

The Holy and Great Council of Crete
and Eastern Orthodoxy's Struggle
for Identity in the Modern West.

<CA>Brandon Gallaher

<AF>University of Exeter

<ABT>ABSTRACT: These are responses to the essays by Daniela Augustine, John Burgess, Dale Coulter and Peter Phan on the Orthodox Council of Crete of June 2016.</ABT>

<KW>KEYWORDS: Council, Eastern Orthodox Church, Orthodoxy, Crete, ecclesiology</KW>

<1>Response to Daniela C. Augustine’s “Where the Spirit Dwells: Reflections on the Encyclical of the Recent Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church through Eastern-European Pentecostal Lens”

I am grateful for Professor Augustine’s profound meditation on the Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church and the Orthodox cosmic theology of the Church as an ongoing Pentecost, a theophany of the age to come of the Kingdom begun in the Church and ready “to circumscribe all of creation” (Augustine). What comes through most strongly is her critique of the institutional boundaries within which the Orthodox theology of communion and union is embodied insofar as she believes it acts as a restraint or domestication of the Spirit “within its institutional boundaries, grieving him when resisting to recognize his life and voice in the life of the Christian other whom the Spirit has joined to the one body of Christ” (Augustine). She believes the exclusion of the non-Orthodox Christian from “Eucharistic communion (for non-pastoral reasons)” is a distortion of the royal priesthood (1 Pet. 2:9) which all baptized

Christians share. How can they, the non-Orthodox, not be included in Orthodox communion when they are, in their very Trinitarian baptism, “made members by the same Spirit ...without which the Eucharist cannot be administered” (Augustine) and when they, just as the Orthodox, affirm the same Symbol of faith/Creed?

Drawing on an interpretation of the great Russian theologian Fr Sergii Bulgakov (1871–1944), Augustine wants to argue that the royal priesthood, as the common gift of all Christians in their baptismal anointing with the Spirit, and not the ordered special charism of the episcopate, is the foundation of the handing on of the faith. The principle of communion, the unity of the Church’s shared faith/teaching seen in the Eucharist, does not depend on apostolic succession, as many Orthodox and Catholics contend, but, rather, on the baptism of all believers in the royal priesthood. The laity, she argues, is empowered in matters of preservation of the faith in light of their Trinitarian baptism with Chrismation (i.e. Western Confirmation) understood as a sort of general ordination to the royal priesthood. It might be replied to Augustine, from a stricter Orthodox perspective, that Christian baptism and the gift of the Spirit are normally given not by all of God’s people but preeminently through the episcopate, as the ongoing synaxis of the apostles seen at Pentecost, or at the very least through those who have been ordained by the bishops to act in their stead. Augustine’s response to this sort of more clericalist theology is to point out that there are those who are not Orthodox, such as the Pentecostals, who have been inspired by the Spirit directly, like the household of Cornelius (Acts 10), without even the laying on of Apostolic/episcopal or presbyterial hands. The Spirit, she argues, does not require institutional mediation through the episcopate. Following Bulgakov again, she claims that Christians of different traditions have a unity in Christ, a similarity of Christian experience, which is a sort of “spiritual communion” (Augustine) that exists long before communion at the same chalice takes place.² She seems to hint that intercommunion or some sort of eucharistic hospitality might be

possible within some version of an Orthodox ecclesiology. She thinks, quoting Bulgakov, that a sort of “new inspiration” of Pentecost (Augustine) might be needed for a unity of the different divided churches to take place. Once again delicately hinting, she suggests that it might be possible for the Orthodox to overcome their “routinized ritualism” nurtured by “superstition” through Pentecostals inspiring the Orthodox to have a “renewed experience of Pentecost” making for a sort of “Orthodox revival” (Augustine). Although she does not say this directly, she hints that this hypothesized revival might be accomplished through intercommunion by citing a famous paper of Bulgakov⁴ from the time of his proposals in the mid-1930s for limited episcopally blessed intercommunion between Anglicans and Orthodox in the ecumenical Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius.

Augustine’s paper is a profound and challenging critique of the Orthodox opposition to intercommunion but there is no space here to respond to all her points at length. Instead I want to take this opportunity to briefly explain why the Orthodox traditionally are opposed to intercommunion.⁵ This will be helpful as it will illumine the Orthodox ecclesiology of the Holy and Great Council of Crete that Augustine both appreciates and critiques. The Orthodox, as should be clear from Augustine, do not see themselves as one among many different Christian “confessions” or denominations holding a particular theological interpretation of the Gospel (a notion dating back to the divisions in the Reformation), but rather they believe themselves to be the creedal “One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.”⁶ This is sometimes expressed in the rather unnuanced but common formula: “The Orthodox Church *is* the One True Church.” Christ, the Orthodox believe, founded the Orthodox Church on the rock of the foundation of the apostles and prophets who proclaimed the Gospel and who dwell perpetually and iconically in our midst in the person of the bishop leading the liturgical synaxis. Christ Himself, the Word of life, is the chosen and precious stone who, although He was rejected, has become the head of the corner in whom by faith in

Him “the whole structure is joined together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord . . . a dwelling place of God in the Spirit” (Eph. 2:21–22). The Church is, therefore, both founded on the cornerstone of the Word of the Gospel and the preaching of that Word by the saints, which is proclaimed and consumed and thereby realized (“communicated” in multiple senses) when the assembly of the saints gathers together in the worship of God as Holy Trinity *in one place (epi to auto)* (Acts 2:1). In communicating Christ as the life-giving Word, the Church ceaselessly becomes “his body, the fulness of him who fills all in all” (Eph. 1:23; cf. Col. 1:18–19, 24) which is the eschatological reality of the Kingdom that is to come that breaks into our midst in the corporate work of God’s people remaking creation as a foretaste of the life to come. This “body of the living Christ,” the Church, is one and undivided, through the grace of the Holy Spirit, although it has many members (1 Cor. 12:12, 27).⁷ Christians, being baptized as members into that body, proclaim the Gospel of Christ because their baptism and chrismation (the anointing following baptism, as the calling down of the Holy Spirit on them) is a baptism into the death and resurrection of their head, Jesus Christ (Rom. 6:3ff., Col. 2:12).

In being members of the body of Christ, Christians are knit together in their hearts through the Spirit of Christ in truth, love, and holiness from baptism and chrismation onwards and in this fashion they come to know Christ as the mystery of God “in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge” (Col. 2:3). This ecclesial knowledge, being the knowledge of an enacted faith given to us through the Spirit, is given to Christians anew each time they assemble *in one place* around their bishop, or the one ordained to represent him, locally as the Catholic Church (1 Cor 11:18, 14:23). The bishop, as the inheritor of the apostles, symbolizes the invisible head of each liturgical synaxis, Christ, as the Great High Priest (Heb. 4:14–16; Ignatius. *Smyr.* 8–9 [cf. long form: *PG* V.853A] and *Magnes.* 6). In assembling as the Church around the local bishop (or the presbyter ordained by him) and

breaking bread in the Eucharist (Acts 2:42), calling down in the Anaphora or Offering in the Divine Liturgy the Spirit upon themselves and the elements of Bread and Wine, Christians become the Catholic Church by proclaiming, and, in proclaiming, effecting a perpetual remembrance (*anamnesis*) of Christ as their Redeemer until He comes again (Luke 22:15–20, 1 Cor 11:23–26). Christ, in turn, as their Great High Priest, in the person of the celebrant, remembers them before Our Father in heaven:

<ext>Remembering therefore this our Saviour’s command and all that has been done for us: the Cross, the Tomb, the Resurrection on the third day, the Ascension into heaven, the Sitting at the right hand, the second and glorious Coming again, offering you your own from your own—in all things and for all things.⁸

In short, every local Orthodox parish is Catholic insofar as it gathers regularly in one place around its canonical diocesan bishop and/or the presbyter representing him to celebrate the Eucharist and in this act proclaims in this liturgy “the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints” (Jude 1:3) thereby communicating in a common faith and life with all other canonical Orthodox communities likewise so gathered.⁹ Catholic communion, if it exists, exists between local Orthodox churches in a total communion of faith and life in Christ led by canonically consecrated and elected Orthodox first hierarchs or primate bishops who acknowledge one another’s Orthodoxy symbolized by their concelebration of the liturgy.¹⁰ These men are the first among equals of their particular local church’s Synod of bishops who when they meet are led in the concelebration of the liturgy by their primate. On the rare occasion of a universal meeting of the majority of the local Orthodox churches, such as the Council of Crete in June 2006, the meeting is opened and closed by a communal celebration of the liturgy of the primates of all of the canonical Orthodox churches led by the primate of the Orthodox Church, the first among equals, the Patriarch of Constantinople. A famous

example of this sort of Divine Conciliar Liturgy was the Feast of Pentecost liturgy which opened the Council of Crete with ten primates of local Orthodox churches concelebrating with Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I of Constantinople presiding.¹¹

One can now understand why the Orthodox claim that communion between local churches that have no common faith and life cannot occur. Communion is the crown of unity and to break bread where there is no unity of faith and life and, by natural extension as an expression of that faith and life, where there is no communion between universally recognized and canonically consecrated and elected primates or heads of local Orthodox churches is to symbolize a nonexistent reality or, worse, to make the sacrament to be magic effecting unity where there is none. This is why Orthodox theologians have generally rejected the term “intercommunion” since, they argue, according to the ancient Patristic understanding of communion, two churches are either “not in communion” or “in communion.”¹² Indeed, the prefix “inter” (in the modern coinage “intercommunion”) normalizes an abnormal situation¹³ by implying that communion can exist between two separated Church bodies while they yet remain separate in their faith and life and where there is no communion (i.e. ultimately no concelebration of the liturgy) between their respective primates.

In the Orthodox understanding, to reiterate, when two churches are not in communion, eucharistic fellowship is not practiced between their two primates (as well as their respective episcopates and flocks right down to the parish level) and indeed should not be practiced as there is no commonality of faith and life in the whole body from top to bottom. In contrast, when two churches are in communion, eucharistic fellowship is rightly celebrated and practiced between the primates (and their respective episcopates and flocks) because it is the organic expression of a complete unity of faith and life of the two churches as the communion of the one Church.¹⁵ In other words, no halfway house of sacramental communion can exist for churches that are not already one in faith and life. Nor, at this point

in Orthodox thinking, can there be communion between two churches where one has no Orthodox canonical episcopal hierarchy. The only conceivable version of intercommunion that could be acceptable for an Orthodox is the consummation in the Eucharist of an already existing total unity of faith and life of two churches, led by their primates, which are already spiritually one church. The intercommunion would, then, be a sacramental acknowledgement or eucharistic seal of an already existing spiritual and confessional reality. Since the Orthodox value so highly the sobornicity or conciliarity of the Church, as Augustine details so eloquently, it is sometimes said that a process of the reunion of whole churches could only take place in an ecumenical council although it is unclear who would preside at such a Florence like sobor and how it even would be called.

The position I have sketched above is repeated time and again in official Orthodox statements and by representative theologians with little variation and, I am afraid, often very little creativity. In my opinion, like any theological position, in order that its truth may be embodied anew for each generation, it needs closer examination and rearticulation. This is especially the case because Sergii Bulgakov (1871–1944), perhaps the most profound Orthodox theologian of the modern period, a figure who for many reasons is only now being given a wider appreciation, advocated, as I mentioned earlier, intercommunion between Orthodox and Non-Orthodox in the 1930s.¹⁷ Augustine is clearly building on the thought of Bulgakov. In 1933–35, Bulgakov put forward proposals for a limited, mutually episcopally blessed intercommunion between the Anglican and the Orthodox members in the Anglican-Orthodox ecumenical Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius.¹⁸ Both Bulgakov and the prominent Orthodox theologian Fr Georges Florovsky (1893–1979) (perhaps the most influential Orthodox theologian of the twentieth century) were active members. Bulgakov made his proposals in light of widespread official Orthodox acknowledgment of Anglican orders, sacraments, and basic teaching. Florovsky strongly opposed Bulgakov's proposals,

which never went beyond the discussion phase and became assimilated into the vaguer notion of “spiritual intercommunion.”

Bulgakov’s basic idea was for a mutual episcopal “sacramental blessing” of Orthodox and Anglican Fellowship members, both ordained and lay, to partake of communion at one another’s altars at Fellowship conferences; this (it was hoped) would serve as a sort of seed leading to the eventual complete unity of the two Churches. In the case of the Orthodox, the blessing or sacramental sanction would come from Bulgakov and Florovsky’s bishop, Metropolitan Evlogii (Georgievsky) (1868–1946) of the Russian Exarchate under Constantinople, and Evlogii would ask for a corresponding blessing from the Patriarch of Constantinople. In the case of the Anglicans, the appropriate blessing would come from the diocesan bishop or from the Archbishop of Canterbury. Anglican and Orthodox bishops alike would confer the blessing on the Fellowship priest of the other Church so that the blessing would be fully mutual. Orthodox bishops would bless Anglican priests to communicate at the Orthodox liturgy, to concelebrate with Russian priests if they so desired, and to communicate Orthodox and Anglican laity in the Fellowship who wished to participate in these celebrations. Likewise, in an analogous fashion, which Bulgakov left to the Anglicans to determine, the Anglican bishop would bless the Orthodox priest to participate in intercommunion with Anglican clergy and laity. The particular sacramental blessing of Anglican laity to participate in intercommunion at Orthodox altars could take either the form of a blessing by a bishop or, more preferably, the form of chrismation with the invocation of the Trinity by a priest. This latter rite is the standard Russian way of receiving converts with a Trinitarian baptism to Orthodoxy, and Bulgakov was using it to acknowledge the tacit Orthodox ecclesial status of Anglican Christians. The final version of Bulgakov’s proposals was ultimately rejected in June 1935 by the Fellowship council before, however, it could be

discussed in open session at the conference. A thorough theological examination and history of the proposals has yet to be published.

