Editor’s Notes

It is frequently said that in modern times biblical scholarship cut its ties with the church’s theological and ethical concerns, to chart an independent course of its own. Exegetes became academic specialists whose studies were of interest to other exegetes and hardly anyone else. The resulting isolation of disciplines that were once complementary aspects of one mindful enterprise is certainly to be regretted. Fortunately, it is by no means universal. Rigorous scholarly interpretation need not, nor does it always, rule out conversation with theological tradition or contemporary praxis. This issue of the Review offers two fine articles on Scripture, quite different in many respects, yet similar in their openness to other fields of inquiry.

C. K. Robertson examines early church leadership, concentrating on Luke’s gospel and its sequel, the Acts of the Apostles, with special attention to groups that Luke designates with numbers—the Twelve, of course, together with the Seven and the Seventy. The examination makes use of systems analysis, not to replace or contradict methods that have long been employed by commentators, but to add to what they have discovered. A systems approach, as Robertson notes, is valuable not so much because it gives new answers to questions that have been answered many times already, as because it elicits questions that may never have been asked before. Such an approach is especially well suited to understanding change and the limits within which change can be accommodated—topics that are not without contemporary relevance, to which the conclusion of the article turns suggestively.

Anyone who has followed the trends displayed by recent publications in systematic and philosophical theology will be aware that the doctrine of the Trinity has moved from the wings to center stage. One central issue in the discussion has been whether, and how far, what can be known about the way in which God is integrally multiple ought to be reflected in normative statements about human societies, and vice versa. Katherine Grieb presents a careful study of the ethical problems Paul faced in the communities he wrote his letters to, and asks whether his description of the church as “koinonia of the
Spirit”—a description that serves as the unifying “glue” of his ethics—might also be the decisive element in his incipiently Trinitarian language. It was from these problems, which were at once practical and theological, that Paul drew his insights about the integrity of God, insights, Grieb suggests, that may well bear on conceiving the Trinity today in such a way as to draw out its social implications for the church.

Two additional articles honor the journal’s dedication to retrieving and developing Anglican tradition. Egil Grislis, whose perceptive explorations of Richard Hooker’s work have appeared previously in the ATR, here investigates a side of Hooker that is not often presented. That he was judicious, extraordinarily well-read, and unswervingly devoted to his church is all common knowledge. That he might have been, perhaps was, not only a man of prayer but a mystic has not usually been considered and certainly not stressed. The evidence of what he wrote is assembled and evaluated in Grislis’s article, which concludes that “in the eucharist, as in prayer, Hooker did not remain the calm, analytical theologian, but at times could even record the ecstasy which he had personally experienced.”

In answering the question posed in the title of his article—why the ancient creed known as “Nicene” is still recited—Mark Chapman draws on the thought of F. D. Maurice and at the same time makes a contribution of his own to theology today. What the creeds mean and how they mean it can be elusive. Formulas they no doubt are, but they have their primary function in worship: in the offices, at baptism, and especially in the eucharist. Worshipers meet the creed less as a theological text than as an act, something done. That act, the article suggests, is an act of allegiance which serves, in the first instance, to declare the name of someone with whom those declaring it are thereby affiliating—sonning, daughtering—themselves. To recite a creed is thus “to stress the beyondness of God and to long for a truth which would not be contained by any system”; and to do this knowingly, as Chapman points out, has a bearing on some aspects of current intra-Anglican quarreling.

Framing these four articles are two responses to official documents. The issue opens with the lecture delivered by associate editor Ellen Wondra to inaugurate her tenure as Professor of Theology and Ethics at Seabury-Western Theological Seminary. The importance of her topic, the Windsor Report on Communion, has not diminished in the months since the Report was issued. Quite the re-
verse. Meanwhile, an earlier text, “The Gift of Authority,” which deals with a very similar set of issues from a very different viewpoint, has been under consideration throughout the Anglican Communion. As part of the consideration, it is important that official responses to this third agreed statement of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission should be shared among the churches on the Anglican side of that important ecumenical dialogue. The Review is pleased to make available for wider study the one response (so far) from a province in the “global South,” namely the Episcopal Anglican Church of Brazil.

Most readers will be familiar with the ATR’s Seminaries Abroad Gift Program, but few are aware that in addition to sending the journal free of charge to seminaries and Christian communities around the world, our office also receives inquiries and requests from students, priests, and teachers in many countries for whom the price of a subscription is beyond their means. Over the years, it has been possible in various ways to meet some of these requests, though not as many as we should like. Recently we received a letter from a former professor in Vanuatu who wrote, “I want to thank you with all my heart for the complimentary subscription that you all have sent.” He went on to write that he had been moved to a new ministry in the Solomon Islands: “I brought with me every copy of the ATR that you sent me. Is it possible for you to change my address and for me to keep receiving it? Even though I can’t afford a subscription, I do read every word and talk about the articles with our students.” A seminarian in Cuba who also receives a gift subscription wrote, “My wishes to subscribe to the Review have been sadly roadblocked by facts beyond my will . . . and you have turned it all into a reality, with generosity and good will . . . . I do want to say that [receiving the journal] is going to be an occasion to celebrate both the beautiful mind of our faith and the generosity of another child of God.”

Because the subscription requests are multiplying and because we think our readers will want to share the journal with friends throughout the Anglican Communion, we are establishing the Overseas Subscription Fund. Donations will be used to send the ATR to individuals who are unable to subscribe but well able to enjoy and profit from (if we may so) the outstanding work of the authors whose
writing we publish. Please consider making a contribution. Who knows where in the world it might enable someone to read every word?
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