

ARTICLES

Cardinal Cormac Murphy-O'Connor: An Interview with <i>Martin Browne</i>	2
Musings on Archbishop Rowan Williams's address at the Willebrands Symposium. <i>James Puglisi</i>	14
The Apostolic Constitution 'Anglicanorum coetibus': an Anglican Juridical Perspective. <i>Norman Doe</i>	23
'Anglicanorum coetibus': Ecumenical Implications for Mutual Recognition of Ministry. <i>G.R. Evans</i>	49
'Anglicanorum coetibus': Generous Offer or Aggressive Attack? A Problem of Ecclesiology. <i>J.A. Arnold</i>	56
John Henry Newman and the Sanctification of Ambivalence. <i>Andrew Pierce</i>	67
Oneness and Trinitarian Pentecostalism: Critical Dialogue on the Ecumenical Creeds. <i>Wolfgang Vondey</i>	86
Review article. 'Beloved Dust: Tides of the Spirit in Christian Life' by Robert Davis Hughes III. <i>Radu Bordeianu</i>	103
The Italian-Albanian Church: a study in modern history and contemporary ecclesial context. <i>Anthony O'Mahony</i>	113
A note on the antiphon: 'Sub tuum praesidium'. <i>Eoin de Bhaldraithe</i>	133

REPORTS & EVENTS

Conference commemorating the 15 th Anniversary of 'Orientale Lumen', 15 May 2010. <i>Benedict Gaughan</i>	136
Conference opening address. + <i>Vincent Nichols</i>	139
A Call to Celebrate the Resurrection of Christ on the same day: 8 April 2012.	145
Christianity in Iraq Seminar Day, 24 April 2010. <i>Erica Hunter</i>	148
How Interchurch Families Live the Reality of the 'Domestic Church'. <i>George A. Kilcourse, Jr.</i>	151
Edinburgh 2010: Reminiscences and Reflections on the Spirituality of a Conference. <i>Elizabeth Moran</i>	157

BOOK REVIEWS

167

EDITORIAL

Given our remit to cover as much of the ecumenical spectrum as possible, a single issue of ONE IN CHRIST will inevitably focus more particularly on one area, and less on others. In the current issue, the great majority of articles concentrate on primarily 'Western' topics—albeit *Anthony O'Mahony's* 'The Italian-Albanian Church' recounts a Byzantine presence in the West.

Still, the majority of the Reports and Events have an Eastern connection. We are particularly pleased to report on the 'Orientale Lumen' anniversary conference, held at Heythrop in June, and to present *Archbishop Vincent Nichol's* opening address. The continuing fate of Christians in Iraq, and the ecumenical imperative of agreeing a universal date for Easter, also feature. And we attend to other topics of perennial concern, namely, Pentecostalist inspiration (*Wolfgang Vondey, Radu Bordeianu*), and Interchurch Families.

Martin Browne's interview with *Cardinal Cormac Murphy O'Connor* cannot fail to interest those with a concern for recent ecumenical history. Nor could there be a more timely subject than the personality of John Henry Newman (*Andrew Pierce*). 'Anglicanorum Coetibus' is examined (*Norman Doe, G.R. Evans, J.A. Arnold*), the Apostolic Constitution having been touched on by Archbishop Rowan Williams in his address to the Willebrands conference in Rome, reproduced in our previous issue. And *James Puglisi*, reflecting on that address, outlines a number of issues for Catholics to ponder.

In the last issue we previewed the centenary of Edinburgh 1910. Here our particular focus finds expression in *Elizabeth Moran's* piece on the spirituality of the Edinburgh 2010 Conference—and also in John D'Arcy May's words during the closing session of the Trinity College Dublin conference, 'From World Mission to Interreligious Witness: Visioning Ecumenics in the 21st Century', words with which we conclude:

'The ethical contribution the religions can make depends crucially on the spiritual quality of their relationships with one another.'

CARDINAL CORMAC MURPHY-O'CONNOR: AN INTERVIEW

*Cormac Murphy-O'Connor was born on 24 August 1932 in Reading, Berkshire. After seminary studies at the Venerable English College and the Gregorian University in Rome, he was ordained priest for the Diocese of Portsmouth in 1956. After a number of appointments in the diocese, he returned to Rome in 1971, as Rector of the English College. He was appointed Bishop of Arundel and Brighton in 1977. Among the many positions he held in the Bishops' Conference of England and Wales was that of Chairman of the Committee for Christian Unity from 1983 to 2000. From 1982 to 2000 he was Co-Chairman of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC). He was installed as Archbishop of Westminster on 22 March 2000 and in February 2001 was created a cardinal by Pope John Paul II. He retired in April 2009, and now lives in Chiswick in West London. **Martin Browne OSB*** interviewed him there in the spring of this year.*

MB *Where did your interest in ecumenism originate?*

CMOC My first interest in ecumenism actually came from my mother. During the war, when Cardinal [Arthur] Hinsley was Archbishop of Westminster, she joined an inter-denominational organisation called *Sword of the Spirit*. My father thought it was very daring, but she was very enthusiastic! She went to the meetings in Reading, where we lived, and even then, as a boy, I found the idea very interesting.

I studied in Rome for seven years, but it really wasn't a very helpful time for ecumenism. Every year during the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity we'd go to a nearby church, and we'd pray for Anglicans. The sermon would always be by someone who would wax lyrical about all the wives of Henry VIII and that sort of thing! It was all kind of amusing, but it was really what I would call a 'dream'—about *return* to the 'One True Church'.

* Br Martin is a monk of Glenstal and Headmaster of Glenstal Abbey School.

When I was first ordained, I served in parishes in Portsmouth and Southampton, and would participate in 'clergy fraternals'. At that time, things were just beginning to get a little bit more friendly, following the arrival of Pope John, because he had 'opened the doors'. After that I was appointed secretary to Bishop [Derek] Worlock. He had just come back from the Council, and he was full of zeal. He really was *the* 'Council bishop'. There were also tensions at that time, particularly with the Anglicans, who tended to want too much to happen quickly.

But the visit of Archbishop [Michael] Ramsey to Pope Paul was a turning point—and the beginning of ARCIC. Also, the *Malta Report*, which was the prelude to ARCIC, was very significant. It was then that the word *koinonia* was 'coined', and it became the foundation of all the ARCIC work.

MB *What about your time as Rector of the English College in Rome?*

CMOC

That was a very profound experience, really. For one thing, I hosted the Archbishop of Canterbury [Donald Coggan] when he came to visit the Pope in 1977.

I have particularly fond memories of Norman Goodall, a United Reformed Church minister. He was lecturing at the Gregorian University for a term and he stayed in the College, and we became great friends. And I realised, not for the first time, but much more profoundly with him, that friendship is hugely important in all ecumenical endeavour. We kept in touch, and after I became a bishop I called to see him. It happened that he was actually dying at the time and we blessed each other.

I also got Anglican students to come to the English College for the first time. They would come for a term and swap with two of ours, who would go back to an Anglican Theological College in England. During that time I visited one of those, Westcott House, Cambridge, where the Principal was Mark Santer, who of course was Co-Chairman of ARCIC with me.

Those years in Rome and the different initiatives that were happening in the last years of Pope Paul VI were very important ones for me. So that when I was ordained a bishop, in the last year of Pope Paul's reign as Pope, I was very open—at least ecumenically.

MB *You mentioned the significance of friendship. Informal 'tea and cake' ecumenism can sometimes be derided. In your experience, how important are friendship and personal relationships in ecumenical conversations?*

CMOC To be friends is not as simple as saying that you like a person. You also share things with friends. You share your views and your convictions. And with friends, you laugh. So, of the many ecumenical friends I've had over the years, our relationships have always involved friendship, sharing, and an *understanding*—that goes beyond official documents—of the deep importance of what we share together as Christians.

MB *When you were appointed Co-Chairman of ARCIC it was a very exciting time ecumenically. It was just after Pope John Paul's visit to Canterbury Cathedral and there was an air of optimism abroad. What exactly was it like?*

CMOC The Pope's visit was extraordinary. It was a very tense time, with the Falklands war and so on, and we were worried for a while that he mightn't actually come. We had dramatic meetings of the bishops, and Archbishop [Thomas] Winning and Archbishop Worlock were camped out in Rome, almost on the Vatican steps, in order to make sure it would happen and poor Cardinal [Basil] Hume had to go out and celebrate Mass with the Argentinean Primate, so it was all very complicated. Luckily, Pope John Paul actually wanted to come, so that helped a lot, and when he actually came we had a most incredible week.

Gatwick Airport is in Arundel and Brighton diocese, so I was the first person to greet him when he arrived. He

was there, rather tentatively, thinking there would be rotten eggs, but there weren't. I think it was probably a more interesting week for him personally than for many others. It was a great visit, and of course it was a great boost for the Catholics of Britain. The whole thing was on television, and people were very moved, not just by the Pope, but by what was for many the first real view of a Catholic community of all sorts and kinds.

The visit to Canterbury Cathedral was most incredibly moving and when they walked out together—the Pope and Archbishop [Robert] Runcie—I remember there were tears in my eyes. By this time ARCIC I had ended and there was real hope that before long there would be at least a recognition of each other's ministries. Cardinal [Johannes] Willebrands¹ had been saying that the debate about the Catholic Church's attitude to recognising Anglican Orders was now in a 'new context'. We were already trying to work out how that would be done—would it be re-ordination or would it simply need a word from the Pope? So it really was a very exciting time.

MB

Tell me about your time as Co-Chairman of ARCIC II.

CMOC

Our first document was on Justification—but, of course, the Lutherans rather upstaged us on that with their one! After that we addressed the idea of *koinonia*. Then we got on to morals. That was difficult. It is frustrating that some Anglican provinces won't stick to what is in that document. When all the controversy arose in the Anglican Communion over homosexuality, we could point to the ARCIC document and say, 'Look: This is the paragraph we agreed about homosexuality, and it's a very reasonable one. Why not hold to that?' But, of course there is great pressure for change.

We struggled to do a common document on women, and of course by the early 1990s, the Church of England was getting ever closer to ordaining women to the

¹ President of the Secretariat/Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity 1969-1989.

priesthood. When the General Synod eventually did pass the legislation it was to a great extent the death blow. It was a huge, huge disappointment, because then all possibility of the recognition of ministries faded. And Rome became much less sympathetic to the dialogue, even though it has carried on and there's going to be an ARCIC III.

So, what do I think? Well, I think the Joint Statements of both ARCICs are well worth reading. I gave a lecture about ARCIC a few months ago and the title I gave it was 'Money in the bank, or dead in the water?' I very much believe that it is money in the bank. As common documents they really are very fine. We had very fine theologians on both sides. The Dominican Father Jean Tillard was absolutely brilliant. He and Henry Chadwick, more than anybody else, knew the Fathers, and their contribution was immense. For me, our annual meeting was more or less a ten-day study seminar on the early Church and on Tradition.

MB *Were you naive to think that you really were on the brink of a major breakthrough?*

CMOC I suppose we were. All the people on ARCIC were fervent ecumenists, and so was Cardinal Willebrands. The expectations regarding the Anglicans were certainly very great. Here was a Church called a 'Sister Church' by Pope Paul; they had episcopacy, and sacraments and the Bible; they were 'Catholic and Reformed'. Well the Catholic Church was reformed now, and the hope was great therefore. But I don't think we realised—I certainly didn't—the extent to which the factions among the Anglicans could not continue without being under authority. The three ARCIC documents on Authority are actually the most crucial. The third one, *The Gift of Authority*, is a great document, but it has remained on paper, I'm afraid.

MB *A lot of these documents seem to be read by ecumenists only, and don't seem to be 'received' by the Churches.*

CMOC You're right. They don't enter into the blood-stream and that's a pity. I think ARCIC III could spend a lot of their time going around and talking about them and helping people to absorb them.

MB *Is the dream over?*

CMOC Well, I think we've realised that it's a long, long road. The thing is though, in recent years we've had two meetings of Anglican bishops and Catholic bishops here in England and what has drawn us together, in spite of the difficulties we've experienced, is the fact that we're facing a secular culture together, and therefore, to a certain extent, we rely on each other.

MB *Might it be the case that you are just 'settling' for that kind of co-operation, now that full organic unity seems to have slipped from sight?*

CMOC Well, both sides want this kind of co-operation. For one thing, the Catholic Church in England is a much more 'English' Church now than previously. There are more second-generation people like me. More of them have been to English universities and so on, so they have a different background. As bishops, we have more in common with the Anglican bishops and other church leaders than previously.

MB *When the Church of England began ordaining women as priests and some former Anglican clergy were received into the Catholic Church and re-ordained, what was the effect on ecumenical relationships?*

CMOC On the whole I think it was handled very well—generously by us, and very generously by the Church of England. It was all done in a very gentlemanly English way! But I think the present situation is more difficult.

MB *We've just had the Pope's letter, Anglicanorum Coetibus, with its proposal for special Ordinariates for those Anglicans who want to enter into full communion with the Holy See. We have the*

document, but we don't know yet what exactly it will actually mean in practice. Have you any ideas?

CMOC Numbers of Anglican bishops, both from here [the UK] and abroad, have been going to Rome for some years now, to seriously discuss entering into full communion. I think because of that Rome said 'let's make it even easier for them', and so we now have the proposal for the Ordinariate. I don't think there's any intention of 'poaching' or anything like that. I personally think it will be of more benefit to those in Australia and perhaps in America than here. But I really just don't know yet. A lot of people are thinking about it. It may work out very well. We'll just have to wait and see.

MB ***When the proposal for the Ordinariates was being announced, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, sat beside your successor, Archbishop Vincent Nichols, at the press conference. Was that just a damage limitation exercise?***

CMOC I think he wanted to see how, in an ecumenical way, he could accept it.

MB ***There's a sense in some quarters that there is little enthusiasm for the Ordinariate among Catholic bishops. Do you think that is the case?***

CMOC I think it's partly the media stirring it, and partly some who don't like it making their voices heard. Some of the difficulties it has encountered are because of the vulnerable position of the Church of England and of the Anglican Communion as a whole, as they try to figure out how they are going to remain in fellowship and in communion with each other.

MB ***On that very point, given its divisions, is it actually possible to have a meaningful dialogue with the Anglican Communion anymore?***

CMOC I think it's very difficult. As you know, the Anglican Communion started with the Church of England, and wherever the British Empire extended, there was the Church of England. While England continued to have an

Empire and even when it had a strong Commonwealth, the Church of England had a certain centrality, which somehow helped keep it together. But now, the Empire is gone and the Commonwealth is greatly diminished, and so all these Churches in Africa, and some in Asia, and of course in the United States and in Canada and Australia, would see themselves as much more loosely attached to the Church of England. And so, for an Archbishop of Canterbury it is nearly impossible to keep any kind of control in terms of doctrine and discipline.

MB *Where does that leave the ARCIC agreed statements?*

CMOC I still think they're money in the bank. I still think the Catholic Church can't say, 'well, we've given up on ecumenism', or 'we've given up on the Anglicans'. I don't think that's right. In no way do we rejoice in the difficulties they are experiencing. Any break-up in the Anglican Communion would not be greeted with any kind of pleasure by us. It is much easier to deal with a group that is united rather than with lots of little groups. I think the ARCIC documents are money in the bank and a resource from which to draw.

MB *You spoke earlier of facing a secular culture together. How is that affecting the life of the Churches in the United Kingdom?*

CMOC Well, we lost the debate over the rights of Catholic adoption societies, and we're facing questions about assisted dying. We're 'up against it' in all kinds of ways here, with things like assisted dying and the Equality Bill. If that were carried to its logical extreme it could mean that we'd have to have a particular syllabus in our schools and so on. And it isn't all just coming from the UK government either, but from European legislation as well. It's very worrying. I know that in other countries where governments are laying down what is to be taught in schools, some bishops are saying that there's no point in keeping on our schools and that it would be better to do religious instruction outside of school. The thing is though, that the Churches—the Church of England and

the Catholic Church—run 30 per cent of all the schools in this country. That's a very big number, and they're generally very good schools.

MB *You described Pope John Paul II's visit to the UK as extraordinary and moving. What will it be like for the Catholic Community to have Pope Benedict XVI visiting the country later this year?*

CMOC It will be a different sort of visit. For one thing, he is only coming for a few days, whereas Pope John Paul was here for nearly a week. This visit is also not just a pastoral but a state one, so that will be different too.

I must say though that in this Pope there is so much not just to admire but to be glad about. He speaks beautifully—his homilies are always very good—and certainly the bishops are finding him very easy to talk to. He listens well. And I think he is very interested in England. And of course, the Newman context is significant.

MB *Speaking of whom, this Pope doesn't normally carry out beatifications himself, yet he will beatify Cardinal John Henry Newman during his visit. On a certain level this could be seen as some kind of Catholic triumphalism. What are the ecumenical implications of the beatification?*

CMOC I don't think it will be seen as a negative on the whole. Newman has always been known as a great Victorian, and even for Anglicans, his theology, his hymns and his life are extraordinary—forty-five years an Anglican and forty-five years a Catholic.

He had a fascinating life. I gave a sermon in the English College when I was in Rome recently and I spoke about the times Newman had been to the College—twice on occasions of joy and twice on occasions of sorrow. The first occasion for sorrow was 1836. He visited Rome and called at the English College, to see [Nicholas, later Cardinal] Wiseman, who was the Rector, and lamented the sadness of the Catholic Church, whence he went on to Sicily and nearly died, and when he was becalmed on

the way back he wrote *Lead, Kindly Light*. And then the next time was a great joy, after he had been received into the Church he was in Rome for a year, at the *Propaganda* College, and went to the English College a lot. He was feted everywhere he went that time. And then, about fifteen years later, he was out in Rome again and a lot of his plans had fallen flat on their faces. The Dublin thing [Newman's Catholic University of Ireland] hadn't gone well, and the Oratory was having lots of difficulties and people were attacking him. And then the last time he was getting the Red Hat.

If the beatification is handled well, which I think it will be, it will be seen as the recognition of an extraordinary Christian, who gave a lot to the Anglican Church as well as to the Catholic Church. Personally I don't think there will be a great deal of controversy over Newman's beatification.

MB *There is a perception that the current Pope is more interested in ecumenism with the Orthodox, and, being German, with the Lutherans. How significant is he personally in the relationships which you as an English bishop have with other Christian Churches?*

CMOC His significance is that he is waging his great campaign against relativism and I think that's a very pertinent point which we in England and elsewhere in Europe would do well to take note of. You can't actually have a conversation if everybody says the truth is relative—'This is my truth; that is your truth'. That's what he thinks, and he's right. He wants to defend the idea of what is right and wrong and to defend Europe's Judaeo-Christian heritage.

MB *What about the Pope's role in documents like Dominus Iesus and his repudiation of Paul VI's use of the term 'Sister Churches' which you mentioned earlier?*

CMOC Sometimes, you've got to realise that some Roman documents, although they're officially addressed to the whole Church, are really addressed to certain

theologians. I think *Dominus Iesus* is primarily addressed to certain theologians who in delving so deeply into the theology of other faiths seem to cast doubt on the uniqueness of revelation and salvation in Christ. So, I think it was written 'against' them rather than anyone else. So, what I'm saying is that the context is important in documents like this.

As for the idea of 'Sister Churches', things were so hopeful in the days of Pope Paul, and indeed for the first years of Pope John Paul they were the same. I remember I went to Rome with Archbishop Runcie and we met the Pope. Nothing much came of the meeting, but I remember afterwards I was walking with Archbishop Runcie and he said to me, 'You know, we didn't get very far, but *affective* collegiality will lead to *effective* collegiality'. So, we're drawn back to that idea of friendship we were speaking about earlier. So, praying together and working together and wanting unity are hugely important. So, in a sense, we're back at the essentials of where we started.

MB *Pope John Paul used to talk about this as 'Spiritual Ecumenism', and Cardinal Walter Kasper uses the term a lot.*

CMOC He does, and it's important. It's not wishy-washy or anything like that. It's based on the Bible, on prayer, on Baptism—the sort of things we've just been talking about.

MB *Or is it just a fig-leaf to hide the fact that doctrinal convergence has slowed down?*

CMOC I always quote that line from *Unitatis Redintegratio* that there is no ecumenism worthy of the name without interior conversion, newness of attitudes and unstinted love. It's beautiful. We're still being converted to newness of attitudes towards each other in such a way that we recognise each other now in ways that we didn't formerly, even though we are not in full communion. What comes first is the fact that we are Christians together.

I learned a lot from Cardinal Willebrands. He was a wonderful ecumenist. When he encountered other Christians he always listened and then affirmed—his first step was always to affirm—what we had in common, before getting on to the issues we had to work on. I thought he was a brilliant man.

MB *Is it possible to have such a thing as an ecumenical spirituality?*

CMOC I think it is, yes. What we deeply believe about God and about Christ is almost all shared by Protestants, and so I have no hesitation about feeling in a real communion with them—a real prayerful communion—because we share so much. And I do think that the developments that have come about in the Catholic Church, particularly through our growing understanding of the Bible, mean that an ecumenical spirituality can be based on those things which we have re-discovered. What we believe influences our spiritual lives and if we really renew our understanding of the things we hold in common, then we can say that our prayer will be in communion with other people's prayers.

MUSINGS ON ARCHBISHOP ROWAN WILLIAMS'S ADDRESS AT THE WILLEBRANDS SYMPOSIUM

James Puglisi*

Since there is agreement between the Anglican Communion and the Roman Church on the 'first order' essentials of the Nicene Trinitarian faith, Rowan Williams argued the need for greater diversity regarding 'second order' issues, such as authority, primacy and universality. The present article considers how, building on Lumen Gentium, the Roman Church might re-situate collegiality, and re-focus episcopal authority in a synodical structure rather than treating the bishop as a member of a central 'board of directors'. Universality resides above all in the churches' mutual charity, embodied in the episcopal college, presided over by the bishop of Rome.

In November of last year, the Archbishop of Canterbury addressed an international symposium organized to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Cardinal Johannes Willebrands. The text was published in *One in Christ*.¹ This text is to be placed not only in the context of the symposium but also as following upon the then recently published Apostolic Constitution *Anglicanorum coetibus* and the work *Harvesting the Fruits*.² It is quite obvious that the Primate of the Anglican Communion was in a very difficult situation with the possible break-up of the Anglican Communion over internal questions and with groups withdrawing from the Communion declaring some parts of the Communion 'dubious' in terms of doctrinal orthodoxy. In the face of this situation he poses some very difficult questions not only to his own Communion but also to the Roman Church.

* James F. Puglisi SA is director of the Centro Pro Unione, Rome, Italy and professor of ecclesiology, ecumenism and sacraments at the Pont. Athenaeum S. Anselmo and the Pont. University of St. Thomas Aquinas-Angelicum, Rome.

¹ *One in Christ*, 43/2 (2009), 154-66.

² Walter Kasper, *Harvesting the Fruits: Basic Aspects of Christian Faith in Ecumenical Dialogue* (London/NY: Continuum Books, 2009).

It seems that his methodology was to consider the issues that the churches have been able to agree upon. For the Archbishop these are what he called 'first order' issues, issues concerning the Trinitarian faith, how people are integrated into the communion through baptism and Eucharist and are reconciled to God and one another—issues dealing with the identity and mission of the church. Other issues, such as authority, primacy, relations between local and universal church, are seen as of the 'second order'. The troubling question that he wants to put is whether these latter can continue to justify being treated in the same way as the former and as vital for the health and integrity of the church.

One of Williams's premises is that there is no fundamental disagreement between Catholics and Protestants on the Nicene faith that expresses the filial relation with the Triune God and the communion established with other believers. He feels that the question lies with the determination of where the fullest realization is to be found. The hard question that he puts to the Roman Church might be phrased this way: If we are in agreement on the essentials of the Trinitarian faith and the Gospel mission of the church, is there not ample space for legitimate diverse expressions concerning issues such as *authority, primacy, universal Church*? We may ask does the Catholic church demand that all other churches express these realities exactly in the same way, with the same terms and processes as she does? If this were the case then it would seem that no further dialogue is possible and each other must become an identical mirroring image. Dialogue is only possible when difference is present just as unity is only possible with diversity.

Williams, in treating the first of the three issues, authority, raises the question to whom is obedience due since for him the flip side of authority is obedience. The theological answer to this troubling question opens horizons that Vatican II unfortunately did not have the possibility to deal with, namely the question of synodality. The council was able to affirm a theology of collegiality which however had some limitations. The most obvious is the distinction made between the college of bishops and the communion of the Church. This was possible since the concept of the 'college' was understood as a group of persons who held power over the universal church in abstraction from the communion of churches. *Lumen Gentium* [LG] 22 explains how one becomes a member of the college exclusively and

technically: 'one is constituted a member of the episcopal body in virtue of sacramental consecration and hierarchical communion with the head and members of the body.' In this way the bishop is seen as a member of a college of persons like a board of directors of a universal institution. Hence the link to the communion of the local church is practically non-existent as it is expressed in *LG*. Instead, the college is seen as a *communio personarum* rather than a *communio ecclesiarum*. Furthermore, the college is seen as a perpetuation of the college of the Twelve independent from the presidency of a diocese and from a ministry of communion among churches. Even though ordination was given as the foundation of communion, *LG* 22 relates this to the universal church. This was done because of the large number of bishops who are *sine populo*, without a people. In other words, they are auxiliary bishops, or titular bishops or retired bishops. The weakness observed here comes from an absence of correlation between the college of bishops and the communion of local (diocesan) churches. This is due to the fact that the bishop is being situated *vis-à-vis* his church and not *in* his church.¹

Why is this point so important? Principally because we miss the primary focus of the relationships that must exist between the bishop and his church, and the ministry of the communion that, because of this first relationship, he articulates between the churches. He is minister of the communion of churches and, therefore, its unity.

It is this secondary character of the communion among churches that is furthermore confirmed in relation to the pope. Nowhere in *LG* is the pope treated as the bishop of the local church of Rome. Neither is his role as Patriarch of the West treated (an ecclesiological title recently dropped!) but he is only considered from the point of view of his universal ministry. The other ecclesiological title of the pope,

¹ The adage of the 'Bishop in the church and the church in the bishop' may be found in Cyprian of Carthage, ('*episcopum in ecclesia esse et ecclesiam in episcopo*' *Ep.* 66, 8), see Vittorio Grossi, '*Episcopus in Ecclesia: The Importance of an Ecclesiological Principle in Cyprian of Carthage*', *The Jurist* 66 (2006), 8-29. All of volume 66 of *The Jurist* carries the texts of an important ecumenical symposium sponsored by the Centro Pro Unione, the Ecumenical Institute 'San Bernardino' and the Pontifical University of St. Thomas Aquinas. This volume is entitled: *The Relation between Bishop and Local Church: Old and New Questions in Ecumenical Perspective*.

'Bishop of Rome', is mentioned as an historical incise (*LG* 22) but never treated theologically or ecclesiologicaly.

Will the great risk for the Roman Church (as history has revealed) especially with the episcopal collegiality fashioned by Vatican II be to absorb other religious identities? Not only are there new churches arising in the culturally different contexts of Africa and of Asia but the historical denominational realities are likewise present in the pluricultural setting of the global reality of today. Certainly, the structuring of the *communio ecclesiarum* cannot be reduced to the *communio episcoporum* since the theological reality of regional churches cannot be dealt with in this way.

To the degree that collegiality is explained in terms of personnel that appear as high functionaries of the universal church who exercise full power over the church, our dialogue partners will remain very uncomfortable. It is necessary that the college of bishops is presented as representative of the communion of churches from which they come and that space is explicitly left for the use of the processes of reception of decisions.

This is the point that we join Williams's comments on authority and obedience. Authority is to be seen in the Gospel context of *exousia* which Jesus alludes to several times. It is not to be considered as a power to be exercised over someone but rather as an obedience given in love to the service of the Gospel. Here is where the notion of synodality would be introduced. We could very well recall what the Faith and Order document of 1982 on *Baptism, Eucharist, Ministry* [*BEM*] says:

The ordained ministry should be exercised in a personal, collegial and communal way [we might say synodical way]. It should be personal because the presence of Christ among his people can most effectively be pointed to by the person ordained to proclaim the Gospel and to call the community to serve the Lord in unity of life and witness. It should also be collegial, for there is need for a college of ordained ministers sharing in the common task of representing the concerns of the community. Finally, the intimate relationship between the ordained ministry and the community should find expression in a communal dimension where the exercise of the ordained ministry is rooted in the life of the community and requires the community's effective participation in the discovery of God's will and the guidance of the Spirit. (*BEM*, Ministry, 26)

While *BEM* represents a step forward neither Vatican II nor the Lima document was able to develop the idea of synodality in relationship to collegiality. It is important to note that the Council did establish some structures that could be considered to be a form of synodical involvement such as pastoral councils but these are rendered optional since the Code of Canon Law (can. 515, 536) does not render them obligatory just as it makes the convocation of a diocesan synod rely solely on the wish of the bishop (can. 461). The synodical structures of the church are as it were more or less optional and mainly dependant on a superior authority. For example, if a regional council is convoked its acts may not be enacted until the Holy See has approved them (can. 439f).¹ It is well known that Paul VI shortly after the Council instituted the Synod of bishops. However, in current Catholic practice synods are not *deliberative* but rather consultative.²

These facts concerning the relationship of collegiality and synodality are important to establish because they illustrate how important it is to obtain an ecclesiological balance in the structures of the church for decision making. What are the limits and boundaries of the participatory structures of the church? These processes are likewise important especially when the decisions that are made will have implications for relations with other churches.

One further observation may be made. We find the model for a synodical form of ecclesial existence in the New Testament in that first 'council' of the church. Recalling that a serious problem arose in the Jerusalem church over the question of whether or not to admit non-Jews, it is interesting to note that the manner in which the early church dealt with this issue was to listen to all concerned. A delegations was then sent to hear the opinion and to see the results of the mission in Antioch. 'The apostles and the elders with the consent of the whole church' (Acts 15:22) decided to send the message of the decision of all concerning the conditions of the Gentiles' admission to the church as they concluded that 'it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us ...' (Acts 15:28). This decision was extremely difficult, due to the issues at stake. Nevertheless, the decision which was discerned as the result would impinge upon the 'whole church' for the future of

¹ S. Dianich, 'Sinodalità,' in G. Barboglio, G. Bof, S. Dianich (eds.), *Teologia* (Cinisello Balsamo: Edizioni San Paolo, 2002), 1525.

² See CIC, canons 338, 343, 344.

Christianity. Yves Congar would observe the general norm in ecclesiology that is derived from this New Testament incident: *'Quod omnes tangit ab omnibus tractari et approbari debet'*.¹

The idea of 'walking together' was present in the form of life that these early communities embraced because it enabled them to hold together in communion. This communion was not the communion of individuals but rather the communion of churches. The Council's dogmatic constitution on the Church is 'flawed' in this respect. It seems that rights were established for individuals (especially when we consider the fact that bishops had access to the college without representing a people except one that was 'titular'—not an existing community of men and women—or those in curial posts or in the diplomatic service of the Holy See) and not for the relations between churches. This means that the effective communal relationship was missing between communities. It is true that the bishop forms the link between churches but he is not to be considered as an individual but as a collective reality in so far as he represents the faith of his church.

When the first council dealt with a serious community-dividing issue, in order to maintain the bond of love in unity they were inspired by a principle that 'saved the day', thus avoiding a potentially disastrous disintegration of the community. That principle was not to place a burden greater than that which the Gospel requires. Both factions had to refrain from or give up something so as to maintain unity in the bond of love—the Jews their ritual, circumcision that gave identity to their social reality as well as dietary norms, while the Gentiles had to refrain from eating foods sacrificed in pagan rituals. The communion in faith was preserved and the two communities submitted to the Gospel in obedience to the Word of God and therefore to each other.

Not every decision had to be on the same level but certainly the ones that were community-dividing had to be dealt with together using the principle stated above. The Gospel became the *regula fidei* for all decisions and all decisions that threatened the Gospel mission

¹ Y. Congar, 'Les conciles dans la vie de l'église,' in *Sainte église. Études et approches ecclésiologiques*, Unam sanctam, 41 (Paris: Cerf, 1964), 308. Here Congar notes how this thirteenth century principle borrowed from Roman law was enlarged by its Christian interpretation as 'that which concerns everyone must be discussed and approved by everyone'.

were taken together. Obviously this is only possible when communities are in real effective relationships with one another.

Some of the Archbishop's concerns have arisen when decisions were taken that touched the unity of the church but were taken unilaterally. This has led not only to damaging the relationships between the Anglican Communion and other churches. It has also had negative effects on the Anglican Communion itself. It is in this context that the question of the meaning of primacy in Anglicanism has been challenged from within the communion. The very question of catholicity is tied in with this issue as Williams rightly points out when he talks about the relationship between 'local community gathered around the bishop ... not as a portion of some greater whole but as itself the whole, the *qualitative* presence, as we might put it, of the Catholic reality of filial holiness and Trinitarian mutuality here and now.'¹ Catholics will recognize the same idea in *LG* 26. Does this justify the action of any one local church that would damage the communion of the whole? The early church had great diversity in expression and articulation of faith but a basic principle held that no local church would do anything that would break the communion of the whole. This is the reason for the presence of bishops at the ordination of a bishop—to receive and confirm the apostolic continuity of the other church's faith and thereby insert its head into the ministerial succession of apostolic teaching, practice and life.

No minister of the Lord, however, is alone but is always minister in communion because the very ministry of the ordained is to be minister of the *communion of the Holy Spirit*. One is in fact a member of a college, the whole body of bishops which is in communion *together* because of its communion with the Twelve. Jean Tillard will note that:

the mere 'recognition' of ministers is not sufficient. *Togetherness* is also needed. And because the bishop has to be the one who 'watches over' the quality of *communion* in his local church, it is thanks to this *togetherness* that we may know how the *same* understanding of the Word and the *same* means of grace are, *substantially*, in all the churches.²

¹ *One in Christ* 43/2 (2009), 162.

² Jean-Marie Tillard, 'Our Goal: Full and Visible Communion', *One in Christ* 39/1 (2004), 42.

He will conclude:

Thus, the unity we are looking for is the rich Eucharistic *koinonia* of Churches demonstrating by their harmonious diversity the richness of faith, unanimous in the application of the principles governing moral life, served by ministers that the grace of their ordination unites *together* in an episcopal body grafted to the group of the Apostles.¹

In Archbishop Rowan's last point, he asks:

I am asking how far continuing disunion and non-recognition are justified, theologically justified in the context of the overall ecclesial vision, when there are signs that some degree of diversity in practice need not, after all, prescribe an indefinite separation.²

From the very beginning the church has known 'some degree of diversity'. We know this from the fact that churches were structured differently in the first centuries, that there were some churches with a collegial structure and others who had a mono-episcopal order. The *Ordines Romani* asked the elect to list the canonical books read in his church and what canons are observed. All of these elements point to a fairly non-uniform structure in the church. So there was a high degree of diversity admitted. What was the bottom line in this situation was that in spite of the diverse expressions of the faith of diverse local churches, the other churches were able to confirm that the content of the faith was recognized as essentially the same, apostolic faith. Irenaeus says that this faith is expressed and celebrated in the Eucharist ('our doctrine is in accordance with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist in turn establishes our doctrine').³

In the brief paragraphs on synodality in ARCIC II's *Gift of Authority* it is the Eucharist in the local church that is seen as the 'fundamental expression' of the synodality of the people of God. In paragraph 37, we find the beginning of the answer to the Archbishop's question especially as regards decisions that are taken that effect the whole of the church:

The mutual interdependence of all the churches is integral to the reality of the Church as God wills it to be. No local church that participates in the living Tradition can regard itself as self-sufficient. ... The ministry of the bishop is crucial, for this ministry serves

¹ Ibid.

² *One in Christ* 43/2 (2009), 165.

³ Irenaeus of Lyons, *Adv. Haer.* IV 18, 5.

communion within and among local churches. Their communion with each other is expressed through the incorporation of each bishop into a college of bishops. ... The maintenance of communion requires that at every level there is a capacity to take decisions appropriate to that level. When those decisions raise serious questions for the wider communion of churches, synodality *must* find a wider expression.¹

The experience of ecumenical dialogue for over four decades has taught us that we each have gifts received and gifts to give. Hopefully the primary questions that have been dealt with on the essentials of the faith will also give the same confidence in dealing with the secondary ones.

Perhaps the words of the late Jean Tillard, passionate ecumenist and lover of the Anglican Communion can provide further impetus to the next phase of ARCIC. He describes what he believes to be the goal of this dialogue:

What is the unity ARCIC has the mandate to prepare? It is a Eucharistic *communion* of Churches demonstrating by their harmonious diversity the richness of faith, unanimous in the applications of the principles governing moral life, served by ministers that the grace of ordination unites *together* in an episcopal body, grafted to the group of the Apostles, and which is at the service of the authority that Christ exercises over his Body with the Spirit of Truth, for the Salvation of the World and the glory of the Father. In one Word, it is the communion of the Body of Christ, here and now on earth.²

¹ *Gift of Authority*, 37, italics added.

² J.-M. Tillard, 'Our Goal...', op. cit. 43.

THE APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION *ANGLICANORUM COETIBUS*: AN ANGLICAN JURIDICAL PERSPECTIVE

Norman Doe *

The Apostolic Constitution, Anglicanorum coetibus, and its Complementary Norms, approved by Pope Benedict XVI on 4 November 2009, provide for the foundation of personal ordinariates for Anglicans seeking full communion with the Latin Church. From an Anglican perspective, this development raises a host of fascinating practical and juridical questions. This short paper deals with three issues: (1) responses to the Apostolic Constitution, especially Anglican responses; (2) the Apostolic Constitution itself, with particular reference to Anglican canonical categories within it (such as that of the Anglican Communion and its patrimony); and (3) some relevant legal provisions of or applicable to Anglican Churches which may either obstruct progress or facilitate progress around the initiative. The paper ends with brief conclusions.

1. Responses to the Apostolic Constitution

The Apostolic Constitution has aroused widespread interest within global Anglicanism. Prior to its announcement, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster made a joint statement: the Constitution ended uncertainty for groups seeking ‘new ways of embracing unity with the Catholic Church’; it was now for those who had requested provision to respond; the Constitution itself is further recognition of the substantial overlap in faith, doctrine and spirituality between the Catholic Church and the Anglican tradition; and the Constitution ‘is one consequence of ecumenical dialogue between the Catholic Church and the Anglican

* Norman Doe, Professor of Law and Director of the Centre for Law and Religion, the Law School, Cardiff University, is author of several books, including *Canon Law in the Anglican Communion* (Oxford, 1998); he has served as a canon law consultant to the Primates of the Anglican Communion and the Lambeth Conference, and on the Lambeth Commission 2004. This paper was given by invitation at a seminar of *Consociatio internationalis studio iuris canonici promovendo*, Rome, 9 April 2010.

Communion'; however, the two Archbishops stressed that on-going official dialogue provides 'the basis for our continuing cooperation'.¹ Queen Elizabeth II, supreme governor of the Church of England, also asked her Lord Chamberlain to speak privately with the Archbishop of Westminster on the matter.²

Whilst generally the governing bodies of Anglican churches have not (as yet) pronounced formally on the subject, several leading Anglicans worldwide have responded publicly to the Constitution. The Constitution itself had been stimulated by approaches to Rome from individuals and groups (such the Traditional Anglican Communion) opposed to developments within Anglicanism over the ordination of women as priests, ordination and homosexual practice, and liturgical revision.³ Not surprisingly, the responses cover a wide spectrum of positive and negative views.

One concern for some has been whether or not the process leading to the Apostolic Constitution was an exercise in ecumenism; some see it as an exercise in unilateralism.⁴ Certainly, the Apostolic Constitution itself seems to present the scheme within it as a quasi-ecumenical initiative, with its focus on the 'scandal' of division amongst baptized people and 'the Churches and Christian Communities separated' from

¹ Joint Statement, 20 Oct. 2009. The secular press portrayed the Apostolic Constitution variously as a 'humiliation' of the Archbishop of Canterbury, that it is designed to 'poach Anglican manpower to fill the Pope's depleted ranks', and that it is 'damaging to Anglican morale': see C. Longley, 'The Church of England is close to the heart of what it means to be English', *The Tablet*, 19 Dec. 2009, 7.

² M. Greaves and E. Pentin, *The Catholic Herald*, 5 February 2010.

³ The Traditional Anglican Communion (TAC) was founded in 1991 and it is understood that in 2007 its bishops made a formal request for 'full, corporate and sacramental union' with Rome. TAC, which claims to have about half a million members in 44 countries, is not a part of the Anglican Communion but is under the leadership of Archbishop John Hepworth of Australia.

⁴ See eg Bishop Christopher Epting, The Episcopal Church USA, who observed that the constitution 'may be understood as "pastoral" but is not necessarily very ecumenical.... This appears to be a unilateral action on the part of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith which flies in the face of the slow, but steady progress made in the real ecumenical dialogue of over forty years': *Episcopal Life Online*, 16 Nov. 2009: <http://www.episcopalchurch.org/79901_116893_ENG_HTM.htm>

the Catholic Church.¹ However, the waters became perhaps a little muddied when Cardinal Kasper felt it necessary to offer reassurance to Anglicans that the Constitution was not a substitute for ecumenical dialogue between Anglicans and Rome.² Indeed, at a meeting on 21 November 2009 the Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury reaffirmed their desire to strengthen ecumenical relations between Anglicans and Catholics. As a result, a committee met on 23 November to prepare the next (third) phase of the work of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC), to deal with fundamental questions about the Church as communion and ethical teaching.³ Nevertheless, others see the Constitution as a distraction from ‘the real goal of ecumenical conversation between the largest (Roman Catholic) and third largest (Anglican) Christian communion in the world.’⁴ According to some, the Apostolic Constitution is inconsistent with the spirit of *Unitatis redintegratio*, and, rather, has ‘a triumphalistic accent’.⁵

Many responses consider that a mass exodus of Anglicans is unlikely. Several leaders, such as Archbishop Hiltz, primate of the Anglican Church of Canada, ‘do not foresee a groundswell of response’ to the Constitution, but rather ‘even among those who have separated themselves from the Anglican Church of Canada, there is an abiding desire to remain in communion with the Archbishop of Canterbury, and to maintain a place within the family of churches that is the

¹ Apostolic Constitution, *Anglicanorum coetibus* (hereafter ACAC), Introduction.

² Made in *L'Osservatore Romano*, 15 November 2009; see also Bishop C. Hill, Bishop of Guildford in the Church of England, ‘What is the personal ordinariate: canonical and liturgical observations’:<<http://www.cofe.anglican.org/news/prguildapcon.html>>; see also K. Kasper, ‘Still a place for optimism’, *The Tablet*, 13 Feb. 2010, 8, in which Cardinal Kasper expresses his hopes for the ecumenical enterprise (in edited extracts from his opening address to the ‘Harvesting the fruits’ symposium held in Rome earlier that month).

³ See also the report of the International Anglican-Roman Catholic Commission on Unity and Mission (IARCCUM), *Growing Together in Mission and Unity* (SPCK, 2007).

⁴ Bishop Christopher Epting, *Episcopal Life Online*, 16 Nov. 2009.

⁵ Bishop Pierre Whalon: *Episcopal Life Online*, 30 Nov. 2009.

Anglican Communion.¹ One opinion is that ordinariates will be more attractive to those who left Anglicanism in the 1970s and 1980s (over the ordination of women).² Some consider that many Anglican clergy already using the Roman Missal (or elements of it) are unlikely either to abandon these practices or join an ordinariate.³ Another view identifies as a possible deterrent the pressures on Anglicans seeking reception in the Latin Church in terms of the changes in the doctrinal posture required of them.⁴

Some Anglicans are sceptical about the ‘Anglican patrimony’ which members of ordinariates will be able to retain. For example, clergy of the Church of England would leave behind their pastoral and evangelistic ministry, currently exercised for the whole community beyond congregations (including eucharistic ministry to the divorced)—this is a fundamental of the established position of the Church of England; both clergy and laity would leave behind a unique architectural and cultural heritage (and the resonances these carry); clergy in service would lose further contributions to their pension fund; and the laity would leave behind the right to exercise the power of governance in the church.⁵ Others criticise the provision in the Constitution for corporate reception of groups into the Latin Church, arguing that such decisions should be made on an individual not a

¹ Quoted in L.A. Williams, ‘Vatican publishes plan for full communion with disaffected Anglicans’, *Anglican Journal*, 12 Nov. 2009.

