

CENTRO
PRO
UNIONE

N. 6 - 1974



Via S. Maria dell'Anima, 30
00186 Rome, Italy

CONTENTS

Program for 1975	2
<i>français</i>	2
International Ecumenical Bibliography (I.O.B.)	
– by Charles Graves	3
<i>français</i>	6
The Canterbury Statement, 1973, a comment	
– by Harry R. Smythe	10
The Canterbury Statement: an Anglican comment	
– by Eric Mascall	11
Is there an Ecumenical Dimension to the Holy Year?	
– by André Joos	13
The Cosmic Powers and Reconciliation	
– by Elias Mallon, S.A.	18
<i>français</i>	22
Second Edition of the ecumenical directory: Ecumenism around the World-L'Oecuménisme à travers le Monde	
<i>English-français</i>	27
Centro Pro Unione	
<i>English-français</i>	27

*Conference Program for 1975
Theme: "Reconciliation and Renewal"*

*Programme de Conférences pour le 1975
Sujet: "Réconciliation et Renouveau"*

- February 20*
"Cosmic Reconciliation: A New World View for Twentieth Century Man"
- March 20*
"Tensions within the Church: Parties and Polarization"
- April 17*
"Cultural and Anthropological Expressions of Reconciliation"
"Structures of Renewal and Unity: the Eucharist and Reconciliation"
- May 15*
"Convergences in the Marxist-Christian Dialogue"
- October 16*
"Toward an Understanding of Christian Unity: What Prospectives for Christian Unity are Realistic?"
"The Church: People of God, not Perfect Society but 'Koinonia' in Christ"
- November 20*
"Why in There a 'Third World' When There Should Only be One World? The Problem of Exploitation"
"The Christian Community as Reconciler: Development of World Peace and Social Justice"
- December 11*
"Send Forth Your Spirit and Renew the Face of the Earth: Ecumenism and the Working of the Spirit"
"The Notion of Unity in Prayer and the Life of the Community"

- 20 février*
"Réconciliation Cosmique: une nouvelle vision du monde pour l'homme du XXème siècle"
- 20 mars*
"Tensions et Polarisation dans l'Eglise"
- 17 avril*
"Expressions Culturelles et Anthropologiques de Réconciliation"
"Structures de Renouveau et d'Unité: l'Eucharistie et la Réconciliation"
- 15 mai*
"Convergences dans le Dialogue Chrétien-Marxiste"
- 16 octobre*
"Vers une compréhension de l'Unité Chrétienne: quelles sont les perspectives réalistes"
"L'Eglise, Peuple de Dieu: non Société Parfaite mais 'Koinonia' en Christ"
- 20 novembre*
"Pourquoi exist-il un 'Troisième Monde' lorsqu'il en devrait exister un seul? Le Problème de l'Exploitation"
"La Communauté Chrétienne réconciliatrice: développement de la justice sociale et de la paix dans le monde"
- 11 décembre*
"Donne Ton Esprit et renouvelle la face de la terre: Oecuménisme travail de l'esprit"
"La notion de l'Unité dans la vie et dans la prière de la communauté"

CONFERENCE ON THE IOB 31 JANUARY 1974
CENTRO PRO UNIONE, ROME

According to the Jesuit Aloysius Pieris of Sri Lanka, there are four positions which the Church can take or has taken, as regards the other religions: the conquest theory, the adaptation theory, the fulfillment and the sacramental theory.

Pieris begins by explaining that over the last four hundred years the Church has changed her attitude towards other religions, considering them first as anti-Christian, then as non-Christian, now as pre-Christian and probably soon as anonymous Christian. He therefore presents four theories corresponding to these — the Conquest, Adaptation, Fulfilment, and Sacramental theories.

The Conquest theory, according to Pieris, began in the sixteenth century, the great missionary era, when it was felt that to save the pagans it was necessary to bring them into the visible fold of the Church, because outside there was no salvation. The underlying argument was that there was no salvation outside God's Kingdom, and God's Kingdom was identified with the visible Church.

The Adaptation theory began with the Italian Jesuits who defended the values of the East, finding their religious motifs not only good in themselves, but also effective means of evangelization. Thus De Nobili became a Sannyasi, Beschi a Tamil Pundit, and Ricci a Christian Mandarin. Pieris' objection to this theory is that, although it had its value then, today it seems like "an artificial way of becoming natural, a conscious effort at becoming spontaneous". He feels that the Adaptation theory now gives the impression of "robbing a culture of its religious content" and inserting Christianity in its place. The method is one of displacement, and so the theory is associated with deception. Christ himself did not just appear to be a man, but fully assumed human nature. The attitude towards non-Christian religions should therefore be that of assumption, perfection, completion, and fulfilment.

The theory of fulfilment is taught in the Second Vatican Council. In this theory the Kingdom of God is taken as a wider reality than the Church, and salvation is possible outside the Church. The other religions, according to the Council, are a "preparation for the Gospel" a "secret presence of God" which are to be restored to Christ. This fulfilment theory, according to Pieris, was advocated by the Belgian Jesuits in Calcutta a few decades ago, and in the West by such men as Danielou and Guardini.

Pieris finds two difficulties with this fulfilment theory. The first pertains to the pre-Christian character of both the Old Testament and the non-Christian religions. He finds it difficult to accept the distinction that the Old Testament was supernatural and the other religions are natural, because, for him, there is a "oneness of man's supernatural vocation to salvation". The second difficulty pertains to the Church as the fulfilment of the other religions. Pieris asks whether fulfilment means that the religions have to die to themselves and be reborn in Christ, or whether the Church should go and meet the other religions and thus discover "a clear manifestation of her messianic awareness". If the Church is to experience her fulfilment

only at the end of time, and if restoring the values in non-Christian religions to Christ will reach their fulfilment also at the end of time (Ad Gentes, 9), should the relationship between the Church and the other religions not be one of "mutual fulfilment, mutual conversion, mutual completion... by which all religions including Christianity march towards fulfilment in the Total Christ which is the Kingdom".

These ideas are, for Pieris, the basis for his "Sacramental theory". In this theory the Church as the Universal Sacrament of Salvation is the sign and instrument of the Kingdom (salvation being synonymous with the Kingdom and not with the Church). Conversion signifies a "conscious acceptance of the Kingdom and not necessarily the acceptance of the Church which is its sacramental form. In this theory the non-Christian religions are seen as "a secret presence of God" or "anonymous Christianity", and the role of the Church, as the sacrament of the Kingdom, is "to explicitate in her own life the anonymous Christianity that surrounds her", and "to promulgate those values among the very people who have accepted them on principle". (1)

This gives some introduction to some of the problems facing an International Ecumenical Bibliography. The same is repeated in the efforts of the World Council of Churches "Dialogue with men of Living Faiths", especially the Ajaltoun 1970 conference. Other religions are acceptable as they are; Jesus comes into the midst of the discussions without the institution. From the point of view of the Orthodox Churches, there are fewer possibilities of "dialogue" with other religions, but some philosophers, for example Bulgakov, on whom I wrote a doctoral dissertation, present a vision of the Church which goes beyond institutional boundaries, and includes all mankind. Father André Joos has written very well on this aspect of Bulgakov's ecclesiology, "Melanges Dom Rousseau".

This is to serve only as a kind of introduction. Our problem is not with the relation of Christianity to non-Christians but of the "dialogue" among Christians themselves. This is what is recorded in the IOB. However, the "dialogue" among Christians cannot be seen alone, without the larger perspective of the world in which we live, where there are many beliefs and religions and where there is a need to know what we mean by *Christianity*. This becomes a question when we think of the other religions, of our relation to them, of our service to Christ. These other religions challenge us to ask ourselves, "what is our Christian faith?"

Now, of course, this is both a very simple question, and yet also a very complex one. It is simple because all of us strive every day to live on the basis of our Christian faith, and if it were not simple, then we could not live. It means trust, fellowship in the Church, sacramental life, concern for our brother. In this way, Christianity is so simple, that just by our wills and lives we are faithful — we don't need to search, to question etc. But in our world today the questions are always arising about our faith in Christ. These questions arise because Christ and Christianity are differently interpreted by different people and different churches in different ways.

This fact is a scandal to our simple Christian faith.

But it is a fact in our world. Christians all have the same simple faith, but in fact they are very much divided from one another (their churches, in different lands) by lack of understanding, one holding himself better than the other, and so forth.

The scandal of our divisions can be overcome by one way — everyone seek to know Christ better and to do His will in the world. This is essential and often overlooked in ecumenical activity. There is a unity among us which already exists, because Christ is One, and therefore all who are part of His Body, the Church, are one. The deeper we go into the spiritual life, the more we partake in the riches of the sacramental life of the Church, the closer we find ourselves to our neighbor, and the more we can help him and receive from him. This is a primary fact for ecumenism and should not be forgotten.

But it is not necessarily so that the deeper we go in the spiritual life, the closer we come to our neighbor. Often our spiritual life itself, which is closely related to the culture in which we live, *alienates* us from our brother. It is not the One Christ who alienates us from our brother, but the means by which we come to the One Christ, i.e. our local church life. And here is the scandal — that the very means which leads us closer to Christ is also the means to divide us from our brother. Therefore, the ecumenical movement has tried by all possible ways to *understand* this *divisive* factor, to isolate it, so to speak, like a doctor would a bad disease, and to treat it. This has been the effort of the Ecumenical Movement since the last century — to look into Faith and Order problems, to see what really divides us.

Unfortunately, the disease has now spread to become world wide. It is no longer the Anglicans and the Presbyterians in Great Britain who argue, or the many churches in the U.S., or the long standing Catholic-Protestant debate, or the Orthodox with their Western brethren, but all over the world churches misunderstand one another, and Christians do not understand each other, so that they can really help one another, as they should be doing in the Body of Christ.

It seems to me the Church should be united and strong in face of the many other religions and ideologies in the world, but in fact it is not. It is weak and divided. Theologians in the West complain that Christians in the East are not willing to *cooperate*. Eastern theologians refuse to be *dominated* by the Western theology and theologians. Africans try to free themselves from missionary domination and at the same time bring their Christian contribution to building the world Church. They are frustrated because this contribution is not accepted. Rather they are taught to become like the Europeans, etc. South American Christians are not understood because of their language and particular approach to the faith, etc.

In fact, the problems of our modern ecumenical movement are so vast, so unresolvable that we sometimes despair if there really is a *body of Christ* in the world! The purpose of the International Ecumenical Bibliography has been from the beginning to try to overcome the scandal of our divisions. It was founded in 1965 among Protestant professors, Roman Catholic monks and professors, Orthodox professors, Protestant pastors, Roman librarians, and Oecumenical Institute

directors, etc. to be a means of working together to overcome the barriers of theology and church life which separate Christians. Some of the names of these people are well known as leaders of the ecumenical movement (see introduction IOB to Bd. 5). Thus have the editors of the IOB published 5 volumes to include all the important books and articles on ecumenism since 1962. Summaries of the most important articles were included, underlining the importance of the article for the ecumenical dialogue. In this way, for the number of years following 1965 — the time of the Vatican Council, the Rhodes Pan-Orthodox Conferences, the Assemblies of the World Council of Churches — the time when all Christians of different confessions were getting to know one another — for this period of time the IOB was one small means of avoiding the *scandal* of our divisions. It was managed, financed, put together in the offices, printed, talked about and discussed by persons of all the denominations. Therefore both as a final product (the book) and in the preparation and consequences — it had a very important ecumenical role.

What is the situation today? The IOB has served its time well, but our time has changed. The IOB needs to become the tool of a *world-wide ecumenical encounter*. The problems of the oecumene are now immense! The dialogue which must be entered into and resolved is much larger than we thought. It includes the whole world!

Of course, this is not to say that we must not attempt to go back to the unity which underlines our churches — our unity in Christ, and try personally to do our best to follow Christ in our daily practical life, and thereby find our unity with our Christian brother. As members of the body of Christ this is our primary obligation. But, as well, there is a great mass of work to be done on the basic conflicts and problems which beset the Christians of the world in their relations with one another. I would like to mention just a few of these problems so we can see what is the task of the IOB in the years to come.

First, there is the problem of *God and Revelation*. The way of looking at God and revelation is radically different for Greek culture, on which much of our theology is based, and African culture, for example. The Africans see God as related to their ancestors, worshipped through dance, etc. — the Greeks on the other hand saw Him as a fixed idea. These differences of approach to God are at the background of much of the difficulties we face in trying to build an ecumenical theology today.

Secondly, the problem of *the Church*. Does the church really include everyone, as Pieris and other modern supporters of the “sacramental” theory of the Church claim? Does the Church include Protestants, Orthodox, Catholics? Is there some underlying unity which unites all mankind? Those thinkers who have emphasized most the unity of mankind, as Bulgakov, Rahner, Panikkar, Pieris etc. have also laid the basis for unity among the members of different churches, for if we are united with a non-Christian on the basis of our common humanity (which God loves), then certainly we are at one with our Christian brother who shares the same faith in Christ with us.

But is there actually a “Body of Christ” in the world? Is there a unity among all Christians? How is

this realised in the world? Is it an actual fact that all Christians, from Africa, from Europe, from Asia, from Latin America, *depend upon one another*, and *support one another*? Are all Christians part of one "sacramental" body in the world which is united in itself and which witnesses to others about the love of Jesus Christ? In a minute we shall return to this idea whether there exists a "body of Christ" in the world which is mutually self-supporting and which speaks to all men and all religions about Christ.

Another question which is very pressing is the following: Is there not only a unity of the body of Christ, is there a *unity of theology* in the world. Is there an "ecumenical" theology? Here we touch upon an extremely difficult challenge facing Christians today. For example, there is now a great problem between the world-views of the Orient and the Occident. Theologians from the Orient and from the European countries are having a difficult time understanding one another. Theologians from the Western countries accuse their Oriental brethren of lack of good faith, of not cooperating (in projects arranged according to Western models); Oriental theologians demand their liberty from such Western-arranged projects, and they believe they are speaking in the name of God of the Christians when they challenge their Western brethren. On the other hand, they want Christian faith to be understood and acted upon in the fashion of the Orient.

For example: Chinese philosophy is now becoming very important in working out a Chinese Christian theology. Chinese scholars are trying to work out a Christian theological system based on teachings of Heaven and Earth found in Confucius and other Chinese philosophers. The Christian theology which they are developing is very lofty and beautiful — it makes Christianity truly an indigenous Chinese faith. But as the Chinese and other peoples in the Orient try to work out their own theology, the professors from the Western countries arise and say to them: come now, *let's dialogue!* We don't understand your interpretation of Christian faith at all, but we want to (cf. many professors from Switzerland and Germany). But the Oriental people reply: there is no particular unity between your theology and ours. Besides, your theology is exhausted, you believed in Karl Barth and "revelation only" and now he is discredited in the West because many people realise that there is much of salvational value in "religions". Therefore, why should we dialogue with you when you are so unsure of yourself. We shall try to build our own theology based on our own philosophy.

I think there is much that is justified in this rejection of the Occidental by the Oriental theologians. The West theologically is in a great chaos, and secularism seems to draw out all of its strength, and leave it unable to deal with "transcendental" themes. Here is a great challenge, then, for our work with the IOB. How can we bring some light to this conflict where the Oriental Christian theology is developing without the help of the European theologians, and even despising them? The basic question here is the following: Is there a "unity of Theology"? Perhaps we must wait a while for each national church to formulate its own indigenous theology, and then after this has been accomplished, look at all the products, and try to

somehow put them together. Then we shall have an ecumenical theology. I think this is a very necessary step, but we must not just wait and allow many local theologies to develop without at the same time trying to see whether a "unity of Theology" is possible. This unity would have to combine the mysterious qualities of the Eastern theologies with the practical qualities of the western theologies — their concern for secularism, and so forth.

In saying this I don't want it to be thought that I am leaving out other theologies, e.g. the African. Here we have theology which is based on animistic culture and I think one of the greatest tasks of Christendom today is to resolve the conflict which arises when Christians with an animistic background as in Indonesia, Korea and Africa try to work together with Christians from a Greco-Roman background, i.e., most Europeans and North Americans. But looking back again to this problem of a "unity of Theology" — it must, in its ideal sense include Oriental thought forms as well as Western thought — forms, and the basic concepts and outlook on life of those from animistic cultures. This is an immense task! I had just finished showing some of the difficulties facing the creation of a theology which would be both Oriental and yet also Occidental, and then all of a sudden we are faced with another thought world — the animistic — and we are put to the *very limit of our possibilities*.

There is certainly plenty of challenge and work for the IOB in the future — to solve all these problems will be the task of centuries of effort. The IOB, if it is aware of the nature of the problems facing the Church in the world, which we have been trying to discuss, can have an important role — that of documenting this discussion between the many different theologies and contributing to this discussion. For if we gather into one book form all the different Christian world-views, then it is easier for the scholars to know what is *the scope and importance of the problem they are dealing with*. Our task is to record the many sides of this problem.

Since this has gone on rather long, now I should like to make a brief conclusion: We can go back to our starting point and discuss the relation of Christian faith with the non-Christian religions. It is in relation to men of other faiths that the Church must have *unity in its mission*. The men of other faiths challenge us to know what our mission is. To understand what our mission is means, *first* of all, to sense that there is a real "body of Christ" existing in the world, and that all Christians from whatever part of the world, are part of it. *Secondly*, we need a "unity of theology" by which we can express to our non-Christian neighbors what it is that we believe. As we have seen, this is very difficult to achieve, with so many interpretations of the Christian faith, and the IOB has a special role to play to publicise what these different interpretations are, so that we can work towards a unity of theology.

I am not disregarding the serious problems which face us all in this task: From the point of view of the Protestants and the Orthodox in the World Council, there is so much at the moment to be done to overcome the gap between the Greco-Roman way of thinking and action, and the African (or Asian) way of thinking. In the Roman Catholic Church, there are certainly many problems in the area of having a "unity

of theology". There are those who believe in the sacramental view of the relation with non-Christian religions, as Pieris and Raymond Panikkar and there are those who believe the Church includes only believers, or those who are incorporated in the Church life. There is a real debate here which must come to a resolution. On the other hand, as regards the problem of the unity of the Church, Roman Catholics are divided — some believe that it is found only in the Roman Church, others that the unity spreads outside to include all Christians, or even, in some cases non-believers.

So, with all these problems to be solved, I think we see how necessary it is for us to work towards a *unity in mission*, and this can only be done if we know what are the divisive factors, if we publish them (as in the IOB) and discuss them, and if we arrive, then, at the unity in the body of Christ for which we all hope.

Charles Graves

Further information about collaborating with the IOB will be sent upon request. The main addresses of the bibliography are: 262, rue de Morat — 1700 Fribourg, Switzerland and: Dr. Charles Graves, 150, route de Ferney — 1211 Genève 20, Switzerland.

