

# KOINONIA



*The Journal of the  
Anglican & Eastern  
Churches Association*

New Series No. 69, Trinity 2017

ISSN No. 0012-8732

# THE ANGLICAN & EASTERN CHURCHES ASSOCIATION

*Founded 1864*

*Orthodox Patron:* The Ecumenical Patriarch

*Anglican Patron:* The Archbishop of Canterbury

*Orthodox President:* The Archbishop of Thyateira and Great Britain

*Anglican President:* The Bishop of Southwark

## *Chairman of the Committee*

The Revd Dr William Taylor  
St John's Vicarage  
25 Ladbroke Road  
London W11 3pd  
Tel: 020 7727 4262  
email: vicar@stjohnsnottinghill.com

## *General Secretary*

Janet Laws  
The Bishop of London's Office  
The Old Deanery  
Dean's Court  
London EC4V 5AA  
Tel. 020 7248 6233  
email: janet.laws@btopenworld.com

## *Treasurer*

Mr David Powell  
32 Westminster Palace Gardens  
Artillery Row  
London SW1P 1RR  
Tel. 020 7222 3604  
email: dp@dpcca.co.uk

# *Koinonia*

THE JOURNAL OF THE ANGLICAN &  
EASTERN CHURCHES ASSOCIATION

## Editorial

THIS EDITION of *Koinonia* reaches you around the time of the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity. At the start of a new calendar year, and this time of prayer, it seems appropriate to reflect

# Contents

News and Notices .....	3
AECA Annual Meeting – Chairman’s Report .....	5
Hooker’s Trinitarian Theology and the Everyday .....	7
Creation and Evolution: The Problem of Evil in the Writings and Lectures of Alexander Men.....	24
Praying with the Fathers in the Holy City .....	29
Book Review .....	32

# Contributors

ANDREW LOUTH is a Russian Orthodox priest and emeritus professor of Byzantine and Patristic Studies in the theology and religion department of Durham University. In 2016 he delivered the AECA Constantinople Lecture.

GARY THORNE is ...

THOMAS JEE is ...

## News and Notices

### *May he rest in peace - Bishop Geoffrey Rowell*

As most members of the AECA will be aware, Bishop Geoffrey Rowell, former bishop in Europe, died on 11th June 2017. Bishop Geoffrey was a learned scholar, loving pastor and wise friend to many, but it is his outstanding contribution as an ecumenist, and especially to Anglican-Orthodox unity, that will be particularly known to members of the Association. There have been a number of obituaries published, but it is hoped that there will be a special article in the next edition of Koinonia, reflecting on his ecumenical achievements.

### *Constantinople Lecture 2017*

2017 is being commemorated as the 500th anniversary since the publication of Martin Luther's 'Ninety-Five Theses' and the commencement of the European Reformation. With this anniversary in mind, and also UK's decision to leave the European Union still a matter of widespread concern and debate, this year's Constantinople Lecture is entitled 'The Reformation and the Future of Europe?'. The Lecture will be delivered by Bishop Graham Tomlin, the Bishop of Kensington (Diocese of London), and take place (by kind permission of H.E. the Archbishop of Thyateira) at the accustomed venue of St Sophia's Greek Orthodox Cathedral, W2. Full details and how to book a ticket for the reception (N.B. No ticket needed for the lecture) can be found in the poster at the back of this booklet.

### *Visit of Pope Tawadros*

Pope Tawadros II visited the UK in May of this year, and spent time visiting the Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth Palace, and attended a special Choral Evensong at Westminster Abbey. The image on the front cover is a photograph from this service.

### *AECA Annual General Meeting 2017*

The Association's AGM took place on 22nd June at S. Sava's Servian Orthodox Church, W11. Vespers preceded the meeting and dinner followed. The Chairman's report delivered to the meeting is included in this edition of Koinonia.

## *Archive Digitalisation*

The AECA are delighted to announce that part of its extensive archive has now been digitalised and can be accessed free of charge on the website. We are adding to the list of publications all the time, but currently there are editions of Koinonia and its predecessors (The Christian East and the Eastern Churches Newsletter) going back as far as 1930! All publications be downloaded as a high-quality PDF and make for the most fascinating reading, revealing the vigour and importance of the Associations' role in the ecumenical movement of the 20th century.

## AECA Annual Meeting – Chairman’s Report

2016 HAS BEEN a remarkable year of blessing for all of us who work in the field of Anglican-Orthodox relations. For the first time in recent history, London hosted three Patriarchal visits – H.H. Patriarch Irenej of Serbia, H.H. Patriarch Kyrill of Moscow and all Russia, and H.H. Patriarch Mor Ignatius Aphram II of the Syriac Orthodox Church. Patriarch Irenej was here to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the first non-Anglican to preach in St Paul’s Cathedral, St Nikolai Velimirovich. Patriarch Kyril was here to commemorate 300 years of Russian Orthodoxy in London, and Patriarch Aphram was here for the consecration of the new Syriac Orthodox cathedral in Acton. All three visits marked milestones in our ongoing histories and relationships, and all have resulted in new fields of practical co-operation, of which more anon.

AECA has been closely involved in the preparation and delivery of all three visits, underlining the central role AECA continues to play in the development of Anglican Orthodox relations. We also marked the retirement of our Anglican President, the Bishop of London, at our annual reception for Orthodox clergy in October. We were able to thank Bishop Richard for the pivotal role he has played over decades as lead Bishop for relations with the Orthodox Churches with the presentation of an icon of St Seraphim of Sarov, a saint close to Bishop Richard’s heart. At the reception, Bishop Richard spoke movingly of the resurrection of the Orthodox Church in Russia since the end of the Soviet atheistic system. We thank Bishop Richard for his steadfastness over many years in leading our relations with Orthodox Churches and endearing himself to many in the process. We wish him a long and happy retirement. At the same reception, we were able to welcome The Bishop of Southwark as his successor as Anglican President. We look forward to working with Bishop Christopher in the months and years ahead, and thank him for agreeing to take on this role which we know he will fill with grace and skill. He will chair the new Orthodox Round Table for Archbishop Justin at Lambeth Palace and be supported in this role by AECA, which will have a key role in facilitating the new Round Table arrangements. When they are formally in place, there will be more on the significance of the Orthodox Round Table in a future edition of Koinonia, together with some planned administrative changes in 2017.

As Chairman, I have been called on to represent the Archbishop in the following ways:

- At the General Assembly of the Middle East Council of Churches in Amman Jordan in September, which strengthened our international co-operation, especially in caring for displaced Christians from Syria and Iraq.
- As a member of the Anglican-Oriental Orthodox International Theological Commission at its meeting in Beirut in October, which produced further agreement in Christology and a new agreement on the work of the Holy Spirit.
- At the consecration of a new Bishop for North Africa at the Anglican Cathedral in Cairo in February 2017.
- Was part of the Archbishop's suite for the formal welcome of H H Pope Tawadros II of the Coptic Orthodox Church at Lambeth Palace and at Evensong following that visit in Westminster Abbey.

Orthodox-Anglican relations have never been better than they now are, and in this spirit of the hope which our common Gospel brings to us, we continue our work in 2017 with words of John the Theologian "Behold, I make all things new."



# Hooker's Trinitarian Theology and the Everyday

GARY THORNE

AS A university chaplain in Canada, I observe that the majority of thoroughly secular students who arrive on campus each year have an intuition and experience of 'transcendence' that enriches the natural world and human communities. Unlike their previous generation who currently govern the university as administrators, staff and faculty, and who hold on to a rather sterile definition of secularity simply as the 'absence' of God, these young people seek to discover a deeper transcendence in the created order and human community than they perceive institutional religion to have on offer. They seek a world enchanted (or perhaps re-enchanted) with wonder and transcendence. This experience of transcendence is a large part of what motivates their uncompromising commitment to honoring and caring for the natural order. These students also differ from their previous generation in that many suffer from an anxiety of impotence both in regard to their personal well-being and in regard to their potential to influence large-scale and global significant change through collective political action. Their existential personal anxiety reflects a deep solidarity with the suffering of so many in the world.

