

# ECNL

A Publication of the  
Anglican and Eastern  
Churches Association

New Series No 8  
Spring 1979  
50p to non-members

and 142) on the human 'environment'. She does not tell us why she treats of 'theodicy' rather than 'divine providence', but affirms (p. 21) that 'What is *natural* for the creation is to fulfil the purposes of its creator', so (p. 120) Christ came 'to fulfil all that is fully human and to enable us to fulfil the purpose for which we were created'. The position from which she proceeds (and for which she does not explicitly argue) is (p. 20) that it is 'the theology of creation that provides the perspective for understanding the presuppositions and the goal of redemption'. The language of the theology of redemption is the complement of the language of the theology of creation. This is of course attractive, for it enables her to make use of an unusual range of material to illuminate some features of the theological tradition, or perhaps, rather, this material determines the selection and interpretation of theological material she employs. So she has shrewdly identified those theological resources which are going to be of most help to her, e.g. her most welcome emphasis on spirituality (pp. 23 and 122 ff.) coheres with her remarks on 'inner disposition' in the middle of her book. And, Abelard, carefully appreciated, is the mediaeval theologian of her choice, (despite K. E. Kirk's great book, *The Vision of God* (London, 1928) and his starting point, *Matt 5:8*, plus Irenaeus, as for her). So she affirms (p. 30) that to discriminate and acknowledge 'genuinely innocent suffering' is a major intellectual and moral achievement' and to get this clear distinguishes it from 'karma' *en route* to the book of Job. There is no inherent connection (p. 48) between suffering and innocence, but when the righteous suffer (p. 43) their faith is being tested, and the possibility of disinterested goodness established. So (p. 91) reward, is a means of '*drawing attention to* the intrinsic value and desirability of the good act, assuming that we have not yet learned to see this in and for itself'. Thus (p. 92) 'The righteous may be rewarded, but the reward is not definitive or constitutive of their righteousness, and neither is it possible nor would it be desirable for the righteous only to be rewarded', (for who would then be saved, perhaps?) And, 'Rewards should serve and be subservient to the promotion of goodness; and goodness in the midst of suffering is still its own reward', (even when the sufferer is overwhelmed by physical agony?) And (cf. p. 151) 'Indeed if the reward of righteousness is basically none other than the intrinsic reward of self-emptying, there need no longer be any logical difficulty in the proposition that the righteous may suffer'. (Logic does indeed matter, as she exhibits so well in her various analyses, but is there something peculiarly appalling about the suffering of the righteous, perhaps because of their righteousness, and in any case, why use the language of 'reward' here?) And Kirk (*The Vision of God*, ed. cit., 140 ff) has some remarks worth noticing where he wrote of 'The motive of reward in the Gospel', on the 'baffling prominence'

given to it in Christ's teaching, that men should learn not to be afraid of it, but look forward to the self-forgetfulness of those whose hearts are set on God, which transcends both reward and disinterestedness. In any case, the point of distinguishing the suffering of the innocent or the righteous is to get clear the notion of suffering appropriate to 'guilt'. So the centre of the book is the teasing out of the notion of 'lineal' responsibility for what we as individuals have done. Punishment has to do with checking the consequences of wrong-doing, and possibly forestalling moral deterioration, counteracting impenitence. Commendably, Miss Moberly is not at all wary of 'punishment' but puts it in its right 'moral place' as a form of suffering, the 'constraint of the guilty' (p. 81) and therefore has a high regard for moral freedom. Not all wrongdoers are 'sick'. The inflicting of punishment is a means of access to the wrongdoer's inner disposition without overriding the person's freedom (and cf. Abelard's response to Christ crucified—? Christ gaining access to us —of which she has written). Punishment is an instrument for doing something about the inner disposition that led to the wrong-doing. And this she has learned from Walter Moberly's theory of moral or personal realism (p. 101) his 'symbolic theory of punishment', in which punishment points beyond itself to the 'inward and spiritual disgrace' (p. 72) of the wrongdoer, at any rate in the first instance, and thence to the possibility of change from impenitence to penitence. From here Miss Moberly moves to the correspondence (p. 109) of 'hell' (avoiding a 'vindictive', p. 94, notion of hell) and 'purgatory', via death as the transition (p. 113) to after life. (But is *death* merely transition?) Her own assessment about the importance of silence (p. 133) and apophatic/ kataphatic theology might have prompted her to write with more caution here, especially with *after life* in play, as for example, p. 110, 'In describing penitence and intransigence, we may equally speak of purgatory and hell respectively'. So hell is ultimate intransigence, the abrogation of interdependence, with the suffering of penitence, the realism of self-knowledge leading to bliss-kenosis and coinherence. We might agree about what sorts of moral concern prompt the language of hell /purgatory (*vide* Ian Ramsey's essay on the topic) but is the subject matter of Christian theology to efficiently manageable? At the consummation of the process of growth, not at death (this would not fit the scheme) she writes of judgement (p. 114) that it is '*the statement of what we have become and are*. It is no longer something imposed *ab extra* or a partial critique of one's actions, Rather it is an intrinsic judgement, a complete critique of all that one is. What one has *done* is but symptomatic of what one has *become*'. So the confident employment of analogy does not extend to divine judgement. God is seen, but does not himself pronounce sentence, let alone do for the guilty what they *cannot* do for them-

selves? This is the area where it becomes particularly clear that 'repentance' determines the meaning of 'redemption', as (p. 115): 'To have committed wrong, and to have repented of it, is no barrier but the removal of barriers. Heaven is peopled not by the innocent, but by the redeemed . . . Moral deterioration can be forestalled, and can only be forestalled on these terms'. But is it that, p. 116, the possibility that hell is one of two options that gives us ground for specifically Christian hope? As a Kant-enthusiast, I note passages familiar in manner to readers of post-Kantian theology (cf. pp. 82, 104, note 2, and 160) p. 120: 'The acceptance of a relationship with Christ is to turn us from the will to wrong ("Christ came to save the lost") and to receive us, through penitence, to restoration ("repent, and be saved"). The question of man underlying the atonement is one of how the sinful may be "saved" from their state . . . Maybe, but there is also the language of 'sacrifice' to grapple with, and the elucidation of what is utterly 'tragic', (pp. 381 and 51 *vide* D. M. MacKinnon) as a category for some minimal apprehension of some uncomfortable and perhaps intractable emphasis of the Gospel, even if that apprehension can't be so nicely organised. Some of the technique which has led Miss Moberly to apply a useful corrective criticism on e.g. 'eternal punishment' could be employed on 'God's forgiveness' with which she is clearly ill at ease—the unchanging steadfastness of love', it is the 'love of God that cleanses one'. Also, Kolnai's paper on forgiveness, (p. 164), is available in the *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, LXXIX, 1973-4, 91-106. The book represents a lively and worthwhile introduction to a range of tricky problems but I think there are some particularly awkward features of the Christian tradition that still need to be grappled with, and they might well make Miss Moberly think again about the fundamental presupposition and the consequences she draws from it.

Ann Loades

#### CORRIGENDUM

Through an unfortunate telephone misunderstanding two footnotes on p. 14 in *ECNL* n.s. 7 were given as if the reference within them was unsubstantiated in the source of the quotation. It was not possible for the editor to check against the original on the evening of the day on which the proofs had to go to press, and so the error got through. I very much regret the accident, and take the opportunity to reiterate to *all* our contributors that it is vital to have your references so accurately given in the first instance as not to give occasion for extensive revision which could, as in this unfortunate instance, end up in an error because the original author could not be bothered to put things down accurately.

B.S.B.

# The Anglican and Eastern Churches Association

founded in 1864

*Orthodox Patron:*

The Oecumenical Patriarch

*Anglican Patron:*

The Archbishop of Canterbury

*Anglican President:*

The Bishop of St. Alban's

*Orthodox President:*

Archbishop Athenagoras of  
Thyateira and Great Britain

*Chairman of Committee:*

The Rev. H. EMBLETON, M.A.,  
R.N.(retd.),  
The Vicarage,  
17 Victoria Drive,  
Bognor Regis,  
West Sussex, PO21 2KH.

*General Secretary:*

The Rev. A. T. J. SALTER, A.K.C.  
137 Liverpool Road, London, N.1.

*Treasurer:*

SIMON BREARLEY, ESQ.  
9 Emperor's Gate, London, S.W.7.

*Editor of ECNL:*

B. S. BENEDIKZ, M.A.  
The Main Library,  
University of Birmingham,  
P.O. Box 363,  
Birmingham B15 2TT.

## Contents

**Editorial**

**Appeal from the Russian Orthodox Church in  
London**

**General Secretary's Notes**

**Assistant Secretary's Notes**

**The Spirit of Anglo-Catholicism (Part I)**

**Suffering and Death of Children**

**The Church is One**

**News and Causerie**

**Reviews**

**Corrigendum**

*No responsibility can be accepted either by the General Committee or by the  
Editor for the views expressed by the contributors.*

## Eastern Churches News Letter

### EDITORIAL

The heavy cost of the last issue, for which there was so much solid material that could not be kept back, has meant that this number has to be governed by a spirit of thrift and brevity. In consequence, all that can be put off until the autumn has been held back, including an editorial in which I had proposed to put my own views on current ecclesiastical discords.

One thing I must add, however. Six years is enough for anyone to edit a journal continuously. If there were no other reason, I have lively recollections of how an ageing editor nearly strangled the healthy continuity of a well-known journal by clinging to his post long after energy and zeal had deserted him. I do not propose, even at my humbler level, to be caught emulating him. In 1979 I shall have served for six years, and so the present statement is a firm notice that when I have seen the Autumn issue through the press, I shall no more be functioning as the Editor of *ECNL*. I very much hope that I shall be able to announce in that number who will be taking over; but whether I can or not, I shall not be editing the journal any more—no doubt to the great relief of those who have vented their spite on me because I have at all times refused to let illiterate outbursts into print without regard for punctuation, spelling, grammar or reason.

May I, finally, appeal to our members to give what can be spared, even in these times of Governmental fleecing, to the two Orthodox churches whose appeals the General Secretary and I have noted in the last and present issues.

B. S. Benedikz

### APPEAL FROM THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH OUTSIDE RUSSIA IN LONDON

Before the persecution of Christians began in Russia, there were few Russians living in the diaspora, and very few in England. Those that lived here worshipped in a chapel attached to the Russian Imperial Embassy in Welbeck Street. This chapel is still in existence, although now it is used as a lecture hall, and where the holy altar once stood there is now a speakers' rostrum.

With the fall of the Russian Empire, the Russian community in London was greatly increased by the influx of hundreds of refugees from the homeland, and at the same time the Chapel at the former Embassy was lost to the faithful. Through the mercies of our Saviour, and the kindness and generosity of the British people who offered a home and refuge to the exiles, in 1921, the Russian community was kindly given the use of a former Anglican church, St. Philip's, Buckingham Palace Road. And here they established their parish and celebrated the divine services for a whole generation. The older members of our congregation still remember that church with much affection.

However, our people were not permitted to remain there for ever, because the site was required for the expansion of the Victoria Coach Station, and for a period the congregation was again without a regular place of worship, save for the small chapel here in the Church House.

This second "exile" was brought to an end when the Russian congregation was able to rent the former Presbyterian Chapel in Emperor's Gate from the Anglican Parish of St. Stephen's, Gloucester Road. The church was converted for use as an Orthodox place of worship, and was blessed by the Blessed Archbishop John Maximovitch of holy memory, who expressed the desire that one day the Russian community would find a permanent home. The congregation, now greatly augmented by an influx of refugees from Stalin's Soviet regime, rejoiced as did David of old—"The sparrow hath found herself a house, and the turtle dove a nest for herself where she may lay her young, even Thine altars, O Lord of hosts" (Ps. 83).

Now the lease on our church at Emperor's Gate is nearing termination, and our people feel that now is the time to fulfil the Holy Archbishop John's desire and to find a church which we can buy, and there establish ourselves permanently, or rather—as long as the Lord our God shall allow.

