Thank you very much Mother Nikola and Sr Benedict.

I am delighted to be part of this ecumenical gathering. I come with a sense of humility as a Catholic to present, or perhaps to run with the ‘baton’ Olivier Clément holds out to us, to also run with. We are all here as gift bearers, not only of knowledge, creativity and a desire to encounter each other at a deeper level than dialogue, but as ‘pneumatophores’, bearers of the Holy Spirit. His presence in the unique way He indwells each of us is our true gift to each other. As Clément and Patriarch Athenagoras might say, we are icons of God for each other.

I will start by briefly answering the question: Who is Olivier Clément? Then situate Clément ecclesially in the Tradition of the Orthodox Church and ecumenically and dialogically with Catholicism, before moving on to discuss an Orthodox view of the papacy and Clément’s response to Ut Unum Sint. The following questions are examined: In what way can the Orthodox help the process of ‘ecumenical reinterpretation’ of primacy in the universal Church? Is there a place in Orthodox ecclesiology for a position of ‘universal leadership’?
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Introduction

The French Orthodox lay theologian, Olivier Clément, deeply desired that both lungs of Christianity would breathe fully and in harmony. It would seem that nothing in his immediate family background predisposed him to become one of the great Christian dialogical theologians of the twentieth century. Born in a dechristianised milieu in

---

4 John Paul II used this metaphor. See also Henri Tancq, Le Monde, 16 Janvier, 2009.
Southern France on 17 November 1921, into a family with socialist and atheist beliefs, he received no religious education and grew up embracing those ideologies. He had little familiarity with Catholic culture and faith, and this at first affected his openness to Catholicism. His encounters at university with the important thinkers Henri-Irénée Marrou\(^5\) and Alphonse Dupront\(^6\), introduced him to the Patristic writings and anthropology of religions; later during his time with the French Resistance he avidly read Kierkegaard, Newman, Heidegger and Chestov. But it was his encounter with the theologians and philosophers of the Russian emigration that led him to Christian conversion and reception into the Russian Orthodox Church in Paris in 1951, aged 30. Historian and teacher, Clément also became a professor at the Institute of St Sergius in Paris, the intellectual centre for Orthodoxy founded by Russian émigré Christians in 1925 under the leadership of Nicolas Berdiaev and Sergius Bulgakov, and influenced by the thought of Nicolas Afanasieff, Vladimir Lossky and Paul Evdokimov, who were Clément’s friends and colleagues. Clément is recognised as one of the major figures of this ‘Paris School’ that flourished in France after the Russian Revolution, and also as a significant pioneer of the renewal of Orthodox theology from mid-twentieth century until his death on 15 January 2009. In significant ways the Russian émigré group brought a renewed faith, rooted in Tradition, into dialogue with problems posed by Western modernity, the flaming torch, as it were, of the ‘Russian idea’ was passed on to Clément who brought it forward into the twenty-first century. The importance of his thinking continues to have significant contemporary relevance.

**Situating Clément ecclesially in Orthodoxy and dialogically with Catholicism**

Becoming strongly anchored in the Tradition of Eastern Orthodoxy, Clément however remained French and European. The origins of his thought on ecclesial authority would have been influenced by the experience of Russian émigrés who sought to come under the ecclesial authority of Constantinople rather than Moscow, when a temporary Russian exarchate was established in Western Europe in 1931. This orientation and Clément’s later collaboration with Patriarch Athenagoras

\(^6\) Alphonse Dupront (1905-1990, French historian who specialised in the Middle Ages to Modern era.
I was an early defining influence. The experience of the patriarch who had bravely protected the island of Corfu against Mussolini’s marine attack, and later as Archbishop in America became a friend of President Truman during 1930-1948, inclined him towards openness and understanding of the West and modernity. Clément and Athenagoras shared the desire to raise awareness of Orthodoxy, almost unknown in the West, and to work for Christian unity.

