

ISSN 0273-3269

COPTIC CHURCH REVIEW

Volume 17, Number 3 Fall 1996

• *SALVATION AND FAITH*

• *THE SOUL/BODY ANALOGY AND
INCARNATION IN CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA*



Society of Coptic Church Studies

EDITORIAL BOARD

Bishop Wissa
(Al-Balyana, Egypt)

Bishop Antonious Markos
(Coptic Church, African Affairs)

Bishop Isaac
(Quesna, Egypt)

Bishop Dioscorus
(Coptic Church, Egypt)

Fr. Tadros Malaty
(Alexandria, Egypt)

Professor Fayek Ishak
(Ontario, Canada)

William El-Meiry, Ph.D.
(N.J., U.S.A.)

Girgis A. Ibrahim, Ph.D.
(Minnesota, U.S.A.)

Esmat Gabriel, Ed.D.
(PA., U.S.A.)

EDITOR
Rodolph Yanney, M.D.

CIRCULATION MANAGER
Ralph Yanney

© Copyright 1996
by Coptic Church Review
E. Brunswick, NJ

Subscription and Business Address:
Society of Coptic Church Studies
P.O. Box 714, E. Brunswick, NJ 08816

Editorial Address:
Coptic Church Review
P.O. Box 1113, Lebanon, PA 17042

Subscription Price (1 Year)
U.S.A. \$10.00
Canada \$12.00 (U.S. dollars)
Overseas \$13.00

Articles are indexed in *Religion Index One: Periodicals*; book reviews are indexed in *Index to Book Reviews in Religion*. Both indexes are published by the American Theological Library Association, Chicago, available online through BRS Information Technologies (Latham, New York) and DIALOG Information Services (Palo Alto, California).

Abstracts of articles appear in *Religious and Theological Abstracts*, Myerstown, PA 17067.

COPTIC CHURCH REVIEW

A Quarterly of Contemporary Patristic Studies
ISSN 0273-3269

Volume 17, Number 3Fall 1996

50 About This Issue

50 Special Issue: Cyril of Alexandria

51 Salvation and Faith
Father Matta El-Meskeen

59 The Soul/Body Analogy and Incarnation in Cyril of Alexandria
Thomas Weinandy, O.F.M.

67 Patriarchal Succession
Otto Meinardus

71 Book Reviews

- **Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom**
- **Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism**
- **Eastern Monasticism and the Future of the Church**
- **Beasts and Saints**
- **Von Echnaton Zu Jesus**
- **Coptic Roots of Christianity**
- **Coptologia**
- **History of Christianity in Africa**

80 Book Notices

Microfilm and microfiche copies of previous issues and articles are available from University Microfilms International, 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

ABOUT THIS ISSUE

In *Salvation and Faith*, Father Matta El-Meskeen corrects a common misconception in the relation of faith to salvation. The article was written in Arabic in March 1994 and translated into English and published in the September 1995 issue of *St. Mark Monthly Review*. Father Matta is known worldwide as an ascetic, theologian and spiritual director. Most of his major works have not been published in English. They include several commentaries on the NT books, and volumes on the liturgy, liturgical year, monasticism, spirituality and a biography of St. Athanasius.

Dr. Thomas Weinandy discusses *The Soul/Body Analogy and Incarnation in the Writings of St. Cyril of Alexandria*. This paper was presented at the *12th International Conference on Patristic Studies* (Oxford, 21-26 August 1995). Fr. Weinandy is an American and a member of the Capuchin/Franciscan Order. He obtained a Ph.D. from Kings College, London and is presently the Warden of Greyfriars, Oxford. He also tutors and lectures in History and Doctrine in the University of Oxford. He has written three scholarly works: *Does God Change?: The Word's Becoming in the Incarnation*, *In the Likeness of Sinful Flesh: An Essay on the Humanity of Christ*, *The Father's Spirit of Sonship: Reconceiving the Trinity*.

In *The Pontifical Succession by White Smoke or Altar Lot?* Dr. Otto Meinardus discusses the methods used in choosing the patriarchs in the main Apostolic churches with a historical review of the different ways which have been followed in the Coptic Church since the first century. Professor Meinardus is a well-known church historian, archaeologist and Coptologist who has frequently contributed to this journal.

Editor

Acknowledgement

Scripture quotations in this volume, unless otherwise noted, are from the Revised Standard Version of the Bible copyrighted 1946, 1952. © 1971, 1973 and used by permission of the division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches.

Special Issue of Coptic Church Review
ST. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA
(His Life, Works, Liturgy and Theology)

- Scheduled for Spring 1997.
- New and previously published articles and reviews (Scholarly or General) are appreciated.
- Deadline for the receipt of articles is December 1996.

An Amendment to the Concept of:

SALVATION AND FAITH

Father Matta El-Meskeen

The relationship between salvation and faith seems to be misunderstood theologically by many. Someone may assume that he must have faith in Christ—the faith which consists in believing that Christ died for our sins and was raised for our justification, as the verse goes (Rom 4:25). [He assumes that it is] through this faith we are saved; “If you confess with your lips that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved” (Rom 10:9). Salvation [in this view] comes through the forgiveness of sins and liberation from the punishment of eternal death [on the basis that] Christ died on the cross for our sins. Salvation [in this perspective] also includes the acceptance of eternal life—for Christ trod death down and rose from the dead, raising us with him in newness of life.

[So to summarize the view of many] salvation is understood as being effected through faith, faith being the instrument of salvation or that which brings about salvation. However, this is a theological concept which has been turned on its head.

The correct concept is that Christ fulfilled salvation for humanity and offered it to sinners as a free gift. To him who has faith, who believes, God reckons his faith as salvation. Therefore, faith here is not [something we have to offer in exchange for] salvation, for salvation was fulfilled free and offered free without exacting any kind of price whatsoever. This point can be illustrated practically as follows.

Christ fulfilled salvation, took it in his hands and offered it to the sinner. He who stretches out his hand and takes it is saved. Faith then is neither a price nor a means of salvation; it is both believing and taking together. Such is the case because God in Christ, through love and compassion for the sinner, wishes to save us (“the sinner shall not perish but live”). So the sinner has no preconditions to meet. He only has to trust in the Father’s love—“We know and *believe the love* God has for us” (1 Jn 4:16). He has only to accept the gift of salvation which God tore out of his Son’s flesh and blood.

For a sinner to be saved, faith demands no mental, emotional or physical effort. All that God requires of him is to accept and be content with the salvation that was fulfilled and offered to him. He has only to make it his own possession and right, starting to live it out on the spot. This he does in conformity with the will of God and Christ “who desires all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge

of the truth” (1 Tim 2:4).

It is God’s dealings with Abraham which highlight this theological process. They reveal the depths of God’s benevolence, which transcends our mind and logic. They form the divine basis for the significance and validity of God’s gift and man’s faith, standing for the best image of God’s heart and his thoughts toward humanity.

“After these things the word of the Lord came to Abram in a vision, ‘Fear not, Abram, I am your shield; your reward shall be very great.’ . . . And he brought him outside and said, ‘Look toward heaven and number the stars, if you are able to number them.’ Then he said to him, ‘So shall your descendants be.’ And he believed the Lord; and he reckoned it to him as righteousness” (Gen 15:1,5,6).

It is evident here that God offered to become Abraham’s shield, his guardian and protector from all evil, without stipulating any condition or prerequisite. God then affirmed to him that his reward, which means Abraham’s share in God, would be very great, again without setting any conditions or reasons. After this he endowed him with the blessing to have descendants in unbelievable numbers. In answer to all these gifts, Abraham’s only response was to believe God’s free promise. God in turn reckoned to him his faith as righteousness, meaning that he considered Abraham as having become righteous and saintly without any work on Abraham’s part.

The question now is: was it Abraham’s faith that gave him God’s promise and blessing?

In point of fact, it was before Abraham’s heart moved with faith that God had [already] made his covenant with Abraham and had promised and blessed him!

What then is the value or weight of Abraham’s faith?

It is his belief in the truthfulness of God, his love, promise and covenant. Abraham’s *belief*, meaning his faith under such circumstances, captivated God’s heart extremely. It was an honoring, gratification, acknowledgement and praise of God’s faithfulness in his promises and of his lavish love and compassion which he freely shows. Nothing is more honoring to God than to believe in his promises and his extremely bountiful love. Conversely, there is nothing more insulting to God’s glory than to doubt his promises and love. That is the reason why Christ never scolded his disciples more than when he scolded them for being faithless: “O faithless generation, how long am I to be with you? How long am I to bear with you?” (Mark 9:19). Note that all that was required to provoke such a forceful rebuke was the fact that their lack of faith had led them to fail to carry out a miracle. God was so pleased at heart with Abraham’s faith that he reckoned it as righteousness, which means that he considered Abraham’s belief in God’s works to be equivalent to the attainment of righteousness or in other words godliness and sainthood in the fullest sense. This is the wonder of God’s behavior and also of Abraham’s behavior at one

and the same time.

Hence, among the theological items which deserve all understanding and attention is the fact that faith in God, in itself, is the greatest honoring and glorification to be rendered to God; for it means believing his promises and covenants with mankind, which are charged with love freely-given. Faith means accepting God's gifts and boldly taking possession of them as rights given to mankind; this is the proper response to God's unconditional giving. When God said to Abraham, "I am God Almighty; *walk* before me and *be* blameless" (Gen 17:1), it was not said to Abraham in the sense of an appeal or expectation or even endeavor: God said it in the same tone in which he said to creation: "Let there be . . . ; and there was . . ." (Gen 1:3). It was [given] in the form of a command, [no sooner said than] carried out, because the blessings given by God include the guidance and protection of grace: "I am your shield" (Gen 15:1).