At the moment, the IOB is seeking to build up a network of collaborators to cover materials from Asia, Africa and Latin America. If your institute has suggestions of collaborators, the IOB should like to know the following information:

1) *For which nation or area would the collaborator be responsible?*

2) *For what kind of materials would the collaborator be responsible: journals, books, conference documents, theses?*

Since the IOB is already in contact with persons to do this work, it is hoped there will be no overlapping of efforts. At the moment help is being received from Ghana (Prot.), Philippines (Prot.), Japan (Prot. and Rom. Cath.), Korea (Prot.), Chile (Pentecostal), India (Prot.), Sri Lanka (Cath.), Zambia (Cath.), Hong Kong (Prot.), East Africa (Prot.), U.S.A. (black theology), Viet Nam (Cath.), Colombia (Cath.), Cameroun (Prot., Rom. Cath.). Of course, these collaborators may require the assistance of others who are interested.

Generally speaking, the material is being gathered from the year 1966, though we are concentrating now on that from 1969 and 1970. Materials in non-European languages are included, with a transliteration and a summary if possible, in a European language.

The IOB is an informal joint project of the World Council of Churches and the Secretariat for Christian Unity in the Vatican.

(1) Asandas Balchand, S.J., "The Salvific Value of non-Christian Religions according to Asian-Christian Theologians writing in Asian — Published Theological Journals 1965-1970". East Asian Pastoral Institute, Manila 1973, pp. 51-52.

CONFERENCE SUR LA I.O.B. 31 JANVIER 1974 CENTRO PRO UNIONE, ROME

Selon le jésuite Aloysius Pieris (Sri Lanka), il y a quatre positions que l'Eglise peut prendre, ou a prises, à l'égard des autres religions: la théorie de la conquête, la théorie de l'adaptation, la théorie de l'accomplissement et les théories sacramentelles.

Pieris commence par expliquer qu'au cours des quatre derniers siècles l'Eglise a changé son attitude à l'égard des autres religions, en les considérant au début anti-chrétiennes, ensuite non-chrétiennes, actuellement pré-chrétiennes et bientôt elles seront probablement considérées chrétiennes anonymes. Il présente donc quatre théories qui correspondent à la conquête, à l'adaptation, à l'accomplissement et aux théories sacramentelles.

La théorie de la Conquête, selon Pieris, commença au XVIIe siècle, la grande ère missionnaire, quand on pensait que pour sauver les païens il fallait les amener au sein de l'Eglise, car en dehors de celle-ci il n'y avait pas de salut. L'argument fondamental était qu'il n'y avait pas de salut en dehors du Royaume de Dieu, et le Royaume de Dieu était identifié avec l'Eglise visible.

La théorie de l'Adaptation commença avec les jésuites italiens qui défendaient les valeurs de l'Orient, en considérant les sentiments religieux de cette région non seulement bons en eux-mêmes mais comme des moyens efficaces d'évangélisation. Ce fut ainsi que De Nobili devint un "Sannyasi", Beschi un professeur de Tamil et Ricci un mandarin chrétien. L'objection que Pieris fait à cette théorie est que, même si elle avait sa valeur à l'époque, aujourd'hui elle semblerait "une façon artificielle de devenir naturel, un effort conscient pour devenir spontané". Il croit que la théorie de l'adaptation donne maintenant l'impression de "vider une culture de son contenu religieux" en le remplaçant par le christianisme. C'est une méthode de remplacement et par conséquent cette théorie est associée à une certaine déception. Le Christ Lui-même n'apparut pas simplement comme homme, mais Il assuma pleinement la nature humaine. L'attitude à l'égard des religions non-chrétiennes devrait donc être une attitude d'intégration, de perfectionnement, de complètement et d'accomplissement.

Le Concile Vatican II enseigne la théorie de l'accomplissement. Dans cette théorie le Royaume de Dieu est pris comme une réalité plus large que l'Eglise, et le salut est possible en dehors de celle-ci. Les autres religions, selon le Concile, sont une "préparation à l'Evangile", "une présence secrète de Dieu"; elles doivent être rendues au Christ. Cette théorie de l'accomplissement, selon Pieris, fut préconisée il y a quelques décennies par les jésuites belges à Calcutta et par des hommes tels que Danielou et Guardini en Occident.

Pieris trouve deux difficultés dans la théorie de l'accomplissement. La première a un rapport avec le caractère pré-chrétien soit de l'Ancien Testament soit des religions non-chrétiennes. Il trouve difficile d'accepter la distinction entre l'Ancien Testament qui était surnaturel et les autres religions qui sont naturelles, parce que, pour lui, il existe une "unité de la vocation surnaturelle de l'homme au salut". La deuxième difficulté a un rapport avec l'Eglise en tant qu'accomplissement des autres religions. Pieris se demande si "accomplissement" signifie que les religions

doivent mourir en elles-mêmes et renaître dans le Christ, ou si l'Eglise doit aller à la rencontre des autres religions et découvrir ainsi "une claire manifestation de sa conscience messianique". Si l'Eglise doit expérimenter son accomplissement seulement à la fin des temps, et si la réintégration au Christ des valeurs des religions non-chrétiennes atteindra également son accomplissement à la fin des temps (Ad Gentes, 9), les relations entre l'Eglise et les autres religions ne devraient-elles pas être d'accomplissement mutuel, de conversion mutuelle, de complètement mutuel... moyen par lequel toute religion y compris le Christianisme marche vers l'accomplissement dans le Christ Total qui est le Royaume?"

Ces idées sont, pour Pieris, la base de sa "théorie sacramentelle". Dans cette théorie, l'Eglise, en tant que Sacrement Universel de salut, est le signe et l'instrument du Royaume (le salut étant synonyme de Royaume et non pas d'Eglise). La conversion signifie une "acceptation consciente du Royaume et pas nécessairement l'acceptation de l'Eglise qui en est la forme sacramentelle. Dans cette théorie les religions non-chrétiennes sont vues comme "une présence secrète de Dieu" ou "Christianisme anonyme" et le rôle de l'Eglise, en tant que Sacrement du Royaume, est "d'explicitier dans sa propre vie le Christianisme anonyme qui l'entoure", et "de répandre ces valeurs parmi le même peuple qui les a acceptées pour principe" (1).

Cela introduit quelques-uns des problèmes qui confrontent une Bibliographie Internationale Oecuménique. La même chose se répète dans les efforts du Conseil Mondial des Eglises "Dialogue avec des hommes ayant une foi vivante", spécialement lors de la Conférence d'Ajaltoun en 1970. Les autres religions sont acceptables telles qu'elles sont; Jésus apparaît au milieu des discussions sans l'institution. Du point de vue des Eglises orthodoxes, il y a moins de possibilités de "dialogue" avec les autres religions, mais quelques philosophes, par exemple, Bulgakov sur lequel j'ai écrit une dissertation de doctorat, présentent une vision de l'Eglise qui va au-delà des limites institutionnelles, et qui comprend tout le genre humain. Le Père André Joos a très bien écrit sur cet aspect de l'écclésiologie de Bulgakov "Melanges Dom Rousseau".

Cela nous sert seulement d'introduction. Notre problème n'est pas la relation du Christianisme avec les non-Chrétiens mais le "dialogue" parmi les Chrétiens eux-mêmes. C'est cela qui a rapport à la I.O.B. D'ailleurs le "dialogue" parmi les Chrétiens ne peut pas être vue seul, sans une perspective plus large du monde dans lequel nous vivons, où existent beaucoup de croyances et de religions et où il existe le besoin de savoir ce que nous voulons dire par *christianisme*. Cela devient une question quand on pense aux autres religions, à notre relation avec elles, à notre service au Christ. Ces autres religions nous poussent à nous demander "qu'est-ce que notre foi chrétienne?"

Or, évidemment, c'est là une question à la foi très simple et très compliquée. Elle est simple parce que nous tous, nous efforçons de vivre chaque jour sur la base de notre foi chrétienne, et si elle ne l'était pas nous ne pourrions pas vivre. Cela signifie confiance, fraternité dans l'Eglise, vie sacramentelle, souci pour notre frère. De cette manière, le Christianisme est si simple, que nous sommes fidèles par notre volonté et

par notre vie — nous n'avons pas besoin de chercher, de questionner, etc. Mais dans le monde d'aujourd'hui les questions surgissent toujours sur notre foi dans le Christ. Elles surgissent car le Christ et le Christianisme sont interprétés différemment par des gens différents, d'Eglises différentes et de façons différentes.

Ce fait est un scandale pour notre simple foi chrétienne. Mais c'est un fait dans notre monde. Les chrétiens ont tous la même foi simple, mais en fait ils sont très divisés les uns les autres (leurs églises, dans divers pays) par manque de compréhension, les uns se réputant meilleurs que les autres, etc.

Le scandale de nos séparations ne peut être surmonté que par un seul moyen — en essayant chacun de mieux connaître le Christ et de faire Sa volonté dans le monde. Cela est essentiel et a souvent été oublié dans l'activité oecuménique. Il y a une unité parmi nous qui existe déjà parce que le Christ est Un, et par conséquent tous ceux qui font partie de Son Corps, l'Eglise, sont un. Plus nous allons dans le fond de la vie spirituelle, plus nous participons aux richesses de la vie sacramentelle de l'Eglise, plus nous nous trouvons près de notre prochain, et plus nous pouvons l'aider et recevoir de lui. Ceci est un fait essentiel pour l'oecuménisme et ne devrait pas être oublié.

Mais ce n'est pas nécessairement ainsi que plus nous allons dans le fond de la vie spirituelle, plus nous nous trouvons près de notre prochain. Souvent notre vie spirituelle elle-même, qui est étroitement liée à la culture dans laquelle nous vivons, nous *éloigne* de notre frère. Ce n'est pas le Christ Un qui nous éloigne de notre frère, mais les moyens par lesquels nous arrivons au Christ Un, par exemple, notre vie dans l'Eglise locale. Et ici le scandale est — que le vrai moyen qui nous conduit plus près du Christ est aussi le moyen qui nous sépare de notre frère. Par conséquent, le mouvement oecuménique a essayé par toutes les manières possible de *comprendre* ce facteur de division, de l'isoler, pour ainsi dire, comme un médecin le ferait avec une mauvaise maladie, et de le soigner. Celui-ci a été l'effort du Mouvement Oecuménique depuis ce dernier siècle: examiner les problèmes de la foi et de l'Ordre, pour voir ce qui nous sépare réellement.

La maladie est malheureusement devenue mondiale. Il ne s'agit plus des Anglicans et des Presbytériens qui se disputent en Grande Bretagne, des nombreuses Eglises aux Etats Unis, de l'ancien débat Catholique-Protestant, ou du débat des Orthodoxes avec leurs frères occidentaux, mais dans le monde entier, les églises se méconnaissent l'une l'autre, et les Chrétiens ne se comprennent pas les uns les autres, pour pouvoir s'aider réellement les uns les autres, comme ils devraient le faire dans le Corps du Christ.

Il me semble que l'Eglise devrait être unie et forte face aux nombreuses autres religions et idéologies du monde, mais en fait elle ne l'est pas. Elle est faible et divisée. Les théologiens occidentaux se plaignent que les Chrétiens en Orient ne veulent pas *coopérer*. Les théologiens d'Orient refusent d'être *dominés* par la théologie et les théologiens occidentaux. Les africains essayent de se libérer de la domination des missionnaires et d'apporter en même temps leur contribution chrétienne à la construction de l'Eglise universelle. Ils se sentent frustrés car cette contribution n'est pas acceptée. On leur enseigne plutôt à devenir comme les Européens, etc. Les chrétiens d'Amériques du Sud ne

sont pas compris à cause de leur langage et de leur approche particulière à la foi, etc.

En effet, les problèmes de notre mouvement oecuménique moderne sont si vastes et sans solution que parfois nous désespérons de la vraie existence d'un *corps du Christ* dans le monde! Le but de la Bibliographie Oecuménique Internationale a été dès le début d'essayer de surmonter la honte de nos séparations. Elle a été fondée en 1965 par des professeurs protestants, des moines et des professeurs catholiques romains, des professeurs orthodoxes, des pasteurs protestants, des bibliothécaires romains, et des directeurs de l'Institut Oecuménique, etc. pour être un moyen de travail commun en vue de surmonter les barrières de la théologie et de la vie ecclésiale qui séparent les Chrétiens. Quelques-unes de ces personnes sont bien connues comme leaders du mouvement oecuménique (cfr. introduction I.O.B. jusqu'à Bd. 5). Les éditeurs de la I.O.B. ont donc publié 5 volumes comprenant tous les livres et les articles de valeur concernant l'oecuménisme depuis 1962. Des résumés des articles les plus importants y étaient inclus; ils soulignaient l'importance de l'article concernant le dialogue oecuménique. De cette manière, pendant les années après 1965 — l'époque du Concile Vatican, des Conférences Pan-Orthodoxes de Rhodes, des Assemblées du Conseil Mondial des Eglises — époque où tous les Chrétiens des diverses confessions commençaient à se connaître les uns les autres — pendant cette période de temps la I.O.B. était un petit moyen d'éviter le scandale de nos divisions. Elle a été élaborée, financée, mise ensemble, imprimée par des personnes de toute dénomination qui en ont parlé et discuté. Elle a donc eu un rôle oecuménique très important soit comme produit final (le livre) soit dans la préparation et les conséquences.

Quelle est la situation aujourd'hui? La I.O.B. a bien servi son temps, mais notre temps a changé. La I.O.B. doit devenir l'instrument d'une *rencontre oecuménique mondiale*. Les problèmes de l'oecuménisme sont maintenant immenses. Le dialogue qui doit être entamé et résolu est plus vaste que nous ne le pensions. Il inclut le monde entier!

Evidemment, cela ne signifie pas que nous ne devons pas essayer de revenir à l'unité qui caractérise nos églises — notre unité dans le Christ, et tâcher chacun de son côté de faire de notre mieux pour suivre le Christ dans notre vie pratique quotidienne, et de ce fait, trouver notre unité avec notre frère chrétien. En tant que membres du corps du Christ c'est là notre obligation principale. Mais il y a aussi un grand travail à faire sur les conflits fondamentaux et sur les problèmes qui submergent les chrétiens du monde dans leurs relations les uns avec les autres. Je voudrais mentionner certains de ces problèmes en vue de voir quelle est la tâche de la I.O.B. dans les années à venir.

Premièrement, il y a le problème de *Dieu et la Révélation*. La façon de regarder Dieu et la Révélation est radicalement différente dans la culture grecque, sur laquelle se base la plupart de notre théologie, et dans la culture africaine, par exemple. Les Africains voient Dieu comme étant rattaché à leurs ancêtres, adoré à travers la danse, etc. — les Grecs d'autre part le voyaient comme étant une idée fixe. Ces diversités d'approche de Dieu sont à l'origine de beaucoup de difficultés que nous affrontons dans l'effort de construire aujourd'hui une théologie oecuménique.

Deuxièmement, le problème de l'*Eglise*. L'Eglise embrasse-t-elle tout le monde, comme Pieris et d'autres partisans modernes de la théorie "sacramentelle" de l'Eglise l'affirment? L'Eglise embrasse-t-elle les Protestants, les Orthodoxes, les Catholiques? Existe-t-il une unité fondamentale qui unie tout le genre humain? Les penseurs qui ont souligné le plus l'unité du genre humain, tels que Bulgakov, Rahner, Panikkar, Pieris, etc., ont également jeté les fondements de l'unité parmi les membres des diverses Eglises, car si nous sommes unis avec un non-chrétien sur la base de notre nature humaine commune (que Dieu aime), alors nous sommes certainement un avec notre frère chrétien qui partage avec nous la même foi dans le Christ.

Mais y a-t-il véritablement un "Corps du Christ" dans le monde? Y a-t-il une unité parmi tous les Chrétiens? Comment comprend-on cela dans le monde? Est-ce un fait réel que tous les Chrétiens, d'Afrique, d'Europe, d'Asie, d'Amérique latine, *comptent l'un sur l'autre, et se soutiennent l'un l'autre*? Les chrétiens font-ils partie d'un corps "sacramentel" dans le monde qui est uni en lui-même et qui témoigne aux autres l'amour de Jésus Christ? Dans un moment nous reviendrons sur cette idée de l'existence d'un "corps du Christ" dans le monde, qui en même temps est uni et parle du Christ à tous les hommes et à toutes les religions.

Une autre question très pressante est la suivante: il n'y a pas seulement une unité du corps du Christ, il y a une *unité de théologie* dans le monde. Existe-t-il une théologie oecuménique? Ici nous touchons un défi extrêmement difficile qui se pose aujourd'hui aux chrétiens. Par exemple, il y a actuellement un grand problème entre les vues mondiales de l'Orient et celles de l'Occident. Les théologiens d'Orient et des pays d'Europe traversent un moment difficile dans la compréhension mutuelle. Les théologiens des pays occidentaux accusent leurs collègues orientaux de manquer de bonne foi, de ne pas coopérer (dans des projets adaptés aux modèles de l'Occident); les théologiens d'Orient réclament leur liberté d'envisager de tels projets et ils croient parler au nom du Dieu des Chrétiens quand ils interpellent leurs collègues de l'Occident. D'autre part, ils désirent que la foi chrétienne soit comprise et mise en pratique à la manière orientale.

Par exemple: la philosophie chinoise est en train de devenir très importante dans l'élaboration d'une théologie chinoise chrétienne. Les humanistes chinois essayent d'élaborer un système théologique chrétien basé sur les enseignements du Ciel et de la Terre et qui se trouvent dans la philosophie de Confucius et dans d'autres philosophies chinoises. La théologie chrétienne qu'ils sont en train de développer est très élevée et très belle — elle fait du christianisme une vraie foi chinoise indigène. Mais dès que les chinois et les autres peuples de l'Orient essayent d'élaborer leur propre théologie, les professeurs des pays occidentaux leur disent: *allons, dialogons!* Nous ne comprenons pas du tout votre interprétation de la foi chrétienne, mais nous voulons la comprendre (cfr. plusieurs professeurs de Suisse et d'Allemagne). Mais les Orientaux répondent: il n'y a pas de lien particulier entre votre théologie et la nôtre. Bien plus, votre théologie est épuisée, vous avez crû en Karl Barth et seulement dans la "Révélation" et maintenant ce dernier est discrédité en Occident car bien des gens se rendent compte qu'il y a beaucoup de

valeur salvatrice dans les "religions". Pourquoi donc, devrions-nous dialoguer avec vous si vous n'êtes pas sûrs de vous-mêmes. Nous essaierons d'élaborer notre propre théologie basée sur notre propre philosophie.