Our congregation is composed almost entirely of people who are exiled from their homeland. They are scattered not only throughout the great city of London, but many of them come from far further afield. Their material resources are small, many are really poor, and therefore we ask your help and financial support.

With the blessing of the First Hierarch of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia, Metropolitan Philaret, we make this appeal and call upon your generosity. All those that make contributions will be remembered in our prayers; indeed the Lord Himself in heaven will remember them, for it was He who said: "Whosoever shall give

you a cup of water to drink in My name, because ye belong to Christ, truly I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward." and again it was He who benefacted that centurion of whom the elders of the Jews testified—"He loveth our nation, and hath built us a synagogue."

Archimandrite Alexis,  
*Administrator of the British Diocese  
of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia*

Please make all donations payable to:  
Russian Orthodox Church-Building Fund.  
And address them to the Treasurer of the Fund:  
Prince Dmitri Galitzine  
36 Charlwood Road  
London S.W.15.

#### GENERAL SECRETARY'S NOTES

The highlight of the year for the Association and a day which had certain overtones of sadness about it was the Solemn Eucharist celebrated by the priest officers of the Association (Frs. Embleton, Salter and Beal) at St. Peter's, Eaton Square, on 21 July, the eve of the opening of the Lambeth Conference. The Mass was Mozart's *Coronation Mass*, it being Coronation year, and was sung in the presence of the Bishop of Mons Calpe, the Right Reverend Ambrose Weekes, auxiliary bishop of Fulham and Gibraltar. Also present in choir were the Bishop of Truro, the Bishop of Cyprus and the Gulf and the Bishop of Basingstoke, together with Bishop Timothy of Miltoupolis and Bishop Matthew of the Polish Orthodox jurisdiction under the Oecumenical Throne. Archimandrite Meletios (Webber) read the epistle. Also present were Archimandrite Nectarios, Archpriest Miloye Nikolic and other Serbian priests, Archpriest John Pierkarski of the Belorussian Church in Exile, Father Constantine Alesee of the Roumanian Church, Abba Gabriel of the Ethiopian Church and Father Shenouda of the Coptic church in Allen Street. Archpriest Borovoy represented the Patriarch of Moscow and All The Russias, the only Orthodox representative at this Lambeth Conference actually to travel from an Orthodox country, the other Churches being represented by the heads of their Churches already resident in the United Kingdom, or not represented at all. It was good to see Father Borovoy enjoying a chat at the reception afterwards with Prince George Galitzine of the Russian Church Outside Russia, differences of jurisdiction and politics being forgotten for an hour or so.

Father Embleton welcomed the guests at the reception and asked Bishop Timothy, who was representing the Oecumenical Patriarch's delegate to the Lambeth Conference (Archbishop Athenagoras II, who had only that day returned from the Pendeli conference of Anglicans and Orthodox in Athens) to say a few words to us at this critical time for Anglican-Orthodox relations. Bishop Timothy spoke kindly and amusingly and lightened the seriousness of the occasion for us considerably. He pointed out that the altar for the male priest was the public altar in the church: that of the wife and mother the private altar, the table in her own home surrounded by members of her own family. This was the basis of a happy Christian family life in the eyes of the Orthodox Christians. Anglicans should strive to hold fast to the same tradition which they had received along with the Orthodox and the Roman Catholic Churches, who formed the vast majority of Christians in the world. The Bishop of Truro, wearing an Orthodox rosary—a nice oecumenical touch much appreciated by the Eastern Christians present, underlined this from the Anglican side. He, too, had just returned from the Pendeli talks.

The annual festival at St. Peter's, Eaton Square, was not nearly so well attended as the July gathering. The Archbishop of Thyateira presided, together with the Bishop of Basingstoke. Archimandrite Meletios preached an excellent sermon on the nature of the Church and the priesthood and the need for the Establishment to take note of those many priests who would have been rendered homeless had they had to follow their consciences and leave the Established Church over the question of the ordination of women. In retrospect one wonders whether those women who are putting phoney money on the collection plates in their parish churches in protest at the way the vote went in General Synod would have been so generous towards making financial arrangements for those priests and their families who might have had to seek employment elsewhere. It was good to hear an Orthodox priest speaking up for those who would have had only the wilderness for a home had the vote gone the other way. That the vote went the way it did was due in no small part to the influence of our Orthodox friends who love the Church of England, not least to our Orthodox President, Archbishop Athenagoras II, who has spent many long and weary hours urging Anglicans of word of mouth and in print, not to embark on a course which would break up the old "special relationship" and "*entente cordiale*" between Canterbury and Constantinople and their sister Churches. It was a Greek of Tarsus, Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury, who formed the Church of England as we now know her with her parochial system. Another Greek Archbishop, alas, as yet not in communion with Canterbury, helped to rescue the Church of England from a course, which, as far as her continuity in the

Catholic faith and in Catholic Orders were concerned, would have been totally disastrous.

We have heard a great deal about what has happened in the U.S.A., but the Episcopal Church, although a member of the Anglican Communion, is nevertheless a long way off and few Anglicans ever meet members of that Church. Perhaps we should be directing our gaze to the Churches of Europe with whose peoples our destiny lies rather than to the Transatlantic community with whom we have, politically, so little in common. A Church of Europe—the union of Canterbury, Constantinople and Rome may be of more urgent necessity for Anglicans than the retaining of a loose communion with the very diversified Churches of those countries once coloured pink on the map. We used to be told that it was the vocation of the Anglican Communion to disappear. Could it be that the Church of England and her sister Churches in the United Kingdom and Ireland ought to be aiming for a Catholic-Orthodox reunion for the benefit and well-being of the newly emerging European Community? Perhaps God is moving us in this direction. Most of us prayed long and fervently in our churches for the guidance of the Holy Spirit over the period of crisis before the vote was taken in the General Synod, surely we must take the Holy Spirit's answer seriously if we believe He can and does work through the democratic process, however much this may reveal divisions between priests and bishops. Let us not forget a great saint, venerated in East and West alike, St. Athanasius, who whilst only a deacon is said to have saved the Catholic Church from Arianism.

There is much bitterness and frustration in this vacuum which has followed the General Synod's voting. Friends have been divided as they were at the time of the Anglican-Methodist reunion scheme and one feels sorry for those who have been so disappointed in their hopes for ordination for women. For many months in my first curacy I knelt at the same altar rail with Dr Una Kroll and Prebendary Henry Cooper. Wags may scoff and say that this shows that God has a sense of humour, but when deeply held convictions are brought to nought we are always hurt for our friends and fellow Christians on whichever side of the division we find ourselves. At least one hopes we are.

Archimandrite Kallistos Ware gave an excellent paper on the Orthodox attitude towards the ordination of women at the annual general meeting. We hope that it may be published and so reach a wider audience.

Unique in London and perhaps in the United Kingdom is another Orthodox priest, Fr. Lucian Gafton, who is Orthodox chaplain to the University of London and now has his own chapel

complete with iconostasis in the Lady Chapel of the University Church of Christ the King in Gordon Square. This is the most recent initiative in the pastoral care of students in the University of London. It involves Orthodox of all jurisdictions and, although the University of London (with the exception of King's College) is a secular foundation, the Vice-Chancellor, Sir Frank Hartley, has indicated his support for this pan-orthodox chaplaincy.

The Holy Orthodox Liturgy is celebrated on all major feasts and on all Sundays in term time, the singing being of a very high standard. Since March 1977 the Very Revd. Lucian Gafton has been chaplain having previously been pastorally responsible for the Orthodox students in the School of Slavonic and Eastern European Studies.

Each Orthodox jurisdiction will be invited to nominate its own chaplain to assist in the pastoral care of the University staff and students. The Orthodox chaplaincy needs money to go forward with its unique work among the Orthodox population of the University of London. Members of the Association wishing to support this work financially should send their cheques to:—

The University Orthodox Chaplaincy,  
The University Church of Christ The King,  
Gordon Square, London, W.C.1.

During the summer I visited Archimandrite Barnabas at his remote house and chapel of St. Elias at New Mills near Welshpool. Father Barnabas welcomes Orthodox, Anglicans and Roman Catholics and members of the Free Churches who wish to make a visit or a retreat. Whilst in the Midlands I called on Father Zebece at his lovely cathedral of St. Lazar in Bournville, a building of which he and the Serbian community may be justly proud. It is the only Orthodox church to be built in the United Kingdom since the last war and has involved the Serbs in great sacrifices to erect such a fine temple.

Many people who write to the General Secretary, especially the brethren from the United States of America, seem to be under the mistaken impression that the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association has a vast secretariat in London based on 137 Liverpool Road, with typists and several assistant secretaries working from dawn to dusk on the business of the Association. The truth is that an overworked parish priest with no office help whatsoever has to cope with the large amount of queries single-handed, which pour in by almost every post. For this reason correspondents must bear with the General Secretary if their letters are not answered immediately.

Some members send their subscriptions to the treasurer and some to the General Secretary. It would be better if all subscriptions were paid to the General Secretary because then the subscription can be entered on the card index. There is then no possibility of the subscriber being asked for a further amount of money before his subscription falls due.

I would remind subscribers that their subscriptions are now due. The last issue of the News Letter cost £830 to print, on top of this the postage was in the region of £40. Needless to say the subscriptions from our 550 or so members (even supposing all those who receive the News Letter had paid £1) went nowhere near covering the cost of the News Letter.

From time to time the archives of the Association are consulted by scholars and research students. Miss Narsibian, an Armenian student has recently perused our documents for information on the Armenian massacres. Should any reader have any published information on these tragic events would they send the papers to me.

One of our members in the West Country, John Palmer, very kindly arranged a small festival for the Association at St. John's, Taunton. Father Benedict Ramsden of the Moscow Patriarchate's jurisdiction celebrated the liturgy and preached, about fifty people were present for this on 16th September 1978. We are grateful to the Vicar of St. John's for offering the Association hospitality.

In October Fr. Michael Fortunato celebrated the Holy Liturgy in the chapel of Lancaster University. Donald Hayes reported that the service was very well attended by students and members of the Moscow Patriarchal jurisdiction in the north. Members in the Manchester area will be interested to know that the Belorussian congregation under the Oecumenical Throne have their own church of St. Nicholas of Myra in Blackley. There is a liturgy once a month in English. The parish priests are Fr. Michael Iskrycki and Fr. Kyril Jenner. The Belorussian priest using my own church of St. Silas-with-All Saints, Pentonville, Fr. John Pierkarski, now has a liturgy in Cambridge at the Anglican church of St. Andrew. These Belorussians are under the Synod of the Belorussian Church in the United States.

David Cohen, a devout Jew, died suddenly in November. Although he did not always see eye-to-eye with those who defended the rights of the Palestinian Arabs—he was a fervent apologist for the State of Israel—he remained on good terms with members of the Association and attended our annual festival in October and the pre-Lambeth reception in July. Richard Avery, a member of

our committee, was hoping to attend the memorial service for David at Westminster Cathedral.

Last year the Association helped to pay for the visit of a group of theological students from King's College, London to their opposite numbers in the Orthodox Church of Crete. This September a similar visit was partially financed by the Association for a group from the same college to visit the Serbian Orthodox Church in Sibenik. The leader of the party was the Warden of King's College Hostel, the Revd. C. J. A. Hickling, who writes: "The visit really was tremendous—great warmth of every side and a great sense of re-affirming a traditional link between the Church of England and the Orthodox Serbs . . . very many thanks for the grant, *sine qua*, most emphatically, *non*."

