Invoking Holy Spirit, Ecumenical Service celebrates Pentecost for Eastern & Western Christians at Capistrano Mission Basilica

The annual prayer for unity incorporates elements of Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Coptic and Armenian prayers and hymns that express our desire for the Holy Spirit to help our churches overcome those issues which still keep us apart.

The annual event was inaugurated, not by clergy, but by a dynamic woman. Frustrated by the disunity of the churches, Irma Contraes gathered together members and clergy of the various traditions to assist in creating an prayerful program that breaks down barriers to Christian unity.

The Orange County Catholic newsletter of the Diocese of Orange contributed to this report.

Above: Fr. Joseph Boules, pastor of St. Mary & Verena Coptic Orthodox Church offers ideas on unity in the Holy Spirit. Below: Fr. Eamon O’Gorman walks in procession into the Basilica of San Juan Capistrano followed by icon of Pentecost held aloft by Deacons Musil Shihadeh and Elias Kashou.

Photos courtesy of the Orange County Catholic.
The Society of Saint John Chrysostom

The Society of St. John Chrysostom is an ecumenical group of clergy and lay people which promotes Eastern Christianity and Ecumenical Dialogue between the Eastern and Western Churches. It sponsors the Eastern Churches Journal and the annual Orientale Lumen Conference. It has been in existence since 1997 in the United States and for over 70 years in England.

**THE GOALS OF THE SOCIETY ARE TO:**
- Make known the history, worship, spirituality, discipline and theology of Eastern Christendom.
- Work and pray that all Christians, particularly the Orthodox and Catholic Churches, will attain the fullness of unity which Jesus Christ desires.
- Develop educational programs which present information about the Eastern Churches.
- Organize and conduct pilgrimages and conferences that encourage ecumenical dialogue.
- Contribute to fund-raising activities which support Eastern Christian communities and other programs in need of financial aid.
- Publish books, brochures, and other information which help explain Eastern Christianity.
- Encourage and support the study of the writings and liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom.
- Promote scholarships for the study of Eastern Churches in Catholic and Orthodox seminaries.

**WESTERN REGION**

President,
The Very Rev. Fr. George Morelli, PhD.
Vice President, The Rt. Rev. James Babcock
Secretary, Anne Petach
Treasurer, Robert Greenwell
Sgt. at Arms/Parliamentarian, Major Frank Scialdone USMC Ret.
Catholic Liaison: Msgr Dennis Mikulanis
Chaplains:
Archimandrite James Babcock (Eastern Catholic)
Fr. Cávana Wallace (Roman Catholic)
Fr. Ramon Merlos (Orthodox)

**Light of the East**

Official newsletter of the Society of Saint John Chrysostom Western Region is published quarterly by the Western Region of the SSJC and is distributed free of charge to all SSJC members and through churches throughout the Western Region of the USA.

**Editorial contact:**
*Editor:* Rt. Rev. Archimandrite James Babcock, hemelkite@holycrossmelkite.org
*Distribution:* 451 W. Madison Ave., Placentia CA 92870
*Membership:* Robert Greenwell
2700 Katherine Street, El Cajon, CA 92020
rjgreenwell@sbcglobal.net

A message from the President of SSJC-Western Region

**Working together in charity**

By the Very Reverend Father George Morelli, Ph.D.

"If you would be perfect, go, sell what you possess and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me." (Mt 19: 21)

In my past President's messages I have emphasized the importance of responding to Metropolitan Hilarion Alfeyev's call for the Apostolic Churches of Christ: the Roman Church, Eastern Catholic Churches, Oriental Orthodox Churches and Orthodox Churches to form a moral alliance to fend off the marginalization of God and the values of Christ in our society. More and more I am faced with the subtly of the media in our secular society that endorses lifestyles and practices that are un-Godly. For example, recently I saw a primetime television program, that portrayed a same-sex couple who according to secular law were 'married.' Their lifestyle was considered normative and reflective of the modern society and perfectly acceptable. Of course, for those committed to Christ, such a lifestyle is unacceptable.