The divine saying, "God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, that whoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life" (Jn 3:16), [describes] what God fulfilled through Christ. God connected love, sacrifice, faith, and eternal life. Together [they represent] an offering or a completeness of self-giving which must be carried out. Faith in what God did through Christ is a gift, like the gift of love, the gift of sacrifice, the gift of eternal life which He gave freely. He who has faith, believes and trusts, will have entered eternal life. Faith is offered as a gift together with eternal life. A person has no merit except in responding with trust by grace—thus gaining the gift as a right [of his own], because it was offered to him free of charge. Faith is offered side by side with eternal life—both gifts together. He who takes the one takes the other. If you believe this offer you are saved. Faith is nothing more than a matter of the heart's belief. [As] a person is moved to trust, [so] eternal life flows in.

From what is said above it is clear that faith, in God's eyes, is equal to righteousness, meaning complete godliness and sainthood. In other words, faith is esteemed by God as being on a higher plane than offering one's whole life in fasting, praying or doing good deeds to gain his favor.

Such is the reality of faith in the Christian life. He who believes and trusts that God exists lives in that existence. He who believes and trusts that God is love lives in his love. He who believes and trusts in the salvation which God made through his Son lives in that salvation. We therefore say: "Whoever believes in him shall have eternal life" (Jn 3:16); "He who believes in him is not condemned" (Jn 3:18); "He who believes in the Son has eternal life" (Jn 3:36); "if you would believe you would see the glory of God" (Jn 11:40); "Believe in the light, that you may become sons of light" (Jn 12:36); "He who believes in me shall never thirst" (Jn 6:35); "Truly, truly I say to you, he who believes has eternal life" (Jn 6:47).

We would like to remind the reader that according to [the pattern of]

Abraham's faith the blessing comes first, then faith; that is, it is believing which justifies a person before God. It is not faith that gives a person the blessing, but the blessing is offered first and faith follows. For God [first] blessed Abraham and promised him an inheritance. Then Abraham believed and God reckoned it to him as righteousness. You have received salvation, grace and eternal life. All that is left for you to do is to have faith in this fact and believe it, so that God may reckon your faith as righteousness. But your faith will have no value unless you believe that God has given it to you freely [without demanding anything in return]. He has already brought you salvation, blessings, grace and eternal life as a gift. Your faith by itself is not equal to the cost; it will not soften God's heart nor oblige him to give you anything. For God's heart is full of compassion for you and he has offered you all his love [without demanding anything in return], in the salvation brought about through his Son. Now do you believe you have really been saved?

In the case of, for instance, Lazarus' sister Martha, God's glory was in front of her and around her. Christ said to her: "if you would believe you would see the glory of God" (Jn 11:40). This meant that her mere faith was enough to let her see and possess the glory of God. Faith then is like an open window through which we can see God's glory. But our faith does not bring down God's glory from heaven nor raise us to it. Salvation is such: it is in us, for us and around us. If we have faith or believe that it exists we will see it and live: "For man believes with his heart and so is justified, and he confesses with his lips and so is saved" (Rom 10:10). It is clear that this verse applies to Abraham's faith through which he believed the promises and which God reckoned to him as righteousness. St. Paul considers that the heart and not the mind is the source of belief; for God's gifts and talents to us and the salvation which has been fulfilled lie at the spiritual and not the intellectual level. Belief then is a vision of the heart.

The heart thus becomes the source of faith, i.e., vision, belief and trust. The weight of its faith, in other words, the belief in God's promises and salvation that was fulfilled through the Lord Jesus Christ, is a true claim to salvation and consequently to obtaining the righteousness of Christ. For Christ, in working out [our] salvation, "was put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification" (Rom 4:25). For this reason, our faith in salvation, meaning our belief in it, indicates that we have received it in the spirit; for we were actually raised and inevitably justified! Hence it is the heart that has faith, [in the sense that] it believes, and so is justified by Christ's righteousness which is equivalent to the utmost Christian perfection.

Dear reader, your faith in salvation, which in practice means that you believe that Christ died and was raised for your sake, directly offers you the "righteousness of Christ" from God as a free [gift]. "Righteousness" we define as the utmost godliness and sainthood. It is for that reason that believers in apostolic times were

named saints, for they had truly become sanctified by their faith in the blood of Christ:

“To all God’s beloved in Rome, who are called to be saints: . . .” (Rom 1:7);

“To the church of God which is at Corinth, to those sanctified in Christ Jesus [through faith] called to be saints . . .” (1 Cor 1:2);

“To the church of God, which is at Corinth, with all the saints . . .” (2 Cor 1:1);

“To the saints who are also faithful in Christ Jesus: . . .” (Eph 1:1);

“To all the saints in Christ Jesus . . .” (Phil 1:1);

“To the saints and faithful brethren in Christ at Colossae: . . .” (Col 1:1).

It is obvious from the manner in which St. Paul addressed them, that all the Christians who formed the church were considered saints because they had faith in Christ and were in Christ. “Saints in Christ” means that they draw their righteousness from Christ’s righteousness, and their sainthood from Christ’s sainthood. Therefore they are truly righteous and truly saints. Theologically speaking, faith in Christ means union with Christ based on salvation, receiving the Holy Spirit and eternal life. Union with Christ also implies communion in Christ, that is, sharing in eternal life.

Sadly and unfortunately, Christians nowadays are no more named saints. Only the bishops and the rest of the clergy are named as such, and then only as a title. Each of them is given this title and addressed as “your sainthood”. This is despite the fact that any Christian believer is called righteous and a saint in Christ, on the basis of his faith. [Through faith] he has believed and accepted his fellowship with Christ and his inheritance in God with Christ. This is evident from the verse: “to all the saints in Christ Jesus who are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons . . .” (Phil 1:1). Accordingly St. Paul made the title of sainthood the same for all the congregation which believed in Christ, together with their bishops and deacons. For the attribute of sainthood is derived from “faith” in Christ: it is not [acquired] as a personal qualification. “For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness” (Rom 10:10 AV), meaning unto sainthood or sanctification. Christ in whom we believe “is the source of . . . our righteousness and sanctification and redemption” (1 Cor 1:30).

The discrimination that exists today in [the use of] the title of sainthood can be traced to a loss of appreciation of the value of faith for godliness. Once freely available as a gift, faith in Christ has become a matter of status and personal prestige. Its value as a gift of godliness by which we trust in God’s promises and receive his free gifts has been lost: “For it has been *granted* to you that for the sake of Christ you should not only believe in him but also suffer for his sake” (Phil 1:29). So sainthood became associated with suffering alongside Christ.

1. According to Coptic practice. (Ed.)

We now call for raising the value of faith as being God's first and foremost gift given to whoever God has chosen and called to himself, that he may receive through faith, i.e. through believing God, all the promises of salvation which God fulfilled in his Son for our sake. His faith will then be reckoned to him as righteousness, which means he will receive sainthood in Christ, there being no difference between one believer and the other. Titles we will not discuss, but would have the ordinary believer be aware that his faith will be reckoned to him as righteousness, meaning sainthood, provided he believes that the promises of salvation have been fulfilled for him and that he has received them according to God's sure word. For everyone who received salvation and lives it out is the true believer in Christ.

Now that we know the truth and firmly believe that God has reckoned us righteous in his Son and made us saints to his glory and praise, what sort of life are we to lead in the sight of God, Christ and his angels? We repeat and confirm to the reader that God does not only count us as saints, but will also judge us on the grounds that we are actually saints who have been sanctified through the blood of his Son and by his Holy Spirit. [Even] if we find it too much to be counted or called saints in terms of the gospel and the church, we will [still] be judged on these grounds, [as really being the bearers of] the blessed name of saints. If God through Christ made us true saints, and not only assumed it, then we must understand and trust that he has given us his Holy Spirit to work in us holy works with the thoughts, ideas and meditations of the saints.

We are called saints in God's church, and were determined to have communion with all its saints since the beginning: "Giving thanks to the Father, who has qualified us to share in the inheritance of the saints in light" (Col 1:12). Hence, we definitely have the support, help and reminder of their spirits to live up to the level of their behavior and sainthood. As for the sainthood that holds us together as believers in Christ, it [does not consist of] promises, names or titles, but [constitutes] an inheritance—the inheritance of filial sainthood in the body of the Son. The church is a church of saints. None can live in it or belong to it except saints, whether they be children, men, or women—all alike. All are contained within the body of Christ as its members who have an existence and communion in him and with him, who live in his sight and presence.

And now, in accordance with what we have said and again affirm as a living experience which God has offered in his Son as one of our rights, which are sealed with the blood of Christ and the good pleasure of the Father, let us trust God's promises and the gifts of his Son. The sainthood we have received is the fruit of his Holy Spirit who is with us and in us—dwelling in the temples of our spirits which God and Christ have sealed with blood. What is left for us to do is to set the Holy Spirit free to work within us by opening up new potentialities in our behavior and actions—offering love to everyone, especially to our enemies who curse us, abuse us, persecute us and plunder our property. For sacrificial love activates the Holy

Spirit and speeds up his work—illuminating thought and [showering] his countless gifts [upon us]. The Holy Spirit does not come from outside us but is within us, dwelling in us according to the promise of our Lord and Savior. He is only waiting for us to beckon him by obedience and submission. Then He will act in power, to [bathe] the depths of our [beings] in light, and open us up to the depths of the Son[‘s being], that we may know the Father’s will that has been offered us in Christ.