In case our members are worried that the provincial universities may have been neglected the Association is hoping to be able to help sponsor a visit of a party of students from Cambridge to visit the Copts next July. The aim is to make an assessment of current conditions in the Coptic Church. The particular aims of the study are to examine the extent and character of the recent resurgence of Coptic Christianity, the relationship between parish and monastic life in a Church in which monasticism plays a crucial role in its life and organization, the response of the Church to its minor position within the Islamic world, and its experience of growing contacts with other Christian traditions and with secular Western society and culture. Some of the visitors will be studying the new role of women within the Coptic Church with special reference to the recent growth of women's communities, others will be concentrating on the significance of miracles in Christian experience and theology, and its importance in helping to define Christian identity in an Islamic environment. Such a study will be of special interest inasmuch as miracles are acknowledged particularly amongst the Copts as a continuing and important part of the Church's experience. Andrew Shanks of Caius College and Westcott House hopes to be able to visit the monasteries of the Western Desert, particularly St. Makarios, in the Wadi Natrun, where the community includes a considerable number of men with professional backgrounds and a good grasp of English. The superior of St. Makarios, Abba Matta El Maskia (Matthew the Poor) is a leading figure in the revival of monasticism and the spiritual life within the Church of Egypt at large, and now almost a national saint. Certain of the Church's monks have played a role analogous to the Russian Orthodox *staretz*, Abba Matta being one of the chief contemporary examples of this. Should any member of the Association wish to help sponsor this expedition to a sister Church would they contact Mr. Stephen Wilson, Westcott House, Jesus Lane, Cambridge. It goes without



saying that one of our committee members, the Rev. Dr. E. R. Hardy of Jesus College, is taking a keen interest in this visit.

The Russian Orthodox Patriarchal Cathedral in Ennismore Gardens, as noted in the last issue of *ECNL* is appealing for funds so that it can be purchased from the Diocese of London for £80,000. Members of the Association are once more asked to support this. Cheques should be sent to:—

His Eminence Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh,  
All Saints' Chantry Cottage,  
Ennismore Gardens, London S.W.7.

John Salter

#### ASSISTANT SECRETARY'S NOTES

The 60th anniversary of the restoration of the Moscow Patriarchate was celebrated in Moscow and Zagorsk during the Orthodox Paschal season (25-29 May) 1977. These extracts will be read during the Paschal season of 1979 (when the Orthodox festival will occur a week after the Western celebration), for which I send greetings to all my readers.

Not for a long time had such large delegations of all the Orthodox churches come together as at this celebration; it could be said of the occasion 'As we stand in the house of Thy glory, it is as though we stood in Heaven'. This phrase expresses the very heart of Orthodoxy, in the belief that Heaven and earth are not separated by an unbridgeable gulf, but, living here and belonging to earth, we may nevertheless belong to another world and dwell with the saints in eternity.

We in the Church of England have maintained very close liaison with the Russian Orthodox Church since the days of J. M. Neale, especially through the devoted work of W. J. Birkbeck; I extend to the Patriarchate of Moscow and to all faithful Christians in Russia my warm greetings in the Risen Christ.

In the opening address of the 1977 celebration the Patriarch Pimen recalled the restoration of the Patriarchate; greeted the Oecumenical Patriarch Demetrios I and the representatives of all the churches attending, and reported with pleasure on the constructive developments between the two Patriarchates of Constantinople and Moscow. He also referred to relationships with other churches.

Dialogue was being prepared with the Eastern Churches separated since the Council of Chalcedon (451). Though dialogue with the Roman Catholic Church had not yet started, the Russian Orthodox Church was actively involved in the work of the Inter-Orthodox Theological Commission which is preparing for this dialogue. Conversations took place with representatives of the Anglican Church in 1976, and increasing agreement on theological issues is being reached with the Old Catholic Churches. Cordial links were being maintained with the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem and the Church of Greece, shown in recent visits to Jerusalem, Greece and Russia.

The Metropolitan Meliton said in his address that those present were gathered not merely to celebrate an anniversary, but especially to bear witness of the Resurrection to the whole world.

I regret to report the deaths of the Metropolitan Nikodim and of Professor Nicholas Arsenev, a good and long-standing friend of our Association.

The Association's Festival in 1979 will take place at an Orthodox Church; its theme will be 'Orthodoxy in the world today'.

Cuthbert Fearon, o.s.b.

#### THE SPIRIT OF ANGLO-CATHOLICISM<sup>1</sup>

This paper is for an Anglo-Catholic Conference; therefore something ought to be said about Anglo-Catholicism; as distinct from the issues of women priests, race relations, housing, teaching, sexuality, etc. These are of vital importance to *all* Christians and therefore not our exclusive concern. People may look to us for a lead on such issues and we may well want to give an example, but our unique spiritual tradition is our *especial* concern and not only illumines the world and its problems for us, but will be the path along which we travel to our eternal home.

The Catholic way into which I grew up in love and devotion was not only orthodox in belief, but through its atmosphere of holiness full rein was given to the aspect of 'personal religion'. Therefore it shall suffice to describe the faith in which I grew up, and not speak in highflown words, which only provide a circuitous route, bringing us round about and back from whence we began, merely collecting concepts along the way. Instead of intellectual exercise I offer a challenge—'renew' what is here described!

Today we see an age of many contradictions; one which ignores the reality of spiritual existence, even though meditation, mysticism, and the charismatic gift are highly exalted and much mentioned; an age which is known as materialistic, one which claims to affirm 'matter' in the theology of the Incarnation; yet fails to live the Incarnation and comprehend the earthly in the context of the Transfiguration and thus present matter in a glorified form. (The lack of richness and beauty in Church and Liturgy is a denial of the Transfiguration and the theology of the Icon). The material vehicles of spiritual realities have never been depreciated to such an *unprecedented* extent as they are now.

Nor are *spiritual* realities stressed by our Church today. It is no mere accident that the soul is hardly ever mentioned, and even Heaven and Eternal Life are almost embarrassments to the modern Christian. Nor is it made clear that, far from the spiritual being a second-rate order of existence or a 'make-believe' substitute for something 'real', it is *the* reality which makes things real. Material things are called into existence by the spiritual; they pass away after a season, and are only called back into being by the spiritual. But genuine spirituality, which seeks to proclaim and expound the mysteries of the soul and eternity, is replaced by merely attempting to apprehend the spiritual content of *this* world—people are interested to bring out the spiritual value of human relationships in the here and now, which is fine as far as it goes, but dangerous if it ignores eternal verities; i.e. they have little enthusiasm for establishing a personal relationship with God and the Saints.

The spiritless, devotionless atmosphere of our Church today *seems* to have replaced spirituality with abstractions, and replaced matter with concepts. An instance of the former can be seen in modern Biblical study. Nowadays the basic pre-occupation seems to be with dating and authorship. Reading the Bible has been reduced to an intellectual exercise. We no longer hear of meeting with Jesus, or of the Word of God speaking to us. Ideas such as these would appear to be intolerably naive today. The latter problem is seen in the various discussions on the Liturgy. Hundreds of liturgical concepts are set before us, and yet people fail to be caught up in the Liturgy itself. Surely worship is more caught than taught! So much seems to be over-intellectualised.

So, what of the spirit of Anglo-Catholicism? What has happened to the zeal and zing so characteristic of the Movement? Anglo-Catholics had an unique outlook, a desire for the authentic; pure faith and stable practice; constructive discipline; it was strict and it was orthodox. The desire for the 'authentic' makes one seek Catholic orthodoxy; indeed this search is the very hallmark of the

Movement and what the Oxford Movement was based on. To illustrate this point: I received my first communion (at the age of ten) at an evening Mass after a three-hour fast. When, as a young man of seventeen, I discovered that this was a mere modification of the Eucharistic Fast—a compromise—I could not be content or satisfied with its sufficiency. (One cannot do the impossible, i.e. be ardent by compromise). There are any number of compromises that preserve something of Catholicism, but we need Catholicism in its *fullness*, not in some modified or impoverished form. So the quest for fullness is the very essence of the Catholic Movement. It is a movement because it is a quest, and it is Catholic because it seeks the totality of Faith *and* practice. So that, when one hears of what is 'traditional' there is an accompanying sense of 'rightness' in it which feels like coming home. One is drawn after integrity and there is no room for the invention of expediency. In Catholicism it is useless to say "I don't understand" or "that doesn't interest me" and remain content with such negative attitudes. One must go on discovering and wrestling with things until understanding, according to the measure of God's grace, is bestowed. It is pointless saying "I agree with 'X' in principle, but . . ." There is no place for mere principle in the Catholic way—there has to be action without compromise. This sense of the genuine is then the *principal* ingredient in the 'spirit' of Anglo-Catholicism.

But what of the visible side of the movement? Those things which are now regarded as just external or eccentric were in fact the fruit of genuine personal holiness—the results of thought which is the fruit of the interior life; concern; prayer; ascetic endeavour and self-denial. There was of course a strong sense of tradition and heritage and of belonging within them. But also there was careful prayer and love of the Sacraments, and understanding of the Eucharist, not simply as a central service; valid sacrament; the means of receiving communion or a fellowship event; but as a meeting with the transcendent God in eternity: of joining the eternal worship of Heaven in the liturgy of the Saints. It seemed as though they were all there—John and Paul, Cosmas and Damian—the whole lot!

Some, maliciously, think of traditionalists as mere conservatives. The conservative is pre-occupied with a fixed form; the traditionalist is concerned about what is *known* to be valid, and with a strong link with the Church of the venerated Saints, and, most importantly, the historical Epiphany of God<sup>2</sup>—not at all the same as conservatism. The evocative power of worshipping in the words of the same Canon that S. Augustine brought here in his mission to Kent; that S. Francis of Assisi heard, and the *Anglican* martyrs of June 1549 died for, is a testimony to the Communion of Saints; not nostalgia

or sentimentalism. However, I am just as happy worshipping in the Liturgy of S. John Chrysostom—a rite he compiled, S. Sergius knew, which was the spiritual food of S. Seraphim of Sarov, and S. John of Kronstadt celebrated. Further, I am sure the Celtic liturgies which Saints David, Colman and Aidan hallowed by their worship would be equally glorious. The poor old English Missal—abused suddenly because of its apparent lack of authority—and source of amusement in esoteric circles—is actually a *very potent blend* of ancient Latin gravity and noble Common Prayer, that Common Prayer for which King Charles gave his life. We see '1662' and King Charles's Prayer Book as impoverished rites, yet they kept the Catholic Faith alive, and nourished the spirituality of truly great men: George Herbert, Nicholas Ferrar, Jeremy Taylor and Bishop Ken. (Excuse this catalogue of Saints). The question which needs a really hard, *honest* answer is: "In what way can any of the new liturgies, 1662 included, be considered to have surpassed the old?" Why not have, simply, new translations of the old? It seems absolutely absurd, that with the *vast* treasury of 'pre-disunion' rituals that Christianity has produced, we have to go on concocting *new* ones, which are never going to convey that tangible link with the '*un-divided*' historic church of our fathers.

To return, there was indeed a very real sense of joining the Saints and the Departed in the Eucharist. People regarded it as the essential 'meeting place' *not* the 'social club' atmosphere which pervades so many churches today. There is nothing against fellowship, but priorities must be right; first and foremost there is the invisible fellowship of *Eternity*; then visible wordly fellowship (which is undeniably important). I remember, too, the sense of *awe* at Communion, to some extent engendered by careful preparation. So different from the easily made Communions of today. How seldom in a bare modern Church can one understand it as the 'Icon of Heaven'! The great Tractarian architects like Butterfield, Pearson and Comper were also theologians and they saw their churches as theology and prayer in brick and stone. Although a Roman Catholic, Pugin probably did as much to inspire Anglo-Catholicism as the tracts from the Oxford Fathers.

To quote but two sayings (of Pearson and Comper) will suffice to demonstrate that we have lost a sense of the numinous and wonderful in our places of worship. "I want to design Churches that will bring people to their knees!" (Pearson) "A Church should pray of itself" (Comper). Here we see the material order presented in the glorified form; so different from the modern concept of presenting it in the crudest, barest, mundane unglorified forms, devoid of the garments of consecration.<sup>9</sup>

The sense of "The Presence", "The Other-worldly", permeated our churches; it drew people; and in the towns it was unusual to find an Anglo-Catholic Church empty for more than a moment or two. The church I went to had a "five-minute" scheme. People would come into church at any time of the day and pray for five minutes at least. There was a little book of intercessions and people's names and problems were constantly being presented before the Lord.

