

Orthodox Ecclesiology: The Temple of the Spirit

PAUL NEGRUȚ

Emanuel University of Oradea

Introduction

Speaking about the Holy Spirit, Bobrinskoy contends that “throughout the two thousand years of its tradition, the Orthodox Church has been deeply conscious of the fact that the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost inaugurates a new time for the whole humanity and cosmic history. From Pentecost on, the church, and with it the whole creation, has been experiencing the pains of childbirth until Christ is formed in each one of us, the single humanity is restored and the universe becomes, in Him, by a Christological cosmology, the Body of Christ”.¹

Orthodox theologians argue that their theology has been more “Spirit-sensitive” than Western theologies. In fact, Orthodoxy believes that the Holy Spirit is the life of the Church².

Historical Background

The mystical theology of the Orthodox Church is not primarily concerned with positive theological definition, but with the mystical experience of union with God. Eastern Orthodoxy understands salvation in terms of deliverance from mortality and corruption for life everlasting.

Therefore, the doctrine of salvation is not focused on sin and guilt, but focuses rather on progressive appropriation of the divine energies, culminating in deification (*theosis*)³. Deification means participation in the life of the triune God. It is the work of the Holy Spirit, however, to impart the divine energies to humans and to the whole creation through the Church. When it comes to ecclesiology, Orthodoxy speaks about their church as being founded on a twofold divine economy: the work of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit. Thus, the christological ecclesiology of Ignatius⁴ and the pneumatological ecclesiology of Irenaeus⁵ are being brought together. The Church is both the Body of Christ and the Temple of the Spirit. Ware argues that the Orthodox Church, “is not only hierarchical, it is Charismatic and Pentecostal. The Holy Spirit is poured out upon all God’s people. In the Apostolic Church, besides the institutional ministry conferred by the laying

on of hands, there were other charismata or gifts conferred directly by the Spirit".⁶

The Spirit and the Institution

The view that the Church as communion is instituted by Christ and constituted by the Spirit has, according to Zizioulas, significant consequences for ecclesiology:

The institution is something presented to us as a fact, more or less a *fait accompli*. As such, it is a provocation to our freedom. The "con-situation" is something that involves us in its very being, something that we accept freely, because we take part in its very emergence. Authority in the first case is something imposed on us, whereas in the latter it is something that springs from amongst us. If pneumatology is assigned a constitutive role in ecclesiology, the entire issue of *Amt und Geist*, or of "institutionalism", is affected. The notion of communion must be made to apply to the very ontology of the ecclesial institutions, not to their dynamism and efficacy alone.⁷

However, Zizioulas affirms that the actual situation in Orthodoxy, "both theologically and canonically no longer does full justice to the tradition of which [his] exposé has been a reflection".⁸ Consequently, we turn now to examine the actual relation between the Spirit and the institution in contemporary Orthodoxy.

Charismatic Institution

Patterned after the monarchical model of the Trinity,⁹ the Orthodox Church is a hierarchical Church.¹⁰ As Hopko puts it: "the church is rather a monarchical, patriarchal and hierarchical community in imitation of the Trinity".¹¹ However, since this hierarchical structure of the Church is pneumatically constituted, Ware argues that it is not a dead institution but a charismatic body.¹² The bishop is not only appointed by God to be the monarch of his own diocese, but he also receives a special charisma from the Holy Spirit to be the teacher of the faith and the president of the eucharistic assembly.¹³ Moreover, since the Spirit is poured out on all God's people in baptism and chrismation the lay state should be considered charismatic: "a royal priesthood" which could be understood as ordination, although, only in a limited sense of the word.¹⁴

It follows, then, that within Orthodoxy the institutional and charismatic spheres are not in opposition, but actually coincide. However, this raises the question concerning both the origin and the *modus operandi* of this model of "two-tier priesthood": the sacramental (bishop, priest, deacon) and the universal (laity).¹⁵

“Two-Tier” Priesthood

Stăniloae argues that the origin of this model is not socio-historical, but theological, that is, from the very beginning of the Church the sacramental priesthood was necessary in order both to mediate in a visible way Christ's invisible ministry as king, prophet and priest, and to point toward the otherness of Christ in His relationship with the believers.¹⁶ Similarly, the official teaching of Romanian Orthodoxy affirms that the christological and pneumatological origin of hierarchy is clearly recorded in Scripture.¹⁷ The biblical “proof-texts” put forward are: the Holy Orders were instituted by Christ after His resurrection when he gave His Spirit (John 20:21-23) to the Apostles and sent them to proclaim the Gospel to the whole world (Matt. 28:18-20; Mark 16:15-16; Luke 24:47-48); the institution of hierarchy was constituted by the Holy Spirit at Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4, 37-42); the hierarchy (bishop, priest and deacon) were endowed with the power of the Holy Spirit for the authoritative preaching of the Word (Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:15; 2 Tim. 2:15), the administration of the holy sacraments (Matt 28:19; Mark 16:16), and for leadership (Matt. 28:20; Acts 20:28; 1 Tim. 4:16). Thus the threefold ministry (prophetic, priestly, and kingly) of the invisible High Priest continues in the Church with the same authority through the visible ministry of the hierarchy. Further, the apostles continued the practice of the sacramental priesthood in its threefold structure (John 20:21-23; Acts 6:3, 5-6; 20:28; Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3:1-7, 8-12; 4:14; 5:17-22; 2 Tim. 1:6; Tit. 1:5, 7; 1 Pet. 5:1-2,5; James 5:14).

