

ORTHODOXY, ROMAN CATHOLICISM AND ANGLICANISM, by Methodios Fouyas. *O.U.P.* £4.50.

It is said that young people today are less and less interested in the structure of the institutional churches, or the politics of church unity, but if there is to be the authentic presence of Christ in the world, the struggle of Christians to become a unified and unifying force for mankind must continue.

One therefore welcomes this unusual approach to the problem from the eastern pen of Greek-born Archbishop Fouyas of Ethiopia who brings fresh light and perspective to the debate. A Roman Catholic finds it difficult enough to see Rome as an Anglican sees her, but we have even less opportunity to view both Roman Catholicism and Anglicanism through Orthodox eyes; but unless we try to enter into another's mind and heart, and accept the real religious life-experience of the other's church we will never truly meet him as friend or brother. Only in this way can we begin to understand what the treatment of one church by another has led to in outlook and sentiment—and one suspects that the real barriers to unity are largely in this area.

The matter of Primacy of Authority and Jurisdiction is undoubtedly theological and scriptural, but it is the emotional overtones deep in the community memory rather than failure to unravel the theological issue that make resolution of such a question so difficult. And in regard to the East this very matter is central to the problem of disunity. Along with an outline of Western aggression towards the East which make sober reading for Romans, the archbishop hints at a theological emphasis which he sees to be the root of the trouble. In Eastern thinking about God, he would maintain, the emphasis is on the three equal Persons whose unity of nature has to be preserved; to the Latin, God is One, within whom is the threefold life of Persons whose equality has to be defended. The Latin has thus a 'monarchic' mind from the start, the Greek leans to 'oligarchy'; hence the Church, to the Latin, is built on a monarchic image with the petrine texts as key, while the Orthodox see the Church as a collegiate body, with the equality of the apostles as central. The debate then between East and West is about whether one bishop has ultimate jurisdiction over all others, or are all bishops equal having strict jurisdiction only in their own church—allowing at most a primacy of honour to one when the church is in council.

Unfortunately, while we in the west at least today, discuss and analyse the political theory of the papacy at length, the archbishop fails to raise or respond to some glaring problems

that require solution in the Orthodox theory of collegiality, but at least it is spelt out that primacy of Jurisdiction, even more than the doctrine of Infallibility, as proclaimed in Vatican I and Vatican II are insurmountable barriers to the Greek. And the Roman is reminded that for a full nine centuries universal jurisdiction was not used or claimed by the western patriarch, and the Orthodox has grounds for seeing the doctrine as a later accretion, and not *de essentia ecclesiae*.

The author reveals other facets of the Orthodox approach to the west that are not generally known to us, such as the 'quisling' nature, in orthodox eyes, of the Uniate churches, and the offensiveness of proselytising work by Latins among the Greeks.

It is questionable whether approaches to unity are well served by repeated historical analysis of the causes, and we might be more fruitfully engaged if we compared current faith and belief and seek to go forward from there. But if one does choose to look at history to throw light on the present, it must be done with the greatest care, and in this the archbishop has not done his homework, especially in regard to the Anglican Roman Catholic dialogue. He quotes Casserley approvingly, for instance, of the Reformation as 'an episode in Anglican existence, not the beginning of Anglican existence', yet he seems unaware of such Anglican historians as Maitland, Powicke, and in particular of the work of Professor Z. N. Brooke in regard to the term 'Ecclesia Anglicana'. The passage, introducing the chapter on Anglican attitudes to Orthodoxy, is either a supreme schoolboy howler, or else just naughty (the italics, alas, are mine): 'The Church in England at the time of its foundation and for four and a half centuries afterwards was in communion with the Orthodox church. When the final separation between Rome and Constantinople took place . . . the Church of England was not given its earliest tunity to express its opinion. . . .' Or again: 'The Church of England (sic) from its earliest foundation to King Henry I was an independent church and the Popes interfered very little with it'. Thus blandly he brushes aside the pallium with the whisk of a lamb's tail, while the struggles over Investitures do not ever merit a footnote. 'In actual fact', says the author, 'the Church of England is the Catholic Church of the English people'—leading logically to the conclusion that Catholic Emancipation was nothing better than the recognition of 'quislings'.

