

St Mark's Review in the twenty-first century: valuable 'window' into this decade?

Neil Bowey

Methodology

The aim of this paper is to identify whether and how *St Mark's Review* (SMR) provides a valuable 'window' into the twenty-first century. But how does one begin critically to examine ten years or so of a journal?

Being unable to access printed copies in a remote locality, I have downloaded the electronic field labels (supplied by Informit) into EndNote and created a database of the 210 papers accessible in that period.¹ There appear to be other SMR articles *not* accessible electronically so I have not considered the latter. It was relatively simple to access authors, years and keywords. A more challenging task was to determine what events were important; the 210 articles cover a broad field. Was it better to précis the whole decade of articles, or to concentrate on one specific event?

Neil Bowey is a Master of Theology student in the School of Theology, Charles Sturt University.

I have relied on the wisdom of Graeme Garrett. He edited a book on the fifty years of SMR from 1955–2005² and titled the volume after a seminal SMR paper and event, 'The Habit of Freedom' by Patricia Brennan, founding President for the Movement for the Ordination of Women (SMR 168, 1997, pp. 6–13). This and another paper he selected, 'Obedience, a Questionable Virtue', by Marie Louise Uhr, founder of the group Ordination of Catholic Women (173, 1998, pp. 3–9), convinced me to accept gender inclusiveness as the 'window' into my chosen period of the twenty-first century, and thus to chart the ripples these papers produced in subsequent issues of SMR. In addition it seems that the subject of the ordination of women was highly significant in an Australian Anglican context as opposed to in the Uniting Church where it has been far less controversial or in the Roman Catholic tradition where the issue cannot seriously be promoted. It is significant that Garrett highlighted the fact that Brennan's and Uhr's papers did not appear in SMR until the late 1990s.³ However, before discussing SMR's contributions to gender issues, I examine the rationale for this journal, its *raison d'être*, and consider an overview of the journal from 2001 to 2010.

A short history of *St Mark's Review*

St Mark's National Theological Centre (St Mark's), St Mark's National Memorial Library and SMR are interconnected. Bishop Ernest Henry Burgmann, founding Editor of SMR 1955–1959, said of St Mark's:

It will be the express purpose of St Mark's in all its activities in church and college to restore theology to its proper place in the thought of the nation ... The Church cannot go on at an educational level that is lower than that which prevails in the world. If it tries to do so it will lose the respect of thinking people and be ruled out as no longer relevant.⁴

Burgmann intended SMR 'to be the organ of communication between the Library and College and all the Friends of St Mark's throughout the Commonwealth' (216, 2011, p. 76). Burgmann was concerned by the low level of Anglican theological education in Australia and saw SMR as the channel for St Mark's to promote its ideals (216, 2011, p. 79). All Editors of SMR have been Anglican and most have been ordained. The target audience for SMR has never been academics but 'the intelligent and informed lay person.'⁵ As Garrett⁶ (Editor of SMR 1992–1999) indicated, SMR 'is not and never has

been a specialist journal' (218, 2011, p. 76). Perhaps that is the reason why Informit (the online source for SMR) does not indicate SMR to be peer reviewed.⁷ Whilst opining that SMR has contributed towards a picture of Australian history since 1955, Garrett allowed that the view has especially tended towards the Anglican Church (218, 2011, p. 74.) Tom Frame, Editor 2000–2002 and 2007–2010, stated that of Australian magazines and journals begun in the mid-1950s, only SMR and two other publications remain (216, 2011, p. 76).⁸

Garrett lamented the fact that, over fifty years, SMR has been heavily androcentric as regards both language and authorship. Only 9 per cent of articles from 1965–1975 were authored by women, and the language was still all 'man' and 'his' (164, 1996, p. 24). In 1979 Kevin Giles authored a paper arguing a biblical case for the ordination of women, and in 1980 SMR devoted an issue to 'Women in the Church', (165, 1996, p. 23). In spite of this, the 'seismic social shift in gender relations' was given only a fleeting glimpse during the period 1975–1984 (165, 1996, p. 26). Frame conceded, that 'with the wisdom of hindsight ... the thoughts and opinions ... published [have not] always been wise or just' (216, 2011, p. 82).

An examination of *St Mark's Review* 2001–2010⁹

For the years 2001–2010 inclusive there were 31 issues (issues 184–214) produced. SMR is billed as a quarterly, but in the years 2005–2007 only two issues were produced each year, while in 2003, 2004 and 2008, three issues were published annually. Thus the full quota of four quarterly issues appeared only in 2001–2002 and 2009–2010 (and has continued to the present).