² Bishop Dennis Drainville, Diocese of Quebec, co-chair of the Anglican-Roman Catholic Bishops’ Dialogue—however, it might affect larger numbers in England ‘because they are just going through their crisis about women in Episcopal orders’: Williams, *op. cit.* See also V. Combe, ‘Living apart together’, *The Tablet*, 13 Feb. 2010, 6: this carries the opinion that whilst evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics are both against women bishops, the former will not join an ordinariate, but the latter might.

³ S. Trott, ‘You don’t know what you’ve got till it’s gone’, *Church Times*, 11 Dec. 2009.

⁴ Bishop Drainville: ‘So if Anglicans are going to truly be part of this then there are a number of things they are going to have to accept, the Catholic Church’s dogma on trans-substantiation is still there, the Petrine doctrine of the supremacy of the Pope and infallibility are central... Whoever is going to make this move is going to have to move accepting all of that’: Williams, *op. cit.*

⁵ S. Trott, ‘You don’t know what you’ve got till it’s gone’, *Church Times*, 11 Dec. 2009.

collective basis.¹ Generally, however, Anglican leaders commend with their blessing ‘any Anglican who in good conscience wishes to become a Roman Catholic’ in the same way that they welcome ‘any Roman Catholic who in good conscience wishes to enter into full communion ... with the See of Canterbury, and therefore with the Anglican Communion.’²

On the other hand, those who sought the provision welcome it greatly. It opens ‘a new way into unity with the See of Peter’.³ The Pope has displayed ‘huge understanding and compassion for traditional Anglicans’ in an act of ‘incredible generosity and vision’ helping to redeem recent disappointment and despair.⁴ Indeed, a Special General Meeting of Members of Forward in Faith Australia, held on 13 February 2010 in Melbourne, directed its National Council to foster by every means the establishment of an ordinariate in Australia; moreover, it affirmed its commitment to provide care and support for those who feel unable to be received into the ordinariate; it welcomed the appointment of Bishop Peter Elliott as delegate of the Australian Catholic Bishops’ Conference in the project to establish such an ordinariate; the meeting also established the Friends of the Australian Ordinariate.⁵

In turn, there are press reports of about 100 traditionalist Anglican parishes across the United States converting to the Catholic Church in

¹ Bishop Epting: ‘the Vatican may rest assured that there will be no “Roman Catholic Ordinariates” within the Anglican Communion for former, disaffected Roman Catholic converts. We will continue to welcome individuals, from the Roman Catholic Church or any other Christian communion, who desire to be in full communion’: *Episcopal Life Online*, 16 Nov. 2009.

² *Ibid*; the Archbishop of York is reported to have said on BBC Radio Ulster’s *Sunday Sequence* programme that people joining an ordinariate would not be ‘proper Catholics’: see V. Combe, ‘Living apart together’, *The Tablet*, 13 February 2010, 6.

³ B. Bishop of Ebbsfleet quoted in B. Bowder, ‘Anglo-Catholics gather to pray over Pope’s offer’, *Church Times*, 26 Feb. 2010.

⁴ A. Reader-Moore, ‘Anglo-Catholics do have a real patrimony’, *The Catholic Herald*, 22 Jan. 2010.

⁵ See eg G. Conger, ‘Australians are first to take up Pope’s offer’, *The Church of England Newspaper*, 19 Feb. 2010, 7: this provides the basics of the decisions. See also Forward in Faith Australia, 15 Feb. 2010: <http://www.forwardinfaith.com/artman/publish/article_501.shtml>

response to the Constitution, and that the Anglican Church in America (ACA)—a member of the Traditional Anglican Communion—has decided formally to make a request to enter the Catholic Church as a block, bringing an estimated 5,200 people along with their own bishops, clergy, buildings and even a cathedral.¹ Forward in Faith in the United Kingdom is also considering a similar approach and has set up its own Friends of the Ordinariate.² In preparation for this, some say that the Episcopal Conference of England and Wales has established a commission to explore for example the possibility of church-sharing and taking out 100-year leases of some Anglican places of worship. The timing of the forthcoming visit of Pope Benedict to the United Kingdom, to attend the beatification of Cardinal John Henry Newman, might prove significant for recruitment.³ There are also reports of more than forty Anglican parishes in Canada seeking an ordinariate.⁴

¹ S. Caldwell, 'US Anglicans to convert to Rome en masse', *The Catholic Herald*, 12 March 2010: The decision was taken by the House of Bishops of the ACA during a meeting in Orlando, Florida, which was attended by the primate of the Traditional Anglican Communion, Archbishop John Hepworth. The bishops said in a brief statement on their website afterwards that they had agreed formally to 'request the implementation of the provisions of the Apostolic Constitution *Anglicanorum coetibus* in the United States of America by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith'. The ACA House of Bishops also proposes to seek guidance from Anglican Use Parishes.

² Ibid: the report suggests this might involve in the region of 200 Anglican congregations, which would amount to thousands of people: Caldwell. See also T. Cohen, 'Delay in Vatican vote', *The Church of England Newspaper*, 26 Feb. 2010: a decision from Forward in Faith (UK) is likely following the July 2010 meeting of the General Synod (which will consider women bishops).

³ S. Caldwell, 'US Anglicans to convert to Rome en masse', *The Catholic Herald*, 12 March 2010.

⁴ The leaders of the Anglican Catholic Church of Canada—a member of the breakaway Traditional Anglican Communion (TAC)—have sent a petition to the Vatican requesting full communion with Rome through the implementation of *Anglicanorum coetibus*: *The Catholic Herald*, 19 March 2010.

2. The Terms of the Apostolic Constitution: Anglican Understandings

The reception of Anglican groups into the Latin Church, and the retention of their liturgical traditions, is not new. The ‘Anglican Use Parishes’ have of course existed since the *Pastoral Provision* of Pope John Paul II in 1980; these are parishes of the Latin Church which retain elements of Anglican liturgy in their worship whilst remaining fully Catholic.¹ Similarly, the erection of ordinariates under *Anglicanorum Coetibus* is not entirely new. Though the category ‘ordinariate’ is not explicitly found in the Code of Canon Law 1983, Anglicans understand that the model for it lies in military ordinariates; Fr Ghirlanda recognises this in his commentary on the Apostolic Constitution.² In turn, as with a military ordinariate,³ an

¹ For example, in the USA: the parish of Our Lady of the Atonement Catholic Church, Archdiocese of San Antonio, Texas (this has no affiliation to the so-called ‘Continuing Anglican Movement’); its Order of Mass, drawing on the 1928 and 1979 Book of Common Prayer of the Episcopal Church USA, consists of Rite I (traditional English) and Rite II (contemporary English); Our Lady of Walsingham, Archdiocese of Galveston-Houston, and the parish of St Thomas More, Fort Worth, Texas.

² Fr G. Ghirlanda, ‘The significance of the Apostolic Constitution *Anglicanorum Coetibus*’, as published on the official website of the Vatican (9-11-2009) and in *Osservatore Romano* (10-11-2009); see www.zenit.org; Fr Ghirlanda also concedes that ‘Personal Ordinariates for Anglicans’ are not envisioned in the Code of Canon Law.

³ *The Canon Law: Letter and Spirit*, Canon Law Society of Great Britain and Ireland (Dublin, 1995), para. 1112: ‘The armed forces in any country constitute a community with very special needs and problems. The “special laws” mentioned in the canon are contained in ap. con. *Spirituali militum curae* of 21 April 1986 and in the statutes approved by the Holy See for each country or region’; see also para. 1113: ‘Where a military ordinariate is created, it is equivalent to a diocese (see Cann. 368-369). The powers of the military Ordinary are proper, and he is equivalent to a diocesan Bishop wherever this is mentioned in the Code. In some countries, for practical reasons, the office is combined with that of a diocesan Bishop. Whether this be so or not, the military Ordinary belongs to the Bishops’ Conference. The extent of the responsibilities of the Ordinary and of the chaplains is specified in the norms for each country. Jurisdiction is personal, and so it applies outside national boundaries to those who pertain to the ordinariate. The jurisdiction of the military Ordinary and of the chaplains is cumulative with that of the diocesan

ordinariate for Anglicans is equivalent to a diocese and possesses public juridical personality;¹ the power of its ordinary (appointed by the Roman Pontiff and to whom pastoral care is entrusted) is vicarious and personal.² To be erected by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, each ordinariate is not territorial, though an ordinariate will be erected ‘within a territory’, and its erection may lead to the creation of personal parishes.³ The ordinary enjoys ‘legitimate autonomy’ from the local bishop but at the same time exercises authority ‘together with the Diocesan Bishop’, and pastors of the ordinariate are to minister in mutual assistance with local pastors.⁴ Anglicans are familiar with the concept of non-territorial structures for ministry and pastoral care: ministry to the armed forces, with episcopal oversight, is an example of this.⁵

Secondly, some Anglicans seem to think that members of an ordinariate will remain ‘Anglican’ in terms of canonical status.⁶ This is

Bishop and clergy ... A full-time military chaplain is, in effect, the parish priest of a personal parish (see Can. 518), belonging to the military ordinariate and possessing all the rights and obligations of a parish priest’.

¹ ACAC, I.3: ‘juridically comparable to a diocese’, each ordinariate possesses public juridical personality by the law itself; see also XIII: ‘The Decree establishing an Ordinariate will determine the location of the See and, if appropriate, the principal church’.

² ACAC, V: bishops have ordinary, proper and immediate power (CIC, c. 381.1); they are not ‘vicars’ (representatives) of the pontiff but vicars and legates of Christ (*Lumen gentium*, 27); a vicar general or episcopal vicar exercises ordinary jurisdiction by delegation (c. 131.1 and 2); as do auxiliary or co-adjutor bishops; in an ordinariate, ordinary power is exercised vicariously, not being proper to the office.

³ The ordinariates for Anglicans are personal structures in so far as the jurisdiction of the ordinary and of parish priests ‘is not geographically defined within the territory of an Episcopal Conference like a particular territorial Church’, but is exercised ‘over all who belong to the Ordinariate’: Ghirlanda (citing ACAC, V); see also ACAC I. 2; for personal parishes see CIC, c. 518.

⁴ Ghirlanda: the personal prelatures model (c. 294-97) was not followed; under c. 294 personal prelatures are composed of secular priests and deacons and (under c. 296) lay people may simply dedicate themselves to the apostolic works of personal prelatures by agreement.

⁵ See N. Doe, *Canon Law in the Anglican Communion* (Oxford, 1998) 123-4.

⁶ This observation is based on personal conversations with many. See also Anglican Communion in America (ACA) website for Frequently Asked

clearly not the case from the Catholic perspective. Whilst the Apostolic Constitution itself speaks of ‘Personal Ordinariates for Anglicans’, for ‘those faithful Anglicans who desire to enter into the full communion of the Catholic Church in a corporate manner’, an ordinariate will be composed of members ‘originally belonging to the Anglican Communion and now in full communion with the Catholic Church’;¹ it explicitly speaks of clerical members as those ‘who ministered as Anglican deacons, priests, or bishops’,² and the Complementary Norms speak of ‘former Anglicans ministers’.³ Fr Ghirlanda too considers that an ordinariate is open (amongst others) to ‘those coming from Anglicanism’ or those who had ‘previously adhered to Anglicanism’.⁴ There is no category, in the Apostolic Constitution, of Anglo-Catholic or Anglican Catholic or Catholic Anglican. Indeed, the Constitution provides for their full integration into the Latin Church: certainly they are not members of the Latin Church diocese in which they are domiciled,⁵ but they will be registered with the ordinariate.⁶ The marks of their integration in the

Questions, ACA House of Bishops Endorsement of Apostolic Constitution, 8: “united, but not absorbed” will be the guiding principle of our relationship’.

¹ ACAC, Introduction and I.1 and I.4.

² ACAC, VI.1.

³ CN, Art. 4.2.

⁴ Ghirlanda, ‘The significance...’: namely, those ‘who have repeatedly petitioned the Holy See to be received into full Catholic Communion’; this suggests that the scheme is for currently practising Anglicans who are still members of their own respective churches. The erection of an ordinariate is ‘[t]he juridical means by which the Holy Father has decided to receive these Anglicans into full Catholic communion’.

⁵ Ibid: this may be compared with the scheme in Pastoral Provision adopted by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and approved by John Paul II 20 June 1980, under which the faithful coming from Anglicanism were members of the diocese in which they were domiciled receiving special care from the diocesan bishop.

⁶ Ibid (there is something here of Anglican polity in which parochial electoral rolls or other registers are used); ordinariates are designed to enable reception ‘corporately’ ‘for groups composed of people in various states of life’ (lay, clerical and religious). The ordinary ‘enjoys legitimate autonomy with respect to the jurisdiction of the Diocesan Bishop in which the faithful of the Ordinariate have their domicile and is, therefore, better able to ensure that those faithful are not simply assimilated into the local Dioceses in a way

Latin canonical order are clear: they must accept the Catholic Catechism;¹ they must be confirmed, and Anglican ministers must be ordained to exercise the functions of priests.² The ordinariate will be within the territory of an Episcopal Conference.³ Its ordinary exercises authority together with the diocesan bishop;⁴ and will be a member of an Episcopal Conference.⁵ Clerical formation is integrated,⁶ and any ‘Anglican clergy who are in irregular marriage situations may not be accepted’ for admission to holy orders in the ordinariate;⁷ no married men may be admitted to the episcopate.⁸ Priests will be incardinated into the ordinariate.⁹ There must be mutual cooperation between ordinariate clergy and diocesan clergy;¹⁰ and ordinariate clergy are eligible for election to the Presbyteral Council and the Pastoral Council of a diocese.¹¹ Personal parishes may be erected within an ordinariate after consultation with the diocesan bishop and with the consent of the Holy See;¹² where there is no personal parish, the ordinary may after consultation with the local diocesan bishop make provision for quasi-parishes.¹³ Provision also exists for a tribunal.¹⁴ As Fr Ghirlanda points out, these norms are designed for the integration (if not assimilation) of the former Anglicans into communion with the

which would lead to the loss of the richness of their Anglican tradition’ but the ordinary must ensure the ordinariate ‘does not evolve into an isolated community’.

¹ ACAC, I.5.

² CN, Art. 5: they must make their Profession of Faith and have received the Sacraments of Initiation (under CIC, c. 845), ie baptism and confirmation.

³ ACAC, I.2.

⁴ ACAC, V, CN, Art. 5.2.

⁵ CN, Art. 2: and the ordinary will be obliged to follow its directives unless incompatible with the Apostolic Constitution.

⁶ ACAC VI.5; CN Art. 10.2.

⁷ CN, Art. 6.2.

⁸ CN, Art. 11.1.

⁹ CN, Art. 4.2.

¹⁰ ACAC, VIII.2; CN, Art. 14.2.

¹¹ CN, Art. 8.1 and 8.2.

¹² ACAC, VIII.1; see also CN, Art. 14.

¹³ CN, Art. 14.3; see CIC, can. 516.1.

¹⁴ Its competent tribunal is that for the diocese if the ordinariate has not constituted its own (AC XII).

Latin Church.¹ Similar integration would follow reception into Anglican churches.²

Equally, however, the Apostolic Constitution provides for the continuation of elements of Anglican identity. In terms of liturgy, each ordinariate has the faculty to celebrate the Eucharist and other sacraments, the Liturgy of the Hours and other liturgical celebrations according to the liturgical books proper to the Anglican tradition and approved by the Holy See, without however, excluding liturgical celebrations according to the Roman Rite.³ In terms of ministry, in each ordinariate a ‘married former Anglican Bishop is eligible to be appointed Ordinary’ (once ordained a priest in the Catholic Church);⁴ to provide for ‘formation in Anglican patrimony’, the ordinary may establish seminary programmes or a house of formation;⁵ those who

¹ Ghirlanda, ‘The significance...’: ordinariates respond to two needs: the need ‘to maintain the liturgical, spiritual and pastoral traditions of the Anglican Communion within the Catholic Church, as a precious gift nourishing the faith of the members of the Ordinariate and as a treasure to be shared’ (AC III); and the need to integrate fully into the life of the Catholic Church groups of faithful, or individuals, coming from Anglicanism; the enrichment is mutual: the faithful coming from Anglicanism receive the richness of the spiritual, liturgical and pastoral tradition of the Latin Roman Church ‘in order to integrate it into their own tradition, which integration will in itself enrich the Latin Roman Church. On the other hand, exactly this Anglican tradition—which will be received in its authenticity in the Latin Roman Church—has constituted within Anglicanism precisely one of those gifts of the Church of Christ, which has moved these faithful towards Catholic unity’; to protect and nourish the spiritual, liturgical and pastoral tradition developed within Anglicanism ‘and recognised as authentic by the Catholic Church’.

² See N. Doe, *Canon Law in the Anglican Communion* (Oxford, 1998) 162: ‘received members’ are those who, after appropriate instruction, and a mature public declaration of their faith, are received by a bishop into the institutional church in question; see also Principle 99 of the *Principles of Canon Law Common to the Churches of the Anglican Communion* (Anglican Communion Office, 2008).

³ ACAC, III.

⁴ CN, Art. 11.1; former Anglican bishops may also be called upon to assist the ordinary in administration of the ordinariate (11.2); invited to participate in meetings of the Episcopal Conference (with the status of a ‘retired bishop’: 11.3); and may request permission from the Holy See ‘to use the insignia of the episcopal office’: 11.4.

⁵ ACAC, VI.5; CN, 10.2 and 4.

ministered as Anglican deacons, priests and bishops may be admitted to holy orders;¹ the ordinary may petition the Roman Pontiff (on a case by case basis) to admit married men to the priesthood although the general norm is to admit only celibate men.² In terms of institutional structure, the Apostolic Constitution provides for the erection of personal parishes after consultation with the diocesan bishop and with the consent of the Holy See;³ it allows for the reception of religious communities (to be placed under the jurisdiction of the ordinary by mutual consent);⁴ and it provides ‘respect for the synodal tradition of Anglicanism’.⁵ However, some of these provisions have been heavily criticised: ‘Any former Anglican who has been ordained will not only have to be re-ordained as a priest in the Roman Catholic Church, not only re-ordained as a transitional deacon, but even re-confirmed as an adult member of the Body of Christ! Any one who does make this move is not an Anglican, nor an Anglo-Catholic, but a Roman Catholic convert’.⁶ Others have rightly pointed out that there is nothing particularly new in these provisions.⁷ In any event, currently, no church in the Anglican Communion has analogous provisions applicable to the reception of groups into those churches; indeed, Anglican churches also have criteria for recognition of valid holy orders.⁸

In its portrayal of Anglicanism, the Apostolic Constitution uses several categories unfamiliar to Anglican canon law—that is,

¹ ACAC VI.1; they may be ordained priests according to the norms of the Encyclical Letter of Paul VI *Sacerdotalis coelibatus*, n. 42 and the Declaration In June.

² ACAC, VI.2 (ie as a derogation of CIC, c. 227.1).

³ ACAC, AC VIII.1; this is possible under CIC, c. 518.

⁴ ACAC, VII: the ordinary may erect new institutes of consecrated life and societies of apostolic life.

⁵ Ghirlanda, ‘The significance...’; ACAC, X: governing council of six priests (to assist the ordinary); finance council; and pastoral council which includes laity (for consultation); see also CN, Art. 12.

⁶ Bishop Christopher Epting, *Episcopal Life Online*, 16 Nov. 2009.

⁷ The provisions are of course based on the position of Rome on Anglican orders, and many appreciate them in that light: Bishop Christopher Hill, *op. cit.*

⁸ N. Doe, *Canon Law in the Anglican Communion* (Oxford, 1998) 364ff. See also PCLCCAC, Principle 94.

categories not found in the legal systems of churches in the Anglican Communion, or in the principles of canon law common to those churches.¹ Unlike the notion in the Apostolic Constitution that 'belonging to the Anglican Communion' is enjoyed by individuals,² Anglicans see the Anglican Communion as composed not of individuals but of institutional churches.³ The 'Anglican tradition', and 'Anglican patrimony',⁴ are not canonical categories in Anglicanism, though 'tradition' and 'catholic tradition' are.⁵ Similarly, the laws of Anglican churches speak of 'forms of service' or 'service books', rather than 'liturgical books';⁶ and the Liturgy of the Hours is not a category in the laws of churches.⁷ However, these categories in the Apostolic Constitution are out-numbered by those which are familiar to Anglican canon law; these include: the notion of 'the Anglican Communion within the Catholic Church';⁸ the need for structures in the visible life of the church;⁹ the idea that norms must have a theological foundation;¹⁰ the concept of an ordinary;¹ the

¹ *Principles of Canon Law Common to the Churches of the Anglican Communion* (Anglican Communion Office, 2008), hereafter PCLCCAC.

² ACAC, I.4, and IX.

³ PCLCCAC, Principle 10.1: 'The Anglican Communion is a fellowship of churches within the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, characterised by their historic relationship of communion with the See of Canterbury'; the Communion consists of 'duly constituted national, regional, provincial churches and dioceses'. See also the Anglican Communion Covenant, 4.1.1.

⁴ ACAC, III (Anglican tradition); VI.5 (Anglican patrimony); Anglicans have been much exercised by the latter category: see, typically, S. Trott, 'You don't know what you've got till it's gone', *Church Times*, 11 Dec. 2009.

⁵ PCLCCAC, Principle 8.4: interpretation of law may in cases of doubt have recourse to, *inter alia*, 'practice and tradition'; Principle 9.2: catholic tradition.

⁶ PCLCCAC, Principle 54.5 and 8 and 55 (however, see 55.8 for 'liturgical text').

⁷ Morning Prayer and Evening Prayer are the traditional canonical categories: see N. Doe, *Canon Law in the Anglican Communion* (Oxford, 1998) 234.

⁸ ACAC, III; see above n. 70 for PCLCCAC, Principle 10.1.

⁹ ACAC, Introduction; PCLCCAC, Principle 1.2: 'A church needs within it laws to order, and so facilitate, its public life and to regulate its own affairs for the common good'.

¹⁰ ACAC, Introduction: 'In the light of these ecclesiological principles, the Apostolic Constitution provides the general normative structure for regulating the institution and life of Personal Ordinariates'; PCLCCAC, Principle, 2.3: 'Law has a historical and a theological foundation, rationale and end'; 2.4:

principle that there is no right to ordination;² the duty to seek ecumenical dialogue;³ the remuneration of clergy;⁴ the permission for clergy to engage in a secular profession;⁵ the notion of membership of an ecclesial entity;⁶ and many others.⁷

All this suggests that it is very surprising not to see in the Apostolic Constitution any reference at all to the ‘canonical tradition’ of Anglicanism,⁸ alongside, that is, references to its ‘liturgical, spiritual and pastoral traditions’.⁹ Fr Ghirlanda recognises, for example, that ‘out of respect for the synodal tradition of Anglicanism’, the ordinary is to be assisted by a Pastoral Council;¹⁰ the synodal tradition is of course part of the canonical tradition of Anglicanism.¹¹ The omission is especially surprising given the work of the Colloquium of Anglican and Roman Catholic Canon Lawyers. Set up in 1999, at a meeting which included an audience with Pope John Paul II (and a later one included an audience with Pope Benedict XVI), the Colloquium has

‘Law is intended to express publicly the theological self-understanding and practical policies of a church’.

¹ ACAC, V; PCLCCAC, Principle 38.4: ‘An assistant bishop is subject to the ordinary jurisdiction of the diocesan bishop’.

² PCLCCAC, Principle 32.3.

³ ACAC, Introduction; PCLCCAC, Principle 93.1: ‘The church universal is indivisible and it is the will of God that separated churches should share a more visible communion than exists one with another’.

⁴ CN, Art. 7.1 and 2; PCLCCAC, Principle 91.1: ‘A church should provide for the financial maintenance of ministry, both lay and ordained’; 91.2: ‘Ministers in full-time ministry have a legitimate expectation to a stipend or other remuneration payable by virtue of the office or other position held by them’.

⁵ CN, Art. 7.3; PCLCCAC, Principle, 41.4: ‘Clergy must not engage in any secular employment or other occupation outside their ministry without consultation with, or as the case may be permission from, the diocesan bishop or other relevant church authority’.

⁶ CN, Art. 8.1; PCLCCAC, Principle 27.

⁷ Such as the notion of norms, rights and duties: PCLCCAC, Principle 4.

⁸ See for example, PCLCCAC, Principle 3: ‘Historical sources recognised as such in the canonical tradition, including custom, have such status within a church as may be prescribed by law’.

⁹ ACAC, III: though the spiritual and pastoral traditions are nowhere defined.

¹⁰ Ghirlanda, ‘The significance...’.

¹¹ PCLCCAC, Principle 18.1: ‘Representative government is fundamental to church polity, and in matter which touch all, all should have a voice’.

over ten years compared the juridical systems of the Latin Church and churches in the Anglican Communion. Its role is to identify similarities and differences, in a very detailed manner, and articulate shared principles, with a view to exploring how these contribute to greater visible communion between the two traditions. The Colloquium has examined church property,¹ clerical discipline,² rites of initiation and authority,³ holy orders, primacy, and clerical formation,⁴ and marriage.⁵ These encounters have always been marked by academic rigour, candid exchanges of views, respectful listening, fellowship and shared worship, as well as a deep respect for the respective doctrinal positions of the parties.⁶

Both the Anglican Communion and the Catholic Church are governed by complex systems of law, but, unlike Catholics, Anglicans have no global canon law. In Anglicanism each of the forty-four churches in the Anglican Communion is autonomous, with its own legal system; however, *The Principles of Canon Law Common to the Churches of the Anglican Communion* induced from the similarities between their legal systems (and launched at the Lambeth Conference in 2008), represents a significant innovation in the Anglican landscape.⁷ But *The Principles* do not have the juridical authority that

¹ See generally J. Fox (ed), *Render Unto Caesar: Church Property in Roman Catholic and Anglican Canon Law* (Rome, 2000).

² M. Hill (ed), *Clergy Discipline in Anglican and Roman Catholic Canon Law* (Cardiff and Rome, 2001).

³ J. Conn, N. Doe and J. Fox (eds), *Initiation, Membership and Authority in Anglican and Roman Catholic Canon Law* (Rome, 2005).

⁴ N. Doe (ed), *The Formation and Ordination of Clergy in Anglican and Roman Catholic Canon Law* (Cardiff, 2009).

⁵ N. Doe (ed), *Marriage in Anglican and Roman Catholic Canon Law* (Cardiff, 2009).

⁶ 'A Decade of Ecumenical Dialogue in Canon Law', Report of the Proceedings of the Colloquium of Anglican and Roman Catholic Canon Lawyers 1999-2009 (2009) 11 *Ecclesiastical Law Journal*, 284.

⁷ *Principles of Canon Law Common to the Churches of the Anglican Communion* (Anglican Communion Office, 2008); this is the work of the Anglican Communion Legal Advisers Network; for background to this work see *ibid.*, 97: N. Doe, 'The contribution of common principles of canon law to ecclesial communion in Anglicanism'. Under the presidency of Archbishop Carey, in 2001 the Primates' Meeting discussed (for the first time) the contribution (or not) made by the laws of the churches to global communion

is provided for the Catholic Church by its two *Codes* (Latin and Eastern). Indeed, the ecclesiologies of Catholicism and Anglicanism emphasise either a universal papal authority and episcopal collegiality or provincial and national autonomy. Nevertheless, Anglicans and Catholics agree that scripture and tradition are fundamental sources for canon law. In Anglicanism, making law involves the laity more than occurs among Catholics, who stress the clerical nature of the power of governance. There is a good deal in common as to the subjects dealt with by the respective laws, not least in governance, ministry, property and the sacraments. Now—on a more general point about Anglican-Catholic dialogue, canon law can be perceived as an obstacle to the advancement of fuller visible communion because of its need for clarity, certainty and stability. This may partly explain why canon law has been the missing link both in ecumenical dialogue and in the Apostolic Constitution. However, given its thoroughly theological nature and its capacity to order and facilitate Christian life and mission, it definitely has its place. On the wider ecumenical canvas, by making clear what is not always perceived as clear, by setting out boundaries and limits, canon law serves not just as a useful source of norms regulating ecumenical relations but can be seen as an instrument of that very same dialogue. Canon law helps Catholics and Anglicans see how they are radically united, where progress is yet to be made, and what is simply a legitimately different expression of something shared.¹ The work of the Colloquium has been fed into that of the International Anglican-Roman Catholic Commission on Unity and Mission.

in Anglicanism. At the request of the Primates, an Anglican Communion Legal Advisers Consultation met at Canterbury in 2002 (a first for such a meeting) and proposed that there are principles of canon law common to the churches of the Communion. The Primates in 2002 recognised that ‘the unwritten law common of the Churches of the Communion and expressed as shared principles of canon law may be understood to constitute a fifth “instrument of unity”’ (alongside the Archbishop of Canterbury, Lambeth Conference, Anglican Consultative Council and Primates’ Meeting). The ACC at Hong Kong then established a Network of Legal Advisers to produce a statement of the principles. In 2003, the Primates urged completion of the work, as did the Lambeth Commission in its *Windsor Report* (2004). The Network launched its work at the Lambeth Conference in 2008.

¹ ‘A Decade of Ecumenical Dialogue in Canon Law’, (2009) 11 *EcclJ*, 284 at 296.

3. The Law of Anglican Churches Relevant to the Development

Fr Ghirlanda observes in his commentary that many doctrinal questions have had to be addressed in the process leading to the Apostolic Constitution; he also concedes that such questions will continue to arise during the formation of ordinariates and the incorporation of Anglican groups into them.¹ What follows is an attempt to identify elements of the laws of Anglican churches which are relevant to, and may impact on, these processes. Some provisions of Anglican laws may hinder the process. Others may facilitate it. The following identifies a number of laws relevant to these issues.

Anglican Laws which might frustrate the life of an Ordinatee:

First, whilst Anglicans are of course free to leave the churches of the Anglican Communion, at the same time the faithful are subject to discipline to the extent and in the manner prescribed by law.² The canonical consequences for an Anglican seeking to become a Catholic through admission to an ordinatee will depend on what status that Anglican has in their own province.³ Such people may lose their communicant status voluntarily by failure to receive Holy Communion on prescribed occasions (typically three times a year) in that church (or by receiving it in another church with which the

¹ Ghirlanda, 'The significance ...'; he also observes that personal ordinariates for Anglicans 'cannot be considered as Particular Ritual Churches since the Anglican liturgical, spiritual and pastoral tradition is a particular reality within the Latin Church'; the creation of a Ritual Church might have created 'ecumenical difficulties'.

² PCLCCAC, Principle 25.4 (as to the laity); for the clergy, see Principles 41 and 47.

³ N. Doe, 'Termination of membership in Anglican canon law', in J. Conn, N. Doe and J. Fox (eds), *Initiation, Membership and Authority in Anglican and Roman Catholic Canon Law* (Rome, 2005) 109: it is sometimes difficult to ascertain whether loss of a particular status terminates membership of the institutional church itself, as for the most part loss of status results simply in exclusion from aspects of church life and the enjoyment of rights belonging to the relevant ecclesial status or class. For example, in churches in which baptism effects membership of the institutional church (as well as the church universal), given the indelibility of baptism, this form of membership would seem incapable of termination: see eg The Episcopal Church USA, Can. 1.17(1)(a).

Anglican church in question is not in communion).¹ Communicant status may also be lost involuntarily by means of excommunication if the view is taken (usually by the bishop) that joining an ordinariate causes public scandal or brings the church into disrepute or that the excommunicate has engaged in schism.² The status of enrolled or registered church members may be lost voluntarily, or involuntarily through removal from a roll or register, such as when a person becomes a member of a church which is not in communion with the Anglican church in question.³ Loss of membership may also occur through failure to attend worship, or to contribute to the church financially.⁴ Indeed, theoretically, joining an ordinariate may of itself constitute an offence; in many churches of the Anglican Communion breaking communion with that church may be the subject of disciplinary proceedings, if the view is taken that such conduct constitutes schism.⁵ The same applies to holding and teaching publicly

¹ See eg Church in Wales, Const., I.7: ‘communicant’ means ‘a person who has lawfully received Holy Communion in the Church in Wales or some other Church in communion with it and is entitled to receive Holy Communion in the Church in Wales’; for three occasions see eg West Indies, Const. Art. 6.1 and Can. 26.2; see also PCLCCAC, Principle 27.4.

² PCLCCAC, Principle 69.2; for schism, see eg West Indies, Can. 26; see also below n. 104.

³ PCLCCAC, Principle 27.7: names may be removed from a parish roll or other register in accordance with the law and observing the principles of justice and equity; see eg Australia, Const. XII.74.1, and Wales, Const. IV.5: a name shall be removed from the roll if a person ‘becomes, without the written permission of the Bishop, a member of any religious body which is not in communion with the Church in Wales’. However, some churches give communicant status to members of other non-Anglican churches when these are in good standing in that other church: Doe (2005) at 118-119.

⁴ See eg Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui, Can. 25.7: a registered member of a parish is a Christian who is at least 18, baptised, confirmed, a regular communicant, and ‘is making monthly contributions to the parish concerned’.

⁵ See eg Southern Africa, Can. 37.1(g): ‘schism, that is to say, acceptance of membership in any religious body not in communion with the Church of this Province’; see also eg West Africa, Const. Art. XXXII.6(d)-(f); the Church of England too provides in Canon A8 Of Schisms, that: ‘it is the duty of clergy and people to do their utmost not only to avoid occasions of strife but also to seek in penitence and brotherly charity to heal such divisions’.

doctrines and opinions contrary to the doctrine of that church.¹ It also applies to abandonment of clerical ministry by formal admission into another religious body not in communion with the Anglican church in question.² Some churches enable restoration on the abandonment of ministry.³ Of course, it will be a matter for each church to determine whether or not disciplinary action is taken against those seeking to join a Catholic ordinariate—though it would be a sad day for ecumenism if such action were taken. However, in the Anglican Church of Australia, a bishop (who is a member of Forward in Faith which has decided to petition Rome for admission to an ordinariate) has recently been the subject of disciplinary charges in the Special Tribunal for, *inter alia*, claiming that the Anglican Church of Australia is not ‘a true church’ and for attending worship in the Roman Catholic Church whilst several parishes in the diocese are without clergy.⁴

Secondly, there are difficulties if a group of former Anglicans seeks to continue to use their Anglican parish church for worship in accordance with rites which are part of the Anglican liturgical tradition and which have been approved for use in the ordinariate by the Holy See.⁵ The ownership of an Anglican church building does not usually vest in a congregation but in prescribed ecclesiastical bodies (usually at diocesan or provincial level), and the building must be used in accordance with the rules of the church (including any relevant trusts);⁶ a group entering an ordinariate has no inherent right

¹ See N. Doe, *Canon Law in the Anglican Communion* (Oxford, 1998) 84.

² See eg Canada, Can. XIX; see also The Episcopal Church USA, Cans. IV.10, followed generally in Chile, Cans. B.7b; Brazil, Cans. IV.5,6; Mexico, Cans. IV.43-44.

³ Southern Africa, Can. 19: ‘If any person in Holy Orders shall without consent from the Bishop abandon the exercise of his ordained ministry, or shall forsake the Communion of the Church, he shall not be allowed to resume the exercise of any Ministerial Office in this Church, until he shall have given to the proper authority evidence of the sincerity of his repentance for the fault which he has committed’.

⁴ M. Porter, ‘Bishop of the Murray faces long list of charges’, *Church Times*, 12 March 2010.

⁵ That is, under ACAC, III.

⁶ Church property is held on trust for the purposes of worship: PCLCCAC, Principle 80; in the Church of England, for example, the parish church is vested in the incumbent (and responsibility for its maintenance in a Parochial Church Council): see M. Hill, *Ecclesiastical Law* (3rd edn., Oxford, 2001) 3,74;

to take the building with them.¹ Moreover, generally, an Anglican place of worship (such as a parish church) may be used only for the administration of such rites as are authorised under the law of the church in question.² The laws of Anglican churches carefully prescribe which forms of service are authorised for liturgical use and, needless to say, these do not include liturgical texts revised and approved by the Holy See.³ The approval of liturgical texts belongs to the central legislative assembly of a church (its general synod, provincial council, or other central body), and such texts must be neither contrary to nor indicative of a departure from the doctrine of a church in any essential manner; moreover, a bishop has limited authority to authorise new forms of service, for example for experimental use or for services for which no provision already exists in the authorised services.⁴ Anglican laws also provide for the dissolution of parishes and the sale of church buildings.⁵

Finally, there is the issue of copyright. This links property and liturgy. Once more, the Apostolic Constitution provides that an ordinariate may celebrate prescribed rites according to those liturgical books proper to the Anglican tradition ‘which have been approved by

in the Church in Wales, ownership vests in provincial trustees, the Representative Body: see N. Doe, *The Law of the Church in Wales* (Cardiff, 2002) 302, 318ff; for other Anglican churches, see N. Doe, *Canon Law in the Anglican Communion* (Oxford, 1998) 308ff.

¹ The civil law would of course be relevant here: see for example the recent case of *Bentley v Anglican Synod of the Diocese of New Westminster*, heard in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, in which four parishes sought to leave the diocese with parish property: (2009) BCSC 1608. In the USA, judicial decisions in litigation concerning parishes seeking to secede from dioceses of The Episcopal Church USA have gone either way, depending on the precise terms of the trust instruments and State laws involved: for a brief overview of recent events, see eg G. Conger, ‘Legal battle looms as US church secedes’, *The Church of England Newspaper*, 1 April 2010, 7.

² However, see below for liturgical ecumenism.

³ PCLCCAC, Principle 56.1; see generally, N. Doe, *Canon Law in the Anglican Communion* (Oxford, 1998) 223ff.

⁴ PCLCCAC, Principle 55 (especially 55.4-9); see also 55.10: ‘No minister in a parish or other local unit may formulate or use a form of service for which no provision exists in authorised service books without lawful authority.’ This authority would probably not extend to services approved by Rome.

⁵ PCLCCAC, Principle 21.2 (dissolution of parishes); Principle 80 (sale, etc).

the Holy See'.¹ Let us assume that a group of Anglicans has left their church (and its buildings), and has entered an ordinariate. The ordinariate seeks to use the Book of Common Prayer 1662 in their services (let us say in a Roman Catholic church building).² In England, for example, the Book of Common Prayer 1662 is not protected by statutory copyright,³ but it is protected by Crown Privilege: rights in the Book of Common Prayer 1662 are vested in the Crown and administered by the Crown's patentee, Cambridge University Press.⁴ It is not clear (without looking at the grant made by the Crown to Cambridge University Press or any other patentee),⁵ whether Crown Privilege extends to prevent reprinting the entire Book of Common Prayer or to reproducing substantial parts (the statutory copyright test for infringement); Copyright Guidance issued by the Church of England suggests the latter in that extracts of greater than 500 words require permission from the patentee Cambridge University Press.⁶ In short, if an ordinariate were to draft, and the Holy See to approve, a liturgical text containing extracts from the Book of Common Prayer, then as far as the Church of England were concerned, it would be

¹ ACAC, III.

² PCLCCAC, 55.1: 'The Book of Common Prayer 1662 is the normative standard for liturgy'.

³ Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988; hereafter CPDA. I am very grateful to the Revd Simon Stokes for help with this paragraph. See generally S. Stokes, 'Intellectual Property and the Church', LL.M. in Canon Law, Dissertation 1996, Cardiff, University of Wales.

⁴ Crown Privilege subsists independently from the CDPA—see s. 171(1)(b) CDPA; see Stokes (1996) for the background, history and the rationale for this. There is very little modern law on this area—the only recent case was the New English Bible case where the Crown Patentee The Queen's Printer Eyre and Spottiswoode were held to only have rights to the Authorised Version and not the New English Bible: see *Universities of Oxford and Cambridge v Eyre & Spottiswoode Ltd* [1964] 1 Ch 736 at 748 for a discussion of the right.

⁵ Printing was historically controlled by the Crown which is where the practice as regards the BCP and AV originated. The privilege/words used in the grant of the patent for the AV (and hence BCP) were discussed in the NEB case.

⁶ *A Brief Guide to Liturgical Copyright*, Archbishops' Council (3rd edn., Church House Publishing, London 2000) p. 13: 'Applications for permission for single use are not required for extracts of up to 500 words. Permission for other uses must be obtained' from Cambridge University Press.

prudent to obtain permission from Cambridge University Press.¹ If other Church of England liturgical texts were to be similarly used in an ordinariate, such as the Prayer Book as Proposed in 1928, copyright permissions would similarly have to be obtained.²

Anglican Laws which might facilitate the life of an Ordinariate:

Former Anglicans, who have been admitted as Catholics to an ordinariate, may continue *under Anglican laws* to enjoy a connection with the Anglican churches which they have left. Various legal mechanisms enable this. First, in many Anglican churches ordinariate members will continue to enjoy the right to attend worship—this is certainly the position in the established Church of England: the right of all people resident in a parish, members of the church or not, to attend public worship at the parish church has been one recognised at common law; they will also continue to enjoy the right to marriage and burial at the parish church.³ They may also enjoy pastoral care: it is a fundamental principle common to churches of the Anglican Communion that ministers offer their pastoral ministry, with respect and compassion, and without unlawful discrimination, not only to

¹ In order to be sure not to infringe, a request would be made to the copyright owner/crown patentee to grant a licence to cover the acts that would otherwise infringe; this is a voluntary licence (ie not statutory)—simply a matter of contract law—and a royalty might be requested. A licence may be refused in which case if publication/infringement goes ahead then the owner could seek an injunction as well as damages. The Copyright Guidance of the Church of England (see p.43 n.6 above) indicates the current approach of the owners to granting licences. It can also be debated whether the privilege applies to electronic rights—clearly not contemplated by the Crown in the seventeenth century.

² See *A Brief Guide to Liturgical Copyright* (2000) p. 13. The copyright of the *Alternative Service Book* (1980), discontinued in 2000, which vested in the Central Board of Finance, would qualify for copyright under CDPA like any other literary work and usual publishing practice would apply to getting permission: see *A Brief Guide to Liturgical Copyright: the Archbishops' Council* acquired title to it. The Book of Common Prayer 1984 of the Church in Wales vests in Church in Wales Publications; material in this was reproduced from the Book of Common Prayer 1662 with permission on the basis that the BCP 1662 is 'Crown copyright'.

³ N. Doe, *The Legal Framework of the Church of England* (Oxford, 1996) 358 (right to worship: see *Cole v Police Constable* 443A [1937] 1 KB 316); for marriage and burial, see *ibid.*, chs. 13 and 14.

members of the congregation but to all people as witness to the example of Jesus the Good Shepherd.¹

Secondly, from an Anglican perspective, it may be lawful for prescribed authorities within a church to permit the administration of public worship in accordance with the rites of an ecumenical partner, subject to the satisfaction of conditions and to the extent permitted by the discipline of the partner church. This may be done on an occasional basis (for instance, where clergy of an ordinariate may be authorised to participate in an Anglican service).² Or it may be done on a more permanent basis, typically in the form of a local ecumenical project.³ In the Church in Wales, for example, a diocesan bishop may authorise (by written declaration) the establishment of a local ecumenical project in a parish within the diocese; no such project can be established without the consent of the Bench of Bishops of the Church in Wales, the Diocesan Conference, and the relevant Parochial Church Council and incumbent of the parish concerned. Under such a project, a duly accredited minister, of another church,⁴ may officiate (according to rites other than those of the Church in Wales) at a service of holy communion, baptism, morning or evening prayer, and burial of the dead, with the written authorisation of the Anglican diocesan bishop; numerous other conditions have to be satisfied. There are also provisions dealing with terminations of such projects.⁵ It is possible, *from an Anglican perspective*, that in such churches local ecumenical projects may be entered with Catholic ordinariates.

¹ PCLCCAC, Principle 44.1.