In the 16th century Richard Hooker's presentation of reality in terms of law describes a natural order of transcendence and beauty that is simultaneously accompanied by a suffering that is beyond human resolution. Hooker proposes that the discovery of this enchanted world is through the revelation of the Trinitarian character of the natural order<sup>1</sup>, and that a healing solidarity with the suffering of the world is achieved in the Christian sacraments. This paper will suggest why Hooker's emphasis on a thoroughgoing notion of participation that pervades all of reality resonates powerfully with many young people today.

It is regularly noted that the concept of participation is the theme that holds together the entirety of Richard Hooker's theology from Book I to Book

---

<sup>1</sup> C.S. Lewis points out, Hooker's universe is "drenched with Deity." C.S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, excluding drama* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1954), 462.

VIII of his *Larwes of Ecclesiastical Polity* (hereafter *Larwes*).<sup>2</sup> One critical discussion of participation occurs in Bk V as part of Hooker's commentary on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist as found in the 1559 Book of Common Prayer.<sup>3</sup> There Hooker makes clear that Trinitarian and Christological theology, outlined in *Larwes* V.50-55, provides the key to an understanding of the Sacraments.

*Larwes* V.56 has been called the theological heart of Bk V<sup>4</sup>, and thus of the entire *Larwes*. It is the hinge that sums up the consideration of Trinitarian and Christological theology in *Larwes* V.51-55 and introduces the discussion of the Sacraments proper.

Hooker begins this bridge chapter *Larwes* V.56 by summing up the notion of how Christ is in us (the argument of *Larwes* V.51-55) in terms of participation:

Wee have hitherto spoken of the person and of the presence of Christ. Participation is that mutuall inward hold which Christ hath of us and wee of him, in such sort that ech possesseth other by waie of special interest propertie and inherent copulation.

Hooker then briefly reviews the overall argument of the *Larwes* in terms of participation. He recollects his teaching from Book I that law is to be discovered in the nature of God the Trinity: "The being of God is a kinde of lawe to his own working: for that perfection which God is, giveth perfection to that he doth."<sup>5</sup> This first eternal law which governs God in Himself (*in se*) is like unto the second eternal law that governs all created reality (*ad extra*). All law reflects the following principles.

Everie original cause imparteth it selfe unto those things which come of it, and Whatsoever taketh beinge from anie other the same is after a sorte in that which giveth it beinge.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> John Booty calls the concept of participation "the philosophical-theological key to Hooker's theology in Book V" (*The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker* (hereafter FLE), volume VI, pt 1, p. 197), but the consideration of participation provides integrity to the whole of the *Larwes*.

<sup>3</sup> *Larwes* V is an apologia and commentary on the entire *Book of Common Prayer* and *Larwes* V.50 begins the commentary on the Sacraments.

<sup>4</sup> John Booty, FLE, *ibid*.

<sup>5</sup> *Larwes* 1.2.2; FLE 1:59.5.

<sup>6</sup> *Larwes* V.56.1; FLE 2.235.1-3.

These universal principles of knowing and being<sup>7</sup> necessarily determine and limit our ability to say anything of the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation, but they also make clear that our knowing and being is dependent throughout on a notion of participation that runs through of all reality, both created and uncreated. In this chapter Hooker outlines his intent to describe the various types and degrees of participation within the Trinity itself, between the two natures of Christ in the Incarnation, and between the created order and God the Trinity both as Creator and as Savior.

All created things participate in God the Trinity through the natural law:

All things are therefore partakers of God, they are his offspring, his influence is in them, and the personal wisdom of God is for that verie cause said to ... reach unto everie thinge which is. ... Whatsoever God doth worke, the hands of all three persons are joyntlie and eqaullie in it according to the order of that connexion whereby they ech depende upon other... The father as goodness, the Sonne as wisdom, the holie Ghost as power doe all concurre in everie particular outwardlie issuing from that one onlie glorious deitie which they all are ... So that all thinges which God hath made are in that respect the offspring of God, they are in him as effects in their highest cause, he likewise actually is in them, thassistance and influence of his deitie is their life.

The final desire of man is God and since “desire tendeth unto union with it that it desireth,” union with God, return unto our highest cause, is our happiness.

If then we be blessed it is by force of participation and conjunction with him [i.e. God] ... Then we are happie therefore when fully we enjoy God ... although we be men, yet by being unto God united we live as it were the life of God.<sup>8</sup>

But by the sin of pride man’s reason is corrupted so that the knowledge of good and evil is confused and thus return of the effect unto the cause is desired but

---

<sup>7</sup> In concluding these to be the very principles of knowing and being, Hooker looked to the sixth century Dionysius who in turn was explicating in Christian terms the thinking of his near contemporary Proclus: “Every effect remains in its cause, proceeds from it, and reverts upon it.” (*The Elements of Theology*, Proposition 35).

<sup>8</sup> *Laws* I.11.2; FLE 1.

unattainable. In the Incarnation Christ makes the ascent possible again because He “is in us as a moving and working cause.”<sup>9</sup> Humankind’s return to God, and participation in God the Trinity, is restored by supernatural grace in the divine law:

These were in God as in their Savior and not as in their creator only. It was the purpose of his *saving* goodness, his *saving* wisdom and his *saving* power which inclineth it selfe towards them. Life as in all other gifts and benefites groweth originallie from the father and cometh not to us but by the Sonne, nor by the Sonne to any of us in particular but through the Spirit. ... which three St Peter comprehendeth in one, the *participation of divine nature*.<sup>10</sup>

Thus in broadest terms outlined in *Lawes* V.56, all creatures participate in God through following the laws of their nature. The law of man’s nature is that he desires the Good, but in fact he cannot will the Good and his return to God is frustrated.<sup>11</sup> Christ has come to be the new law, the divine law that makes it possible for man to obtain, by degrees, that highest Good which he seeks, and thus to live the life of God.

Finally since God has *deified* our nature, though not by turning it into himself, yet by making it his own inseparable habitation, we cannot now conceive how God should without man either exercise divine power or receive the glory of divine praise. For man is in both an associate of Deity.<sup>12</sup>

In subsequent chapters, Hooker will proceed to describe the Sacraments as the instrumental means by which we participate in that divine law. Baptism provides “that saving grace of imputation ... [and] that infused divine virtue of the holie Ghost which giveth to the powers of the soule their first disposition towards newness of life”<sup>13</sup> and participation in the Eucharist increases, by degrees, one’s growth in “holiness and virtue.”<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> *Lawes* V.56.10; FLE 2:242.8.

<sup>10</sup> *Lawes* V.56.6-7; FLE 2:238.6-18.

<sup>11</sup> The divine good, says Aristotle, is “a life too high for man” (*Nicomachean Ethics*, X.7) though, at the same time, it is the only end of human longing, and man’s only final happiness.

<sup>12</sup> *Lawes* V.54.5; FLE 2:224.14-18.

<sup>13</sup> *Lawes* V.60.2; FLE 2:255.9-13.

<sup>14</sup> *Lawes* V.67.1; FLE 2:330.

That's the overall argument, too briefly considered.

But since our theme is that of knowing and loving the triune God, let's return to the beginning of Hooker's commentary on the Sacraments in the *Book of Common Prayer* where he argues that the Prayer Book doctrine of the sacraments depends directly on the doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation.

