed out of the Church (ecclesia in et ex ecclesiis) (45)*. Clearly the relationship between the universal Church and the particular churches is a mystery, and cannot be compared to that which exists between the whole and the parts in a purely human group or society.' For convenience, the footnotes quoted in that passage are: 44: 'Const. *Lumen gentium*, n. 23/a: "it is in these and formed out of them that the one and unique Catholic Church exists". This doctrine develops in the same line of continuity what had been stated previously, for example by Pius X, Enc. *Mystici Corporis*, as quoted, p. 211: "out of which the one Catholic Church exists and is composed"'; and 45: 'Cf. John Paul II, *Address to the Roman Curia*, 20-XII-1990, n.9: as quoted, p.5'

[2] May they all be one: a Response of the Church of England House of Bishops to Ut unum sint (London, 1998), para 58, p. 21.

[3] Michael Ramsey: *The Gospel and the Catholic Church* (London: Longmans, 1936), 220

less systematically Calvinist circles, through the increasingly sophisticated accumulation of 'primitive' (early Christian) consent. Independence did not mean for the Church of England a *lack* of accountability to certain established canons of recognizable Christian orthodoxy. But the significance of the Declaration's assertion that the Church of England is part of, or 'belongs to', the Una Sancta is that it sets aside the famous 'branch theory' to which many Anglicans had been given since its emergence in the early 19th century—the idea that Catholics, Orthodox and Anglicans have some invisible bond (which only the Anglicans were aware of) as branches of true catholicity. 'The only principle really involved in it', wrote Edward Pusey to John Henry Newman in 1870, long after the latter had become a Roman Catholic, 'was that there could be suspension of intercommunion without such schism as should *separate either side from the Church of Christ*.' In other words, what makes a church truly catholic is not automatically and totally lost when, however deplorable it is, churches separate from each other.

In 1888 in an attempt to set out a statement of its principles for 'reunion', the Lambeth Conference approved the famous so-called Quadrilateral: the Holy Scriptures, the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed, the two Sacraments ordained by Christ himself, the Historic Episcopate.[4] After sixty years' experience of its use, a 1947 report by a glittering group of Anglican theologians for the Archbishop of Canterbury called simply *Catholicity,* very helpfully clarified,

> It is upon the Quadrilateral that the Communion insists, as the condition of Anglican fellowship and as the basis of the re-union of Christendom. But there are *two ways* in which the Quadrilateral can be used. It can be used as a set of separate items, necessary for re-union partly for reasons of principle and partly for reasons of expediency. It can also be used as a symbol of the undivided wholeness of the primitive Tradition that lies behind. And it is *only in the latter sense that it points the way* towards unity in the truth.[5]

As an approach to the essential questions at the heart of our topic I want to offer three vignettes of Anglican experience and theology.[6]

[4] Archbishop Michael Ramey, at the end of his *Gospel and the Catholic Church* (223), compellingly describes a time when 'every section of Christendom' will be preserved as parts, but only as parts, of the whole. When the essential elements of communion were identified—and for Ramsey that included 'the firmest insistence on episcopacy so long as the insistence is made in terms of the universal Church'—each particular tradition would remain as legitimate patrimony within a reunited wholeness of the Church.

[5] Gregory Dix *et al*: *Catholicity: a Study in the Conflict of Christian Traditions in the West* [a seminal report presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury by a group of eminent Anglican scholars] (London, 1947), 55 http://anglicanhistory.org/amramsey/catholicity1947.html

[6] Anglican experience has obliged it to think more deeply, and at times to struggle, about what belongs at the heart of unity. It has done this in dialogue within its own fellowship and increasingly with ecumenical partners. From that experience we have learned and are continuing to learn, at times with pains, that the visible life of Christ's Church must express and realise *continuity* with the apostolic testimony, with the witness to the cross and resurrection. This has been underlined in recent years by the former Archbishop of

Independent but interdependent

The Church of England is still deeply marked by the sixteenth-century Reformation. The story is quite hard to tell comprehensively since, in England in particular, it emerged as a narrowly juridical and theologically indeterminate issue. Only later did it burgeon as a political matter, before becoming a fully-fledged multi-thematic theological one. In the course of the story the Church of England's final court of appeal was defined in the law of the land, but that never resolved the theological tensions. Where should the newly-independent Reformed Church of England appeal for its authenticity as a Church? The later-sixteenth and early-seventeenth century debates between Calvinists on the one hand, and those on the other who, if they were not Catholics in the sense of ecclesial communion, had a historical and theological conscience about Christendom as a whole, clearly illustrate the point. Both argued for processes of theological investigation that required forms of outside consultation and discernment. The turning point was reached by the Calvinist Synod of Dort in 1618 to which a learned English delegation was sent, after which non-Calvinists in the Church of England started more thoroughly articulating their position, asserting *episcopacy de jure divino*, and apostolic succession as a justification. Thus, Anglican theology increasingly laid claim to one of the essential instruments of ecclesial communion, conceding that the Church of England was endowed with it from the communion from which it had broken away. From the 1520s to the 1660s there had been no unambiguous high point of Anglican orthodoxy. It was a history that gave rise to several myths.[7]

Canterbury, Rowan Williams in a paper, 'The biblical foundations of a theology of Christian unity: implications and challenges' given to in Rome for the fiftieth anniversary of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity: 'If we want to know that it is *Christ* we are talking about, in his death and resurrection, the question of *unity with the apostolic witness* is not a matter of indifference'. http://aoc2013.brix.fatbeehive.com/articles.php/803/archbishops-address-at-50th-anniversary-of-pcpcu.

This I believe (with a great many Anglicans behind me) is the only route to a single visible ecclesial proclamation of Christ crucified and risen, and not ultimately different and optional versions of that proclamation. If we are serious about *baptism*, if we are serious about *koinonia*, we must pursue with greater energy—despite all difficulties—the issues of *apostolicity*. Otherwise the churches may find themselves standing, to use the phrasing of our former archbishop, in the 'very strange and rather anomalous position [of] standing in Christ in *different places*, and trying to serve one another's sanctification *without* the visible bond of communion'. *Ibid.*

[7] See Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'The Myth of the English Reformation', *Journal of British Studies,* 30.1 (1991): 1–19. On the one hand, MacCulloch was right to identify as a persistent myth the continuities of catholic faith and practice from *ecclesia Anglicana* to the Reformed Church of England: i.e., the myth that the Reformation didn't happen or sought a via media between Catholicism and the magisterial Reformers. Laudians in the seventeenth century and Tractarians in the nineteenth had been very clear that this was the proper way of reading history. But MacCulloch proved that in its late-sixteenth century form the emerging English reformed tradition was discontinuous with its past, and deeply marked by Calvinism. But he was right only to a limited degree. First because, from the outset, major conservative catholic figures like Bishop Stephen Gardiner remained deeply influential and resilient; but, more importantly, because the episcopal and synodical structure of the Church of England was maintained throughout the most Reformist decades. The dioceses were reorganized and new ones created with cathedrals made of some of the most major dissolved monasteries. From the early seventeenth century the historic succession and the episcopal office itself (which was conclusively restored alongside the monarchy following the mid-century

The central point in all this is that, having begun its independent life in the context of a failed *appeal* to the papal magistracy, it decided to reject that magistracy but did not settle—in matters of theology—for any purely local authority either of state, or church, or a single Reformed magisterial teacher. In time, international connections with the Continental Protestant world waned, and polarization in England itself deepened between those who still regarded the Reformation as incomplete and those who increasingly insisted upon the maintenance of signs of universal consensus through the historic ministry.[8]

Aidan Nichols has argued that the full history of the Church of England is really a history of 'three churches rolled into one. It is one and the same time a church of a classically Protestant stripe, a Church of a recognizably Catholic stripe, and a Church of a Latitudinarian—or what would later be called "Liberal"—stripe'.[9]

United not absorbed, or Legitimate patrimony?

It will be clear from the forgoing comments that Anglicans have an aversion to drawing boundaries so clearly and tightly that it is impossible for the different legitimate theological commitments it embraced to find their life together. The corollary is that Anglicans have seen the Roman Catholic Church (at least historically if not in terms of present theology and practice) too ready to draw *premature* boundaries as to the content of faith, or where the Church of Jesus Christ can be seen and encountered. This contrast can be briefly illustrated from the increasingly purposeful considerations by the early Lambeth Conferences of issues of episcopacy and succession as crucial for ecumenical advance.

The Lambeth Conference of Bishops, convened and presided over by the Archbishop of Canterbury—which (for better or worse) was from its origins a *consultative* expression of the episcopal college rather than a mutually binding juridical synod—began in 1867, and met on average every ten years thereafter. Not least because its early meetings were marked by a determined and dynamic vision of the *wholeness* of the Church, its decisions soon accrued serious moral weight. In 1908, four decades into the Conference's existence, and building on the 1888 Lambeth Quadrilateral I quoted earlier, they were so bold as to declare,

Presbyterian Commonwealth) increasingly generated renewal in Catholic theological commitments, and a concern to restore the unity of the Church. Thus not one but *several different myths* of the Reformation became established in Anglican history—persistent and mutually exclusive narratives about the trajectory of the Anglican Church, unresolved even today.

[8] The history of Church of England and wider Anglican theology for the next 400 years amply shows how deeply the concern went for 'diachronic' Christian consensus, for that central sense of a core element to doctrine, order, and practice defined by the accord of the patristic and post-patristic periods, even if it is a sense that has diminished in recent decades.

[9] Aidan Nichols, 'Anglican Uniatism: a personal view', in Stephen Cavanaugh, ed., *Anglicans and the Roman Catholic Church: Reflections on Recent Developments* (San Francisco CA: Ignatius Press, 2011).

> This Conference reaffirms the Resolution (34) of the 1897 Conference that 'every opportunity should be taken to emphasise the *divine purpose* of visible unity amongst Christians as a *fact of revelation*.' It desires further to affirm that in all *partial projects* of reunion and intercommunion the *final attainment* of the divine purpose should be kept in view as our object; and that care should be taken to do what will advance the reunion of the whole of Christendom, and to abstain from doing anything that will retard or prevent it. (Resolution 58)[10]

This clearly shows that the Communion had already come to *understand* its experience of what Michael Ramsey would come to call 'its incompleteness', that 'very brokenness [which points] to the universal Church'; and in the process of addressing the integrity of its own global mission had embraced a vocation to exemplify a wider Christian unity. Initiatives were taken in many directions: relations with the Eastern and Oriental Orthodox, the Old Catholic churches originating both in the eighteenth century and in the wake of Vatican I, Moravians, the Church of Sweden. The story is intensive. Suffice to say for our purposes that repeated resolutions of the Conference expressed concern (in 1888 and 1897) for Reformers in France, Italy, Spain, and Portugal who were 'struggling to free themselves from the burden of unlawful terms of communion';[11] and it refused to concede 'the lawfulness of the imposition of new terms of communion' on Old Catholic community in Germany after Vatican I.[12] Conversely in 1897 the Conference upheld its own interests in connection with the setting up of a new body in a place where 'a church with apostolic ministry and Catholic doctrine [already] offers religious privileges *without* the imposition of *uncatholic* terms of communion',[13] and in 1908 it asserted that the 'use or disuse of [the Quicunque vult] cannot be made one of the terms of communion'

[10] Furthermore, it went on, 'the Conference recognises with thankfulness the manifold signs of the increase of the desire for unity among all Christian bodies; and, with a deep sense of the call to follow the manifest guiding of the Holy Spirit, solemnly urges the duty of special intercession for the unity of the Church, in accordance with our Lord's own prayer'. (Resolution 59) The Anglican ecumenist Bishop Oliver Tomkins also notes that the 1897 Lambeth Conference understood 'the Anglican Church' as having 'a vocation to exemplify Christian unity'. See Oliver Tomkins, 'The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral and the Ecumenical Movement', in Jonathan Draper, ed., *Communion and Episcopacy* (Oxford: Ripon College Cuddesdon, 1988), 6ff.

[11] Resolution 15d in Randall Davidson, ed.: *The Lambeth Conferences of 1867, 1878, and 1888: with the official reports and resolutions together with the sermons preached at the conferences* (London, 1889), 123

[12] See the Report of the Committee Appointed to Consider the Relation of the Anglican Communion (a) to the Scandinavian and other Reformed Churches, (b) to the Old Catholics and other Reforming Bodies: 'As regards the form of doctrine actually professed by this body, we believe that its return to the standards of the undivided Church is a distinct advance towards the reunion of Christendom. We learn that it formulates the fuller expression of its belief in catechisms and manuals of instruction, rather than in articles or confessions, because it desires to avoid any methods which might create or perpetuate divisions.—We cannot consider that it is in schism as regards the Roman Church, because to do so would be to concede the lawfulness of the imposition of new terms of communion, and of the extravagant assertions by the Papacy of ordinary and immediate jurisdiction in every Diocese'.

[13] Resolution 69 in Davidson: *Lambeth Conferences* (1889), 334.

among its own fellowship. Always the concern was to define where unity in faith and practice *admitted of no difference*, and recognizing *legitimate liberties of tradition*. Questions concerning the limits of legitimate diversity between churches *within* the Anglican Communion, and of the *recognition* of legitimate patrimony (Anglican or otherwise) by separated churches in dialogue, were to emerge in dramatic new colours a century later in the events following the ordination of women as priests and bishops and the election of bishops in same-sex unions.

The rock from which we were hewn

Despite the profound connections that had developed from at least the sixth century between the Apostolic See and the English Church, historic sensitivities and hostilities about the Petrine ministry, and the theological expression of its authority, have been part of the self-identity of Anglicans since the Reformation. It is all the more remarkable then that in the course of 500 years of separation, there have been repeated attempts to bridge and heal the division; in fifty years of formal dialogue between Anglicans and Roman Catholics since 1968 no other church-dividing issue has been more extensively explored.

The local Anglican churches have generally and authoritatively expressed their openness to re-receive the papacy as an instrument of unity. No other world communion has, I believe, gone so far in envisaging the possibility of it. In responding to the *Final Report* of ARCIC I, the 1988 Lambeth Conference welcomed two reports on *Authority in the Church*, together with an *Elucidation*, as a firm basis for continuing dialogue on authority and encouraged ARCIC II:

- 'to continue to explore the bases in Scripture and tradition of the concept of the universal primacy, in conjunction with collegiality, as an instrument of unity, and the character of such a primacy in practice, and
- to draw upon the experience of other Christian Churches in exercising primacy, collegiality and conciliarity'. [14]

There has since been a third agreed statement, *The Gift of Authority* (1999); and the subject also featured in the first document of ARCIC's present phase, *Walking Together on the Way* (2017). Progress has been described officially in the following terms:

> While some Anglicans are coming to value the ministry of the Bishop of Rome as a sign and focus of unity, there continue to be questions about whether the Petrine ministry as exercised by the Bishop of Rome exists within the Church

[14] Resolution 8.3 in *The Truth shall make you Free: the Lambeth Conference 1988* (London: Church House Publishing, 1988), 211 [also https://www.anglicancommunion.org/resources/document-library/lambeth-conference/1988/resolution-8-anglican-roman-catholic-international-commission-(arcic).aspx].

by divine right; about the nature of papal infallibility; and about the jurisdiction ascribed to the Bishop of Rome as universal primate.[15]

The general conclusion to be drawn is that despite some dissenting voices, Anglicans are keen to discuss what kind of renewed papacy could serve the whole church, and to offer some of their own experiences of primacy as a contribution to this renewal. There is convergence in Anglican dialogue with both Orthodox and Roman Catholics about all these themes. And we are encouraged that for the first time a major Faith and Order text, *The Church: Towards a Common Vision*, has included reflections (§56f) on universal primacy.

Perhaps now is the time for a properly *trilateral* conversation (between Anglicans, Orthodox, and Roman Catholics) on the issues raised by this Conference? The need is to clarify what service can and should the ministry of witness to the apostolic heritage be giving to an apostolic Church, given Peter's role in the New Testament as the 'guarantor of the authentic tradition of Jesus's teaching … a pointer to the true and only foundation of the messianic community, Jesus the Christ'?[16] In other words, what kind of papacy is *essential* for the Church to *be* the Church? For their part Anglicans look for a papal institution with the capacity for self-criticism and repentance because it serves a cause—namely of the visible unity of the Church—that is bigger than itself. Pope Francis's urgent reiteration in *Evangelii gaudium* (32) helpfully extends Pope St John Paul's seminal initiative to a new generation. 'I too must think about a conversion of the papacy. … We have made little progress in this regard. The papacy *and the central structures* of the universal Church need to hear the call to pastoral conversion'.

'Whose communion?'

The key question of our conference is surely, 'What is to be the test, the standard, of ecclesial authenticity?' Is it coordination with the *Roman see*, or is it the *universal*

[15] *Growing Together in Unity and Mission: Building on 40 years of Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue* (London: SPCK, 2007), 75, p.38; cf *The Gift of Authority: Authority in the Church III* (London: Catholic Truth Society and Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1998), 56–57, pp.33–4. See John Hind, 'Primacy and Unity—Some Anglican Reflections', *One in Christ* 37.1 (2002): 31–35: 'Nonetheless, serious questions have also been asked about the actual exercise of papal authority. The Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission, in its *Virginia Report*, one of the preparatory documents for the 1998 Lambeth conference, asked whether a universal primacy may not be necessary for the universal church. 'Is not universal authority a necessary corollary of universal communion?' It is apparent therefore that 'Anglicans are … by no means opposed to the principle and practice of a ministry at the world level in the service of unity'. These questions were repeated in *May they all be one,* the response of the English bishops to *Ut unum sint* (see footnote 2). The general conclusion to be drawn is that despite some dissenting voices, Anglicans are keen to discuss what kind of renewed papacy could serve the whole church, and to offer some of their own experiences of primacy as a contribution to this renewal.

[16] Loveday Alexander, 'The Church in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts', in Paul Avis, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Ecclesiology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 78.

fellowship? I know that Roman Catholics would say the former is the only way of making the latter practically functional and meaningful, but many Anglicans remain sceptical. The very fact that the method of our dialogue with Rome seeks unity in truth on the basis of the 'Gospel and the ancient common traditions' (including presumably the Roman primacy) acts as a version of the famous Ratzinger proviso in relation to Orthodox, and suggests to Anglicans their instinct is not wrong. From the viewpoint of a strict Vatican I Roman Catholic what I called the 'test' is communion with the apostolic see in the terms of the juridical doctrine of the Dogmatic Constitution, *Pastor aeternus*, even if it is balanced by the c*um et sub Petro* of Vatican II and the growing recognition of the *sensus fidelium* in the period since the council. If it is not to be that, then the test of ecclesial authenticity is surely more elusive, and it makes more sense to speak of 'one church in a state of schism' (even if, as Edward Pusey suggested, that is 'not such a schism as wholly *separates*' from Una Sancta itself). Put another way, the latter position implies that unity is both given, and, simultaneously, an *eschatological hope*, since the reality of the integral human communion which is God's purpose cannot be expressed *unambiguously* by any existing structure.

However, to say 'eschatological' here is *not* to defer to an indefinite future; it is rather to say 'sacramental', a sign and foretaste of the future kingdom. In other words, the unity that is *prayed for*, that continually needs to be given and made manifest, truly becomes a visible *reality* when the Church gathers to do nothing but be the Church, to do nothing other than to be the guests of the Incarnate Word, taking his life into theirs, in the holy things. In order to manifest this unity as its gospel the Church *requires agreement* in all that doctrinally and spiritually belongs to the Catholic Eucharist.

The consideration of what such a eucharistic ecclesiology might mean in ecumenical practice is undoubtedly difficult, but needs (I think) to be distinguished from issues that seem to concern canonical 'rights' to share communion in certain practical and personal circumstances. As Sergii Bulgakov used to argue,[17] sharing communion under certain theologically shaped conditions can in itself be part of the *eschatological* force of the sacrament.[18] Such a possibility must not be allowed to pre-empt or obviate the difficulties of negotiating the full mutual recognition of

[17] See Brandon Gallaher's account of the proposal which Bulgakov advanced for limited intercommunion between members of the Fellowship of St Alban and St Sergius: 'Bulgakov and Intercommunion', *Sobornost* 24.2 (2002): 9–28. The theology underlying his approach can be exemplified in this extract from his magnum opus, *The Bride of the Lamb:* 'The mystery of the Church, the *Una Sancta*, is the prophetic force that even now bears witness to the unity of Christ's humankind and draws the churches to return to the Church, to become reintegrated in the ecclesial unity of the Incarnation and the Pentecost, to overcome in the confessions the spirit of confessionalism which supplants the universal unity with ecclesiastical provincialism'. Sergii Bulgakov, *The Bride of the Lamb,* trans. Boris Jakim (*Grand Rapids*, *MI*: Eerdmans, 2001), 292f

[18] One might apply the same argument, *mutatis mutandis*, to the current Roman Catholic debate about the admission of divorced and remarried faithful to the Sacrament.

churches, and the reconciliation and integration of ministries; but it might go some way to recognizing, in each ecclesial body that might be involved, an *intention*, in its incompleteness, to *receive* the fullness of unity.

The question then becomes how we hold together such an eschatological (sacramental) perspective on unity with serious shared scrutiny of current practices in worship and witness. Many Protestants would simply say that the givenness of common baptism and the ministry of word and sacrament in every local community is all we could ever look for in terms of visible unity. But while that may be attractive in some ways (attractive not least to many Anglicans of a Protestant stripe!) the Anglican Catholic has to warn that it will remain a very inadequate account of the catholic qualities of the Eucharistic event as something addressing the particular and local on behalf of the whole identity of Christ's Body. (This is being exemplified time and again in the travails of contemporary Anglicanism).

Which brings me to a final point—the question of balancing two equally significant doctrines: on the one hand, that the fullness of Catholic identity *must be present* in any and every eucharistic community, and, on the other, that no eucharistic community *can* express the fullness of Catholic identity in a state of separation from or (especially in the world as we now experience it) ignorance of the others.

This is where the significance of the bishop enters in, as the person who stands at the convergence of these two doctrinal currents. The purely Vatican I position disrupts this by seeing episcopal authority in terms of delegation from a *single centre*, rather than arising in the celebration of the Catholic Eucharist. To my mind, the most important move, enabling a move from the Roman Catholic side towards such a balancing would be an acknowledgement that the Petrine ministry is not to be the universal bishop from whom, as it were, all episcopacy in heaven and earth is named, but (like the bishop in his own diocese) the animator and preserver of active communion between the distinct eucharistic communities of the Catholic fellowship because he is the guarantor of Jesus's teaching.[19] Much of papal *practice* actually looks like that; but how much such practice has mitigated the theological formulations of *Pastor aeternus* is far less apparent.

The great vision of *Ut unum sint* (of a papacy that serves the witness and unity of different ecclesial traditions) could be fulfilled in a way barely imagined by earlier ecumenists. That is to say, not in the drawing closer together of Orthodox, Anglican or even the Protestant churches with the Roman Catholic Church; but for the papacy to become the focus and the protector of all those who in the varying traditions wish to maintain and to receive the fullness of the apostolic and catholic faith which they confess already in the creeds and the Eucharist.

[19] See the final section of Rowan Williams, 'Authority and the Bishop in the Church', in Mark Santer, ed., *Their Lord and Ours: Approaches to Authority, Community, and the Unity of the Church* (London: SPCK, 1982), 90–112.

I want to end by quoting from the 1947 *Catholicity* report I mentioned at the outset, a report to the Archbishop of Canterbury from a group of eminent Anglican scholars (the emphasis here is mine):

> There is one Spirit; and it is possible for there to be in diverse Churches and cultures the same wholeness or integrity of the Christian Tradition as is exemplified in the apostolic age. It is *this wholeness that has become damaged* in our divisions, and re-union means the recovery of it. The movement for the restoration of visible unity is at present endangered by the advocacy of patchwork remedies, on the part of those who have hardly seen what the problem really is. The immediate duty of Christians, therefore, is to become aware of *the loss of 'wholeness'* which characterises the present state of Christendom.[20]

[20] Dix, *Catholicity* (1947), 17

Eucharistic Doctrine and Eucharistic Devotion

ANDREW LOUTH
Professor Emeritus, University of Durham

Although there are doubtless some (mostly Orthodox) who would disagree, it seems safe to say that, so far as the doctrine of the Eucharist is concerned, there is agreement between both Orthodox and Catholic: that is, we both affirm that that in the Eucharist Christ becomes present, in his full humanity and full divinity, as the Body and Blood of Christ, the elements of bread and wine having been changed by the Eucharistic prayer. Furthermore, this presence is not fleeting; the Holy Gifts are reserved and given as the Body and Blood of Christ. In addition, both Orthodox and Catholic are agreed on the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist. But what about devotion to Christ present in the Eucharist? More specifically, what about devotion to Christ's consecrated Body and Blood outside the Eucharist, which in the West is called 'extra-liturgical' devotion? There is a sense in which there is no extra-liturgical devotion to the consecrated Holy Gifts among the Orthodox; the sacrament is reserved in an artophorion kept on the holy table, but it receives no especial devotion separate from the Holy Table itself. This paper will concentrate on comparing the Western Rite of Benediction and, closely associated with this, the Exposition of the Host and Adoration, with the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts in the East. Despite accord on doctrine, the nature of Eucharistic devotion expressed in these two rites is in most ways strikingly different.

I think I have taken the subject of our colloquy, *Mapping the Una Sancta*, in perhaps a slightly different way from most of us here. I understood Dr Sotiris Mitralexis's suggestion, when he asked me to take place in the Syros Symposium, to be that we think ahead and begin to consider what the next steps might be if Catholics and Orthodox reached the conviction that there are no *doctrinal* differences between us. Judging from the abstracts, several have taken this to mean the papacy, looking at the last major issue—which is why Edward Siecienski's book on the papacy has been suggested as preliminary reading—and wondering if we are approaching this issue in the right way. I took Sotiris's suggestion in a different way: if we were agreed on doctrinal issues, are there other issues that might distinguish or even divide us? Issues where, although there is no real doctrinal disagreement, there are still differences of *ethos* or of devotion: what might these differences entail? My proposal is to consider this in relation to the Eucharist, for although there are doubtless some (mostly Orthodox) who would disagree, it seems safe to say that, so far as the *doctrine* of the Eucharist is concerned, there is broad agreement between Orthodox and Catholic: that is, we both affirm that that in the Eucharist Christ becomes present, in his full humanity and full divinity, as the Body and Blood of Christ, into

which the elements of bread and wine have been changed by the Eucharistic prayer (whether we understood the words of institution as words of consecration, as in the West, or see the change as the result of invocation, *ἐπίκλησις*, of the Holy Spirit, as in the East); furthermore, this presence is not fleeting: the Holy Gifts are reserved and given as the Body and Blood of Christ. In addition, both Orthodox and Catholic are agreed on the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist. But what about devotion to Christ present in the Eucharist? More specifically, what about devotion to Christ's consecrated Body and Blood outside the Eucharist, which is called in the West 'extra-liturgical' devotion?

