

Honouring Jesus Christ

Peter Adam

The following article is an adapted version of a talk given at a colloquium held in Melbourne in July, 2004. The colloquium was chaired by Archbishop Peter Carnley of Perth, Primate of Australia, the author of a recent book denouncing Sydney Anglicans as 'Arian'. Also present at the colloquium was Kevin Giles, an author whose critique of Sydney Anglicans follows lines very similar to those employed by Archbishop Carnley. (Editor)

Theology as politics

Theology is often political, and this colloquium is as much politics as it is theology. Indeed, I suspect that politics predominates, and that it is both the driving force and the not-so-well-hidden agenda of the day. Sadly, we have become all too accustomed to a game frequently played by Anglicans of every school of thought. It can be summarized as: 'I am more Anglican than you are' or in a more extreme form: 'I am a true Anglican and you are not.' This colloquium, however, is playing for higher stakes than this. The game we are playing today is not: 'I am more Christian than you are' but: 'I am a Christian and you are not.' For to suggest that some past or present members of the Diocese of Sydney are Arian is to imply that they are not Christians at all.

In his recent book, *Reflections in Glass*,¹ Archbishop Peter Carnley of Perth described his own writings as representing 'discovery and learning and of ever-deepening communion together as we enter into the truth of Christ'.² Alas, this colloquium does not seem to me to be an example of 'ever-deepening communion'. It feels more like an attempt to drive even stronger divisions between the tectonic plates that form the Anglican Church of Australia. May I ask bluntly: is this appropriate behaviour for an archbishop or primate? Should not someone in the role of primate try to hold the church together? Is attacking people and their ideas a very good way to do this? Is this not divisive? To what purpose? To engage in public attacks of this kind looks very much like an attempt to pull the church apart.

In *Reflections in Glass*, Archbishop Carnley writes approvingly of Rowan Williams' warning that those who engage in building theological systems may

use their body of clear and distinct truth as a weapon of power to browbeat and bludgeon others.³ Is this not a description of what is happening in this colloquium? Is this not what the Archbishop is doing in continuing this discussion? Is he not, in fact, using his position as Primate and his theological system as a way of bludgeoning others? It seems bizarre to attack other believers on details of their inner-Trinitarian doctrine, when the Archbishop himself holds the view that ‘God remains a mystery, beyond our understanding’.⁴ If that is true, how is it possible to attack any particular view of the relationship between the Father and the Son? If our God is an unknown God, how is it possible to lay down the law about the internal relations of the Trinity? To be blunt, if God is a mystery, how can anyone be sure that Sydney is wrong?

Rowan Williams has written of the difficulty of formulating precise language about God: ‘We cannot say what God is in himself; all we have is the narrative of God with us.’⁵ He explains why it is necessary to follow the *via negativa* in our quest for God: ‘It is ‘negative’... because [we are] obliged to be suspicious of its recurring temptation to theoretical resolution and conceptual neatness.’⁶ I am not as pessimistic about the reality of the language we use about God as Rowan Williams is, because I believe that in the incarnation of Christ, God not only lived a human life but also spoke in human language, so that at least some of the words we use come from God and, as John Webster has recently pointed out, they are common earthly realities made ‘holy’ in order to achieve God’s revelatory purpose.⁷ I imagine though that Archbishop Carnley would sympathize more closely with Rowan Williams on this point, and I would therefore ask him to heed Archbishop Williams’ warnings about the danger of ‘theoretical resolution and conceptual neatness’; at the very least, this must point to the conclusion that attacking others on the finer points of theological discourse is unwise.

I was particularly distressed to discover that Archbishop Carnley chose this occasion to launch an attack on the late T. C. Hammond, a figure of virtually iconic significance in the Diocese of Sydney. To ask whether Hammond was an Arian is to spread ill-will and resentment, without even trying. Maurice Wiles has shown us that the label ‘Arian’ has become a general term of abuse within the church, but if that is so, then we must be even more reluctant to use it of people with whom we disagree.⁸ Attempts to construe modern debates in terms more appropriate to ancient enmities is misguided, and to describe a modern opponent

as an Arian is to use an ill-defined and general term of abuse which makes a mockery of the discipline of theology and is an insult to those being attacked.