Je crois que ce refus de l'occidental de la part des théologiens orientaux peut être en grande partie justifié. L'Occident est théologiquement dans un grand chaos, et le sécularisme semble aspiré toute sa force et le rendre incapable de traiter les thèmes "transcendants". Il existe donc ici, un grand défi pour notre travail dans la I.O.B. Comment pouvons-nous apporter de la lumière dans ce conflit où la théologie chrétienne orientale se développe sans l'aide des théologiens européens et elle en arrive même à les dédaigner? La question fondamentale est ici la suivante: Y a-t-il une "unité de théologie"? Nous devons peut-être attendre un peu avant que chaque église nationale élabore sa propre théologie indigène, et ensuite, quand cela aura été accompli, considérer tous les résultats, et essayer de les mettre ensemble d'une manière ou d'une autre. Nous aurons alors une théologie oecuménique. Je pense qu'il s'agit là d'une démarche très nécessaire, mais nous ne devons pas nous borner à attendre et permettre ainsi à plusieurs théologies locales de se développer sans essayer en même temps de voir si une "unité de théologie" ne serait pas possible. Cette unité devrait allier les qualités mystérieuses des théologies orientales avec les qualités pratiques des théologies occidentales - leur intérêt pour le sécularisme, etc.

En disant cela je ne voudrais pas que l'on pense que j'exclus les autres théologies, par exemple, celle africaine. Ici nous avons une théologie qui est basée sur une culture animiste et je crois que l'une des tâches majeures de la Chrétienté aujourd'hui est de résoudre le conflit qui surgit quand des Chrétiens qui ont une origine animiste comme en Indonésie, en Corée et en Afrique essayent de travailler ensemble avec des Chrétiens d'origine gréco-romaine, par exemple, la plupart des européens et des américains du Nord. Mais, en revenant encore une fois sur ce problème d'une "unité de théologie" - elle devrait comprendre dans son sens idéal aussi bien les formes de la pensée orientale que celles de la pensée occidentale, les concepts et les perspectives de vie fondamentaux de ceux provenant de cultures animistes. C'est une tâche immense! Je viens de mentionner quelques-unes des difficultés qui se posent devant la création d'une théologie qui serait en même temps orientale et occidentale, et nous nous trouvons soudain devant un autre monde de pensée - l'animiste - et nous nous rendons compte de la vraie limite de nos possibilités.

Dans l'avenir il y aura certainement beaucoup de difficultés et de travail pour la I.O.B. - résoudre tous ces problèmes sera une tâche qui prendra des siècles d'efforts. La I.O.B., si elle est consciente de la nature des problèmes que l'Eglise doit affronter dans le monde et que nous avons essayé de discuter, peut avoir un rôle important - celui de documenter cette discussion parmi les très diverses théologies et d'y contribuer. Car si nous recueillons en un livre toutes les diverses vues mondiales chrétiennes, il sera plus facile pour les humanistes de savoir quelles sont l'étendue et l'importance du problème qu'ils sont en train de traiter. Notre tâche est de prendre acte des nombreux aspects de ce problème.

Etant donné la longueur de ce texte, je voudrais à

présent en faire une brève conclusion: Nous pouvons revenir à notre point de départ et discuter la relation de la foi chrétienne avec les religions non-chrétiennes. C'est par rapport aux hommes d'autres confessions que l'Eglise doit avoir une *unité dans sa mission*. Les hommes des autres confessions nous défient de savoir quelle est notre mission. Comprendre ce qu'est notre mission signifie, *premièrement*, pressentir qu'il existe un vrai "corps du Christ" dans le monde, et que tous les Chrétiens de n'importe quelle partie du monde, en font partie. *Deuxièmement*, nous avons besoin d'une "unité de théologie" à travers laquelle nous pouvons exprimer à notre prochain non-chrétien ce que nous croyons. Comme nous l'avons vu plus haut, il s'agit de quelque chose de très difficile à réaliser, avec tant d'interprétations de la foi chrétienne, et la I.O.B. a un rôle spécial à jouer en vue de faire connaître ces différentes interprétations, pour que nous puissions travailler en vue d'une unité de théologie.

Je n'ignore pas les problèmes sérieux qui se posent à nous tous dans cette tâche. Du point de vue des Protestants et des Orthodoxes dans le Conseil Mondial, il y a en ce moment beaucoup à faire pour surmonter le fossé qui existe entre la façon gréco-romaine de penser et d'agir et la manière africaine (ou asiatique) de penser. Au sein de l'Eglise Catholique Romaine, il existe certainement beaucoup de problèmes pour ce qui est de la réalisation d'une "unité de théologie". Certains croient en une perspective sacramentelle de la relation avec les religions non-chrétiennes tels que Pieris et Raymond Panikkar, certains croient que l'Eglise comprend seulement les croyants, et certains au contraire sont incorporés dans la vie ecclésiale. Il existe un vrai débat à ce propos qui doit arriver à une solution. D'autre part, pour ce qui est du problème de l'unité de l'Eglise, les Catholiques romains sont divisés - certains considèrent l'unité comme étant fondée seulement sur l'Eglise romaine; d'autres croient que l'unité s'étend en dehors pour englober tous les chrétiens, ou même, dans certains cas les non-croyants.

Avec tous ces problèmes à résoudre, je crois que nous nous rendons compte de combien il nous est nécessaire de travailler pour une *unité dans la mission*, et cela peut être fait seulement si nous connaissons les facteurs qui nous séparent, si nous les publions (comme dans la I.O.B.) et en discutons, et si nous arrivons, alors, à l'unité dans le corps du Christ, dans laquelle nous tous espérons.

Charles Graves

Des informations ultérieures pour la collaboration avec la I.O.B. seront données sur demande. Les adresses principales de la bibliographie sont: 262, rue de Morat - 1700 Fribourg (Suisse) et: Dr. Charles Graves, 150 route de Ferney - 1211 Genève (Suisse).

Actuellement la I.O.B. cherche à créer un réseau de collaborateurs pour recueillir du matériel d'Asie, d'Afrique et d'Amérique latine. Si votre Institut peut faire des suggestions à propos de collaborateurs, la I.O.B. aimerait recevoir les informations suivantes:

1) Pour quelle nation ou domaine le collaborateur serait-il responsable?

2) Pour quel genre de matériel, le collaborateur serait-il responsable: journaux, livres, documents de conférences, thèses?

Etant donné que la I.O.B. est déjà en contact avec

des personnes pour faire ce travail, on espère qu'il n'y aura pas d'efforts superflus. En ce moment on reçoit de l'aide du Ghana (Prot.), des Philippines (Prot.), du Japon (Prot. et Cath. Rom.), de la Corée (Prot.), du Chili (Pentecôtistes), de l'Inde (Prot.), du Sri Lanka (Cath.), du Zambie (Cath.), d'Hong Kong (Prot.), de l'Afrique Orientale (Prot.), des Etats Unis (théologie noire), du Viet Nam (Cath.), de la Colombie (Cath.), du Cameroun (Prot. et Cath. Rom.). Ces collaborateurs peuvent naturellement demander l'aide d'autres personnes intéressées.

Du matériel a été recueilli depuis 1966, bien que nous nous concentrons actuellement sur celui de 1969 et 1970. Du matériel dans des langues non-européennes est incluí, avec une translittération et si possible un résumé dans une langue européenne.

La I.O.B. est un projet informel conjoint du Conseil Mondial des Eglises et du Secrétariat pour l'Unité des Chrétiens du Vatican.

THE CANTERBURY STATEMENT, 1973, A COMMENT

Robert Martineau, in his book *The Office and Work of a Priest* (Mowbrays, London, 1972), writes: "Priesthood is a gift of God to the Church and through the Church to the world. By looking at priesthoods and trying to find some pattern in what God enables them to do and in what kind of people, by the grace of God, they become, we can see what it is that God is giving to the Church through its ordained priesthood" (op. cit., p. viii).

This sentence provides a good starting-point for analysis and discussion of the *Agreed Statement on Ministry*, published in London on December 13 by S.P.C.K. This document represents the second major agreement of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, and is designed to be understood in relation with the *Agreed Statement on the Eucharist* of 1971.

The two churches, Anglican and Roman Catholic, are now in dialogue with each other in the persons of their accredited representatives. These representatives have made for the second time a unanimous decision. They have sought and received permission from their respective authorities to publish their reports, which are offered for wide and careful study. Ultimately, of course, when the work of the Commission is done, there will come a time of decision and commitment for the churches themselves, because dialogue is not envisaged (mercifully!) as a permanent state of christian relationship. This dialogue, however, is designed to create a new context of thought within which divisive issues, handled very abrasively in the past, may be truthfully and charitably resolved.

By means of its painstaking work of research and elucidation the International Commission, we may believe, has the capacity of demonstrating that no insoluble theological differences need divide the Anglican and Roman Catholic communities, provided that the members of these two churches really wish to live together in one organic unity. The theological successes of the Commission highlight sharply this other and deeper source of trouble. Step by step the

three major theological issues (Eucharist, Ministry, Authority) are being clarified, and recognitions of identity of faith within diversity of forms are being made; but the fundamental problem of inciting the will to unity remains. No international commission, however eminent its membership, can solve that, because it is, I believe, part of the problem of sin. All disunity (not only within the Church) is sin against love, and is all the more serious for the Christian because the Love whom he serves has a personal Name and has Himself made the mission of His Church depend for its effectiveness upon the unity in love of His People (S. John 17, 20-23). Nothing less than a spiritual resurrection of the Christian People is called for. No mere re-integration, re-absorption, or recovery could be adequate, whilst the renewal provoked must be of such a kind that the priorities of the Gospel are given an evident and compelling place within all our other interests, activities, and relationships with one another.

The question of Ministry has a special importance in discussion between Anglicans and Roman Catholics because of the peculiar, even melodramatic, situation introduced by the absolute condemnation of the Holy Orders of the Anglican Church on the part of Pope Leo XIII. To this condemnation, but within the terms of argument proposed by the Pope, the Archbishops of England made a dignified and effective reply. Since that time much historical information on the background of the papal decision has come to light, and, to say the least, not all of this reflects creditably on some of the Roman Catholic personalities involved. On the Anglican side it is important to recognize that: "For our own part we are sure, and have always been sure, that the apostolical succession has never been broken in the Church of England, and that a valid formula of consecration has been continually maintained" (Letter to the Archbishop of Utrecht from the Archbishop of Canterbury, July 1925, published in G. K. Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity* 1920-1930, Second Edition, p. 65).

In view of this absolute impasse it was important for the International Commission to go behind and beyond the situation of contradiction by evaluating the doctrine of ministry held in both Churches, by looking at its biblical origins and post-biblical developments, and by considering what the ministers of both Churches do *to-day* and what they believe about themselves. We both exemplify the same fundamental forms of ministry: bishop, priest and deacon. Do we share the same faith on this essential matter where the Commission considers that "doctrine admits no divergence"? (Paragraph 17 of the *Agreed Statement on Ministry*). The encouraging and unanimous answer of the Commission is: "Yes, We do", and that an agreement indispensable for unity has been achieved.

The first papers on Ministry were prepared at Venice in 1970 and led to some discussion after their publication in 1971. The present document, however, states the issues in a more developed and complete form – not, be it noted, all the issues, because only some aspects of the doctrine of Ministry and Ordination have been in dispute between us. The four major themes treated are: – the rôle of the ordained ministry within the life of the christian community; the priestly nature of this rôle of ministry; ordination; and aposto-

lic succession. These themes are studied and expounded in the context of the doctrine of the Church in its mission to the world. Basic agreement is claimed in areas of controversy which have previously obscured common convictions about the ministry.

When we speak of Ministry, Priesthood and Ordination within the Church, our discussion must take place within a context of christology and of ecclesiology, because we are really speaking of Christ-in-His-Church. This Presence is a mystery with many dimensions of reality.

The Preface of the Anglican Ordinal claims an august lineage for the three sacred Orders of our Church. Anglicans find these claims to antiquity sufficiently convincing. The *Agreed Statement on Ministry*, however, has been wise not to reduce the problems between us at this level to any question as to who possesses the more ancient pedigree! Presumably such an issue could be resolved by reference to the College of Heralds. The apostolicity of the Church is strongly affirmed, however. If our ministers are "anointed to preach good tidings unto the meek, to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound" (*Isaiah* 61, 1), it does not help to say: "I am an old priest. You are a new presbyter. I have been here for a very long time"! Apostolicity goes with catholicity and both are 'marks' primarily of the Church. The question as to who has the correct historical lineage of Orders, although not unimportant, is a secondary and historical question. It may be more relevant to ask: which community, Anglican or Roman Catholic, proclaims the Gospel with respect for its integrity and self-given priorities?

Certain things about Ministry and Priesthood within the Church are held within Anglican Tradition which are very precious and very important. These are all expressed and safeguarded in the new *Agreement on Ministry*.

First, in the Anglican Tradition of Ministry, whether as Bishop, Priest or Deacon, there is a tremendous, even awesome sense of vocation. He who serves thus, the Church affirms, may not do so unless he is called of God to this office and ministry. Bishop, Priest and Deacon, in Anglican Tradition, be it noted, are not 'ranks' or 'grades' of ministry, but Holy Orders. Between 'rank' and 'Holy Order' is the difference between divine calling and function and sacramental status and mere bureaucratic or social status. The fact of divine vocation to Holy Orders, the response to this by the minister himself, and the recognition of it by the Church in the person of both people and Bishop, are all essential ingredients in our understanding of our offices of ministry.

Secondly, in Anglican Faith and Order, there is a strong emphasis upon the apostolic character of our Orders. We mean by this that we believe ourselves to possess all that is essential in matters of historical descent, if we wish to pose that problem between ourselves and other Christians, or they with us. More importantly, we mean that there is a kind of 'sacramental identity of activity' between what we do in ministry and that which was proclaimed and done by the Lord and His Apostles: we believe not only that we are authorized to do these things, but that we do what they did, or, put more correctly, that He

fulfils in us what He fulfilled in them. This is what the Agreement refers to when it speaks of the priestly rôle of Jesus being 'reflected in' His ministers (Paragraph 13).

Thirdly, Anglican Tradition stresses heavily the pastoral character of ministry. The episcopal charges and examinations of the candidates in the context of Ordination make this very plain. The Church, in its Servant-form, continues and fulfils the ministry of Christ. He Himself remains always the archetype of all patterns of ministry, and He established His lordship, as S. Paul teaches in the celebrated passage of *Philippians* 2, 5-11, in the shattered dignity of our humanity. This means for an Anglican, not that unity, sanctity, apostolicity, catholicity are unimportant, but that they are supremely important, and that above all else, above even these qualifications of Church and ministry, dominates that unique, man-centred value which we call love, so that, in a radical sense, without love, no ministry, however ancient its credentials, has moral value or authentically christian spiritual life.

We must now begin to teach together what we profess by these Agreements on Eucharist, Ministry and Ordination to believe in common.

Harry Reynolds Smythe,
Representative in Rome
of the Anglican Communion,
Director of the Anglican Centre, Rome.

THE CANTERBURY STATEMENT: AN ANGLICAN COMMENT

When the Agreed Statement of the Anglican/Roman-Catholic International Commission on the doctrine of the Eucharist (the "Windsor Statement") was published, many people in both communions were astonished that agreement could have been reached on a matter which had been a subject of violent contention for centuries, and there was a tendency to look upon the achievement as a brilliant *tour de force*. Closer attention, however, showed that the contention had been largely due to limited and biased theological outlooks, which more profound scholarship, both theological and historical, in both communions had shown to be either secondary or mutually reconcilable. Even when this had been recognised, it was anticipated that agreement about the Ministry would be much more difficult to reach. Apart from anything else, the condemnation of Anglican orders as "absolutely null and utterly void" by Pope Leo XIII in the document *Apostolicae curae* seemed to present a virtually insuperable obstacle. Nevertheless, the Agreed Statement on the Ministry and Ordination (the "Canterbury Statement") has appeared, and, although it both needs and invites critical and sympathetic examination, the degree of agreement which it embodies is indeed remarkable. As the Statement itself says, "it seeks to express our basic agreement in the doctrinal areas that have been the source of controversy between us, in the wider context of our common convictions about the ministry" (parag. 1).

The avoidance of a direct consideration of *Apostolicae curae* was not, in my opinion, mere cowardice. In Bishop Clark's words, "to agree as to what is a bishop

or priest does not give an answer to the question where he is to be found — there are other factors to be taken into consideration” (*Ministry and Ordination*, p. 5). Such historical research, both as regards the inside history of *Apostolicae curae* and as regards the commonly held views at the end of the Middle Ages on the Eucharist and the priesthood, as is embodied in Dr. John J. Hughes’ books *Absolutely Null and Utterly Void* and *Stewards of the Lord* must be relevant to any future consideration of the validity of Anglican orders. The agreed statement wisely made no attempt to settle that matter, though it was frankly conscious of its existence and of its own ultimate relation to it. It asserts that “the development of the thinking in our two communions regarding the nature of the Church and of the Ordained Ministry, as represented in our Statement, has, we consider, put these issues in a new context” (parag. 17).

What, one may ask, has made possible the agreement which was possible in 1973 and which would have been quite impossible in 1897?

First of all, a great deal of research in the New Testament and the patristic workings has shown that in the early church the structure and functions of the ministry were less rigid than they became later on. This does not discredit the later forms, but it reduces to some degree their normative and mandatory character. The relation of this to the whole question of doctrinal and ecclesiological development — that burning question in contemporary theology — is obvious. Vatican II showed commendable caution when it said that “by divine institution bishops have succeeded to the place of the apostles as shepherds of the Church” (*Lumen Gentium*, parag. 20), without specifying the precise relation between the two or the time and manner of that divine institution.

This is, however, not the only issue involved, nor is it the most important. Far more central are the way in which the statement locates the ministry in the context of the Church and the way in which it sees the liturgical aspect of the ministry as united with its other aspects — pastoral, evangelistic and so on. The essence of the priesthood is not simply identified with power over the sacramental body of Christ, nor is the ecclesial body of Christ — the Church — seen as a kind of appendage of the priesthood. Not, indeed, that the Eucharist and the other sacramental rites are downgraded. In the words of the statement, (quote parag. 13. “So our two traditions . . . as a living sacrifice”).

There is, however, no concession to the common Protestant view that the minister is nothing more than a layman who has been given some special functions, the view expressed, for example, by Paul Tillich, that a minister differs from a layman only by his training. The statement says explicitly “Their ministry (sc. that of the ordained ministers) is not an extension of the common Christian priesthood but belongs to another realm of the gifts of the spirit” (parag. 14). The phrase “another realm” has been criticised as theologically unfamiliar and it does perhaps need amplification; nevertheless it makes it clear that the ordained ministry is something distinct from the general priesthood of the Church, though it exists within the Church and for the Church’s welfare. In spite of its different language the Statement seems fully in agreement with Vatican II when the latter says “Though they differ

from one another in essence and not only in degree, the common priesthood of the faithful and the ministerial or hierarchical priesthood are nonetheless interrelated. Each of them in its own special way is a participation in the one priesthood of Christ” (*Lumen Gentium*, parag. 10).