The Church was an alive place with people before the Blessed Sacrament and the statue of Our Lady. There was a conviction of the importance and apartness of Holy days (both fasts and festivals); of self-denial in Lent and on Fridays; and of fasting before Communion. People took things seriously, devoutly, fervently—and they *did* things! It is impossible to be fervent about *not* doing something. You can't *not* genuflect fervently, but you can genuflect fervently. The physical action becomes a vehicle for an act of love. This is orthodoxy; that an outward and physical sign signifies an inward and spiritual reality. It does not demonstrate just an inner conviction, but confirms, strengthens and stabilises that conviction itself. An action clothes the mind and emotions.

So to what effect do we abandon kneeling to receive Holy Communion? Some say that the Orthodox have never knelt, but do we have their Eucharistic fast or their lengthy preparation? No, we do not; we are intent on *discarding* things, but not ready to *adopt* very much. You can't have it both ways. There is a limit to how much negativeness Christianity will take. You cannot be ardent about *not* fasting, *not* kneeling, *not* making the Sign of the Cross. (Or at least only in the Protestant sense of 'No Popery' or the modernist sense of "No Traditionalism" but neither can be called true fervour). Rather, they represent a destructive attitude. There is at present a feeling of getting back to the bare essentials, but in this sort of quest it is very easy to lose those very bare essentials. In the Catholic way there are no bare essentials, since Catholicism is a fullness, not a barrenness. We have forgotten what Catholicism is. It is *not* a question of what we can get away with—of a bare minimum required for validity. It is a case of "What more can we do?" How to remind people of the cataclysmic, overwhelming phenomenon in which they are participating, the plentitude of good things, the "treasury of blessings"? As Alexander Schmemmann says: "If millions of people, 'validly' baptized, have left the Church and still leave it, if Baptism seems to have no impact on them whatsoever, is it not, first of all, because of us, because of our weakness, deficiencies, *minimalism* and *nominalism*, because of our own constant betrayal of baptism? Is it not because of the incredibly low level of the Church's life, reduced to a few 'obligations', and thus having ceased

to reflect and to communicate the power of renewal and holiness? All this of course applied above all to the clergy—to the priest, the celebrant of the Church's mysteries. If he himself is not the image of Christ 'by word, by deed, by teaching' (1 *Tim.* 4:12) where is man to see Christ and how is he to follow Him? Thus to reduce sacraments to the principle of 'validity' only is to make a caricature of Christ's teaching. For Christ came into this world not that we may perform 'valid' sacraments: He gave us valid sacraments so that we may fulfil ourselves as children of light and witnesses of His kingdom."<sup>4</sup>

Let us be honest. We have all been guilty of backsliding in the last twelve years or so. Let us not attempt to deny it. However, I think that the clergy seem to have let us down very badly during this period in so many ways (ways which are not always easy to define). We read about the wonderful praying priests, forever interceding for their flock under their breath. St. John of Kronstadt from the East, the Curé d'Arns from the West, and our own Fathers—Lowder, Dolling, Stanton, etc. And did not the cassock and biretta (almost causes for amusement among churchmen today) symbolize the praying, caring priest among his congregation? By these 'externals' did not people know that here was someone appointed by God and interceding with Him for them; that here was a man set apart and consecrated for God? People describe the wonderful priests they knew in times past, but find it impossible to say the same of priests today. There *are* a few, known to me, who can be described as loving, praying, sincere men, but they are very old. (Those who are younger and have these gifts seem to come from other confessions). In the East, people, especially children, rush up to the priest to kiss his hand and just 'be with him' and it was similarly the case here not so long ago. Now with the break-down of family life and smaller family units, less time for listening and sympathy, with people becoming increasingly isolated and estranged from society, with less stabilizing influences, they are becoming less domesticated, less receptive, and colder and duller.

We need the prayers, sympathy and counsel of the priest more than ever before—wherefore do they withdraw themselves from our midst? In the old days, families were large and there were grandparents and maiden aunts to spare, ready to listen and offer advice, and yet there was need for the priests. How much more do we need them now?

Many people realize the need for stabilizing influences in our life, and lament the lack of discipline. I have heard people say half-heartedly that we need to restore discipline in the spiritual life. But we fail completely to understand fasting, regular prayer, pre-

parations, penitence and gestures if we see them only as mere cold, wholesome discipline. Rather these things are and should be seen as acts of love. The Italians have a saying: "Love without kisses is like a sky without stars". Would we discard the signs of human love? Wherefore do we discard the signs of divine love? Would we reduce love to its bare essentials? Is not a kiss an external? Is it necessary? Maybe this is what this wicked society has tried to do—to reduce love to what it sees as the bare essentials—to the genital area, and so has started to destroy human love by replacing it with self-gratification! Catholic devotion is all about love and no matter how debased the signs become they still speak of love. Has Judas' betrayal made us suspicious of kisses? Modern Catholics fear formalism and regression so much, you would think they were full paid-up members of the Protestant Truth Society!

If it is absolute fact that things were too rigid, it is absolute fact that now things are too lax. (If we are honest, we shall own that the term 'Anglo-Catholic' has become virtually synonymous with 'Lapsed Catholic'). It would have been a constructive gesture if churches had restored the genuflection at the 'Incarnatus' in the Creed after the publication of "The Myth of God Incarnate" (rather than expend hundreds of words in a belated bid for orthodoxy) an act of *love* for the condescension of Almighty God for us sinful and ungrateful men. Once theology becomes divorced from action we've had it! If we know anything today, it seems to be a mere acceptance by the mind, not an acclamation by the whole being. If only we were persecuted for our faith as we once were! Nothing aids knowledge of a faith as much as persecution. You will have all heard of this new nonsense which masquerades as tolerance, i.e. one belief is right for one person, another for someone else; both ways equally valid, depending on personality and taste. Just as well the apostles did not think this way. Belief mattered to early Christians. After all, if it is likely that one may be called on to die for a belief, it stands to reason to value it, and indeed to want to know as much as possible about what one is persecuted for. The imprisoned priests took stands over things that Anglo-Catholics presume to inform us are unimportant now. A decadent attitude leading to a careless piety leads to an impotent spiritual life, mundane liturgy and unorthodox theology. Belief, practice, enthusiasm, sincerity and personal holiness matter for us today. We need the whole, integrated, stable Catholic life!

(To be completed)

(Footnotes to follow Part II.)

### SUFFERING & DEATH OF CHILDREN<sup>1</sup>

The purpose of the Society is a concern for children, but I think that whether we are dealing with children or grown-ups, in pain or in anguish, we must never forget the people who are around them. Children have parents, grown-ups have wives and families, and it is not always the person who actually suffers who is the most distressed. One may say that at times the person who is physically suffering or in anguish has enough to do with being anguished and suffering to fill his time; to use up all his spiritual and other opportunities, while the people who are around him, particularly when they feel helpless, have a very complex and distressing time.

I would like to say something about suffering and about death of children, but this applies to a very great extent to grown-ups, with regard not to the suffering child but to parents, to friends, to people who are outside the actual suffering but concerned with what is going on. For one thing, I don't think we can approach this question of suffering and death in life unless we have an idea, a sort of evaluation of suffering, and of death, and of life. One of the things which makes us so helpless in the face of the suffering of children, more particularly, but also of grown-ups, is that we have no point of view on it. We face situations without having any idea of what we think of the predicament as such. Nowadays, for instance, it seems to be a commonplace to consider suffering as an evil and to think that suffering must be avoided, or alleviated, or pushed back as completely and as far as possible. The result of this is, I think, the growth of cowardice: people are afraid, and this fear of suffering at times is more disastrous than the suffering itself.

I have spent ten to fifteen years of my life being a physician, so I have some personal experience of how it works in hospitals and outside them. What happens usually is that a person is told "there is no reason why you should suffer—life should be smooth, things should be good, suffering is an evil", so that when suffering comes one's way, most of the people who surround us take it as an injustice on the part of fate, as an event that should not take place. It is probably put together with the various things which one calls "acts of God" in insurance policies. This is, I think, a very remarkable expression, because an "act of God", if you try to define it from the list of things which are called by this name, are things so monstrous, so shocking, that no man would do them—it takes God to do them. In many cases, suffering is taken in that way. No human would inflict it, and yet God allows it. It is completely evil and wrong and yet God does not do anything, and people are deprived both of the manly approach to the suffering as such, and of any real help they could derive from God if they did not define Him in the first place as the very person who is responsible for all evils.

At times people come to me and express a distress at what their life is like. More often than not they explain why they react so wrongly to circumstances, like saying "well, God has allowed this and that; I would be a saint if God had not made my life unbearable". Very often, before suggesting absolution, I would tell the person, "Now, before you receive God's forgiveness, are you prepared to forgive Him for all His misdeeds? Because, from what you have said, quite obviously He is the cause of all evils." Well, this is very much the way in which people react to their own suffering and to the suffering of others around them, and if *that* is the approach, then there is nothing to lean on anyhow.

Now I do not consider suffering and death as good in themselves, but they are not an evil in themselves. They are not, either, a one-sided act of divine cruelty; life on earth is something more complex than this. God, His will, His wisdom, and His love, plays a substantial part. The powers of darkness play their part, and man plays his part between the evil which could or can invade the world, and the good that can conquer it; man has the dread power of allowing either the one or the other to have the upper hand. So that whenever suffering or any form of evil comes our way, it is not enough to turn to God either accusingly or miserably. We must realise that the situation is defined by human evil as much as by anything else. There is a collective responsibility for particular suffering which we must accept and face together.

When grown-ups suffer, one can more easily than with children see the good it can do to them. It is against odds that character is built. It is against suffering that we can learn patience, endurance, courage. It is by facing other people's suffering that we can reach that depth of faith or that depth of surrender to which otherwise we could not attain. *Not* to rebel, *not* to protest, to grow into harmony with the ways of God is something which we cannot achieve without challenge. You remember, probably, the Crucifixion: the way in which the Mother of God stood by the cross and said no word in defence of her divine Son who was dying. She did not accuse those who had condemned Him. She did not turn aggressively against people who, with curiosity or indifference, were surrounding the cross. She said no word. She accepted the death of her Son with the same perfection of faith and surrender which she had shown when she accepted the Incarnation. This applies to those surrounding: to all of us. The Mother of God in that respect should be to us an image and an example. Throughout the Gospel she is the one who allows her Son to go *His* way. To go into all the tragedy which is the destiny of the Son-of-God become Son-of-Man. This is important for us when someone who is dear walks into pain, suffering, anguish.

Now there is in the suffering of children something which is more puzzling in a way than in the suffering of grown-ups, because in the suffering of the grown-up we can see the good it *might* do if the person lived up to the greatness of his vocation. But what about the child? Can a child who suffers learn something which is of real and great value—patience and humility, courage and endurance, faith and surrender? I remember a child whose answer is recorded in the life of one of the French saints of the 18th century. The man asked a child of nine years of age how he managed to endure a very painful illness that eventually killed him, and the child said "Father (*he was nine*), I have learnt not to perceive today either yesterday's suffering, or anticipate tomorrow's." This is something of which very few grown-ups are capable, because whether it is moral suffering, psychological distress or whether it is physical suffering, what makes it usually so unbearable is that at every moment we seem to live and re-live all those past moments of pain and anguish, and at every moment we expect that it will last for ever, never come to an end, and we cannot face this sum total of all the past suffering and of the future suffering, while more often than not we could face the present actual suffering of our body or of our soul. So this is an example concerning a child of nine. What about children smaller, who cannot reason things out in that particular way? Can suffering do something to their eternal soul, or is it sheer nonsense and cruelty? We have a tendency to think that it is through our minds, through our conscious response, through our intellectual elaboration, that we grow in spirit. We imagine that our spiritual life is made of the lofty thoughts and deep feelings which have developed. This is not our spiritual life. It is not the life of the Spirit. It is that intermediary part of us which is somewhere neither the body nor the spirit. But I would like to draw an analogy to make myself clearer. We do baptise children. What do we expect, if we expect anything at all? What is the reason why we find it makes sense? Because, consciously or not, we believe that the living spirit, the living soul of this infant, is capable of meeting face-to-face the living God. Apart from any psychological understanding, apart from intellectual or emotional response, a living soul meeting the living God; and that the Sacraments of the Church address themselves to this living soul which does *not* depend for its knowledge of God on intelligence, consciousness, and so on.