While standing fast to following the teachings of Christ and upholding His moral teachings, I want to remind all that any interaction we have with others, especially those who may differ with us should be based on the utmost charity that Christ showed Himself. Arrogance, harshness and anger incite adverse consequences in others. We as Christians lose all credibility and are subject to being accused of being hypocrites. Observing Christians figures displaying aggressive words and deeds literally destroys Christ's message.

A personal suggestion: I have found a simple statement of one's commitment to Christ is a good initial first step. If someone wants to follow-up on a discussion on some moral issue, I usually ask: What is your value system? If their answer conforms to secularist morality, then I usually simply respond, in charity: "Well you are being true to your values." Many times such an answer, however, sparks some interest and the discussion goes further. At some point comes up the question of what is the "Mind of Christ and His Church?" Then without further ado I simply state if one wants to follow Christ then this is what one has to do. [Basing my particular answer on what the person has specifically stated is their moral belief]. My response is based on Jesus own almost downplayed reply, to the Rich Young Man who asked Him what he had to do to be perfect. Respecting the young man's free will, Jesus said: "If you would be perfect, go, sell what you possess and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me." In emulation of Jesus Himself: we witness, but not coerce.
Orthodox-Catholic Dialogue discusses roles of laity, bishops’ conferences at its 10th meeting

WASHINGTON—The North American Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation held its 80th meeting at St. Vladimir’s Orthodox Seminary in Crestwood, New York, June 6-8. The members reviewed major events in the lives of their churches, and heard presentations on the role of the laity in the Church and intermediate levels of ecclesial authority.

Thomas Bird, Ph.D., of Queens College, City University of New York, Flushing, New York, gave a presentation on “The Role of the Laity in the Catholic Church: Points for Reflection.” Susan Ashbrook Harvey, Ph.D., of Brown University presented on “Some Reflections on the Laity in Ancient Syriac Christianity.” Father Nicholas Apostola of the Romanian Orthodox Archdiocese in the Americas gave a presentation on the role of the laity in the Church from an Orthodox perspective.

On the question of regional structures of Church authority, Orthodox members reported on the second meeting of the new Orthodox Episcopal Assembly, which took place in Chicago in May. Father Joseph Komonchak, professor emeritus of religious studies at The Catholic University of America (CUA), delivered a paper on bishops’ conferences in the Catholic Church. This included an analysis of Pope John Paul II’s 1998 Apostolic Letter Apostolos Suos on the theological and juridical nature of episcopal conferences. The members decided to further investigate these areas.

They also discussed two reports released at the end of their last meeting on finding a common way to determine the date of Easter and steps that could be taken to reunite the Catholic and Orthodox Churches. The next two meetings were scheduled for October 27-29, 2011, and June 5 to 7, 2012.

The North American Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation is chaired jointly by Archbishop Gregory M. Aymond of New Orleans and Metropolitan Maximos of Pittsburgh. Due to the Metropolitan’s absence because of illness, Rev. Dr. Thomas FitzGerald, dean of the Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology in Brookline, Massachusetts, co-chaired this meeting on his behalf.

Since its establishment in 1965, the North American Consultation has issued 25 agreed statements, which are available at www.usccb.org/seia/orthodox_index.shtml and the Standing Conference of the Canonical Orthodox Bishops in the Americas (SCOBA) website at www.scoba.us/resources/orthodox-catholic.html.

Additional Orthodox members include Father John Erickson, former dean and professor of canon law and church history at Saint Vladimir’s Orthodox Theological Seminary in Crestwood, New York; Father James Dutko, pastor of St. Michael’s Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Church in Binghamton, New York; Paul Meyendorff, Ph.D., Alexander Schmemann professor of liturgical theology and editor of Saint Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly, Crestwood, New York; Father Alexander Golitzin, professor of theology at Marquette University, Milwaukee; Robert Haddad, Ph.D., Sophia Smith professor emeritus of history at Smith College in Northampton, Massachusetts; Father Robert Stephanopoulos, pastor emeritus of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocesan Cathedral of the Holy Trinity, New York; Father Theodore Pulcini, associate professor of religion at Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania; and Father Mark Arey, general secretary of SCABA, New York, (staff). Father Patrick Viscuso, Ph.D., of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America was a new Orthodox member at this meeting.