The Statement concludes with a section on Vocation and Ordination, in which it is stressed that vocation is a call which comes through the Church and not just directly to the individual. “Those who are ordained are called by Christ in the Church and through the Church. Not only is their vocation from Christ but their qualification for exercising such a ministry is the gift of the Spirit . . . This is expressed in ordination, when the bishop prays God to grant the gift of the Holy Spirit and lays hands on the candidate as the outward sign of the gifts bestowed” (parag. 14). It is stressed that both communions have the threefold ministry of bishops, presbyters and deacons and that bishops are the ministers of ordination. The ordination of a bishop by other bishops is seen as implying both the reception of the new bishop into the existing episcopal college and also his historical continuity with the original apostolic ministry. Important significance is seen in the fact that ordination takes place in the context of the Eucharist, a fact which, I would remark, is not common in the Protestant churches. Skillful and scholarly exposition has already been given of the fact that “priest” can mean both *presbyter* and *hieruus* and the way in which the latter word came legitimately to be applied to the ordained minister, although in the New Testament the Christian minister is never explicitly described as *hieruus* (parag. 13).

The Statement sees the ministry as having a wide and inclusive character: “the part of the ministers in the celebration of the sacraments is one with their responsibility for ministry of the word” (parag. 11). The pastoral nature of the Christian priesthood is emphasized in the assertion that the ministers are “not only the persons who normally administer baptism, but also those who admit converts to the communion of the faithful and restore those who have fallen away” (*ibid.*). Explicit reference is made to the “authority to pronounce God’s forgiveness of sin, given to bishops and presbyters at their ordination” (*ibid.*), and I would remind you that in the Anglican ordinal, the words that accompany the laying of the bishop’s hands on the head of the deacon who is being raised to the presbyterate are the following:

“Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou forgive they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of his holy Sacraments; In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen”.

To have recovered and maintained the conception of the priesthood as an essentially pastoral ministry has been one of the glories of Anglicanism since the sixteenth century. The Agreed Statement makes no claim to be perfect and indeed it admits its own incompleteness. I will conclude by quoting one criticism which was made in *my hearing* by one of the most sympathetic of our bishops, namely that insufficient attention was paid in the Statement to the actual worshiping life of the

Church. *Lex orandi, lex credenti*, that it is normal in Anglican churches for the Eucharist to be celebrated at least once every Sunday and in many churches every day, that the sacrament of penance, while not compulsory upon the faithful, is a normal part of Anglican pastoral practice, that confirmation by a bishop is the normal prerequisite to communicant status, and that the anointing of the sick is more and more widely used, — these facts are by implication of deep theological significance. Furthermore, in missionary areas the primary pastoral problem for Anglicans and Roman Catholics is the same, namely how to keep the faithful in regular and frequent contact with the sacramental Eucharistic life of the Church. This is not a problem in the same way for the Protestant bodies, for most of which sacramental participation, while taken seriously, is much less frequent and normative. The pastoral tasks of the Anglican and Roman Catholic priests are, not only theologically but practically, identical, and it may be through facing together their common pastoral problems and not only by discussions engaged in by theologians that Anglicans and Roman Catholics will reach that visible unity for which they all pray.

Eric Mascall

IS THERE AN ECUMENICAL DIMENSION TO THE HOLY YEAR?

Some difficulties and desires in reference to the proclamation of the next celebration of the Holy Year in 1975.

Pope Paul VI, announcing his decision to celebrate the Holy Year, stressed its fundamental aspect during the talk he gave at one of his weekly audiences last May. (1) The Holy Year will aim to be a special time of renewal and interior conversion: "In view of the variety of purposes it is necessary to stress what is the essential concept of the Holy Year. It is the interior renewal of man . . ." (2)

What is most striking in the Holy Father's words is a certain analogy between his words and the expressions employed by the Second Vatican Council in speaking of the need for conversion and interior renewal, especially in the texts applied to spiritual ecumenism in the *Decree on Ecumenism*. There, among other things, we read: "There is no genuine ecumenism without an inward conversion. Longings for unity are the product, the ripened fruit, of renewal of the inner life, self-denial and the generous bestowal of charity". (3)

We find several similar affirmations in the texts from the world ecumenical assemblies. (4)

This initial similarity of expressions is sheathed in a second analogy which appears in the theme itself of the Holy Year — "reconciliation". Just as the Holy Year, the ecumenical movement tends to effect the full reconciliation, and even more, the full communion among Christians in order that their unity may be a sign of reconciliation for the entire human family. Without doubt, this theme of the Holy Year was not chosen lightly and implies a specific orientation of the initiative proposed to the catholic faithful. (5) The relation between this perspective and the ecumenical reality has been taken up by some commentators. (6)

Finally, we may find another indirect affinity with ecclesial orientation between ecumenical life and the orientation of the Holy Year, in the relation between the celebration of 1975 and the 10th anniversary of the council as specified in the pontifical texts. (7)

The Holy Year, having been announced in this way, and *integrating* the celebration of the 10th anniversary of the Second Vatican Council, is very naturally placed in the Council's line of action and reflection. It is clear that, as the Pope says, one of the renovating aspects of the last council, was its opening to ecumenism.

I. SOME DIFFICULTIES

Some objections were made after Paul VI made the first proclamation. It is proper and in accord with the ecumenical attitude to take cognizance of these objections and, therefore, perhaps propose some suggestions for their solution.

A general difficulty

Apart from the fact that the Holy Father uses a language and expresses himself in terms close to those of ecumenism, or that he even adopts the approaches which encircle the ecumenical undertaking itself, we do not find a direct or explicit relation indicated in the official proclamation between the proposed objective for the Holy Year and the reconciliation among Christians to which the ecumenical movement attempts to contribute. Should this relation be made?

In fact, the general criticism rather touches the validity of the external forms of the Holy Year and the possibility of harmonizing these latter with other actual developments which are ecumenical in character. The questions posed in this domain seem to arise from the same basic question, which we may express in these terms: Do the two ways of renewal in the Church — the ecumenical way and the invitation to Christian renewal within the framework of the Holy Year — block one another or do they interact?

To put the question more directly: does not the actual ecumenical undertaking and its spiritual manifestations render the resumption of the tradition of "jubilee years" or "holy years" superfluous? If we consider, moreover, those regions where ecumenism is progressing only with difficulty, we ask ourselves if it would not be better to inculcate a better understanding of interior renewal in the spirit of ecumenism, which has not yet been fully accepted in the minds of the catholic faithful.

And finally, where ecumenical work is already well developed, but meets with a "zone of indifference" because of results which sometimes are judged slow or unsatisfactory, we do not see immediately or always how one of the two ecclesial initiatives could contribute to the welfare and the deepening of the other. Furthermore, it seems that the Pope himself raised the larger question concerning the validity of this form of tradition for our present world. (8) Here we touch upon a reaction which is not specific to the ecumenical area but which extends to the larger and more complex domain of pastoral adaptations and reinterpretations of the forms of ecclesial tradition in the culture of our time.

The special moment

Having presented this first problem, we can relate it to the question of whether or not there is need for a "special time" or a "particular year" dedicated to striving for interior conversion and justice among men. (9) Pope Paul has not failed to mention that his decision was taken after reflection upon this point.

The opportunity for a "special moment" is naturally linked to that of a "gathering place". Will not the concentration of faithful, visitors, and curiosity seekers be a "gross tourist affair" rather than a witness to interior conversion? (10)

How can we safeguard the character of simplicity and poverty in one or several gatherings *in order not to stress the impression of 'power and grandeur' of what some call 'Roman ecclesiastical power'?* A show of this style could accent the contempt of our Christian brothers toward the Church of Rome.

Along side these more general difficulties concerning the validity or the timeliness of a Holy Year as such, we may find some others which are directed at the form of events correlary to the Holy Year celebration. The criticisms made in this domain touch more upon the style and the manner in which the Holy Year is currently presented and lived by the catholic faithful. Let us not forget in this respect, that the institution of the practice of 'jubilee years' goes back to a time which, from an ecumenical viewpoint, could be described as the period between 'two great schisms'. Not without reason then, our Christian brothers of the other Churches have divided sentiments about this period of Church history – sentiments which have often been transmitted from one generation to another, and at times, lived unconsciously as generalized resentment. In conformity with the wishes of the Council, we must take into account this situation, and for our part, purify what has been lacking in fidelity to the Lord. Further, we can force ourselves to set aside certain misunderstandings caused by the way we express our thoughts and life. (11)

The problem of indulgences

The biggest difficulty which must be noted in this context concerning traditional expressions is that of the concept of indulgences – often taken in its popular and sometimes, impaired form. The general director of the Commission – Faith and Order, has voiced this objection, and he states it clearly in his recent article, "L'année sainte, une occasion à saisir pour l'œcuménisme" – ("The Holy Year an opportunity for ecumenism"). (12)

How can we clarify Catholic doctrine in this matter and communicate it to large sectors of the faithful people? Certain proposals that the secretary for the Commission of Migration and Tourism made in an article devoted to the timeliness of pilgrimages, could inspire us in this respect. (13)

The author concludes his study with a triple proposal that we can take up here within the framework of the Holy Year at the three levels indicated: draw up a manual in simple and direct style for the use of the faithful, the content of which will integrate the essential ecumenical ideas, and expose the true catholic

doctrine of the spiritual fruits of the Christian life; – exercise continuous care in the preparation of those who will assist the visitors (a few sessions of ecumenical sensitization are needed here); – foresee meetings among the leaders of this pastoral area at to the local level and integrate therein an explicit ecumenical dimension.

Clarification by means of these three channels would seem to contribute to an overcoming of misunderstandings, especially with reference to indulgences, and would thus favor the search for Unity of the Churches by expressing certain conceptions still spread among the people in a way more in conformity with catholic truth.

The context and forms of invitation addressed to our Christian brothers

Another difficulty concerning the events connected with the Holy Year is that of its ecclesiological presentation within the ecumenical context, and of the way in which our Christian brothers are invited to be interested and to participate in the Holy Year.

At this point, we recall the Holy Year of 1950, and it is good to remind ourselves of the proposals of Pastor Boegner which he published at the end of the year, and which sum up the negative reaction of the Protestant world to the Pope's paternal call, inviting them to the "Great Return". (14) We understand that a certain fear may be reawakened among our Christian brothers in finding themselves once again confronted with "the invitation to the 'Great Return' of all Christians to Rome".

The Council wished to avoid the ambiguities of a way toward Christian unity seen simply as the "pure and simple return to Roman obedience". We cannot ignore how sensitive our Christian brothers are about this matter. (15)

The memory of certain manifestations connected with the Holy Year

Here again we are dealing with the memory of an event which does not touch the Holy Year as such. However, we may sense a fear in some occasional reactions, that celebrations on the occasion of the Holy Year may have certain unpleasant repercussions within the framework of ecumenical dialogue.

And in this respect, the development of the 1950 Holy Year serves as an indication, particularly as concerns the celebrations of the 15th of August of that year.

In the article cited above, Pastor Boegner gives a description and judgment of the repercussions of the solemn definition of the Marian dogma on the 15th of August 1950, within the ecumenical context of that time. (16)

Certain reservations or contemptuous reactions may be better understood and respected when we recall the circumstances of the commentaries by Christians or by the leaders of other Churches.

II. DESIRES

Apart from attempting to surmount the difficulties, what can be done so that the Holy Year may be

truly a sign of concord and reconciliation, especially among Christians? How can the celebration of the Holy Year be best harmonized with the ecumenical life of the Church?

The Holy Year and its biblical parallel

A first and urgent desire is to relate the Holy Year with biblical tradition. It is not sufficient to relate — in an exterior way — this initiative dating from the year 1300 to the Old Testament practice. Above all, we must explain the continuity of divine revelation through both expressions of faith. (17)

The Council recognized the original contribution concerning the knowledge of sacred texts made by our Christian brothers of the Churches and communities which have issued from the Western Reform. (18) Is there not therein a particularly rich domain from which our Christian brothers can contribute towards a deepening of biblical knowledge?

From exchanges and common studies on the Old Testament “jubilee”, the dimensions of biblical “reconciliation” and “the visit to the temple” could contribute in this sense to a better preparation for the Holy Year, whether at the local level or throughout a broader sector of society.

The Holy Year and the aspect of pilgrimage

Another desire proposed is to center the Holy Year on the aspect of spiritual pilgrimage that is implied therein and the dimensions of this reality for Christian life.

In this respect, a question is raised immediately as to the form and place of pilgrimage. What is the ‘better’ pilgrimage in an ecumenical framework? (19)

We certainly cannot ask, in the present period of ecumenical contacts, that all our Christian brothers consider the pilgrimage to Rome as the most perfect expression of conversion of heart and of total reconciliation with the Lord in the way that the ecumenical movement seeks this conversion and reconciliation. It suffices to recall the reactions to the invitation addressed by the Holy Father in 1950 in terms described then by Pastor Boegner as “a warm and paternal invitation to the Great Return.” (20)

Here we find ourselves faced with a question susceptible of creating some misunderstanding. In fact, we can consider the Holy Year as an initiative specific to the Church of Rome, or we can present it as a Christian initiative in the broader sense.

In the ecumenical movement, each Church is called to express itself in all its dimensions and to actualize all the riches of its tradition at the same time as it continually purifies them. (21) It is therefore evident that likewise the Church of Rome follow and realize its own tradition. Out of respect for the originality and the specific contribution of the Church of Rome, it will be possible to develop the meaning of a larger common sharing. The Pope seemingly intends to express this aim in his letter to the Cardinal Vicar for the Diocese of Rome. (22)

Therefore it is normal that the Church of Rome play a particular role in this initiative which is of interest to the entire catholic Church.

How then can we conceive the passage from

Catholic specificity to broader Christian participation?

First of all let us note here the recent outbreak of pilgrimages, due in part to the mobility of people today, especially the young. This revaluation is manifest in a twofold way within Christianity: a search for the value of credibility and common deepening of faith, and a will to serve those who suffer in the spirit of hope and charity. (23)

Taking advantage of the search for “special moments” of Christian life, combined with the great mobility of persons and groups, a comparison can be made between these aspirations and the actual ecumenical reality.

If the Holy Year has been defined as a “special moment” of Christian life, it must be said that the ecumenical movement also has its special moments.

Among these, the Week of Prayer for Unity occupies a central place. (24) The theme and the spiritual orientation of the Week of Prayer are determined by previous agreement among the Churches and Christian communities. It is well to ask about the possibility of harmonizing the expressions of this movement toward ecclesial conversion. (25) Could not the Week of Prayer for the jubilee year 1975 be the occasion for the Church of Rome to make a gesture of penance and conversion and fraternal charity (perhaps a sharing collection for the benefit of the deprived), carried out at the visible center of Catholicism before receiving pilgrims from the local churches?

Further, could we not envisage within the framework of pilgrimages an “itinerary of reconciliation in the footsteps of the apostles” — or could it perhaps take the form of a pilgrimage to the great sanctuaries and spiritual centers of the Churches and Christian communities? What would be the place of Jerusalem and the Holy Land?

An ecumenical dimension at the very beginning of the Holy Year would at the same time permit us to valorize the specific character of this ecclesial initiative of the catholic Church, and on the other hand, to articulate it with the dialogue of union and reconciliation among the Churches.

The Week of Prayer, coming just at the beginning of the Holy Year would give it a sense of reconciliation among Christians immediately after its solemn inauguration. The expression of pilgrimage thus proposed could be lived, in whole or in part, by the pilgrims, taking into consideration the actual mobility and the search for “special moments” in “places of spirituality”.

Ecumenical revalorization of liturgical gestures and forms of prayer during the Holy Year.

If the entire liturgical life has been recently renewed as well as reformed, and if it responds better or more directly to the spiritual needs of the faithful people, this has not been done except in very close association with the birth of the ecumenical movement. Have the rites of the Holy Year been renewed in the same way so that by that fact alone they will speak more to the Catholic faithful and our Christian brothers? Perhaps the opening of the “sealed doors” could find, for example, a richer meaning — “symbol of openness to dialogue and reconciliation”? (26)

Would it be possible to think of different ‘styles’

of prayer meetings, taking into account, among other things, the forms of present-day spirituality such as the 'pentecostal movement'? On the other hand how can we reconcile the search for "special moments" for young people who belong to different churches and who visit several places of pilgrimage, with the 'Roman reality'? Some places of prayer such as the catacombs would have in this light an important role to play, and at the same time they would recall witness and Christian unity.

Finally, would it be possible for the leaders of the local Churches, not yet in full communion with Rome, to participate in some of the more central celebrations? Certain gestures performed in common would then take on a meaning of interpellation and of invitation much more expressive toward the world which surrounds and watches us.

A question.

Pastor Vischer ends his article with a question: "why not make the Holy Year together?" (27)

This question which concludes a text of constructive reflection must not be neglected. It belongs to ecclesial authority to decide how it is to be answered. But a first orientation has already been clarified in the general dispositions for the Holy Year. (28)

It is certain that the interested ecumenical milieu desire a clarification of the proposal of the first orientations: "TO ASSURE THE PARTICIPATION OF THE CHRISTIAN BROTHERS FROM OTHER CHURCHES AND COMMUNITIES IN THE FORESEEN UNDERTAKINGS."

This question coming at the end of Pastor Vischer's article makes us think of another question. The Holy Year of 1975, in fact, coincides with another great Christian manifestation, that of the W.C.C. — the General Assembly. (29) Would it be possible to suggest a relation between these two efforts for 'conversion' to the will of the Lord in order to bring about a full reconciliation and communion among Christians?

Could we avoid giving the world the witness of a celebration radically divided in to isolated groups?

What gesture of rapprochement would give the greater credibility to each of the Christian initiatives, at the same time guaranteeing the character specific to each one. Of course, a definitive response cannot be given except by the responsible spokesmen for each side.

Conclusion

The essential of the Holy Year is personal, concrete, local renewal we could say the renewal of the Eucharistic assembly itself. It is at this level that the most beautiful fruits of reconciliation could be harvested. Likewise, at the local and personal levels the efforts of renewal will serve most profoundly the unity of Christians and the ecumenical movement. The major ecumenical preoccupation of the Catholic Church today is precisely that the development of awareness by the local churches.

The present article does not treat of this capital perspective, and without doubt, the convergences of intention relative to the need for a common renewal, carried out together with our Christian brothers at the

personal and concrete level, in the local setting, are already very explicit and are reality in many places.

Our intent was more limited, *viz.*, to take cognizance of certain objections and listen to the expression of certain wishes, so that the true fruits of reconciliation at the heart of the Christian people may not be covered by certain clouds which could have been avoided.

At this level, these few observations can make us understand that the ecumenical element of the Holy Year is not reduced to an activity among so many others in the course of the unfolding of this one, but that the ecumenical element is a spiritual dimension which must inspire each development and each aspect of realization of both the particular and general manifestations of the Holy Year.

André Joos

(1) General Audience, May 9, 1973, *L'Osservatore Romano*, May 17, 1973 (English edition).

