---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

The Churchman Advertiser.

*JULY*, 1932.

# Missionary Captured !

## probably killed.

*Antioch reports :*

Miss Edgar of Latakia was removed from the City about 4 o'clock and very little has been heard of her since. There is no doubt but that she has been murdered and as a martyr, too. The truth may never come out, but we feel sure about it.

Most likely there will be more of this sort of thing . . . it is part of the price that some will have to pay.

The Evangelist you support had to leave and go elsewhere. To-day we hear he has had to leave that place also. This is his experience of taking up the Cross.

Please pray for these faithful labourers in Syria and Palestine.

Your gifts to support this truly Gospel work greatly appreciated.

**Bible Lands Missions' Aid Society,**
**76P Strand, London, W.C.2.**

HARRY FEAR, Esq., J.P., Treasurer.
Rev. S. W. GENTLE-CACKETT, Secretary.

# CONTENTS.

PAGE

NOTES AND COMMENTS .. .. .. .. .. .. 157
The Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen. The Findings of the Conference. Intercommunion. Disestablishment.

THE OXFORD CONFERENCE OF EVANGELICAL CHURCHMEN.
Subject: THE WAY OF REVIVAL

Opening Address, THE CENTRALITY OF THE CROSS. By the Rev. C. M. Chavasse, M.A., M.C. .. .. .. .. .. 160

CONVERSION. By the Rev. W. W. Cash, D.S.O., O.B.E. .. 169

PROFESSOR RUDOLF OTTO AND "THE IDEA OF THE HOLY." By J. W. Harvey, Esq., M.A. .. .. .. .. .. 176

THE ABIDING SIGNIFICANCE OF THE APOCALYPTIC. By the Rev. J. W. Oman, D.D. .. .. .. .. .. .. 184

PROFESSOR KARL BARTH AND THE THEOLOGY OF CRISIS. By the Rev. A. J. Macdonald, D.D. .. .. .. .. 192

THE GRACE OF GOD. By the Rev. G. F. Graham Brown, M.A. 202

DR. FRANK N. D. BUCHMAN AND THE GROUP MOVEMENT. By the Rev. J. Thornton-Duesbery, M.A. .. .. .. .. 207

THE CONVERSION OF SIMON FISH. By John Knipe .. .. 218

REVIEWS OF BOOKS .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 228
The Development of Religious Toleration in England. A History of Christian Thought. Calvin and Calvinism. Hildebrand (Gregory VII). Jesus Came Preaching. The Church of England and her Reformations. Christus Victor. Personal Problems of Conduct and Religion. The Beauty of Jesus. A Guide to the Study of the Book of Common Prayer. The Church in England. The Minister, the Method and the Message. Arnold of Brescia. The Significance of Karl Barth. Through the Prayer Book. The Romance of Death. Catholicity. The Renewed Church of the United Brethren, 1722–1930. The King's Book, 1543.

# THE CHURCHMAN

**July, 1932.**

## NOTES AND COMMENTS.

### The Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen.

THE Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen, held at St. Peter's Hall on April 6th, 7th and 8th, maintained the traditions of useful discussion and instruction already established at these Conferences. The Committee, feeling that not only is the present a critical time in the history of the country—and indeed of the world—but there is a widespread feeling abroad that a revival of religion is impending, chose for its subject " The Way of Revival " in the hope that its papers and discussions might prove of practical help to the clergy in reaping in their parishes the fruits of quickened spiritual life. The Committee also selected as a sub-title, " Ruin, Redemption, Regeneration." The Conference opened with an affirmation that the Cross is central to the whole discussion. After that, as the great purpose of the Conference was to be practical in character, three Movements which are exerting undoubted influence in revival-thinking and practice were examined, the three chief sessions of the Conference being applied to the teaching of Professor Rudolf Otto, Professor Karl Barth and Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman. Very useful discussions took place after the reading of each paper, in which many members of the Conference took part. We regret that we are unable to give the addresses of the speakers who contributed to these discussions, but they formed a useful contribution to the final drawing up of the Findings.

### The Findings of the Conference.

For the convenience of readers we give the Findings of the Conference :—

1. The Conference holds that in view of the present critical time in the history of the world a revival of personal religion, which is imperatively needed, must be the work of the Holy Spirit, and the Church must prepare itself more fully to be used for the carrying out of God's purpose for humanity.

2. The Conference thankfully recognizes the value of the " Way of Renewal " that is being carried on by the Bishops and Clergy,

but suggests that it should include a clearer call for the conversion of the sinner.

3. In regard to the tendency to-day to present the offer of salvation through the life of Christ as distinct from His death, the Conference emphasizes the objective nature of the Atonement and the centrality of the Cross as the vital factors in man's salvation.

4. The Conference recognizes with thankfulness that in the movements associated with the names of Otto and Barth, as well as in the Oxford Group Movement, the controlling thought is the supreme power and sovereign authority of God.

5. The Conference appreciates the value of the numinous element in man's approach to God as a means of elevating the idea of worship, but feels the difficulty of associating it with ideas which can be conceptually and rationally apprehended.

6. The Conference recognizes that the value of Professor Barth's teaching on the sovereign power of God is important as restoring the true conception of God's relation to man, but in its present stage it is incomplete as an adequate interpretation of all the elements in that relationship.

7. The Conference appreciates the work of the Oxford Group Movement in bringing into prominence the value of the power of complete self-surrender to God and of the exchange of religious experiences, and would appreciate the opportunity of discussing the elements in it which appear to many to be inconsistent with Christian experience and teaching throughout the ages.

8. The Conference recognizes that the urgent need of the present day is to bring the sinful nature of man under the saving power of the atoning death of Christ, and that when this is effected, renewal and regeneration are experienced by the individual soul.

9. The Conference believes that by this means the "Way of Revival" will be opened up, and to this end it emphasizes the importance of continual believing prayer on the part of all Christians.

### Intercommunion.

At the last session of the Conference Canon Guy Rogers moved the following resolution :—

"That this Conference, recognizing the great need of Reunion with Free Churchmen if the Church of England is to give an effective witness to the Nation, emphatically re-affirms its former findings on the subject.

"And believing that unity is promoted by giving sacramental expression to fellowship already existing, welcomes as a growing manifestation of the Christian spirit the specific proposals made by the Bishops for the cordial reception on occasion of Free Churchmen at the Holy Communion Service."

In moving it Canon Guy Rogers pointed out that it was difficult at first sight to see how the proposals of the Bishops for admitting Nonconformists on occasion to the Holy Communion would arouse more than a flicker of interest in a world grown accustomed to far-reaching proposals for Intercommunion and Reunion. He expressed

the firm belief that we are called in a special way to give this witness with our Nonconformist brethren in a United Church in this country, just as the Churches in South India believe that God has called them to give a United Witness to the power of the Gospel in that country.