The major difficulty with the Orthodox account of its opposition to intercommunion I have sketched above is that it is based on an arbitrary opposition of the Eucharist as end, sign, and crown of unity (assumed in Orthodox sacramental theology) and the Eucharist as the means and builder of unity (often asserted by some Orthodoxy to be at the core of non-Orthodox sacramental theology). What must be said about this opposition is that the Eucharist is neither solely the end nor solely the means of Christian unity but both! Why cannot a limited intercommunion between separated churches be officially encouraged, perhaps on the diocesan level or even between local churches whose mother churches due to a few important but not insuperable barriers yet remain separate, as long as their exists between the particular groups a fullness of unity in faith and life? Thus, there exist proposals, for example, about limited intercommunion between local Orthodox and Greek Catholic churches where there are significant theological differences on a few key issues but a nearly complete unity on most every other aspect of church life including liturgy.¹⁹ Most contemporary Orthodox would respond to this tentative proposal that any unity of two different local churches must be total and from top (primate) to bottom (parish), particularly in regard to the faith, before the Eucharist can consummate that unity. This would mean that it is impossible at the parish or diocesan level to have any sort of economic intercommunion not blessed by the Synod and the primate. Furthermore, in the case just mentioned, it would be also replied that holding to Catholic teachings such as papal infallibility, as Greek Catholics do, is a dire impediment for eucharistic union and not merely a small doctrinal difference between two churches.

The second difficulty of the Orthodox status quo theological position opposing intercommunion is that it is not entirely apparent, especially in matters of belief, what

constitutes such a prior existing unity in faith and life allowing for a *communicatio in sacris* between two local churches out of communion. The Orthodox say that on matters of faith, the unity, allowing sacramental communion, must be a unity of the “whole faith” but this assertion assumes that this matter is perspicuous. It both ignores the fact that the Church’s dogmatic teaching has developed as God has ever led her to a deeper understanding of the revelation of the Father God given to us in Christ through the Spirit (e.g., the teaching on the ever-virginity of the Mother of God was not given at Pentecost) and the fact that in any given epoch of the Church some teachings have abiding or essential value (e.g., Christology) whereas others are more or less ephemeral. In other words, the “whole faith” of the Church does not necessarily coincide with the whole faith of what the Church may have taught at any given period. One is impelled, therefore, to follow the wise dictum, often misattributed to St. Augustine, “in essentials, unity; in doubtful matters, liberty; in all things charity.” One must attempt to distinguish through love, in the Church’s teaching, what is necessary (dogma proper) from what is in doubt (*theologumena* or theological opinion) where liberty must be the rule. Otherwise, one must advocate that the only way of reunion is conversion to the Eastern Orthodox Church with its present “whole faith,” which would make ecumenism a species of evangelism understood as one church swallowing the other. It must be admitted, sadly, that this sort of “Byzantinecentrism” lies behind much modern Orthodox involvement in ecumenism, following, arguably, Florovsky.²⁰ This is why Bulgakov and the historian Anton Karteshev (1875-1960) argued in the context of discussion of Anglican-Orthodox intercommunion that if Orthodoxy is honestly open to reunion with the separated western churches then it must attempt to perceive in our own age and in other non-Orthodox ecclesial bodies a “living minimum” of dogma that is the maximum of the Orthodox Church’s common heritage over all time.²¹ Furthermore, Bulgakov saw the potential reunion of the churches as ultimately being based upon a “living minimum” of dogma which would be

grounded in the life of the sacraments, above all, the Eucharist.²² This ecumenical position upon which basis there might be built a reunion of the Orthodox Church and the western churches, Bulgakov contended, was in contrast to both an abstract dogmatic maximalism²³ and an abstract dogmatic minimalism.²⁴

What I hope is clear in my response to Augustine and explanation of the Orthodox position on intercommunion is that the ecclesial structures of communion in Orthodoxy, its institution including the office of the episcopate and with it apostolic succession, are not simply hieratic extras needed merely to perform liturgical functions in services. Faith and Communion are woven together in Orthodoxy and are inconceivable without the office of the bishop just as Spirit and institution are woven together in the tightest compact. It is for this reason that the Orthodox have traditionally privileged dialogue with churches such as the Catholics and Anglicans that not only have Orthodox teaching but have apostolic succession and sacraments akin to our own. If this is the case, then communion assumes an episcopate with enduring apostolic succession and to be in communion is to be gathered in one place around one's bishop as both chief celebrant and chief exegete of the Word of life heard and consumed. For two different local churches to be in communion is for their chief bishops or primates, as the ones who "rightly discern the word of your [God's] truth" (2 Tim. 2:15 in the Anaphora of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom),²⁵ to be communing together at the same altar. This means that "open communion," as practiced in many Protestant churches—where any baptized Christian in good conscience, often despite serious theological differences, is permitted to share the Eucharist even if their bishops are not in communion—is an impossibility for the Orthodox though some form of intercommunion between churches where there is partial communion between bishops (or blessed by hierarchs) is at least conceivable and debatable. Augustine's contemporary critique, which reminds us of Bulgakov's historic proposals, is evidence that the Orthodox need to look again at their first

principal opposition to intercommunion if only so that they might re-envision eucharistic ecclesiology, which has at times become a rather stale orthodoxy riddled with contradictions. Contemporary Orthodox eucharistic ecclesiology needs to take into greater consideration the mystery of baptism as the mystery of the ongoing reality of Pentecost,²⁶ which, as Augustine has argued so eloquently, cannot be contained within the bounds of the Orthodox Church.

<1>Response to John P. Burgess’s “A Protestant Response to ‘Relations of the Orthodox Church with the Rest of the Christian World’”

Professor Burgess is a rare among evangelical Protestant theologians in not only being well grounded in Orthodox theology but in having a detailed first-hand experience of the Orthodox Church, especially in the Russian tradition, through living and participating in Orthodox life in Russia and America.²⁷ This is crucial, as Burgess notes quoting a priest in St. Petersburg, since Orthodox belief is bound up inextricably with Orthodox worship. The Russian polymath and new martyr Fr Pavel Florensky (1882–1937) puts this in a trenchant manner characteristically emphasizing Orthodoxy’s claims (to which I will return) to ecclesiological and soteriological exclusivity over against Western churches:

<ext>The Orthodox taste, the Orthodox temper, is felt but it is not subject to arithmetical calculation. Orthodoxy is shown, not proved. That is why there is only one way to understand Orthodoxy: through direct Orthodox experience. One hears that, in foreign lands, people are now learning how to swim, lying on the floor, with the aid of equipment. In the same way, one can become a Catholic or a Protestant without experiencing life at all—by reading books in one’s study. But to become Orthodox, it is necessary to immerse oneself all at once in the very element of Orthodoxy, to begin living in an Orthodox way. There is no other way.²⁹

This sense that truth cannot be known except experientially in worship, and above all in the liturgy, is indeed at the heart of Orthodoxy and the Pan-Orthodox Holy and Great Council. (Indeed, precisely here, though this would require a interlocutor from a different Christian tradition than that of the Reformed churches, it has a vast amount in common with Pentecostalism and other non-Western and nonmodern forms of religiosity where secular and sacred, creed and worship have not yet been separated.) Burgess adeptly and in detail explicates in the Council documents the Orthodox vision splendid of the Christian life as “the transfiguration of all reality” (Burgess). By “transfiguration” Burgess refers to the Orthodox contention, seen in the Council texts, that the “purpose of the incarnation of the Word of God is the deification of the human person” where Christ makes “the human person divine like himself, the beginning of our hope.”³¹ The hymnography of the Feast of the Transfiguration emphasizes that when Christ was transfigured on Mt. Tabor (Mt. 17:1–8, Mk 9:2–8, Lk 9:28–36 and 2 Pet. 1:16-18) and the disciples saw the glory of “Christ our God” that they knew that when he was crucified that his suffering was a free self-offering and could then proclaim to the world that he was the brightness of the Father calling all to become similarly transfigured, new creations:

<ext>When the infinite Light that knows no evening, even the brightness of the Father that gives splendour to creation, ineffably appeared in unapproachable glory on Mount Tabor, it made men godlike as they sang: “O all ye works of the Lord, bless ye the Lord.”³²

This vision of transfigured life, cooperating with God in Christ in the transformation of ourselves and God’s creation as sons and daughters of God in Christ, is woven into all aspects of Orthodoxy beginning with the liturgy but then going outwards in mission to the world in what the Romanian theologian Fr Ion Bria (1929–2002) called the “liturgy after the liturgy.”³³ The Orthodox face issues (as Burgess reminds us) as diverse as social justice and

politics in light of the call for transformation into the new humanity we receive in Christ, and, in light of him, the gospel's declaration of a new heaven and new earth. Here we have one of the key contemporary contributions of Orthodoxy to current theology: transfiguration—and, by extension, deification and sacramentality—as the foundation of all Christian praxis.³⁵

Burgess's paper on the Holy and Great Council of Crete of June 2016 (hereafter I will refer to the Council as "Crete") understands, in a way sometimes lost by other non-Orthodox writers, that Orthodoxy sees its involvement in ecumenism as a form of witness, tantamount to a tacit evangelism, that aims to present to the world the truth of Orthodoxy and draw the non-Orthodox back to the true Church. (I want to return to this issue of Orthodox exclusivism below.) Crete is no different. To the extent that Crete is an ecumenical event, it aims to witness, give a *martyria* to the world of the truth of Orthodoxy ("a trustworthy witness to the truth to all humankind").³⁷ The reality of witness though, for Orthodoxy, given its lack of a strong central authority, the fact that it is only partially modernized and its tendency to be enthralled by a mix of clashing nationalisms, politics of small nations and various corrupt monied interests (all noted in Burgess's broader writings on Orthodoxy), is often much more martyric than the idealistic language of the Council documents let on. Moreover, witness in a contemporary context requires from the Church that it masters the new medias of witness. No longer is it sufficient to simply promulgate documents and to trust that these will reliably meet their multiple audiences. One must enter into the mechanics of witness and inevitably a question is raised as to whether the message changes subtly with the challenges of new media.

I attended Crete while working in the Ecumenical Patriarchate's Press Office as a theological subject expert in a small team led by Archdeacon John Chryssavgis.³⁸ It is here that I was faced with the problems attending Orthodox Christian witness in the Internet age. This position, which I took on before Crete and carried on in different capacities for months

afterwards, was slightly unusual for an academic theologian. I was certainly nothing as glamorous as my theological heroes, the periti of Vatican II, such as Yves Congar and Karl Rahner, drafting from scratch, over an intensive conciliar period of many years, church constitutions after the preprepared drafts of the Holy Office were rejected at the outset of Vatican II. The documents in Crete's case (except for what became its Encyclical—perhaps its most dynamic text) were already long drafted by court theologians and ecclesiastical bureaucrats—in some cases over a period of decades—and the fear was that any change to these texts would blow apart the fragile consensus of fourteen different churches. The Russian Church, in particular, which has strong ties to the Russian government, had no other object in participation in the conciliar process except the advancement of its own supremacy over Constantinople and the exaltation of the Russian nation. Indeed, at the last moment, the Moscow Patriarchate pulled out of the Council. It was joined in pulling out of the proceedings, as an attempt to crash the Council and humiliate Constantinople, by Antioch (based in Syria), Georgia and Bulgaria, all churches from countries firmly within the Russian sphere of influence. The most contentious issues requiring creativity and new thinking, such as autocephaly (the declaration of new fully independent churches) and primacy, had long been taken off the Council agenda. Crete aimed not at a renewal of the faith in the contemporary context and certainly nothing like an updating of the faith but at a sort of general overall witness to Orthodoxy in the present age, that is, a snapshot of sorts of what is held by all Orthodox churches, and, being Orthodoxy, what is asserted has always been held as handed down by the Fathers.

