

Charles as he rediscovers the mortal Sarah amid the Pre-Raphaelites on the Chelsea Embankment, or else he may walk alone from the house: 'The river of life, of mysterious laws and mysterious choice, flows past a deserted embankment; and along that other deserted embankment Charles now began to pace, a man behind the invisible gun-carriage on which rests his own corpse. He walks towards an imminent, self-given death? I think not; for he has at last found an atom of faith in himself, a true uniqueness, on which to build; has already begun, though he would still bitterly deny it, though there are tears in his eyes to support his denial, to realize that life, however advantageously Sarah may in some ways seem to fit the role of Sphinx, is not a symbol, is not one riddle and one failure to guess it, is not to inhabit one face alone or to be given up after one losing throw of the dice; but is to be, however inadequately, emptily, hopelessly into the city's iron heart, endured. And out again, upon the unplumb'd, salt, estranging sea.'

Contemplation and Mission

Simon Tugwell, O.P.

The Church is both called and sent by God: called to sanctity and to salvation, and sent to preach the gospel to the whole creation (Mark 16, 15), healing the sick and driving out demons (Matt. 10, 8). It is only where action and contemplation have become secularized (or, for that matter, sacralized—it comes to the same thing), that any contradiction appears; that is to say, it is only because we try to apprehend and to practise prayer or good works without seeing how they proceed from the mission of Jesus Christ, that the hoary problem of reconciling and balancing the two arises.

'You shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the end of the earth.' 'As the Father has sent me, even so I send you . . . Receive the Holy Spirit' (Acts 1, 8; John 20, 21f). In their different ways, each of the evangelists (even the unexpanded Mark) concludes with some kind of experience of the risen, exalted Lord, coupled with a command to go and tell people, to bear witness, whether by word or by example. Luke's Pentecost story is but the most dramatic version of this.

Now, as I have suggested,¹ for those who did not live with Jesus on earth, baptism is the appointed way into the whole event of Calvary to Pentecost. In baptism we die with Christ and rise with

¹'He will Baptize you in the Holy Spirit.' *New Blackfriars*, June 1971.

him, receiving the Spirit that we may live no longer for sin and self, but for God. Of itself, this obviously does not entail any formally apostolic mission; but it certainly includes some kind of obligation to bear witness. 'To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good. To one is given through the Spirit the word of wisdom, and to another the word of knowledge according to the same Spirit . . . for just as the body is one and has many members, so it is with Christ. For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body' (I Cor. 12, 7ff). Tertullian is quite in line with this when he exhorts the newly-baptized, as they emerge from the font, to pray for an 'apportioning of charisms'.

We are baptized not simply into a community of salvation, but also into a missionary body bearing witness to the lordship of Jesus Christ. As we enter more fully into the reality of our baptism, our own mission within the Church can be expected to become clearer and more effective.

Now, as I have suggested,¹ what contemplation is essentially about is precisely the 'manifestation of baptism', the conscious and free appropriation of God's working in us. If this is so, there can be no genuine contemplation which is closed to mission. And if, as I further suggested,² following Karl Rahner, contemplation needs to be seen in terms of prophecy, the implication becomes even clearer. As in Isaiah's famous experience, the vision of God's glory leads straight into the question, 'Whom shall I send?'

At this point I must, once again, mention the Pentecostal teaching about this, and also one quite respectable Catholic theory of confirmation. Pentecostals, as we should expect, link mission, especially charismatic mission, with 'baptism in the Spirit', which, for them, is a man's personal Pentecost, distinguished fairly sharply from the grace of conversion and water-baptism. Using, often, exactly the same scriptural texts, Catholic theology too has sometimes regarded confirmation as a man's commissioning to witness in the full power of the Spirit. Baptism is seen as conferring saving grace, while confirmation confers the power to witness.