(2) *Idem*, "In view of the variety of purposes it is necessary to stress what is the essential concept of the Holy Year. It is the interior renewal of man: of the man who thinks and who in his thought has lost the certainty of truth; of the man who works and who in his work has realized that he is so extroverted that he no longer fully possesses communication with himself; of the man who enjoys life and who so amuses himself and has so many exciting ways to gain pleasurable experience that he soon feels bored and disillusioned. Man must be renewed from within".

(3) Second Vatican Council, *Decree on Ecumenism*, n. 7, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1965. etiam, n. 8: "Conversion of the heart, holiness of life and prayers, in private and in public, for the unity of Christians must be considered the soul of the ecumenical movement and may rightly be called ecumenism of the spirit." See also *Le Directoire Oecuménique*, part I, n. 2, T.P., p. 6.

(4) We cite here as an example a passage from the report on the Unity of the Church for the World Assembly of New Delhi: "The New Delhi Report", London, 1961, pp. 133-134, p. 57: "In this concern unity at every level of church life, we are mindful that the unity we seek is not for its own sake nor even for our sake. It is for our Lord's sake and for that of the world which he died to save. Unity is inseparable from renewal in holiness and truth, to God's glory. We offer this report to the churches in the prayer that it may contribute to deeper unity in our witness and service in the name of Jesus Christ, the Light of the World."

(5) The exact ecumenical dimension of the theme is not developed in the text of the Holy Father's discourse. Without doubt, its clarification depends in part upon the exchanges and ecumenical dialogue.

General Audience, *op. cit.*: "The term "reconciliation" evokes the opposite concept of a break. What break would we have to mend in order to reach that reconciliation which is the condition for the desired renewal of the jubilee? What break? But is it not perhaps enough to use this word reconciliation, which involves a whole programme, to realize that our life is disturbed by too many breaks, too much disharmony, too much disorder to be able to enjoy the gifts of personal and collective life according to their ideal finality?"

(6) In a recent article, the general director of the Secretariat for Faith and Order, Pastor Lukas Vischer, has given a first reaction to the Pope's proclamation. This article includes a collection of observations and proposals worthy of note, to which we will return.

Vischer, L., "L'Année Sainte, une occasion à saisir pour l'oecuménisme", *La Vie Protestante*, 3 août 1973; p. 5: "Paul VI has stressed that the Holy Year must be a year of 'reconciliation' — of reconciliation and peace among separated men. Some catholic commentators immediately deduced that the Holy Year must also be a year of reconciliation of separated Churches. The hope has thus been expressed that the Holy

Year may contribute to the ecumenical movement. How can we respond to this expectation?"

See also, Vischer, L., "Année Sainte, s'engager ensemble même à la *Convergence*", n. 3, 1973, pp. 15-17.

(7) The Holy Father's words are clear: cfr. General Audience of May 16, 1973, *L'Osservatore Romano*, May 24, 1973, p. 1 (English edition):

"It is the theology of life, as outlined by the Council, which, ten years after its conclusion, challenges our faithfulness to its renewing word and our capacity to reconstitute our personal conscience and our society in justice and peace."

(8) His Holiness, Paul VI, General Audience - May 9, 1973, *op. cit.*, p. 1: "We have asked ourselves if such a tradition should be continued in our times, which are so different from times gone by and so conditioned both by the style of religion given to ecclesial life by the recent Council and by the practical lack of interest of many parts of the modern world in the ritual expression of other centuries. We have immediately however been convinced that the celebration of the Holy Year not only can be consistently fitted in with the spiritual line adopted by the Council itself - which it is our responsibility to develop faithfully - but also can very well be harmonized with and contribute to the tireless and loving efforts being made by the Church to meet the moral needs of our time, to interpret its deepest aspirations and to accept honestly certain forms of its preferred external manifestations."

(9) Vischer, L., *op. cit.*, p. 5: "Once again a very important question must be raised: the holy year has been designated in catholic theology as the year 'which serves especially the sanctification of believers by the granting of a plenary indulgence and other spiritual graces.' (*Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, p. 125). Let us suppose that a new understanding of pilgrimage reduces the idea of indulgence to the background, there always remains the question whether a specific time, a special year can serve the sanctification of believers in a special way. Why 1975? Why not every year?"

(10) *Idem*, p. 5: "While the Italian tourist trade must have learned the papal news with interest and has perhaps already begun its preparations, non-Roman Christians cannot help but express a divided sentiment. Will the celebration help the cause of the Gospel? Will it bring the Churches together? Or, on the contrary, will it recall their deep and permanent division? We still vividly remember the last holy year of 1950. The Pope, Pius XII, profited from the solemn year to make the ex-cathedra definition of the dogma of Mary's Assumption. This decision remains one which weighs upon relations of Roman Catholic Church with all the other confessions."

(11) Second Vatican Council, *Decree on Ecumenism*, n. 3-4. Joint declaration by Pope Paul VI and the Patriarch Athenagoras I, December 7, 1965, announcing the removal of anathemas, *Tomos Agapis*, Rome-Istanbul, 1971, p. 280.

(12) Vischer, L. *Op. cit.*, p. 5: "The question of indulgences, in a certain sense, has nearly become the symbol of the Reformation. Who does not remember that the Reformation began with the protest against the indulgences? The story of Luther can hardly be told without mention of Jean Tetzel, the officious and well-versed preacher, who remains an ambiguous figure not only in the eyes of the Protestant churches, but almost as much so in those of Catholic Christians."

"Can a holy year reunite Christians? Certainly, but on condition that it does not have for its principal topic the subject of indulgences. Would it then be possible to break with the tradition begun by Boniface VIII and set off on a new path?"

(13) Clarizio, E., Msgr., "Attualità dei pellegrinaggi", *Mi-grazioni e Turismo*, n. 5, 1973, pp. 85-86: "From these perspectives the concrete indications arise, three of which seem of immediate relevance.

"First of all the pilgrims should use an appropriate manual with deep religious content, which is of cultural and historical value. This should be a worthwhile guide for him during the pilgrimage and may serve later as a souvenir. Such manuals must be prepared by a commission of experts.

"Secondly, there is the problem of preparing those who will guide the tourist groups - and this preparation must be studied from the cultural-religious viewpoint. The phenomenon of

tourists who visit the places of worship must not be neglected. Even if tourism as such cannot be transformed into pilgrimage, the occasions it presents for spiritual inspiration must be appreciated with positive outlook. The adequate formation of guides is an element of great importance.

"Finally, we note the opportunity for meetings at an international level, for a deepened dialogue among those, who in the local Churches, are devoted to this practical domain."

(14) Boegner, M., "Le Grand Retour?" *Le Semeur*, n. 3-4, 1951, pp. 155-156: "We had reached the end of 1949. Then we received an invitation from the Holy Father - an invitation that we could not hear without emotion. As you recall, in his consistorial address of 1949, right after he had opened the Holy Year, the Holy Father addressed an invitation to Christianity - and in particular, to non Roman Catholic Christianity - expressing his fervent hope that the Holy Year would be the year of the 'Great Return'."

(15) Second Vatican Council, *Decree on Ecumenism*, n. 1-4.

(16) Boegner, M., *op. cit.*, p. 167: "Nevertheless on this day an event of great importance took place - I will not say as a writer did in *Le Monde* 'the greatest event of the century' - but as I said myself last Monday, the ecumenical movement is one of the greatest of the 20th century, and I say this following catholic theologians, who say so without hesitation."

pp. 168-169: "What troubles them perhaps even more, is that it appears in their eyes as untimely to have given this definition in a year precisely in which we had heard in non-Roman Catholic milieux - the Invitation to the Great Return. It seems that, through other documents and other developments it was made inevitable that - what I refer to as a great estrangement, should occur. We must recognize that the uneasiness is great - both for Catholics and for Protestants.

cfr. etiam, Vischer, L., *op. cit.*, p. 5, par.: "Some reserves..."

(17) Vischer, L., *op. cit.*, p. 5: "The Holy Year could become right away a significant celebration if it were conceived in the light of the Jubilee Year of the Jewish law (Lev., 25). What was the intention of this extraordinary institution? ..."

(18) Second Vatican Council, *Decree on Ecumenism*, n. 21.

(19) Vischer, L., *op. cit.*, p. 5: "Some are proposing that the central theme no longer be indulgences but pilgrimages. The suggestion is plausible. In fact, is there not spiritual value in a common pilgrimage?"

"A pilgrimage can signify a departure, a sign that we are all on the path of the Lord's mountain.

"But this conception of the holy year also presents some difficulties. Why must the common departure lead precisely and exclusively to Rome? Why to the four basilicas indicated? Why not also - with equal right - to the other cities which received the apostles or their successors? Should not our pilgrimage reflect something of the missionary movement realized by the apostles?"

(20) Boegner M., *op. cit.*, pp. 155-156.

(21) This desire to respect the total autonomy of the Church members of the World Council of Churches, is clearly expressed in its declarations.

The New Delhi Report, London, 1961, p. 129: "It is agreed that the WCC must not attempt to violate the autonomy of any member church..." cfr. 'Toronto statement', in: "Six Ecumenical surveys", New York, 1954, p. 15: "The churches remain wholly free in the action which, on the basis of their ecumenical contacts, they will or will not take."

(22) His Holiness, Paul VI, Letter to the Cardinal Vicar as preparations begin for the Holy Year, *L'Osservatore Romano*, June 28, 1973, p. 2: "In this dynamic movement the Church of Rome cannot but be first: this is required by its 'unique' position in the context of Christ's Church; it is desired by the other Churches, which look to it as an example and guide; it is suggested by the tradition of preceding Holy Years, which have seen it not only receptive and hospitable to pilgrims, but staunch in faith and consistent in its religious behaviour."

(23) Clarizio, E., Msgr., *op. cit.*, pp. 84-85: "It is not only the attraction of a sacred experience, broken at times by curiosity and eccentricities, which lead a great number of young people to Lourdes or Taizé.

The first element which appears in meetings of youth is characterized by the exchange of an experience in a collective search for the values of faith, its meaning and its credibility. The young meet each other to seek, discuss, verify their own faith with that of others, with modes of expression which generally indicate a well-formulated unanimity."

(24) Conc. Vat. II, Decretum "Unitatis Redintegratio", n. 7-8. Directorium oecumenicum, Pars I, n. 25-35, n. 34: "Mais les prières à faire en commun doivent d'abord avoir comme but la restauration de l'unité entre les Chrétiens. L'objet d'une telle célébration peut être par exemple: . . . la rénovation de la vie, tant personnelle que sociale comme voie nécessaire pour atteindre l'unité . . ." (trad. Information Service, Secrétariat pour l'Unité des chrétiens, 1967/2. p. 10).

(25) Vischer, L., *op. cit.*, p. 5: "It has also been suggested by some to consider places for pilgrimages other than Rome, for example the places where the apostles preached. The less the holy year presupposes a fixed place, such as the center of Christianity, the more easily will meetings and collaboration among Christians be arranged. The possibility must remain open for the expansion of the list of places. Perhaps new forms of pilgrimage must be foreseen, for example, an exchange of visits among Churches. *The Week of Prayer* could be the time for preparing such pilgrimages.

But are these proposals sufficient for a common celebration? At this point we are only correcting the tradition which has existed up until the present time. Do we not need a new vision, a new context?"

(26) A typed note from the Director of the Secretariat of the Commission for Faith and Order, alluded to this aspect: p. 5, "Could not a few old customs of the Holy Year take on a new and contemporary meaning? Could not the opening of the sealed doors be interpreted as the symbol of openness and reconciliation?"

(27) Vischer, L., *op. cit.*, p. 5: "If the celebration of the Holy Year must be conceived on this basis, community would be formed immediately and the doubts still maintained by the Protestant churches would disappear. Of course, the grace of God is available to all at each moment. But there are also common signs to acknowledge his presence and it is good to pause from time along the painful road of fulfillment, and concentrate on preparing a new witness. Hence, why not have a holy year together?"

(28) "Essential characteristics of the Holy Year", *L'Osservatore Romano*, May 17, 1973, p. 3: n. 6 - "As far as possible to secure the participation of the separated brethren in the initiatives undertaken for the celebration of the Holy Year, in order to have cooperation in the areas of piety, charity and penance. It is in these spheres that there is more easily found, through the conversion of hearts, unity in Christ, and thus reconciliation in the Church comes to maturity (cf. Decree "Unitatis Redintegratio", 7). Similar attention shall be given to those belonging to non-Christian religions;

n. 7 - Care shall likewise be taken to give to the celebration of the Holy Year a radiating expansion reaching the widest sectors of humanity, including those who do not believe, by involving them at least in those initiatives that have as their common purpose reconciliation and peace."

(29) It would be good if the organizers of the next assembly were also concerned about a renewal in the style of the gathering:

cf.: *E.P.S.*, no. 26, September 20, 1973, "The 1975 Assembly will differ from the last Assembly, held in Uppsala in 1968, and from earlier Assemblies: it will combine with careful study and deliberation many opportunities for delegates to establish personal relationships with one another and provide many avenues for free spontaneous participation . . ."

THE COSMIC POWERS AND RECONCILIATION: PHIL. 2:6-11, COL. 1:15-20, AND EPH. 1:3-14

The early church was not a quiet one. Tongues, revelations, interpretations and prophecies made for anything but a dull gathering. In fact, an outsider, unaccustomed to such gatherings, might easily conclude the congregation was mad (I Cor. 14:23). Very early in his ministry Paul has to introduce regulations to impose order upon the gatherings of the early Christians. Yet Paul desired order and not merely silence (I Cor. 14:33). At all the meetings everyone is to be ready with a psalm or a sermon or a revelation (I Cor. 14:26); they are to sing to God with hymns and inspired songs (Col. 2:16), singing the word and tunes of the psalms and hymns when they are together, and continuing to sing and chant to the Lord in their hearts (Eph. 5: 19-20). The Roman official Pliny in his famous letter to the Emperor Trajan between the years 111-112 describes the Christians as, among other things, "singing a hymn to Christ, as if to a god." (1) Hymns seem to be a central theme in Christian worship from the very beginning. It is not unusual then that hymns, either whole or in part, should be found cited in Paul's letters to the young Churches. (2) Such hymns would provide familiar references, enabling Paul to emphasize a particular point or teaching. The rhythmic and popular nature of the hymns would make them suitable for catechesis and easily remembered.

Three of the larger hymns found in NT are Philip-
pians 2:6-11, Colossians 1:15-20 and Ephesians 1:3-14. At first reading these three hymns show very little in common. The famous hymn in Philippians speaks of the parabolic descent and exaltation of the one "whose state was divine." In Colossians Christ, "the image of the invisible God," is presented as the center and reconciler of creation. And lastly the hymn in Ephesians might rightly be termed a hymn of Salvation History. However, for all the differences of style, content and purpose, it is significant that all three hymns mention the subjugation of the invisible cosmic powers, the Thrones, Dominations, Sovereignities and Powers (Col. 1:16), the heavenly beings, the terrestrial beings and the subterrestrial beings (Phil. 2:10).

It is belaboring the obvious to state that the Biblical man had a much different concept of the cosmos than modern man. Nevertheless, the much heralded three level concept of the world, supposedly the prevalent notion in OT and NT times, is too simple. Even a cursory reading of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (3) immediately reveals a far more complex world view than a simple up there, down here and down below. The Book of the Secrets of Enoch relates the successive ascension of Enoch through different levels of heaven until he reaches the tenth heaven. It is only when he has reached the tenth heaven that the archangel Michael leads him before the face of the Lord. Likewise in III Baruch we find an ascension through five heavens; and in the Ascension of Isaiah the passage is to the seventh heaven. Admittedly none of the works mentioned are canonical. Nevertheless, Paul's mention of being caught up to "third heaven" (II Cor. 12:2) indicated that the NT has at least similarities with the world view expressed in apocryphal and pseudepigraphic writings.

Far more important than the number or levels of the heavens in apocryphal and pseudepigraphic literature is the angelology found therein. Since there is no systematization of the numbers of the levels of heaven, i.e. three, five, seven or ten, and since there is hardly any overall systematic theology in this type of literature, we cannot expect to find a uniform angelology in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. One thing, however, is certain. However diverse the divisions of the cosmos may have been, angels play an extremely important rôle in its workings. (4) There are angels in charge of the stellar orders (*Secret of Enoch* A:4:1-2), the snow and clouds (*Secrets of Enoch* A:5:1-2), and the sun and moon (*Secrets of Enoch* A:11:1-5). In the seventh heaven we find the "great archangels, incorporeal forces," and dominions, orders and governments, seraphim, thrones and the "many-eyed ones." Of these different orders five are specifically mentioned in Pauline literature: dominions (*kyriotés*) (5), thrones (*thronoi*) (6), orders (*archai*) (7), sovereignties (*exousiai*) (8), and powers (*dynameis*) (9). In the *Secrets of Enoch* these powers are seen as servants of God, while in the Pauline literature they are normally hostile powers.

The workings of the angelic spirits are not limited to the heavens, however. In the apocryphal Gospel of Bartholomew, Beliar reveals the names of the angels who "run together through the heavenly and earthly regions" and those who "fly through the regions of heaven, of earth and the underworld" (*Gospel of Bartholomew* 4:47). The testimonies of the Patriarchs Reuben and Levi clearly indicate that the angelic spirits are not always friendly towards men. There are "seven spirits to tempt man and to lead him astray" (*Testimony of Reuben* 2), "the spirits of error" (*Testimony of Reuben* 3) as well as "the spirits of the retribution for vengeance on man" (*Testimony of Levi* A:3:2).

The significance of the angelic powers in post-NT Christianity is underlined by references in the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic Fathers (10). In language very similar to Phil. 2:10 Ignatius of Antioch speaks of Jesus dying "in the sight of those in heaven (*epouranion*), those on earth (*epigeion*) and under the earth (*hypochthonion*)." Likewise the "heavenly things" (*epourania*) and the "earthly things" (*epigeia*) are subjected to Christ in the letter of Polycarp. Cullmann sees the subjugation of the invisible powers as a constant theme in the early confessions of the Church, traces of which are found as late as the middle of the second century when Justin names Christ as "Lord of the Powers" (*Dialogue with Trypho* 85).

In summation we have seen that the cosmic powers or angelic spirits play a considerable rôle in both pre- and post-NT apocryphal literature. If we accept Cullmann's theory, a similarly important rôle is attributed to these powers, or more correctly to the subjugation of these powers, in post-NT credal statements. What remains is to investigate NT literature, specifically Paul, to see if similar concerns exist.

THE COSMIC POWERS IN PAULINE LITERATURE:

Within the corpus of Pauline literature we find frequent mention of the cosmic powers: Sovereignties, Authorities, Powers, Dominations and Thrones. (11)

The presence of such terminology outside the hymnic material indicates that, whatever the authorship of the hymns, the invisible cosmic powers and their subjugation play an important rôle even in the indisputably Pauline material.