Thus, my participation at Crete as a then-lay married theologian, a convert not educated at any of the ecclesiastical institutions of the churches attending, was always slightly surplus to requirements from a traditional understanding of the sort of person who attends a church council. However, I and my fellow Orthodox scholars and theologians did

have one key use for the hierarchy: public relations or the dissemination of Crete's message (such as it had a unified message) to the world and, above all, the non-Orthodox world.³⁹ So much attention had been given to church diplomacy in the decades of preparation that little or no attention was given to the mechanics of broadcasting and streaming this unique gathering of Orthodoxy. I use the electronic and media language purposefully as contemporary Orthodox witness inevitably must adapt itself from Twitter and social media to news outlets. My witnessing work for the Council, therefore, included more traditional forms such as helping to draft an earlier form of what became its Encyclical, advising informally occasionally on other documents and meeting with and helping to brief the ecumenical representatives at Crete, but also, more strangely for a theologian, creating a large database of media and church contacts, helping to run a daily international press briefing, writing two scholarly articles, writing or co-writing five news pieces, press releases, and scripts for videos. Much of this work culminated recently in my participation in a drafting commission led by Fr Chryssavgis with many of the same people from the press office at Crete. We recently published a social doctrine teaching document for the Ecumenical Patriarchate in twelve languages entitled, *For the Life of the World: Toward a Social Ethos of the Orthodox Church*. *For the Life of the World* attempts to give guidance to the Orthodox faithful on all of the key areas in modern life from sexuality to religious diversity and economics.⁴⁰ This conciliar spade work was extremely painful and often immensely frustrating given Orthodoxy's fractious nature, about which I have written at length in another context.⁴¹

But the underlying major problem faced at Crete was that in witnessing in a contemporary context to the Orthodox faith the Council Fathers were forced to respond to a world that is often wholly alien to Orthodoxy. Crete's documents at times strongly attack "evil in the world," seen in the pluralism of modern societies, broadly understood to precipitate everything from secularism to substance abuse, and biotechnology to "moral

laxity.” This is particularly apparent in the document, “The Mission of the Orthodox Church in Today’s World.”⁴² Pluralism in this document and others is understood to threaten the stability and integrity of Orthodoxy’s perennial identity. This broad suspicion of the modern Western world by many Council Fathers (reflecting their own churches, it must be said) caused difficulties for myself and colleagues as we attempted to faithfully witness to the Council but in a way that was constructive and highlighted the best side of Crete and did not simply bolster the negative aspect of the Orthodox Church’s exclusivism: reactionary anti-Westernism and triumphalism. Sometimes we ended up with irresolvable tensions in our witnessing work. Some Council Fathers were extremely negative about technology. Yet it was technology that made it possible to broadcast the message of Crete itself. Moreover, effective and skillful engagement with technology was the presupposition of my own work in the press team in letting the Council Fathers’ message be known in as broad a way as possible.

At this point I want to turn back to a point raised repeatedly by Burgess, which is Orthodoxy’s ecclesiological and even soteriological exclusivism. Crete is very clear that the Eastern Orthodox Church is the “One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church” of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed. As I noted in my response to Professor Coulter’s essay, this assertion of Orthodoxy’s unique identity is shared alike by ecumenists and anti-ecumenists in Orthodoxy.⁴³ Generally speaking, however, Orthodox anti-ecumenists tend to deny that any element of the Church qua Church exists outside the walls of the canonical reality of the 14 autocephalous/fully independent local churches⁴⁴ that constitute the Eastern Orthodox Church. In contrast, Orthodox pro-ecumenists, as Burgess notes, citing Prof Peter Bouteneff and the late Fr Thomas Hopko (1939–2015), would argue that even though Orthodoxy *is* the Church of the Creed, that this does not negate that certain elements of graciousness, of the

Spirit, catholicity, do remain in other Christian communities, for, as Metropolitan Kallistos Ware observed, “We know where the Church is but we cannot be sure where it is not.”⁴⁶

One possible Orthodox theological way of articulating this “qualified ecclesiological exclusivism” (to borrow a phrase from Professor Phan’s essay),⁴⁸ building on the ideas of Sergii Bulgakov, is to speak of seeds or grains of the Orthodox Church in non-Orthodox churches. Other non-Orthodox churches are Orthodox in some sense given not only scripture, common history, shared moral vision, and confession of the Faith of the Councils but also because such Christian groups, through their Trinitarian baptism, contain, as Bulgakov put it, “a grain of orthodoxy.” The invisible universal Church, *Una Sancta*, Orthodoxy as such, is, Bulgakov argued, like the ancient Jewish temple composed of two circles and all baptized Christians belong to her and are in a sense Orthodox insofar as they are Christian. In the inner circle, the holy of holies, is the visible empirical Church, which coincides with the canonical family of churches known as Eastern Orthodoxy, but in the larger circle, the court of the temple, are the other mainstream Western and doctrinally orthodox Christian confessions and churches. These groups have to a lesser or greater degree “a grain of Orthodoxy” insofar as they are related to the “Orthodox” center of the temple with its fullness of divine-human life, but all doctrinally orthodox mainstream Christian churches are alike ecclesial, tacitly Orthodox.⁴⁹

The Christian sacraments, even if partially ineffective, as in the case of the sacraments of Western non-Orthodox, are “a call to universality,” being of the empirical Church, insofar as they are celebrated in it, but are from the invisible Church above.⁵⁰ Echoing St. Augustine, Bulgakov contends that non-Orthodox sacraments from baptism to ordination are, to a greater or lesser degree, depending on the nature of the schism, merely ineffective in schism although most certainly not nonexistent.⁵¹ In short, the Church exists outside of its own canonical walls: “*ecclesia extra ecclesiam*’ or rather *ecclesia extra muros*.”⁵² All baptized

Christians, in light of their baptisms, are called to reunion with the Orthodox Church from which they have become separated either through willful schism or, more often than not, through history and no fault of their own. For “The light of Christ shines for all!” (*The Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts*).⁵³ This means that all Orthodox ecumenism is bound up with evangelism and mission, and, as Georges Florovsky bluntly noted (though this position has severe limitations), for Orthodoxy “Christian reunion is just universal conversion to Orthodoxy.”⁵⁴

But does the affirmation of this qualified ecclesiological exclusivism mean that it is impossible for Orthodoxy to learn anything new from other Christian traditions? Or that if it does learn something that it is simply remembering some aspect of Orthodoxy that was forgotten (as Burgess suggests would be an Orthodox move)? If the Orthodox Church is simply without remainder the Bride of the Lamb ascending and descending in our midst at each Divine Liturgy, perfect and spotless, then it would seem to be that it is indeed impossible for the Orthodox Church to become more perfect and certainly then it would seem to be impossible for it to learn anything from other “churches.” (whose ecclesial status is questioned). Tradition, in this ecclesiology (which suffers from an overly realized eschatology), is a sort of abyss of grace around which Orthodox Christians congregate as a sort of bottomless whirlpool and which perpetually spews up ever ancient and ever new truths uniquely and exclusively available to the Orthodox. This is certainly the contention of many Orthodox and would explain not only their complete refusal to learn anything from other non-Orthodox Christians (dismissed as heretics and schismatics) but also the refusal of any sort of self-critique. I must say sadly that I agree with Burgess that Crete, to a degree, reflects this “eschatological excess” (Burgess) of Orthodox self-consciousness. This self-consciousness is a direct result of Orthodoxy’s universally acknowledged liturgical self-awareness. Its self-identity is said to be found in the Eucharist and this identity is understood

to be the fullness of the Church in the eschaton: the Church in the process of gathering in one place for the Eucharist becomes the new Jerusalem, the Kingdom of God, the Bride of the Lamb “coming down out of heaven from God” (Rev. 21:2).⁵⁵

But such a Church is a static reality like the “gold mosaic of a wall”⁵⁷ forever bound to one moment, trapped in an icon of its own making. It is not the dynamic reality of the Church immersed in history, broken by the battering of its own institutional wrangling and clashes with the world, whose deeply mixed and contradictory encounters are the means by which it, as Bride of the Lamb, is being sanctified by its Bridegroom, cleansed by the washing of water with the Word so it might be presented to its Lord in the bridal chamber of the age to come as holy and without blemish (Eph. 5:25–27). The Church in being both broken and transfigured with Christ on Mt. Tabor is *already but not yet* the Bride of the Lamb as experienced in the Liturgy or, to adapt Luther’s famous phrase, the Church is *simul peccator et justus*. Another Western conception is helpful here to convey the paradoxical sense of the Church being at once in perfection and in brokenness—the Church, we might say, is a chaste whore, *casta meretrix*, both Hosea’s former unfaithful spouse Gomer (Hos. 1:2–3) and “the woman clothed with the sun” (Rev. 12:1).⁵⁸ Put in Orthodox terms, we can affirm with Florovsky that “the *true* Church is not yet the *perfect* Church.”⁵⁹

What Orthodoxy, therefore, can learn from other Christians is not simply self-examination and repentance and, indeed, a little humility (!), but something more theologically basic, which is the ability to take the Church as an historical Body, an institution that changes and can continue to change and *become perfect*, with utmost theological seriousness. If the Church is at once *perfect* in the Divine Liturgy as a foretaste of the eschaton, but also enmeshed in history as an institution *becoming perfect*, then it can change to a degree in structure and even teaching and can learn and adapt in light of the experience of contemporary Christians when they encounter new knowledge from contemporary scientific

advances to social changes. Yet this learning and adaptation for the Orthodox must always be in light of divine revelation as witnessed to us in scripture and interpreted through tradition as given in the Mind of the Fathers (which is the ‘Mind of Christ’ (1 Cor 2:16)) articulated authoritatively through the episcopate who rightly divide the Word of God’s truth (2 Tim 2:15), ideally gathered in council. The fundamental contemporary challenge of Orthodoxy, which the Council of Crete only began to respond to, is how to creatively respond to Western modernity and secularism and still remain faithful and identical to the tradition of the Eastern Orthodox Church and the Church as affirmed in the Creed.⁶⁰ It is in this creative task of responding to modernity that Western Protestant churches, who had to meet the challenges of modernity long before, can assist Orthodoxy in both what to do and what not to do in responding to the key challenges of our time.

<1>Response to Dale M. Coulter’s “Response to the Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church

I want to focus my response to Professor Coulter on his ecclesiological concerns. In particular, I want to try to respond to his hope that Orthodoxy in light of the Holy and Great Council of Crete now has space to recognize Pentecostals as “churches,” in some sense, even if these same Pentecostal communities remain (from the Orthodox position) schismatic or churches that have a depleted form of ecclesiality: “the HGC opens the door to a genuine acceptance of Pentecostals not simply as fellow Christians, but also as partial forms of the church attempting to realize the fullness of Pentecost in their lives” (Coulter). This hope for the Orthodox recognition of Pentecostalism is particularly poignant for me as Profs Coulter, Daniela Augustine (also published in this forum) and I have all been participants in the ongoing Orthodox-Pentecostal Academic Dialogue.⁶²

The Orthodox-Pentecostal Academic Dialogue followed on official and informal exploratory talks concerning a possible official and formal dialogue between senior representatives of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople and Classical Pentecostals from the Pentecostal World Fellowship held between 2010 and 2012. With the blessing of Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I, an informal and nonofficial academic dialogue between Orthodox and Classical Pentecostal academics started in 2017. Both the earlier official talks with the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the current nonofficial academic dialogue have been endorsed by the Pentecostal World Fellowship. The Academic Dialogue was to be a very different sort of dialogue from the previous Orthodox-Pentecostal talks, above all because neither side was presenting the official position of their respective churches. Rather, the participants engaged one another in the dialogue as academic colleagues from the basis of their respective ecclesial traditions and commitments rather than as formal representatives of a church. The dialogue aims to increase the understanding and appreciation of each ecclesial tradition. It seeks to identify points of convergence or intersection of Orthodoxy and Pentecostalism, while being aware of areas of divergence. The meetings proved to be for me, as an Orthodox theologian (echoing Coulter's paper), places of encounter where there was a real movement of the Spirit deeply uniting the participants in and with Christ and through him with one another. They were characterized by free-flowing academic and spiritual exchanges with the day's meetings opening and closing in prayer led by the different traditions.

The Orthodox-Academic Dialogue was co-chaired for its first three years by Revd. Dr. Harold D. Hunter (International Pentecostal Holiness Church) with the assistance of Prof. Daniela C. Augustine (University of Birmingham) and myself (University of Exeter and a deacon of the Ecumenical Patriarchate) with the assistance of Prof. Paul Ladouceur (University of Toronto and Orthodox Church in America (OCA)). We first met at Hellenic

College–Holy Cross Seminary (the seminary of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, Ecumenical Patriarchate) in Boston in 2017 before the annual meeting of the American Academy of Religion with an exploratory meeting where there was a sharing of our two traditions with two speakers from each tradition (Prof. Peter Bouteneff (St. Vladimir’s Seminary and OCA) for the Orthodox and Professor Coulter himself) talking about their respective tradition’s spiritualities. We then subsequently met in November 2018 in Denver held at Iliff School of Theology where the topic of “Spiritual Experience” was explored by speakers from both traditions (for the Orthodox: Prof. Paul Ladouceur; for the Pentecostals: Revd. Prof. Lisa P. Stephenson)⁶³ and then in November 2019 in San Diego held at University of San Diego where the discussion was on “Mediation in the Christian Life” (for the Pentecostals: Revd. Prof. Chris E. W. Green; for the Orthodox: Revd. Prof. Philip LeMasters). The Academic Dialogue now continues in a new phase (though without the informal connection to the Ecumenical Patriarchate) with two new co-chairs, Profs. Paul Ladouceur (Orthodox) and Daniela Augustine (Pentecostal). A meeting was held in January 2021 by videoconference (given the worldwide pandemic) on the theme of “Charisms and Authority in the Church” (for the Orthodox: Revd. Prof. John Jillions; for the Pentecostals: Revd. Prof. Terry L. Cross) and the Academic Dialogue plans to meet again in November 2021 in San Antonio, Texas (or online as necessary) on the theme of “Discernment of Holiness and Holy Persons.”