In *Lawes* V.50, Hooker describes Sacraments as "powerfull instruments of God to eternall life" and the means whereby humans are made partakers of God in Christ. In his own much quoted words:

For as our natural life consisteth in the union of the bodie with the soule; so our life supernaturall in the union of the soule with God. And for as much as there is no union of God with man without the meane between both which is both, it seemeth requisite that wee first consider how God is in Christ, then how Christ is in us, and how the sacraments soe serve to make us partakers with Christ. In other things wee may be more briefe, but the waight of these requireth largeness.<sup>15</sup>

Generally speaking this scheme is unexceptional. Hooker will rehearse several times how the first Council of Nicaea insisted that the Son was not in the Father simply by an undefined 'participation,' but that the Son shared the same uncreated divine essence as the Father. Subsequent Councils up to Chalcedon describes how the Eternal Word, the Son of God, assumed human nature so that, though an unconfused yet indivisible union of the divine and human natures defined by *communicatio idiomatum*, this human nature became deified human nature in the Son. In Baptism and the Eucharist we participate in Christ's deified humanity and thus we become partakers 'with Christ' of the divine life of the Trinity.

Although this scheme is commonplace, Hooker's selection of sources and authorities in *Lawes* V.50-56 is what interests us. In Hooker's 852 patristic references throughout the *Lawes* the Latin Fathers (Augustine, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Jerome) dominate. Yet in *Lawes* V.50-56, Theodoret of Cyrillus, Cyril of Alexandria and John of Damascus are prominent and in these chapters there are only six medieval and no classical or contemporary references.<sup>16</sup> That

---

<sup>15</sup> *Lawes* V.50.3; FLE 2:208.22-209.2.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. A.S. McGrade, "Classical, Patristic and Medieval Sources" 67, in Torrance Kirby (ed.) *A Companion to Richard Hooker* (Leiden: Brill 2008) 51-87.

Hooker privileges these three Greek authors is unquestionable from any plain reading of this section of the text.

It is natural to ask why Hooker determines these three particular Greek authors to be authoritative in establishing the Trinitarian and Christological theology that best explains the nature of the sacraments in the Book of Common Prayer.

Some bits of the answer to this question are well established, even if often overlooked by scholars. For example, Hooker is entirely in step with 16th century magisterial reformers in their humanist cry of *ad fontes*. The general response of the magisterial Reformers to the scholastic arguments over the localized presence of Christ in the Eucharist was to turn to an earlier Greek Patristic Christology as the key to understanding the nature of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The early Reformers had discovered that in the pre-scholastic Greek patristic tradition, Eucharistic theology was directly and intimately connected with Trinitarian and Christological doctrine. Melancthon wrote to Matthäus Alber in 1526,

The Greek doctrine of the Lord's Supper holds that the real presence of the Eucharistic Christ is analogous to the mode of being of the historical Christ. The Greeks understood the presence of the Body of Christ as an anamnesis of the Incarnation, and the Eucharist itself as an anamnesis of the whole Christ-event. Thus, the doctrine of the Eucharist recapitulates the doctrine of the person of Christ.<sup>17</sup>

Secondly, that Hooker should highlight Theodoret of Cyrillus in this doctrinal introduction to the Sacraments is also to be expected.

Theodoret had been introduced to the English context by Peter Martyr when he arrived in 1547 with a fresh copy of Theodoret's *Eranistes*, or *Three Dialogues*. It is likely that Cranmer borrowed Peter Martyr's copy of Theodoret in composing his 1550 *Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ*.<sup>18</sup> In his response to *The Defence*, Stephen Gardiner engaged both Peter Martyr and Thomas Cranmer over their interpretation of Theodoret's theology and thereafter Theodoret's *Three Dialogues* became a

---

<sup>17</sup> H. Ashley Hall, *Philip Melancthon and the Cappadocians: A Reception of Greek Patristic Sources in the Sixteenth Century* (Göttingen 2014) 192.

<sup>18</sup> Marvin Anderson, *Peter Martyr, A Reformer in Exile (1542-1562): A Chronology of Biblical Writings in England and Europe* (Netherlands 1975) 90-91.

central text in the continuing Eucharistic controversies in England in the 16th c. As Marvin Anderson rightly suggests,

The Christological observations in this ancient Greek treatise became integral to the Tudor reformation at a critical juncture.<sup>19</sup>

What remains to be explained, however, are Hooker's references to John of Damascus, and particularly his extended use of Cyril of Alexandria.<sup>20</sup>

The main argument of this paper is that in these central chapters of the *Lawes* Hooker specifically leans upon the theology of Cyril of Alexandria as a determining influence on his interpretation of the sacraments in the Prayer Book tradition. And although I think Hooker could not be more direct in pointing to Cyril's theology, commentators on Hooker have not acknowledged sufficiently this dependence.

But first a very brief excursus to Hooker's use of the *De Fide Orthodoxa* of John of Damascus which will help set the context for Cyril's contribution.

### *John of Damascus and perichoresis*

In *Lawes* V.51, Hooker begins his argument of how God is in Christ by reminding us that the statement, 'The Lord our God is but one God' refers to the 'indivisible unitie' of God. Here Hooker brings to mind his discussion in Bk I. 2.2, "God is one, or rather verie Oneness, and mere unitie, having nothing but it selfe in itself, and not consisting (as all things do besides God) of many things." Nonetheless, says Hooker, we adore that 'indivisible unitie' as Father, Son and Holy Ghost: the father being of none, the consubstantial word which is the Son is of the Father, and the coessential Holy Ghost proceeding from both. The Persons of the Trinity share one substance, but in each there is also "that propertie which causeth the same person, reallie and trulie to differ from the other two." Each person of the Trinity has its own 'subsistence' (because of the uniqueness of origin) and thus when God became man it was not the Father nor the Holy Spirit, but only the Son or the Word that was made flesh. In

---

<sup>19</sup> Marvin Anderson, "Rhetoric and Reality: Peter Martyr and the English Reformation" *Sixteenth Century Journal*, XIX.3.1988, 451-469, p. 462.

<sup>20</sup> Hooker would have been familiar with Thomas Cranmer's use of Cyril's Commentary on John in his *Writings and Disputations Relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*. Cf *ibid*, Parker Society: Cambridge 1844, 165-172. But Hooker reads Cyril more broadly and significantly considers Cyril's dispute with Theodoret over divine impassibility, thus introducing aspects of Cyril's theology not referenced by Cranmer.

Christ divine nature assumed human nature so that God might be in Christ reconciling the world to himself. Christ took to himself our flesh to offer it to God on our behalf: He took manhood to suffer for the sins of the world, to humble himself unto death, and to make intercession for sinners with “a true, a natural, and a sensible touch of mercie.”

In this introductory chapter to his Trinitarian and christological doctrine, Hooker turns to John of Damascus<sup>21</sup> to support his summary of how God is in Christ in the Incarnation.

In *De Fide Orthodoxa* as the Damascene moves to consider the revealed *theologia* and *oconomia* (Trinity and Incarnation) he quotes the dictum of Gregory the Theologian which Hooker would acknowledge to be the principle that guides all of Christological doctrine, and which will encourage him to turn to Cyril:

[Christ] in His entirety assumed me in my entirety and was wholly united to the whole, so that He might bestow the grace of salvation upon the whole. For that which has not been assumed cannot be healed.<sup>22</sup>

Although Hooker’s several summaries of the oecumenical councils in these chapters always conclude with Chalcedon in 451, and he asserts that all errors in Christology can be reduced to one of the four principal heresies refuted in the “fower most ancient general Councils,”<sup>23</sup> in turning to John of Damascus Hooker acknowledges that there was continued debate after Chalcedon about just how this individual person Jesus Christ could be both of, and in, the two natures of divinity and humanity. John of Damascus’s *De Fide Orthodoxa* is a recapitulation and resolution of three centuries of debate among various groups of Neo-Chalcedonians, Nestorians and Monophysites over the definitions of the notions of *ousia*, *physis*, *hypostasis* and *prosopon*. Thus Hooker’s first quotation acknowledges this history in presenting John’s definition:

The hypostasis has that which is common (τὸ κοινὸν) along with that with is individuating (ιδιάζοντος), [i.e. substance plus acci-

---

<sup>21</sup> *De Fide Orthodoxa* III.3-11. Note that quotations are taken from Frederic H. Chase (trans.) *St. John of Damascus: Writings* (USA: Catholic University of America 1958).