Differences over the Eucharist between East and West have a long history, almost as long as any concern for the division between us has been felt. Traditionally, the main difference that focuses on the Eucharist has concerned the kind of bread used in the Eucharist, leavened or unleavened—the question of the *ἄζυμα*—and I have argued elsewhere that the difference involves more than the kind of bread used, but rather the *symbolic associations* of leavened or unleavened bread.[1] The bread used and consecrated in the Eucharist enters into a symbolic universe, and the presence or absence of yeast gives rise to different symbolic associations. Maurice de la Taille, a Jesuit theologian of a century ago—who is certainly worth revisiting—spoke of Christ in his own person wishing 'to become a sacrament, in order to be the efficacious sign' of the union between himself and all Christians. To that end, 'He placed himself in the order of signs, in the order of symbols, to have the joy of symbolizing and, by symbolizing it, of building up the mystical body of which we are members.'[2] On the question of leavened *v.* unleavened bread and the symbolism involved, I remarked:

> Once unleavened bread was introduced, a powerful symbolism attached to it, and Paul's words in 1 Corinthians found a new resonance: 'Do you not know that a little leaven leavens the whole dough? Purge out the old leaven, that you may become new dough, just as you are unleavened. For Christ our Pascha is sacrificed for us. Therefore, let us keep the feast, not in the old leaven, nor in the leaven of evil and wickedness, but in the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth' (1 Cor. 5: 6–8)—especially as the Latin text reads: 'Do you not know that a little leaven *corrupts* the whole dough?…' Two systems of symbolism, focused on the same liturgical act, developed, but they took their inspiration from the stark contradiction of leavened or unleavened bread.[3]

[1] See my *Greek East and Latin West: the Church ad 681–1071* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2007), 306–18.

[2] Maurice de la Taille, S.J., *The Mystery of Faith and Human Opinion contrasted and defined* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1934), 212. For a recent discussion of his theology, see Michon M. Matthiesen, *Sacrifice as Gift: Eucharist, Grace, and Contemplative Prayer in Maurice de la Taille* (Washington, D.C.: CUA Press, 2013).

[3] On the importance of symbolism in the dispute of the *azyma*, see John Erickson, 'Leavened and

> The refusal, on either side, to enter one symbolic world or another could be presented as a fundamental apostasy. To the Greeks, the Latins, with their unleavened bread, were Judaizing, or shrinking from acknowledging the full humanity of Christ (an objection that worked better against the Monophysite Armenians, with whom the question of unleavened bread was first raised); to the Latins, the Greeks, with their leavened bread, were virtual Marcionites, discarding the Old Covenant, and rejecting Christ's fulfilment of the Old Covenant in celebrating the Passover with his disciples.[4]

It is not this issue, however, that I want to pursue now, but a rather different manifestation of difference, connected with the devotional attitude adopted towards the already consecrated Holy Gifts—a difference that also involves matters of symbolism (or so it seems to me).

For although both Catholic and Orthodox affirm clearly the Real and Enduring Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, this is expressed devotionally in markedly different ways in the Catholic Church (and many Anglican churches of an Anglo-Catholic bent) and in the Orthodox Church—by which I mean, in the way the Holy Gifts are reserved, in the way they are venerated, which, among Catholics involves visiting the Blessed Sacrament and praying before it, and in particular Solemn Exposition of the Host and the service of Benediction. Several converts to Orthodoxy from the Catholic West (including Anglo-Catholicism) have commented to me that it is this that, at least to begin with, they miss on becoming Orthodox (indeed, I found that myself). In Orthodox churches, although the Holy Gifts are reserved in a pyx, or artophorion, on the holy table, there is no specific veneration of the Holy Gifts, reserved on the Holy Table: the perpetually burning light is a mark of the sanctuary, within the sanctuary the holy table itself is venerated, the gospel book, the cross, the icons… but not specifically the reserved Holy Gifts. Except as part of one liturgical action: the celebration of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, which takes place two (occasionally, three) times a week during Lent. It might seem to be some kind of parallel to, or equivalent of, the Western service of Benediction: throughout the service the already-consecrated Holy Gifts are venerated, both with prostrations and with incense. It is also a deeply meditative service, a quiet service; this is noticed more, I suppose, by the celebrating priest, as, in contrast with the Divine Liturgy, he is not given lots of prayers to say quietly—he censes and venerates in silence. The structure of the service is a kind of extended Vespers, with small litanies after the three *staseis* of the *kathisma* of the psalter that is read as normal at Vespers. During each of these litanies, the priest, behind the iconostasis, prepares the paten with the Holy Gifts, solemnly censes the Holy Gifts on the holy table, takes it solemnly to

Unleavened: Some Theological Implications of the Schism of 1054', in idem, *The Challenge of our Past* (Crestwood NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991), 133–55.

[4] Louth, *Greek East and Latin West*, 314 (slightly modified for the new context).

the table of preparation, and completes the preparation there by filling the chalice with wine and water. Vespers continues with prayers of supplication, during which the holy table and the Holy Gifts are venerated, and then, after the readings and the usual litanies after the readings, there takes place the Great Entrance, as at a normal Liturgy. Only this time, it is the Holy Gifts themselves that are carried in procession and all prostrate themselves while the choir sings, instead of the Cherubic Hymn, this hymn:

> Now the powers of heaven worship with us invisibly. For behold, the King of glory enters. Behold the sacrifice, mystical and fully accomplished, is escorted in. With faith and longing let us draw near, that we may become partakers of life eternal. Alleluia, alleluia, alleluia!

There are two things that seem to me striking about these ceremonies. First, the clear and emphatic sense of the presence of Christ in the Holy Gifts, but more than that the sense not just of the *presence* of Christ, but the sense of the completion of the eucharistic sacrifice: Christ is present, the Lamb sacrificed from the foundation of the world. In the celebration of the Eucharist or Divine Liturgy we join in, we take part in Christ's sacrifice; at the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, we are present at the eucharistic sacrifice, 'mystical and fully accomplished'. The lack of prayers for the priest underlines this sense that there is really nothing more to do: it is all done, both Christ's sacrifice on the Cross and the recalling, the re-presentation, of this in the Eucharist. Christ is present, but not just as a presence; he is present as the fully accomplished sacrifice. Secondly, the veneration of Christ in the Holy Gifts takes place liturgically—as part of the liturgical action, both behind the iconostasis in the first part of the service and then as the Holy Gifts are carried from the altar, through the body of the Church, and back to the holy table within the altar, whence they will be brought out as the Holy Gifts, offered to the Holy People of God: 'The presanctified holy things for the holy: *Τὰ προηγιασμένα ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις*'. The real presence is celebrated, not as just there, but as the presence of One who is coming to us, coming to encounter us, and give himself to us. Christ is the one who is coming, *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*—a term that is repeated throughout the Liturgy: in the creed, the 'one who is coming to judge the living and the dead', in the *Sanctus, Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, 'Blessed is he who is coming…' And then, as in the Divine Liturgy, the Holy Gifts are brought by the deacon, or the priest, through the holy doors to the people, with the exclamation: 'With fear of God, in faith and love draw near!' To which the response is: 'Blessed is He who is coming—*ὁ ἐρχόμενος*—in the name of the Lord.' Christ is the one who comes to us in the Holy Gifts, and at this point in the Liturgy all prostrate themselves before Christ who has come among us. In the Liturgy, we encounter Christ as he comes to us in the Holy Gifts and we receive them in Holy Communion: this is an encounter that enables us, as we go out

into the world (the true 'liturgy after the liturgy'), to encounter Christ in those we encounter, especially those in need.

The Catholic service of Solemn Exposition of the Host, Adoration, and Benediction has both points of similarity and points of difference with the Liturgy of the Pre-sanctified. The service of Benediction is one aspect of the sense of the enduring presence of Christ in the Host that is acknowledged all the time through habitual veneration. The perpetually burning light in the Church is understood in the West to be burning before the Blessed Sacrament, reserved in a tabernacle or aumbry: it is a mark of the presence of Christ in the sacrament of the altar. It is venerated when you enter the church, when you pass before it, by genuflecting. There is often a custom of visiting Christ in the sacrament: going into the Church to spend some time in silent prayer before Christ's sacramental presence. The service of Solemn Exposition and Benediction is quite simple: after a few prayers, the priest takes the Host from the tabernacle and places it in a monstrance, where the Host can be seen (which is why the sacred vessel is called a monstrance), which is then placed on the altar; there follows a time of silence, which may be quite extended—several hours in some cases—at the end of which there are prayers, including a set prayer of praise, the so-called 'Divine Praises', and the singing of a hymn (in my memory the last two verses of a long and beautiful hymn, composed by St Thomas Aquinas, beginning *Tantum ergo sacramentum, / veneremur cernui*—'Therefore we, before thee bending, / this great sacrament revere'. Aquinas wrote other hymns in honour of the Blessed Sacrament, including the sequence, the long hymn sung after the Epistle on the Feast of Corpus Christi, *Lauda, Sion, Salvatorem*—'Praise, Sion, your Saviour'). During the singing of *Tantum ergo*, the priest blesses those present with the Host (hence, I suppose, the title of the service); then the monstrance is taken down from the altar, and the Host returned to the tabernacle. This service is usually described as an 'extra-liturgical' devotion. It has no particular place in the liturgical cycle of the Church, though mention just now of the Feast of Corpus Christi reminds one that, at least with this feast, room is made for devotion to the Body (and Blood) of Christ within the liturgical year of the West, for the Feast of Corpus Christi is a kind of displaced Holy Thursday celebration—on the first Thursday after the conclusion of the Paschal cycle, therefore, according the old Western liturgical Calendar, on the Thursday after Trinity Sunday (the Sunday *after* Pentecost, rather than, at least among the Slavs, another name for Pentecost itself). However, much of the traditional celebration on the Feast of Corpus Christi is extra-liturgical, with a procession throughout the town or village of the host in a monstrance at the head of the procession.

Extra-liturgical: that is the first of a number of contrasts one notices when one compares the Orthodox Liturgy of the Pre-Sanctified Gifts with the Catholic rite of Exposition of the Host and Benediction, for the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts is thoroughly integrated into the liturgical year. It is essentially a Lenten service,

for during Orthodox Lent, weekdays from Monday to Friday are days on which the Divine Liturgy is not celebrated (in contrast with the West, where Lent is a period of special eucharistic devotion, with readings from the Epistles and Gospels provided for all the days of the week, in contrast with the rest of the year, when the Eucharistic lectionary only provided for Sundays: a distinction obliterated now, with a lectionary covering all the days of the year). The Liturgy of the Pre-sanctified is to make up for the lack of Eucharistic celebrations during Lent: nowadays in most weeks only on Wednesdays and Fridays (which has the odd effect in many parishes of making Lent a period of *more* frequent encounter with the sacrament than outside the aliturgical days of Lent; in particular the requirements of canon 66 of the Synod *in Trullo* that people should attend the Liturgy every day between Pascha and New [or Thomas] Sunday is now a completely dead letter).

There are plenty of other contrasts. Benediction essentially provides an opportunity for *gazing contemplatively* on the Host; in contrast, in the Liturgy of the Pre-sanctified the Holy Gifts are never seen by the people—they are always veiled, furthermore, during the Great Entrance, where, though the procession goes round the church in the midst of the people, they are all meant to be prostrate before the presence of the 'Sacrifice, mystical and fully accomplished', and not to see anything at all. This contrast is part of a broader contrast between Eastern and Western Liturgical practice: in the East, the altar, or sanctuary, is visually separated from the nave by an iconostasis, whereas, in the West, the sanctuary is open to the people, a difference made more marked when the priest faces the people over the holy table, rather than standing with the people and facing East.

There is *movement* in the rite of Benediction, but it is purely functional (though not, I suppose, the processions that traditionally take place on the Feast of Corpus Christi); in the Liturgy of the Presanctified, movement, whether hidden away in the altar with the curtains drawn or through the church at the Great Entrance, is at the heart of what is taking place. I have already remarked that Christ is present in the Holy Gifts as *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, the one who is coming, whereas Benediction seems to focus on the bare presence of Christ in the Host: a presence that calls forth contemplative attention. There seems to me a similar contrast in the words with which the priest presents the sacrament to the people for communion: in the West, it is with the words, *Ecce Agnus Dei, ecce qui tollit peccata mundi. Beati qui ad cenam Agni vocati sunt*—'Behold the Lamb of God, behold him who takes away the sins of the world. Blessed are those who are called to the supper of the Lamb'; whereas in the Orthodox Liturgy the words are more direct: 'With fear of God, with faith and love, draw near', to which the response is, as I have already remarked, 'Blessed is He who is coming in the Name of the Lord'. On the one hand, look, *ecce*; on the other, draw near to the One who is coming.

One might argue, too, that the notion of the Eucharistic sacrifice is more evident in the Liturgy of the Presanctified, though the very term used in the West, Host,

hostia, connotes sacrifice, sacrificial victim, and Latin devotion to the Host is to the Host as sacrificed. Nevertheless, in the Liturgy of the Presanctified, Christ is perceived not just as present but as sacrificed: we are explicitly asked to behold, not just the presence of Christ, but the 'sacrifice, mystical and fully accomplished'—*Ἰδοὺ θυσία μυστικὴ τετελειωμένη*.

And finally, the Liturgy of the Presanctified ends with Holy Communion; the Christ whose presence we have celebrated as the accomplished mystical sacrifice is given and received in Communion. I do not think Benediction ever ends with communion from the reserved sacrament: the Host is exposed for the contemplative gaze of the people, and then returned to the tabernacle. (I have not mentioned that the Host is just the consecrated unleavened bread, while in the Liturgy of the Presanctified, the Lamb that has been reserved is present in both kinds, consecrated bread intincted with the holy blood).

What kind of a contrast have we here? Is it a contrast of incompatible ways of devotion that could hardly be combined and perhaps could not even co-exist? There is certainly a contrast, and the emphasis on the contemplative gaze that lies at the heart of Benediction is something that relates more widely to ways of prayer within the Western tradition. What lies at the heart of the Liturgy of the Presanctified I find more difficult to capture, for the Presanctified Liturgy has its place in the liturgical experience of the Orthodox Church, and does not, I think, open out on to anything else. Both, however, could be said to present an opportunity to dwell on the completeness of Christ's work of love on the Cross and in the Resurrection—giving space and time to absorb what all this means. Rather than come to any conclusion, I would rather hope my thoughts might lead into some discussion, dialogue, one with another.

A Spectre Is Haunting Intercommunion

SOTIRIS MITRALEXIS
Teaching Fellow, University of Athens & Visiting Research Fellow, University of Winchester

As an introduction to the current issue, this paper looks at certain details of the current state of the ecclesial dialogue between East and West, in light of Edward Siecienski's two important contributions, *The Papacy and the Orthodox: Sources and History of a Debate* (Oxford University Press, 2017) and *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (Oxford University Press, 2010) and of other sources. The core question of the paper is, which Church is the "One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church" that we confess to during each liturgy and mass? Is it one of two divided Churches, or the one Church in schism?

1

Allow me to start with my personal incentives for embarking upon this enquiry. Reading Edward Siecienski's treatises on the *history* of the divide, the recent *The Papacy and the Orthodox: Sources and History of a Debate*[1] and his earlier *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy*,[2] I saw with considerable clarity that the actual historical trajectories of the Orthodox and the Catholic Church, in all the vertiginous complexity of these trajectories in all their details, look quite different from the simplified, *retroactively* formulated historical narratives concerning purported clear-cut divisions.

Of course, there is much to be said about which differences are indeed seemingly or currently irreconcilable doctrinal and ecclesiological divisions and which differences are merely legitimate local liturgical, ecclesiological and theological *traditions*, from the vast pool of *theologoumena*, of apostolic churches comprised of different peoples and at different points and circumstances in history. It must be remarked that this diversity of legitimate traditions of apostolic churches has also been largely lost *within* both the Roman and the Byzantine Church, in view of the homogenisation that emerged during the reign of the empires within which each of these churches flourished.

[1] A. Edward Siecienski, *The Papacy and the Orthodox: Sources and History of a Debate* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017).

[2] A. Edward Siecienski, *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

Later I proceeded in the study of works exploring, either directly or indirectly, cognate issues from different angles—for example, Adam DeVille's *Orthodoxy and the Roman Papacy*[3] and his recent *Everything Hidden Shall Be Revealed*,[4] the 2018 paper *Serving Communion: Re-Thinking the Relationship between Primacy and Synodality* by the Saint Irenaeus Joint Orthodox-Catholic Working Group,[5] or Cyril Hovorun's books including his recent *Scaffolds of the Church*, with particularly valuable insights on re-thinking primacy, ecclesiology and synodality: 'the Church is not hierarchical in its nature. The hierarchical principle is not even its natural property. It was borrowed from outside the Church and remains there as its scaffolding';[6] hierarchy 'is useful, *but not sacred*'.[7]

What, however, truly remains a scandal for me is that we seem to be taking for granted the Orthodox and the Catholic Churches' claim to being the 'One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church', the *Una Sancta,* even though their participation in bilateral and ecumenical dialogue attests to their conviction that 'something is missing', as it were.[8] My problem is a *historical* one rather than a question of being 'open' or 'not open' to ecumenical relations. *When exactly* and *how*, did the Church define that *only* the Orthodox or the Catholics—that is, the aggregate of all Orthodox or, respectively, Catholic dioceses and parishes—are the *Una Sancta* in the only way the Church knows in order to confidently proclaim truth—i.e., synodically, in a conciliar manner? In the case of the Catholic Church, we know that she continued to convene councils it proclaimed as *ecumenical*—and the historical and theological soundness of this decision will, I hope, be part of the discussions of this conference—and we know the normative proclamations and statements she has issued on the matter, as she increasingly often has done since the nineteenth century, not only on doctrine but indeed on most matters, from moral[9] and sexual to ecological

[3] Adam A. J. DeVille, *Orthodoxy and the Roman Papacy: Ut Unum Sint and the Prospects of East-West Unity* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2011).

[4] Adam A. J. DeVille, *Everything Hidden Shall Be Revealed: Ridding the Church of Abuses of Sex and Power* (Brooklyn: Angelico Press, 2019).

[5] Saint Irenaeus Joint Orthodox-Catholic Working Group (Graz, October 2018), *Serving Communion: Re-Thinking the Relationship between Primacy and Synodality* (Los Angeles: Huffington Ecumenical Institute, 2019).

[6] Cyril Hovorun, *Scaffolds of the Church: Towards Poststructural Ecclesiology* (Eugene, Oregon: Cascade, 2017), 141.

[7] Hovorun, *Scaffolds of the Church*, 143.

[8] It is customary for progressive theology in Greece to lament—and rightly so—the exclamation of hardcore Orthodox that *only* the Orthodox Church is the *Una Sancta*. However, we should also be reminded that the Catholic Church does not consider the Orthodox Church a full and complete Church either, but, so to speak, at the *threshold* of the Church, possessing, along with apostolicity etc., certain ecclesial *elements:* Nikolaos Loudovikos, "Ψηλαφώντας Τὴ Συνοδικότητα [Grasping Synodality]", *Synaxi* 140 (2017): 62–66.

[9] The Orthodox tend to have a substantially different approach to the dilemma between treating moral questions 'centrally', through something akin to the *magisterium*, or pastorally, at a one-to-one level. On certain Orthodox objections to an *objective* (and thus potentially enforceable?) morality, see John D. Zizioulas, 'Ontology and Ethics', *Sobornost* 6 (2012): 1–14, https://doi.org/10.5937/sabornost6-3109.

and political ones.[10] It has been demonstrated exhaustively that the 'Great Schism' of 1054 was not that great at the time, with various local churches acknowledging both Rome and Constantinople for centuries, and with intercommunion and other contacts continuing their course even well after the eleventh century. We also know that the *true* Schism came with the Sack of Constantinople in 1204 and the Fourth Crusade, after which the Roman Church forced itself on the Orthodox, installing for example its bishops and its liturgical rite in dioceses. This, however, is a *historical* matter, not a *theological* one, and I find this distinction immensely crucial.

However, the Orthodox Church has *never* synodically proclaimed herself (and herself *exclusively*) as the *Una Sancta*. Before returning to this, allow me to underscore the scandalous nature of this ambiguity concerning the *Una Sancta*. The precise nature of the 'One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church' that we confess during each liturgy and mass (this witnessing being the cornerstone of the Eucharistic assembly, particularly given that both the Catholics and the Orthodox insist that the *Una Sancta* is a *visible* Church, one we *see* and *know*) cannot be an object to individual, free theorizing, in the same way that basic Christology cannot be treated as if it were a *theologoumenon*. The definition of the visible *Una Sancta* cannot hang in mid-air, even if this entails the acknowledgement that she indeed finds herself in Schism. If the question whether this *Una Sancta* is one of two divided Churches, or the one *Church in schism* (until either the conclusive healing of this schism or the permanence and consolidation thereof that would be declared by a joint council, similar to the councils on the Christological controversies of the first millennium), cannot remain open, as it undermines the witness upon which the Eucharistic assembly, *every* Eucharistic assembly, materialises. Despite the obvious cheesiness of the title, it is indeed true that a spectre is haunting intercommunion: the spectre of mapping the *Una Sancta*.

The fact remains that there was no universal council in the case of the Orthodox—up until Crete, ironically, whose reception by the people is at best lukewarm, if not inexistent—proclaiming a particular Orthodox body, an Orthodox sum of actual dioceses and parishes, as the exclusive One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic church. Thus, we see that certain 'traditional' utterances that are taken for granted, such as the Orthodox proclamation that 'the Una Sancta IS the Orthodox Church', are rather quite modern innovations, historically speaking.[11] While I believe that a similar problem should be (re)thought of in the case of the Catholic Church, I can speak in this paper only about my Church, the Orthodox Church.

[10] I remind the reader here that many texts are generated within the Orthodox Church, but only texts issued by a council akin to—and received by the people as—an ecumenical one may be binding and normative.

[11] One may see more examples of this tendency in George Demacopoulos, '"Traditional Orthodoxy" as a Postcolonial Movement', *The Journal of Religion* 97.4 (2017): 475–99, https://doi.org/10.1086/693164.

Let us take the 2016 Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church in Crete in order to elaborate on this. A controversy surrounding it mainly centred on anti-ecumenists harshly criticizing it as an 'ecumenist' council. This was due to the Council resolutions employing a terminology of 'churches' vis-à-vis, for example, the Catholic Church; critics saw in this an undermining of the certainty that the Orthodox Church is the creed's 'one, holy, catholic and apostolic church' and an indirect adoption of the branch theory and/or the 'invisible church' theory in ecclesiology, which mainly emanate from Anglican and protestant communities respectively.

Interestingly, this ostensibly 'traditional' criticism presupposes a radical innovation by the anti-ecumenist wing, for example, the notion that the employment of the term 'church'—*ἐκκλησία*—*always* and *necessarily* refers to the *technical content of the term* 'church' as in the creedal *Una Sancta*, the *one* church. Seeing that, historically, this is simply and plainly not the case, given that a plethora of Orthodox documents during the second millennium refer to the Catholics *and not exclusively the Catholics* by employing the term 'church' in a variety of contexts, it has to be identified as an innovation on the part of the 'anti-ecumenists' (i.e., as the introduction of a wholly un-traditional use of vocabulary as normative). It is not the first time that notions and ideas presented as the quintessence of tradition turn out to be wholly modern and new;[12] however, this is a digression from my main point.

What I would like to demonstrate is that, perhaps counter-intuitively and certainly in spite of all the positive and constructive elements of that historic council, the Holy and Great Council of Crete has to be considered an *anti*-ecumenist council in an unprecedented way. This is the case because, for the first time in Orthodox history, a council of such proportions declared that *the particular sum of local churches* (*Patriarchates, Archdioceses, dioceses, etc.*) *that we term 'the Orthodox Church*' claims to be 'the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church'. It did not proclaim that Orthodox *theology* is on the right side of doctrinal disputes, but that the Orthodox *Church* is the *Una Sancta*. There is nuance in this distinction: through its terminology, the Council of Crete did not declare that *particular theological doctrines* were Orthodox, correct, and ecclesial (and that the ones rejecting them are to be condemned), which would not be uncommon in Orthodox history (this was the case, for example, in the Hesychast councils of 1341–1351). Rather than that, it explicitly declared that *the Orthodox Church,* that particular body which was represented in this council, was 'the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church': 'The Orthodox Church, as the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, in her profound ecclesiastical self-consciousness, believes unflinchingly that she occupies a central place in the matter of the promotion of Christian unity in the world today'.[13] This is, as it were, an *organi-*

[12] See, for example, George Demacopoulos's '"Traditional Orthodoxy" as a Postcolonial Movement', *The Journal of Religion* 97.4 (2017): 475–499, https://doi.org/10.1086/693164.

[13] This is the first paragraph of the 'Relations of the Orthodox Church with the Rest of the Christian

zational rather than doctrinal exclamation; it defines ecclesial *bodies*, not doctrines and theology. Again, such a conciliar claim is unprecedented in Orthodox history.

Let us start by the admission that the Orthodox Church understands itself as speaking its truth in councils, provided that these are subsequently accepted by the faithful and that they acquire an exalted status in the Church's consciousness in the long run. Neither an elder, nor the monastic communities,[14] nor a saint, nor tradition in itself as the mere passage of time, nor any local or not-well-received synod may raise a claim at uttering *the truth*. During the first millennium and its major Christological heresies, the Church has manifested itself conciliarly on numerous occasions, defining herself and her boundaries. Thus, *the Church* and Arians *external to her* emerged out of the First Ecumenical Council (in which Arians participated); *the Church* and Nestorians *external to her* emerged out of the Third Ecumenical Council (in which Nestorians participated), and so on. After 325 AD when this was conclusively settled, it was clear to 'the Church's consciousness' that Arians are *external* to the One Church; after 431, it was clear that Nestorians lie beyond the *Una Sancta*; and so on.

However, nothing of the sort has ever taken place as far as the Catholic Church is concerned. There was no council of ecumenical validity, where both the Orthodox and the Catholics would participate, and out of which—from an Orthodox perspective—*the Church* and Roman Catholics *external to it* would emerge. There was, of course, the Great Schism of 1054, which we now know was *anything but* a particular point in time in which the one Church conclusively split into an Eastern Orthodox Church and a Roman Catholic Church. There were numerous Orthodox councils, some of them of towering significance to the Church (e.g., 1341–1351), in which

World'. In general, such a declaration is to be found in two documents, the Encyclical and the 'Relations' document. In the former, we read that 'The Holy and Great Council of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church constitutes an authentic witness to faith in Christ, the God-man, the Only-begotten Son and Word of God who, through His Incarnation, through all His work on earth, through His Sacrifice on the Cross and through His Resurrection, revealed the Triune God as infinite love' (Encyclical of the Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church, https://www.holycouncil.org/-/encyclical-holy-council). In the latter, apart from the above-cited quote, we read that '(4) Orthodox participation in the movement to restore unity with other Christians in the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church' and that '(21) the Orthodox Church maintains reservations concerning paramount issues of faith and order, because the non-Orthodox Churches and Confessions have diverged from the true faith of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church' (Relations of the Orthodox Church with the Rest of the Christian World, https://www.holycouncil.org/-/rest-of-christian-world). That very last reference is milder than the previous ones, as it refers to a diversion from the *faith* of the *Una Sancta*. That is, it defines Orthodox theological doctrines as properly corresponding to the *faith* of the *Una Sancta* in contrast to non-Orthodox ones, which statement in itself does not claim to explicitly define the particular ecclesial body that *exclusively* embodies this *Una Sancta*. However, when read in conjunction to the other statements, it is inescapably included into such claims.

