

A COMMENT ON THE PAPAL ENCYCLICAL *ORIENTALE LUMEN*

Archbishop Stylianos of Australia

Pope John Paul II, now elderly and visibly exhausted, has never ceased since his elevation to the Papal Throne (1978) to state at every given opportunity his personal interest in the reunification of divided Christians, especially Roman Catholics and Orthodox. Proof of this is that, within a year of his enthronement, during a visit to the Ecumenical Patriarchate at Phanar in the days of the late Patriarch Dimitrios (29.11.79), he announced without any hesitation the names of those who would represent his Church on a committee comprising international members in light of the commencement of the official Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox and Roman Catholics.

This special interest towards the Orthodox should not be considered - according to what the Pope has repeatedly stated - to be an obligation which has been merely inherited from his immediate predecessors, namely to continue and to promote the *Dialogue of Love* established by them, by way of an official and extremely responsible theological *Dialogue of Truth*, but also something which derives from his personal geographical and cultural background, where the two Greek brothers and missionaries from Thessalonika, Saints Cyril and Methodios, had worked. At any rate the present Pontiff has missed no opportunity to call upon both these missionary brothers and illuminators of the Slavic peoples for the relations between East and West.

If one adds to these positive or fairly positive presuppositions and expressions the various favourable comments that the Pope has made from time to time with regard to the work that is being conducted - despite obstructions - for the task of rapprochement by the official Theological Dialogue, then one has almost all of the features which comprise the spiritual framework in which the *Orientalium Lumen* Encyclical was written.

The official occasion which the text presents is of course the 100th anniversary since the Encyclical of Leo XIII, *Orientalium Dignitas*, was issued. Yet, *occasion* is one thing and *cause* is another.

The cause for writing this Encyclical, and its overall goal, must be much more substantial than the mere commemoration of an anniversary. This is clearly implied by the irregular situation existing in the relations between the two Churches, in this historic period, which also dictated - as is clearly indicated - the very peace-loving and triumphant tone of the Papal text.

Thus the main reason for writing this Encyclical, just prior to the first visit of the new Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew to the Vatican, is the almost explosive relationship of Rome with the whole of the Orthodox world, as well as the generally negative impression which this creates for other churches internationally, especially after the hopeful attitude which prevailed upon the commencement of the official Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox and Roman Catholics in 1980.

It is no secret that the sudden and most unforeseeable crisis which fol-

lowed is due primarily to the serious issue of the revivification of Uniatism after the fall of communism, particularly of course in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, but no less in the extremely unstable social political region of the Middle East.

In this regard, it would not be honest to overlook or even to underestimate the accusations of the Orthodox peoples of the Balkans against the Vatican as a worldly State - with its access to governments, mass media and international organisations -and which greatly influences international socio-political conditions of the present Pontiff, since no one can overlook the decisive role which he played in the acceleration of the fall of communism¹.

Despite these extremely disturbing and unsettled issues, the consequences of which are not unknown within the Roman Catholic Church, it appears that the immediate advisers of the Pontiff have unfortunately learned nothing from the failures of the distant and more recent past. This is why they have not been able to rise to the occasion and express a more honest, modest and positive message - to the extent that this is possible - for the sake of improving the shaken confidence of the Orthodox.

Before carefully analysing the reasons for which the *Orientalium Lumen* Encyclical not only does not improve the current relations between the Roman Catholics and Orthodox, but unfortunately increases the suspicion of every alert Orthodox person in so far as the honesty of these feelings of Rome are concerned, it would perhaps be worthwhile to remind ourselves of some very characteristic and vital points mentioned in that Encyclical, *Orientalium Dignitas* of Pope Leo XIII, the 100th anniversary of which today's Pope has tried to honour so festively with his own corresponding Encyclical.

First of all it must be said that Leo XIII (20.2.1878- 20.7.1903) was inspired by almost the same ambitions as Pope John Paul II, as both nurtured grandiose designs. Let us not forget that the major and unceasing concern of Leo XIII, who was the immediate successor of Pius IX who had officially declared Papal infallibility to be a dogma (1870), was the worldwide promotion and imposition of the Roman Church in all facets of life at the end of the 19th century². This in any case was continued and expressed in manifold ways since then by all Popes up until the present, and the good natured late Pope John XXIII was no exception (with the difference that he formulated his notion with the more concise and no doubt more successful phrase "Consecratio Mundi" in order to establish the broader ecclesiological and strategic programme of the Second Vatican Council).