Praying for the Holy Spirit to descend upon us or fill us is but an expression in terms of the feelings and sense: we seek to feel his action in us. But he is actually within us awaiting the movement and offer of our will in order to manifest himself in it, enhance it and ignite it with fire from Christ. The fire of Christ is the flame of divine love. If divine love dwells in us, it will turn everything in us to God’s account, [and also] to that of our neighbor and our enemy, free of charge. In return we will have nothing but the face of Christ looking down on us from heaven as he once looked down on St. Paul, filling his life with thanks, praise, prayer and ministry which never grew cold.

Saints in Christ, strength, light and oil of the church: the church without your sainthood is dark and its doors burn with the fire of sin, negligence and irresponsibility. Kindle your sainthood by zealously believing the truth and action of the Spirit, that the fragrance of Christ’s sainthood may return to the church, making the world believe that Christ really [lives] in you. When your lives and the activity of your sainthood are absent, Christ is absent from the church. The cross in the church is turned head-down and abased because there is no one to take it up genuinely and follow Christ with the true determination to *die* on it. Crosses are sold in churches and on streets for piasters.² This has led to the value of the cross being debased in peoples’ eyes, because [that quality of] sainthood and the saints who valued the cross at the rate of sacrificing their necks and their blood have fallen into oblivion.

We always need to go back to Abraham’s faith and look for its meaning, nature and power. When God gave Abraham and his descendants his gifts of freely given and eternal blessings, Abraham believed and God reckoned it to him as righteousness. Abraham’s faith here was simply his belief—but with confidence in God’s grace which had been given him. We cannot help but wonder at his faith, which was nothing more than believing God’s promise of a blessing. It was but a signature or seal on an agreement for a gift and inheritance which God pledged to him on oath. It became immediately valid with the signature of his faith.

This is exactly the case with the decree of salvation, which Christ wrote with his blood and God the Father sealed by offering his freely given fatherhood to all who would receive it. Nothing remains but to seal it with our sanction and believe in confidence that it might become effective here and now.

2. Equal to pennies. (Ed.)

What is really amazing about the greatness of God the Father is his decision to offer righteousness—the righteousness of Christ—to any one who would stamp it with his endorsement and believe, that is, have faith in the work of salvation: He will offer him the power of sainthood or sanctification in Christ.

It is the importance given to faith in the first place which deserves our greatest wonder. For God decreed that the mere endorsement of any person for the work of salvation would make it immediately effective to his benefit. Not only so, but God set no limits to his generosity when He added that he who has faith, who believes what the Father and Christ have done, will be made righteous, that is, will be given sainthood—which is the full qualification to obtain eternal life with God.

Salvation in itself confirms to us the greatness of God the Father, which is manifest in his fatherly love and in the offering of his Son for our sake. The way to receive salvation reconfirms to us the greatness of God the Father. For it is demonstrated in the way He transmits salvation to us through faith. Faith is the gift of believing trustingly in God's promises in order to gain all these promises, which He pledged in his divine economy from eternity. Over and above everything else, God decided that he who would have faith and believe would be offered the righteousness of Christ, that is, the sainthood of spirit in Christ—free of charge.

People of faith, wake up and make use of your right to faith. Do not dismiss your inheritance with the saints in Christ. Your faith and sainthood are treasures to the church and the world. They are a living testimony for more faith to manifest the reality of Christ, if you really want Christ to have an existence in the church and in the world. For Christ's presence and manifestation depend on your faith in your sainthood.

“For this is the will of God, your sanctification” (1 Thes 4:3).

**This publication
is available
in microform
from University
Microfilms
International.**



Call toll-free 800-521-3044. In Michigan,
Alaska and Hawaii call collect 313-761-4700. Or
mail inquiry to: University Microfilms International,
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

THE SOUL/BODY ANALOGY AND THE INCARNATION: CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA

Thomas Weinandy, O. F. M., Cap.

Once patristic theologians undertook a systematic enquiry into the relationship between the humanity and the divinity of Christ, they almost universally employed, by way of analogy, the relationship between the soul and the body. What was not clearly distinguished at that time (nor even today) is the two aspects inherent within this analogy. 1) As the soul/body form one ontological reality or entity (man) so the divinity and the humanity are united so as to form one ontological entity (Jesus). There is a substantial union between the divinity and the humanity analogous to that of the soul/body.¹ However, there is simultaneously (and almost necessarily) a second aspect. 2) The soul/body union illustrates not only the ontological and substantial oneness of the divinity and the humanity in Jesus, but also the type of relationship or the manner of the oneness that exists between the divinity and the humanity. As the soul is united and relates to the body, so the divinity is united and relates to the humanity.

In this paper I wish briefly to examine Cyril of Alexandria's use of the soul/body analogy, for I believe he is the first (and maybe the only patristic theologian) to use the analogy properly. I wish to demonstrate that while the first aspect of the analogy is legitimate, the second is not. That is, that in the Incarnation the eternal Son of God does become man so as to form the one ontological reality of Jesus (as the soul/body constitute the one reality of man), but the divinity and the humanity are not united to one another, nor do they interact with one another, nor are they related to one another as the soul and the body are united, interact and relate.² The incarnational union is not then, what I would label, a compositional

1 While most patristic authors will use the soul/body analogy to illustrate the substantial union, that is, bringing about an ontological oneness, between the divinity and humanity in Christ, some, notably the Antiochenes, will use the analogy to demonstrate how the divinity and humanity can be united without losing their full integrity and thus not form a substantial union according to their understanding, that is, where such a union would imply change and mutation on the part of the divinity and humanity.

2 As we will see different Fathers conceive the union of the divinity and the humanity in Christ in different ways depending on whether they understand the soul/body union in a Stoic, Platonic or Aristotelian manner.

union, that is, a union of different “natures” or “parts” so as to form some third kind of being, as the union of the distinct soul and body gives rise to man. Cyril of Alexandria uses the analogy only to illustrate the ontological oneness of Christ, but not to illustrate the type of relationship between them.

Logos/Sarx Christology

The full implications (and dangers) of the soul/body analogy are first found within the extreme forms of Logos/Sarx Christology. As the soul is united to the body so the divinity is united to the flesh (only). The human soul of Christ is denied precisely to make the analogy work, that is, to ensure the substantial oneness between the divinity and the *sarx* and, in turn, to explain the manner of their relationship.

For example, within Arian Christology the Incarnation consists in the Logos uniting to himself flesh (without soul) so as to form one reality.³ Because the Logos is united to flesh as the soul is to the body, he becomes the life principle within this substantial union or *systasis*. The Logos then directly assumes, as well, the experiences of the flesh. Therefore, Arius and his followers are forced to conclude that the Logos cannot be God since God cannot enter into such a compositional union. He would be changed in the process of becoming ‘flesh’ and, moreover, the human experiences would be located within his very nature as the Logos. Thus the question posed to the Nicene’s: ‘How dare you say that the Logos shares in the Father’s existence, if he had a body so as to experience all this?’⁴

We find the same problem within Apollinarianism, but now in the other extreme. Like the Arians the governing analogy is the soul/body. For Apollinarius the Incarnation is not by way of indwelling or adoption. The Son actually has to become ‘man’ and thus Christ must be ontologically one, a ‘σύνθεσις ἀνθρωποειδής’.⁵ However, if Christ had a soul, there would be two complete wholes and two wholes cannot form a third whole.⁶ A *physis* is made up of the two parts, as the Logos with his divine perfection contributes a partial energy to the whole. This is also the case with the ordinary man, who is made up of two incomplete parts which

3 For example, Eudoxius, Bishop of Antioch (357-59) and Constantinople (360-69), in an Arian confession of faith stated:

We believe in . . . the one Lord, the Son, . . . who became flesh, but not man. For he took no human soul, but became flesh so that God was revealed to us men through the flesh as through a curtain; not two natures, since he was no complete man, but God in the flesh instead of a soul; the whole is one nature by composition (μία τό ὅλον κατὰ σύνθεσιν φύσις) . As quoted by A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, (London: Mowbrays, 1975), p. 244.

Moreover, Lucian, the Bishop of Alexandria (373-78) said that Christ is ‘one person, one composite nature (ἐν πρόσωπον, μία σύνθετος φύσις) like a man, of body and soul’. *Ibid.*, p. 245.

4 Athanasius, *Contra Arianos*, 3:27.

5 Apollinarius, *Ep. ad Dionys*, A 9.

6 See Ps. Athanasius, *C. Apollin.*, I, 2.

produce one *physis* and display it under one name.⁷ Jesus then is a “Heavenly man” because of the flesh’s substantial union with the Logos. Christ is **μία φύσις** because the Logos and flesh form one organic whole with the Logos being the vivifying and governing (ἡγεμονικόν) principle just as the soul is to body. Within Apollinarianism it is the humanity that is now jeopardised precisely because the Incarnation is modelled after the soul/body relationship.