[14] For example, the community of Mount Athos has declared that 'We believe that our holy Orthodox Church is the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ, which possesses the fullness of grace and truth' (Announcement of the Extraordinary Joint Conference of the Sacred Community of the Holy Mount Athos, April 9/22, 1980, http://orthodoxinfo.com/ecumenism/athos.aspx, 04.01.2019); considerable authority as such a statement may have, it does not engender binding Orthodox ecclesiology by itself, but rather forcefully indicates a tendency.

the 'errors' or even 'heresies' of the 'Latins' or of 'the West' were condemned.[15] However, such condemnations do not and cannot automatically engender a different and new *Una Sancta*. Rather than that, they are doctrinal problems and schismatic conditions *within* the Church, such as the ones *prior* to the particular first millennium Christological councils that defined Orthodoxy and solidified schisms by situating the heterodox parties as *external* to the *Una Sancta*. What we *do* know is that there are important doctrinal and other differences between the Orthodox and the Catholics, and we Orthodox firmly believe that Orthodox doctrines reflect the witness of the *Una Sancta* whereas there is error in heterodox doctrines—take the *filioque*, for example.

There is, of course, the widespread conviction among the Orthodox that the Orthodox Church is the *Una Sancta*. However, there are nuances that are of critical importance here. It is one thing to understand the Orthodox side as, well, *orthodox,* while other sides within the Church are considered as being *in error*, errors to be resolved by correction or conclusive schism in a future council. And it is a very different thing to hypothesize a 'one, holy, catholic and apostolic church' which corresponds to the particular organisation of the local churches we term today 'the Orthodox Church', without any council of ecumenical significance for the Orthodox having explicitly stipulated this. The latter would be a potentially dangerous innovation rather than 'tradition', in the same way that the introduction of the exclusive use of the term 'church' as the technical *Una Sancta* is a glaring innovation rather than 'tradition'. 'The Latins' being *in error* (however defined, whatever we are to make of this, and in whichever way this may be rethought today) and being *external to the Church* are not quite the same thing. In any case, the shift from an Orthodox self-understanding of being 'at the right side of the schism', as it were, of being the *orthodox* ones, to one according to which the Orthodox Church understands itself as *the Church* next to communities *external* to it is harder to locate than many would think. It is one thing to declare a certain teaching as unorthodox and another thing to re-define the borders of the *Una Sancta,* as first millennium councils did.

Interestingly, the problem here is not whether one is ecumenically open to Catholics or not. The problem is that, by identifying the *Una Sancta* with the Orthodox Church and excluding 'Catholics-in-error' from it, we have to identify when exactly the *Una Sancta* was engendered as such. As said above, we can pinpoint when exactly the Arians where excluded from the *Una Sancta*; we can pinpoint when the Nestorians were excluded from the *Una Sancta.* But the Catholics? Since every Orthodox liturgy depends on the recitation of the creed, the 'Symbol of Faith', it is of cardinal importance for us to know *which* is the 'one, holy, catholic and apostolic church' we believe in. And, (excluding Crete for a second) if we claim that this is

[15] And there were, of course, the Ferrara-Florence union councils of 1438–1445, which however were not successfully received by the people and as such are rightfully considered null and void from an Orthodox perspective.

identified with the sum of the Orthodox ecclesial bodies, then we do not draw our creedal witness and definition of the One Church from the conciliarly articulated voice of the Church, but rather from our particular convictions formed by our interpretations of the sayings of particular elders or saints, or of (perhaps many) individual bishops or primates, our view on *theologoumena,* and from the innovation that being in an error not dealt with by an ecumenical council automatically re-traces the borders of the *Una Sancta.* This is ecclesiologically dangerous; it is the individual *doxai* appropriating the voice of the Holy Spirit; it opens the door to a legion of private ecclesiologies, with each faithful by him- or herself defining the Church in a different manner on this or that basis. *For the Orthodox to be Orthodox rather than a modern invention, it is necessary to maintain an ecclesiology of the Schism, in which—until further notice and in view of a future council—*the Una Sancta *is where the last ecumenical council left it, in spite of the pending nature of potentially very serious errors of groups within it.* Precisely due to their dire nature, these are to be resolved by a properly executed ecumenical council, not by you and me. [16]

Again, it is not for me to say whether similar, symmetric problems are the case in the Catholic Church. However, as long as we claim that either one of our apostolic churches *are* the *Una Sancta* herself and exclusively, I would claim that we theorize *not* on the basis of history and, by extension, theology. According to this view, we have *one Church in Schism* (the *Una Sancta* in schism), not two churches, if history is to be taken seriously into account. Given the importance of witnessing the *Una Sancta* in each one of our Eucharistic celebrations, this, I believe, lies at the root of the whole discussion. Of course, we will continue to refer to the 'two Churches'; but I hope we may do this for convenience rather than due to preciseness. Both a 'two Churches' ecclesiology and a 'my Church is the *Una Sancta*' ecclesiology seem to me modern inventions, innovations, retroactive readings of history: will we start from a 'One Church in Schism' ecclesiology instead? Concluding this part, allow me to remind you the words of Nicolas Afanassief:

> For Eucharistic ecclesiology, the Orthodox Church and the Catholic Church are both Churches, or to be more exact, each local church of both groups remains a Church – as it was before so it is after the 'separation'. I put 'separation' in quotation marks for it did not take place and there is no separation. The Church of God is forever and remains one and unique. The break in communion was not able to produce the division of the Church which, by her very nature, cannot be divided into parts. [17]

[16] The last six paragraphs were first presented as part of my January 2019 conference paper, Sotiris Mitralexis, 'More Than the Sum of Its Parts: A Pro-Conciliar Afterthought on the Need of Critical Engagement' (IOTA Conference, Iasi, Romania, 2019).

[17] Nicolas Afanassieff, 'Una Sancta', in *Tradition Alive: On the Church and the Christian Life in Our Time: Readings from the Eastern Church*, ed. Michael Plekon (Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield, 2003), 22.

2

In view of the above, I propose that instead of triumphant versions of ecumenism, we should opt for an *ecumenism of failures*: that is, by starting with what we are *not* doing right, and with what we have *not* done right—both in history and in theology, and particularly in projecting *theologoumena* into what indeed should be binding doctrine, thus eradicating the very possibility of local traditions. And an *ecumenism of failures* is needed particularly now that both our apostolic churches find themselves in very deep, although substantially different, crises.

3

On these matters, perhaps we should turn to the voice of the prophets: I am referring, of course, to Michel Houellebecq. In practically doing an unsolicited and anything but academically theological 'ecumenism of failures', the novelist—a thinker deeply lamenting the loss of meaning that the advent of secularism entailed—recently opined in an interview that the Catholic Church should perhaps draw certain elements from Orthodox practice. So Michel Houellebecq:

> For a long time, I had the impression that the Orthodox Church appeared wiser on [sex] and knew how to maintain an attitude of tolerance. But it was a diffuse impression for which I labored to find textual support (precisely because the Orthodox are reluctant to express themselves on this question, which is secondary in their eyes)—until, in an article by Olivier Clément (clearly, it's always necessary to resort to good authors), I fell upon this quotation, to my eyes luminous, from Athenagoras I, patriarch of Constantinople: 'If a man and a woman truly love one another, I have no need to enter their bedroom: Everything they do is holy'.[18] [...] Can the Catholic Church regain her former splendor? Yes, perhaps, I don't know. It would be good if she moved away definitively from Protestantism and drew closer to Orthodoxy. Unity would be the best solution, but it would not be easy. The question of the *Filioque* could easily be resolved by competent theologians. The problem of the installation of Western barons in the Middle East no longer presents itself; even Donald Trump has dropped it. However, for the bishop of Rome, renouncing his universal ambition and having only an honorific preeminence over the patriarchs of Constantinople or Antioch, would be, perhaps, difficult to swallow. At the very least, the Catholic Church, imitating Orthodox modesty, ought to limit its interventions in the domains that are not directly within its competence (I mentioned scientific research, the government of states, and

[18] Michel Houellebecq and Geoffroy Lejeune, 'Restoration: An Exchange of Views on Religion', First Things, May 1, 2019, https://www.firstthings.com/article/2019/05/restoration.

> human love). [...] It ought to abandon encyclicals as well, and put a brake on its doctrinal inventiveness.

Poignantly for the Orthodox reader aware of recent intra-Orthodox developments, Houellebecq is also advising his Church to 'abandon this mania for organizing councils, which are, above all, the opportunity for triggering schisms'. In any case, it is interesting that the above comments come not from a joint group of theologians, but from our prophetic novelist. I am not citing his comments as a recommendation or solution, but rather as an example of a bottom-up 'ecumenism of failures', a readiness to discern what we *lack*.

4

Allow me to turn to certain disparate comments in the hope of igniting discussion. Historical circumstances change, shedding new light to earlier reasons for division (e.g., for the Orthodox, what happened after the Fourth Crusade, 1204–1261, or the fact that the Catholic Church was for many centuries also the religious arm of an imperialist West; now that the West does not really want to be Christian anymore, and that the Catholic Church wisely discerns rising demographics elsewhere rather than Europe as the *locus* of its future, this has changed considerably...) might reframe certain *allegedly* theological questions. Sometimes, political and historical questions masquerade as theological ones: it is a question of our faith's integrity to separate between the two. And some other times, the mere passage of time reframes certain other questions. Stanley Hauerwas recently meditated on the 500 years since the Reformation[19] and, while coming extremely and, frankly, shockingly close to admitting that a believer true to the spirit of the Reformation would today have rather limited reasons for remaining outside the Catholic Church, stopped short of declaring the Reformation's obsolescence. If we adopt, like Edward Siecienski and others do, a historically informed theological logic (or theologically informed historical logic) which separates theological from historical problems with discernment, what are we to make of the last millennium of division? For the projection of a self-evident conviction in either the Orthodox or the Catholic Church as *the Una Sancta* onto history is merely one of those modern theologies that are constructed *a posteriori*: they are quite literally re-collected and re-membered.

5

[19] Stanley Hauerwas, 'The Reformation Is over. Protestants Won. So Why Are We Still Here?', Washington Post, October 27, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/the-reformation-is-over-protestants-won-so-why-are-we-still-here/2017/10/26/71a2ad02-b831-11e7-be94-fabb0f1e9ffb_story.html.

In discussing the possibility of union *if* the 'big two' issues are somehow resolved (the Papacy and the *Filioque*), we have to ask: are we aiming for a *sacramental* union (i.e., intercommunion) or an *organisational* one? I think that only the former makes sense, as the latter would unrealistically and without adequate reason ask for fundamental changes in both churches (or rather, in both sides of the one Church in schism) that would be of a scale grander than the one needed to resolve the 'big two' issues! For example, if the—hardly implemented—Orthodox ecclesiological principle of the exclusive geographical territory of a bishop is to be retained, then the Catholic Church would have to drop all *sui iuris* Churches and the Orthodox Church would have to effectively withdraw from the West, as it is hardly realistic that one bishop can successfully preside over parallel rites (and ethnic peoples and languages) within the same territory and without *chorepiskopoi* or some parallel structure. The maximalism of organisational union should be avoided: I think that we ought to focus on what hinders us from intercommunion instead.

6

There are *hidden* issues that are in reality much more divisive than the 'big two' (matrimony and its dissolution, for example). These are rarely discussed as seriously as they should in Orthodox-Catholic dialogue. However, history and theology allow for *local traditions* that manifest difference without needing to be a source of division (for example, azymes, or liturgics), as well as *theologoumena*: the question is, where should the line be drawn, since both the Orthodox and the Catholics frequently raise the claim that their *traditions* (rather than first-millennium doctrines) should be normative? It should be noted that this is particularly problematic in view of the sheer volume of Papal documents which are being generated and claim binding normativity on a variety of issues, from moral and political to ecological and sexual; this *normative* character of said documents is bound to remain a bone of contention, lest it remains constrained within the *Roman* Catholic Church, rather than the Catholic Church at large.

7

I mentioned 'history' with a view to the past, but history *with a view to the future* should also be taken seriously into account. Merciless demographics demonstrate that the future of the Church and Christianity at large lies not in their 'historical nests', but in places (Africa, Asia, etc.) where the ways of evangelization are indeed mysterious—and where versions of Christianity emerge, laudable as they are, that bear minimal resemblance to what we experience as the historical, apostolic, liturgical Church which has been handed down to us via a trajectory having the Apostles at its other end (Pentecostalism, for example). How does this fact (i.e., the fact that

the future of the Church lies in territories with a very different reality than the one in her 'historic nests') reframe the question of Orthodox-Catholic relations?

8

The question of modernity and secularism should be discussed as well. At least in societies where demographics indicate the possibility of a future for those societies (any future at all!), secularism is not feeling very well lately. However, the hidden premise behind ecumenism seems to be an implicit acceptance of the secular 'immanent frame' (to borrow Charles Taylor's phrase), with Christian communities merely trying to either fight back or to redefine themselves within this frame. I would go as far as to say that usually, ecumenism is presented as something modern and new that was made possible due to (late?) modernity's circumstances, spirit, and mind-set. In recognizing, together with John Milbank for instance, that the Church is *everything but* a reality that reflects 'the spirit and mind-set of modernity' and that it flourished in eras that can even be described as healthier in *some particular* respects, how does *this re*frame the question of Orthodox-Catholic relations? Are Orthodox-Catholic relations to strive towards a better *modus vivendi* within modernity and the secular immanent frame, or rather, as John Milbank would presumably say, towards embodying the *alternative* to our modern (and in many ways bankrupt) predicament? I am not referring here to a 'return to the past'; were the Catholics and the Orthodox to truly sharpen their ecclesial criteria vis-a-vis the current condition, this would not lead us to a return to the past, but rather to a very different future. I believe that the work of John Milbank and of Radical Orthodoxy is acutely important in this respect and could even act as a catalyst for Orthodox-Catholic relations—a catalyst being precisely an *external* agent that significantly increases the rate of a chemical reaction between elements.

Indeed, and apart from Radical Orthodoxy, the current of Anglo-Catholicism *at large* within the Anglican Church has the potential to act as a catalyst in Orthodox-Catholic relations—Anglo-Catholicism being a tradition with apostolic succession, a liturgical and Eucharistic subsistence, a thirst for the Patristic witness, and a claim to a Catholic nature with, however, a—let me put it this way—certain curtailing of the universal jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. The *third point of reference* that Anglo-Catholic insights provide can act in a decisive way in the future of Orthodox-Catholic relations, or to be more precise in the future of the quest for unity among churches with apostolic succession and a patristic, ecclesial and Eucharistic mind-set. Even Anglican choices that have *alienated* the Orthodox and the Catholics,[20] such as the ordination of women to the ranks of presbyter and bishop,[21] teach us to engage

[20] And even some Anglicans, as the need for alternative episcopal oversight (i.e., flying bishops) attests.

[21] Since, under normal ecclesial circumstances, the historically unquestionable acceptance and ordination of *deaconesses* would have already been a settled issue in all apostolic churches.

with such issues—whatever our conclusions and decisions—with *theological* criteria rather than with a sanctification of history as tradition. That is, to discuss such issues in their theological dimensions without simply elevating the mere passage of time to Holy Tradition, but understanding the wholly different *nature* of tradition in an ecclesial context (here, Gustav Mahler's dictum may apply, according to which 'tradition is the spreading of fire, not the veneration of ashes'). The witness of the Anglo-Catholic current within Anglicanism has the potential to reframe the very *question* of Orthodox-Catholic relations and of the *Una Sancta.*

9

Should this conference contribute something to the issue at hand, we hope this contribution lies in its *bottom-up* rather than *top-down* nature: I would hope we can all agree that the ecumenism of high-rank clergy coming together to discuss technical issues, absolutely essential as it is, often flirts with the danger of becoming a meeting of ecclesiastical *nomenklatura*, decisively in absence of the people of God whom it directly concerns. To confess that the limits and limitations of that type of ecumenism are rather clear and visible would not be an affront to the continuing 'official' dialogue of critical importance attempted in the past as well as in the present. There are groups that strive for a more bottom-up approach, such as the aforementioned Saint Irenaeus Joint Orthodox-Catholic Working Group. We remain with the hope that a *bottom-up* approach would act in a complementary way.

10

In any case, the initiative for any future union lies wholly in the hands of God: we do not trust in ourselves, but in God who raises the dead (2 Cor 1:9). We do not believe in any union of the Church in schism that will come about solely by human attempts, but with the grace of God. However, it wouldn't hurt to be properly prepared in advance for such a merry development, particularly given the sheer volume of details, issues and technicalities... In classical Greece there was a phrase to the effect of 'aside from goddess Athena's activity, do not omit to move your own hands as well' (*σὺν Ἀθηνᾷ καὶ χεῖρα κίνει*). In spite of the profound chasm between paganism and the Christian Church, a chasm separating fiction from Life, this saying may apply to the Triune God as well.

The origins of an ecumenical church: links, borrowings, and inter-dependencies

THOMAS O'LOUGHLIN
Professor of Historical Theology, University of Nottingham, UK

The creed's confession that we believe in 'one holy catholic church' should not simply be understood as a doctrinal datum, but as an understanding of the Spirit's work based in the *experience* of the early churches. The churches did not exist as discrete groups with merely a common religious profession, but as nodes within a network. This network was established and maintained by constant contact and by those who saw it as part of their service/vocation to travel between the churches—and these human and physical links account for how the Christian Church as a whole developed; its common heritage in the writings it produced which became, in time, the canonical collection; and its awareness that, despite difficulties, such links were essential to its identity. This culture of links, of sharing and borrowing, could form a model for a practical way forward today towards a renewed *sense* of our oneness in the Christ.

Around 150 CE we get the first explicit mention of the one Church—encompassing all the communities of Christians—as itself an intrinsic element of the Christian faith. The statement comes from the *Epistula apostolorum* and takes this creedal form:

> Then when we had no food except five loaves and two fish, he commanded the men to recline. And their number was found to be five thousand besides women and children, and to these we brought pieces of bread. And they were satisfied and there was some left over, and we removed twelve basketsful of pieces. If we ask and say, 'what do these five loaves mean?', they are an image of our faith as true Christians; that is, in the Father, ruler of the world, and in Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Spirit, and in the holy church, and in the forgiveness of sins. (5,17–21).[1]

This text, the *Epistula*, presents historians with a wonderful array of problems such as how it relates to those texts, the gospels, which were at that time shifting in their status from being the standard and, possibly somehow authoritative, texts in use in the churches towards becoming the canonical texts of those groups by

[1] I rely on Francis Watson, *An Apostolic Gospel: The* Epistula Apostolorum *in Literary Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming) for the dating and the translation of the *Epistula*. I am indebted to Prof. Watson for making available to me his work, ahead of publication, so that I could cite it here.

being placed on an equal footing with the 'the [Septuagint] scriptures.'[2] The *Epistula* also intrigues us as an example of how the churches were relating their liturgical practice—for this is a creed that bears the hallmarks of liturgy and we know, from later evidence, that it was used liturgically[3]—to what they considered to be their rule of faith. But there is also a much simpler question which this text calls upon us to answer: what was the actual experience of those Christians which brought the unity of the church to their attention?

For most of our history this question has not only not been asked, but was irrelevant to the questions we were then asking. The statement in the creed, as we actually use it, was taken a datum of faith, namely 'we believe in one holy catholic and apostolic church,' and then this statement was investigated for it antecedents—most notably in those texts which were privileged by being part of the Christian scriptures—and for the explication of that datum within the tradition. It was a fact testified from 'sacred scripture and holy tradition', and as such we need to look further for its origins than that it was part of the deposit of faith.[4] However, that approach fails to take full account of the historicity of Christian faith and the ways in which it developed. From this perspective of observing the churches actually growing and changing and becoming steadily more aware of the nature of their discipleship, we can view the issues that appear in the creeds as a response to the lived experience of Christians. In this particular case, it means that we must search for the experiences of those groups that gave them an awareness that they were not just isolated gatherings with a common religious outlook, but which led them to believe that there were real links between them, that they were related forming a single organism. What made them experience that there was more to the whole than that they could be categorized as instances of a species within the genus 'monotheistic religions'?

But if unity was real rather than notional, then they had to have some affective human sense of this such as that they valued unity, were affronted by disunity, and reflected upon the linking bond between them so that they saw it manifested through other qualities of their life, practice, and faith. Just as they know the church should be holy, so they know it was a network and not just a discrete group of devotees. It is this sense that, in reflection, allowed them to imagine themselves linked backwards

[2] See Thomas O'Loughlin, 'The *Protevangelium Iacobi* and the Status of the Canonical Gospels in the Mid-Second Century' in G. Guldentops, C. Laes, and G. Partoens eds, *Felici Curiositate: Studies in Latin Literature and Textual Criticism from Antiquity to the Twentieth Century: In Honour of Rita Beyers* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2017), 3–21.

[3] This creedal statement is often referred to the 'Der Balyzeh Symbol' (because it was found in the Dêr-Balyzeh Papyrus: for the text see the *editio princeps* in P. de Puniet, 'Le nouveau papyrus liturgique d'Oxford', *Revue Bénédictine* 26 [1909]: 34–51) and asserted to be 'no later than the fourth century'; however, its presence in the *Epistula* demonstrates that it at least as ancient as the *Epistula* (i.e., a mid second-century product) and, indeed, may be older for it seems to be a liturgical formula that has been adopted within the *Epistula* and thus given a dominical origin.

[4] For a recent and learned example of this process, one could look at Thomas F. Torrance, *The Trinitarian Faith* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988), 252–301.

in time to a common origin and linked laterally to one another so that they formed a common entity. Thus, a church was part of 'the church' because they saw it as actually connected with the community around Jesus through the apostles (i.e., it was 'apostolic'); and the groups were linked laterally in that it was a unity across not only the empire but across the human world (i.e., it was 'catholic').[5] But what experience could generate this ecumenical sense?

Mutual Dependency

We read the letters of Paul as a corpus of extant documents, but the fundamental basis of their availability to us is that the various groups—virtually entirely in the Aegean world—were not just believers but belonged to a physical network. Paul assumes that he lives within such a net. He takes it for granted that he can receive information from distant churches (we can speculate as to where he was located when he heard of the disputes that were taking place in the churches in Corinth that were the occasion for the letter we label 1 Cor) and that he can transmit a document to them. This linkage is not simply a matter of there being some postal service to which he had access—such as the imperial post—and that we then enquire about the about Paul's access to such a service. This network is a fact of the way the groups related to one another because he imagines that whenever one of the groups receive a letter, they share it with others and those others share their letter with them.

Rather than seeing the churches as independent units, the fact of our corpus of Pauline letters presents us with the churches as members of 'a religious book club' where these letters are shared around because those to one's own church are insufficient. The best illustration of this comes the Deutero-Pauline letter to the Colossians:

> Give my greetings to the brothers and sisters in Laodicea, and to Nympha and the church in her house. And when this letter has been read among you, have it read also in the church of the Laodiceans: and see that you read also the letter from Laodicea (Col 4:15–16).[6]

These sentences, usually ignored as but the epistolary wrapping for the letter's actual message, deserve the most careful reflection. First of all, it assumes that wherever Paul is located he can find someone who will carry the letter from him to Colossae—and that the recipients will not be surprised by this messenger's arrival. Second, that those in Colossae have links with the church in another city such that

[5] The vision of charity located by the narrative far beyond the Greco-Roman world in India that is a central part of the *Acts of Thomas* would be an example of this (while this text is probably early-third century, the geographical assumptions supposed in its audience must be older that this).

[6] This is the New Revised Standard Version.

they can send on greetings. Moreover, they know these other groups well, as is witnessed by the assumption that they know the church that meets in Nympha's house: there must have been contact between Nympha's church and themselves. Thirdly, it can be taken for granted that the Colossians will go to the bother and expense of having the letter copied so that it can be forwarded: whether that means just one copy (for the Laodiceans) or two (one also for Nympha's church) is unclear, but the survival of the letters as a corpus (witness P^{46} now in Dublin[7]) depended on multiple copies in circulation. Fourthly, the Colossians can expect the same service in return—so this sharing of letters (i.e., 'being part of the book club') is an on-going demand of being a church. And lastly, if one considers this letter, as I do, to be not from the historical Paul but from those who saw themselves as his disciples, then its evidentiary value in this case in increased because it witnesses to what could be taken for granted by anyone who was familiar with the communities of Christians. It is the conceit of the author that he knows what can be assumed by all as common knowledge and so be employed as tokens of verisimilitude in his attribution of the letter to Paul.

This network of links between churches, physical bonds in the material order, has been a theme taken up by some biblical scholars and dubbed by one 'the holy internet'.[8] Building on this network, scholars have challenged the notion that differences between texts, most notably between the four gospels, can be explained by the origins in distinct churches in which distinct needs were the spur to idiosyncratic developments. Based on the evidence of this 'holy internet' these scholars—most notably Richard Bauckham—have argued that we have to see the gospels as being composed for *all* Christians.[9] Moreover, it is clear from the survival patterns exhibited in our earliest, if fragmentary, codices that those gospels were valued not as isolated texts but were valued as a collection of texts over a wide area: not only were gospels for all Christians, but very many Christians valued the same collection of gospels.[10] But for our purposes we can reverse the logic of this argument to observe how the distinct churches perceived their relationships to one another.

If every church has more or less the same collection of gospel texts, along with other texts produced within the Jesus movement, then part of knowing that one had heard the gospel is the awareness that a key physical expression of this is the codices shared with other churches. One is a church not as an island standing alone simply having a common belief in Jesus, but as one location within the geographically scattered whole because all are holding these texts in common, providing them

[7] See J. Keith Elliott, *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000 [second ed.]), 29–30.

[8] Michael B. Thompson, 'The Holy Internet: Communication Between Churches in the First Christian Generation' in Richard Bauckham ed., *The Gospel for All Christians* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 49–70.

[9] See previous note.

[10] See Graham Stanton, *Jesus and Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 63–91.

for one another, and preserving them for one another.[11] If the message of the books is for all, then there is a sense of belonging to that 'all' inherent in the possession of those books.

But if this is the case, then it, in turn, assumes another forming of mutual dependence: actual human beings who move from one church to another performing a service to each church they encounter. That this is so can be grasped, to some extent, by everyone today who picks up a bible furnished with some maps (even if these are more often provided more for decoration than actual use).[12] Let us take the recent editions of Nestle-Aland as typical and note that it has a map of Paul's journeys as one of its endpapers. This shows Paul and his companions on their three paradigmatic 'mission journeys' founding churches coupled with a fourth journey from Jerusalem to Rome as presented to us in Acts. However, if instead of seeing this map as a guide to discrete events in the life of the Apostle, we view it as an image of the interconnections and travelling between churches (thus the map is not representative of four trips but represents hundreds if not thousands of journeys between groups) we have a glimpse of how the churches saw themselves. In this case it is not as individual groups with common features and aims, but as related to one another and depending upon one another. While one should note that this feature of Acts is an expression of the ecumenical vision of Luke as he imagines the apostles bearing witness 'in Jerusalem, in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth' (Acts 1:8), it is also the case that his account would lack credibility if that level of connection between churches did not exist. For example, Luke describes the believers in Rome, on hearing of Paul's coming, travelling to meet him on the way (Acts 28:15) which assumes that communication—and so travel—between the churches was an everyday occurrence. But what was the nature of this inter-church travel?

When we examine the *Didache* alongside the lists of ministries in 1 Cor 12:28 and Eph 4:11–13, we see not only travellers of various kinds, but encounter the assumption that each church needs the gifts of the travellers to become what it is called to be. Paul's listing in 1 Cor is our oldest indisputable evidence, and he mentions as those 'appointed in the church, first apostles, second prophets, third teachers; then [doers of] deeds of power, then [those with] gifts of healing, forms of assistance, forms of leadership, [and] various kinds of tongues.' From other references within Paul's writings, and with the *Didache* as confirmation, we know that the first three groups—apostles, prophets, and teachers—are seen as link people moving from church to church. For all we know there may be cases where teachers and prophets are firmly based in just one church, but most of our evidence indicates

[11] See Thomas O'Loughlin, 'Ὑπηρέται...τοῦ Λόγου: does Luke 1:2 throw light on to the book practices of the late first-century churches?' in H.A.G. Houghton ed., *Early Readers, Scholars and Editors of the New Testament* (Piscataway NJ: Gorgias Press, 2014), 1–15.