Theologically, the mystery of the Holy Orders, particularly that of the bishop is the condition and the source of the other sacraments (mysteries) although it cannot be separated from them.¹⁸ Therefore, concludes Radu, since laity cannot administer the sacraments, it follows that the Church as a sacramental community cannot exist without hierarchy (bishop, priest and deacon).¹⁹ However, the Romanian approach is in striking contradiction with Bulgakov's view, who argues that,

It is impossible to state, historically, the place, the time and the manner of the institution by the Apostles of the hierarchy in its present form, that is in the three orders: bishops presbyters, deacons. The documents of the beginning of the first century are silent on this point. Or indeed, if we find suggestions about the hieratic dignities it is evident that the orders there have another meaning than that of day, or that the distinction and the correlation between the three degrees, very clear today, at that time lacked precision (Acts 20:17, 28; Titus 1:5-7; 1 Tim. 2:5, 7; 1 Peter 5:1-5).²⁰

Yet, Bulgakov does not question the Orthodox presupposition concerning the apostolicity of the Church's hierarchy, but affirms that it developed gradually during the second century as a result of the interplay between the Old Testament priesthood and the apostolic succession.²¹

The difference between Bulgakov who argues that the early church had only a “germ” of hierarchical structure and the Romanian view which asserts

that from the very beginning the Church had a fully developed hierarchy (bishop, priest, deacon) demonstrates not only the disagreements within Orthodoxy concerning this issue, but also the constant appeal by Romanian Orthodoxy to the authority of Scripture as a result of its encounter with the evangelical movement which emerged from the work of the three Romanian Orthodox priests: D. Cornilescu, T. Popescu, and I. Trifa.²²

However, once the idea of divinely appointed hierarchy is accommodated, the next problem the Church faces is to reconcile the charismatic constitution of the Church to its hierarchical institution.²³

Sobornost – The “One” and the “Many”

One attempt to resolve the tension between the Spirit and the institution is the ecclesiology of sobornost.²⁴ Whilst rejecting both Catholic “overinstitutionalized” and Protestant “overdemocratized” ecclesiologies, Khomiakov, who coined the concept,²⁵ developed a conciliar model, which, in his understanding, is a synthesis between the two.²⁶ Sobornost affirms that both clergy and laity are constitutive of the Church. In other words, neither can exist without the other, and consequently both clergy and laity are in the Church and not outside or above it.²⁷ This clarification was intended to correct the Catholic influence which stressed the right of the bishops to exercise episcopal authority even if they were not titular bishops.²⁸ Alternatively, in the Orthodox tradition, the bishop cannot exist without a local church and neither can a local church exist without the bishop.²⁹ In this way the “one” and the “many” are in a dynamic unity. Moreover, charisma and institution do not exclude each other and actually coincide due to the fact that sacramental priesthood is both divinely ordained and empowered:

The clergy is not above the people but in them and with them: it is not a judicial absolutism but a divinely-given authority. Yet, for the faithful, this authority is a spiritual power, based upon the mystical energy imparted in ordination to the priesthood for the fulfilment of its sacramental task. The sacrament which this energy of the priesthood brings into operation is a divine, not a human activity: not an idea, a doctrine, an institution, but an immediate divine Fact. The priesthood has the power to link the divine with the human, to bring heaven down to earth, and it is in this sacramental ministration that the efficacy and basis of the Holy Orders consists.³⁰

This divine power is not conferred to the clergy as a result of human election for office, but is transmitted by apostolic succession.³¹ Consequently the presence in the Church of this charismatic priesthood in apostolic succession is vital for the being of the Church. *Sine episcopo nulla ecclesia.*³²

However, Bulgakov argues that amongst the three offices of Christ (priest, prophet and king) entrusted to the Church, only that of priesthood is by divine right and power (*de jure divino*) entrusted to hierarchy, whilst the ruling ministry is an expression of the unity of the whole body and the prophetic ministry belong to the whole Church (clergy and laity). Hence

Bulgakov concluded that laity has the right to participate both in the teaching and ruling ministry of the Church.³³ However, whilst affirming that all believers are charismatic due to the fact that the Holy Spirit is poured out upon all God's people, Ware points out that lay charismatic ministries have been less emphasized in the Orthodox Church.³⁴ Bulgakov attempted to overcome this problem by creating space for laity in Orthodox ecclesiology. He argues that despite the fact that this *ordo* of laymen is subordinate to the priesthood, it has certain independence.

Baptism even without confirmation, imparts some charismatic gifts; and because of this, baptism in the Name of the Holy Trinity is valid even when performed by a layman, so that baptism is valid even among those Christian confessions which do not recognize Holy Orders and have lost apostolic succession.³⁵

In sobornost, however, this freedom represents the grounds for cooperation between clergy and laity, or in other words, between the "one" and the "many".

Firstly, the laymen co-operate with the clergy both in the administration of sacraments, and in the eucharistic liturgy through singing, responses and prayer.³⁶ In this way the unity between the "one" and the "many" is clearly illustrated during the eucharistic liturgy, when the bishop as the image of Christ presides and the many are around him and participate at the Eucharist.³⁷ Therefore, the eucharistic assembly can have only a single person as its head, the bishop.³⁸ At the same time, the bishop who is the source of all the other ministries (priests and deacons) in the Church is consecrated within the Church during the eucharistic assembly and subsequently he can exercise his episcopal prerogatives only in his church, as long as he is in office.³⁹ In this sense the Orthodox Church follows Cyprian: "The bishop is in the church and the church is in the bishop".⁴⁰

Secondly, the "one" and the "many" work together in the election of the clergy, in all its degrees from that of the deacon to that of the patriarch.⁴¹ The laity present at the ordination of a clergyman signify their approval by acclaiming him as *axios* (worthy) immediately after the impositions of hands. Without this approval, affirms Bulgakov, ordination cannot take place.⁴²

Thirdly, administration is conducted by the bishop ("one") in "concert with representatives ("many") of clergy and laity organised in episcopal, diocesan or presbyterial councils, or in special gatherings such as local or ecumenical councils".⁴³

Fourthly, the "one" and the "many" work together in preaching and teaching. Bulgakov asserts that the authority to preach the Gospel and even the power to baptise are compatible with the status of the laymen.⁴⁴

Strictly speaking, the succession of gifts of the Holy Spirit, given to the Church at the time of Pentecost and descending by the Apostles and their followers, extends to the whole Church. The "apostolic succession", special and restricted, exists only for the sacramental ministry, for the priesthood and not for teaching and dogmatic consciousness.⁴⁵