Additional Catholic members are Jesuit Father Brian Daley (secretary), Catherine F. Huisking professor of theology at the University of Notre Dame; Sylvain Destrempes, Ph.D., faculty of the Grand Seminaire in Montreal; Father Peter Galadza, Kule Family professor of liturgy at the Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky Institute of Eastern Christian Studies, Ottawa; Chorbishop John D. Faris, pastor of St. Louis Gonzaga Maronite Church, Utica, New York; Father John Galvin, professor of Systematic Theology, CUA; Father Sidney Griffith, professor in the Department of Semitic and Egyptian Languages and Literatures, CUA; Monsignor Paul McPartlan, Carl J. Peter professor of systematic theology and ecumenism at CUA; Father David Petras, spiritual director and professor of liturgy at the Byzantine Catholic Seminary of Sts. Cyril and Methodius, Pittsburgh; Sister of Charity of Leavenworth Susan K. Wood, professor and chair of the Department of Theology at Marquette; Vito Nicastro, Ph.D., associate director of the Office for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, Archdiocese of Boston; and Paulist Father Ronald Roberson, Ph.D., associate director of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops’ (USCCB) Secretariat for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, staff.

Our Website
www.ssjc-wr.org now jumps to www.lightoftheeast.org
Still our site, just an easier to remember title. The handsome layout is thanks to our webmaster Fr. Hans Jacobse of Logos Web Services (Naples, FL)
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The North American Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation

Steps toward a reunited church:
A sketch of an Orthodox-Catholic vision for the future: Part 3

Editor’s Note: On October 10, 2010 at Georgetown University, Washington D.C. The North American Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation issued a statement of the progress of their work. Due to the length of the statement Light of the East has printed this document in parts over several consecutive issues. This is the final installment. The entire document can be found at:

www.usccb.org/seia/steps-towards-reunited-church.shtml

8. Preparatory Steps. To prepare for an eventual restoration of full communion within a reunited Church formed from the Orthodox and Catholic traditions, a number of steps might be helpful.

a) Delegations of Orthodox and Catholic bishops in a nation or region could begin to gather regularly for consultation on pastoral issues. Patriarchs and representatives of the autocephalous and autonomous Orthodox Churches could also meet with the Pope and leading Catholic bishops and curial officials on a regular basis for consultation and planning.

b) The Pope and the Orthodox primates could invite all the faithful under their jurisdiction to recognize each other’s Churches as “sister Churches” that fully realize the Apostolic faith in doctrine, sacraments and ecclesial life, despite the historically different forms in which our liturgy is celebrated, our doctrine taught, and our community life structured.

c) Special liturgical services and activities of common prayer and social ministry, involving lay people of both communions, could be organized as a way of drawing Orthodox and Catholic Christians into a deeper practical awareness of their common faith and dependence on God.

d) Ultimately, new structures of authority, in which the relationships of local and regional primates are concretely regulated, would need to be instituted by common consultation, perhaps by an ecumenical council.

9. Outstanding Questions and Problems. Confronted by these long-term prospects of growth towards ecclesial unity, we are aware that many serious theological, liturgical and structural questions remain unsolved, and need to be considered further. For example:

To what extent is the distinctive role of the pope rooted in the ancient site of Peter’s martyrdom? While some of the Church Fathers present the Peter of Scripture as a model for all bishops, or even for the whole believing community, others – especially some fourth- and fifth-century bishops of Rome – have stressed the unique, even mystical connection between Peter and the later Popes who led Peter’s local Church. To what extent do these Scriptural interpretations simply reflect differing ecclesiologies?

b) What limits should be acknowledged, canonically and theologicially, to the exercise of initiatives by the bishop of Rome in a universally reunited Church? What limits should be acknowledged to the authority and jurisdiction of the other patriarchs? Who has the authority to define these limits? To what extent can the formula of Apostolic Canon 34, from the late fourth century, serve as a model for the universal Church as well as for the local Churches: “The bishops of each national group should recognize the one who has first place among them, and consider him as head, and do nothing out of the ordinary without his agreement;... but neither should he do anything without the agreement of all”?