This is particularly unfortunate, given that as recently as the year 2000, Archbishop Carnley wrote the following in a very helpful chapter on ‘Incarnation and the Humility of God’—

That is why the cross reveals the heart of God more fully than any other event in the life of Jesus, and why the cross is so central to the Christian tradition. At the end of the day, the cross is the clue to the right understanding of the incarnation. For this reason, the human limitations of Jesus are not to be seen as a curtailment of divinity, but as a positive expression of true divinity.⁹

If humility is indeed the expression of true divinity, then Archbishop Carnley develops his argument logically when he concludes: ‘The self-emptying [of the Son of God] did not obscure his divinity like the undercarriage of the aircraft in flight, but rather revealed the true divinity of the Father in the Son.’¹⁰ If this is so, then the consequence is either that self-emptying constitutes divinity *tout court*, or that it is a particular feature of the divinity of the Son. The notion that self-emptying constitutes divinity may be true, but it is difficult to assert this without, at the same time, asserting other complementary truths about God. In that article, the Archbishop seems to assert that the eternal Word is perfectly expressed within his human limitations, which means that his humiliation was not a temporary stage in salvation history but the permanent content of his divinity. Is this not close to Arianism?

I believe that it was G. K. Chesterton, the staunch lay defender of catholic Christianity, who coined the phrase ‘Any stigma to beat a dogma’. Today we observe the reverse approach ‘Any dogma to create a stigma’. Archbishop Carnley’s attacks on Sydney Anglicans seem even more bizarre when we remember that as recently as July, 2002, he used the same theological assumption—that of a hierarchy within the Trinity—to assert the authority of bishops within the church.¹¹ I am told that he has since retracted that idea, but it is clear that he was teaching it publicly as recently as 2002. Was he then an Arian because of that? If not, why does he now use the term as a way of abusing others?

In his book on Arius, Rowan Williams refers to John Henry Newman's attempt to characterise the Protestants and Evangelicals as the Arians of the nineteenth century, on the ground that they demonstrated a narrow biblicism and a carnal, self-indulgent religion. Rowan Williams describes this historical reconstruction and misuse of Arius to discredit those whom he regarded as his opponents as 'built upon a foundation of complacent bigotry and historical fantasy'.¹²

I am forced to conclude that this colloquium does not honour Jesus Christ, the head and Saviour of the church. You may well feel that this criticism is an impertinence, but the days are long gone when a bishop could act without any accountability to the people of God, and so I must ask the Archbishop to reflect on the wisdom and appropriateness of his words and actions in this matter. Some of you may object that I should play the ball and not the man. But my comments are directed to the political significance of this event, which has been organized by the Primate of our church. Try as we may, we cannot ignore the significance of the Primate's role in our meeting today.

Kevin Giles

It seems clear that Archbishop Carnley's remarks were based, at least to a significant extent, on similar attacks made against Sydney Anglicans by Kevin Giles.¹³ Giles' basic claim is clear. It is that no 'subordination' of any kind will be found in the operations of the Triune God, except that in the incarnation the human Jesus is subordinate to the Father. In his view, this has always been the position of historical Christian orthodoxy, but that recently some conservative Evangelicals have fallen into heresy by straying from this doctrine. The discussion here is not what is objectively true about the Trinity, but rather about what the historic orthodox doctrine of the Trinity really is. Giles wants to exclude from it all of the following forms of subordinationism—

- a. Arian subordination, where the Son is begotten in time.
- b. Derivative subordination, where the Father is seen as pre-eminent as the *fons* or *principium* of a diminished Son and Spirit.
- c. Numerical subordination, where the concept of rank is seen to derive from the listed (and/or derived) order of father, Son and Spirit.
- d. Nineteenth and twentieth century subordinationism, which ranks the

persons according to being and function.

e. Operational subordinationism, which grounds the order of the persons in a temporary covenant or compact.

f. Eternal role subordinationism, in which the persons simply act as if they were ranked, but without any ontological underpinning.

There are three aspects of Giles' method which weaken his argument, which we shall deal with in turn.

1. It appears that Kevin Giles has devised a theory, and then read through some mainline theologians in an effort to find evidence which supports that view.

The problem with this method is that it may not do justice to these theologians, since they may also have expressed other views which complement the ones cited by Giles, and which also need to be taken into account. A theologian may well make clear statements about the absolute equality of the three persons of the Trinity, but he may also make other statements which make distinctions between the persons of the Trinity which imply or assert some kind of asymmetry. His intention is that both statements should be held in tension, and this must be respected.