The 210 articles electronically accessible include standard papers, editorials, review articles and review essays. I have not discriminated between the different categories of articles; overall they are equally relevant. To give two specific examples, Duncan Reid reviewed Kevin Giles' book, *Jesus and the Father: Modern Evangelicals Reinvent the Doctrine of the Trinity* (2006) with relevance to the Diocese of Sydney (201, 2006, pp. 50–52) and Frame wrote a substantial review on two books; the first being *Saints, Sinners and Goalposts: A History of All Saints East St Kilda* by Colin Holden (2008) and the second *Divine Discontent – The Brotherhood of St Laurence: A History* by Colin Holden and Richard Trembah (2008), (208, 2009, pp. 93–101). The 210 articles are authored by only 132 authors¹⁰; a number of writers have authored multiple papers. 43 papers have been by women; 20 per cent¹¹ is

an improvement on the 9 per cent recorded in 1965–1975. 34, or 26 per cent, of the 132 authors have been women.

There are 30 authors from whom more than one paper has been published during 2001–2010. It could be argued that they were accepted for multiple publications because of the quality or the relevance of their work or, in some cases, because their work was controversial. All 30 authors are either Anglican priests and/or in some way connected to St Mark's or Charles Sturt University (CSU). Of these 30 authors, five have been women.

The highest number of published articles is from Frame with 19 contributions of which nine are editorials. It is curious that online, no other editorials are indicated except for 12 during the period 1977–1984.¹² With one exception, all of Frame's other ten papers were published in 2001–2002 or 2007–2010, both periods when he was Editor. The exception was a defence of Archbishop Peter Hollingworth in 2003 (194, 2003, pp. 34–37).

Scott Cowdell contributed the second highest number of published articles with nine entries, ten if an extensive interview co-authored with sociologist Trevor Hogan is included. This was also on the Hollingworth affair (194, 2003, pp. 3–12). Cowdell's contributions over the period 2001–2010 extend either side of his period as Editor. Heather Thomson has six entries distributed throughout the decade. Frame also had five papers published from 1994–1999 and three papers in 2011. Cowdell had four papers included from 1988–1998 plus three papers accepted in 2011. Thomson was twice published in 1995 and 1999 and once in 2011. A total of 14 writers have authored three or more papers and another 16 have had two papers published.

Gender inclusiveness and *St Mark's Review*

Before referring to Brennan's (1997) and Uhr's (1998) papers previously mentioned, I make a brief detour. St Mark's is in the geographic area of the Diocese of Canberra and Goulburn. On 2 February 1992, ten women and four men were to be ordained in St Saviour's Cathedral Goulburn. This was blocked by an injunction granted by the NSW Supreme Court.¹³ Thus the first ordination of women in the Anglican Church of Australia did not occur in the Diocese of Canberra and Goulburn but in Perth, on 7 March 1992, when the then Primate of Australia, Archbishop Peter Carnley ordained in St George's Cathedral ten women and one man (the husband of one of the women).¹⁴ In his sermon he declared:

Today, we are peeling away the sickly yellow, faded, silverfish-ridden wallpaper with which the Church has surrounded itself and imprisoned its women for centuries in its benign and perhaps well-meaning determination to confine them by role. We are peeling away the wallpaper in order to liberate women from the well-intentioned but humanly diminishing stereotypes in which they have been bound.¹⁵

The Anglican ordination of women had been subject to 14 years of 'humiliating public debate' until in 1991 the General Synod cut a deal with the Diocese of Sydney, 'Let the rest of us ordain our women in exchange for releasing you to do whatever you like with yours' (168, 1997, p. 11). Brennan saw an analogy between this deal and the deal made between the Ephraimite and the men of the city in Judges 19: (168, 1997, p. 11).

Here are my virgin daughter and his concubine; let me bring them out now. Ravish them and do whatever you want to them; but against this man do not do such a vile thing (Judges 19:24, NRSV).

Thus Archbishop Carnley was able to conduct these ordinations in 1992; other dioceses have followed. The notable exception is the Diocese of Sydney, the diocese of which Brennan now sees herself as 'one on the margins' (168, 1997, p. 6). Uhr, like Brennan, also used a biblical analogy. In Genesis 16:2 Sarai tells Abram to conceive a child through Hagar. This he does. Later (Genesis 21:10–14) Sarah tells Abraham to get rid of Hagar and her son Ishmael. This he does. Uhr likens Abraham's blind obedience to the attitude of the Catholic Church, 'It does not seem important to Abraham whether Hagar and his son survived the ordeal; what mattered was that he remained "pre-eminently obedient to God's command"' (173, 1998, p. 3). Sadly Uhr died on 28 July 2001 and Sarah Macneil wrote a moving tribute to her the same year, in SMR (186, 2001, p. 31).