c) What kind of accountability can be canonically demanded of the bishop of Rome in his primatial role? What relevance does the ancient western principle used later by the defenders of papal authority, “the first see is to be judged by no one else,” have in today’s world of constitutionally regulated authority? What does the synodal or collegial dimension of papal authority imply for the Pope’s concrete exercise of his proper jurisdiction?

d) Can the bishop of Rome, as the one responsible for convening synods and councils of the universal Church, compel attendance and participation by representatives of particular Churches? Can he overrule those councils’ initiatives? Can he lay down rules of procedure?

e) What limits should be set to the common Orthodox practice of recognizing the autocephaly or autonomy of particular churches on ethnic, linguistic and geographical grounds? By what primatial and synodal authorities does such independence need to be recognized? Should diversity of national background continue to determine the structures of church life in a world that is increasingly shaped by the migration of peoples? What should the effect of today’s ethnic and cultural pluralism be on the unity and diversity of local Church organization, in countries representing the Orthodox “diaspora”? What aspects of the ancient principle of “one bishop, one place” can be reclaimed in contemporary society?

Continued on page 5
Orthodox-Catholic statement

Continued from page 4

f) Beyond these technical questions, how much formal agreement on doctrine and Church structure is necessary before the Orthodox and Catholic Churches permit local communities to begin at least some degree of sacramental communion with each other? If diversity within our own Churches on theological issues is usually not seen as a barrier to Eucharistic sharing, should we allow the differences between Orthodox and Catholic issues to overrule the substantial agreement our Churches already enjoy on most of the fundamental issues of faith, and keep us from receiving each other at the Eucharistic table, at least on some occasions? Would it be acceptable to both of our Churches to allow priests of one Church at least to care for the dying in the other, when no priest of their own is available? The extraordinary practice of shared communion has been carried on, at various critical points of recent history, in some parts of the world, and is occasionally carried on today. Can this serve as a precedent for wider Eucharistic sharing? Can such occasional sharing of communion serve as a concrete step towards deeper and more lasting unity?

10. One Body. In his Commentary on the 17th Chapter of St. John’s Gospel, St. Cyril of Alexandria argues that the unity of the Church, modeled on the unity of Father and Son and realized through the gift of the Spirit, is primarily formed in us through the Eucharist in which the disciples of Jesus share:

For by liturgically blessing (eulogōn) those who believe in him into a single body – namely, his own – through sacramental participation, [Christ] has made them completely one body with himself and with each other. Who, after all, could divide, or alienate from natural unity with one another, those who are bound through the one holy body into unity with Christ? For if “all of us partake of the one loaf” (1 Cor 10.17), all of us are formed into one body. It is impossible to divide Christ. That is the reason that the church is called the Body of Christ, and we are individually his members, as Paul understands it. For since we are all united with Christ through his holy Body - which we take, one and undivided, into our own bodies - we owe our own limbs more to him than to ourselves... How, then are we all not clearly one [Cyril goes on to ask] in each other and in Christ? For Christ is himself the bond of unity, existing at the same time as God and as a human being.... And all of us who have received one and the same Spirit – I mean the Holy Spirit – are blended together, in a certain way, with each other and with God... For just as the power of his holy flesh forms those to whom it comes into a single body, in the same way, I believe, the one Spirit of God, who dwells in all of us undivided, brings us all to a spiritual unity (Comm. on John 11.11 [ed. Pusey 2.735f-737]).

Conscience holds us back from celebrating our unity as complete in sacramental terms, until it is complete in faith, Church structure, and common action; but conscience also calls us to move beyond complacency in our divisions, in the power of the Spirit and in a longing for the fullness of Christ’s life-giving presence in our midst. The challenge and the invitation to Orthodox and Catholic Christians, who understand themselves to be members of Christ’s Body precisely by sharing in the Eucharistic gifts and participating in the transforming life of the Holy Spirit, is now to see Christ authentically present in each other, and to find in those structures of leadership that have shaped our communities through the centuries a force to move us beyond disunity, mistrust, and competition, and towards that oneness in his Body, that obedience to his Spirit, that will reveal us as his disciples before the world.