² See eg Church of England, Can. B43: ministers in good standing in their own church may be invited to perform certain duties within Church of England services if they are authorised to perform similar functions in their own church; the incumbent invites, and the bishop and/or parochial church council approves; joint worship might also occur as might worship in accordance with the forms of service of the other church.

³ PCLCCAC, Principle 97.3: 'A parish may enter a local ecumenical project to provide for shared ministerial, liturgical or sacramental communion or other form of reciprocity agreed by the participant churches, in the manner and to the extent authorised by law'.

⁴ Ie: a church other than the Church in Wales or a church in communion with the Church in Wales.

⁵ Church in Wales, Can. 26-9-1991; see also Church of England, Can. B44 and Church of Ireland, Const. IX.11.

Thirdly, some Anglican churches participate in church sharing agreements, and it may be worthwhile exploring the possibility of sharing agreements between Anglicans and Catholic ordinariates. This is the position in England, where civil law expressly facilitates the sharing of church buildings by the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church. A church building vested in the Church of England must continue in Church of England ownership. To enter a sharing agreement, for the Church of England the diocesan board of finance, the incumbent and the parochial church council must each be a party to the agreement; for the Roman Catholic Church, the party shall be that as approved by the diocesan bishop. Before a sharing agreement can be made, the consent of the Church of England bishop and the pastoral committee of the diocese must be obtained. The agreement (a statutory covenant) may be amended with the agreement of the parties and the statutory consents. The purposes of a sharing agreement are protected by way of trusts and the agreement must provide for financial and management issues. It must also provide for determining the extent to which the building is to be available for worship in accordance with the forms of service and practice of the sharing churches and it may provide for the holding of joint services, as well as rites for the solemnisation of marriage. The faculty jurisdiction of the Church of England continues to apply to all consecrated buildings which are the subject of a sharing agreement (but it does not extend to movables required for the worship of any sharing church other than the Church of England).¹ It is possible that a sharing agreement could be made with an ordinariate.

Finally, it may be possible, in the fullness of time, to explore the possibility of some connection between a Catholic ordinariate of former Anglicans and the Anglican Communion itself. At international level, as we have seen the Anglican Communion has no formal body of law applicable globally to its forty-four churches in communion with the See of Canterbury; each church is autonomous with its own legal system. The Communion is held together by 'bonds of affection': shared loyalty to scripture, creeds, baptism, eucharist, historic episcopate, and its institutional instruments of communion—

¹ Sharing of Church Buildings Act 1969; this also applies to the Church in Wales. The position of the Church of England under a sharing agreement is also governed by Canon B44 (see above).

Archbishop of Canterbury, Primates Meeting, Lambeth Conference, and Anglican Consultative Council, but these cannot make decisions binding on churches.¹ However, the Communion is currently debating adoption by each church of an Anglican Communion Covenant on faith, mission and ecclesial relationships; this is currently before the churches for adoption.² Signing the covenant does not represent submission to any external Anglican jurisdiction.³ The covenant provides that: 'The Instruments of Communion may invite other Churches to adopt the Covenant using the same procedures as set out by the Anglican Consultative Council for the amendment of its schedule of membership'; however, '[a]doption of this Covenant does not confer any right or recognition by, or membership of, the Instruments of Communion, which shall be decided by those Instruments themselves'.⁴ It would be ironic indeed if such a facility, or at least the concept underlying it, were to prove a basis upon which further ecumenical dialogue were possible between the Anglican Communion and the Catholic Church.

Conclusions

The Apostolic Constitution, *Anglicanorum coetibus*, has stimulated a wide range of responses in worldwide Anglicanism, from hostility to what is perceived as an action inconsistent with the ecumenical spirit, to statements of intent to petition Rome for admission to its personal ordinariates. The ordinariate concept is known, but as a rarity, to Anglican canon law. Above all, an ordinariate will enable former Anglicans to become Catholic and to enter full communion with Rome, with all that entails in terms of integration within a new canonical order. It will also enable ordinariate members to continue aspects of their liturgical, pastoral, spiritual and synodal traditions. It

¹ See generally N. Doe, *Canon Law in the Anglican Communion* (Oxford, 1998).

² The idea was proposed in the Lambeth Commission on Communion, *The Windsor Report* (London, 2004) paras. 113-120; see generally, N. Doe, *An Anglican Covenant: Theological and Legal Considerations for a Global Debate* (London, 2008). For the idea that "covenant" does not introduce an alien notion into Anglicanism, see N.T. Wright, 'A scripture-formed Communion? Possibilities and prospects after Lambeth, ACC and General Convention', 7 *Journal of Anglican Studies* (2009) 163 at 179.

³ Anglican Communion Covenant, 4.1.3.

⁴ Anglican Communion Covenant, 4.1.5.

is surprising though, given many of the experiences which Anglicans will bring to the ordinariates, that the Apostolic Constitution fails to acknowledge the canonical tradition of Anglicanism. However, for those Anglicans who wish to be obstructive, there are many facilities in Anglican canon law to respond negatively to this development: removal of those who join an ordinariate from ecclesial status and membership in their former churches will not be problematic, but the (theoretical) possibility of disciplinary action against them (for abandonment of their membership and ministry) could be devastating for ecumenical advancement. On the positive side, there are equally several mechanisms in Anglican canon law, to enable a continuing connectedness of ordinariate members to Anglican life and worship, subject of course to the discipline of their new (Roman Catholic) Church. Church sharing agreements, at least in a small number of Anglican churches, are possible ways of achieving some form of connectedness with Anglicanism.

ANGLICANORUM COETIBUS: ECUMENICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR MUTUAL RECOGNITION OF MINISTRY

G.R.Evans*

This paper argues that the ecclesiology of Anglicanorum coetibus is unsatisfactory from an ecumenical point of view. While recognizing the validity of the ecclesial life of Anglicans, it identifies this life chiefly as an identity of rites. This reinforces rather than addresses the problem of mutual recognition of ministry arising from the Roman Catholic insistence that Anglican Orders are null and void, on which so many attempts at rapprochement have foundered. These ecumenical drawbacks are examined in the context of the notions of dispensation and oikonomia, emergency and exceptional provision.

The Apostolic Constitution *Anglicanorum coetibus* was announced in a Vatican press release on 20 October 2009, as a response to

the many requests that have been submitted to the Holy See from groups of Anglican clergy and faithful in different parts of the world who wish to enter into full visible communion with the Catholic Church.

This is to be achieved, it is proposed,

by establishing Personal Ordinariates, which will allow the above mentioned groups to enter full communion with the Catholic Church while preserving elements of the distinctive Anglican spiritual and liturgical patrimony.¹

The history of the Church contains many examples of ‘reactive’ developments, in which ecclesiastical authorities seek to resolve a problem by making exceptional or ‘emergency’ provision. Emergency provision has usually involved allowing something which would not normally be permitted because circumstances appear to leave no other course and an important need has to be met. A well-known

* G.R. Evans is Emeritus Professor of Medieval Theology and Intellectual History at the University of Cambridge. She served on the Faith and Order Advisory Group for a decade and is the author of *Ecumenical Method, The Church and the Churches and Problems of Authority in the Reformation Debates*, as well as articles on ecumenical themes.

¹< <http://www.zenit.org/article-27268?l=english>>

example is the occasion when Augustine of Canterbury, finding himself short of bishops when his conversion of the southern inhabitants of the British Isles began to prove successful, asked Pope Gregory the Great whether a bishop might be ordained without the participation of the normative three bishops if there were no other bishops within reasonable reach. Gregory's reply was yes. Unless some bishops would come over from Gaul, he had no choice. But he should ensure that he ordained bishops in this way who would be close enough geographically to enable him to ensure that future ordinations would not have to be done in this emergency manner.¹

An emergency has its moment. Gregory was anxious to ensure that that moment should pass and things should return to normal. 'Exceptional' provision claims not to omit any part of the norms but to adapt them to meet exceptional needs, sometimes with the intention that the arrangements will continue in the long term. That appears to be the intention of *Anglicanorum coetibus*.

In the West the approach has, historically, been to grant a 'dispensation', allowing a departure from accepted requirements which is not deemed to alter the usual rules. In the East the approach has been that of *'oikonomia'*, which involves deeming what is done to sit properly within the tradition even though it may appear to constitute an exception. The approach of *Anglicanorum coetibus* seems closer to *oikonomia* than to 'dispensation' in that the emphasis is placed upon accommodating a difference of rites. From the early ecumenical Councils local variation of rites has always been looked on indulgently—within certain defined limits, since a liturgy carries a theology within it. Corporate reunion with Rome of 'groups' which want to preserve their patterns of worship and style of churchmanship is already envisaged in the provision for 'Personal Parishes'. In the case of the new Apostolic Constitution the overarching principle appears similarly to be that Anglicans who are willing to be admitted to the Church of Rome should be able to maintain their familiar ways of life and worship.

From Personal Parishes to a Personal Ordinariate

Personal Parishes break the ancient rule that a parish or a diocese is normally territorial, so as 'to embrace all Christ's faithful of a given

¹ Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, I, xxvii, ed. B. Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969).

territory' (Canon 518), but that breach is accommodated by giving 'territory' a metaphorical sense, and allowing for the superimposition upon a geographical region of a metaphorical 'region' defined by the 'rite, language or nationality' of a group of the faithful. (The allowable reasons also include 'some other basis', which may include a clear need to be met such as that of the deaf who wish to worship in sign language.) In Personal Parishes the use of a rite congenial to the faithful is allowed. There is perhaps a loose historical precedent in that it has also been accepted, in some cases for centuries, in the Eastern Catholic Churches which tended to be formed under political pressures of the time of their formation, that recognition of the Primacy of Rome may be compatible with the continuing use of a liturgy derived from Orthodoxy.

This does not seem to be regarded as a wholly exceptional provision, looked at statistically. Personal parishes are not a rarity. In the case of the Archdiocese of Toronto 44 personal parishes are listed at the time of writing.¹ Nor is the admission of refugees from Anglicanism without precedent. Our Lady of the Atonement in Texas claims to be the first of the 'Anglican Use' parishes which have been created to accommodate communities of Anglicans wishing to become Roman Catholic while retaining some elements of Anglican liturgy and life. The parish was formed in 1983 with 18 converts and a minister who had been an Anglican (Episcopal) priest but was ordained as a Roman Catholic priest in order to provide them with pastoral care²

The innovation of *Anglicanorum coetibus* consists in the creation of what are in a sense 'personal dioceses' to add to the existing established arrangements for the creation of 'personal parishes'. The new Ordinariates will be able to create new Personal Parishes 'within' them (AC VIII.1). The new proposal is to create the equivalent of a diocese, with a literal territorial reference since it will lie 'within the confines of the territorial boundaries of a particular Conference of Bishops in consultation with that same Conference' (AC I.1), but also, it seems, a metaphorical 'territoriality', which allows for two (or more) of these ecclesial entities to coexist in the same geographical 'place'.

Members of the Ordinariates may come in from the Anglican Communion or be admitted directly by baptism and confirmation.

¹ <<http://www.archtoronto.org/parishes/index.html>>

² <<http://www.atonementonline.com/intro.php>>

Canon law will apply and the current Catechism of the Catholic Church will be deemed to constitute 'the authoritative expression of the Catholic faith' (AC V.1-2). Worship and the life of the Church will remain essentially Anglican, preserving

the liturgical, spiritual and pastoral traditions of the Anglican Communion within the Catholic Church, as a precious gift nourishing the faith of the members of the Ordinariate and as a treasure to be shared.

'Jointly'?

It is an important question whether what is proposed can strictly be deemed to concern itself only with 'rites' when it stretches to the limit the arrangements which have historically ensured that there is 'one bishop one diocese'. The Ordinary is really to be something very like the 'flying bishop' introduced in the Anglican Communion in an attempt to deal with the problems caused by the introduction of the ordination of women. The power (*potestas*) of the Ordinary is carefully defined in AC V. He is to hold an office 'entrusted to him by the Roman Pontiff' and which he is to exercise 'in the name of the Roman Pontiff' and personally 'over all who belong to the Ordinariate'. This power is to be exercised jointly with that of the local Diocesan Bishop, in those cases provided for in the Complementary Norms.

There is a complex and not clearly workable set of intentions that decision-making and activities will be in some sense shared. The provision for the creation of Personal Parishes within an Ordinariate (AC VIII.1) requires the Ordinary merely to 'hear' the 'opinion of the Diocesan Bishop of the place' first. And:

Lay faithful and members of Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life, when they collaborate in pastoral or charitable activities, whether diocesan or parochial, are subject to the Diocesan Bishop or to the pastor of the place; in which case the power of the Diocesan Bishop or pastor is exercised jointly with that of the Ordinary and the pastor of the Ordinariate (AC V.2).

This uneasy relationship of an immediate papal jurisdiction with the local diocesan jurisdiction is intended to extend to the presbyterates of the diocese and the Ordinariate:

Priests incardinated into an Ordinariate, who constitute the presbyterate of the Ordinariate, are also to cultivate bonds of unity with the presbyterate of the Diocese in which they exercise their

ministry. They should promote common pastoral and charitable initiatives and activities, which can be the object of agreements between the Ordinary and the local Diocesan Bishop (4).

In further respects the notion of a coinherence in one place of a literal 'diocese' and a metaphorical Ordinariate is likely to prove problematic. 'The Decree establishing an Ordinariate will determine the location of the See and, if appropriate, the principal church.' This has the potential to create significant disputes about territorial questions which are far from metaphorical. Church buildings taken over by the Church of England at the Reformation or built since could in principle become Roman Catholic churches if, as is said, groups of Anglicans wanting to move to Rome 'are very keen to carry on worshipping in their former Anglican parish churches'.¹ But this could not take place as a result of unilateral decisions by the congregations, especially portions of the previous congregations, as became expensively apparent in the dispute over who had the right to worship in the Russian Orthodox Cathedral in Knightsbridge when some of the congregation left the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate and submitted themselves to that of Constantinople.² And who is to live in the existing vicarage?

Mutual recognition of ministry has proved again and again to be the place where ecumenical agreements break down. If ordination confers an indelible character, as both the Roman Catholic and the Anglican doctrine of ministry hold, a bishop remains a bishop for life. Rome does not accept the validity of Anglican orders and Anglican priests and bishops will be ordained *de novo* if they wish to exercise a priestly ministry. But some blurring of the boundary between priesthood and episcopate which half recognizes the continuing episcopal standing of former Anglican bishops seems to be envisaged in ways which arguably go beyond mere courtesy. There are surprising anomalies. The Ordinary may ordain yet the Ordinary does not necessarily have to be a bishop (Norms, Article 4.1). A former Anglican bishop may be appointed Ordinary. In such a case he is to be ordained a priest in the Catholic Church and then exercises pastoral and sacramental ministry

¹<<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/damianthompson/100024340/unhappy-queen-sends-lord-chamberlain-to-ask-archbishop-nichols-about-popes-anglican-plan/>>

²<<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/the-battleoverbritains-orthodox-church-1606233.html>>

within the Ordinariate with full jurisdictional authority (Norms, Article 11.1).

But

A former Anglican Bishop who belongs to the Ordinariate may be invited to participate in the meetings of the Bishops' Conference of the respective territory, with the equivalent status of a retired bishop (Norms, Article 11.3).

And

A former Anglican Bishop who belongs to the Ordinariate and who has not been ordained as a bishop in the Catholic Church, may request permission from the Holy See to use the insignia of the episcopal office (Norms, Article 11.4).

On the other hand, there is a sanction which recalls the practice of the early Church in readmitting to communion penitents who have apostatized but who, if they had previously been clergy, might not exercise ministry again:

Those who have been previously ordained in the Catholic Church and subsequently have become Anglicans, may not exercise sacred ministry in the Ordinariate (Norms, Article 6.2).¹

Conclusion: ecumenical consequences

This is an 'offer' which seeks both to accommodate individuals and to make room for groups, possibly with an existing priest or bishop whom they wish to continue as their minister and pastor, but is not and cannot be ecumenically helpful. There has been consciousness in Rome that the proposals may present ecumenical difficulties and it is suggested that an effort has been made to avoid that happening:

Personal Ordinariates cannot be considered as Particular Ritual Churches since the Anglican liturgical, spiritual and pastoral tradition is a particular reality within the Latin Church. The creation of a Ritual Church might have created ecumenical difficulties.²

Yet the attempt to provide a home in communion with Rome for disaffected Anglicans whose primary wish is to continue in a Church which they believe to be changing involves a degree of ecclesiological

¹ Similarly, 'The lay faithful ... baptized previously as Catholics outside the Ordinariate are not ordinarily eligible for membership, unless they are members of a family belonging to the Ordinariate' (1).

² Gianfranco Ghirlanda, 'The significance of the apostolic constitution *Anglicanorum coetibus*', <http://212.77.1.245/news_services/bulletin/news/24626.php?index=24626&lang=e>

hybridization which seems bound to lead to conflict and uncertainty. It can in any case meet the needs of only one party of churchmanship:

It has put considerable strain on the Fellowship of Confessing Anglicans in the UK and Ireland, which is led by conservative evangelicals and has sought to include traditionalist Anglican Catholics, and it will divide further the latter group between those who become Roman Catholics and those who remain as Anglicans.¹

Those with links with 'Forward in Faith', as reported by the Church Times,² set up a 'Friends of the Ordinariate' group.³ But statements from other conservative wings of the Church of England have been hostile. The Church Society dislikes any suggestion of moving to a Church of Rome it deems to be 'fundamentally flawed'.⁴ So far from being a force for unity, *Anglicanorum coetibus* is already proving to be fissiparous.

Anglicanorum coetibus does not create full visible communion of two communities. It invites a few from one communion to join another on special terms. There has been no rethinking of the architecture of the whole building. The terms have been designed round a number of fixed pillars, in some cases apparently weakening them and the support they give to the ecclesiology of Rome itself. It is an attempt to adapt and reconstruct so as to save existing structures and assumptions. Its flavour is that of the series of 'ecumenical agreements' with separated Eastern Churches during the fifteenth century, continuing the work of the Council of Florence, in each of which it is recorded that the representative of the separated Church has found himself able to accept the Roman position. They failed. *Anglicanorum coetibus* does not allow for the radical review of the underlying ecclesiological principles which is, paradoxically, perhaps the only way to achieve unity.

¹ Graham Kings <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/belief/2009/nov/09/religion-anglicanism>>

² <http://www.churchtimes.co.uk/blog_post.asp?id=89821>

³ <<http://www.friendsoftheordinariate.com/>>

⁴ <http://www.churchsociety.org/press/pr_2009-11_Rome.htm>

ANGLICANORUM COETIBUS: GENEROUS OFFER OR AGGRESSIVE ATTACK? A PROBLEM OF ECCLESIOLOGY

J. A. Arnold*

The Anglicanorum coetibus constitution has highlighted ecclesiological differences between Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches that cannot easily be resolved. The main issues concern the ecclesial identity of both denominations and their perception of each other. Such tensions between the ecclesiology of the Roman Catholic Church and that of other Christian Churches are nothing new. This article seeks to demonstrate that the Council of Florence, in the fifteenth century, is one important example that offers an historical insight into the difficulty of reconciling two distinct ecclesiological positions.

Pope Benedict XVI's response to apparently numerous petitions from certain Anglicans to be 'received into full Catholic communion individually as well as corporately'¹ has been, in the Apostolic constitution *Anglicanorum coetibus*, to reassert the Roman Catholic doctrine (from Vatican II) that: 'This single Church of Christ ... "subsists in the Catholic Church, which is governed by the successor of Peter and by the Bishops in communion with him"', whilst acknowledging that "... many elements of sanctification and of truth are found outside her visible confines."² Therefore, the Pope proposes

* Revd Dr Jonathan Arnold is Chaplain and Senior Research Fellow at Worcester College, Oxford. His academic interests are Reformation and pre-Reformation European Ecclesiastical History. He is author of *Dean John Colet of St. Paul's: Humanism and Reform in Early Tudor England* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2007), as well as several articles on Dean John Colet (1467-1519). His new book, *The Great Humanists: Europe on the Eve of the Reformation* (London: I.B. Tauris) will be published later this year.

¹ Pope Benedict XVI, 'Apostolic Constitution *Anglicanorum coetibus*: Providing for Personal Ordinariates for Anglicans entering into Full Communion with the Catholic Church', given in Rome at St Peter's on 4 November 2009 [hereafter AC], opening sentence.

² AC, paragraph 4, quoting Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen Gentium*, 8.

that there should be 'Personal Ordinariates for those Anglican faithful who desire to enter into the full communion of the Catholic Church in a corporate manner.'¹

This proposal raises questions of faith and rites that are fundamentally ecclesiological. In the constitution, it is envisaged that those who are disaffected with Anglican practices, such as the ordination of women, the proposed consecration of women bishops, and some developments in attitudes to human sexuality, may enter into full communion with the Roman Catholic Church whilst retaining '... the liturgical, spiritual and pastoral traditions of the Anglican Communion within the Catholic Church, as a precious gift nourishing the faith of the members of the Ordinatee and as a treasure to be shared.'² This offer may be attractive to some who are dismayed at recent developments in the Anglican Church, such as those who see the Anglican Church as becoming '... the church of political correctness', objecting not only to the ordination of women but also to '... many attitudes on human sexuality', including divorce and homosexuality.³

However, even though they may continue to use some Anglican liturgy, those Anglicans wishing to convert would have to accept that the Pope could, on occasion, be regarded as infallible, as well as Roman Catholic views on contraception, Mary the mother of Jesus, and transubstantiation.

Moreover, 'Clergy wishing to convert will have to be re-ordained as Catholic priests, and some might face painful choices—having to leave well-placed and historic medieval churches with thriving congregations for more modern churches on the edge of town.'⁴

The press release of 20 October 2009 makes it clear that the constitution is intended to be ecumenical in nature, with the best intentions of seeking unity whilst retaining diversity:

¹ AC, 5.

² AC, Norms, III.

³ Nick Pisa, 'Pope is not trying to lure Anglicans', *Daily Telegraph*, 10 November 2009, quoting Fr Geoffrey Kirk of Forward in Faith.

⁴ Robert Pigott, 'Anglicans Welcome Offer from Rome', BBC News website, Tuesday 10 November 2009: <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/8351584.stm>> In fact clergy would have to be ordained (not re-ordained) and converts would be confirmed (not re-confirmed).

This Apostolic Constitution opens a new avenue for the promotion of Christian unity while, at the same time, granting legitimate diversity in the expression of our common faith. It represents not an initiative on the part of the Holy See, but a generous response from the Holy Father to the legitimate aspirations of these Anglican groups. The provision of this new structure is consistent with the commitment to ecumenical dialogue, which continues to be a priority for the Catholic Church.¹

I shall begin by assessing how recent responses to the constitution demonstrate the ecclesiological issues.

Reactions to *Anglicanorum coetibus*

Initial reaction to *Anglicanorum coetibus* has ranged from those who see it as a generous offer, to those who perceive it as an attack upon the Church of England. The constitution has received a warm response from certain Christians of both Roman Catholic and Anglican denominations. Gianfranco Ghirlanda's official commentary from the Vatican website stresses that:

The enrichment is mutual: the faithful coming from Anglicanism and entering into full Catholic communion receive the richness of the spiritual, liturgical and pastoral tradition of the Latin Roman Church in order to integrate it into their own tradition, which integration will in itself enrich the Latin Roman Church.²

In turn, some Anglican Bishops have welcomed the move,³ considering it 'extremely generous ... What Rome has done is offer exactly what the Church of England has refused.'⁴ Other senior Anglican clergy perceive *Anglicanorum coetibus* as arising from the Pope's 'affection for Newman [and] the Anglican theological and liturgical traditions (the so-called "Anglican patrimony")' and that 'by offering Anglicans a distinct place, the Pope intends that qualities he

¹ <<http://www.zenit.org/article-27268?l=english>>

² <<http://www.zenit.org/article-27492?l=english>>

³ See report by Steve Doughty, 'Pope allows married Anglicans to become Catholic priests in bid to tempt them to defect', *Daily Mail*, 10 November, 2009: <<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/worldnews/article-1226449/Pope-allows-married-men-priests-bid-attract-Anglican-recruits.html>>

⁴ <http://www.forwardinfaith.com/artman/publish/article_497.shtml> Bishop of Fulham, John Broadhurst, 'A first reaction to today's publication *Anglicanorum coetibus*', 9 November 2009.

associates with the Anglican tradition should be a significant witness to the wider Church.”

However, many commentators have been quick to recognise the potential problems in the constitution, not least in that it has already ‘... put considerable strain on the fellowship of confessing Anglicans in the UK and Ireland, which is led by Conservative Evangelicals and has sought to include traditionalist Anglican Catholics, and it will divide further the latter group between those who become Roman Catholics and those who remain as Anglicans.’²

Moreover, the constitution has been compared with the 1928 encyclical *Mortalium Animos*, re-articulating the ancient Roman Catholic stance on unity, which ‘argued that the only road to Christian unity is for all to admit their errors and return to Rome ... formulated once more in the apostolic letter *Apostolicae Curae* of 1896 which declares Anglican orders “absolutely null and utterly void”.’³

The historical problem embedded in these extreme reactions is rooted in the Anglican Church’s identity as a ‘*via media* between Catholicism and Protestantism.’ However, the developments concerning women and homosexuality have brought into question ‘the nature and authority of the Church of England’.⁴

Of course, *Anglicanorum coetibus* does not seek to unite Anglicanism and Roman Catholicism, it is an exceptional provision, similar to the 1986 constitution *Spirituali Militum Cura*, which provided for those serving in the armed forces. The argument, from the Vatican, is that

the pastoral concern of the Church and the flexibility of her canonical norms permit the creation of juridical structures which are specifically

¹ Peter Doll, ‘What the Pope sees in Newman’, *Church Times*, 7669, 12 March 2010.

² Graham Kings, ‘The Pope’s Anglican Division’, *The Guardian*, Monday 9 November 2009.

³ Bill Franklin, ‘Vatican’s Apostolic Constitution Explained’, *Episcopal Life Online*, 9 November 2009:

<http://www.episcopal-life.org/80050_116538_ENG_HTM.htm>

⁴ Andrew Cole, ‘Swimming the Tiber: The Background, Provisions and Eventual Implementation of *Anglicanorum coetibus*’:

<http://www.thinkingfaith.org/articles/20091120_1.pdf>

adapted to the spiritual good of the faithful, while not contradicting the foundational principles of Catholic ecclesiology.¹

Whilst it may be true that such exceptional provision does not fundamentally change Catholic ecclesiology, it does raise questions of what it means to be distinctively Anglican. In her article, in this issue of *One in Christ*, Professor Evans concludes with a reference to the attempts of the “ecumenical agreements” with separated Eastern Churches during the fifteenth century, continuing the work of the Council of Florence, in each of which it is recorded that the representative of the separated Church has found himself able to accept the Roman position. They failed.² Continuing this reflection on the ecclesiology of the issue, it may help to explore the further lessons that can be learned from Ecclesiastical history, in particular attempts to reconcile Eastern and Western Churches from the Council of Florence in the fifteenth century. Indeed, ‘Whenever talk of ... union is in the air, the Council of Florence is certain to be mentioned.’³

The Council of Florence

The Council of Florence, called by Pope Eugenius IV in 1438, sought to address questions of unity between the Latin Western Church and the Greek Eastern Church. The Byzantine emperor John VIII Palaeologus, keen to associate himself with the Catholics due to the Turks advancing on Constantinople, agreed to attend with representatives of the Greek Church at a location where notions of union could be debated in the presence of the Pope and of the Latin council. Following the dissolution of the Council of Basel, a 700 strong Greek contingent arrived at Ferrara in April 1438 and the first session began with the Eastern Roman Emperor, the Patriarch of Constantinople and representatives of the Patriarchal Sees of Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem in attendance and Pope Eugenius presiding. These early sessions, lasting until July 1438, involved discussion of the issues surrounding the Great Schism: the processions of the Holy Spirit and the *filioque* clause in the Nicene Creed, Purgatory and Papal

¹ G. Ghirlanda, ‘The Significance ...’

² G.R. Evans, *Anglicanorum coetibus ... One in Christ*, 44/1 (2010), p.55 above.

³ Basil Popoff’s Introduction to Ivan N. Ostroumoff, *The History of the Council of Florence*, translated from the Russian 1847 edition, by Basil Popoff (Holy Transfiguration Monastery, Boston, Massachusetts, 1971), vii.

Primacy. Resuming in October 1438, in order to discuss the *filioque* clause, it became clear the Greek Church would never consent to the doctrine. Nevertheless, the Emperor continued to press for reconciliation.

On January 1439, the Council transferred to Florence and, in the following months, agreement was reached, in the decree *Laetentur caeli*, on the Western doctrine of Purgatory in the compromise that 'their souls are cleansed after death by cleansing fires' and on a doctrine of the papacy, which allowed the Pope 'full power of tending, ruling and governing the whole Church', but with the qualification 'according to the acts of ecumenical councils and sacred canons'.¹ On 6 June 1439 an agreement was signed by Patriarch Joseph II of Constantinople and all the Eastern bishops but one, Mark of Ephesus, who held that Rome continued in both heresy and schism. For a brief time, the Great Schism was over. However, after Patriarch Joseph II of Constantinople died only two days later, the Greeks insisted that ratification by the Eastern Church could be achieved only by the agreement of an Eastern synod.

Upon their return home, the Eastern bishops found their agreement with the West broadly rejected by the populace and by civil authorities (with the notable exception of the Emperors of the East who remained committed to union until the fall of the Byzantine Empire two decades later). The union signed at Florence, even down to the present, has never been accepted by the Eastern churches: 'Thus, the union of Churches proclaimed in Florence was, (a) undertaken without the Greeks being persuaded of the justice of the Latin doctrine; (b) was unlawfully brought to pass; and (c) very lawfully rejected.'²

Although the aim of the Council of Florence may have been 'the restoration of Christian unity ... which both Pope Eugenius IV and the council fathers at Basel repeatedly professed with great conviction',³

¹ N.P. Tanner, *The Councils of the Church: A Short History* (Crossroad, New York, 2001), 72.

² I.N. Ostroumoff, *The History of the Council of Florence*, translated from the Russian 1847 edition, by Basil Popoff (Holy Transfiguration Monastery, Boston, Massachusetts, 1971), 189.

³ J.W. Stieber, 'Christian Unity from the Perspective of the Council Fathers at Basel and that of Eugenius IV', in Giuseppe Alberigo (ed.), *Christian Unity:*

nevertheless, it appears that Pope Eugenius IV's motivation was to bring about 'acceptance of papal primacy in the universal Church ... by ordering [Basel] members to attend a council held in an Italian city that was politically allied with the pope.'¹ Thus 'the possibility of union with the Eastern Churches ... for him, meant above all, universal recognition of the primacy of the Roman See.'²

The Council of Florence, akin to Vatican II, strove to 'come to a mutually acceptable recognition of one another's ecclesial standing'.³ However, the problem involved in achieving this goal was Pope Eugenius's stance that 'the Greeks have left the mother Church and must return to her fold if the church is to be reunited.'⁴ Thus the Florentine debates prefigure modern ecumenical discussions in that mutually agreed and respected ecclesiology must be established before any consensus on doctrine can be reached. For 'ecclesial equality is difficult to define where the partners in dialogue are working with different conceptions of what a Church is ... it was unavoidable that the two sides should be sometimes at cross-purposes where they were unable to speak the same ecclesial language.'⁵

This problem has persisted through the centuries and the gesture of welcome offered in *Anglicanorum coetibus* belies a doctrinal history which fails to recognise other Christian ecclesiologies:

Roman ecumenism has often found it difficult to allay a paralyzing fear in its ecumenical partners, namely that when the Orthodox or Anglican Churches acknowledge Roman primacy in terms which are the maximum that they can truthfully grant, those terms will be for Rome a minimum, later to be amplified into centralised control and uncongenial uniformity.⁶

The Council of Ferrara-Florence, 1438/9-1989 (Leuven University Press, Leuven, 1991), pp. 57-74 [hereafter Stieber], here at p. 57.

¹ Stieber, 57-8.

² Stieber, 73.

³ G.R. Evans, 'The Council of Florence and the Problem of Ecclesial Identity' in Alberigo, pp. 177-185 [hereafter Evans, 'Council'], here at p. 177.

⁴ Evans, 'Council', p. 178 citing G. Hofmann (ed.), *Concilium Florentium. Documenta et Scriptores*, Rome, 1940-1977 (CF), I, 11.

⁵ Evans, 'Council', 184-5.

⁶ H. Chadwick, 'The Theological Ethos of the Council of Florence', in Alberigo, pp. 229-239 [hereafter Chadwick, 'Ethos'], 239.

Agreement was reached at Florence which was a brief reconciliation, with each side ready to blame the other if it did not work out. The Greeks accepted the agreement but changed their minds when they got home:

The most obvious characteristic shared in common by the anti-unionists on both sides in ecumenical conversation, whether at Florence or elsewhere, is that their interpretation of the past defines the limits of what is possible in the present.¹

Like Pope Eugenius IV's desire for unity, Pope Benedict's constitution highlights the gulf between Anglican and Roman Catholic doctrines, just as those between East and West (especially Papal primacy, purgatory and the *filioque* clause) were highlighted at Florence. Just as the Eastern Church could not be grafted onto the Roman Catholic one, due to its distinctive nature, so *Anglicanorum coetibus* can only produce further division in the Anglican Communion as another dissenting sect is created. The brief notional union between East and West in 1438 was superficial and failed to heal the Great Schism because, at Florence, the Eastern Church was given the opportunity to decide exactly what it believed and what it did not, therefore becoming more focussed in its distinctively Eastern identity, even if that identity was not fully formed. The Anglican Communion now has the opportunity to look again at its distinctive ecclesial nature. Indeed, the ecclesiological problem for Catholic Anglicans is very much alive today:

The problem is that there has been a basic acceptance of the Roman Catholic Church's definition of 'Catholic'. Since this has always involved a claim that other Churches are less Catholic, it becomes an interesting problem to accept the teaching and remain in another Church. One of the most interesting ways in which Anglican Catholics have done this is to regard the Church of England as an accidentally detached branch of the Catholic Church, which when the time is right will be re-grafted into its true parent ... It is of course somewhat tricky that the Roman Catholic Church has never regarded the Church of England in this light.²

¹ Chadwick, 'Ethos', 239.

² Jonathan Clark, *The Republic of Heaven: A Catholic-Anglican Future* (London: SPCK, 2008), 10.

Thus there is, among some Anglicans, confusion over ecclesiological allegiance, given the Church of England's historical stance between Protestantism and Catholicism. Within the Anglican Communion there exist the axes of Protestant and Catholic. It is the Anglican role of *via media* between these two traditions that gives the communion its distinctive ecclesiology and its catholicity. Anglicans of both Protestant and Catholic persuasions may have difficulties with recent doctrinal developments within the communion, but for Anglican Catholics to confuse their stance with Roman Catholicism is to make a fundamental error of ecclesiology and to deny their distinctive Anglican identity.

Conclusion

Although the Council of Florence was a much more ambitious project than *Anglicanorum coetibus*, aimed at the reconciliation of East and West and did not require the re-ordination of Greeks, nevertheless the adherents of the Union were a minority. Likewise, there may be a minority of Anglican adherents to *Anglicanorum coetibus*. But whatever the numbers, continued ecumenical work must be based upon a fundamental belief in Christian unity in order to limit the potential damage of the constitution for the Anglican Church:

Together with all Christians, Anglicans and Roman Catholics are called by God to continue to pursue the goal of complete communion of faith and sacramental life. This call we must obey until all come into the fullness of that Divine Presence.¹

Thereafter, serious thought and discussion is necessary, from Roman Catholics and Anglicans alike, as to what each ecclesiology means:

We all need now to ask the question 'is this what we want?' For some of us I suspect our bluff is called! This is both an exciting and dangerous time for Christianity in this country. Those who take up this offer will need to enter into negotiation with the Church of England about access to parish churches and many other matters. This situation must not be used to damage the Church of England but

¹ Quoted in 'Church as Communion: A Briefing paper from the Council for Christian Unity and the Faith and Order Advisory Group', published by the General Synod of the Church of England (Archbishops Council, 2009), 8.

I do believe we have a valid claim on our own heritage in history. ...
We will all need to meet and talk.¹

As in the Council of Florence, any move by the Roman Catholic Church which proposes a degree of unity on the basis of papal primacy is a conditional offer from one party to certain members of another to join on certain terms. Just as Pope Eugenius IV failed truly to acknowledge the ecclesial integrity of the Eastern Church, so Pope Benedict's advisors have failed to acknowledge the catholicity of the Anglican Church, allowing, in *Anglicanorum coetibus*, only some forms of Anglican worship in the ordinariate and making an offer that only appeals to the 'Catholic' members of the Anglican Communion and not those conservatives on the evangelical wings.

Thus, the constitution is, at best, a proposal to a few members of the Anglican Church, who might sign up to the canonical and doctrinal changes they would have to make. At worst, it is an anti-ecumenical move, which is at odds with the majority desire for the Anglican communion to remain unified in its catholicity. Those who confuse that catholicity with Roman Catholicism will find this offer attractive. Those who consider themselves both Catholic and Anglican, but not in communion with the Bishop of Rome, will surely see this constitution as of little effect.

The Anglican Communion needs to ask what are the fundamental features of its faith and identity. These are much bigger questions than can be answered by *Anglicanorum coetibus*, but they are, nevertheless, the questions raised by the constitution's existence. If the constitution proves more divisive than unifying, then at least its presence may have helped Catholic Anglicans think carefully about what they believe.

As for the immediate future of Anglican/Roman Catholic relations and the Papal visit to Britain this year, the final words must be reserved for the Archbishop of Canterbury himself:

[When *Anglicanorum coetibus* was announced] ... it felt a bit like different bits of the Vatican not quite knowing what other bits were doing and somebody's bright idea suddenly emerging into the light a bit prematurely. I don't think its going to be a big deal for the Church

¹ <http://www.forwardinfaith.com/artman/publish/article_497.shtml> Bishop of Fulham, John Broadhurst, 'A first reaction to today's publication *Anglicanorum coetibus*', 9 November 2009.

of England ... I think there will be a few people who will take advantage of it ... because they think they ought to be in communion with the bishop of Rome and, I can only say, fine – God bless them! I don't, at the moment, and so we proceed ... with, I hope, the level of mutual respect on that basis ... [In 2010] the Pope will be coming here to Lambeth Palace—we'll have the bishops together to meet him. I'm concerned that he has a chance to say what he wants to say in and to British society, that we welcome him as a valued partner—and that's about it!¹

¹ Rowan Williams, on *Start the Week*, BBC Radio 4, broadcast Monday 5 April 2010.

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN AND THE SANCTIFICATION OF AMBIVALENCE

Andrew Pierce *

John Henry Cardinal Newman has always perplexed his readers. His contemporaries wondered if Newman was a heretic or a saint. Since his death, the debate about Newman's real identity has continued unabated. On the threshold of Newman's beatification, this essay looks at Newman's life and work, and at the ways in which scholarly readers of Newman produce seemingly contradictory accounts of this potential saint. If canonized, which Newman has become a saint? Zygmunt Bauman's reading of ambivalence as the 'waste of modernity' suggests that a canonized Newman may yield less ordered notions of sanctity and devotion than anticipated.

In life, and since death, John Henry Cardinal Newman (1801-90) has displayed a consistently Janus-like capacity for dividing opinion. Based on an examination of the same range of evidence, Newman has been both lauded and derided, provoking the question of whether his mockers and promoters can possibly be referring to one and the same person. It is striking that many of the questions raised concerning Newman's identity tend to be configured in starkly dichotomous terms: was he a heretic or a saint? Proto-modernist or reactionary? Did he—or was it his contemporary Charles Darwin—who more properly deserved to be called the most dangerous man in England? Was he an ecumenist and prophet of Vatican II, or a reactionary and defender of Vatican I?

* Dr Andrew Pierce is Lecturer in Ecumenical Theology in the Irish School of Ecumenics, Trinity College Dublin, where he is co-ordinator of the MPhil Programme in Intercultural Theology & Interreligious Studies. His doctoral research concerned the Catholic modernist reception of the work of the French Reformed theologian, Auguste Sabatier. Recently his work is concerned with the connections—in late nineteenth and early twentieth-century theology—between modernism, ecumenism and so-called religious fundamentalism.

Interpreting Newman is thus a challenge: successive biographers have reached strikingly different perspectives on the Cardinal's life and work, and this situation shows no sign of being resolved. The Newmans of Ian Ker and Sheridan Gilley, for example, differ significantly from that of Frank Turner.¹ And, compared with Turner's Newman, the Newman to whom Cambridge University Press has provided a *Companion* appears as a model of sanctity and tranquility. And, sometimes running parallel to the continuing conflict over the interpretation of Newman, and sometimes exhibiting conflicts of its own making, has been the promotion of his cause for canonization. Inevitably, therefore, Newman's impending beatification—at Coventry Airport on 19 September 2010—raises once more the question concerning the identity of this increasingly-normative Newman. Which Newman faces possible canonization?

The question does not yield an easy answer: Janus faces in opposing directions at once. Securing an adequate point of view—a task for which Newman strove in his *Essay on Development*—becomes ever more complex as well as important. This paper proceeds on the assumption that, regardless of how Newman's readers view the case for his canonization, his complexity in both life and work is not something that can safely be compromised. The paper argues that the term best-suited to characterize Newman's complexity is that of 'ambivalence,' and that seeking to resolve his identity one way or the other is in fact to be guilty of a category error. The concept of ambivalence, as we shall see, has a particular power to resonate with late-modern readers of Newman.

This paper commences with a brief biographical overview of Newman, noting some of the faultlines between his interpreters, both during his lifetime and later on. A second section addresses the 'cloud' that Newman detected over his orthodoxy as a Catholic theologian in the years before he was made a Cardinal by Leo XIII. In a concluding discussion, indebted to recent work by Zygmunt Bauman, the third

¹ Ian Ker, *John Henry Newman* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988); Sheridan Gilley, *Newman and his Age* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1990); Frank M. Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002); Ian Ker and Terrence Merrigan, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to John Henry Newman* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

part of the essay argues for an explicit acknowledgment of Newman's ambivalence.

1. Newman and the Conflict of Interpretation

Newman's biographers are remarkably prone to significant disagreement among themselves. This is hardly surprising. One early response to Newman—and that from one of his followers—anticipates the head-scratching by many of Newman's later readers: 'John H. Newman is a queer man. Who can understand him?'¹ Newman struck his contemporaries, and has continued to impress successive generations of readers, as a source of conflicting responses.

Newman was born in 1801 and spent his childhood in a closely-knit and prosperous banking family. During his mid-teens—in the financial crisis following the Napoleonic wars—his father's bank failed (as did a later venture in running a brewery). This fall from economic grace formed the backdrop to Newman's conversion to—what he at any rate judged to be—Calvinist evangelicalism. As a boarding pupil at Ealing School, Newman came under the influence of one of the masters, the Revd Walter Mayers, who had himself only recently undergone a religious conversion experience. Under Mayers' guidance, Newman began to explore the tradition of Calvinism, and was especially helped by the autobiography of Thomas Scott, whom Newman describes in his *Apologia pro vita sua* as 'the writer who made a deeper impression on my mind than any other, and to whom (humanly speaking) I almost owe my soul.'² Scott's *The Force of Truth* charted its author's pilgrimage from an Unitarian position to a firmly dogmatic Trinitarian theology.

Yet, here biographers begin to part company in their assessment of Newman's religious roots, or at least in their assessment of Newman's understanding of his religious background. Newman's work—taken as a whole—betrays a curious and uneven understanding of

¹ T.W. Allies, writing in 1864; cited by Terence Merrigan, 'Newman the Theologian,' in Terence Merrigan, ed., *John Henry Cardinal Newman 1801-90* a special issue of *Louvain Studies* 15/2-3 (1990), 103-118; 103.

² John Henry Cardinal Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua & Six Sermons*, edited, annotated and with an Introduction by Frank M. Turner (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008), 134. The image of an 'impression' being left on the mind exemplifies Newman's indebtedness to John Locke's empirical psychology.

