A friend in Paris, in fact, a Swedish Lutheran, dislikes elaborate liturgy. Because he is well educated in the history of aesthetic forms, he recognizes the period from which each of the liturgical elements springs. Elaborate worship makes him conscious of the changes the Christian religion has undergone. But, at worship, he, like most of us, wishes rather to be aware of his presence with and in the eternal and immutable God. Familiarity with a fixed rite probably helps most of us to forget the development which is essential to Christian forms so we do not suffer from my friend's distraction. We will be aware, however, of liturgists whose strategy is precisely to make us constantly aware in the midst of worship of change which is also at the centre of the Christian religion, and, before this paper is complete, we will consider what is to be said for and against their views. But whatever our views about liturgy and whatever our experience of it, we must sympathize with my friend. For, from the beginning, change, together with the denial of change and any essential development have been fundamental features of the Christian tradition.

I. The New Testament church and development: (a) the gospels

This ambiguous relation to change is to be found at our origins in our blessed Lord himself. Certainly he self-consciously changed the received doctrine: "Ye have heard that it was said by them in old time" (Matthew, 5.21 and 5.27), indeed, "It hath been said" (Matthew 5.31), "But I say unto you" (Matthew 5.20, 5.22, 5.32). "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another" (John 13.34).[1] The changes

---

[1] The problematic I am attempting to expose in the first part of this paper is all implicit in the fact that for the New Testament the commandment to love is both new and old. See John 12. 49-50, John 14. 23-24, John 16. 9-10, Luke 10. 25-37 [especially when the parable is interpreted, with the fathers, typologically], 1 Thessalonians 4.9; the first two Johannine epistles are preoccupied with the problematic: 1 John 2. 7-8, 13-14, 1 John 3. 23, 1 John 4. 7-21 [where the problem is solved because God is love and loves us in Christ, so the imitation of Christ and obedience to his new commandment is to obey the one who was in the beginning], 2 John 4-6.

I employ the Authorized Version for the translated texts and I use the New Testament uncritically. James Barr, *Holy Scripture: Canon, Authority, Criticism*, The Sprunt Lectures delivered at Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia February 1982, (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1983), 4 is apt: "the biblical evidence for all this does not depend upon any 'critical' view or reconstruction but is available from the text of the Bible as it stands". Barr's first chapter contains a polemical and one-sided statement of part of what I assert about the relation of tradition and scripture. My general method is closer to Protestant orthodoxy than his in that I treat the Bible as a system but as complete only in principle. With Thomas Aquinas I assimilate *sacra doctrina* and *sacra scriptura* and regard each solution or determination as impelling new questions within the encompassing logic. See W. J. Hankey, "Theology as System and as Science: Proclus and Thomas Aquinas", *Dionysius* 6 (1982), 83-93, idem, *God In Himself. Aquinas' Doctrine of God as Expounded in the Summa Theologiae*, (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1987), 42-43, 145-146, 162-163, idem, "The *De Trinitate* of St. Boethius and the *Summa Theologiae* of St. Thomas Aquinas", *Atti Congresso Internazionale di Studi Boeziani, (Pavia, 5-8 ottobre, 1980)*, ed. L. Obertello, (Herder: Rome, 1981), 367-375, idem, "Aquinas, Pseudo-Denys, Proclus and Isaiah VI.6," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge,* 64 (1997), 59-93; idem, "The Sacraments According to the Lord's Command", in *Rebuilding the House of*

which took place before him are sometimes degenerations, corruptions: Jesus demanded of the scribes and Pharisees: "Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition?" (Matthew 15.3), and these degenerations are even to be found in the Torah: "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives" (Matthew 19.8). But, while the day of the Son of man is like the days before Noah went into the ark, a terrible last day of the Lord[2] (Matthew 24.57, Luke 17.26-30), still there is a progress to them; for, John Baptist, who announces the coming judgement, is the greatest of those born to women (Matthew 11.11 and Luke 7.29). There is also a perfection and fulfilment in them (Matthew 5.17, Matthew 26.54, Mark 14.49, Luke 4.21, John 13.18 etc.). "I come not to destroy but to fulfil," says the Lord. Moreover, after him, despite troubles he foresees for his disciples (John 14.19-20, 16 *passim*), his works will be perfected in his followers: "He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do" (John 14.12), and there will be development of his doctrine: "the Holy Ghost ... shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you" (John 14.26). "When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth" (John 16.13). This will be an unfolding of the wisdom of the Father: "All things that the Father hath are mine, therefore... he [the spirit] shall take of mine and shall show it unto you" (John 16.15).

The evangelists, then, represent Christ as self-consciously in religious transformations of various kinds, changing what has been taught as of God even in scripture, and initiating development in the works of God and in his self-revelation. This is also denied. Jesus is not a teacher in the succession. He is "in the Father" (John 14.10). He reveals what he has seen in the Father, he speaks the Father's words and he

---

God. The Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1888, ed., G. Richmond Bridge, (St. Peter Publications: Charlottetown, 1988), 55-71 with "Reply to Dr. Hughes's Paper" in the same volume 38-40 [both on the role of scripture in Anglicanism] and idem, "Scripture and Theology: the Current Dilemma", in *The Scriptures and Modern Christian Teaching,* ed. G. Richmond Bridge, (St. Peter Publications: Charlottetown, 1989), 7-21.
     I agree with Candido Pozo, "Development of Dogma", in *Encyclopedia of Theology: A Concise Sacramentum Mundi,* (Burns and Oates: London, 1975), 360: "this infallible answer to a previous question can open up avenues to new questions. The ensuing answers will form new stages in dogmatic progress which will gradually explicate further what is already acquired."
[2] Though it is appropriate to my argument, I have not found opportunity in the text to note the logical connection between the notions that these are the last days, that in them the revelation is complete, and that those who have received it are safe in the immovable provided they hold to the revelation. In this perspective the development of doctrine takes place because we rest in the last day through the course of extended time. Relevant are 1 Corinthians 10.11: "upon whom the ends of the earth are come" and Hebrews 1.2: "in these last days hath he spoken unto us by his Son whom he hath appointed heir of all things" etc., and Hebrews 9.26. This logic permeates 1 Peter. Karl Rahner puts the matter thus: "And this self-communication by God has reached its definitive, eschatological stage. For by God's definitive and unsurpassable saving action in the incarnate Word, revelation is concluded (because it now directly opens out on the vision of God), and God's definitive word is present...Consequently, dogma now exists in the full sense of the absolute and supreme claim by which ultimate salvation and perdition is decided.": "Dogma", *Encyclopedia*, 353. The question of the reconciliation with time while living in the last days is splendidly treated by Charles Williams, *The Descent of the Dove. A Short History of the Holy Spirit in the Church,* (Faber and Faber: London, 1950).

has "finished the work" which the Father gave him to do (John 14.7, John 14.10, John 17.4, Matthew 11.27). Rejecting him is to reject the Father and to be judged by the Father, while abiding in the Son and in his commandments is to abide in the Father (John 14.20-25, John 15.19-23, John 16.27, etc.). He was "before Abraham" (John 8.58) and, when he is seen in his transfigured glory, Moses and Elijah are present with him (Mark 9.2-10, Matthew 17.1-9, Luke 9.28-36). So there is nothing new in his teaching. Jesus is either correcting the false tradition by a return to the true sense of scripture (Matthew 15.3-4), or returning us to what is fundamental in it, to what was "in the beginning" (Matthew 19.4 and 8). Even Jesus himself is nothing new, when the one who has seen the Father and done his work interprets the scriptures. According to Luke his final teaching is "that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me. Then he opened their understanding that they might understand the scriptures" (Luke 24, 27 and 44-45).[3] He is to be found in what is already revealed.

I(b): community, tradition, scripture

The Ascension of the Lord Jesus Christ leaves Christianity as constituted of three elements: a community, a scripture and a tradition. But what is distinctively Christian is found neither in the fact of being a community (there are many religious communities, indeed, many within and at the borders of Judaism), nor in its scripture (the Christian scripture is initially what we come to call the Old Testament, a scripture shared then with Jews who are not in the new "way"). All which is distinctively Christian belongs to the tradition of the community. Part of the tradition will be known, at least at the beginning, solely to the apostles who, according to the evangelists, were the only ones present at some events and discourses (e.g. the Transfiguration, the Last Supper and Agony: see above and Luke 22).

We know from the New Testament that the tradition contained at least: (1) the sayings and deeds of the Lord Jesus, (2) the structure of the Christian community and the origin of that structure (e.g. the calling of the twelve apostles: [Mark 3.14-19, Mark 6, Matthew 4.18-22, Matthew 16.17-19, John 6.70, etc.]), (3) features of what we will come to call its liturgy and sacramental life (Luke 22.19-20, 24.30, 1 Corinthians. 11.23-26, Acts 2.44.47, etc.), (4) rules for the interpretation of scripture, which become in part our lectionaries,[4] and (5) brief statements of essentials of the faith, which we will

---

[3] If interpreting the Old Testament is essential to Christianity, then it does control the New Testament church, but as interpreted. Only in this sense could one accept Barr, *Holy Scripture*, 14: "The essential verbal authority was the kerygma of the Gospel, that is, an oral proclamation more like a sermon than like a Bible. Thus the unquestioned authority of the Old Testament as holy scripture for the early church ... does not mean that the New Testament placed itself under the *control* of the Old, as if the Old was its final criterion or the absolute source for the derivation of religious truth." The two sides of this problem are seen in this: the correct interpretaion of the scripture is a life and death matter for Jesus and upon it depends the significance of his death and resurrection which happen "according to the scriptures" (Nicene Creed and 1 Corinthians 15.3). See W.J. Hankey, "Scripture", 14-19.

[4] Consider the significance for the interpretation of Old Testament texts of their association with the liturgical commemoration of the events of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus. The selection and

come to call creeds (1 Corinthians 15.3-7). We know about these elements of the tradition from the New Testament as well as from other written and archaeological evidence about the early church. But it is essential to recognize that, except for the accounts of the sayings and deeds of the Lord, the tradition cannot **in principle** be reduced to the New Testament. The structure and practice of a community are logically and really different from the written word. Rules for the interpretation of scripture and brief statements of what is, at least in part, contained but dispersed throughout scripture cannot be reduced to the scriptures they interpret or summarize. Certainly, there are necessities forcing the doctrinal content of the tradition to become written and so fixed and public, for it thus to become the scripture we call the New Testament. One of these necessities is the encounter with a rival secret tradition about Jesus, gnosticism.[5] Another is the inherent completeness of the knowledge of God in Christ which constitutes the basis of Christianity. The scripture is the form which represents to the church what is complete for it. So the enemies of a given divine revelation seek to reopen the canon or to radically change the rules of interpretation.[6] But, it is impossible that the tradition be reduced to scripture.

It follows from this that the dynamic features of the Christian religion belong not to scripture, which becomes fixed, canonical, but to the other constitutive elements: community and tradition. The community can grow or shrink, encompass different races, languages, peoples and assume, at least to some degree, a variety of forms.[7] Worship and sacramental life will develop.[8] Scripture itself will initially expand from out of tradition and only then be fixed in virtue of something inherent in the community, a quality which must logically be distinguished from scripture and which enables the church to determine its canonical scripture. The attribute of the community fixing its scripture is positively related to the opening of the understanding by which the Lord Jesus enabled the eleven and others to interpret the Jewish scriptures so as to find him in them (Luke 24.25-27, 44-48). One of the earliest impulses of Christian theology will be to expand this understanding in respect to the Old Testament books, and it will be essential to the church's doctrinal continuity with the apostles to maintain a Christian understanding when reading the New Testament.

The expansion and development of the apostolic interpretation is necessary to the other dynamic aspect of the tradition we have already identified and associated with,

---

association is traditional, though it is found in part in the New Testament. It is very ancient, and, in large part, common to the various ecclesiastical traditions. See W. J. Hankey, "Scripture", 18-19.

[5] See J. A. Doull, "The Christian Origin of Contemporary Institutions. Part II: The History of Christian Institutions", *Dionysius* 8(1984), 78-79 and W.J. Hankey, "Scripture", 15-16.

[6] See W. J. Hankey, "The Bible in a Post-Critical Age", in *After the Deluge. Essays Towards the Desecularization of the Church*, ed. W. Oddie, (SPCK: London, 1987), 41-92 and idem, "Scripture", 7-21.

[7] Newman places this under "material developments": J.H. Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, 2d ed.,(Toovey: London, 1846), 44.

[8] Newman seems to place this under "moral developments", ibid., 50-54; they are "not properly matter for controversy, but are natural and personal, substitute what is congruous, desirable, pious, decorous, generous for strictly logical inference" (50).

though it is not confined to, the creeds. The creeds develop along side of, in relation to, and in reflection upon scripture; but they are not, nor are the doctrinal developments they partly embody, reducible to scripture. They are not just scripture compacted or summarized.[9] One of the impulses promoting their development in the tradition is identified by St. Paul. The community is divided, "for there must be heresies among you, that they which are approved may be manifest among you" (1 Corinthians 11.19). The creeds came, in part, from the dynamic of community: its dividing and reuniting. Holding to an identity which is only partly given by having a fixed scripture will turn out to require the development of conceptual forms which are not found in scripture. Equally comprehending scripture in changed circumstances requires creating or finding, or reshaping these non scriptural concepts. For these reasons, "biblical theology" was, and has been shown to be, impossible.[10]

    I hope to show later in this paper that a true understanding of the development of doctrine requires appreciating the radically creative function of tradition in this process and its relation to fundamental shifts in the circumstances of the church. It is here that we will encounter the most profound questions about the relation between ecclesiastical traditions and the development of doctrine. Those questions and problems will, I think, require us to move beyond the understandings of the development of doctrine which were formulated by the distinct and opposed western churches in the first three hundred years of the modern period. However, before confronting those classical modern formulations, let us sharpen the fundamental problematic a little further by looking at the New Testament outside the gospels.

---

[9] I intend here to contradict the words and position of John Bramhall as quoted and explained by D. P. Curry in "Response to Dr. Hankey's Paper", in *The Thirty-Nine Articles*, ed. G. Richmond Bridge, (St. Peter Publications: Charlottetown, 1990), 22 and idem, "The Recovery of Reformed Catholicism", a paper for the 150th Anniversary Conference, 'Theology and the Year 200' at Nashota House, Sept. 10-13, 1992, in *The Machray Review* 3(May, 1993), 8. These, with the more Tractarian G.W.A. Thorne, "Scripture as the Rule and Ultimate Standard of Faith", in *Rebuilding the House of God*, (St. Peter Publications: Charlottetown, 1988), 7-26, are the best current presentations of the classical Anglican notion of immutable fundamental articles known to me.