Canon Guy Rogers' speech was reported in full in the *Record* newspaper on the 15th April last, and was trenchant and powerful in character; and the resolution being wholly in accord with the general principles of the Conference it was formally seconded by Dr. A. J. M. Macdonald and carried unanimously.

### Disestablishment.

In view of the effort being made by the Bishop of Durham and others to force the question of Disestablishment into the realm of practical politics, the issue of Sir Lewis Dibdin's collection of Essays entitled *Establishment in England* (Macmillan & Co., *7s. 6d.* net) is very welcome. Its publication just as this number of the CHURCHMAN was going to press compels us to defer our review of the book until October, but we very cordially commend it to the notice of our readers. It will be invaluable to those who may have to take part in discussions on the subject and to all who wish to have a clear and just view of a question which is being obscured by partisan prejudice and by heated declamation with regard to the connection between Parliament and the affairs of the Church.

Our own view is that the connection between religion and the State which is involved in and secured by the establishment of a National Church is of the utmost practical value and benefits the nation in ways none the less real because they are not always apparent on the surface. It remains true that "righteousness exalteth a nation and sin is a reproach to any people." Whatever therefore makes for the rational recognition of God and of the fact that "He ruleth in the affairs of men," helps towards the attainment of national righteousness and the avoidance of national sin, and should be preserved at all costs. It is not by their conduct alone that we should judge either individuals or communities, but by their ideals; and to destroy those ideals or whatever helps towards their maintenance is to that extent a lowering of the stimulus to moral and spiritual achievement.

# THE OXFORD CONFERENCE OF EVANGELICAL CHURCHMEN.

## GENERAL SUBJECT: THE WAY OF REVIVAL: RUIN, REDEMPTION, REGENERATION.

## THE CENTRALITY OF THE CROSS.

Inaugural Address by the REV. CHRISTOPHER M. CHAVASSE, M.A., M.C., Master of St. Peter's Hall, Oxford.

THE summons to the "Way of Renewal" was first sounded by the Archbishops' Pastoral of July, 1929, and again in the following summer by the Encyclical Letter of the Lambeth Report.

In the "Way of Renewal" the two means whereby the growing forces of materialism are to be checked and "our vision of God's glory" renewed are intellectual study and also corporate worship in which adoration should be the chief note. But although the Lambeth Encyclical acknowledged "that the root of our failure to behold God, and to manifest Him to the world, is sin," yet the "Way of Renewal" contained no call for the conversion of the sinful will—whereby alone we may know God in order to know about Him, and enter into what the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews describes as a worshipping relationship with God. It is to include this primary necessity of a change of heart preceding an appeal to reason or the senses, that we have altered the title of the subject of this Conference to the "Way of *Revival.*" We believe that the real issue to-day is a moral and practical one of pardon and power, and can only be met by the eternal Gospel of our Lord and Saviour. We hold that there is no way either of Revival or Renewal which does not run past the foot of the Cross, and so includes in its progress the stages of Ruin and Redemption as well as that of Regeneration.

The "Way of Renewal," with its important objects, might indeed have produced great effect in more quiet and stable times, but in these days of raw reality and ethical upheaval it has fallen upon deaf ears, and at this Conference we shall examine instead other movements which challenge us by the stir they have provoked.

All such movements, whether of Renewal or Revival—if they are to be healthy and enduring—must rest upon a well-thought-out theology. The revival of the Reformation was based upon the New Learning; and the great Evangelical Revival was preceded by the Holy Club in Lincoln College, Oxford. The Lambeth Way of Renewal likewise emerges from the greatest Report of that great Conference—"The Christian Doctrine of God." It is hard to exaggerate the excellence of this treatise with its depth of thought and wide scholarship. Suffice it to say that it has been termed

the most important document produced by the Church of England since the Reformation. But the vital omission of a Gospel message for sinners in the Way of Renewal is immediately explained by the equally unaccountable omission of the Atonement from "The Christian Doctrine of God." In the eighteen closely reasoned pages of that Report, with its 8,000 words, the Cross of our Saviour is dismissed in twenty-three words and as merely symbolic of the eternal struggle of Love with evil.[1] It may be that the Atonement is taken for granted, and so finds no specific mention in this Report. On the other hand, the doctrine of the Cross has for so long been a matter of controversy, and its morality as a transaction so much questioned even by Evangelicals, that it is more probable that Lambeth dared not commit itself upon the subject—even if its caution against our thought of God being inconsistent with all that we may learn of His character in Christ,[2] does not include a caveat against a substitutionary view of His Passion. It is the Incarnation, not the death of Christ, which is central in the theology of Lambeth; with the Church as its next most important theme. Hence it is that intellectual study—to relate all things to Christ the immanent Word (Logos) of God—and the worship of the Christian Society, form the two features of the Lambeth Way of Renewal. And, to adopt a thought of Dr. Kirk's in *Essays Critical and Catholic*, after reading the Report on "The Christian Doctrine of God" we should rise and sing an amended version of Mrs. Alexander's hymn:

> He *lived* that we might be forgiven;
> He *lived* to make us good.
> That we might go at last to heaven,
> Saved by His precious *love*.

But such Christian doctrine is not Christ's doctrine either of God or of His own Mission to this world. I turn to St. Peter, who describes himself as "a witness of the sufferings of Christ,"[3] and who, as St. Luke tells us,[4] had been taught by the Master Himself, both before and after the Resurrection, the meaning of those sufferings and how remission of sins should be preached in His Name unto all nations.