[12] See Thomas O'Loughlin, 'Maps and Acts: a problem in cartography and exegesis', *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 21 (1998): 33–61.

that they are moving from church to church. The final chapter of Romans presents us with a few details of the travels of such ministers. Phoebe of Cenchreae is going to Rome—presumably as one sent from one church to another: we know from Rom 1:6 that there are women apostles. Prisca and Aquila appear to not only travel with Paul but among 'all the churches of the Gentiles.' Epaenatus, once in Asia, is now in Rome along with Mary who is known to Paul and, therefore, must have travelled there. Andronicus and Junia are prominent and long-standing apostles.[13] Paul also has come into contact with Ampliatus, Urbanus, Stachys, Apelles, the families of Aristobulus and of Narcissus, and his relative, Herodion—that he knows them from his travels and now knows they are in Rome indicates a level of communication that would be unexceptional in the case of the government or military, or indeed some traders, but what is remarkable is that these links are all in connection with a very small religious movement. And if that were not all, Paul then names thirteen others (not counting references to relatives) who are all taken to be 'workers in the Lord'. I consider this phrase of great importance: Paul is not simply sending greetings to those who happen to be in Rome, for whatever reason, whom he happens to know, rather he wants these people greeted with a holy kiss because they are in one way or another his fellow workers. And as fellow workers they have been moving between the churches.

The list in Eph 4:11–13 emphasizes that the Spirit builds the body of Christ through the variety of gifts, which viewed from the recipients' side are their skills, different members of the church have been given: apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers. The apostles, from their name, are the only group which imply movement: the emissaries of one church to another and their travels seems to form the 'hard wiring' of the whole network. On the other hand, the name pastor suggests someone who stays with a community and acts as a permanent guide. Whether or not the prophets, evangelists, and teachers were moving between churches or based in only one church is not obvious from this letter, but from the guidance given about their reception in the *Didache* it seems clear that they were all peripatetic.[14]

What did the travellers do?

Given the evidence for the extent of contact between churches, it is surprising that the purpose and content of this travelling is so opaque. The only explicit evidence we have for churches helping other churches—and with an elaborate network of contacts to facilitate this—is the case of the collection being made in the churches of Greece to provide money for famine relief for the churches in Judea. This very practical linking becomes a major concern for Paul and, in the medley of letters that

[13] See Eldon Jay Epp, *Junia: The First Woman Apostle* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005); cf. J. Thorley, 'Junia, A Woman Apostle', *Novum Testamentum* 38 (1996): 18–29.

[14] See below.

we find in 2 Cor we can trace both his energetic promotion of this endeavour and his practical concern that it takes place efficiently.[15] But while this could be dismissed as a one-off crisis, it provides us with implicit evidence that the notion of helping each other, and the logistic capacity such assistance requires, could be presupposed.

When we come to the role of the evangelists our evidence is more circumstantial. At some time between the death of Jesus and the beginning of Paul's work (because he used the word 'the gospel' as a term already familiar among the followers of Jesus), some unknown theological genius brought the term 'the gospel' into use among the disciples. Here was a familiar term within the world of political relations whereby the ruler expressed his solicitude for a community, invariably a city, who in return became his 'friends' and subjects.[16] This term for the relationship established between God and his people through the Christ was readily comprehensible to a gentile audience in a way that words based around the word for 'covenant' (*diathēkē*) were not, and so the whole impact of the Christ-event could be expressed in terms of 'the gospel'. This gospel, in turn, came to be the stories of the life and teaching of Jesus that were told by specialist performers. So those who did this preaching—and we know there were many of them[17]—became known as such: 'the evangelists', literally: 'the gospellers', from their distinctive activity within the churches. We have to think of them as being specialist performers, the Christian equivalent of rhapsodes, who could come among a community, give a performance that related the gospel, perhaps left a text after them, and then moved on (presumably—as did Paul—adhering to the rules on their stay we find in the *Didache*). Moving on, but leaving a text which could be re-voiced in their absence, would lead to texts called after them, gospels, and allow us to see why the churches kept both a plurality of these texts and also why four of them—three of which are very closely related—became the familiar and standard library of each church preserved by that crucial, but forgotten, non-travelling office holder: the *huperides tou logou*.[18]

It would appear that no one church would be able to support a specialist like an evangelist, nor, presumably, would there be as much attraction in having the same performer every week when one could have variety! The performer of 'the gospel' was a guest in each church, and by each receiving from the next church, and then sharing a copy of the text of the performance with another, a unity of experience and memory was built. Borrowing from, and sharing with, other churches is the material

[15] See Hans Dieter Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1985).

[16] See Stanton, *Jesus and Gospel,* 2005.

[17] We know this not only from explicit references to there being many (Lk 1:1), but from the fact of the levels of redaction we find in the four canonical gospels, and from the fact of the other gospel texts and fragments which are either not in the canon or on its fringes (e.g., the *Pericope de adultera* (Jn 7:53–8:11).

[18] See O'Loughlin, 2014.

basis of the functional canon of the four gospels[19] that led to the prescriptive canon of those gospels we find towards the end of the second century.[20]

We all know that there is a massive difference between a born-teacher who can with their very being communicate, elucidate, and enlighten, and someone who has taken on 'the job' and whose labours produce a fitful transfer of information. The first is, from the Christian perspective, as witnessed in Eph 4:11, inspired and possessed of a gift. Even if a single community could support this person, the skilled teacher's gifts were to be shared between the churches. This teacher offered the gift of teaching in one place, then moved to teach in another community, then moved on yet again so that another church could benefit. What individual churches lacked in terms of this special gift was given them through borrowing and sharing. However, if we are thinking of those teachers in terms of our use of the word 'teacher' we may miss an essential aspect of their ministry. I have argued elsewhere that *didache* should not be translated as 'teaching' but as 'training'[21] because the Christian way was a matter of having a new way of living; and this required a training in the way of the Lord such as that we find in the 'Two Ways' section of the *Didache*.[22] If we think of these *didaskaloi* as trainers we see that they were sharing a common way of being a follower of Jesus and thus a common practice. It was this common practice, distributed over the churches by having common trainers, that may have given those with that shared way of living their most profound sense that they were one with every other person who had chosen and learned the Way. Shared training, as every army knows when it stresses common boot camp training, builds a unique spirit of unity between people. Would that today we could say that all Christians were being trained to act as Christians in such a way that when Christians met they would first experience a sense of their commonality rather than of their differences!

Lastly, we come to the third group, prophets, of whom we have the least information.[23] What service did a prophet offer? We know that they could speak in an oracular manner—for the *Didache* warns of those who did so for their own benefit.[24] We also know that they could perform some spectacular ritual while with a church—

[19] See K.W. Folkert, 'The "Canons" of "Scripture"' in M. Levering ed., *Rethinking Scripture: Essays from a Comparative Perspective* (Albany NY: SUNY Press, 1989): 170–9 for the notion of a 'functional' canon preceding a 'prescriptive' canon.

[20] See O'Loughlin, 'The *Protevangelium Iacobi,* 2017.

[21] See Thomas O'Loughlin, 'The Missionary Strategy of the *Didache*', *Transformation* 28 (2011): 77–92.

[22] Thomas O'Loughlin, *The Didache: A Window on the Earliest Christians* (London: SPCK, 2010): 28–45.

[23] On the identity of 'the prophets' and their place in the early churches, see J.A. Draper, 'Social Ambiguity and the Production of the Text: Prophets, Teachers, Bishops, and Deacons and the Development of the Jesus Tradition in the Community of the *Didache*' in Clayton N. Jefford ed., *The Didache in Context: Essays on its Text, History, and Transmission* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 284–312; idem, 'Weber, Theissen, and "Wandering Charismatics" in the *Didache*,' *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 6 (1998): 541–76; and idem, 'Performing the Cosmic Mystery of the Church in the Communities of the *Didache*' in Jonathan Knight and Kevin Sullivan eds, *The Open Mind: Essay in Honour of Christopher Rowland* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2015): 37–57

[24] See text below.

again on the basis of the *Didache*—but its exact nature eludes us.[25] And we know that on account of their status, they were given certain freedoms in worship and were not considered part of the normal pattern of church life.[26] That is all we know regarding the details; but the two most significant aspects of their ministry is known by implication. First, the prophets were not considered as belonging within the community, but as visitors to the community: it was part of their identity to be itinerant moving from church to church. [27] Second, they were considered, despite their later disappearance, the most special of the visitors whom a church had to make welcome.[28] It is because of this uniquely high status that 'prophet' was so often the guise chosen by those who wanted to abuse a church's welcome. This group of charlatans was referred to disparagingly as the christhawkers (*christemporoi*).[29]

Problems

It is always a temptation of theologians to idealize their 'the early church' as some kind of perfect, springtime of youth, yet nothing is so reality-inducing as consideration of the processes of links, networking, and sharing between the early churches. Indeed, all the classic examples of how the early churches did not exist in some ideal privileged time relate to the churches as part of a network. It was failures in behaviour by a church in Corinth which gathered eucharistically that prompted Paul's rebuke: he had heard of the problems through the network and responded with 1 Cor sent though that network. It was the reluctance of other churches to share with the churches in Judea that prompted other letters. Moreover, it was because Paul was staying with churches as a visitor that criticisms of him arose in some of the churches. In turn, it was these criticisms that provoked his statements and actions in his own defense. He, Paul, did *not* avail of those standard provisions that were

[25] See David A. Clark, 'Order and Chaos in the *Didache*', *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 25 (2016): 287–96.

[26] The *Didache* 10:7 says that 'the prophets should be permitted to give thanks in whatever manner they wish.' In the context it is clear that this refers to the offering of what we would call the Eucharistic Prayer as distinct from using the formula provided in the *Didache*. See Thomas O'Loughlin, 'The Prayers of the Liturgy' in Vivian Boland and Thomas McCarthy eds, *The Word is Flesh and Blood: The Eucharist and Sacred Scripture - Festschrift for Prof. Wilfrid Harrington* (Dublin: Dominican Publications, 2012), 113–22.

[27] See Draper, 1998.

[28] See Thomas O'Loughlin, 'Sharing Food and Breaking Boundaries: reading of Acts 10–11:18 as a key to Luke's ecumenical agenda in Acts', *Transformation* 32 (2015): 27–37.

[29] *Didache* 12:5. This fragment of early Christian slang has gained a standard translation in English since the discovery of the *Didache* with the word 'christmonger' formed in English by analogy with 'ironmonger' and 'fishmonger.' However, this rendering fails on two counts: first, '-monger' is simply archaic and does not contain any note of disapproval as would be contained in a word like 'chancer' or 'con artist'—an ironmonger is a perfectly respectable specialist seller of hardware—and so a word with a dimension of slur is needed; second, words in the form '*-emporos*' need to have some note of this being a travelling seller of goods, one who hawks his wares from place to place selling in market after market, place to place, or perhaps door to door. Therefore, I shall use the form 'christhawker which I hope conveys both a sense of slang reproof and of travel. I am indebted to my colleague, Dr Patricia Rumsey, for suggesting this form to me.

made for such inter-church travellers; therefore, he could assert his innocence of the charges.[30]

It is to the *Didache* we must turn for the clearest, explicit evidence that the system of links between churches could be problematic and was prone to financial abuse. Indeed, the *Didache* is so valuable as a guide to this phenomenon because one of its sections lays down 'a protective wisdom' so that a church's hospitality will not be abused by those travellers who, under the pretext of being ministers, would simply take the community's food and money.[31] The abuses took several forms ranging from the abuse of perks—a teacher coming, overstaying, and so having a free holiday—to fraud in the form of a prophet giving a revelation that he should be given a feast or that a collection should be taken up for his benefit. Bitter experiences, an obtuse indicator of the volume of inter-church traffic, had led to the production of a code of conduct to regulate the matter.

The whole code is worth reading:

> Now, whoever comes to you and teaches all these things which have just been set out here, you are to welcome him.
>
> However, if a teacher has himself wandered from the right path and has begun to teach a teaching that is at odds with what is set out here, you should not listen to him.
>
> On the other hand, if his teaching promotes holiness and knowledge of the Lord, then you should welcome him as you would the Lord.
>
> Now, turning to apostles and prophets you must treat them according to the rule of the gospel.
>
> Every apostle who arrives among you is to be welcomed as if he were the Lord.
>
> But normally he must not stay with you for more than one day, but he may stay a second day if this is necessary. However, if he stays a third day, then he is a false prophet!
>
> When he leaves you, an apostle must receive nothing except enough food to sustain him until the next night's lodgings. However, if he asks for money, then he is a false prophet!

[30] 1 Cor 9:1–18.

[31] See Aaron Milavec, 'Distinguishing True and False Prophets: The Protective Wisdom of the *Didache*', *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 2 (1994): 117–136.

Now if any prophet speaks in the Spirit he is not to be tested: for every sin can be forgiven but this sin cannot be forgiven.

However, not everyone who speaks in the Spirit is a prophet: only those who show that they follow the Way of the Lord. It is by the way that he lives that the true prophet can be separated from the false one.

Now if a prophet speaking in the Spirit orders a banquet, then that man should not partake in it; if he does eat the meal, then he is a false prophet.

And any prophet who teaches the truth, but does not live according to his teaching is to be considered a false prophet.

Any prophet, who has been proven to be a true prophet, who acts out in his life the earthly mystery of the church (provided that he does not teach everyone to do as he does) is not to be judged by you: leave his judgment with God. After all, the prophets in olden times also acted in that way.

Now if anyone should say in the Spirit 'Give me money'—or anything like that—you should not listen to that man; however, if he tells you to give something to other people who are in need, then he is not to be condemned.

Now anyone coming in the Lord's name should be made welcome; then you can test him, using your own insight into human nature to see if he is genuine or a fraud.

If the visitor is someone who is passing through, help him as much as you can. However, he is not to stay for more than two days—or three out of necessity.

If the visitor wishes to settle in your community, then if he is a craftsman, he should work for his living.

But if he does not have a trade, then use your own judgment to decide how he is to live among you as a Christian: but he is not to live in idleness.

> If he is unhappy with this arrangement, then he is a christhawker. Be on the watch for such people.
>
> Any true prophet who wishes to settle down among you is worthy of his food. In the same way, any true teacher is like a labourer who is worthy of his food.
>
> So take the first fruits of the vine and the harvest, of cattle and sheep, and present these first fruits to the prophets because they are to you, the high priests.
>
> But if you have no prophet settled in your community, then give the first fruits to the poor.
>
> When you bake a batch of bread, take the first loaf and present it as it says in the commandment.
>
> Do likewise when you open a fresh flask of wine or oil, take the first portion from it and present to the prophets.
>
> So also with money and cloth and other commodities, set aside the first fruits, and give it—as much as seems right to you—according to the commandment.[32]

These regulations of the travellers—which in a real sense can be said to form the earliest stratum of our canon law—were considered so important that they can be seen as 'the rule of the gospel' which I interpret as the regulations concerning the reception and celebration of that which is held in common between the churches. That the *Didache* was not out of touch with the actual situation in the churches in the late first and early second centuries can be seen in echoes in other documents, for example the dictum 'if they will not work, let them not eat' (2 Thes 3:10),[33] and in the close observance of these regulations within the accounts of the ideal visitors to churches (Peter and Paul) in Acts.[34]

That the *Didache* was dealing with a problem that was actually perplexing the churches indicates that the amount of travelling between the churches was so significant in both extent and importance that it could give rise to a group of people—

[32] *Didache* 11:1 – 13:6. The translation is adapted from O'Loughlin, *The Didache*, 161–71.

[33] This section of this letter sets a high importance on not supporting those who refuse to work and presents it as the command of Paul thus reflecting the kind of tension in the community we see in the *Didache*.

[34] See O'Loughlin, 'Sharing Food and Breaking Boundaries'.

given the disparaging name of 'the christhawkers'—who would exploit them and so the need for these rules to distinguish true travellers from false. More significantly for the longer term—but already visible *in nuce* in the *Didache*—this problem gave rise to a change in the form of ministry: the tasks once performed by the visitors became associated with the ministers, *episkopoi*, *presbyteroi*, and *diakonoi*, who were appointed from within the community. There were, presumably, seen as being less of a charge on the churches' resources and, since they were well known to the group, more accountable.

Travelling ministries in the explicit forms of apostles, evangelists, prophets, and teachers did disappear from Christian structures, probably sometime in the first half of the second century. For then onwards, any traveller arriving was more likely seen as an accidental visitor rather than someone engaged in their life ministry.[35] But those earlier wanderers left us an important legacy: the memory among the Christians that they were are not just single groups (which because of similarities of practice and belief could be classed together), but one church 'gathered from the four winds' just as each eucharistic gathering was a gathering from the four winds to be one in the Christ.[36]

Taking steps forward

If the appreciation of the gift of the unity of the Church was experienced in the practicalities of actions and practices that linked church to church, then if we wish to renew that experience we must not merely declare our desire for the unity for which the Christ prayed, 'that they might all be one' (Jn 17:21), but find practical ways that overcome the tribal tendencies in human nature that sets 'the others' in opposition to us and 'us' to them. Only when we experience commonalities, such that we experience 'them' as 'our people too,' do we have a framework within our mental maps that can give our ecumenical theology flesh.

Such steps in sharing and borrowing are not going to be easy to build: centuries of doing things apart mean that our practices seem *and feel* very far apart, we sound different, and we have a large stock of bitter memories and suspicions. Religions are conservative of their inheritances and we are attached to what we take to be the traditions of the fathers such than any borrowing or sharing that seems to depart from them is itself suspect and painful. Yet the perfection of the Church as the Lord's seamless garment requires that we see this as part of the process of repentance / conversion that is the first command of the gospel: 'The time is fulfilled, and the

[35] The famous journey of Ignatius of Antioch is a case in point if we accept—and the case is virtually irrefutable—the dating for Ignatius put forth by Timothy D. Barnes ('The Date of Ignatius', *Expository Times* 120 [2008]: 119–30) which places him in the mid-second century, if not slightly later.

[36] See the *Didache* 9:4 where the image of the in-gathering of the new people, fulfilling a prophesy, is part of the anaphora.

kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the gospel' (Mk 1:15). But pastoral wisdom also dictates that such practical steps should proceed by taking many small steps while keeping one's eyes fixed on the distant summit. What could some of those steps be like?

1. Become more aware of the other regions of the Church

We tend to work as theologians with those who share our interests and perspectives—a quite normal element among the adherents of any body of expertise: a conference of cardiologists wants to be sure that all participants have that specialization in common—but can any body of theologians ever have such a vision of comprehension? Whenever we speak about the divine, we do so from our fractured partiality: *Deus semper maior*. We cannot say anything completely; and we cannot ever say 'the last word' on anything: there is *always* another perspective to consider. One such perspective is that of those whose ecclesial experience is different from our own. In relation to our debates that perspective is a gift from another church which transforms the context of what we, as one group, say and so helps us towards saying something that might be closer to what we, as the *una sancta*, say.

Could we have a situation where whenever a group of theologians meet—even to discuss matters that only affected their own church or a particular cultural situation—that it becomes a standard practice that they have among them those who represent other churches and situations? Having these 'others' present is not part of some vague hope of yet another joint statement couched in language of mediation and diplomacy, but where the presence of that 'other' voice reminds the group that they are not the sole voice of the Church nor indeed just the tip of the ecclesial iceberg, but represent but a part of the Christian witness to the truth. Being nudged to keep in mind our particularity has the effect of alerting us to the whole, and that it is the whole that is the body of the Christ.

If such participation were a standard element in theological debate it would bring another benefit: the lessening of mutual misunderstanding. I have heard many Orthodox complain about how their position is not represented in its true light when Catholics seek, from their reading, to summarize their theology. It is a cliché that many Protestants are exasperated when Catholics tell them what they do *not* believe on the basis of how Catholic rhetoric has defined a position as 'Catholic' and, consequently, a non-Catholic is assumed to reject that position. I, as a Catholic, am often shocked by what Orthodox writers say is the position of the Catholics on this or that matter, and my immediate response is that it would have been so good if that writer had chatted the matter over—my use of an amicable informal verb is deliberate—with a Catholic theologian. Removing needless disagreements is a not insignificant step in ecumenism, while removing disgruntlement and annoyance is a real step towards promoting it.

2. Sharing resources in the training of clergy

An ecclesial culture of sharing, borrowing, and making connections will not mean much if it is restricted to those who consider themselves theologians. At the level of academic discourse such mutual learning is already taking place, and our meeting on Syros is itself a wondrous sign. The culture of sharing needs to be part of the world of those who are charged with being the teachers and guides of the People of God: the clergy. It is a constant amazement to me how little the clergy of individual churches know about the other churches that make up the Church. One way to lessen this gulf in knowledge would be to seek mechanisms that link the ministerial training centres so that the students in each institution are not only aware of the others, but mingle with each other. Faced with the ever growing financial burdens of training—look for a moment at the spiralling costs of library resources in a digital age—there are practical benefits in every such collaboration that would underpin, practically, the cultural and educational collaboration that might take place among the students. Is it too much to dream that an Orthodox seminary professor would swap places with Catholic seminary professor for a term or semester?

Immediately one hears the cry that if such a teacher exchange occurred then 'we' would be allowing an unacceptable alien influence into the minds of our ordinands! If such an objection were to be sustained, then we should admit that it is tantamount to holding that what divides us is heresy so serious that we cannot acknowledge that the other is genuinely a Christian—and I have met some in the Orthodox, Catholic, and Protestant camps that take that view and often express it intemperately. But such an approach is self-contradicting in that in denying the unity of the Church to be anything more than uniformity with one's own position, one must engage with an ever-decreasing circle. The *una sancta* was established by the reality of seeking to ever extend the links between one church and another. There is also a practical reply to this objection: the clergy formed in the various seminaries are, in contrast to even a few decades ago, unlikely to serve in situations where they will only meet Christians belonging to their own church. In a world of people movement, there are often more 'brands' of churches on a city street than there are brands of supermarket; and in this situation, those who serve need a deep familiarity with one another and to know how to co-operate in practical details. Some months ago, I spoke to a small group of clergy from several western churches in a meeting room located next to the Roman Catholic church building. From its window I could see the blue and white dome of an Orthodox building and asked if they took part in any joint activities. The reply is fascinating: we never thought of asking them, 'we would not know how to talk to them'! In such a situation genuine ecumenism is still far below the horizon.

3. Adopting common solutions

The glue that bonds many relationships is the practical one of borrowing: Only a fool seeks to re-invent the wheel, while only a bigger fool rejects an idea on the basis of 'not invented here.' It was just such borrowing that produced the corpus of Pauline letters, the corpus of the gospels, and so many of the building blocks of the liturgy. *Phos hilaron* did not become common property of our evening worship by the *diktat* of a council or a patriarch, nor as a result of the uniformity that is a function of printed texts, but because church borrowed from church.

The western churches are currently re-discovering the wisdom inherent in such borrowing in seeking a solution to one common problem. The lectionary that was inherited from the middle ages was not well arranged: the individual lections were often very badly formed, it had a very limited range (and within the gospel, lections give a very limited selection of stories and parables) and, most significantly, was not very useful for any system of preaching / catechesis based on the actual readings. But, with all its faults, it was continued in the Roman Catholic liturgy as promulgated by the Council of Trent. This is not surprising, but what is surprising is that it was adopted by almost all the churches of the sixteenth-century Reformation who retained a lectionary. Its faults were largely invisible to Catholics because the readings were in Latin rather than in a living language and because the readings were seen as 'merely' part of the 'Mass of the Catechumens' which preceded the eminently more important 'Mass of the Faithful.' However, the Reformed churches, despite using local languages and emphasizing the importance of the promulgation of the word continued to use that lectionary without demur. It was only in the period after the Second World War that the Evangelical Church in France identified its weaknesses and began designing a new lectionary build around a three-year cycle that would, in effect, use all of the gospels presenting the word of each evangelist in a way that respected the actual text (allowing that every lectionary is a compromise). With the coming of the Second Vatican Council—and with it the prospect of a move from Latin in worship—Roman Catholic scholars began to note the problems with the inherited lectionary. In an earlier time the mere fact that a Protestant church had gone in one direction was sufficient to spur Catholicism to go in the other: there should, in the imagery of that ecclesial culture, be clear blue water between churches, and there should always be a certain sneer at the changes 'they' made to 'accommodate modernity.' Happily, the opposite course was taken and the basic idea of dividing the four gospels over a three-year cycle and with a clear reading plan within each year became a fact in the *Ordo Lectionum Missae* of 1969 which has been in force now for half a century virtually always in the local language. While appreciation of the new lectionary has been patchy at parish level, for a complex of reasons, it has had an effect beyond Catholicism that was not foreseen by any of its designers. Church after church from the traditions of the Reformation have taken

up the idea and adopted it to a greater or lesser extent. In most cases they have not taken over the Catholic lectionary in its entirety—different churches have identified what each sees as a weakness in it or opted for the other opinion in cases of compromise—but they have, almost entirely, kept to its core structure: the gospel lectionary for Sundays. Indeed, many churches that traditionally rejected the notion of a lectionary as a limit on the Spirit have come to see the benefits of a lectionary and adopted either the Revised Common Lectionary or a set of readings close to it, but invariably this means they use the system of Sunday gospels.

This wondrous, and unplanned coming together based on borrowing ideas from one another has prompted a statement from Anglophone liturgists some years ago which declared:

> For the first time in history, Christians in the English-speaking world are using common liturgical texts. In the process of coming to agreed common texts, scholars from different Christian traditions agreed on principles for the translation from the earliest sources. This in itself has been a gift. Despite only having been in existence for a relatively short time, these texts have been adopted freely by an ever-increasing number of churches. We celebrate this. They are being experienced as a gift, a sign and a way to Christian unity in our diversity. As the churches continue to discover the riches of these shared texts, we believe further revision is inappropriate at the present time. We invite all who have not yet explored these texts, and those who have departed from their use, to join us in prayerful reflection on the value of common texts and careful consideration of the texts themselves. Prayed together, shared common texts become a part of the fabric of our being. They unite the hearts of Christians in giving glory to God as we undertake the mission of the Gospel.[37]

This is a very interesting vision of the *una sancta* and a very different approach to ecumenical progress. This ecumenical vision is not a deduction from a theological first principle nor an enforcement that is seen as filling out a confession within the creed: such impositions 'from the top-down' rarely achieve more than token success. Rather this is a bottom-up ecumenism: each church makes a discovery of the value of the lectionary—and so borrowing from another church—for itself. Then based on this practical experience it discovers other 'good things', such as praying together and witnessing together. It is only then in reflection that it sees this whole process, which each set out upon with the needs of their own liturgy in mind, as part of a much greater ecclesial event which is itself a gift from God. They have not become one, but grown toward unity through borrowing and sharing. This is a unity

[37] The English Language Liturgical Consultation, *The Reims Statement: Praying with One Voice*. This 2011 statement can easily be accessed on the internet.

in diversity for while they are each using the common texts with all the benefits this brings; each is using it to fulfil its particular needs and adapting the lectionary to those precise needs.