    The problem with Bramhall's position is that, assuming with the Fathers and the scholastics the union of faith and philosophy in doctrine, he does not notice what is new in the creeds and is sufficiently Protestant to think the medieval and reformed developments on free-will, sin, grace, justification etc. to be merely biblical and Augustinian. Fr. Thorne's paper and that of Dr. Crouse (and of Fr. D.L. Stokes' response to it), delivered at the same conference, "The Creeds as the Sufficient Statement of the Christian Faith", 41-48 and 53-54, record the collapse of the union of faith and hellenic philosophy in Christian doctrine upon which union classical Anglicanism depends. So also Dr. J.N. Steenson, "The Teaching Tradition: Scripture and Doctrine" in *The Scriptures and Modern Christian Teaching*, (St. Peter Publications: Charlottetown, 1989), 59-71.

    Barry L. Craig, "Response to Fr. Hankey's Paper" in *The Scriptures and Modern Christian Teaching*, says well: "The reformed character of our Church is founded upon an absolute confidence in the Scriptures and a belief that our Articles can, and indeed *must*, be demonstrable from the Word of God." (23) Are Anglicans capable of reconstructing the union of scripture, philosophical theology and Christian doctrine on which their reformed catholicism depends? I see evidence neither of a serious cultivation of the necessary elements, nor of the perception that all three are necessary to the reconstruction, nor of a demand from ecclesiastical authority that they be drawn together. See note 55 below.

[10] W. J. Hankey," The Bible", 70-72 and idem, "Scripture".

I(c): the epistles in the New Testament

I have said already that as written, fixed, normative (or canonical) the New Testament has the form of what is changeless. However, scripture for Christians is not just the formally unchanging element among the various features of their religious constitution. In it we have the record of the encounter in virtue of which Christian doctrine is changeless. Moreover, the experience is understood in such a way in the scriptural record that this changelessness is and must be ascribed to Christian teaching. The "Jesus Christ" who is the teacher and the principle of the teaching "is the same yesterday, and today, and for ever", (Hebrews 13.8). Accordingly "the faith" is something "once delivered unto the saints" (Jude 3). To keep the effect in themselves of what has been received, they must "hold fast the form of sound words" (2 Timothy 1.13), "standing fast and holding the traditions taught" by word or in writing (2 Thessalonians 2.15, see also 1 Corinthians 15.1-3, Hebrews 4.12-5.1, 2 Peter 3.1-2, 1 John generally). The changelessness, both of the teacher and of the doctrine (and these are in great measure identical),[11] comes simply from this: in and through Jesus Christ, Christians know themselves to be taught by, and in union with "the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness neither shadow of turning" (James 1.17).

There are three essentials of the changelessness belonging to and communicated by Jesus Christ: first, God, second, the state of those who are one with God in Christ, third, the medium between the two, Jesus Christ himself. Doctrine and its immutability come under Christ as one of the means of his mediation.

First, then, is God, the invariable (James 1.17), eternal life and light in which is no darkness at all (1 John 1.2 and 5), "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, who only hath immortality" (2 Timothy 6.16).

But, second, there is the experience of Christians of what is contrary to their corruptible nature, itself of the earth, earthy, mortal (2 Corinthians 4.11-12, 1 Corinthians 15). By a gift of God (2 Corinthians 1.9-10, Ephesians 2.5-7, Romans 5.15), they now self-consciously possess the immortality of God, his eternal life.[12] They have "received a kingdom which cannot be moved" (Hebrews 12.28). They are "partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world" (2 Peter 1.4). They have been "born again ...of incorruptible seed, by the word of God" (1 Peter 1.23, see also James 1.18 and 1 Peter 1.3-4). They are actually "raised up together" with Christ, and are "sitting together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus" (Ephesians 2.6 and Colossians 3.1), who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to

---

[11] Thorne, "Scripture", 9-10.

[12] From the Heideggerian perspective treated under "Discontinuities" above, this New Testament concern with immortality is not Christian, only hellenic. See Hankey, "The Bible", 41-45 and 69-77. For the recent, and very sophisticated treatment of the dehellenization of Christianity by Jonathan Z. Smith, *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity*, (School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London: London, 1990), salvation as immortality is only one of the New Testament solutions.

light through the gospel (2 Timothy 1.10) and already has delivered his people "from the wrath to come" (1 Thessalonians 1.10).[13] This actual state of Christians is spoken of in a number of ways, but they all involve receiving what belongs to God: e.g. his righteousness (Philippians 3.9, Colossians 1.14 and 22, Romans 3ff.) being his sons, and heirs of what is his (Galatians 3.29 - 4.6). They know themselves as complete (Colossians 2.10). In sum, what belongs properly only to God is now experienced as actually possessed by those who know him in Christ: "That which was from the beginning ... that eternal life which was with the Father was manifested unto us" (1 John 1.1-2). What means is adequate to this union of opposites? What are the properties of the mediator?

At this third point, the properties of the mediator, Jesus Christ, we witness Christian doctrine at its very heart developing within the New Testament itself. The development begun there will be continued in respect to his properties as God and man especially by the councils of the greek patristic church for five centuries, and, in respect to the nature of his justifying work and his character in it, especially by the latin and western church into modern times. But what is essential about the New Testament development, and what enables the church to see the doctrine as complete in its beginning, is that Jesus Christ is recognized as perfect principle of all deriving from him. The object of Christian faith is, from the beginning, known as perfect, complete, in no need of change.

John, in the prologue of his gospel, declared that the "fullness" of grace and truth, of which we have all received, was that of the Word which was "in the beginning ... God" (John 1.1 and 1.14 and 16). He is the "alpha and omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last" (Revelation 22.13). "In Him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily" (Colossians 2.9 and Colossians 1.19). He is "God manifest in the flesh" (1 Timothy 3.16). All things were created in, and consist in, him (Colossians 1.15-17, John 1.3, Hebrews 1.2). And, since in offering to the Gentiles what was formerly offered to the Jews, he manifested what was formerly hidden in God, he is the eternal purpose of God manifesting the hidden mysteries of the eternal Father (Ephesians 3.9-11, Ephesians 1.4-10, 1 Corinthians 2.7-16, Colossians 1.25-27). As the purpose of God, he is also that for which all things exist (Colossians 1.16). God having willed his purpose in him, by him and for him. And so, as we have noted, he is the same "for ever". (Hebrews 13.8) "Because he continues forever, this man has an unchangeable priesthood" (Hebrews 7.24).

For Christians to possess what properly belongs to God, properties mediated to us by Jesus, Christians must inhere in the Christ. The means conveying his changeless completeness must themselves be capable of that perfection. I do not wish to impose a complete systematization upon the New Testament, both because it appears that there are several beginnings of such orderings in its literature and because explicit systematization belongs to a later stage of doctrinal development.[14] Nonetheless, I will

---

[13] Thus, Karl Rahner, *Encyclopedia,* 353: [immediately following on his words quoted in note 2 above], "Hence dogma is not merely a statement 'about' something, but one in which because it is an 'exhibitive' word with a 'sacramental' nature, what it states actually occurs and is posited by its existence: God's self-communication in grace which is also the grace of its absolute acceptance (faith)."

[14] See notes 1 and 12 above.

arrange the means for the participation of Christians in the properties of the Father through their union with the Son roughly according to my earlier division between community, tradition and scripture.

(1) By the gift of the Holy Spirit, the community is constituted as the very body of Christ. "By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body ...[so] ye are the body of Christ and members in particular" (1 Corinthians 12.13 and 27). The Spirit, by which they are members of the body of the Son, not only transforms them into the image of the Lord "from glory to glory" (2 Corinthians 1.18), but also keeps Christians in union with the Father. He "is sent forth unto your hearts, crying, Abba, Father" (Galatians 4.6, 2 Corinthians 5.5 and Ephesians 2.18) and, because he "searches ... the deep things of God", we "know the things that are freely given to us of God" and "have the mind of Christ" (1 Corinthians 2.10-16).

(2) The Spirit moves the body in those aspects of its communal life which belong to its tradition but are not reducible to doctrine or scripture. That (a) "whereby we cry Abba Father" is the spirit of prayer both groaning within us and "making intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered" (Romans 8.11-27). (b) Through the Spirit we are "baptized unto Jesus Christ", so that being "dead with Christ", we may "reckon ourselves dead indeed unto sin but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Romans 6.3 - 11). (c) The sacred meal of the community also "shows the Lord's death" (1 Corinthians 11.26) and unites us with his body: "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread" (1 Corinthians 10.16-17). (d)The structure of the body: "And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets ..." and so on, is also the work of the Spirit "dividing to every man severally as he will" (1 Corinthians 12.28 and 11).

(3) Finally, doctrine is also an essential means of union with the mediator of the divine life. St. John writes: "That eternal life, which was with the Father" what "was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life ... declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ" (1 John 1.1-3). Doctrine is an essential means of sharing in the apostolic fellowship with God in Christ. The fellowship is complete in the sense that it is with what is "from the beginning", the first principle, and the life shared is "eternal life". Evidently, this fellowship, conveyed by several means, is adequate to a known, experienced, participation in the divine life itself. The adequacy of the Christian means, and the perfection of the principle they communicate are necessary elements of the doctrine (see, particularly, Hebrews 1,4,5,12). Moreover, the character of the experience both in form and in content make it essential that what is communicated, the fact that it is communicated, and how it is communicated be known to those by whom it is received. Therefore this knowledge is in principle changeless and must be changelessly in the church. However, it is not thereby necessary that everything **in** the beginning be known **from** the beginning.

Jesus did not himself say anything about many matters which had to be dealt with by the New Testament church, let alone by the church in subsequent times, and, as we shall see, St. Paul is aware of this. The principle of eternal life must be heard, seen, touched and communicated and communicable, and he must be known to have completely what he communicates, but that is sufficient. Everything else can develop out of that. Certainly, some things must, as St. Paul says, "be kept in memory" as the

things which he preached and "by which also ye are saved" (1 Corinthians 15.2, see also 1 John 2.24), but these are very few: in effect, that Christ has encompassed death in accordance with the scriptures, that this was accomplished in, and known in, the flesh, and that there were witnesses of these things. [15] While there is nothing in the New Testament to indicate that this essential changeless deposit must be given the form of a new scripture, its character as complete and changeless in principle, and the assistance the written word can give to what must absolutely be remembered moves the New Testament writers (1 John 5.13, 2 Peter 1.12-15, Luke 1.1-4). [16] This does not prevent a development of doctrine beyond scripture and much compels it.

I(d): The development of doctrine, its necessity
(i) Problems inherent in the New Testament development itself.

The necessity for the development of doctrine will be evident to us, aware as we must be of the problems inherent in the development which took place already in the New Testament. For example, in Christ is the fullness of God bodily: certainly, but how? What does this mean for the idea of God? What does bodily mean? How are divinity and humanity joined? Five centuries of thought will be devoted to these basic questions. We are in his resurrected life by entering into his death: how and why does his death bring life? How can his death be finished: "He dieth no more" (Romans 6.9), and yet still be present and effective? In both cases, the very perfection and completeness of the mediator and of his mediating work, as we have seen, necessary elements of a doctrine of Christ which explains what his disciples experienced in him, require the development of doctrine beyond the New Testament. Moreover, we will be aware of at least one instance in which a New Testament writer drew a false conclusion from the completeness of Christ as the principle of our salvation and from the perfection of his work.

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, strongly and necessarily contrasting Christ's finished priesthood with that of the Levitical priesthood established under the old law, drew the conclusion that there could be no forgiveness for sins committed after we enter the new covenant: "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened ... if they shall fall away, to renew them again into repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh" (Hebrews 6.4-6, see also 10.26-29, and 12.15-29). Convinced of the perfection of Christ, it took the apostolic and patristic church about the same time to develop a doctrine and practice for the forgiveness of sin after baptism as to think how humanity and divinity could be preserved together and joined to one another. [17] It is crucial to my argument to note that these three matters, the doctrine of God and man, i.e. Trinity and Incarnation, of justification, and of the forgiveness of sins, which must by the character of their formulations in the New Testament be developed beyond what is in the New Testament, belong

---

[15] Williams, *The Descent*, 3-4, puts it well: "They had not the language; they had not the ideas; they had to discover everything. They had only one fact, and that was that it had happened. Messias had come, and had been killed, and risen; and they had been dead 'in trespasses and sin' and now they were not. They were regenerate; so might everyone be."

[16] Barr, *Holy Scripture*, 12: "Jesus in his teaching is nowhere portrayed as commanding or even sanctioning the production of a written Gospel, still less a written New Testament. He never even casually told his disciples to write anything down, nor did he even, short of writing, commend them to memorize his words exactly for future committal to the medium of writing". See also p.20 re. 2 Timothy 3. 16. This is correct but needs to be balanced by examining our Lord's relation and that of the early Christians to the Old Testament, on which see Hankey, "Scripture", 14-16 and note 3 above.

[17] See Williams, *The Descent*, 31-49.

indubitably to the essentials of the faith, the fundamentals, what are generally required for salvation.

While there is no evidence that the New Testament authors were aware of the need for a developing doctrinal tradition to correct what they taught or to resolve the questions implicit in their solutions, there is evidence that they understood the need to supplement what they had received, to develop the principle and beginning which they knew, and to build upon the foundation which had been laid.

(ii) Supplement, adiaphora?