Since in the days of Leo XIII the international movement known today as "ecumenism" - which began in 1920 and has developed steadily among Christians - did not exist, the only possibility for Rome to approach and communicate with Christians of the East was through *Unia*. Therefore the Pope wasted no time in stating in the *Orientalium Dignitas* Encyclical that he no longer expected the Uniates to adapt to the Latin model of external forms and order, nor of Church discipline which evidently did not at all matter for Rome and its ecclesiology, so long as the new dogma concerning the Pope (primacy and infallibility) could be accepted without question.

The main goal of such an initiative was not of course to give the

Uniates a sense of relief, but rather to make easier and more effective the further proselytism of the “schismatics of the East”, namely the Orthodox. While Leo XIII declared the “Dignitas” of easterners right from the outset, apparently in order to flatter them, John Paul II considers it more suitable to pursue their “Captatio Benevolentiae” by directly correlating them with God who, out of mercy, has visited His people as the “sun rising from on high” (Luke 1:78).

From the very first page of the 54 page Encyclical *Oriente Lumen*, the current Pope makes manifest the same feelings towards the Christian East that Leo XIII had expressed in the *Orientalium Dignitas*. Before analysing these feelings in more detail, we can briefly characterise them as follows:

- (i) Strong inclination towards proselytism through expressions of friendship which are not verified in practice.
- (ii) Intentional or unintentional underestimation of the intelligence of the Orthodox and their special sensitivity towards ecclesiology.
- (iii) Unbearable paternalistic spirit according to which any positive judgement concerning the Christian East is formulated by Rome.

In examining the Papal Encyclical more closely, it would be useful to make relevant comments under these three inter-related headings.

Strong inclination towards proselytism

It is not only the direct and organic correlation of this Encyclical with the *Orientalium Dignitas* Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII which he has attempted to honour and comment upon favourably, but also the *Oriente Lumen* itself, especially on some of its vital points⁴.

After formally stating by way of introduction that “the light of the East has illuminated the universal Church, from the moment when “a rising sun” appeared above us (Lk 1:78) Jesus Christ, our Lord”, the current Pope does not hesitate to present Leo XIII as being “inspired by that light”. Yet he does this through a diplomatic, if not equivocal, formulation so that no one can tell with certainty whether the “light of the East” (a key phrase which also forms the title of the Encyclical) refers to Him who visited His people as “the sun from on high”, or whether it refers to the spiritual ethos, so to speak, which prevailed in Church life arising from the East where Christ was born. All Eastern Christians to whom the ‘Dignitas’ of Leo XIII refers could boast in the Lord about this.

The degree to which Pope John Paul II shares the feelings, views and goals of Leo XIII concerning the “Eastern Churches” is displayed by the tone of *proximity* with which the latter is described, as if he were the *immediate* “predecessor” of the current Pope.

Thus following the diplomatic introductory statement, and in complete organic connection with it, which perfectly serves the aim of proselytism, it is characteristically stated that: “That light inspired my predecessor Pope Leo XIII to write the Apostolic Letter *Orientalium Dignitas* in which he sought to safeguard the significance of the Eastern traditions for

the whole Church". He immediately states after this that, just as his predecessor one hundred years ago was interested in "restoring unity with all Christians of the East", so does the current Pope wish to make a similar appeal to "the Catholic Church", given that it (the Catholic Church) "has been enriched by the knowledge and interchange which has taken place over the past century".

The first thing which the current Pope considers necessary is to make the Christian East "familiar", so that its value in the life of the Church as a whole may be appreciated. The wording for this, however, is once again unfortunately curious and problematic. Let us see exactly what is said: "Since, in fact, we believe that the venerable and ancient tradition of the Eastern Churches is an integral part of the heritage of Christ's Church, the first need for Catholics is to be familiar with that tradition, so as to be nourished by it and to encourage the process of unity in the best way possible for each".

Through a careful comparison of the above quotations which are taken from the very first page of the *Orientalium Lumen* Encyclical, we could not omit to mention with great disappointment the unacceptable lack of stability and clarity as well as internal contradiction in the ecclesiological terms. These weaknesses do not of course derive from the pen of an inexperienced student of theology, in order to be leniently judged. Rather, they come from experienced and distinguished advisers of the Pope, who are wilfully and purposely trying to create this confusion so that they can fish "in shallow waters", as the saying goes, which is unfortunately an old custom of theirs.