Clément sought to implement a new paradigm for ecumenism through an ecclesiology of communion and a synthesis of culture and Christian values. He notes that for Christians of the first centuries, the Church was above all the Body of Christ, that there was no ecclesiology per se; and affirms, ‘It is the eucharist that makes the Church the Body of Christ’.7 Clément’s colleague, Nicolas Afanasiev8, professor at St Sergius Institute from 1930 until his death in 1966, states in his thesis on eucharistic theology, that the gathering of the faithful around the Scriptures and eucharistic table forms the Church’s ecclesial identity. Afanasiev’s eucharistic theology, ‘the Eucharist makes the Church’, made a significant contribution to ecumenical dialogue. This ecclesiology of communion recognised by most Christian Churches and Confessions today, was prior to the 1960s a radical expression of ecclesiology for both Orthodox and Catholic Churches, whose identity was characterised externally by hierarchical structures, rules and rubrics. Afanasiev returned to the early Patristic sources to understand the Church in its relationship and engagement with the world, and with the culture in which it lived. His theological vision was shared by many important contemporary Catholic theologians, including Louis Bouyer, a Lutheran minister who converted to Catholicism and acted as a consultant at Vatican II; French Jesuits Henri de Lubac, peritus at the Council, and Jean Daniélou, invited by John XXIII to attend the Council as an expert; Dominican Marie-Dominique Chenu also a peritus at the Council; Dominican scholar and ecumenist Yves Congar and others.

The so-called ‘return to the sources’ brought about a restoration of Tradition and ecclesial renewal, as many scholars sought to bring Tradition and contemporary problems into a creative Christian synthesis; it also prepared the Council Fathers of Vatican II to be more openly receptive to elements of truth embodied in the Eastern tradition; Clément recalls that Orthodox observer Paul Evdokimov commented on this receptivity and openness. Athenagoras I, with whom Clément was to identify closely, recommended Afanasiev to be an official observer at the Second Vatican Council, where his ecclesiological work influenced the writing of Lumen Gentium. Orthodox influence was a reality at Vatican II, ‘a kind of transfusion of ecclesial lifeblood from the East to the West’ occurred, due also to the presence of Eastern Catholic Churches who unite Orthodox East and Latin West within their ecclesial expressions. This influence resulted in greater emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit; the important role of the laity; and a more collegial understanding in connection with papal authority. In Hermann Pottmeyer’s assessment the Fathers and theologians of Vatican II were convinced that the Petrine office was a gift of God to his Church; they ‘understood the universal church as a community of local churches requiring collegial leadership open to participation by all’. He judges the Council had provided a theological foundation for an ‘ecclesiology of communion’, but had failed to overcome centralisation of papal jurisdiction. The Orthodox Bishop Vsevelod of Scopolos declares the ‘Roman Primacy is and should be a gift of God to His Church, a service to the Church which we need.’ Similarly Clément recalls the ‘presidency of love’ vested in the Church of Rome and the need to recall ‘the special role of Peter (prôtos not archê) to which the New Testament attests’. Prôtos refers here to the first in a series, Clément points out,
and not arché, the first cause, which could only be Christ.\textsuperscript{18} Alexander Schmemann’s view accords with Vsevelod and Clément in recognising a three-fold structure of the ‘local primacy’, the ‘regional primacy’ and the ‘highest and ultimate form of primacy: universal primacy,’\textsuperscript{19} also identified by Pottmeyer as normative. Schmemann affirms that as well as ‘centres of agreement’, universal primacy also existed; the ecclesiological error in his view lies in the primacy’s identification with supreme power; this should not force Orthodoxy to reject primacy but to seek an Orthodox interpretation.\textsuperscript{20}

Pope John XXIII’s convocation of the Second Vatican Council initiated an era of papal commitment to dialogue in which three subsequent popes, Paul VI, John Paul II and Benedict XVI, have called for a deeper reflection on Christian unity. Benedict XVI declares ‘The task of ecumenical commitment is even more urgent today, to give our society, which is marked by tragic conflicts and lacerating divisions, a sign and an impulse towards reconciliation and peace’.\textsuperscript{21} What is needed is a hermeneutics of Renewal initiated at Vatican II in synthesis with a hermeneutics of Tradition. In Clément’s view the phenomenon of globalisation demands that Christians join together as leaven in the history of the world.\textsuperscript{22} United in love and solidarity, the Church becomes an icon of the Body of Christ that makes Christ present in a visible form, not only to other religions but to a ‘secular’ non-believing or atheist society, where consumers, politicians and intellectuals seek Truth in the material.