Ukrainian Catholic Patriarch responds to question regarding meeting Russian Orthodox Patriarch

In an interview to Left Bank, in response to the question whether he would like to meet with Patriarch Kirill and what he would say to him, the new head of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, Patriarch Sviatoslav, said that the best way to communicate is to be open in a brotherly dialogue, be open to the purification of our memory, to ask for forgiveness and to forgive.

“I would like very much to visit him and hold a personal meeting with him. I am convinced that in peacefully and openly communicating with each other, we can relieve any tension.

“Our church has voiced its readiness and openness for a dialogue ever since it emerged from the underground. I remember how Patriarch Ivan Lubachivskyi, who ordained me, after he moved to Ukraine, said: ‘We forgive and ask for forgiveness.’ It was a very deep call to reconciliation on his part. It was in the 1990s, at the time of the strongest confrontation, particularly in western Ukraine. There was the will for reconciliation on our part. Later, His Beatitude Lubomyr confirmed and repeated the same in the presence of Pope John Paul II who visited Ukraine.

“I think that today, we should heal the wounds rather than irritate and deepen them. One can heal the wounds of our memory only with mutual forgiveness. Therefore, as for any our brethren or neighbors who wounded us or were wounded by us, the best way to communicate is to be open in a brotherly dialogue, be open to the purification of our memory, to ask for forgiveness and to forgive,” said Patriarch Sviatoslav.
Notes from the Orientale Lumen Conference
by Deacon Musil Shihadeh

Marking its fifteenth year, the Oriental Lumen Conference took place in Washington D.C. June 20-23, 2011. Presenters included: Metropolitan Jonah (Orthodox) Primate of the Orthodox Church in America, Washington, DC; Metropolitan Kallistos of Diokleia (Orthodox, Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople); Professor Emeritus of Oxford University, Archimandrite Robert Taft, SJ (Greek Catholic) Professor Emeritus of the Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome; Msgr. Michael Magee (Roman Catholic) Professor of Systematic Theology, St. Charles Borromeo Seminary, Philadelphia, PA; Father Ron Roberson, CSP (Roman Catholic) Associate Director for Ecumenical Affairs, USCCB, Washington, DC; Sr. Dr. Vassa Larin (Orthodox, Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia) Lecturer, University of Vienna, Austria; and Dr. Adam De-Ville (Greek Catholic) Assistant Professor, University of Saint Francis, Ft. Wayne, IN and Editor, LOGOS.

Opening Remarks:

In his opening remarks, OL Conference director, Jack Figel, welcomed the participants, first describing the history of Oriental Lumen since its inception in 1997. Cardinal Theodore McCarrick expressed his gratitude toward the Orthodox Churches for their participation in these conferences, which have resulted in better dialogue between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches, and have led to progress from talking about each other to talking to each other, showing the true love that is required of us by Christ. Figel read a letter from Patriarch Gregorios Laham III, Patriarch of the Melkite Church, who is convinced that we are coming closer to union and that the Eastern Catholics show this perfect union model for the rest of the world. Bishop John Michael Botean, Bishop of the Romanian Catholic Church of the Eparchy of Canton, OH, described his mission to speak for Orthodoxy in the name of Catholicism, and said he is starting to see the fruit of the Holy Spirit of this action in the dialogues. Finally, Metropolitan Kallistos of Diokleia, introducing the theme of the conference, “Rome and the communion of Churches: Bishop, Patriarch or Pope?,” explained that the history of discussion of the Papal claims is very brief and that this conference was important because it would provide ample discussion time on Papal Primacy.

Plenary One:

Archimandrite Robert Taft, S.J. (Greek Catholic), Professor Emeritus of the Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome. The vision of the Future Church is of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. The Church can grow and change, evolving itself without compromising its doctrine, based upon Vatican II. The Orthodox Church is the star of the Eastern Churches, while Rome wants union without compromising their traditions. However, it is necessary to confront the Orthodox Church on its outright slander of the Catholic Church. The Catholic ecclesial structure is problematic for the Orthodox Church. He proposed that a change in the Western hierarchical structure would promote union, by returning to the original roots. The possession of legitimate authority in no way justifies the [unlimited] exercise of that authority, especially in the Papacy. It is limited by Divine Revelation, the doctrines of the faith, Tradition, and charitable works. Tradition holds that there is a Petrine authority that was accepted, but not to the extent expressed at Vatican I. A renewed ecclesiology is ideally [needed to be] proposed. There should be a rereading of Catholic and Orthodox history in order to subdue any propaganda against one another. In addition, looking at various events in Church history shows the imperfect ways of both in reducing and causing schisms, including as to Protestant communities. A redefinition of mandatory clerical celibacy for the Catholic Church would also improve relations between the Catholic and Orthodox. An extended collegiality between the Eastern Churches, Catholic and Orthodox, would also help relations. … it is not doctrine but behavior change that is needed – [the problem of] knowing how to live the Christian life, but not how to apply it. Realizing the potential to be less hypocritical will lead to openness and desire to know each other and finally achieve perfect union in the Future Church.