So that the impression may not be given that we are exaggerating or complaining unjustly, we must proceed to a more detailed analysis of the first page of the papal text. We therefore ask: Which indeed is the main object with which the first page and, by extension, the whole Encyclical is concerned? In only one page, this object is described with the following names and definitions: "The light of the East", "The Eastern Traditions", "the Eastern Churches", "that Tradition", "all Christians of the East". Who could honestly dare to acknowledge an identity, or at least a range of receptive conciliation and balance in a unified and homogeneous whole, with so many different formulations? Who would be able to forget a host of heteroclitic and asymmetrical pieces of the disordered mosaic which was formed in the East? But does not this lack of homogeneity exist, to an even greater extent, in the West also, and in any other part of the world today?

Given all of this, how is it possible for one to believe that a variety of unclear terms could, with 'one stroke of the pen', cover the entire Christian reality of a region of the world, regardless of whether it is East or West?

It is as clear as the sun that, were it not for the desire of Rome to realise its programme of proselytism, a spade would have been called a spade, and an honest, clear and consistent name corresponding to the identity of each would have prevailed.⁵

Intentional or unintentional underestimation of the intelligence of the Orthodox

The disappointment stemming from the misleading inconsistencies of the ecclesiological terms turns to indignation when one proceeds to the sec-

ond page of the text, where two things are immediately made apparent: on the one hand, the addition of a new term for the situation in the Christian East - which only complicates matters - and, on the other hand, the unashamed and jubilant levelling through this new term with the Oriental Orthodox who have a distinct identity but who, on account of very clear dogmatic reasons and terms, are distinguishable -indeed separate - from all other Christians of East and West.

We refer to the very misleading and hitherto unknown (which means that it is new) term "Eastern Catholics". The entire passage in question is presented here so that we may have the full picture of this unexpected bold theological position, which is indicative of the lack of feeling and hypocrisy with which the Vatican continues to act towards the Orthodox. As we shall show below, fundamental ecclesiological principles which were commonly agreed upon in our official Theological Dialogue are violated:

"Our Eastern Catholic brothers and sisters are very conscious of being the living bearers of this tradition, together with our Orthodox brothers and sisters. The members of the Catholic Church of the Latin tradition must also be fully acquainted with this treasure and thus feel, with the Pope, a passionate longing that the full manifestation of the Church's catholicity be restored to the Church and to the world, expressed not by a single tradition, and still less by one community in opposition to the other; and that we too may all be granted a full taste of the divinely revealed and undivided heritage of the universal Church which is preserved and grows in the life of the Churches of the East as in those of the West".

This passage, through its unconditional levelling of all kinds of Uniates - now called "Eastern Catholics" - with the Orthodox, would be sufficient cause for outrage. This would especially apply to theologians who have studied the texts of the Joint Commission of our official Theological Dialogue which, in the most recent years, has dealt exclusively with uniatism and related proselytism. As is known, these texts express an unreserved common condemnation of *Unia* both as a method and as a way of thinking. It is unacceptable for Christian ecclesiology, according to which those Churches which no longer have unity of faith still respect each other as sisters. How much more should this be the case for those who are in a Dialogue of truth and love, and whose sacred goal is the restoration of unity in the faith⁶.

One could therefore ask: From where did the Pope obtain the right to place himself above the work of the Joint Theological Commission, officially and openly expressing himself in diametrical opposition to the verdict of the Commission? After this behaviour, is it possible to believe that all the things that His Holiness had said up until now about the importance of the Dialogue were honest? Or that his continuous expressions of interest and concern that the Dialogue should not stop, despite recent difficulties, are genuine? We may justifiably ask, even as members of the Commission of the Dialogue, whether there is any point in making such sacrifices - in

theological labour, precious time and enormous expense for meetings over so many years - when the minimum consent achieved by the commission, which is constantly derided by fanatical groups and disbelievers on both sides, is so easily overturned by the Roman Pontiff without the slightest theological or moral hesitation.