Moreover Bulgakov asserts that the commandment, “Go into all the world and preach the Gospel to the whole creation” (Mark 16:15) was given to all believers and subsequently “we find in the Scriptures instances when not only the apostles but all believers were involved in preaching and teaching (Acts 6:5; 8:5, 12, 14, 26-36)”.⁴⁶ However, a certain limitation of the right of the laity (“many”) to preach was introduced, asserts Bulgakov, not because of charismatic inferiority, or of the incompatibility of the right of preaching with the status of laity but because of practical and disciplinary reasons.⁴⁷ As a matter of fact, “only one ministry is withheld entirely from the laity, that of the mysteries—the celebration of the holy Eucharist and other sacraments”.⁴⁸

Fifthly, the *pleroma* of the Church (clergy and laity) is considered to be the deposit and the guardian of truth, the only organ of infallibility. Even the definitions of the Ecumenical Councils become normative⁴⁹ only after they have been accepted by the whole Church.⁵⁰ In all these ministries, argues Bulgakov, by acting in unity and co-operation, and not one group against the other, the Church reveals the very essence of Sobornost.⁵¹

The Church is Christ’s body, in which there are many members, differing from each other and yet indispensable to the body, and in that sense each has the same value. They are many: the body is one [...] the Church has a hierarchy and its constitution is hierarchical, and yet it is an organism rather than a juridical institution.⁵²

Whilst this approach attempts to resolve the problem of clericalism as a separate class from laity by emphasizing the unity between the “one” and the “many”,⁵³ Orthodox theologians do not always agree over the practicality of this model. Some emphasize the primacy of the community (“many”) over the bishop (“one”) whilst others stress the primacy of the bishop over community. Thus Meyendorff argues that,

The documents of our disposal do not give us any certainty about the existence of a “monarchical episcopate” in all churches from the first century [...] On the other hand, we can assert that there never was a Christian Church when the Lord’s Supper was not celebrated.⁵⁴

Alternatively, Florovsky asserts that,

[...] the order of bishop is so necessary for the Church that without it the Church is not a Church and the Christian is not a Christian, and they cannot even be so called.⁵⁵

Whilst attempting to overcome this contradiction between the “one” and the “many”, Zizioulas proposes a eucharistic ecclesiology which reflects “the proper synthesis between Christology and Pneumatology. This principle is that the “one”, the bishop, cannot exist without the “many”, the community, and the “many” cannot exist without the “one”.⁵⁶

Observations

Methodological

The Orthodox approach to the relation between the Spirit and the institution represents a significant attempt to realize a synthesis between both christology and pneumatology, and the “one” and the “many”. However, from a methodological point of view the whole construct has weak exegetical foundations. Thus, in addition to the disagreements between the Orthodox theologians concerning the origin of the monarchic episcopate, the validity of the biblical evidence put forward by the Romanian Church is severely questioned by the conclusions of recent studies in New Testament and post-apostolic writings.⁵⁷ Schillebeeckx, for instance, argues that the relation between the Spirit and the institution in the early church took the form of a charismatic type of leadership based upon the “solidarity and equality of all Christians ‘in the Spirit’ (Acts 2:17-18)”.⁵⁸ Due to their charisma, those leaders, or “teachers of faith” who could be ordained or non-ordained, had undoubtedly “great prestige in the Church”.⁵⁹ Faivre is of the opinion that the process of clericalization began in the middle of the third century when the bishop took all the authority in the Church.⁶⁰ Similarly, Stockmeier argues that,

The conspicuous absence from the New Testament writings of the office of bishop as is materialized in the course of the second century is sufficient proof of the variety which characterised the developing outward structure of the Church.⁶¹

Whilst this view has been, to a certain degree, accepted in recent years by some Orthodox scholars, there is no evidence, yet, of significant implications for ecclesiology.⁶² However, Bria points out that the development of the institution in the imperial church had been achieved at the expense of its charismatic dimension.

A particular understanding of the apostolic succession of the bishops appeared which conceded to them the right to make pronouncements of faith. Their doctrinal authority was based on their consecration in the apostolic succession, leaving little room for consideration of their spiritual capacity to discern the truth on the basis of the experience of the Pentecost. In some periods of church history, this led to crisis situations in which ecclesiastical authorities did not speak the word of God clearly or defend gospel values.⁶³

Second, in the absence of a critical hermeneutic, the typological approach which underlines the model of unity between the “one” and the “many” can be misleading. For example, Ignatius wrote:

You must all follow the lead of the bishop, as Jesus Christ followed that of the Father. Where the bishop appears, there let the people be, just as where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church.⁶⁴

In the first sentence the bishop is the image of the Father and the people are the image of Jesus, whilst in the second the bishop is the image of Jesus and the people the image of the Catholic Church. Elsewhere Ignatius argues:

Everyone must show the deacons respect. They represent Jesus Christ, just as the bishop has the role of the Father and the presbyters are like God's council and an apostolic band. You cannot have a church without these.⁶⁵

Here the deacons represent Jesus, the bishops represent God and the presbyters represent the apostolic band. Comparing the two passages from Ignatius' writings it becomes clear that a theology of hierarchy construed upon his hermeneutical approach faces difficulties in harmonising the overlapping senses of the images. Even if one accepts Zizioulas' attempt to reconcile the historical and eschatological aspects of the ministry,⁶⁶ that is, the ministry is not an *interim* period between *Ascension* and *Parousia* but an expression of the eschatological nature of the Church, one still faces the problem of reconciling Ignatian overlapping typological roles, both historically and eschatologically. Additionally, commenting on the emergence of a rich literature concerning the "reality and the symbolism of the episcopate", Bria asserts:

The episcopate is a visible structure exercising a power that gives certainty to the life and mission of the church. It is a structure which gives the church a status of certainty, but such a church cannot take risks in its affirmations and acts.⁶⁷