The particular nature and functions of the separate powers are not clear in Paul. (12) This is not surprising, given the similar ambiguity in the apocryphal literature, where the different orders of angels and/or demons are not treated systematically. Rather they are presented as accompanying the protagonists, e.g. Isaiah, Enoch, etc., as they ascend through the various heavenly levels.

Of the names of the cosmic powers listed above, the *archai*, "Sovereignties," is the most common. When the word *archè* is not used with the meaning "beginning," but with the meaning "dominion, force," it is almost invariably linked with the *exousiai*, "Authorities." (13) The connection between the *archai* and the *exousiai* extends beyond the NT. In the book of the *Secrets of Enoch* A:20 "dominions, orders, governments and thrones" form part of the angelic host of the seventh heaven. The nature of the relationship between man and the cosmic powers is ambiguous in most of the pseudepigraphic literature, an ambiguity which some would find also in Paul. In much of the literature the angelic beings are engaged in work proper to their heavenly level. However, often the powers are presented as at least menacing – the "dark angels" of the second heaven (*Secrets of Enoch* 7), the fearful and merciless angels on the north side of third heaven (*Secrets of Enoch* 10). The unfriendly nature of these angelic beings is more explicit in the Testimonies of the Twelve Patriarchs. The testimonies are often moral instructions given by the individual patriarch prior to his death. Although not mentioned by name, spirits play an important part in the moral life of the descendents of the patriarchs. When mentioned in the moral instructions, the spirits are almost inevitably unfriendly. There are seven spirits to tempt man and lead him astray (*Testimony of Reuben* 2); the spirits of sleep and the spirits of error (*Testimony of Reuben* 3). The patriarch Levi (ch. 3) warns his descendents of the evil spirits. However, as mentioned in n. 12, it is also in this chapter that the *archai* and *exousiai* are presented as praising God and hence not specifically unfriendly to man. The ambiguous nature of the cosmic powers is underlined by Foerster (TWNT II:572). Delling (TWNT I:482-3) demonstrates the ambiguity in a more dramatic, though less satisfying way. In speaking of the *archai* he states: their dominion is widened, though we cannot say what function they have and whether they are hostile to God. However, he later notes: man is still engaged in continuing conflict with them. They are not merely behind those who threaten Christians for their faith; they are also behind all moral temptations. (14) If, as Delling asserts, the cosmic powers, here the *archai*, are behind all moral temptations, it would seem strange to assert that we cannot say whether they are hostile to God.

In treating the Pauline material I do not find that the cosmic powers are ambiguously presented. Except for Col. 1:16 where the Thrones, Dominations, Sovereignties and Powers are presented as having been created through Christ and for Christ, they are elsewhere presented as hostile. They are the spiritual army of evil in

the heavens (Eph. 6:12). Perhaps to be identified with the “elemental principles of the world” (Gal. 4:3), (15) they have enslaved man (Eph. 2:2). However, the victorious Lord has bound and conquered the powers (I Cor. 15:24; Col. 2:15), freed man from their power (Col. 1:13) and has been exalted over them as their head (Col. 2:10). The rôle of the cosmic powers, therefore, is not ambiguous in Paul. They are the ones who are hostile and who have been conquered and bound (16) by the Risen Christ.

The hymn in Philippians treats the subjection of the cosmic powers in the second half of the hymn. In the first half we find the abasement of the Christ, “who was in the form of God.” The nadir of the work comes with the “death of the cross” in verse 9. (17) Immediately following is the upward motion of the exaltation, literally the super-exaltation (*hyperypsoun*), of Christ the bestowing of “the name which is above all other names,” and the confession and homage of “those in heaven, on the earth, and under the earth.” The interpretation of these three verses is not without its difficulties. First, we might ask what is “the name which is above all other names”? What is the meaning of the phrase “in the name of Jesus”? And who, if anyone, is meant by the adjectival phrases “in the heavens (*epouranioi*), on the earth (*epigeioi*) and under the earth (*katachthonioi*)?”

The name which was given Jesus at his “super-exaltation” has been suggested as Jesus, Jesus-Christ, Son, and God. (18) It is not likely that the name Jesus would be given at the exaltation, since that was the name given at the circumcision. The exaltation in the hymn seems to speak of an additional title given to the Abased One who is now the Exalted One. Martin is of the opinion that the composite name Jesus-Christ, suggested by Vincent and Meyer, has no evidence to prove it to be “the name which is above all other names.” Likewise with the title Son, suggested by Theodoret, Augustine and Pelagius, Martin finds little compelling evidence. The title God (*theos*), which is suggested by Gregory Nazianzum and Cyril of Alexandria, is unsatisfactory to Martin, since he would find it anachronistic. The practice of calling Jesus God is, according to Martin, a second century practice and unlikely at the early date of the hymn. Several things stand in favor of the title Lord (*kyrios*). Jesus Christ is Lord is the confession which is expressed in verse 11. In addition *Kyrios* is the normal Septuagint translation for the divine name Yahweh. If we agree with Martin that the bestowal of the name is at the same time the bestowal of an office and power, then the connection which Phil. 2:6-11 has with Isaiah 45:23 ff. is reinforced. Käsemann (19) realizes the difficulties in this interpretation and provides a satisfactory conclusion. If the title bestowed on Jesus is Lord, how then does it stand with the pre-existent equality with God, which the opening of the hymn seems to proclaim? Käsemann, realizing the comparative force of the word super-exalt (*hyper-ypsō*), attempts to solve the dilemma by positing that at the bestowal of the name Christ is no longer the hidden Godhead. He is clearly and manifestly exalted as Lord of the Cosmos. Thus, according to Käsemann, the cosmos no longer has to deal with the unknown God, or what calls itself Fate; but it deals openly with the exalted Lord.

If one accepts the “name” as Lord, some of the

difficulties with the phrase “in the name of Jesus every knee etc.” are obviated. Part of the difficulty with the phrase stems from the grammatical ambiguity evident both in the Greek and English. The genitive *jesou* can be interpreted as explicative, i.e. the name Jesus, or it can be taken as possessive, i.e. the name which Jesus possesses. The difference is considerable. In the former a liturgical or cultic act seems to be implied. Adoration is given to the Father in the name of Jesus, although the action in 11^a seems to be clearly directed to the Son. If one accepts the latter interpretation, the possibility is open that the stress of the hymn is upon the bestowal of the name. Thus, when the name, i.e. Lord, is proclaimed, all the cosmic powers bow in Submission. Martin (20) sees Lohmeyer’s rejection of a liturgical or cultic interpretation of the text as being decisive for modern European exegesis. Although commentators have developed and expanded Lohmeyer’s theory, the basic outline still remains — the verse deals with a cosmic drama in which the heavenly beings offer their homage to the victorious Lord.

However, one might still ask how this heavenly court is understood, especially in light of the three categories mentioned in 10b. The listing of the *epouranioi*, *epigeioi* and *katachthonioi* could simply be explained as a pleonasm, a neutral attempt to express the totality of the homage. The word *katachthonios* is hapax here. Although the word does appear on funerary monuments and inscriptions, it is usually used in connection with gods or demons, i.e. the dwellers of the underworld. However, the interpretation that the *katachthonioi* refers to the buried dead appears to be weak. Faced with numerous mention of the cosmic powers elsewhere in Paul, it unnecessarily weakens the text to interpret the three categories here merely as the Church Triumphant, Militant and Suffering. (21)

Further indication that cosmic powers are understood here can be found in the usage of *epouranios*. In Eph. 6:12 the *epourania* is the abode of the *archai*, who can hardly here be the blessed who are with the Lord in heaven. It is also clear that Ignatius in his letter to the Trallians 9:1 sees in the three divisions something more than three possible conditions of believers. Using very similar vocabulary, (*epouranioi*, *epigeioi* and *hypochthonioi* instead of the *katachthonioi* of Phil. 2:10b) he speaks of (cosmic?) witnesses of Christ’s death.

Recapitulating we can see that in the hymn in Philippians the exaltation of the Lord is accompanied by the homage of the cosmos. (22) The homage here, as also in non-hymnic Pauline material, is the homage of the cosmic powers; powers originally hostile to man and now subdued and bound by the victorious Lord.

The situation in Colossians 1:15-20 is less complicated than the hymn in Philippians. The cosmic import of the victory of Christ is more clearly delineated. At the opening of the hymn all creation is presented as being through Christ and for Christ. Creation is divided into “things in heaven and on earth” (*ta panta en tois ouranois kai epi tēs gēs*) and “things visible and invisible” (*ta horata kai ta aorata*). At this point in verse 16 the cosmic powers are mentioned by name — Thrones, Dominations, Sovereignities, Powers — so there can be no doubt who is included in the visible and invisible things in heaven and on earth. In the

Primacy (note: *arché*) of Jesus he is first to be born from the dead and holds primacy in every way. The goal or result of his primacy is the reconciliation of all things. The description of the "all things" is "everything in heaven and everything on earth" (*ta epi tēs gēs, eite ta en tois ouranois*), a chiasmic repetition of the beginning of the more inclusive description of the same things found at the beginning of the hymn. Thus specifically included in the reconciling act of Jesus' death and exaltation is the reconciliation of the cosmic powers. These powers now recognize his primacy and their hostility is overcome. (23)

A less explicit reference to the reconciliation and subjugation of the cosmic powers is to be found in the hymn in Ephesians 1:3-14. Whereas the previous two hymns revolve around the activity and condition of Christ, the scope of this hymn is broader. Here the plan of the Father, or Salvation History, is the central theme. This is, of course, not to underestimate the rôle of Christ in the plan of the Father, but merely to indicate that the emphasis of this hymn is different. The "hidden plan" of verse 9 is expanded and explained as the bringing together of everything under the headship of Christ (*anakephalaïosasthai ta panta en to christo ta epi tois ouranois kai ta epi tēs gēs*), everything "in heaven and everything on earth." The language is strikingly similar to what we found used and expanded in the hymn in Colossians. Admittedly the notion of cosmic reconciliation and the homage of the cosmic powers is not found in Ephesians 1:3-14 in as striking a form as it is in Colossians 1:15-20 and Philippians 2:6-11. Nonetheless it is significant that immediately after the hymn in Ephesians there is a paragraph developing quite fully the theme of cosmic reconciliation. If, as we have indicated, the Father and his plan of salvation is central to the hymn, immediately after the hymn (vss. 15-23) we find the practical application of the Father's plan and power in raising Jesus from the dead. For Jesus is seated at the right hand of the Father "far above every Sovereignty, Authority, Power or Domination." One wonders then if the connection between the early Christian hymns and cosmic reconciliation was so strong in the minds of early Christians that even a passing reference (Eph. 1:10) would attract to itself further material which would render explicit what the hymn presents implicitly. The presence to a lesser or greater degree of the notion of the conquering and subjugation of the cosmic powers in the hymns treated here might do little more than indicate a popular Christian theme. However, the further evidence in the non-hymnic material should caution us against putting too little emphasis upon the centrality of cosmic reconciliation. It would simply be an overstatement to say that cosmic reconciliation is one of Paul's major themes, as, for example, the Body of Christ. (24) Nonetheless, the subjugation of the hostile cosmic powers, the cosmic homage given to the victorious Lord and the final handing over of the reconciled cosmos to the Father is an important theme in the theology of Paul and the early Church. (25)

A renewed interest in the theology of the cosmic reconciliation is particularly relevant during the Holy Year whose theme is reconciliation. To be sure, the world view of Twentieth Century man has altered considerably in the past two thousand years. The world view of the apocalyptic and pseudepigraphic

literature is no longer prevalent. However, Lohmeyer's comment that the cosmic powers signify the natural determination of the world which also engulfs man has profound applications to contemporary man. No longer threatened by Sovereignities, Powers, Authorities and Principalities, contemporary man often feels himself overwhelmed by forces of evil such as war, racism and poverty which appear to be part of the very fabric of our world. If such evils are the cosmic powers of the Twentieth Century, their defeat by the victorious Lord and the reconciliation of the cosmos speak to modern man at the core of his contemporary existence. Thus the reconciliation proclaimed by the Holy Year is infinitely widened in its scope. No longer merely the reconciliation of man with man and man with God, but now it is seen as the working out of the plan of the Father to bring all things together under Christ as Head so that the Father might be all in all.

Elias D. Mallon, S.A.

(1) Cf. R.P. Martin. *Carmen Christi: Philippians ii:6-11*. Cambridge, 1967, pp. 1 ff. for discussion on possible meanings for Pliny's phrase *carmen dicere*.

(2) Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 19 offers four categories of hymns in NT, viz. sacramental (Eph. 5:14; Tit. 3:4-7); meditative (Eph. 1:3-14; Rm. 8:31-39; I Cor. 13); confessional (I Tim. 6:11-16; II Tim. 2:11-13); christological (Heb. 1:3; Col. 1:15-20; I Tim. 3:16; John 1:1-14; I Pet. 1:18-21; 2:21-25; 3:18-21; Phil. 2:6-11). Further discussion could be had both on Martin's classification and some of his choices which are not convincing. However, it is interesting and to our point to mention that in Martin's extensive listing there are three "hymns" explicitly referring to cosmic powers - Rm. 8:31-39; Heb. 1:3, (4); I Tim. 3:16, while such a reference may be implicit in another two - I Tim. 6:11-16 and I Pet. 3:18-21.

(3) All citations from the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic writings are taken from R.H. Charles (ed.) *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Vv. I, II (Oxford, 1973), and Edgar Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha*, Vv. I, II (Philadelphia, 1964).

(4) Angels begin to take on increased importance in the later apocalyptic writing of the OT. In Dan. 10 we find the guardian angels of the nations mentioned. Michael refers to himself as *heis archonton*, obviously friendly (*cf.* discussion below), who does battle with the *archon* of Persia and the *archon* of the Greeks. For a treatment of the development of the theology of angels in intertestamental Judaism, cf. TWNT 1:80-82.

(5) Eph. 1:21; Col. 1:16.

(6) Col. 1:16.

(7) Rm. 8:38; I Cor. 15:24; Eph. 1:21; 3:10; 6:12; Col. 1:16; 2:10, 15.

(8) Eph. 1:21; 2:2; 3:10; 6:12; Col. 1:13, 16; 2:10, 15.

(9) Rm. 8:38, Eph. 1:21.

(10) Ignatius, *To the Trallians* 9:1, Policarp, *To the Philippians* 2:1. O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time*. Philadelphia, 1964, p. 154: "The further developed confession of Ignatius of Antioch shows the regularity with which both (sic) the heavenly things, the earthly things and those under the earth appear in the ancient creeds". Similar concerns may be reflected in the Nicene Creed. The Father is presented as the "factor visibilium et indivisibilium," cf. the *horata* and *aorata* (Col. 1:16), "things seen and unseen" created in Christ. While the context of the Nicene Creed and Col. 1:16 differs considerably, the former may reflect concern over the cosmic powers extending considerably beyond the second century.

(11) Cf. Notes 5-9.

(12) Cf. TWNT III:571 – “as powers of the world, they (the *exousiai*) share its twofold character. On the one hand they represent the carnal side of fallen creation with the powers which seduce and enslave man. On the other, they belong to the creation which is created and *en christo* and *eis christon*”.

I fail to see the ambiguity which Foerster feels. His citation of Col. 1:16 is accurate. However, it is not at all a positive mention of the powers as friendly, especially vis-à-vis the other citations (cf. Notes 5-9) where the powers are invariably hostile. Col. 1:16 provides a caveat against the almost inherent dualism in the notion of the cosmic powers (cf. Rabbinic efforts to control developing angelology TWNT I:82) and is hardly an example of a presentation of the powers as friendly. A certain ambiguity can be found when one compares the usage of the powers in the *Secrets of Enoch* A:20 where they are presented as fearful, though not necessarily hostile. The only clear presentation of these powers as unambiguously friendly which I have found is in the *Testimony of Levi* where they are presented as praising God.

(13) I Cor. 15:24; Eph 1:21; 2:2; 3:10; 6:12; Col. 1:16; 2:10, 15. Even with the neutral political meanings of power and authority the two are found together in Lk. 12:11 and 20:30. Exceptions: *archai* alone Rm. 8:38; *exousiai* alone Col. 1:13. The difference, if any, between the two is hard to determine. Cf. TWNT I:571: “they are different expressions for much the same thing”.

(14) Eph. 6:12 strengthens the notion of the cosmic powers tempting man. Christians are doing battle with them as the originators of darkness in the world.

(15) R.P. Martin, *op. cit.* cites Lohmeyer, *Kommentar zum Kolosserbrief*, p. 119: the cosmic powers “signify in a mythical way no other than the natural determination of the world which also engulfs man.”

I am not sure that this is, in fact, a demythologization of the “elemental principles” in Galatians. It seems more like a contemporary homiletic interpretation of a far more complex line of thought in Paul.

(16) Whether the conquest of the powers is final or not is open to question. I Cor. 15:24 ff. and Heb. 10:13 seems to indicate it is not. On the other hand II Tim. 1:10 presents the conquest as having been accomplished. Cullman, *op. cit.*, p. 153 sees this as representing a tension which characterizes the present redemptive period.

(17) The acceptance or rejection of the phrase (*thanotou de stauthou*) is immaterial here. Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus* is of the opinion that it is a Pauline gloss, while Dibelius, *An die Philipper*, Cerfaux, *Le Christ dans le théologie de S. Paul*, Michaelis, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Philipper*, and Stauffer, *NT Theology* accept the phrase as genuine and original to the hymn.

(18) Cf. Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 234 f.

(19) E. Käsemann, *Kritische Analyse*.

(20) Cf. Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 252.

(21) TWNT III: 633: “it is a mistake to see the *katachthonioi* only as the dead who rest in the earth. This is refuted by the Greek usage in which the *katachthonioi* are always *theoi* or *daimones*.”

(22) Cullmann, *op. cit.*, p. 154: “in this connection we must refer above all to the confession of Phil. 2 ff., which reaches its climax in the formula “*kyrios christos*,”... He (Christ) is at the right hand of God, after he has ascended into heaven and the angels, authorities and powers have been subjected to him.”

(23) Edward Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon*, Philadelphia, 1971. “The last verse of the hymn deals with this work of reconciliation. Although there has been no previous mention of it, it is presupposed here that unity and harmony of the cosmos have suffered a considerable disturbance, even a rupture... The universe has been reconciled in that heaven and earth have been brought back into their divinely

determined order through the resurrection and exaltation of Christ. Now the universe is again under its head and thereby cosmic peace has returned.”

(24) Cf. most recently MacPherson, *Symbol, Church and the Body of Christ* (unpublished paper, The Catholic University of America).

(25) Cf. Cullmann, *op. cit.*, p. 153, the subjection of the invisible powers are regularly emphasized in the developed creeds of the early Christian Church. Also Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, Philadelphia 1955. “Outside the New Testament the subjection of these powers is expressly mentioned in the confessional formulas cited by Ignatius (Tral. 9:1), Polycarp (2:1) and Justin (Apology I, 42)... I emphasize this point in order to indicate the important place this assertion held in the faith of the first Christians. All these ancient confessional formulas preserve only the most important elements of the early Christian faith. If Christ’s lordship over the powers and authorities is regularly mentioned in these short summaries, it must be a quite central article of faith.”