Similarly, this growth towards a single lectionary has not been the result of some great ecumenical big bang! If one had asked the framers of the *Ordo lectionum Missae* in 1969 how could one get churches from across the western Christian spectrum to adopt a more or less common lectionary they would probably have answered with a statement of the need for a common ecumenical agreement among the authorities of all the churches involved, perhaps a great synod at which it would be promulgated, and then a decision as to the precise moment it would come into force. Anyone with any experience of inter-church affairs, anywhere in the world, knows that this is a utopian vision. To get all the churches who have actually adopted the common lectionary to agree beforehand to come together and then agree on a lectionary would have been impossible: many would not agree to such a great event, others could not come if someone else was willing to come, and the debates among those who actually turned up would have been interminable! If such a synod did succeed in producing a lectionary, then many in each church would have rejected it precisely because they considered its origins tainted, while it would also have generated counter proposals that would have caused further divisions within some churches. Indeed, if suggested *ante factum*, any reasonable ecclesiastic would have laughed at the idea one could have such ecumenical support for a lectionary as fanciful.

That there are churches across the western ecclesial spectrum, and in a wide range of languages, all using one lectionary—and their seeing this as a mark of their unity—is due to the process by which it came about. Each discovered something good for themselves, fulfilling their internal needs, and adopted it. It was now their own possession resulting from their own decision, but it was also a link to a whole network of other churches, and each was benefiting from the sharing. Here also we have a curious demonstration that this bottom-up ecumenism model, based on borrowing, is the way forward more generally. If there is one western church, which uses that new lectionary, where it is *not* appreciated, it is among Catholics. I have been writing and speaking on the lectionary for over thirty years and am amazed at how few clergy have ever given it a thought: it is just there as that which is to be followed. Likewise, one can speak to group after group of lay Catholics who volunteer 'to read at Mass' on Sundays, and when one points out that there is a three-year cycle of lections, it comes as news.[38] The lectionary had been followed as that 'commanded for use', but it has not been actively adopted as a precious element of liturgy nor have its possibilities been appreciated. It was just promulgated and—given the value Catholicism gives to uniformity in liturgy—it was expected that all

[38] See Thomas O'Loughlin, 'Sharing the Living Word: Looking at the Lectionary as it approaches its golden jubilee', *Music and Liturgy* 43 (2017): 8–13; and 'Hearing the Gospel in the Churches: Reflecting on the *Revised Common Lectionary*', *Methodist Sacramental Fellowship* 145 (2018): 3–15.

would use it. They have (more or less), but it is often just a passive uniformity. It is useless now to speculate if it would have been better to offer it as an option and see if individual clergy would have adopted it as 'the better alternative'. But it is noteworthy that while those who have been part of a process of choosing a lectionary have seen the advantages, albeit with limitations, of their choice, Catholics are almost unaware of it. This year, 2019, marks its golden jubilee, but how many dioceses are having any events to mark it?

The spread of the new mid-twentieth century lectionary among the western churches is a little-known ecumenical success story, but, perhaps more importantly, it is a model ecumenical progress among all the churches. It has not spread beyond Catholicism as part of a grand ecumenical strategy, nor does the spread involve some affirmation, explicit or implicit, of a source of authority such as a patriarch or council, it has spread because it was a better way of each doing what they knew would enhance their own ecclesial reality. That now we can see a greater dimension, that it is bringing churches closer to one another, in this jagged succession of adoption and adaptation is, to me, evidence of the work of the Spirit. Each have the fruit of their action, and that there is an abundance of fruit that was 'not part of the plan' is the Spirit's gift to the churches in our time.

4. Places of encounter

Ecumenical endeavour is all too often the preserve of patriarchs and bishops, a few scholars, and a handful of parish clergy, but is there a way that 'ordinary' Christians can come to experience the reality of the *una sancta* while preserving the richness of their distinctive inheritances? We are often separated by language, customs, calendars, and for many churches *communio in sacris*—eating and drinking at one another's eucharistic celebrations is a step too far.[39] But links that grow from borrowing and sharing only grow through actual contact. One phenomenon valued by Orthodox and Catholics, and after several centuries of censure now being adopted by many Protestants, is that of pilgrimage. The journey to a particular place becomes for us, spatial and locomotive beings, a special place of encounter with the divine, a special moment in our lives as worshippers, and moment of transformation. Is there a possibility that in sharing pilgrim sites we could walk together, sing and pray together, encounter at our elbow that we are sisters and brothers in the Lord?

On visiting the maps section of a large Athens' bookshop I was amazed by the number of maps available of the Holy Mountain, yet to most Catholics the name 'Mount Athos' is unknown, and much less any of the other pilgrim sites in Greece. Speaking to a group of Anglicans recently, having mentioned the impact of Lourdes (a Marian pilgrimage site in the French Pyrenees) on the liturgical renewal within

[39] See Thomas O'Loughlin, *Eating Together, Becoming One: Taking Up Pope Francis's Call to Theologians* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2019).

Catholicism, I was asked 'what is Lourdes?' Yet there is hardly a Catholic church building in western Europe which will not have on its notice boards prominent posters about a pilgrimage to Lourdes at least once in the year, and one of the most common statues of the Theotokos found within or around Catholic buildings is of 'Our Lady of Lourdes.' By contrast, the *Camino* to the shrine of St James at Compostella in Galicia (north-west Spain), which only a generation ago hardly attracted any pilgrims, is now as busy as a city thoroughfare. They are not in any way traditional pilgrims seeking the pilgrim's indulgence nor favours at the shrine, indeed many boast that they are not Catholic nor Christian, and many would claim that they are not 'religious'—their collection of the stamps on their pilgrim passport is a proof to themselves and their associates of their endurance rather than, as in former times, a claim on the divine mercy. But few, whatever their explicit faith, would not agree that this journey is, somehow, an important moment in their own life journey. Another contrast is the tiny island of Iona off the west coast of Scotland once, in the seventh and eighth centuries, the setting of a great monastery, and now a place of pilgrimage within the Church of Scotland. Imagine how many learned divines from a period of four and half centuries must be shuddering in their graves at the thought of a Calvinist church promoting pilgrimage to a monastic site; but for many of those who arrive there the act of pilgrimage is a transformative event giving them a new vision of their inheritance and faith.

These few instances should put before us the continuing reality of pilgrimage as speaking to something deep within us even in a post-Christian or post-religious world. Equally, pilgrimage can be a unifying experience as the travellers lose their normal identities and share the common, if transitory, identity of pilgrim—and returning home bring something of the shared experience of *communitas* with them. Some sites of pilgrimage will always remain firmly in the possession of just one church or culture—the Holy Mountain might be one such place and, certainly, some of the Marian sites in Italy will appeal only to very specific cultural groups of Catholics—but perhaps there are other places where we can mingle on a common journey of faith, pray together, and experiencing the breath and variety of the *una sancta* return with a new ecumenical consciousness.

5. Sharing a language of sharing

The terminology of the higher echelons of ministry, in whatever church, often has a common element: it is designed to inculcate a sense of individual self-sufficiency. We have 'monarchical bishops' who know where they stand within the hierarchical ladder are also aware that they are, severally, each self-sufficient and, as an individual, standing on top of little triangle of authority and power within the larger triangle of apostolic succession. The terms 'primate', 'pope', and 'patriarch' suppose a distinctive group, whole in itself, such that if all other Christians ceased to exist,

here with this head would be a church, indeed 'the church', the *una sancta* as a matter of arithmetic fact rather than as a completeness. The use in discourse of terms like 'autocephaly' or 'subsistence' likewise presume that churches can exist without one another and that contacts between them might be likened to great ships who merely happen to meet upon the ocean. Notions of grand patriarchates may have a tight wrapping of apostolic language surrounding them, but in a world aware of the ramifications of colonialism, and the colonial vision of those who perceive themselves at a 'centre' as they look out to a 'periphery', such terminology seems simply grandiose. We have only to look at earlier debates on ecumenism, in every part of the Church, to know that these can become imperial endeavours (whether or not they are related to political entities with similar ambitions).

But what other language have we? We do not yet have a language that sees every worshipping community of the baptized as a real and primordial church: all 'churches' only exist in so far as there are actual communities of Christians who, in union with the Christ and empowered by the Spirit, offer acknowledgement and praise to the Father. Perhaps we need keep the word 'church' for such actual communities—returning to its original usage among the followers of Jesus—and devise new words for particular networks of the churches. How, for example, can we have a language that expresses the groupings of actual churches in terms of their mutual interdependence—for they are interdependent. What language of leadership could we find that stresses our need for mutual exchange and support—and acknowledges that without that sharing each actual church is but a lonely gathering rather than an active member of the *una sancta* to which it contributes its gifts and from which it receives gifts.

There is no new language for ecclesial relationships that we can just take 'off the shelf': it is an area where many churches will have to gently but deliberately change their ways. But there is, at least, a clear first step we can take: remove the language of uniqueness and splendid isolation that many of us, and Catholics more than any other, have inherited.

A 'cup of sugar' ecumenism

It has often been remarked that the phenomenon found in poor neighbourhoods in the British Isles of the women borrowing and re-borrowing cups of sugar was a far more profound practice in terms of social cohesion than simply answering the practical urgency of a moment of need: it created a common sense of belonging, fostered the need for good relations, and was located within the tangible reality of the world of 'things' which impinge on us so much more than good intentions. This forms the bedrock for my vision of ecumenism where we move forward as disciples together rather than waiting for the (possibly imaginary) day when church leaders

agree, theologians resolve the difficulties of centuries, and all wait for a general acceptance of the notion of ecumenism.

We all have a tendency to look back to the origins of Christianity and admire the unity (despite all the problems) we see there. But we should also recall that this was based not in some great vision, much less in a common theology, but based in solid things. People, letters, money, and books moved around. The sea was a great connector, they made use of the roads, and benefited from the peace of the empire, and so they could lean upon each other and learn from each other. Given that today we revel in an unparalleled connectivity, we might relearn this 'cup of sugar' approach to unity for which the Christ prayed (Jn 17:21).

'Unity of the Churches—An Actual Possibility: The Rahner-Fries Theses and Contemporary Catholic-Orthodox Dialogue'

A. Edward Siecienski
Associate Professor of Religion,
Clement and Helen Pappas Professor of Byzantine Culture and Religion,
Stockton University, New Jersey USA

In 1983 Karl Rahner, SJ and Heinrich Fries wrote *Unity of the Churches: An Actual Possibility* (*Einigung der Kirchen—reale Möglichkeit*) a small book proposing eight theses that they hoped could bring about the almost immediate reunion of Christendom. Although widely criticized for their 'epistemological tolerance', if 'resurrected' and properly adapted to issues currently under discussion in the Catholic-Orthodox dialogue (e.g., the *filioque*, the papacy, the Marian dogmas), these theses (particularly 1, 2, 4a, 4b) have the potential to build upon the progress already made and move East and West even closer toward full communion.

A Personal Note

In the years since the publication of my book on the *filioque*,[1] and then its companion volume on the papacy,[2] I have been asked many times by both Catholic and Orthodox friends if and when these debates will end so that the goal of unity between the churches can finally become a reality. Up to this point I have not addressed these questions in print, because until now I have restricted myself to chronicling what has been rather than detailing what should be. My work has largely been descriptive rather than prescriptive, a natural consequence of being a dogmatic historian far more concerned with the past rather than with the future.

However, I must admit that as a scholar who has spent the last two decades studying the genesis and progression of the schism I have often wanted to take the

[1] A. Edward Siecienski, *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

[2] A. Edward Siecienski, *The Papacy and the Orthodox: Sources and History of a Debate* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

next step—to use my findings and figure out what can be actually done to try and heal it. Naturally this requires moving beyond the past—my 'comfort zone', if you will—and discern, based upon our shared history, what can presently be done to move the Catholic and Orthodox churches closer to full communion. My hesitation comes from the knowledge that it is far easier to chronicle the past than to suggest solutions, where one opens oneself to criticisms from both sides, especially those who think such schemes always reek of compromise and relativism. Also, I feared the loss of my reputation for objectivity—a reputation I have tried scrupulously to maintain.[3] In suggesting a way forward, I feared, not only did I risk attack, but also the accusation that I have somehow 'tipped my hand' and displayed my biases toward one side or the other.

All that said, I decided that the risk was worth taking, since the cause of Christian unity is not, for me, merely an academic interest. On the contrary, like millions of Christians throughout the world who find themselves unable to approach a common altar with friends and families because of dogmatic differences, the disunity of Christianity is more than just a theological concern; it is also an existential one. For that reason, I decided the time had come to suggest possible concrete steps toward reunion based upon my research, and I was extremely happy when the organizers of the Syros Conference offered me the opportunity to do so. This paper, I hope, is but a first attempt at that task.

The Rahner-Fries Theses

Anyone who has studied the history of the 'estrangement'[4] or the current state of relations between the Orthodox and Catholic churches knows that healing a millennium old schism is not going to be easy. As I wrote in the epilogues to my books on the papacy and *filioque*, while 'the optimist in me believes that a resolution to these issues is possible … a sober analysis of the history also demonstrates that optimism … is often unwarranted'.[5] There are elements in both churches that view all ecumenical dialogue as a dangerous exercise whereby truth is sacrificed on the altar of tolerance. In the Orthodox world, where many still harbor a deep-seeded anti-Roman affect, Catholics are considered not only schismatics but also heretics, unworthy of the appellation 'church' having abandoned the true church over a millennium

[3] In his review of my papacy book Aidan Nichols, OP wrote, 'It is a tribute to the fastidiousness of Siecienski's scholarship and the integrity of his mind that no one without inside knowledge of the man would be able to determine from this text whether he is himself a Catholic (as his Polish name might suggest) or an Orthodox'. Aidan Nichols, 'How can Orthodoxy be reassured about the Pope?' *Faith* 52 (2017): 32–34.

[4] This term was popularized by Yves Congar in his book *After Nine Hundred Years: The Background of the Schism between the Eastern and Western Churches* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1959). The schism, he wrote, is not 'of itself the estrangement … it was the acceptance of the estrangement' ibid., 88–89.

[5] Siecienski, *The Filioque*, 215; idem, *The Papacy and the Orthodox*, 417.

ago.[6] Roman Catholicism, perhaps a little better off because it is unburdened by any real anti-Orthodox sentiment, still has elements that fear the slippery slope of compromise, unwilling to grant anything to the Orthodox for fear that the Protestants will exact similar concessions. Avery Cardinal Dulles, himself a longtime participant in ecumenical dialogues, once despaired that reunion between the churches is so far from realization that it could only be understood as an eschatological event.[7]

Cardinal Dulles may, in fact, be right, for as the premature *Te Deums* sang at Lyons and Florence testify, even joint statements and agreed positions do not necessarily guarantee unity. It took centuries for the estrangement to become schism, and it will likely take several decades (or more) to reverse that process. Still, the sobering realities of the present situation should not be allowed to tempt either side into passivity or inaction. Unity may be a distant dream, but there are concrete steps that can be taken, here and now, to help bring that dream closer to reality.

In 1983 Karl Rahner, SJ and Heinrich Fries wrote *Unity of the Churches: An Actual Possibility (Einigung der Kirchen—reale Möglichkeit)* a small book proposing eight theses that, if acceptable to the Catholic church and all of its 'partner churches' (*Teilkirchen*), could bring about the almost immediate reunion of Christendom. Chiefly targeted at the churches of the Reformation with whom Rahner and Fries were more familiar, the theses provided both the dogmatic and practical groundwork for a loose confederation of churches joined by a unity of faith 'even though we think this unity of faith—based on the spiritual situation of today—as more differentiated than had been supposed in earlier ecumenical reflections'.[8] Simply put, church unity required a degree of 'epistemological tolerance', whereby certain doctrines of one church would not be forced upon, or rejected by, the others.[9]

The Catholic reception of the Rahner-Fries theses was, at best, cold. They were derided as an 'ecumenical shortcut' in Daniel Ols' semi-official *L'Overseratore Romano* attack,[10] and criticized by (then) Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger as 'an artificial exploit of theological acrobatics'[11] and 'a forced march toward unity … that skipped

[6] Among the most acrimonious debates before and during the Great and Holy Council of Crete in 2016 was whether one could apply the term 'church' to Catholic and Protestant bodies. In the end the council's document on 'Relations of the Orthodox Church with the Rest of the Christian World' decided to sidestep the issue by holding that Orthodoxy 'accepts the historical name of other non-Orthodox Christian Churches and Confessions that are not in communion with her'. Simply put, while the council took no decisions as to whether these other groups are or are not actual 'churches', it was agreed that most people describe them as such.

[7] Avery Dulles 'Paths to Doctrinal Agreement: Ten Theses', *Theological Studies* 47 (1986): 32–47. See also idem, 'Ecumenical Strategies for a Pluralistic Age', in *The Resilient Church* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1977), 173–90.

[8] Karl Rahner and Heinrich Fries, *Unity of the Churches: An Actual Possibility*, trans. Ruth Gritsch and Eric Gritsch (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 6.

[9] Ibid., 25–41.

[10] Daniel Ols, 'Ecumenical Shortcuts', *L'Osservatore Romano*, February 25–26, 1985, In the accompanying interview Ols claimed that he had written the article at the request of the hierarchy. Ibid.

[11] Joseph Ratzinger, 'Luther and the Unity of the Churches: An interview with Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger', *Communio: International Catholic Review* 11 (1984): 216. Reprinted in *Joseph Ratzinger in Com-*

the question of truth'.[12] Avery Cardinal Dulles argued that Rahner's 'epistemological tolerance' would 'result in a reductionistic, nondescript union of churches that would be "culturally, religiously and theologically disastrous"'.[13] This was because 'withholding assent to a dogma was equivalent to doubting or even to denying it', which meant that the Rahner plan 'would ultimately relegate all the particular doctrines of the churches to optional status'.[14] Faced with these critiques, not to mention those from Protestant authors,[15] the Rahner-Fries theses receded into the ecumenical backwaters, seemingly never to return.

Yet despite the criticisms leveled against them—criticisms with which I find myself in general agreement were the Rahner-Fries theses uncritically applied to all the churches of Reformation—in the context of the present Catholic-Orthodox dialogue they could be useful tools. In fact, if 'resurrected' and properly adapted to those issues currently under discussion (e.g., the *filioque*, the papacy, the Marian dogmas), certain of the theses (particularly 1, 2, 4a, 4b) have the potential not only to build upon the progress already made on the doctrinal issues, but also provide a basis for concrete action.

Thesis 1 and the Filioque

The fundamental truths of Christianity, as they are expressed in Holy Scripture, in the Apostles' Creed, and in that of Nicaea and Constantinople are binding on all partner churches of the one Church to be.

On one level this thesis is simple enough, and seemingly easy for both Catholics and Orthodox to accept, for it recognizes the normative character of the creeds as well as the fact that any sort of unity must have as its foundation the truths of the faith. Unity without truth is a false unity, for as Fries himself admitted, Christianity has 'very specific, concretely discernable contents to which faith is linked and by which faith finds its bearings'.[16] Because the church is a 'community of faith and witness, and as such requires a shared vision',[17] one cannot claim church unity exists unless there also exists agreement on what the fundamental truths of that faith are.

munio: The Unity of the Church (Grand Rapids, MI: William Eerdman's Publishing, 2010), 50.

[12] Ibid. For a Protestant critique of the Rahner-Fries theses see Eilert Herms, *Einheit der Christen in der Gemeinschaft der Kirchen: Die ökumenische Bewegung der römischen Kirche im Lichte der reformatorischen Theologie: Antwort auf den Rahner-Plan* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984).

[13] Jon Nilson, *Nothing Beyond the Necessary: Roman Catholicism and the Ecumenical Future* (New York: Paulist Press, 1995), 33; See also Robert Masson, 'Rahner and Dulles on the Unity of the Churches: The Karl Rahner Society', *CTSA Proceedings* 48 (1993): 90–92.

[14] Nilson, *Nothing Beyond the Necessary*, 33–34.

[15] For a Protestant critique of the Rahner-Fries theses see Eilert Herms, *Einheit der Christen in der Gemeinschaft der Kirchen: Die ökumenische Bewegung der römischen Kirche im Lichte der reformatorischen Theologie: Antwort auf den Rahner-Plan* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984).

[16] Rahner and Fires, *Unity of the Churches*, 13.

[17] Dulles, 'Paths to Doctrinal Agreement: Ten Theses', 32.

For both Catholic and Orthodox Christians the Scriptures and the Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed remain the normative and binding expressions of that shared Christian faith.[18] However, as anyone familiar with the history knows, it was the West's addition of the *filioque* to that creed that is often cited as the 'sole dogmatic grounds' for the schism between them.[19] For this reason, in order for both churches to better recognize and build upon their common faith, and to remove the stumbling block to unity that the *filioque* has become, it is necessary to address and (hopefully) to solve this troublesome ecumenical issue.[20]

Accomplishing this, I believe, would require three concurrent acts, all aimed at ensuring that the creed *as adopted at Constantinople in 381* be accepted and liturgically professed by both churches. The first act requires that the creed as professed in the Church of Rome, and all those churches in communion with her, should be recited in its original form, without the addition of the *filioque*, as it was during the first millennium.[21] This suggestion is hardly an original one. It was the conclusion of the WCC's Klingenthal Memorandum in 1979,[22] the North American Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation (in both 2003[23] and 2010[24]), and almost every

[18] The Apostles' Creed (*Symbolum Apostolicum*), 'a rather elaborate variant of the Old Roman Creed' has been widely used and accepted by the churches of the West (Catholic, Anglican, and Protestant) for centuries, but since it was never accepted by an ecumenical council it has traditionally been viewed with some suspicion in the East. Although 'the suspicion with which they once regarded it has disappeared', it is still regarded as a local (rather than ecumenical) creed and as such is not a binding statement of faith for the Orthodox despite general agreement with its contents. See JND Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (New York: Longman Group, 1972), 368–434.

[19] Vladimir Lossky, 'The Procession of the Holy Spirit in Orthodox Trinitarian Doctrine', in *In the Image and Likeness of God* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985), 71.

[20] I am keenly aware that for centuries people have claimed—always prematurely—to have solved the *filioque*, so that another attempt comes across as both futile and hubristic. However, as I hope becomes evident, the solution I propose, relying as it does on the theology of the first saint to address the issue, Maximos the Confessor, is nothing 'new' but rather an embrace of the two churches' shared patristic heritage.

[21] The first recorded use of the interpolated creed in Rome did not occur until 1014, when it was inserted at the insistence of Emperor Henry II. Berno of Reichenau, *Libellus de quibusdam Rebus ad Missae Officium Pertinentibus* (PL 142:1060–61).

[22] In order that Christians might again 'confess their common faith in the Holy Spirit' who is 'the one who in his fullness both rests upon Jesus Christ and is a gift of Christ to the Church', the Klingenthal Memorandum recommended that 'the original form of the third article of the creed, without the *filioque*, should everywhere be recognized as the normative one and restored'. Lukas Vischer, ed., *Spirit of God, Spirit of Christ: Ecumenical Reflections on the Filioque Controversy* (London: SPCK, 1981), 17-18.

[23] The Catholic Church, which had recognized the 'normative and irrevocable dogmatic value of the Creed of 381' in its 1995 *Clarification on the Filioque*, was asked in future 'to use the uninterpolated creed in both catechetical and liturgical settings'. This way 'the ancient Creed of Constantinople… by our uniform practice and our new attempts at mutual understanding [could become] the basis for a more conscious unity in the one faith'. 'The Filioque: A Church-Dividing Issue? An Agreed Statement of the North American Orthodox- Catholic Theological Consultation (October 25, 2003)'. *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 48 (2004): 122–23.

[24] 'The faith of Nicaea, professed by the ancient councils as the foundation of Christian faith and practice, is received most fully in the original form canonized at the Council of Constantinople in 381, as understood through the canons and prescriptions of the other ecumenical councils received by Orthodox and Catholic Christians'. For this reason 'the original Greek form of the Creed of 381, because of its authority and antiquity, should be used as the common form of our confession in both our Churches'. North American Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation. 'Steps towards a Reunited Church: A Sketch of

Catholic theologian (with some notable exceptions) who has studied the issue since the middle of the last century.[25] Most, if not all, of the Eastern Catholic churches have already dropped it. Even John Paul II and Benedict XVI have followed this course, albeit in a limited fashion, and on several occasions have omitted the *filioque* during events with Orthodox participants.[26] Hence what is suggested here is not something radical, but rather a wider application of a principle already in use. Rome, acting on behalf of all the churches in communion with her, should simply remove the *filioque,* and then the creed would henceforth be recited throughout the Catholic world without the interpolation.

Although seemingly an uncontroversial move, there are several reasons typically given why such a shift is, at least from the Catholic perspective, highly inadvisable. Some worry that the removal of the *filioque* would essentially jettison huge chunks of the Latin theological tradition, and the work of those Western saints (e.g., Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure) who wrote so eloquently in its defense. Another, as expressed by Aidan Nichols, is that 'the pastoral ill-consequences of removing an article from the creed may be quite high', signaling to Catholics that their beliefs were 'changing' or (even worse) being compromised.[27] A third fear is that such a move would not be accepted by the Orthodox in the correct spirit, and that they

an Orthodox-Catholic Vision for the Future'. Referenced at: http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/ecumenical-and-interreligious/ecumenical/orthodox/steps-towards-reunited-church.cfm

[25] André Halleux was among those who proposed that the Roman Catholic Church should simply drop the *filioque* and 'receive' the unaltered creed of 381 as the basis for reunion. André Halleux, 'Orthodoxie et Catholicisme: du personnalisme en pneumatologie', *Revue théologique de Louvain* 6 (1975): 3–30; idem, 'Pour un accord oecuménique sur la procession du Saint-Esprit et l'addition du Filioque au Symbole', *Irénikon* 47 (1975): 170–77. This last article can be found translated and expanded in 'Towards an Ecumenical Agreement on the Procession of the Holy Spirit and the Addition of the Filioque to the Creed', in Lukas Vischer, ed., *Spirit of God, Spirit of Christ*, 149–63. Yves Congar also described himself as 'categorically in favor of suppression', arguing that Rome 'as a gesture of humility and brotherhood' should remove the *filioque* from the creed. He maintained that it had been 'introduced in a canonically irregular way' in the first place, and its suppression 'if it was welcomed in a really "genuine" sense by the Orthodox Church, could create a new situation which would be favorable to the reestablishment of full communion'. Yves Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit* 3 (New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1997), 206, 214. See also idem, *Diversity and Communion*, trans. John Bowden (Mystic, Conn.: Twenty-third Publications, 1984), 97–104.

[26] When Patriarch Dimitrios I visited Rome on December 7, 1987, and again during the visit of Patriarch Bartholomew I to Rome in June 1995 . . . the Pope and Patriarch proclaimed the creed in Greek (i.e., without the *filioque*). Pope John Paul II and Romanian Patriarch Teoctist did the same in Romanian at a papal Mass in Rome on October 13, 2002. The document *Dominus Iesus: On the Unity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ and the Church*, issued by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on August 6, 2000, begins its theological considerations on the Church's central teaching with the text of the creed of 381, again without the addition of the *filioque*.