Theological

One important point of trinitarian theology, as C. E. Gunton argues, "is that enables us to develop an ontology of the personal", that is, of being in relations of mutual constitution with other persons.⁶⁸ However, an uncritical emphasis of the monarchy of the Father has not only trinitarian implications,⁶⁹ but also ecclesiological, that is, it leads to a strongly episcopal ecclesiology that tends to see the bishop as the image of the Father.⁷⁰ For example, as a result of the emergence of the monoepiscopate, with Ignatius of Antioch, the bishop acquired special ecclesiastical and soteriological prerogatives. Thus, the bishop is the locus of unity and "without him the lifegiving sacraments could not be administered".⁷¹ The bishop is not only "a living image of God upon earth" but actually the "fountain of all Mysteries (sacraments) of the Catholic Church, through which we obtain salvation".⁷² And further, "what God is in the heavenly Church of the first born, and the sun in the world, that every High Priest [bishop] is in his own particular Church".⁷³ Similarly, Bulgakov affirms that the bishop "has the power to link the divine with human, to bring heaven down to earth, and it is in this

sacramental ministration that the efficacy and basis of Holy Orders consists".⁷⁴ Consequently, the bishop is not "one among equals" but, as Chadwick points out, this approach gave "vertical justification by claiming that the bishop is God's representative on earth, an earthly counterpart corresponding to the heavenly Monarch, so that 'we ought to regard the bishop as the Lord himself'."⁷⁵

Additionally, a hierarchical ecclesiology reflects strong tendency to reduce the relation between the Spirit and institution to the relation between the Spirit and the hierarchical structure of the Church. Consequently, the sobornost attempt to create space for lay ministries is, to a large degree, rejected by other theologians. For instance, the relative lay independence illustrated by the idea that baptism administered by lay people is valid, is strongly rejected by Zizioulas who affirms that "there is no baptism, which is the constitutive act of the community, i.e. the ontological basis of the laity, without the bishop".⁷⁶

Further, concerning the teaching ministry of the Church, Ware argues that "the bishop is the divinely appointed teacher of the faith, whilst the guardian of the faith is not the episcopate alone, but the whole people of God, bishop, clergy, and laity together".⁷⁷ Thus to teach and to possess the truth are two distinct functions: the former belongs to the bishop, the latter to the entire people of God.⁷⁸ However, whilst the role of laity is being reduced to that of the guardian of faith, the Orthodox theologians do not agree as to the significance of this role. Drawing from the belief that the whole Church, not simply the clergy, is the guardian of truth,⁷⁹ Kotsone argues that a lay person is obligated to oppose even a bishop who is not holding the truth.⁸⁰ Alternatively, Lossky contends that except in the case of schism the will of a bishop is binding for the faithful regardless if the bishop is right or wrong.⁸¹ Whilst attempting to reconcile these two trends, Ware fails to offer a synthesis which would create space both for relatedness and freedom between both clergy and laity, and the Spirit and institution.

More than once in Orthodox history the "charismatics" have come into conflict with the hierarchy, but in the end there is no conflict between the two elements in the Church's life: it is the same Spirit who is active in both.⁸²

However, Ware offers a lengthy description of the charismatic hierarchy, whilst the charismatic laity is considered to be a silent guardian of faith. This approach leads to the conclusion that when the space between the Spirit and the institution (hierarchy) diminishes, the space between hierarchy and laity increases, as it happened, for instance, in the imperial church.⁸³

Sociological

Whilst the Orthodox Church dismisses the charge that its model of Spirit-institution downgrades the laity by arguing that the latter participates both in the election of the hierarchy and in the life of the Church, a careful analysis of

Orthodox ecclesiology proves beyond any doubt that lay ministries are not encouraged.⁸⁴ Being aware of this aspect, Bulgakov attempted to create space for lay participation in Church governing, teaching and prophecy.⁸⁵ Thus, compared with the imperial church in which the “People of God” (*laos*) were considered to be a “mob” (*ochlos*), and thus totally excluded from episcopal election,⁸⁶ sobornost represents a significant step towards a more corporate ecclesiology. However, whilst affirming that lay people are necessary in episcopal election, sobornost ecclesiology limits their participation to the right to acclaim (*axios*) the newly elected bishop. Consequently, Bulgakov’s assertion that “ordination cannot take place without this approval” is without object if one observes that the acclamation takes place after the “imposition of hands” which represents both the divine endowment and apostolic succession.⁸⁷ Thus, compared with the early church model in which the community was actively involved in the election of its leaders⁸⁸ due to their belief in “horizontal unity”,⁸⁹ sobornost ecclesiology believes in “vertical unity”⁹⁰ which “operates through the levels of being reflected in lower levels and representational levels, all held together in a synthesis of divine Word made human flesh”.⁹¹

Another sociological aspect concerns the ecclesial relation between the “one” and the “many” by analogy to the Trinity. Thus, whilst within the Godhead each divine hypostasis has His specific office as Father, Son, and Spirit, a hierarchical ecclesiology which fails to provide space for each member of the community to have his/her particular office runs the risk to perceive the “many” in non-personal terms such as “crowd” or “public”. Although Orthodoxy acknowledges that the gifts (*charisma*) of the Holy Spirit are intended to safeguard the absorption of the person into an impersonal being,⁹² in practice the “many” who respond to the “one” during the liturgy have no space for the development of “charismatic” ministries. As Fitzgerald puts it:

Orthodox theologians are challenged by the critical need to reaffirm the important place in the Church which the laity is meant to have. Simply put, can the Orthodox continue to advance the valuable features of eucharistic ecclesiology without, at the same time, calling for a genuine renewal of community worship and church life, in which the laity are enabled and encouraged to take their rightful place? In many places, the Eucharist appears to be very much an action of the clergy and their “assistants”, in which the laity are but passive spectators. Such a situation is certainly contrary to the best expression of Orthodox liturgical theology.⁹³

However, one has to acknowledge that there have been periods in the history of Orthodoxy when lay persons played an important role in the life of the Church, such as St. Seraphim of Sorov, Father John Kronstadt, or the *starts* (elders) of the monastery of Optina,⁹⁴ but such examples are exceptions rather than the rule of the Orthodox Church.

Consequently, it can be argued that, so far, Orthodox ecclesiology in general and sobornost in particular, have failed to offer a satisfactory answer to the question concerning the tension between institution and the Spirit.