Unbearable “paternalistic” spirit

Since the first eight introductory, so to speak, pages of the Encyclical attempt to serve the fixed long term goal of Rome, namely to proselytise all of the Christian East, it is only natural that the praise of the East which follows subsequently cannot be taken seriously, no matter how much it is given.

For it is true that the *Oriente Lumen* Encyclical apparently goes beyond every previous papal writing in terms of praising and promoting the spiritual values for which early Christianity of the East was known and maintains to this day, for the enrichment of the whole Church.

Thus the major contents of the Encyclical are divided into two main parts - the first under the general title “Knowing the Christian East; An Experience of Faith” (pp 9-34), while the second title is “From Knowledge to Encounter” (pp 34-51). The concluding section appears under the heading: *Journeying together towards the ‘Oriente Lumen’*. The unique richness and depth of symbolism in Orthodox worship, the apophatic character of Orthodox theology, the orientation of Orthodox monasticism, towards mystical vision, the eucharistic way of treating creation etc., are treated with truly wonderful theological sensitivity, insight and accuracy.

It is highly indicative that the Pope gladly mentions the characteristic virtues of Eastern Christendom with gratitude, while taking pride in his Slavic background and being mindful of the services offered to the Slavic people by the brothers Sts Cyril and Methodios. This, however, is not unfortunately without a tendency for proselytism and ulterior motives, which can easily be seen in the relevant phrase: “A Pope, son of Slav people, is particularly moved by the call of those peoples to whom the two saintly brothers Cyril and Methodios went” (p.5).

The deeper aim of proselytism becomes apparent from the fact that these good statements and evaluations in general about the Christian East are to be considered relevant to the whole range of “Eastern Churches” without exception (in other words Monophysites, Pre-Chalcedonians, Armenians etc., who are not mentioned by name). It is expressly stated that: “these considerations now need to be broadened so as to embrace all eastern Churches, in the variety of their traditions” (p.6).

The Pontiff considers it worthwhile to make the passionate plea which he made in his address after the Way of the Cross during Great Friday in 1994: “Dearly beloved, we have this common task: we must say together from East and West: *Ne evacuetur Crux* (cf. 1 Cor.1:17). The Cross of Christ must not be emptied of its power because if the Cross of Christ is emptied of its power, man no longer has roots, he no longer has prospects; he is destroyed! This is the cry of the end of the 20th century. It is the cry of Rome, of Moscow, of Constantinople. It is the cry of all Christendom: of the Americas, of Africa, of Asia, of everyone. It is the cry of the new evan-

gelisation”(p.6). Despite this, it appears that, in his attempt to make many people under the general name “Eastern Church” sound closer, the Pope thought it necessary to redefine those Churches by observing that each of them should be considered as a continuation and living bearer of its own tradition, and not of a single tradition which, as we have seen, was his original evaluation. He therefore, states: “Pondering over the questions, aspirations and experiences I have mentioned, my thoughts turn to the Christian heritage of the East. I do not intend to describe that heritage or to interpret it; I listen to the Churches of the East which I know are living interpreters of the treasure of tradition they preserve” (p.9).

He apparently considers it dangerous, however, to allow the impression to be given that he is interested in each of the individual Churches of the East, which is why he immediately underlines the importance of this inheritance which he discerns for all Christians: “In contemplating it, before my eyes appear elements of great significance for a fuller and more thorough understanding of the Christian experience. These elements are capable of giving a more complete Christian response to the expectations of the men and women of today”.

This extremely positive estimation and promotion of these elements of the eastern Christian heritage reaches an incomparable climax in the Pontiff’s comparison between them and “any other culture”, acknowledging their “unique and privileged role”. The relevant portion reads as follows: “Indeed, in comparison with any other culture, the Christian East has a unique and privileged role as the original setting where the Church was born” (p.10).

Similar moving moments of exaltation and confession are to be found spread throughout this historic Encyclical, on account of which Pope John Paul II of Polish background could be considered the most just and most courageous one to theologise about the value of the Christian East. This however, is unfortunately undermined by the paternalistic spirit in which it is written.

After such a triumphant hymn about the spiritual values of the Christian East, one would expect that the Pope’s intense and imperative wish would follow for the universal importance of these values to be maintained at all costs in the West also, especially today. These can be advanced or, much more, reintroduced according to the degree to which they have been weakened or forgotten. The final measure of their worth, it is quite clear, is always Rome, as can be seen for example from the following lines: “The Christian tradition of the East implies a way of accepting, understanding and living faith in the Lord Jesus. In this sense, it is extremely close to the tradition of the West, which is born of and nourished by the same faith. Yet, it is legitimately and admirably distinguished from the latter, since Eastern Christians have their own way of perceiving and understanding, and thus an original way of living their relationship with the Saviour”.