This study is also disappointing in the way

the author selects his spokesmen for the three traditions. A bishop's statement here, a theologian's there, synodal decisions, private views, conciliar declarations jostle with each other without real evaluation or any sense of deep penetration. When discussing the belief or ecclesial theory of a church there is here some merit in the Roman Catholic tradition of councils and council statements in that one can know, at least in substance, what the Church holds and teaches, whereas it is not nearly so easy to ascertain the Eastern position, and not easy at all to be sure in any detail what is the true Anglican stance. It can be as difficult to be indefinite, as to be over defining.

One can understand the Greek unwillingness to accept doctrinal developments that have taken place in the West since its separation from the East, but the chapter dealing with the

recurrent objection against papal authority as juridical rather than as a 'primacy of love' leaves the key question unresolved—is there or is there not an ultimate juridical authority? Archbishop Fouyas sees this the central of issue between East and West, but while Steven Runciman's work is often referred to, he does not seem to give to the enormous cultural and political sources of the separation the weight they deserve—and as these recede into the past agreement may be reached sooner than we think.

The author is at his best on the Sacraments, where he is less prejudgmental and if, throughout, his comparative study of the three churches had taken this form he would have given us an even more valuable and refreshing impetus to the search for a united Christendom.

ANTHONY STOREY

INTRODUCTION TO THE BIBLE, by John H. Hayes. *SPCK*, London, 1973. 515 pp. + 16 maps. Paperback £2.95.

There is a great deal to recommend this work.

It is a pleasure to find a book so competently sign-posted. Chapter-titles and sub-headings are obvious and informative; charts and illustrations consolidate the text; 16 maps, 3 indices and a 20-page bibliography give the reader ample guidance—though it should be noted that there is nothing later than 1970 in the bibliography: one regrets that no additions were made for this paperback edition of a work first published in 1971. Almost everything possible has been done for the aid and comfort of the reader, except in the problem of the size and appearance of the work. This 'substantial volume' (p. xv) is physically cumbersome to read—the type-line is too long, the margins too narrow, and the general appearance 'heavy'.

Fortunately the text itself, though sometimes dense, is never, like the Bible (in Professor Hayes' opinion), 'occasionally quite tedious to read' (p. 6). There is a forthrightness and simplicity which avoid this.

Simplicity does not replace accuracy. This is a remarkably thorough, scholarly and judicious presentation of the 1970 state-of-play in biblical studies. Professor Hayes is quite willing to leave question-marks and to state that particular problems have not yet been satisfactorily resolved. There is nothing idiosyncratic in this Introduction, nothing that marks it out as especially significant, other than its breadth, depth and extreme objectivity. It is what it claims to be: an Introduction—neither superficial nor polemical.

The final recommendation is the price.

RICHARD PEARCE

MEANING AND CONTROL, D. O. Edge and J. N. Wolfe (Eds). *Tavistock Publications*, London, 1973. 274 pp. £4.

This volume is a collection of twelve papers given at a seminar at Edinburgh University, and in the editors' words they 'reflect the Seminar's exploration of the social meaning of the emergence of modern science and technology, and of the challenge posed by that emergence to the processes of social control'.

The first few essays are concerned with the meaning of this emergence, and start with an attempted demolition of Ryle's description of the possible, or impossible, conflict between scientific assertions and common sense. (I say 'attempted' since, even in Ryle's absence, one senses a certain elusiveness in the argument.) There then follow a couple of much more

relevant papers: one on the use and influence of technological metaphors in describing human behaviour (e.g. the structure of the meeting allowed a lot of feedback to Edge's letting off steam) and another, compressed account by Armytage of the rise of a technocratic class. As befits an article on technocracy it's good on description but poor, or simply incurious, on significance; it reads a little like Armytage's own description of an engineer: 'too busy keeping things going to worry about society'. There is a stimulating, if short, discussion of the paper by Littlejohn, going right to the point of the argument about the dehumanizing role of technology: '. . . the