All Logos/Sarx Christology fails precisely because it is patterned after the soul/body analogy. The unity of the divinity and the humanity is seen as a compositional union of natures. Arius, in denying the divinity of the Logos, comprehends, unlike Apollinarius, the full implications of such a union.

Logos/Anthropos Christology

Since the soul/body analogy was employed, to disastrous effect, within Logos/Sarx Christology as the basic model for the incarnational union, one might be surprised to find the analogy being used by the Antiochene christologists. That they do use it demonstrates just how entrenched it was within the christological tradition. What is not so surprising is that they used it, to illustrate not the oneness of the divinity and the humanity, but to justify how two ‘natures’ can be united and yet remain what they are.⁸ However, it is precisely because the Antiochenes have not only not liberated themselves from the soul/body framework, but have also actually modelled their own Christology upon it that they themselves offer a defective view of the Incarnation. Having separated the divinity and the humanity they cannot find a way to substantially unite them since to do so, they believe, would jeopardise the integrity of each.

Cyril of Alexandria

The problem, to this point, is that the soul/body analogy has been used not only to illustrate the oneness of the divinity and the humanity, but also the type, manner, and nature of the union. What has not been grasped is that the incarnational act or ‘becoming’ is not the compositional or organic union of natures, and thus it is not like the union between the soul/body. Christ is one ontological being or entity but he is ontologically one in a different kind of way than that of the soul/body.

Cyril of Alexandria is the first to grasp adequately the true nature of the incarnational union. He begins to make, not without ambiguity, a distinction between person (the who) and nature (the manner of person’s existence). He proposes, what I have come to call, a ‘personal/existential’ understanding of the Incarnation. One

7 Apollinarius, *De Unione*, 5.

8 See Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Ad Apollinarem*, 4 and *De Incarnatione*. Also Nestorius, *Nestoriana*, 197f. and 330-1. Also Theodoret of Cyrus, *Eranistes*, 2.

and the same person of the Son comes to exist as man. It is not then a composition-
al union of natures, similar to the soul/body, but rather the person of the Son taking
on a new mode or manner of existence. Thus Cyril never uses the soul/body analogy
to illustrate the relationship between divinity and humanity, but only to illustrate
that they form one ontological reality—the Son existing as man. The manner of the
union is quite different from that of the soul/body.

However, the novelty and insight of Cyril's Christology is easily missed. It can
too easily be assumed, as the Antiochenes did, that he conceived the incarnational
union in a manner similar to Apollinarius. His ambiguous use of such terms as
φύσις, **μία φύσις**, and **ἐκ δύο** contributed to this misunderstanding. More-
over, since he continues to employ the traditional soul/body analogy in relationship
to his **μία φύσις** formula, it can again be too easily presumed that he conceives
the incarnational union as a compositional union of natures forming some *tertium*
quid. To elucidate Cyril's Christology, I will first examine his use of the soul/body
analogy and then discuss, in the light of this, how he conceives the incarnational
act.

Cyril rightly upholds, against what he considers the Antiochene dualism, the
ontological oneness of Christ. But what is the nature of the oneness that Cyril
insists upon?

Cyril, for example, writes to Nestorius:

As for our Saviour's statements in the Gospels, we do not divide them out to
two subjects (**ὑποστάσεις**) or persons (**προσώπους**). The one, unique Christ has
no duality though he is seen as compounded in inseparable unity out of two
(**ἐκ δύο**) differing elements in the way that a human being, for example, is
seen to have no duality but to be one, consisting of the pair of elements, body
and soul.⁹

This quotation contains a number of ambiguities as to the manner of Christ's
oneness. It is all too obvious to Nestorius and his supporters that since the one
Christ is formed out of two natures just as the body and soul forms one man, Cyril
could only mean that the divinity and the humanity form some *tertium quid*.
However, the point Cyril is making is not that the divinity and the humanity form
one nature in the sense of one quiddity, but rather that they form one reality or enti-

9 *Ad Nest.* 3, 8; see also 4. Translation from *Select Letters*, edited and translated by L. R. Wickham
(Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983).

ty. As one human being is formed out of soul/body so the one Christ is ‘formed’ *out of* the divinity and the humanity. The analogy is used to illustrate the one ontological entity of Christ and not the one quiddity of Christ.¹⁰

What Cyril has not adequately distinguished is the one person (ὑποστάσις or πρόσωπον) of Christ (the eternal Son) and the one reality (φύσις) of Christ (the Son of God existing as man). While Cyril begins speaking, in the above quote, about the necessity of one subject or person, his whole argument addresses the question of the need for Christ to be ontologically one reality. Instinctively, Cyril realises, despite his lack of clarity, that Christ can possess only one subject or person if the humanity is substantially united to the person forming one ontological entity. Thus he concludes the above paragraph by stating: ‘Accordingly all the sayings contained in the Gospels must be referred to a single person (προσώπῳ) to the one incarnate subject of the Word (ὑποστάσει μᾶ τῇ τοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη).’¹¹

Significantly, Cyril uses the soul/body analogy almost exclusively (the above quote being somewhat the exception) as a hermeneutical tool for understanding his μία φύσις formula. The analogy normally comes immediately before or follows immediately upon the formula. Thus the meaning of the formula not only becomes clear in light of the analogy, but also, and equally, Cyril’s use of the analogy can be clearly seen in relation to the formula. Cyril writes:

The same holds good of Nestorius if he says ‘two natures’ to indicate the difference between the flesh and God the Word—the point being that the nature of the Word is other than that of the flesh. However, he fails to affirm the union along with us. We unite these, acknowledging one Christ, one Son, the same one Lord and, further, one incarnate nature of the Son (μίαν τὴν τοῦ ἰοῦ φύσιν σεσαρκωμένην) in the same way that the phrase can be used of ordinary man. The point is that man results from two natures—body and soul, I mean—and intellectual perception recognises the difference; but we unite them and then get one nature of man. So, recognising the difference of natures is not dividing the one Christ into two.¹²

Μίαν φύσιν could mean that the unity of the divinity and the humanity form one nature in the sense of quiddity, which would imply that Jesus is neither fully God nor fully man, but a *tertium quid*. This is how the Antiochenes would interpret

10 This is equally the point that Cyril wishes to make by calling the incarnational union ‘natural’ (ἔνωσιν φυσικὴν οἷα κατὰ φύσιν) The union is ‘natural’ in the sense that it results in one ontological being or entity. As the union of body and soul is ‘natural’ forming the one reality of man, so the union of divinity and humanity is ‘natural’ forming the one reality of Christ. For example, see *Ad Nestorius*, 3, 5, and appended 3rd Anathema; *C. Nest.* 2, 1 and 13; *Ad Succensus*, 1, and *Apol. c. Theodor.*

11 *Ad Nestorius*, 3, 8.

12 *Ad Eulogius*.

it. However, the soul/body analogy, as the interpretative tool for understanding the **μία φύσις**, makes clear that for Cyril **φύσις** here means, not one quiddity, but one reality or one entity. The rest of the formula designates what the one Christ is—the one **φύσις** is the Son incarnate.

Part of the difficulty is that Cyril uses the word **φύσις** equivocally, that is, meaning both quiddity (as in the nature of the soul and the nature of the body and as the nature of man) and also as designating one ontological being or entity (as in the one reality of man and the one reality of Christ). However, in his Letters to Succensus, while the equivocation still remains, his meaning becomes even clearer.

May we illustrate the case from the composition which renders us human beings? We are composed out of soul and body and observe two different natures, the body's and the soul's; yet the pair yields a single united human being, and composition out of two natures does not turn the one man into two men but, as I said, produces a single man, a composite of soul and body.¹³

Moreover, in his Second Book Against Nestorius he writes:

The nature (**φύσις**) of the Incarnate Word himself (**ἡ αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένου**) is after the union now conceived as one (**μία**) just as will reasonably be conceived in regard to ourselves too, for man is one, compounded of unlike things, soul I mean and body.¹⁴

In both quotations the soul/body analogy illustrates only the ontological oneness that is obtained between the divinity and the humanity and not the manner or mode of that oneness. In answering the criticism that to say that Jesus is **μία φύσις τοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη** means that there is a mixture and merger of natures, Cyril responds:

If we call the Only-begotten Son of God become incarnate and made man 'one,' that does not mean he has been 'mingled', as they suppose; the Word's

13 *Ad Succensus* 1, 7.

14 C. Nest. 2: *proema*. Translation taken from *Cyril of Alexandria, Library of the Fathers* (Oxford: James Parker, 1881).