Clément’s work for unity made him unpopular with some members of his own Church, as when he critiqued the tendency towards nationalism at the end of the ‘Cold War’ and revival of the Orthodox Church. Clément writes in 1997, ‘Orthodoxy must provide an unbiased witness to

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 19.
\textsuperscript{19} Cohen, 340.
all humanity’ and ‘free itself from the idolatry of nationalism’.  

Clément’s discussions with many eminent religious leaders of the twentieth century on important contemporary spiritual, ecclesial and cultural problems enabled him to make an informed and sensitive ecumenical contribution. Dialogues with Patriarch Athenagoras; Patriarch Bartholomew I; Pope John Paul II; Brother Roger of Taize; Dmitru Staniloae, some of these were published in book form, of which *Dialogues avec le Patriarch Athénagoras*, in 1969 was a landmark in ecumenical dialogue, that marked an era of ecumenical springtime. In 1998 Jean Paul II invited Clément to compose a new *Via Crucis* text for the Good Friday meditation and procession from Rome’s Coliseum to the Roman Forum. Clément reflects that the death of Christ makes all attitudes other than penitence and reconciliation derisory; it is no longer possible to think of separation while meditating on the *Via Crucis*. John Paul II’s request for an Orthodox theologian to compose the meditation reflected his desire to recognise and bring healing to historical wounds and divisions, a course which he further pursued through words of apology and reconciliation.

---


24 Patriarch Athénagoras I of Constantinople (1886-1972), born in the Ottoman Empire, son of the village doctor. In 1922 he was elected Metropolitan of Corfu, and in 1930 became Greek Orthodox Archbishop of North and South America until he was elected Patriarch of Constantinople in 1948. His meeting with Pope Paul VI in Jerusalem, 1964, was a landmark that resulted in the lifting of anathemas that separated East and West since 1054, thus opening up dialogue between Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches. See: Clément, *Dialogues avec le Patriarch Athénagoras*, Fayard, 1969.

25 Patriarch Bartholomew I, 1940, has Turkish nationality. While head of the small Greek community remaining in Turkey, he is spiritual leader of 300 million Orthodox Christians worldwide. See Clément, *Vérité vous rendre libre*, Lartes, 1996; translated as *Conversations with Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I*, 1997.


27 Taizé, an ecumenical French monastic order has approximately one hundred brothers from Catholic, Orthodox and Protestant traditions. Over 100,000 young people from around the world make pilgrimages there each year. See Clément, *Taizé, un sens à la vie*, Bayard-Centurian, 1997.


30 In May 2001, John Paul II went on pilgrimage to Greece, the first visit by a Pope since the Great Schism of 1054, when excommunication of the Patriarch of Constantinople by papal legates was responded to by the Patriarch’s excommunication of the legates: Christianity was divided on doctrinal, theological, linguistic, political and geographical lines, into Western (Latin) and Eastern (Greek) branches. The pope asked God to forgive Catholics for sins against Orthodox Christians, specifically mentioning the pillage of Constantinople by Crusaders in 1204. In 2004 John Paul II returned a precious icon to the Russian Orthodox Church as a personal gift from himself, an eighteenth century copy of the Virgin of Kazan which had hung above his desk in the Vatican. The relics of two saints kept in St Peter’s for approximately 800 years, were returned to Bartholomew I in Constantinople,
The Exercise of Papal Primacy

While some Orthodox expressed scepticism after Vatican II, John Paul II’s encyclical on ecumenism *Ut Unum Sint*, 25 May 1995, was acknowledged among positive developments since the Council and recognised as ‘affirming’ and of ‘tremendous historical significance’. John Paul’s encyclical invited Christian leaders and theologians, not in union with Rome, to engage with him in patient and fraternal dialogue, ‘in a common reflection of papal primacy’. The pope hoped to rediscover together ‘forms in which this ministry may accomplish a service of love recognised by all concerned’ (UUS 95); ‘to find a way of exercising the primacy which... is open to a new situation’, (UUS 95); that leaving ‘useless controversies behind, we could listen to one another, keeping before us the will of Christ for his Church and allowing ourselves to be deeply moved by His plea “that they may all be one ... so that the world may believe that you have sent me”’ John 17:21, (UUS 96).