This technique is by no means a recent one and can easily be found in the writings of some of the most classic representatives of historic orthodoxy. Let us look at Athanasius and Thomas Aquinas, both of whom demonstrate this tendency on numerous occasions. Of Athanasius, Alvyn Pettersen writes—

central to the understanding of the divine community...is the philosophical belief that the Son is 'second' to the Father, in the sense that the Father is the eternally uncaused cause and the Son is the eternally caused cause, or as Athanasius traditionally puts it, the Father is unbegotten and the Son is the only-begotten.¹⁴

Again, he quotes Athanasius: 'The Logos is related to God as radiance, thereby signifying both his being "from the essence", proper and indivisible, and his oneness with the Father.'¹⁵ Pettersen comments: 'Not only is this image used to stress God's indivisible co-eternity, but also the Father and Son's asymmetrical distinction.'¹⁶

In his magisterial study of divine substance, Christopher Stead writes of how *homoousios* is used in Athanasius: ‘The analogy of human paternity, of father and son; the analogy of continuous natural processes, fountain and stream, source and ray of light, vine and branches; the analogy of two men; and the analogy of mind and word.’¹⁷ Fountain and stream are one *ousia*, but this does not mean that together they constitute one reality. For Athanasius asserts: ‘Not just equal dignity, but shared or communicated substance’ although the Father initiates and the Son responds—not *vice versa*. Therefore, for Athanasius, there is both ‘asymmetry and distinctiveness of function’, so that ‘We cannot claim that there is any consistent suggestion of numerical identity in the strict sense’.¹⁸

Turning to Thomas Aquinas, we find the following on the asymmetrical relationship between the father and the Son: ‘So the Son has the same omnipotence as the Father, but with another relation, the Father possessing power as *giving* signified when we say that he is able to beget, while the Son possesses the power as *receiving*, signified that he can be begotten.’¹⁹ Likewise in the twentieth century, Rowan Williams writes of ‘the *arche* of the Father, the ultimate source’.²⁰ Giles cites Karl Barth as an example of what he regards as the orthodox tradition of Trinitarian doctrine, and yet Barth clearly asserts asymmetry as well as equality:

We have not only not to deny, but actually to affirm and to understand as essential to the being of God, the offensive fact that there is in God Himself an above and a below, a *prius* and a *posterius*, a superiority and a subordination. And our present concern is with what is apparently the most offensive fact of all, that there is a below, a *posterius*, a subordination, that it belongs to the inner life of God that there should take place within it obedience. We have to reckon with such an event even in the being and life of God Himself... His divine unity consists in the fact that in Himself he is both the One who is obeyed and Another who obeys.²¹

Or again:

In His mode of being as the Son, He fulfils the divine subordination, just as the father in his mode of being as the Father, fulfils the divine superiority.²²

Or again:

We have to draw no less an astounding deduction that in equal Godhead the one God is, in fact, the One and also Another, that He is indeed a First and a Second, One who rules and commands in majesty, and One who obeys in humility. The one God is both one and the other.²³

How does this relate to Giles' summary of Barth: 'In this Christocentric Trinitarianism, subordination in the end is excluded absolutely by Barth. The Son reveals the Father.'²⁴ Obviously it does not, and Giles, it seems clear, has misunderstood Barth. He thinks that Barth held his own view and repudiated the view of his opponents. He understands Barth to be a defender of that interpretation of what historic orthodoxy is, which he claims is the only correct one. In fact, Barth held the view which Giles is now trying to marginalise, for Barth managed to combine both the equality of the persons of the Trinity and their asymmetry, a sophisticated and subtle theological position which Giles seems to be quite unable to grasp.