Cyril employs two versions of the **Μίαν φύσιν** formula. The most common uses **σεσαρκωμένη** which would modify the **μία φύσις** and thus be translated: 'The one incarnate nature/person of the Word.' The second, as in the above quote, uses **σεσαρκωμένη** which would modify the **μία φύσις** and thus be translated: 'The one nature of the Incarnate Word.' In a previous work I have argued that the first version stresses that it is the one nature/person of the Word who is incarnate. Nature here verges on the meaning of person, and so Cyril is defining who Christ is—he is the one person of the Word incarnate. The second variation highlights that the being/reality of Christ is one. Christ is one ontological reality. The one reality of Christ is the Word incarnate. While I think there is still some validity to this interpretation, I would now argue that because Cyril uses the soul/body analogy to interpret both formulas, both formulas tend to stress that Christ is ontologically one reality. See T. Weinandy, *Does God Change*, pp. 47-50.

nature has not transferred to the nature of flesh or that of the flesh to that of the Word—no, while each element was seen to persist in its particular natural character for the reason just given, mysteriously and inexpressibly unified he displayed to us one nature (μία φύσις) (but as I said, *incarnate* (σεσαρκωμένη) nature) of the Son. ‘One’ is a term applied properly not only to basic single elements but to such composite entities as man compounded of soul and body. Soul and body are different kinds of thing and are not mutually consubstantial; yet united they constitute man’s single nature despite the fact that the difference in nature of the elements brought into unity is present in the composite condition. It is therefore idle for them to claim that if there is one incarnate nature of the Word (μία φύσις τοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη) it follows there must have been a mingling and merger . . . for to state that he is incarnate gives completely adequate expression to the fact that he has become man.¹⁵

Again the soul/body analogy is employed to illustrate not the manner of the relationship between the divinity and the humanity in Christ, but only to assert that as the soul/body form one being (man), so the incarnational union forms the one entity or reality of Christ. What the one reality or being (φύσις) of Christ is is the incarnate Word. Again Cyril writes:

Take the normal human being. We perceive in him two natures; one that of the soul, a second that of the body. We divide them, though, merely in thought, accepting the difference as simply residing in fine drawn insight or mental intuition; we do not separate the natures out or attribute a capacity for radical severance to them, but see that they belong to one man so that the two are two no more and the single living being is constituted complete by the pair of them. So though one attributes the nature of manhood and of Godhead to Emmanuel, the manhood has become the Word’s own and together with it is seen one Son.¹⁶

What is now also becoming clearer is Cyril’s use of the term μία . I have emphasised that for Cyril this oneness consists in the one ontological reality of Christ. Moreover, this one Christ is also defined by Cyril as the one person of the Son existing as man. Here we see the significance of Cyril’s understanding of the incarnational union as καθ’ ὑπόστασιν . It is by conceiving the incarnational union as καθ’ ὑπόστασιν that Cyril is able to break free of the detrimental effects of the traditional soul/body analogy. While the union forms the one ontological reality of

15 *Ad Succensus* 2, 3.

16 *ibid.*, 5. For a couple of other examples of Cyril’s use of the soul/body analogy see, *Scholia de Incarn. Unigen.*, 8 and 27.

Christ, it is not a union of natures similar to that of the soul/body which would bring about change and mutation, but a union according to the hypostasis.

We do not mean that the nature of the Word was changed (ἡ τοῦ λόγου φύσις μεταποιηθεῖσα) and made flesh or, on the other hand, that he was transformed into a complete man consisting of soul and body, but instead we affirm this: that the Word personally (καθ' ὑπόστασιν) united to himself flesh.¹⁷

Thus the manner of the relationship between the Son and his humanity is not similar to that of soul/body, but a completely unique kind of relationship. The relationship being καθ' ὑπόστασιν means that the humanity is united to the person of the Word so that the Word actually comes to exist as man. It is, as noted above, a personal/existential notion. No longer is the incarnational union the compositional or organic union of natures (similar to the soul/body), but rather the incarnational act is seen as the one person of the Son taking on a new manner or mode of existence, that is, as man. This is why Cyril could legitimately stress, against the Antiochene accusations, that the natures are not merged and mixed and thus not changed. They are not transformed because the manner of the union is no longer on the level of natures, as is the soul/body, but rather on the level of the person of the Son assuming a new existence as man. Thus what the Son eternally is (God) and what he has become (man) are in no way jeopardised. Actually, conceiving the incarnational act as personal/existential establishes, and so guarantees, that it is truly the one person of the Son who is man and that it is truly as man that the Son exists. It is this insight that the Council of Chalcedon will sanction.

17 *Ad Nestorius*, 2, 3. See also 4. I disagree with Wickham's translation. He translates καθ' ὑπόστασιν as 'substantially'. While it does designate a substantial union, Cyril sees it as a substantial union of a special type. The incarnational act does not bring about a union of natures, but rather it is the act by which the humanity is united substantially to the person (ὑπόστασις) of the Word. See *Cyril of Alexandria Selected Letters*, p. 4, fn. 6.

THE PONTIFICAL SUCCESSION BY WHITE SMOKE OR ALTAR-Lot?

Otto F. A. Meinardus, Ph.D.

For several centuries churches of the apostolic tradition have dealt with the problems of the pontifical or patriarchal succession in very different ways. Ever since the Third Lateran Synod in the 12th century the majority of two-thirds of the Roman Catholic cardinals used to determine the successor to the apostolic throne of St. Peter. It was in 1274 that the conclave, consisting of the Sacred College of Cardinals, was especially instituted for the purpose of electing the new pope. Since January 1, 1971, all cardinals under eighty years of age are eligible to participate in the electoral process.

Following the death of the pope, on nine consecutive days the obsequies, the *novendialia*, are celebrated. Until February 1922 when Pius XI was elected, the cardinals used to enter the conclave the day following the *novendialia*. Today, the interval between the death of the pope and the opening of the conclave is extended to eighteen days to allow cardinals from all parts of the world to attend. Voting takes place in the Sistine Chapel. After each vote, the burning of the voting-papers takes place. The smoke issues through a small iron pipe which passes through one of the windows of the chapel. This enables the people to follow the voting process. When no candidate receives the two-thirds majority the votes are burned with wet straw and the smoke appears black. When a pope is elected, the votes are mixed with dry straw and the smoke appears white!

In the ancient Assyrian Church of the East the patriarchal throne became hereditary in the 15th century, from uncle to nephew. The ecumenical patriarch of Constantinople is elected by the members of the Holy Synod and subsequently confirmed by the secular powers. In actual practice, however, the government has always given its placet to the names of the candidates. This used to be the Byzantine emperors, then from 1453 onwards the Ottoman sultans and nowadays the Turkish government.

Throughout the centuries the Egyptian Christians employed several methods for nominating and electing their successors to the apostolic throne of St. Mark. In

some instances it is merely reported that the patriarchs “were raised up by the Lord Christ” or were “consecrated by the command of God.” These, of course, are mere figures of speech, which convey that one or the other method was used. From the testimony of the *History of the Patriarchs of the Egyptian Church* we learn that at least five different procedures for the nomination and election of the Coptic popes were used. In some instances several methods seem to have been employed conjunctively. We can distinguish between the following practices:

1. Nomination and appointment of the candidate by his predecessor.
2. Nomination by consultation and election by members of the clergy and the laity.
3. Nomination by consultation of the clergy and the laity in conjunction with the government.
4. Nomination and/or election by means of a dream or a vision of a devout Christian.
5. Nomination by consultation and election by the casting of the altar-lot.

During the first few centuries, it was customary for the patriarch to nominate and prepare his successor. Dionysius (d. 264), used to be attached to Demetrius (d. 230), and received the grace from him which he solicited. Appointment of the patriarch by his predecessor seemed to be an accepted and most satisfactory way of handling the issue of succession. The custom of serving a spiritual “apprenticeship” for the patriarchal office is attested in numerous instances. Athanasius I (328-373) used to serve as a scribe for Alexander, and Theophilus (384-412) was the secretary of Athanasius. Cyril I (412-444), the nephew of Theophilus, was diligently prepared by his uncle for the patriarchal office. John II (505-516) was a kinsman of John I, and Dioscorus II (516-518) was the scribe of John II.

By the 9th century, patriarchs no longer could dictate the names of their successors, and thus a vision or a dream by the patriarch with regard to his successor substituted the former practice. In the case of James (819-830), Mark II had a vision, which revealed unto him the name of his successor.

By far the majority of all patriarchs between the 1st and 12th centuries, however, were nominated by consultation and elected by “the Orthodox people”, which used to take place in Alexandria. During the 11th and 12th centuries, and possibly even later, the privilege of electing the patriarch was shared between the Christians in Cairo and in Alexandria, who met alternately in one or the other city for their consultations. The first recorded dispute pertaining to the privilege of electing the patriarch occurred following the death of Theodore (730-742) when the episcopate and the Alexandrian clergy and laity assembled in Cairo. The Alexandrians disputed the right of the episcopate to nominate the patriarch. Finally a revelation from the Lord confirmed the choice of Michael from the Monastery of St. Macarius. In

the case of Shenûdah I (859-880) the episcopate made the choice without consulting the priests and archons of Alexandria and Cairo. By the latter part of the 10th century, the clergy and laity of Cairo had acquired sufficient power and prestige to stipulate that the patriarchal elections were also to be determined by the Cairenes, though at this time, no definite pattern for handling the respective rights and privileges of the Alexandrians and Cairenes had been agreed upon. Throughout the years of the 9th to the 12th centuries the nomination and election of the patriarch was the result of consultations between the members of the various groups, *i.e.*, the synod of the bishops, the notables of Cairo and Alexandria, and the monks of the Monastery of St. Macarius. True, in several cases one or the other party was not consulted; moreover during the centuries the constallation of the electorate changed significantly. We discover that certain powers and privileges were passed from one group to another.