<sup>22</sup> *De Fide Orthodoxa* III.6.

<sup>23</sup> “... the Council of Nice to define against Arians, against Apollinarians the Council of Constantinople, the Council of Ephesus against Nestorians, against Eutichians the Calcedon Council”, *Larves* V.54.10; FLE 2.227.3-5.



dents or characteristic properties.] Ousia does not subsist in itself, but is to be perceived/contemplated (θεωρεῖται) in individuals (ὑποστάσει).<sup>24</sup>

In Hooker's second quote from John of Damascus in this section the Damascene quotes Dionysios the Areopagite (Hooker's chief source in his general philosophy of Law, or *lex divinitatis*)<sup>25</sup>:

The Father and the Holy Ghost have no communion (κεκοινωνήκεν) with the incarnation of the word (τῆ σαρκώσει τοῦ λόγου) otherwise than by approbation and assent (their good pleasure and will - Chase).<sup>26</sup>

But most interesting is Hooker's third passage from John of Damascus where he points to John's notion of *perichoresis*. The Damascene had gathered up and reconciled various strands of Christological thinking after Chalcedon in his embellishment of the notion of *perichoresis* that had roots back to Gregory the Theologian. In the section of *De Fide Orthodoxa* to which Hooker refers<sup>27</sup> John promotes the term *perichoresis* as adequate both to Trinitarian and Christological doctrine in describing a type of mutual indwelling or immanence that protects the identity and difference of the Persons of the Trinity on one hand, and of the divine and human natures of Christ on the other.<sup>28</sup> In Hooker's consideration of the *communicatio idiomatum* he cautions that the union must not be seen as "any mutual *participation* whereby the properties of the one are infused into the other,"<sup>29</sup> but rather the notion of *perichoresis* serves to protect the asymmetry of the union, allowing the divine nature to take the initiative and

---

<sup>24</sup> *Laws* V.51.1; FLE 2.209.note m; *De Fide Orthodoxa* III.6.

<sup>25</sup> This same sentence is repeated at *De Fide Orthodoxa* III.11 as a conclusion to John's consideration of Cyril's expression, 'the One Incarnate Nature of the Word of God'. Since Hooker also directly discusses the orthodoxy of this Cyrillian expression, Hooker points the reader to both places where this passage appears in the text of *De Fide Orthodoxa* Bk III.

<sup>26</sup> *Laws* V.51.2; FLE 2.210.8-9. Note that FLE 5,717 cites *De Fide Orthodoxa* III.11 as Hooker's source, which is a close variation, but the actual quote is from III.6, several paras after Hooker's first quotation in this section.

<sup>27</sup> *De Fide Orthodoxa* III.5, 6.

<sup>28</sup> "One must know ... that although we say that the natures of the Lord (τοῦ κυρίου φύσεις) are mutually immanent (περιχώρειν ἐν ἀλλήλαις), we know that the immanence (περιχώρησις) comes from the divine nature (τῆς θείας φύσεως). For this last pervades all things and indwells (περιχωρεῖ) as it wishes, but nothing pervades it. And it communicates its own splendors to the flesh while remaining impassible [ἀπαθής] and having no part in the affections of the flesh."

<sup>29</sup> *Laws* V.53.3; FLE 2.219.3.

essentially to remain unaffected by that which it indwells or pervades, or as Hooker says, the “union doth ad perfection to the weaker, to the nobler no alteration at all.”<sup>30</sup>

Such then is the manner of this exchange by which each nature (φύσεως) communicates its own properties to the other through the identity of their person (τῆς ὑποστάσεως) and their mutual immanence (τὴν εἰς ἀλληλα αὐτῶν περιχώρησιν).<sup>31</sup>

Thus Hooker learns from John of Damascus that the notion of *perichoresis*, or mutual indwelling is adequate to how God is in Christ (*theologia*) and how Christ is in us (*oeconomia*).

We also note that in this section of John’s *De Fide Orthodoxa*<sup>32</sup> which Hooker has before him, John quotes Cyril more than any other author. More significantly, John alludes to Cyril’s controversy with Theodoret over theopaschitism and we shall now see that this controversy becomes an important theme in Hooker’s understanding of how Christ has assumed the totality of humanity for its salvation.

### *Cyril of Alexandria and theopaschitism*

At the beginning of *Laws* V,52 begins, Hooker cautions that in respect to the Incarnation,

It is not in mans habilitie either to expresse perfectlie or conceive the maner how this was brought to passe. ... Howbeit because this divine mysterie is more true than plaine, divers having framed the same to their owne concepts and phancies are found in their expositions thereof more plaine than true.<sup>33</sup>

After Hooker presents one of his several summaries of the four ecumenical councils, most of *Laws* V,52 is given to a close examination of the error of Nestorius, introduced by a quote from Cyril’s letter to Eulogius, a priest in Constantinople (c. 433-35). The passage states that Nestorius errs in denying the union of natures in Christ. Hooker focuses positively on Cyril’s role in identify-

---

<sup>30</sup> *Laws* V,54.4; FLE 2.223.7.

<sup>31</sup> *De Fide Orthodoxa* III.7.

<sup>32</sup> *De Fide Orthodoxa* III, 3-11.

<sup>33</sup> *Laws* 52.1; FLE 2.211.29-32.

ing the Nestorian heresy condemned at Ephesus in 431, and then goes out of his way to insist that Cyril did not hold the position that “even as in the bodie and the soule, so in Christ God and man make but one nature.”<sup>34</sup> Hooker clearly knows that the most recurring image in Cyril of the union of godhead and humanity in Christ is precisely that of the manner of the union of the soul and body in man. It is this image in particular that Cyril uses to support his strong claim that in the incarnation the Eternal Word suffers, and that the Word’s engagement in human sorrows is the supreme redemptive principle. I think that this aspect of Cyril’s thinking is embraced by Hooker and critical to his argument, and that is why Hooker insists that Cyril uses this image appropriately. The inappropriate use of the image of body and soul to suggest that there is one nature in Christ is the error of Eutyches who was condemned at Chalcedon. In keeping with Hooker’s appropriation of Cyril’s teaching that the suffering of the Word brings within the Godhead the fragile and suffering flesh for the purpose of redemption and return of the creative order to its First Cause, Hooker concludes his discussion with reference to a passage from Theodoret’s third *Dialogue*, “The divine nature must be confessed inseparable from the flesh even on the cross and in the tomb.”<sup>35</sup> This is a surprising passage for Hooker to quote because it appears in Theodoret’s third *Dialogue* in the *Eranistes*, written a year or two after the death of Cyril, in which under the guise of his literary heretic Theodoret ridicules Cyril’s paradoxical turn of phrase that the Son suffered impassively. Nonetheless, because of Theodoret’s continuing influence on English Eucharistic theology since Peter Martyr introduced the *Eranistes* to Cranmer<sup>36</sup> Hooker must show substantial agreement between Theodoret and Cyril and this expression is the closest that Theodoret would come to Cyril’s extreme language of the suffering God.

I suggest that for Hooker’s overall argument of how God is in Christ, how Christ is in us and how we are partakers of Christ in the sacraments, Hooker seeks to embrace a Cyrillian Christology that allows the fullness of God’s presence in the world by bringing suffering within the life of the Trinity while at the same time denying suffering in the inner life of the Trinity.<sup>37</sup> This

---

<sup>34</sup> *Lawes* V.52.4; FLE 2.215.25ff.