In the five chapters of the first Epistle of St. Peter—styled the "Catholic Epistle" because its authenticity has been universally acknowledged—there are no less than eight passages in which reference is made to the Blood, or the Death, or the Sufferings of our Lord. And in them the Cross is set forth as central to the whole purpose of history, and as standing at the very heart of the Universe itself. Christ as the Lamb of God was foreknown before the foundation of the world.[5] Prophecy, with its developing theme of a Suffering Servant, prepared for His great redemption.[6] The event of His Death marked the end of one age and the beginning of another;[7] and the Resurrection floods that Death with glory.[8] That

[1] Lambeth Report, p. 69.
[2] Lambeth Report, pp. 20 & 39.
[3] 1 Peter v. 1.
[4] Luke xxiv. 44 ff.
[5] 1 Peter i. 19, 20.
[6] 1 Peter i. 10 ff.
[7] 1 Peter i. 20.
[8] 1 Peter i. 3, 21.

is to say, all that went before pointed forward to the Cross, and all that comes after points back to it. So is it central in history. Also the Cross stands at the very heart of the Universe. Angels look down upon it with amaze ; [1] it wrought the salvation of men ; [2] and its reverberations were felt even in the underworld of departed spirits.[3]

Moreover, it is worth noticing that while St. Paul—who has been credited with inventing the expiatory theory of the Atonement—can speak of the sufferings of Christ as an example, without a word as to their character, St. Peter seems forced to dilate on what the Death of Christ actually effected, even when it involves a digression. It is when he is holding up the Saviour as an example, only, of patient suffering, that he bursts out with those two supreme sayings : " Who His own self bare our sins in His Body on the tree " ; [4] and " Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that He might bring us to God." [5] But this centrality of the Cross in the Evangel of him who was its eye-witness, is only what we find in the Gospel of His Teacher—the Saviour Himself. If we consider (as, indeed, we are bound to do, and as scholarship is doing increasingly) that all four Gospels must be taken together in order to gain a true picture and record of our Lord's life and teaching ; and that the fourth Gospel is not the least important of the four as history as well as philosophy : then we are bound to conclude that in our Saviour's mind the Cross was central to His whole earthly Ministry ; and that at Calvary He believed that He was giving His life a ransom *instead* of (*anti*) many,[6] and for the remission of sins.[7]

*It was a death that was foreseen,* and that from the first days of His Ministry. The Cup was *accepted,* even as early as in the Wilderness of Temptation ; and that by One Who deemed Himself the Suffering Servant of Isaiah, if we may judge by the Baptist's description of Him, immediately afterwards, as " the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." [8] The death was definitely *proclaimed,* only a few weeks later, on the occasion of our Lord's first visit to Jerusalem ; and that both publicly in the Temple,[9] and also in private to Nicodemus as the fulfilment of what Moses pictured by the brazen serpent.[10] And in his great work *The Atonement* (a book that should still find an honoured place on the shelves of every Minister's study) Dr. Dale has set forth with great force and clarity how the Cross cast an ever-darkening shadow upon the Saviour's path, as with increasing foreboding He journeyed towards its foot. As Bengel has put it, " His life was one constant going to death." It would then be false to the facts not to recognise that —like as His Death occupies one-third of the gospel story—so also, according to the Evangelists, His Atonement occupied a unique

[1] 1 Peter i. 12.
[2] 1 Peter i. 9, 20 & 21.
[3] 1 Peter iii. 19.
[4] 1 Peter ii. 24.
[5] 1 Peter iii. 18.
[6] Mark x. 45.
[7] Matt. xxvi. 28.
[8] John i. 29.
[9] John ii. 19.
[10] John iii. 14.

and central position in our Lord's mind, such as His Incarnation and Resurrection cannot claim. The Incarnation led up to the Atonement. Christ did not die because He was born, but He was born in order that He might die—"*for this cause came I unto this hour.*" [1] and the Resurrection is the glorious consequent upon it—"*behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into His glory?*" [2] That is to say our Lord taught that His death was not simply a fitting conclusion to a life of self-sacrifice and obedience to the uttermost, but that (in the words once more of Dr. Kirk) it "effected something vital for our salvation which His earthly Incarnation, had it ended in some other way, could not have secured for us." [3]

*It was also a death that was entirely voluntary*, and in which the Victim Himself took the initiative—"*No one taketh it (my life) from me, but I lay it down of myself.*"[4] He chose the place—"*It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem.*" [5] He fixed the hour—"*His hour was not yet come.*" [6] But when the hour did come that, like the serpent in the wilderness, He should be lifted up and draw all men to Himself,[7] then no longer did the Saviour seek to escape the plots of the Jews, which were fully known to Him, and which He had easily evaded before and might as easily have avoided again. Of set purpose He journeyed to Jerusalem, declaring that He was going to His death, and thus deliberately putting His neck into the noose. He even arranged the halter round His own throat. First He bade Judas at the Last Supper to fetch his confederates. And then He resorted to that Garden whither He knew that His enemies would seek Him; instead of—when He had passed unchallenged through the city gate—hastening on to the asylum of Bethany. We who are taught, by the Christian ethic, the sanctity of human life must regard such suicidal action as immoral if inspired by any other purpose save by that greater love which lays down its life for its friends. As a demonstration, simply to reveal God's love to the uttermost or the full horror of sin, the Cross would only be excusable on the part of an unbalanced fanatic. Socrates, indeed, refused to lift a finger to escape the condemnation of his judges by evasion, or the infliction of death by bribing his jailor. To do so, he contended, would be to run away in the day of battle, and to break the laws of the State he had agreed to uphold.[8] But it would have been interesting to have heard him on the immorality of deliberately *courting* death in order to show up the iniquity of his accusers.

*But, again, the death of Christ cannot be explained as the death of a martyr.* On such an assumption our Lord's shrinking from the Cross is quite unaccountable—not so are martyrs wont to meet even a cruel death. Twelve months before the Cross, away up in

[1] John xii. 27. [2] Luke xxiv. 26.
[3] Dr. K. E. Kirk in *Essays Catholic and Critical.*
[4] John x. 17. [5] Luke xiii. 33.
[6] John vii. 30 & viii. 20. [7] John xii. 23 & 32.
[8] Plato's *Apology*, c. 39; & *Crito*, c. 50.

sunny Galilee, He had cried out "There is a flood of sorrow in which I must be plunged, and how I am tortured till it is all over!" [1] Two days before the betrayal, in the Temple, He had cried out again, "Now is my soul troubled, Father, save me from this hour.[2] The Sweat of Blood in Gethsemane is the culmination of an agony of foreboding which had always dogged the Saviour's steps, but which did not even so anticipate to the full the actual experience of Calvary itself. It is a well-known phenomenon that martyrs are exalted above the pains they endure, supported (according to their testimony) by an intense realisation of the Presence of God. So, indeed, had our Lord been upheld to suffer with serenity and even joy all the sorrows and stress of a life of pain and persecution because of His sense of perfect communion with His Father.