Moreover, even the attempt made by sobornost to address this issue faces a growing opposition from within both Russian and Greek Orthodox fold. The main charge brought against Khomiakov and his school, for instance, is that it has endangered the prerogatives of the episcopate and “democratized” the idea of the Church.⁹⁵ Consequently, by failing to create space for laity to participate in the life of the community, a hierarchical Church runs the risk of losing the very communities which its bishops are supposed to represent. In fact Zizioulas draws attention to this phenomenon when he affirms that, “the community has almost disappeared and the number of titular bishops is increasing rapidly”.⁹⁶ Further, whilst acknowledging that the Orthodox Church a “pyramidal” structure, Zizioulas argues that this “clericalization” can be corrected only if christology and ecclesiology are pneumatically constituted.⁹⁷

Conclusions

Commenting on the situation of contemporary Orthodoxy, Gvosdev affirms that “the Orthodox Church has been described as a rigidly hierarchical, authoritarian body. At various points in its history, particularly in the nineteenth and twentieth century, the national Orthodox churches in Eastern Europe ‘remained static, lacking a horizontal cohesiveness and local dynamism’ because of a system of ‘bureaucratized, pyramidal subordination’ to a state dominated hierarchy.”⁹⁸

This hierarchical model which has characterized the Orthodox “school-theology”⁹⁹ has its roots in the unbalanced translation of both Chalcedonian christology and monarchical trinitarianism into ecclesiology. Thus, whilst an ecclesiology construed around the image of the Body of Christ provides a frame of thought for the relation between Christ and the Church, it does not allow for enough space between the “Head” and the “Body”. Consequently, emphasis has been made on the invisible Church which shares the same authority with Christ. Further, since the Holy Spirit is the life of the Church there is no space between the Spirit and the institution: hence the latter claims the same authority as the former. Theologically, this approach paved the way for an ecclesiology in which Christ, the Spirit and the Church are so inextricably knit together as to run the risk of merging into one another, or to extend the principle of *communicatio idiomatum* from christology to ecclesiology. Historically, however, the Orthodox Church faces the danger of incoherence between symbolism and reality. In other words, whilst Orthodoxy took the magisterial route of idealizing the institution, it lost the community.¹⁰⁰ The hierarchical ecclesiology provides space for the “one” (the bishop) whilst failing to create space for the “many” (the laity).

However, the twentieth century has revealed not only the crisis of the Orthodox Church, but also its significant potential for renewal. The most significant change appears to be the shift from a hierarchical institutionalism to a hierarchical community. The underlying principle for this change is the

belief that the universal church exists only in and through local communities.¹⁰¹ There are two main trends within this shift from institution to community. First, the eucharistic vision emphasizes the fact that since truth exists ontologically as communion,

Only in the Eucharist does the Church acquire a vision of the truth as both historical and free from the laws of history; as social and yet transcending all societies; as love which although experienced in and through human relations remains ultimately only a matter of sharing the trinitarian love of God, of theosis. The Eucharist is the only historical experience that the Church possesses in which all this becomes real.¹⁰²

This view adopted by Melia, Florovsky, Meyendorff, Schmemmann and Afanasieff,¹⁰³ and particularly emphasized by Zizioulas attempts to develop a neo-patristic synthesis in order to recover both the symbolic-hierarchical and corporate-existential aspects of the Greek Fathers.¹⁰⁴

Secondly, there is the pastoral vision which is primarily concerned with the present situation of the Orthodox *pleroma* living in different cultures and facing different challenges than those of the Byzantine period. This approach argues that contemporary Orthodoxy has to re-write its theology in such a way as whilst being faithful to the Holy Tradition, it has to be also relevant for the present realities. In other words, Orthodoxy has to re-discover the theology of community which allow space for all the faithful to participate in the truth of faith according to their charisma.

Pentecost continues to enable the people of God to hold the Tradition in ways the Spirit wills. The Eastern Church understands this continuity as ensured by an episcopal ministry consecrated in the apostolic succession. But the church is built on the foundations of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as its main cornerstone (Ephesians 2:20). This view of the church does not prevent the participation of all in building up the body. The wholeness-*koinonia*-of the body implies that all categories of the people of God share fully in "all truth". This is the charismatic ministry of the people of God, who are transformed by the power of the Holy Spirit into the "living stones" of the church.¹⁰⁵

This pastoral view illustrates clearly the shift from the institutionalism of the past through the contemporary crisis towards a new ecclesial community. Consequently authority is no longer a predicate of the office but a quality of truth; and truth is Christ in communion and community.

Notes

¹ B. Bobrinsky, "The Holy Spirit in the Bible and the Church", in *The Ecumenical Review* 42-43 (1990), 357-362 (here 361).

² See C. N. Tsirpanlis, *Introduction to Eastern Patristic Thought and Orthodox Theology* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991).

³ See J. Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, 1974, ch. 11.

⁴ "Wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the universal church". Ignatius, *Letter to the Smyrneans*, 8.2.

⁵ "Wherever the Spirit of God is, there is the church, and all grace". Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, 3.24.1.

⁶ K. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, rev. edn. (Penguin, London, 1993), 240.

⁷ J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 140.

⁸ J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 141.

⁹ Hopko argues that the interpersonal communion of the persons of the Holy Trinity is both ontologically and "economically" ordered according to the *monarchy* of the Father. The communion of the three Persons of the Godhead is rooted not only in the consubstantiality of the three hypostases, but basically in the Person of the one God and Father, the divine "source" and "cause" of the Word and the Spirit. However, the *headship* of God the Father does not imply heterosubstantiality or metaphysical subordination among the three hypostases. T. Hopko, "God and Gender", 166.

¹⁰ T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 252.

¹¹ T. Hopko, "God and Gender", 173.

¹² See T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 253.

¹³ In virtue of the special *charisma* which the bishop receives as his consecration, he is endowed with the threefold power of ruling, teaching and celebrating the sacraments. See T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 253.

¹⁴ S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 48.

¹⁵ N. Chițescu și C. Cornițescu, "Sfântul Duh Sfințitorul: lucrarea Lui în biserică și în lume", in D. Radu (ed.), *Îndrumări misionare*, 398-399.

¹⁶ D. Stăniloae, "Isus Hristos, Arhiereu în Veac", in *Orthodoxia*, XXXI/2 (1979), 223.