<sup>35</sup> *Lawes* V.52.4; FLE 2.216.4.

<sup>36</sup> Theodoret’s discussion of the Eucharist is in the second *Dialogue* of the *Eranistes*, also quoted by Hooker in this section.

<sup>37</sup> See the insightful consideration of this theme in John McGuckin, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria and the Christological Controversy* (USA: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press 2004) 198–207. Cf. John O’Keefe, “Impassible Suffering? Divine Passion and Fifth-Century Christology” *Theological Studies* 58, 43.

paradoxical language is an instance where “this divine mysterie is more true than plaine.”

As Hooker says in *Larwes* V.52,

in Christ there is no personal subsistence but one, and that from everlasting. By taking only the nature of man he still continueth one person ... Whereupon it followeth against Nestorius, that no person was born of the virgin but the Sonne of God, no person but the Sonne of God baptized, the Sonne of God condemned, the Sonne of God and no other person crucified...

Hooker concludes his discussion of the *communicatio idiomatum* in *Larwes* V.53 by pointing to the fifth century Christological debate between Cyril and Theodoret over divine impassivity:

Theodoret disputeth with great earnestnes that God cannot be said to suffer. But he thereby meaneth Christes divine nature against Apollinarius which held even deitie it selfe passible. Cyrill on the other side against Nestorius as much contendeth, that whosoever will denie verie God to have suffered death doth forsake the faith. Which notwithstandinge to hold were heresie, if the name of God in this assertion did not importe as it doth the person of Christ, who being verily God suffereth death, but in the flesh, and not in that substance for which the name of God is given him.<sup>38</sup>

Hooker is referring to Cyril’s third letter to Nestorius in 430 AD to which were attached twelve anathemas. The twelfth anathema pushed the limits of Trinitarian doctrine:

If anyone does not confess that the Word of God suffered in the flesh, was crucified in the flesh, and tasted death in the flesh, becoming the first-born from the dead, although as God he is life and life-giving, let him be anathema.

Theodoret (representative of the Antiochene tradition) was convinced that this language violated the impassible God of Nicaea and that Cyril allowed the human pathos of Jesus to touch the godhead. Indeed, the entire argument of the three dialogues of Theodoret’s *Eranistes* (c. 447–8), so influential in the devel-

---

<sup>38</sup> *Larwes* V.53.4; FLE 2.220.8–17.

opment of Eucharistic Doctrine in England in the second half of the 16th century, was to reject Cyril's notion of 'impassible suffering of the Son' as nonsensical. In Francis Young's phrase, Theodoret accused Cyril of destroying "the Godness of God."<sup>39</sup>

Hooker knows all this, and he knows that Cyril refused to recant. Cyril was primarily a biblical exegete and in passages like John 1.14, Hebrews 2.14-17, and Philippians 2 (all cited by Hooker in this section) Cyril read how the Son participated fully in human limitation. The biblical text spoke of a Christ who both suffered and was God. For Cyril, the Antiochene position represented by Theodoret meant that the great gulf separating God and the world had not been bridged at all. In respect to the "divine mysterie" Theodoret's position is "more plaine than true."

The paradox of impassible suffering points to the soteriological purpose of the Incarnation, inviting our participation in the eternal life of Triune love. The Son's suffering does not merely demonstrate God's solidarity with us. By being incarnate the Eternal Son took on a state in which he could in some real sense experience suffering and death.<sup>40</sup> That which is not assumed is not healed. Or, as Cyril says, our deification and enjoyment of the life of God requires that "he took what was ours to be his very own so that we might have all that was his"<sup>41</sup> Hooker tells us (*Larwes* V.54):

The union therefore of the flesh with deitie is to that flesh a giuft of principall grace and favor. For by virtue of this grace man is reallie made God.<sup>42</sup>

Hooker concludes *Larwes* V.53 by championing both Theodoret and Cyril, allowing Hooker to embrace Theodoret as an authority yet at the same time to affirm a Cyrillian emphasis on how Christ is in us.

## Conclusion

In these chapters (*Larwes* V.50-56) Richard Hooker shows "How God is in Christ, how Christ is in us" and in subsequent chapters he will consider how the sacraments make us partakers with Christ. We have seen that the structure

---

<sup>39</sup> Francis Young, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon, 2nd Edition* (USA: Baker 2010) 333. Cf. John O'Keefe, "Impassible Suffering? Divine Passion and Fifth-Century Christology", *Theological Studies* 58, 39-50.

<sup>40</sup> Young, *Ibid.*, 337.

<sup>41</sup> St Cyril of Alexandria, *On the Unity of Christ*, trans. John McGuckin (USA: SVSP 1995) 59.

<sup>42</sup> *Larwes* V.54.3; FLE 2.222.21.

of Hooker's commentary on the sacraments in the Book of Common Prayer is in keeping with the general tendency of the magisterial reformers who avoid the scholastic question of how Christ is localized in the Eucharistic elements, and rather embrace the Greek Patristic tradition in which the Eucharist is an anamnesis of the whole Christ-event: the doctrine of the Eucharist recapitulates the doctrine of the person of Christ.<sup>43</sup>

Thus the doctrine of the sacraments is essentially Trinitarian and Christological doctrine.

Theodoret, Cyril and John of Damascus all consider the meaning of the Eucharist itself in these passages we have been considering. In the second Dialogue of *Eranistes*, Theodoret writes that as the flesh assumed by the Son of God remains flesh whilst deified, so likewise the bread and wine of the Eucharist retain their creaturely natures after the consecration. This is the critical theme of the Magisterial Reformers in response to the doctrine of Transubstantiation of the Church of Rome, and is emphasized likewise by Hooker.

But significantly, Hooker also highlights Cyril's language of the Eucharist, referring several times to Cyril's third letter to Nestorius in which his use of the expression 'impassible suffering' is followed by a description of how communicants are sanctified by "becoming participants in the holy flesh and the precious blood of Christ." Communicants receive "the personal, truly vitalizing (lifegiving) very-flesh of God the Word himself."<sup>44</sup> In his commentary on John's Gospel Cyril emphasizes that Christ comes to dwell in us more and more fully as we partake of the Eucharistic flesh and blood. Thus as Christ is more fully in us, we participate more fully in the divine nature. When Hooker speaks powerfully of

our participation also in the fruit grace and efficacie of his bodie  
and blood, whereupon there ensueth a kind of transubstantiation  
in us, a true change both of soule and bodie....,

Hooker cites Cyril's commentary on John:

---

<sup>43</sup> Hall, *Ibid.* 192.

<sup>44</sup> *Third Letter of Cyril to Nestorius*, p. 270.

Since the redeeming flesh, joined to the word of God, which is by nature life, has become life-giving, when we eat it, then have we life in us, being joined to that Flesh which has been made life.<sup>45</sup>

At the beginning of our paper we noted that Hooker promises that through the “meane between both which is both” we are made partakers of the divine nature. (1 Peter 1.4) Hooker tells us that in the Incarnation God has deified our nature,<sup>46</sup> that man is an associate of God both in his deified humanity and in his divinity, and that by virtue of the unity of flesh with divinity man is “reallie made God.”<sup>47</sup> Lately several scholars have pointed to the theme of ‘deification’ in Cyril, and we suggest that Hooker’s robust understanding of deification can reasonably be traced to his reading of Cyril of Alexandria. Norman Russell says that “Cyril brings the doctrine of deification ... to full maturity.”<sup>48</sup> But as a recent study of divinization in Cyril suggests, Cyril faced the challenge of untangling the complicated notion of participation in order to speak of deification without collapsing the primary distinction between the uncreated and the created. Cyril struggles to maintain the asymmetrical character of the union of the natures in Christ. We have identified that it is precisely here that Hooker depends upon the mature notion of *perichoresis* in John of Damascus to protect his Trinitarian and Christological orthodoxy.