The need to supplement is clear, explicit, open. St. Paul is often required to determine practical matters on his own judgement and by his own authority, e.g. 1 Timothy is full of such determinations. And he clearly distinguishes between what he speaks "by permission and not of commandment", when advising marriage to avoid fornication, and what "I command, yet not I, but the Lord", when forbidding divorce or, at least, remarriage of the divorced (1 Corinthians 7.1-11 and perhaps also, on another matter, 1 Corinthians 14.34). Just as, later in the same epistle, he will distinguish his own disciplinary regulations from the tradition about the Lord's supper which "I received of the Lord" and "which also I delivered unto you" (1 Corinthians 11.23). However, this supplementation may not touch our central problem. Perhaps these practical determinations are *adiaphora*, things indifferent in themselves, things not concerned with what is necessary for salvation, even though they must necessarily be determined authoritatively for the sake of the order of the community. This distinction enabled the Protestant reformers to reverse decisions which had been taken earlier by the church - like the compulsory celibacy of the clergy - and to provide a basis for their own new civil and ecclesiastical structures while maintaining that doctrine, certainly in regard to essentials, was immutable.[18] It is not clear, in fact, either that the apostolic church determined without the Lord's word only things indifferent or that the essentials of doctrine do not require development beyond the New Testament. Yet Paul's distinction between what he commands himself and what he hands on as commanded by the Lord does not itself show that the apostolic church was self-consciously aware of an ongoing necessity for the essentials of doctrine to develop.

(iii) Change and development

There is, however, another feature of the teaching we find in the epistles of the New Testament which indicates both an awareness of essential development as a problem and which also moves toward a solution. The problem is the change in God's promise, word and covenant made by Jesus. The solution is the language about principle, beginning, foundation, cornerstone which enables change to be

---

[18] An excellent presentation of church history which regards the doctrinal fundamentals as becoming fixed, leaving the post-patristic church, or at least the post-medieval church to determine only the practical *adiaphora* is J. A. Matheson, "The History of Synods", in *Church Polity and Authority*, ed. G. Richmond Bridge, (St. Peter Publications: Charlottetown, 1985), 15-21 [also the response by Jonathan Eayrs in the same volume]. W. J. Hankey, "The Thirty-Nine Articles as a Theological System" in *The Thirty-Nine Articles*, (St. Peter Publications: Charlottetown, 1990), 1-11 exhibits a similar order within the structure of the Articles themselves. Idem, "The Ends and Limits of Spiritual Authority", in *Church Polity and Authority*, 42-51, idem, "Canon Law" in *The Study of Anglicanism*, ed. S.W. Sykes and J. E. Booty, (SPCK/ Fortress: London and Philadelphia, 1988), 200-215 and Curry, "Response to Dr. Hankey's Paper" in *The Thirty-Nine Articles*,12-31 show the effective collapse of this vital distinction among Anglicans.

development or at least revelation and manifestation of what was already changelessly in the first principle.

I(e): Change and development, the common logic of gospels and epistles

Before exhibiting for you this logic as I find it in the epistles, where it is especially, though not exclusively, Paul's concern, let me remind you of the logic I claimed to find in the gospels, since, in the end, I think the logics are the same. The logic has four moments.[19] First, there is a change: Jesus contradicts both Moses and the tradition of the elders. Second, Jesus claims that Moses and the tradition, not he, has effected the change, since he teaches what God intended from the beginning, which is in fact found in the scripture. Third, Jesus asserts that he knows and teaches what is in the beginning with the Father, because he was in the beginning with and knows the Father, speaks the Father's words and does the Father's will, and the scriptures from the beginning speak of him. Fourth, the change has the effect, therefore, of enabling what was changelessly present and working from the beginning, but hidden, to be manifest and thus explicitly and self-consciously operative. This is the gospel.

Just so also, the Pauline writings know the changeless gospel in virtue of a change. Firstly, there has been a change: you Gentiles, the peoples of the earth, "in time past", "being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, ... but now, in Christ Jesus, you who sometimes were far off are made nigh ... Now, therefore, you are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God ... fellow heirs, and of the same body and partakers of God's promise" (Ephesians 2.11 -3.6). There was a "middle wall of partition" between Jew and Gentile (Ephesians 2.14), but now "there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek" (Romans 10.12). This change, without which the peoples would have no fixed, changeless hope in an eternal life which "fadeth not away" (1 Peter 1.4), precisely because it is a change, creates a problem at the very heart of the hope. Unless this problem can be solved, the peoples are in fact hopeless; there is no changeless good news for anybody. The problem is, of course, this: if God has changed his mind once, why not again? The question which Paul asks, in the Epistle to the Romans, "Hath God cast away his people?" is not just important for him as a Jew. Unless he can show how his "God forbid" (Romans 11.1) is true, the Gentiles have no real hope either; there is **no** gospel of eternal salvation.

It is not possible in this paper to go into all the solutions Paul attempts, especially as they are contrary, if not contradictory, to one another. But, let this be clear: the concern of the New Testament and of subsequent Christian theology with the immutability and eternity of God and with the eternity of his predestining or electing will does not import into the gospel a problematic foreign to it. Unless the church can

---

[19] Another four part scheme with some similarity to mine is to be found in K. Rahner,"History of Dogma in the primitive church" in *Encyclopedia*, 363: "What was radically new (the universality of the gospel of the absolute mediator of salvation in the death and resurrection) was envisaged on the basis of the divinely ordained OT (theology of the fulfilment of Scripture), and so had to preserve continuity with (Romans 9-11; opposition to Marcion), and distinction from its prehistory (the Pauline theology of freedom from the Law; polemics against the Jews; theology of the separation of the Church from the Synagogue, cf. Letter of Barnabus)." Rahner's purpose is to establish how the "Church's new sense of faith" established itself in relation to "the world of the OT".

show how bringing the Gentiles into the promises of Israel is the changeless will of a changeless God, the church cannot preach that God is love and that he wills all to be saved. Unless his eternal nature as love and his eternal will are known, the gospel of love must be preached under a condition, i.e. in the form: "God loves you unless he has changed, or he has changed his mind". So it is essential that the logic of the solution to this problem be evident at the beginning of Christianity, even if what is resolved leaves also much to be worked out.

Secondly, what appears as change from the human perspective, both Jewish and Gentile, is seen not to be a change in the divine will as declared in scripture. First, the scriptures are discovered to have always spoken of an inclusion of the Gentiles in the promises of Israel. Romans, chapter 15, and Galatians, chapter 4 with its allegorical interpretation of Sarah and of Mount Sinai are examples of gatherings or interpretations of scripture towards demonstrating this. Second, there is the demonstration that faith and Christ were always the principles of salvation, even to the Jews. Romans, chapters 1 to 4, Hebrews, chapter 11, and 1 Corinthians, chapter 10 with its typological allegory of Christ in the cloud and the sea and in "the Rock that followed them" are examples of this kind of argument. Again, what was formerly taken as absolute is now exposed as provisional: the law is a "schoolmaster" (Galatians 3.24), a "shadow" (Hebrews 10.1), for slaves not freemen (Galatians 4), bringing death, and sin (or at least its consciousness), being a curse, though also good (Romans 4, Corinthians 15, Galatians 3, 1 Timothy 1.8, etc.). Part of showing this includes the allegorical interpretation of the old sacrifices and the old priesthood in Hebrews. We should notice, by the way, that the allegorical interpretation of the Hebrew scripture is essential to this part of the logic. Therefore, when the Protestant reformers insisted that scripture be interpreted only literally, they included in what they called the literal sense all the senses formerly called allegorical or spiritual. When, in our time, those supposedly following these reformers insist on a literal, historical, critical interpretation of scripture excluding the allegorical, they make the Christian interpretation of scripture impossible.[20]

Thirdly, this new Christian understanding that the change is in humanity, not in God nor in his revelation of himself in scripture, exists because Christ, by whom we have it is in the changeless beginning (John 1.1, 1 John 1.1, 1 John 2.7, 1 John 2.13 and 14, 1 John 2.24 and 25, 1 John 3.11 [assimilating the character of the promise, the doctrine and the source], similarly, 2 John 5 and 6, Hebrews 1.10). He is superior to and before all other beginning and power (Romans 8.38, 1 Corinthians 15.24, Ephesians 1.21, Colossians 2.10, Colossians 2.15). He himself is the true principle (Colossians 1.18) being himself, like Melchisedec, without beginning (Hebrews 5.6, 6.20, 7.3, 7.17, 7.21). He and his sacrifice are from before the foundation of the world (Apocalypse 13.8, 1 Peter 1.20, Ephesians 1.4 and 3.9, Hebrews 4.3 with Hebrews 9.26, 1 Corinthians 2.7). In fact he is the foundation or the cornerstone of the foundation (1 Peter 2.5-7,

---

[20] See W.J. Hankey, "'Magis… Pro Nostra Sentencia': John Wyclif, his mediaeval Predecessors and reformed Successors, and a pseudo-Augustinian Eucharistic Decretal," *Augustiniana* [Institutum Historicum Augustianum Lovanii], 45, fasc. 3-4 (1995), 213-245, idem, "Aquinas, Pseudo-Dionysius," Coraggio, "A Nearer View, Observations on Christianity in Continental Europe: Part IV", *Anglican Free Press* 10, #1(1993), 16-19. The necessity for the spiritual or allegorical reading of scripture is accepted by the Roman church and by Prayer Book Anglicans. See *Catechisme de l'eglise catholique*, (Mame: Paris, 1992), sections 115-119, pages 37-38 and W.J. Hankey, introduction, *Common Prayer, A Commentary on the Prayer Book Lectionary. Volume One: Advent-Epiphany*, (St. Peter Publications: Charlottetown, 1985), iv-ix, Carolyn Westin, Michael W. Hawkins, Peter T. Young, *A Commentary on the Psalms. A Devotional and Practical Commentary on the Psalms for daily use*, (St. Peter Publications: Charlottetown, 1993), ix-xi.

Hebrews 6.1, 1 Corinthians 3.11, Ephesians 2.30). Thus, all is created, willed, foreordained in him, by him and for him (Hebrews 1.2, 1 Peter 1.20, Colossians 1.16, 1 Corinthians 2.6). Crucially, to return to our point, the apparent new unity of Jew and Gentile in a single humanity really existed already in Christ. "By his blood ... he abolished in the flesh the enmity ... to make himself of twain one new man" (Ephesians 2.15). He is the true Adam (1 Corinthians 15.44 and Romans 5.14). He is both the true image in which we were created in the beginning (Hebrew 1.2 and 3, Colossians 1.15-17) and that to which we are to conform in the end (Romans 8.29, Colossians 3.10). So beginning and end are one in him (Hebrews 3.14 and 13.8, Apocalypse 21.6 and 22.13, Philippians 2.6-11, Colossians 1.16).[21]

Fourthly, and finally, Christ, and the change wrought in us by his coming, works and words, are not a change in God or in his will. Rather, by the change in us, is manifest and revealed what had been hidden to creation (even to principalities, angelic powers), but, in fact, ordained from the beginning (Ephesians 3.3 - 10, Colossians 1.26-27, 1 Corinthians 2.7-16). But now comes the crucial point. Jesus Christ is known as the principle in the principle, the cornerstone in the foundation; all is in him, in him is the fullness of God and in him we are complete (Colossians 1.19 and 2.9 and 10). Further, the gospel which proceeds from him confers a changeless gift and has the character of its origin and its purpose (see above in the third point and Hebrews 3.14). In consequence, this aspect of the doctrine can be given, and is appropriately given, the form of fixed scripture. We get the New Testament. However, Christ is the **principle**, the **beginning**, the **foundation** and the **cornerstone**. The creation is in its principle, but it comes out of the principle. Creation is not identical with the beginning: the prologue to John's gospel, with its Christology, as well as the first Johannine epistle, on tradition and doctrine, are intended to be read in the light of Genesis 1. The riches of Christ are not exhausted by the doctrine found in scripture; they are unsearchable (Ephesians 3.8); they are to be built upon (1 Corinthians 3 and Ephesians 4.13-16). Indeed, without laying any other foundation, we are to go on unto perfection (1 Corinthians 3.1 and Hebrews 6.1). We have "the first principles of the oracles of God" and the "chief cornerstone, chosen, precious" (1 Peter 2.6). But already, something has been built on it: first "the foundation of the apostles and prophets" (Ephesians 2.20 and Apocalypse 21.14), then, the "household of God" (Ephesians 2.19), a "spiritual house" (1 Peter 2.5). This building, manifesting, uncovering, explicating, revealing what is in Christ, involves both, as his preaching did, and also, as the apostolic preaching to the Gentiles did, change. But, because building, manifesting, uncovering, explicating is grounded in the changeless, the change is a development. The language the epistles use to exhibit the character of the changeless in the change they experienced allows us to make intelligible the development of doctrine we find in the tradition of the Christian church. **Change, as the manifestation and explication of what is changelessly in the principle, is development**.

II Development, tradition and traditions: our immediate crisis
(a) Development and tradition

[21]Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, (Dacre Press, Westminster, 1945), 748-752 and Williams, *The Descent*, 84: "The Church, with extreme intelligence, had developed, largely through the assistance of Paul and Augustine, a doctrine which incidently explained any apparent failure on its own part, the doctrine of the Fall of Man. Adam had not played a great part among the Jews; they had preferred Abraham. But the Christian doctors had recovered Adam; they expanded the most comfortable idea of the corruption of man's nature, and the free redemption which could, body and soul, correct it."

So much, for now, respecting the necessity for the development of doctrine and the distinction between development and change. What of tradition? Tradition is the dynamic element among the constituents of Christianity. The doctrine which tradition originally contained declared that the creation had been changed by the death and resurrection of Christ. The preaching of that doctrinal tradition changed the world. Moreover, the doctrinal tradition not only recorded and effected a change, but also, its character requires a continuing developmental change. Further, because development is essential to the tradition, the tradition incorporates, carries and hands on the doctrinal development which takes place within it. Precisely, because Christian tradition requires and bears doctrinal development, there is not only doctrinal tradition, but also there are doctrinal traditions.