Ivan Head comments that Karl Barth provides a statement of fundamental importance for this vocabulary in Church dogmatics IV, 1: 'The way of the Son of God into the far country,' p. 209. He writes—

The one who in this obedience is the perfect image of the ruling God is himself—as distinct from every human and creaturely kind—God by nature, God in his relationship to himself, i.e., God in his mode of being as the Son in relation to his mode of being as the Father, one with the Father and of one essence. *In his mode of being as the Son he fulfils the divine subordination, just as the Father in his mode of being fulfils the divine superiority.*²⁵

'I assert that this quoted passage...show[s] that the vocabulary of superiority and subordination is a legitimate part of a major modern theology of the Triune God—indeed, in one of the theological giants of the twentieth century. The use of this vocabulary by Karl Barth should cause a hesitation in any hand poised over the heresy button. It is clear that for Barth there is a precise use of these terms that does not run into the waiting arms of Arius, but on the contrary, is required to fully express the better and orthodox doctrine of God.'²⁶

Barth's theology is more subtle than Giles imagines. He certainly rejects a false

notion of subordination, describing it fully in *Church Dogmatics*, IV, 1, p. 196, but shortly afterwards he affirms his own form of eternal subordinationism, which he describes as follows—

The second idea we have to abandon is that...there is necessarily something unworthy of God and incompatible with His being as God in supposing that there is in God a first and a second, an above and a below, since this includes a gradation, a degradation and an inferiority in God, which if conceded excludes the *homoousia* of the different modes of divine being...Does subordination in God necessarily involve an inferiority, and therefore a deprivation, a lack? Why not rather a particular being in the glory of the one equal Godhead, in whose inner order there is also, in fact, this dimension, the direction downwards, which has its own dignity?²⁷

Colin Gunton comments—

In Barth's way of putting it, there is in God both superordination and subordination, both command and obedience. It is in his very difference from God the Father that God the Son is divine—God in a distinct way of being God.²⁸

It is not just that Kevin Giles has missed vital evidence within the writings of those whom he quotes as supporting his view. I suspect that he has done this because he does not think that it is possible to combine belief in the equality of the persons of the Trinity with their asymmetry. But this subtle tension is well represented in Trinitarian theology, and it is unfair to exclude those who espouse it.

2. Kevin Giles appears to have a habit of misquoting and misreading those quotations from his sources which he makes use of.

In another quotation, Giles makes a number of mistakes, with the result that Barth's original meaning is the exact opposite of what Giles asserts. As Giles quotes it, it reads—

We have to draw no less an astounding deduction that in equal Godhead the one God is, in fact, the One and also Another, that he is indeed a First

and a Second. One who rules and commands in majesty and the one who obeys in humility. The one God is both...in perfect unity and equality.

But the original passage actually reads—

Therefore we have to draw the no less astounding deduction that in equal Godhead the one God is, in fact, the One and also Another, that He is indeed a First and a Second, One who rules and commands in majesty and One who obeys in humility.²⁹

In this quotation, Giles has put ‘he’ instead of ‘He’, and the last sentence is misleading because he makes the phrase: ‘in perfect unity and equality’ refer to the Father and Son, whereas Barth’s reference is to the equality of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Furthermore, in this quotation, Barth is actually supporting the notion of an asymmetrical relationship—God the Father, who rules and commands in majesty, and God the Son, who obeys in humility. Giles comments that here Barth is asserting a ‘subordination in God’ and not ‘the subordination of the Son’, when in fact, and contrary to Giles’ statement, he is doing both.³⁰

Again, Giles claims that Barth believes that any idea of subordination occurs only within ‘the forecourt of the divine being’. But a few pages later on, Barth clearly refers to ‘One who rules and commands in majesty and the one who obeys in humility’.³¹ Or again ‘That is the true deity of Jesus Christ, obedient in humility, in its unity and equality, its *homoousia*, with the deity of the One who sent Him and to whom He is obedient’.³² Or again ‘In His mode of being as the Son He fulfils the divine subordination, just as the Father in His mode of being as the Father fulfils the divine superiority’.³³ So I think it is fair to say that Giles has missed some vital evidence in the sources which he has quoted and used.

3. Kevin Giles has slanted the evidence he cites in order to give a misleading impression of the isolated position of his opponents, and of the extent to which they are and should be marginalised.