The basis of Coulter’s hope that Orthodoxy might begin to acknowledge or recognize the Christian graciousness, the Spirit’s presence, in Pentecostal communities is twofold. First, he believes that Orthodoxy might come to recognize ecclesiality in Pentecostal communities given the mutual contention in Pentecostalism and Orthodoxy that “the entire life of the Church, moved by the Holy Spirit,” to quote Bulgakov, “is an extended Pentecost.”⁶⁵ Second, he points to a famous and contentious passage in Crete’s documents (“Relations of the

Orthodox Church with the Rest of the Christian World,” 6) whereby the Orthodox Church has for the first time at a council *seemed* to accept non-Orthodox bodies like the Pentecostals as churches.

Coulter argues that while Pentecostals may not have a commitment to the sacraments, especially the Eucharist, which is so central for Orthodoxy, they do still have a “sacramentalism grounded in the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit” (Coulter) seen in the gift of tongues but concretized above all in baptism and anointing with oil as sites of encounter with the risen Lord through the Spirit. Might it be possible, Coulter asks, for the Orthodox to “discern the Spirit among the Pentecostals” (Coulter) if they have this Pentecostal reality and if Crete now accepts that bodies like the Pentecostals are “churches” in some sense? Building on this recognition, he hopes the Orthodox would—even if proselytism is wholly rejected—begin to accept as a legitimate movement of grace the decision of some nominal Orthodox to become Pentecostal in countries where Orthodoxy “has been the state religion for hundreds of years” (Coulter) (here he is presumably referring to the rise of Pentecostal missions in Eastern Europe after 1991).

Much as I am sympathetic to Coulter’s desire for official Orthodox acknowledgment of Pentecostalism and personally committed to Orthodox-Pentecostal rapprochement, Crete’s pronouncements on the status of non-Orthodox are in fact far from straightforward acknowledgments of “churches” outside of Orthodoxy and so I think on an official level most Orthodox would have difficulty accepting the ecclesiality of Pentecostal communions. Much of the debate at Crete focused on paragraph 6 of the document “Relations of the Orthodox Church with the Rest of the Christian World” which Professor Coulter cites and whether it was permissible to call other Christian bodies and confessions “churches.” The passage in question reflects the dissension on the ecclesiality of non-Orthodox and ecumenism more generally that still remains an ongoing issue in Orthodoxy even after Crete. The initial pre-

conciliar wording of the draft document approved in October 2015 at the 5th Pre-Conciliar Conference was the following much more straightforward text:

<ext>According to the Church's ontological nature, her unity can never be shattered. The Orthodox Church acknowledges the historical existence of other Christian Churches and Confessions that are not in communion with her and believes that her affiliation with them should be based on a speedy and objective elucidation of all ecclesiological topics, most especially their general teachings on sacraments, grace, priesthood, and apostolic succession. Accordingly, for theological and pastoral reasons, Orthodoxy has viewed dialogue with various Christian Churches and Confessions, as well her participation, in general, in the present-day Ecumenical Movement in a favorable manner. She is hopeful that through dialogue she will bear dynamic witness to the fullness of Christ's truth and to her spiritual treasures to those who are separated from her. Her objective purpose, therefore, is to tread upon the path that leads to unity. (§6)⁶⁸

I learned about the debate on this passage in Council sessions while working for the Ecumenical Patriarchate in its press office at Crete.⁶⁹ Some eminent bishops, principally from the Church of Greece (especially, the ultraconservative and anti-ecumenist Metropolitan Hierotheos (Vlachos) of Nafpaktos (b. 1945)), but joined by the Church of Serbia and a few from the Church of Cyprus, attacked the use of *ekklēsia* (church) for the non-Orthodox (“heterodox”). They opposed using “church” not only for Pentecostals but even for the ecclesial communities of Catholics (despite the fact that Orthodoxy and Catholicism have clear similarities in doctrine, sacraments and polity). These hierarchs, who represent an anti-ecumenical stream in canonical world Orthodoxy, argued that it was dogmatically and historically impossible to refer to the non-Orthodox by the name (“church”) that was solely

reserved for the Orthodox Church, which is the true and only Church. In response, other theologian bishops, principally from the Ecumenical Patriarchate, notably Metropolitan John (Zizioulas) of Pergamon (b. 1931), who represent a contrasting Orthodox tendency, argued that in Patristic literature from pre-schism times down to the writings of modern “fathers” (like Georges Florovsky and Vladimir Lossky) that the Orthodox Church has always referred to the bodies of those Christians who are not Orthodox as “churches.” *Ekklēsia*, it was argued, is not a magic word that makes non-Orthodox (“heterodoxy”) into Orthodoxy. Therefore, some in this pro-ecumenist group, among which I include myself, would be open to seeing, to a greater or lesser degree, ecclesiality in non-Orthodox from the Catholic Church to the various Pentecostal churches. After this standoff, Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew requested the two sides to come up with a compromise wording the following day. The result of the discussions between the churches after this debate is the following somewhat strange wording, which is arguably *intentionally ambiguous* as is typical of conciliar phrases born out of compromise:

<ext>In accordance with the ontological nature of the Church, her unity can never be perturbed. In spite of this, the Orthodox Church accepts the historical name of other non-Orthodox Christian Churches and Confessions that are not in communion with her [Παρά ταῦτα, ἡ Ὀρθόδοξος Ἐκκλησία ἀποδέχεται τὴν ἱστορικὴν ὀνομασίαν τῶν μὴ εὕρισκομένων ἐν κοινωσίᾳ μετ’ αὐτῆς ἄλλων ἑτεροδόξων χριστιανικῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ Ὁμολογιῶν], and believes that her relations with them should be based on the most speedy and objective clarification possible of the whole ecclesiological question, and most especially of their more general teachings on sacraments, grace, priesthood, and apostolic succession. Thus, she was favourably and positively disposed, both for theological and pastoral reasons, towards theological dialogue with

*other Christians on a bi-lateral and multi-lateral level, and towards more general participation in the Ecumenical Movement of recent times, in the conviction that through dialogue she gives a dynamic witness to the fullness of truth in Christ and to her spiritual treasures to those who are outside her, with the objective aim of smoothing the path leading to unity. (§6)*⁷⁰

Both pro-ecumenist and anti-ecumenist Orthodox groups acknowledge that the Orthodox Church is the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church of the Creed and that neither history nor schism has divided it (“her unity can never be perturbed”) and that it will remain unified and one until the *parousia*. The next clause, “the Orthodox Church accepts the historical name of other non-Orthodox Christian Churches and Confessions that are not in communion with her,” is Orthodoxy’s “subsist in” moment (the famous highly debated, contentious and ambiguous phrase which appears most famously in the eighth paragraph of Vatican II’s *Lumen Gentium* where there was an attempt to define the universal Church’s identity with or relationship to the Catholic Church).⁷¹ It is not perspicuous. It is a purposefully ambiguous statement meant to join two very different Orthodox ecclesiological positions that are retained in the Church in an unresolved tension. The clause can mean different things for pro- and anti- Orthodox ecumenists. It can mean two quite different things. Firstly, it can mean that the Orthodox Church has always accepted that other (Western) Christian bodies like the Roman Catholic Church and the various Pentecostal communions are called and are in some sense “churches” and so are spiritually linked with Orthodoxy (as Zizioulas holds) even if they are not in visible communion with Orthodoxy. Secondly, and in contrast, it can also mean that the Orthodox Church accepts that other (Western) Christian bodies have and continue to call themselves “churches” and that the Orthodox respect that they do so. However, by calling these bodies “churches”, this in no way means that the Orthodox Church accepts them as such since, given their ecclesial defectiveness and being the products of

schism and heresy, they are neither in spiritual nor visible communion with the (Orthodox) Church (as Vlachos argues).

Here we see coming to the surface one of the classic theological debates in modern Orthodoxy concerning the “limits of the Church.”⁷² This is bound up with the issue of sacramental economy or the question of the ecclesial status of non-Orthodox Christians and sacraments and how they might be received into Orthodoxy.⁷³ Some Orthodox like Vlachos, drawing on the tradition of the great theologian, spiritual writer and canonist, St. Nikodemos the Haghiorite (1748–1809), hold to the position that the canonical and the spiritual bounds of the Church as *Una Sancta* coincide: the Eastern Orthodox Church *is* the Church of the Creed. Here we have an absolute identity. Other Christian “churches” have no ecclesial status and we only call them churches by convention. By extension, sacraments, above all baptism, are something *sui generis* to Orthodoxy and have no reality outside of the body of the Orthodox Church. Thus, one receives non-Orthodox Christians into the Church by baptism, strictly speaking (*akrevia*). If one were to receive them in another manner than the strict keeping of the sacramental law--a decision granted to the hierarch--then this would be by pastoral *economia* or a dispensation in order that the person’s salvation might not be endangered. In Western terms, heterodox baptism is not simply invalid and ineffective but wholly nonexistent and utterly graceless. As has been pointed out by various critics of this approach, this theory of sacramental economy grants such an enormous sacramental power to the Church, through the bishop, that, if the Church so desired, it would be able to declare a heretical sacrament (by definition graceless--a non-sacrament) a sacrament. In short, this sacramental approach gives the possibility to the Church of recognizing as existing that which does not exist. It should not be a surprise, therefore, that, in this view, one simply cannot speak strictly speaking of the Spirit among the Pentecostals, let alone acknowledging any sort of sacramentalism in Pentecostal communities as a sort of continuation of Pentecost.

Ecumenism for such Orthodox traditionalists or rigorists (sometimes called “fundamentalists”) is regarded as a “Pan-heresy.”⁷⁴

Other pro-ecumenist Orthodox likewise assert the identity of the Eastern Orthodox Church with the Church of the Creed. However, for this group, this identification is not the end of the story for they hold that the spiritual limits of the Church are unclear and, though we may know canonically where the (Orthodox) Church is, we still cannot say where it is not because the Spirit of God cannot be contained by the canonical walls of the institution of Eastern Orthodoxy. It is possible, the pro-ecumenists argue, that the Church exists outside its own walls or observable limits. Trinitarian baptism, as well as some other sacraments, in some non-Orthodox churches that uphold Orthodox teaching (to a greater or lesser degree depending on the Church), and, especially those that have apostolic succession, can be said to have an ecclesial and graceful reality even if it is ineffective (echoing Augustine) outside of baptism or in schism. For this second Orthodox pro-ecumenist group, one receives non-Orthodox Christians with a Trinitarian baptism by Chrismation or (though it is now rare) simply by confession of faith. One is recognizing the tacit Orthodoxy of non-Orthodox sacraments here by not repeating the sacrament of baptism but simply praying for God to fill up sacramentally what is not fully realized in an Orthodox ecclesial context. Sacramental economy here is recognizing sacramentally what already exists albeit in an ineffective form. Thus, with this group and their notion of sacramental economy and its vision of ecclesiology lies the possibility of acknowledging Pentecostal churches as in some sense partial windows on to Pentecost and “churches” in some sense akin to Orthodoxy.

It should be said that many Orthodox combine elements of these two general tendencies along with the usage of the language of sacramental economy, though they often mean very different things by the same terms. A debate remains among those who hold the second more open ecclesial Orthodox stream as to whether Pentecostal churches are churches

in the same sense as Catholic and Lutheran churches. Quite a number of mainstream Orthodox today—at what is a low ebb of ecumenism—would tend to view Pentecostals and their churches as being so far from Orthodoxy (pointing to their lack of apostolic succession, valid sacraments, emphasis on speaking in tongues as well as other different teachings and practices) that Pentecostal converts to Orthodoxy would need to be received by baptism. Those who support this second type of more expansive ecclesiology have sometimes suggested that the various eucharistic ecclesiologies ascendant in world Orthodoxy are inward looking, triumphalist and ecclesiological and soteriologically exclusivist. Those espousing these theologies need, it is argued, to rediscover Trinitarian baptism as a “corrective” given that Trinitarian baptism is shared with non-Orthodox Christians who exist “outside” but paradoxically “inside” (in a sort of “intermediate sphere”) the Eastern Orthodox Church.⁷⁵

It is because of these ongoing tensions in Orthodoxy on the limits of the Church *reflected but not resolved at Crete* that it must be said that Orthodoxy sadly is very far away from recognizing at a universal level Pentecostal churches as churches and its baptism as Spirit breathed. For related reasons, Orthodoxy does not have the distinction between “dead churches” with many nominal members and “living churches” that are inspired by the Spirit. While on a personal level one can certainly understand nominal Orthodox being attracted to Pentecostalism and converting given the rigid formality of some Orthodox church life, the Orthodox would reply that the Orthodox Church is the ark of salvation and the onus is on the Orthodox Christian to dig more deeply into their own tradition rather than leaving to join a non-Orthodox church that is somehow more “alive” with the Spirit than the dead formalism of Orthodoxy. Yet the Spirit indeed cannot be quenched. It has taken Orthodoxy more than a century to come to its compromise acknowledgment of other churches at Crete. It may, being

Orthodoxy, take a century more to build constructively on this step forward in ecumenism at the universal level. But the Spirit is a spirit of surprises.