But on the Cross a mysterious and dreadful loneliness of spirit oppressed the Saviour's soul, which His great cry of desolation revealed as a sense of utter separation from God, and which broke His heart (literally so, it seems) in six hours. Bodily torture cannot wholly account for this swift collapse upon the Cross. Crucifixion was devised as a lingering torment and its victim usually survived for two or even three days. It is true that after His long trial and cruel scourging our Lord fell beneath His Cross. But strength to support a load is different from the capacity to endure suffering; and Pilate, who was experienced in these matters and had been given ample opportunity of judging the physical endurance of his Prisoner, was so astonished that He was already dead that he required confirmation of the fact. More than this, Christ's actual passing held no mystery, and was what we should have expected for Incarnate God. As regards the world He left it was with a triumphant cry of victory upon His lips—"*It is finished.*" As regards the spirit world He entered, it was a voluntary and quiet breathing out of His Spirit into the hands of His Father with Whom once more He knew Himself in full communion. We speak in general terms of the Atonement being consequent upon the *Cross* and the *Death* of the Crucified; but such language is symbolic and pictures a deeper spiritual reality—namely, that shame for sin and that sense of alienation from God which is the sting of death. As He hung upon the Cross the Sinless Saviour, with His Divine horror of sin, experienced pangs unknown even to the chief of sinners, as he confronts his lonely journey into the unknown and trembles at the conviction of judgment to come. So only can we account for the facts of the Cross, even as St. Paul has summarised them—"Him who knew no sin, God made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in Him." [3]

I have shrunk from thus dwelling upon the central scene of the world's supreme and most sacred drama, upon which nature reverently rang down the curtain of thick darkness; and which, as in great Greek tragedy, took place off the stage, in a spiritual realm whither the eyes of the curious may not and cannot penetrate.

But I have found that those who, actuated by the noblest

[1] Luke xii. 50. [2] John xii. 27. [3] 2 Cor. v. 21.

sentiments, instinctively revolt from a theory of the Atonement which we are bound to term "substitutionary," yet refuse to face the facts either of our Lord's own words or of the circumstances of His Cross and Passion. It is significant, for example, that a few years ago, when I was privileged to attend a little gathering of Oxford scholars who met each week over a long period to study the Atonement in the Bible itself, though the evident desire was to discover therein a doctrine that did not involve Substitution, yet it could not be done.

It is true that the reconciliation between God and man wrought by the Atonement can never be fully understood by the finite mind —"How, in what particular way Christ's death was efficacious there are not wanting persons who have endeavoured to explain; but I do not find that Scripture hath explained it," is Bishop Butler's summing up of the matter. At the same time there is no occasion for a theory of substitution, as held to-day, to be branded as immoral. Loose language and inadequate pictures may, in the past, have suggested both a wrathful Potentate appeased by the sufferings of a pitiful Redeemer; and also a single unrelated transaction nineteen hundred years ago cancelling the guilt of sinners to-day—thus giving colour to Mr. Bernard Shaw's indictment of "an insane vengeance and a trumpery expiation." But the mistake has lain in dividing not only the Godhead, but also the two Natures of the One Christ. The Atonement is the work of the Father, Who so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, and Whose changeless love is always going out towards His sinful children. The New Testament never speaks of God being reconciled to us, but always of ourselves being reconciled to God; and even in defiance of grammatical construction the Saviour is described, not as propitiating the Father, but as making propitiation for sin.

All theories of the Atonement must begin with St. Paul's declaration, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself";[1] and if we speak in terms of substitution, the whole Godhead is involved in the transaction. The immorality of an "insane vengeance" simply does not exist in such forth-giving forgiveness. Then also incarnate God identifies Himself completely with His brother men; and suffered not only *for* man but *as* man. Seeing, then, that the solidarity of the human race is an axiom of our existence, carrying with it the fact both of vicarious suffering and of vicarious benefit, there is no "trumpery expiation" in the spectacle of the whole mass of the world's suffering and penitence for sin, summed up, interpreted, and consummated in the self-sacrifice of the sinless Son of Man, Who is the Representative Man and the Head of all Creation. On the contrary, as I have already hinted, any theory of the Atonement which does not include some element of a price paid for sin is not only inadequate to explain the facts of the Gospel record, but itself falls into the condemnation of being immoral. If I may so put it, the events of the Passion are so dreadful that they are inexcusable merely as a revelation of Love

[1] 2 Cor. v. 19.

to the uttermost or of the horror of sin; they demand also the necessity of a rescue, whereby the gate of heaven is opened to all believers.

In this connection I would draw your attention to the equally perplexing and kindred problem of punishment as inflicted by human authority. The history of the ethics of punishment has followed very much the same orbit as that of the Atonement, and I believe that the explanation of them both lies in the same region—namely, the moral order of the world as purposed by God.

Retributive Justice has been called "one of the deepest ideas of the world's history." Its authority is based on moral "intuition," and is summed up in the maxim of Spinoza: "It is not good that a guilty man should profit by his guilt." As far back as Aristotle the idea has been held of punishment equating or nullifying this wrongful surplus or profit; and we still employ such phrases as that which our Lord used of "paying the price." Moreover, retributive punishment is considered to be an end itself and inflicted for a past offence, not for any advantages that may accrue from it; though it is recognised that retribution does actually bring with it the useful fruits of the reformation of the punished, and of the deterrence of others from wrong-doing. It is even suggested that punishment is *owed* to the guilty, who is defrauded of his right if he does not receive it. As Professor Leo Polak, of Holland, has expressed it:—by being punished "the culprit . . . is not wronged at all, on the contrary he is honoured as a moral agent susceptible of the claims of justice and righteousness, and as such he gets only his due, only what serves him right."

In modern times—perhaps because we have been moving in a self-indulgent and sentimental age—the principle of retributive punishment has been challenged as immoral: as witness an author on prison reform changing the title of his book from "The Punishment of Crime" to "The Crime of Punishment." And the theory of punishment propounded instead is called the "Utilitarian Theory," because it holds that punishment can only be justified by its good effects—namely, as reformative and a deterrent; and must only look forward to the future good it hopes to achieve. But recently the greatest scholars have returned to a retributive conception of punishment, and agree that "no solution can stand which does not satisfy the essential purpose of this theory." [1] And the reason advanced is that pain is an evil, and its infliction cannot be justified on the grounds of utility alone, whether we have regard to the selfish ends of deterrence or the pious hopes of reform. As Mr. F. H. Bradley, in his *Ethical Studies*, has vigorously summed up the intuitive sentiments of humanity:

"We pay the penalty because we owe it, and for no other reason; and if punishment is inflicted for any other reason whatever than because it is merited by wrong, it is a gross immorality, a crying injustice, an abominable crime, and not what it pretends to be. We may have regard for whatever considerations we please—our own convenience, the good of society, the benefit of the offender—we are fools and worse, if we fail to do so. Having

[1] *The Morality of Punishment*, p. 45, by A. C. Ewing, M.A., D.Phil.

once the right to punish, we may modify the punishment according to the useful and the pleasant, but these are external to the matter; they cannot give us a right to punish, and nothing can do that but criminal desert. . . . Yes, in despite of sophistry, and in the face of sentimentalism . . . our people believe to this day *that punishment is inflicted for the sake of punishment.*"

If we change the word "punishment" to "Atonement" we have here a statement which as truly expresses the intuitive belief of mankind regarding the transaction of the Cross. "*The Atonement was necessary for the sake of Atonement*"; and without that necessity the Cross is immoral, whatever other considerations of good may accrue from it. Indeed, I believe we may even discern in the ethics of retributive punishment some explanation of the Cross—so intimately do the two seem to be related.