(b) Development and traditions: (i) the existence of doctrinal development

Doctrinal traditions may differ on (1) whether or not they accept the existence of doctrinal development, (2) which doctrinal developments they accept, (3) by what agency they judge the process to occur. The consciousness of doctrinal development, as well as the problematic of the contemporary discussion, result from the rise of critical historical studies both of the scripture and also of the tradition which occurred in the western european culture during the seventeenth century. Crucial to this consciousness was the confrontation between these critical historical studies and scholastic theological rationality. In the first half of the nineteenth century, new western theological and philosophical forms were created first by German Lutherans. These then spread, at least partially, to Roman Catholic, Anglican, and other thinkers.[22] The new forms of Christian rationality made historical development essential both to Christianity and to its understanding of reality. The oriental, or Orthodox churches, shared neither in the seventeenth century rise of the historical critical study of Christianity nor in the nineteenth century transformation of Christian rationality.[23] Moreover, they understood their own scholastic tradition differently than the west has done and they have, generally, established their position *vis a vis* western Christendom by means of a polemic against latin scholasticism,[24] as well as

[22] Part of this history may be found in Thomas F. O'Meara,o.p., *Romantic Idealism and Roman Catholicism: Schelling and the Theologians*, (University of Notre Dame Press: Notre Dame, 1982), Gerald A. McCool,s.j., *Nineteenth-Century Scholasticism. The Search for a Unitary Method*, (Fordham University Press: New York, 1989), W.J. Hankey, "Pope Leo's Purposes and St. Thomas' Platonism", in *Atti dell' VIII Congresso Tomistico Internazionale sull' Enciclia 'Aeterni Patris' e nell centenario della fondazione dell' Accademia S. Tommaso, Roma, 1980*, ed. A. Piolanti, Studi Tomistici, viii(Vatican City, 1982), 39-52, idem, "Making Theology Practical: Thomas Aquinas and the Nineteenth Century Religious Revival", *Dionysius* 9(1985), 85-127, idem, "'Dionysius dixit, Lex divinitatis est ultima per media reducere': Aquinas, hierocracy and the 'augustinisme politique'," in *Tommaso D'Aquino: proposte nuove di letture. Festscrift Antonio Tognolo,* edited Ilario Tolomio, *Medioevo. Rivista di Storia della Filosofia Medievale*, 18 (Padova: Editrice Antenore, 1992), 119-150. idem, "The Bible", idem, *God In Himself*, 159-161,166-167, Corragio, "A Nearer View, Part II", *The Anglican Free Press* 9,#3(1992), 10-14

[23] See, for example, Fran O'Rourke, *Pseudo-Dionysius and the Metaphysics of Aquinas*, Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 32,(Brill: Leiden, 1992), xiv; the radically different character of the influence of Dionysius in the Orthodox East and the Catholic West is reported by Paul Rorem, *Pseudo-Dionysius. A Commentary on the Texts and an Introduction to Their Influence*, (Oxford University Press: New York, 1993) and Eric D. Perl, "St. Gregory Palamas and the Metaphysics of Creation", *Dionysius* 14(1990), 105-130.

[24] See W.J. Hankey, "The *De Trinitate*" and Eric Perl, "St. Gregory Palamas" and many of the articles in P. Ranson, ed.,*St. Augustin*, Les Dossiers H, (L'Age d'homme: Giromagny, 1988).

against the historical-critical study of scripture and tradition, and against the new Christian rationality which emerged in western modernity. On this account they are not participants in this debate about tradition and the development of doctrine on both of which the Orthodox have important and considerable theories. In general, the Orthodox theological tradition will be chosen by those who reject as mistaken the western developments in Christian rationality as well as its origin in Augustine.

In the west, modern Roman Catholic scholasticism, drawing on possibilities inherent in its patristic and medieval heritage, arrived at a conception of the logical explication of doctrinal premises which approximately anticipated the nineteenth century idea of development.[25] However, since for this way of thinking, nothing new, except logical reasoning, had been introduced, neither the radical creativity of thought in doctrinal development nor its relation to history was appreciated. It was possible to think that this progress involved no real change in intellectual content since only the ecclesial act declaring the deduced conclusion to be an article of the faith made anything new.[26] Critical historical study, as developed and used by the churches of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, aimed at showing the biblical and patristic antiquity of one's own body of doctrine and aimed equally at showing that the other side had introduced variation and novelty. These were equated with heresy and corruption. This polemic ultimately collapses. Both sides recognize that what they demonstrated in respect to the other was also true of themselves.[27]

Theological traditions which maintain these early modern ways of thinking will still reject development except in accidents[28] (to use the Roman Catholic term belonging to the Aristotelian logic of substance) or in *adiaphora*, things indifferent, (to use the Protestant formulation associated with the irenic efforts of Philipp Melanchthon).[29] Our Prayer Book tradition with the 39 Articles and Homilies is such a tradition. So our Canadian *Book of Common Prayer* (1962) presents itself both as an order "agreeable with Holy Scripture and with the usage of the primitive Church" and also as the result of a process of revision which admitted "no alterations ... which would involve and imply any change of doctrine of the Church as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer" (p.vii).

The nineteenth century Tractarians held to a like position. Yet they and their High Church predecessors were not opposed to an addition to Anglican fundamentals made from the Restoration to the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, and loosely reflected in the Solemn Declaration of 1893, namely, of the historic episcopate.[30] But, then, they had the Fathers, if not scripture, on their side. Certainly neither Fathers, nor Reformers, nor Tractarians, nor St. Paul himself (Galatians 1.2 - 9), nor even the

---

[25] On this and what follows, see Owen Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman: The Idea of Doctrinal Development*, (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1957).

[26] Ibid, 43-45.

[27] Ibid, 1-20, e.g. Bossuet "was a critical historian only in his history of the Protestants" (9). The last great examples of this polemic are to be found in Louis Allen, ed.,*John Henry Newman and the Abbe Jager. A Controversy on Scripture and Tradition (1834-1836)*, University of Durham Publications, (Oxford University Press: London, 1975) and John Henry Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*, (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1990). In my view Abbe Jager defeated Newman on the substance of the argument. Newman's rhetorical and polemical skills were superior and he survived by restricting the scope of the discussion.

[28] For a recent treatment in these terms, see E. Dublanchy, "Dogme", in *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique*, iv,2 (Letouzey: Paris,1920), 1602-1650, also the preceding columns 1599-1602.

[29] See note 18 above.

[30] See Hankey, "The Thirty-Nine", 10.

ecumenical consensus recently reached at Lima, Peru, supposed, like the present
Bishop of Nova Scotia, that Christians could differ "greatly over matters of faith", but
not over "matters of order."[31] They uniformly supposed that apostolic order served
apostolic faith.

    To return to the Tractarians, they were, like Rome in the same period, reacting
against the German philosophy and theology which made historical evolution
essential to Christianity. From this they fled to the study of the church Fathers, where
they sought like their Anglican predecessors, to find the immutable articles of
Christianity. [32] It was from the Tractarian (and so his own) version of the classic
Protestant conception of changeless fundamental doctrine, which, according to St.
Vincent of Lerins, "quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus" is taught by the
church, that John Henry Newman moved. When, just after converting to Roman
Catholicism, Newman, in mid-life (44 years old) published his *Essay on the
Development of Christian Doctrine*, he was, he said, giving his reasons for his
conversion and rejecting the notion of fixed, changeless fundamentals of doctrine.[33]
However, in very considerable measure, Newman thereby created the conception of
the Roman Catholicism he was joining, and, in the Roman Church, he was
intellectually isolated.[34] He was, and remained, philosophically both anti-scholastic
and opposed (like Pusey, for example) to the German thought which, in fact, was
necessary to give adequate rational form to his conception. He supposed them both to
be rationalistic.[35]

    Newman's thesis on development could not be refuted by those who remained
Anglican. Latitudinarians, Evangelicals, and, ironically, the next generation of
Tractarians (the so-called liberal Anglo-Catholics led by Gore), all accepted the new
German historical treatment of Christian forms, even, indeed, especially, in respect to

---

[31] Arthur Peters to G. Richmond Bridge, *Anglican Free Press* 10,#1 (1993), 9; in contrast: "Within the Church
the ordained ministry has a particular task of preserving and actualizing the apostolic faith. The orderly
transmission of the ordained ministry is therefore a powerful expression of the continuity of the Church
throughout history; it also underlines the calling of the ordained minister as guardian of the faith...[I]n the
early centuries the succession of bishops became one of the ways, together with the transmission of the
Gospel and the life of the community, in which the apostolic tradition of the Church was expressed. The
succession was understood as serving, symbolizing and guarding the continuity os the apostolic faith and
communion." [*Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, (World Council of Churches: Geneva, 1982), 29] and
Hankey, "Scripture", 15-16; J. Webster, "Ministry and Priesthood" (286) and R. Norris, "Episcopacy" (307-308)
in the *Study of Anglicanism*, ed. J. Booty and S.W. Sykes, (SPCK/Fortress: London/Philadelphia, 1988).

[32] Hankey, "The Bible", 44 and 80-82, idem, "Making", 87-89, R.D.Crouse, "'Deepened by the Study of the
Fathers': The Oxford Movement, Dr. Pusey and Patristic Scholarship", *Dionysius* 7 (1983), 137-138, J.A. Doull,
"The Logic of Theology since Hegel", *Dionysius* 7 (1983), 133, idem, "The Christian Origin, II", *Dionysius*
8(1984), 64.

[33] Best explained in John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, ed. W. Oddie, Everyman's
Library,(Dent/Tuttle: London/Rutland, Vermont,1993), parts III-VI.

[34] Chadwick, *From Bossuet*, 96-118, the treatment of Newman in Dublanchy, *art. cit., Dict. de Theo. Cath.*,
1629-1636, is an attempt to prevent his use by the Modernists and neuters his idea of development; H. D.
Weidner's introduction to *The Via Media*, lxxvi-lxxvii is useful.

[35] There is, however, some movement in his thought; see Stephen Sykes, *The Identity of Christianity.
Theologians and the Essence of Christianity from Schleiermacher to Barth*, (SPCK: London, 1984), 102-113.
"[T]he difference between the writing of 1835 and that of 1845 is that in the meantime Newman had learnt a
greater respect for the implied order and system bestowed on Christianity by the unitary character of its
original inspiration" [113]. However, the suspicion of systematic thought remained with the Anglican
Tractarians and their successors; see Hankey, "Making", 87-89.

scripture.[36] In fact, in the twentieth century a significant group of Anglo-Catholics embraced the Modernism which reactionary Rome was expelling.[37]

For a century and more after Newman's *Essay*, the Roman church was engaged not only in a revival of scholasticism, with an exaggerated emphasis on its philosophical aspect, but also in opposing, by this means, modern philosophy.[38] Especially feared in modern philosophy was its basis in human subjectivity and thus in historical movement, those aspects precisely necessary to advance and underpin the notion of doctrinal development. Leo XIII's revival of Thomism was followed by the expulsion of Modernism by Pius X. Christian forms, Christian doctrine, the holy scriptures were not to be subjected to evolutionary philosophical and historical criticism.

However, things have changed. Roman Catholic theology has not been able to escape the positive encounter with modern philosophy against which the Thomistic revival was a reaction. Pope Paul VI regarded Newman as the father of the Second Vatican Council. [39] Since it, Thomism has discovered its roots in neoplatonic idealism and its common ground with Hegel and Schelling (as well as Kant). The Catholic theologies of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, open to neoplatonism and to modern philosophy, theologies condemned by Rome on its way back to Thomism, are being explored again.[40]

---

[36] Hankey, "The Bible", 47-48, 57-67, 81-82; idem, "Making", 85-89, 121-122; idem, "Scripture", *passim*, idem, "The Sacraments", 6off.; Thorne, "Scripture as the Rule", 12-20; Crouse, "The Creeds", 45-46; J.N. Steenson, "The Teaching Tradition: Scripture and Doctrine", *passim*; Andrew C. Mead, "The Bible and Modern Times: A Different View", *Mission and Ministry* 7, #3 (Winter,1990), 12-15.

[37] teenson, "The Teaching Tradition", 6off.; A. Vidler, *Scenes from a Clerical Life. An Autobiography*, (Collins: London, 1977), 46-48, 81-84; W.J. Hankey, "From Metaphysics to History, from Exodus to Neoplatonism, from Scholasticism to Pluralism: the fate of Gilsonian Thomism in English-speaking North America," a communication delivered to a colloque at the Collège de France, October 12, 1992: *La Réception de la pensée d'Étienne Gilson dans la philosophe contemporaine en France*, published in *Dionysius*, 16 (1998), 157-188.

[38] O'Meara, *Romantic*; McCool, *Nineteenth*; idem, *From Unity to Pluralism: The Internal Evolution of Thomism*, (Fordham University Press: New York, 1989); W.J. Hankey, "Aquinas' First Principle: Being or Unity?" *Dionysius* 4 (1980), 133-139, idem,"Pope Leo's", idem, "The *De Trinitate*", idem, "Making", idem, *God In Himself*, 1-17, idem, "From Metaphysics", idem, "'Dionysius dixit'".

[39] Jean Guitton, *Un siecle, une vie*, (Laffont: Paris, 1988), 228.

[40] See, for example, Hankey, McCool and O'Meara as in note 38 above, Hankey, "Aquinas and the Passion of God", in *Being and Truth. Essays in Honour of John Macquarrie*, ed. A. Kee and E.T. Long, (SCM: London, 1986), 318-333; O'Rourke, *Pseudo-Dionysius*; E. Booth,o.p., *Aristotelian Aporetic Ontology in Islamic and Christian Thinkers*, Cambridge Studies in medieval life and thought (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1983), idem, "St. Augustine's 'notitia sui' related to Aristotle and the early neo- Platonists", *Augustiniana* 27(1977): 70-132, 364-401, 28(1978): 183-221, 29(1979): 97-124; idem, "Hegel's Conception of Self-knowledge Seen in Conjunction with Augustine's", *Augustiniana* 30(1980), 221-250, idem, "Hegel and the Intellectuality of the Father's", *Studia Patristica*, ed. E.A. Livingstone, xviii,4(Cistercian/Peeters: Kalamazoo/Louvain, 1990), 322-327, idem, "A Confrontation between the Neoplatonisms of St. Thomas Aquinas and Hegel", *Angelicum* 63 (1986), 57-89, idem, "*TO YPEREINAI* of pseudo-Dionysius and Schelling", *Studia Patristica*, ed. E.A. Livingstone, xxviii(Peeters: Louvain, 1989), 215-225; Vivian Boland,o.p., *Ideas in God According to St Thomas Aquinas: Sources and Synthesis,* Studies in the History of Christian Thought LXIX (Leiden: Brill, 1996); Francois-Xavier Putallaz, *Le sens de la reflexion chez Thomas d' Aquin* and *La connaissance de soi au xiiie siecle*, Etudes de philosophie medievale lxvi and lxvii (Vrin: Paris, 1991); Claude Bruaire, *L'etre et l'esprit*, Epimethee. Essais philosophiques, (PUF: Paris, 1983); Emilio Brito, s.j., *Hegel et la tache actuelle de la christologie*, (Lethielleux: Paris, 1979), idem, *La christologie de Hegel. Verbum Crucis*, Bibliotheque des archives de philosophie 40 (Beauchesne: Paris 1983), idem, *La creation selon Schelling*, Universum Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium lxx (Leuven University Press/Peeters:

So much then for the first point: classical modern Christian traditions, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and continuations of their thought forms like the *Book of Common Prayer* reject doctrinal development, as indeed they reject all essential change in Christianity. Protestant and Roman Catholic traditions fundamentally reconceived in the last two centuries accept it, though we may doubt whether any modern western church has successfully integrated the first and the second halves of its modern history. Obviously, this integration is not the problematic confronting Eastern Orthodoxy.