I now examine articles involving gender inclusiveness in the period specifically under investigation, 2001–2010, in chronological order. SMR issue 189 of 2002 contains a number of relevant papers. Brennan wrote on the history of the ordination of women debate, introducing her history with the astute comment, "The job of an historian, like that of a high jumper, is to get just far enough back "in the past" to make a reasonable chance of

clearing "the present" (p. 3). She made the intriguing point that Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics, normally at opposite ends of the doctrinal spectrum, banded together to outmanoeuvre the Liberals (p. 3–4). Colleen O'Reilly, an Anglican priest in suburban Melbourne, observed that in that diocese ordained women have been readily accepted but darkly hinted that 'the reality is different in other places', 'largely confined to one diocese' (pp. 9–10). Penny Jamieson, Bishop of Dunedin, New Zealand had been a bishop for twelve years when she wrote with droll humour, 'One of the advantages that women have always held over men, is that no one, not anyone, ever, mistakes us for God', and goes on to caution against feminine hubris (p. 14). She indicated that especially in Australia, the United States and England there is considerable opposition to the ordination of women as bishops (p. 13). Catherine Waynick, Bishop of Indianapolis, USA got irritated when asked to speak on 'the special gifts women bring to ministry' (p. 19). She took the quite reasonable view that men and women are both equally competent (and non-competent). She complained that she was taught that Thomas Aquinas declared women to be 'inferior matter' and therefore unworthy of ordination, but when she asked her male colleagues to explain how this could be when women were created from men, the conversation very quickly changed (p. 9). Geryl Wolf, Bishop of Rhode Island, related that when she was studying in a seminary in 1974, she lived for a time in an Anglo-Catholic convent. Even her own confessor told her 'that he was praying I would take the veil instead of the collar' (p. 23). Her paper dwelt on the leadership role that a bishop should take; she did not dwell on the fact that she is a woman and takes it in her stride that she is a bishop (pp. 23–26).

David McCall, Bishop of Bunbury, Western Australia, contributed a brief but succinct personal viewpoint on 'How Did a Traditionalist Accept the Ordination of Women?' (pp. 27–29). When the debate began circa 1970 he was deeply opposed to such an idea, and as a priest in Adelaide from 1978–1987 'rarely missed an opportunity' to register his disapproval of the concept (p. 27). In 1988, newly consecrated as a bishop, he joined around 200 other Anglican bishops who signed the Ash Wednesday declaration. These bishops declared their opposition to the ordination of women priests (p. 27). His opposition was on ecclesial grounds rather than being ontological; namely, that if the whole Church, including the Orthodox and Roman Catholic, were to agree, then he would have no problem (p. 27). McCall first began to doubt his stand when a senior colleague declared that 'God is male

and therefore priests must be male' (p. 27). He affirmed that because God is without gender, such a declaration is a nonsense. The incarnation was not about Jesus being made male but being made human, the Latin of the Nicene Creed being worded *homo factus est* and not *vir factus est* (p. 28). He now accepts that the right to ordination is not determined by gender; rather, there is no right to ordination; a person of either gender must receive a call. Furthermore, he considers that anyone who demands ordination on the grounds that they have a right should automatically be rejected (pp. 28–29). He still laments the fact that the Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches have not ventured down the *homo* pathway, but accepts the fact, that in the circumstances, the Anglican Church had to act independently (p. 29).

The article authored by Duncan Reid in SMR 189 of 2002 reported on the findings of two consultations held in 1996 between the Orthodox and Old Catholics (p. 34–36). Reid rhetorically asked if more discussion on the ordination of women was really necessary and answered 'yes'. As he said of the Anglican conundrum, 'we still have dioceses in Australia that are strongly resistant to women's ordination, and as a church we have yet to allow for the consecration of women bishops' (p. 34). He pointed out that Anglicans have been in full communion for over 70 years with the Old Catholics who, in most provinces of Europe, ordain women priests (p. 34). The findings of the 1996 consultations are relevant. Even though these findings have no official standing, they are significant. A key sentence of the 'Common Considerations' statement reads, '*We have reached the common conclusion that there are no compelling dogmatic-theological reasons for not ordaining women to the priesthood*' (p. 36, Reid's italics). Heather Thomson rounded out this gynocentric SMR issue with a pithy review of feminist theology. She cited Elizabeth Cady Stanton as concluding that, so long as the Church continues to teach the subordination of women, there will be no equality, and Mary Daly as suggesting that if women stay in an androcentric church that they 'may as well assent to their own lobotomies' (p. 37).