Protestantism; and, in this specific instance, his reconsideration of his youth and early adulthood is viewed—both by Newman and by many of his readers—through the tinted lenses of his much later *Apologia*. The devotional diet prescribed by Mayers seems to have been confined to English Reformed and evangelical writers, and to have bypassed Calvin himself and his followers on the European mainland. This restricted grasp of what Calvinism entailed remained with Newman throughout his life.

If the legacy of Calvin suffered at the hands of Newman, the term ‘Lutheran’ suffered worse indignities. Newman is astonishingly ill-informed about the Wittenburg Reformer, and relies on the term Lutheran as an almost intrinsically pejorative term. In this regard, interestingly, Newman echoes the rhetoric of Alexander Knox, the Irish-born forerunner of the Oxford movement, for whom—despite no obvious familiarity with either Luther or Lutheranism—the adjective functioned as a term of theological abuse.

In 1817 Newman began a lifetime’s love-affair with Oxford University. He entered Trinity College, where, despite his puritanically industrious personal regime, he fell apart psychologically in his final examinations, and graduated with a disappointing pass degree in 1820. These were stressful years for Newman: his father’s brewery failed and so Newman senior was forced to return to London to work as a pub landlord and John Henry Newman became increasingly conscious of his financial responsibility towards his younger siblings. In 1822, Newman began the fellowship examinations for Oriel College, a grueling process of oral and written examination. Newman was one of two new Fellows elected in 1822, and as a result he suddenly found himself moving in more exalted intellectual company than he had in Trinity. Newman’s years at Oriel coincided with an era of striking cultural achievement within the college—the Fellows were nicknamed the ‘Noetics’ and their common room, or so the rumour ran, ‘stank of logic’. There, Newman was a contemporary of John Keble, but initially the principal influence on Newman came from Richard Whately, who was given the task of building bridges between the withdrawn and silent new fellow and his more gregarious new colleagues.

At Oriel, Newman was exposed to influences ranging from Keble’s high churchmanship to Whately’s respect for a theological appeal to tradition viewed through a rationalist optic. This challenged Newman’s evangelical appeal to *sola scriptura*, and produced

important consequences for his emerging sense of the nexus between epistemology and ecclesiology. Perhaps the most vivid way to gauge Newman *in via* is through the collection of lectures that he published in 1843, *Sermons: Chiefly on the Theory of Religious Belief, Preached before the University of Oxford*.¹ Readers can sense the differing pressures to which Newman is responding, and the differing ways in which he locates and interprets the appropriate authority for this response over the course of fifteen addresses. The first sermon, delivered in 1826, is the sole representative in this collection of the preaching of Newman the evangelical; the next eight sermons were given before 1833, when Newman was a tutor at Oriel and was open to the rationalist influence of Whately; and finally six sermons given by Newman between 1836 and 1843, during his period as an Anglo-Catholic leader, including his famous sermon ‘The Theory of Developments in Religious Doctrine.’² This sermon anticipated the thrust of his 1845 work, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, though significantly the sermon appears more comfortable with organic models of development than does the *Essay*.³

In 1828 Newman was instituted as vicar of the parish of St Mary the Virgin, where his ministry began to impact on the wider public of the city of Oxford and on the students and fellows of other colleges. Matthew Arnold famously invokes his memory of Newman the priest:

Who could resist the charm of that spiritual apparition, gliding in the dim afternoon light through the aisles of St Mary’s, rising into the pulpit, and then in the most entrancing of voices, breaking the silence with words and thoughts which were religious music—subtle, sweet, mournful?⁴

¹ John Henry Newman, *Fifteen Sermons Preached Before the University of Oxford Between AD 1826 and AD 1843 in the Definitive third edition of 1872*, 1997; Introduction by Mary Katherine Tillman (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003).

² *Ibid.* 312-351.

³ John Henry Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, The edition of 1845, edited with an introduction by J.M.Cameron, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974.

⁴ Matthew Arnold, *Discourses in America*, cited by R.D. Middleton, ‘The Vicar of St Mary’s,’ in *John Henry Newman: Centenary Essays* (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1945), 127-138; 131.

But behind the serene spiritual apparition before Arnold and others, Newman was in turmoil. He was in conflict on various fronts; with the newly elected provost of Oriel, Edward Hawkins, over Newman's belief that as a tutor he was obliged to offer moral and pastoral, as well as academic, supervision to his tutees. More fundamentally, however, Newman was drifting away from the kind of liberalism with which he identified Hawkins. Newman's intellectual movement to date through evangelicalism to liberalism had ensured that Keble had kept his distance, but from the late 1820s onwards, they became aware that they were in fact kindred spirits (credit for this recognition of compatibility was claimed—with some justification—by Newman's close friend at Oriel, the brilliant, reactionary high churchman Hurrell Froude).

As Newman became estranged from Hawkins and closer to Froude, he became ever more immersed in a combination of reading the Church Fathers and engaging in high profile political debate. His Tory principles were scandalized when the Oxford MP Robert Peel withdrew his objection to Catholic Emancipation, resigned his parliamentary seat and sought re-election. Even sympathetic readers struggle to follow Newman's argument ('hardly coherent' is Gilley's verdict¹). Newman's turn both to the Church Fathers, and to Anglican high-church theology, calls for closer attention, because here again his interpreters diverge.

To what extent was Newman a Patristic scholar? And to what extent did he inhabit the concerns of traditional high church Anglicanism? No one doubts Newman's passionate engagement with the Church Fathers, and particularly with his theological pin-up Athanasius: his writings are liberally interspersed with examples from his favourite fathers (again, like Knox, he displays a fondness for the Greek fathers). But it is hard to escape the impression that Newman's energetic trawling of Patristic sources is motivated primarily by a desire to find support for cases that are being constructed on other grounds.² John T. McNeill refers to the emerging Tractarian leaders as 'not

¹ Gilley, *Newman and his Age*, 73.

² See the fascinating account in Benjamin J. King, *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers: Shaping Doctrine in Nineteenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

philosophers but crusaders',¹ emphasizing the belligerence with which Newman and his fellow crusaders approached both their opponents and their subject matter.

Newman's indebtedness to Anglican high-churchmanship is connected with his approach to Patristics. His 1837 defence of a distinctively Anglican ecclesiology, in *The Prophetical Office of the Church*, appealed to the Caroline Divines, and was dedicated to a contemporary interpreter of the tradition, M.J. Routh, Master of Magdalen College Oxford. These divines were thus not only *not* Reformers (a point of growing importance for Newman), but they were also deeply embedded in the literature of the primitive and undivided Church. The Caroline Divines and the Church Fathers formed a mutually reinforcing source of authority for Newman at this period.²

But how deeply was Newman indebted to this tradition? It was, in all probability, a late discovery for Newman; and he treated it with the same magpie-like approach with which he treated the Fathers—but, with the Carolines, the fascination lasted only as long as his *via media* apologetic for Anglicanism remained plausible to him, and this would not be for long. In 1979, Michael Ramsey warned readers of Newman's *Apologia* that it was 'highly selective,' and indicated one reason why this might be so: comparing Newman with his fellow Tractarians, Ramsey remarks, 'But in a sense he was not quite of it; that is, he had not quite gotten historic Anglicanism into his bones in the way that the others had, and he came to it rather as one who is fulfilling deep personal needs of his own.'³ Newman's *Apologia* plays down Newman's anti-Protestantism, and consequently plays-up his doomed efforts (precisely as doomed) to defend Anglicanism as a middle way between Roman corruption and Reformed excess.

Meanwhile, the Oxford Movement was taking shape. During travels to Italy and Sicily, Newman had received regular updates concerning

¹ John T. McNeill, 'Anglicanism on the Eve of the Oxford Movement,' in *Church History* 3:2 (1934), 95-114; 114.

² See the helpful discussion by Thomas M. Parker, 'The Rediscovery of the Fathers in the seventeenth-century Anglican tradition,' in John Coulson and A.M. Allchin, eds., *The Rediscovery of Newman: An Oxford Symposium* (London and Melbourne: Sheed and Ward; London: S.P.C.K., 1967), 31-49.

³ Michael Ramsey, *The Anglican Spirit*, edited by Dale Coleman (Cambridge MA.: Cowley Publications, 1991), 156 n.4; 60.

the plans of the Whig administration for the reform of the established Church of Ireland, and returned to Oxford with a clear idea of the kind of encircling gloom that he would face there. In retrospect, Newman viewed Keble's sermon on 14 July 1833, 'National Apostasy,' as the start of the Oxford Movement. Keble offered a prophetic denunciation of the reform of the Irish Church: the government had no business in the ordering of the divine society of the church. Bishops are successors to the apostles, therefore their sees are not to be suppressed for reasons of political expediency.

By late August 1833, three *Tracts for the Times* had begun to circulate (though these were dated September 1833). These polemical writings began to roll off the press—some short, some voluminous—assaulting both evangelical piety and high-and-dry Erastianism for their mutual collusion in the spread of liberalism and its instrumentalist approach to religion. Behind the heat of this polemic, Newman was shaping a new apologetic for the Church of England, an apologetic echoing the earlier work of John Wesley's Irish disciple, Alexander Knox. Roman Catholicism was corrupt; the reforms of Luther and Calvin had been excessive: where then was the Catholic Church of Christ to be found? The answer, according to Newman, was in the Reformed and Catholic Church of England, that branch of the Catholic Church in England that had resisted Roman corruption and Protestant excess. Yet, the Church of England was now in peril, as Newman interpreted the signs of his time; it had grown slipshod and casual about its participation in Christ's Catholic Church and no longer treasured the Catholic substance of its ministry and sacraments. Hence the *Tracts* directed Anglican readers back to a *via media* between Rome and Geneva, and they positively celebrated all aspects of the Anglican tradition that marked a difference with popular Protestantism.

The *Tracts* brought Newman to national attention as a tormented high church Tory, fulminating against the pernicious inroads of liberalism. And, in *The Tamworth Reading Room*, he rounded—yet again—on Robert Peel, whose published remarks at the opening of the non-denominationally controlled Reading Room seemed—to Newman at any rate—to embody the willingness of unprincipled, opportunistic secularism to lay claim to tradition whilst evacuating it of traditional content. The original articles attacking Peel in *The Times* of London in 1841 were signed 'Catholicus.' Events in the early 1840s

would make clear to Catholicus that the contemporary Church of England was not prepared to go beyond a certain point in articulating its sense of its own Catholicity. The key episode concerned Newman's *Tract 90*, in 1841.

Tract 90 did not emerge out of the blue. Newman's close friend Hurrell Froude had died in 1836, and Newman considered himself 'widowed' by this cruel loss. Along with John Keble, Newman edited and published Froude's literary *Remains* in four volumes (1838-39). The reaction to Froude's *Remains* anticipated the storm over *Tract 90*: even hitherto sympathetic high-churchmen were scandalized by Froude's hostility to both the Reformation and the Reformers, and by his personal asceticism which was considered 'monkish'; they might have been high-churchmen and conscious of Anglican Catholicity, but they were no less convinced that the Church of England was also Protestant. For the Protestant and Evangelical critics of the Oxford Movement, the *Remains* provided a clear public declaration of Newman and company's true colours.

The task facing Newman in *Tract 90* was that of providing a Catholic interpretation of the Church of England's Reformed dimensions. Protestants appealed to the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England to demonstrate that—clearly—the Church of England was a Protestant Church. Newman therefore needed to show that clergy who affirmed the Thirty-Nine Articles were not denying the Catholicity of the Church of England. Concentrating on only fourteen of the articles, it appeared to many of his more critical readers that Newman's reading of the articles robbed them of what they were plainly asserting. The Church of England, through Newman's local bishop in Oxford, made it clear that its claim to Catholicity could do without Newman's defence. The *Tracts* were discontinued, and Newman resigned his college living.

In retrospect the outraged reaction to *Tract 90* is perplexing. Newman did not anticipate clamour on this scale: he was not the first and nor would he be the last Anglican high churchman to read the Thirty-Nine Articles against their Protestant grain. That the fallout was so momentous is probably a result of the ripples spread by the scandal caused by the publication of Froude's *Remains*. Readers of Froude suspected that Tractarian appeals to Catholicity were less concerned with reawakening the tradition of Laud, Andrewes and Taylor, and were instead animated by an alien principle that was both

anti-Protestant and pro-Roman. *Tract 90* did not strike such readers as traditional high church apologetic, but as an attempt to halt overheated Oxford movement supporters from heading to Rome.

Newman's Anglicanism was dying. A variety of events conspired to persuade Newman that the Church of England was no longer even trying to be Catholic. He withdrew to Littlemore, not far from his beloved Oxford, and began to live a common life of study and devotion with a number of his followers.

It was at Littlemore that Newman wrote his *Essay on the Development of Doctrine* (1845), during the course of his conversion to Roman Catholicism. This book—and with it Newman himself—confronts the question: where is the true church to be found since, historically, its continued existence is 'antedecedently probable?' Newman's account of development relied on this notion of antecedent probability, by which he meant—to put matters crudely—an historically responsible assumption. What kinds of future development might an historian legitimately expect from an idea over the course of history? Theologically, the answer was highly-charged, with a Catholic historical imagination preferring to anticipate continuity of identity over against the more characteristically Protestant option for historical discontinuity. For Newman, seeking a point of view on the Church's history as a whole, continuity was—historically—antedecedently more probable than its alternative. Thus the true Church is more likely to remain in existence, than to have petered out sometime before the Reformation: so, where is it? If, say, St Athanasius, were to walk again on earth, where would he find the true church? Protestantism was not a contender: it had, according to Newman, despaired of history and sought a new beginning on more than one occasion. Anglicanism had tried to be a middle way, but in the debates of the Patristic period the middle way had been the strategy of the heretics, whereas the true Church had always espoused a more extreme position. Only one Church now claimed to be the one true (and 'antedecedently probable' one and true) church, namely the Church of Rome. Newman's argument is aimed at his fellow Tractarians, urging them to see prolonged historical continuity as Rome's great asset, rather than as an inexhaustible source of infidelity and corruption as Anglican and Protestant apologetic tended to stress. The argument of the *Essay* owes much to Bishop Joseph Butler—arguing *ad hominem* that if one sought guidance from the Church

Fathers, then one could not stop at an Anglican *via media*. The choice was not between Rome, Canterbury and Geneva; the choice was between unbelief and Rome: 'time is short, eternity is long,' Newman concluded—a great deal depended on the choice taken.

Having been received into the Roman Catholic Church on 8 October 1845, Newman left Littlemore for Old Oscott College, which was put at the disposal of Newman and other Oxford converts by Nicholas Wiseman, by then President of New Oscott. Late in 1846 he set off for Rome to begin training for ordination.

Whilst his conversion had brought Newman a degree of security his career as a Roman Catholic was every bit as controversial as his later Anglican years had been. He returned to England and with some of his convert-friends founded the Birmingham Oratory of St Philip Neri. In the 1850s he underwent the trauma of the Achilli trial, in which, despite the outcome (a fine of one hundred pounds), his reputation had once more been tarnished in the eyes of society. He was invited to Dublin by Archbishop Paul Cullen to become Rector of a new Catholic University, and although this experience provided the opportunity for writing *The Idea of a University*, his time in Dublin brought Newman considerable frustration, particularly in his dealings with Cardinal Cullen. His resignation as Rector in November 1858 brought Newman relief; and he looked forward to having the time to spend on writing a substantial piece of apologetics.

Instead of apologetics, however, Newman took over the editorial responsibilities of Lord Acton's periodical *The Rambler*, and ran foul of Bishop Brown and a conservative theologian from Oscott, delightfully dubbed by John Coulson 'the fire-eating Dr Gillow.'" This episode immediately preceded Newman's controversy with the novelist and clergyman Charles Kingsley, following an article by Kingsley in *Macmillan's Magazine*, for January 1864, in which he claimed that Newman—and all Catholic priests with him—viewed truth in entirely strategic terms. This called forth Newman's *Apologia pro vita sua*, which, as a piece of apologetic, succeeded brilliantly in portraying Newman as man of the highest integrity, whose good name and whose

¹ John Henry Newman, *On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine*, edited by John Coulson, foreword by Derek Worlock, Archbishop of Liverpool (1859; 1961; Glasgow: Collins, 1986), 37.

life's work had been travestied by Kingsley in a brutally casual manner.

Yet, as Ramsey warned, the *Apologia* requires careful reading. It has, moreover, set the agenda for later interpreters to a marked extent. Partly the nature of a conversion narrative is to blame; the subject moves in a definite direction (rendered more definite in retrospect), out of shadows and into a greater reality, stressing the gulf between pre- and post-conversion realities. In Newman's case, however, by so comprehensively pulling out the moral rug from under Kingsley's feet, Newman positioned himself in his own narrative as a martyr for the sake of truth, and rendered himself all but immune from criticism. Frank Turner's recent work usefully reminds readers of Newman that a refutation of Kingsley was one thing; but providing an adequate *theological* account of Newman's life to date was a rather different task. The former task was relatively easy to accomplish; the jury of biographers do not agree that Newman accomplished the latter.

By 1870 Newman had finally found the time to write his apologetical masterpiece, *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent*, a complex work that—bizarrely, given its dense and difficult subject-matter—sold out on its first day in print. Published just before Vatican I ended prematurely, what is perhaps most striking to Newman's readers—then and now—is how this work simply ignores contemporary neo-scholastic philosophy (and particularly neo-scholastic apologetics) in its distinction between real and notional assent and its stress on the need to secure imaginative assent before looking towards the securing of cognitive assent. Within a decade, neo-Thomistic scholasticism would become the normative framework for Catholic theology and philosophy (*and* for accounting for relations between the disciplines) as a result of Leo XIII's encyclical *Aeterni Patris*. Later non-scholastics (and anti-scholastics) would find apologetics a far more dangerous arena than did Newman's *Grammar*.

But it was dangerous territory, nevertheless. In 1878 Leo XIII replaced Pius IX, and set about making Newman a cardinal, but the pope's plans nearly came unstuck as a result of scheming by Cardinal Manning. Manning—like Newman, a convert to Rome—was identified with a maximalist interpretation of Vatican I's teaching on papal infallibility, and was not at all persuaded of Newman's orthodoxy. Newman's bishop, W.B. Ullathorne, however, was able to monitor Manning's intrigues, and in May 1879 Newman received the *biglietto*

and, in his speech, described his life in terms of a sustained conflict with liberalism—defined by Newman as the anti-dogmatic principle in religion. When news of his impending red hat had finally reached Birmingham, Newman told his Oratorians, ‘The cloud is lifted from me forever.’

Newman’s sense of himself as an anti-liberal crusader calls for further comment. As Owen Chadwick has noted, this works only because of Newman’s idiosyncratic notion of liberalism: what he called liberalism, no one else did. Indeed, many considered Newman to be precisely a proponent of what he claimed to be campaigning against. George Tyrrell remarks, with some disappointment, ‘Newman was a reactionary for the Noetics, a progressive for the Ultramontanists. Of the two the Noetics were nearer the mark.’¹ But, writing in 1909, Tyrrell would say that, wouldn’t he? Liberal and conservative are relative terms, and each must be used with care—if at all—and with a careful eye on context.

Even the briefest account of Newman’s life and work, therefore, highlights areas where Newman appears to face in different directions depending on the commentator consulted. Was he someone who understood—and who was therefore in a position to criticize—classic and contemporary forms of Protestantism? Or had he formed an eccentric attachment to a revivalist form of Protestantism, which—lacking the theological depth of, say, the Wesleys—was unable to nourish him over a sustained period. Or, what of Patristics? Did Newman know his way around the field as a scholar, or was he—in McNeill’s term—simply ‘a crusader,’ with an eye open for a handy weapon as he explored the Church Fathers? How well did he grasp the tradition of Anglican High Churchmanship? Did Newman understand this strand in Anglican identity, or is Ramsey right to see something superficial in Newman’s grasp of the Caroline inheritance? And what is the best way of balancing Newman’s expressed hostility to Liberalism on the one hand, with the belief of many commentators that the Cardinal’s opposition relied upon a fairly precious definition on the other?

¹ George Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Crossroads* (London: Longmans and Co, 1909), 4.

2. Concerning the cloud

Newman's uncharacteristically optimistic belief that being made a Cardinal removed 'for ever' the cloud that had hung over him, confirms that it is not only later readers that face the problem of interpreting Newman, but Newman faced the same problems himself. Was he a heretic, or was he potentially a saint? Referring to the recurrent allegation that his viewpoint was less than orthodox, Newman tends to speak in terms that diminish his own agency: a cloud hangs over him until finally it is banished by ecclesiastical *fiat*. As we shall see, however, this emphasis on passivity contrasts with Newman's theological activities, indicating that far from being the victim of a marauding cloud, Newman was self-consciously performing ecclesiastical and theological rain dances. The cloud did not come unbidden.

Newman summoned his cloud on two occasions during his own lifetime, and it returned shortly after his death in 1890 and haunted his reputation until the 1960s. Each of these episodes was characterized by an imaginative clash between neo-scholasticism's static concept of doctrinally revealed truth (which could 'develop' only by drawing out logical implications), and Newman's more dynamic sense of development.

Following his conversion, and during his preparation for ordination in Rome in the late 1840s, Newman campaigned energetically to ensure that his *Essay on Development* escaped condemnation. He succeeded, with the strange support of the uncomprehending but sympathetic Jesuit theologian, Giovanni Perrone. Later, in July 1859, Newman published his article 'On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine,' which was delated to the Holy See by Bishop Brown of Newport as evidence of Newman's heretical views. Newman had returned—deliberately—to contentious matters, and he no-less deliberately sought to defend himself. Finally, in the early twentieth century anti-Modernist campaign, spear-headed by Pope Pius X, the proximity between Newman's notion of doctrinal development and the notion of doctrinal evolution attributed to the Modernists in the encyclical *Pascendi* (1907) ensured that Newman's cloud remained inextricably linked with the modernist crisis. One reason why the cloud attached itself to Newman's doctrinal development is suggested by Timothy McCarthy, who has argued that *Pascendi's* accusation of 'doctrinal evolution' was the encyclical's most serious allegation

against the heresy of modernism. Whilst this is open to debate, McCarthy is surely correct to note that doctrinal evolutionism was a point at which Modernism 'aroused the greatest opposition from the traditionalists'.¹ Newman's name was thus associated with a worrying doctrinal flashpoint. Newman, moreover, was at pains to ensure that his name kept dangerous company.

It may be helpful to look in greater detail at the first of these episodes, concerning the immediate after effects of Newman's *Essay on Development*. Frank Turner makes the startling—but excessive—claim that 'this remarkable book had little effect at the time among either Anglicans or Roman Catholics.'² For now, the wider impact of the *Essay* can be left to one side; here our concern is with Newman's action to protect his *Essay*.³ Newman was worried that his *Essay* would be misunderstood: by the time that Newman had arrived in Rome his fears appeared to have been justified. In Boston, Orestes Brownson had attacked the *Essay* as heretical, and in doing so had attracted support from his bishop. And in Rome itself, Dr Alexander Grant had made similar accusations against the *Essay*. Although Brownson seemed to think that the *Essay* was already a decade in print—and was therefore a 'Protestant' work—its controversial point for Newman was that his *Essay* and his becoming a Roman Catholic were intimately connected, both chronologically and thematically. If his *Essay* were to be condemned, then the grounds for Newman's decision to convert would appear questionable.

In order to head off this difficulty, Newman tried to garner support from Roman theologians. The three leading lights at the time were the Jesuits Carlo Passaglia, Giacomo Mazio and Giovanni Perrone; Passaglia—a Patristics expert—proved hostile to the *Essay*, Mazio was sympathetic to the author, but was a canon lawyer rather than a doctrinal theologian. And so, by 1847, when Newman approached Perrone, he had grown pessimistic. Indeed, the fallout from the

¹ Timothy G. McCarthy, *The Catholic Tradition: Before and After Vatican II 1878-1993* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1994), 53.

² Turner, 'Editor's Introduction,' in Newman, *Apologia*, 28.

³ On the impact of Newman's *Essay*, see Owen Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman: The Idea of Doctrinal Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 1957.

controversy over his *Essay* had led Newman to abandon his plans for a Catholic college in England.

The result of their encounter is an intriguing document. Newman provided a Latin précis of his thesis in the *Essay—De Catholici Dogmatis Evolutione*—to which Perrone responded.¹ Two recent commentators on this text have interpreted Perrone's comments as being largely positive. Gerard McCarren states that 'Perrone's marginal comments suggested general acceptance of Newman's theology.' And, James Gaffney, in his editorial comment on the text, notes that 'Perrone read the work sympathetically and perceptively and criticized it with amiable candor.' Gaffney acknowledges 'some sharp note of disagreement,' but suggests that, since these are 'concentrated at the beginning of the chapter ... it may be that continued reading proved reassuring about initial reservations.'² But this judgement would seem to be altogether far-fetched to Owen Chadwick, according to whom, 'Perrone laconically but flatly denied Newman's thesis.'³

The water is further muddied by Newman's genius for combining friendship with mutual theological incomprehension. Perrone approved of Newman's conclusions, and liked him as a person, but his comments also indicate complete bafflement at how those conclusions were reached. There is a palpable weariness in Perrone's final synopsis of his own position vis-à-vis that of Newman:

My comments can be summarized by the following propositions: First, the Church was always conscious of all the truths of faith divinely entrusted to her. Second, this deposit was entrusted whole and entire to that same Church. Third, truths of faith are not in themselves capable of growth, but only of being expounded more explicitly. Fourth, as a result, those truths do not grow materially, to use the scholastic expression, or in themselves, but only in relation to our greater awareness or more distinct knowledge of them by means of

¹ T. Lynch, ed., 'The Newman-Perrone Paper on Development,' in *Gregorianum: De Re Theologica Et Philosophica*, XVI (1935) 402-447.

² Gerard H. McCarren, 'Development of Doctrine,' in Ker and Merrigan, eds., *Newman Companion*, 118-136; 129 and James Gaffney, 'Introduction,' in John Henry Newman, *Roman Catholic Writings on Doctrinal Development*, edited with Translation and Commentary by James Gaffney (Kansas City: Sheed & Ward, 1997), 4-9; 4,8.

³ Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, 182.

ecclesiastical definition, not, as they say, with respect to them, but only with respect to us.¹

Paradigms rarely clash any louder.

In a letter attached to the précis of the *Essay*, Newman wrote to Perrone:

I hope I have not fallen into error. Still, with this kind of material it is much easier to hope than to be sure. I shall only declare, most emphatically, that although 'I may err, I have no wish to be a heretic.'²

Newman knew that he stood on dangerous ground, but he knew also that he was obliged to stand there given his strong personal identification with the *Essay*.

3. Concerning Ambivalence

This essay has highlighted the extent to which Newman has consistently provoked controversy—often between proponents of dichotomous judgements on his life and work. Even those who are sympathetic to aspects of Newman's career, or who are willing to acknowledge—sympathetically or not—his importance for religious thought in the nineteenth century and in present discussions, the sympathy and/or acknowledgement are often qualified. An excellent example of this is Baron Friedrich von Hügel, who readily acknowledged the profound influence of Newman on his own life and work. And yet, despite his admiration for Newman, the Baron was of the view that whilst Newman might possibly be beatified, a flaw prevented his canonization. The flaw? Newman's lack of joy. In typically tortured prose, von Hügel writes:

[The] love of God, where uninhibited and full, brings Joy—it seeks God, Joy; and it finds Joy, God. I used to wonder, in my intercourse with John Henry Newman, how one so good, and who had made so many sacrifices to God, could be so depressing.³

¹ Newman, *Roman Catholic Writings on Doctrinal Development*, 54-5.

² *Ibid.* 9.

³ Baron Friedrich von Hügel, *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion*, Second Series (London and Toronto: J.M.Dent; New York: E.P. Dutton, 1926), 242.

Perhaps, the Baron muses, the late Cardinal never really outgrew his Puritan and predestinarian training? Admiration and sharp criticism together mark von Hügel's judgement on Newman.¹

Standard dictionary definitions of 'ambivalence' take inspiration from its Latin etymology, *ambi* and *valentia*, to yield a meaning of the coexistence in one person of contradictory emotions or attitudes towards something or someone. It is not, therefore, the same phenomenon as 'ambiguity,' with which it is often confused—ambiguity suggests a current uncertainty of outcome, but an outcome of some sort is nonetheless envisaged. Linguistically, the term is modern. It was coined first, in German, in 1910 by a Swiss writer as *ambivalenz*, and during the 1920s it moved into the Anglophone world via the discipline of psychology. By the late 1920s 'ambivalence' had migrated from psychology to other cultural and academic spheres.

Over time, meanings change. It is significant, however, that the emergence of this diagnostic term coincides with a range of crises in modernity, ranging from the specifically theological anti-modernisms of Catholic integralism and Protestant Barthianism, to the wider post-war crisis in European culture. In *Modernity and Ambivalence*, the sociologist Zygmunt Bauman offers a suggestive account of the interconnections between modernity and the phenomenon of ambivalence.² Modernity mounts a 'quest' to categorize and order every aspect of reality; it seeks to extirpate chaos. Yet this undertaking is doomed to fail. Chaos and order are bound together, as Baumann observes:

But the negativity of chaos is a product of order's self-constitution: its side-effect, its waste, and yet the condition *sine qua non* of its (reflective) possibility. Without the negativity of chaos, there is no possibility of order; without chaos, no order.³

This inherently unstable concept of ambivalence resonates well with our attempts to interpret Newman and his interpreters to date. In one

¹ See some rather sharp remarks in a letter to the Abbé Albert Houtin in 1903, Baron Friedrich von Hügel, *Selected Letters 1896-1924*, edited with a memoir by Bernard Holland (London and Toronto: J.M.Dent; New York: E.P.Dutton, 1927), 121-124;122.

² Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and Ambivalence* (Oxford: Polity, 1991). See especially chapter 1, 'The scandal of ambivalence,' 18-52.

³ *Ibid.* 7.

sense, referring to Newman as an ambivalent figure says little beyond saying there is no 'final' solution to Newman's identity: he may well be called Venerable, but that does not banish the legacy of his recurrent cloud. Nor should it. For an age rich in unwanted ambivalence, Newman's capacity to embody and express modernity's ambivalence may offer new interpretative possibilities—and limitations—for our current notions of sanctity.

ONENESS AND TRINITARIAN PENTECOSTALISM: CRITICAL DIALOGUE ON THE ECUMENICAL CREEDS

Wolfgang Vondey*

The oneness-trinitarian Pentecostal dialogue illustrates the contemporary crisis of creedal theology. The creedal formulations are in content acceptable to both trinitarian and oneness thinking but remain irreconcilable in structure. The path to reconciliation leads to a reformulation of the doctrine of God that replaces the existing creedal structure of three distinct articles with a narrative formulation that holds together in an affectionate story christology and pneumatology as joint aspects of the activity of the Father. Central to this profession of faith 'without articles' is the human being as a vital element without which the story of God cannot be told.

Creedal theology in the late modern world is in a crisis. Twentieth century theology, in particular, has lamented the widespread disconnect of the formulation of Christian doctrine in the ancient creeds from the ecumenical life of today's churches. The single most dividing issue, and the most dominant and persistent problem of ecumenical reconciliation, has been the conflict on the precise formulation of trinitarian doctrine exemplified in the controversy over the addition of the *filioque* clause to the Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed.¹ In this essay, I suggest that the impact of this crisis is

* Wolfgang Vondey is Director of the Center for Renewal Studies and Associate Professor of Systematic Theology at the Regent University School of Divinity. He is the founding chair of the ecumenical studies group in the Society for Pentecostal Studies, currently the only organized ecumenical think tank among Pentecostals. Among his recent publications is *Beyond Pentecostalism: The Crisis of Global Christianity and the Renewal of the Theological Agenda* and *Pentecostalism and Christian Unity: Ecumenical Documents and Critical Assessments*.

¹ For the ecumenical discussion see 'The *Filioque*: A Church-dividing Issue? An Agreed Statement of the North American Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation,' *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 48, no. 1 (2004) 93-123; Bernd Oberdorfer, *Filioque: Geschichte und Theologie eines ökumenischen Problems* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001); Pontifical Council for

illustrated with particular clarity in the divisions of oneness and trinitarian Pentecostals and the recent oneness-trinitarian Pentecostal dialogue.¹ My goal is to illuminate the challenges and opportunities of the creedal affirmations from viewpoint of the history and doctrine of early Pentecostal theology.² This goal does not aim at justifying oneness Pentecostal doctrine but at integrating it into an ecumenical analysis of the ecumenical crisis of creedal theology. This intention is admittedly carried out from my own commitment to trinitarian thought. My intention is not an assimilation of the two positions but an analysis of the oneness Pentecostal critique of creedal theology in order to critically evaluate the continuing task of the ecumenical traditions to formulate Christian doctrine.

This intention may be surprising in light of the fact that the rejection of ecumenical creeds is a well-known trademark of early Pentecostal history in North America. The doctrines, rituals, and creedal statements of the church presented for Pentecostals generally an often insurmountable obstacle to spiritual freedom and the realization of the priesthood of all believers. Pentecostal pioneers

Promoting Christian Unity, ed., 'The Greek and Latin Traditions Regarding the Procession of the Holy Spirit,' *L'Osservatore Romano* (Weekly Edition in English) 38 (20 September 1995), 3, 6; World Council of Churches, ed., *Spirit of God, Spirit of Christ: Ecumenical Reflections on the Filioque Controversy*, Faith and Order Paper 103 (Geneva: WCC, 1981).

¹ For a larger treatment of the theological issues involved see Wolfgang Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism: The Crisis of Global Christianity and the Renewal of the Theological Agenda*, Pentecostal Manifestos 3 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 78-108. On the ecumenical implications of Pentecostal thought and praxis, see Wolfgang Vondey (ed.), *Pentecostalism and Christian Unity: Ecumenical Documents and Critical Assessments* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2010).

² See the 'Oneness-Trinitarian Pentecostal Final Report, 2002-2007,' *Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 30, no. 2 (2008): 203-24. On the history of Oneness Pentecostalism see David A. Reed, 'In Jesus' Name': *The History and Beliefs of Oneness Pentecostals*, Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement 31 (Blandford Forum: Deo, 2008); Daniel L. Butler, *Oneness Pentecostalism: A History of the Jesus Name Movement* (Bellflower: International Pentecostal Church, 2004); Talmadge L. French, *Our God Is One: The Story of the Oneness Pentecostals* (Indianapolis: Voice & Vision, 1999); Arthur L. Clanton, *United We Stand: A History of Oneness Organizations* (Hazelwood: Pentecostal Publishing House, 1970).

boasted in having ‘no creeds, rituals, or articles of faith,’¹ and no creed but Christ or the Bible. Few Pentecostals, however, have voiced concrete doctrinal grounds for their rejection beyond concerns about the institutionalization of church structure and the formalization of doctrine at the cost of practical ministry.² Most classical Pentecostals do not reject the content of the Apostles’, the Nicene, or the Athanasian creedal confessions and have little concerns using the ecumenical creeds to support their own beliefs. The stereotype that the rejection of creeds forms the basis for a broader rejection of ecumenical unity among classical Pentecostals can therefore not be sustained.

A fundamental concern among early Pentecostals was not the doctrine or wording of the creeds but their ecclesiological significance. Creeds were seen as destructive to the life of the church and synonymous with ‘isms’ and ‘schisms’³ among God’s people. Replacing God’s law of unity with ‘men-made creeds’,⁴ the council of Nicaea was made primarily responsible for the initial disruption of the Christian fellowship. The challenge to adhere to the creedal proclamation of faith confronted first-generation classical Pentecostals with the ecumenical ecclesiology that was fundamental to their own movement. Pentecostals saw the creeds as ecumenical fences, a ‘test of fellowship’⁵ in opposition to the ‘unity of the Spirit,’⁶ separating the faithful from one another. In this sense, it did not matter whether the creedal statements were true or false, since they broke the law of love and unity. This separation was often experienced

¹ A. J. Tomlinson, ‘Great Crisis Near at Hand,’ *Evening Light and Church of God Evangel*, 1 October 1910, 1; A. S. Copley, ‘Pentecost in Type,’ *The Pentecost* 1, no. 9 (August 1909): 8.

² See Gerald T. Sheppard, ‘The Nicene Creed, Filioque, and Pentecostal Movements in the United States,’ *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 31, no. 3-4 (1986): 401-16.

³ T. K. Leonard, ‘Prayer—As Taught by Jesus,’ *Christian Evangel* 50 (July 18, 1914): 1.

⁴ R. G. Spurling, *The Lost Link* (Turtletown: np, 1920), 16; *Book of Minutes: A Compiled History of the Work of the General Assemblies of the Church of God* (Cleveland: Church of God Publishing House, 1922), 163-64.

⁵ E. N. Bell, ‘Questions and Answers,’ *Weekly Evangel* 152 (August 12, 1916): 8.

⁶ W. Jethro Walthall, ‘The Unity of the Spirit,’ *Weekly Evangel* 153 (August 19, 1916): 12. See also Spurling, *The Lost Link*, 23-26.

among Pentecostals in the harsh reality of persecution at the hands of the established churches.¹ Ecclesiological and ecumenical concerns governed much of the Pentecostal hostility toward the adherence to creedal formulations. The birth of oneness Pentecostalism and the rise of the so-called 'new issue' in 1914 illustrates these challenges with particular clarity. I therefore begin with an overview of the rise of the oneness-trinitarian debate among Pentecostals and its relation to the formulations of creedal theology. This largely phenomenological introduction highlights the central concerns of the ecumenical divisions and leads to a theological analysis of the current impasse in the conversation and its potential contributions to the future of creedal affirmations among the established Christian traditions.

Oneness Pentecostalism and the Creed

The oneness-trinitarian controversy, immediately labeled the 'new issue' among the rapidly solidifying Pentecostal movements, arose from the liturgical context of classical Pentecostalism in the early second decade of the twentieth century. It marked the first theological issue that led to a major division among Pentecostals into oneness and trinitarian camps. The emphasis on the liturgical origins of the debate is important on at least two levels. First, the debate emerged amidst the widely attended camp meetings that shaped the early Pentecostal liturgy and the cultural and ecclesiastical diversity of classical Pentecostalism.² Second, the debate on the new issue emerged in the explicit context of the administration of water baptism, the understanding of the baptismal mode, and the question of the correct baptismal formula.³ The origins of oneness Pentecostal doctrine mirror the liturgical seedbed of the creeds.

¹ Cf. Dale M. Coulter, 'The Development of Ecclesiology in the Church of God (Cleveland): A Forgotten Contribution?' *Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 29, no. 1 (2007): 64-67.

² Cf. Joseph H. Howell, 'The People of the Name: Oneness Pentecostalism in the United States,' (Ph.D. diss., Florida State University, 1985), 26-30. See also Wolfgang Vondey, 'The Making of an American Liturgy: Pentecostal Worship from African Slave Narratives to Urban Cityscapes,' *Religion and American Culture* (2011): forthcoming.

³ See French, *Our God Is One*, 57-58; Howell, 'The People of the Name,' 30-31; Clanton, *United We Stand*, 13-16.

Unlike most trinitarian Pentecostals, oneness Pentecostals understand conversion as reflected in Acts 2:38 to comprise repentance, water baptism, and baptism in the Spirit, and the liturgical practices of oneness congregations typically include opportunities for all three activities.¹ Water baptism 'for the remission of sin' obtained an essential role in the order of salvation and in the theological reflection of early oneness teaching.² Moreover, most early Pentecostals embraced William H. Durham's teaching of the 'finished work of Calvary,' which rejected the idea of sanctification as a second crisis separate from salvation and instead ascribed to the full efficacy of Christ's death that finds its application in one inseparable event of conversion (see chapter 2).³ The 'finished work' theology concentrated the *ordo salutis* essentially in one experience which was identified by oneness Pentecostals with Christian initiation.⁴ Hence, the recent oneness-trinitarian Pentecostal dialogue (2002-2007) acknowledged 'that the struggle over the biblical formula for baptism and, ultimately, the meaning of baptism, initiated historically our divisions as oneness and trinitarian Pentecostal churches,'⁵ and granted the topic of baptism primacy in the dialogue toward reconciliation.

At the heart of the historical debate about Christian initiation stood the reconciliation of the triadic baptismal formula in Matthew 28:19 with the apostolic practice of baptism in the name of Jesus, as recorded in Acts 2:38 and elsewhere.⁶ The discussion inquired about

¹ See Thomas A. Fudge, *Christianity without the Cross: A History of Salvation in Oneness Pentecostalism* (Parkland, FL: Universal Publishers, 2003), 150-64; David K. Bernard, "'The Whole Gospel": Oneness Pentecostal Perspectives on Christian Initiation,' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the SPS, 2001, 449-68.

² See Gregory A. Boyd, *Oneness Pentecostals and the Trinity* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992), 131-46.

³ Cf. French, *Our God Is One*, 48-50; Fudge, *Christianity without the Cross*, 58-59; Douglas Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit: Theologies of the Early Pentecostal Movement* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003), 136-64; D. William Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel: The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought*, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement* 10 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996), 270-306.

⁴ See Reed, 'In Jesus' Name,' 83-105.

⁵ 'Oneness-Trinitarian Pentecostal Final Report, 2002-2007,' no. 18.

⁶ See David Reed, 'Aspects of the Origins of Oneness Pentecostalism,' in *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan (Plainfield:

the 'correct' paradigm of water baptism in the church, a task typically seen among early classical Pentecostals as identifying the 'biblical' paradigm in the New Testament. In its doctrinal concerns, the debate questioned which baptismal formula should be used in the movement that saw itself as restoring the apostolic life. The consequences of this debate did not immediately emerge as trinitarian questions but unfolded on the basis of a distinction in liturgical praxis between the single name of Jesus and the three titles 'Father,' 'Son,' and 'Holy Spirit.' In this context, the triadic structure of the creed emerged as a dividing line between adherents of the oneness and trinitarian Pentecostal positions.

The council of Nicaea clearly emerges as a watershed between the oneness and trinitarian views of God.¹ David Bernard, senior theologian of the United Pentecostal Church International (UPCI), the largest oneness Pentecostal organization, sees the primary reason for the ascendancy of the triadic formula of the creed in the impact of the baptismal practice on combating heresy, while he emphasizes that a distinctively trinitarian language and doctrine did not develop until the fourth century.² His analysis of the Nicene Creed begins by pointing to the lack of trinitarian theology despite the apparent triadic structure.

While this confession was threefold, it was not explicitly trinitarian, for it did not state that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were three distinct persons. Rather, its fundamental purpose was to affirm the deity of Jesus Christ against the Arians. ... The phrase 'God of God ... very God of very God' may imply two divine persons, but it can also be understood as simply referring to the Incarnation.³

While oneness doctrine would reject the trinitarian interpretation of the creed as implying the eternal procession of the Son, oneness Pentecostals are able to 'use the same words to mean the one God came in flesh and therefore God who dwelt in Jesus is the same as God

Logos International, 1975), 143-68; Reed, 'In Jesus' Name,' 147-66; Boyd, *Oneness Pentecostals*, 139-40.

¹ Cf. William B. Chalfant, *Ancient Champions of Oneness* (Hazelwood: Word Aflame, 1981), 137-48.

² Bernard, *Oneness and Trinity*, 165-74; David K. Bernard, *The Trinitarian Controversy in the Fourth Century* (Hazelwood: Word Aflame, 1993), 9-23.

³ Bernard, *The Trinitarian Controversy*, 22. See also Bernard, *Oneness and Trinity*, 70

before the Incarnation.¹ In addition, the profession of faith in the Holy Spirit in the third article of the creed is not integrated in any explicit trinitarian theology of divine personhood,² leaving open the interpretation of the exact relation between the oneness of God and the manifestation of God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit even among the supporters of trinitarian thought. In other words, the creedal formulation is in *content* acceptable to both trinitarian and oneness thinking.³ The point of contention is the triadic sequence in the *structure* of the creedal confession and its implications for distinguishing three separate divine persons.