Giles seems to want to give the impression that the view which he abhors is only held by a small fringe minority of conservative Evangelicals, and that it is not found anywhere in mainline orthodox Christianity. But in actual fact, he

quotes a wide range of theologians who all hold to some form of subordinationism. When referring to those who represent early Christian orthodoxy, he writes: 'But they did not ignore or neglect the other evidence of Scripture for a relational subordination of the Son and the Spirit to the Father.'³⁴ Indeed, in his third chapter, he lists the following as having expressed some form of subordinationist teaching: the ante-Nicene fathers Justin and Tertullian, and the Cappadocian fathers, at least in some parts of their writings.³⁵ He kindly refers to this as 'naive subordinationism', but subordinationism it is.³⁶ With respect to the twentieth century, Giles does not hesitate to refer to the subordinationist tendencies which he finds in the works of the Orthodox theologian John Zizioulas, as well as in the Roman Catholic Cardinal Ratzinger.³⁷ As I have already shown above, Giles certainly cannot call on Karl Barth as a defender of his cause either, although he refers happily to his 'creative and insightful discussion of the Trinity'.³⁸

If this is so, then why does Giles persist in giving the impression that these views are only found among a small conservative evangelical minority, as chapter headings like 'Conservative evangelicals head off on their own' and 'Evangelicals at the end of a very thin branch' clearly indicate? Giles seems determined to marginalise his opponents and to represent them as alone holding views which he regards as lying beyond the orthodox Christian tradition of Trinitarian theology. Are conservative Evangelicals really the only ones who assert the asymmetry as well as the equality of the Trinity? Hardly, for many of the early church fathers supported that view, as did Karl Barth, as we have seen.

What then are the tolerable limits of orthodoxy? They are, in fact, wider than Giles allows, and it is misguided of him to try to draw narrower boundaries, and then go on to imply that only conservative evangelicals hold the views which he has decreed are eccentric. His attempt to marginalise them is as uncharitable as it is inaccurate. He has attempted to build a wall in order to exclude some from the claim that they represent historic Christian orthodoxy, and he has attempted to show that he can claim evidence of the support of the Christian tradition for his views. I have attempted to show that the wall is both uncharitable and based on error, that at least some of the bricks fall to pieces on closer inspection, and that those on the other side have a legitimate claim to represent the historic, orthodox Christian tradition of Trinitarian thought. I am sorry to have to disagree with Kevin Giles, but both clarity and charity demand my comments.

To sum up what I have said so far, I have been trying to demonstrate that the orthodox Christian tradition holds two elements in tension; that of the equality of the persons of the Godhead, and that of asymmetry. Equality and asymmetry are both found within Christian orthodoxy. I think that it would be wrong to try to assert one without the other.

Some theologians do assert equality without asymmetry, others assert both. The question at issue is whether or not those who assert equality and asymmetry are merely a small, misguided and lonely minority. I believe that they are not, and that it is wrong to attempt to marginalise them.

Furthermore, those theologians who attempt to hold equality and asymmetry in tension are, in my opinion, reflecting a tension that lies deep within the orthodox tradition. For these two elements are to be found within the Nicene Creed itself. The notion of equality is represented by the phrase *consubstantialis Patri*. The notion of equality and asymmetry is represented by the words *Deum de Deo, lumen de lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero*. For these words imply that the origin of the Son lies within the Father. As Alois Grillmeier reminds us: ‘After Nicaea there was necessarily a hard struggle to see how both the oneness of substance of the Son and the Father and the distinction between them could go together.’³⁹

Let me conclude this section with some words from Colin Gunton, a thoughtful exponent of orthodox Trinitarian thought in the twentieth century.

We thus achieve a Trinitarian *perichoresis*. The Father who begets and the Son who is begotten are together one God in the *koinonia* of the Spirit. They are one because the Son and the Spirit are, in a sense, though as God, subordinate in the eternal *taxis* as they are in the economy. But in another sense they are not subordinate, for without his Son and Spirit, God would not be God....It follows that the distinctive personhood of each—their being each what they are and not something else—derives first from the constituting action of the Father, but also from the responsive action of the Son and the particularizing action of the Spirit....In other words, it is thus possible to maintain an Eastern—and Scriptural—sense of the monarchy of the Father without succumbing to an ontological hierarchy which renders the Son and the Spirit as less than fully divine.⁴⁰

Honouring Jesus Christ

Of course I am delighted that both Archbishop Carnley and Kevin Giles have brought the question of Trinitarian theology back into the public consciousness. The doctrine of the Trinity is essential to the assertion of the uniqueness of Christ as one person with two natures, divine and human. It is good for Anglicans in particular to focus on the doctrine of the Trinity, for only this doctrine can preserve us from that mystic unitarianism which seems to be the natural result of that over-emphasis on the self-giving kenotic incarnation which has been part of Anglican self-understanding since the publication of *Lux mundi* in 1889. Furthermore, the doctrine of the incarnation has now taken on a life of its own. John Webster writes—