<1>Response to Peter Phan's "The Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Churches: A Roman Catholic Appraisal"

I am grateful to Professor Phan for his sympathetic reflection on The Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church that met in Crete in June 2016. Phan has an interest in Orthodoxy dating back to his first doctorate in the late 1970s with the Salesian religious congregation in Rome on the teaching on iconography of the Franco-Russian theologian Paul Evdokimov (1901–70).⁷⁶ What clearly is at the heart of Phan's theological concerns in his study is the lack of mutuality between Vatican II's understanding of a special place for what it calls the "Eastern Churches" (as seen in *Unitatis Redintegratio* or the Decree on Ecumenism and *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* or the Decree on Catholic Eastern Churches--both promulgated by Pope Paul VI in November 1964) and the Orthodox Church's virtual ignoring ("This silence is startling" (Phan)) of its relations with the Catholic Church in the documents of Crete (notably in the "Relations of the Orthodox Church with the Rest of the Christian World"). Phan notes that it is startling because it is "generally agreed" that "theologically speaking, the Orthodox church and the Catholic Church, despite their bitter disputes, are in many ways closer to each other than to any other church or ecclesial community" and that since Vatican II and under pontificates from Paul VI onwards there has been "significant rapprochement" (Phan). Indeed, the Decree on Ecumenism acknowledges a "'special position' for the Orthodox church with its many particular local churches vis-à-vis the Catholic church with its many dioceses" (Phan). He notes a "sense of disappointment at both the substance and style of the COC's [= "The Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Churches"] document" (Phan). What is going on here? Why, if there is indeed such a close relationship, as Phan

claims, and even a special position for the “Orthodox church in its triple division (Byzantine, Oriental, and Assyrian)” (Phan) vis-a-vis the Catholic or (as Phan frequently calls it) Latin Church, would Crete almost ecumenically (to adapt a contemporary term) *ghost* the Catholic Church in its Conciliar documents?

There are a variety of reasons for this lack of symmetry between Vatican II and Crete on ecumenism and the lack of a special position for the Catholics in Crete’s documents. First, and I think it needs clarification as misunderstandings between the two churches are the major hurdle preventing Catholic-Orthodox rapprochement, Crete as a council was not akin to Vatican II and the Orthodox Church is not the same sort of body institutionally as the Catholic Church. One notes here a stark contrast (which I first heard from Metropolitan Kallistos Ware). The Roman Catholic Church calls an Ecumenical Council in 1959 and it meets in a little less than four years in 1962. The Orthodox Church calls a Council in 1961 and it meets after an interval of fifty-five years in 2016, with four large churches pulling out at the last moment.⁷⁸ The difference is due to many factors, including that many of the Orthodox churches concerned were under persecution for much of this long period. However, one major reason for the difference is quite simply that there is no papacy or strong central governance in Orthodoxy.

The Orthodox Church has no papal office that can enforce doctrinal unanimity on the various local Orthodox churches and has supremacy jurisdictionally over the whole Church. The documents at Vatican II, in comparison to Crete, were certainly the result, as Phan notes, of a much larger body of theologians and bishops and the product of a much longer concentrated period of work. Yet the matter is also structural: the theologians and bishops at Vatican II all were held within certain doctrinal and canonical bounds by the highly centralized system that is Roman Catholicism focused as it is on the Office of the Papacy and the papal bureaucracy in the Curia. The documents at Vatican II were not official teaching

until they were promulgated by the pope and indeed each of them is dated from that promulgation. The Ecumenical Patriarch is certainly the “spiritual head” or “primate” of the Orthodox Church (though this sort of language for him is even widely disputed by some Orthodox today). Yet the office of Ecumenical Patriarch is simply not symmetrical with the office of the Pope of Rome *as it exists today*. Unlike the present-day pope in reference to the cardinals and the Catholic episcopate who are canonically not his equal, the Ecumenical Patriarch is *first among equals* with his fourteen (or fifteen or sixteen depending on your reckoning!) brother primates of the different local Orthodox churches. The pope as Roman Pontiff can define doctrine infallibly, that is, he can define a doctrine of the Church on faith and morals in an “irreformable” manner without the consent of the Church in the form of the Catholic episcopate or College of Bishops (“*non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae,*” as Vatican I puts it).⁸⁰ His ecclesial power is absolutely free and is concretely expressed in his jurisdiction that stretches from being the Bishop of Rome to controlling the governance of the smallest diocese in say Peoria, Illinois (as Fr. Robert Taft, SJ, reminds us in a wonderful interview).⁸¹ This sacral power is, as the *Code of Canon Law* makes clear, supreme, full, immediate, and universal ordinary in character.⁸²

The Ecumenical Patriarch, in contrast, has traditionally been accepted to have certain universally acknowledged primatial prerogatives in Orthodoxy including the ability to draw the Orthodox together for Church-wide meetings (including councils such as Crete) and in acting (when called upon by local churches) as a sort of court of appeal of last resort to mediate pastoral disputes and crises. A relatively recent example of the latter vocation of the Ecumenical Patriarch was Patriarch’s Bartholomew’s May 2006 convening (at the request of the Church of Cyprus) of a Pan-Orthodox council in Chambésy, Switzerland to deal with the void of leadership in the Church of Cyprus. Cyprus’ then primate, Chrysostomos I (1927-2007), had been in a coma from 2005, but, for canonical (and family) reasons, the Synod of

Cyprus could not independently elect and nominate a successor. Therefore, a Pan-Orthodox Council was convened by the Ecumenical Patriarchate which removed Cyprus' primate from office while allowing him to retain his titles. It then nominated a *locum tenens* for the Church of Cyprus and proclaimed a date in September 2006 for a canonical election of a new primate, that is, Chrysostomos II of Cyprus, who had been nominated *locum tenens* in September and was enthroned in October 2006.⁸³ (More controversially for some Orthodox, the Ecumenical Patriarch also has the prerogative to first acknowledge and then formally authorize and name a new autocephalous church).⁸⁴ Yet, unlike the pope, the Ecumenical Patriarch has neither universal jurisdiction nor any sort of doctrinal infallibility, let alone the ability to define doctrines through a magisterial body like the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith. He is the Primate of the Orthodox Church but he is so as an archbishop of an archdiocese and primate of just one (albeit the most senior) local Orthodox church. The Ecumenical Patriarch cannot directly control the affairs of the other autocephalous churches and indeed has no desire to do so. His power is solicitude, a moral force of service whereby he gathers his brothers to act together in conciliarity.

Crete was a miracle for even having taken place given the opposition of many autocephalous churches to the work of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in organizing it right throughout its long formal preparation from the 1960s and down to its opening in 2016, sans four local churches led by the Moscow Patriarchate in blustering and blocking mode. Crete's documents, it would not be an overstatement to say, were the product of agonizing compromise with every single line of multiple iterations of documents being argued for by churches whose decision making was not in the power of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and who attempted to routinely torpedo documents to slow down the process of unity led by the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The last Council of similar universality in representation to Crete met in Jerusalem in 1672, separated from Crete by almost 350 years, whereas less than a

century separates Vatican I and II. Thus, Crete, *pace* Phan, simply cannot be seen as a council in the same way as Vatican II and its documents are different sorts of texts produced by a very different sort of body.

Furthermore, the Orthodox Church is not as centralized a body as the Roman Catholic Church as there are issues on which local autocephalous churches greatly diverge and on which the Ecumenical Patriarchate cannot enforce doctrinal uniformity. One of the most contentious is ecumenism. Indeed, two of the fourteen universally acknowledged local Orthodox churches (Georgian and Bulgarian churches) who helped draft the “Relations of the Orthodox Church with the Rest of the Christian World” but ultimately pulled out of the Council at the last moment are not members of the World Council of Churches as they by and large oppose official ecumenism. Strong anti-ecumenical feeling, moreover, can be found in the remaining ten churches that attended Crete including in Constantinople itself (Mt. Athos, which is infamously opposed to ecumenism, is part of the Church of Constantinople). Indeed, one of the churches, the Church of Serbia, which is a member of the WCC and attended Crete, has multiple prominent bishops who are spiritual children of the Serbian theologian and spiritual father St. Justin Popović (1894–1979) who coined the phrase “ecumenism is a pan-heresy.”⁸⁵ (On how Crete’s text on ecumenism was affected by Orthodox anti-ecumenists see my response to Professor Coulter.)

Yet all of this points to something far deeper that prevents Catholic-Orthodox rapprochement: the lack of a common Orthodox-Catholic narrative of their own shared history. Many Orthodox suspect the Catholic Church precisely because they think that the Catholic narrative of Orthodoxy’s history does not respect its existence as a distinct and unified church, let alone its claim to be *the Church*. Phan has pointed to the famous call of Pope John Paul II for a purification and healing of memories between the two churches⁸⁶ but to heal the wounded memory of the two churches is to come to forge together and then share

a common story of how we have come to arrive at the present schism. We need a common renarration of our common history but to do so requires an ecclesiological leap of trust on the part of both churches and their different leaders.

A few examples in Phan's Catholic narrative of the history of Orthodoxy might illustrate some of the difficulties that I believe face both churches in their dire need to work toward a common history and a common way of speaking about one another that respects each other's self-understanding. Official Catholic documents, and Phan reflects this tendency in exegeting those texts, group the Eastern Orthodox Church (what Phan calls the "Byzantine Church") with churches with which it is not in communion, the Oriental and Assyrian churches, as "separated Eastern churches." All of these "Eastern Churches" are separated, in this official Roman Catholic story, from the Roman Apostolic See, which Catholic texts say by common consent acted as a guide when disagreements arose between these fractious Eastern churches over matters of faith or discipline. Only Rome could act as a universally authoritative guide and judge for the divided churches because it alone had apostolic authority given to it by Christ to provide them a focus of wisdom and catholic unity.⁸⁸ Sometimes in Catholic official texts the Eastern Orthodox Church is discussed separately from the various Oriental churches as the "Eastern Patriarchates."⁸⁹ However, this reference to Orthodoxy as being coextensive with the "Eastern Patriarchates" cannot be understood without the acknowledgement that the Pope of Rome, until fairly recently when in 2006 Pope Benedict XVI removed the traditional papal title from the *Annuario Pontificio*, was also considered by the Catholic Church to be the "Patriarch of the West." Benedict XVI excised the papal title, in a rationalizing move, as it was said to be obsolete and practically unusable as it was so freighted with obscurity.⁹⁰ This excision was part of the ecclesiological tendency of longue durée to refuse to acknowledge any parity of Rome with other (to combine all the various Catholic descriptives for Orthodoxy) "ancient eastern patriarchal sister churches."⁹²

One of the difficulties with this Catholic narrative on Orthodoxy, from an Orthodox perspective, is that it ignores the fact that the Eastern Orthodox Church considers itself to be *one church*, not just one of *various* ancient *Eastern churches* along with Copts, Armenians, and the Church of the East, or, even diverse Eastern Patriarchates of noble tradition that are less than Rome as the pre-eminent apostolic see. Instead Orthodoxy sees itself as the “One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church” affirmed in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed. Moreover, the Eastern Orthodox Church has the same canonical relationship to the Oriental and Assyrian churches as it does to the Catholic Church. However friendly and amicable the relations are between the Eastern Orthodox Church and the Catholic, Oriental and Assyrian churches, they are considered (from the strict point of view) to be in a formal break of communion (= schism) with the Eastern Orthodox Church as *the* Church. It is not a surprise, therefore, that Orthodoxy, like the Catholic Church, does indeed (*pace* Phan) have various theologies that express a “qualified ecclesiological exclusivism,” as I note in my responses to professors Coulter and Burgess.

Yet Phan still insists on identifying the Orthodox Church with the other “Eastern churches”: “the Orthodox church in its triple division (Byzantine, Oriental, and Assyrian)” (Phan). In a note, he remarks on the fact that four of the local Eastern Orthodox churches (Russia, Antioch, Georgia, and Bulgaria) did not attend Crete and then adds immediately that, “in addition,” the Oriental and Assyrian churches did not attend the council. However, the issue of Oriental and Assyrian churches (non-) attending Crete is wholly different in kind ecclesologically than particular local Eastern Orthodox churches *that are a constitutive part of* the Eastern Orthodox Church attending or not attending the council. Phan might as well have noted that the Catholic Church did not attend Crete, for the various Oriental Orthodox churches he bunches together with the Eastern Orthodox have the same ecclesiological status for the Orthodox as the Catholic Church does towards it. In fact, there were *both* Catholic and

Oriental Orthodox *ecumenical observers* at Crete. It was part of my responsibility when I worked in the Ecumenical Patriarchate's Press Office to work with a team to brief these episcopal representatives on the events of the council as they did not attend the working sessions of Crete but only certain more formal sessions.

At the close of his essay, Phan talks about the issues that have been by and large resolved between “the Orthodox church and the Latin church” in the last fifty years and here he includes “the christological debates on the two ‘natures’ and the one ‘person’ of Christ, the *Filioque*, the azymes, purgatory, and the Marian dogmas” (Phan). It is highly debatable whether issues like the Marian dogmas, the *Filioque*, azymes, and purgatory have been fully resolved. Indeed, some Orthodox churches still regularly critique Catholicism on precisely these points. However, what is particularly strange from an Eastern Orthodox perspective in this phrase of Phan is to point to *Christological teaching* as a point of contention between the Catholic and *Eastern Orthodox churches as the two churches have never ceased to hold this teaching in common*. Christology is a point of division between the Oriental churches and the Eastern Orthodox and Catholic churches and not Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy.