¹⁷ I will present here the biblical texts indicated by D. Radu in "Învățătura despre biserică" in D. Radu (ed.), *Îndrumări misionare*, 399-400; S. Cosma, *Cuvinte*, 244-250; Patriarch Teoctist, *Învățătura*, 279-280; Metropolitan Nicolae, *Catehism Orthodox* (Editura Mitropoliei Banatului, Timișoara, 1990), 78-79.

¹⁸ *The Confession of Dositheus*, X; T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 253.

¹⁹ D. Radu, "Învățătura despre Biserica", 400-401.

²⁰ S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 40.

²¹ S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 41. "We cannot affirm that the Apostles instituted this succession immediately, but the fact of such institution cannot be denied. After some fluctuation the hierarchy was formed in the second century after the type of the priesthood of the Old Testament, yet always with a difference. For the Church, which lives in the unity of tradition, the institution of the apostolic succession of the hierarchy is axiomatic. Tradition remains the same, always possessed of the same power, whether a certain form or institution appears in the first or the second or the twentieth century, if only the new form contains, not a denial, but a completion of what has previously been contained in the substance of tradition". See S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 43.

²² D. Cornilescu translated the Bible into vernacular and underwent a similar experience of faith as Martin Luther. T. Popescu was converted by D. Cornilescu and subsequently challenged the apostolicity of the Orthodox tradition. I. Trifa underwent a dramatic experience of conversion to biblical faith and founded the evangelical movement called "The Lord's Army" within the Romanian Orthodox Church.

²³ Bulgakov presents his view on the role of the clergy and laity within the Church in "The Church's Ministry", in C. Patelos (ed.), *The Orthodox Church in the Ecumenical Movement*, 166-171. In the following I will present Bulgakov's view on ministry because he makes an attempt to create space for laity that is very unusual within the Orthodox tradition.

²⁴ S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 166.

²⁵ During the nineteenth century there were three major theological tendencies in Russia. The first one known as "Latinophilism" was led by Chaadaev who favoured an openness to Western ideas, especially Roman Catholic. Chaadaev thought that Roman Catholicism and socialism are not irreconcilable as they would be adapted in Russia. Consequently he turned to the ideas of the French writers such as: De Maitre, Lamennais, Saint-Simon and Prospero Enfantin. The second tendency represented the "Occidentalists" or "Westernizers". They were primarily interested in providing an instrument of revolution against the oppressive regime of Nikolai I. Russian thinkers such as Herzen, Bakunin, Belinskii and Stankevich adopted from Hegel the historical dialectic method and subsequently they associate the Church and its theology with

the past that necessarily had to be ploughed under in order that a new age might begin. The third tendency was known as "Slavophilism". This saw the future of Russia not in French socialism or German idealism but in Muskovite traditionalism. Therefore it supported the Orthodox Church as synonymous with Russian native culture in opposition with Western Catholicism or Protestantism. The leaders of this movement such as K. S. Aksakov, I. V. Kireevskii, M. P. Pogodin, F. I. Tiutchev, I. Samarina and A. S. Khomiakov fought for a spiritual and political isolationism from the contagious and decadent philosophies of the West and a turn instead to the Muscovite Russia and Slavic culture for the inspiration for all that would make Russia of the 19th century truly great. Thus, the ecclesiology of *sobornost* has its roots on one side in the Orthodox reaction to the so-called "Western captivity" which followed after the fall of Constantinople in 1453 and on the other in the Russian Orthodox quest for identity. Thus Khomiakov considered that the Roman Church is founded on external authority but has no liberty whilst Protestant ecclesiology strives for internal liberty but loses any unity. See G. A. Maloney, *A History of Orthodox Theology*, 56-59.

²⁶ According to this approach the tension between clergy and laity, institution and the Spirit that characterise both the Catholic and Protestant churches has been overcome. S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 61.

²⁷ S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 54-60. See also J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 137.

²⁸ See K. McDonnell, "Infallibility as Charism at Vatican I", in P. C. Empie, (eds), *Teaching Authority and Infallibility* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1980), 270-286. For an analysis of the difference in the Catholic tradition between a titular bishop and a bishop without diocese see G. Feliciany, "The Process of Codification", in *Concilium* 167/7 (1983), 37-40. In the Orthodox tradition the mention of the name of the community takes place during the prayer of ordination of a bishop meaning that the community forms part of the ontology of the bishop. See J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 137.

²⁹ S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 169-170.

³⁰ S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 168.

³¹ S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 169.

³² S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 169-170.

³³ "He [the bishop] does not impose his personal opinion upon his church but gives authoritative expression to the voice of the whole Church". S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 168.

³⁴ T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 254.

³⁵ S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 167.

³⁶ S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 167.

³⁷ "This 'catholicity' of the eucharistic community was also reflected in its structure. As far as we can reconstruct this structure from pieces of evidence that we possess, we can see that in the centre of the *synaxis* of the 'whole' Church and behind the one altar, there was the throne of 'one bishop' seated 'in the place of God' or understood as the living image of Christ.' Around his throne were seated the presbyters, whilst by him stood the deacons helping him in celebration, and in front of him the 'people of God' that *order* of the Church which was constituted by virtue of the rite of initiation (baptism-chrismation) and considered the *sine qua non* condition for the eucharistic community to exist and express the Church's unity". See J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 152-153.

³⁸ See J. Meyendorff, *Catholicity and the Church*, 53-54.

³⁹ S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 46-48.

⁴⁰ Cyprian, *Epist.*, 66 in *ANCL*, vol. VIII, 231-235.

⁴¹ Bulgakov illustrates his point referring to the lay participation at the election of the Patriarch Tikhon of all the Russians. See Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 167.

⁴² S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 167.

⁴³ S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 168.

⁴⁴ S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 168.

⁴⁵ S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 60.

⁴⁶ S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 52.

⁴⁷ S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 53.

⁴⁸ S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 169.

⁴⁹ J. Madey, "Ecumenical Council and Pan-Orthodox Synod: A Comparison", in *Concilium* (1983), 64-65.

⁵⁰ S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 64-75

⁵¹ S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 167.

⁵² S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 166.