[27] He doubted that 'Church leaders could put across this distinction [i.e., between the *filioque*'s orthodoxy and place in the creed] in a forceful way'. Aidan Nichols, *Rome and the Eastern Churches: A Study in Schism* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992), 219–20. However, it is interesting to note in the 2010 edition of the same book Nichols added this footnote: 'Monsignor Franciscus Papamanolis, Latin bishop of Syros, Santorini, and Crete, assured the present author… in a conversation on 15 August 1991 that no adverse comment greeted the decision of the Holy See to remove the filioque from the vernacular creed of the Latin church of Greece'. Aidan Nichols, *Rome and the Eastern Churches: A Study in Schism*, 2nd edition (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2010), 259.

would see the *filioque*'s removal as either insufficient or (perhaps more problematically) as a Roman admission of guilt.

To alleviate these fears, it is necessary that the suppression of the *filioque* be accompanied by two other acts. The first, from Rome itself, would be a statement similar to the one made by the Catholic Church of Greece after they removed the *filioque* from the creed in May of 1973.[28] Reaffirming that this is no way entailed a rejection of the doctrine properly understood, nor addressed the larger question of whether its inclusion was licit in the first place, it made clear that this act of ecclesiastical charity and reconciliation was a brotherly gesture aimed at healing divisions in the church.

The second act, and I would argue that both the removal of the *filioque* and the Roman statement should not take place without it, is the assurance of the Orthodox that such a move would be received as the significant ecumenical gesture it is. After all, it has been a demand of the Orthodox since the ninth century, and was the only demand of the Greeks at Florence.[29] It is true that for Mark of Ephesus and others in the fifteenth century, the *filioque*'s removal would have been a *de facto* admission of its heretical nature, but modern Orthodoxy (it is hoped) should be able to appreciate the distinction. This is why any response to the *filioque*'s removal other than fraternal joy and gratitude would be counterproductive, especially if it led to some sort of Orthodox triumphalism ('We were right all along'). Although a pan-Orthodox statement recognizing the gesture in its proper spirit seems impossible given the current divisions within world-wide Orthodoxy, a statement by (at the very least) the Ecumenical Patriarchate welcoming the move and expressing its heartfelt appreciation would be in order.

Concerning the theological status of the *filioque*, since the nineteenth century scholars on both sides of the East-West divide have suggested that the Orthodox should simply accept the *filioque* as a *theologumenon*, or theological opinion, of the Western Church and be asked neither to accept nor deny it (for more on this approach see *Thesis 2*).[30] Others suggest the need for a common statement. I, however, would

[28] François Rouleau, 'A propos du "Filioque," un document: Instruction pastorale de l'épiscopat catholique de Grèce', Dieu révelé dans l'Esprit, *Les Quatre Fleuves* 9 (1979): 75–78. Theologically the decision was justified, according to Congar, 'by a knowledge … that the terms *ekporeuesthai* and *procedere* are not identical . . . as confirmed by the declaration made by Maximus the Confessor'. Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol 3, 207.

[29] According to Mark of Ephesus, 'This Symbol, this noble heritage of our Fathers, we demand back from you. Restore it then as you received it… The addition of a word seems to you a small matter and of no great consequence. So then to remove it would cost you nothing; indeed it would be of the greatest profit, for it would bind together all Christians… It [i.e., the filioque] was added in the exercise of mercy; in the exercise of mercy remove it again so that you may receive to your bosoms brethren torn apart who value fraternal love so highly'. Joseph Gill, ed., *Quae supersunt Actorum Graecorum Concilii Florentini: Res Ferrariae gestae*, CF 5.1.1 (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 1953), 216 (Eng. trans: idem, *The Council of Florence* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959], 163).

[30] In his 'Twenty-seven Theses on the Filioque' Boris Bolotov claimed that given the fathers' teaching on procession through or from the Son, the *filioque*—understood as expression of the eternal relationship between the Son and the Spirit and not the Spirit's eternal coming-into-being—could not 'simply [be]

argue that all this is unnecessary given the fact that there already exists a 'common statement' on what the *filioque* means, and that it was authored almost fourteen centuries ago by a saint recognized in both East and West, Maximus the Confessor.

The statement, found in Maximus' *Letter to Marinus*, provides a firm basis for a mutually acceptable teaching on the *filioque* that captures the Western position (the eternal *proienai* or 'flowing forth') of the Holy Spirit through the Son while safeguarding the monarchy of the Father by making him the sole cause of the Holy Spirit's eternal coming into being (*ekporeuesthai*).[31] At several points during the Florentine council, this formula was suggested as a means to reunion[32] and it was Mark of Ephesus himself who claimed that 'the words of the Eastern and Western fathers can only be reconciled… by means of the explanation given them in the *Epistle* of Maximus'.[33] According to Mark, if the Latins accepted, in word and thought, the teachings of Maximus, the union could proceed.

Although the Latins at Florence were not yet prepared to do this (despite the fact that it was they who first introduced the *Letter*), increasingly Catholic scholars and hierarchs have come to see Maximus' teaching as an hermeneutical lens for better understanding the West's teaching on the *filioque*—an approach far different than the one taken by earlier generations, where later teachings provided the hermeneutic for Maximus. The 1995 Vatican clarification went a long way toward doing this,[34] something which the Orthodox themselves recognized as a significant advancement despite wishing it had gone further in addressing the issue of 'causality'.[35] Of course,

regard[ed] as the private opinion of a father' but instead must be accorded 'the value of an ecumenical *theologoumenon*'. He clarified that '*theologoumena* I rate highly, but…I quite sharply distinguish them from dogmas. The content of a dogma is truth: the content of a *theologoumena* is only what is probable. The realm of a dogma is *necessaria*, the realm of a *theologoumena* is *dubia*: *In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas*!' Basil Bolotov, 'Thesen über das Filioque von einem russischen Theologen', *Revue internationale de Théologie* 6 (1898): 682.

[31] 'From this (i.e., the writings of the fathers) they showed that they themselves do not make the Son the cause of the Spirit for they know that the Father is the one cause of the Son and the Spirit, the one by begetting and the other by procession, but they show the progression through him and thus the unity of the essence'. Maximus the Confessor, *Opusculum* 10 (PG 91:136).

[32] Emperor John VIII asked the assembled Greek delegates: 'If we should discover that the Latins gladly accept whatever Holy Maximus relates in his *Letter to Marinus* on the subject of the Holy Spirit, does it not seem good to you that we should unite through it?' Syropoulos, *Memoirs*, 8.12 in V. Laurent, ed., *Les Mémoires du Grand Ecclésiarque de l'Église de Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos sur le Concile de Florence* (1438–1439), CF 9 (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 1971), 400.

[33] Syropoulos, *Memoirs* 9.19 in V. Laurent, *Les Mémoires*, 452–54 (Eng. trans.: Joseph Gill, *The Council of Florence*, 260).

[34] 'In the seventh century, the Byzantines were shocked by a confession of faith made by the Pope and including the *filioque* with reference to the procession of the Holy Spirit; they translated the procession inaccurately by *ekporeusthai*. St Maximus the Confessor then wrote a letter from Rome linking together the two approaches—Cappadocian and Latin-Alexandrian—to the eternal origin of the Spirit: the Father is the sole principle without principle (in Greek *aitia*) of the Son and of the Spirit; the Father and the Son are consubstantial source of the procession (*to proienai*) of this same Spirit'. 'The Greek and Latin Traditions Regarding the Procession of the Holy Spirit', *Catholic International* 7 (1996): 36–43.

[35] 'As Saint Maximus the Confessor insisted, however, in defense of the Roman use of the *Filioque*, the decisive thing in this defense lies precisely in the point that in using the Filioque the Romans do not imply a "cause" other than the Father. The notion of "cause" seems to be of special significance and importance in

even a shared acknowledgement of the *Letter to Marinus* as normative would still allow for a variety of trinitarian models and theologies, but this legitimate diversity would all take place within the boundaries set by Maximus's teaching. Neither side would have to accept or reject anything they have not already affirmed in their common acceptance of Maximus.

Thesis 2 and the Marian Doctrines

'Nothing may be rejected decisively and confessionally in one partner church which is binding dogma in another partner church' nor may any 'explicit and positive confession in one partner church… be imposed as dogma obligatory for another partner church'.

The second thesis in the Rahner-Fries program was among the more controversial of their proposals, because (as Cardinal Dulles noted) 'withholding assent to a dogma was essentially no different to doubting or even to denying it'. It was, in the minds of many, the worst sort of ecumenism—the least common denominator variety, bordering on what is popularly known as cafeteria Christianity. One could be part of the church and simply choose which doctrines to affirm, simply ignoring those dogmas with which one had difficulties. The 'tyranny of relativism' in its worst form.[36]

Outside of *Pastor Aeternus* and the *filioque* (dealt with in the other theses), the doctrinal issues often cited as ecumenical stumbling blocks, especially given the method of their promulgation, are the two Marian dogmas of the Catholic Church—the Immaculate Conception and Assumption. Part of the problem, of course, is that both doctrines were promulgated in papal documents (*Ineffabilis Deus* in 1854, *Munificentissimus Deus* in 1950) whose teachings are now regarded as infallible. Historically it has been very difficult for the Orthodox to disentangle the content of the two dogmas from the manner of their promulgation, which has often resulted in their automatic rejection.

Here, I believe, the Rahner-Fries Theses may be of some assistance, because as it concerns these two teachings there is no real question of the Orthodox denying the essential content of either, even if there are some difficulties with their dogmatic formulations. Celebrations of the Dormition in the East go back to the fifth century,[37]

the Greek Patristic argument concerning the Filioque. If Roman Catholic theology would be ready to admit that the Son in no way constitutes a "cause" (*aition*) in the procession of the Spirit, this would bring the two traditions much closer to each other with regard to the Filioque'. John Zizioulas, 'One Single Source: An Orthodox Response to the Clarification on the Filioque', http://agrino.org/cyberdesert/zizioulas.htm.

[36] There is a difference between the epistemological tolerance criticized by Ratzinger in his famous homily on the 'tyranny of relativism' at the 2005 funeral of Pope John Paul II, and legitimate diversity existing within the one church. For an Orthodox view see John Zizioulas, 'Uniformity, Diversity and the Unity of the Church,' *The One and the Many: Studies on God, Man, the Church and the World Today*, (Alhambra, CA: Sebastian Press, 2010), 333-348.

[37] Stephen J. Shoemaker, *Ancient Traditions of the Virgin Mary's Dormition and Assumption*' (Oxford:

and in its hymns the Orthodox Church teaches that Mary died a natural death, that she was assumed body and soul into heaven, and that it was there that Christ himself received her—in icons Mary's pure soul is usually depicted in Christ's hands as an infant.[38] While the Catholic doctrine maintains a silence about her death—Pius XII was deliberately ambiguous in the definition by using the phrase 'having completed the course of her earthly life'—in content the teachings of both churches are the same.[39]

The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is more complicated, especially as it ties into Augustine's teaching on original sin and the idea of ancestral guilt—i.e., do we inherit simply the consequences of Adam's sin (e.g., corruption of the will and mortality) or do we also carry the guilt of it? Leaving aside for the moment the compatibility of the two traditions on this question today—the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* issued in 1992 and the International Theological Commission's 2007 document 'The Hope of Salvation for Infants Who Die without Being Baptized' sound almost 'Orthodox' on the subject [40]—it is clear that the Western debate on the Immaculate Conception took place with a particular understanding of ancestral guilt in mind. John Meyendorff wrote from the Orthodox perspective that given the Mariological piety of the Byzantines and their clear teaching on Mary's sinlessness, if they had shared that understanding of original sin they certainly 'would have accepted the dogma of the Immaculate Conception as it was defined in 1854'.[41] However, they did not. Yet at the same time Meyendorff quoted several hymns and authors who praised Mary as 'fully prepared', 'cleansed', and 'sanctified' for the in-

Oxford University Press, 2003).

[38] 'At the sovereign command of God, the God-bearing apostles were caught up from every place, and when they came to your all-pure body from which life has come, they kissed it with love. The heavenly powers also came with their master, and in awe escorted the body all-pure and well-pleasing to God: the body which had received God in the flesh! And with dignity they went before and invisibly cried out to the most high powers: Behold, the Queen of all and the Maiden of God is coming! Be lifted up, O gates! And lift up her who is the mother of the Everlasting Light, for through her was accomplished the salvation of all!' Vespers for the Dormition

[39] Kallistos Ware is clear that 'Orthodoxy…firmly believes in [Mary's] bodily Assumption' and that this teaching 'is clearly and unambiguously affirmed in the hymns sung by the Church on 15 August'. Timothy Ware, *The Orthodox Church: An Introduction to Eastern Christianity* (New York: Penguin, 2015), 252–53.

[40] The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* teaches that 'By yielding to the tempter, Adam and Eve committed a personal sin, but this sin affected the human nature that they would then transmit in a fallen state. It is a sin which will be transmitted by propagation to all mankind, that is, by the transmission of a human nature deprived of original holiness and justice. And that is why original sin is called "sin" only in an analogical sense: it is a sin "contracted" and not "committed"—a state and not an act. Although it is proper to each individual, original sin does not have the character of a personal fault in any of Adam's descendants. It is a deprivation of original holiness and justice, but human nature has not been totally corrupted: it is wounded in the natural powers proper to it, subject to ignorance, suffering and the dominion of death, and inclined to sin—an inclination to evil that is called concupiscence. Baptism, by imparting the life of Christ's grace, erases original sin and turns a man back towards God, but the consequences for nature, weakened and inclined to evil, persist in man and summon him to spiritual battle' (CCC, 404–5).

[41] John Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1975), 148.

carnation of Christ,[42] and cited Gennadios Scholarios as the an explicit proponent of the doctrine, while more recently scholars have found other examples (e.g., Gregory Palamas, Mark of Ephesus) of saints who upheld the teaching. [43] The liturgical appellations of Mary as 'All-Holy' [*Panagia*] and even 'spotless' [*achrantos*]) come very close to the Catholic teaching on the Immaculate Conception, even if framed in a non-dogmatic way. True, there are some Orthodox who believe the Roman dogma is in danger of exalting Mary 'to an equality with God' by separating her from the rest of humanity,[44] but even these figures praise her as 'ever-blessed and most pure… more honorable than the cherubim, and more glorious beyond compare than the seraphim'.[45]

And thus, while then Cardinal Ratzinger might criticize the Rahner-Fries theses for their epistemological tolerance, the fact is that, at least as it concerns the Catholic-Orthodox divide and the Marian dogmas, great tolerance is not really called for. Rome would simply be asked to not to impose the Marian doctrines upon the Orthodox Church, assured that the essence of both teachings is already confessed by them liturgically. In return, the Orthodox would not reject the 1854 and 1950 dogmatic framing of the two doctrines because, in substance if not in exact formula, these teachings are already part of their Tradition.[46] This is clearly not least common denominator ecumenism or the tyranny of relativism.

Thesis 4a and the Papal Office

'All partner churches acknowledge the meaning and right of the Petrine service of the Ro-

[42] Ibid., 147. Meyendorff does contextualize these writings within both 'the doctrine of original sin that prevailed in the East' and 'the poetical, emotional, or rhetorical exaggerations characteristic of Byzantine liturgical Mariology' Ibid., 147–48.

[43] Christiaan Kappes, *The Immaculate Conception: Why Thomas Aquinas Denied, While John Duns Scotus, Gregory Palamas, and Mark Eugenicus Professed the Absolute Immaculate Existence of Mary* (Bedford, MA: Academy of the Immaculate, 2014).

[44] John Maximovitch, *The Orthodox Veneration of Mary, the Birthgiver of God*, trans. Seraphim Rose (Platina, CA: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1978), 52.

[45] Kallistos Ware points out that 'although a great majority of Orthodox have rejected the doctrine… the Orthodox Church has never in fact made any formal and definitive pronouncement on the matter'. He also recognizes that although 'individual Orthodox have made statements which, if not definitely affirming the doctrine… at any rate approach close to it', in the end 'the whole question belongs to the realm of theological opinion'. Timothy Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 252.

[46] It would not be dissimilar to the agreement reached with the Oriental Orthodox at Chambésy in 1990, when the Orthodox affirmed that 'in light of our Agreed Statement on Christology as well as of the above common affirmations, we have now clearly understood that both families have always loyally maintained the same authentic Orthodox Christological faith, and the unbroken continuity of the apostolic tradition, though they have used Christological terms in different ways. It is this common faith and continuous loyalty to the Apostolic Tradition that should be the basis for our unity and communion'. Simply put, different words do not immediately mean that there is a different faith. See Paul Ladouceur, 'Orthodox Critiques of the Agreed Statements between the Orthodox and the Oriental Orthodox Churches', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 60 (2016), 333–68; Christine Chaillot, ed., *The Dialogue between the Eastern Orthodox and the Oriental Orthodox Churches* (Volos GR: Volos Academy Publications, 2016).

man pope to be the concrete guarantor of the unity of the church in truth and love'

It is with discussion of the papacy that things get a bit trickier. As formulated, this thesis should be acceptable to the Orthodox, especially as recent examinations of the papacy from both sides (e.g., Paul McPartlan, Hermann Pottmeyer, JMR Tillard Olivier Clément) have refocused discussions away from the pope's powers to instead concentrate on his role as servant of unity.[47] Pope John Paul's encyclical *Ut Unum Sint* (1995) focused on this theme, and even asked other churches (particularly the Orthodox) how best this service of unity may be exercised in 'a new situation' while at the same time 'in no way renouncing what is essential to its mission'. [48]

As for the primacy itself, historically speaking there is no doubt that for centuries Orthodoxy did recognize the primacy of Rome—setting aside for the moment *how* it attained that primacy—and conciliarly granted to the Bishop of Rome certain powers (e.g., the Sardican Privilege) that allowed him to serve the unity of the Church when normal structures were unable to do so. Despite the East's general acceptance of the principle of accommodation—the ecclesial structures mirror political realities and thus Rome achieved her primacy because she was the imperial capital—there is also more than enough evidence to support that the contention that the pope's 'petrine' claims were widely accepted in the East until the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. During the conciliar period when doctrinal or other issues arose that could not be resolved by local bishops or synods, everyone looked to Rome, whose significance (whatever the exact reasons) no-one seriously doubted.[49] True, the East did not recognize anything akin to universal jurisdiction during the first millennium, despite the attempts of Catholic polemicists to spin the evidence that way, but it would be equally false to claim, as the Orthodox have done and continue to do, that Rome's primacy was merely honorific, without the real authority, recognized by all, to help guarantee the unity of the church.

[47] Olivier Clément, *You Are Peter: An Orthodox Theologian's Reflection on the Exercise of Papal Primacy*, trans. M.S. Laird (New York: New City Press, 2003); J.M.R. Tillard, *Church of Churches: The Ecclesiology of Communion*, trans. R. C. De Peaux (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992); Paul McPartlan, *A Service of Love: Papal Primacy, the Eucharist, and Church Unity* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2013); Hermann Pottmeyer, *Towards a Papacy in Communion: Perspectives from Vatican Councils I & II* (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1998).

[48] For a whole millennium Christians were united in 'a brotherly fraternal communion of faith and sacramental life… If disagreements in belief and discipline arose among them, the Roman See acted by common consent as moderator' In this way the primacy exercised its office of unity. When addressing the Ecumenical Patriarch His Holiness Dimitrios I, I acknowledged my awareness that 'for a great variety of reasons, and against the will of all concerned, what should have been a service sometimes manifested itself in a very different light. But… it is out of a desire to obey the will of Christ truly that I recognize that as Bishop of Rome I am called to exercise that ministry… I insistently pray the Holy Spirit to shine his light upon us, enlightening all the Pastors and theologians of our Churches, that we may seek—together, of course—the forms in which this ministry may accomplish a service of love recognized by all concerned' John Paul II, *Ut Unum Sint* (Boston: Pauline Books and Media, 1995), 95.

[49] See Vincent Twomey, *Apostolikos Thronos. The Primacy of Rome as Reflected in the Church History of Eusebius and the Historico-apologetic Writings of Saint Athanasius the Great*, Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie 49, (Münster: Aschendorff, 1982).

Thus the question for the Orthodox, at least until relations deteriorated after the Fourth Crusade, was never Rome's role as 'the Church which presides in love', but rather the limits of its authority and whether circumstances merited his direct involvement in the affairs of another local church.[50] The question was more often than not a matter of interpretation—i.e., had events occurred jeopardizing ecclesial communion, thus requiring the pope's intervention as guarantor of the church's unity? The case of Photios is the perfect example—for the Constantinopolitans this was an internal affair that did not need Roman interference, while for Pope Nicholas Ignatius's appeal to Rome against an unlawful deposition gave the pope the right to judge the matter.[51]

As time went on, of course, Rome became (to use the modern term) more 'proactive' in ensuring unity, not only coming to the rescue when asked, but also inserting itself where it clearly was not wanted. This development was largely the result of the Gregorian Reform, when guaranteeing the unity and reform of the church was thought to require more direct Roman involvement, and the pope's powers grew exponentially as a result. Yet for most of the first millennium this was not the case. All agreed that the pope had a role in serving the unity of the church, but where East and West differed was when exactly this authority should be brought into play. If the church today is going to use the first millennium as a model, but at the same time avoid the problems of interpretation that plagued it then, what is required is some clarity as to when papal power should be employed in the service of unity, especially in those churches outside the patriarchate of the West.

Thesis 4b and the Limits of Papal Power

'The pope, for his part, explicitly commits himself to acknowledge and to respect the thus agreed upon independence of the partner churches'.

While not directly treating the 'universal jurisdiction' granted to the pope by *Pastor Aeternus*, what this thesis does is contextualize it by guaranteeing that the pope will only become involved in the affairs of other local churches when absolutely necessary. He *can* act (or even better, be asked to act) throughout the church in times of crisis, when the normal processes no longer serve their purpose, but he would pledge that under ordinary circumstances he would not insert himself into the affairs of other churches. Essentially this is the application of the principle of

[50] For the evolution of the Eastern response to the papacy's rise see A. Edward Siecienski, 'Byzantium and the Papacy from the Fifth to Fifteenth Centuries: The Three Stage Response', in A. Bucossi and A. Calia eds, *Contra Latinos et Adversus Graecos: The Separation between Rome and Constantinople from the Ninth to the Fifteenth Century* (Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2020), 1-30.

[51] Despite its age, Francis Dvornik's *The Photian Schism: History and Legend* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948) remains an invaluable resource for understanding the political and ecclesial complexities of the schism.

subsidiarity to the exercise of the papal office—i.e., affairs would be handled locally until they cannot be. [52]

Today, as a matter of practice (not dogma) the Bishop of Rome is very involved in the affairs of local churches in communion with him because over the centuries popes have seen this as necessary for protecting Catholic unity. Various offices in the Vatican select the world's bishops,[53] approve local translations of liturgical books, oversee canonical processes, and investigate perceived deviations from Church teaching. Thesis 4b imagines a future church where the pope, recognizing the ability of local, metropolitan, and patriarchal churches to carry out their functions without this level of involvement, would act only in extraordinary circumstances when the unity of the church demanded it. It would be, historically speaking, a return to the situation that existed during the first millennium.

However, as was the case during the first millennium, there will inevitably be differences of opinion as to when these extraordinary circumstances have come to pass. In order to avoid these debates some concrete guidelines would need to be outlined. What specific powers should the East recognize as necessary to the pope's petrine mission to maintain unity? Thankfully, history offers at least one example of a mutually agreeable formula. The plan, first proposed in the year 1253 by the Emperor John III Vatatzes (1222–54) with the support of Patriarch Manuel II (1244–54), was accepted by Pope Innocent IV (1243–54), although the death of all three parties in quick succession prevented its adoption.

The agreed-upon formula suggested that along with 'complete acknowledgement and profession' of Rome's primacy over the other patriarchal sees, there should also be recognition of the pope's right to hear the appeals of bishops who disputed the decisions of regional councils.[54] This, of course, is the famous 'Sardican privilege' that in 342/343 granted the Bishop of Rome the right to receive appeals from deposed bishops.[55] Essentially it was the synod's way of addressing the problem raised by

[52] Because of the fear that subsidiarity would also apply to matters of faith, some reject the term when applied to the Church (preferring collegiality or synodality). Philip Brown, p.s.s., 'The 1983 Code and Vatican II Ecclesiology: The Principle of Subsidiarity in Book V', *The Jurist: Studies in Church Law and Ministry* 69 (2009): 583–614; N. Knoepffler and M. O'Malley 'Karl Rahner and Pope Francis on Papal Ministry: Towards an Ecumenical Ecclesiology of Communion and Subsidiarity', *Ecclesiology* 13 (2017): 55–82.

[53] According to both the 1917 and 1983 Codes of Canon Law the power of appointing a bishop normally belongs to the pope, although the 1917 code acknowledged there were exceptions based on preexisting agreements with certain secular powers. The current code says 'The Supreme Pontiff freely appoints bishops or confirms those legitimately elected' (CIC 377 §1). However, historically speaking the right of the pope to appoint bishops is relatively new.

[54] Theodosius T Haluščynskyj and Meletius M Wojnar, eds., *Acta Alexandri PP VI (1254–1261)* (Rome: Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1966), 28 (Eng. trans: Joseph Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy 1198–1400* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1979), 92–93.

[55] The Council of Sardica (342/3), which had been convened by the Emperors Constans and Constantius II following the Council of Nicaea, issued several canons concerning church discipline, including one pertaining to appeals. Hamilton Hess, *The Canons of the Council of Sardica: A Landmark in the Early Development of Canon Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958); Herman Josef Sieben, 'Sanctissimi Petri apostoli memoriam honoremus. Die Sardicensischen Appellationskanones im Wandel der Geschichte',

the deposition of Athanasius, for if one wanted to appeal the unjust sentence of a regional synod, going to 'the Roman bishop… [seemed] a more desirable alternative than being at the mercy of political powers and factional intrigue'.[56]

It is interesting to note that even as late as the thirteenth century, long after Byzantine polemicists had begun attacking the authority and pretentions of the papacy, few (if any) Orthodox questioned his conciliarly granted right to hear appeals. During the debate of Niketas of Nikodemia and Anselm of Havelburg in 1136, Niketas maintained that he had never 'deni[ed] or reject[ed] the primacy of the Roman Church… [where] all the others made appeal in problematic ecclesiastical cases'.[57] Even during the heated exchanges of the Latin occupation following the Fourth Crusade the Greeks never denied that a patriarch deposed by a synod of his own church could appeal to the Roman pope just as Athanasius had done.[58]

If one wanted to extend this principle for the good of the present-day Church, one could also include the right of the pope to hear appeals from patriarchs disputing with one another, when, for example, they sever communion because of disagreements over jurisdiction. As with the Sardican privilege, the pope would not necessarily serve as judge in such cases but could instead delegate others—perhaps other bishops, metropolitans, patriarchs—to 'judge according as they think right'.

The second part of John III Vatatzes's plan was that in disputed matters of faith the pope's decisions were to receive 'canonical obedience' from all 'provided they did not oppose the gospel and the canonical precepts'—an ambiguous formula it must be admitted, but one that did recognize the historical reality that Rome had played a key role in settling previous doctrinal disputes.[59] At councils, the pope would have the right to 'give his opinion before others,… have precedence in proposing his judgment', and on all decrees he shall have 'the first place and the first signature'.[60] This last bit is interesting for it sidestepped the issue of who should call and preside at councils—the Greeks believing that this right belonged to the emperor, while the

Theologie und Philosophie 58 (1983):501–34; C.H. Turner, 'The Genuineness of the Sardican Canons', *Journal of Theological Studies* 3 (1902): 370–97.