Orthodoxy and Catholicism have always been united in being Pro-Chalcedonian and Pro-Ephesite. Once again, Phan, in the way that is far too typical of the Catholic narrative I have mentioned above is glomming together Eastern Orthodoxy with the various Oriental churches.⁹⁵ Moreover, he erroneously refers to the “Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Churches” (note the plural) as a legitimate official name of the Council and says this is the same (*for the Orthodox*) as the singular “Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church” and that the Council itself uses, as he does, the singular and plural form of church to speak of itself. This is false. Referring to Crete as a Council of the Orthodox churches (plural), rather than the Orthodox Church (singular), makes as much ecclesiological sense for the Orthodox as referring to Vatican II as a “Ecumenical Council of the Catholic churches.” It is almost as

if (though Phan does not say this) the Eastern Orthodox Church was being viewed as a sort of Eastern ecclesiological equivalent to the Anglican Communion: an ordered federation of churches or provinces in communion. But Anglican and Eastern Orthodox ecclesiology and polity are markedly different. Orthodoxy is radically distinct from both the Roman and Anglican ecclesiological models forming a sort of ecclesiological *via media*.

The text also has other sorts of narrative problems from an Eastern Orthodox perspective. Phan says that the non-Ephesite Assyrian Church of today *separated from* the Eastern Orthodox Church after the Council of Ephesus (431) and the non-Chalcedonian churches *split from* the Eastern Orthodox Church after Chalcedon (451). This sort of description is decidedly odd as there was nothing called the Eastern Orthodox Church in the fifth century and the various ancient eastern patriarchates were part of one Church *with* the Church of Rome (as the Patriarchate of the West) so presumably the schism was from that *one Church* (both Catholic and Orthodox, to speak anachronistically). Phan refers repeatedly to the “Byzantine Church” prior to 1054 and the “Byzantine patriarch Michael Cerularius” by which he means the Ecumenical Patriarch, which we are told was organized according to the “pentarchy” and “the medieval and modern notion of national church” (Phan). Neither today nor at the time before the eleventh century do the churches comprising the Eastern Orthodox Church recognize ecclesiologicaly the denomination of “Byzantine” and the pentarchy by definition (five) included Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem *led as first among equals* by Rome.

Now Phan does ultimately seem to acknowledge that Crete is a Council of the (as he calls it) “Byzantine Orthodox” but these sorts of ambiguities in his narrative as well as a tendency to project present day descriptive scholarly divisions (often pioneered by Catholic scholars) anachronistically on to the ancient church leads me to believe he is not entirely clear who the Eastern Orthodox understand themselves to be. Alternatively, perhaps he

simply is accepting a Catholic magisterial position as self-evident and articulating it without nuance. With his tendency to project contemporary scholarly denominations and divisions of Orthodoxy as well as the absolute monarchical Roman papacy of the last several centuries on to the Church of the first undivided millennium, one has difficulty as an Orthodox seeing oneself in Phan's account of our common history. Why this matters is that it reflects in a very mild form past Catholic narratives of Orthodoxy that see the "Christian East" as a series of disputatious, largely national churches that over the first millennium broke from the assured orthodoxy, unity, apostolicity, and supremacy of the Latin Roman Church focused on a papacy that from earliest days was the rock upon which the Church was built by Christ. This universal nonnational Church, in the narrative Phan often echoes in a mild form, is forever solicitous and patient in drawing back the erring, nationalistic, and divided eastern churches to obedience to the Apostolic See whose powers and authority have changed little from the ancient church to modern times. It might be replied that Vatican II says nothing explicitly of the sort as just described but one only has to follow the notes in its own conciliar texts to earlier Catholic ecumenical councils to see just such a narrative, which it uses to tacitly justify its own more ecumenically sensitive positions.⁹⁹ This is a profoundly patronizing narrative that Orthodoxy can and never will accept and it is one of the major stumbling blocks to reunion between the two churches. I accept that Phan does not represent the most egregious version of this old story but in his ever-sliding denominations of Orthodoxy he certainly reminds one of older Catholic accounts of Orthodoxy that look down on it from on high.

But are there other common narratives that both churches might accept? Here I would point to the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church as a model. It was chaired for many years, on the Orthodox side, by Metropolitan John Zizioulas. He has now been succeeded by the eminent Orthodox

theologian and liturgist, Archbishop Job (Getcha) of Telmessos who is the Representative of the Ecumenical Patriarchate to the WCC as well as Rector of the Ecumenical Patriarchate's Institute of Postgraduate Studies in Orthodox Theology (Chambésy-Geneva). Getcha's Catholic counterpart as co-chair of the Commission is Cardinal Kurt Koch, the President of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity who served as an ecumenical observer at Crete. Koch took over as Catholic co-chair in 2010 from Cardinal Walter Kasper. In 1976 a Joint Catholic and Orthodox Commission was established to prepare for an official theological dialogue. This was followed in 1978 by a jointly promulgated document between the Catholic and Eastern Orthodox churches that said that the goal of the dialogue would be to reestablish full *communio* of the churches, not unity or merely a "union of the churches", as had been discussed at the previous failed reunion councils. This document proposed a unique methodology for the dialogue, which was to begin with issues on which the two churches already had much in common and then on this positive basis to go on to the more divisive issues that were the cause of their original schism. On November 30, 1979, Pope John Paul II (1920–2005) and Ecumenical Patriarch Demetrios I (1914–1991) met in Istanbul and announced the beginning of the dialogue. The first plenary session ("The Mystery of the Church and the Eucharist in the Light of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity") was held on Patmos and Rhodes in 1980. From the perspective of the Ecumenical Patriarchate some of the most productive statements of the International Dialogue in recent years have been the Ravenna Statement (or "Document") of October 2007 on Conciliarity and Authority¹⁰⁰ and the Chieti Statement of 2016 on "Primacy and Synodality in the Church."

The October 2007 *Ravenna Statement* affirmed three levels of ecclesial communion: local (as in a local metropolitan who is in communion with his bishops), regional (as in autocephalous or local churches), and universal (as in primates like Rome and Constantinople). The *Ravenna Statement*, therefore, cautiously affirmed that primacy at a

universal level was accepted by both East and West. In the era of the undivided Church, this involved a canonical *taxis* in which Rome occupied the first place as *protos* among the patriarchs, “presiding in love” (in Ignatius of Antioch’s famous phrase: *Ep. Romans*, prologue). Here we hear nothing (as is found at councils such as Lateran IV, Lyons II, and Florence) about Greeks submitting in obedience to Latins. Likewise, it was agreed that this primacy was not merely one of honor in a hollow sense¹⁰² but involved a detailed and active engagement of Rome with the other churches, though Rome did not convene ecumenical councils and did not personally preside over them (though it was involved in their decision making).¹⁰³ Moreover, *Ravenna* also agreed that in both the Roman Catholic and Orthodox churches primacy and synodality (which implies conciliarity) go together as the synod needs a president/primate and the president/primate needs a synod.¹⁰⁴ Thus there was agreement on the fact of primacy but not on the manner of its exercise or, for that matter, its scriptural and theological foundations.¹⁰⁵ The *Ravenna Statement* left the question of the role of the bishop of Rome in the communion of all the churches to be studied in greater depth by future commissions.¹⁰⁶ The Church of Moscow ultimately rejected the *Ravenna Statement* for internal Orthodox political reasons as it felt it gave too much power to Constantinople—which traditionally has taken the place of Rome in the diptychs or order of the primates of the churches as Primate of the Orthodox Church following the Great Schism with Rome—but the *Statement* was an important stop on the way to a common nonpatronizing Orthodox-Catholic narrative of their common history that respected both churches’ self-definitions, names, and descriptions.¹⁰⁷

In the International Orthodox-Catholic dialogue a breakthrough then happened subsequently in the Chieti Statement of September 2016.¹⁰⁸ At Chieti, for the first time, a common document of both the Orthodox and Catholic churches agreed on the three levels of communion (local, regional, and universal). On the universal level both churches agreed that

(1) Rome exercised a primacy of honor in the ancient church followed by Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem; and (2) although in the West from the fourth century onward the primacy of the see of Rome was understood with reference to Peter's role as chief of the apostles, *this was not so in the East*, which had a different understanding of the prerogatives of Rome and did not see him as exercising direct canonical authority over the East but as being a court of last appeal for ecclesiastical disputes and crises. (This is, as we have argued, how the Orthodox by and large see the primacy of Constantinople until today albeit with some churches disputing this role like the Moscow Patriarchate) Why this is such a breakthrough is that the Catholic Church has finally agreed (though this understanding would need to be officially ratified by the pope through the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith rather than just merely the lesser Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity) that the subsequent evolution in the second millennium of the papal office is something in no way necessitated by the teaching of the whole Church in the first millennium. This leaves open the (albeit highly remote) possibility that the Roman Catholic teachings promulgated by the popes after the schism, including universal jurisdiction of the pope and infallibility, will not be the basis of any agreement for full communion between the two churches. In other words, there is now the (admittedly also highly remote) possibility that much of the post-great schism magisterium of the Catholic Church can be localized to its communion and not necessarily have to be accepted by the Eastern Orthodox in order to enter into full communion with Rome.

What I hope has been made clear in my response to Prof Phan's sympathetic essay on Crete is that if one wants to come to a rapprochement with another church, then one must come to respect their own denominations and the ambiguities of their distinctive stories. Yet this alone is not sufficient. A new common story must be begun by both partners. This must be a narrative that respects both of their distinctive identities, their traditions, and their

common names for themselves but yet is wholly new, for it forges a line of story that weaves together that which formerly was in contradiction. It is as if two iconographers started painting at two sides of a large image of Christ until they came to meet in the middle joining and forming the image of their common Lord brushstroke by brushstroke till both of the divine-human eyes stare out together. Now—Catholic and Orthodox—they both can see the Lord together in full union and communion and be seen alike by him, as one Church breathing with both of its lungs. The International Orthodox-Catholic dialogue is just such a forging of a common narrative, a common icon of our shared history, of the one whom we worship as our mutual head. The process of painting a common icon of the Lord is a long one but it is not without its small victories as can be seen at the meetings in Ravenna and Chieti. Eventually one can hope, as an Orthodox, that there will come a time when there will be held an Orthodox Council that will receive and evaluate the work of the International Orthodox-Catholic dialogue moving decisively toward full union and communion with the Catholic Church. But that is a hope for the future.

<bio>Revd Dr. Brandon Gallaher is senior lecturer of systematic and comparative theology at the University of Exeter (Devon, UK) and a deacon of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. He served in June 2016 in Crete at the Eastern Orthodox Holy and Great Council as a Theological Subject Expert in the Ecumenical Patriarchate Press Office.

<N1HD>Notes

² See Sergii Bulgakov, “Spiritual Intercommunion,” *Sobornost’*, No. 4 (New Series) (December 1935), 3-7 (*Father Sergius Bulgakov 1871-1944. A Collection of articles by Fr. Bulgakov for the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius and now reproduced by the Fellowship to commemorate the 25th Anniversary of the death of this great Ecumenist*, ed.

Nicolas Zernov (London: The Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, 1969), 29-32) and O. F. Clarke and Xenia Braikevitch [‘The Editors’], “The Nature of Catholic Action,” *Sobornost’*, No. 3 (New Series) (September 1935), 12-20 at 17; For commentary see Brandon Gallaher, “‘Great and full of Grace’: Partial Intercommunion and Sophiology in Sergii Bulgakov” in *Church and World: Essays in Honor of Michael Plekon*, ed. William C. Mills (Rollinsford, New Hampshire: Orthodox Research Institute, 2013), 69-121.

⁴ See Sergii Bulgakov, “By Jacob’s Well—John iv. 23 (On the Actual Unity of the Divided Church in Faith, Prayer and Sacraments),” *Journal of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius*, No. 22 (December 1933), 7-17 [Abridged] (*Father Sergius Bulgakov 1871-1944. A Collection of articles*, 1-11. Russian original: “U Kladezia Iakovlia (Io. 4:23). O real’nom edinstvie razdielnoi Tserkvi v Vierie Molitvie i Tainstvie,” in *Khristianskoe Vozsoedinenie: Ekumenicheskaia Problema v Pravoslavnom Soznanii. Sbornik Staei* (Paris: YMCA, 1933), 9-32. Recollected in *Tradition Alive: On the Church and the Christian Life in Our Time-Readings from the Eastern Church*, ed. Michael Plekon (Lanham, MD: Sheed & Ward, 2003), 55-65).

⁵ The Orthodox opposition to open communion and intercommunion is broad and comprehensive. See Kallistos Timothy Ware, *Communion and Intercommunion: A Study of Communion and Intercommunion Based on the Theology and Practice of the Orthodox Church*, rev. ed. (Minneapolis, MN: Light and Life Pub., 2002); and Brandon Gallaher, “La Question de ‘l’intercommunion’: Point de vue orthodoxe,” *Unité des Chrétiens*, no. 138 (April 2005): 26–28.