There are at least two fundamental reasons why oneness Pentecostals can accept the content of the creed. First, oneness Pentecostal doctrine does not completely reject a triadic aspect of the Godhead. Garfield T. Haywood, a pioneer of first generation oneness thought, admitted a triadic manifestation of God in the world as creator, redeemer, and sustainer.⁴ His contemporary, Andrew D. Urshan, did not hesitate to speak of 'the Three-One God', a 'Tri-Unity', or 'a divine three-ness of being'.⁵ The content of the creedal confessions continued to be reflected in publications and statements of faith for many years, since it did not explicitly contradict oneness Pentecostal doctrine. Second, the history of the creeds was interpreted as leaving room for non-trinitarian interpretations of the doctrine of God.⁶ Oneness Pentecostals found in modalistic monarchianism of the fourth century a historical forerunner that affirmed the two central aspects of their own doctrine of God: '1) there is one indivisible God with no distinction of persons in God's eternal essence, and 2) Jesus Christ is the manifestation, human personification, or incarnation of

¹ David K. Bernard, *A History of Christian Doctrine*, vol. 1, *The Post-Apostolic Age to the Middle Ages A.D. 100-1500* (Hazelwood: Word Aflame, 1995), 127.

² See Bernard, *Oneness and Trinity*, 42-43, 58-59.

³ Bernard, *A History of Christian Doctrine*, vol. 1, 127.

⁴ See Douglas Jacobsen, 'Oneness Options,' in *Thinking in the Spirit: Theologies of the Early Pentecostal Movement* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2003), 194-259, here p. 206.

⁵ Andrew D. Urshan, *The Almighty God in the Lord Jesus Christ* (Los Angeles: n. p., 1919), 2, 10; Urshan, 'The Trinity,' *Witness of God* (September 1924), 2. Cf. Reed, 'In Jesus' Name,' 246-73.

⁶ Bernard, *The Trinitarian Controversy*, 59.

the one God.¹ Oneness Pentecostals argue that the creed can be read from this perspective, since its affirmation of ‘oneness’ relates explicitly only to the unity of the divine being and the unity of natures in Jesus Christ and not to a unity of divine persons, a distinction of persons that is not made in content, in the first place.

On the other hand, the rejection of the structure of the creed by oneness Pentecostals as implicitly trinitarian is based on at least two observations. First, a dismissal of the creedal structure emerges from the significance attributed to the apostolic community for matters of faith and praxis among classical Pentecostals, in general, and from an observation of the apostolic practice of baptism, in particular. Oneness Pentecostals emphasize the widespread use of baptism ‘in the name of Jesus Christ’ as the original apostolic formula before the age of the Greek apologists. Even when the formula was expanded to a triadic form, it continued to include the name of Jesus—not in opposition to the threefold structure but as convocation of the grace of God that included the grace of the Father and the sanctification of the Holy Spirit.² Oneness Pentecostal doctrine juxtaposes the practice of baptism ‘in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit’ (Matt. 28:19) with the proclamation of ‘one baptism’ (Eph. 4:5), highlighting the identity of singularity in name and baptism and the difficulty of the church to reconcile the oneness of God with a threefold immersion. This tension is ultimately consolidated in the triadic structure of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed and its proclamation of ‘one baptism’, which reflects the emphasis on ‘one God’, ‘one Lord’, and ‘one church’ but does not reconcile this oneness with the distinction of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Second, the triadic structure of the creed is seen as resulting from an inadmissible combination of the radical monotheism of the Old Testament and the redemptive manifestation of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the New Testament on the basis of a philosophical distinction

¹ David K. Bernard, ‘The Future of Oneness Pentecostalism,’ in *The Future of Pentecostalism in the United States*, ed. Eric Patterson and Edmund Rybarczyk (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2007), 123-36, at 123.

² Bernard, *Oneness and Trinity*, 121-28. See also Donald Bryan and Walter L. Copes, ‘Historical Development of the Trinitarian Mode of Baptism,’ in *Symposium on Oneness Pentecostalism*, ed. United Pentecostal Church International (Hazelwood: Word Aflame, 1986), 197-216.

between economic and immanent trinity.¹ This departure from the biblical revelation and subjection of Scripture to philosophical reasoning is a chief reason for the oneness Pentecostal rejection of the creedal tradition.² While the biblical witness affirms the tri-unity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the economy of salvation, a distinction of 'economic' and 'immanent' is foreign to oneness Pentecostal doctrine, and the conceptual distinction of three manifestations does not translate into an ontological argument of the Trinity.³ The supposed rejection of the notion of 'person' and denial of economic and ontological arguments for the doctrine of God form the main reasons for the manifestation of the crisis of the creed in contemporary Pentecostalism. The theological consequences of both views for the task of theology need to be further elaborated.

The brief preceding overview highlights only the chief concerns dividing oneness Pentecostals from the trinitarian creedal tradition. The fact that the divisions are based on structural or methodological concerns rather than on the content of the doctrinal confession has generally been overshadowed by what the oneness-trinitarian Pentecostal dialogue has called the 'passions' of the early debate.⁴ Yet, the report of the dialogue itself does not contain a section on the respective methodological approaches to the doctrine of God. Most significantly, it does not consider the epistemological consequences of following the misleading distinction made popular by Theodore de Régnon, and widely employed by theological scholarship during the twentieth century, that one must choose either the unity of being or the diversity of persons as a starting point for the formulation of trinitarian doctrine. Recent scholarship has shown that no such universal dichotomy existed among the Greek and Latin creedal

¹ See William B. Chalfant, 'The Fall of the Ancient Apostolic Church,' in *Symposium on Oneness Pentecostalism, 1988 and 1990* (Hazelwood: Word Aflame, 1990), 351-85; Thomas Weisser, 'Was the Early Church Oneness or Trinitarian?' in *Symposium on Oneness Pentecostalism, 1986*, 53-68.

² David K. Bernard, *The Oneness of God*, Pentecostal Theology 1, rev. ed. (Hazelwood: Word Aflame, 2001), 144.

³ David K. Bernard, 'A Response to Ralph Del Colle's 'Oneness and Trinity: A Preliminary Proposal for Dialogue with Oneness Pentecostalism,'" unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of the SPS, 1996, 1-7.

⁴ See 'Oneness-Trinitarian Pentecostal Final Report,' nos. 9 and 10.

traditions.¹ Even if the paradigm of de Régnon were historically substantiated, the triadic structure of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed and the oneness-trinitarian impasse among Pentecostals can be explained by neither an approach from the unity of nature nor the distinction of personhood, or a progressive correlation between the two.² As a consequence, while the five-year study illuminates many of the commonalities and differences between the traditions, it does not offer a proposal to overcome the impasse. This path would inevitably confront both sides with the reconciliation of content and structure of trinitarian thought or, theologically, with the questions of divine personhood and the eternal processions.

Central Issues of the Oneness-Trinitarian Impasse

The notions of divine personhood and the eternal processions, arguably central to the *filioque* controversy and thus a substantial part of the crisis of creedal theology, form the chief dimension in the impasse among oneness and trinitarian Pentecostals. Although it is widely believed, even among supporters, that oneness Pentecostals reject the concept of 'person' intrinsically, such judgment is misguided. Like their trinitarian counterpart, oneness Pentecostals see God as 'a personal being, not a generic, abstract substance.'³ However, oneness Pentecostal doctrine makes no distinction of persons (plural) in the Godhead and attributes personhood (singular) only to Jesus Christ. This choice seeks to speak to the difficulty in trinitarian doctrine to reconcile the distinction of three persons with the unity of the divine being, generally addressed in the concepts of the interpenetration (*perichoresis*) of the three divine persons and the eternal procession of the Son and the Holy Spirit. In the place of these trinitarian ideas, oneness Pentecostals speak of one God who is one being in the person of Jesus Christ and encompasses in this person all three manifestations of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. This understanding is supported by reading Matthew 28:19 not as a command to distinguish in baptism three separate persons but to

¹ See Michel René Barnes, 'De Régnon Reconsidered,' *Augustinian Studies* 26, no.2 (1995): 51-79 and 'Augustine in Contemporary Trinitarian Theology,' *Theological Studies* 56, no. 2 (1995): 237-50.

² See Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism*, 79-88.

³ David K. Bernard, *The Oneness View of Jesus Christ* (Hazelwood: Word Aflame, 1994), 15.

identify the Father, Son, and Spirit as a single being identified by a single name.¹ This 'name' does not merely represent the character, authority, rank, or power of God, but it is 'the indispensable part of the *personality*' of the divine being, that is, in God 'the name and the person are synonymous.'² This ontological equivalence seeks to address the challenge of trinitarian theology to reconcile the univocal use of the term 'person' with the personhood of three divine persons and the distinction of each person from the other two. Oneness Pentecostal doctrine replaces the idea of three 'persons' with the single 'name' of God manifested in the person of Jesus Christ. In other words, from a oneness Pentecostal perspective, the person of Jesus *is* the name of God.³ It is therefore possible (and necessary) to confess faith in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit among oneness Pentecostals.⁴ However, this confession is summed up in the act of water baptism 'in Jesus' name' so that theologically and practically Jesus Christ is proclaimed as the only personification of God.

In light of the preceding considerations, oneness Pentecostals have been frequently labeled incorrectly as a 'Jesus only' movement—a label that applies more correctly to their baptismal formula than to their doctrine of God. Yet, while their approach to the doctrine of God is certainly christocentric, oneness Pentecostal faith and praxis is after all a reflection of the profoundly christological orientation of the Pentecostal affections in general, and the emphasis on the name of Jesus is not synonymous with a rejection of the Father or the Holy Spirit. At the same time, the prominence of christology emerges from a more profound acknowledgment of the Jewish heritage of the Christian doctrine of God⁵ and should not be confused with a doctrine of the second article.⁶ While that approach would account for the

¹ 'Oneness-Trinitarian Pentecostal Final Report,' no. 28.

² Butler, *Oneness Pentecostalism*, 89-90. Emphasis original. See also David K. Bernard, *In the Name of Jesus* (Hazelwood: Word Aflame, 1992), 19-27.

³ Cf. Reed, 'In Jesus' Name,' 227-306; French, *Our God Is One*, 211; Bernard, *The Oneness View of Jesus Christ*, 24.

⁴ See John Paterson, *God in Jesus Christ* (Hazelwood: Word Aflame, 1966), 39.

⁵ See David A. Reed, 'Oneness Pentecostalism: Problems and Possibilities for Pentecostal Theology,' *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 11 (1997): 73-93.

⁶ This expression refers to an artificial isolation of doctrinal focus on one person of the Trinity at the expense of the others based on the position of the person in the articles of the creed. The result is historically a focus on the first

personhood of Jesus, it also presupposes the distinction of more than one divine person through the essential application of the terms 'Father,' 'Son,' and 'Spirit.' Oneness Pentecostals, on the other hand, reject the identification of these terms with the personhood of three distinct divine persons and propose that 'the titles of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit describe God's redemptive roles or revelations, but they do not reflect an essential threeness in His nature.'¹ The three manifestations are therefore necessary, coexistent redemptive roles in the economy of salvation proclaimed in the doctrine of God as creator, savior, and sanctifier² and centered in the experience of Jesus Christ.

The oneness-trinitarian Pentecostal dialogue brings attention to christology immediately following the discussion of water baptism. While subscribing to the joint affirmation of the incarnation and the full humanity and deity of Christ, the oneness Pentecostal team rejects the definition of the Son as the 'second' divine person on the basis that this definition 'results in two Sons—an eternal, divine Son who could not die and a temporal, human Son who did die.'³ In order to escape this dilemma, the oneness Pentecostal team affirms that 'Jesus is not the incarnation of one person of a trinity but the incarnation of all the identity, character, and personality of God.'⁴ In other words, Jesus is not the eternal second person but the eternal God who became Son in a 'begotten Sonship'⁵ manifested in the economy of salvation. The incarnation marks the beginning of the work of the Son, whose redeeming role will end when the present world ceases to

article (God the Father) in medieval scholasticism and on the second article (God the Son) in the sixteenth-century Reformation tradition. From this perspective, the contemporary focus is on the third article (God the Spirit). See D. Lyle Dabney, 'Saul's Armor: The Problem and the Promise of Pentecostal Theology,' *Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 23, no. 1 (2001): 115-46, particularly 126-30.

¹ Bernard, *The Oneness View of Jesus Christ*, 16.

² Bernard, *The Oneness View of Jesus Christ*, 15-16.

³ 'Oneness-Trinitarian Pentecostal Final Report,' no. 42.

⁴ 'Oneness-Trinitarian Pentecostal Final Report,' no. 37.

⁵ Gordon Magee, *Is Jesus in the Godhead or Is the Godhead in Jesus?* (Hazelwood: Word Aflame, 1988), 25.

exist.¹ While oneness Pentecostals insist that this perspective can in principle be reconciled with the content of the creedal confession of faith in Jesus Christ, oneness Pentecostals see a ‘single-clause, christological pattern’² as more consistent with the intentions of the creed and refute a representation of the christological emphasis as a ‘second article.’ In contrast, the oneness Pentecostal view would account for only one article in the creed, which is identical with the confession in Christ and comprises at the same time the redemptive manifestations of God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. A label of oneness Pentecostal thought as a doctrine of ‘one article’ emphasizes that oneness and trinitarian thought are like-minded in content but, in principle, incompatible in structure.

The implications of the last sentence for creedal theology have to be worked out in more detail. In this context, the statement of faith of the UPCI offers at least a starting point for understanding one alternative that oneness Pentecostalism offers to the triadic structure of the creed.

We believe in the one ever-living, eternal God: infinite in power, holy in nature, attributes and purpose; and possessing absolute, indivisible deity. This one true God has revealed Himself as Father; through His Son, in redemption; and as the Holy Spirit, by emanation.... Before the incarnation, this one true God manifested Himself in divers ways. In the incarnation, He manifests Himself in the Son, who walked among men. As He works in the lives of believers, He manifests Himself as the Holy Spirit....³

In this statement, the three articles of the creed are combined into a single proclamation of faith in the three redemptive manifestations of God. This focus on the economy of salvation is symptomatic of classical Pentecostalism, in general, and a significant aspect for understanding the oneness Pentecostal doctrine of God.⁴ It carries

¹ See, recently, David S. Norris, *I AM: A Oneness Pentecostal Theology* (Hazelwood: Word Aflame, 2009); Gary C. Rigger, *The Oneness Doctrine: Written for Easy Learning* (Bakersfield: G.C. Rigger, 1997), 9-11.

² French, *Our God Is One*, 189.

³ David K. Bernard, *Understanding the Articles of Faith: An Examination of United Pentecostal Beliefs* (Hazelwood: Word Aflame, 1992), 27.

⁴ Cf. Reed, ‘Aspects of the Origins,’ 152; Amos Yong, *The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh: Pentecostalism and the Possibility of Global Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 232.

primary implications for the rejection of a distinction of persons in God's eternal being.

Oneness Pentecostal doctrine resists the distinction between immanent and economic Godhead primarily because it is contingent on substance metaphysics, that is, more precisely, the distinction is based on the concept of the eternity of the undivided divine substance and a distinction of substantial manifestations (i.e. persons) in the economy of salvation. Bernard shows that oneness Pentecostals give priority to the biblical concept of 'spirit' in the place of the philosophical notion of 'substance' and uphold a threefold distinction of manifestations while rejecting the idea of three distinct persons.

The Spirit of Jesus existed from all eternity because he is God Himself. However, the humanity of Jesus did not exist before the Incarnation, except as a plan in the mind of God. Therefore we can say that the Spirit of Jesus preexisted the Incarnation, but we cannot say the Son preexisted the Incarnation in any substantial sense.¹

This pneumatological perspective on the redemptive manifestations of God illuminates the desire of oneness Pentecostal doctrine to speak of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as simultaneous rather than successive manifestations. From the perspective of the redemptive experience of the work of God, Christians 'do not experience three personalities when they worship, nor do they receive three spirits, but they are in relationship with one personal spirit being.'² Therefore, the Spirit of God can be called 'simply God', 'God himself', or 'the one God'.³ 'Father' is the designation of the Spirit as a 'transcendent God' and synonymous with the Spirit in the 'Son' or with the deity of Christ.⁴ From the perspective of oneness pneumatology, in the incarnation, the transcendent 'Father' and the omnipresent 'Spirit' are manifested in the flesh in the human person of the 'Son'. As a consequence, the 'Holy Spirit' is the Spirit of Jesus and 'does not come as another person but comes in another form (in spirit instead of flesh) and another relationship ("in you" instead of "with you"); the Holy Spirit is actually Jesus coming to dwell in human lives.'⁵ The

¹ See Bernard, *The Oneness of God*, 182-83.

² 'Oneness Trinitarian Final Report,' no. 40.

³ See Bernard, *The Oneness of God*, 128-29.

⁴ See Bernard, *The Oneness of God*, 129-32.

⁵ 'Oneness Pentecostal Final Report,' no. 39.

single-clause, christological pattern of oneness Pentecostal doctrine is therefore in a fundamental sense pneumatologically oriented. From the perspective of the creedal structure, the single-clause would have to parallel the affirmation of the oneness of God's being proclaimed in the first article, center in the confession of faith in Jesus Christ as divine-human person asserted in the second article, and proclaim the activity of the Holy Spirit as declared in the third article. From the oneness Pentecostal perspective, these affirmations would have to be made in a single-clause that avoids both a triadic structure of the doctrine of God and the necessary consequence of relating each aspect of the triad to the other.

At this point, the oneness-trinitarian controversy has reached a methodological impasse. From a oneness Pentecostal perspective, the triadic structure of the creed unnecessarily perpetuates tritheism. The trinitarian distinction between one substance and a threefold division of persons in God makes necessary the notions of *perichoresis* and procession that are ultimately held responsible for the *filioque* controversy. However, the creed does not make use of either concept since their full development belongs to the post-Nicene era. Oneness Pentecostals, on the other hand, basically ignore both concepts because they presuppose the distinction of persons and are based on a notion of interaction among the persons in the immanent Trinity of which we have no experience. An examination of the biblical witness to the interpenetration of redemptive manifestations of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit or of the applicability of the concept to the economy of salvation, in general, has not been attempted among either trinitarian or oneness camps. The question whether the oneness Pentecostal doctrine of God is essentially 'perichoretic' in nature might offer a direction for further discussion if the concept can be loosed from the notion of personhood and applied to God's activity in the world, with particular emphasis on a pneumatological orientation.

Oneness Pentecostals would consider 'procession' an economic term that denotes a 'sending' or 'appointment' in 'the supernatural plan and action of God',¹ but that does not refer to a distinction of the divine substance or a preexistence of persons apart from the economy of salvation. When applied to the Son, 'the sending ... emphasizes the

¹ Bernard, *The Oneness View of Jesus Christ*, 74; Bernard, *The Oneness of God*, 184.

humanity of the Son and the specific purpose for which the Son was born.¹ The Son does not proceed eternally from the Father but is begotten by the Spirit as the human manifestation of God. In turn, the sending of the Holy Spirit refers to the 'return ... of Jesus manifested in a new way'² after the glorification of the Son. As a result, the sending of the Son is a necessary presupposition for the sending of the Holy Spirit in the sense that both are redemptive manifestations of one God. At the same time, while it is denied that Christ preexisted in a substantial sense before the incarnation, oneness Pentecostal doctrine upholds the preexistence of the incarnate Christ as the eternal Spirit of the one God.³ The concepts of the 'manifestations' or 'roles' of the one God therefore replace the idea of the 'procession' of persons in the economy and interpret the relations in a pneumatological sense and toward a christocentric proclamation of faith that stands in stark contrast to the credal affirmation and makes the addition of the *filioque* clause unnecessary. This proposal, however, remains unacceptable to trinitarian theology as long as its own methodological options are rooted in a necessary tension between the unity of the divine being and the division of persons that can be bridged only in terms that preserve the triadic structure. Put differently, oneness Pentecostalism challenges contemporary theology to go beyond the structural and compositional framework of its established trinitarian doctrine. Such a framework, however, is the very hallmark of the ecumenical creeds.

Conclusion

The dialogue between oneness and trinitarian Pentecostals reflects with particular intensity the ecumenical ramifications of the crisis of credal theology. While the goal envisioned here is trinitarian, oneness Pentecostalism challenges the established tradition to reevaluate its credal formulations, to revise its credal structure, and to focus its perspective on the ecclesiological significance of the credal affirmations, particularly the experience of God in the economy of salvation and the implications this emphasis carries for

¹ Bernard, *The Oneness of God*, 185.

² Bernard, *The Oneness of God*, 196.

³ French, *Our God Is One*, 206; Bernard, *The Oneness of God*, 182-84; David Campbell, *The Eternal Sonship* (Hazelwood: Word Aflame, 1978), 94-95.

the idea of the relations and processions of the divine persons. The way forward is certainly a way toward overcoming the existing oneness-trinitarian polemic in order to show possible directions to avert a crisis of the doctrine of God in larger proportions.¹ This task is as much a Pentecostal endeavor as it is a concern of the larger ecumenical community.

On the way to a reformulation of the doctrine of God, Pentecostalism in general emphasizes in place of the existing creedal structure a narrative formulation that holds together in an affectionate story christology and pneumatology as joint aspects of the activity of the Father in the economy of salvation. The so-called 'second' and 'third' article of the creed are joined together to illuminate the 'first,' and in this interplay, the artificial structure of distinct articles of faith ceases to exist. Central to this narrative formulation 'without articles' is the human being as a vital element without which the story of God cannot be told. The oneness-trinitarian Pentecostal dialogue corrects the creedal affirmation of this aspect in speaking of God's activity 'for us' by giving witness to the story of God who in Christ and the Spirit is also 'among us', 'with us', 'in us', and 'through us', and thereby invites humanity to participate in the story of redemption. In turn, the response of the church demands not only a 'we believe' but also 'we have encountered', 'we have experienced', and 'we have been transformed'. This Pentecostal way of speaking is not an expression of a subjective observation but constitutes a moment in the ontological participation of all the faithful in the triune life of God. This affirmation is without doubt also the central affirmation of creedal theology.

¹ For existing proposals see Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism*, 98-108; Amos Yong, *The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh: Pentecostalism and the Possibility of Global Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 203-34; Ralph Del Colle, 'Oneness and Trinity: A Preliminary Proposal for Dialogue with Oneness Pentecostalism,' *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 10 (1997): 85-110.

REVIEW ARTICLE. *BELOVED DUST: TIDES OF THE SPIRIT IN CHRISTIAN LIFE* BY ROBERT DAVIS HUGHES III

Radu Bordeianu*

Hughes's purpose in Beloved Dust is to develop spiritual theology within its proper place in dogmatics. According to his definition, 'Spiritual theology is a disciplined theological reflection on the spiritual life or spirituality of Christians, and, envisioned this way, should have the Holy Spirit and her movements in those lives for its primary subject' (3). Just as Christology is composed of two inseparable but distinguishable parts (Christology proper and soteriology), so should pneumatology consist of pneumatology proper and spiritual theology. The book is organized into the concurrent tides of conversion, transfiguration, and glory, with two interludes occurring between these tides.

Hughes's book, *Beloved Dust*,¹ represents the most significant contribution in the area of pneumatology in the past five years. Thus concluded several scholars who recommended it for the Poullart Libermann Award in Pneumatology, offered by Duquesne University in 2010. Indeed, if this book has the impact it deserves, pneumatology will include spiritual theology just as Christology includes soteriology, and the disciplines of systematic theology (traditionally known as

* Radu Bordeianu PhD is an Assistant Professor of Systematic Theology in the Theology Department of Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, Director of the Annual Holy Spirit Lecture and Colloquium, and a Romanian Orthodox priest. His research focuses on ecumenical ecclesologies—especially the dialogue between the Orthodox and Catholic churches—the relationship between the Trinity and the Church, Pneumatology, spirituality, theology of creation, and environmental issues. He is particularly engaged with the ecclesiology of Dumitru Staniloae.

¹ Robert Davis Hughes III (New York: Continuum, 2008), paperback, xii + 428. ISBN: 9780826428431.

dogmatics), moral theology, and spirituality will be intrinsically linked.

Hughes teaches at the University of the South in Sewanee, Tennessee, and his research focuses on spiritual theology. He is an Episcopal priest, missionary, and a tireless advocate for those who suffer from abuse and addiction, being involved in several organizations dedicated to this latter cause (the twelve-step program is often mentioned in the book). His sensitivity, compassion, and honest appraisal of these contexts are inspiring.

Writing from his experience as a spiritual director, throughout the book he recommends enlisting the help of such a charismatic, pneumatophoric figure in the process of discerning both the aspects of our personality that need to be re-incorporated into our converted self and the demons that need to be exorcised as our true self is being birthed. He masterfully balances these spiritual concerns with a solid scholarly method. He does not lose his authorial voice even when making a dizzying number of references to other authors. Erudite and original, he remains very much rooted in the reality of spiritual growth with all its messiness—sometimes describing it in shockingly strong terms. Thus, the style of the book ranges from attentive scholarly analysis to realistic engagement with our fallen world, as they relate to his personal experiences.

The main purpose of the book is to develop spiritual theology within its proper place in dogmatics. According to Hughes's definition, 'Spiritual theology is a disciplined theological reflection on the spiritual life or spirituality of Christians, and, envisioned this way, should have the Holy Spirit and her movements in those lives for its primary subject'(3). Just as Christology is composed of two inseparable but distinguishable parts (Christology proper and soteriology), so should pneumatology be composed of pneumatology proper and spiritual theology. Consequently, theological disciplines neatly separated by neo-scholasticism now become integrated into one another, like Russian dolls. Systematic theology encompasses pneumatology, which in turn contains spiritual theology, which includes moral theology. In this pneumatological perspective, moral theology becomes 'the study of the Holy Spirit's impact on the formation of conscience, conviction of sin, the call to and the possibility of real conversion, the discernment of the good, and the formation of character and virtue' (7).

Hughes proposes a reform even within spiritual theology as it has become divided into asceticism and mysticism. Instead of the traditional excessive turn toward interiority and ascribing mystical experiences solely to secluded elites with no social concerns, he advocates for an ecclesial, communal, and socially-oriented spiritual theology. His theology has the characteristics of *ressourcement*, *nouvelle théologie*, or (as George Florovsky would say from an Orthodox perspective) a neo-patristic synthesis: a departure from neo-Thomist theology and a return to the sources; an engagement with contemporary thought and social issues; an ecclesial and liturgical centering of spiritual theology. While the need for this departure and the lines of the 'new' theology were identified almost a century ago, examples of such theology are still rare. This is one of them.

His theology is also profoundly trinitarian: Hughes's Triadology is a living theology about a Trinity 'for us,' and not an abstract neo-scholastic speculation, remote from our world. The ecclesiological dimension of spiritual theology is another welcome contribution, since today ecclesiology is more and more recognized as a chapter of pneumatology (though, at its best, ecclesiology is also a chapter of Christology and the theology of the Father). This shift leads to a spirituality that is not an individualistic, but an ecclesial endeavor. Conversely, Hughes moves beyond ecclesiology's excessive focus on institution and charisms and enriches it with a spiritual dimension that has been forgotten: 'the structures of *koinonia*, the common life of the people of God, are sacramental realities provided by the Holy Spirit as the ligaments that bind together the Body of Christ as God's covenant people. These are not merely the context for any true Christian spirituality; they are its principal incarnate instruments' (41).

Masterfully integrating all areas of theology, including Revelation, creation, anthropology, Trinity, sacraments, eschatology, moral theology, history, biblical studies, he also manages to be eminently ecumenical.

No theologian in the Anglican tradition has quoted John Wesley to the extent to which Hughes does. A Wesley admirer myself, I find the integration of concepts such as perfection and social and personal holiness into spiritual theology refreshing. As an Orthodox, I salute this author's appropriation of Eastern Triadology, anthropology, spirituality, and *theosis*. Catholics will be impressed with his assimilation of various spiritual traditions, with John of the Cross,

Ignatius, and Benedict significantly shaping the structure of the book. Other Protestants (with the possible exception of Evangelicals) will be thrilled with his integration of various principles characteristic of the Reformation. Far from irreverent eclecticism, this book offers a constructive spirituality, an area in which Christians are more likely to agree than when they address confessional differences. Via spirituality, Hughes also facilitates doctrinal union, lest we forget the main aim of the book: the integration of spiritual theology into systematics. Spiritually and doctrinally, it is a deeply ecumenical work.

The reform (or resurrection) of spiritual theology requires not only a theological departure from 'manual' theology, but also embracing the language and data of contemporary human sciences, so that spirituality will be relevant in today's culture. Just as previous views of the person contributed to traditional theology, so modern discoveries have a role in the revival of spirituality. Hughes's theology integrates various insights from contemporary philosophy, sociology, developmental psychology, the connection between holiness and liberating justice, and our new appreciation for sexuality and family life.

The book is organized according to the pseudo-Dionysian threefold rhythm of spiritual life. Hughes rejects the idea that the progressive succession of these stages defines consecutive degrees of perfection, as well as the notion of instantaneous entire sanctification. He prefers to speak of the concurrent tides of conversion, transfiguration, and glory. Moreover, corresponding to John of the Cross's dark nights of the soul, there are two periods of slack, or interludes, which occur between these tides. These are periods when no progress seems to take place, although, in retrospect, they were times of grace-filled growth.

The first tide

The three theological virtues structure the tide of conversion as a response to prevenient grace. In faith we are *converted from* sin; when hope is born, we are being *converted to* the commonwealth or reign of God; we are *converted by* love, falling in love with our Lover and becoming beloved.

In their continuing education, pastors, spiritual counselors and seminarians will particularly appreciate chapters 12-16 on conversion and spiritual growth. Here Hughes draws from behavioral sciences,

developmental psychology, sociology, the experiences of adult catechuminate, and various theologians. He encourages spiritual directors to use these developmental stages as tools for identifying and nurturing the underdeveloped dimensions of conversion. For example, they should help the directee discern between the perfectly natural phase of honest doubt and a detrimental hypercritical spirit, which is combined with vanity, cynicism, and resignation. The Romanian Orthodox theologian Dumitru Staniloae would say that this is a perpetual challenge to anyone, but especially to theologians who are caught between fidelity to Revelation, creative responsibility to contemporary times, and the eschatological, salvific orientation of their theology.

If these challenges can be overcome with the help of a spiritual director, others also require the expertise of a therapist. These are the sacred illnesses of our time, such as obsessive-compulsive disorders, addiction, clinical depression, and traumatic stress reaction from abuse and oppression. They are forms of suffering for which we did not volunteer and which we cannot surmount alone. Similar to the twelve-step program, overcoming them first requires that we admit our powerlessness. Then conversion (understood more as liberation and healing than repentance) will occur by God's grace and 'the companionship of fellow sufferers' (86). Finally, the limitations caused by abuse, trauma, or mental illnesses do not restrict the Spirit, who brings sanctification, loving knowledge, and union with God. Thus Hughes looks beyond the psychological and theological aspects of conversion as espoused by various contemporary scholars. His account of conversion fills a great void in contemporary scholarship: the neglect of the role of grace in conversion.

Grace is nothing less than the Spirit, who is God's gift of love in person and not simply an energy or power. The Father loves the Son in the Spirit, God loves us in the Spirit, and we return God's love in the Spirit who dwells in us, beloved dust that we are. At this point we do not only experience grace, which is given to all as gift; we now experience grace precisely *as grace*. It is a transforming grace: the Spirit reshapes us personally, ecclesially, and socially.

As opposed to the Stoic view that passions are intrinsically evil and must be uprooted, Hughes is very Aristotelian in his approach to desires as morally neutral: if correctly redirected, they become virtues. A virtuous life is a sure sign that the Spirit shapes us as friends of Jesus

who has assumed our finite life in the flesh. Hughes's description of moral growth is perfectly synergic, balancing human and divine actions. Lest we fall into a Pelagian overemphasis of the human role, there are no 'acquired' virtues (in classical parlance) but they are all ultimately infused. They too, are the effect of the Spirit's indwelling in us. And yet, these virtues are also ours, since we are created in the image of God and we collaborate with grace.

Far from giving priority to personal sanctification over the ecclesial indwelling of the Spirit, the author affirms that, as friends of Jesus empowered by the Spirit, we are engrafted into the Body of Christ through Baptism. The covenant community then shapes us as members of the priestly people of God. This is a community that serves the world for which Jesus died and which the Spirit indwells. In this way, the Church makes manifest the reign of God by transforming society.

The second tide

Hughes prefers to entitle the second tidal current 'transfiguration' in order to ground it Christologically and to stress that it is neither rational, nor natural, as the Western terminology of 'illumination' for this stage might imply. It rather refers to God's glory, the Holy Spirit indwelling in all of creation, especially human dust. Easterners will recognize our author as an unapologetic Palamite. And yet, he remains grounded in Western thought, since he allows Simone Weil's four forms of implicit love to shape the structure of the second tide into: 1. love of neighbor, vocation, and study; 2. love of the order and beauty of the world and work; 3. love of religious practices and prayer; and 4. love of friendship and life in community. Hughes connects each implicit love to an aspect of the Benedictine Rule—study, work, prayer and community—and engages them with Lonergan's layers of conversion. Again, the book is organically ecumenical.

It is also communally oriented towards the Church and society, being grounded in trinitarian communion. Our spiritual growth is related to the contribution of our charisms to the edification of the Church and of society, all Christians having the vocation to mission and evangelism. This focus on apostolate transcends many traditional accounts that overemphasized individual interiority together with affective, intellectual and moral conversion, to the detriment of political and social concerns. Case in point, Hughes formulates the

'postcolonial principle: a radical hospitality and inclusivity that welcomes the Spirit-filled but previously unsavable other precisely in his or her radical otherness' (304). This means that the Spirit is already present in the other's culture, orienting all creation towards the Father through the Son. Consequently, mission is first service, healing, and liberation. The 'always-and-already-present Spirit' is at work in the other and will subsequently provide the opportunity for an explicit proclamation of Christ from within, rather than one that is artificially imported from outside. These considerations, of course, reflect the movements of the Spirit within the Trinity.

While the above remarks represent an aspect of traditional spirituality that is often underemphasized, Hughes also pays attention to the expected topics related to this stage. For example, a life of virtue is no longer the renunciation of sin and the acquisition of virtues, but sharing in the transformation brought by the Spirit's indwelling in us. The same is true of personal prayer, which becomes our joining in the Spirit's prayer within us (cf. Rom. 8:25-27). While all people are created as beloved dust that prays, Christians receive a new communitarian level of existence in the Church, because a prayerful Spirit indwells in them. Thus is avoided the individualistic pitfall of some traditional accounts.

The third tide

Hughes considers that most Christians experience the tide of transfiguration in this life and that of glory in the afterlife. This optimistic assessment, however, does not render the third tide overly eschatological. Glory is attainable in this life through the moral, affective, and intellectual union of the person with God. Memory, understanding, and will play an important role in this stage of divinization.

While elsewhere in the book Hughes describes *theosis* as pure gift, here he overemphasizes the human element. His initial position was more in line with the Orthodox understanding of *theosis* as the phase in which our input is drastically reduced to being aware of what God does in us; grace is more than ever in the forefront. But Hughes needs a more prominent human role because he ascribes a missionary dimension even to this stage, further departing from the neo-scholastic mysticism that reserved these higher stages to a few spiritual elites. But he also stresses the human dimension beyond the

classics of spirituality. I tend to side with these traditional accounts, but I appreciate the missionary concern as well. The middle ground might be found in a cyclic, not linear, description of spiritual ascent (which Hughes advocated in the beginning), so we can come back to mission after having experienced the third tide. We would withdraw in order to return. This seems to have been the case of all the great spiritual fathers and mothers of the past, or of the Apostle Paul who, after having been caught up to the third heaven (2 Cor. 12:2) and declared, 'it is no longer I who live, but it is Christ who lives in me' (Gal. 2:20), went to preach the gospel.

Hughes confesses that his description of the third tide of glory is also limited by his experience, or lack thereof. One wonders, however, if trust in a longstanding spiritual tradition on this subject would have changed the outlook of the book. In relation to *theosis*, the past goes beyond the limits of today's developmental sciences. The impossibility of relating the tide of glory to modern science should not be a deterrent from discussing this ultimate experience that is still very much alive today. Moreover, a stronger pneumatology would demand that we be able to replicate the transfiguration of Christ's humanity in the divine glory made visible to the physical eyes of the disciples. Thus, the Palamite insistence on the role of the body in *theosis* could have been better emphasized in a book on 'beloved dust.' But Hughes chooses instead to focus on ecclesial and missionary endeavors. While this is the book's greatest strength, in this case it unnecessarily limits the third tide to merely one chapter—by far the least developed section of the book.

Suggestions

Hughes offers a very strong spiritual theology as the practical aspect of pneumatology. His pneumatology, however, is left implicit in its specifics, and only its general lines are explicitly applied to spirituality. The little Hughes says about the Spirit is almost exclusively through her work in the economy; her role in immanent Trinity is insufficiently emphasized. A stronger pneumatology (construed both immanently and economically) would strengthen the author's spiritual theology. His Christology is more complete in this regard. The imbalance between Christology and pneumatology is further augmented by an underdeveloped soteriology, which does not match Hughes's strong spiritual theology. While the latter insufficiency is

probably due to page limitations, even sympathetic readers will be left wanting a more explicitly developed pneumatology. One feels this need, for example, in the discussion of matter.

The author designates our material bodies as dust. We are also given a 'soul,' or the life of the body, and when our life is one of self-transcendence, the soul goes by the name of 'spirit'. He adopts an exclusively Aristotelian view according to which the soul does not survive the death of the body, although, along partial Platonic lines, the dust will be alive again at the end of time in glory. The contents of Hughes's eschatology refer exclusively to the events after Jesus's second coming, passing over in silence our condition between death and the Parousia. This stance raises at least two questions: Will the eschatological resurrected dust have the same spiritual identity as it has today? If so, one is forced to speak of a resurrection of the soul, since the soul is simply the life of the body, outside of which it does not exist. Moreover, is the dust 'beloved' between death and the Parousia, even if it is lifeless? These questions are not asked from an abstract essentialist perspective, but from the relational/existential prism that the author himself advocates, so that 'dust' is always in relation.

The larger context of these issues is the value of matter in itself, which Hughes carefully preserves against any Manichaean tendencies: no matter how much we progress spiritually, matter remains matter, but becomes infused (or, more precisely, is always infused) with the Spirit. Hughes is somewhat inconsistent and leaves one wondering if he believes that God actually created matter profane, despite his embracing of Teilhard de Chardin's affirmation that nothing in creation is profane. In the body of the text he espouses an exclusively relational reading of Teilhard and abandons a substantial reading that, I believe, was Teilhard's primary intent. While Hughes's concern to emphasize the relationality of creation is worthwhile, he does not seem to integrate texts with substantial overtones, which he only mentions in the endnotes. He admits that Teilhard wrote about the 'marvelous force contained in things' and 'that the whole universe in all its elements is moving from the Alpha of creation to the Omega of consummation by a mighty evolution of Ontogenesis and Christogenesis. He discusses this in the section on "the spiritual power of matter", and it is the essence of his other works such as *Mass on the Earth* (278).

Hughes could also draw from Maximus the Confessor and Dumitru Staniloae (both quoted in the book), according to whom we desecrate matter when we unsuccessfully attempt to render it as a purely material, profane reality meant for anthropocentric consumption. Both affirm that God continues to be present in matter, which makes our rejection of its spiritual value sinful. Dust is filled with God to begin with, and that presence is fulfilled in the incarnation and ultimately in the *eschaton*. Hughes would not deny the spiritual character of dust, but he would not emphatically affirm it in these pre-incarnational terms, either. One exception is his account of the Spirit's presence in all cultures and times, mentioned above.

Hughes has already expressed his intention to take this volume further, in the direction of the Spirit's presence in human history and cosmology. He hopes, in the end, to articulate the tides of the Spirit in trinitarian life and thus develop a pneumatology proper. The above remarks are simply suggestions for further developments in the directions already indicated by the author, as well as arguments for the necessity of a rich pneumatology for a strong spiritual theology, and the link between the two.

This book should constitute required reading in any graduate class on pneumatology, spirituality, moral and pastoral theology, placing itself at their intersection. Beyond its academic audience, clergy and educated faithful in the pews will find it useful. While the endnotes will delight the scholar, the non-specialist will appreciate the explanatory footnotes, though one should not hope for an easy read. This book is a must-have, must-read, and must-treasure for any student receptive to the tides of the Spirit.

THE ITALIAN-ALBANIAN CHURCH: A STUDY IN MODERN HISTORY AND CONTEMPORARY ECCLESIAL CONTEXT

Anthony O'Mahony*

In Southern Italy and Sicily a strong Eastern Christian and Greek influence was evident for many centuries. Its significant decline was reversed with the arrival of two large groups of Latin and Orthodox Christian Albanian immigrants, fleeing their country following the Ottoman conquest. These Albanian Christians settled into a distinctive ecclesial relationship with the papacy, which favoured them retaining their Byzantine theological and liturgical culture. Today, after four centuries, there are three Greek-Byzantine Catholic ecclesial groupings, making a unique contribution to the Eastern Catholic presence in contemporary Italy and Europe: the dioceses of Lungro and of Piana degli Albanesi, and the monastery of Santa Maria di Grottaferrata.

1. Historical and contemporary Context

The Eastern Christian (Byzantine) presence in southern Italy and the island of Sicily has two distinct phases: Italo-Greek and Italo-Albanian, which represent two historical currents which are clearly distinct for historical, cultural, ethnic and linguistic reasons, which reflect on the general consciousness of Italy's Byzantine Catholics today. This historical context means that there are two distinct ecclesial expressions: the Monastery of Grottaferrata¹ and the Italian-

* Anthony O'Mahony, Heythrop College, University of London, is Reader in the History of Christianity and Director of the Centre for Eastern Christianity. He has written extensively on Eastern Christianity, including: *Christianity in the Middle East: Studies in Modern History, Theology and Politics* (2007); *Christian responses to Islam: Muslim-Christian relations in the modern world* (co-ed., 2008); and *Christianity and Jerusalem: Studies in Modern Theology and Politics in the Holy Land* (ed., 2009).

¹ Stefano Parenti, 'Il monastero Esarchico di Grottaferrata e la Chiesa Italo-Albanese', *Apollinaris*, 73/1-4 (2000-2002), 629-662.

Albanian Church.¹ Pietro Pompilio Rodatà in his *Dell'Origine, Progresso e Stato presente del rito Greco in Italia, osservato, dai Greci, monaci basiliani e Albanesi libri tre (1758-63)* made this now classic distinction in the ecclesiological history of the Byzantine Church in Italy in the eighteenth century.² Rodatà's study is still an important work, even though we have to add clarifications which take into account new dimensions of today's ecclesiological vision.³ The Italo-Greek phase of the Byzantine presence in Italy until the fifteenth century, and that of the Italo-Albanians which followed it—I should emphasize that there are *two* distinct presences—were subsumed by Rodatà into the general category developing at that time into the so-called the 'Greek rite'.⁴ Rodatà does not speak about the Greek

¹Eleuterio F. Fortino, 'Aspects ecclésiologiques de l'Église italo-albanaise. Tensions et communion', *Irénikon*, 65 (1992), 363-386.

² Rodatà, an Italo-Albanian from Calabria, S. Benedetto Ullano (1707-1770) was professor of Greek language at the Greek College in Rome and 'scriptor graecus' at the Vatican Library. This gave him the opportunity to carry out painstaking research in the Roman Archives, drawing up for the first time an organic history of the Greek Church in Italy, which he published in three volumes (1758, 1760, 1763) under the title *Dell'Origine, Progresso e Stato presente del rito Greco in Italia (1758-63)*. The first volume deals with the Greeks in Italy, the second with the cultural and religious development brought by the Basilian monks, and the third the Albanians. He distinguishes clearly between the two phases of the presence of the Byzantine Church in Italy: the Italo-Greek phase (from Justinian until the fifteenth century), and the second phase from the arrival of Albanians in Italy (fifteenth century). This distinction was not only motivated by periods of time, but mainly by ethno-cultural variation such that a clarification was felt necessary by the Italo-Albanians. See V. Peri, 'Pietro Pompilio Rodotà e gli studi sulla Chiesa bizantina in Italia', pp. 5-76 in the reprinted edition of Rodotà's classic text (Cosenza: Edizioni Brenner, 1986), and C. Korolewskij, 'Qualche cosa su Pietro Pompilio Rodotà, la sua famiglia e la sua patria', *Bollettino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata*, serie II, no. 4, 1950, pp. 236-245.