Ever since the days of the Arab Conquest, the new Islamic Government became increasingly involved in the administrative affairs of the Church. This was largely due to the new status of the Copts under Islamic rule. On the one hand, they were officially entitled to full protection against the possible encroachment and molestation, but on the other hand, they had to pay the poll-tax. In practice, the collection of the poll-tax became the most severe burden for the Coptic community, and the patriarch, as head of the "Coptic Nation", who was held responsible for the payments, suffered more than anyone else. Thus, as early as the end of the 7th century, the government exercised certain rights and privileges regarding the nomination and election of the candidate to the patriarchal office. The benevolent paternalism of the 'Umayyâd governors is one of the typical characteristics of the 7th and 8th centuries when all patriarchs were appointed with the explicit approval or even command by the governor. At the same time, there were always people within the Coptic community, who hoped to obtain the office of the patriarchate through the Sultan. This temptation remained with the Copts for many years to come, so that finally it was considered officially unlawful to consecrate him who had solicited the office through the Sultan.

By the middle of the 12th century, the influence of the government in the internal affairs of the Church had increased so much that at the time of the election of John V (1147-1166) the episcopate, the priests and archons met in the Government House in Alexandria. There the governor, the judge and the jurists questioned those who attended the council held for the Christians, and they all shouted with one word: "Yuhannis ibn Abû'l-Fath is patriarch".

Whenever a dispute pertaining to the candidate arose among the electors, or whenever the electors were divided into two or more interest-groups, then a supernatural revelation in the form of a dream or a vision by a devout person, a bishop or a monk, determined the future patriarch. Also, in some cases, the dream, the

vision or the revelation served as a divine confirmation of the electoral deliberations and consultations. One illustration should suffice. The *vita* of James (819-830) mentions the following vision: "Our pure Lady, the Mother of the Light, appeared to him standing beside his head at night, wearing a great crown, and shining with a very great light, and accompanied by two angels. And the Queen of Truth said unto him: 'It is I that have brought thee up from thy childhood, and preserved thee until now, since my beloved son elected thee from the time when thou wast in thy mother's womb, to set thee over his household, and yet now thou hast departed from me. Do not so, but rise up and return to the place which thou hast quitted. For thou shalt be chief over a great congregation, namely those who have been chosen for the place of rest . . .'"

The first reference to the apostolic practice of casting lots in the electoral procedures for the Coptic patriarchate is mentioned in the *vita* of John IV (777-799). The bishops assembled in Alexandria and consulted together, and prayed the Lord to shew them a faithful servant. Many names were mentioned, and they continued to discuss the matter for several days. Now our fathers were accustomed to write many names on small sheets which they laid in the sanctuary . . . afterwards they brought a young child, ignorant of sin, which put forth his hand and took one sheet among the number. And him, whose name was drawn they promoted to the patriarchal dignity . . .

The method of electing the patriarch by altar lot was employed only in eleven out of 117 elections. Both, Cyril VI (1959-1971) and the present Pope and Patriarch Shenûdah III ascended the apostolic throne through the election by the biblical practice of the altar-lot (Acts 1, 23-26). Following the death of Cyril VI on March 9, 1971, procedures for the nomination and election of a successor were initiated. An electorate of 622 delegates consisting of 28 bishops, 19 abbots and monastic administrators, 5 representatives of the clerical council, 11 representatives of the laity, 31 priests, 11 notables, 47 members of the *maglis al-milli*, 72 Cariene Copts, 12 Alexandrian Copts, 12 Copts from each and every administrative region, 140 episcopal administrators and 22 journalists. For the first time, 40 Ethiopians were included to represent their church. The three papables of the five nominated candidates were Bishop Samuel, Bishop Shenûdah and Qummus Timotheus al-Maqârî. The papers with the names of the papables were enclosed in a silver box and placed upon the altar of the Cathedral of St. Mark. On October 31, 1971, following the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, the five-year-old Ayman Munir Kamel was led to the altar. There he took one envelope which he submitted to Anbâ Antonius of Sohâg, the *locum tenens*. He opened the envelope and announced: "Shenûdah". The 117th Patriarch of Alexandria, All of Egypt, Jerusalem, Nubia, Ethiopia, the Pentapolis and the realm of the Preaching of St. Mark, the most holy Pope Shenûdah III, was elected by the Grace of God.

BOOK REVIEWS

Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom. Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop

By J.N.D. Kelly. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1995. pp. vii + 310, ISBN 0-8014-3189-1, cloth, \$47.50.

Saint John Chrysostom occupies a prominent place in the Church's patristic canon: his voluminous writings—letters, sermons, treatises, and biblical commentaries—take up volumes 47 to 64 of the *Patrologia Graeca*, 18 volumes (and counting) in *Sources Chrétiennes* and, in English, 6 volumes of the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (first series). Still, I would hazard, he is not exactly a familiar saint in the West. This unfamiliarity should be eased now with J.N.D. Kelly's impressive biography of the bishop of Constantinople, the first in English in over a century.

A reader of a Life of Chrysostom is like a seasoned theater-goer attending a new production of *Hamlet*: he or she knows the terrible conclusion, and even much of the plot; but still there is fascination in watching the tragic events unfold. As bishop of Constantinople, the "imperial see" of the late antique Roman world, Chrysostom managed to alienate just about everybody: the rich, the imperial couple (Arkadios and Eudoxia), the monks, neighboring bishops, his own clergy—just about everybody, except the masses, who loved him precisely because he stood up to the rich and powerful.

Kelly manages, no mean success, to present this flawed and noble person as a rounded human being, exasperating and naive, and yet deeply moral and ethical as he sought to live and preach the gospel: Chrysostom "was already [at the age of thirty], and for the rest of his career was to remain, scornfully impatient of anything less than total commitment to the gospel." This impatience, this single-mindedness, led to unequivocal positions. Kelly straightforwardly describes the Chrysostom of the anti-Jewish sermons (Jews are "Christ-killers," *Christoktonoi*) as "a master of unscrupulous, often coarse invective," yet he does both the bishop and us the service of placing the saint's assaults in the larger context of Jewish-Christian relationships in late antiquity.

Single-mindedness, we may need to be reminded, *can* serve the gospel. In the name of Christian ethics and morality, Chrysostom was willing to found a hospital

for lepers, to “the furious indignation of the wealthy owners of property in the neighborhood,” and he savaged the wealthy for having toilet utensils made of solid silver while the poor went hungry: “one person defecates in a silver pot, another has not so much as a crust of bread.” These evangelical stances should strike up as very relevant to our own time where NIMBY (Not In My Backyard) is a suburban mantra, and pastors are afraid to tackle “unpopular” social issues out of fear of alienating the rich and powerful in their congregations.

In *Golden Mouth*, Kelly displays an outstanding command of the primary sources, using Chrysostom’s homilies to shed light on hitherto obscured events in his life; the author, refreshingly to this reader, does not fall victim to the extreme skepticism of many modern Church historians, and is willing to accept that many of Chrysostom’s statements actually mean what they say. Kelly gives concise summaries of all the major works and of many of the homilies; so sprightly, in fact, are his renderings from Chrysostom and others that one occasionally wishes to see the Greek originals (for example, from Palladius, *Dialogue 6*: “Isaac, the little Syrian, the layabout, troop-leader of bogus monks, who has worn himself out with incessant slander of bishops”).

A few, relatively minor, complaints: While good at pointing out and detailing Chrysostom’s poor opinion of women, Kelly sometimes falls into politically correct anachronism: “John is an incorrigible sexist.” There is no bibliography, which is disconcerting in a scholarly book—and can be very irritating: if the reader misses the first full citation of a secondary work, it can take time-consuming labor to backtrack to find the reference. A map of the many places mentioned in the text, especially one with the civil dioceses, would be very helpful. And, finally, there are some odd conclusions, based on modern presuppositions: Chrysostom’s “assumption” that “the author of scripture (not remotely but directly) was the Holy Spirit. . .effectively blocked any open-minded examination of the Bible [sic].”

Nevertheless, this is an outstanding book, and a most welcome addition to patristic scholarship in English. *Golden Mouth* often reads like a good, suspenseful novel, and combines readability with open-handed scholarship; Kelly is not afraid to give his opinion or overturn previous scholarship, but he always does so without oneupmanship or grandstanding. *Golden Mouth* is a tribute to “his old age” (as Kelly refers to himself in his preface) and, one hopes, is not the final installment in a long and distinguished vocation in patristics.

California State University Bakersfield

Tim Vivian

Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism: A Comparative Study in Eastern Monasticism, Fourth to Seventh Centuries

By Joseph Patrich. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1995. Pp. xv + 419. Hardbound, \$50, ISBN 0-88402-221-8.

Palestinian monasticism in the Byzantine period was for a long time among scholars the neglected child of the early monastic family, underappreciated in comparison with its more famous Egyptian, Syrian, and European siblings. Recently, though, a number of studies and translations of Palestinian monasticism have appeared, many of them in English (see the list at the end of this review). The latest is Joseph Patrich's comprehensive study of Saint Sabas.

As the title and subtitle of this book indicate, Patrich aims to present much more than just a biography of Sabas (439-532) or even a history of Sabaite monasticism. Before Sabas' biography in Part I, Chapter 3, chapters one and two offer overviews of "Monasticism in Palestine before Sabas" and "Eastern Monasticism: Historical Survey and Characteristics." Thus Patrich sets his study of Sabas and Sabaite monasticism (parts II-IV) within the larger framework of early monasticism.

Sabas makes two very valuable contributions: first, Patrich brings together a wealth of historical and archeological research scattered in scholarly journals, much of it his own, and presents a clear and readable account of Sabas and his monasteries. Second, while focusing on Sabas and Sabaite monasticism, Patrich offers his comparisons with non-Sabaite monasticism, both within Palestine and outside it. The author's comparisons are very sensible; he has not set out to find "missing links" between Egypt and Palestine.