⁶ John Zizioulas, “Orthodox Ecclesiology and the Ecumenical Movement,” *Sourozh*, no. 21 (August 1985): 16–27, at 26.

⁷ Georges Florovsky, “The Body of the Living Christ” (1948), in *The Patristic Witness of Georges Florovsky: Essential Theological Writings*, eds. Brandon Gallaher and

Paul Ladouceur (London: T&T Clark-Bloomsbury, 2019), 272–277 (select translation of Florovsky’s seminal extended essay, “Le corps du Christ vivant: une interprétation orthodoxe de l’Église,” in *La Sainte Église Universelle: Confrontation oecuménique* (Neuchâtel/Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1948), 9–57; the first complete English translation (by Robert Arida) is forthcoming in *The Living Christ: The Theological Legacy of Georges Florovsky*, eds. John Chryssavgis and Brandon Gallaher (London: T&T Clark-Bloomsbury, forthcoming 2021)).

⁸ *The Divine Liturgy of our Father among the Saints John Chrysostom*, trans. Archim. Ephrem Lash (London: The Greek Archdiocese of Thyateira and Great Britain by Nigel Lynn Pub., 2011), 46.

⁹ See Nicholas Afanasiev, “The Church that Presides in Love”, trans. Katherine Farrer in John Meyendorff et al., *The Primacy of Peter* (London: Faith Press, 1963), 57-110, *The Lord's Supper by Fr. Nicholas Afanasieff*, Translation and Introduction by Fr. Michael J. Lewis, MDiv Thesis, St Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary, Crestwood, NY, May 1988 [*Trapeza Gospodnia, L'Orthodoxie et l'actualité*, Nr. 2/3 (Paris: Orthodox Theological Institute, 1960)], Nicholas Afanasiev, *The Church of the Holy Spirit*, trans. Vitaly Permiakov and ed. Michael Plekon (Notre Dame, Ind.: Notre Dame UP, 2007 [original Russian publication: 1971]) and John Zizioulas, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood in the Church* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997). For commentary see Brandon Gallaher, “The Christian Church Facing Itself and Facing the World: An Ecumenical Overview of Modern Christian Ecclesiology' in *The Community of Believers: Christian and Muslim Perspectives*, eds. Lucinda Mosher and David Marshall (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2015), 97-146, espec. 114-117.

¹⁰ On primacy and conciliarity in Orthodoxy see John Chryssavgis, ed., *Primacy in the Church: The Office of Primate and the Authority of the Councils*, 2 vols. (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2016).

¹¹ Ecumenical Patriarchate Press Office, John Chyrssavgis, “Feast of Pentecost: A Concelebration of Unity,” June 19, 2016, www.youtube.com/watch?v=onh6xiVfRRY (last accessed February 3, 2021).

¹² Georges Florovsky, “Terms of Communion in the Undivided Church,” in *Intercommunion: The Report of the Theological Commission Appointed by the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order together with a Selection from the Material Presented to the Commission*, ed. Donald Baillie and John Marsh (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952), 47–57, at 50, 57; and Ware, *Communion and Intercommunion*, 42ff.

¹³ N. A. Nissiotis, “Worship, Eucharist and ‘Intercommunion’: An Orthodox Reflection,” *Studia Liturgica*, Vol. 2, Issue 3 [AU: What is the S?](September 1963): 193–222, at 215.

¹⁵ Thomas Hopko, “Open, Closed Intercommunion,” *The Orthodox Church* 12, no. 7 (1976): 6.

¹⁷ See Gallaher, “‘Great and full of Grace’: Partial Intercommunion and Sophiology in Sergii Bulgakov,” 69–121.

¹⁸ See *Fellowship of St Alban and St Sergius* website, <http://www.sobornost.org> (last accessed February 3, 2021).

¹⁹ See Peter Galadza, “Editorial: Rome’s Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and Ukrainian Ecumenism: A Plea for Clarity,” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 51, nos. 1–2 (2010): 1–4; and Société Scientifique de Théologie d’Ukraine, “Appel aux théologiens des Églises de tradition Kévienne,” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 51, nos. 1–2 (2010): 123–136.

²⁰ See Florovsky, “Confessional Loyalty in the Ecumenical Movement” (1950), in *Patristic Witness of Georges Florovsky*, ed. Gallaher and Ladouceur, 279–288, at 285–286.

²¹ Bulgakov, “Ways to Church Reunion,” *Sobornost*, 2 (June 1935): 7-15 at 8 (*Collection*, 22-28 at 23); A more developed form of this conception can be found in Anton Kartashev’s “Intercommunion and Dogmatic Agreement,” *Sobornost*, 4 (December 1935): 41-48 (Recollected in *Tradition Alive*, 213-219). See the report on Kartashev’s talk: “Our minimum means the whole dogma of the Universal Church” in Clarke and Braikevitch, “The Nature of Catholic Action,” 14-15. Kartashev argues accordingly: “Our minimum is the absolute necessary--the *necessarium* [...] *Our minimum means the whole dogma of the Universal Church*” (“Intercommunion and Dogmatic Agreement,” 43 and 46).

²² Bulgakov, “Ways to Church Reunion,” 8-9 (*Collection*, 23).

²³ *ibid.*, 7-9, 12-13 (*Collection*, 22-24 and 26).

²⁴ Sergii Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, trans. Lydia Kesich (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1988 [1932]), 188.

²⁵ *The Divine Liturgy of our Father among the Saints John Chrysostom*, 48.

²⁶ See John H. Erickson, “The Church in Modern Orthodox Thought: Towards a Baptismal Ecclesiology,” *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church* 11, nos. 2–3 (2011): 137–151.

²⁷ See John P. Burgess, *Encounters with Orthodoxy: How Protestant Churches Can Reform Themselves Again* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2013), and Burgess, *Holy Rus’: The Rebirth of Orthodoxy in the New Russia* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2017).

²⁹ Pavel Florensky, *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth*, trans. Boris Jakim (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997 [Russian original: 1911]), 9. [AU: Is 1911 the date it was first published?]

³¹ ‘The Mission of the Orthodox Church in Today’s World,’ §A.1, <https://www.holycouncil.org/-/mission-orthodox-church-todays-world> (last accessed February 9, 2021).

³² “The Transfiguration of Our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ,” Mattins, Cant. 8, First Canon in *The Festal Menaion*, trans. Mother Mary and Arch. Kallistos Ware (South Canaan, PA: St. Tikhon’s Seminary Press, 1990 [first published: 1969]), 491. **[AU: Is 1969 the date it was first published?]**

³³ See Ion Bria, “The Liturgy after the Liturgy,” *International Review of Mission* 67, no. 265 (1978): 86–90.

³⁵ See Aristotle Papanikolaou, *The Mystical as Political: Democracy and Non-radical Orthodoxy* (Notre Dame, IN : Notre Dame University Press , 2012), Kristina Stoeckl, Ingeborg Gabriel, and Aristotle Papanikolaou, eds., *Political Theologies in Orthodox Christianity* (London: T&T Clark–Bloomsbury, 2017); and Brandon Gallaher, “A Secularism of the Royal Doors: Toward an Eastern Orthodox Christian Theology of Secularism,” in *Fundamentalism or Tradition: Christianity after Secularism*, ed. Aristotle Papanikolaou and George Demacopoulos (New York: Fordham University Press, 2019), 108–30.

³⁷ ‘Encyclical of the Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church Crete 2016,’ preface and §I.2, <https://www.holycouncil.org/-/encyclical-holy-council> (last accessed February 6, 2021). See Burgess and compare Coulter.

³⁸ Ecumenical Patriarchate Press Office, Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church, <https://www.orthodoxcouncil.org/staff> (last accessed February 6, 2021). See Brandon Gallaher, “The Orthodox Moment: The Holy and Great Council in Crete and Orthodoxy’s Encounter with the West: On Learning to Love the Church,” *Sobornost* 39, no. 2 (2017): 26–71.

³⁹ Gallaher, “The Orthodox Moment,” 52ff.

⁴⁰ David Bentley Hart and John Chryssavgis, eds., *For the Life of the World: Towards a Social Ethos of the Orthodox Church* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2020), and also at <https://www.goarch.org/social-ethos> (last accessed February 7, 2021).

⁴¹ See Gallaher, “The Orthodox Moment.”

⁴² See Davor Džalto, Effie Fokas, Brandon Gallaher, Perry Hamalis, Aristotle Papanikolaou, and Gregory Tucker, “Orthodoxy, Human Rights and Secularization,” in *Toward the Holy and Great Council: Decisions and Texts*, ed. Nathanael Symeonides, Faith Matters 2 (New York: Dept. of Inter-Orthodox, Ecumenical and Interfaith Relations, Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, 2016), 103–7, also at <https://publicorthodoxy.org/2016/04/05/orthodoxy-human-rights-secularization> (last accessed February 7, 2021).

⁴³ See Gallaher, “Ecumenism as Civilizational Dialogue: Eastern Orthodox Anti-Ecumenism and Eastern Orthodox Ecumenism: A Creative or Sterile Antinomy?,” *International Journal of the Christian Church* 19, no. 4 (2019): 265–285 (also *Analogia: The Pemptousia Journal for Theological Studies* 8 (2020)): 45–68).

⁴⁴ With Orthodoxy nothing is simple when it comes to primacy and the determination of autocephaly or the fully independence of local churches. Some Orthodox churches include, on top of the 14 local universally acknowledged autocephalous churches (reflected in the liturgical list or diptychs of the primates of autocephalous churches commemorated at the Hierarchical Divine Liturgy served by an autocephalous primate:

<https://www.holycouncil.org/churches> (last accessed: February 9, 2021), the Orthodox Church in America (OCA) (autocephaly granted by the Moscow Patriarchate in 1970) and the Orthodox Church of Ukraine (OCU) (autocephaly granted by the Ecumenical Patriarchate in 2019) as also being autocephalous. For discussion of the broader problems of primacy in contemporary Orthodoxy see Brandon Gallaher, “The Pure Signifier of Power:

Remembering, Repeating and Working Through the Significance of the Papacy and Pope Francis for Eastern Orthodoxy,” in *The Geo-Politics of Pope Francis*, *Annua Nuntia Lovaniensia*, ed. Jan de Volder (Leuven: Peeters, 2019), 169–198.

⁴⁶ Timothy Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 2nd Ed. (London: Penguin, 1997), 308. [AU:

Penguin was in Baltimore in 1964?: Yes]

⁴⁸ Phan uses it for the ecclesiology of Vatican II and denies anything similar is found in Orthodoxy, let alone at Crete.

⁴⁹ Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 188; cf. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 308.

⁵⁰ Sergii Bulgakov, “The Church Universal,” *Journal of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius* 25 (1934): 10–15, at 11 (*Collection*, 16-21 at 17).

⁵¹ See Will Cohen, “Sacraments and the Visible Unity of the Church,” *Ecclesiology* 4, no. 1 (2007): 68–87.

⁵² Bulgakov, “Outlines of the Teaching about the Church—The Church and Non-Orthodoxy” [Part 1], *American Church Monthly* 30, no. 6 (1931): 411–423, at 418 (and see pt. 2 in 31, no. 1 [1932]: 13–26 [AU: What do the 1931 date and page numbers refer to?]) (original: “Ocherki ucheniia o tserkvi. [III]. Tserkov’ i ‘Inoslavie’,” *Put’* 4 [June–July 1926]: 3–26).

⁵³ *The Holy and Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts*, trans. Archim. Ephrem Lash, https://web.archive.org/web/20160316185606/http://anastasis.org.uk/lenten_verseps_2.htm (last accessed: February 10, 2021).

⁵⁴ Georges Florovsky, “Une vue sur l’Assemblée d’Amsterdam,” *Irénikon*, 22, no. 1 (1949): 5–25, at 9; Florovsky, “Confessional Loyalty in the Ecumenical Movement,” *The Patristic Witness of Georges Florovsky*, 285.

⁵⁵ See Paul Evdokimov, *Orthodoxy*, trans. Jeremy Hummerstone and Callan Slipper (London: New City, 2011 [original ed: 1979]), 245-268, Olivier Clément, *The Roots of Christian Mysticism: Text and Commentary*, trans. Theodore Berkeley and Jeremy Hummerstone (London: New City, 1993 [original ed.: 1982]), Alexander Schmemmann, *The Eucharist: Sacrament of the Kingdom*, trans. Paul Kachur (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1988), 27-48, John D. Zizioulas, *The Eucharistic Communion and the World*, ed. Luke Ben Tallon (London: T & T Clark-Continuum, 2011), 39-82 and Andrew Louth, *Introducing Eastern Orthodox Theology* (London: SPCK, 2013), 141-159.

⁵⁷ W. B. Yeats, "Sailing to Byzantium", 1.18 in *The Collected Poems of W. B. Yeats: A New Edition*, ed. Richard J. Finneran (NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 1989), 193-194 at 193.

⁵⁸ See Hans Urs von Balthasar, "Casta Meretrix," in *Explorations in Theology*, vol. 2: *Spouse of the Word* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1991), 193–288, and for commentary see Gary A. Anderson, "The Roman Church as *Casta Meretrix*," *Church Life Journal: A Journal of the McGrath Institute for Church Life*, October 25, 2018, <https://churchlifejournal.nd.edu/articles/the-roman-church-as-casta-meretrix> (last accessed February 10, 2021).