But if this is true, then it applies also to all those things that happen in the body or soul of a child, before the moment it can be intellectually aware of things, and also apart from it. As far as grown-ups are concerned, I think, from what I have seen, that it applies to people who are mentally ill, who are beyond reach, who seem to be completely separated from the surrounding world; if

they recover, we meet them no longer where we left them but as men and women who have matured and become greater than they were, as though behind this screen of folly, of madness, the life of the Spirit has continued, because God cannot be stopped or kept out by what is going on in our intellect or in our emotions. God has direct access. God meets a human at the level of his soul, that is ultimately at the level of silence, of those things which are beyond words; or the level of mystery, that is, of those things which can be known within the silence and which cannot be expressed by words otherwise than symbolically—hinted at.

So that if a child is ill, at a moment when we cannot expect that he will consciously be aware of what is going on, when he will not be able to learn those things which require will, intellect, maturity of emotion, an active faith, an active surrender, it does not mean that what is happening to him in body will not *do* something, be a positive event or a positive contribution to his eternal life. And that, I think, is particularly important for parents, grown-ups, to realise when children are beyond reach, like certain mongol children, intellectually deficient children. There is a limit to communication in words but there is no limit to communication in other ways. Ultimately, a meeting between a soul and God takes place at the heart of silence. A meeting between two persons takes place beyond words. It takes place where God is. And in the Orthodox Church we insist that when a woman is pregnant she should make her confession, put all her life right, receive Communion, pray: because the relatedness there is between the child and her is such that what happens to her happens to the child. When the child is born, we expect the parents to pray over it. We give Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Communion to new-born babies for the reason which I have said before: because the living God can meet His living creature at that depth which is far beyond any means of human communication. When a child is ill, intellectually beyond reach, it still remains that this child can be prayed over, prayed about, held before God. And, also, have participation in the Sacraments of the Church. If parents and those surrounding such a child realised that more often, if instead of trying to break through a wall that cannot be broken through, they went to that depth where in God we all meet, there could be a relatedness, and a relatedness perceptible: a relatedness of which they would be aware, which would be the beginning of an eternal relationship. And that applies also to death.

God is not the God of the dead; He is the God of the living. If we live *in* God we live close to each other, and when a child has departed this life so often the parents have got a double sense of distress. On the one hand, the child has died. That would apply also to a grown-up. There is no physical presence, there is no direct

physical relatedness. But also, in a strange way, we imagine that the child that dies, the baby that dies, remains, as it were, a baby for ever, remains out of reach, because on earth he did not evolve that intellect which allows communication and those emotions that bind us together. Yet, if this is a living soul, alive in and by the power of the living God, if we could only reach out to the depth which is our own soul, our own spirit, we could without fear be certain that nothing can separate us. When the time will come when all things are fulfilled, we will not meet on the level of our psychological richness or poverty, we will meet spirit to spirit and soul to soul, and on this earth we must be aware of it. Our relationship with those who have departed this life is not in the past, it is not in the future: it is in the present—that split second which the present is, and which is the meeting-point of eternity, that is, God. It is *now* that we continue to be related to those who have departed this life and it is in this category of eternity and not of time that this takes place. Yes, it is true that there is no physical vision, no physical touch, but this is not the level on which we communicate anyhow. Even as we are now, when there is between us a real relationship, it is not simply conditioned by our mutual understanding of words, of language, of symbols. We have understanding and relation to the extent to which soul in soul we meet in silence, at the depth. In a way, real communication begins where all the means of communication are left aside. Real understanding is beyond words. When children suffer, we must make this act of faith concerning their ability because they are living souls, to grow into an ever deeper intimacy with God, and be certain that what is happening to them is not lost for them. When they depart this life, we must also remember that God is the God of the living.

One thing which I wanted to say and which I forgot in the process is the importance of touch. Touch in relationships. Physical contact. Practically in every religious rite things are conveyed by contact: the laying-on of hands, a blessing—so many things are done physically, and we should be aware of the spiritual quality of our bodies. Without our bodies we could not commune in the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. We could not commune with Him. It is through our bodies and because of what they represent, because of what they are, that we can have this communion with Christ and God. In human relationships touch plays an immense role. How much one can convey of compassion, of love, of tenderness by putting one's hand on another's hand or on a shoulder, which will never be conveyed by words and discourse, and with sick children perhaps more than with anyone—or perhaps no, because when a person is ill, gravely, grievously ill, everyone becomes a child again—so much can be conveyed by human touch:

sacramental, sacred or simply human (which is also sacred and sacramental); and this is something which we must teach the parents of sick children, that where words fail, when means of communication are not there, there is a mysterious way of conveying what cannot be conveyed, or translating what one is incapable of expressing: love, tenderness, compassion, but also faith and life in certainty by the way in which we treat a body.

Well, these are perhaps disjointed thoughts, but I would like you to think about what I have said because we have got to deal not only with the child who is ill but also with those who around him are distressed and they *must* learn, through faith, instead of being overcome by grief, instead of being conquered and destroyed, that they are partaking of a mystery, in a situation in which human power fails and Divine Power is abroad, acting sovereignty, building a kingdom in which each child—and we are all someone's children—in which each child participates one way or another in the mystery of the Lord Jesus Christ, born into a world of time, out of eternity, in order to die; and through death to open to us unconquerable, eternal life.

+Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh

1. A talk given to the Society of the Child Jesus, Hill Brow, The Green, Pitton, Salisbury, Wilt. First published in *Truth and Unity*, 15, 11-14, it appears here by permission of the Editor and the Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh (who possesses the copyright of the text).

#### THE CHURCH IS ONE<sup>1</sup>

A worshipper at a small church during the second world war made the following observation:

"The congregation of Saint Mary's, filled with patriotic fervour and rather heavily salted with retired military men, had persuaded the Vicar to close each service—except Holy Communion, which was said without benefit of music—with the singing of the National Anthem. I found myself standing, burning with shame and indignation at what seemed to me then—and appears still—something very like blasphemy, silent while the ladies chirruped and the colonels bellowed out their partisan pleas for God's particular favour."<sup>2</sup>

In a few minutes we will all sing the Creed, a statement of belief accepted by all Christians, formulated over 1,500 years ago and embodying the essence of faith in the Christian revelation, proclaimed by the life and work of the Son of God as shown forth in

Holy Scriptures. And yet when we come to the clause "I believe in one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church" it is likely that each one of us will commit the very same sort of theological indiscretion as those rather outmoded military men I mentioned earlier. The problem is not the "holy, catholic and apostolic Church" . . . all of us can agree to that. The problem is the word "one". Where most of us will be at fault is that we make a mental substitution of the word "my" for the word "one". Thus; I believe in *my* holy catholic and apostolic Church. But this is not what the Creed says. The Church is one.

There are indeed two bodies within Christendom which take this statement in the Creed very seriously, and this obviously causes problems. The larger of these two is the Roman Catholic Church. The other is my own Church. Each of these bodies, separated as they are by ethos, language and several centuries, is beginning to look afresh at the other. Each claims to be *the* Church, *the* body of men founded by Christ himself. And yet, with developments in Rome in the last few months, is it not time that we looked into our claims, which at first glance seem mutually exclusive. The installation of Pope John Paul I, with its lack of triumphalism, its simplicity and, at its heart, the humility of the man himself, showed us that the Bishop of Rome is once again prepared to take the place which is rightfully his in a united Church of East and West. Pope John Paul in thirty-four days brought the union of these two Churches closer together than almost anyone else.

Relations between the Orthodox and the Anglican Churches were, until comparatively recently, most cordial. There were many problems to overcome, but there was a deep spirit of mutual respect. We were working towards unity—at least that was our aim. Unfortunately, the views and actions of some members of the Anglican Communion have cast very dark shadows over that purpose. I am referring here, and in what follows, to the ordination of women to the priesthood, but it could apply to any departure from, or innovation within, Christian tradition.

The Anglican Church does not make any claim to be the sole embodiment of the Christian Church. It does, however, claim to be part of the Catholic Church. How that claim is evaluated by other Christians depends very much on the way the Anglican Church acts *like* a Church.

If we do believe in the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church, then now is the time to forget the polemic of bygone ages, the hatreds, the distrust, the exclusiveness. This is a large task, and it will not be accomplished overnight. Nevertheless, even in these

days there is hope, there must be hope that union of the Churches will eventually take place. But it is certainly not the time to create difficulties. Today, as every day, is the day of our salvation, and our salvation is to be achieved in the realisation of what we recite daily in the Creed: one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church. We are the Body of Christ, says Saint Paul, and in Christ there is equality in status, race and sex. The Body of Christ is one body, just as the Church is and must become one. We are potentially nearer to that ideal at this moment than we have ever been at any time. For example, the ancient Oriental Churches are learning to live and Co-exist with other Christians for the first time in centuries, just as we are learning to appreciate and learn from them. A new unity will be achieved in sincerity and truth, not in a context of compromise, point-scoring, territorial ambitions and ethnic bitterness.

And what can we say of the millions of others who call themselves Christian, but whose status as a "Church" may be in doubt? Certainly one must be careful not to underestimate their place within the Body of Christ. The spirit of God goes where he will; I can say with certainty where the Church is, but I can never say with any certainty where the Church is not. Moreover in our situation where the sixth wound is so evident within the Body of Christ, we must be as open as possible to all manifestations of truth.

Given that the Body of Christ is one, one must consider one's own status as a Christian, and the status of others, in the light of the life of Christ himself, and in the light of the life of the community which he founded. Of course, there is no man who lives without sinning; only Christ is perfection; nevertheless, Christian tradition is a great deal more than the lowest common denominator of the lives of all sinful Christians of all ages. Christian Tradition is the Holy Scriptures, it is the Creeds, it is the lives of the saints, it is the sacramental, mystical and prayerful lives of millions of men pleasing to God. It is intangible, but it is not amorphous. But it is no common melting pot, nor is it flexible enough to contain all aspirations of men, no matter how well intentioned. Christian tradition is not a consensus, nor is it just the sum of pious opinion. It is rather the working of the Holy Spirit amongst and within the people of God. Indeed, Christian tradition *is* the life of the Church and is the standard by which we can judge our own claims and the claims of others to belong to Christ. Moreover, departure or deviation from Christian tradition in no circumstances creates new Christian tradition.

There are terrible problems facing the Anglican Communion at this time. But there are problems facing all Christians in the modern



world. Secularism, in all its multifarious and ephemeral forms, attempts to make inroads into the realms of faith. Political, ethnic and personal interests have caused schism in the Church time and time again, and we are only now beginning to realise that these interests are, and always were, outside the Christian life. Our ways are not God's ways unless we work in complete faith and in line with what he sets before us. We are the Body of Christ as long as we receive Christ as our standard.

But I, or any group of individuals, or any Church or Communion of Churches, can depart from that standard—that is the freedom which God gives us. If I were to preach heresy, or depart drastically from Christian tradition, I would in time be excommunicated. That is to say, my actions would cause me to excommunicate myself from the Body of Christ. My priesthood would still be authentic, but that would be of little or no interest to anyone but myself. I could continue to pray to God, but I could no longer say "Our Father . . ." for I would be alone. I could become a very good person, giving all my goods to the poor and my body to be burnt, but I would no longer be an inheritor of the Kingdom.