While theology and worship for the Orthodox East constitute an unbroken soteriological reality, with the latter constituting the manifestation and expression in mystery - for the participation of all the faithful - of the inaccessible truths of revelation belonging to the former, with which

teachers of the divine word become more familiar, the Pope sees it fit to separate these two homologous spheres, apparently in order to detach the reader from the theological differences. Thus he observes that: "Here, with respect and trepidation, I want to approach the act of worship which these Churches express, rather than to identify this or that theological point which has emerged down the centuries in the polemical debates between East and West" (p.10).

Yet, it is precisely in this separation of theology and worship, in the final analysis, that the whole problem of *Unia* is to be found. We therefore see another difference between Orthodox and Roman Catholics unfortunately, one which is purely theological and not merely concerned with moral behaviour. Clearly, if the Pope and the Uniates considered worship and all related external aspects as a direct and faithful reflection of what is taught, as do the Orthodox, then of course they could not so unhesitatingly combine eastern styles with Roman Catholic doctrine. By its very nature, the doxological character of dogma only finds full expression in the apophaticism which is innate in the word of God. This is why one can state that worship is the incarnation of dogma which, in turn, enlivens worship which is "reasonable" and "pleasing" to God.

Before finishing, Pope John Paul II underlines in the Encyclical a more formal recapitulation of the special responsibility which he, as the Bishop of Rome, feels towards the "Churches of the East"⁷ - which, according to the Roman viewpoint, is a part of the mission given by the Lord to Peter - and he, therefore, refers to the establishment of special institutions in the Roman Catholic Church which are meant to serve the interests of the Churches in question. The relevant section reads: "Particularly significant anniversaries encourage us to turn our thoughts with affection and reverence to the Eastern Churches. First of all, as has been said, the centenary of the Apostolic Letter *Orientalium Dignitas*. Since that time a journey began which has led, among other things, in 1917, to the Congregation for the Oriental Churches and the foundation of the Pontifical Oriental Institute by Pope Benedict XV. Subsequently, on 5 June, 1960, John XXIII founded the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity. In recent times, on 18 October, 1990, I promulgated the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches, in order to safeguard and to promote the specific features of the Eastern heritage" (pp. 40-41).

In explaining the nature and significance of these institutions, the Pope takes the opportunity to remind the reader of his primacy rights and duties: "These are signs of an attitude which the Church of Rome has always felt was an integral part of the mandate entrusted by Jesus Christ to the Apostle Peter: 'to confirm his brothers in faith and unity' (cf. Lk 22:32)" (p.41). An attempt is then made to explain the historical disputes which arose from the issue of the Primacy and which supposedly derived from the mentality of each period. According to Rome, "Peter's task" with regard to Primacy is to maintain unity between the Churches rather than to create obstacles. It is at this point that the Pope makes a direct and lengthy mention of the Uniates by presenting them as the extremely sensitive and mature ones who wished to promote Christian unity, achieving union with the Church of Rome.

That entire paragraph is the climax of the obvious provocation and

irony that, at this critical time, the *Oriente Lumen* Encyclical seeks nothing other than to legitimise and indeed glorify and sanctify Uniatism both in the past and the present. This understandably causes great indignation for the Orthodox, and leads unfortunately to the aggravation of their relations not only with the Uniates, but also with the highest leadership of the Church of Rome itself.

What is therefore clearly made manifest is that the statements of the Vatican until recently, that it could not restrain the deviousness of the Uniates in Orthodox countries, were not in the least sincere, as we had perceived and officially stated many times before. The fact that the Pope, together with others, expresses his sorrow that the Orthodox do not recognise a "family tie" with the Uniates (p.44), is of course the height of hypocrisy and lack of feeling with regard to the acute problem of Unia. No matter how many Papal Encyclicals are issued in the spirit of *Oriente Lumen*, the fact that the Joint Theological Commission of the Dialogue *officially condemned it twice* cannot be underestimated.