[56] In such cases the pope was not to serve as judge, but merely determine whether the case should be reviewed, and then, if necessary, to send 'presbyters bearing his authority' to the province to 'judge according as they think right'. 'Strictly speaking, Rome was not yet established as a genuine court of appeal', but Sardica is nevertheless important because it gave to the pope, by conciliar legislation, a role and authority not possessed by any other bishop. Klaus Schatz, *Papal Primacy: From Its Origins to the Present*, trans. John Otto and Linda Maloney (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1996), 25.

[57] Anselm of Havelberg. *Anticimenon: On the Unity of the Faith and the Controversies with the Greeks*, trans. Ambrose Criste and Carol Neel, Cictertian Studies 232 (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2010), 169.

[58] August Heisenberg, ed., *Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des lateinischen Kaisertums und der Kirchenunion 1: Der Epitaphios des Nikolaos Mesarites auf seinen Bruder Johannes* (Munich: Verlag der bayer. Akad. der Wissenschaften, 1922), 57 (Eng. trans: Michael Angold, *Nicholas Mesarites: His Life and Work in Translation* [Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2017], 178-79).

[59] Theodosius T Haluščynskyj and Meletius M Wojnar, eds., *Acta Alexandri PP VI (1254–1261)*, 28 (Eng. trans: Joseph Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy 1198–1400*, 92–93).

[60] Ibid.

Latins had long held that the pope had this power.[61] Here the pope was granted, if not necessarily the right to convene such a gathering, at the very least the first and most powerful voice at it.

Today, in the absence of an emperor, the right to call councils in the Orthodox world remains unsettled—the results of the 2016 Great and Holy Council of Crete make this abundantly clear—but certainly it would not be unreasonable in a future united church to grant this right to the Bishop of Rome, in consultation with the other patriarchs. The 2010 'Steps toward a Reunited Church' issued by the North American Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation thought so, maintaining that the pope's 'universal role would also be expressed in convoking and presiding over regular synods of patriarchs of all the Churches, and over ecumenical councils, when they should occur'.[62]

These specific powers, if granted by the Orthodox and agreed to by the Catholics as voluntary limits on papal authority, would go a long way toward addressing the ecumenical stumbling block of *Pastor Aeternus*. It does not, I admit, completely untie the Gordian knot of Vatican I, but by refocusing the pope's petrine ministry on the service of unity, and then distinguishing what he *can* do in extraordinary circumstances to preserve communion and what he *should* do under normal conditions, it does loosen it a bit. As for the actual doctrines contained in *Pastor Aeternus*, it was Cardinal Ratzinger himself who first suggested that 'Rome must not require more from the East with respect to the doctrine of primacy than had been formulated and was lived in the first millennium'.[63] In accepting thesis 4a and the powers/

[61] This issue had first been raised following the Lateran Synod of 649, when Pope Martin I and Maximus the Confessor organized a council—without imperial approval—to condemn the monothelite heresy. Both during and after the synod, Maximus's and Martin's actions indicate that in their minds this gathering was a genuinely ecumenical council, directly challenging the long-held and universally recognized right of the emperor to call such a gathering. For Maximus it was the Orthodox faith, not imperial recognition, that dictated the legitimacy of councils. Whether they were aware of it or not, in suggesting a council could be called by the pope without the emperor's consent, Maximus and his Roman allies 'were claiming nothing less than a revolutionary role for the papacy… boldly challenging the emperor's authority to supervise and direct divine matters'. In subsequent years the popes had called several 'ecumenical councils' without imperial (or Eastern) involvement. See Catherine Cubitt 'The Lateran Council of 649 as an Ecumenical Council', *Chalcedon in Context: Church Councils 400--700*, Richard Price and Mary Whitby, eds. (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009), 133–47; Rudolf Riedinger, "Die Lateransynode von 649 und Maximos der Bekenner," in *Maximus Confessor. Actes du Symposium sur Maxime le Confesseur, Fribourg, 2-5 septembre 1980*, ed. Felix Heinzer and Christoph Schönborn (Fribourg-en-Suisse: Editions Universitaires, 1982): 111–21.

[62] North American Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation, 'Steps towards a Reunited Church: A Sketch of an Orthodox-Catholic Vision for the Future', Referenced at: http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/ecumenical-and-interreligious/ecumenical/orthodox/steps-towards-reunited-church.cfm

[63] Joseph Ratzinger, 'The Ecumenical Situation: Orthodoxy, Catholicism, and Protestantism', in *Principles of Catholic Theology: Building Stones for a Fundamental Theology* (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 1987), 198–99. See Richard A. Mattiussi, *The Ratzinger Formula: A Catalyst for the Unfolding Dialogue between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches on 'Conciliarity and Primacy,'* (Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 2010). In fact, the 'Ratzinger formula' was the inspiration for the Rahner-Fries' book, the authors' calling it as 'the one conceivable solution' to the ecumenical impasse created by *Pastor Aeternus*. Rahner and Fries, *Unity of the Churches*, 70.

limits entailed in thesis 4b, the Orthodox of today would essentially be doing exactly that. It should be noted that even as late as the thirteenth century Pope Innocent IV was willing to accept the Eastern plan, and the specific powers entailed therein, so the question becomes why the popes of the twenty-first century should ask for more.

Conclusion

Karl Rahner, unlike his brother Hugo, was not a Church historian, and had relatively little interaction with the Christian East. Although he and Fries often used the Eastern Catholics as examples of how different rites can coexist within the same church, it is obvious that *Unity of the Churches* was aimed at the West and the churches of the Reformation. And yet the theses they proposed, when applied to the Catholic-Orthodox situation and coupled with the theological dialogues taking place on both an unofficial and official level, have the ability to provide the foundation for concrete action. As was stated at the beginning, it is unlikely that the schism will be eliminated overnight, but at the same time any move forward brings the two churches ever closer to that day when it will occur. The Catholic-Orthodox dialogue is on the cusp—not there, but almost. We cannot yet solve all the theological issues that divide us, but we can eliminate or lessen some of them by applying some of the recommendations contained herein. The danger, of course, is that the fruits of the dialogues will be left to wither on the vine, and that the loss of momentum will lead to inaction. One may note, with some sadness, how discussions between the Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox have all but settled the theological issues between them and yet nothing has come of it. Having come so far, it would be a shame if the same thing should happen here.

Schmemann's Approach To The Sacramental Life Of The Church: Its Orthodox Positioning, Its Catholic Intent

MANUEL SUMARES
Associate Professor of Philosophy,
The Catholic University of Portugal, Braga

> […] we need in *this* world the experience of the *other* world, its beauty, depth, treasure, the experience of the Kingdom of God and its Sacrament – the Eucharist.
>
> Alexander Schmemann, *The Journals*, p. 24–25.

The nominalist contagion has become transversal in contemporary culture. Schmemann sees it as pervasive in Western Christianity, but it can be also found in the Eastern Church in the excessive ritualism and formalism associated with Byzantium: in sum, Orthodoxism and the issue of clericalism. Moreover, the transversality of nominalism is such that it practically defines secularism with its own universalist pretensions. The two great church bodies that see themselves as apostolic and catholic would do well to look back to Schmemann's criteria for the right kind of consolidations, especially in regard to sacramental realism, to break the hold of nominalism. In exploring this theme, we shall note Paul Ricoeur's critical hermeneutics to bring forth the peculiarities of Schmemann's Orthodox positioning, and, we shall briefly allude to some facets of Donald Davidson's theory of radical interpretation to suggest how the dialogue might proceed, as well as Bulgakov's own take on *Una Sancta* and where it meets one of Schmemann's crucial concerns.

1

The issue of 'Mapping the *Una Sancta*' would have interested Father Alexander Schmemann. To begin with, from the time of his upbringing in Paris to his mission on behalf of the Orthodox Church in North America, his relationship with the Roman Catholic Church was been never less than meaningful.[1] Along with his

[1] In his *Journals* he would recall his student life in Paris and the positive experience of stopping by to hear parts of the Catholic Mass. He associated with it the same intuition that he experienced as an Orthodox and will have a place in this essay, namely, 'the coexistence of two heterogeneous worlds, the presence in this world of something absolutely and totally "other." This "other" illumines everything, in one way or

stature among modern Orthodox theologians and besides his familiarity with the Catholic world, his quest for a satisfying expression of Orthodoxy's call to catholicity makes Schmemann an especially pertinent figure for the meeting's theme. His concerns are primarily directed at his own church's difficulties in that matter. In regard specifically to the Eastern Church, the new cultural contexts in which she increasingly finds herself put into relief how much ethnic baggage from her peoples' ancestral homelands have been brought with them to those contexts. And this would include an uncritical attachment to a later 'illustrative' Byzantine style of worship that gradually dilutes the ontological grounding of her earlier worshipping practices that assumed sacramental realism. A pernicious nominalism gradually showed itself in its excessive formality that came to obscure the reality of Christ and His Kingdom as revealed in the Gospels. In his posthumously published *Journals*, he confesses, 'I realise how spiritually tired I am of this "Orthodoxism", of all the fuss with Byzantium, Russia, way of life, spirituality, church affairs, piety, of all these rattles […] All of it appears to me to have no common measure with Christ and His commandments'.[2] And, in a later entry, he expresses his disquiet in this way: '[…] I feel that the West is my native land, my air. Rome, not to mention Paris, are closer to me than Athens, Istanbul, Palestine […]'.[3] So, the West matters to him enough that he cannot possibly pretend not to belong to it. As far as the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church is concerned, the same kind of realism is called for.

It is the lasting influence of Byzantium on the Orthodox mind that lies at the root of Schmemann's personal *angst* about the matter. However, it should be said that not every Westerner who is also Orthodox feels the same. Nor does Schmemann ignore the impressive creativity of truly lasting import for the Christian Church in the early and middle periods of Byzantine culture. Among these achievements, he recognises enduring significance in the patristic writings, the dogmatic settlements of the Ecumenical Councils, and, with some reservations, the ascetic culture and prayer life of monastics. These contain the universalistic core of the Eastern Church's doctrinal teaching and devotional practices. For him, they speak to the human condition and its renewed and enhanced possibilities, generated by God's philanthropic and saving action on behalf of all humankind. Nevertheless, Schmemann does raise the important issue of the Orthodox Church's capacity to effectively express the catholic

another. Everything is related to it—the Church as the Kingdom of God among and inside us.' *The Journals of Father Alexander Schmemann (1973–1983)* translated by Juliana Schmemann (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2000), 19. Besides his interest in the works of Catholic theologians, specifically those associated with *La nouvelle théologie* and the idea of returning to the Fathers as an important resource for overcoming the dominance of neo-scholastic theology in their Church, he became an Orthodox observer at the Second Vatican Council. From the Catholic side, Fr Richard John Neuhaus's admirable and admiring recollection of him in, 'A Man in Full', written on the occasion of Schmemann's posthumous publication of his *Journals* in the influential periodical, *First Things* (January, 2001), gives us a picture of a man to be reckoned with.

[2] *The Journals,* 146.

[3] *The Journals*, 210.

vocation that inheres in her. With the Fall of Constantinople in 1453, the Byzantine culture that characterised the Church at that time remained relatively undisturbed, and, in the aftermath of its isolation from the West, it continued to inform the essential style of the national churches in the East that retained it as an expression of their Orthodoxy during the intervening centuries. Not only do they persist today as fragmented jurisdictions, the catholic intent that they claim will seem odd and idiosyncratic in contexts that are not organically Orthodox. It is an issue that preoccupied him from very early on in his writings. For example, in his foreword to *The Historical Road of the Eastern Orthodoxy*, originally published in 1963.

> I have always been amazed by the absence within the Orthodox Church of historical reflection aimed at the whole Church, at the Church as a totality. Our historical memory seems to be fragmented into local and national memories, just as—alas—is our Church life itself. Yet without the restoration of a common and truly 'catholic' memory, without a common understanding of our common past, we shall not recover that catholicity, that universality of Orthodox life and experience which we confess and proclaim to be the very essence of our Tradition.[4]

By his own admission, the writing of this book represents a personal reflection, aiming notably at detecting critical moments of transitions 'in the long historical pilgrimage of Orthodoxy'.[5] He often discovers in them ambiguous ecclesiastical policies that still compromise the catholic vocation of the Eastern Church. Yet, though finding the situation bothersome and a source of spiritual discomfort, Schmemann maintains a high view of the witness that the Orthodox Church is meant to provide 'for the life of the world'. In his later *Journals*, he formulates the state of mind that he mostly maintained throughout in his writings:

[4] Alexander Schmemann, *The Historical Road of Eastern Orthodoxy* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1977), v. In *The Journals,* a much later text, Schmemann leaves us with this observation: '[…] nothing at all has harmed the Christianity and the Church as much as the merging of Christianity with nationalism, of the Church with the natural order of things'. (152) In both cases, the ontological difference of the Church is sacrificed to a reified onticity.

[5] In the section of his useful and insightful presentation of modern Orthodox theologians, Father Andrew Louth's opinion of *The Historical Road of Eastern Orthodoxy* was limited to being 'derivative' and a projection of Schmemann's dislike of Peter the Great upon the Byzantine emperors. (Andrew Louth, Modern Orthodox Thinkers: From the Philokalia *to the Present* (Lonkon: SPCK, 2015), 198. Granted that there is no particular surprise in the actual 'givens' pertaining to the history of the Church that were included in Schmemann's version of it, it reveals much more than Louth supposed in his summary opinion. Reading back into the earlier work from the last ones, including *The Journals*, *The Historical Road* reveals a discrete but complex reasoning about where things went wrong. Though the core conditions of Orthodox faith remain intact, it has the obligation to be more than that what it has been and, indeed, is. Such is the conviction and message that remain constant throughout his writings.

> I feel that my heart cries for something 'other.' But I do not see any way out. To leave? Where to? I cannot leave the church—the church is my life. But as I am now, I cannot serve the church as I understand that service. I firmly believe that Orthodoxy is Truth and Salvation and I shudder when I see what is being offered under the guise of Orthodoxy […].[6]

Given this confession, and considering the thematic content of Schmemann's intellectual labour, a primary motivation for his efforts can be understood as an advocacy for an Orthodox Church that he *can* effectively serve in good faith. As he puts it, it is not the one that he finds and is immediately involved in, it is 'other'. Nevertheless, Orthodoxy is the bearer, in Christian terms, of Truth and Salvation. So, the task ahead of him promises to be largely revisionist, namely, the reviewing and realigning the instances and categories that genuinely characterise Orthodox life. This will imply the recuperation of that 'common and truly "catholic" past' from within the fragmented ecclesial bodies. Yet it seems clear to him, as it does to us, that this cannot be done without adequately dealing with the West (i.e., the Church of Rome) and its own peculiar historical path. There is no place where Schmemann makes this more explicit than in his Introduction to *Ultimate Questions: An Anthology of Modern Russian Thought.*

2

Thinking particularly of Russian religiosity and the theology and philosophy that it inspired, Schmemann admits that the quest for 'total unity' is the Orthodox theme that underlies the various contributions that constitute the volume. This should remind us, he thinks, of the 'inner-universalism' that characterises early and middle Byzantine culture. He notes that the Eastern Church's propensity to confine the Orthodox experience as something strictly 'eastern' can only find its cure through the challenges of Western thought and may be thus 'overcome from within'.[7] We take this to mean that the self-inflicted limitations that Eastern Christianity imposed on itself—surely for historical reasons as well—need to be loosened. From this, a more authentic expression of the Orthodox sense of universal mission can emerge, along with a more lucid acknowledgment of its historicity and cosmic dimension.

In the process of introducing the contributing authors' reflections on eastern and western modes of thinking and being, Schmemann offers the following summary of the historical situation of the catholic and apostolic Church that we can easily grasp and that has everything to do with the subject we have at hand: 'The two halves

[6] Schmemann, *The Journals*, 31.

[7] Alexander Schmemann, *Ultimate Questions: An Anthology of Modern Russian Religious Thought* (Crestwood: Saint Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1977), 8. The authors of the anthologized texts are: Weidlé, Khomyakov. Solovyov, Florensky, Fyodorov, Rozanov, Berdyaev, Fedotov, and Bulgakov.

of the ancient and primitive Christian world were gradually separated and transformed from "halves" to two independent, self-sufficient "wholes", tragically losing the consciousness of belonging to each other'.[8] This repression of consciousness, regarding the co-belonging of the Catholic Orthodoxy of the East and the Orthodox Catholicism of the West, seems progressively more difficult to sustain. At the very least, self-conscious apologetic retrenchment on both sides only and obviously serves as a confirmation of the significant otherness with which they consider one another, be it with sympathy or not.[9]

However, Schmemann never abdicates his Orthodox positioning and its thematic emphasis on unity, oneness in Christ, the wholeness of creation, and conciliarity.[10] Equally telling is the claim made in 'The Ecumenical Agony' (1976), in which he sees the import of an Orthodox perspective in ecumenical meetings as consisting largely in its bringing into sharper focus in the spiritual destiny of the West, 'of that Western culture which has truly become today *the* culture'.[11] In his *Journals,* Schmemann expresses clearly some forty years ago how this destiny appears to him.

> The West—secular, hedonistic, technological, etc. lives by its renunciation of Christianity. I emphasise, not by indifference to Christianity, but precisely renunciation (happiness, economics, sex, abortion …)
>
> The revolutionary West lives by its fight with Christianity, with the Christian man, *homo Christianus*
>
> The East is divided between Western renunciation […] and fight with the West under the sign of either revolution or Islam.[12]

The rootedness of the rebellion in the West, its dogmatic secularism, conjoined simultaneously with insistent Islamic *Jihad* (however its meaning about struggle is ultimately defined and put into practice), engenders its own mission to confine and weaken the historical import of Christianity. It furthermore deems that talk of or thought about 'God and his Kingdom' would actually be threatening to its own purposes. 'What God reveals to people is unheard, impossible, and the tragedy consists of this deafness. And this revelation can no longer penetrate Western life without ripping it apart'.[13] Something conceived of as crucial for the life of the world, namely, the Christian *kerygma* has been systematically made to appear harmful for

[8] *Ultimate Questions*, 7.

[9] Edward Siecienski's works on *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010) and *The Papacy and the Orthodox: Sources and History of a Debate* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017) have, for example, documented in impressive detail the constant back-and-forth work by both 'halves' to justify their doctrinal differences within the common conviction of catholicity and apostolicity, to which both lay claim.

[10] As a sustained reflection on authority in the Orthodox Church, there is a pre-Vatican II text, 'Towards a Theology of Councils' (1962), where Schmemann argues for a conciliar unity, the catholicity of which is assured by a 'council of bishops', functioning as a necessary hierarchical instance. *Church World Mission: Reflections on Orthodoxy in the West* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1979).

[11] Schmemann, 'Ecumenical Agony', *Church World Mission*, 202.

[12] *The Journals*, 212.

[13] *The Journals,* 122.

human well-being and needful of gradual marginalisation. Hence, there is all the more reason to think more thoroughly and critically about the co-belonging of the communions to establish what they both must suffer and confront together. But this also involves an effort to ascertain just where, each in their own way, the sanity of ontological realism that both presuppose in their theology and sacraments tend to yield to forms of 'nominalism'—a term that Schmemann uses to indicate idolatrous flight from content into form for its own sake. Otherwise expressed, it is where ecclesiology becomes ecclesiolatry.

For example, Pope Paul VI's visit to New York and Washington in 1979 occasioned a reflection on the state of the Roman Church. In *The Journals,* Schmemann noted in the celebrations surrounding the event, that the fixation was on the Pope *qua* Pope. Where is Christ, or even Saint Peter for that matter, in all of this? 'Only *he* is needed, the Pope is needed as manna, as physical presence of the supernatural. […] Again, a thirst for the sacred. And I fear for religion'.[14] But the most interesting comments are stated in terms of paradox. Firstly, 'The tragic paradox of Catholicism is that without an absolute obedience to the Pope, without the cult of the Pope, Catholicism falls apart'.[15] And yet, Schmemann goes on to comment that the majority of Catholic faithful, even after a papal visit, go on living their lives as if the papacy had nothing to do with them. Secondly, and now bringing his Orthodox Church into the picture, he wonders about the issue of clericalism: in the event that the papacy becomes less monolithic and clericalism less a factor (as it currently endeavours to be), succumbing to secular priorities, then he reasons, 'clericalism will, in any case, become stronger in *our* Church because we will be the last truly apocalyptic carriers and worshippers of the *typicon,* of canonical law and of clerical triumphalism. One must pray for the Church!'[16] That is, the Orthodox Church might be sought after for the assuring of strict conservativism that that her claims to be the 'ancient' faith might encourage, namely, a kind of utopianism of the past.

But, here too, we find in a backhanded way that we belong to each other: both run the risk of allowing themselves to be drawn into forms of idolatry that betray the realism of God's saving acts, assumed and celebrated in the early Church. Both are, thereby, faced with the increasing irrelevance of Christianity as a spiritually transformative presence before the naturalising process aligned with globalisation. The loss of relevance is proportional to the nominalism that has supplanted the eschatological and realist conviction that Christians once had in regard to the sacraments of the Church. This has affected in different ways both communions and is the result of the propensity to divorce religious formality from the content of faith, individualistic piety from participative communion in Christ, utopic versions of the eschaton from the Kingdom within and with us. In other words, a dramatic tension

[14] *The Journals,* 231.
[15] *The Journals*, 232.
[16] *The Journals,* 232–33.

exists between the realised, or at least, imminent Kingdom, of which the Gospels give witness, and the illustrative versions of it, ardently wished for but purely textual and projected into some imagined future ideal that ought to determine how the present should be organized in anticipation—that which Sergius Bulgakov called 'anthropotheism'. For Schmemann,

> […] we live in a frightening and spiritually dangerous age. It is frightening not just because of its hatred, division and bloodshed. It is frightening above all because it is characterised by a mounting rebellion against God and his Kingdom. Not God, but man has become the measure of all things. Not faith, but ideology and utopian escapism are determining the spiritual state of the world.[17]

The sense of the eschatological that constituted the binding force by which Christian believers in early times perceived the presence of the Kingdom in their Eucharistic celebrations seems to him to be seriously compromised. He notes, for instance, a 'discrepancy between the demands of Tradition on the one hand, and the nominalism and minimalism of liturgical piety and practice on the other hand'.[18] The inconvenience that this represents is that, having limited the effects of the liturgy to the confines of the physical church, it then has no power to shape the world-at-large. Schmemann's celebrated work in the domain of liturgical theology, and perhaps everything else that he wrote, constitutes, at least tacitly, an appeal to re-appropriate the sacramental realism postulated in the ecclesial event around the celebration of the Eucharist, overcoming thereby forgetfulness of the primacy of the Kingdom, of Paradise, and resisting the drift into ritualism and textualism.

3

The historical setting for Schmemann's theological project is the middle period of the twentieth century in Paris and the growing proximity of the Russian émigré scholars with the Roman Catholic theologians who sought to reinvigorate Catholic theology by returning to its patristic sources. Writing from within the spirit of shared exploration, Vladimir Lossky's suggestion, advanced in the Introduction to his *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church,* remains pertinent:

> If while remaining loyal to our respective dogmatic standpoints we could succeed in getting to know each other, above all in those points in which we differ, this would undoubtedly be a surer way towards unity than that which

[17] Schmemann, *The Eucharist: Sacrament of the Kingdom* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997), 9–10.

[18] Schmemann, "Theology and Liturgy", *Church, World, Mission,* 131.

would leave differences on one side. For in the words of Karl Barth, 'the union of the Churches is not made but we discover it'.[19]

In illo tempore, the idea of getting to know each other better in the points under contention translated fundamentally into getting to know Gregory Palamas better—i.e., moving beyond Martin Jugie's negative assessment of 'Palamism' and Orthodoxy. From the Orthodox side, the aim would have been to see in the Palamite synthesis a consequent and culminating explication of Orthodox spirituality and what it means to live and think apophatically according to the mode of the uncreated. As such, it ought to be judged a genuine contribution to Christian theology, regardless of its origins in late Byzantium and its being practically lost from view for centuries. In truth, it constitutes a theological project that should be granted its deserved space among others deemed worthy of reflecting the Christian faith and its catholicity.[20]

Along with its convincing advocacy on behalf of Palamas' theological promise, Norman Russell's *Gregory Palamas and the Making of Palamism in the Modern Age* provides a useful reconstruction of the Russian émigré theologians' retrieval of Palamite thought, tracing a network of influences and positionings between the main protagonists among them. Although Schmemann is never mentioned in the account, Kiprian Kern, Schmemann's preferred teacher, receives special acknowledgement for his contribution to the campaign around the figure of Palamas, a contribution that received much moral and material support from the Benedictine monastery of Chevetogne in Belgium. In Russell's presentation of Kern's thinking, he underscores its two vectors: on the one hand, the continuing importance of the Fathers in general and Palamas in particular; on the other, the liturgy and the Eucharist. Both have in common the Orthodox insistence on the primacy of experience and non-dialectical, participative relationality. In sum, where they differ is in the former's close alignment with the hesychast spirituality that grew from within

[19] Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church.* (Cambridge: James Clark & Co., 1957, repr. 1968), 22. Lossky's *Seven Days on the Roads of France* (Yonkers: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2012) is a moving account of his love and loyalty to France under attack, but also his devotion to the saints of France, especially those who were free from later Germanic influences in the medieval Roman Church. The 'New Preface' to this work by his son, Fr Nicholas Lossky, accentuates his father's open-hearted Orthodoxy, but also reveals that his discipleship to Etienne Gilson led to friendships with Fathers Jean Daniélou, Henri de Lubac, and Yves Congar. Apparently these were among the original audience of the lectures that became *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church.*

[20] The conviction that a fairer reading of Palamas is still held persistently by the Orthodox side as potentially useful for strengthening the bonds between the communions. It can be found notably in appeals made by Fr Nicholas Loudovikos who maintains, 'It is impossible to find one Western scholar who completely rejects Palamas *due to a deep knowledge of his theology*'. (his italics—'Initiating the Discussion: "For the Fall and Rising of Many": St. Gregory Palamas at the Crosswords of Interpretation' in *Analogia* 3.2 (2017): 1). On this, see especially Norman Russell's crucial work, *Gregory Palamas and the Making of Palamism in the Modern Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019). Edward Siecienski also appears to suggest something of the sort in Palamas' proposal to resolve the *Filoque* controversy, a proposal that follows closely that of Maximus the Confessor, in his book on the subject.

Eastern monasticism, emphasizing on *ascesis* and deification (i.e., divine union, attained through purification and illumination). About this vector and in relation to John Meyendorff, Schmemann's friend and colleague in those Parisian times as well as later at Saint Vladimir's Seminary in New York, Russell states neatly that, 'The next step was to be taken by Kiprian Kern's pupil, John Meyendorff, who was there to inaugurate a new era in Palamas studies'.[21]

Meanwhile, though left unnamed in Russell's account, Schmemnn's publication of *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (1966), 'Dedicated to the Memory of Archimandrite Kiprian Kern, February 10, 1960', confirms his taking forward Kern's convictions concerning the experience of the *mysterion* in the liturgical prayers, or more specifically, in the Eucharist. The situation of Schmemann's discipleship in relation to Kern—who was, in fact, his spiritual father—is made even more obvious, as the work that Father Alexander wished to be his most decisive textual offering to the Church, *The Eucharist*, bears the same title as Kern's work to which he refers on occasion, *Evkharistiya*.[22] It is the eschatological realism in the sacramental life of the Church that may contribute to the whole, all-embracing, and total vision that must define the Church's catholicity.[23] And the thought from *The Eucharist* that we might keep in mind as we seek to bring this out is the following: 'In the tradition of the Church, nothing has changed. What has changed is the crisis consists in a lack of connection and cohesion between what is accomplished in the Eucharist and how it is perceived, understood and lived'.[24] It is that which is realised and effectively consolidated in the Eucharist that needs to be repeatedly rediscovered and expressed in words that are adequate to the real depths of the symbol that provides the conditions for synergetic union.