Clement’s response to this invitation was *Rome Autrement*, a ‘concise, learned and articulate’ reflection on the papal primacy, published in 1997. He opens by stating that ‘the problem of the papacy is clearly the greatest difficulty facing ecumenical dialogue today, and particularly the dialogue between Catholicism and Orthodoxy.’ But in his view, John Paul’s encyclical is a ‘doorway of hope’. As an historian Clément judges that knowledge of past changes in the Petrine office assists in creatively shaping an ecclesiology to the needs of the present and the future. His opening emphasis is the history and experience of the ‘undivided Church’; he then recalls the contrasting development of who responded: ‘There are no problems which are insurmountable, when love, justice and peace meet’. ‘The Catholic Church desires nothing less than full communion between East and West’, *Ut unim sint*, 61, 1995.

---

31 Cohen, 335.
32 You are Peter, 9
34 Avery Cardinal Dulles SJ, ‘Foreword’, You are Peter, 8.
35 A phrase that contrasts with Peter Brunner’s statement that Vatican I ‘slammed the door shut’, and marks a new beginning; Peter Brunner, Evangelium und Papsttum* Evangelisch-lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, 10, 1956, 42, cited in Pottmeyer, 16.
eastern and western Christianity; and concludes with the tasks that call Christians to unity.37

His approach is irenic. During the five decades of his Christian life, Clément’s understanding of Christian unity matured and deepened. In an interview for France Catholique in 2004, he reflects on his decision above all to give up the use of polemics. He recalls it was Patriarch Athenagoras, the man of reconciliation and unity, who freed him from ‘fear of the other’, and opened a ‘capacity’ to love, that chooses to regard another Christian as a brother rather than be against him. This capacity, he believes, matured since meeting Jean Paul II.38 ‘Moving beyond polemics, we need today to reflect on a period of ecclesial life in which tensions were resolved neither against the pope, nor against the councils, but in a different way.39 It would seem the prophetic Patriarch of Constantinople, Athenagoras I, demonstrated a ‘different way’. A year after Athenagoras and Paul VI met in Jerusalem the anathemas exchanged in 1054 were lifted, signalling a new era, ‘a dialogue of charity’40 had begun. It is significant that Clément chose a photograph of Paul VI and Athenagoras embracing fraternally in Jerusalem in 1964 for the front cover of Rome Autrement. In 1967 Paul VI visited Istanbul and as a sign of atonement prayed at the Hagia Sophia on the spot where a cardinal had excommunicated the ecumenical Patriarch in the name of the See of Rome in 1054. Later in the Phanar, Athenagoras greeted Paul VI as ‘the very holy successor to Peter’; and in a message in 1971, Athenagoras declared he saw the bishop of Rome as ‘the elder brother’, ‘the herald and eminent artisan of peace, love and unity of Christians.’41 In a spontaneous response Paul VI knelt and embraced the feet of the Metropolitan who brought the message,42 symbolically reversing the negative response of Pius IX on 1870, who put his weight on the neck of the Greek Catholic Patriarch of Antioch who dared oppose the dogma of Vatican I. The dialogue between Athenagoras and Paul VI is recorded in the Tomas Agapis, published simultaneously by the Phanar and the

37 You are Peter, ‘Introduction, 9.
39 Clément, Conversations with Bartholomew I, 177
40 You are Peter, 83. SEE RATZINGER’S ARTICLE ON LIFTING OF ANATHEMAS, REF?
41 Ibid.
42 Ibid.
Vatican, and in Clément’s opinion it remains for today, and still more for tomorrow a true *locus theologicus*, a theological meeting-point. The Pope and the Patriarch demonstrated the use of a common language between two sister-churches: of the Apostles and the Fathers as well as over a thousand years as an undivided Church. ‘From this perspective of an ecclesiology of communion the Patriarch ... stressed that it was not the mystery of the Roman primacy that was questioned by the Orthodox, only some of its modern applications.’ He frequently used the phrase of Ignatius of Antioch to speak of a ‘presidency of love’ vested in the Church of Rome. The term ‘sister Churches’ appeared in correspondence between Athenagoras and John XXIII, then between the Patriarch and Paul VI, and was frequently used by John Paul II, as when he visited Constantinople in 1979 and in *Ut Unum Sint*, (56) where he refers to ‘the doctrine of Sister Churches’ (60). Dialogue between the two Churches, Clément believed was no longer simply one ‘of charity’ but had become properly theological. Before his election as Athenagoras’ successor, Patriarch Bartholomew I served eight years as vice-president of the ecumenical council, ‘Faith and Constitution’, where Catholics were fully represented. It was within that council, Clément observes, that progress characterised by integrity had been made; Bartholomew is thus very well informed about ecumenical problems and has knowledge of contemporary exegesis that, in Clément’s view, Athenagoras lacked.