Any extension of the incarnation...can be Christologically disastrous, in that it may threaten the uniqueness of the Word's becoming flesh by making 'incarnation' a general principle or characteristic of divine action in, through, or under creaturely reality.⁴¹

At its weakest, the claimed Anglican focus on the incarnation has left behind any other than symbolic connection with the historical and unique revelation of God in Christ, with all the scandal of that particularity, and uses it as nothing more than an ethical or political priority. The doctrine of the incarnation cannot be understood except in its Trinitarian context, as also the doctrine of the atonement cannot be understood without the Trinity.⁴²

Many theologians have claimed that the Trinity is essential for the preservation for the Gospel.⁴³ Timothy George has written—

The Trinity was crucial [to the reformers] because it was a witness to the deity of Jesus Christ and thus to the certainty of salvation secured by him.⁴⁴

Karl Rahner said—

No adequate distinction can be made between the doctrine of the Trinity and the doctrine of the economy of salvation.⁴⁵

Catherine LaCugna adds—

The purpose of the doctrine of the Trinity is to speak as truthfully as possible about the mystery of God who saves us through Christ in the Holy Spirit.⁴⁶

J. B. Torrance wrote—

[The Trinity is] the very grammar of the Christian Gospel.⁴⁷

Claude Welch asserts—

[The Trinity] is an immediate consequence of the Gospel, because the revelation on which everything depends cannot be stated except in Trinitarian terms.⁴⁸

Broughton Knox claimed that—

Jesus cannot be called Lord apart from the doctrine of the Trinity.⁴⁹

And finally, Emil Brunner wrote of the Trinity that—

It is the theological doctrine which defends the central faith of the Bible and the church.⁵⁰

Without the doctrine of the Trinity it would be ridiculous to claim that we know the heart of God, for ‘no-one has ever seen God. It is only God the Son, who is close to the Father’s heart, who has made him known’ (John 1:18). We could not claim that Jesus is the way, the truth and the life, for no-one comes to the father except through him (John 14:6). We could not rightly address Jesus as ‘My Lord and my God’ (John 20:28). We could not affirm that ‘there is salvation in no-one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among mortals by which we must be saved’ (Acts 4:12). We could not assert that ‘in Christ God was reconciling the world to himself...for our sake, he made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God’ (2 Cor. 5:19, 21). We could not look forward to the day when ‘at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father’ (Phil. 2:10-11). Finally, we could not anticipate the great song of Revelation 4: ‘You are worthy to take the scroll and to open

its seals, for you were slaughtered and by your blood you ransomed for God saints from every tribe and language and people and nation' (Rev. 4:9).

We can only rightly honour Jesus Christ as the only Son of the Father, as the one who has made God known, as the only Saviour and Mediator, if we have the essential truths of the doctrine of the Trinity as our foundation. The doctrine of the Trinity provides a coherent basis for evangelism, because it combines the universal claim of a monotheistic faith, the universal claim of one historic, definitive revelation of God in the incarnate Lord Jesus Christ, the universal claim that this Jesus has poured out the Holy Spirit on all flesh, and the universal claim that there is one people of God, one body of Christ, one temple of the Holy Spirit and one bride of the Lamb.

We would honour Jesus Christ more effectively if we spent our energy in compassionate, caring and effective evangelism, the proclamation that Christ has died, Christ has risen and Christ will come again, rather than spending our time attacking fellow Christians without just cause. We might honour Jesus Christ more effectively if we put our liturgy into practice and took our proclamation of the gospel not just down the aisle, but out into the world. For we owe the world this gospel debt, the message that, in his words: 'repentance and forgiveness of sins is to be proclaimed in [my] name to all nations' (Luke 24:47) that Jesus is 'the bread of God come down from heaven' to give his flesh for the life of the world (John 6:51). Our Gospel that Christ has died for our sins according to the Scriptures, that he was buried, that he rose again according to the Scriptures is a gospel for all the people of the world. We would do well to focus less on the Anglican Communion and more on creating an Anglican Mission.

It is right that we should want to honour Jesus Christ in our theology, that we should want to honour Jesus Christ in the love and respect that we show to fellow believers, and it is right that we should honour Jesus Christ in our practice of resolute and compassionate evangelism.