Hooker also discovers in Cyril another side of the fifth century Christological debates that informs and deepens the efficacy of the Prayer Book Liturgy. Cyril represents a tradition that emphasized God’s intimate presence in and to creation. For Hooker, Theodoret was too narrow in his relentless efforts to avoid the potential ‘confusion’ of God and creature and thus (representative of the Antiochene position) too much emphasized God’s *otherness* in regard to creation?

---

<sup>45</sup> *Larwes* V.67.11; FLE 2.339.6-8, quoting Cyril, *In Evangelium Joannis*, 4.14. In keeping with the Reformers, Cyril nowhere explains how the elements are transformed, or the manner in which the consecrated bread and wine may be understood as Christ’s body and blood.

<sup>46</sup> *Larwes* V.54.5; FLE 2:224.14-18. “Finally since God has *deified* our nature, though not by turning it into himself, yet by making it his own inseparable habitation, we cannot now conceive how God should without man either exercise divine power or receive the glory of divine praise. For man is in both an associate of Deity.”

<sup>47</sup> *Larwes* V.54.3; FLE 2.222.21.

<sup>48</sup> Norman Russell, ‘The Concept of Deification in the Early Greek Fathers’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, Oxford University, 1988), p. 436, cited by Daniel Keating ‘Divinization in Cyril: The Appropriation of Divine Life’, in *The Theology of S Cyril of Alexandria*, Weinandy and Keating (T&T Clark, 2003) 149.

Cyril, on the other hand, represents a tradition that stretches language to paradox and is willing to rest in the poetry and paradoxes found in Scripture, embracing the fullness of God's presence in His creation. Thus in Cyril's hermeneutic we find the possibility of the re-enchantment of nature. The Word has taken all of our human flesh and human experiences, including our limitations and our suffering, to be His own. In the gift of the Holy Spirit, and in the personal, substantial Eucharistic presence of Christ we become partakers of the divine nature.

Cyril's theology is consistent with Hooker's all-embracing *lex divinitatis* that he inherits from Dionysius and is summed up in *Larwes* V,56 in terms of exitus/reditus, cause and effect, creation and redemption. As for Dionysius, so for Richard Hooker, the whole of the created order is theophany: both divine transcendence and divine immanence simultaneously.

Equally for Hooker, in the sacramental principles drawn from the Scriptures, interpreted by the Greek Patristic tradition, and expressed in the Prayer Book liturgy, the whole of the created order can be described as sacramental in character. The natural order does not lose its autonomy, beauty or integrity but the divinity is made present to the individual believer precisely through the integrity of the natural order. The conversion, *metanoia* and transfiguration occurs within the believer himself by participation in Christ.

As Theophany and Sacrament the goodness and integrity of the natural order is fully acknowledged, yet it is not exhaustive of its meaning: the natural points to a transcendence and immanence that ultimately, in return, gives the deeper meaning and reverence to nature itself that many young people of our generation are seeking.

On the one hand, the thoroughly secular students who arrive at my small liberal arts university each year typically are convinced that an objectifying and reductionist view of nature has contributed to its exploitation and destruction. On the other hand, these students reject the God of institutional Christianity that represents an unresolved separation or duality between the divine and the world. Thus many of these students remain restless for a way of 'thinking' that makes sense of their apprehension of transcendence and immanence in the natural world and human community.

They seek to know the world as Theophany: to acknowledge the presence of the divine throughout a natural order that is 'drenched with divinity'.

They also seek to know the world as Sacrament: our return to what makes us truly human is through the natural order that is deified, and not in overcoming or destroying the natural order.



The Anglican sacraments, as interpreted by Hooker in the light of the Greek Fathers, encourages a particular world-view: a way of seeing and interpreting the whole of experience as theophany and sacrament, making us partakers of the divine within the created order and leading us to know our happiness by living the life of God the Holy Trinity.

As Thomas Traherne, next generation to Hooker, would express it:

*From dust I rise  
And out of nothing now awake;  
These brighter regions which salute mine eyes  
A gift from God I take:  
The earth, the seas, the light, the day, the skies,  
The sun and stars are mine; if these I prize.*

*Long time before  
I in my mother's womb was born,  
A God preparing did this glorious store,  
This world for me adorn,  
Into this Eden so divine and fair,  
So wide and bright, I come, his son and heir,*

*A stranger here  
Strange things doth meet, strange glories see,  
Strange treasures lodg'd in this fair world appear,  
Strange all and new to me:  
But that they mine should be who nothing was,  
That strangest is of all; yet brought to pass.*

(from "The Salutation" *Oxford Book of Christian Verse*, p. 272)

# Creation and Evolution: The Problem of Evil in the Writings and Lectures of Alexander Men<sup>1</sup>

DANIEL MULLANEY

## *Critical Assessment*

We shall now briefly consider Men's critics in the Russian Orthodox establishment. We shall attempt to assess which of these criticisms are the strongest, and where their most important concerns lie.

We have already mentioned four points made by Fr. Daniil Sysoev in the Introduction to this essay. The first of these is an accusation of Manichaeism on the basis that Satan took part in the creation of the world. This is an accusation also put forward in Part 5 of the essay by Fr. Sergiy Antiminsov. He accuses Men of proposing the idea of a created god or intermediary in the creation of the world.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, Konstantin Bufeev terms Men 'a dualist', and claims that Men's understanding of chaos as satanic forces is in contradiction with the writings of Basil the Great.<sup>3</sup> We have already established, however, in part 2 that Men does not see creation as the by-product of a battle between good and evil, as the first impulse of Gen 1:1 is wholly good. In this he differs from Solovyov, Berdyaev and Bulgakov.

Men does indeed claim that creation is an ongoing process. The appearance of Chaos in Gen 1:2 has an effect on all of the subsequent stages of creation, as each stage is mediated by what has previously been created. Satanic forces are indeed connected with nature, and Men provides citations from Revelation to support this. Where Bulgakov is content to see these satanic forces as creative if not ontological, Men sees them as wholly destructive.

Bufeev cites in Russian from Basil the Great's *Nine Homilies on the Hexaemeron*: 'Some say that the darkness is an evil power, it would be better to say that evil itself, having origins in itself, contradicts and counteracts God's goodness... and on this supposition what evil and godless teachings are not founded?'<sup>4</sup> Where Basil speaks of an 'evil power', it is clear from the context

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the continuation of a thesis from the previous issue.

<sup>2</sup> Antiminsov, part 5

<sup>3</sup> Bufeev, internet source

<sup>4</sup> The Russian can be found at [orthlib.ru/Basil/sixday02.html](http://orthlib.ru/Basil/sixday02.html)

that he has in mind something with an independent ontological existence. His criticism is aimed at ontological dualism, not the aspects of process theology in Men's thought. Men has in common with Basil that neither believe in an independent ontological origin for the existence of evil. Men explicitly sees the personified force of evil that results in chaos as *created*.

The second accusation made by Fr. Daniil Sysoev is one of teaching that humans are 'transfigured monkeys'. He refers to the statement made in the Fifth Ecumenical Council against Origen's teaching that the soul pre-existed the body, and also to Fr. Sergei Bulgakov's condemnation as a heretic by the Synod of the Moscow Patriarchate in 1935.

Like Bulgakov, Men certainly adheres to an evolutionary understanding of creation, including an evolutionary understanding of the origins of man. This is indisputable. Nonetheless it is difficult to see how Men's teachings on the nature of the human are connected with Origen's teaching on the pre-existence of souls. Origen's teaching in fact has far more in common with the sophiological aspects in the thought of Bulgakov, Berdyaev and Solovyov, where Adam existed in a pre-temporal 'meta-history'. Although Men does in a certain sense believe that humans are transfigured monkeys, he also attributes to humans a real ontological distinction as the only creatures who are able to carry a spirit. Men sees the appearance of this spirit in the course of evolution as a creative act from without, from God.