In 1995 Patriarch Bartholomew referred to ‘our elder brother, John Paul II’, but was quick to issue warnings, perhaps in awareness of the anti-Western and anti-Catholic view held by many Orthodox following the collapse of communism and subsequent intrusion of objectionable aspects of western culture into the eastern and south-eastern countries of Europe; for these Orthodox, although a minority, the West means Rome. Although Bartholomew was in agreement with the Vatican

---

43 Ibid., 84.
44 Ibid., 84.
47 *You are Peter*, 85.
48 Ibid., 86.
concerning the *filioque* problem, he strongly criticised Rome’s interpretation of the passage from Matthew 16:18, which continues to provoke controversy, ‘You are Peter, the rock, and on this rock I will build my Church.’ At a subsequent meeting in Rome between Bartholomew I and John Paul II on 27-29 June 1995, the Patriarch, as the pope’s personal guest, was invited to give the homily in St Peter’s, he again raised Peter’s confession of faith at Caesarea Philippi, emphasising how deeply controversial the interpretation of the text Matthew 16:18 remained, stressing the ‘need for self-criticism and continuous repentance’; when a kenotic ethos finally prevails then we will restore the unity of faith. The pope said little apparently but agreed the exercise of the primacy only makes sense as service and requires humility. Clément notes the pope’s real response is found at the conclusion of *Ut Unum Sint* which calls for a reflection on the role of the primacy. He judges the encounter was rich in symbolism but a ‘failure as a meeting of minds’. In Zurich, December 1995, Bartholomew affirmed his view that the ‘only authority of divine origin existing in the Church was that of the bishops and their collegiality... the pope’s role had no scriptural foundation’. In June 1996, in an interview with a Polish weekly, Bartholomew ‘reaffirmed that “the ministry of the Pope has become the biggest and most scandalous stumbling-block” to dialogue between Orthodox and Roman Catholics’; he went on to question the exercise of the papal ‘ministry since the end of the first millennium, notably the “mistaken theological claims” to universal papal jurisdiction.’ Bartholomew stated the Church of Rome founded by the Apostles Peter and Paul, had the responsibility of solicitude, ‘presiding in love’ among the local churches but not of governing them. Clément judges that while it is necessary to be open, and criticism of the way the Roman primacy is exercised is justified, these statements seem

51 *You are Peter*, 86.  
52 Ibid., 87.  
55 Clément, *Conversations*, 188.
somewhat ‘reductive and polemical’. In Clément’s view it is important to remember the ‘mystery’ recognised by the East from the fifth century of the presence of Peter (and Paul) in Rome, and the ‘presidency of love’ vested in the Church of Rome. Clément finds it important to recall the special role of Peter as prôtos not arché, validated by the New Testament. He recalls Serge Bulgakov’s appraisal, that the separation of Orthodox and Catholic Christians does not mean the radical formation of two Churches; rather it is ‘a crack in the single trunk, which continued to bring fruits of holiness to both sides’; if history is accelerated in the West, the archaism of the Eastern Christian tenaciously brings witness to the arché, the original. Clément adds that ‘Vatican II recognised that the Petrine ministry could only function within the grace sustaining the episcopacy, for there is no sacrament of papacy.’