Now, confirmation is a notoriously difficult subject! But it seems pretty clear that, like Pentecostal doctrine, the latin theory of confirmation evolved very much out of a particular historical situation; it is completely different, for instance, from the eastern Christian theory. The most thorough scriptural and patristic research (especially the work of G. W. H. Lampe and, more recently, J. D. Dunn) tends to draw the emphasis very much back to the one event of repentance and baptism. The older practice did not separate confirmation from baptism, and the eastern churches have remained faithful to this. The Vatican Council, in emphatic terms, insisted on the retention of the eastern practice, and further decreed that the

¹'The Manifestation of Baptism.' *New Blackfriars*, July 1971.

²'Prophecy and the Gift of Tongues.' *New Blackfriars*, August 1971.

latin rite be revised 'in order that the intimate connexion of this sacrament with the whole of Christian initiation may appear more clearly'. It seems that adult converts are normally to receive both sacraments at once.

So we do not have to, indeed we should not seek to make any sharp separation between sanctification and mission. Rather, they are two aspects of the one life given to us by Christ in the Holy Spirit. The unfolding of this one life cannot be fitted to a blueprint; moral transformation, public witness, charismatic ministry, contemplative prayer, all these are involved, but in what degree and order they will grow cannot be determined in advance.

It is true, all the same, that there are two things that we can distinguish. There are the specific ministries within the Church, at least some of which begin at some definite point in time subsequent to baptism. And there is also the witnessing which consists simply in the kind of transformed life that the Christians live (cf. especially John 13, 35; 17, 23. It is interesting that John never once uses the word 'preach'). These two complement each other. It is greatly to the credit of the Pentecostals that they have revived the whole range of ministries in the Church, and we can ill afford to spurn this lesson. However, the more Johannine emphasis on the perfecting of our own lives in love is just as important. As Wesley said, 'the work of God does not prosper where perfect love is not preached'.

'If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, without having love, I am a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal. If I have prophecy and know all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have complete faith so as to move mountains, but without having love, I am nothing. And if I give away all my possessions and hand over my body to be burned, but without having love, I gain nothing' (I Cor. 13, 1-3). St Paul is not recommending love instead of tongues, prophecy, good works; he bids us seek such things. Nor is he denying the reality of the various phenomena of moral and social excellence, mystical knowledge and miraculous powers. Only, in his view, the phenomena, of themselves, have no Christian significance at all. Deeper than all the phenomena is love, and it is love that validates all our moral and religious acts; it is love that makes them Christian.

And St Paul does not mean simply a human sentiment of love. There is more to the man who gives away all his goods, but without love, than simply wrong human motivation. Love, for St Paul, is the love poured out in our hearts by the Holy Spirit.

'And in this is love: not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son as a propitiation for our sins' (I John 4, 10). The love which makes our contemplation, our good works, our miracles, Christian, is not, in the first place, a fact about us at all, it is a fact about God. Deeper even than the phenomenon of human love, is the fact of God's love, the fact of Jesus Christ.

And here we touch the very nub of the Christian mystery. Deeper

than our ministries and works, deeper than our prayer and contemplation, lies the reality of God's everlasting Will, the eternal generation of his Son, in that inconceivable ecstasy of love which is the Holy Spirit proceeding from them both; in which already, from before all time, the Father also wills his whole creation and all that is or will be in it. That we should love and know is only a function of our being loved and being known.

This means that we can base our lives on nothing in ourselves, however sanctified. It is man's peculiar privilege to be nothing in himself; it is only in so far as we transcend ourselves that there is any possibility of sense. We may transcend ourselves into the world, letting the world construct and interpret us. Or we may let God mould us. We cannot serve two masters, we must choose. And to opt for God is, in principle, to opt for living wholly on his terms, and that means, living at a level deeper than ourselves, deeper than anything we can really comprehend.

This means, on the one hand, a total detachment from phenomena of all kinds. If we work, we must not depend on success, and we must be prepared to stop working. If we pray, similarly we must not look for success; and we must be prepared to stop praying. The Spirit is as unaccountable as the wind.