PETER ADAM is the principal of Ridley College, Melbourne, Australia.

1. Peter Carnley, *Reflections in Glass* (Sydney: Harper Collins, 2004).
2. *Ibid.*, p. 21.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 47.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 236.
5. Rowan Williams, *On Christian Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), p. 159.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 146.
7. John Webster, *Holy Scripture. A dogmatic sketch* (Cambridge: CUP, 2003).
8. Cf. Maurice Wiles, *Archetypal heresy. Arianism through the centuries* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996).
9. *That Our Joy May be Complete*, ed. Marian Free, Rosemary Gill, Jonathan Holland and John Maidstone (Adelaide: Openbook Publishers, 2000), pp. 33-46.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 46.
11. Peter Carnley, "In praise of hierarchy. A response to Jürgen Moltmann" in *Common Theology* I, 1 (July, 2002), pp. 9-15.
12. Rowan Williams, *Arius, Heresy and Tradition* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1987), p. 5.
13. See Kevin Giles, *The Trinity and Subordinationism. The Doctrine of God and the Contemporary Gender Debate* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2002).
14. Alvyn Pettersen, *Athanasius* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1995), pp. 168-9. This book also carries a commendation from Rowan Williams.
15. Athanasius, *De decretis*, 22.
16. Pettersen, *Athanasius*, p. 180.
17. Christopher Stead, *Divine Substance* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), p. 262.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 266.
19. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I, 42.6 (London: Burns and Oates, 1921), p. 193.
20. Williams, *On Christian Theology*, p. 145.
21. Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics* (4 vols., Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956-75), IV, 1, pp. 200-1. I deliberately worked on Barth before reading the evidence in Mark Baddeley, "The Trinity and Subordinationism: a Response to Kevin Giles," in *Reformed Theological Review* LXIII (2004), pp. 29-42, which seems to support the views which I have described here.
22. Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, IV, pp. 200-201.
23. *Ibid.*, IV, 1, p. 209.
24. *Ibid.*, IV, 1, p. 202.
25. Giles, *Trinity*, p. 90.
26. Italics mine.
27. Ivan Head, in personal correspondence, quoting a private paper he had written called "A Paper on the Vocabulary of Subordinationism," dated 23 July, 2004.
28. Colin Gunton, *The Christian Faith* (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2002), p. 182.

29. Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, IV, 1, p. 202; Giles, *Trinity*, p. 89. Unfortunately, Giles quotes the source as *Church Dogmatics* III, 1 by mistake.
30. Giles, *Trinity*, p. 88, quoting Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, IV, 1, p. 196. Once again, Giles misquotes his source as III, 1.
31. Barth, *Church Dogmatics* IV, 1, p. 202.
32. *Ibid.*, IV, 1, p. 204.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 209.
34. Giles, *Trinity*, p. 129.
35. *Ibid.*, pp. 33-41.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 62.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 130.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 91.
39. Alois Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, Vol. 1 (2nd edn., London: Mowbrays, 1975), p. 275.
40. Colin E. Gunton, *Father, Son and Holy Spirit* (London: T. and T. Clark, 2003), pp. 73-4.
41. Webster, *Holy Scripture*, pp. 22-3.
42. See Mark Thompson, "From the Trinity to the Cross," *Reformed Theological Review*, LXIII (2004), pp. 16-28.
43. See Peter Adam, "The Trinity and Human Community", in Timothy Bradshaw, ed., *Grace and Truth in a Secular Age* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998), pp. 52-65.
44. Timothy George, *Theology of the Reformers* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1988), pp. 200-1.
45. Quoted in Catherine Mowry LaCugna, *God for Us* (San Francisco: Harper, 1991), p. 211.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 320.
47. J. B. Torrance, "The Doctrine of the Trinity in Our Contemporary Situation," in Alasdair I. C. Heron, ed., *The Forgotten Trinity* (London: IBCC/CCBI, 1991), p. 3.
48. Quoted in Ted Peters, *God as Trinity—relationality and temporality in Divine Life* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993), p. 87.
49. D. B. Knox, *The Everlasting God* (Homebush West: Anzea, 1988), p. 50.
50. Emil Brunner, *The Christian Doctrine of God* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949), p. 206.