SMR 198 of 2005 was devoted to 'Subordinationism and Gender Politics: An Australian Theological Debate'. It is fitting that the colloquium was introduced by Archbishop Carnley, the Anglican Archbishop who first ordained women as priests. The symposium was held in Melbourne in 2004 to discuss a 1999 Report of the Doctrine Commission of the Diocese of Sydney. This Report, entitled 'The Doctrine of the Trinity and its Bearing on the Relationship of Men and Women', argued that just as the Son is subordinate

to the Father, women are subordinate to men. Archbishop Carnley considered this view to savour of Arianism (p. 3). He expressed disappointment that, even though the symposium was well supported, only one then-current member of the Sydney Diocese Doctrine Commission attended (p. 3). With perhaps unintended humour and irony, he contended that the intricateness of the Doctrine of the Trinity 'has never been amongst the easiest of theological topics for Christians to get their minds around' (p. 4).

The opening paper, also written by Archbishop Carnley, was critical of this Commission's concept of subordination and blamed TC Hammond, Principal of Moore Theological College in the 1930s, for introducing this doctrine and for the problems that have subsequently arisen in Sydney from its implementation (p. 5). He reiterated Peter Adam when he pointed out that, in Moore College circles, Hammond is revered 'almost to the point' of veneration (p. 5). Adam, then Principal of Ridley College Melbourne, wrote that Hammond is 'a figure of virtually iconic significance in the Diocese of Sydney' (p. 12). He opined that Carnley's accusing some Sydney Anglicans of being Arian is tantamount to implying that they are not Christian (p. 11). Adam accused Carnley as Primate of acting like a bully and opined that it 'does not honour Jesus Christ, the head and Saviour of the church' (pp. 11–12).

Adam was also critical of Kevin Giles who presented the next paper. In fact Giles' book, *The Trinity and Subordination: the Doctrine of God and the Contemporary Gender Debate* (2002), was initially responsible for the colloquium's being set up (p. 24). Giles did not take the Doctrine of the Trinity lightly; he avowed that not since the fourth century have theologians devoted so much time and effort on it. In his opinion it is no longer 'an obtuse, secondary and impractical dogma' (p. 19); rather it summates God's whole relationship to humankind. Giles showed an ability to be able simply to précis the Doctrine of the Trinity:

If no one is before or after, greater or lesser in the Godhead, this must suggest that all hierarchical ordering in this world is a human construct reflecting fallen existence, not God's ideal. God would like to see every human being valued in the same way (p. 19).

Giles lamented that conservative evangelicals take a contrary view. He opined that because they believe that the Father has headship over the Son, that in like manner men have headship over women, both in the church and

the home (p. 19). Giles stated that for these conservative evangelicals, the Doctrine of the Trinity is not the issue at all, rather it is the vehicle for 'a great cause', namely that women shall be forever subordinate to men (p. 20).

Andrew McGowan wrote on Arius. McGowan steered well clear of any mention of subordination and the status of women. His unique and captivating turn of phrase summed Arius in terms which could caution both the conservative-evangelical and the liberal camps:

Since we are dealing with someone [Arius] who, depending on one's perspective, could be either the Philip Jensen or the Jack Spong of ancient Christianity, a level of circumspection is called for in using the name of Arius as a label for later constructs, We might even ask ... 'was Arius an Arian?' (p. 25).

The history of the Nicene Creed is extremely convoluted and McGowan (p. 27) offered the caution and advice that 'historians are perhaps less likely than systematic theologians to say that subordination as such was excluded at either' the Councils of Nicaea (325) or Constantinople (381).

After McGowan's neutral and nuanced stance appeared Reid's paper on 'Trinity and Personhood'. He hypothesised that a child may be subordinate to its parents, but upon reaching adulthood obtains equality with the parents. In like manner, the Son is equal to the Father. He continued his hypothesis by suggesting 'that because these divine persons [the Trinity] were equals, then human persons were conceivably also equals (p. 30).