So, on the other hand, we must be prepared to take all phenomena in our stride. The principle of unity in our lives is quite simply God's Will, transforming our will into his own. This is the answer to the problem, so vexed in all the manuals of spirituality, how to combine love of God with love of neighbour. There is no problem. The fundamental reality is not my love at all, but God's. My love for God is a function of his love for me; my love for other people is a function of *his* love for them. In everything it is God who works in us 'both to will and to work' (Phil. 2, 13). So, just as in prayer we must seek to pray the prayers that God gives us, so in action we must seek to do the good works 'that God has prepared for us to walk in' (Eph. 2, 10). This is the love that validates our prayer and our activities; it is not a matter of our motivation, but of the reality of Jesus Christ, who is the Will of the Father.

And so we cannot opt out of the 'greater works than these' which our Lord promised us that we should do (John 14, 12). Healing the sick, casting out demons, even raising the dead, are part of the job given to the Church (Matt. 10, 8). It is not for us to decide that we are unworthy to do such things—anyway, what makes us think that we are worthy to do the things we *do* do? When St Catherine said to the Lord on one occasion, 'I am not worthy', he replied, 'No, but I am worthy'.

In 850 a local church council specially bid the clergy preach the sacrament of the sick 'by which sins are forgiven, and so bodily health is restored'. At last the church is again beginning to pay serious attention to her healing ministry, both in the sacrament and

more widely. The ministry of exorcism, unfortunately, still seems sadly neglected in the Catholic Church, though the Church of England has given an exemplary lead. At a time when so many are dabbling in spiritualism and magic and diverse kinds of occultism, it is particularly lamentable that the Church pays so little attention to the battle against demonic powers. This too is part of her job, whether we like it or not.

It would be tedious to relate the various ministries in the church which have largely gone into abeyance, or underground. What is vital is that we grasp the principle of all ministries, official or unofficial, spectacular or unspectacular. The vital root of all Christian action, as of all Christian prayer, is the Will of God. And this is something that cannot be judged by the standards of the world. In so far as we act as Christians, we act, humanly speaking, unjustifiably. This is, of course, typical of prophetic action, and, as we saw, all Christians are called, at least in this sense, to be prophets. We must be prepared to do things that we cannot explain, to say things that we cannot really back up. We must be ready to act, to speak, to pray, on the authority of God himself. ('And he gave them authority over diseases . . .' (Matt. 10, 1.)

The fundamental tenet of Christianity, perhaps, is that God reveals himself to us. But what we have been rather reluctant to face is that this happens, not only in general terms, moral and theological principles and so on, and through the officials of the Church, but in the particular, and to each one of us, in so far as we are willing to look. Increasingly, the Christian should be one who is led by the Spirit; whose motivation, therefore, becomes more and more inscrutable, even to himself, whose activity is likely to look ever more and more wayward (June 3, 8). It is not enough for him simply to look around the world and see what needs to be done; he must seek to discover what God is giving him to do. He must learn not to work, so that God can show him what he is to do. And he must not judge by outward criteria of success or failure (the Crucifixion didn't exactly look like success). He must abandon himself more and more to God's unaccountable ways, with little to assure him that he is on the right tracks, except that, somehow, it *is* right.

And, of course, this is not illuminism. 'The wisdom that is from above is peaceful, gentle, open to reason' (James 3, 17). Divine guidance draws together into harmony all our various levels of knowledge and intuition, and leads to a quiet confidence, far removed from the stubbornness and contentiousness of the merely opinionated man.

In fact, the truly spiritual man is characterized by a profound realism. Because he has let God be God, he can forgo cares and ambitions; he can surrender the luxury of ideology, and all its attendant righteous indignation. He does not have to constrain the world to prove his point. A Biafran child is simply a Biafran child,

not the proof of a political theory; a Bengali refugee is simply a Bengali refugee, and as such can be loved with a pure love, barbed by no latent selfishness. The spiritual man, because he is not trying to make a point, never has to make anyone feel 'got at' by his charity. Most of our human interaction is to some extent soured by our need to assert or to abase ourselves, to prove or to disprove some hypothesis. The spiritual man has, in a sense, dispensed with theories. He acts with sublime authority—as it was said of St Dominic that, having prayed and deliberated, he hardly ever changed his mind. But the result is not tyranny or arrogance, but an amazing purity of love. And this is because human motivation is swallowed up in divine motivation. And God's love sets us truly free. Our love finds its fulfilment in being transformed into God's love, and only then will our works be truly fruitful.