Clément attempts an explanation of the ‘intransigent positions taken by the patriarch’. He points to a hardening, reactionary position of some Orthodox, which the patriarch must take into consideration, and secondly the admirable ecclesiology developed by John Zizioulas, close advisor of Bartholomew. Zizioulas prefers the theological method, considering the ‘historical approach to the question of papal primacy has proved to be almost pointless in the debate and can be of very little use in the ecumenical discussion of the issue.’ He sees no other structure of grace in the Church than that of the episcopacy, a view which contrasts with the great ecclesiologist Nicolas Afanasieff, who observed that from the earliest years of the Church, a greater ‘priority of reception’ was accorded to the church of Rome.

Within this context Clément recalls a prophetic event which occurred a month after the publication of Ut Unum Sint. When the synod of the Greek Catholic Church took place in Lebanon nearly all bishops present signed a profession of faith that expressed firstly, ‘I believe everything
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56 Clément, Ibid.
58 You are Peter, 87.
59 Ibid., 88.
60 Professor John Zizioulas, Metropolitan John of Pergamum.
61 Zizioulas, 170.
62 You are Peter, 88.
63 Ibid. See Zizioulas concerning the local and universal Church: Afanasieff reversed the priority preferred by Catholic ecclesiology by positing the local church first; Zizioulas considers the Eucharist points to the ‘simultaneity of the locality and the universality in ecclesiology’, 173.
that the Orthodox Church teaches’, secondly, ‘I am in communion with
the bishop of Rome, in the role that the Eastern Fathers accorded him
before the separation.’ The text was approved by Metropolitan George
Khodr of the Orthodox patriarchate of Antioch, with the agreement of
the Patriarch Ignatius IV Hazim. The Metropolitan declared, ‘I consider
this profession of faith to set the necessary and sufficient conditions for
re-establishing the unity of the Orthodox Churches with Rome.’ ‘The
collegial character of the organisation of the Church based on the
original body of Apostles was everyday doctrine among Melkite, Greek,
Council II, Orbis, Maryknoll, 1999, 17.}

\textbf{The Mystery of Primacy}

Debates about the Church as an institution, Clément considers, fail to see
the real state of ‘ecclesial being’ as the experience of a person in
communion, for whom humanity and the cosmos are by nature
‘resurrectional and paschal’.\footnote{You are Peter, 88-89.} Russian émigré theologian, Georges
Florovsky,\footnote{Sources, 12.} considers there is a ‘preparatory grace’\footnote{Georges Florovsky, ‘The Eastern Orthodox Church and the Ecumenical Movement’, \textit{Theology Today}, 7.1, 1950, 69; cited by Will Cohen, ‘Florovsky – Ecclesiology and Unity’, 20.} present in the
Eucharistic communion of the divided Churches, that introduces an
eschatological dimension of ‘sacramental grace as an in-breaking of the
\textit{future} into the present in the life of the Church’. The ecclesiology of
John Paul II stresses this category of communion: ‘The reality of the
Church as communion is ... the central content of the “mystery”, it
cannot be understood in merely sociological or psychological terms.’
The supreme model of the Church, John Paul explains, is ‘the divine
Trinity as a \textit{communion personarum}’\footnote{Pope John Paul II, \textit{Sources of Renewal: The Implementation of Vatican II}, Harper & Row, San

Unity of the Church was for
Clément, he says, ‘a Trinitarian obligation’\footnote{Clément, \textit{Memoires de l’espérance}, Desclée de Brouwer (DDB), 2003,21.}. His early quest as an
atheist for the meaning of being fully human became a life-long search
that developed into a theology of the mystery of the human person, to
whom he accorded eternal value and dignity, rooted in the Trinity,

\footnote{CHECK}\footnote{Will Cohen, ‘Sacraments and the visible Unity of the Church’ Ecclesiology, 4.1, 2007, 68-87, 81.}
recognising that Christ crucified and risen is the ultimate meaning of the existence of the human person, of history and death. Clément expressed his deep gratitude to the Orthodox Church, first for opening him up to an awareness of an ‘Easter joy that heals the secret wounds of the soul’, and secondly, for the ‘sense of mystery and a sense of joy’ that characterises Orthodox liturgy and ascesis. The key to understanding all significant processes of change, he expresses in his commentary on the roots of Christian mysticism, is the interpretation of the whole of life and the universe in the light of Christ’s death and resurrection; the witness of the Church; and the ‘mystery’ of Christ who restores us to life and brings about the transfiguration of the cosmos.