SMR does not close the discussion of subordination in issue 198 of 2005. Archbishop Peter Jensen is published in the next issue, 199 of 2005. Jensen confined himself to replying to Carnley's article on TC Hammond. Jensen affirmed that 'there is nothing Arian about the original report' of the Sydney Diocese Doctrine Commission on the Trinity and Subordination (p 44). He firmly rejected that Hammond was in any way guilty of latent Arianism, but conceded that Hammond 'is honoured [at Moore Theological College] ... as a giant of a previous generation' (pp. 44–46). Jensen referred Carnley's paper to David F Wright (who revised Hammond's 1936 book *In Understanding Be Men*) and attached Wright's response to the paper in SMR. Wright declared that he has not seen the Sydney Diocese Doctrine Commission paper, but conceded that in some respects 'the Son ... [is] subject

to the Father' (p. 48). Wright is mystified by Carnley's charge of Arianism against Hammond. With delightful drollery he wrote:

I am ... puzzled that, after studying patristics as an undergraduate at Cambridge and a postgraduate at Oxford and teaching it for a few years in New College, University of Edinburgh, I should have failed in the later 1960s to discern Arianism lurking in *In Understanding Be Men* (p. 46).

Wright expressed his displeasure at Carnley in no uncertain terms, 'I personally take it very ill that a book which bears my name ... should be so traduced by Dr Carnley's theorising', and later added, 'It is nothing short of outrageous to accuse T.C. Hammond of Arianism or Arianising tendencies'. He further accused Carnley of subtly re-defining Arianism to suit his own purposes (p. 47).

The final word on subordination appears in SMR 201 of 2006, where Reid reviewed Giles' book, *Jesus and the Father: Modern Evangelicals Reinvent the Doctrine of the Trinity* (2006). Giles reiterated that the Sydney Diocese Doctrine Commission 'sincerely believe certain gender roles involving subordination find their ontological foundation and justification in an eternal subordination within the Godhead' (p. 50). Reid agreed with Giles that the Sydney theologians are not Arians, and accepted that Sydney does not deny Christ's role as the eternal Logos (p. 51). Reid suggested that the debate between Sydney and other dioceses had reached a stalemate:

Each side is committed to its position with a passion which indicates that a great deal more, practically speaking, hangs on the outcome than might otherwise seem to be the case. Both sides are absolutely convinced that they are right, neither willing to concede (p. 50).

Conclusion

This critique of SMR is in no way intended as a polemic levelled against the journal; rather it is intended as an academic criticism of why church historians should be cautious in using this source. SMR was, and is, a denominational publication slanted towards communication between St Mark's and the readers of its *Review*. SMR's denominational and institutional ethos has its advantages; if a church historian wished to research a particular topic from an

expressly Anglican viewpoint (and that of the Anglican Church of Australia in particular), then the journal would indeed provide a valuable 'window'.

On the matter of gender inclusiveness in the Anglican Church of Australia I do consider that SMR has provided a valuable 'window' into a uniquely Anglican debate with conservative-evangelicals (with Anglo-Catholic backup) on one side and liberals (with non-conservative evangelical backup) on the other. Church historians should remain mindful that SMR is the voice of St Mark's and as such is weighted towards that institution's ethos. If an historian wished to research the matter from a conservative-evangelical viewpoint such as is represented by the Diocese of Sydney, then I suggest that historian should look to some other journal or publication.

Endnotes

1. I am grateful to Charles Sturt University Library for technical advice on saving Informit records to EndNote.
2. Garrett, *The Habit of Freedom*, p. 6.
3. Garrett, *The Habit of Freedom*, p. 5.
4. Cited in Graeme Garrett (ed.), *The Habit of Freedom: Fifty Years of St Mark's Review*, Barton Books, Canberra, 2011, pp. 1–2.
5. Garrett, *The Habit of Freedom*, p. 3.
6. In general my chronology of SMR Editors comes from Garrett, *The Habit of Freedom*, p. 294.
7. There are some exceptions, for example the papers of Reid, 198, 2005, pp. 29–31 and Cowdell, 200, 2006, pp. 43–49, have notes saying 'This article has been peer reviewed'.
8. The two publications are *Overland* and *Quadrant*.
9. My statistics in this 'examination' section come either by direct access to Informit or the EndNote database created from it.
10. To be precise, there are five of these papers authored by more than one person. I have only counted the primary authors.
11. That is 43 out of a total of 210 papers.
12. There is an editorial indicated by Clive Rodger in 161, 1995. Other editorials may well exist, but there is no indication of their existence on Informit.
13. Harris, 'One for the ladies; 20 years of women's ordination in Australia', (2012), <http://www.abc.net.au/local/stories/2012/03/07/3447615.htm> viewed 12 July 2012. The Canberra and Goulburn candidates were not ordained until December 1992.
14. Peter Carnley, 'The Yellow Wallpaper', in *The Yellow Wallpaper and other Sermons*, HarperCollins, Sydney, 2001, p. 85.
15. Carnley, 'The Yellow Wallpaper', p. 87.