⁵⁹ Florovsky, "Confessional Loyalty in the Ecumenical Movement," 285.

⁶⁰ Brandon Gallaher, "Orthodoxy and the West—The Problem of Orthodox Self-Criticism in Christos Yannaras," in *Polis, Ontology, Ecclesial Event: Engaging with Christos Yannaras' Thought*, ed. Sotiris Mitralaxis (Cambridge: James Clarke and Co., 2018), 206–25, at 219ff.

⁶² See "Orthodox-Pentecostal Academic Dialogue," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 28, no. 2 (2019): 163–164.

⁶³ See Paul Ladouceur, "The Experience of God as Light in the Orthodox Tradition," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 28, no. 2 (2019): 165–185; and Lisa P. Stephenson,

“Pentecostalism and Experience: History, Theology, and Practice,” *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 28, no. 2 (2019): 186–201.

⁶⁵ Sergii Bulgakov, “A Word on Pentecost,” *Journal of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius* 9 (June 1930): 27–31, at 27–28; cf. Coulter.

⁶⁸ “Relations of the Orthodox Church with the Rest of the Christian World, 5th Pan-Orthodox Pre-Conciliar Conference, Chambésy, 10–17 October 2015,” §6, <https://www.holycouncil.org/-/preconciliar-relations> (last accessed February 11, 2021).

⁶⁹ See Gallaher, “The Orthodox Moment,” 26–71, esp. 47–50.

⁷⁰ “Relations of the Orthodox Church with the Rest of the Christian World,” §6, <https://www.holycouncil.org/-/rest-of-christian-world> (last accessed February 11, 2021).

⁷¹ *Lumen Gentium*, §I.8, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html (last accessed February 11, 2021). The phrase also appears in *Unitatis Redintegratio*, §I.4 and §III.13, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19641121_unitatis-redintegratio_en.html (last accessed: February 15, 2021) and *Dignitatis Humanae*, §1 (http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651207_dignitatis-humanae_en.html (last accessed: February 15, 2021)); For commentary on the phrase see Karl Joseph Becker, “An Examination of *Subsistit in*: A Profound Theological Perspective,” *L’Osservatore Romano*, Weekly English Edition, 1923, December 14, 2005, 11-14 (<https://www.ewtn.com/catholicism/library/examination-of-subsistit-in-a-profound-theological-perspective-10183> (last accessed: February 12, 2021)), Francis Sullivan, “Quaestio disputata: a response to Karl Becker, S. J., on the meaning of *subsistit in*,” *Theological Studies*, Vol. 67, No. 2 (2006): 395-409 and Paolo Gamberini,

“‘Subsistit’ in Ecumenical Ecclesiology: J. Ratzinger and E. Jüngel,” *Irish Theological Quarterly*, Vol. 72, No. 1 (2007): 61-73.

⁷² See Georges Florovsky, “The Limits of the Church” (1933), in *Patristic Witness of Georges Florovsky*, ed. Gallaher and Ladouceur, 247–56; and Bulgakov, “Outlines of the Teaching about the Church—The Church and Non-Orthodoxy,” *American Church Monthly*, Part 1 (1931) and Part 2 (1932).

⁷³ See John H. Erickson, *The Challenge of Our Past* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1991); Erickson, “On the Cusp of Modernity: The Canonical Hermeneutic of St. Nikodemos the Haghiorite (1748–1809),” *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly*, 42, no. 1 (1998): 45–66 at 59–66; Kallistos Ware, *Eustratios Argenti: A Study of the Greek Church under Turkish Rule* (1964; Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2014), 90–97; and Will Cohen, “Sacraments and the Visible Unity of the Church,” *Ecclesiology* 4, no. 1 (2007): 68–87.

⁷⁴ See Brandon Gallaher, “Ecumenism as Civilizational Dialogue: Eastern Orthodox Anti-Ecumenism and Eastern Orthodox Ecumenism: A Creative or Sterile Antinomy?,”; Paul Ladouceur, “On Ecumenoclasm: Anti-Ecumenical Theology in Orthodoxy,” *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly*, 61, no. 3 (2017): 323–35; George Demacopoulos, “‘Traditional Orthodoxy’ as a Postcolonial Movement,” *Journal of Religion*, 97, no. 4 (2017): 475–499; and Vasilios N. Makrides, “Orthodox Christian Rigorism: Attempting to Delineate a Multifaceted Phenomenon,” *Interdisciplinary Journal for Religion and Transformation in Contemporary Society*, 2, no. 2 (July 2016): 216–52.

⁷⁵ See Erickson, “The Church in Modern Orthodox Thought”; Florovsky, “The Doctrine of the Church and the Ecumenical Movement,” *Ecumenical Review* 2, no. 2 (1950): 152–61, at 158.

⁷⁶ See Paul Evdokimov, *L’Art de l’icône: théologie de la beauté* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1970) (*The Art of the Icon: A Theology of Beauty*, trans. Stephen R. Bigham

(Redondo Beach, CA: Oakwood Publications, 1990)); and Peter C. Phan, *Culture and Eschatology: The Iconographical Vision of Paul Evdokimov* (New York: Peter Lang, 1984).

⁷⁸ See Gallaher, “The Orthodox Moment,” 26–71, at 33ff. ([AU: Is this a reference to Gallaher’s note 6?]see n. 6, 31 in the article for bibliography on the long preparations for Crete).

⁸⁰ *Pastor Aeternus*, §4, <https://w2.vatican.va/content/pius-ix/la/documents/constitutio-dogmatica-pastor-aeternus-18-iulii-1870.html> (last accessed: February 16, 2021).

⁸¹ “There’s no reason on God’s earth why the pope should be appointing the bishop of Peoria. None whatsoever” (John L. Allen Jr., “Interview with Jesuit Fr. Robert Taft of the Pontifical Oriental Institute,” February 4, 2004, *National Catholic Reporter*, <http://www.natcath.org/mainpage/specialdocuments/taft.htm> (last accessed: February 16, 2021)).

⁸² ‘Code of Canon Law,’ Canon 331, http://www.vatican.va/archive/cod-iuris-canonici/eng/documents/cic_lib2-cann330-367_en.html (last accessed: February 16, 2021).

⁸³ Felix Corley, “Archbishop Chrysostomos I: Leading cleric in Cyprus,” January 5, 2008, <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/obituaries/archbishop-chrysostomos-i-leading-cleric-in-cyprus-768356.html> (last accessed: February 16, 2021)

⁸⁴ See Brandon Gallaher, “The Pure Signifier of Power,” 169–198.

⁸⁵ Brandon Gallaher, “Ecumenism as Civilizational Dialogue,” 271–272.

⁸⁶ See International Theological Commission, *Memory and Reconciliation: The Church and the Faults of the Past*, December 1999, espec. §5.1-2, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/cti_documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20000307_memory-reconc-itc_en.html (last accessed: February 17, 2021), Ambrose Mong, *Purification of Memory: A Study of Modern Orthodox Theologians from a Catholic Perspective* (Cambridge: James Clarke and Co., 2015), Adam Deville, “On the ‘Healing of

Memories’: An Analysis of the Concept in Papal Documents in Light of Modern Psychotherapy and Recent Ecumenical Statements,” *Eastern Churches Journal*, 11 (2004): 59-88, “Eastern Orthodox rivalries and the healing of memories,” June 16, 2016, <https://www.catholicworldreport.com/2016/06/16/eastern-orthodox-rivalries-and-the-healing-of-memories/> (last accessed: February 17, 2021) and “John Paul II: Diagnostician of Divisions, Doctor of Ecumenism,” May 24, 2020, <https://www.catholicworldreport.com/2020/05/24/john-paul-ii-diagnostician-of-divisions-doctor-of-ecumenism/> (last accessed: February 17, 2021).

⁸⁸ *Unitatis Redintegratio*, §§II–III.5–18 and *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, §§24–30, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19641121_orientalium-ecclesiarum_en.html (last accessed September 10, 2020). And see *Lumen Gentium*, §23.

⁸⁹ *Unitatis Redintegratio*, §III.13, and see *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, §§7–11.

⁹⁰ Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, “Communiqué concernant la suppression du titre ‘Patriarche d’Occident’ dans l’Annuaire pontifical 2006,” https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/general-docs/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_20060322_patriarca-occidente_fr.html (last accessed: September 15, 2020).

⁹² “It needs to be noted that no Roman Pontiff ever recognized this equalization of the sees or accepted that only a primacy of honour be accorded to the See of Rome. It should be noted too that this patriarchal structure typical of the East never developed in the West” (Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, “Note on the Expression ‘Sister Churches’” (2000), http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_2000_0630_chiese-sorelle_en.html (last accessed: February 17, 2021). The removal of the title was heavily influenced by the work of Adriano Garuti who had been a student of Joseph

Ratzinger (the future Benedict XVI): *Il Papa Patriarca d'Occidente? Studio storico dottrinale* (Bologna: Edizioni Francescane, 1990). For commentary and bibliography see Will T. Cohen, *The Concept of "Sister Churches" in Catholic-Orthodox Relations since Vatican II*, *Studia Oecumenica Friburgensia* 67 (Münster: Aschendorff Verlag, 2016), and Kallistos Ware, "The Ravenna Document and the Future of Orthodox-Catholic Dialogue," 69 *The Jurist* (2009): 766–89 at 772–75.

⁹⁵ Here Phan's tendency to lump the Orthodox together is simply reflecting the general Catholic ecumenical *phronema* in dividing up Christendom into discrete **non-Catholic [AU: non-Catholic?]** parts. The Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity is divided into two sections: the Western Section for Catholic relations with different Churches and Ecclesial Communities of the West; and the Eastern section **[AU: Capitalization is inconsistent. Western Section, eastern section. Churches capped? It should be consistent.] [AU: here you have two open quote marks (one of which should be a double quote mark). The other one doesn't have a close quote. Please fix.]** which "deals with Orthodox Churches of Byzantine tradition and the Oriental Orthodox Churches (Coptic, Syrian, Armenian, Ethiopian and Malankara), as well as the Assyrian Church of the East" ("The Pontifical Council for Promoting of Christian Unity," http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/documents/rc_pc_chrstuni_pro_20051996_chrstuni_pro_en.html (last accessed: February 17, 2021)). Also see "Eastern Section," <http://www.christianunity.va/content/unitacristiani/en/dialoghi/sezione-orientale.html> (last accessed: February 17, 2021).

⁹⁹ See, for example, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, §I.3, with its n. 23 citing of various examples of Greek submission to the Papacy and Latin Christianity from past Catholic Ecumenical Councils: Lateran IV, Lyons II, and Florence.

¹⁰⁰ *Ecclesiological and Canonical Consequences of the Sacramental Nature of the Church: Ecclesial Communion, Conciliarity and Authority [Ravenna Statement]*, October 13, 2007, <http://www.christianunity.va/content/unitacristiani/en/dialoghi/sezione-orientale/chiese-ortodosse-di-tradizione-bizantina/commissione-mista-internazionale-per-il-dialogo-teologico-tra-la/documenti-di-dialogo/testo-in-inglese.html> (last accessed: February 17, 2021). For discussion of Ravenna see Kallistos Ware, “The Orthodox Church and the Primacy of the Pope: Are We Any Closer to a Solution?,” *Album Accademico 2008–2009 Pontificio Istituto Orientale* (Rome: n.p., 2009), 43–59; and Ware, “The Ravenna Document and the Future of Orthodox-Catholic Dialogue,” *The Jurist* 60, no. 2 (2009): 766–789. For different theological Orthodox responses to the possibility of papal primacy see Olivier Clément, *You Are Peter: An Orthodox Theologian’s Reflection on the Exercise of Papal Primacy* (Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 2003), and the curious unpublished little book (over 25,000 words) by the late Fr. Thomas Hopko, “The Sun in the West: A Response to Pope John Paul’s Apostolic Letter The Light of the East (*Orientale Lumen*)” (manuscript copy 2007). Also see the Ukrainian Catholic theologian and scholar Adam A. J. DeVille’s important volume: *Orthodoxy and the Roman Papacy: Ut Unum Sint and the Prospects of East-West Unity* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2011).

¹⁰² See Brian E. Daley, “Position and Patronage in the Early Church: The Original Meaning of ‘Primacy of Honour,’” *The Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. 44, Issue 2 (October 1993): 529-553.

¹⁰³ See Rosamond McKitterick, *Rome and the Invention of the Papacy: The Liber Pontificalis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020) and A. Edward Sicienski, *The Papacy and the Orthodox: Sources and History of a Debate* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

¹⁰⁴ *Ravenna Statement*, §§41–43.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., §43, and see Ware, “The Orthodox Church and the Primacy of the Pope,” 53–54.

¹⁰⁶ *Ravenna Statement*, §45.

¹⁰⁷ For more detail see Gallaher, “The Pure Signifier of Power,” 175–179.

¹⁰⁸ “Chieti Statement,”

<http://www.christianunity.va/content/unitacristiani/en/dialoghi/sezione-orientale/chiese-ortodosse-di-tradizione-bizantina/commissione-mista-internazionale-per-il-dialogo-teologico-tra-la/documenti-di-dialogo/testo-in-inglese1.html> (last accessed: February 17, 2021).