But, as I have already intimated, this can only happen where there is a profound detachment from the results of our actions. Of course, anxiety about results notoriously impedes results; but this is more than a bit of practical lore: results belong to God, and we must genuinely not mind what happens, so long as we have done, so far as we can, what we believe is given to us to do.

There is a great temptation in all religious revival to put a premium on spiritual success; and where, as in Pentecostalism, there is a pronounced interest in charismatic manifestations, there can be a most terrifying kind of triumphalism. People are blackmailed into physical and spiritual healing, and coerced into a particular kind of spiritual experience, greatly to the detriment of their total well-being.

There is no doubt at all that any spirituality tends to get the results that it expects. If you are determined enough, you will almost certainly find that everything falls into your lap—money will turn up when you need it, you will feel always on top of the world, lots of people will show dramatic signs of improvement under your ministry. It looks as if God is vindicating your every move.

The only trouble is, that any competent magician—and I know several—can claim just the same. As St Paul reminded us, the phenomena of themselves mean nothing, from a Christian point of view, without love. And this does not mean, I repeat, human sentiment; it means that total realism that lets God be God, that lets God's love work. And that means a love that gets crucified, it does not mean success. There are certain evangelists, so-called, with colossal and thriving ministries, who advertise the gospel largely in terms of a success story: faith makes you psychologically and physically strong, and your business prosper. So it does; but is this necessarily anything to do with Jesus Christ?

According to St Thomas, schism is a sin against charity. One of the greatest hazards for renewal movements in Christianity has always been schism, the desire to set up a perfectionist Church, a

Church of the 'full gospel'. The results have always been the same (see already St Paul's first letter to the Corinthians). Somehow, it is only in the Church, in the tiresome medley of mediocre people who normally make up the Church, that true Christian love is found. We are not to say 'I am Paul's man' or 'I am for Apollos' or 'I am for Christ' (perhaps the worst schismatic cry of all). Nor should we say 'I am a Marxist' or 'I am a Pentecostal'. There is something profoundly realistic about the Church; in taking the Church just as it is, not starting movements, not starting campaigns, but simply loving and waiting upon God in prayer and service, 'preserving the unity of the Spirit', our fruits may be much less impressive, our experience much less exciting; but we shall be all the more truly rooted and grounded in love, and our works, some of them, at least, may survive, because they are secure on the one foundation that has been laid.

Incarnation as Translation by Frank O'Hara

There has been a remarkable convergence in recent years between Catholic and Protestant theology in the field of christology. The old pattern was that Catholic theologians offered scholastic interpretations of the incarnation, centring on such conciliar and scholastic concepts as person, nature, subsistence and existence, while Protestants followed some form of kenoticism. Kenotic theories of the incarnation, ostensibly based on the ancient hymn in Philippians 2, 5–11, affirmed some sort of change of the Logos or Word of God into human form, and ran into insuperable difficulties concerning the immutability of God as taught by the Bible (cf. Wisdom 7, 27, James 1, 17, and especially Psalm 102, 25–27 and Ecclesiasticus 42, 20–21).

Instead of this dichotomy, there is now emerging a new type of christology, which I classify as 'translation christology'. Among its supporters I would list J.-J. Latour, Christian Duquoc, Edouard Schillebeeckx, Christopher Butler and Charles Davis among the Catholics, and John McIntyre and Wolfhart Pannenberg among the Protestants. Many other modern authors can be quoted in support of the view, although few if any have explicitly made the concept of translation the heart and centre of their christology.

But pride of place must go to Eustace of Antioch, that staunch supporter of St Athanasius who was deposed from his bishopric by the Arians. 'As God the Son, he says, is the image of the Father, so is the man whom He wore the image of the divine Son, though in a