The fourth criticism of Sysoev concerns Men's 'denial' of original sin and his failure to connect the appearance of death in the world with *human* sin. Similarly, Antiminsov, in part 6 of his essay claims that it is a theological necessity for the Orthodox Christian to attribute death in creation to human sin. Concerning original sin, Antiminsov refers in part 10 of his essay to Men's argument in *Magicism and Monotheism* that death and all the entropic processes of the universe could not have been the result of the sin of Adam and Eve, because two created individuals could not have such power for moral reasons. Antiminsov refers to the exalted nature of humans in creation, their call to look after and manage creation and their interrelationship with creation. He then also refers to Jesus Christ. If one man could redeem the whole of creation, then it seems absurd to suggest that Adam and Eve could not have corrupted the whole of creation.

Men's argument is perhaps weak here, but nonetheless Jesus is the Incarnation of the divine Logos, whereas Adam and Eve certainly do not have such authority or power. Antiminsov's comparison of the two is not unproblematic. Although Men's argument is intriguing, there does not ultimately seem

to be any substantial theological reason why the Fall of Adam could not have been responsible for the corruption of the universe. Antiminsov's references to Adam's exalted state before the Fall are supported throughout Genesis 1 and 2.

Weaker, however, is Antiminsov's claim that it is a theological necessity to attribute death in creation exclusively to *human* sin. This seems to be little more than doctrinal rhetoric, not supported by evidence. The claim that Men rejects the concept of original sin also rings hollow, because although he does not accept the concept of a genetic or hereditary transfer of human sin in the Augustinian sense, he does recognise a common unity of all humans in a human soul or 'Adam' – the 'vsechelovek' – in the manner of the 'Alexandrian' school.<sup>5</sup> For Men, The Fall of Adam represents a reality that was true for the first humans, and is just as true now.

Sysoev's fifth criticism concerns Men's rejection of a personal Adam in favour of the collective Adam, 'vsechelovek', which he associates with Kabbalist teachings. This is something criticised by Antiminsov in part 2 of his essay.

Antiminsov's primary criticism is directed towards Men's use of a passage in Gregory of Nyssa's *De Hominis Optificio* 16, both in *Isagogics* and *Magicism and Monotheism*. This rather complex passage runs as follows: 'When the word says that God made man, the whole of humanity is indicated by the indefiniteness of the expression. For it is not named now Adam alongside the creature, as the history says in the following, but the name for the created man is not the particular, but the universal'. Men takes this to be a direct indication that Gregory of Nyssa interprets 'Adam' as 'vsechelovek'. Antiminsov tells us that the 'universal' term is 'man' not 'Adam'. Zachhuber tells us, 'the exegetical starting point of Gregory's argument is, obviously, the observation that the verse mentions the creation of 'man', not 'Adam''.<sup>6</sup> Nonetheless, it seems clear that 'Adam' is not being regarded as a single individual. Although Men's assertion is doubtless anachronistic, and possibly incorrect, in its attempt to apply Solovyov's terminology to Gregory of Nyssa, Men's principal claim that there is a tradition in the Church Fathers of interpreting 'Adam' as a collective personality still stands, not least because he provides numerous other examples from for example Gregory Nazianzen and St. Macarius the Great.<sup>7</sup>

Men does not necessarily reject the idea of a single Adam, as we have discussed above, although he is not as convinced of its truth as the Patristic

---

<sup>5</sup> See discussion on this topic in *Bibliological Dictionary* and *Magicism and Monotheism*

<sup>6</sup> Zachhuber, Johannes, *Human Nature in Gregory of Nyssa*, p156

<sup>7</sup> See discussions in *Magicism and Monotheism* and *Isagogics*

writers. It is not important to him, however, that the Patristic writers would have primarily seen Adam as one individual. The important thing is that it is *possible* to see 'Adam' in a collective sense.

These specific criticisms of Sysoev, Antiminov and Bufeev are not as powerful as their rhetoric, which plays an important part in their writings against Men. In their conclusions, Men is described as 'a heretic' or even an 'antichrist' (Antiminov). The association of Men with established heresies (Manichaeism, Origenism, Dualism etc.), and modern thinkers they consider to be 'heretics' is undoubtedly a significant rhetorical device. For example, Bufeev's article is a comparison between Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, who 'bears no relation to Orthodoxy', and Alexander Men. Antiminov tells us that Men is under the influence of 'heretics' such as Solovyov, Bulgakov and Berdyaev in part 1 of his essay. Sysoev explains that Bulgakov's heresy trial in 1935 covers Men's views. We accept that the views of these other thinkers may well not fit well with certain aspects of Orthodox teaching, but an uncritical labelling of Men as an adherent of their views is undoubtedly misplaced. In Part 1 we considered the precise extent to which each of these thinkers influenced Men.

### *Summary*

While the strongest criticisms concern matters of detail such as Men's comments on Gregory of Nyssa and the flaws in Men's reasons for rejecting an absolute association between Adam's Fall and death in the universe, attempts to associate Men with the heresies of the Patristic period such as dualism or Manichaeism ultimately fail, and appear to have been brought forward for rhetorical reasons. These accusations fit with a tendency to see the present in terms of the past. Since Men sees both symbol and reality in the first three chapters of Genesis, attempts to accuse him of a purely symbolic interpretation are unconvincing. Likewise, attempts to connect him with the 'heresies' of Teilhard, Solovyov, Berdyaev and Bulgakov show a lack of subtlety in their understanding of how Men uses the ideas of these theologians. The most important difference between Men and his critics is in his acceptance of an evolutionary worldview, and his resulting denial of a purely naturalistic interpretation of Genesis 1-3.

### *Conclusion*

Men seeks to explain the existence of evil in such a way that his evolutionary views not only fit with his understanding of Christian revelation, but that the

two mutually support and enrich each other. He draws on the ideas of Teilhard, Solovyov and Berdyaev, but not uncritically. His own explanation of the presence of evil builds on his sense of two Falls, one cosmic and one human, but it does not seek to place the Cosmic Fall 'prior' to the created world that we experience. The presence of evil finds its origins in a strong understanding of freedom and both this freedom and evil itself are ultimately inexplicable in rational terms. He places emphasis on the role of revelatory encounter through creativity in understanding these mysteries.

Although not all of his arguments are completely convincing in detail (Part 3), the main area of contention between Men and his critics is in his acceptance of evolution and his desire to investigate and understand the world. In considering Alexander Men's attempt to interweave Christian 'Orthodoxy' and modern science, and the controversies surrounding it, we feel drawn to compare it with the case of Byzantine humanism and its representatives. Michael Psellos, for example, in his *The Encomium of His Mother* tells us of his desire for learning, set against the strict, monastic religious practice of his mother. For example, we read his comment: 'What is the generation of living beings, what is the spiritual, what are the natural properties of numbers up to ten, how is a triad produced, what is the procession, and how does it extend through all of the divine becoming?'<sup>8</sup> A similar desire for all kinds of knowledge permeates the writings and lectures of Alexander Men, and his critics find parallels with the 8th anathema directed at another 11th century Byzantine humanist, against 'those who among other mystical fictions, reform on their own initiative *our* doctrine of the creation'.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Psellos, *The Encomium of His Mother*, p287

<sup>9</sup> Clucas, p56

# Praying with the Fathers in the Holy City

THOMAS JEE

THIS YEAR I spent the fortnight before Holy Week with the community of St Mark's Syriac Orthodox Monastery in Jerusalem. I went to join the monks at St Mark's in their rhythm of life and prayer, to pray with the Syriac community of Jerusalem and to learn from their spirituality. My experience has left me much to reflect on. Until this year, I'd had almost no experience of Orthodox Christianity, and found my time in St Mark's both rewarding and challenging. The unique atmosphere of Jerusalem as a city made the experience all the richer.