4

[21] Russell, *Gregory Palamas and the Making of Palamism in the Modern Age,* 74.

[22] An entry in *The Journals* also reveals Kern's place in Schmemann's life. His ordering of pictures on his desk reflect purposely decisive influences in his life and leaves one with the impression of having a totemic character: 'On a shelf over my desk, I arranged the picture of Bishop Vladimir (who ordained me); Father Cyprian (professor of Liturgics, friend); in a beautiful blooming garden, my father—our last picture together, at the Schmemann gravesite, where he is buried now, my father and his five sisters. When I die, nobody will know any longer what huge layers of my life are reflected in these pictures. And the picture of Solzhenitsyn and me, the day of his confession and communion in Zurich', (174).

[23] In his *Orthodoxy and the West* and citing Metropolitan John Zizioulas, Christos Yannaras puts the matter in this way: 'Orthodoxy does not constitute the criterion of the Catholic Church; the Catholic Church is the criterion of Orthodoxy' (*Orthodoxy and the West: Hellenic Self-Identity in the Modern Age,* trans. Norman Russell, [Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2006], 285). This is a good rule that is consonant with Schmemann's thinking. Owing much thematically to Schmemann's early writings, Yannaras deals explicitly with this issue as well, albeit less sympathetically relative to Catholicism. 'The Religionization of the Ecclesial Event: Historical Overview,' *Against Religion: The Alienation of the Ecclesial Event*, trans. Norman Russell (Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2013), 130–66.

[24] Alexander Schmemann, *The Eucharist*, 9.

Schmemann had little patience with speculative theology and academic niceties, for example, extensive use of footnotes and bibliographical references to relevant counter-proposals. But he does set up certain conceptual parameters that provide him with a heuristic tool to correlate the unchanging and the culturally relative, the ontological and the ontically derived. He sees this as an 'eternal tension' and as characteristic of an Orthodox approach to the Church, her mission, and the world to be saved. In 'Ecumenical Agony', he asks, for instance, '[…] if ours is, as we always claim, the *true faith*, has not the time come to show—to ourselves in the first place—how it works in life, in that eternal tension between the total, absolute and truly apophatic transcendence of God and His real and wonderful presence in this created, fallen world?'[25] Also, he typically organizes the issues of Orthodox Church history and liturgy by distinguishing layers (or levels, or strata) that are seen as constitutive of them. Within each, their diachronic character involves the ebb and flow of crises and consolidations that attend to changes in historical and cultural circumstances, that refer to the often ambivalent issues of articulation and connection within the absolutely unchanging and the problematics of the changing and potentially nominal. In a short address to Orthodox university students, he offers this general observation: 'The entire history of the Church is in a way the history of her mission, that is, of her relation to and action in the world. And as we look into the past, we discover there a rhythm, which I think could be defined as the rhythm of crisis and consolidation'.[26] In *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, where this crisis and consolidation view of church history is particularly notable, the self-evidencing Church emerges from her Judaic matrix to configure the reality of a new Israel with a universalist vocation in her worship. Here, crises represent inevitable challenges that appear in the course of history. Configurations of political and cultural forms of life involve processes of constant re-figuration. It is ever-changing and subject to idolatrous temptation, investing the yearning for the infinite in finite forms and manifesting itself in endless argumentation and self-justification. While these are dissonant in relation to the maximalist expression of both the content of faith and the Church, their temporal and worldly dimensions are not disrespected and beyond redemption. On the other hand, consolidation appears as the struggle to secure the content of faith in strict correlation with the sacramental realism that sustains the Church's enduring prophetic presence on behalf of the salvation and life of the world. Though its meaning is unchanging, it is, nevertheless, available to human experience, the justification of which takes the form of a gift 'from above', recognised in the Ordo of the Church's liturgy. Therefore, the object of liturgical theology is,

[25] Schmemann, 'Ecumenical Agony,' *Church Mission World,* 208.

[26] Alexander Schmemann, 'The Mission of Orthodoxy,' (Chesterton, Indiana: Ancient Faith Publishing, 1994), 12 (adapted from a lecture given in 1968).

> To find the Ordo behind the 'rubrics', regulations and rules—to find the unchanging principle, the living norm or 'logos' of worship as a whole, within what is accidental and temporary: this is the primary task which faces those who regard liturgical theology not as the collecting of accidental and arbitrary explanations of services but as the systematic study of the *lex orandi* of the Church.[27]

By Ordo, he means, then, not the historical development of the Church's sacramental system and its particular order. He associates it rather with the Eucharist, an event indicative of a realised presence of the Kingdom already at hand in *this* world. As '*logos* of worship,' the Ordo actively structures (*lex orandi*) the *logos* of belief (*lex credendi*), implying the creative effort to articulate right-thinking with right-praxis. However, what is crucial is how the upper end of the eternal tension is, for Schmemann, safeguarded in the supra-temporal factor of the Ordo:

> The worship of the Church has as its real centre the constant renewal and repetition in time of the one unchangeable Sacrament; unchanging, that is, in its meaning, content and purpose. […] The Eucharist is the actualisation of one, single, unrepeatable event, and the essence of the Sacrament consists first of all in the possibility of the conquest of time […].[28]

As Schmemann expands his thinking about the Ordo, he associates the supra-temporal aspect of the Eucharist, celebrated in the Divine Liturgy, with the non-sacramental 'liturgy of time' (Vespers, Matins, Hours). These assure the connectedness with the temporality of the cosmos and its rhythms, situating the worship of the Church within the worldly reality it aims to save and transform. Thus, the Eucharist and the liturgy of time are 'connected in such a way that this connection actually constitutes the Ordo in its general and basic form'.[29] But what is relevant for us is the persistent presence of the transcendent supra-temporal conserved in the Ordo and its correlation with the eschatological experience of the Kingdom. For this, Schmemann proposes a law of 'development', proposing that '[…] changes in outward form are frequently determined by the necessity of preserving inner content, of preserving intact the succession and identity of the experience and faith of the Church under all changes in the outward circumstances of her existence'.[30] Thus, with the advent of the Empire, the rise of monasticism, and the Byzantine

[27] Alexander Schmemann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (Crestwood: Saint Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1966), 39.

[28] Schmemann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, 43. In *The Eucharist*, the idea of the eternal tension receives this formulation: '[…] if [the liturgy] is served on earth […], it is accomplished in heaven, in the new time of the new creation, in the time of the Holy Spirit'. (218)

[29] *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, 42.

[30] Schmemann, *The Eucharist*, 109.

Synthesis, new layers in the life of the Church emerged and necessitated alterations capable of retaining the dignity of the Ordo at its centre and, with it, the uncreated energy communicated in the Eucharist.

At this first level, we likewise encounter the Gospels and the Apostolic writings, presenting us with a maximalist picture of Christ that calls for a maximalist commitment of faith. They are constitutive of the 'inner content,' the core of the Christian faith that calls for insistent realisation through sacramental participation. The action suggests a movement of recuperation of that which is radically given in an antecedent way. It is anagogical rather than dialectic: the consolidations that might follow the crises are not properly progressive and surely not dialectic. 'I see the error of any dialectics that proceed with thesis, and synthesis, removing possible contradictions, I think that openness must always remain, it is faith, in it God is found, who is not a "synthesis" but life and fulness'.[31] This non-dialectical position, assumed by Schmemann, is, by his own definition, decidedly Orthodox and can eventually be an important aspect of what 'the Orthodox man' can contribute to the mapping of *Una Sancta*, namely, the primacy of experience of divine gifting: '[…] that I was a part of Hegel's or Kant's life leaves me completely indifferent. The gift of life is in inverse proportion to the gift of ideas'.[32] But with even more pertinence,

> […] the Orthodox man begins with the 'end', with the experience, the breakthrough, the very reality of God, the Kingdom, the Life—and only afterwards does he clarify it, but in relation to the experience he has had. The Western man rationally arrives at and evokes the 'end' from a series of premises. The Orthodox often expresses that 'end' quite poorly in theology. For the

[31] *The Journals,* 47.

[32] *The Journals,* 28.

In what can be construed as a nearly direct response to Paul Ricoeur, who describes himself as a 'post-Hegelian Kantian', but whose critical hermeneutics could appear at first sight with Schmemann's crisis / consolidation approach. Ricoeur's 'post-Hegelian Kantism' is permanent in his work but becomes particularly recognised in his proposed resolution of the hermeneutical problem, inherited from Wilhelm Dilthey's aim to create a specific epistemology for the historical sciences. Dilthey's solution consists in distinguishing 'understanding', necessary for grasping the interiority implied in the range of human cultural productions, from the objective explanatory approach of the natural sciences. What is relevant for our purposes is how much the preoccupation with hermeneutics (and, thereby, language) dominated the philosophical and theological discussion of mid-twentieth century France and the extent to which this is reflected Schmemann's own critical bent when dealing with Orthodox matters, particularly Orthodox tradition. In addition, writing in the 50s and 60s of the last century in that atmosphere would imply at least tacit reference to existentialism and Nietzsche's legacy, including that of God's death. Schmemann was no exception—and neither were the Orthodox—Zizioulas and Yannaras with their personalist responses that paralleled those of Ricoeur's and his Catholic colleagues in the movement *L'esprit.* What interests us, however, is just where Schmemann is exceptional in his usually calm factoring of the cultural agitation of his time into an Orthodox perspective. His consolidation / crisis approach is distinctly different than that of the Protestant Ricoeur and that which might be implied in the Roman Catholic idea of doctrinal development.

> Westerner, the end somehow disappears, is diluted in elaborate constructions.[33]

Schmemann's liturgical theology contemplates the living tradition of the Church as non-dialectical tension between unchanging self-donating God, encountered in the Eucharist, 'sacrament of the Church and unity par excellence',[34] and the demands of contingent historical contexts. The former is postulated as that which effectively (and affectively) communicates the Kingdom in symbolism directly and immediately related to the experience. As a function of this primary positioning, the latter reveals a nominalist tendency, seeking to substitute surreptitiously conceptual distinctions, insights, or embellishments for the integrity of experiential content. This being the case, ontological connectedness would sustain the catholic intent of the eschatological realism that Schmemann recognises in the Eucharist and, extensively, to the intelligibility of both personal and cosmic reality. This stands over against the varied manifestations of nominalism that cultivate dichotomies and ultimately rely on discursiveness in lieu of bodily and transformative experience.

5

Schmemann makes much of being attentive to the spiritual destiny of the West for all that it means for the entire world, and he would see the Roman Church as part of it. But, as mentioned from the beginning, he is far from ignoring the creeping infiltration of nominalism in the Eastern Church in relation to Byzantine culture and even claims it is responsible for the failings of the Christian Church. '[…] More and more I am convinced that the root of evil about which I wrote (i.e., the isolation of the Eucharist from its eschatological, hence cosmic and historical meaning) is not in the West, but in Byzantium, in undigested Platonism, in the platonic heresy about time'. [35] (Hence, the importance he attributes to the theology of time as also constitutive of the Ordo.)

In a stream of journal entries, he raises questions about the possible relevance for contemporary humanity of Pseudo-Dionysius' *Church Hierarchy*, a standard reference point for Byzantine theology. He thinks that advancing such a metaphysic has resulted only in 'the reduction of the Church to a mysterious piety, the dying of its eschatological essence and mission, and, finally, the de-Christianisation of this world and its secularisation'.[36] He feels alienated from the world that deems itself Christian and very much a part of the secular one that Christ has come to save and where the Church must remain to continue the work: '[…] in the Bible, there is

[33] *The Journals*, 110.
[34] *The Eucharist*, 95.
[35] *Journals,* 314.
[36] *The Journals*, 316–17.

space and air; in Byzantium the air is always stuffy. All is heavy, static, petrified'.[37] The onus falls heavily, for him, on the Platonic residue that remains in Byzantine thought, where the world is treated as an indifferent reality. For this reason, the Church gradually turned its back on the eschatological and very biblical concern for the salvation of the world and its life.

Nevertheless, our question as Christians—Schmemann's reasoning continues—is how to live in the real world with God and in God. 'Byzantium's complete indifference to the world is astounding. The drama of Orthodoxy: we did not have a Renaissance, sinful but liberating from the sacred. So we live in non-existent worlds: in Byzantium, in Rus, wherever, but not in our own time'.[38] *Grosso modo*, the issue with the sacred is that it brings into the picture its opposite, the profane. This would represent an unfortunate dichotomization, sustained by a nominalist tendency, belying not only the fullness of salvation that comes with Christ, but also the reality of transforming participation as exemplified in the Eucharist. In other words, it represents a prime example of the mysteriology that create the conditions for the religionization of Orthodoxy.

So, along with his ample criticism of the West's decidedly nominalist tendencies in conceiving Church life, Schmemann demonstrates good grace in turning his attention principally to his own communion's responsibility (not at all common among Orthodox authors) in contributing to the conditions of the Church's failure in giving effective testimony to the power and glory of Christ's Kingdom realised. 'In Orthodoxy there is no less apostasy, no less betrayal than in Catholicism or Protestantism, maybe even more; *but none of it is made dogma, or proclaimed to be the truth*'.[39] The problem seems to lie around the mysteriology and the weakening of the *mysterion* at work in the eschatological realism of the Eucharist, the gage of the Church's fullness that needs to be preserved. It will require some pruning of the rationalising scholastic intrusions, as well as the deviating Byzantine accretions, that have found their way, in the Orthodox understanding of the Divine Liturgy. The rehabilitation of the deep grammar of the *ordo*, the original principle of correlation between the celebrant and the people who together seek communion with Christ/God, requires also that of the symbol, the ontological sense of which has been diluted, even lost—hence our ecclesiastical malaise and with it the diminishing or any claim for catholicity that is more than nominal.

[37] *The Journals,* 213.

[38] *The Journals,* 213.

[39] *The Journals*, 81. My *italics*. We are left by this with the impression that, if so, the eventual failure of the Western Church might be somewhat derived from the Byzantine constraints imposed on the vitality of Eastern Christianity to positively affect Latin Christianity, or, at least, to have become such that Rome saw it as obligatory to oppose as a matter of ecclesiastical principle and, perhaps, convenience. Whatever the justificatory apologetics, they have been, up to now, effective enough to maintain the two traditions with the conviction that one of them is the holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, and not the other—or, at least, not so much.

6

For Schmemann, the typical Orthodox argument against the predominance in the West of the scholastic approach to theology underscores its systematic rational reconstruction of theological and ecclesiological givens. Lacking an authentic understanding of apophatic thinking, it has had the effect of accentuating argumentation at the expense of experience of divine life-giving reality. As we saw above, Schmemann recognised this as a generalisable trait of Western thought. However, his concern is less with rational systemisation and more with how scholasticism played a role in the suppression of the symbolic realism that the Church Fathers acknowledged in the sacraments, namely, as the embodiments of reality's mode of expression.[40] For them, the content communicated by the sacrament is not produced as if by a miracle in discontinuity with the natural order, or what one would normally expect from it. The sacrament is rather drawn forth from the very sacramentality of the world, or creation, given to man/Adam as gift, by which he may eventually participate in divine life. The Christian sacrament realises the potential of the gift, manifesting it in its maximal form, perhaps even its maximal intelligibility. 'The "mysterion" of Christ reveals and fulfils the ultimate meaning and destiny of the world itself'.[41] Christ is the life of the world by saving and renewing it in its sacramentality, as both cosmic and eschatological.[42] Therein lies the authentically catholic reach of the sacramental life.

This continuity between sacrament and symbol is crucial, for while it satisfies the patristic position concerning the unknowability of God in His essence, it also illuminates that knowledge of God and deification of man can result from the *mysterion's* implication with the symbol, by which its intuited presence takes form.

> For it is the very nature of symbol that it reveals and communicates the 'other' *as* precisely the 'other', the visibility of the invisible *as* visible, the knowledge of the unknowable *as* unknowable, the presence of the future *as* future. The symbol is means of knowledge of that which cannot be known otherwise, for knowledge here depends on participation—the living encounter with and entrance into that 'epiphany' of reality which the symbol is.[43]

[40] A fuller explication of Schmemann's complaint of Western scholasticism's influence on Orthodox Church—i.e., the centuries of her 'Western Captivity'—would involve the loss of the wholeness of the ascending movement of the Divine Liturgy by parceling its moments and considering them individually. Other consequences would be the cultivation of individualism and pietism. We shall not go into those issues here.

[41] Alexander Schmemann, *Life of the World: Sacraments and Orthodoxy* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary *Press,* 1973), 140.

[42] The sense of the Christian vocation goes, consequently, in the same direction, following the pattern of Christ and His self-giving for the life of the world, the world itself being a gift from the Creator/ God to humankind: 'The Christian faith can say that the world was created for each individual, and it can say that each person was created for the world, to surrender himself for the life of the world'. *The Eucharist*, 83. In the light of this, we do not go to Church for ourselves, but for the service of Christ's work in the world.

[43] *Life of the World,* 141.

The epiphanic quality of the experience of participation removes from consideration that the relation between symbolic form and the invisible 'thing' to which it refers is merely semantic, causal, or representative. The relation is participative, ontological, and mutually involved (i.e., synergetic). The sense of the symbolic realism in this regard is for the symbol to manifest the invisible in the visible, the spiritual in the material; it is the evidence of that which cannot be seen, yet thirsts for corporality.

The doctrine of sacramental *real presence*, largely derived from scholastic theology and which became a point of contention between the Church of Rome and the Churches in the West that adhered to the Protestant Reformation in the modern period, is a non-issue in the Eastern Church. For the Orthodox, the sacrament is truly real and, indeed, is symbolically communicated, but the symbol of the sacrament is constituted with the real, namely, its institution by Christ: it is the act of fulfilment and realisation, an 'epiphany—in and through Christ—of the "new creation"'.[44] The problem comes to the fore in the Western Church with the disjunction of the symbol from the real and its reduction to a mode of knowledge and representation of the real. The real is not symbolic and belongs to the order of illustration. The notion of real presence will become dependent on the words that are used at the time of the consecration, as if conjured up in the saying of them, granted under the power of the Holy Spirit. But the reality is not borne within the symbol itself, accentuating the primacy of the mental (i.e., nominal). Instead of a continuity between Christ and the sacraments, a hiatus opens between the real and sign, where causality is extrinsic and discontinuity implied and effectively noted when the sacraments are considered apart from the inner movement of the Divine Liturgy in which the Church, Kingdom, and world are held together, namely, the dimensions implied in the perspective advanced in Orthodoxy. But, here as well, the illustrative symbolism of the later Byzantine era, traceable back to the mystagogical commentaries that became normative for the sake of catechetical purposes, masked the discrepancy between their so-called symbolic interpretations and the meaning and the structure, Ordo, of the liturgical texts themselves.

Schmemann's corrective restatement of patristic realism in relation to symbols constitutes a reminder of the intimate bond between Incarnation and the eventful character of the liturgy: '[…] in its essence, in the fact that it is rooted in the divine incarnation and its orientation to the coming kingdom of God manifested in power, the liturgy rejects and excludes the counter-position of "symbol" and "reality"'.[45] This advent of the real in the symbol has, moreover, an apophatic quality. It cannot be known in terms of a what, but it can be known as responding to an original affirmation of hope that resides in human desiring for wholeness of life, including the world in which the quest for such occurs. In *The Eucharist*, Schmemann expresses it thus:

[44] *Life of the World,* 143.
[45] *The Eucharist*, 106.

'[…] Christian sanctification consists in the restoration to everything in the world of the symbolic nature, its 'sacramentality,' in referring everything to the ultimate aim of being'.[46] The world's failure to see this is largely attributable to Christianity's failure to maintain its original significance in the life of the Church and its epiphanic power, a failure coinciding with the de-ontologising of the symbolic language at her disposition. In other words, the world is not contemplated and taken up in her sacramental character as a possible source of a God-derived epiphany. However, '[The Church] was left in the world, as part of it, as a symbol of its salvation. And this symbol we fulfil, we "make real" in the eucharist'.[47] Sacrament for the world, the Church catholic is, thereby, the privileged *locus* of the sacrament of unity that simply cannot be less than all-embracing and transformative.

7

Keeping in mind *Una Sancta,* let us to return to Lossky's Introduction and the crucial words proffered by Yves Congar that are recalled there:

> Where the West on the basis at once developed and narrow of Augustinian ideology, claimed for the Church independence in life and organisation, and thus laid down the lines of a very definite ecclesiology, the East settled down in practice, and to some extent theory, to a principle of unity which was political, non-religious, and not truly universal.
>
> We have become *different men.* We have the same God but before him we are different men, unable to agree as to the nature of our relationship with him.[48]

From what we have been able to see above from Schmemann's thinking on the subject, Congar's points still need addressing. For his part, Lossky sought to respond to Roman Catholic doubts through a clear presentation of Gregory Palamas' theology. Schmemann's liturgical theology took a different, non-Palamite path to establish Orthodoxy's catholic intent. Presupposing the importance and relevance of the Palamite theological legacy,[49] he eschews, nonetheless, the discussion around the theological metaphysics that it proposes. Schmemann seemed satisfied with simpler categories like 'eternal tension', preferring to work through the theological elements that make up the sacramental life of the Church with the transcendent-im-

[46] *The Eucharist*, 61.
[47] *The Eucharist,* 53.
[48] Lossky, *Mystical Theology* ,14.
[49] In 'The Ecumenical Agony', Schmemann defends, as being lost to the ecumenically minded, the contemporary relevance for man's self-understanding of, 'created versus uncreated grace, the Palamite distinction between the divine essence and the divine energies, the essence of the mystical experience (the 'nature' of the light *seen* and experienced by the saints), the essence of sanctification' (203).

manent antinomy in mind. Details of his interpretative readings of history, and even of liturgy, may be disputable, but the emphasis on liturgy and the Eucharist, the sacrament of unity, rightly situates the living faith of Christians as engaged materially and corporally with and through Christ God for the edification of the visible Church and catholic communion. Schmemann has no particular interest in institutional unity, but Eucharistic unity with its eschatological implications sets the tone for where the Kingdom may be already shared.

We should like to think that some progress towards mutual understanding has been made since Congar's evaluation of Catholic and Orthodox divergence. Some twenty-five years or so afterwards in 1968, Schmemann adds to it a different dimension and difficulty that still is in vigour. 'For us Orthodox one of the most agonising aspects of the ecumenical encounter lies very often precisely in this inability of the "West" to grasp anything "Orthodox" unless it is reduced to Western Categories, expressed in Western terms and more often than not, altered in its true meaning'.[50] Again, this is not entirely unsurmountable. To deal with this sort of thing, the analytical philosopher Donald Davidson advanced the notion that radical interpretation might be useful. Simply described, it has the following features: (1) adopt the principle of charity in relation to the linguistic behaviour of an 'other' (individual, tribe, church, etc.); (2) grant that the meanings attributed to the words employed in relation to contextual actions reflect beliefs that are true for the speakers and part of a holistic system of beliefs and desires; (3) over time, persistent engaged description provides more precise evaluation of the meaning and the consistency of the beliefs, as well the actions they justify.[51] This does not ensure agreement, but a high degree of commensurability is very possible.

But more in line with *Una Sancta*, it so happens that Sergius Bulgakov has a couple of things to say about it, and they offer a wider perspective than the habitual way of dealing with the subject. Moreover, he touches on points that are important for Schmemann, not by chance Bulgakov's former student at Saint Sergius.[52] In *The Bride of the Lamb,* Bulgakov offers his version of what *Una Sancta* means to him and something about the royal priesthood of the faithful that we believe resonates with what is especially important to Schmemann's vision of the life of the Church.

In summary, for Bulgakov, the *Una Sancta* is supra-confessional and uncontrolled by historically determined ecclesiological organisations. In a sense, it serves him as an idea-limit of an ever-continuing Incarnation (of an ever-kenotic God)

[50] Schmemann, 'The "Orthodox World", Past and Present', in *Church, World, Mission*, 25.

[51] Donald Davidson, 'Radical Interpretation', in *Inquiries into Truth and Interpretation* (Oxford: Oxford Univeristy Press, 1984), 125–40.

[52] Schmemann's verdict on Bulgakov's theology is rather negative: it is capricious, lacks humility, and is emotional and likely not to survive. *The Journals*, 261. But there is certainly agreement about clericalism and love for the Divine Liturgy. On the latter, Schmemann writes beautifully of him as a priest and celebrant in a passage that Andrew Louth happily included in his refection on Bulgakov in *Modern Orthodox Theologians*, 51.

and Post-Pentecost coming of the Holy Spirit. Conjoining the effective presence of God with the prophetic power that it communicates, it overcomes all spirit of confessionalism and serves as the living foundation for the multiplicity of ecclesial expressions that exist.[53] This uncontainable notion of the *Una Sancta* speaks tacitly to Schmemann's sense of tragedy that he recognises in the separation of the 'two halves' of the apostolic Churches that, come what may, belong to each other. Bulgakov's solution for the dilemma may seem extravagant, but it contains a poignant message that ought not to be missed.

Putting together the pieces, it comes down to this: the problem of the 'two halves' is based on a presumption that each has its identity in two differing kinds of apostolic successions (i.e., of the nature of the vicariate). One half believes that it comes down to one person, Saint Peter. The other half supposes that all the apostles effectively consecrated bishops in different places with the same legitimacy. It is supposed that the power was given by Christ to the apostles to do so. But, in fact, the bishops have their succession only from the apostles themselves in the case of both traditions, and not from Christ. 'Clearly, with regard to Christ, there can be no question of succession or any kind of succession of any kind of vicariate'.[54] For, in the Body of Christ, the Church, there are not so much functions of power but of ministering services alongside one another. 'Only on the basis of royal universal priesthood, of the hierarchism of the whole Church, can one accept the distinction of hierarchal functions, and avoid the exaggerations owing to which clericalism creeps in'.[55] Hierarchical priesthood must be interpreted properly: '[…] hierarchy arises only on the basis of the universal priesthood, in which the Divine-humanity in the priesthood of Christ is expressed'.[56] Hence, first the Church as the Body of Christ, the royal priesthood of the people, then, hierarchy.

Daring as it is, Bulgakov's visionary theology makes the point about where the undivided *Una Sancta* might find root, namely, in the priesthood of the faithful. It also relates to the problem of clericalism that Schmemann sees as affecting both communions. Finally, it reflects Schmemann's concern with the gathering of the faithful and the clergy, together with them, in the great announcement of the anaphora that he would like to see rendered thus: *Your own of Your own do we give unto You on behalf of all, for all, and* by *all*.[57] Thy Kingdom come, catholicity realised.

[53] Sergius Bulgakov, *The Bride of the Lamb,* translated by Boris Jokim (Grand Rapid: Eerdmans, 2002), 292–3.

[54] Bulgakov, *The Bride of the Lamb,* 277.

[55] Bulgakov. *The Bride of the Lamb,* 279.

[56] Bulgakov, *The Bride of the Lamb,* 281.

[57] *The Eucharist*, 107.

SAINT MAXIM THE GREEK INSTITUTE
RESEARCH, PRESERVATION AND PROMOTION
OF SPIRITUAL AND CULTURAL TRADITIONS

Analogia
VOLUME 09 | 2020

Πεμπτουσια
Ορθοδοξία Πολιτισμός Επιστήμες
www.pemptousia.gr

www.analogiajournal.com