II (b)(ii): doctrinal developments accepted and rejected by the differing traditions

Traditions differ in terms of the doctrinal development they accept or reject. These must be treated separately from the theologies by which the separate traditions define their positions in respect to doctrinal development for two reasons. First, we are proceeding according to the judgement that doctrinal development exists, and exists in all the major Christian traditions whether or not they themselves recognize this reality. Second, at least in some cases, the doctrinal developments actually accepted as fundamental to, and sometimes even as defining the specific ecclesial or theological traditions are not possible in terms of the theory of doctrinal development belonging to that tradition.

The Roman tradition accepts the greek patristic development of a doctrine of God expressed in unbiblical philosophical language and found in part in the Nicene Creed as the *homoousion*. It accepts the greek patristic conception of Mary as *theotokos*, mother of God. It accepts the latin patristic and medieval development of a doctrine of the atonement expressed in the unbiblical legal terms, satisfaction and substitution, a doctrine and a formulation not found in the ancient creeds.[41] It accepts Augustine's developments in respect to theological anthropology with their far reaching results in dividing the western and eastern traditions, namely, the Augustinian account of sin, freedom and grace, leading to the western emphasis on original sin and predestination, as well as the Augustinian understanding of the divine Trinity through the structure of the human mind, leading both to the western addition of the *filioque* to the Nicene Creed and to the western unification of human self-knowledge and knowledge of the divine.[42] These are developments in respect to what is essential but

---

Louvain 1987), idem, *Dieu et l'etre d'apres Thomas d'Aquin et Hegel*, (PUF: Paris, 1991). These are only part of the work. The recent series of issues devoted to individual philosophers in *The American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* is worth noting; Kenneth L. Schmitz edited lxiv,#4 (1990) dealing with Hegel. It includes an article in english by Emilio Brito.

[41] Dublanchy, *art. cit., Dict. Theo. Cath.*,1605: "Le terme *satisfactio*, pour le premiere fois employe par saint Anselme, *Cur Deus Homo*...pour exprimer l'oeuvre redemptrice par Jesus Christ, fut bientot consacre par l'usage theologique et admis dans les documents ecclesiatiques, notamment dans les definitions du concile de Trente." and W.J. Hankey, "St. Anselm and the Mediaeval Doctors", in *Atonement and Sacrifice: Doctrine and Worship*, ed. G.E. Eayrs, (St. Peter Publications: Charlottetown, 1991), 41-62.

[42] Williams, *The Descent*, 63: Augustine "came to address (or, as some have thought , to upset for ever) the balance of the Church. Speculation had in the East ascended from the foot of the imperial throne to the height of the heavenly and the idea of the exchanged had been followed into the extremest corners of heaven. With Augustine theology returned to man and to sin." E. Booth,o.p., *St. Augustine and the Western Tradition of Self-knowing*, The Saint Augustine Lecture 1986 (Augustinian Institute Villanova University: Villanova, 1989) and W.J. Hankey, "The Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation", in *Conference Report: Christian Initiation*, ed. G. Richmond Bridge, (St. Peter Publications: Charlottetown, 1982), 30-43.

not credal. There is also nothing about original sin or grace or predestination in the fundamentals rehearsed in the ancient creeds. In the middle ages, the Roman church develops, and takes into her tradition, a doctrine of sacrificial oblation in the eucharist and invents another nonbiblical concept, transubstantiation, to express the real identification between the believer and Christ's sacrificial satisfaction and substitution of himself for the sinner.[43] She develops ways of applying the meritorious satisfaction rendered by Christ and by the works of the church and the saints in union with him to sinners, one of which is the doctrine of indulgences. [44] She accepts the pseudo-Dionysian writings into her tradition as quasi-Apostolic, and from them derives, amongst much else, a hierarchial conception of the church as mirror of the heavenly hierarchy, a notion of God as non-being, of mystical union with the unknowable God beyond being apart from love, and of creation as the being and theophany of God; all of which oppose, complement and provoke the Augustinian side of the western tradition.[45] In modern times, the Roman tradition develops and defines teaching about tradition and scripture as sources of revelation, about the immaculate conception of the mother of God , about the infallibility of the church in certain operations of the Petrine primacy: all of which it thinks to be scripturally and patristically founded. And Rome defined a dogma about the assumption of the mother of God which she derives from tradition. At the Council of Trent, Rome affirmed features of her tradition rejected by the Protestants and rejected the Protestant developments and orderings of the latin doctrine of the atonement and the Augustinian doctrines of sin, nature, grace, freedom, justification, etc. These are only a small number of the doctrinal developments accepted by the Roman church, nor necessarily the most momentous, but chosen to illustrate the points of agreement and difference in respect to other western ecclesial traditions.

The great churches of the Protestant Reformation: Lutheran, Calvinist, Anglican, accept the development of doctrine in nonbiblical language both credal, as in the case of the *homoousion*, and noncredal, as in the case of substitution, satisfaction, etc. but reject the doctrine of transubstantiation. However, the Lutherans retain a theory of eucharistic presence derived from the Aristotelian language of substance, namely, consubstantiation.[46] All three retain the doctrine of the Council of Ephesus which defined the *theotokos*. Indeed, the differences between Lutherans and Calvinists on

---

[43] See G.H. Williams, "The Sacramental Presuppositions of Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*", *Church History*, (1957), 265; Hankey, "St. Anselm", 54-57, idem, "'*Magis*'" and J. Goering, "The Invention of Transubstantiation", *Traditio* 46(1991), 158. Charles Williams, *The Descent*, 114-115: "Innocent III...when he summoned the [Lateran] Council he caused it to open its decrees with a declaration 'On the Catholic Faith'. It ran 'There is one universal Church of the faithful, outside which no one at all is in a state of salvation. In this Church Jesus Christ himself is both priest and sacrifice; and His body and blood are really contained in the sacrament of the altar under the species of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated into the body and the wine into the blood by the power of God, so that, to effect the mystery of unity, we ourselves receive of that which is His, what He himself received of that which is ours.'"

[44] See Williams, *The Descent*, 162-163.

[45] See Rorem, *Pseudo-Dionysius*; W.J. Hankey, "The Place of the Proof for God's Existence in the *Summa Theologiae* of Thomas Aquinas", *The Thomist* 46(1982); 370-393, idem, "'Dionysius dixit'", idem, "Aquinas, Pseudo-Dionysius," idem, "The *De Trinitate*"; R.D. Crouse, "Augustinian Platonism in Early Medieval Theology", in *Augustine, from Rhetor to Theologian*, ed. J. McWilliams, (Wilfred Laurier University Press: Waterloo, 1992), 109-120.

[46] See P.J. Leithart, "What's Wrong with Transubstantiation? An Evaluation of Theological Models", *Westminster Theological Journal* 53 (1991) though it misrepresents the character and ground of the doctrine of transubstantiation. The article is useful on Calvin and shows the continuing opposition of Protestants to transubstantiation.

the eucharistic presence, between Anglicans, Romans and Calvinists on the government of the church (according to Tory Kirby) and between Anglicans and Romans on the eucharist (according to Roger Beckwith) depend on the interpretation each tradition gives to the exchange of the properties of the human and divine natures which underlies the notion that Mary is the mother of God.[47] They accept, and extend beyond Augustine, his account of sin, freewill and grace as far as the conception of imputed righteousness which Luther recognized was not taught clearly in Augustine.[48] Calvinists and Lutherans give it, and the doctrine of justification by faith alone, an absoluteness and priority which is found neither in the scripture nor in the Fathers.[49] The Calvinists also develop doctrines of total depravity, unconditional election, double predestination, the priority of penal substitution as the form of atonement, and *sola scriptura*, which have a logical necessity but are not found thus understood or thus ordered in scripture or the Fathers.[50] The Protestants generally rejected Augustine's understanding of the divine Trinity through the triadic structure of the human mind, but develop very strongly the religion of personal conversion dependent on it, and are instrumental in the secularization of Christianity which is its consequence.[51] Similarly, rejecting strongly the medieval development of transubstantiation, the mass as a meritorious work of sacrificial oblation, and the doctrine of indulgences, all of which

[47] See W.J. Torrance Kirby, "Response to Dr. Hughes's Paper" and R.T. Beckwith, "The Doctrine of the Sacraments in the Thirty-Nine Articles", in *The Thirty-Nine Articles*, 63-67 and 74 with note 14. I am now inclined to agree with Dr. Beckwith. I think there is a like shift in the theology of Cardinal Berulle, see Hankey, "'Dionysius dixit'", note 12 and Corragio, "A Nearer View, Part IV."

[48] Martin Luther, "Preface to the Complete Edition of Luther's Latin Writings, 1545", *Selected Writings of Martin Luther*, ed. Theodore G. Tappert, 4 vol., i (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1967), 27: "Although ...he [Augustine] did not explain all things concerning imputation clearly, it nevertheless was pleasing that God's righteousness with which we are justified was taught."

[49] Rodney A. Whitacre, "The Scriptures" and Stephen G.W. Andrews, "Reply to Dr. Whitacre's Paper" in *Atonement and Sacrifice*, 1-12, especially note 32, p. 15 and p. 21.

[50] On the divisions of the modern western churches as a matter of different emphases see Williams, *The Descent*, 168ff.; W.J. Hankey, "Response to Mr. Beckwith's Paper" in *The Prayer Book*, (St. Peter Publications: Charlottetown, 1986), 81-86; J.A. Doull, "Augustinian Trinitarianism and Existential Theology", *Dionysius* 3 (1979), 155, idem, "Faith and Enlightenment", *Dionysius* 10 (1986), 131-135. I do not accept Doull's judgement: "The Roman church, in which the Renaissance concept of the relation of order and government was primary, could not accommodate Augustine." ["Faith", 135] I begin to show the contrary in my "'Magis'" and "'Dionysius dixit'."

All sides assume the developments of Christianity in the western middle ages, but draw out the consequences differently, particularly in respect to their institutional implications. It is absurd to suppose that we can get beyond the divisions by adopting the Protestant polemic against the corruptions of the medieval church, adding to this an equal condemnation of what the Protestants built on these, and pretending that we can return to a relation to scripture and the Fathers unmediated by modernity. This is the strategy of Dix, *The Shape*, and Gustaf Aulen, *Christus Victor. An Historical Study of the Three Main Types of the Idea of the Atonement*, trans. A.G. Hebert, (SPCK: London, 1931) and those who follow them. See against this R.D. Crouse, "St. Augustine and the Fathers", Gavin Dunbar, "Reply to Dr. Crouse's Paper", W.J. Hankey, "St. Anselm and the Mediaeval Doctors", and Richard U. Smith, "Reply to Dr. Hankey's Paper", in *Atonement and Sacrifice*, 24-31, 32-40, 41-62, 63-71; Hankey, in "The Great BAS Debate", *Anglican Free Press* 2, #3 (December, 1985), 13, R. Beckwith, "The Origins of Modern Anglican Liturgies", *Anglican Free Press* 3, #4 (March, 1987), 3-4,13 and *Ten More Questions Concerning the Canadian Book of Alternative Services,* Question 8, (St. Peter Publications: Charlottetown, 1985).

[51] Philip Edgecumbe Hughes, *The True Image. The Origin and Destiny of Man in Christ*, 11 and 17; John Calvin, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. H. Beveridge, 2 vol., (Eerdmans:Grand Rapids, 1966), i, book 1, chapter 13, para. 18-21; J.A. Doull, "The Christian Origins, II", *Dionysius* 8 (1984), 97-103, idem, "Faith", 134-135, idem, "What is Augustinian 'Sapientia'", *Dionysius* 12 (1988), 66-67.

depend upon, or have salvific meaning because of, the medieval understanding of the atonement as satisfaction and penal substitution, they, and their present day evangelical successors, emphasize and elevate that medieval understanding of the atonement.[52] In general, they suppress the Dionysian aspect of the western tradition in favour of the Augustinian, but Anglicans retain important features of the Dionysian conception of ecclesiastical hierarchy and some remnants of its Neoplatonic theology, its mysticism and its sacramental theology.[53] Lutherans are unable to extinguish its mysticism from among them. They all reject the nineteenth and twentieth century new Roman definitions of dogma as additions to the fundamental articles whatever they think of their content.[54] Tractarians and their successors are in a particularly weak position in respect to the content of the Marian doctrines and because of their enthusiasm for the Anglican addition of the historic episcopate as a fundamental of the church. Especially as this addition took place more or less simultaneously with the definition of Petrine infallibility and has a corresponding function in Anglican polity. (See notes 18, 30 and 31 above, notes 63, 64 and 68 below). In fact for Protestants and Anglicans with their view of the relation of doctrine and scripture, the almost unlimited acceptance of historical critical study of the scripture was the most important nineteenth century doctrinal development because it was part of the simultaneous acceptance of evolution and progress as essential to Christianity. As a result they frequently forsook the Augustinian doctrines defining their traditions: original sin, predestination, satisfaction, substitution, etc., became despicable to Protestants.[55] Collaterally, the general modern emphasis on religious experience is essential to the logic by which change becomes the content of Christian doctrine in some traditions. In Wesleyanism, for example, religion is based on actual experience and not on formal belief.[56] As progress has become the content as well as a formal

---

[52] For example, John Stott, *The Cross of Christ*, (Inter-Varsity Press: Downer's Grove, 1986), see Hankey, "St. Anselm", in Atonement and Sacrifice, 55-57, idem , "Response to Mr. Beckwith's Paper" and Corragio, "A Nearer View, Part IV", 16-19.

[53] See, for example, the treatment of holy orders and angels in Richard Hooker, A. M. Allchin, *Participation in God. A Forgotten Strand in Anglican Tradition*, (Morehouse-Barlow: Wilton, Connecticut, 1988), and C. A. Patrides, ed., *The Cambridge Platonists*, The Stratford-Upon-Avon Library 5, (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1970).

[54] Curry, "Response to Dr. Hankey's Paper", *The Thirty-Nine*, 12 and note 3,p. 24.