Goodness is a state of soul that is other-centred, and is good in proportion as its devotee loves God with his whole heart and his neighbour as himself. Sin is a state of soul that is self-centred, and is sin in proportion as self is enthroned as god, and neither fears not God nor regards man. Goodness brings with it a commensurate amount of happiness, and sin a commensurate amount of unhappiness; and these effects of happiness or unhappiness are twofold —inward and outward. Inwardly, goodness and sin produce a corresponding result on character, either of union with God or of alienation from Him. Outwardly, they bring benefit or suffering to the world, though this is largely vicarious—owing to the solidarity of the human race—and is not always reaped by the well-deserving, or the guilty, individual himself.

Nature, with its inviolable law of cause and effect is parabolic of this Moral Law. And the universal moral intuition which has introduced retributive justice into society, is a God-implanted instinct which has instituted the sacrament of punishment as an outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual reality of the consequences of sin, and as a means whereby righteousness is vindicated and the guilty enabled to expiate his offence. We might almost add that at Calvary it was "ordained by Christ Himself."

The Atonement does not touch the natural consequences of sin; neither does retributive punishment. Both are concerned with the character, or the soul, of the offender. And I think it will be conceded that it is not possible for God to unite Himself with sinners without first satisfying this instinct for retributive justice which He has implanted in the very centre of their being. To do so would be to make Himself regarded by sinners as One who winked at sin, and as an accessory to their sin. God is bound by the moral order of the universe which He has created; a truth which explains the otherwise meaningless confession of the prodigal, "Father, I have sinned against *heaven* and before Thee," that is, not only against forgiving Love but against inviolable law. Therefore it is that modern thought, even as it is returning to a retributive theory of punishment, is increasingly re-affirming a substitutionary theory of the Atonement. Professor Streeter, in his book *Reality*,[1]

[1] pp. 230, 231.

could not better reinterpret the old orthodox position when he says that in a moral universe all bills must be paid, and God has paid the bill. And this is only to paraphrase the Saviour's own declaration that He gave His life a ransom instead of many.

So does the Cross stand at the very centre of human existence, and is at once the beginning and the end of any Way of Revival.

If sin is essentially to be self-centred, then Revival is to become Christ-centred, and this the Cross only can truly effect. The Cross is central because it reveals the full *Ruin* which sin occasions. The chief horror of sin is that it blinds to its own sinfulness. But this stupendous crime of man blindly crucifying his God, shocks and startles us out of ourselves—revealing the foulness of our own nature and opening our eyes to the deathless Love of God. Again, the Cross is central because it proclaims a Gospel of *Redemption* that fully assures even the chief of sinners of his complete reconciliation with God. The guilty soul of man, with an intuitive belief in retribution so deeply implanted within him that it has produced the universal phenomenon of sacrifice, is yet satisfied that his offence is done away and remembered no more against him. Even if he should still remember it—and it may be that the memory of our sins will remain with us even in another world—yet the Cross once more will turn his thoughts from himself to sublimate the pang of remorse in adoring love for his Saviour. And, once more, the Cross is central because it is the only true constraining power for our *Regeneration*. It converts us from the death of Self-centredness to the life of Christ-centredness.

I would add one word of caution in conclusion. The whole of this paper has been devoted to an attempt to vindicate the substitutionary theory of the Atonement, in order to establish the centrality of the Cross in the Saviour's ministry, in the world's history, and in any Way of Revival. That does not imply that all to whom we preach the Gospel of salvation must accept any particular theory of the Atonement in order to receive its benefits. Dr. Dale has some very wise words on the point:

> " There is true Christian faith wherever the Lord Jesus Christ is acknowledged as ' Prince and Saviour,' the Founder of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the Moral Ruler of mankind, the Author of eternal salvation. That He atoned for sin on the Cross is the explanation of the power which He has received to forgive sin ; but a penitent heart may rely on Him for forgiveness, and for restoration to holiness and to God, without apprehending the relation of His Death to human redemption." [1]

But it is for us especially, to whom is committed " the word of reconciliation," who are " ambassadors on behalf of Christ," and beseech others " as though God were intreating by us," [2] to ponder to its depths the meaning of this historic event—that upon this fragment in space a Cross has been planted, and that the God by Whom all worlds were made hung upon it. For there pre-eminently is to be found the heart of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ which we are to proclaim to the ends of the earth.

[1] *The Atonement*, p. 112. [2] 2 Cor. v. 20.

# CONVERSION.

By The Rev. W. Wilson Cash, D.S.O., O.B.E.,
Secretary of the C.M.S.

ANY student of world affairs must be struck by the immense forces operating to-day on a world-wide scale, forces which are breaking up the existing social order, forces against which the ancient religions of the East such as Confucianism are powerless, forces which challenge the whole Christian position. Practically every country in the world reveals a breakaway from all organised religion, on the ground that it is no longer necessary to life. With it there has come an anti-God movement and a secular way of life which eliminates God from the universe.

I am not speaking of Russian Communism only but of a much wider movement which is visible in the west as well as the east and which cannot be ignored by any of us clergy, for it is invading every parish in England. Mr. H. G. Wells puts it thus: "Religion in the future can only be the service of humanity, detached from any belief in a personal God."

In England we see the breakdown of moral standards. The divorce courts are evidence of the growing paganism in our land. The past thirty years have witnessed new and marvellous changes, not the changes simply which are due to the visible forces of applied science but the changed mentality of a younger generation which will take nothing for granted, and which demands the investigation of all life. If Western moral standards are challenged, Christian ethics are none the less called in question and the demand is made for liberty to live a life that is free and unfettered by any religious restraints.