## *Praying*

Prayer in the evangelical tradition in which I grew up often felt very wordy. At times the daily office feels the same. Sometimes I have found myself feeling suffocated by words. Prayer at St Mark's was in many ways the antidote to this. Very little was spoken – almost everything was sung or chanted. Morning, noon, and evening, the community gathered for prayer: a series of canticles, intercessions, and psalms sung antiphonally. Prayer was repetitive and physical. Bowing and crossing oneself, incense and candles, kissing the gospel, all were an integral part of each service. I think I appreciated all of these things even more because of my lack of Syriac. For the first time in a long time, I was conscious that I was an 'outsider' in the church – unsure of what was happening or what it meant, unable to understand the words, uncertain about what I ought to do. For all of these reasons, the repetitive, sung, and physical nature of prayer became far more important. They created a space that I was able to enter. In England, I often think of the sermon as the focal point of a service. Here, it was the opposite – for the sermon was the one part of the service I couldn't enter into at all, as I didn't understand the content. In contrast, the symbolism and repetition of chanted prayers helped me to encounter God. I began to learn which chants meant which things, and so was able to join in the prayer of the congregation without any syriac at all.

One of the books I read in Jerusalem was Henri Nouwen's 'Way of the Heart.' In this meditation on the desert fathers, Nouwen talks of the 'Prayer of the Heart' – prayer that is unceasing, totally internalised, prayer that almost prays itself. In particular, he reflects on the power of short, repeated prayer, such as the Jesus Prayer or even a single word. I've always found the Jesus Pray-

er a really helpful way of praying as I walk or go about my day. In Jerusalem, I found myself on numerous occasions singing the kyrie – words that I’ve never known to appear in the churches that I have belonged to, but that led me deeper into prayer. The repeated chanting of prayers at St Mark’s opened a space for me to go deeper in prayer, to internalise prayer and to meet with God. In particular, the Lenten prayers of confession and repentance, sung while continually bowing before the altar, brought me in to the presence of God.

### *Praying with the Fathers*

One of the most striking things about the Syriac community in Jerusalem was their sense of connectedness to history. The various strands of Syriac identity – faith, language, history, culture – seemed all inextricably linked. The monastery itself connected with the Syriac ‘club’ next door, for meals and community events. The community had a strong and deeply felt sense of historical continuity. St Marks itself is built on what the church believes is the Upper Room, where Jesus celebrated the last supper. It contains a 6th century plaque identifying it as the ‘house of Mary, mother of Mark, called John.’ The building is understood therefore as the first church, the site of the first ‘mass’, the site of Pentecost. Syriac itself is the living descendant of the Aramaic that Jesus spoke. Each Saturday and Sunday the monks process to the church of the Holy Sepulchre for vespers and mass, where their chapel contains the believed site of Joseph of Arimathea’s tomb. The sense of historical continuity is therefore palpable. Personally, I found the experience of receiving Holy Mass in the location of the Last Supper very moving, and the combination of continuity of language and location mutually reinforcing.

Yet connected with this is the pain of uprootedness – one monk described the Syriac people to me as ‘a people without a country.’ The conflict in Syria, the dominance of Islam in the heartlands of the church, and Israeli control of Palestinian territory, all contribute to this sense of displacement. The Syriac community is spread around the world, with pilgrims from Sweden, Germany, Switzerland and Australia all arriving while I was staying. The juxtaposition of contemporary displacement and historical continuity seemed only to emphasise the latter.

It was interesting to see the way that Orthodox theology influenced the life of the community. The theology of ordained ministry was much higher than anything I had experienced before. The priests themselves submitted



totally to the bishop in all matters. One said, 'We're like soldiers. What the Bishop says, we obey.' Visitors to the monastery would greet the priests by kissing their hands and asking for a blessing. This itself connected with a deep theology of holiness – not just holy men, but holy places. The Syriac community saw their church and priests as deeply representing the holiness of God. In them, God was present. Joining this community, emphasising obedience and holiness, made me reflect on what ordained ministry in the Anglican tradition means, and gave me a greater sense of the call to represent God in ordained ministry.

### *Praying with the Fathers in the Holy City*

Finally, the backdrop of Jerusalem added an extra layer of atmosphere to my experience. It was my first visit to the Holy City, which really felt like it deserved the name. Religion was visually dominant. Not just the proliferation of 'Holy Places' belonging to one of the three Abrahamic faiths, but the combination of cassocks, headscarves, kippahs, and Haredi suits flowing past each other forces religion into the frontline. The city's skyline is dominated by the Dome of the Rock, and the Jewish cemetery on the Mount of Olives, awaiting the resurrection. The way in which the Jewish areas shut down on Erev Shabat, the call to prayer sounding from the minarets, and the bells of churches tolling the hour, all contribute to this sense of holiness, and rival claims to identification with the One God. I am deeply grateful for the fortnight I was able to spend in St Mark's. My experience of prayer is deeper. My mental image of the global church is richer. My connection with the early church feels stronger. In Syriac Orthodoxy, I saw a community with an identity built on historic continuity with the church of the first apostles. In joining them, I continued to learn how to pray, and especially about the prayer of the heart.

# Book Review

KEVIN MORRIS

*Three Wise Men from the East: the Cappadocian Fathers and the Struggle for Orthodoxy.*  
Patrick Whitworth. Sacristy Press, 2015, 254pp.

IN 2015 I took a parish pilgrimage to Turkey in which we visited Cappadocia and then the seven churches of Revelation. It is country where one walks in the footsteps of great saints: the Blessed Virgin Mary, St John, St Peter, St Paul, St Philip, St Thecla, St Timothy and St Silas. The New Testament and early Christian tradition guides the pilgrim well in understanding the depth and liveliness of



THE ANGLICAN AND EASTERN  
CHURCHES ASSOCIATION

CONSTANTINOPLE LECTURE  
2017

*The Reformation and the Future  
of Europe?*

Thursday 23rd November

*Lecture to be given by*

The Rt. Rev'd Dr Graham Tomlin  
Bishop of Kensington

5.30 pm Vespers

6.30 pm Lecture

7.15 – 9.00 pm Reception

At St Sophia's Greek Orthodox Cathedral,  
Moscow Rd, London W2

By Kind Permission of His Eminence the  
Archbishop of Thyateira

Tickets for the Reception: £18 per person.  
Cheques payable to 'The Anglican &  
Eastern Churches Association', to:

The General Secretary, AECA, The Old  
Deanery, Dean's Court, London, EC4V 5AA

e-mail: [janet.laws@btopenworld.com](mailto:janet.laws@btopenworld.com)

Telephone 020 7248 6233

*Closing dates for booking tickets Friday  
17<sup>th</sup> November. Please include your name  
and address with payment.*



*Pilgrimage Secretary*

The Revd Andrei Petrine  
The Rectory  
52 Epping Road  
Toot Hill  
Ongar  
Essex cm5 9sq  
Tel: 01992 524 421  
email: a.petrine@mac.com

*Editor of Koinonia*

The Revd Stephen Stavrou  
St Michael's Vicarage  
39 Elm Bank Gardens  
London sw13 onx  
Tel: 07801 551 592  
email: stephenfrancisstavrou@gmail.com

*The views expressed in Koinonia do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editor  
or of the Committee of the Association.*

[www.aeca.org.uk](http://www.aeca.org.uk)

Cover Photo:

*Bishop Christopher with Bishop Angaelos following the latter's installation as an  
ecumenical canon of Southwark Cathedral.*