-oOo-

NOTES:

1. The current Pope, being of Polish background, played a very active part in overthrowing the Communist regime, together with Lech Valesa and the anti-communist union movement of *Solidarnosc* (Solidarity). It is also not a coincidence that the Pope was one of the first political leaders of the western world visited by Gorbachev, and the content of their discussions is unknown.
2. The most distinct measures taken by Leo XIII in order to achieve his plans include: the expansion of the international influence of the Vatican through an unusual development of diplomatic relations with many non-Christian nations; broadening the role of the *Nuncia* not only in relation to governments, but also in relation to local bishops; strengthening of Thomism and greater centralisation in the Roman See; the establishment of the Biblical Commission (*Bibelkommission*) for the purpose of strictly monitoring exegetic theologians (cf. *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 2nd ed. vol. 6, pp. 953-955, Freiburg, 1961).
3. A direct and favourable commentary on the Encyclical of Leo XIII is given as a footnote on the very first page of *Oriente Lumen*. Its undisguised aim is proselytism. It speaks of the "esteem and the concrete help which the Holy See has given the Eastern Churches, and its willingness to safeguard their specific qualities". Also mentioned are two documents which followed the *Orientalium Dignitas* Encyclical, namely, the Apostolic Letter *Praeclara gratulationis* (20-6-1894) and the Encyclical Letter *Christi Nomen* (24-12-1894).
4. The English version of the text by Libreria Editrice Vaticana is used and quoted from here.
5. It is well known that Rome has never consented to a standard name for the Christian communities which broke away from local Orthodox Churches either through proselytism or by force. The Orthodox call them Uniates given that, on an external basis at least, it is only by the imposed union (*Unia*) with the Church of Rome that they can be distinguished from the Orthodox.

During the inaugural meeting of the Joint Commission of the Dialogue in Rhodes (1980), and in an attempt to have both sides agree to a common name, the author proposed that they be called "Roman Catholics of the Eastern rite". This was accepted by the Roman Catholic representatives, who were satisfied that this would relieve them of the bad implications of the term "Uniates" but who did not discern that the proposed term betrayed more eloquently the unacceptable invasion of Rome into Orthodox regions of the East. Apparently, this was understood after some time, which is why they continued to name the Uniates "Greek Catholics". Other terms were also used locally where expedient, yet in the common texts of the Dialogue, they could not avoid the term uniatism, even though the Orthodox sometimes allowed the addition of the words "so-called".

6. Although the topic of *Unia* is extremely complex and many-sided given the variety of historical and geographical circumstances, the Joint Commission of the Theological Dialogue had to deal with it pastorally first of all - in order to try and stop disputes in areas where conflict was occurring so that a strictly theological evaluation could follow at a more suitable time. Regardless of the unfortunate exploitation on the part of the Vatican of the position taken by the Orthodox members of the Commission on this topic for pastoral reasons, one cannot underrate the fact that a common condemnation of *Unia* was achieved for the first time in history. This condemnation was made possible only after extraordinary efforts of the Orthodox members of the Commission, much Christian bravery on the part of capable Roman Catholic members of the Commission, and through a humane and realistic distinction proposed by the Orthodox between *Unia* as a method and mentality on the one hand, and the people on the other. The majority of the latter who form the Uniate communities or "Churches" today are not of course the initiators of the schisms and break away groups, but they are the descendants of apostates, or even victims of western propaganda which separated them from the mother Orthodox Church and tradition. The distinction gave the entire Joint Commission the possibility of condemning the method of Uniatism used by Rome while at the same time accepting the basic rights of the relevant communities for religious freedom as well as the legitimacy of their pastoral needs. All of this was done for no other reason than to allow them to decide freely, without anguish or insult, whether they wish to be received into the local Orthodox Churches from which they were forcefully or skilfully separated, or whether they should be obliged to join the West fully.
- 7 The levelling of Orthodoxy with every other ecclesiastical situation in the East was perceived towards the end of the 1960s - with the opening of Vatican II - during the establishment of the so-called "Institute of Canon Law of the Eastern Churches". The Orthodox saw the danger in this and dissuaded Orthodox scholars from becoming office-bearers of the Institute since it would not modify its curious title (see Metropolitan Stylianos of Miletoupolis, "Issues of Terminology on the Modern Theological Dialogue" in *Kleronomia*, vol. 4,1 pp.162-164 [in Greek]).