[55] See notes 6, 9, 36 and 37 above. The net result is well described by Jon D. Levenson, "The Bible: Unexamined Commitments of Criticism", *First Things* 30 (February, 1993), 24-33, who shows that the historical critical treatment of the Bible which comes from the Enlightenment is now only "another tradition" (30) and asks: "What common conceptual framework will ground this new discourse [between religious communities] once historicism has been relegated to another item within it?" (32). He sees the canonical approach of B.V. Childs as part of the way forward. The Roman Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith seems determined not to allow historical study of the scripture, philosophical theology and Christian doctrine to fall apart in the way they have done for Protestants generally and Anglicans particularly. See *Biblical Interpretation in Crisis. The Ratzinger Conference on Bible and Church*, ed. Richard J. Newhaus, (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1989) and J. Wicks,s.j., "Biblical Criticism Criticized", *Gregorianum* 72, #1 (1991), 117-128. Some Roman Catholics think that the move by Protestant scholars to canonical approaches as a way out of the division between scripture and theology requires Protestants to move away from *sola scriptura* toward the Roman teaching on scripture and tradition: see *Catholic International* 3, #3 (February, 1992), 122. I agree; see Hankey, "Scripture" and "The Bible", 82-84. In contrast to my approach see Thorne, "The Scriptures" and Craig, "Response to Fr. Hankey's Paper.".

[56] Williams, *The Descent*, 206. Rahner, *Encyclopedia*, 356: "For Modernism, dogma is secondary and derivative as compared with religious experience, which can possess the reality signified, in total independence of conceptual expression in dogma. Viewed positively, dogma, according to Modernism, is a derivative expression of religious experience, unavoidably necessary for the religious community, but always

feature of doctrine, balanced language rewrites liturgy and scripture to remove the gender bias in the biblical and traditional doctrine of God.[57]

In sum: Christian traditions all create and accept developments of fundamental doctrine beyond the scripture, the creeds and the Fathers. These traditions depend upon and interpenetrate one another. The defining character of a modern western ecclesiastical tradition is substantially given by the developments it accepts or rejects from the other western churches. In this sense they all assume the developments each has made, as well as those made by the greek patristic church, those made in the New Testament church and those made in the Judaism upon which the Christian developments themselves depended. To understand and justify a particular western tradition these developments must all be understood and the particular creations, rejections and adoptions given an appropriate reason.

II (b)(iii): the agent of development

Something must be said in what follows about what compels development of doctrine and in what it consists. As to what institutionally guides and controls doctrinal development, this much must be said immediately. For John Henry Newman, having judged that Christian doctrine developed within and beyond the patristic church, that the Anglican notion of scriptural and patristic fundamental articles could not encompass this, that development was the sign of life not corruption in the church, he judged also that the only adequate explanation of doctrinal progress, assurance of its fidelity to the Christian idea, and sufficient control of its operation was the infallible papacy of the Roman Church.[58]

The competing Protestant idea is that of the organic spirit of an institution manifesting itself in various ways. For example among Anglicans there is a notion of

---

subject to revision or even to change into its contrary, and religious experience itself is given an immanentist interpretation."

[57] W.J. Hankey, "The Misunderstandings in the BAS. A review of Michael Ingham's *Rite for a New Age, Understanding the Book of Alternative Services, (Anglican Book Centre: Toronto, 1986), The Anglican Free Press* 3, #4 and 4, #2, especially the second part, idem, "The Sacraments", 59-66 and idem, reporting the views of Alan L. Hayes: "The BAS: A Party Victory", in *The Anglican Free Press* 4, #1 (May, 1987), 5-7; D.A. Ousley, "The Teaching Tradition: Scripture and Liturgy", in *The Scriptures and Modern Christian Teaching*, (St. Peter Publications: Charlottetown, 1989), 75-93, idem, "Building the Tower of Babel", *The Anglican Free Press* 5, #4 (March, 1989), 3-5 and 20, 6, #1 (June, 1989), 6-9 and 11; D.P. Curry, "Inclusive Language Liturgies. The Renunciation of Revelation", *Anglican Free Press* 7, #2 (July, 1990), 14-16 and 7, #3 (September 1990), 10-13, and 17; M.L. Carreker, "Balanced Language?", *The Parish Paper of St. John's Church [Savannah, Georgia]*, 24, #26ff. (May 23, 1993-July 4, 1993).

[58] Chadwick, *From Bossuet*, 138-146; J.H. Newman, *An Essay on the Development*, idem, *Apologia*, part 7, 274-297, idem, *An Essay in aid of A Grammar of Assent*, 5th ed., (Longman, Green: London, 1885), note 2, 498[added December, 1880]: argues from analogy "in the first instance it had presented itself to me as a mode of accounting for a difficulty, viz. for what are called 'the Variations of Popery', but next I found it a law, which was instanced in the successive developments through which revealed truth has passed... I reflected that a law implied a lawgiver, and that so orderly and majestic a growth of doctrine in the Catholic Church, contrasted with the deadness and helplessness, or the vague changes and contradictions in the teaching of other religious bodies, argued a spiritual Presence in Rome, which was nowhere else, and which constituted a presumption that Rome was right ..."

dispersed authority.[59] It must be remembered that Newman imposed on the Roman church his conception of it and that, while the fact of doctrinal development is now widely accepted in it, even progressive Roman Catholic theologians admit there is a gap between the fact and an adequate theory of it. Nonetheless the Roman church has perhaps come closest to having an institutional form corresponding to an understanding of herself as the agent and guide of doctrinal development. The Anglican communion is undergoing a crisis of authority as a result of its fundamental self-transformations.[60] There is an agreement by all parties that its present ecclesiology is inadequate.

II(c): Our immediate crisis

For many the present issue between the Roman and Anglican traditions turns, as it did for John Henry Newman in 1845, on the question of the development of doctrine.[61] On the 28th of November just passed *The Tablet*, an English Roman Catholic periodical published a letter from Sheridan Gilley, still then an Anglican and chairman of the Department of Theology of Durham University. At Easter he was received into the Roman Catholic communion. I quote at length:

The Church of England has been a kind mother to me, in never asking me to believe in anything not explicitly taught in Scripture and the tradition of the ancient undivided Catholic Church. On this basis, until a fortnight ago, I rejected the dogmas of papal

---

[59] Best set out by R.D. Crouse, "The Prayer Book and the Authority of Tradition", in *Church Polity and Authority*, 54-61: "What we must look for ..rather is the Church's common mind, the *consensus fidelium*, in relation to the word of God revealed"(55). "What we are speaking of, then, is the living, developing tradition of the universal Church, as it is guided by the Spirit in relation to the word of God. That traditional *consensus* is really the only fundamental authority in the church of God"(55-56). "Authority in Anglicanism is fundamentally the authority of a tradition, a *consensus fidelium*, fostered and expressed by the book of Common Prayer"(59). The problems with the conception in the present circumstances are developed by G.W.A. Thorne in his response: "Reply to Dr. Crouse's Paper", 64: "I am convinced that there can be no Anglican spiritual life apart from a stable, habitual and constant liturgy" and in Hankey, Crouse, Curry, Steenson, and Thorne as in notes 9, 18 and 36 above. Fred Krieger, "Reflections: Age of ecumenical miracles is over", *Anglican Journal Anglican* [Toronto] June, 1992, 9: understands Anglican authority in an way analogous to Crouse. "Rome holds that agreement in faith begets communion, while we hold that communion begets agreement in doctrine... Anglicans believe that church teaching is acceptable when it conforms to Scripture and tradition and has been received by the faithful, while Rome is certain that teaching is acceptable when it is authoritatively defined by authentic teachers. For Rome, it is not sufficient to interpret Scripture historically, but rather within the living tradition of the church". So also, Tom Baker, reviewing *The Identity of Anglican Worship [Mowbray, 1991]*, in *Theology* 90, #766 (July/August 1992), 306-307, has worked out the difficulties with this conception from the perspective of the revolutionaries: "The once striking identity of Anglican worship is starting to resemble the grin on the face of the Cheshire cat...when it comes to maintaining the identity of the Anglican Communion similarity of worship is fast becoming a fading asset. I suspect that in future, as Archbishop Runcie perceived, its identity will lie rather in such things as its capacity to handle and contain diversity and conflict." The comparison to the Cheshire cat's grin is also found in Garth Bennett's famous preface to the 1987-1988 edition of *Crockford's Clerical Dictionary*; on which see W. Oddie, *The Crockford's File: Gareth Bennett and the Death of the Anglican Mind*, (Hamish Hamilton: London, 1989).

[60] See notes 57 and 59 above W.J. Hankey, "Toward an Anglican and Christian Future", *The Anglican Free Press* 5, #3 (December, 1988), 14-18 and D.P. Curry, "Response to Dr. Hankey's Paper" in *The Thirty-Nine*.

[61] But some Tractarians "dismissed Newman's arguments as not giving even an inkling as to the grounds on which Newman left the Church of England". H.D. Weidner, in John Henry Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*, xv, quoting F.L. Cross, *John Henry Newman*, (London,1933), 70.

infallibility, the Immaculate Conception, and the Assumption, as indefensible on strict Anglican principles of the authority of Scripture and the Fathers, though these dogmas are clearly defensible on Roman Catholic principles of an implicit teaching developed doctrinally by the authority of the living Church... [T]he ordination of women to the priesthood might be defended on these same Roman Catholic principles: time will tell. The ordination of women is not, however, possible on my old Anglican arguments, but as Anglicans have now behaved as if the Church of England exercised the Roman Catholic Church's teaching authority, and have thereby given up Anglicanism, I can in conscience, no longer remain an Anglican myself.[62]

Much else has appeared in *The Tablet* to the effect that the real problem confronting Anglicans following the decision of the General Synod of the Church of England to ordain women to the priesthood is that they have no theoretical basis for permitting such a development of doctrine. Those who make this point make it independently of whether they judge the ordination of women to be a proper Christian development. Therefore the question is strictly one about the capacity of the Anglican tradition for accepting doctrinal development.

I estimate Sheridan Gilley's argument to be correct: Anglican identity as given by the Prayer Book, the 39 Articles and the Homilies cannot encompass the development of doctrine involved in the ordination of women; by it classical Anglicanism comes to an end. The Roman church has an ecclesiology adequate to such development, though it may abide in the present judgement of the *magisterium* that this particular change is impossible, just as she continues to annul marriages rather than allow divorce and remarriage, because of the Lord's command and of her understanding of the nature of this sacrament. However, two points need to be made about his argument.

First, Dr. Gilley gives an account of Anglican fundamentals which is that given by the Tractarians and based on the Anglican apologists and the Homilies rather than that found explicitly in the 39 Articles. Fundamentals to be required of Anglicans are what are explicitly taught in the scriptures and what has been proved or gathered out of them by the ancient undivided church. The Anglican development in respect to the necessity of the historic episcopate is probably based on a shift from Cranmer's criterion, which would need to find it required in a scriptural order, to the criterion of the Homilies and the apologists which looked also to what patristic tradition had made of scripture.[63] I think it may be asserted that the reasonable investigator of these sources will find no basis there to require anyone to accept the ordination of women to the priesthood.

Second, and more doubtfully, Dr. Gilley's argument depends upon the judgement that the ordination of women to the priesthood is not a practical matter belonging to the *adiaphora* over which each "particular or national church has authority" (Article 34). He evidently regards the proposed practical change to involve a question of fundamental doctrine. Many would agree with him. At our conference on the 39 Articles, I reported what Professor Oliver O'Donovan wrote on the subject. Let me

---

[62] Vol. 246, #7947, 1506-1507.

[63] See Hankey, "The Thirty-Nine", in *The Thirty-Nine Articles*, 10 and Oliver O'Donovan, *On the Thirty Nine Articles: A Conversation with Tudor Christianity*, (Paternoster Press: Exeter, 1986), 109. On the significance of such a shift, see Hankey, "The BAS: A Party Victory", idem, "The Sacraments", 59-62; Beckwith, "The Origins of Modern Anglican Liturgies", idem, "The Prayer Book and Evangelical Doctrine", in *The Prayer Book*, 74-77, J.H. Newman, *The Via Media*.

repeat it now, because it shows the reasoning involved in the classical Anglican notion of changeless fundamentals.

Professor O'Donovan noted that the church appears twice in the 39 Articles: once in Articles 19 to 24 and again in Articles 32 to 36. He gives the reason:

It is clear from the content of Articles 22-24 that there are some points of practice and order which are not negotiable in a church where the role of church order is rightly understood in relation to the church's authority and responsibility to teach the word of God...Christian believers find themselves ordered in a certain form of society precisely by the message which they believe and are charged to proclaim. And the decisive character of their order, as the Reformers understand it, is that it maintains the teaching of the truth of the gospel. The truth of the gospel is a self-communicating truth, which reaches out into the world; the church which it fashions is a church of authoritative communication which maintains, by its structures, the central position of the New Testament gospel as the norm of faith.[64]

So, on this account of the 39 Articles, what of the ordination of women? Does it belong in the *adiaphora* of Articles 32 to 36 over which the church has liberty to exercise its own authority? Professor O'Donovan asks:

"Does Scripture say anything about it? Not directly, but there are instructions by Saint Paul on the conduct of women in the churches which are hardly encouraging. Is Saint Paul, then, simply using his liberty in his circumstances as we may in ours?"[65]

If we say yes, development will allow changing the practice, to shift from O'Donovan's sixteenth century categories of liberty and authority to the nineteenth category of development. Then the Anglican church as identified in the Prayer Book, the 39 Articles and the Homilies would remain herself in ordaining women.

To decide that question we need, Professor O'Donovan judges, to answer others: "What is the [scriptural] complementarity of male and female? How and why should it be respected in an order of service and worship?"[66]

Development of doctrine involves discovering the answers to these questions and certainly our present circumstances require that our fundamental principle become manifest anew and further in this area of Christian thought and life. Doctrinal development may show, as the present Roman Pontiff judges, the reason for the present restriction of the priesthood to males. Doctrinal explication, doctrinal change in the sense of explication, may show this order to be changelessly given in the principle. But it may not. To know the one or the other we cannot avoid that development which is the very process of thought. In proceeding to the ordination of women has the Anglican church thought deeply and fundamentally enough about the nature of this question and about its own Christian identity?