This is a big, coffee-table book, with eighty black and white illustrations. Dumbarton Oaks is to be congratulated for the book's handsome layout, clear illustrations, and large print. For its pictures, its erudition, its presentation of the laurae and coenobia of Palestine, the ways of life of the monks, and its biography of Sabas, *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism* belongs in every monastic library and on the reading list of anyone interested not only in monasticism but in the history and spirituality of the early Church.

Other recent books in English on Palestinian monasticism:

—John Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ: The Monasteries of Palestine, 314-631* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).

—Yizhar Hirschfeld, *The Judean Desert Monasteries in the Byzantine Period* (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1992).

—R. M. Price, trans., *Cyril of Scythopolis: The Lives of the Monks of Palestine* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1991).

—Tim Vivian and Apostolos N. Athanassakis, trans., *The Life of Saint George*

of *Choziba and the Miracles of the Most Holy Mother of God at Choziba* (San Francisco: International Scholars Publications, 1994).

—John Wortley, trans., *The Spiritual Meadow of John Moschus* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1992).

California State University Bakersfield

Tim Vivian

Eastern Monasticism and the Future of the Church

By Archimandrite Boniface (Luykx), Stamford, CT: Basileos Press, 1993, \$13.95.

This challenging book with its promising title begins a bit slowly, with a discussion of Title XII, “On Monks and Other Religious,” of the new “Code of Canons for the Oriental Churches.” I mention this because the beginning might scare off all but canon lawyers! That would be a great shame, for *Eastern Monasticism and the Future of the Church* has a great deal to offer, both to western and eastern Christians. The author is writing first of all for those in the Uniat Churches, the twenty-one eastern Churches in communion with Rome; he is lamenting the “latinization” of monasticism in those Churches and calling for a return to the more authentic ways of the eastern (Orthodox) Churches.

This argument will, of course, interest, and please, Copts. But Archimandrite Boniface has a deeper theme that may prove more challenging, especially for those of us in the secular West. The author insistently reminds the Church “of her primary, contemplative dimension,” and urges that monasticism is “the model of all religious life” and is “the heart of Christianity.” Why is this? “Primarily because monasticism stands in the heart of the Mystery of the Church as the New Testament and the Fathers saw her.” The “authentic, consecrated monk” is “the model and example of perfect Christian life in accord with the Gospel.”

Since the Coptic Church is, in Archimandrite Boniface’s phrase, a “monastic Church,” why should his message be a challenge? Because all of us in the West, Copt and non-Copt alike, are under “the pressure of Western secular culture” which, slave to science and technology, “is filled up with a consumer mentality: entertainment, noise, addictions.” The antidote? Monasticism, or, more broadly, monastic spirituality—which, let’s face it, Western culture is inimical to. In other words, for the Church to survive, it will have to be monastic, if not in shape, at least in substance. That is why this book is, or should be, a clarion call for us at the dead end of the twentieth century.

A Christian is most Christian when he or she is monastic. That doesn’t mean wearing a habit or being cloistered, but it does mean keeping alive “constantly the awareness of the Gospel by taking it seriously, by living it entirely and by celebrating it joyfully in a life-style totally permeated by love for God and for neighbor.”

As Archimandrite Boniface concludes, monasticism is especially relevant now because it represents “the lasting values of Christianity itself, especially in times of revolution where everything is put into question.”

California State University Bakersfield

Tim Vivian

Beasts and Saints

By Helen Waddell with Woodcuts by Robert Gibbings (Introduced and Edited by Esther de Waal). Darton Longman and Todd, London 1995, pp. 128. Sterling: Seven pounds ninety-five pence. US Publishers: Eerdmans Publishing Company. \$12.00 (Paper).

This is a welcome reprint of the appealing 1934 edition: the earlier printing, known to all older Coptologists, is in attractive format with an embossed cover and much wider pages, but this new edition will place the neglected text in the hands of a new generation of readers and is to be warmly commended.

Some of these stories are taken from the Desert Fathers and affirm the natural, paradisaical relationship between redeemed man and the animals. In the Creation Narrative, in Genesis chapter 2, man is called into a covenant with the animals by the process of being called to name them, though God must know their names. Man in Paradise is bound to the animals, but the covenant has been broken. The beautiful stories in Helen Waddell’s book are eschatologically oriented: they look to the time foreseen in the prophecies of Isaiah when “the calf and the lion and the fatling (lie) together, and a little child shall lead them. . .the sucking child shall play over the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the adder’s den (Isaiah 11:6-9). Such visions, conveyed to us in these timeless stories, remind us immediately of our Christian responsibility in the face of the destruction of the environment, the exploitation of natural resources, the despoiling of the earth and the annihilation of too many species.

Most of these stories are translated from Latin version of older originals in Greek and other tongues, but one concerning St. Makarios the Alexandrian, whose traditions in Late Antiquity were often confused with those of St. Makarios the Great (both died c. AD 390), is from a French translation of the Coptic text by Amelineau in “Monastères de la Basse-Egypte”.

This is a small, beautifully illustrated book of forty-four wonderful narratives which children may love and understand, though half a century of reading does not pretend to have exhausted their real treasures. This new edition deserves to sell so that a further edition is required and this text remains one of those ageless treasures which is always in print. Superb.

Sutton Valence School, Kent

John Watson

Von Echnaton zu Jesus. Auf den Spuren des Christentums im Alten Agypten (From Ikhnaton to Jesus: In the Steps of Christianity in Ancient Egypt)

By Kamal Sabri Kolta. München, Wewel, 1993, pp. 144.

About ten years ago, Kamal S. Kolta, academic counsellor at the Institute of Medicine, Munich University, published his *Christianity in the Land of the Pharaohs*, in which he traced the history of the Copts through the centuries. In this volume he attempts to discover in the religion of Pharaonic Egypt the seeds of the Christian faith, an ambitious undertaking!

In the introductory chapter, Professor Manfred Görg, well known Biblical scholar at the University of Munich presents ancient Egyptian images as they appear in the Gospel. "Thou art my beloved Son, with thee I am well pleased: (Mk 1:11) a quote from Ps 2:7 which has a slightly different text: "Thou art my son, today I have begotten thee." A text in the Temple of Abydos refers to Osiris who states: 'My son, my first-born, I am thy father who has created thee perfect, I am the one who has born thee..' In his discussion of the Infancy story (Mt 1:18-25), Görg traces the development from the Hebrew 'alma,' the young woman, to the Greek 'parthenos' or virgin of the Septuagint. He mentions the virginal wives of Amun as well as the apotheosis of Queen Arsinoe, sister of Ptolemy II, who advanced to the goddess Isis. It was under Ptolemy II that the LXX with the 'parthenos-text' appeared in Alexandria, where centuries later the Virgin advanced to the God-bearer or Theotokos (Cyril of Alexandria).*

Kolta has divided his presentation into five chapters: Pharaonic anthropology and Christianity, the monotheism of Ikhnaton, Circumcision and Embalming, the Beginnings of Christianity in Egypt, and Images and Symbols among the Copts.

Parallel to the Biblical creation-texts, Kolta introduces the classical Egyptian creation-myths, that of Hermopolis, Heliopolis and that of Memphis. It is the memphitic story of Ptah, who is 'father and mother' of Aton and who creates man with his hands (cf. Gen 2:7, Acts 17:24). Like Khum with a ram's head and double horns also Ptah is the creator of all living things. As the potter he modeled on his wheel the egg from which all life emerged. The conception of men being created in God's likeness has its parallels in the wisdom literature of Meri-ka-Re (2040 B.C.). Also the Old Testament story of the fratricide of Cain and Abel corresponds to the myth of the assassination of Osiris by his brother Seth. Typical in both cases is the character polarization, where the motive was envy and jealousy. In the traditions of both cultural regions we discover the plans for the divine extermination of creation and the subsequent deliverance. Rê decided to destroy man because of his rebellion and thus he ordered the leonine Sekhmet to carry out his plans. However, she knew to kill but also she was able to heal. The priests of Sekhmet formed one of the oldest associations of physicians and veterinary surgeons. The Old Testament God

and Rê can forgive, both are merciful and gracious.

Prophetic was the Egyptian monotheism as expressed by Amenophis IV (1372-1354 B.C.) or Ikhnaton. The Amarna doctrine promoted the faith in Aton, represented by the solar disc. For our understanding of the "theological ingredients" of Ikhnaton's monotheism Kolta published an informative table of comparison between the Amarna Hymn to the Sun, the 104th Psalm and the Ode to the Sun by St. Francis of Assisi. As high-priest of Aton the young monarch ordered the names and figures of Amon and the other deities expurged from all monuments. But Ikhnaton's reform was not destined to outlive him. It is noteworthy that Kolta was not tempted to cite and to comment on the bold and daring theories of Sigmund Freud's "Moses and Monotheism"!

In his discussion of the Hebrew practices of circumcision (Gen 17:10-14) and embalming (Gen 50:2,3) Kolta traces the origin of these rituals to the ancient Egyptians. The former is portrayed on a relief in the tomb of Ankh-ma-Hor in Saqqara, while the ancient embalming ceremonies are mentioned in Herodotus' *History*.