Plenary Two:

Msgr. Michael Magee (Roman Catholic), Chairman and Professor of Systematic Theology at St. Charles Borromeo Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. “What is at stake when it comes to the idea of the patriarchate?” Starting with the Council of Ephesus there is a unity [to be noted] within the diversity of the collegiality of bishops. In the modern context, there is a diversity that refuses to live in unity because of the foreignness of cultures. The patriarchate is not determined by Popes or individuals, but by synods. Thus, it is a concrete determination of ecclesiastical law. The responsibility of the patriarchate must be cast in purely geographical terms. The Pope is necessary to ecclesiology and to preserving the Tradition of the Latin church. Eastern ecclesiology begins with the college of the episcopacy, requiring a spokesman. Western ecclesiology holds that Peter is the start of the primacy. Primacy is inherent to the college of bishops. The Council of Nicea determined that there are regional primacies, and a universal head patriarch was not [recognized] until after the first millennium. One idea to rectify the enormity [of size] of the Western patriarchate: the Pope should establish six different patriarchates within the Western church. A synod is needed to establish and coordinate a
common life of all the patriarchates. However, Msgr. Magee disagreed with the first solution, as a single act of doing something new will not “fix” the problem. Instead, focusing on a process that will work over time [will help]. One way of helping the dialogue would be a correction in terminology. By fixing the terminology of “patriarchate” we would be able to establish better definitions of global jurisdiction. It was not imperial factors that determined the patriarchate, but accommodation to anthropological realities.

Plenary Three:
Metropolitan Kallistos of Diokleia (Orthodox, Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople), Professor Emeritus of Oxford University, U.K. The Primacy is a unique pastoral mission, with three elements. The Orthodox Church does not consider complete any ecclesiology where freedom in the Holy Spirit, the Catholic and Apostolic tradition, and the charism of Peter are not in total harmony. The bishop of Rome is the successor of Peter in a special sense; the phrase, “care of the all the churches,” used by [St.] Paul, applied to the Papal office. The servant of the servants of God is another phrase, used by Gregory the Great. Pope Benedict XVI says that the Orthodox should not be expected to offer more nor less than expected of them during the first millennium when considering the Papacy. Vatican I gave the Pope the power and supreme jurisdiction over the church. They [Romans] claim it is consistent tradition on this fact; the question is whether there is a true appeal to history on this particular doctrine. The Roman Pontiff was indeed the first among equals among the patriarchs. However, the other aspects of the primacy are conflicting within church history. According to John Zizioulas, there is always a president when it comes to the Eucharistic ecclesiology, but primacy is a form of service and not power or honor. While people looked to the Pope as an appeal concerning decisions made by patriarchs or synods, a universal jurisdiction claimed by Rome was not accepted by the East.

Plenary Four:
Sr. Vassa Larin PhD. (Orthodox, Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia), Assistant Professor at the University of Vienna, Austria. When it comes to dialogue, there is an emphasis on the hierarchs and an ignoring of the laity. The importance lies in the laity’s participation in the communion of the Churches. She described an [academic] seminar she had offered titled “Feasting and Fasting: The liturgical seminar of the East,” all [participants] were Catholics of varying professions. The students were required to attend services and read literature on the various services. There were mixed reviews by the students, but they expressed openness to new liturgical practices. Some were impressed by the faithful, the focus of the people during the services; the freedom of movement, which they thought allowed better participation in liturgical Services and that they [the faithful] could thus develop their own relationship with God with the movement, while having the unity of liturgical worship. They shared many insights and demonstrated self-criticism and application of their own liturgical traditions. To strive together for a communion of churches, there must be education of all the Catholic and Orthodox laity and an empowering of them to be involved in the ecclesiological structure.