³ John Faris, 'Byzantines in Italy: A Microcosm of an evolving ecclesiology', *The Jurist*, 67 (2007) 89-108; A. O'Mahony, 'Between Rome and Constantinople: The Italian-Albanian Church. A study in Eastern Catholic history and ecclesiology', *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church*, 8/3 (2008) 232-251.

⁴ The late Vittorio Peri, 'scriptor graecus' in the Vatican Library and Rodotà's successor in this rôle, speaking of the latter's work as having 'remained a classic', says that 'from the very title of his work he does not consider *the Church* but the *Greek rite* as the real subject of his research'—the subject-

Church, even though his ecclesiological vision does not limit the differences to simply a question of rite; on the other hand, he does not identify 'diversity' with 'divergence' and clearly distinguishes between 'Italo-Greeks' and Italo-Albanians'.¹

In contemporary ecclesial terms, in Italy today the three historical Byzantine districts are the heritage of two distinct traditions within the context of the same Byzantine tradition. The exarchal monastery of Grottaferrata is heir to the Italo-Greek monasticism which flourished during the first millennium in the Byzantine Church in Italy.² The two Italian-Albanian eparchies of Lungro (Cosenza) and Piana degli Albanesi (Palermo), on the other hand, still within the Byzantine framework, are heirs to the Albanian emigration which took place mostly in the fifteenth century following Ottoman invasions into Albanian territory. While they belong to the same Byzantine tradition, the exarchate, on the one hand, and the two eparchies, on the other, have different histories and their own way of living out their faith. The presence of the tradition of the Eastern Church in Italy goes even further back, to the first half of the sixth century when Justinian, Emperor of the Eastern Roman Empire, invaded Italy. This domination and settlement, cultural, ecclesial and human, went on for a long time, even if it later only affected the southern regions of Italy, from Puglia to Calabria and Sicily. In this

matter already implies an ecclesiological understanding. See V. Peri 'Chiesa latina e Chiesa greca nell'Italia posttridentina (1564-1596)', *La chiesa Greca in Italia dall'VIII al XVI secolo: Italia Sacra*, 20 (1973), 271-469. On Peri (1932-2006), the great scholar of the encounter between Western and Eastern Christendom, see Giuseppe Alberigo, 'Vittorio Peri: in memoriam', *Cristianesimo nella storia*, 27 (2006) 1-7.

¹ Fortino, 'Aspects ecclésiologiques de l'Église italo-albanaise', 364. Eleuterio F. Fortino is a senior member of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, responsible for relations between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church, and an Italian-Albanian. For a recent view on the ecclesial and ecumenical dimensions to the question see Taras Khomych, 'Eastern Catholic Churches and the Question of "Uniatism": Problems of the Past, Challenges of the Present and Hopes for the Future', *Louvain studies*, 31 (2006) 214-237.

² C. Korolewskij, 'Basilien italo-grecs et espagnols', *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et Géographie Ecclésiastique*, vol. VI, 1932, col. 1180-1215; A. Pertusi, 'Rapporti tra il monachesimo italo-greco ed il monachesimo bizantino nell'alto Medio Evo', *La Chiesa Greca in Italia dall'VIII al XVI*, Italia Sacra, 21 (Padua: 1972), 481-493.

context, of major importance for the Eastern Church in Italy was the exile of many monks who, persecuted by emperors who were hostile to the cult of holy images (or iconoclast), left their country to settle in Italy, particularly Sicily, where, while they were still under the rule of Constantinople, they found refuge.¹ The Arab conquest of Sicily led these monks to emigrate to Calabria. In this region there was from then on a major expansion of Basilian monasticism, so-called because the Rule of St Basil inspired the monks. Later this order also underwent a slow, but inexorable decline.² Just when the presence of these representatives of the Eastern Church was about to disappear from Italian soil, the Albanians arrived to give renewed vigour to this tradition.³ Between the arrival of the Eastern monks and the Albanian monks, a serious event had disturbed the peaceful coexistence between the Churches of the East and West—the 1054 schism. But when the Albanians arrived in Italy, unity had been re-established by the Council of Florence in 1439 and they were warmly welcomed.⁴

In the climate following the Council of Florence, the Archbishop of Ochrid, who was able to style himself the Archbishop of all Albania, and whose jurisdiction even extended over the Albanians of Italy, appointed Paphnuce Metropolitan of Italy. Once appointed, he sent him to the Pope, who had jurisdiction over all Italy, so that he would order the Albanians in Italy to obey Paphnuce. Pope Julius III accepted this request and appointed Paphnuce Archbishop of Agrigento, and in a Papal letter which he gave him he confirmed that the new Metropolitan could freely exercise his ministry and that no one was to prevent him from doing so. In practical terms, what Paphnuce could do was to celebrate Mass and administer the sacraments according to the rites, customs, traditions and observances of the Eastern Church.

¹ Peter Herde, 'Il papato e la chiesa greca nell'Italia meridionale dall' XI al XIII secolo'. *La Chiesa greca in Italia dall'VIII al XVI secolo. Italia Sacra*, 20 (1973) 213-55.

² V. Peri, 'Documenti e appunti sulla riforma postridentina dei monaci basiliani', *Aevum*, 50 (1977) 411-78.

³ A. Vaccaro: 'Fonti Storiche e Per corsi della Storiografia sugli Albanesi d'Italia (secc. XV-XVII). Un consuntivo e Prospettive di Ricerca', *Studi sull'Oriente Cristiano*, 8/1 (2004), 131-209.

⁴ V. Peri, 'La lettura del Concilio di Firenze nella prospettiva unionistica Romana', *Christian Unity of Ferrara-Florence, 1438/39-1989*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo (Leuven: Peeters, 1991), 593-611.

Prior to Paphnuce, the Metropolitan of the Albanians in Italy had been James, until 1543; the second was Paphnuce, who died in 1566; then came Timothy, initially Bishop of Corizza, and finally Acace Casnesio, the last Metropolitan of Agrigento, but who in fact was never able to exercise his prerogatives.¹ A situation like this, based on the unionist spirit established at Florence, encouraged various papal decisions. The most explicit document is Leo X's letter *Accepimus nuper*, dated 18 May 1521. In this document, the Pope confirmed the free exercise of particular traditions for all the faithful of the Byzantine rite, allowed the celebration of the sacraments for the Eastern faithful even on the territory of a Latin bishop, and forced Latin bishops to have an Eastern Vicar-General if they had Eastern faithful in the territory under their obedience.² Nothing changed until the Council of Trent.³

The canons approved at the Council of Trent did not specifically deal with the Eastern Christians; however, some decisions deeply influenced the friendly relations which had now been established between them and the Church of the West.⁴ The canons which were most clearly opposed to the previous regime dealt with pastoral visitations by bishops, who were held to visit every church each year with apostolic authority; and the canon on ordinations, which forbade anyone from being ordained priest by any other bishop than the Ordinary of his place of residence. The decrees of the Council of Trent

¹ V. Peri, 'I metropolitani orientali di Agrigento. La loro giurisdizione in Italia nel XVI secolo', *Bizanzioe l'Italia. Raccolta di studi in memoria di Argostino Pertusi* (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1982), 274-321 presents these significant ecclesiological facts and publishes the important documents, most of which have not been edited before now.

² Lorenzo Lorusso, 'Le statut juridique de l'Église Italo-albanaise et son projet de droit particulier', *Kanon*, 19 (2004), 208-232. Here p. 209.

³ V. Peri, 'Il concilio di Trento e la Chiesa Greca' in Giuseppe Alberigo & I. Rogger (eds.), *Il concilio di Trento nella prospettiva del terzo millennio* (Brescia: Morcelliana, 1997), 403-41; and Mikhail V. Dimitiev, 'Western Christianity and Eastern Orthodoxy', *The Cambridge History of Christianity, Vol. 6. Reform and Expansion 1500-1660*, ed. R. Po-Chia Hsia (Cambridge University Press, 2007), 321-342.

⁴ V. Peri, 'Chiesa latina e Chiesa greca nell'Italia postridentina (1564-1596)'. 'La chiesa Greca in Italia dall'VIII al XVI secolo', *Italia Sacra*, 20 (1973) 271-469.

had been approved for a few months when a series of communications from the first reforming bishops transferred into several dioceses in southern Italy began to confront the Holy See with the survival of an Episcopal hierarchy and a clergy who administered the sacraments and exercised their jurisdiction within the territory of these dioceses, but did so knowing that in ecclesiastical terms, they were subject not to the Pope but to the Patriarch of Constantinople. So it was that Pope Pius IV intervened directly with the Letter *Romanus Pontifex* dated 16 February 1564, abrogating the exemptions and privileges which had been granted by earlier popes and submitting the Oriental communities to the jurisdiction of the Latin Ordinaries.¹

But even this papal document did not have the hoped-for effect. Some years later the Calabrian bishops, particularly Prosper Vitaliani of Bisignano and Luc Owen of Cassano, asked the Holy See to intervene with coercion against the Albanian priests because they were professing heretical opinions. The 'heretical opinions' which the Albanians who had remained faithful to their own tradition were professing dealt with baptism administered with a holy oil blessed by these same priests during the same ceremony; the Eucharist given to children before the age of reason; anointing conferred by the priests themselves; the repudiation of an adulterous wife, followed by a new marriage; and feasts of the liturgical calendar which did not correspond to the Latin feasts. In terms of faith, some did not believe in purgatory, and none believed that the Holy Spirit proceeded also from the Son (*filioque*). On 20 August 1566 Pope Pius V signed the Bull *Providentia Romani Pontificis*, by which he formally forbade any kind of liturgical flexibility and coexistence and annulled all earlier permissions for priests of either rite to celebrate divine worship according to the use of one or other Church, who might only use their own rite.² But even this intervention did not obtain the expected result, to the extent that, where there was no Eastern priest, as the Latins were unable to celebrate any other rite, the Albanians refused to go to church. Even more radical treatment was introduced for the

¹ Bullarium pontificium Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda fide, vol. 1, Rome, 1839, 8-10. in Lorusso, 'Le statut juridique de l'Église Italo-albanaise et son projet de droit particulier', 210.

² Ibid.

Orthodox bishops who continued to have pastoral care for the Albanians and the communities of Greek origin. The Roman Curia sent orders to those Latin Ordinaries in whose dioceses these prelates came to visit their faithful that they were to be denounced, arrested and transferred as captives to Rome. Any act of jurisdiction which appeared to be independent of the supreme Roman pontiff was inadmissible. But even this measure could not get the Eastern faithful to give up their religious practices. Given the lack of success of previous interventions, the Roman Curia tried another approach to the Italo-Albanian question.

So in 1573, under the pontificate of Gregory XIII, the Congregation for the Greeks (the Curia never distinguished between the Italo-Albanians and the Italo-Greeks, describing them all as Italo-Greeks) was founded.¹ Thanks to this body, and particularly, thanks to the work of its president, Julius Antoni Santoro, Archbishop of Santa Severina,² the presence of this marginal Eastern Christian community in Italy stopped being a problem to be resolved. By examining the historical facts it became clear that the work of the Congregation was to lead the Eastern faithful into the Western Church. There could be no intervention with the rite, for it was clear that the faithful would never abandon it. The obstacle needed to be solved, rather than breaking the link with Constantinople. The solution was found in the establishment of a bishop of the Greek rite, who was Catholic, able to ordain the new Albanian and Greek priests in good and proper form. Pope Clement VIII agreed to this request and enshrined it in the papal document known as *Perbrevis Instructio* on 31 August 1595. The first bishop, Eastern in his ecclesial origin and rite, who was directly subject to the authority of the Roman pontiff was the Cypriot Germain Kouskonaris who, having fled Famagosta and abjured Orthodoxy, lived frugally in Rome as chaplain to the Greek College.³

¹ V.Peri, 'La Congregazione dei Greci (1573) e i suoi primi documenti', *Studia Gratiana*, 13 (1967) 131-256.

² V.Peri, *Chiesa romana e 'rito' Greco. G.A.Santoro e la congregazione dei Greca (1566-1596)* (Brescia: Editrice Paideia, 1975).

³ Lorusso, 'Le statut juridique de l'Église Italo-albanaise et son projet de droit particulier', 211; V. Peri, 'L'unione della Chiesa orientale con Roma. Il moderno regime canonico occidentale nel suo sciliuppo storico', *Aevum*, 58 (1984) 439-90.

From here the development in ecclesiastical terms can be summarized. From the Roman point of view there were no longer two Churches, two communities, each with their liturgical, spiritual, disciplinary and theological tradition, in full communion, but one single Church within which were Catholic communities who could partially maintain their traditions, but not their own hierarchy. The presence of an Ordinary for Eastern priests authorized these priests to exercise their ministry, but nothing more. In 1635 the Congregation of Propaganda Fide decided to open a seminary in Reggio di Calabria for the formation of candidates descended from Albanian immigrants, but it was not possible to put this decision into practice.¹

On 11 October 1732, Pope Clement XII opened the Corsini college in San Benedetto Ullano for the Albanians of Calabria.² In 1794, the college was transferred to San Demetrio Corone, near the wealthy abbey of the Basilian monks. This institution, which trained priests and lay staff from the Albanian regions, soon acquired a reputation and esteem because of the moral and intellectual formation of the young people who came from it. Two years after the foundation of the Corsini college in Calabria, another one was founded in Palermo in Sicily. So the Albanians' future priests had local institutions for elementary formation, while in Rome from 1577 there was the Greek College for further study.³ Pope Clement XII appointed the rector of the Greek College, Felix Samuel Rodota, as titular bishop in the Bull *Superna dispositione* on 10 June 1732, specifically to enable him to ordain priests of the Eastern rite for the Calabria community. The other prerogatives of these bishops dealt with the governance of the seminary, which was under the jurisdiction of the local Ordinary, as well as the celebration of anointing. They had no jurisdiction over the

¹ Lorusso, 'Le statut juridique de l'Église Italo-albanaise et son projet de droit particulier', 211.

² Angelo Zavaroni, *Storia dell' erezione del Pontificio Collegio Corsini italo-greco di Ullano* (Napoli: 1750). Reedited into modern Italian by Domenico Morelli, under a new title *Il Collegio Corsini di S. Benedetto Ullano*, Biblioteca degli Albanesi d'Italia 5, (Cosenza: Edizioni Brenner, 2001).

³ Claude Soetens, 'Collège Grec', *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et Géographie Ecclésiastique*, vol. XXI, 1986, col. 1347-1348; V. Peri, 'Inizi e finalità ecumeniche del Collegio Greco in Roma', *Aevum*, 44 (1970) 1-71.

clergy and faithful of the Eastern rite, as this jurisdiction remained totally within the hands of the Latin bishops.¹

Thanks to the founding, first of the Greek College in Rome, and then of the elementary colleges in Calabria and Sicily, the religious heritage of the Albanians in Italy had a good chance of being successfully maintained. This springtime would not have been possible without the long and tenacious fidelity of the people and clergy to their religious roots and traditions.²

On 26 May 1742 Pope Benedict XIV issued the Bull *Etsi pastoralis*,³ which included liturgical prescriptions, like the introduction of the *filioque* clause into the Nicene-Constantinople Creed to be recited in the Eastern liturgy. It also contained other canonical prescriptions, prohibiting a husband from adopting his wife's Eastern rite, while obliging a wife to conform to the rite of her Latin spouse. On the other hand, a Latin woman was forbidden from doing the same if her husband were Eastern; children were to follow the rite of the father, unless a Latin wife wished to bring them up in her own rite. In summary, the superiority of the Latin over the Greek rite was being established. On first reading, *Etsi pastoralis* appears to be a law which is clearly opposed to the Greek rite, but as Benedict XV had the opportunity to emphasise two centuries later, these norms were dictated by the need to preserve the Greek rite, which was desired by divine design, to avoid conflicts arising between the Latin Ordinaries and the Albanian priests and faithful. In other words, *Etsi pastoralis*, with its restrictive regulations, guaranteed the Albanians of Eastern tradition the framework for their survival.⁴

¹ V. Peri, 'Culto e pieta popolare degli Albanesi d'Italia prima della riforma tridentina', *Oriente Cristiano*, 30/3 (1980) 9-41; V. Peri, 'L'ideale unionistico di P.Giorgio Gazetta. La pace da ristabilire tra la Chiesa Greca e la Chiesa Romana', *Oriente Cristiano*, 35/2-3 (1985) 18-41.

² Lorusso, 'Le statut juridique de l'Église Italo-albanaise et son projet de droit particulier', 211.

³ Ibid. 212.

⁴ Ibid. 211. For a modern historical account of this development in relations between Latin and Eastern Catholics in Italy see G. Veneziano, 'Contrasti confessionali ed ecclesiastici tra Albanesi Greco-ortodossi o cattolici e cattolici latini in Calabria e Lucania (dale origine della colonia el 1919)', *Archivio storico per la Calabria e la Lucania*, 36 (1968) 89-115.

With time, however, the need for stability and visibility for a Church with its own territory, gathered around its bishop, became more and more obvious for the Italo-Albanian faithful. This requirement, noted for a long time by the Italo-Albanians, became more urgent as it was noted how often the Greek ordaining bishop continued to be considered to have an inferior position in relation to the Latin Ordinary; this inferiority was felt by the whole populace he had care for. The Italo-Albanian communities expressed their discontent with canonical practice instituted in this way in Rome several times, and towards the end of the nineteenth century their requests became pressing. In 1888 the Italo-Albanians sent a petition with thousands of signatures to Pope Leo XIII requesting ecclesial autonomy. His successor Benedict XV established the eparchy of Lungro for the Albanians of Calabria and continental Italy. In 1936 Pius XI established the eparchy of Piana of the Albanians for the Albanians in Sicily, erected by the apostolic constitution *Apostolica Sedes* on 26 October 1937,¹ under the protection of St Demetrios of Thessaloniki. The eparchy of Lungro was established on 13 February 1919 by the apostolic constitution *Catholici Fidelis*² under the protection of St Nicholas of Myra.

2. The Italian-Albanian Church and the Monastery of Santa Maria di Grottaferrata in contemporary Italy

The Monastery of Grottaferrata was founded in 1004 by St Nilus of Rossano. This abbot, a Calabrian Greek, and hence a subject of the Byzantine Empire, had left Rossano in 980 to avoid the inroads of Muslim invaders. Under the authority of Rome the monastery experienced many changes over the centuries. In 1462 began a line of commendatory abbots, one of the most distinguished, the Greek Bessarion, himself a Basilian monk, increased the scanty and impoverished community and restored the church. Until 1608 priors dependent on the commendatories ruled the community, but in that year Grottaferrata became a member of the Basilian congregation founded by Gregory XIII, the revenues of the community were

¹ AAS, 30, 1938, 213-216. Lorusso, 'Le statut juridique de l'Église Italo-albanaise et son projet de droit particulier', 212.

² AAS, 11, 1919, pp. 222-226. Lorusso, 'Le statut juridique ...', 212.

separated from those of the commendatories, and the first of a series of triennial regular abbots was appointed. The triennial system survived the suppression of the *commendam* and lasted till the end of last century, with one break from 1834 to 1870, when the Holy See appointed priors. In 1901 new constitutions came into force and Arsenio Pellegrini was installed as the first perpetual regular abbot since 1462. The Greek Rite, which was brought to Grottaferrata by St Nilos, had lost its native character by the end of the twelfth century, and gradually became more and more latinized, but was restored by order of Leo XIII in 1881. Since being given a new jurisdiction and status in 1937, as a territorial abbey, Grottaferrata has been attempting to reinstate the Byzantine Rite as an indigenous Italian Greek tradition. Grottaferrata is actually the only remnant of the once-flourishing Italo-Greek monastic tradition.¹

The eparchy of Lungro today has 32,328 inhabitants and stretches over an area of 493 sq. km, but has no territorial continuity. The eparchy covers the whole of southern continental Italy, with parishes in Lecca, Bari, and Villa Badessa (Pescara). In Calabria the bishop has exclusive jurisdiction. The first Ordinary Bishop of Lungro, John Mele (1919-1979) had various problems to resolve, but notably the problem of embodying a Byzantine tradition affected by time into a particular Albanian culture. His job was to create an eparchial community which integrated the great Byzantine liturgical, spiritual, disciplinary and theological heritage into the Albanian communities in the most authentic way possible. His successor was John Stamati (1967-1987), the apostolic administrator *sede plena*, and Ordinary of the Eparchy from 1979. Bishop Stamati, taking on the leadership of the eparchy in the immediate aftermath of the Council had a programme which was inspired by the documents of the Second Vatican Council for a spiritual and religious renewal, based on the two essential components of the life of the local Church—the liturgy, and pastoral work. The liturgical renewal had the aim of making the whole eparchial community participate in its Eastern tradition. To this end, the Albanian language, which was spoken by the people, was

¹ S. Parenti, 'Il monastero di Grottaferrata nel medioevo (1004-1462): Segni e percorsi di una identità', *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* (Rome), 274 (2005) 1-570.

introduced into the liturgy. At the same time the pastoral renewal aimed to stimulate all, particularly lay people, to take part in the life of the eparchy in an effective and conscious way, taking on the jobs which were theirs in the eparchy. The third bishop of the Eparchy is Ercole Lupinacci (since 1987). The eparchial Church has devoted itself to a catechetical, liturgical and missionary renewal, witnessed to by the celebration of an eparchial meeting, regulated by the Code of Canon Law of Oriental Churches, and emphasising the specific nature of the Italo-Albanian Church of Byzantine tradition, which the Lord's providence has established at the heart of the West and called to live the Christian life according to its liturgical tradition, in a faithfulness to the Byzantine spirituality and Albanian language, while not forgetting its own particular ecumenical mission.¹

The eparchy *Piana degli Albanesi* is made up of four Albanian colonies of the Byzantine rite, namely *Piana*, *Mezzojuso*, *Contessa Entellina* and *Palazzo Adriano*; one Latin, *St Christine Gela*; and the parish of *Martorana* in *Palermo*. On 8 July 1960, by decree of the Sacred Oriental Congregation, the unity of the jurisdiction of the eparchy in the territory of *Mezzojuso*, *Palazzo Adriano* and *Contessa Entellina* was established. The territory, 430 sq. km, is situated in the province of *Palermo*, but is discontinuous, with villages 40 to 80 km from one another. Some of the faithful are in *Palermo*. There are currently 30,000 faithful, 22,750 of them of the Greek rite, and 7,250 of the Latin rite, with a total of 14 parishes, 11 of which are of the Greek rite and 4 of the Latin rite. The first apostolic administrator was the Archbishop of *Palermo*, Cardinal *Luigi Lavitrano* (1937-1946). Just after the Second World War, on 3 January 1947, the new Apostolic Administrator, Archbishop of *Palermo* Cardinal *Ernesto Ruffini* (1947-1967) was appointed. This initial period is marked by drafting the organisation and safeguarding the liturgical tradition. A further element which gave a new face to the eparchy was constituted by John XXIII's Bull *Orientalis Ecclesiae* of 8 July 1960. Under a canonical arrangement unique in Europe, all the parishes, with their faithful present in the territory of the eparchy, whatever their rite, became under the jurisdiction of the 'one bishop' of *Piana* of the Albanians, *Giuseppe Perniciaro*, previously auxiliary to the Apostolic Administrator. He ruled the eparchy until 1981. Among the

¹ Lorusso, 'Le statut juridique ...', 213-214.

characteristics of his rule were his resolute desire to promote ecumenical activity, particularly in contact with the Orthodox Churches—he had taken part in the works of the Second Vatican Council. In 1981 Ercole Lupinacci was appointed bishop and ruled the diocese until 1987. During this period the eparchy was characterized by its shepherd's resolute desire to faithfully continue the ecumenical work undertaken by Perniciaro, by encouraging a complete appropriation of the cultural and ecclesial (Byzantine) identity, the reorganization of various of the eparchy's offices, and above all, the commitment to achieve a real coexistence between the two rites, Roman and Byzantine. On 15 October 1988 the current bishop, the third in line, Sotir Ferrara was appointed, and consecrated on 15 January 1989.¹

3. Eastern Catholicism in modern Europe: What Future for Byzantine Catholicism in Italy?

A significant marker in the contemporary religious situation in modern Europe is the relationship between Eastern and Western churches.² The frontiers of Western Europe are often religious borders with Eastern Christendom, with Eastern Catholicism located along the divide.³ The Italian historian Roberto Morozzo della Rocca, has characterized their situation thus:

The History of the Eastern Catholic churches in Europe in the twentieth century suffers from the consequences of their geographical location on the boundaries of different civilizations and in areas of bitter ethnic and ideological conflicts. In the first half of the twentieth century, the Greek-Catholic churches endeavoured to safeguard their identity in the clash of nations and the types of nationalism which characterized the lands in which they existed. On the other hand, in the second half of the century, they resisted the harsh treatment,

¹ Lorusso, 'Le statut juridique ...', 214-215.

² C. Alzati, 'Chiesa romana e Oriente cristiano tra medioevo ed età moderna. Il problema degli Uniti', *Nicolaus*, 20/2 (1993), 31-54. See also the reflections by a Melkite priest in contemporary Europe, R. Gibbons, 'Pride and Prejudice: the Vocation of the Eastern Catholic Churches', *One in Christ*, 43/2 (2009) 35-53.

³ See the very helpful collection by S. Mahieu, & V. Naumescu (eds.), *Churches In-between: Greek Catholic Churches in Postsocialist Europe*, Halle Studies in the Anthropology of Eurasia Bd.16 (Berlin : Lit Verlag, 2009).

confronting the desire for the annihilation and the persecutions carried out by the communist regimes against Catholicism and especially Eastern-rite Catholicism. The destiny of Greek Catholics in the Europe of the 'brief century' is marked by great suffering and tenacious struggles for survival in really difficult historical contexts.¹

With the fall of communism and the Soviet political system, another geo-political European structure has emerged. It is not without significance that it is a German pontiff, Benedict XVI who, conscious that the future of Christianity in the new emerging Europe will depend upon a rapprochement between Eastern and Western churches, is making Christian unity a central point of his papacy.² Dominant Eastern Orthodox states such as Bulgaria, Greece and Romania are now part of the EU and many other states have significant Eastern Christians communities, and in particular Eastern Catholic minorities which together number some millions, for example in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Poland. In the Ukraine relations between Eastern Catholics and Orthodox makes it an extremely important political fault line that in many ways determines this state's relations with Europe.³

Modern Italy is not often placed in this debate as a significant cultural and religious space for Eastern Catholicism or a meeting point for relations between the Western and Eastern churches.⁴ However

¹ Roberto Morozzo della Rocca, 'Le Chiese orientali cattoliche d'Europa nella storia del Novecento', *Fede e martirio. Le Chiese orientali cattoliche d'Europa nella storia del Novecento*, Atti del Convegno di storia ecclesiastica contemporanea, Città del Vaticano, 22-24 ottobre 1998, Rome, Libreria Editrice Vaticana 2003, pp. 13-21, p. 21.

² See the reflections by Vincent Nichols, Archbishop of Westminster, *The Tablet*, 5 June 2010.

³ Roberto Morozzo della Rocca, 'L'ortodossia balcanica e l'Europa', A. Canavero & Jean-Dominique Durand (eds.), *Il fattore religioso nell'integrazione europea* (Milan: Ed. Unicopli 1999), 81-97; Roberto Morozzo della Rocca, *Le Chiese ortodosse: una storia contemporanea* (Rome: Ed. Studium, 1997).

⁴ See the following studies: Robert J. Taft, 'Between east and west: the Eastern Catholic ('Uniate') churches', *The Cambridge History of Christianity: vol. VIII World Christianities, c.1815-c.1914* (Cambridge University Press, 2006), 412-425; Peter Galadza, 'Eastern Catholic Christianity', *The Blackwell Companion to Eastern Christianity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), 291-318. For an important canonical comparison between Eastern Catholic and Eastern Orthodox

this paper is an attempt to address this significant modern historical and contemporary religious context.¹ With Eleuterio Fortino, we may note Benedict XV's initiatives for the Christian East, which included the founding of an Eparchy for the Italo-Albanians of Calabria and continental Italy in 1919, as well as the action of Pius XI who, in his turn, founded the Italo-Albanian Eparchy of Sicily in 1937 and granted the abbey of Grottaferrata the rank of exarchate-monastery (territorial monastery).² Together, these initiatives enabled the Italo-Albanian Church to rediscover its ecclesiological meaning: the configuration of the Church, its faithful people, its tradition, language, and episcopate. In this new context, the pope authorized an inter-eparchial synod which met at Grottaferrata in 1940, with the aim of *purifying* liturgical practice from elements from other traditions, and *unifying* disciplinary norms. Even though it did not act as a provincial synod (the Ordinaries did not yet form a *Provincia Ecclesiastica*), it helped to reinforce the Church structure of the Italo-Albanese community, and its unity.³

Against this background a contemporary question has emerged—how do we understand the ecclesial witness of the Italian-Albanian Church. The two eparchies of Lungro and Piana degli Albanese and

ecclesiology, see Dimtri Salachas: 'Le "status" ecclésiologique et canonique des églises catholiques orientales "sui iuris" et des églises orthodoxes autocéphales', *L'année canonique*, 33 (1990), 29-56.

¹ Constantine Simon, 'Benedict XVI's Church Politics towards the East and its Repercussions on the Foundation of the Pontifical Oriental Institute', *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* (Rome), 284 (2009) 11-36; Jan Krajcar, 'The Christian East and Popes from Leo XIII to Pius XII', *Seminarium* 27/2 (1975) 298-315.

² Eleuterio F. Fortino, 'Aspects ecclésiologiques de l'Église italo-albanaise. Tensions et communion', *Irénikon*, 45 (1992) 363-386; Eleuterio Fortino & George Gallaro, 'The Byzantine Church in Italy: Tensions and Communion', *Eastern Churches Journal*, 7/3 (2000) 43-64; Pasquale Magnano & George Gallaro, 'Byzantine Catholics in Sicily', *Diakonia*, 30/2-3 (1997) 89-106; Salvatore Manna, 'Byzantine Presence in southern Italy', *Diakonia*, 25/2 (1992) 121-160.

³ For documentation on the meeting, the organisation and the preparation of the Synod and the canonical configuration of the three new Byzantine ecclesial areas in Italy, see Eleuterio F. Fortino, 'Il sinodo intereparchiale di Grottaferrata e chiesa bizantina in Italia' in *Studies in honor of Robert Taft, SJ*. Rome, Studia Anselmiana, 110 (1993) 119-40.

the Exarchate monastery of Grottaferrata are well-defined canonical entities, independent of any other local authority and subject to the direct control of the Holy See. They organize pastoral care and all other initiatives within the common law autonomously. The new canonical organization offers these communities the possibility of finding their identity together, reinforced in cultural, spiritual and disciplinary ways. As dioceses, they are part of the communion of particular Churches, a communion which lives organically at various levels: regional, through their participation in their respective Episcopal conferences; national, through their full participation as members of the Italian Bishops' Conference. As these Eastern Church jurisdictions are directly suffragan to the Holy See, they express communion with Peter's successor and the universal Church through this link. In terms of the internal canonical organization of three Byzantine jurisdictions in Italy as unitary entities, it must be noted that until now, while they have all the necessary elements, they do not constitute a Church *sui iuris* in the sense defined by the new *Code of Oriental Canon Law*, as they are neither a Patriarchal Church (canons 55-150) nor a major Archiepiscopal Church (canons 151-54), nor a Metropolitan Church (canons 155-73). They could be put into the latter category, but this would require a positive act by the Holy See. The final category of provision in the *Code* for other churches *sui iuris* (canons 174-76), according to Fortino, does not correspond to the reality of the Italo-Albanian Church, because it is too constraining.¹

The new *Code of Oriental Canon Law* clearly distinguishes between the two realities: while the Church *sui iuris* is a group of faithful brought together by the hierarchy according to the norm of the law and recognized as such (canon 27), the rite expresses a way of living faith proper to each Church *sui iuris* (canon 28). This ecclesiological category, applied to the Italo-Albanians, offers the possibility of a complete recovery of the ecclesial dimension as an organic unity, as a structured community with its own hierarchy in communion with the local Latin Church. In this way the vision of the two Churches in full communion of faith, sacraments and hierarchy would be re-established. And in this way a fuller vision of the Catholic communion from the point of view of unity in legitimate diversity would be reaffirmed.²

¹ Fortino, 'Aspects ecclésiologiques de l'Église italo-albanaise', 375-377.

² Ibid. 377.

However, Faris clearly states that under the current canonical arrangement, the Italian-Byzantines are categorized as ‘other churches *sui iuris*’, with each entity, two eparchies and one monastery, immediately subject to the Apostolic See as determined in canons 174-76 of the Eastern code.¹ The Eastern churches categorized as ‘other’ include: the Bulgarian Church (Apostolic Exarchate of Sofia); the Greek Church (Eparchy of Athens and Apostolic Exarchate of Istanbul); the Hungarian Church (Eparchy of Hajdúdorog and Apostolic Exarchate of Miskolc); the Slovak Greek Catholic Church (Eparchies of Prešov [Slovak republic], Sts Cyril and Methodius of Toronto [Canada], and the Apostolic Exarchate of Košice [Slovak republic]);² the Ruthenium Greek Catholic Church (Eparchy of Mukačevo [Ukraine] and Apostolic Exarchate of the Czech Republic; the Greek Catholics in the former Yugoslavia (Eparchy of Krizevci [Croatia], Apostolic Exarchate for Serbia and Montenegro, Apostolic Exarchate of FYROM [Macedonia]. Four other ‘churches’, Russian, Belarussian, Georgian and Albanian, fall into this category, but lack hierarchies.³ The recent elevation of the Slovak Greek catholic Church to metropolitan status has inspired many Italian-Albanians to seek this canonical, historical solution to their ecclesial presence in Italy.

Despite the important historical presence of Eastern Christianity in Italy, the numbers of Italo-Albanians remain small (in 2007 there were 33,150 in the Eparchy of Lungro; 30,000 in the Eparchy Piana degli

¹ Faris, ‘Byzantines in Italy’, 91-2. For ways in which the ‘Latin Church’ fits alongside this category, see Faris, ‘The Latin Church *sui iuris*’, *The Jurist*, 62/2 (2002) 280-93.

² The Holy See—as the recent decision on creating a metropolitan structure for the Slovak Greek Catholic Church shows—is not opposed to establishing new structures for Eastern Catholicism in Europe. On 30 January 2008, Pope Benedict XVI reorganized the Greek Catholic Church in Slovakia and raised it to the status of a Metropolitan Church *sui iuris*. In doing so, he elevated the eparchy of Presov to a Metropolitan See, elevated the Apostolic Exarchate of Kosice to the status of eparchy, and created a new eparchy in Bratislava, the Slovak capital. See Jozef Pavlovic for the origins of this development: ‘The Byzantine Catholic Church in Slovakia’, *Eastern Churches Journal*, 5/3 (1998) 61-84. For the canonical background to this ecclesial development see Cyril Vasil, *Kanónické pramene byzantsko-slovanskej katolíckej cirkvi v Mukačevskej a Prešovskej eparchii v porovnaní s Kódexom kánonov východných cirkví*, (Trnava: Dobrá kniha, 2000).

³ Faris, ‘Byzantines in Italy’, 105.

Albanesi; 90 at the Monastery of Grottaferrata). However, due to emigration from southern Italy during the twentieth century, more than 100,000 live in North America and northern Europe. The wave of emigration from southern Italy between 1900 and 1910 depopulated approximately half of all Albanian villages, almost causing the disappearance of their culture. In recent years there has been a significant revival in Italo-Albanian (known today as *Arbëreschë*) culture, placing much political pressure on ecclesial jurisdiction. It is estimated that the population of Albanian villages in southern Italy is about 250,000, with about two-thirds preserving their Albanian dialects and those who are Byzantine rite maintaining the totality of their culture better. Albanians from Albania and Kosovo have started to settle in these villages, though it is not always clear if they are Christians or crypto-Christians from Islam.¹ In the USA there is a pastoral mission, *Our Lady of Grace Greek Catholic Mission/Society*, Italian-Greek Catholic Church, Staten Island, New York. It aims, eventually, to reinstate the Italo-Albanian rite in North America. In northern Italy more than 10,000 Italo-Albanians live in the Piedmont region. However, the status of the Italo-Albanian ecclesial body continues to experience on-going tensions within the community and between itself and the Latin Church in Italy.

For example Parenti,² a historian and liturgical scholar of the Monastery of Grottaferrata and the Byzantine Church, sets out the changing position of the Byzantine rite in the nomenclature of the Holy See. In the 1944 edition of *Annuario Pontificio*, the different faces of the Eastern Churches are grouped according to their liturgical tradition, the monastery of Grottaferrata and the Italo-Albanians being entered as part of the Constantinople Byzantine Rite until 1972. In the 1972 edition, Grottaferrata was no longer held distinct but part

¹ Crypto-Christianity is a significant historical issue and a continuing reality in Albania-Kosovo. See Noel Malcolm, 'Crypto-Christianity and Religious Amphibianism in the Ottoman Balkans: the Case of Kosovo', *Religious Quest and National identity in the Balkans*, eds. C. Hawksorth, M. Heppel & H. Norris (London: Palgrave, 2001), 91-109. (Abbé Georg Stadtmüller's classic study might also be cited here, 'Die Islamisierung bei den Albanern'.)

² S. Parenti, 'Il Monastero Esarchico di Grottaferrata e la Chiesa italo-albanese', *Apollinaris*, 73 (2000) 629-662; also *Il monastero di Grottaferrata nel medioevo (1004-1462). Segni e percorsi di una identità*, Rome, Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2005.

of the Italo-Albanian ecclesial grouping. The position remained the same until the 1993 edition. From Parenti's perspective Grottaferrata would now appear to be included in the same rite and jurisdiction as the Italo-Albanians. According to Parenti, despite the proposed grouping in *Annuario Pontificio*, these three entities are in fact not one but three jurisdictional churches, subject directly to the Holy See. This arrangement of three separate and independent jurisdictions remains unsatisfactory.

The monastic establishment of Grottaferrata has made it clear on a number of occasions that the monastery does not want to be included in any metropolitan structure comprising the two Italo-Albanian eparchies.¹ The Holy See—as the recent decision on creating a metropolitan structure for the Slovak Greek Catholic Church shows—is not opposed to establishing new structures for Eastern Catholicism in Europe. Benedict XVI, conscious that the future of Christianity in the new emerging Europe will depend upon a *rapprochement* between Eastern and Western churches, as the political and economic union of the continent marches eastwards, will be aware of the need to create an 'archipelago' of robust Eastern Catholic ecclesial structures across Europe, and would be open to a new Eastern Catholic structure in Italy which might help to build bridges with the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Constantinople, a key relationship in the religious leadership of Europe. Ceffalia has suggested that a new eparchy be created in northern Italy to support the Italo-Albanians there and unite the three ecclesial structures to create one metropolitan church *sui iuris* that would be governed by canons 155-173 of the Eastern Code.²

History has presented a challenge and opportunity, as the 'Italo-Byzantines, Greeks and Albanians are living witnesses that it is possible to be faithful to both Eastern tradition and Roman Catholic communion.'³ However, in a new and dynamic situation in which the patrimony of the Western church's ecclesial structure is being

¹ Parenti, 'Il Monastero Esarchico ...', 659-61; Faris, 'Byzantines in Italy', 108.

² I. Ceffalia, 'La Chiesa Italo-albanese, Chiesa *sui iuris*?', Luis Okulik (ed.), *Le Chiese sui iuris: Criteri di Individuazione e delimitazione* (Venice: Editrice Marcianum, 2005) 193-208; Faris, 'Byzantines in Italy', 108.

³ Faris, 'Byzantines in Italy', 108.

challenged, not just by the legacy of the reformations, but also by political changes and the movement of peoples, especially Eastern Christians, and in which an authentic identity is being sought, church structures will need to respond, whilst maintaining the bonds of communion. Finding a solution after centuries of tension and instability to the Italo-Albanian situation might be considered a model for other Eastern Catholic communities: Chaldeans, Maronites, Syrians, Syro-Malabars, arriving as new settlers in Europe as the Albanians did from Ottoman domination and conquest some centuries ago.

A NOTE ON THE ANTIPHON: *SUB TUUM PRAESIDIUM*

Eoin de Bhaldraithe*

The antiphon Sub tuum is of very ancient origin. It is often used to bolster Catholic devotion to Mary. However when we become aware of its possible Gnostic origins, some caution is advisable.

The Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC) issued an agreed statement on Mary in February 2004.¹ In it, the oldest invocation of Mary in the liturgy, known to Catholics as the *Sub tuum*, is quoted as follows: 'We fly to thy protection, O holy mother of God; despise not our petition in our necessities, but deliver us from all dangers, O ever glorious and blessed Virgin.' Along with the Greek text it appears in a footnote. According to the ARCIC methodology, controversial matters that do not affect ecumenical agreement are dealt with in footnotes.

This well-known antiphon was never part of the Roman liturgy even though it was recommended as an introduction to the Litany of Loreto. It is used in the Liturgy of Vespers in the Coptic and Byzantine rites. It is also used in the Ambrosian rite as an antiphon after the gospel on Feasts of Mary.²

It took on a completely new status, however, when part of it was discovered on a papyrus in Manchester. The word *Theotoke* was quite clear.³ The papyrologist, Edgar Lobel, thought it belonged to the third century. It was published by M.C.H. Roberts in 1938 who said that it must belong to the fourth century as it was 'almost incredible that a

* Eoin de Bhaldraithe is a monk of the Cistercian monastery of Bolton Abbey, Co. Kildare.

¹ D. Bolen, G. Cameron (ed.), *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ. The Seattle Statement of ARCIC. The Text with Commentaries* (London: Continuum, 2006) text: 7-88. We will refer to this as 'Bolen'.

² E. Lanne, 'Marian Doctrine and Piety up to Chalcedon' in A. Denaux, N. Sagovsky, *Studying Mary: The ARCIC Working Papers* (London: Clark, 2007) 55-56.

³ Reproduced as the frontispiece of M. O'Carroll, *Theotokos: A Theological Encyclopedia of the Blessed Virgin Mary* (Dublin: Dominican, 1982).

prayer addressed so directly to the Virgin in these terms could be written in the third century.¹

A monk of Chevotogne, Feuillen Mercenier, identified it the following year as part of the Greek version of the *Sub tuum*.² This was greeted with some triumphalism by Catholics.³ One should, however, proceed cautiously as its origins are quite doubtful.

Gnostic

The ARCIC note cites the classical study of Otto Stegmüller but only to quote his Greek text. If Lobel is right, the text would be contemporary with Origen who uses *theotokos* five times.⁴ Stegmüller (1952) places it around 400 AD. For him it is clear that it did not come from the liturgy of the time. It would appear that it was composed in heretical Gnostic circles. It does not ask for Mary's intercession but for her mercy and her direct intervention. Stegmüller compares it with liturgical texts in the apocryphal Acts of Thomas. 'Almost the whole vocabulary of the prayer is found in those Acts. That means that we are dealing with an old liturgical formula. It was applied first to the Father, then to the Son and in later development was used for praying to the mother of God.'⁵ There is a prayer for anointing in those same Acts where the holy Spirit is invoked as 'merciful mother'. It was an easy transition then to apply this to Mary. Because it included the word *theotokos* it had great influence in later times.

Hilda Graef accepts the position of Stegmüller who 'assigns it to the fourth century and to gnostic circles'.⁶ If it belongs to the fifth century, how would one explain its influence on the *Akathistos* hymn (composed about 550)? 'Hail, unespoused Spouse, deliver all from

¹ M.C.H. Roberts, *Catalogue of Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library* (Cambridge 1938) n. 470. O'Carroll, 'The Sub tuum', op.cit., 336.

² P.F. Mercenier, 'L'antienne mariale grecque la plus ancienne', *Le Muséon* 52 (1939) 229-33.

³ I. Cecchetti, 'Sub tuum praesidium', *American Ecclesiastical Review*, 140 (1959) 1-5.

⁴ M. Starowieyski, 'Le titre θεοτόκος avant le concile d'Ephèse', *Studia Patristica* 19 (1987) 236-42. He accepts the third century date proposed by Lobel.