⁵³ "But the Church of Christ is not a community of equals in which all the faithful have the same rights. It is a society of unequal, not only because among the faithful some are clerics and some are laymen, but particularly because there is in the Church the power of God whereby to some is given to sanctify, teach, and govern, and to others not". See J. Neuner and H. Roos, (eds), *The Teaching of the Catholic Church* (Staten Island: Alba House, 1967), No. 669.

⁵⁴ J. Meyendorff, *Orthodoxy and Catholicity*, 5.

⁵⁵ G. Florovsky, *Collected Works*, vol. 3, *Creation and Redemption* (Nordland, Belmont, Mass., 1976), 191.

⁵⁶ J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 136-137.

⁵⁷ The unity of the believers with Christ and among themselves in John 17:21-23 is not mediated by men (bishop) but it is a direct relationship: "the believer is in Jesus as Jesus is in the Father". Further the New Testament records do not suggest that unity in Christ is replaced by unity around a person (bishop) who replaces Christ, or is the image of Christ. G. M. Burge, *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1987), 60. The same approach to unity of faith is followed in the Shepherd of Hermas, where the Church gathers its members from the whole world, forming them into one body, which is united in understanding, mind, faith, and love. Shepherd of Hermas, *Similitudes*, 9.17 in *ANCL*, vol. I, 402-403. Similarly, Justin Martyr spoke of all who believe in Christ as united in "one soul, one synagogue, one Church, which is brought into being through His name and shares in His name; for we are all call Christians". See Justin Martyr, *Dial*, 63.5 in *ANCL*, vol. II, 173-174. Chadwick asserts that the unity of the Church "depended on two things: on a common faith and on a common way of ordering their life and worship". See H. Chadwick, *The Early Church* (London: Penguin Books, 1967, reprinted, 1990), 32. See also J. Ash, "The Decline of Ecstatic Prophecy in the Early Church", in *Theological Studies* 37 (1976), 227-252; M. E. Boring, *Sayings of the Risen Jesus. Christian Prophecy in the Synoptic Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); D. Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch. A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

⁵⁸ E. Schillebeeckx, "The Teaching Authority of All. A Reflection about the Structure of the New Testament", in *Concilium* 180/4 (1985), 16.

⁵⁹ E. Schillebeeckx, "The Teaching Authority", 18.

⁶⁰ See A. Faivre, *Naissance d'une hiérarchie. Les premières étapes du cursus clerical* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1977), 153-170.

⁶¹ P. Stockmeier, "The Election of Bishops by Clergy and People in the Early Church", in *Concilium*, 137, 7 (1980), 4.

⁶² See J. Meyendorff, *Imperial Unity*, 40-41; T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 254.

⁶³ I. Bria, *The Sense of Ecumenical Tradition*, 43.

⁶⁴ Ignatius, *Smyr*: 8,10 in *ANCL*, vol. I, 249.

⁶⁵ Ignatius, *Trall*: 3,1 in *ANCL*, vol. I, 191-192.

⁶⁶ See J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 209-246.

⁶⁷ I. Bria, *The Sense of Ecumenical Tradition*, 42.

⁶⁸ C. E. Gunton, *The Promise of Trinitarian Theology*, 164.

⁶⁹ An uncritical over-emphasis of the Father as the source of communion in the Trinity runs the risk of undermining the mutual constitution of the Father, Son, and Spirit as communion. Alternatively, an uncritical over-emphasis of the "social" analogy of the Trinity may suggest a form of tritheism. Further, C. E. Gunton proposes a model in which communion is "a function, a way of characterising the relation of all three". He writes: "Whatever the priority of the Father, it must not be conceived in such a way as to detract from the fact that all three persons are together the cause of the communion in which they exist in relation of mutual and reciprocal constitution". See C. E. Gunton, *The Promise of Trinitarian Theology*, 165.

⁷⁰ See C. E. Gunton, *The Promise of Trinitarian Theology*, 167.

⁷¹ H. Chadwick, *The Early Church*, 41.

⁷² *The Confession of Dositheus*, X, in J. H. Leith (ed.), *Creeds of the Churches*, 491-495.

⁷³ *The Confession of Dositheus*, X.

⁷⁴ S. Bulgakov, "The Church's Ministry", 168.

⁷⁵ H. Chadwick, *The Early Church*, 41.

⁷⁶ J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 137.

⁷⁷ T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 255.

⁷⁸ T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 255.

⁷⁹ See P. E. Bratsiotis, "The Fundamental Principles and Main Characteristics of the Orthodox Church", in A. J. Philipou (ed.), *The Orthodox Ethos* (Oxford: Holywell Press, 1964), 28-29; J. Stamoolis, *Eastern Orthodox Mission Theology Today*, 107.

⁸⁰ See I. Kotsone, *The Place of the Laity* (Athens, 1956). Cf. J. Stamoolis, *Eastern Orthodox Mission Theology Today*, 107; H. Kraemer, *A Theology of the Laity* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1958), 96-98.

⁸¹ "The acts which emanate from episcopal power have a binding authority: in submitting to the will of the bishop one is submitting to the will of God [...] the bishop, if he has not himself acquired grace, and if his understanding is not enlightened by the Holy Spirit, can act according to his human motives, he can err in the exercise of the divine power which is conferred upon him. He will be assuredly be responsible for his actions before God; they will have, nevertheless, an objective and binding character, save only in case of a bishop who acts contrary to the canons – in other words, at variance with the common will of the Church. In such a case he becomes the promoter of schism and places himself outside the unity of the Church". See V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology*, 188.

⁸² T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 254.

⁸³ J. Meyendorff, *The Orthodox Church*, 25.

⁸⁴ T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 253-254.

⁸⁵ "In the Church there is no place for speechlessness and for blind obedience... In our time the terms "prophet" and "prophecy" have become rather literary epithets... But the spirit blows where it wills; the gift of prophecy by the Holy Spirit is not connected with the hieratic ministry, though it may be united with it". See S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 53.