I could appeal to the Church to listen and consider my opinion, whatever it is, and it is possible that in the course of time the whole Church would once again feel strong enough to say "It seems good to the Holy Spirit and to us . . ." and agree with my opinion. However, if I were to act in a way which contradicts Christian tradition and act in complete disregard to other Christians, I can hardly expect any agreement from the Church and the only understanding I can expect to receive is the same understanding which the Church had to Arius, Nestorius and all the others.

The division of Christians into many groups, each having different philosophical, ethnic and sociological interests is a human problem which is likely to last for ever. The division of Christians into groups, each having its own revelation, doctrine and Church order is a sin which with the grace of God we can obliterate. Any action of ours which does not work towards union, is, at best, doubtful. And action which is a positive barrier to that union is a sin.

The Lambeth Conference placed a decision before the bishops present there. They had to choose between the ordination of women and a schism within the Anglican Communion. It is not surprising that even prominent opponents of women's ordination had to vote in its favour.

Christian tradition places another decision in front of the Church. This is to choose between women's ordination and the union of the Churches. Even if we were to admit, in darker moments, that

there are very many obstacles to overcome before the union of the Churches can be effected, it is surely foolhardy to suggest that one more obstacle will not make any difference.

I wish to make one final plea, and this is addressed primarily to the hierarchy of the Anglican Churches. Many members of the Anglican Church feel very strongly that the ordination of women is a departure from Catholic faith. It is up to those who have initiated this innovative and divisive topic to show a genuine pastoral concern for those who cannot agree with it. Leaving the Anglican Church in numbers large or small is not the answer, and yet this will be the obvious step for many to take. The ministry of many is in grave danger at this time; the faith of many is in peril. What action do you intend to take as the shepherds of your flock?

The sermon is almost over. It has not been my desire to hurt or offend anyone. You would probably have heard something very different from Metropolitan Anthony, had he been well enough to be present this morning. Even though we share in the same priesthood, I have very little of his experience, humility or sanctity.

Nevertheless, as we are about to recite the Creed, the great decision is forced upon us here and now: Do we really believe in one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church?

Peter Webber

1. Address given to the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association A.G.M. Service, 14 October 1978.
2. Anthony Barker (in: D. Morgan (ed.): *They became Anglicans*. London, 1959, 19).

#### NEWS ITEMS

##### Oecumenical Patriarchate

A patriarchal delegation has been examining the state of the monastic communities of Mount Athos, where the present combined population of novices and professed monks is 1250, the numbers in individual houses ranging from 10 at the Docheariou to 375 in the Great Lavra.

During the Autumn of 1978 a delegation of Lutheran theological scholars visited the Oecumenical Patriarchate to discuss topics for dialogue between the Lutheran World Federation and the Orthodox Churches.

### Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Thyateria and Great Britain

Archbishop Athenagoras attended a conference in Constantinople in August 1978 with the Oecumenical Patriarch and his advisers on ecumenical affairs. On his return journey he stopped at Turin to examine the Holy Shroud, and to look over the problems it poses to enquirers before declaring himself satisfied as to its authenticity.

### REVIEWS

W. Brueggemann: *The Land* (Overtures to Biblical Theology). London, SPCK, 1977, £4.95.

The aim of this book is ambitious, for it is nothing less than "to contribute to the current redefinition of categories of biblical theology". My own view is that the author has manifestly not succeeded; that so far from clarifying this issue, he has increased the confusion. In principle there is no objection to an intuitive selection of a single idea by which to organise the varied material of the Old Testament into a theological statement. Indeed a strong case for so doing was made by David Kelsey who spoke of the "imaginative discernment" by which a theologian tries to catch up in a single metaphorical judgment the full complexity of God's presence. The theologian tries to grasp what the Old Testament is basically about in a single, synoptic, imaginative judgment. It seems to me that this admirable intention is not fulfilled by means of the idea of 'land'.

Confusions are at least threefold. First there is the constant uncritical transition from the modern question of homelessness to the history of Israel's relation to the land and further to the land as a symbol of the people and of the kingdom of God. If the author had carefully traced the history of Israel's relation to the land, we would have been much in his debt. But the attempt to relate this to modern sociological problems is unconvincing and the further attempt to see it as the unifying factor in the theology of the Old Testament often grotesque. The history of Israel's relation to the land could have been traced with the full and unambiguous use of critical resources. The symbolic use of the 'land' in poetic and prophetic passages also could have been clearly analysed. The tacking between the two so that one is never quite sure which is which is not helpful.

The second and related confusion is created by the minting of a special vocabulary. The author divides the Old Testament into three main divisions:

the history of promise into land;  
the history of management into exile;

the new history of promise which begins in exile and culminates in kingdom. From this point of view, the wilderness becomes "space far away from ordered land". Manna is "the bread that refuses to be administered and managed and therefore is not perverted by the distinctive inequalities of land-bread". Yahweh makes a protest against managed land-bread! "Gifted land gives life and managed land does not." The monarchy is "a significant dimension of landedness". "The land is not only for satiation, it is for guaranteed satiation." Even the Torah becomes relevant only when it is landed! Jeremiah is "the poet of the land *par excellence*". Jehoiachin and Josiah are models of land-losing and land-keeping kings. Chapter 9 begins: "Exile history did move to land". The Magnificat is "a vision of land-loss by the graspers of land and land-receipt by those who bear promises but lack power". Jesus is "the re-arranger of the land". "It is precisely the end of exile with the inversion of life for those who denied turf which is recognised in the person and preaching of Jesus." In the Fourth Gospel, land = "life in the new age" = eternal life. Land-less = crucifixion, land = land-gift = resurrection. "The resurrection of Jesus is the amazing restoration of power and turf." The central theme of Pauline theology is thus re-interpreted: "If the law issue is in fact related to having and keeping land, then grace-law becomes a prism for asking about keeping and losing turf." And as to the New Testament as a whole: "it is sobering for New Testament exegesis to recognize that the single central symbol for the promise of the gospel is land".

The author might retort that it is misleading to take a series of quotations out of their contexts. So it is. I readily agree that when you read the whole book, you can often discern what the author is straining after by this strange language. But even in context, they are strained. These quotations are grotesque in and out of context. Moreover the esoteric vocabulary tends to disguise the fundamental confusions to which we have drawn attention.

The third and again related confusion is caused by this forcing of the material into categories which do not suit it. Much of the Old and New Testament is being forced into a procrustean bed which manhandles the deeper themes to which these Testaments bear witness. There is a profound tension between the concreteness of earthly aims and that which transcends all limited human designs and resources. This book virtually dissolves the tension. It is inevitable that some features of the Old Testament simply do not fit the pattern. On the small scale, we notice how it is said of the poor,

the sojourner, the widow and orphan and the Levite that they are without land (pp. 65-66). This is true of the poor, the sojourner and the Levite. But the point about the widow is that she is without a husband and about the orphan that he is without parents. The reason prophets link the sojourner, the widow and orphan together is that the sojourner has no nation responsible for him, the widow no husband and the orphan no parent. Both the point and the distinctions are obliterated by relating everything to land. On the larger scale, the author has rendered himself unable to put a proper evaluation on the Temple. The temple is interpreted simply as an achievement of the monarchy (pp. 86-7). It is regrettable because it represents an attempt to corner Yahweh and use him to legitimate the monarchy. It turns religion into a decoration rather than a foundation. Historically there is something in this, but the author's primary interest is theological. Theologically the Temple has a far greater importance as the symbol of the presence of Yahweh, destined to give way to the temple not made with hands and to the worship that is in spirit and in truth. No-one would guess that the Temple is one of the great promises of the Old Testament, that it is the centre of a sophisticated theology. I regard the author's treatment of this theme as a culpable misrepresentation.

All in all I am given no help towards the redefinition of categories of biblical theology except to know that the material of the Old and New Testament is far too complex to be organised in terms of land.

Douglas R. Jones

P. Moore (ed.): *Man, Woman, and Priesthood*. SPCK, 1978. £2.95.

Synodical government, whether in the form employed in the Church of England or in that used in the Episcopal Church in the USA, opens new possibilities for self-determination through democratic procedures, particularly where the force of tradition has diminished in power. Furthermore, unless these procedures are informed by great Christian wisdom, they run the risk of treating all questions alike as business to be got through as expeditiously as possible, supposing that momentous affairs can be solved by vote. While the one thing can threaten the apostolicity of the Church, the other can threaten its unity.

It is just as well to be aware of these dangers as one approaches any major issue in Church life. They do not provide an argument against synodical government, but one *for* Christian wisdom informed by Scripture and tradition and for Christian charity for

those who disagree. And these are scarce enough to make one grateful for them when they do appear.

They have been particularly scarce, it seems to me, where the ordination of women to the priesthood has been discussed and acted upon. There has been much politicking and prayerful incantation, but as the one is no substitute for charity so the other is no substitute for Christian wisdom, and one is left with the conviction now that decisions have been taken at least for the present—*for* in America and Canada, *against* (though not 'in principle') in England—that all are much poorer, and that nowhere has much Christian wisdom and charity been in evidence.

Apparently speedily produced to influence the Lambeth Conference and the decision by The General Synod of the Church of England, the present book comes late for this phase of the discussion but soon enough, perhaps, to stimulate a growth in the Christian wisdom and charity which are necessary for the Anglican Churches to advance in this matter. This is not to say that it is itself a model in these matters, since it contains not a little suspect material and even some of the bitterness found in so much of the debate so far. But these lapses notwithstanding, it should bring, or help to bring, the wisdom and charity which are so badly needed.

Introduced and concluded by its editor, Peter Moore (Canon of Ely) the book contains essays of three kinds: those which are properly theological, which attempt to discern the main issues focused in the question of the ordination of women to the priesthood and to bring to bear on them authoritative considerations; these include essays by four priests, two Anglicans of different traditions (Eric Mascall and Roger Beckwith), a Greek Orthodox (Kallistos Ware) and a Roman Catholic (Louis Bouyer). A second group is formed by the essay on the role of women in Judaism (by an Orthodox Rabbi, Jonathan Sacks), and those which focus on wider issues related to masculinity and femininity, employing materials drawn from anthropology, psychology and literature (by Gilbert Russell, an Anglican psychiatrist and priest, together with Margaret Dewey, sometime Warden of the Association of Missionary Candidates for USPG, and by Susannah Hezel, formerly assistant principal of the Institute of Christian Studies, All Saints, Margaret Street). And finally there are two essays describing the experiences of churches in the Catholic tradition which have ordained women priests, the Church of Sweden (by Bishop B. E. Gärtner and Dean Carl Strandberg) and the Episcopal Church in the USA (by Bishop R. E. Terwilliger).

An interesting division runs through the book. Eric Mascall expresses the common mind of the Christians when he says that

'the restriction of the priesthood to males rests upon a deep and valid intuition in the mind of the Church', but only some would agree as he continues, 'which may be none the less authentic although it has not hitherto found a complete or fully satisfactory theological formulation.' It is clear that Scripture itself (for Beckwith) and Jesus Christ Himself as found in the continuing apostolic Church (for Ware and Bouyer) supply what is needed by way of a final theological formulation for some of the essayists, whereas, while agreeing with that 'deep and valid intuition' there is no such theological stability for the others. They must, and do, proceed with the task of defending that intuition by inquiring into what they consider the fundamental questions—which are ontological questions about the nature of man and woman and ontological and theological questions about the nature of priesthood. But their arguments are different in kind from those founded on authoritative theological formulations—having the character of natural theology, rather than that of dogmatic theology.

Different questions must be posed about the first kind than about the second. These essays by Beckwith, Ware and Bouyer are excellent expositions of the viewpoints which their authors represent; and they are systematic in a way which the other essays are not—as their use of fixed authorities makes possible for them. The same things can be said of the essay by Jonathan Sacks.