---

[64] Hankey in "The Thirty-Nine", 9, quoting Oliver O'Donovan, *On the Thirty Nine Articles*, 117 - 118. Part of a similar argument in respect to the relation of holy orders to the gospel is found in Graham D. Leonard, "The Apostolic Ministry: Principle of Unity", in *Rebuilding the House of God. The Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1888*, ed. G. Richmond Bridge, (St. Peter Publications: Charlottetown, 1988), 88 and 93.
[65] Hankey, "The Thirty-Nine", 10, quoting O'Donovan at 109.
[66] Ibid, 10, quoting 110.

The integrity of the process of thought involved in doctrinal development seems to me to be at the heart of the question before us. If Sheridan Gilley is right, the Church of England has lost her integrity as a community in which the fundamental doctrinal reflection necessary to Christianity occurs. Because she has betrayed the principles of her own judgement, she has lost her Christian mind. Integrity in development requires integrity of mind and this requires the integrity of the community.

I was greatly moved by a short piece in *The Tablet* of 3 April 1993 under the head "A feminist points to Rome";[67] she wrote:

As I wrestle (and I will continue to wrestle) with the theological issues that have concerned me for the last 20 years - gender, sexuality, creativity, power - I desire to do so in a community which will hold me accountable, which insists that I am one member of a universal body and cannot just make it up to suit myself. I want to be held answerable to scripture and history.

Development of Christian doctrine which is not "answerable to scripture and history", which is not required to base itself on and judge itself against the changeless discovered therein, is not development but only endless change masking itself. An institution which does not enforce[68] true answerability to scripture and tradition so as to manifest ever more clearly that it is truly built on the "foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief cornerstone" is not the Catholic church. It has lost its continuity with its principle and has changed itself into something other than the church of Jesus Christ. But the rise of the historical consciousness in the west, and the philosophical form this consciousness has given itself in our time, makes continuity, integrity and real development profoundly difficult. This difficulty we must now consider.

III. The great question: continuity or discontinuities
(a) Continuity

Thus far we have considered two matters. First, we treated the dialectic between change and changelessness which is at the origin of the Christian revolution. From this consideration we arrived at a conception of the development of Christian doctrine

---

[67] Vol. 247, #7965, 422.

[68] See note 59 above. The difference between Roman Catholics and Anglicans may seem to be a question of whether Anglican doctrinal definitions are enforced by the ecclesiastical authorities or rather are historical documents for reflection, as in the ECUSA *Book of Common Prayer*(1979),[see Hankey, "Canon Law"] , and sources, as in *The Anglican Tradition: A Handbook of Sources*, ed. G.R. Evans and J.R. Wright, (SPCK/Fortress: London/Philadelphia, 1991). Thus Krieger, "Reflections: Age": "The unlicencing of wayward Catholic teachers, and the prominence of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in ecumenical dialogue...suggest Rome intends to maintain a strong centre and theological conformity while we, by force of circumstances advocate 'the theology of plural ecclesial practice'". See also Coraggio, "A Nearer View. Observations on Christianity in Continental Europe. Part II", *The Anglican Free Press* 9, #3, 10-14. But the reliance on the *consensus fidelium* and dispersed authority has not in fact produced a "capacity to handle and contain diversity and conflict". Instead an extraordinary totalitarianism now characterises Anglicanism. For example see the Bridge/Peters correspondence note 31 above. There has been no consistent opening; see W. J. Hankey, "Editorial: Communion or Communication", *The Anglican Free Press* 5, #2 (November, 1988), 2, 10-11. The difference is that in Anglicanism hetrodoxy is enforced. See W.J. Hankey, "Why I am Staying", *Anglican Free Press*, 5, #3 (Christmas, 1987), 4, 10 & 16, idem,"Matters of Law I and II", *The Anglican Free Press* 6, #2 (October, 1989), 2 & 18 and 6, #3 (December, 1989), 2 & 20.

as a process of thought in which the changeless is the foundation of change and is further manifested by change. Second, we treated tradition and traditions as the dynamic agents of developmental change creating it, receiving it, remembering it, defined by it. In this second consideration, we noticed a number of shifts to which the development of various aspects of doctrine were related. The development of the Christian doctrines of God and the unity of God and man in Christ: Trinity and Incarnation, appear as the great intellectual accomplishments of the church when it was primarily greek. The work of redemption, the atonement: sin and righteousness, nature and grace, freedom and predestination, penance and forgiveness, sacrifice, satisfaction and substitution. These matters and this language occupied a good part of the mind of latin Christianity as it built on the great conciliar decisions of the east and thought about how man appropriated what God had done in Christ. In both east and west, there was, during this second period, a great development in sacramental theology. Finally, we noticed, at the point when the western church divided, the further logical development of certain earlier, especially Augustinian conceptions, and fundamental reorderings, systematic restructurings, of the received tradition. The doctrinal developments were partly related to great cultural shifts: shifts occurring in this move from greek to latin and from latin to the languages of the european nations. We have noticed the diverse characters of the several developments. We have noticed something of their relation to language and great cultural shifts, but we have implicitly assumed what the churches of classical modernity all assumed; namely, there was a fundamental continuity. The latins received and built upon what the greek church had accomplished; the churches of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation sorted through, rejected, accepted, built upon, extended, restructured what the latin Fathers and the medievals had produced. Because we have assumed this continuity, we have been able to treat these doctrinal changes as developments.

Underlying our second consideration have been two great questions: is it necessary and is it possible to move from the way the western churches thought about the history of their doctrines before the turn from the eighteenth into the nineteenth century to the way many thought about that history after the turn? Is it possible and is it necessary to move from thinking about Christian doctrine as immutable to thinking about it as developing? Our answer to these questions has been 'yes'. Moreover, we have been able to answer 'yes' because we have assumed what the modern western churches all assumed: with the changes there was a fundamental continuity. The absolute revelation of the changeless was not lost in the shifts and changes. What was given of it in one period was carried over into the succeeding even if there were terrible corruptions.

This assumption must now be justified. The justification proceeds thus. The renewed Augustinianism manifest in all the churches of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation has also a philosophical expression.[69] The unification of our self-

[69] On what follows see Gerald J. Galgan, *The Logic of Modernity*, (New York University Press: New York/London, 1982), idem, *God and Subjectivity*, (Peter Lang: New York, 1990); R.D. Crouse, " A Twelfth Century Augustinian: Honorius Augustodunensis", in *Atti del Congresso Internazionale su. S. Agostino nel XVI Centenario della conversione, Roma, 15-20 settembre 1986*, 3 vol., iii, Studia Ephemerides "Augustinianum" 26(Institutum Patristicum "Augustinianum": Rome, 1987), 167-177; Booth, *Saint Augustine*, idem, "Hegel's Conception" and idem, "St. Augustine's *notitia sui*"; W.J. Hankey, "The Place of the Psychological Image of the Trinity in the Arguments of Augustine's *de Trinitate*, Anselm's *Monologion*, and Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae*", *Dionysius* 3(1979), 99-110, idem, "St. Anselm", idem, "The Doctrine of Baptism", idem, "Making", idem, *God In Himself*, 141-162. Etienne Gilson and his like oppose this view of the relation of Christianity and modernity; see Hankey, "From Metaphysics"; G.A. McCool, *Nineteenth* and *From*

knowledge with the knowledge of God, which took place so decisively in St. Augustine's theology, and was pre-eminently exhibited for modern theology by John Calvin, (in this, the modern successor of St. Anselm), became the new beginning for philosophy in Descartes, Malebranche and their successors. In this they were the heirs of Anselm's philosophical dimension. Thereby philosophy cut itself away from the conflict between subjective and objective beginnings, characterizing the pagan Neoplatonism which Christianity had used as the vehicle of its thinking for a millennium and a half. The new Augustinian beginning given to modern philosophy, based in Augustine's unification of the structure of human thought and conversion with the Christian idea of God, gave modern philosophy a claim to be regarded as the first Christian philosophy. However, though it had cut itself off from the Neoplatonic conflict between subjectivity and objectivity, modern philosophy had not thereby solved the problem in which Neoplatonism was entangled. The Cartesian form of the Augustinian subjectivity was set against nature and history. The correction given modern philosophy by the German Idealists at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century was intended to overcome this division of Christian subjectivity from nature and history. History and nature were understood as the life of the spirit, which life had the same trinitarian structures as the human and the divine subjectivities. In the life of spirit they were unified.

It is not our business, and it cannot be our work here in any case, to judge whether German Idealism succeeded in correcting the abstract subjectivity of Cartesian philosophy and thereby established itself as the true and complete form of Christian philosophy. But this was its claim. Whether its claim was understood or believed by nineteenth century Christians and whether much of this philosophy was understood by many of them may well be doubted. But it cannot be doubted that, whether understood and trusted, or the contrary, the claimed unification between a Christian doctrine of God, a Christian understanding of human subjectivity, and a Christian understanding of nature and history was immensely powerful and influential. Indeed it was so powerful and influential that Christians came to think that one of its great categories, 'development' applied to the history of Christian doctrine.[70]

Here lies the possibility and necessity of this application. Because development was the form that the Triune God gave history, it was possible to regard Christian phenomena developmentally and not to cease to regard them in a Christian way. Because the philosophical forms through which they were thus regarded were the first properly Christian philosophical forms, it was necessary to regard all phenomena through them. These are large claims. We cannot here judge whether they are true, but they were influential.

Both Protestants and Catholics came to regard Christian doctrine as developing. Roman Catholic theology, and indeed Anglican theology, despite the attempts to escape these modern thought forms through reactionary Roman Thomism and the reactionary Tractarian move back to the Fathers, are compelled to confront the

---

Unity; J.A. Doull, "Hegel's Critique of Hellenic Virtue", *Dionysius* 9 (1985), 13-17, idem, "Faith", *passim*, "Augustinian Trinitarianism", 155-159, idem, "The Logic of Theology since Hegel", *Dionysius* 7 (1983), 129-136; K. Kierans, "On the Limits of Contemporary Reflection on Freedom: An Analysis of Marxist and Existentialist Responses to Hegel", *Dionysius* 10 (1986), 85-128.
[70] See Chadwick, *From Bossuet*, x; notes 36 and 37 above; Kierans, "On the Limits"; J.A. Doull, "The Logic"; F.L. Jackson, "The New Faith: Strauss, Kierkegaard and the Theological Revolution", *Dionysius* 12 (1988), 111-142, idem, "Can Christianity and Modernity be Reconciled?", *The Anglican Free Press* 8, #2 (3-6) and 8, #3 (8-110).

idealist account of Christian subjectivity and its historicity. Problematic but compelling. And compelling because of this: according to the Idealist view the Christian God is essentially known, is revealed. The Absolute is manifest for thought in each of the stages of the historical process through which the Christian religion develops. The changeless beginning is present, held to, grasped, even as it is ever manifesting itself in new ways. The logic of God's being is revealed and is always known in the church. There is continuity with the changeless principle in the developmental change.

(b) discontinuities

There are many problems with these claims and the church must deeply consider them before she can really rest in what she has in some way already accepted. Surely it could be enough for the church of the last two centuries to consider these problems and adjust herself to this acceptance. But, in fact, our contemporary situation is determined not just by a move to this new Christian philosophy but, more immediately and more urgently our situation is determined by a move away from it, a move primarily occurring in the twentieth century and best expressed by Martin Heidegger. For the philosophies of the twentieth century, best understood through his thought, and for the Christian theologies and treatments of Christian history based in these philosophies, the discontinuities in history emerge as primary. To put it simply, each cultural epoch knows being differently. The logic of God's being cannot be known absolutely so as to bridge the diverse cultural understandings. Indeed, the great sin for Heidegger is to unify in an absolute way God, being and thought, thus our doctrine of God as Trinity is impossible.[71]

When Christian theology proceeds from the assumption of the nineteenth century that doctrine is historical, belongs in history, is subject to its character, and when this assumption is transformed by the twentieth century Heideggarian conviction that history is constituted by a series of cultural discontinuities, each of which has an horizon so that we cannot look from within one to another, changeless Christian doctrine disappears. The only development left is the so called "fate" of western, and above all Christian, theology and philosophy: the loss of Being.

Let me illustrate the problem with an example which combines a number of its aspects. We began this paper by considering first the change in doctrine which the gospels ascribe to Christ: "it hath been said...but I say". Second, we considered the change effected by the apostolic preaching, which the apostles credit to the work of Christ: "there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek". Indeed the apostle to the Gentiles has laboured more abundantly than all the others (1 Corinthians 15.10). Later, we noticed the tremendous development of doctrine wrought by the patristic church when it placed at the centre of the Christian teaching about God a word taken from greek philosophy, a word not found in the Bible, *homoousion*, of the same substance. These are three momentous changes. But they all depend upon a change occurring about 200 years before Christ, the translation of the hebrew Bible into greek. The most influential translation is called the Septuagint after the number of scholars, 72, who traditionally produced it with a miraculous independent unanimity. This translation enabled Christianity to be preached in greek to the greeks, to make

---

[71] W.J. Hankey, "Theology as System and Science", *Dionysius* 6 (1982), 93, idem, "Making", 94-114, idem, *God In Himself*, 13-15 and 143, idem, "The Bible", 69-72, idem, "From Metaphysics"; J.A. Doull, "Augustinian Trinitarianism", 111-124 and 148-159, idem, "The Christian Origin, I and II", *Dionysius* 6 (1982), 113-114 and *Dionysius* 8 (1984), 54-55; Kierans,"On the Limits'.

essential to itself a feature of greek culture not found in hebrew culture, namely, philosophy, as well as a feature of the greek philosophical schools not found in hebrew religion, namely, its reduction to an explicitly formulated doctrine. This reduction later became so essential to Christianity, that admission to the church required the tradition, the handing on and the profession of a doctrinal statement, what we come to call the Apostles' Creed. Moreover, the greek character of the Christian religion was made inescapable when its own scriptural record of the acts and sayings of its Jewish founder were written in greek.[72] But did the translation from hebrew to greek take place without remainder? Did the translation merely put into new words old concepts or was a new culture entered with its own horizons?