⁵ O. Stegmüller, 'Sub tuum praesidium: Bemerkungen zur ältestem Überlieferung', *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 74 (1952) 76-82 (81).

⁶ H. Graef, *Mary: A History of Doctrine and Devotion*, 2 volumes (London: 1963, 1965) I: 48.

every calamity and free all who call on you from the chastisement to come', is clearly taking its cue from the *Sub tuum*.¹

Our Father

The Milan version is altogether different: 'We fly to your mercy, O mother of God; hear our petition, lead us not into temptation but deliver us from danger, only chaste and blessed one.'

There is a clear echo here of the text of the Our Father. 'This aberrant form must date from an extremely early period and it suggests that the Milanese version must have been translated from the Greek independently of the Roman version', says Chrysogonus Waddell.² Yet this is clearly the 'more difficult' reading, so it has a strong claim to be a more primitive form of the text.

Hans Förster (1995) compares the text with another version preserved in Vienna. He argues from the character of the writing, and its use of brown ink, that it must be from the sixth or seventh century. However, he believes, one cannot fully exclude the fifth century.³ His explanation is that the antiphon came from the West (Milan) into the Eastern liturgy. This close connection with the Our Father lets us see the text in a different light and seems to confirm that it came from Gnostic sources.

Conclusion

The *Sub tuum* has many questions attached to its development. The relationship with the Our Father is at the origins of the text. Whether it originated in East or West, it seems that the Milan version witnesses to its earliest state. It must have been strongly influenced by the Our Father, as it gives Mary a role virtually independent of God. It does not ask for her intercession but for her mercy and her direct intervention. There is a strong case for it having Gnostic origins. It probably originated in Egypt and was to have extensive influence before the Council of Ephesus and was at the origin of developments such as the *Akathistos* hymn. It is not appropriate to use it as a Catholic polemical tool.

¹ L.M. Peltomaa, *The Image of the Virgin Mary in the Akathistos Hymn* (Leiden: Brill, 2001) 79.

² C. Waddell, 'The Oldest Marian Antiphon-text', *Liturgy* (Gethsemani) 14 (1980) 41-60.

³ H. Förster, 'Zur ältesten Überlieferung der marianischen Antiphon "Sub tuum praesidium"', *Biblos* 44 (1995) 183-92.

REPORTS & EVENTS

CONFERENCE COMMEMORATING THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE APOSTOLIC LETTER OF POPE JOHN PAUL II, *ORIENTALE LUMEN*

Benedict Gaughan *

A one day conference was held on 15 May 2010 at the Centre for Eastern Christianity, Heythrop College, University of London, entitled *Catholic-Orthodox Relations: Trends and Contexts in Ecumenical, Theological and Ecclesial Dialogue since Vatican II*.

The day was organised by Dr Anthony O'Mahony, Reader in Church History and Theology, Heythrop College and Fr Mark Woodruff of the Society of St John Chrysostom. It was well attended and drew participants mainly from the Orthodox and Catholic traditions.

The speakers were as follows:

Vincent Nichols, Archbishop of Westminster;

Bishop Kallistos Ware, Metropolitan of Diokleia;

Fr Aidan Nichols OP, Blackfriars, Cambridge;

Archimandrite Demetrios Charbak, Vicar General of the Diocese of Akkar, Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch;

Fr Iwan Dacko, Professor of Ecumenical Theology, and President of the Institute of Ecumenical Studies, the Ukraine Catholic University, Lviv;

Dr Simon Marincak, Director of the Michael Lacko Centre for East/West Spirituality, Kosice, Slovakia; and

Mother Nikola Proksch OSB, Prioress of St Mildred's Minster Abbey.

Dr Marcus Plested, Vice-Principal and academic director of the Cambridge Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies, chaired two of the sessions and provided a valuable contribution. He enthusiastically pledged the support of his institute for any future meetings.

The programme was full, yet there was some time for questions and discussion. Archbishop Vincent's informed and encouraging opening reflection provided an excellent appraisal of the Apostolic Letter from which he quoted extensively (his paper is reproduced below). He

* Sr Benedict Gaughan OSB is a nun of Minster Abbey.

expressed his hope for greater co-operation between our Churches in the future, commended the work being done at Minster Abbey and acknowledged the significance of the Society of St John Chrysostom of which he is a patron. Although His Grace was not able to stay for the day, his warm and spirit-filled words facilitated a positive beginning.

It would be impossible to give justice to the various speakers in this account of the day. The following is offered only as a short summary.

There was an enlightening historical element to the day, with insights into the various historical Councils since the 1054 'Great Schism.' Fr Aidan provided a succinct account of the quite astonishing progress that has been made in the Catholic Church since Vatican II. He spoke of the Phanar meeting in November 1979, when Pope John Paul II and Patriarch Dimitrios I announced the establishment of a Joint Commission to begin theological dialogue between our Churches. He gave a clear account of the ensuing meetings, pointing out their successes and failures. The most recent series, begun at Ravenna in 2007, is currently concentrating on the role of the Petrine Ministry in the first Millennium. This theme was then picked up by Bishop Kallistos who was present at Ravenna and subsequent meetings. He spoke of the tensions over the Petrine ministry and candidly pointed out that, if progress is to be made, there must be change on the part of the Roman Catholic Church—returning to a more primitive and collegial form of Papal authority. He reminded us that, in the last analysis, reunion is the work of the Holy Spirit.

Fr Iwan spoke in detail of the Ukrainian Church's struggle as it re-emerges from '70 years of Godless rule'. A careful account was given of the progress which is being made in dialogue especially since the legalisation of the Greek-Catholic Church in 1989. Three documents have been produced by the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic hierarchy since 2004. Fr Iwan provided an outline of the main points. He expressed the hope of his church '... that Catholics and Orthodox might find themselves at home in a Church where full communion with the entire Universal Church is preserved, and a relationship with the main centres of reference: Rome, Constantinople and Moscow for the traditional Churches descending from Kyivan Church, would be maintained.'

Simon Marincak presented the complex history of the Byzantine Catholic Church with reference to its liturgical form. His paper deserves careful study. The Latinization of the Byzantine Catholic Church appears to be a current problem to be solved. However, firstly there

needs to be a recognition that Latinization has happened and then to ask why. Simon recognises the need for a unity of liturgy, spirituality and theology if the authentic Byzantine tradition is to be restored in the Byzantine Catholic Church.

The Monastic contributions came from Archimandrite Demetrios and Mother Nikola. Fr Demetrios spoke of the importance of the Christian presence in the East perhaps more especially at this time when Christians are leaving the area. He emphasized that for the most part, in his country, Syria, Christians enjoy freedom to worship. He spoke of the official dialogue which exists in Syria between the two Churches, and of the great progress that has been made, notably following a meeting between the Greek Catholic Patriarch Maximos and Patriarch Athenegoras in June 1964. Soon after this meeting, the Lebanese Roman Catholic Archbishop Elias Zoghbi said that there was no real justification for the Great Schism between our Churches. We were told of the dual-purpose Churches in Damascus and Aleppo with two different liturgies held at different times. There exists a common use of sacred art and vessels. For the last four years in Safita, Easter has been celebrated together and this will continue. His last remarks deserve to be quoted in full: 'No one in Syria cares much about what talks are going on and conclusions from the international dialogue committee between "When are we going to celebrate Easter together?" We were in union for the first thousand years, we were dissidents for the second millennium, we look forward in the third to unity in diversity.'

In her paper, due to appear in the next issue of *One in Christ*, Mother Nikola highlighted the fact that Monasticism is a vital contributor to the Ecumenical Dialogue and that there has been an enthusiastic response to *Oriente Lumen* at Ampleforth, Minster, Turvey and other European Monasteries. 'The strong common traits uniting the monastic experience of the East and the West make it a wonderful bridge of fellowship, where unity as it is lived shines even more brightly than may appear in dialogue between the Churches' (*Oriente Lumen*, 9). Providing reports of meetings held at Minster since 1996, which bring together a wide range of Orthodox and Catholic contributors and participants, including those from the pre-Chalcedonian traditions, her paper provided practical, concrete responses to the Apostolic Letter. These monastic contributions elicited great interest from the participants.

OPENING ADDRESS OF THE MOST REVEREND VINCENT NICHOLS, ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER*

I am delighted to be with you today, to commemorate the fifteenth anniversary of Pope John Paul II's Apostolic Letter *Orientalis Lumen* on the Eastern Churches. I greet His Excellency Metropolitan Kallistos Ware of Diokleia, and Fr Demetrios Charbak of the Patriarchate of Antioch, who will also speak today. It is especially delightful to share this time with Mother Nikola of the Priory of St Mildred at Minster Abbey. Her community's unstinting work to foster East-West dialogue by providing space for hospitality, prayer and reflection, is well known. It is a significant response to the call of the late Pope John Paul II in *Orientalis Lumen* to foster this dialogue, especially through the monastic tradition. I also greet today's other speakers who will contribute during today's conference.

My thanks, also, go to the Centre for Eastern Christianity here at Heythrop and to the Society of St John Chrysostom for sponsoring this day conference.

The purpose of my remarks is to help set the scene for this conference, and also to reflect the responsibility of the Catholic Church in England and Wales towards the growing number of Eastern Christians, both Catholic and Orthodox, who choose to live here.

But I want to start by focusing our attention on Rome—not the See of Rome as such, but on one of the ancient churches which is situated in that city. In the fourth century Basilica beneath the ground-level twelfth century Church of San Clemente, there is a shrine commemorating the two Slav brothers, St Cyril and St Methodius. They are known as the Apostles of the Slavs and are remembered for their work of evangelisation in their own time and place. Pope John Paul II, in his Encyclical *Slavorum Apostoli*, spoke of the value of these saints for our own time. The Pope proclaimed both saints to be Co-Patrons of Europe, recognising their work among the Slav peoples which, he wrote, was an 'incalculable contribution to the work of proclaiming the Gospel among those [Slav] peoples', and of their work to promote 'reconciliation, friendly coexistence, human development and respect for the intrinsic dignity of every nation' (*Slavorum Apostoli*, 1). Pope

* © Vincent Nichols 2010

John Paul, in *Oriental Lumen*, speaks of himself as the 'son of a Slav people' who 'is particularly moved by the call of those peoples to whom the two saintly brothers Cyril and Methodius went.' He continues:

They were a glorious example of apostles of unity who were able to proclaim Christ in their search for communion between East and West amid the difficulties which sometimes set the two worlds against one another. Several times I have reflected on the example of their activity, also addressing those who are their children in faith and culture. (*OL*, 3)

In a sense, this statement of the Pope sets the scene for what follows in the rest of his Apostolic Letter. It is rooted in his steadfast work for the unity of the Church, both East and West. This, as we know, drove much of his Pontificate, especially in the context of the end of the Cold War in Europe and his efforts for the renewal of European unity. Pope Benedict has called for deeper reflection on the meaning of contemporary European unity in an expanding and changing global context. It is within this context that relations between the Churches of the East and especially the Catholic Church are continuing to emerge. These relations are a new and significant marker for Christian identity in the emerging Europe of today. This important new context for Christianity and the significant enlargement of the European Union towards the East means that for the first time in history, the Churches of the East and the West find themselves side by side in a new European political and cultural framework. With the expansion of Europe eastwards, its centre of gravity, both political and religious, is shifting. In recent times Catholic-Protestant relations in Western Europe have been the key relationship, but this is also changing as countries with majority Orthodox populations join the European Union, such as Bulgaria, Romania and Greece. This will continue if and when Ukraine and Georgia are admitted. A renewed sense of our common roots and shared values will add to our understanding of our common Christian witness in this emerging context. One Orthodox thinker has described a united Europe for Orthodoxy as 'the future of our past'.

We should also pause to reflect a little further on the legacy of the Second Vatican Council, which opened a new period in Catholic-Orthodox relations after almost 1000 years of separation. We especially recall Pope Paul VI's visit to the Orthodox Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople in 1964 and 1967. Pope Paul was the first Pope to visit the East since the ninth century, and it was during these visits that he

referred to the Eastern Churches as 'Sister Churches'. His meeting with Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras I in 1964 in Jerusalem led to the rescinding of the excommunications of the Great Schism of 1054. This significant step towards restoring communion between Rome and Constantinople produced the Catholic-Orthodox Joint Declaration of 1965, which was simultaneously read out on 7 December 1965 in Rome and in Istanbul. Although the declaration did not end the schism, it did show a deep desire for greater reconciliation between the two Churches. This must be considered to be one of the most extraordinary and significant events in the modern history of the Church and turned the Churches in the new direction to seek full unity.

Today's conference gives us the opportunity to dig deeper into the significance and direction that *Oriente Lumen* has provided for the full unity of the Church, recognising the significance of the Eastern Churches. As Pope John Paul II said in his Apostolic Letter, our Churches are closely linked; we have almost everything in common, especially our shared longing for the full unity of the Church.

In *Oriente Lumen*, the Pope reflects on how the Eastern Churches approach the inexpressible Mystery of God as revealed in the Blessed Trinity. This is rooted in what it means to participate in the life of the Trinity through the sacramental life of the Church in the liturgy and especially through the Eucharist, so central to Eastern spirituality. Also, the teaching of the Cappadocian Fathers and especially St Irenaeus on what is understood as the path of divinisation is essential to our understanding of Eastern Christianity. For the Eastern Christian, it is the power of the Holy Spirit dwelling in men and women that begins the process, as it were, of divinisation here on earth. '[T]he creature is transfigured and God's kingdom inaugurated' (*OL*, 6). The martyrs and the saints have a special place in Eastern spirituality, since they have been made most like Christ through God's grace and their commitment to Him, and they go before us on the path towards divinisation.

The Blessed Virgin Mary occupies a special place among the saints, since it is she who gave birth to the Son and she is the icon of the Church. Mary is 'the model and the unfailing hope for all those who direct their steps towards the heavenly Jerusalem' (*OL*, 6). The spiritual traditions of the East are especially expressed in monastic life, which has flourished throughout the centuries and which 'flowed over into the Western world' (*OL*, 6).

Oriente Lumen does great justice to the place and meaning of mystery in the mind and heart of the Eastern Churches. Pope John Paul challenges Catholics to benefit from the spiritual riches of the Eastern Fathers 'which lift up the whole man to the contemplation of the divine mysteries' (*OL*, 6).

The Pope returns to Sts Cyril and Methodius to reflect on the relationship between the Gospel, Churches and culture and the way in which the Eastern Churches provide us with an exemplary model of 'successful inculturation'. To avoid what he calls the 'recurrence of particularism' and 'exaggerated nationalism',

the proclamation of the Gospel is to be deeply rooted in what is distinctive in each culture and open to convergence in a universality, which involves an exchange for the sake of mutual enrichment. (*OL*, 7)

I now want to turn to the more pragmatic aspects of the Apostolic Letter and consider how we might take these forward, fifteen years on. The penultimate section of the letter, entitled *Meeting one another, getting to know one another, working together*, resonates with similar statements based on the ecumenical dialogues between the Catholic Church and, for example, the Anglican Communion, the Methodist Church and the Baptist World Alliance. In some of these dialogues, provision is made for how, at different levels of relationship between the churches, practical shape and form can be given to the degrees of unity that have been achieved. It needs to be said again that, without this practical application of shared belief, the full unity of the Church remains a dream at best and mere theory at worst.

Pope John Paul's appreciation of the Eastern Churches reveals within them a similar coherence of belief and practice as can be seen within the Catholic Church itself, and which encourages a sort of 'ecumenical catechesis' in the light of other traditions. The Pope quotes St Paul's words in his Letter to the Romans, 'that I may impart to you some spiritual gift to strengthen you, that is, that we may be mutually encouraged by each other's faith, both yours and mine' (Rom. 1: 11-12). This 'exchange of gifts' is not new to ecumenical relating and has been encouraged by Pope John Paul and Pope Benedict.

The need for *diakonia*, for a sincere ministry of common charity, is also to be encouraged, which will provide concrete and measurable commitment of one to the other, especially in difficult circumstances. Pope John Paul frequently returns to the theme of common witness to the faith as fundamental, especially in areas where the children of the

Catholic Church—Latin and Eastern—and children of the Orthodox Churches live together.

The Pope also encourages an improving in knowledge of the other tradition, so that mutual understanding may grow. This is to take place, for example, in seminaries and theological faculties. Monasteries are particularly marked out in this respect because of the unique role the monastic life has within the Churches in the East and the West. This is also a significant opportunity for the two traditions to share their theological and spiritual resources for their mutual enrichment and that of wider society and culture.

The Pope also encourages inter-parish activities, such as ‘twinning’, for mutual enrichment and the ministry of charity. Joint pilgrimages to the places of the saints and especially the martyrs of recent times in Eastern Europe should also be considered. Cooperation is also encouraged between local Catholics and Christians of the Eastern Churches who have left their countries of origin. It is estimated that nearly one million Christians of the Eastern Churches from Eastern Europe, the Middle East and the Syriac Churches of India have come to live and work in the United Kingdom in recent years. Our relationship with these Christians is therefore a local reality and challenges us to respond positively. *Oriente Lumen* and subsequent papal teaching provides the direction and resource for a deeper and renewed commitment to this relationship within the Catholic Church and to the wider Christian community in the United Kingdom. This clearly reflects the commitment of Pope Paul VI, Pope John Paul II and Pope Benedict XVI to the meaning and purpose of ecumenical dialogue.

Oriente Lumen provides both a deep theological reflection and clear practical guidance in furthering the growth of the relationship between the Catholic Church and the Eastern Churches. This also provides a template for further reflection and action within the Church in England and Wales as we recognise the growing number of Eastern Catholic and Orthodox Christians who now live within these countries. The Catholic Bishops’ Conference recognises that this challenge differs within each Diocese, depending on the local numbers of Eastern Catholic or Orthodox Christians there are. The Bishops’ Conference has, in collaboration with the Oriental Orthodox Churches in England, established a Catholic–Oriental Orthodox Forum. This Forum seeks to encourage mutual understanding and practical cooperation between our Churches, especially in the ways outlined in *Oriente Lumen*. Since

1957, Ukrainian Catholics of the Byzantine-Slavonic rite have had their own Apostolic Exarchate in England. This ecclesial cooperation is well established within our Bishops' Conference and enriches our understanding of the mystery of the Church among us. The Eastern Catholic Churches in a number of European countries including Slovakia, Hungary, Poland, the Ukraine, and Italy, hold a significant importance for the wider Catholic Church.

In these days of closer practical ecumenical cooperation based on the degree of unity that has been achieved, it is timely for the Catholic Church to explore how to build stronger relations with Eastern and other Orthodox communities. The quality and character of this relationship will be an important witness in the context of a profoundly changing religious and political situation for Christianity in the United Kingdom. But this will only make sense if the cooperation being sought and encouraged by *Orientalis Lumen* is nourished at the local level and between communities. The work of Minster Abbey and others provides a helpful template, based as it is on the shared monastic principles of hospitality, prayer and mutual respect. I want to encourage the Heythrop Centre for Eastern Christianity and the Society of St John Chrysostom to continue their work of deepening understanding and respect between the Churches of the East and the Catholic Church by providing programmes of study and prayer which will encourage further commitment to developing closer unity between these traditions.

But all must be done through joint commitment to prayer. I leave the final word to Pope John Paul II who, in *Orientalis Lumen*, wrote:

May God shorten the time and distance. May Christ, the *Orientalis Lumen*, soon, very soon, grant us to discover that in fact, despite so many centuries of distance, we were very close, because together—perhaps without knowing it—we were walking towards the one Lord, and thus towards one another. (*OL*, 26)

A CALL TO CELEBRATE THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST ON THE SAME DAY: 8 APRIL 2012

At present Christians throughout the world celebrate the great feast of Easter on two different days—a sad sign of the divisions that tear them apart. However it happens that on 4 April 2010 and 24 April 2011 the feast of Easter falls on the same day according to both eastern and western calendars. The signatories of the text below call on Christians of all denominations to use this period to prepare to *celebrate the feast of Easter on the same day, on 8 April 2012*. This date is calculated according to the rule and method agreed by Catholics, Protestants and Orthodox in 1997. The advantage of this calculation, as all agree, is that it actualises the rule established by the fathers of the First Ecumenical Council of Nicaea.

In the early Christian centuries there was disagreement about the date of Easter. The Ecumenical Council of Nicaea, in 325, settled the question by establishing the rule that Easter should be celebrated on the Sunday following the first full moon after the Spring equinox. This kept a link between the Scriptures and the feast of Easter, while the Council acknowledged that the celebration of Easter should not be a cause for division among Christians. When Pope Gregory XIII, aware of the inaccuracy of the Julian astronomical calculations in force at the time, reformed the calendar in 1582, this had the effect of destroying the consensus. Most Orthodox Christians wanted to keep to the Julian calendar. Today all the Churches recognise that there are inaccuracies in both methods of calculation.

A conference was held at Aleppo in Syria, 5-10 March 1997, when the representatives of the major Christian traditions agreed on how to establish a common date that would be acceptable to the whole Christian world. The proposal was that the Churches would continue to follow the Nicaean rule for calculating the date of Easter, but they would rely on very exact modern astronomical data, and use the Jerusalem meridian. This conference at Aleppo, hosted by the Syrian Orthodox Church, included representatives of the Anglican Communion, the Armenian Orthodox Church, the Orthodox Patriarchate of Constantinople, the evangelical Churches of the Middle-East, the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch and all the East, the Lutheran World Federation, the Middle East Council of Churches, the

Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht, the Orthodox Patriarchate of Moscow, the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity of the Roman Catholic Church, Seventh-day Adventists and the World Council of Churches.

If the astronomical calculation of the Nicaean rule is more accurate in the Gregorian than in the older Julian calendar, the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches took a step towards the Orthodox at Aleppo by agreeing to fix the date of Easter according to a cosmic calendar rather than by deciding on a fixed date, as the Holy See had proposed before the pan-Orthodox meeting at Chambésy in July 1977.

This pan-Orthodox meeting at Chambésy recalled that the symbol of the Spring equinox is that of the first day of creation, marking the separation of day and night and proclaiming the victory of light over darkness. The symbol of the full moon (which earlier marked the Jewish Passover) is that of the fourth day of creation, marking the creation of the two lights, and anticipating the victory of light over darkness. Finally the symbol of the first Sunday after the full moon of the Spring equinox recalls the Resurrection of Christ, the unique and definitive victory of life over death in human history, leading to the eternal eighth day of creation. Thus the feast of Easter is always celebrated according to the Nicaean rule *after* the Jewish feast of Passover (since the old Jewish calendar linked the covenant between God and humanity with the crossing of the Red Sea and the fourth day of creation).

Thus, celebrating Easter according to the Aleppo proposal allows all Christians to recover the meaning of the message of the fathers of the Ecumenical Council of Nicaea, that on the day of the Resurrection the whole earth is given light. One hemisphere receives all the light of the sun, and the other receives all the light of the moon.

The representatives of the major families of Christian Churches who met at Aleppo made a second recommendation, namely that there should be a period of study and reflection on this consensus in order to facilitate its acceptance.

In April 2009 an ecumenical seminar was held at Lviv, organised by the Institute of Ecumenical Studies of the Catholic University of Lviv. It gathered representatives from all the Christian Churches of the city (Orthodox, Catholics and Protestants), as well as representatives from the Pontifical Council for Christian Unity and from the World Council of Churches. They studied the consensus reached at Aleppo in a very

positive way. They also expressed the desire that 2010 and 2011, when by chance Easter falls on the same day according to both calendars, should be a time of preparation for the celebration of Easter on the same date in 2012. This would be on 8 April 2012, the date that would conform by astronomical calculations to the Nicæan rule. At the press conference that followed the seminar, participants explained that because the Orthodox Churches had confirmed the consensus represented by Chambésy in 1977 (at the preparatory conference for a Holy Orthodox Council in 1982) this was a real possibility.

Together Christians throughout the world can unite their prayers and their efforts to ensure that the years 2010 and 2011 lead to the widest possible celebration on 8 April 2012—wherever Christians arrive at a consensus and obtain the blessing of their bishops or church authorities—of the victory, the true victory, of Christ over death.

Signatures (Surname, Christian name, email address), preceded by the message:

“I support the call to celebrate the feast of Easter on the same day, 8 April 2012, following the Aleppo consensus, wherever Christians obtain the blessing of their bishops or church authorities.”

should be sent to the Institute of Ecumenical Studies (UCU) of Lviv:
ies.ucu@gmail.com.

CHRISTIANITY IN IRAQ SEMINAR DAY 24 APRIL 2010

Erica Hunter*

The Brunei Gallery Lecture Theatre at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) in London was the venue for the *Christianity in Iraq VII Seminar Day* held on Saturday 24 April 2009 exploring the liturgical heritage of Iraqi Christianity. It was held under the aegis of the Centre for Eastern and Orthodox Christianity, Department for the Study of Religions, SOAS.

Sir Harold Walker on behalf of the *Jerusalem and Middle East Church Association* opened the proceedings by outlining the society's involvement with the various churches of the Middle East including Iraq. Mrs Joan Porter MacIver, the Administrator of *The British Institute for the Study of Iraq* addressed its interests in Iraq, which span both the historic and modern, as well as drawing attention to the programme of bringing Iraqi scholars to England for training and the current fund-raising campaign. She also drew attention to the difficulties encountered—as well as the expenses involved—in obtaining visas for the Iraqi scholars.

The morning session focused on the rich liturgical tradition of Iraq that has preserved some of the most ancient liturgical material in Christianity. The Syriac 'Anaphora of Addai and Mari', commemorating the apostle of Edessa and his disciple who evangelised in Mesopotamia, dates back to the second or third century. It is one of the few complete liturgies to survive from a time when bishops improvised the text of the Eucharistic Prayer and is the oldest extant liturgical tradition in all of Christianity. It lacks the 'words of institution'.

The Anaphora of Addai and Mari fell somewhat into abeyance after 410 AD when the *Synod of Isaac* at Seleucia-Cteisphon declared that the liturgy would thereafter be celebrated in accordance with the Western rite. Over the centuries, the liturgical traditions have been far from static and have undergone many changes. Thus the canons of the *Hudra* (the East Syrian Office book) were rearranged by Patriarch Isoyabh III (647-657 AD) in the Early Islamic period. Later, in the

* Dr Erica C.D. Hunter is Lecturer in Eastern Christianity at the Centre for Eastern and Orthodox Christianity, Dept. for the Study of Religions, SOAS.

thirteenth century the Lectionary readings of the *Hudra* were revised to accord with the Peshitta. Changes to the liturgy are still the subject of discussion today amongst theologians and churchmen.

Both the East and West Syrian churches developed a very rich repertoire of liturgical literature. The West Syrian tradition has received much attention from scholars, but the East Syrian tradition has had less, partly due to the relative paucity of material. Manuscripts from the monastery site at Turfan (dated ninth to twelfth centuries) provide particularly important insight into the development of the East Syrian liturgical tradition. Throughout the far-flung, ethnically and linguistically diverse dioceses of Central Asia, Syriac was the cardinal liturgical language. A rare fragment of a baptismal liturgy gives instructions in Sogdian (Old Persian) to the priest, indicating that this was his native tongue.

Over the last century, the churches of Iraq have faced particular challenges, not the least being the exodus and growth of diaspora communities in the Middle East, Europe, America and Australia. In these cosmopolitan, multi-cultural environments, the liturgy remains a vital artery that links the communities back to their unique, precious Christian heritage that is rooted in the Middle East.

Various papers delivered by distinguished scholars at the *Christianity In Iraq VII Seminar Day* explored the rich legacy. Father Baby Varghese (SEERI, Kerala, India) opened the academic papers discussing *Images of Christ in East and West Syrian Liturgies*, exploring the major Christological differences between the Miaphysite and Diophysite Churches. Dr Aho Shemunkasho (University of Salzburg, Austria), *Changes in West Syrian Liturgy without liturgical reform*, addressed the practical problems which West Syrian diaspora communities face in maintaining their liturgical forms. Moving to the East Syrian traditions, Mr Steven Ring (Bristol), *The structure and history of the Hudra in the Church of the East: preliminary observations* outlined the complex transmission history of the Hudra and its relationship with the Beth Gazza, illustrating his paper with examples drawn from the Turfan collection of manuscripts. The final paper by Dr Sebastian Brock (Oxford), *Early Witnesses to the liturgical tradition of the Church of the East* surveyed the manuscript and epigraphic evidence for the Hudra, the earliest examples going back to the Late Sassanid era.

After lunch, the afternoon session, chaired by Dr Jacob Thekeparambil, was devoted to liturgical musical traditions. The Mar

Behnam Choir from the Syrian Catholic Mission in England gave two performances of hymns, the second preceding the fascinating presentation by Ms Tala Jarjour (Cambridge) of her field-work recording the liturgical chant of the Suryani community in Aleppo which relocated from their ancient city to Aleppo in the 1920s thus ending an almost two-thousand year Christian heritage in Urfa (modern Sanliurfa).

An important part of the Christianity in Iraq Seminar Days is to learn about the current situations facing Iraqi Christians, many of whom are now displaced and living in Syria. Dr Suha Rassam showed a video of the activities of *Iraq Christians in Need*, a charity whose programmes include computer lessons and English instruction. Madame Christine Chaillot discussed the needs of Iraqi Christian refugees in France and the efforts made to help them, a situation aided by the direct support received from President Sarkozy. As persecuted and endangered minorities, the Christians are not alone. The day ended with a statement about the situation of the Mandaeans by Dr Layla Al-Roomi, who emphasized the urgent need for them to have a 'safe haven' if this ancient Gnostic community has any chance of surviving

The interest generated by the Seminar Day, which was attended by sixty-five people, including many Iraqis, was most gratifying. Despite all the vicissitudes surrounding air-travel, all speakers were able to come—from as far away as India and the Middle East. Only Dr George Kiraz (Gorgias Press) who was to travel from New Jersey, USA could not attend due to airline cancellation.

The grants by *The British Institute for the Study of Iraq* and *The Jerusalem and Middle East Church Association* have helped considerably to defray the substantial costs involved in organizing this day and made its success possible. The annual *Christianity in Iraq Seminar Day* is now well-established and the 2011 event, the eighth in the series, is already being planned for Saturday 14 May when the theme will be the connections between Iraqi Christianity and Turfan.

HOW INTERCHURCH FAMILIES LIVE THE REALITY OF THE 'DOMESTIC CHURCH'

George A. Kilcourse, Jr. *

From 10-13 March 2010, Catholic University Leuven (Belgium) hosted an international conference entitled 'The Household of God and Local Households: Revisiting the Domestic Church.' The conference gathered academics, pastoral leaders and a contingent of interchurch families from four continents. This report highlights the presentations related to interchurch families' concerns vis-à-vis the evolving meanings and applications that surround the term 'domestic church.'

Michael A. Fahey SJ's keynote lecture assessed over forty years of development in the notion of the 'domestic church' while also identifying much needed fine-tuning for the future. Understandings of the family as a 'domestic church' originate in Patristic writings. The Second Vatican Council in 1964 retrieved this long-dormant teaching (*Lumen gentium*, 11) and Pope John Paul II's 1981 apostolic letter *Familiaris Consortio* further promoted the family as a domestic church, even reflecting on the interchurch reality in the marriage of 'Christian spouses' or 'marriage between the baptized' and presaging the possibility of limited Eucharistic sharing. However, Fahey described that letter as written in an inaccessible style, too lengthy, too idealistic, and read only by experts. He pointed to the 1980 International Bishops' Synod on the Family where voices called for greater realism regarding issues facing married couples and their children. Fahey pointed to a 'gap' between such Synods and papal post-Synodal exhortations as symptomatic of official ecclesiastical documents. He identified the publications by married lay persons who spoke from their participation in a community of overflowing love—the family as domestic church. Sacramental marriage confers upon spouses a unique ministry not proper to hierarchical ministry. Other plenary speakers took up related issues signaled by Fahey: the avoidance of romanticized descriptions of the family; addictions, abuse, and infidelities vis-à-vis opportunities for

* George A. Kilcourse, Jr. is Professor of Theology at Bellarmine University and a priest of the Archdiocese of Louisville, Kentucky, USA.

forgiveness and reconciliation in the family; diversity among types and cultures of twenty-first century families; the fragility of families in a society of consumerism and individualism; the failure of the church to relate to families in terms of subsidiarity, consulting the faithful or *vox ecclesiae*; the question of new forms of family, not based upon marriage, and their right to live as a domestic church.

The first of the papers (in alphabetical order, according to author) in the Interchurch Families' International Network (IFIN) sessions was by Rosalind Birtwhistle (UK), 'Strange Bedfellows? Households of Different Faiths.' She used the broader lens of an interfaith marriage based upon her Jewish-Christian marriage of thirty years and interviews she conducted with the Christian women spouses, most of whom were practicing in their churches. While it is possible to feel spiritually lonely, exiled, or marginal in such a marriage, she found that they stimulated Christian women to explore their own faith. One finding was that while Christian wives looked for an affirmation of faith, many did not think such 'strong' faith helpful because it was 'blind faith.' The interreligious reality of their marriages made them more flexible. Dialogue about prayer and meditation, trusting God and ethical values made interreligious marriage an ongoing appreciation of the other's faith, 'a work in progress.' In discussion, Mary Marrocco (Canada) described interreligious children as 'spiritually bilingual' and concluded that such families pose new questions to the churches and asked if churches can also help answer those questions.

George A. Kilcourse, Jr. (USA) addressed 'Interchurch Families as "Domestic Church": The Improbable Grace.' The author critically analyzed (from the perspective of interchurch families) lacunae in the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops' November 2009 pastoral letter, *Marriage: Love and Life in the Divine Plan*. He pointed to the text's disappointing silence on the increasingly frequent reality of authentically interchurch couples as a unique type of mixed marriage. In a series of questions, the Bellarmine University priest-professor asked: Is this text a truly 'pastoral' letter? Why are domestic churches not recognized as contributing new insights and warranting new developments born of their experience as faith-filled Christian spouses and children? Why are Catholic-Catholic marriages idealized? Why do the bishops neglect to address or pastorally discuss interchurch marriage and family life vis-à-vis the possibility, by way of exception, for other baptized Christian to participate fully in the Eucharist—

relegating to a footnote reference the Pontifical Council for Christian Unity's 1993 *Directory for the Application of Principles and Norms on Ecumenism*? Kilcourse points out that the bishops' letter places interchurch families in a conundrum because they address mixed marriages by focusing upon challenges they encounter and limit their participation to spiritual ecumenism. He concluded with the hope that the bishops' pledge to collaborate with 'all who seek to create a vibrant culture of marriage rooted in God's plan for the good of humanity' signals a more collaborative, diverse, ecumenical and inclusive future in which interchurch families as domestic church can contribute.

Jean-Baptiste Lipp (Switzerland) presented 'Extract of Ten Arguments For and Against Supporting a Pastoral Ministry to Interfaith Families.' Lipp affirmed that interchurch families are an indispensable microcosm in the macrocosm of the church. An interchurch spouse-parent-pastor, Lipp recounted his experience and growth in reflecting upon pastoral ministry to interchurch families. On a personal retreat he wrestled with the temptation to conclude that Christian unity cannot be left to mere lay people. He emerged with new confidence that his was a vocation to live his interchurch marriage and to bring his family experiences of life, love, and faith into the arena of ecclesiology. Because the Gospel calls for new conversions, new deaths and new resurrections, he considered his breakthrough to be a model for others. The Swiss pastor affirmed that the growing number of such families has ecclesiological implications for every church. Lipp contrasted the Catholic Church's view that interchurch marriages are problematic with Reformed Churches' view that the problem no longer exists. He found the Catholic position (particularly with its *de facto* denial of Eucharistic Hospitality) as a strong and self-satisfied ecclesiology in contrast to the Reformed position's weak but equally self-satisfied ecclesiology. The Swiss Reformed pastor affirmed the increasingly unbearable burden of interchurch families who consciously understand themselves as domestic church but are not recognized by some to be in full communion, while finding others have trivialized the appropriateness of dialogue on ecclesiological questions that intimately affect the lives of faith-filled families. Interchurch families, he concluded, will have a unique role to play in the future.

Mary Marrocco (Canada) presented 'Communion Among Divided Churches: The Interchurch Couples as Domestic Witness.' Theologian and Family Therapist Marrocco posed a paradox: the more interchurch

couples are 'in communion' through marriage, the more they are 'out of community' with the church. Marrocco affirmed that sin, weakness, poverty and misery are in tension and conflict with the institutional church. She bolstered her thesis by employing David Snartch's description of healthy marriage relationships: the more couples let weaknesses and vulnerabilities show, the more they become a marriage. Marrocco employed the work of Cardinal Walter Kasper and Dominican Jean Tillard to support her insights concerning communion theology and communion as an interpersonal reality. She quoted priest-psychiatrist George Freemesser's axiom that when two people marry two universes collide. She affirmed that interchurch couples are enriched by attending each other's church; in a real sense they 'receive' each other's ecclesial tradition. Marrocco pointed to the Eucharist itself as dangerous because interchurch couples may be unprepared for the power of division that their churches hold. She emphasized how therapists help interchurch couples with couple-dynamic theories in family-systems theory to deal with the break-up in their experience of interpersonal communion when their churches abandon them or when difficulties place them on the verge of ecclesial disillusionment. She concluded by asking, 'Can the churches help?'

Bernard Prusak (USA) chose as his topic 'The Ecumenical Household as Domestic Church? Ecclesial Threat or Pastoral Challenge and Even Resource?' Prusak situated his presentation in the context of Vatican Council II texts and the priesthood of the baptized (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, sections 1657, 1634). He pointed to the church's ambiguous attitude toward mixed marriages and observed that the Roman Catholic Church has no common practice when dealing with Eucharistic sharing for ecumenical families. The Villanova University professor proposed the ecumenical 'domestic church' as a micro-model of the ecumenical church envisioned in the collaboration of the Lutheran Heinrich Fries and the Roman Catholic Karl Rahner. He reflected upon ecumenism as a call for ecclesial reform and lamented the fact that we are in a reciprocal 'moment of inertia', waiting for the other church to start first. Prusak recommended the French Bishops' 1993 statement indicating that the needs of ecumenical families be determined on the local level. He concluded by affirming the lived experience of ecumenical families as an ecclesial resource for growth toward Christian unity.

Ray Temmerman (Canada) presented 'Interchurch Families as Domestic Church: Familial Experiences and Ecclesial Opportunities.' Temmerman cited statistics showing 36 per cent of marriages in North America are mixed Christian marriages; in his home diocese they total 50 per cent of marriages. He asked if such couples are truly considered as domestic church. If not, Temmerman concluded, such mixed marriage couples are in 'quasi-ecclesial unity'. If they are really the domestic church, our churches have a responsibility to serve the needs of mixed marriage couples and to recognize their gifts for the churches. Drawing upon his research and interviews at the 2008 conferences of the American and British Associations of Interchurch Families, he discerned indicators of the domestic church. Temmerman affirmed that *communio* in faith begins at baptism and in marriage spouses are bonded to become one, to experience unity in a new, enhanced way that is indissoluble in this life. He quoted from interviews to illustrate recurring experiences of interchurch couples: they grow into interchurch identity and value greater openness to different traditions; they learn about the larger history of Christianity beyond one denomination; they did not realize how difficult their early years would be, being barred from sharing the Eucharist; they come to be stretched so that their love bears fruit and they feel an overwhelming need to worship in both churches; they and their children suffer when the unity of their home is shattered by the church's exclusion and non-acceptance. Temmerman offered a provocative reminder born of the experience of interchurch families: 'Interchurch families are not those who "bridge" the gulf between Christian traditions; they are those who tell us that the "gulf" does not exist.'

Thomas Knieps-Port le Roi, INTAMS (International Academy for Marital Spirituality) Chair and a member of the Faculty of Theology at Catholic University Leuven, organized this visionary conference. He is currently working with a publisher to produce a volume of conference proceedings. In addition, he presented a paper entitled 'Is There a Genuine Type of Spirituality in the Home?' He proposed that the domain of family life constitutes a genuine type of spirituality which in no way competes with the spirituality of the official religious community but covers a different field of human and religious experience. He argued that recognizing the spiritual potential of local households and families as complementary to the official form of spirituality would enable the church to overcome a number of

unhealthy dualisms: clergy versus laity; religious experts versus spiritual amateurs; official religion versus individual spirituality; belonging versus believing, etc.

Antoine Arjakovsky's plenary session presentation, 'Corporeity in an Ecclesial and Familial Perspective,' sparked an especially animated discussion with interchurch families' participants. He drew from the Christian Orthodox tradition grounded in Ephesians 5:21-32 to understand the mystery of the symbolic bond, fractal and eschatologic, between the small church which forms the family unit and the large church of the people of God. Thus the corporeity of the interchurch families, which defies the legal definition of the sacramental borders of the church, would be integrated better into the life of the churches like a cell, showing a way, one among others, of the unity of the church.

If one absence at the conference were noticeable it would be the voice of the Christians from South America, Central America, and Mexico—Latin America—which remains predominantly Roman Catholic and places primary value on family life and community. These typically large families have much to contribute in terms of living as domestic church as future research explores the meaning and applications of this evolving notion.

EDINBURGH 2010: REMINISCENCES AND REFLECTIONS ON THE SPIRITUALITY OF A CONFERENCE

Elizabeth Moran *

The Edinburgh 2010 World Missionary Conference brought together about 300 delegates, coming from many countries in the world, arriving on Tuesday 1 June or Wednesday 2 June, and leaving the conference on the following Saturday, Sunday or Monday. So for most of them, three days—the Thursday, Friday and Saturday of that first week of June—provided the experience of being gathered together for the purpose for which they had been delegated. The purpose, as it was expressed locally in Scotland in the leaflet inviting interest and participation, was to remember and reflect on this centenary occasion, to celebrate Christian mission today, and to be inspired and strengthened to continue to witness to Christ. The remembrance and reflection were to have in focus the 1910 World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh and the changes, during the intervening century, in the understanding and practice of mission. In such remembrance and reflection there is cause for celebration and also for regret and repentance.

This was a conference of committed Christian men and women. From the start of planning it, there was the understanding that the programme of study and consultation would be surrounded by and based on a framework of shared spirituality. To care for this, an international group of men and women met and worked together as the Spiritual Life Group, through the months in preparation for and during the days of the Edinburgh Conference. It was clear from the start that the group were being asked to prepare for specific times of shared prayer or worship within the days of the Conference, and to provide helpful, suitable resources to animate these occasions. Working together, some who knew one another and understood the background and the sense of priorities of particular individuals, some who met for the first time in this work of assisting the Conference, the group had a

* Elizabeth Moran is a Missionary Sister of St Columban and was a member of the Spiritual Life Group which helped prepare Edinburgh 2010. Sister Elizabeth was for several years the appointed Catholic consultant in the WCC Geneva staff team on Mission and Evangelism.

shared concern for developing resources for an atmosphere of faith and trust, gratitude and hope. The spiritual life of the conference should be just that—the energy, the dynamism of the Spirit of Christ present among the members. Not just an activity confined to set times of worship but a developing life of relationship in mission. Everyone present as a delegate was coming either from the experience of involvement in the preparatory study process or from an organisation or church that prepares, sends or supports missionary personnel. Yet everyone present was coming to listen, to respect, to contribute and to learn. Everyone present was conscious of the changes in the 100 years of human history since 1910, and of the differences in the composition of the membership of the 1910 Conference and of this one in 2010. Everyone present was conscious of the need to recognise the many ways in which the call to witness to Christ is to be heard today and of the need to work towards unity in responding. And it was on those realities of ‘everyone present’ that the spiritual life of these conference days could be built.

The primary, deep need was for recognition and welcome, as always in human situations—the official welcome of recognition ‘who are you?’, of finding one’s room, taking possession, the invitation to eat, to explore the territory, familiarise yourself with the notices, find the fire escapes, walk in the garden, ‘feel at home’. Different cultures manage this in different ways. There is a lovely expression of welcome and hospitality in the Celtic tradition:

You will find
Food in the eating place
Fresh water in the drinking place
Clean linen in the resting place
Music in the listening place ...
Come ...