LES POUVOIRS COSMIQUES ET LA RÉCONCILIATION: PHILIPPIENS 2:6-11, COLOSSIENS 1:15-20, ET EPHÉSIENS 1:3-14.

L’Eglise primitive n’était pas une Eglise sans problèmes. Langues, révélations, interprétations et prophéties ne tendaient pas certainement à un rassemblement amorphe. En effet, un profane, peu habitué à de tels rassemblements, pouvait facilement conclure que la congrégation était folle (I Cor. 14:23). Très tôt, dans son ministère Paul doit introduire des règles pour mettre de l’ordre dans les rassemblements des premiers Chrétiens. Néanmoins Paul désirait l’ordre et non le silence (I Cor. 14:33). Dans toute réunion chacun doit préparer un psaume, un sermon ou une révélation (I Cor. 14:26) ils doivent réciter au Seigneur des hymnes et des cantiques inspirés (Col. 2:16), chanter les paroles et les harmonies des psaumes et des hymnes entre eux, quand ils sont ensemble, et continuer à chanter et à célébrer le Seigneur de tout leur cœur, quand ils sont seuls (Eph. 5:19-20). L’officier romain Pline dans sa lettre renommée à l’Empereur Trajan durant les années 111 et 112, décrit les Chrétiens comme étant entr’autres “ceux qui chantent un hymne au Christ, comme s’Il était un dieu.” (1) Les hymnes semblent être un thème central dans le culte chrétien dès le début. Il n’est donc pas exceptionnel que des hymnes, complets ou partiels, aient été cités dans les lettres de Saint Paul aux jeunes Eglises. (2) De tels hymnes fourniraient des références familières, qui mettent Paul à même de souligner un point particulier ou un enseignement. La nature rythmique et populaire des hymnes les rendraient bien adaptés à la catéchèse et faciles à se rappeler.

Trois des hymnes les plus considérables qui se trouvent dans le Nouveau Testament sont les Philippiens 2:6-11, les Colossiens 1:15-20 et les Ephésiens 1:3-14. A une première lecture ces trois hymnes ont très peu en commun. L’hymne renommé des Philippiens parle de la descendance parabolique et de l’exaltation de celui “dont l’état était divin.” Dans les Colossiens le Christ “image du Dieu invisible” est présenté comme étant le centre de la création et comme celui qui la réconcilie. Et enfin l’hymne qui se trouve dans les Ephésiens pourrait justement être

appelé l'hymne de l'Histoire du Salut. Cependant, malgré toutes les différences de style, de contenu et de but, il est significatif que ces trois hymnes citent tous l'assujettissement des pouvoirs cosmiques invisibles, les Trônes, les Dominations, les Souverainetés et les Pouvoirs (Col. 1:16), les êtres célestes, les êtres terrestres et les êtres sub-terrestres (Phil. 2:10).

Il est évident qu'il faille affirmer que l'homme biblique avait un concept de l'univers bien différent de celui qu'en a l'homme moderne. Pourtant le concept annoncé du monde divisé en trois niveaux, soi-disant la notion prédominante à l'époque de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament, est trop simple. Déjà une lecture superficielle des Apocryphes et des pseudo-épigraphiques (3) révèle immédiatement une vision du monde beaucoup plus complexe que le ciel, la terre et l'enfer. Le livre des Secrets d'Enoch raconte l'ascension successive d'Enoch à travers les différents niveaux du ciel jusqu'à quand il arrive au dixième ciel. C'est seulement au moment où il a atteint le dixième ciel que l'Archange Michel le conduit à la présence du Seigneur. Dans Baruch III nous trouvons également une ascension à travers cinq cieux; et dans l'ascension d'Isaïe le passage arrive au septième ciel. Il est reconnu qu'aucun des ouvrages mentionnés n'est canonique. Cependant, la mention de Paul d'avoir été élevé jusqu'au "troisième ciel" (II Cor. 12:2) indique que le Nouveau Testament a au moins des similitudes avec la vision du monde exprimée dans les écrits apocryphes et pseudo-épigraphiques.

L'"angelologie" qui se trouve dans la littérature apocryphe et pseudo-épigraphique est bien plus importante que le nombre de niveaux des cieux. Comme il n'existe pas de systématisation du nombre des niveaux du ciel, par exemple, trois, cinq, sept ou dix, et comme il n'y a presque pas de théologie systématique d'ensemble dans ce genre de littérature, nous ne pouvons pas nous attendre à trouver une "angelologie" uniforme dans les Apocryphes et les Pseudo-épigraphiques. Une chose, est cependant certaine. Quelque diverses qu'aient été les divisions de l'univers, les anges jouent un rôle extrêmement important dans sa construction. (4) Il y a des anges chargés des ordres stellaires (*Secrets d'Enoch* A: 4:1-2), de la neige et des nuages (*Secrets d'Enoch* A: 5:1-2), du soleil et de la lune (*Secrets d'Enoch* A: 11:1-5). Au septième ciel nous trouvons les "grands archanges, les forces incorporelles" et les dominations, les ordres et les gouvernements, les Séraphins, les trônes et "ceux qui ont plus que deux yeux". Cinq de ces ordres divers sont mentionnés spécifiquement dans la littérature paulinienne: les dominations (*kyriotès*) (5), les trônes (*thronoi*) (6), les ordres (*archai*) (7), les souverainetés (*exousiai*) (8), et les pouvoirs (*dynameis*) (9). Dans *Les Secrets d'Enoch*, ces pouvoirs sont vus comme étant au service de Dieu, tandis que dans la littérature paulinienne, ils sont normalement présentés comme étant des pouvoirs hostiles.

Les oeuvres des esprits angéliques ne se limitent d'ailleurs pas aux cieux. Dans l'Évangile apocryphe de Barthélemy, Beliar révèle les noms des anges qui "courent ensemble à travers les régions du ciel et de la terre" et de ceux qui "volent à travers les régions du ciel, de la terre et de l'enfer" (*Évangile de Barthélemy* 4:47). Les témoignages des Patriarches Reuben et Levi indiquent clairement que les esprits angéliques ne sont

pas toujours favorables aux hommes. Il existe "sept esprits qui tentent l'homme et l'égarer" (*Témoignage de Reuben* 2), "les esprits de l'erreur" (*Témoignage de Reuben* 3) aussi bien que "les esprits de la récompense d'une vengeance sur l'homme" (*Témoignage de Levi* A: 3:2).

La signification des pouvoirs angéliques dans le christianisme post-NT est soulignée par des références qui se trouvent dans les Pères Apostoliques et sub-Apostoliques. (10) Dans un langage très semblable à celui de Phil. 2:10, Ignace d'Antioque parle de Jésus qui meurt "devant ceux qui sont dans le ciel (*epouraniòn*) ceux qui sont sur la terre (*epigeiòn*) et ceux qui sont sous la terre (*hypochthoyiòn*)". Les "choses célestes" (*epourania*) et les "choses terrestres" (*epigeia*) sont également soumises au Christ dans la lettre de Polycarpe. Cullmann voit l'assujettissement des pouvoirs invisibles comme étant le thème constant dans les confessions primitives de l'Église, dont des traces se trouvent dès la moitié du II^{ème} siècle quand Justin appelle le Christ "Seigneur des Pouvoirs" (*Dialogue avec Trypho* 85).

En conclusion, nous avons vu que les pouvoirs cosmiques ou esprits angéliques jouent un rôle remarquable dans la littérature apocryphe pré et post-NT. Si nous acceptons la théorie de Cullmann, un rôle pareillement important est attribué à ces pouvoirs, ou plus correctement à l'assujettissement de ces pouvoirs, dans les déclarations post-NT. Il reste à étudier la littérature du Nouveau Testament, spécifiquement Paul, pour voir si des soucis pareils existent.

Les pouvoirs cosmiques dans la littérature paulinienne

Dans le corpus de la littérature paulinienne les pouvoirs cosmiques sont souvent mentionnés: les Souverainetés, les Autorités, les Pouvoirs, les Dominations et les Trônes. (11) La présence d'une telle terminologie hors du matériel concernant les hymnes, indique que, quel que soit l'auteur des cantiques, les pouvoirs cosmiques invisibles et leur assujettissement jouent un rôle important aussi dans le matériel incontestablement paulinien.

La nature et les fonctions particulières des pouvoirs séparés ne sont pas claires dans Paul. (12) Cela n'est pas étonnant, étant donné l'ambiguïté analogue existant dans la littérature apocryphe, où les divers ordres d'anges et/ou de démons ne sont pas traités systématiquement. Ils sont présentés plutôt comme étant ceux qui accompagnent les protagonistes, par ex., Isaïe, Enoch, etc., au moment où ces derniers s'élèvent à travers les divers niveaux du ciel.

Parmi les noms des pouvoirs cosmiques mentionnés ci-dessus, le plus commun est l'*archai* "les souverainetés". Quand le mot *arche* est employé non pas dans le sens de "commencement", mais dans celui d'"autorité, force", il est presque invariablement lié à *exousiai* "autorités". (13) Le lien entre le *archai* et le *exousiai* se prolonge au-delà du Nouveau Testament. Dans le livre des *Secrets d'Enoch* A:20 "les autorités, les ordres, les gouvernements et les trônes" font partie de l'armée angélique du septième ciel. La nature des relations entre l'homme et les pouvoirs cosmiques est ambiguë dans la plupart de la littérature pseudo-épigraphique, ambiguë que certains trouveraient aussi dans Paul. Dans une grande partie de la littérature les

êtres angéliques sont engagés dans un travail propre à leur niveau céleste. D'ailleurs, les pouvoirs sont souvent présentés comme étant au moins menaçants – les “anges noirs” du deuxième ciel (*Secrets d'Enoch*, 7), les anges affreux et sans pitié du côté nord du troisième ciel (*Secrets d'Enoch* 10). La nature hostile de ces êtres angéliques est plus explicite dans les Témoignages des Douze Patriarches. Les témoignages sont souvent des enseignements moraux donnés par le Patriarche individuel avant sa mort. Tout en n'étant pas cités par leur nom, les esprits ont une partie importante dans la vie morale des descendants des Patriarches. Quand ils sont mentionnés dans les enseignements moraux, les esprits sont presque inévitablement hostiles. Il y a sept esprits qui tenent l'homme et l'égarer (*Témoignage de Reuben* 2); les esprits du sommeil et les esprits de l'erreur (*Témoignage de Reuben* 3). Le patriarche Levi (ch. 3) prévient ses descendants contre les esprits du mal. Comme il est d'ailleurs mentionné dans le n. 12, c'est également dans ce chapitre que l'*archai* et l'*exousiai* sont présentés comme glorifiant Dieu, et, dorénavant, non spécifiquement hostiles à l'homme. La nature ambiguë des pouvoirs cosmiques est soulignée par Foerster (TWNT II: 572). Dellling (TWNT I: 482-3) démontre l'ambiguïté, d'une façon plus dramatique, mais moins satisfaisante. En parlant de l'*archai* il affirme: leur autorité est étendue, bien que nous ne pouvons pas dire quelle soit leur fonction et s'ils sont hostiles à Dieu. Cependant, ensuite il note: l'homme est encore engagé dans un conflit avec eux. Ils ne sont pas simplement derrière ceux qui menacent les chrétiens à cause de leur foi; ils sont aussi derrière toute tentation morale. (14) Si, comme l'affirme Dellling, les pouvoirs cosmiques, ici le *archai*, sont derrière toute tentation morale, il semblerait bizarre l'affirmer qu'on ne peut pas dire s'ils sont hostiles à Dieu.

En traitant le matériel paulinien je ne trouve pas que les pouvoirs cosmiques soient présentés d'une façon ambiguë. A part les Col. 1:16 où les Trônes, les Dominations, les Souverainetés et les Pouvoirs sont présentés comme ayant été créés à travers le Christ et pour le Christ, ailleurs ils sont présentés comme étant hostiles. Ils constituent l'armée spirituelle du mal dans le ciel (Eph. 6:12). Il se peut que, pour être identifiés avec les “principes fondamentaux du monde” (Gal. 4:3) (15), ils aient asservi l'homme (Eph. 2:2). Cependant, le Seigneur victorieux a soumis et vaincu les pouvoirs (I Cor. 15:24; Col. 2:15), a libéré l'homme de leur asservissement (Col. 1:13) et il a été élevé au-dessus d'eux comme leur Chef (Col. 2:10). Le rôle des pouvoirs cosmiques n'est d'ailleurs pas ambigu dans Paul. Ils sont hostiles mais ils ont été vaincus et soumis (16) par le Christ Ressuscité.

Dans la deuxième partie du cantique des Philippiens on traite de l'assujettissement des pouvoirs cosmiques. Dans la première partie on parle de l'humiliation du Christ “qui était sous la forme de Dieu”. La nadir de l'ouvrage arrive dans le verset 9 avec la “mort sur la croix”. (17) Le mouvement ascendant de l'exaltation, littéralement la super-exaltation (*hyperypsoun*) du Christ, le don du “nom qui est au-dessus de tout autre nom”, et la confession et l'hommage de “ceux qui sont dans le ciel, sur la terre et sous la terre” suivent immédiatement. L'interprétation de ces trois versets n'est pas sans difficultés. Premièrement, nous

pourrions demander quel est “le nom qui est au-dessus de tout autre nom?” Quelle est la signification de l'expression “au nom de Jésus”? Et qui est indiqué, si quelqu'un l'est, par les expressions adjectives “dans les cieux” (*epouranioi*), “sur la terre” (*epigeioi*) et “sous la terre” (*katachthonioi*)?

Le nom donné à Jésus au moment de sa “super-exaltation” a été évoqué comme étant Jésus, Jésus-Christ, Fils et Dieu. (18) Il n'est pas vraisemblable que le nom Jésus ait été donné au moment de l'exaltation, puisque celui-ci était le nom donné au moment de la circoncision. L'exaltation dans le cantique semble parler d'un titre ultérieur donné à Celui qui a été humilié et qui est maintenant exalté. Martin est de l'opinion qu'il n'y a pas d'évidence pour prouver que le nom composé Jésus-Christ, évoqué par Vincent et Meyer, est “le nom qui est au-dessus de tout autre nom”. Également le titre Fils, évoqué par Theodoret, Augustin et Pelagius Martin trouve peut d'évidence.

L'appellatif “Dieu” (*theos*), qui est évoqué par Grégoire Nazianzé et Cyril d'Alexandrie, n'est satisfaisant pour Martin, qui le trouverait anachronique. La pratique d'appeler Jésus, Dieu, est, selon Martin, une pratique qui date du IIème siècle et peu probable à l'époque de la date primitive du cantique. Plusieurs choses sont en faveur de l'appellatif Seigneur (*kyrios*). Jésus-Christ est Seigneur, est la confession exprimée dans le verset 11. En plus *kyrios* est la traduction normale que les Septante font du nom divin de Yahvé. Si nous sommes d'accord avec Martin sur le fait que le don du nom est en même temps le don d'un office et d'un pouvoir, alors la liaison qui existe entre Phil 2:6-11 et Isaïe 45:23 suiv. est renforcée. Käsemann (19) se rend compte des difficultés présentées par cette interprétation et pourvoit une conclusion satisfaisante. Si le titre donné à Jésus est celui de Seigneur, alors comment s'associe-t-il à celui pré-existant de Dieu, que l'ouverture du cantique semble proclamer? Käsemann, en se rendant compte de la force comparative du mot super-exaltation (*hyperypso*) essaye de résoudre le dilemme en affirmant qu'au moment du don du nom, le Christ n'est plus le Dieu Caché. Il est clairement et manifestement exalté comme le Seigneur de l'Univers. Ainsi, selon Käsemann, l'univers n'a plus à faire avec le Dieu inconnu, ou ce qu'on appelle le Destin, mais ouvertement avec le Seigneur exalté.

Si l'on accepte le “nom” de Seigneur, on obvie à quelques-unes des difficultés dues à l'expression “au nom de Jésus tout genou, etc.” Quelques-unes des difficultés dues à cette expression sont le résultat d'ambiguïtés grammaticales évidentes soit dans la langue grecque soit dans celle anglaise. Le génitif *jesou* peut être interprété comme étant explicatif, par ex., le nom de Jésus, ou bien il peut être pris comme étant possessif, par ex. le nom que Jésus a. La différence est remarquable. Le premier semble impliquer un acte liturgique ou culturel. On adore le Père au nom de Jésus, bien que dans 11a l'action semble clairement adressée au Fils. Si l'on accepte la deuxième interprétation, la possibilité existe que dans l'hymne l'accent soit mis sur le don du nom. Ainsi, quand le nom, par ex. Seigneur, est proclamé, tous les pouvoirs cosmiques se prosternent soumis. Martin (20) voit le refus de la part de Lohmeyer, d'une interprétation liturgique ou culturelle du texte, comme étant décisif

pour l'exégèse européenne moderne. Bien que les commentateurs aient développé et élargi la théorie de Lohmeyer, la configuration de base demeure – le verset traite d'un drame cosmique dans lequel les êtres célestes présentent leur hommage au Seigneur victorieux.

Cependant on pourrait encore demander comment cette cour céleste est-elle comprise, spécialement à la lumière des trois catégories mentionnées dans 10b. La liste de *epouranioi*, *epigeioi* et *katachthonioi* pourrait simplement être expliquée comme étant un pléonasmе, une tentative indéterminée, faite pour exprimer la totalité de l'hommage. Le mot *katachthonios* est ici "hapax". Bien que le mot apparaisse sur les monuments et dans les inscriptions funebres, il est généralement employé à propos de dieux et de démons, par ex. les habitants de l'enfer. D'ailleurs l'interprétation selon laquelle le *katachthonioi* se réfère aux morts enterrés semble faible. Affrontée à plusieurs citations des pouvoirs cosmiques que l'on trouve ailleurs dans Paul, elle affaiblit inutilement le texte pour interpréter les trois catégories ici, simplement comme l'Eglise Triomphante, l'Eglise Militante et l'Eglise qui souffre. (21)

Des indications ultérieures du fait que les pouvoirs sont compris ici peuvent être trouvées dans l'emploi de *epouranios*. Dans Eph. 6:12 l'*epourania* est la demeure des *archai*, qui peuvent difficilement être les bénis, dans le ciel avec le Seigneur. Il est également clair qu'Ignace dans sa lettre aux Tralliens 9:1 voit dans les trois divisions quelque chose de plus que les trois conditions possibles des croyants. En employant un vocabulaire assez semblable (*epouranioi*, *epigeioi* et *hypochthonioi* au lieu de *katachthonioi* des Phil. 2:10b), il parle des témoignages (cosmiques?) de la mort du Christ.