For these reasons the Church is facing a dangerous situation and every clergyman is feeling the pressure of it in his own parish. It is no longer enough to quote the Bible to those who challenge our faith, for they challenge the book as well as the faith. We are facing now a post-war civilisation which is material and critical, which claims to be disillusioned about our religious values, which regards the Church as a worn-out system with no message for this age. So serious is this situation for the future of Christianity we dare not sit at ease while the world is being captured by anti-religious forces. We have lost ground enough already because we have spent so much time in attacking one another instead of joining forces in the face of a common foe. As Church people we hold an entrenched position and we hide behind the parapets of tradition, privilege and class. But the challenge of the hour is for aggressive warfare, for the world has lost its moral balance, it is forsaking its spiritual heritage and is floundering on in a morass. It is vainly searching for a new centre of unity, and if religion it must have it seeks for a religion that is based on reality and experience. Have

we any answer to this challenge? Let us think carefully about it, for the contribution of the Church to the present world crisis will determine the attitude of thousands to Christ. Either we demonstrate the adequacy of the Gospel and the reality of Christ in human experience or we must cease to count as a serious factor in world life. The challenge is therefore for a Gospel which can meet this world of communism, secularism, race conflict, communal strife, international jealousies, national greed and selfishnesses, and meeting it, triumph by the inherent power and reality of the message we proclaim. This means a new discovery of the Gospel as able to produce moral character and thus give to the world a moral basis to life which to-day is largely lost; a Gospel that offers a spiritual experience of God and which answers the charge that religion is dope; a Gospel that carries with it the social implications of justice, freedom and righteousness; a Gospel that can meet men, enslaved by sin, burdened by guilt, and set them free; a Gospel which, while it is world-wide in its range, is nevertheless personal and individual.

I make no apology for introducing the subject of conversion in this seemingly roundabout way, because this background is the soil in which we are called upon to sow the Gospel seed. This situation is our world to-day, and with this in our mind may we ask what relationship the subject of conversion bears to it. I take it you would not wish me to treat conversion as something isolated from those other great religious words of our faith such as redemption, regeneration, repentance and faith.

Conversion in either its noun or verb form is a common enough word in both the Old and the New Testament. In Acts xv. 3 we read, "they passed through Samaria declaring the conversion of the Gentiles." The Apostles connected conversion with both repentance and faith. In Acts iii. 19 we read, "Repent and be converted," and in Acts xi. 21 we read, "A great number believed and turned to the Lord." We are given in these two verses the negative and the positive sides of conversion, the turning from evil and the turning to God. But conversion is much more than simply our turning to God. It involves our conception of God as one who pardoneth iniquity. It implies that, in turning, God meets us and brings into our lives something that was not there before. In other words, conversion represents the whole transaction of the soul in repentance and faith and the whole attitude of God revealed in Christ giving the penitent sinner His pardoning Grace and Peace. We are therefore concerned with nothing less than the coming of Christ into human lives, and any study of this subject must centre in Christ Himself. If He is but the ideal man and the perfect example our use of the word conversion will have little meaning. Ian Maclaren says in his book, *The Mind of the Master*:

"Religion with Jesus has a dynamic and it is Jesus Himself, for Jesus and religion are as soul and body. He did not evolve it as an intellectual conception. He exhibited it as a state of life. The religion of Jesus was in life before it appeared in the Gospels; it had been fulfilled

in Himself before it was preached to the world. Jesus never proposed that men should discuss His Gospel, He invited men to live it."

We are drawn in studying conversion to study Christ Himself, for conversion is surely the acceptance of Jesus Christ as Saviour, Redeemer, Lord and Master.

What bearing, you ask, has this on the great world affairs that loom so large in our modern life? It has this bearing, that all human life tends to Him or radiates from Him. As Liddon puts it:

"He is the point in which humanity finds its unity. He closes the early history of our race. He inaugurates its future. Nothing local, transient, individualizing, national, sectarian dwarfs the proportions of His world-embracing character." [1]

Horace Bushnell gives us the same thought from another angle when he says:

"To Jesus alone, the simple Galilean Carpenter, it happens that never having seen a map of the world in His life or heard the names of half the great nations on it, He undertakes, coming out of His shop, a scheme as much vaster and more difficult than that of Alexander the Great, as it proposes more and what is more divinely benevolent." [2]

It is no exaggeration to say that the attractive power of Christianity is Christ alone. Napoleon on St. Helena is reported to have said to a friend, "Jesus Christ has succeeded in making every human soul an appendage of His own," and it was this attractive power of Christ which baffled the great Emperor. He presented Himself to the world not as a teacher of truth but as the Truth, not as a way of life but as the life itself, not as one of many ways to God but as the way. To quote once more, someone has said:

"Detach Christianity from Christ and it vanishes before your eyes into intellectual vapour, for it is of the essence of Christianity that day by day, hour by hour the Christian should live in conscious, felt and sustained relationship to the ever-living author of his creed and life. Christianity is non-existent apart from Christ. It radiates now as at the first from Christ."

If this is true of the faith as a whole it is equally true of that aspect of it where Christ enters first in human consciousness and experience. Detach Christ personally from the conversion of a soul, reduce conversion to a mere psychological process and its dynamic and moral force will evaporate and leave the sinner in as big a slough of despair as before. Conversion as I understand it is Christ coming into our lives in redemptive love, taking our natural gifts and talents and transmuting them into the pure gold of His Kingdom, working in us a moral regeneration whereby old habits, evils and passions are overcome and new spiritual life bursts forth in us, giving us that conscious and realised presence of God in daily life.

The classic example in the New Testament is St. Paul. No other conversion to Christ in the New Testament is related so

[1] Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 8.
[2] Bushnell, *Nature and the Supernatural*, p. 232.

fully. It is remarkable, because as far as the records go there is no gradual passage from the Jewish Synagogue to the Christian Church but a sudden and complete change of character, due, the Apostle tells us, to his having met personally the risen Christ on the Damascus road. Dr. Holtzmann in his book on the Acts says:

> "It is certain that the Apostle knows nothing of a gradual process which has drawn him closer to Christianity, but only of a sudden halt which he was compelled to make in the midst of an active career."

St. Paul, writing from his prison in Rome, says: "I was apprehended by Jesus Christ," meaning "taken possession of by Christ."

The deciding factor in St. Paul's conversion, therefore, is the appearance of Christ to him. To the Apostle it was no subjective vision but an objective revelation of Christ which he classed with the appearances of Christ to the other disciples. Conversion to St. Paul was not merely the development of latent spiritual gifts within him but the coming of Christ into his life and the bringing to him of a life which was not there before. It was not a stirring of his religious impulses only but the experience of meeting face to face the Christ of God and of surrendering his life to Him. All through the Apostle's life he referred to this experience as something that had been the initiation into a new and divine fellowship which nothing could dim. Yet it was not something he could trace to a human source. The more his experience deepened the more truly he could say, "By the Grace of God I am what I am." The beginning of his Christian life was not found in Paul, nor in his inclinations, gropings, resolvings and prayers, but in Christ who met him in redeeming love. Ever since that day when on the Damascus road Christ seized this hard Jewish persecutor of the Church and converted him into an Apostle to the Gentiles—conversion through Christ has been the supremest of all human experiences. As Dr. Alexander White says:

> "There is such a Divine Hand in every conversion; there is such a sovereignty in it, taking place within a man, there is at the same time such a mysteriousness about it; and withal, such a transcendent importance, that there is nothing else that ever takes place on the face of the earth for one moment to be compared with a conversion."