Plenary Five:
Dr. Adam DeVille (Greek Catholic), Assistant Professor at the University of Saint Francis, Ft. Wayne, IN, editor of LOGOS. The recognition of the importance of the role of the patriarch of Rome. The Roman church took the synods of bishops very seriously in church history. In addition, as the roles of cardinals were developed, then they, too, met very frequently to discuss the future of the church. What is the historical significance of the patriarchate in the West? First, it is necessary to look at the East. The history of the patriarchate varies with great diversity. It is important to highlight the diversity of the power of the patriarchate, even those patriarchs who had more power than the Pope. [He described] Four categories: very centralized, moderately centralized, decentralized, and the very decentralized. The creation of a Patriarchate in the Catholic Church would cause more disarray, according to some. Each patriarchate makes its own necessary arrangements and its relation to the Papal primacy. The necessary adjustments for reform imply going back to the original tradition. This means also reforming boundaries of the Patriarchates based upon the first missions in each region. An Ecumenical Synod would be the most ideal situation because the Pope and Patriarchs would come together to make decisions about the Church. The “Episcopal Assemblies” are small synods that deal with current events in the Orthodox Churches. The authority exercised in the name of the Pope of Rome is sometimes questionable.

Plenary Six:
Metropolitan Jonah (Orthodox), Primate of the Orthodox Church in America. The Papacy vs. Autocephalous churches. There was a conflict between the members of the tradition, and there was a synthesis in some areas with the rising of the Eastern Catholic Churches. Are the papacy and autocephalous church complementary or contradictory? Going through a brief history, [he said that] the Western Church used the Papacy as political and militant influence on the world. However, today the Papacy is central to liturgical, geographical, and ecclesiological formation. In the Orthodox Church there are many autocephalous churches with a strong history of violence and damage: there are multilingual, multicultural churches and the closed ethnic churches, all autocephalous. The churches, Catholic or Orthodox, have very similar structures: the Pope is the head of the college of bishops in the West, whereas the Ecumenical Patriarch is the head of the college of bishops in the East. Primacy means to be first among equals, with the responsibility of accountability for intervention and unity of the synods locally and universally. Autocephalous is about being accountable as a whole and to each other. Unless there is an emergency, a bishop stays within his own jurisdiction. The greatest objection the Orthodox have is to the universal jurisdiction of the papacy, which means that the structure of obedience to the
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papacy contrasts [conflicts with] the integrity of the local churches in the care of the bishops. For example, the formation of a truly American Orthodox Church with union with Rome is a goal of the unity. However, first there must be an understanding [reconciling of ideas] of the autocephalous nature of the East, with the accountability given by the Papacy, with the synodality of all the churches.

Closing Remarks:
Fr. Ron Roberson, CSP (Roman Catholic), Associate Director for Ecumenical Affairs, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Washington D.C., put the dialogue of North American Catholic and Orthodox clergy in context and spoke of its major accomplishments. The purpose of the dialogue is to examine the difficulties of reconciliation and discuss them. There is a joint committee that deals with various pastoral concerns. Overall, the dialogue has been the most fruitful of any anywhere else in the world. The United States has a diminished relationship between religion and ethnicity. Since the 1950s, dialogues between the Catholic and Orthodox theologians have developed over the course of 40 years, and have met over 80 times. Translation differences also are difficult within the dialogue. Theological differences on valid baptisms of Catholics or Orthodox and the Filioque caused some strain. He described ten sections of the vision of the dialogues. The Popes intervened with the Church’s affairs, making the other churches dependent on him. The Orthodox did not accept the universal jurisdiction. Because of the commonality of the sacraments, structure, and the vision of the Church there is a lot more in common with each other and a certain degree of communion exists. This [further communion] can only come [about] with new conceptions and approaches to primacy and unity. With the courage to work together, to set aside the historical differences, and to learn more about our theology and customs, then the unity of the one Church, even Eucharistically, can be achieved.