The mystery of primacy for Clément is linked first to the veneration of the Church of Rome in the early centuries as the church of the martyr-apostles Peter and Paul, then to the martyr-bishops, so that its true role could only be *martyria* - that it is a primacy of service that extends in the special double sense of witness and martyrdom. Secondly, primacy has another foundation: Christ’s teaching on the unity of the disciples as based on the love of the Father and the Son, that is a Trinitarian love. Clement concludes that the Father, within the Trinity, makes himself responsible for a communion which is primary. This for Clément evokes the Orthodox Canon 34: ‘It is fitting that the bishops should know who among them is first and that they acknowledge him as head, and that they do nothing outside their own churches without having consulted him. But neither should the one who is first do anything without deliberating with all the others ... In this way there will be unity of thought, and God (the Father) will by glorified through the Lord in the Holy Spirit.’ It is therefore Clément’s judgement that in no way is it essential to the exercise of primacy that the bishop of Rome should appoint the bishops of the entire world, nor that his administrative headquarters should be a sovereign territory; nor that he should be head of state among all the powerful. Clément points to the papacy of the first eight centuries, who without such a State, bore witness to the independence of the Church through martyrdom if necessary.

---

73 *You are Peter*, 91-92.
74 Ibid., 92.
Clément believes ‘it is possible to conceive of a Church restructured around dynamic eucharistic communities, each gathered round its bishop yet linked ... to centres of unison and of communion ... with universal primacy ultimately pertaining to the bishop of Rome as the embodiment of both the presence of Peter and the charismatic inspiration of Paul.’\textsuperscript{75} In the first millennium Rome did not claim jurisdiction over the other churches, she possessed an ‘authority’, not power, the petrine role was to keep watch over the local churches to prevent them breaking away, to intervene if requested, to serve as a point of reference.\textsuperscript{76}  

Clément cites John Paul II declaration, ‘What I seek with the Orthodox is communion not jurisdiction.’ On a number of occasions John Paul II, but always during private interviews, ‘has spoken of a primatial authority “with different gears” which would fully respect, as the Antiochenes propose, the internal freedom of the eastern Churches, as it existed during the first millennium.’ It would be necessary to specify that infallibility is conferred exclusively by the Holy Spirit; Clément recognises that Vatican I made it clear that it is not the pope who is infallible but his definitions, and this by the particular assistance of the Holy Spirit. As such they would have intrinsic validity and would not require confirmation by the Church, although the statement \textit{non ex consensus ecclesiae} (not with the Church’s consensus) is most unfortunate. It would be necessary to foresee a link between the three forms of Peter’s succession: the faith of the people of God, which can be expressed on occasion by a single prophet; the episcopacy in its collegiality; and the bishop of that church that was ‘founded and constituted by the apostles Peter and Paul.’\textsuperscript{77}  

Prayer and confidence in the promises of Christ, and openness to the promptings of the Holy spirit. ‘\textit{The one essential}’ change required in the exercise of papal primacy in Clément’s judgement, ‘\textit{would be to pass from a situation where the hierarchical dovetailing of power structures has legal backup, to one where tensions are held in balance without predetermined juridical solutions.}’ A fruitful step forward would be to proceed to a common reflection, as John Paul II requested at the end of \textit{Ut Unum Sint}, on decisions made during the centuries of division. Clément reflects that when John Paul II

\textsuperscript{75} Ibid., 92.  
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., 29.  
\textsuperscript{77} Ibid., 91-92.
visited the patriarch in Constantinople, he knew it involved risks from nationalist and Islamic circles used by communist regimes; the intended assassination attempt ‘became the sacrifice which gave to that visit a mystical dimension .. For the blood then shed made ... the Pontifex maximus the Servus servorum Dei.’

‘There is a close connection between the confession of faith and martyrdom.’

The Church moves slowly, and ecumenical advancement is a slow process. Olivier Clément gives us a compass reading that indicates progress in the process of mutual correction and mutual enrichment is underway, a healing of memories has started. His contribution, as Avery Cardinal Dulles declared, is ‘a beacon of hope for the future.’
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