There are so many kinds of conversion that we theorise about the subject and forget the central fact. There are so many different occasions and circumstances of conversion, some sudden and unexpected, some gradual and slow, that we often fail to see the hand of God because other spiritual experiences are not the same as our own. People do not need to travel the Damascus road to find Christ, but the essential thing is that men must find Christ, and here there is one factor in conversion common to all experience—there is no conversion apart from Christ. No psychologist can produce it, no human will-power can work regeneration of soul. The lesson of St. Paul's conversion was not its suddenness, nor its circumstances, but simply that he met Christ and yielded

his life to Him. There is only one other conversion in the world more wonderful than St. Paul's and that is our own. We may never have had a cataclysmic change nor a sudden conversion, but we must know for ourselves the challenge of Christ in His purity, love and power to us. We must have an experience of His redemptive power and His abiding presence if our ministry is to be fruitful to others.

Looking again at our biggest parochial problems to-day I think most will agree that they are moral rather than intellectual, and that to regain the spiritual men must face up to the fact of sin. Dr. Jowett brings this out very clearly. He says:

"Do not let us attempt to deceive ourselves. Sin is most real, guilt is most real, bondage is most real. How can we obtain deliverance? I want deliverance from the baleful shore of guilt. I want deliverance from the power of acquired habit. Where can the liberating power be found? I turn to those who have closed the Bible, denouncing its remedies as fictional, or at the best as antique and obsolete, and I ask them what provision they are prepared to put in its place. The problem is this. Here is a man, guilt-bound, sin-bound, death-bound. Release him. Take that haunted chamber of the mind, lay the ghosts and make the chamber into a quiet and peaceful living-room. Take the heart and turn out the unclean devils of desire and lust and tenant it with the white-robed angels of faith and hope and love. Take the evil power out of to-day and take the black threat out of to-morrow. This is the problem often underestimated because the remedies offered are peddling and insufficient."

Dr. Jowett is right; we speak of sin to-day as though it were a skin complaint instead of a disease of the heart. Polish and culture are quite consistent with uncleanness and depravity.

"When education and culture have reached their utmost limits and the mental powers are refined into exquisite discernment, the two black gruesome birds of the night remain—guilt and death, and only the Eternal Son can disturb them and cause them to flee away."

Here then lies our task. Do we shrink from it? It was our Lord's task. He spent most of His ministry in helping sin-burdened souls into the light of God, and to Him the moral corruption in the world was the foe to be fought. He challenged the lives of Pharisees and rulers, of publicans and sinners, because there could be no true conversion without a moral cleansing. Do we regard this as something narrow and individualistic? Study the work of the Evangelical revival and you will see how the great reforms of the early nineteenth century such as the abolition of slavery, the better industrial conditions and the growth of social service in England were initiated and carried through by men whose lives had been inflamed with divine love, who having found Christ for themselves wanted to share Him with others.

Do we regard this task of conversion as something suitable to certain types of people? Study the history of any foreign missionary society for the answer. The C.M.S. sprang out of the Evangelical revival and for 132 years it has been proving in many countries, among diverse races and religions, that Christ can meet human needs in all countries and in every age. There is coming

home from India, China, Japan, Africa and elsewhere a mass of evidence to prove that a pagan African, a cultured Chinese, a practical Japanese and a mystical Indian can all find peace through the blood of the Cross.

The Gospel has been tested in this past hundred years in many countries and it is now a fact of experience that wherever men of any race are brought face to face with Jesus Christ and surrender to Him, He works in them a mighty social and spiritual regeneration which affects the man's character, gives a new home life and leads the way to nation-wide social uplift.

Because of our ecclesiastical system, are we taking our people for granted? Because they have been baptised and confirmed, do we regard their conversion as unnecessary? We ought perhaps to remind ourselves that every generation needs converting, and that the root problem in our Church life to-day is that many Church members have never entered into a conscious experience of Jesus Christ in His saving and delivering power; in consequence the witness of the Church is blunted. Through a lack of vital spiritual experience within our ranks the world invades the Church, whereas in Apostolic days it was the Church that invaded and challenged the world.

Because of our Evangelical heritage, are we taking the Gospel for granted and thus stereotyping a message which ought to be pulsing with life and carrying with it a transforming power? We may be preaching sound Gospel sermons, yet our message may be but a pathetic survival of a lost experience. Judgment must begin with the House of God, it must begin with us. A rediscovery of the Gospel means first and foremost a new spiritual power in us, transforming our own lives and producing in us that quality of life which will attract others to Christ. Evangelicals sometimes speak as though they had a monopoly of the Gospel. The lesson of Church history is that where a Church is unfaithful to its trust God removes the candlestick and gives it to another. We have been placed in trust with the Gospel, and in these days of crisis and trouble we are being called upon again to give our witness to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, to give it in the power of the Holy Spirit, that those who are seeking for deliverance may find Christ still able to save to the uttermost.

A Missionary writing home said:

"For several years with blunted pencil and awkward hand I tried to draw upon the Arab heart my conceptions, *my* theology, my creed, and I wondered at *God's* failure. One day a proud and fanatical Mullah came to debate with me. I was weary in body and distressed in mind, so I took the Gospel of St. John and read to him the story of Nicodemus, without comment, and at last the story of the crucifixion. When I raised my eyes again tears were in the Mullah's eyes. His blatant defiance had gone and he asked me for a copy of the Gospel so that he might study it."

This Missionary's experience must find an echo in many of our lives. We have tried in our own blundering way to meet this post-war world with social schemes, philosophical treatises and

psychological explanations, and the world has listened in a listless and cold manner, untouched and unstirred. St. Paul says: "I was apprehended by Christ." The secret of our success will be in finding what Paul found in Christ and in witnessing to Him. At a conference I attended a Missionary, in trying to explain his aims, said: "We are not sent to preach sociology but salvation, not economics but evangelism, not reform but redemption, not culture but conversion, not progress but pardon, not a new social order but a new birth, not revolution but regeneration, not a new organisation but a new creation, not democracy but the Gospel, not civilisation but Christ. We are ambassadors not diplomatists."