Whatever the culture, the message has to be the same. You belong, you have a part to take here, you are well come. The Pollock Halls residence reception staff and the supportive Conference staff at the reception/registration desk managed this well. It was, if you will, a good way into the Opening Welcome session which brought this phase of Arrivals and Entry to a close. The spirit of welcome, of gracious hospitality, finds deep resonance in the Christian understanding of life as life in relationship, a journey of meetings, a journey towards the final

welcome. 'In my Father's house there are many rooms. Were it not so, I would have told you. I am going to prepare a place for you ...' In the celebration of the Eucharist there is the prayer for those who have concluded the journey there, 'Welcome into your kingdom our departed brothers and sisters ...'

The most obvious feature of that Opening Welcome Session was the presence of so many different nationalities, called together on this occasion by the insistent beat of the drums, and singing together to melodies from countries of Africa. The WCC poster came to mind, 'The human race: available in a variety of sizes, shapes and colours.' 'God welcomes all'—they sang their truth. The introductory reading was a reminder of the gathering of missionaries 100 years ago in this same city of Edinburgh, and a recognition of the different era, the challenges today to Christian witness, and the hope for a new vision, new energy for the churches.

Then came the invitation to welcome one another—to greet someone as yet unknown, to share names, countries, church families, and hopes for the conference. Next, as individuals became part of the group, welcomed and welcoming, leaders from the local city, University and church communities offered a short welcome speech.

The night prayer verses put ancient, inspired words on the reality of the gathering: 'All nations praise the Lord', 'You are my witnesses', and encouraged the hope 'I am about to do a new thing'. The gospel proclamation brought the reminder 'I am the Vine: You are the branches'.

A final spoken prayer gave thanks and asked protection for the lands and the churches from which the delegates came, and with thanks for the good things that happened with the 1910 Conference, asked for the necessary graces for the here and now of this meeting. A few moments silence, then a quiet night prayer and the 'Our Father' together in various languages, and a simple blessing.

The day was over. The conference had started. Delegates had crossed the boundary, had become a member of this new population of an ecumenical missionary country, would waken in the morning into a new reality. Life is often so complicated, in the world and the times we are in, that much of the attention and the energy goes to what is already past, or to the possibilities of the future. The spiritual life of the conference is situated in the here and now, where we are, in relationship with the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and where we

are called, in that circle, into relationship with one another. Temporary, yes, but real, as is life on earth.

Was it all so clear, at that beginning moment? In that atmosphere of welcome and hope, with its invitation to participation, delegates tired from a long journey, experiencing the dislocation of time and place, separated from the familiar, will also realise that they bring elements of the negative. Here on the path leading away from the Hall of Welcomes, I meet an Asian woman and an African man, and the conversation highlights two of the difficult areas of relationship ready to emerge in this gathering—so full of potential, so vulnerable, the question comes—Where were the women speakers and leaders in that session? All those who welcomed the delegates were white, Western men. The feelings, rather than the facts and their explanation, are important here. They are indicators of a whole range of awareness of need for reconciliation, for dialogue on disturbing or painful aspects of reality. Will they prove to be possible sources of desolation, or entry points to a path to new hope, new energy, new cooperation?

There is also the underlying reality, acutely present for some, vaguely known by others, of recent disagreements among those entrusted with the preparation of the Conference and with the management of its practical aspects, such as the facilitation of the discussions and the processes of refinement and presentation of the outcome, not to speak of the coordination of communication and finance. Complicated by difficult intercultural differences in approaches to management and to process, these are disagreements that must be acknowledged but cannot be solved as the conference opens. They serve as an ever-present reminder of the constant attention needed to mistaken attitudes and destructive actions in the past, and to the continuing challenge to learn, for the sake of peace, for the sake of humanity, for the sake of the gospel.

The Opening Celebration called delegates into awareness of the present and its possibilities, its time and space, in the simplicity of movement into a gathering in the garden. The call was given by the sound of the Scottish bagpipes. It is almost impossible not to hear and be drawn by that sound! This beautiful morning, of sunshine and green growth, it is a summons to hope, to exploration and discovery. Here is this great crowd, each one bringing something of individual life and history, a pebble from home, stones of the ancient earth to be carried, to be laid around the central Cross in the worship space.

The cross is the Celtic Cross, symbol and reminder of death and resurrection, redemption and remaking of all creation. It is all the earth that is carried in the entry procession, with the singing of Psalm 122, 'I was glad when they said to me: Let us go to the house of the Lord ...' Palm trees, with moving leaves made from the fabrics of many countries, provide a symbolic atmosphere of earth's growth and the worship of the nations, and the singing mounts to a unified 'Glory to God the Creator, to the Son and to the Holy Spirit ...' There is no constraint in the singing that follows of 'All people that live on the earth, sing to the Lord with cheerful voice ...' It is in truth the song of the moment. And the prayers that follow are the prayer of the moment—thanksgiving for the privilege of sharing in this gathering of the Church, with all its variety of culture and colour, and a prayer that being together in joy will bring surprise, new insights, new energy, new hope. A prayer too for wisdom that personal agendas may be set aside, that rehearsed speeches may not block the voice of the other. That prayer leads to the invitation to converse for a while with 'the other'—to turn to someone who is as yet a stranger and to share a little of our own faith history. Tell of someone, alive or dead, who has helped to shape our faith, shown us something of God, encouraged us to know and follow Jesus. The worship space comes alive with the sharing of these life stories.

Then the call to silence, to listen together to the Word of God in Scripture, drawn this time from the letters of Peter—the encouragement to come to Christ as living stones, to be built together into a spiritual temple. The response, framed in a hymn from Malawi, is one of dedication to the work of God.

Next, representatives of the stakeholders stand to speak. These are voices from the organisations and churches which have given support and encouragement from the start for this Conference with its studies and its agenda of hope for unity and a renewal of missionary spirit in the churches. Approximately two out of every three of the participants in this Conference are representing these organisations and churches—some of these are major worldwide communions, some are nationally based. They speak of the opportunities and the tasks of the Conference as they see them. This is the strong reminder that, while an intensive and rewarding study programme has involved many in the development of an understanding of mission among the churches, the reflections and the faith commitments that arise from such powerful

and inspiring meetings must be shared. The study process should hear, support and energise the pastoral and practical experience of mission, from which come the questions, the case studies and the new perspectives.

Together, delegates from the stakeholder organisations and delegates from the study process are called to listen to the Gospel—not to study but to listen and respond. The Spiritual Life Group, from the start, looked for ways to provide opportunities for delegates to encounter Scripture as a living Word. Rather than including in the programme of the days a session for ‘Bible Study’ the decision was to present times for ‘Sharing Scripture’. In this time of Opening Worship, three stories from the Gospel, each one about a person who encountered Jesus and was totally changed by that meeting were presented by symbolic actions and by a soliloquy, as it were, from the person in the story. Black mud, a pottery water jug, and a bag of coins recalled the blind man at the pool of Siloam, the woman at the well, and Zacchaeus. Most of us think we know these stories, and may even be prepared to explain their meaning. It is a little different to be asked which of these three you would most like to meet, and to share a little of your possible conversation, in the context of this gathering. Each of these three became a disciple, each became a witness. What have they to say to us?

On the Friday morning the common Worship was led by children from a local primary school. They had prepared very well, with their young enthusiastic teacher, and with support and help from a local singing group and from members of the Spiritual Life Group. Their understanding was that they were coming for the prayer time on the Friday morning, to help these (nearly 300) missionary people from all over the world to celebrate the great work that had been carried on for more than one hundred years. In their classroom they had a very serious discussion about ways of helping. They were going to read the letter that St. Paul wrote to young Timothy telling him to treasure the gift of knowing Jesus and to guard it carefully, with the help of the Holy Spirit (2 Timothy chapter 1, vv.2-11). They prepared to read from that letter as if they had just received it *‘from our brother Paul who is travelling to tell people in far countries about Jesus’*. They chose their favourite words from that letter and prepared 300 small origami-style cards, each containing a chosen word or two, as gifts for the delegates. They presented these to the delegates after the reading, efficiently and easily and then settled down at the side of the room to work in silence

at making cards (helped by Carol of 'Soul Marks') for friends or relatives, while Dr Metropolitan Nifon addressed the seated delegates.

And here something special happened which certainly belongs to the spiritual life of this Conference. Metropolitan Nifon, who had carefully prepared his address to the delegates, was, of course, a little surprised when he realised that this morning's time of prayer involved children, and was perhaps slightly apprehensive that they might be restless and noisy. It was quite a moving moment then, when, after the children had proclaimed their reading, and carried their letters to the delegates, the Metropolitan came to the microphone and started his address by thanking 'my young partners in the gospel' for their song and their message. In his address he brought greetings from the churches and a warm freshness of generosity and willing collaboration. The prayer of gratitude which followed the address was truly a prayer of the moment, giving thanks for good gifts offered, giving thanks for children, for these children who come to us, who remind us of the times in the gospel when Jesus met with children. Giving thanks also that Jesus asks us to become like children, which must mean listening to them, learning from them, encouraging them, as on this morning, so that we will find the kingdom of heaven. The closing blessing and song wished the delegates—and their visitors—peace, hope and joy for this day. It was already tangible.

The time of Scripture Sharing set to follow the Common Prayer on the Friday and Saturday was quite short, but was in proportion for the intensive three-day programme intended to bring together the outcome of the worldwide studies. Scripture sharing was to be in groups of around ten members, each group with a guide who had an overview of the process and was asked to help the group to use the time well. On each of the two days, a particular story from the New Testament was offered for the group's exploration. The guide would have two envelopes each day. Envelope 1 contained the 'name of the story'. Envelope 2 contained 10 printed copies of the appropriate Scripture text, and some suggestions on how to continue. At the start, there is a moment of prayer, to ask for the gift of the Holy Spirit, for wisdom and understanding. Envelope 1 is opened and the group are asked to reconstruct the story together, as each one remembers and contributes to it. After ten minutes, the group divides into two smaller groups. Envelope 2 is opened and each person receives a copy of the Scripture text. This is read slowly in the smaller group, with the

members listening from the background of the way it has been told in the group. There is then some time to reflect on the meanings, the emphases, the omissions and so on, as this story has been told by the group. The stories chosen were those of the meeting of Jesus with the Syro-Phoenician woman (Mark 7:24-30 and Matt. 15:21-28) on the Friday and then the story of the meeting of Philip and the eunuch on the Gaza road (Acts 8:26-39) on the Saturday.

For those who were able to share fully in this short experience of working together with Scripture, there were some realisations and learnings of importance for the Conference itself. We hear and draw on the message of the Gospel as the persons we are and in the context of our present being. In such a rich and varied group as this Conference membership, the stories are being told over and over again, rooted in and challenged by the Word of God in the Scriptures. Not all the delegates were able to be in a group for this particular experience each day. Some discovered other priorities: the bookstall and the coffee lounge were in the same area as some of the places marked off for group meetings. It was then necessary to make a deliberate decision to find and join the appropriate Sharing Scripture Group and some used this time to meet and talk informally. Unfortunately, this time in the entire programme was arranged for some as a time for Press conferences. It is easy to see in hindsight that in a programme of such depth, time must be allowed for exploring books and resources, for establishing connections, for press conferences and one-to-one meetings, and, it might well be suggested, simply for 'free time' to allow for absorption of input and processing of experience. These are not just practical issues or matters of business. They are elements, surely, of the building of a community of faith and commitment.

Saturday of the Conference presented the theme of Repentance, with the strong reminder at the start of the Common Prayer that the nature of God is love; repentance is far from the dark misery of despair. 'Know that God is good' was the song to gather the delegates together, and the constant theme echoing through the prayer time was 'Kyrie Eleison' using several settings, from different areas of the world. Standing together as brothers and sisters in the presence of the Father of Mercies is perhaps one of the most powerful of ecumenical experiences. Here we can listen to the challenge of the truth, and this day it is read in minority languages. 'Are you not still of the flesh? There is quarrelling and jealousy among you. ... Neither the one who plants nor the one who

waters is anything, but only God who gives the growth. ... We are God's servants, working together ...'

All true, and standing together before the Father of Mercies in the freedom of the truth is perhaps the greatest relief. Humility is truth. In this atmosphere it is possible to begin to see ourselves, one another, the churches and the world from the point of view of Almighty God. The homily brings the reminder of Israel's stories of the beginnings and the Creator God who constantly comes looking for the children in crisis, opening the conversation, 'Where are you?' 'What have you done?—up to the point where God has a pain in his heart and is almost ready to 'wipe them off the face of the earth' (Gen. 6:6-7). Instead, the Word Incarnate is sent to earth and our story begins. In this Conference we need to hear the commission as it is given in the gospel of Luke, in the final lines of the closing chapter 24. 'In his name repentance and the forgiveness of sins is to be proclaimed to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem. You are to be witnesses to these things.' The writer Luke is himself witness to these things—his Gospel brings us into the company of the forgiven criminal who speaks the truth, shows us the Risen Lord searching out the Peter who wept bitterly at his own cowardice, takes us into the company of Zacchaeus who apparently just wanted to see, but instead was noticed and called and given back his real self. You are to be witnesses to these things. Looking out from this conference setting, delegates can see painful realities: and the common prayer that follows names some of them in truth and asks forgiveness. Naming them in truth is already a healing, but in the silence that follows there is the call to witness, the beginning of renewed commitment.

In the work of the final study sessions on that Saturday, delegates prepared a common call to the churches and the missionary organisations, which would be presented to a much wider gathering during the 2010 celebration in the Assembly Hall on the next day, 6 June. The 'Common Call' is presented in nine short paragraphs, recalling the nine themes of preparatory studies. It is an elegantly worded document, prepared with care. But each paragraph starts with a declaration of attitude, an element of spirituality, shared among the participants of this conference. It is this attitude, each time, that generates the Call to Mission and to Witness. It is in these attitudes that the work of the Holy Spirit of God in this conference meeting can be heard and seen. One can only listen with respect, with the gratitude

and repentance that informed the prayer of the gathering in these days:

Trusting in the Triune God and with a new sense of urgency ...

Remembering Christ's sacrifice on the Cross and his resurrection for the world's salvation, and empowered by the Holy Spirit ...

Knowing the Holy Spirit who blows over the world at will, reconnecting creation and bringing authentic life ...

Disturbed by the asymmetries and imbalances of power that divide and trouble church and world ...

Affirming the importance of the biblical foundations of our missional engagement and valuing the witness of the Apostles and martyrs ...

Recognising the need to shape a new generation of leaders with authenticity for mission in a world of diversities in the twenty-first century ...

Hearing the call of Jesus to make disciples of all people—poor, wealthy, marginalised, ignored, powerful, living with disability, young and old ...

Recalling Christ, the host at the banquet, and committed to that unity for which he lived and prayed ...

Remembering Jesus' way of witness and service, we believe ...

WE ARE CALLED

BOOK REVIEWS

Christianity and World Religions: Disputed Questions in the Theology of Religions, Gavin D'Costa (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), paperback, 233 + xiv pages. ISBN: 9781405176736.

Time was when interest in religions was the domain of sociologists, anthropologists and social historians. Today, travel and communications make possible contacts between very diverse groups in society and adherents of the various religions engage and debate on an unprecedented scale. As the centenary of the World Missionary Conference (Edinburgh, 1910) dawns the Christian church takes stock of its faithfulness to Christ's mission to the world, and theology looks again at its own understanding of the world religions. The very diversity of cultures and religions places a huge burden on Christians who try to formulate a faithful response. In Gavin D'Costa's recent book they will find much to inform them in this task. They will hear in it a fellow Christian who is clear about the tradition in which he stands (Roman Catholicism) and who clearly and helpfully writes on 'disputed questions', that is, questions about which a diversity of opinion obtains, in the field of the theology of religions. Religions themselves are 'cultural configurations of power and discipline' (xii).

D'Costa divides his book into four parts. In the first part, 'Charting the Territory: Theology of Religions', he examines a number of 'maps' of how Christianity relates to other religions, from the late 1940s to the 1980s, particularly on the question of the salvation of those who are 'inculpably ignorant' (9) of Christ. In the second, 'The Making and Meaning of the Religions', the process of mapping continues with a double focus: first, modernity's take on religion (chapter 3) and, second, the rise of the nation state and its relationship to religion (chapter 4) are presented. Social and political structures largely determine 'the religions'. Though it is the shortest, the third part, 'Religions in the Public Square', is at the heart of D'Costa's thesis. It concerns (post)modernity's demand of religions that, before they enter the public square, they must conform to its standards. In the final part, D'Costa returns to the issue of the just who, not having had Christ preached to them, still need Christ for their salvation.

The relationship between religion and the public square is quite complex and D'Costa's confronting of this relationship is a considerable

benefit of the book. First, he narrates 'modernity's story about religions' (58-73), which castigates the so-called wars of religion. Then he narrates a different story, one which lays bare how the nation-state, in both its rise to sovereignty and rejection of dual allegiances (to a religion and to a state), progressively excludes religious discourse from the public square and, in consequence, religious practice becomes increasingly a matter of private choice (74-102). D'Costa's point is that it is 'modernity's missionary drive' and its construction of the public square, and not the religions, that have led to greater bloodshed and violence. He goes on to argue that 'theology's reading of world religions ... is the most truthful reading available' (101); this provides the basis for his explorations in the third part. There, he discusses secularism in three forms, viz. principled, in which public debate is governed by reason and deference to our common humanity; ideological, which is largely Marxist and atheistic; and postmodern pragmatic, in which people converse but fail to argue in support of their 'basic commitments and claims' (119). More congenial, however, is Alasdair MacIntyre's position (122-3), which appeals to specific traditions, rather than the sacred cow of 'democracy', and which includes different voices. For D'Costa, belonger to a specific religious tradition and seeker of dialogue with people of other specific traditions (especially Islam), the public square as defined by postmodernity tends to exclude religious discourse. His own argument is that Christianity and Islam are traditions of reasoned debate (128-158).

The final part, a look at the credal formula of Christ's descent into hell, may seem extraneous at first, but D'Costa shows that it concerns the debated question of the damnation of the unevangelized and so is integral to a theology of religions. He extends his position on religions preserving their place in public discourse even as he seeks 'analogical conceptual resources' (169) for his purposes. The descent into hell relates to such differentiated matters as damnation, limbo of the just (*limbus patrum*), limbo of the unbaptized (*limbus puerorum*), and purgatory; the core of his presentation concerns the limbo of the just as it 'conceptually explains the entry of non-Christians into a relationship with Christ and his church, and their subsequent enjoyment of the beatific vision' (177). For D'Costa, Christ's descent to the limbo of the just 'takes place' in the Easter liturgy and in the Eucharist. The 'superabundant merits' of Christ's atoning death and resurrection require to be mediated, both to the church and to the world. The

‘eternal sacrifice of God’s self-giving love’ that is the Eucharist is precisely this mediation (183).

At times, and in hindsight, some of his arguments taste a little of intra-Roman-Catholic polemics with Ratzinger and/or Benedict XVI emerging as victor. For instance, Jacques Dupuis’s position on the church’s relation to non-Christians, in which ‘instrumental causality’ is attributable to Christ rather than the church, is trumped by the necessity of seeing the church as the body of Christ; the argument reprises the *Notification* that the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith issued against Dupuis’s *Toward a Christian Theology of Religious Pluralism*. ‘Church’, however, is multivalent, referring differently to Roman Catholicism, assembly of the faithful, (ideal) body of Christ, (less ideal) institution, teaching authority, etc. Nonetheless, the book is written in an articulate and engaging manner, leads the reader sure-footedly into the issues and debates, marshals the thoughts cogently and accessibly, and is unashamedly challenging. It is remarkably free of typos (though, ‘affects’ should surely be ‘effects’, 186). Given the author’s remit, the book addresses concerns of church, academy and society (David Tracy’s three publics) and I warmly encourage readers in each to take it up and read.

John O’Grady, teacher and part-time lecturer. joogradey@tcd.ie

The Eucharist and Ecumenism. Let us Keep the Feast. Current Issues in Theology, George Hunsinger (Cambridge: C.U.P., 2008) paperback, 350 pages. ISBN: 9780521719179.

The title of this work leads one to speculate whether someone is being foolhardy in addressing such an intractable issue or, alternatively, has sufficient grasp of a wide range of eucharistic theologies and is qualified to contribute to ecumenical theology. Happily for the reviewer and any potential reader, this extensive treatment of the topic, by the Professor of Systematic Theology at Princeton, is a work of incisive scholarship based on extensive knowledge of the literature, and reveals an irenic attitude along with the ability to formulate possibilities of convergence which, if accepted by the churches, would create an ecumenical theology of the eucharist.

Hunsinger believes that in contrast with what he calls enclave theology, ecumenical theology is possible. His aim therefore in the book is to set forth an ecumenical proposal on the eucharist, addressed

to his own, the Reformed, tradition, but through it also to the wider *oikumene*. This clearly commits him to dealing with the issues of Real Presence (Part I), Eucharistic Sacrifice (II), Eucharist and Ministry (III), but he goes the further mile by adding a fourth part on Eucharist and Social Ethics. He concludes the first two parts with 'proposals' for ecumenical convergence, but in the third concludes that issues around ordination (celibacy, women, practising homosexuals) may lead to an impasse.

It is interesting to note that while the sequence of topics appears typical of systematic theology, there is an abiding sense of liturgical theology in his approach and this becomes explicit in Chapter 4, 'Christ our Passover: a proposal'. From that standpoint, his sources are impeccable, starting with Dix—and with the standard reservations about that work. At one point he had gone so far as to say that 'resting content with first-order predication'—typical of liturgical theology—'undoubtedly has its appeal. Given the holy mystery at stake, it would be unnatural not to feel there is something repellent about the kind of conceptual analysis attempted in this essay' (61). Nevertheless, he thought it necessary to undertake a second-order discourse for the sake of establishing ecumenical convergence. He seems to accept that theory dominates Spirit-led *praxis* in the churches.

There is then a standard sacramental theology discourse in the earlier chapters, including, for example, a thorough and sympathetic account of Aquinas's thought. 'When we turn to Thomas Aquinas after having heard from the Protestant Reformers, it is not always easy to see just what accounted for the vehemence of the Reformation critique' (110). In a creative approach, he deals with Thomas and with Luther and Calvin on the various issues as if they were contemporaries, making in effect a very dispassionate comparison of theologies. With so much ground to cover, he regularly includes summary though acceptable statements, such as, 'It seems fair to say that Calvin agreed in principle with Aquinas and Luther on the fact of real and objective presence, but disagreed with them about the modes of presence and reception' (38).

As the publishers point out, a special feature of the book is the attention given to Eastern theology, harking back to Fathers such as Gregory of Nyssa and John Damascene, while Hunsinger shows a preference for Schmemmann among contemporaries. The basis for his proposal on consecration and real presence is the Eastern theology of transelementation—in effect the theology of symbol now embraced by

Western theologians such as Chauvet (whom he does not quote). This theory, he says, was expounded by Peter Martyr Vermigli, and acknowledged favourably as a result by both Calvin and Cranmer.

There are issues to be dealt with, of course, other than presence and consecration—sacrifice and ministry (the power to sacrifice) being chief among them. Given the content of the critique that emerged at the outbreak of the Reformation, these issues had and have a neuralgic quality that makes ecumenical convergence more problematic. The difficulty for Hunsinger is that there had been common ground between most of the parties in relation to the presence of Christ—a common medieval inheritance—but the peculiar Reformation insights affected other aspects of eucharistic belief more profoundly. Justification, merit, atonement, Christology itself, these form the basis of the theologies of the eucharist that have to be reconciled when sacrifice, for example, begins to be treated. Hunsinger manages to negotiate the issues generally by relying on what has come to be seen as an important aspect of Calvin's theology, participation. (His book was presumably in preparation before the publication of J. Todd Billings, *Calvin, Participation and Gift*.)

Participation—in Christ's sacrifice—becomes a key idea, allowing a clear assertion of Christ as the primary subject but leaving the question of subsidiary roles, of priest and faithful, remaining to be faced in regard to possibilities of convergence. (Here he might have looked for more support in the tradition, for example Augustine's 'Let Judas baptise, it is Christ who baptises.')

His long chapter, 'Christ our Passover: a proposal', places participation in the context of the Passover, and by drawing on writers such as Torrance (his favourite), Thurian and Francis Clark, he lays claim to 'cracking the deadlock' (160) in relation to affirming eucharistic sacrifice in a way that accords with the Reformation (176). But a difficulty remains, Masses for the dead. He notes that both Orthodoxy and Protestantism reject the traditional idea of purgatory and the doctrine of indulgences. But he does not mention the fact that the Byzantine liturgy includes prayers for the faithful departed, and he could have overcome whatever difficulty he sees here between Rome and Orthodoxy by repeating a previous claim: that their different approaches to various aspects of eucharistic doctrine are not in themselves divisive. The problem remains, though, in the case of the Reformation churches, and for the author himself. He seems unaware of, or has discounted, evidence from the early centuries of eucharistic

offerings for the dead, in the writings for example of Tertullian and Cyril of Jerusalem.

His reasoning is as follows: Christ is the sole saving agent, others might participate in the eucharistic sacrifice as acting subjects (as celebrant or congregation), but not as causal agents. (Works and merit are in the background here, of course.) The eucharistic sacrifice is the one sacrifice of Calvary in sacramental form and that sacrifice of Calvary mediates and actualises its one indivisible efficacy in the eucharist. However, the efficacy of the eucharistic sacrifice must not be confused with that of the sacrifice of Calvary. The efficacy of the latter applies to the living and the dead; that of the former only to the living who are assembled to partake of the sacrament. There is more to the efficacy of Christ than is mediated by the eucharist—his efficacy, Hunsinger says, has other ways of being mediated and extends to the welfare of all things. ‘When special efficacy is ascribed to the eucharist for persons not present in the gathered assembly, it is difficult to see how the implication can be avoided that the eucharist is an independent work that treats the cross as a resource at its disposal’ (176). Hunsinger’s account of this aspect of sacrifice has been related at some length here because it illustrates a tension between a liturgical theology understanding and one based on Reformed theology, in particular Calvin’s strictures on the involvement in the salvific process of those who participate in Christ.

He returns to the question briefly in his overall conclusion, quoting from ‘An Agreed Statement on the Holy Eucharist’, No. 3, of the US Orthodox/Catholic Theological Consultation of 1969: ‘Through the celebration of the Eucharist the redemptive blessings are bestowed on the living and the dead for whom intercession is made.’ Hunsinger comments that it may be presumed that Christ takes up the Eucharistic intercessions of the church and sanctifies them. ‘Insofar as the celebration of the eucharist is itself a sacramental form of Christ’s saving sacrifice, in which he is actively present as the High Priest, it is possible to affirm the statement about intercession cited above—but only on the premise of the centrality of Christ and the Church’s Eucharistic *participatio Christi*’ (318-9). He seems therefore to lean towards acceptance of Catholic practice, possibly because of his own pastoral liturgical experience and sensitivity.

Part IV, on ‘Eucharist and social ethics’, consists of two chapters, the first of which is inspired by, while critical of, Niebuhr’s classic work,

Christ and Culture. The theme, which he expounds by means of quotations from Mascall's *Corpus Christi*, is that Christ transforms culture through the eucharist, that is, that the central place where Christ takes earthly, historical form as the transformer of culture is the eucharist. There is good theology here on the role of the community's self offering, but no treatment of how the various Christian traditions might view the matter or whether there is or might be convergence in relation to it. Nevertheless, as a discussion of the eucharist the book gains from it.

The final chapter, 'Nicene Christianity, the eucharist and peace' obviously ranges very broadly and is a fitting conclusion to the work in that it brings out the rather neglected missionary and ultimately eschatological dimension of the eucharist. '[The eucharist] liturgically enacts the gospel of reconciliation, while communicating an ethos of peace to the church and through the church to the world' (283).

These last two chapters differ significantly from the earlier ones, in which challenges were issued to the churches to seek convergence on Eucharistic theory. These chapters seem to be a plea to take the eucharist seriously and are all the more useful for that. There is little point in finding convergence in doctrine unless the Christian life, and the life of the world, is served by it. Great personal commitment shines through in this work.

Patrick Fintan Lyons OSB, Glenstal Abbey

The Church in Anglican Theology: A Historical, Theological and Ecumenical Exploration, Kenneth Locke (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), hardback, 232 pages. ISBN: 9780754665304.

When the Catholic Church replied to the Anglican-Roman Catholic *Final Report* in 1991 there was some disappointment with the tone and reservations. A bit less attention was given to Anglican reservations, especially from the evangelical sector of that Communion. This volume is a very well documented explication of the Protestant character of Anglican ecclesiology: its emphasis on the invisible essence of the Church; the marks of Word, Sacrament and Discipline; the subordination of the episcopacy as an *adiapharon* within the Church's discipline; the Eucharistic-communion ecclesiological option as one emphasis among Anglican comprehensiveness; and the dispersed, open character of authority in the Church and within the Communion.

The volume is carefully grounded in history, with careful attention given to the identity that is clarified through ecumenical dialogues. It includes seven chapters. The first four are primarily historical, with the Reformation, the continuity of the Protestant emphasis within evangelical Anglicanism from the eighteenth century to the present, the contribution of Richard Hooker and the Caroline Divines to a nuanced understanding of episcopacy, and the theological ambiguities on the episcopal office from the eighteenth century to the present. These chapters on the history of Anglican theology of the Church are followed by an important and central chapter on Anglican approaches to authority. In it the author documents the dispersed character, the reliance on full lay participation, and the commitment to dialogue and an open approach to truth. 'Truth is not a commodity which the Church already possesses, but a goal which she is constantly striving toward' (112). He roots this approach to dialogue and ambiguity in the Elizabethan Settlement, with its commitment to ecclesial unity within the realm. Themes of probability, collegiality and conciliarity are documented from Anglican sources, and related to Anglican understandings of ministry, including episcopacy and the ordination of women.

The book continues with two chapters which cover the ecumenical dialogues, with Reformed and Lutherans, and with Orthodox and Catholics. The author shows how agreements are able to be made with a consistency that may seem inconsistent to some of the partners, because of the comprehensiveness of Anglican ecclesiology, understanding of authority and the subordinate character of the episcopal office within an ecclesiology that locates decision making in dialogue, the full participation of all of the baptized, and an open and processive approach to truth. While his understanding of Catholicism lacks a certain nuance, taking the more restrictive side of the internal debates on 'churches and ecclesial communities' language, and conflating its approach to sacramental sharing with that of the Orthodox, the book provides a helpful clarification of some of the issues that will need to be resolved as the churches move toward that full communion to which they are committed together.

The volume ends with a conclusion summarizing some of the internal debates within Anglicanism about the role of episcopacy, authority and the nature of the unity sought in the Anglican ecumenical project. As the dialogue moves forward, and internal Anglican tensions become

clearer—if not their resolution—this will be an important contribution to ecumenical understanding; and to the ecumenical debates about authority, the role of episcopacy on the road toward unity, and the style of relationships that are appropriate for churches in communion, even if not yet perfected.

Brother Jeffrey Gros FSC, Memphis Theological Seminary

Law, Liberty and Church: Authority and Justice in the Major Churches in England, Gordon Arthur (Farnham: Ashgate, 2006), hardback, 222 pages. ISBN: 9780754654377.

We are used to theologians from the different denominations getting together and examining common themes; what may be unknown to many readers is that for many years canon lawyers from the Anglican Church and the Roman Catholic Church have been holding joint conversations on various aspects of church law with much profit. This book provides an academic base for the conversations, and goes deeper than joint considerations of individual topics by practitioners. It examines the foundations of church regulation in the major denominations in England: the Church of England, the Roman Catholic Church, the Methodist Church, the United Reformed Church, and the Baptist Union. Arthur also looks at how the legal structures have developed, and compares them with the models presented in the New Testament. Although this book is four years old it has only just come into my hands, and fortunately is still available (also as an eBook) because it is a very useful resource for those of us who have to deal with other denominations. It gives in a very clear way the underlying reasons for their ways of working. We know (or we should know) all about our own structures, but often those of others are a mystery. This work will help those of us who engage with other denominations to understand not perhaps how they work through the various committee structures, for example, but more importantly, why they work in a particular way. When one has to attend ecumenical meetings this knowledge can prevent a lot of frustration.

Law in itself has often a bad press, and Christians can easily quote St Paul, and say that we have been set free from the law, and enjoy the liberty of the children of God (Rom. 8: 21). However, there are other parts of the New Testament that do speak of the law. Arthur, using reputable commentaries, puts the various verses in context and

provides a compendium of the texts concerning authority. He reaches the conclusion that there is no place for authoritarian government in the Christian Church. He then goes on to examine how this authority is exercised in the denominations; this is a factual exercise, which is very helpful.

What is even more helpful is the next part of the book, in which he examines the theological theories, and sometimes the political ones, behind the structures of each denomination. Obviously both the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church have their roots in the same pre-Reformation legal system, and the author points out the commonalities and the differences. He notes that the Henrican reforms changed the concept of episcopacy; the laity were not to be 'subjects' of bishops, but 'inferiors.' It was by Henry that the bishops were deprived of their legislative functions; any laws passed by the Convocations needed the Royal Assent before they became law. This, I would suggest, was purely a political move, to ensure that all the laws in the land were approved by the monarch, and that no other authority (sc. Papal) was allowed in the country, rather than a theological or philosophical development in church law. The democratisation of law-making in the Church of England followed the widening of the possibility of membership of the House of Commons. This too could be seen as a political decision rather than a theological or philosophical one.

The chapters on the Free Churches are fascinating, tracing back the Reformers' roots to Marsilius of Padua, the medieval political theorist, as well as William of Ockham and Wyclif. He then moves through the major Reformers to the English Levellers and Congregationalists, as well as the Scottish Presbyterians and their influence south of the border. The crucial point here is the freedom of conscience and the responsibility of the congregation, or leaders, for the whole community, trying to replicate the practice of the early church. Arthur concludes that the modern Methodists and United Reformed Church now have structures which are a sort of canon law, but the Baptists seem not to have structures to regulate the membership.

In his conclusions he compares the biblical data with the actual structures in place in the denominations. He points out the tension between the Biblical sources of authority and the influence of the Aristotelian democratic ideal, and he also discusses the relationship between the ideas of law, liberty and authority. This is not just

speculative, but illustrated by the practices of the various denominations. I noticed that when writing on Roman Catholic Church law Arthur did not mention the use of dispensation: the relaxation of a law in particular instance by the lawmaker; or privilege: a special favour in special cases. He also calls Martin Luther a monk when, of course, he was a friar. But these are minor quibbles in a book which offers a unique insight into the churches' legal systems.

James M. Cassidy CRIC, Diocese of Northampton

Hidden Holiness, Michael Plekon (Indiana: University of Notre Dame, 2009), paperback, 224 pages, illustrated. ISBN: 9780268038939.

The present work is a remarkable, if unconventional, study of the meaning of personal holiness in the contemporary world. The author, Fr Michael Plekon, is a priest of the Orthodox Church in America. In *Hidden Holiness*, he examines the 'shape of holiness' beyond conventional categories, in an attempt to discern its presence in the everyday lives of people of various walks of life, life-styles and convictions. For Fr Plekon, holiness must not be confined to stereotypes of heroic virtue. On the contrary, 'the very lives of holy women and men, and their words are diverse, constantly open to new situations and possibilities, places and times, where the Holy Spirit will blow as she wills'.

The author presents a series of contemporary persons whose lives illustrate the infinite love of God for humankind. Many of them could by no means be considered for classical 'canonisation' by the churches. Some of the most noteworthy amongst them did not confess Christianity. Etty Hillesum, a young Jewish woman from Amsterdam during the Holocaust, shows in her journals and letters from a Nazi deportation camp a passionate search for God in prayer. The French philosopher and mystic Simone Weil, although she drew very richly on Roman Catholic spirituality, never gave up her Jewish identity to enter the Christian community.

Others are known to have fallen into situations—such as extra-marital affairs—which do not correspond to the 'heroic virtue' classically considered necessary for being raised 'to the honours of the altars' and being held up as examples of sanctity. Yet holiness does not imply 'sinlessness', for 'in Adam all have sinned'. It only requires faith in God's justice and mercy.

In the lives of all these 'hidden holy ones', Fr Plekon discerns a movement totally oriented towards God. They reach out to the One who awaits them in the very routine of everyday life, although his presence there is at times barely perceptible.

The adventure of searching for God must never end or grow stale. It is hidden, ordinary, yet always new. A holy person is not 'outside' the world, but one who finds the courage to go beyond his or her own limits by seeking God's will. The American poet Kathleen Norris rightly insisted that there is no opposition between holiness and realism; on the contrary, holiness should be understood as *ultimate realism*. As down-to-earth, practical and realistic as holiness is, meeting it is powerful, life-giving and life-changing.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer is an extraordinary example of the struggle to be holy in our time. His witness speaks of the involvement of believers with each other and with the world. This does not imply undertaking a far-reaching programme of service or reform; it is simply doing what has to be done, in awareness of God. We are to live out the obligations of our daily life conscious of how all around us is the presence of the suffering Christ.

A very telling example of 'hidden holiness' can be found in the life of Olga Arsamquq, the wife of an Orthodox priest in Alaska. In her role as both *matushka*¹ and midwife, she was a tremendous inspiration, as well as being of considerable practical help to the women of her village. After her death in 1979, the 'hidden' character of her holiness gave way to open recognition in a popular devotion to her, which grew up among the people of her village.

Mother Teresa of Calcutta is probably the most universally recognized saint of our time. Yet in her letters, published in 2007, a decade after her death, she reveals that she felt distant from God, even abandoned by him, unable to feel towards God any of the love she demonstrated for the suffering. In this, she is in the good company of a good number of saints. Her letters are a powerful reminder of the *humanity* of holy women and men. Feeling close to God, even believing one hears his voice with a mission, does not spare one from the loss of awareness of strong communion. Even without inner confidence and consolation, it is possible to love.

¹ In many Orthodox circles, the parish priest's wife is called 'Matushka' or 'Little Mother'.

Yet broad recognition of 'hidden holiness' is by no means the final criterion of its authenticity. Political options can sometimes get in the way. The everyday holiness of personalities like Salvadorian Archbishop Oscar Romero and the American Catholic Socialist Dorothy Day endears them to later generations, but their left-leaning tendencies make it unlikely that either of them will ever be 'canonized' by their church.

Fr Plekon is convinced of the importance of visual communication, and therefore includes in his book a number of highly evocative pictures, including the well-known fresco of 'dancing saints' from the Episcopal Church of St Gregory of Nyssa in San Francisco.

Thadée Barnas, Chevetogne

INDEX OF VOLUME 43 (2009) PARTS 1 & 2

Articles

- Battell, Colin OSB. *The Petrine Ministry.* 2/61
- Birmelé, André. *Bilateral Dialogues between the Churches: Milestones on the Path of Unity.* 2/136
- Carter, David. *Roman Catholic-Reformed Dialogue.* 2/99
- Charbak, Demetrios. *The Primacy of Peter: an Eastern Perspective.* 2/54
- Clifford, Catherine E. *Kenosis and the Church.* 2/2
- Cross, B.J. Lawrence. *Re-establishing the Sacramentality of Creation: Understanding the So-called Gnosticism of Paul Florensky.* 1/151
- Del Colle, Ralph. *On Becoming a Christian: Commentary on the Fifth Phase Report of the International Catholic/Pentecostal Dialogue.* 1/98
- Dotti, Br Guido. *Bose: an Ecumenical Monastery.* 1/10
- Egender, Dom Nicholas OSB. *The Figure of Mary from Israel to the Church in the Orthodox Tradition.* 1/134
- Gaughan OSB, Sr. Benedict. *Dom Bede Winslow 1888-1959.* 1/2
- Gibbons, Robin. *Pride and Prejudice: the Vocation of the Eastern Catholic Churches.* 2/35
- Kim, Kirsteen & Ross, Kenneth R. *Edinburgh 1910 to 2010: Centenary Assessment and Centenary Renewal.* 2/113
- Mayhead, Dom John OSB. *'Nothing but God.'* 1/162
- Neuhaus, David. *Moments of Crisis and Grace: Jewish-Catholic Relations in 2009.* 2/6
- Ross, Kenneth R. & Kim, Kirsteen. *Edinburgh 1910 to 2010: Centenary Assessment and Centenary Renewal.* 2/113
- Ruyssen, Georges SJ. *Mixed Marriages and Sharing in the Eucharist: Universal Catholic Norms and some particular Catholic Norms (part 1).* 1/75
- Ruyssen, Georges SJ. *Mixed Marriages ... Catholic Norms (part 2).* 2/75
- Ryrie, Alec. *John Calvin in an age of Ecumenism: a sketch.* 2/25
- Southern R.W. *St Anselm of Canterbury: His Mission of Reconciliation.* 1/51
- Tanner, Mary. *Bishop Bell 1883-1958.* 1/60
- Watson, Timothy. *'Life Precedes Law': The Story So Far of the Chemin Neuf Community.* 1/27

- Williams, Rowan. *A Response to R.W. Southern's 'St Anselm of Canterbury and His Mission of Reconciliation.'* 1/56
- Young, Norman. *The Scope of Salvation. A Wesleyan reflection prompted by the Joint Declaration on Justification.* 1/122

Documents

- A sermon by the Archbishop of Canterbury to celebrate the 900th anniversary of the death of St Anselm, 1109-2009. 1/166
- Address by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Willebrands Centenary Symposium in Rome, 12 November 2009. 2/154
- A Response to 'Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ' by the Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue of Canada. 2/167

Reports & Events

- Anglicans in Rome 2009. *Frederick Bliss SM.* 1/170
- Chemin Neuf's Community Manifesto: Serving the Church and the Unity of Christians. 1986-2009. *Laurent Fabre.* 1/176
- Faith and Order Plenary, Crete, October 2009:
Renewing the Marks: Called to be One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic. *Jamie Hawkey.* 2/183
Receptive Ecumenism and Faith and Order. *Paul D. Murray* 2/189

Books reviewed

- Etty Hillesum. A Life Transformed*, Patrick Woodhouse (London: Continuum, 2009), paperback, 160. ISBN: 9781847064264. 1/181
- Inter-Church Relations: Developments and Perspectives. A Tribute to Bishop Anthony Farquhar*, ed. Brendan Leahy (Dublin: Veritas, 2008), 203, paperback. ISBN: 9781847300952. 1/183
- Rereading Paul Together: Protestant and Catholic Perspectives on Justification*, ed. David E. Aune (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 279, \$26.00. ISBN: 9780801028403. 1/185
- Growth in Agreement III: International Dialogue. Texts and Agreed Statements, 1998 – 2005*, ed. Jeffrey Gros, Thomas F. Best, Lorelei F. Fuchs. (Eerdmans's/WCC, Faith & Order Paper), xvii + 615. ISBN: 9782825415115. 1/188
- 'Because He Was a German!'* Cardinal Bea and the Origins of Roman Catholic Engagement in the Ecumenical Movement, J-M Vereb (Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 2006), 332, cloth. ISBN: 9780802828859. 1/190

- Harvesting the Fruits: Basic Aspects of Christian Faith in Ecumenical Dialogue*, Walter Kasper (London/New York: Continuum Books, 2009), xv, 207. ISBN: 9781441162724. 2/195
- 'You will be called Repairer of the Breach': The Diary of J.G.M. Willebrands 1958-1961*, ed. Theo Salemink (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), viii, 450, paperback. ISBN: 9789042922570. 2/197
- A Century of Prayer for Christian Unity*, ed. Catherine E. Clifford (Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans, 2009), 143, ISBN: 9780802863669. 2/200
- The World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh 1910*, Brian Stanley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 324. ISBN: 9780802863607. 2/201
- Edinburgh 2010: Mission Then and Now*, ed. D.A. Kerr & K.R. Ross (Oxford: Regnum, 2009), paper, 317. ISBN: 9781870345736. 2/201
- Ökumene des Lebens als Herausforderung der wissenschaftlichen Theologie / Ecumenism of Life as a Challenge for Academic Theology. Proceedings of the 14th Academic Consultation of the Societas Oecumenica*, ed. B. J. Hilberath et al. (Lembeck: Frankfurt am Main, 2008), 342, ISBN: 9783874765725. 2/207
- One Baptism: Ecumenical Dimensions of the Doctrine of Baptism*, Susan K. Wood (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2009), 218. ISBN: 9780814653067. 2/209