The beginnings of Christianity in Egypt are traditionally associated with the flight of the Holy Family to Upper Egypt and the mission and martyrdom of St. Mark. For the Copts the Trinitarian doctrines of the early church constituted no problems, since the idea of the divine triad was well established in their religious thinking, e.g. Amon, Mut and Khons, or Osiris, Isis and Horus, or Ptah, Sekhmet and Nefertum, etc. Also the early Christian iconography of the Virgin Mary with the Christchild had its typological forerunner in the goddess Isis who suckled her son Horus. Also the Christian teachings of death and the resurrection Kolta sees foreshadowed in the myths of Osiris. Whenever a king leaves this world, he will be Osiris in the other world. His son, his successor, will be a new incarnation of Horus on earth. The deceased king rules as Osiris in the other world just as he reigned as Horus in this world. Kolta sees in the Egyptian myths certain elements that appear - though in different forms - in the Johannine Christ-mysticism. For the Egyptian the belief in the resurrection is related to the myth of Osiris' resurrection.

The christological doctrine of the divine sonship is also found in ancient Egypt. "The designation of Jesus as "Son of God" is an expression...the roots of which are found in the religious traditions of ancient Egypt..."(69). The king is the son of God, for he is omniscient and his benevolence is without limit. The king is the consanguineous son of the sun-god. The birth of the king is simultaneously the nativity of a god. Moreover, the newly born is the son of a mortal mother and of a celestial father, a mythology which is reminiscent of Lk 1:35. Thus, the Copts had no problems in accepting the Fatherhood of God and the divine sonship.

For the popular equestrian warrior-saints of the Copts there were numerous pre-Christian precursors. Regarding the divine procreation, there are also several parallels. In the well-known Hall of Birth in Dair al-Bahri (Thebes) Amon approaches the queen-mother Ahmes and touches her hand and her nose with the

ankh, the sign of life, thereby transferring the breath of life the *pneuma theou*. The child is the 18th dynasty Queen Hatshepsut!

Copts believe that through baptism the child is freed from original sin and thus reborn. In ancient Egypt also the kings and priests underwent a ritual cleansing. The royal baths were situated in front of the temple (Edfu). In the sacrament of chrismation the Coptic priest anoints the 36 joints of the body of the child. In the *Book of the Dead*, a similar list of anatomical parts is mentioned. These are blessed by the gods of the Egyptian pantheon to grant eternal life.

In his last chapter Kolta discusses the significance of the number four for the concept of universality. He illustrates this with the 6th century iconography of Bawit (Coptic Museum) and relates this to a certain relief in the Temple of Kom-Ombo. In the appendix he lists the names and descriptions of the 47 most important Egyptian deities.

For Biblical theologians this volume constitutes a real challenge to the customary approaches to the Holy Scriptures. To be sure, there are several points in Kolta's presentation that both theologians and Egyptologists will have their problems to accept. At the same time, however, Dr. Kolta is to be congratulated for his daring courage to publish these non-traditional views.

Ellerau, Germany

Otto F.A. Meinardus

*This is the opinion or belief of the writer of the introduction, but definitely not biblical. (Luke 1:35,43 & Gal. 4:4). The Title *Theotokos* has been used by Church Fathers much earlier than Cyril.

(Editor)

Coptic Roots: The Story of Christianity in Egypt

By Victor Beshir. Translation by F. Ateya. St. Mark Coptic Orthodox Church of Washington, D.C., 1995 Pp. 72 \$4.00

This is the first book of a new series, in which the history is presented in the form of short stories that enable the young contemporary reader 'to recall the past events in their proper context,' and live with their heroes in order to reflect their character on his life. The present book covers the first two centuries. Although it is written in a language that is easily understood by young teenagers, it can still be appreciated by older youth as an introduction to the early Church Fathers. The book contains four stories, dealing with the entrance of Christianity into Egypt and its early Church leaders, both clergy and laity. There are adequate notes on the important personalities, places and institutions mentioned in the stories. These notes carry the readers smoothly from the world of fiction to the real facts of history. The book is concluded with a list of references, both ancient and modern. It is attractive in form and style and contains many pictures most of which are in full color. It will hold the reader of any age till he finishes it.

Coptologia: An International Journal of Coptology and Egyptology, Volume XV

Edited by F.M. Ishak, Ph.D. (P.O. Box 235, Don Mills Postal Station, Don Mills, Ontario, Canada M3C 2S2) 1995. Pp. 168. \$8 (US), \$10 (Canada), \$12 (Other Countries), \$16 (Libraries); plus postage.

The 1995 volume of *Coptologia* contains a variety of articles that reflect the different aspects of Coptic life. There are two theological articles (Orthodox Viewpoint regarding Virgin Mary, and The Second Coming of Christ) by Bishop Gregorios. A very informative article by Dr. Otto Meinardus summarizes the relationship and recent meetings between the Coptic Church and other Apostolic churches (Catholic and Eastern and Oriental Orthodox) with a special emphasis on the Coptic Ethiopian relations. Other articles discuss asceticism (by the editor), Coptic language (by Professor Emile Maher), Coptic Civilization (by Professor Mina Abdel-Malek). Among the article reviews are a study of Father Matta El-Meskeen's Commentary on St. John's Gospel, and Readings in the History of the Egyptian Church by Dr. Monir Schoucri; both have been recently published in Arabic.

A History of Christianity in Africa

By Elizabeth Isichei. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995. Pp. 420. \$19.99 (Paper).

This is the first one-volume book dealing with the history of Christianity in Africa, written by a scholar who has lived in Africa and written extensively on the subject. It starts with the early Church when Christianity flourished in Egypt and North Africa, and both regions provided Christianity with the most eminent Church Fathers and its leading theologians. Except in Egypt and Ethiopia, Christianity disappeared from the continent by the eleventh century. Few Catholic missions started in the 16th century. More missionary activity, both Catholic and Protestant, occurred in the 18th and 19th centuries. However, Christian expansion was dramatic only in the 20th century. There were 10 million African Christians in 1900, about 143 million in 1970. The author examines the status of Christianity in the different countries of modern Africa, and shows how it was influenced by social, national and political factors.

BOOK NOTICES

Coptic Language Analysis

By Monir Barsoum Raphael. Chicago, IL: Copts in Chicago (to be reached at 312 728 2867)

Part I The Eucharistic Liturgy of St Basil, 1994. Pp. 148. \$20.00

Part II Liturgy of the Catechumen, 1995. Pp. 66. \$8.00

Part III Raising of Incense, 1996. Pp. 144. \$10.00

The complete text of the liturgy, most frequently used in the Coptic Church in Coptic, English, and Arabic, with word analysis of every Coptic and Greek word. A valuable aid for studying the Coptic liturgy and Bohairic Coptic.

Thomas Merton: Spiritual Master

Edited and introduced by Lawrence Cunningham. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1992. Pp. 437. \$14.95 (Paper).

Substantial selections from the essential writings of the greatest American Catholic spiritual master in this century, including his autobiography, journals, and the place of spirituality in contemporary life.

The School of Virtues: Pope Kyrillos VI

Pp. 60. No price. Published in 1996 by St. Mary's Coptic Orthodox Church, East Brunswick, NJ.

Vivid examples of humility, prayer and solitude from the life of the late saintly Pope of Alexandria (1959-1971).

Awake to Life

By Fr. Alexander Men. Oakwood Publications, (3827 Bluff Street, Torrance, CA 90505), 1996. Pp. 92. \$4.95 (Paper).

A collection of sermons following the liturgical year, from Lent to Pentecost by a contemporary Russian Orthodox priest who died as a martyr in 1990.

Raising Them Right

By Theophan the Recluse. Ben Lomond, California: Conciliar Press, 1989 (Reprinted) Pp. 71. \$5.95 (Paper).

An Orthodox Saint's advice on raising children throughout the various stages of life.

INFORMATION FOR AUTHORS

Articles: The Journal invites submission of articles on biblical, liturgical, patristic or spiritual topics.

Special Issues: We are planning for special issues on:

The Coptic Orthodox Church
Saint Cyril of Alexandria (Scheduled for Spring 1997).

We welcome scholarly and general articles on these or related subjects, as well as translations from the original languages.

Special Sections: Contributors to the sections of *Book Reviews* and *Currents in Coptic Church Studies* are advised to contact the editor before submitting their articles. Of the extensive new literature, we only choose for review books of lasting spiritual benefit for the reader.

Manuscripts are preferred to be typed double spaced (including references and footnotes).

All authors are expected to hear from us within one month of the receipt of their articles. Unpublished material is returned only if requested.

INFORMATION FOR SUBSCRIBERS

Subscription Price: U.S.: \$10.00. Canada: \$12.00 (US dollars). Other countries: \$13.00 a year. Half price for full-time students.

Subscription is for one year (four issues). Unless otherwise stated, it starts from the current issue. However, new subscribers are advised to start by the spring issue to get the full benefit of the annual index which appears at the end of the year.

Previous Issues: \$2.50 per copy plus postage (while supply lasts).

Renewals: Early renewal is appreciated, you do not have to wait for an expiration notice. Notices are sent after you receive your last issue. Failure or delay of renewal will result in interruption or delay of the subsequent issue.

Change of address requires six weeks notice.

SUBSCRIPTION AND BUSINESS ADDRESS:

Society of Coptic Church Studies
P.O. Box 714
E. Brunswick, NJ 08816

EDITORIAL ADDRESS:

Coptic Church Review
P.O. Box 1113
Lebanon, PA 17042