⁸⁶ With the recognition of Christianity by the State under Constantine, the episcopal office was caught in a public conflict of interests and subsequently "the original structure [of the Church] was challenged not by charismatic sectarians, as in the early period, but by temptation to identify church functions with the legal administrative patterns of Roman society". For details, see J. Meyendorff, *Imperial Unity*, 41. Among the consequences of the rapprochement between the Church and State, the association of the office of the bishop with the large cities, political importance of the office and the exclusion of the laity from the election of the bishop are only some which have significant importance for ecclesiology. For a presentation of the transition from pre-Constantinian to post-Constantinian period of the Church see J. Meyendorff, *Imperial Unity*, 41-49; The Council of Laodicaea, canon 13; P. Stockmeier, "The Election of the Bishops", 7.

⁸⁷ See S. Bulgakov, "The Church' Ministry", 167.

⁸⁸ Stockmeier asserts that "The relevant texts more than once specify the congregation as being actively involved in the choice of its ministers". Cf. P. Stockmeier, "The Election of the Bishops", 4. Similarly in *I Clement* 44, 3 (*ANCL*, vol. I, 38-39), the author states that the Apostles appointed presbyters "with the consent of the whole Church". *Didache* is more specific about the procedure of a appointment: "You must, then, elect for yourselves bishops and deacons who are a credit to the Lord, men who are gentle, generous, faithful, and well tried. For their ministry to you is identical with that of the prophets and teachers". See *Didache*, 15, in C. Richardson (ed.), *Early Christian Fathers*, 178. Hippolytus (A.D. 215) expressly emphasizes the election of bishops by the whole people: "Let the bishop be ordained after he has been chosen by all the people". See Hippolytus, *Apostolic Tradition*, 2, in T. Halton, *The Church*, 104. Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258) is an early example of the emergence of a pronounced episcopal and hierarchical self-consciousness, but nevertheless this tendency did not lead him to play down the responsibility of the laity to appointment Church leaders. Thus the account given in his biography points out that Cyprian withdrew in humility when the whole people rose up in love and honour for him under the inspiration of the Lord. See Pontius, *Vita Cypriani*, 5, in *CSEL*, III, III, XCV, lines 15-16. There is no doubt that Cyprian believed in an active participation of the lay people in the election of the bishop and not simply in their presence to acclaim the successful candidate. In a letter sent to the Numidian bishop Antonianus, Cyprian describes the election of Pope Cornelius (251-253): "But Cornelius was made bishop by the judgement of God and of his Christ, by the testimony of almost all the clergy, by the vote

(*suffragium*) of the people then present, and with the approbation of long-serving priest and of upright men". See Cyprian, *Ep.* 55, 8, in *ANCL*, vol. VIII, 186-187. Elsewhere, Cyprian gives an account of the election of the Spanish bishop Sabinus "in virtue of the vote of the whole brotherhood and the judgement of the bishops". See Cyprian, *Ep.* 67, 5, in *CSEL*, III, II, 739, lines, 15-16. Likewise the *Apostolic Constitution* (c. 360) insists that "a man who is to be consecrated bishop should be blameless in every respect and elected by the people". Cf. *Apostolic Constitution*, VIII, 2-4, in *ANCL*, vol. XVIII, 210-213. It is clear from these patristic records that in the pre-Constantinian period "the bishops were undoubtedly elected by clergy and people". See P. Stockmeier, "The Election of the Bishops", 8. See also T. Halton, *The Church* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1985), 105-106.

⁸⁹ In the early Church, the Christians called each other "brother" and "sister" and whatever differences there might be of race, class or education, in the Church they were all equals "in the Spirit". E. Schillebeeckx, "The Teaching Authority", 16-17; H. Chadwick, *The Early Church*, 32.

⁹⁰ For a critique of the sacramental, vertical model of ecclesiology see: B. Depuy, "Is There a Dogmatic Distinction between the Function of Priest and the Function of Bishop?", in *Concilium* 34 (1968), 74-86; Y. Congar, "My Pathfinding in the Theology and Laity and Ministries", in *The Jurist* 32 (1972), 169-188; H. Küng, *Why Priest?* (Doubleday: Garden City, 1972); O. Semmelroth, "The Priestly People of God and Its Official Ministers", in *Concilium* 31 (1967), 100; K. Barth, *The Word of God and the Word of Men* (Harper Torchbooks, 1957); K. Rahner, "What Is the Theological Starting Point for a Definition of the Priestly Ministry?", in *Concilium* 43 (1969), 85.

⁹¹ T. Bradshaw, *The Olive Branch: An Evangelical Anglican Doctrine of the Church* (Paternoster, Oxford, 1992), 77.

⁹² T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 253-254.

⁹³ T. Fitzgerald, "Conciliarity, Primacy, and the Episcopacy", in *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 38/1 (1994), 17-44 (here page 30).

⁹⁴ S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, 51. C. N. Tsirpanlis, *Introduction to Eastern Patristic Thought and Orthodox Theology* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 151.

⁹⁵ T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 257.

⁹⁶ J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 141.

⁹⁷ J. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 139.

⁹⁸ N. K. Gvosdev, "Rendering unto Caesar", 81. See also D. Pospelovsky, *The Russian Church*, vol. 1, 241ff.

⁹⁹ See E. Melia, "Point de vue Orthodoxe sur la probl me de l'Authorit  dans l'Eglise", in *Probl me de l'Authorit * (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1962), 29.

¹⁰⁰ I. Bria, *The Sense of Ecumenical Tradition*, 44.

¹⁰¹ See N. Afanasieff, "The Church which Presides in Love", in J. Meyendorff (ed.), *The Primacy of Peter* (Leighton: The Faith Press, 1973), 74-81.

¹⁰² J. Zizioulas, "Communal Spirit and Conciliarity: 1st Comment", in S. Agourides (ed.), *Proc s-Verbaux du Deuxi me Congr s de Th ologie Orthodoxe* (Athens, 1978), 140-146.

¹⁰³ See Bishop Maximos Agiorgousis, "East Meets West", 12-13.

¹⁰⁴ McPartlan presents a well-documented view on the positive and negative aspects of eucharistic ecclesiology. See P. McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993).

¹⁰⁵ I. Bria, *The Sense of Ecumenical Tradition*, 39.