Beckwith lucidly summarizes Scriptural material (chiefly early parts of Genesis as interpreted by Pauline theology) having to do with the relation of the sexes, and other Biblical material (Acts and the Epistles) concerned with the authority of the Christian ministry. He devotes much attention to the importance given to the *differentiation* between man and woman, and the subjection or *subordination* of woman to man, appealing particularly to Paul's use of the doctrine of the Trinity—the head of the woman is man, of man Christ, of Christ God, and of the doctrine of creation—woman made from man, and therefore receiving the image of God *indirectly* from man. The subordination of woman to man is to be seen, therefore, as a permanent fact of creation, not annulled by redemption but only transformed by it—redemption transforms only the 'attitude' of the two towards each other. Because women must never exercise authority over men 'the exclusion of the subordinate partner in the human race from the principal offices in the Christian ministry is as inevitable today as it was in the first century.' Surely the weak point of this argument—even if one overlooks the question of the culture-bound views of Paul about the nature of man and woman—lies in its failure to probe fully the meaning of subordination and hierarchy, two areas in which much modern discussion has searched deeply. In their original meaning, these notions

were closely tied to military command. But these original connotations already altered in Paul's use of them for describing Christ's relation to God—a fact recognized by the early Church's refusal of subordinationism—and it is arguable that we have still not fully understood this change. If these things are so, it is nothing so subjective as the 'attitudes' between Christ, man and woman which are changed in the act of redemption; the original 'subordination' itself underwent transformation, and the 'headship' of man for woman is transformed by the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of the Father. As a result, to speak of the relationship between man and woman in terms of authority and submission is to step back into pre-Christian times. That is, however, no argument *for* ordination of women, only one against this particular ground for rejecting such ordination.

Louis Bouyer argues against ordination of women on the basis that Christ's exclusion of women from apostolic ministry was not simply a matter of chance, nor of lack of opportunity, but a matter of principle by which distinctive vocations were ascribed to men and women. The public vocation of man was to be that of representing the Head, males representing male; the public vocation of woman was to be that of representing the Church as Bride of Christ, females representing female (after the fashion of Mary). To 'equalize' women and men by confusing the vocation of women with that of men is in fact to deprive women of their special contribution—masculinizing them.

Kallistos Ware's essay follows the same general line, though his is a much more extended and formal statement, particularly as regards the nature of the Orthodox appeal to tradition, the nature and distinctiveness of ministerial order, and the iconic character of ministries for men and women. Holy Tradition for the Orthodox (as distinct from traditions) is dynamic—received, lived and tested as a response to God in each age and thereby enriched in each generation, but also maintains the apostolicity of the Church—its definition from Christ who is within and above history and as such speaks eternal truth, and its invincibility in the long run as such. This tradition has nowhere in its history admitted women to ministerial priesthood (as distinct from the royal priesthood of sanctity shared by all the baptized), and cannot introduce innovation in such a matter of principle. Unlike Beckwith's interpretation of Scripture, this tradition considers women to be created in the image of God equally with men, and equally recreated as capable of fashioning created things with new spiritual meaning and offering them back to God—hence equally 'priest' after the fashion of Mary. But distinct from this royal priesthood is ministerial priesthood,

which receives its character, neither professionally nor by democratic appointment, but immediately from the only One who is priest, Jesus Christ. Thus the priest is one who shares directly in Christ's priesthood, only to make that present. He is necessarily male because he is a sign or icon imitating the One whom he makes present, who is a man, Christ: a female cannot be substituted as though she were an identical entity without losing this iconic character of the human priest—which is a God-given mode of symbolism. Women have their own special vocations—which are neither passive nor subordinate—such as deaconess, spiritual guide, and others which Ware discusses.

Strong arguments these, and the basis on which they rest—ministerial order as receiving its definition from Christ—is such as to lift them above challenge unless one is prepared to challenge the basis at least in some respects. That, of course, is what advocates of women's ordination do. But even without attempting that, one can question these arguments at one point—as to whether the One Priest Jesus Christ, undoubtedly male as a human being, can only subsequently be represented by males, or the Church only by females. Even without disagreeing with the natural difference of men and women or the fact that they are saved in their sexuality, it is much more dubious to assert that the One priest must be represented only by the male. This involves supposing that the One priest functions always as a male, even in his mediatory role in heaven (and there is representative of the female also)—and that a male icon of this is necessary, who can through making that priesthood present bring about the representation of all. Incidentally, the prominence given to this male icon and to the female's separate vocations leaves the lay male without a clear station and role. But must we suppose that though Jesus is always male, the mediation which he performs in heaven has that character alone? If, as it seems, the exalted Second Person of the Trinity is not so solely male, why must the icon of this be male—and not male *or* female? Two answers are forthcoming; that this is a God-given symbolism and that it is part of the apostolicity of the Church. But it can be asked how either claim can be adequately *defended*.

Certainly the views of all those whose essays we have been discussing rely heavily on the givenness of fairly detailed theological positions, and they will tolerate no such divergence from these positions as ordination for women to the priesthood. For them the issue is closed, and it is not surprising that they—and those who agree with them—consider that such ordinations as have already occurred pose such a serious problem. But it is just this 'givenness of detailed theological positions' and the consequent closure of

fundamental questions which is at issue for those who support ordination for women. For they ask whether some of what is 'given' is not the product of certain historical cultures, and whether therefore the question of what is given and what is not must be opened—not in order to make the thinking of today normative (though it is sometimes hard to see how they avoid this) but in order to be properly responsive to the Tradition. For they suppose that apostolicity operates differently, by allowing a more creative response to these questions. But then their views have not been stated so far with anything like the sophistication evident in the essays of this book, and have often been carried along on the breezes of tolerant liberalism uninformed by serious encounter with opposing views, as one sees from the descriptions of Church action in Sweden and the USA.

Apart from these descriptive pieces, the remainder of the essays—with the exception of Jonathan Sacks' good one on the place of women in Judaism, which in its way is as tradition-centered as those we have just discussed—are of a different kind, in that for them there is no such theological stability. They inquire deeply into the way in which the ministerial order of the Church functions in relation to the natural order, as considered ontologically, anthropologically, psychologically and in literature—each usually drawing on several of these approaches.

Because they do not operate from a fixed Tradition, they are much more opencast. What are the questions involved in the issue of women's ordination, what is relevant to them, and what criteria must be employed in reaching the correct solution? These all become problems, where they were not in the other essays; and the essays differ widely in the sensitivity with which they are met.

The best in these respects is Eric Mascall's introductory piece devoted to 'getting the question right', though it remains disappointingly preliminary. The question must be one of the truth of the ministerial order of the Church, and for that matter one of the truth of the nature of sexuality. After a helpful but brief discussion of these things, basically similar in its conclusions to the essays by Ware and Bouyer, Mascall admits the difficulty of finding conclusive arguments where the criteria for what counts as 'fundamental' are not agreed. That is, of course, a crucial question with which Mascall makes little progress. If one does not rely on a fixed authority, and if (as Mascall claims) constitutional means are not adequate in matters of truth, how can there ever be a conclusion to the debate? Mascall wants a mature consensus of Catholic Christendom before there is a change from traditional views about

ordination, but it could be argued that such a consensus is not necessarily more reliable than constitutional democratic decisions.

Two other essays fasten on further intuitive support which may be found for the same theological 'intuition' about women's ordination. One (by Gilbert and Dewey) discusses the change in the basic experience of priesthood when a father-figure is supplanted by a mother-figure, and the reversal that it would involve for the opposition which Judaic and Christian religions provide for Earth-Mother religions. Adding to this the view that the motivation of many women seeking ordination has been a desire for change to manhood, they argue for maintaining the representation of the male Son of God by males. But theirs is a strange case which does not readily command acceptance. Its grounds are psychic and mythological, and they also overstress the importance of masculine attributes in priesthood and in Christianity generally.

Susannah Herzl's views are similar at many points but sometimes more extreme. She puts forward a case for adding to ministerial priesthood a ministry which is opposite and complementary to the male priesthood by being female; and she goes on to explore the givenness of women's nature and the contribution which it may make in a ministry of reconciliation. Her insights about the special awareness by women of the process of time and their immediacy to the world through their bodies are worth consideration, though I for one doubt that they are so peculiar to women. Where she is on much shakier ground is in setting up an opposition between the abstract, spiritual, masculine 'cutting edge', with the Logos as a masculine principle, and the concrete, bodied, feminine intuition with Divine Wisdom as the feminine complement to the masculine Logos—the two to be reunited by water and the Spirit. Even in the order of human nature, hers is a strange position (somewhat resembling the opposition of analytical and romantic) for which there is little but introspective evidence. Attributed to the Godhead, it leads to a very inadequate notion of the Trinity. Even intuitions (as these are claimed to be) require scrutiny by rational and theological norms!

Overall then, this book is an uneasy synthesis of views, some elucidating a fixed position, others agreeing with the main features of that position without the authorities on which it rests and instead bringing forward evidence which is of uncertain value and which is extended beyond its proper scope. Much as they seem to want to agree with the Orthodox and Roman Catholic views, most of the Anglicans do not (and probably cannot) operate from the authorities used for those views—except perhaps the 'authority' of not wanting to diverge too far from those views. Yet they do not here present a

strong alternative case against women's ordination, but rest their case on intuitive analysis of the nature of man and woman which is then rather dubiously correlated with cosmic or theological factors (such as a masculine Logos). One could wish that they were more critical, not only of their own, but also of traditional, positions.

The cautionary accounts of the experience of the churches in Sweden and the USA have much to teach us about the dangers of ill-considered action, but the arguments presented in the other essays of this book offer little more than authority or intuition as a better way forward. Neither will for long suffice in the place of the deeper Christian wisdom for which we must strive to guide us in discerning the best way forward.

Daniel W. Hardy

R. S. Lee: *Principles of Pastoral Counselling*. London, SPCK, 1968 (repr. 1978). £2.50.

An Oxford scientist once remarked to me that psychoanalysis seemed to be rapidly becoming a closed religion, with Freud as its divinely inspired prophet, his works as its scriptures, its analysts as its clergy and its excommunicated heretics men such as Jung and Adler. This observation returns to the mind as one reads Dr. Lee's book. Everyone knows that, besides being a devoted parish priest, he has also been a counsellor to many in trouble and won their respect and allegiance. But it is also well known that he has been and remains a totally committed Freudian, even in an age when this is less and less usual, even among psychologists. He rather sadly remarks on p. 15 that "the teaching of psychoanalysis is still predominantly carried out in the medical schools rather than in the departments of psychology in the universities." In fact this is an understatement. A friend of mine who teaches in such a department assures me that it plays no part in the syllabus and is regarded as an interesting, but outdated phase in the development of scientific psychology, rather as alchemy was in the history of chemistry. I doubt indeed whether it plays much part in medical schools, since practically all the accredited psychiatrists I have met have told me that they are entirely eclectic in their methods and, if they use psychoanalysis at all, do so as merely one of a whole system of possible forms of therapy.

It is important to make this point, for it is clear that Dr. Lee still assumes the absolute truth of all Freud's teaching, makes no reference to recent criticisms of it and assumes that all disorders of the mind which the priest will encounter in spiritual counselling arise from the Ego, the Id the Super-Ego and all the other parts of the Freudian phantasmagoria. Thus Dr. Lee can write "Without

the Oedipal conflicts no super-ego and therefore no conscience proper would be formed" (p. 102). One feels inclined to ask the simple question; "What then of the fatherless boy? Is he therefore devoid of a conscience?"

True, Dr. Lee repeatedly warns the priest-counsellor that he is not and cannot (without the special training required) be a psychoanalyst and must turn over any cases which seem to need psychoanalysis to a qualified practitioner, but he nevertheless assumes that the counsellor *must* work within the framework of Freudian orthodoxy. In view of what has already been said this seems to me both restricting and dangerous, and the priest who takes it seriously would be in danger of attributing every spiritual disease to a particular Freudian complex, as Molière's Toinette, disguised as a doctor, attributes all poor M. Argan's illnesses to the state of his lungs. It is unlikely that we have as yet reached the perfect truth in psychology, or even that it has yet reached the status of an exact science. Freud was neither omniscient nor infallible and anyone who takes him as an oracle should beware of the cracks in the statue of that oracle.