En résumant nous pouvons voir que dans l'hymne des Philippiens l'exaltation du Seigneur est accompagnée de l'hommage de l'univers. (22) Ici l'hommage, comme dans le matériel paulinien également, est l'hommage des pouvoirs cosmiques, pouvoirs originaires hostiles à l'homme et maintenant soumis et limités par le Seigneur victorieux.

La situation dans les Colossiens 1:15-20 est moins compliquée que dans l'hymne des Philippiens. La signification cosmique de la victoire du Christ est délinée d'une façon plus claire. A l'ouverture de l'hymne toute la création est présentée comme étant à travers le Christ et pour le Christ. Elle est divisée en "choses du ciel et de la terre" (*ta panta en tois ouranois kai epi tès gès*) et en "choses visibles et invisibles" (*ta horata kai ta aorata*). A ce point-ci, dans le verset 16, les pouvoirs cosmiques sont mentionnés par nom "Trônes, Dominations, Souverainetés, Pouvoirs – de cette manière il ne peut pas y avoir de doutes sur les choses visibles et invisibles dans le ciel et sur la terre. Dans la Primatie (note *archè*) de Jésus, il est le premier ressuscité d'entre les morts et Il a la primatie de toute façon. Le but ou résultat de Sa primatie est la réconciliation de toutes les choses. La description de "toutes les choses" est "toute chose dans le ciel et sur la terre" (*ta epi tès gès eite ta en tois ouranois*), une répétition du commencement de la description plus globale des mêmes choses, qui se trouve au début du cantique. Ainsi spécifiquement comprise dans l'acte de réconciliation de la mort et de l'exaltation de Jésus, se trouve la réconciliation des pouvoirs cosmiques. Ces pouvoirs reconnaissent maintenant Sa primatie et leur hostilité est surmontée. (23)

Une référence moins explicite faite à la réconcilia-

tion et à l'assujettissement des pouvoirs cosmiques se trouve dans l'hymne des Ephésiens 1:3-14. Tandis que les deux hymnes précédents concernent l'activité et la condition du Christ, l'étendue de cet hymne est plus large. Le plan du Père, ou Histoire du Salut, est ici le thème central. Cela n'est pas pour sous estimer le rôle du Christ dans le plan du Père, mais simplement pour indiquer que l'accent dans cet hymne est différent. Le "plan caché" du verset 9 est développé et expliqué comme la réconciliation de toute chose sous la souveraineté du Christ (*anakephalaiosasthai ta panta en tò christò ta epi tois ouranois kai ta epi tès gès*), toute chose "dans le ciel et sur la terre". Le langage ressemble de façon frappante à celui qui est employé et développé dans l'hymne des Colossiens. La notion de la réconciliation cosmique et l'hommage des pouvoirs cosmiques ne se trouvent pas dans les Ephésiens 1:3-14 dans la forme frappante dont ils sont présentés dans les Colossiens 1: 15-20 et dans les Philippiens 2:6-11. Néanmoins il est significatif qu'immédiatement après l'hymne dans les Ephésiens il y a un paragraphe qui développe presque complètement le thème de la réconciliation cosmique. Si, comme nous l'avons montré, le Père et Son plan de salut constituent le thème central de l'hymne, immédiatement après celui-ci (vss. 15-23) nous trouvons l'application pratique du plan et du pouvoir du Père dans la résurrection du Christ d'entre les morts. Car le Christ est assis à la droite du Père "bien au-dessus de tout souveraineté, autorité, pouvoir et domination". On se demande alors si le rapport existant entre les hymnes des premiers Chrétiens et la réconciliation cosmique était si fort dans l'esprit de ceux-ci que, même une référence de passage, (Eph. 1:10) aurait attiré vers elle du matériel ultérieur qui aurait explicité ce que l'hymne présente de manière implicite.

La présence, à un degré plus ou moins important de la notion de la conquête et de l'assujettissement des pouvoirs cosmiques dans les hymnes traités ici ne peut qu'indiquer un thème chrétien populaire. D'ailleurs, l'évidence ultérieure dans le matériel ne comprenant pas les hymnes, devrait nous mettre en garde contre le fait de ne pas souligner suffisamment le caractère central de la réconciliation cosmique. Ce serait simplement une exagération dire que la réconciliation cosmique est l'un des thèmes majeurs de Paul, comme l'est par exemple, le corps du Christ. (24) Néanmoins, l'assujettissement des pouvoirs cosmiques hostiles, l'hommage cosmique rendu au Seigneur victorieux et la soumission au Père des univers réconciliés sont un thème important dans la théologie de Paul et de l'Eglise primitive. (25)

Un intérêt renouvelé dans la théologie de la réconciliation cosmique est particulièrement pertinent pendant l'Année Sainte dont le thème est le Réconciliation. Certamment, la perspective mondiale de l'homme du XXème siècle a changé considérablement dans les deux derniers siècles. La perspective mondiale de la littérature apocalyptique et pseudo-épigraphique n'est plus prédominante. D'ailleurs, le commentaire de Lohmeyer que les pouvoirs cosmiques signifient la détermination naturelle du monde qui engouffre aussi l'homme, a des applications profondes pour l'homme contemporain. L'homme contemporain, non plus menacé par les Souverainetés, les Pouvoirs, les Autorités et les Principautés, se sent souvent accablé par les forces du mal, tels que la guerre, le racisme et la pauvreté qui semblent faire partie de la construction réelle de notre monde. Si de tels

maux sont les pouvoirs cosmiques du XXème siècle, leur défaite par le Seigneur victorieux et la réconciliation des Univers parlent à l'homme moderne, au coeur de son existence contemporaine. Ainsi la réconciliation proclamée par l'Année Sainte est infiniment élargie dans son étendue. Non plus simplement la réconciliation de l'homme avec l'homme et de l'homme avec Dieu, mais elle est vue à présent comme étant l'élaboration du plan du Père en vue de rassembler toutes les choses sous le Christ Chef pour que le Père puisse être tout en tous.

Elias D. Mallon, S.A.

(1) Cf. R.P. Martin, *Carmen Christi: Philippians ii:6-11*, Cambridge, 1967, pp. 1 suiv. pour discussion sur les significations possibles de l'expression de Pline *carmen dicere*.

(2) Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 19, présente quatre catégories d'hymnes dans le Nouveau Testament: sacramentelle (Eph. 5:14; Tit. 3:4-7); méditative (Eph. 1:3-14; Rm. 8:31-39; I Cor. 13); confessionnelle (I Tim. 6:11-16; II Tim. 2:11-13); christologique (Heb. 1:3; Col. 1:15-20; I Tim. 3:16; Jean 1:1-14; I Pierre 1:18-21; 2:21-25; 3:18-21; Phil. 2:6-11). On pourrait avoir des discussions ultérieures soit sur la classification de Martin soit sur quelques-uns de ses choix qui ne sont pas convaincants. D'ailleurs, il est intéressant et pertinent de mentionner que la liste approfondie qu'il fait, comprend trois "hymnes" se référant explicitement aux pouvoirs cosmiques - Rm. 8:31-39; Heb. 1:3 (4); I Tim. 3:16, tandis que cette référence peut être implicite dans les deux autres - I Tim. 6:11-16 et Pierre 3:18-21.

(3) Toutes les citations des écrits apocryphes et pseudo-épigraphiques sont prises de R.H. Charles (ed.) *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* v. I, II Oxford, 1913, et Edgar Henneke. *New Testament Apocrypha*, Vv. I, II Philadelphia, 1964.

(4) Les anges commencent à acquérir une importance majeure dans les derniers écrits apocalyptiques de l'Ancien Testament. Dans Dan. 10 nous trouvons les anges gardiens des nations mentionnées. Michel se réfère à soi-même comme étant *heis archonton* manifestement de façon amicale (cf. discussion ci-dessous), qui livre bataille contre le *archôn* de Perse et le *archôn* des Grecs. Pour un traitement du développement de la théologie des anges dans le Judaïsme intertestamentaire, cf. TWNT I: 80-82.

(5) Eph. 1:21; Col. 1:16.

(6) Col. 1:16.

(7) Rm. 8:38; I Cor. 15:24; Eph. 1:21; 3:10; 6:12; Col. 1:16, 2:10,15.

(8) Eph. 1:21; 2:2; 3:10; 6:12; Col. 1:13, 16; 1:10,15.

(9) Rm. 8:38; Eph. 1:21.

(10) Ignace, *To the Trallians* 9:1, Polycarpe, *To the Philippians* 2:1. O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time*, Philadelphia 1964, p. 154: "La confession ultérieure d'Ignace d'Antioche montre la régularité avec laquelle soit (sic) les choses du ciel soit celles de la terre soit celles sous la terre apparaissent dans les anciens credo". Des soucis analogues peuvent être reflétés dans le Symbole de Nicée. Le Père est présenté comme étant le "factor visibilium et invisibilium", cf. le *horata* et le *avorata* (Col. 1:16) "choses visibles et invisibles créées dans le Christ. Tandis que le contexte du Symbole de Nicée et Col. 1:16 sont considérablement divers, le premier pouvant refléter le souci pour les pouvoirs cosmiques, souci qui se développe bien-au-delà du IIème siècle.

(11) Cf. Notes 5-9.

(12) Cf. TWNT III: 571 - "en tant que pouvoirs du monde, ils (les *exousiai*) partagent son double caractère. D'une part ils représentent l'aspect charnel de la création qui a cédé aux pouvoirs qui séduisent et asservissent l'homme. D'autre part, ils appartiennent à la création qui est créée (*en christo et eis christon*). Je ne saisis pas l'ambiguïté ressentie par Foerster. Sa citation des Col. 1:16 est précise. Cependant, ce n'est pas du tout une citation positive des pouvoirs comme étant favorables, spécialement vis-à-vis des autres citations (cf. Notes 5-9) où les pouvoirs sont invariablement hostiles. Col. 1:16 fournit une opposition au dualisme presqu'inhérent dans la notion des pouvoirs cosmiques (cf. les efforts des Rabbins pour contrôler le développement de l'"angéologie" TWNT I:82) et peut difficilement être un exemple dans une présentation des pouvoirs comme étant favorables. Une certaine ambiguïté peut être trouvée si l'on compare l'emploi de ces pouvoirs dans les *Secrets d'Enoch* A:20 où ils sont présentés comme étant affreux, mais non néces-

sairement hostiles. La seule présentation claire de ces pouvoirs comme étant tout à fait favorables se trouve dans le *Témoignage de Levi* où ils sont présentés comme glorifiant Dieu.

(13) I Cor. 15:24; Eph. 1:21; 2:2; 3:10; 6:12; Col. 1:16; 2:10,15. Même dans les significations politiques indéterminées de "pouvoir" et d'"autorité", les deux se trouvent dans Luc 12:11 et 20:20. Exceptions: *archai* seul Rm. 8:38; *exousiai* seul Col. 1:13. La différence, s'il n'y en a une, entre les deux est difficile à déterminer (cf. TWNT I:571: ce sont des expressions diverses pour définir la même chose".

(14) Eph. 6:12 raffirme la notion des pouvoirs cosmiques qui tentent l'homme. Les chrétiens les combattent puisqu'ils les considèrent les initiateurs des ténèbres du monde.

(15) R.P. Martin, *op. cit.*, cite Lohmeyer, *Kommentar zum Kolosserbrief*, p. 119: pouvoirs cosmiques "ne signifie, d'une manière mythique, rien d'autre que la détermination naturelle du monde qui engouffre aussi l'homme".

Je ne suis pas sûr que dans les Galates il s'agisse, en effet, d'une demythologisation des "principes fondamentaux". Cela semble plutôt une interprétation homilétique contemporaine d'une ligne de pensée de Paul qui est bien plus complexe.

(16) Si la conquête des pouvoirs est définitive ou non, cela demeure une question ouverte. I Cor. 15:24 suiv. et Heb. 10:13 semblent indiquer qu'elle ne l'est pas. D'autre part II Tim. 1:10 présente la conquête comme ayant été accomplie. Cullmann *op. cit.*, p. 153 voit cela comme étant représentatif d'une tension qui caractérise la période rédemptrice actuelle.

(17) L'acceptation ou le refus de l'expression *thanatou de stauthou* sont ici peu importants. Lohmeyer, dans *Kyrios Jesus* est de l'opinion qu'il s'agit là d'une fausse interprétation paulinienne, tandis que Dibelius dans *An die Philipper*, Cerfaux dans *Le Christ dans la théologie de S. Paul*, Michaelis dans *Der Brief des Paulus an die Philipper*, et Stauffer, dans *NT Theology* acceptent l'expression comme étant authentique et originale dans l'hymne.

(18) Cf. Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 234 suiv.

(19) E. Käsemann, *Kritische Analyse*.

(20) Cf. Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 252.

(21) TWNT III: 633: "c'est une erreur de voir les *katachthonioi* seulement comme les morts qui reposent dans la terre. Ceci est refusé par l'emploi grec où les *katachthonioi* sont toujours *theoi* ou *daimones*.

(22) Cullmann, *op. cit.*, p. 154: "à ce propos nous devons nous reporter surtout à la confession des Phil. 2:6 suiv., qui atteint son apogée dans la formule *kyrios christos*, Lui (le Christ) est à la droite de Dieu, après qu'il s'est élevé au ciel et que les anges, les autorités et les pouvoirs lui ont été soumis".

(23) Edward Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon*, Philadelphia 1971: "Le dernier verset de l'hymne traite de ce travail de réconciliation. Bien qu'il n'y ait pas eu de mention préalable, l'on présuppose ici que l'unité et l'harmonie de l'univers ont subi un égarement remarquable, une rupture même... L'univers a été réconcilié, le ciel et la terre ont été ramenés dans leur ordre divinement établi, à travers la résurrection et l'exaltation du Christ. Maintenant l'univers est de nouveau sous Sa souzeraineté et de ce fait la paix universelle est revenue".

(24) cf. Mac Pherson, le très récent *Symbol, Church and the Body of Christ* (non publié, The Catholic University of America).

(25) Cf. Cullmann, *op. cit.*, p. 153 "l'assujettissement des pouvoirs invisibles est régulièrement mis en relief dans les symboles développés de l'Eglise des premiers Chrétiens.

Toujours Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, Philadelphia 1955. "Hors du Nouveau Testament l'assujettissement de ces pouvoirs est mentionnée expressément dans les formules confessionnelles citées par Ignace (Tral. 9:1), Polycarpe (2:1) et Justin (Apology I, 42)... Je souligne ce point en vue d'indiquer la place importante que cette affirmation a dans la foi des premiers chrétiens. Toutes ces formules confessionnelles anciennes gardent seulement les éléments les plus importants de la foi des premiers Chrétiens. Si la souzeraineté du Christ sur les pouvoirs et les autorités est régulièrement mentionnée dans ces brefs commentaires, elle doit être un article de foi bien central.

ANNOUNCING THE PUBLICATION OF THE
SECOND EDITION OF THE ECUMENICAL
DIRECTORY *ECUMENISM AROUND THE
WORLD - L'OECCUMENISME A TRAVERS LE
MONDE*

This new edition updates and corrects the directory which we published in 1971. It contains information on ecumenical Institutes, Centers and organizations throughout the world. This edition also includes a descriptive list of addresses of currently published ecumenical periodical literature and like the first edition is bi-lingual (English - French).

Copies of the Second Edition may be purchased from:

GRAYMOOR ECUMENICAL INSTITUTE
Garrison, N.Y. 10524
U.S.A.

CENTRO PRO UNIONE
Via S. Maria dell'Anima, 30
00186 ROMA - Italia

(Directory will be ready in the Spring of 1975)

Price: U.S. \$ 3.00 - Lit. 2.000

ANNONCE DE LA PUBLICATION DE LA
DEUXIÈME ÉDITION DU DIRECTOIRE
OCCUMÉNIQUE *ECUMENISM AROUND THE
WORLD - L'OECCUMENISME A TRAVERS LE
MONDE*

Cette nouvelle édition met à jour et corrige le directory que nous avons publié dans le 1971. Il comprend toutes les informations des instituts, des centres et des organisations oecuméniques existant dans le monde. Cette édition comprend aussi une liste descriptive, avec les adresses, de la littérature oecuménique couramment publiée, et comme la première édition est bilingue (anglais et français).

Les exemplaires de la Deuxième Edition peuvent être achetés chez:

GRAYMOOR ECUMENICAL INSTITUTE
Garrison, N.Y. 10524
U.S.A.

CENTRO PRO UNIONE
Via S. Maria dell'Anima, 30
00186 ROMA - Italia

(Le Directoire sera prêt dans le printemps du 1975)

Prix: U.S. \$ 3.00 - Lit. 2.000

CENTRO PRO UNIONE

The *Centro Pro Unione* is a center for ecumenical formation: for study and research, for the exchange of information, and for encounter. To achieve these ends, the Centro runs a series of conferences each year studying various aspects of the ecumenical movement from the pastoral, theological, social and practical points of view. Its facilities are available to any group with an ecumenical concern. The staff organizes programs for individuals as well as groups who visit Rome with an ecumenical purpose. It provides an ecumenical library for students in Rome and is available to supply information on ecumenical activities throughout the world. The Library has 7,000 titles of an ecumenical nature in 5 languages (e.g. theological subjects studied ecumenically, dialogues, documentation, Church History etc.) as well as 1,200 bound periodicals (specialized in ecumenics) and more than 100 current reviews.

The *Centro Pro Unione* is staffed by the Atonement Friars who are a religious community in the Franciscan tradition, existing specifically to help fulfill the Church's mission of Christian Unity, to witness to the Gospel among Christians and non-Christians and to bring all men to the fullness of unity with the People of God.

CENTRO PRO UNIONE

Centro Pro Unione est un centre de formation oecuménique: pour l'étude et la recherche pour l'échange d'informations, et pour les rencontres? Pour réaliser ces buts, le centre organise chaque année des séries de conférences qui étudient les divers aspects du mouvement oecuménique: pastoral, théologique, social, et les points de vue pratiques. Il met ses locaux et autres facilités à la disposition de tout groupe ayant un but oecuménique. L'équipe organise un programme pour les particuliers ou les groupes qui visitent Rome dans un dessein oecuménique. Il possède une bibliothèque oecuménique ouverte aux étudiants, et il est à même d'informer sur les activités oecuméniques à travers le monde. La bibliothèque a 7,000 titres de caractère oecuménique, en 5 langues (sujets théologiques, dialogues, documentation, histoire de l'Eglise, etc.), 1.200 périodiques reliés et plus de 100 revues courantes.

Les Frères de l'Atonement (l'équipe du centre) sont une congrégation religieuse de tradition franciscaine. Leur vocation spécifique est d'aider l'Eglise en sa mission de rétablir l'unité chrétienne, de témoigner de l'Évangile parmi les chrétiens et les non-chrétiens, de conduire tous les hommes à la plénitude d'unité avec le peuple de Dieu.