One instance will illustrate the profundity of the problem. A text of the Old Testament which has been much reflected on in the Christian church is Exodus 3.14. In this passage, according to the Authorized Version, God says: "I am that I am", "I am hath sent me unto you". For a community which will define the relation between its founder, the Christ, and the God encountered in the hebrew scriptures in terms of *ousia*: substance, the being, what fundamentally is, this text is crucial. St. Thomas Aquinas, for example, will use its authority when showing that God exists and that his most proper name is being. In our century, the last generally accepted scholasticism used it to propose, specifically against the claims of modern philosophy, that the true Christian philosophy was the metaphysic of Exodus, the metaphysic of being as the act of existence, the I AM.[73] Yet none of this can be derived from the hebrew text! God cannot be telling us in hebrew that his nature is to exist, or to be, because there is no such hebrew conception to be translated. Contemporary exegetes differ greatly over what the hebrew means. They agree, however, that it cannot ascribe to him being as an eternal nature, the conception patristic, medieval, and Reformation reflection associated with it. Hebrew thinking, they maintain, does not present God's being as an eternal nature in which we can participate.[74] This conception itself is a fundamental doctrinal development occurring in and possible only with the movement from hebrew into greek. No wonder, then, that the Septuagint, the translation of the hebrew scriptures, is regarded as a miraculous divine work, an act of revelation. Significantly, similar attitudes are assumed toward the other great translations which underlie doctrinal developments, ecclesiastical traditions. How many legends have collected about the Jerusalem chamber in which the Authorized, or King James, version was edited? The Bible of the British king is now canonical for some fundamentalists. Luther made the Bible speak german. Rome resisted accepting the new translations and Trent attempted to renew attachment to the Vulgate. No tradition wishes to open the questions lying behind the establishment of the language in which it thinks about God. Too many changes are assumed in the linguistic transition. It is precisely the momentous, but generally invisible and assumed,

---

[72] On the union of patristic theology and hellenic forms see: Hankey, *God In Himself*, 144-147, Doull, "The Christian Origin, II", *Dionysius* 8 (1984), 78-92.

[73] W.J. Hankey, "Aquinas' First Principle: Being or Unity?", *Dionysius* 4 (1980), 133-172, idem, *God In Himself*, 2-15, idem, "From Metaphysics"; M.D. Ewbank, "Remarks on Being in St. Thomas Aquinas' *Expositio de divinis nominibus*", *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et litteraire du moyen age* 56(1989), 123-149; Booth, *Aristotelian Aporetic*; Jan A. Aertsen, "Ontology and Henlogy and Medieval Philosophy (Thomas Aquinas, Master Eckhart and Berthold of Moosburg)", in *On Proclus and his Influence in Medieval Philosophy*, ed. E.P. Bos and P.A. Meijer, Philosophia Antiqua 53 (Brill: Leiden, 1992), 120-140.

[74] Dominique Bourg, "Epilogue. La critique de la 'metaphysique de l'Exode' par Heidegger et l'exegese moderne", *L'etre et dieu*, Publication du Centre d'etudes et de recherches interdisciplinaires en theologie 13(Cerf, Cognitio fidei: Paris, 1986), 215-244, esp. 217-224 and generally *Dieu et L'etre: exegeses d'Exode 3,13 et de Coran 20,11-24*, ed. Centre d'etudes des religions du livre, CNRS. (Etudes augustiniennes: Paris,1978).

doctrinal changes involved in these linguistic cultural shifts to which the Heideggerian study of our history especially attends.

If the language of being as applied to God, opening him to thought as the most intensively existent whose very being is to be, separates a greek and Christian knowledge of God from a hebrew one, similar shifts are also created by the transition when Christianity is translated into latin.[75]

We have already noticed how the doctrine of the atonement is developed among the latins using legal language associating it with redemption from guilt. In consequence, the greeks do not recognize in it their doctrine which emphasizes instead salvation from death and finitude when Christ reunites us with the immortality of God. But this is perhaps just a shift in doctrinal emphasis. Much more momentous is the overwhelming influence of Augustine and the consequent union of knowledge of God with the trinitarian structure of the human mind. I have noted other results of his influence above, including its role in the formulation of a new Christian subjectivity in the west, lying at the root both of the Reformation and of modern philosophy. Another feature will indicate the gulf the Augustinian theological tradition opens between the greek and the latin Christianities. For Augustine what is at the heart of things is love, the act of the will. Sin is the loss in various forms of our capacity to love the good and to do it. Grace depends upon the predestinating will of God. Being and knowing, the first two moments of the trinitarian soul, are gathered into the soul's self-movement in love, the act of the will. The Father and the Son are, for the west, the common source of the Spirit who is their union as love, will. But the last great influence of greek theology on the western Christian mind, the writings of the pseudo-Dionysius and his greek commentators, aims at mystical union with God **without even mentioning love**! The Augustinian west corrects and supplements this, without at first noticing the defect.[76] Such a union as Dionysius teaches is outside its spiritual imagination. Equally, in a Heideggerian analysis, Aquinas silently, without noticing his own act, transforms the Aristotelian notion of being as energy, the perfection in which God remains, into the power to do. *Actus* is that which can act and which is known in the act of creation. God's being is above all manifest in an act of the will, he is known as the cause of being. Orthodoxy judges the western doctrine of the Spirit to be heretical, its doctrine of the atonement with the growing emphasis on original sin, satisfaction, and predestination, to be deformed, and it knows nothing of the movement of western Christianity into a subjectivity which dominates nature through scientific technology.

A Heideggerian analysis will see in the de-hellenization of Christianity, which is explicit at least on the Protestant side of the modern developments, nothing surprising. When for the Lutheran Reformation the act of trust becomes the essence of faith rather than belief in the content of doctrine, when Calvin and the Counter-Reformation emphasize obedience to the will of God and the will of God in the church

---

[75] Bibliography in respect to the Heideggerian analysis of the western Christian tradition is now enormous and is indicated in many of the notes above. While there is much more recent work, I find Jean Beaufret, *Dialogue avec Heidegger: 1.Philosophie grecque, 2.Philosophie moderne, 3.Approche de Heidegger*, "Arguments" 56,58,59, (Minuit: Paris, 1973-1974) the most useful. See especially in 1: "ENERGEIA et actus", 122-145 and in 2: "La philosophie chretienne", 9-27. Also helpful are the essays by J.-L. Marion, J.-F. Courtine, P. Aubenque, and Jean Beaufret in *Etienne Gilson et nous: la philosophie et son histoire*, ed. Monique Couratier (Vrin: Paris, 1980).
[76] Rorem, *Pseudo-Dionysius*, 214-225 and Hankey, "'Dionysius dixit'."

respectively,[77] when Descartes and Kant find man closest to God in the infinite freedom and autonomy of the will,[78] the break with ancient Greece, pagan and Christian, is almost total. Protestants eliminate metaphysics from theology. What remains of it in Roman Catholic thought reduces being to a fact.[79]

In sum, the twentieth century sees the past as a series of fundamentally discontinuous cultural epochs. Each of them gives a wholly new meaning and significance to what it inherits. Historical study, both of the Bible and tradition, is a matter of contextualizing: understanding each thing in the appropriate system of meanings and significances which cannot be ours. There can be no universal revelation of, or knowledge of, the being of God. The changeless cannot enter into a common doctrine at all. There is no development of Christian doctrine only shifts and changes of the most complete kind.

Contemporary biblical study when it succeeds in its contextualizing enterprise, puts the Bible doctrinally into a past past. The Bible is available to us only as a rhetorical source of the means for persuading others to accept our judgements and to join in our enterprises. It cannot form these. This is, of course, the BAS view of the Bible. It follows that the Bible may be and should be rewritten. Contemporary liturgists are only showing their cynicism when they pretend to remodel our worship on patristic forms. They know very well that they accept only their own tendentious reconstructions of the ancient **styles**, the relation of the ancient liturgies to the ancient doctrine is forever gone. The liturgists not only know this but proceed from it as an assumption.

All this is, however, only the good news, so to speak. The bad news follows: we have no answer to this Heideggerian deconstruction of the history of Christian doctrine implicit in and furthered by most contemporary historical study of scripture and the tradition. Scholasticism: Roman, Protestant, Anglican has no answer, not only because it is committed to the conception of an immutable doctrine, but even more because it assumes both that what is revealed to faith is conceptually knowable and that there is a universal reason into which doctrine passes and according to which its deductions are made. When challenged by contemporary contextualizing, scholasticism simply responds either by defining the philosophical concepts as part of the faith or showing such incomprehension of the problem as to identify the aims of scholastic metaphysics and Heidegger's deconstruction of it. But Heidegger understood the history of scholasticism better than the neoscholastics themselves.[80]

The only form of Christian philosophy, or at least of philosophy claiming to be Christian, which has an answer to Heidegger is the one against which he is reacting: modern Cartesian philosophy as advanced by the German Idealists. What they call progress or development he calls the loss and forgetting of being. Like Heidegger, German Idealism knows thought to be historical, and against him, it understands the fundamental shifts in the form of thought to expose rather than to obscure the logic of the divine being: the logic of God before the worlds were made. But, reasonably, Christianity has not yet settled whether this philosophy is Christian as it claims or

---

[77] Williams, *The Descent*, 173-176.

[78] Rene Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy*, meditation 4: "Of the True and the False". On Kant, see Hankey, "The Bible", 58-60, idem, "Making", 85-92 and 121-122, idem, "St. Anselm", 46-47.

[79] Hankey, "Making," 97-99, idem, "From Metaphysics."

[80] Hankey, "Making" and "From Metaphysics".

rather diabolical , and astonishingly, it finds in Heidegger the clue to Christian thinking in our time.

CONCLUSION

From its beginning Christianity has both affirmed and denied the change of doctrine, and for good reason. Both are necessary and a healthy ecclesiastical tradition will maintain both. Anglican and Roman traditions as fixed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries deny development in respect to essentials or the substance of doctrine and affirm it only in respect to accidents or practical needs and circumstances. Though these traditions in their classical modern forms are at odds with one another over particulars, they share a common reasoning which we have called scholastic. For Anglicans this determination that the essence of the faith, what is generally required for salvation, is essentially fixed, determined by a canonical scripture and what has been found therein and proved thereby in the patristic church, is represented by the genuine Prayer Book tradition which admits change only so far as there be no change in doctrine. This position, summed up in the Solemn Declaration of the Canadian bishops in 1893 and the genuine Prayer Book tradition, though it is essential to the identity of Anglicanism, is no longer tenable by itself.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the sciences and philosophy of western modernity which had developed alongside of, with, and against the modern ecclesial traditions assumed a form which western Christianity has not been able to resist. As a result human subjectivity and the historical development which belongs to it have become essential to Christianity and doctrinal development, even in respect to essentials, impossible to deny. There is no longer either a science of scripture nor a scientific study of the history of doctrine which will allow Prayer Book Anglicanism as classically defined to maintain itself. An alternative has consequently appeared presenting itself in Canada in the form of the BAS and in the other Anglican churches in more or less radical versions based on like principles. These are through and through historicist, i.e. the horizons separating historical epochs are absolute. For the revolutionaries, liturgy, by which the community is defined, is a reflection and medium of the ever changing community. It is impossible to give any fixed doctrinal content to the community's faith. As a consequence the only identity the community can have in changing circumstances is that which can be maintained by its administrative structures. No real doctrinal community is possible either with what was in the older view represented as the community's past or with communities in other circumstances. In fact, since there is no essential doctrinal identity, there is no doctrinal development, only doctrinal change. Finally, change becomes the only content of Christian teaching.

The Anglican correlative of a Prayer Book tradition which admits alteration only by denying doctrinal change is a revolutionary liturgical movement, which, as the most one-sided and debased adaption possible to the new theological circumstances of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, admits only change. Unless the opposition between these two, classical Anglicanism, as represented by the genuine Prayer Book tradition, and revolutionary Anglicanism, as represented by the BAS and its like, can be resolved within the community, Anglicanism as a Christian ecclesial tradition must disappear. There is no future for Anglicanism unless its present leadership penitently welcomes back the continuing Anglicans and the Prayer Book Anglicans with the honour properly accorded

to witnesses on behalf of the community the present leadership has deserted and betrayed. The Anglicans who have remained faithful to their church's defining formularies must devote themselves in the honoured position they must be accorded to that reform of the fundamental Anglican formularies and structures which is consistent with what is true in a modernity proposing to give a properly Christian form to philosophy. It is not correct that the liberals have had no new ideas since the eighteenth century,[81] nor that the ideas they had then and since are simply false. It is not just the Evangelical and Catholic Anglicans who must be reconciled with one another; they must both be reconciled with the so-called liberals.

Those who hope for the continuation of Anglicanism as a distinct ecclesial tradition must assess the probability of the reconciliation of which I have just spoken taking place **from either side**! It is essential that this reconciliation take place within the ecclesial community if there is to be a church. It is no more possible for Prayer Book Anglicans to continue without the principles which the BAS Anglicans have debased than the contrary. Christian doctrine is no more changeless than changing. Both are abstract categories. Development is a better category assuming as it does an identity and difference to which temporal process is essential. But the logic of the development of Christian doctrine is not best likened to that of a lifeless substance nor to a living organism, but rather to the process and identity of thought.

The future of western Christianity depends on there being a church in which the denial and the affirmation of change in doctrine can be brought together. If neither the Anglican communion nor any of its churches be such a community, Anglicans who have grasped the problem had best look to a community where the essentials for a resolution are to be found.[82] They may hope then to bear their heritage into a genuinely catholic community in order that none of the fragments which remain may be lost (John 6.12).

---

[81] I judge Roger Beckwith in his Homily given at Morning Prayer to the Episcopal Synod of America, Valley Forge Meeting, 30th April, 1993 to be mistaken.

[82] See W.J. Hankey, "The Coming Disintegration and Realignment of Christendom", *The Evangelical Catholic* 10, #6 (March, 1987), 1, 4-5: "We may not succeed at staying within our churches... If they [the revolutionaries] should succeed in throwing us out, we must be sure that our roots are already so deep and our branches so wide that we shall neither be uprooted from the faith once delivered to the saints nor take with us any fewer than that part of Christ's body which the Father has joined to us."(5), idem, "Why I am Staying" gives arguments as to why one can remain in the Anglican Church of Canada first because it no longer exists as a church and then because continuing Anglicanism is not to be preferred on account of its sectarian character. The present paper intends to show why Prayer Book Anglicanism cannot in the long term exist apart from the catholic church. It is a genuine aspect of the Anglican heritage that Anglicans conceive the church as existing for the whole community and containing in herself the breadth and balance of the elements of Christian life. Anglicans forced out of the administrative structures to which they belong will seek such a church.