This is not to say that Dr. Lee has no valuable things to say to the priest who wishes to become a good counsellor—a very important part of his ministry. In particular his injunctions to be a good listener, not to be impatient or condemnatory are valuable, even though many others have made them. It is good, too, that he warns priests of the dangers of pride and fixed ideas to which this training particularly exposes them. Especially valuable is the sharp distinction Dr. Lee draws between counselling of the kind he is describing and sacramental confession. Much harm has been done when the principles applicable to each have been confused. Nevertheless the book is so dominated by the idea of the all-sufficiency of psychoanalysis that it cannot be recommended to would-be pastoral counsellors, as only if supplemented by some of the classics of the spiritual life could it be of any value and then only if read critically. Any of our Orthodox readers would be surprised, I think, to find that there are only five references to prayer noted in the index and, if one looks them up, one finds that they are of the most fleeting and casual kind. Is not teaching those who come for counsel to pray in accordance with their particular needs a vital part of pastoral counselling? Orthodox who inherit a long tradition of the relation between life and prayer coming down from the Desert Fathers to the *startsy* of our own day will no doubt feel some gentle amusement at counselling of the kind described here.

Thomas M. Parker

Nicholas Cabasilas: *A Commentary on the Divine Liturgy*, transl. Joan M. Hussey and P. A. McNulty. London, SPCK, 1977. £1.95.

This is the third impression and the first paperback edition of the translation of Cabasilas' "Commentary" first published in 1960. It was briefly reviewed by Bernard Wigan in the Church Quarterly Review the following year (1), but nowhere else as far as I am able to discover.

Nicholas Cabasilas was a layman of a distinguished family who flourished in the middle years of the fourteenth century. Politically he was a supporter of John VI Cantacuzenus; theologically he was an adherent of Gregory Palamas and the Athonite monks in the hesychast controversy. The *Commentary on the Divine Liturgy* is by far the best known of his surviving works.

In the first place it is a very important document for all students of the history of liturgy. The *Commentary* provides a blow by blow description, often in the minutest detail, of the Byzantine rite at the apogee of its development. By the time that Cabasilas was writing it had substantially reached the form which it was to preserve in the first printed editions of the sixteenth century, and, hence, in modern times also. In a real sense the *Commentary* marks the climax of the completed tradition.

However the *Commentary* was written, and doubtless largely read, as a work of instruction and devotion. Its influence, whether acknowledged or unacknowledged, on later catechetical works of a more or less popular character has been enormous. As such, it provides a unique insight into the spirit in which people might be expected to approach eucharistic worship both in fourteenth century Byzantium, and in the rich and varied tradition that stems from it.

Naturally, we would not expect to find the sense of anything other than that the Divine Liturgy is something utterly given in all its richness. Attempts to explain why things are said and done in the way that they are need to be reserved for other times and places. The Divine Liturgy needs to be interpreted and entered into as it stands. It is as if the worshipper is present at a sacred drama in which hidden meaning is symbolically represented. For example, the Little Entrance, the Gospel Procession, is seen as betokening Christ's first appearance at the beginning of his ministry. The Great Entrance, the solemn procession of the Holy Gifts into the sanctuary, represents his last journey to Jerusalem to meet his Passion. The thought is as old at least as the Liturgical Homilies of Narsai, and, one might say, as the general approach.

But the worshipper is not to be a mere spectator at the drama. He is a participant in it. As one might have expected, little or nothing is said about the actual act of Communion. A great deal, however, is said about purity of heart, the attention of the mind, and, even; bodily posture. Reverence involves the whole person and the whole personality. So Cabasilas makes a good deal of what were routine diaconal biddings to stand upright or to attend. Once simple liturgical acts of crowd control, they have now become invested with a deep spiritual and psychological significance. The command "The Doors, The Doors!", originally intended to exclude the Catechumens before the beginning of the Liturgy of the Faithful has now become an exhortation to open the doors of the senses. The teaching of awe and reverence is very much in tune with that of St. Cyril of Jerusalem.

As well as the (devotional and spiritual) commentary on the Liturgy, within the strict terms of the act, there are also a number of very informative theological parentheses. Cabasilas was well aware (how could he not be?) both of the different liturgical practice and criticisms of the Latins. He deals with these with a firmness and a charity which is refreshing as it is rare. Even more interesting and deserving of further study are various occasional questions raised at the end of the work in sections 42-52. The material sheds light on what appear to be sundry difficulties, misunderstandings and mistakes that might be thought to be prevalent in a Byzantine congregation of the time. Particular problem areas seem to have been those in connection with the commemoration of the Saints in the Liturgy, and prayers for the departed, both fertile ground for popular error. Cabasilas shows himself aware of these difficulties and constructive in his attempts to meet them.

Quite apart from its value as a historical source, the Commentary is a document illustrating the psychology of Byzantine eucharistic worship from 'the other side of the screen'. I would wish to echo the hope of the first reviewer that, even today, there will be many who will find this a help to their own understanding and devotion.

W. H. Bates

*I. C. Q. R.*, 162 (1961), 514-15.

D. Tsakonas: *A man sent by God*. Brookline, Mass., Holy Orthodox Press, 1977, n.p. given.

This short biography of Athenagoras I (1886-1972), the 268th Patriarch of Constantinople, is a translation from Greek, and rather shows it in its stilted English. Nonetheless it has many merits. It

traces his life story from his birth at Epiros to his first ecclesiastical career in Greece, his American career as Archbishop of North and South America, and finally to his work as the Patriarch of Constantinople. It gives us a history of dialogue and involvement which radiates the charisma of a man clearly sent from God. As the author puts it, Athenagoras was not a historical leader, but "a creator of history". He revoked the excommunications of AD 1054, which for nine centuries had divided Orthodox and Catholic, and paved the way for positive *rapprochement* among divided Christians. He sought to become a bridge between Protestants and Catholics, and he pointed to the tomb of Christ as the place of reconciliation. In his own ecclesiastical context, Athenagoras helped to unify the Orthodox and lead them into a contemporary vision of Orthodox response to present-day challenges.

What emerges from this biography is not the grandeur of a Byzantine Patriarch crowned with magnificent ceremony and living among formal externalities, but the power of an ecumenical person who in his own life provided a contemporary 'definition' of Eastern Orthodoxy. Somehow the details of this life-story are invested with a profound and lasting quality because they radiate the light of God's love and the newness of the Christian divine-manhood. This is the great merit of Tsakonas' book; it has a personal quality which reveals the heart of Athenagoras' life. As such, it demonstrates once again that Orthodoxy is not an abstract tradition but an intensely personal, human and divine communion. It is neither formalistic, juridical nor iconoclastic, but progressive in a redeeming and liberating sense. Orthodoxy, as seen concretely in the life of Athenagoras I, is a tradition which comes from the God-Man and strives to embrace the whole world in the person of Love to lead it towards true freedom and new creation. As such Orthodoxy does not fight Catholicism or Protestantism, or indeed the other religions, but seeks reconciliation and understanding in the light which God has given it. In the pages of this book we can clearly see in the most concrete and dramatic way how one person can tower above his problems whether great or small, individual or communal, national or international, because he is governed by the ecumenical law of God's redeeming love.

G. D. Dragas

George Appleton: *Glad encounter. Jesus Christ and the living faiths of men*. 2nd edition. London, SPCK, 1978. £1.50.

In the reissue of this plea for dialogue between Christians and non-Christians the author includes a new preface and a "prayer for people in their own religious settings". Bishop Appleton published



*Glad encounter* in 1959 after many years experience of ministering to Christians in multi-faith environments on which he has reflected at length.

The new Preface states that the book was intended "to be a starting-point for Christians, giving them confidence to engage in the adventure of getting to know people of other faiths, because we believe that God-in-Christ wills us to". The greatest lesson that Christian missionaries have learnt, says the bishop, is that we cannot take God to the men of other faiths because through their different traditions he has already revealed so much of himself. Christians, therefore, must be glad to listen as well as to speak because in other men's faiths they can discover new insights into religious truth, social justice and human fulfilment.

Prayers are a notable feature of this book. The recently added prayer that follows the Preface sums up George Appleton's belief that all the great religions are well on the path to the one God though they lack in one way or another the fullness of the Revelation of Christ. It includes a recurring theme of the book that Christians can only be effective as missionaries when their own lives conform closely to the will of Jesus.

The main body of this work is an excellent guide to the Catholic faith, written with a clarity of style and lack of technical language which appeals to a wide readership. Through the first five chapters we are led from a basic belief in the existence of God to the full sacramental life based on the divinely appointed role of the Church in the bringing in of God's Kingdom. Each chapter concludes with several prayers taken from a wide range of periods of Christian development and including some of the author's own compositions. The last two chapters speak of the need to understand with patience the spiritual fumbblings, at all levels, of men of faith, and of those who apparently adhere to no religion. It is unfortunate that some of the illustrations seem rather dated; for instance, it was in the 1950's that Fr. Southcott did his notable pioneering work through house-communion groups in Halton (Leeds) to build up on what we sometimes patronizingly describe today as "folk religion".

It is an instinct of the Church of England that although we recognize as committed only a small proportion of those who call themselves Christians, there are many who in their own ways are searching for faith. To present Christ to the masses of industrial workers has never been easy, and we shall not begin to succeed until we take the time and the trouble to understand what are the guiding factors of their lives. It would be interesting to have examples from the seventies, or an assessment of the achievement of previous

efforts in this field, but of course this lies beyond the scope of a reissue.

I find much in this book to commend to Christians of all denominations as well as to those who have not yet found Christ. The final chapter on the theme that whenever a man's love for his neighbour is expressed, there Christ's presence is found—if in a hidden manner—reflects a profound understanding of the Gospel and is completely in accord with the theology of Vatican II and its development in recent Roman Catholic theology. The dominant note of confidence in God's Revelation of himself in Christ, balanced against the need to listen to what the people of the world are saying, points the way to an ecumenism that no longer speaks of denominations or even of religions, but has as its objective the unity of man and his world in the eternal love of the Creator.

R. P. Greenwood

Elizabeth Moberly: *Suffering, Innocent and Guilty*. SPCK, 1978. £3.95.

Miss Moberly's introduction to her interesting book informs us that her work is intended as a study of some of the presuppositions of the doctrine of the atonement. She has a carefully delimited discussion of the consequences of wrong-doing and the possibility of the transformation of those consequences, i.e. by the suffering of the *guilty* at the core of her 'ethical' discussion of 'suffering'. The book has many merits as a piece of exegesis of one interpretation of what Christian faith might be all about, and I learned a lot from it. However, one should not look for an analysis of 'innocent' suffering in order to get beyond the bare affirmation (p. 149) 'Christ, the innocent, suffered for us, the guilty', so as to get a grip on the meaning of Christ's redemptive action as that was focused in his hideous death. Miss Moberly works on the basis of a presupposition that enables her admirably to work out her theme, the theme being (p. 151) that 'Man is to be redeemed by and into vicarious living'. The overall context is that of interdependence, 'coherence', living *from* as well as *for* others: 'Goodness implies the kenosis involved in mutual self-giving. Badness implies the absence of this' (p. 5). We have 'lateral' responsibility one for the other, with burdens inflicted *by* others possibly becoming burdens borne *for* others. With 'coherence' and 'kenosis' as the theological overtones, it is not altogether surprising that she opts for 'synergism' (pp. 126-127). She is giving an exposition of a 'prospective' theodicy (in which she calls on the ever-helpful Irenaeus!) a theodicy that attempts to answer the question, 'Why *is* God creating the world like this?' and which shifts attention to the future, touching (pp. 19