In these days, faced with such problems as we have been dealing with, is there not in our witness to the Gospel a note of urgency? Can we afford in these days to occupy so much of our time with secondary things when the world is hurrying on in a blind and bewildered race, losing its way, seeking for help and finding none? Can we not strike afresh the note of Christ triumphant, adequate through His Cross and passion, through His resurrection and ascension, to meet the needs of this perplexed and baffled age?

---

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND HER REFORMATIONS. By William Howard-Flanders. [xi + 256 pp.] *Heath Cranton Ltd.* 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

It is difficult to understand what is the purpose of this book. The title is decidedly a misnomer unless "reformations" is used in a very loose sense. Indeed, nothing about the book is carefully done. While claim is made that it is the result of patient research, six authorities only are cited and some of these can hardly be called authorities.

Unfortunately the book is still further handicapped by careless arrangement. Wolsey, dead and disposed of, is resuscitated several times. The proof-reading has been badly done. Katharine of Aragon lives until 1636. The Barony of Dudley is stated to be still in abeyance, whereas it was revived several years ago. The sentences are long and involved. It surely is not necessary to extend sentences over fourteen or fifteen lines. It certainly does not make for easy reading. It is doubtful too whether some of the words used are to be found in any ordinary dictionary. Where does "abbotcy" come from? It is not a necessary word.

We think Mr. Howard-Flanders' time, quite obviously generously given in the writing of this book, might have been used to better effect if he had selected one limited period and dived more deeply into causes and events.

F. B.

# PROFESSOR RUDOLF OTTO AND *THE IDEA OF THE HOLY.*

By J. W. Harvey, Esq., M.A., Professor of Philosophy at Armstrong College, University of Durham.

IN the short time at my disposal I think I cannot do better than consider in succession what I take to be the four cardinal elements in Dr. Otto's contribution to religious thought, four central contentions for which he stands. Each of them represents a protest against an error or danger or distortion which either is or has been of influence on religious thought and life; and it may be easiest to characterise the positive contentions of Otto by designating these errors against which they protest.

But at the outset let me note one general mistake about his teaching. Dr. Otto is quite misunderstood if it is imagined that he is claiming to advance any "new doctrine"—a phrase used about him in a recent number of *The Modern Churchman*. Rightly or wrongly, Otto would certainly maintain that he is simply calling attention to aspects of religion and elements in the religious experience which have too often been neglected by theologians and philosophers, but which the entire history of religion unmistakably attests and illustrates. And I think that perhaps his greatest service is in the impressive assemblage of religious testimony drawn from all climes and ages which his books present—a truly illuminating contribution to the "comparative study of religion."

There is probably far more *novelty* in such a position as that of Karl Barth, though the latter owes something, I think, to the writings of Otto: but by the same token there is, I should say, inevitably less of truth. The more the claim is made to be interpreting something permanent and fundamental in human life and experience, the more suspicious should we be—and rightly—of the drastically novel. But we know well that novelty is not the sole or the best originality. And I think that even his critics admit that Dr. Otto has *re*stated, *re*discovered, *re*presented aspects of religion which he would himself claim to be "*uralt*," primeval, in a fresh, personal, original and valuable way.

What then are the central points in this restatement, to which I have referred above?

I think they might be put as a series of protests against a series of "isms": (1) against subjectivism and an undue preoccupation with religious "states of mind"; (2) against intellectualism and a too narrow interpretation of religious "knowledge"; (3) against what I will provisionally call "moralism," a tendency to identify absolute or sacred values with moral values in a wide sense of that term; (4) against naturalism and secularism, a protest on behalf of a supernatural interpretation of the world.

### (1) The Protest against Subjectivism.

Some of the pages of *The Idea of the Holy* which have attracted most attention in this country are those which analyse the primitive and elusive elements of feeling which characterise the religious and also the pre-religious experience; the difference, for instance, between supernatural or "numinous" awe and ordinary fear; the intimate relation between the emotion of daunted creaturehood and the exuberant exaltation or exultation in the contrasted greatness of God. And hence it has been sometimes thought that Otto is concerned to emphasise the importance of the emotional life in religion alongside and supplementary to moral activity and enlightened intellectual belief.

There is, I think, this much of truth in such a view, that Otto's books have been a not unimportant influence in his own country towards bringing about a more sympathetic study of the "varieties of religious experience," especially of Mystical experience, in which the inner emotional life plays its very noticeable part. (The German public was undoubtedly much later than the Anglo-American in developing this interest in and sympathy with mystical literature.) But it is an almost ludicrous error to think of him as emphasising the importance, still less the primacy, of *emotional* experience in the religious life. If this were his position, there would be much more force in the sort of criticism excellently represented by Mr. Leonard Hodgson in his little book on *The Place of Reason in Christian Apologetic*. Mr. Hodgson urges that emotions merely as such must before being accepted and welcomed be subjected to rational examination and criticism. There would be a certain danger in any plea to cultivate (even were this possible) so-called "religious" emotions merely as states of mind. It may lead to the "introversion" of the psychologists, the unhealthy turning away from the outer reality; or to the sort of sentimentalism which characterised the more morbid type of "romantic." And I daresay it is a true criticism of some popular writing on Mysticism, that this unhealthy tendency is, to put it no more strongly, at least not too effectively discouraged.

But in point of fact Otto is throughout himself at issue with this tendency to dwell upon religious emotions for their own sake. Throughout he is concerned with the "objective reference" of religious experience, that it is concerned, as Dr. Oman tells us, with the relation of the individual to an Environment or Environer, which has to be acknowledged and in so far forth is knowable.

The misunderstanding here is due to the unfortunate ambiguity of the term "feeling," to which in fact Mr. Hodgson himself calls attention. There is the same ambiguity in the German word Gefuhl, and Otto has discussed it in an appendix to his volume on *Western and Eastern Mysticism* (not included in the English translation of that book). The point is after all simple enough. We say we feel joy, or fear, or boredom at something. Here there is,

it is true, *a* reference to an object, but the feeling specifies merely a state of our own mind, it is not a *cognition of* an object, but an emotion caused *by* it. But we also say, "I feel the presence of somebody," or "This gives me a feeling of familiarity." And here the word means a kind of awareness, though often not any knowledge that can be explicated and set out in clearly determined concepts. "Feeling" in this second sense may involve varied feelings in the first sense of emotional state, or perhaps none at all that can be noticed. Thus the feeling of familiarity may (the proverb tells us) prompt us to contempt, or it may entail boredom, or relief, hope, joy, according to the circumstances.

Now in so far as Otto is concerned with "feelings," whether of the mystic or the non-mystic, it is nearly always as *apprehensions*, ways of knowing other than, perhaps more delicate and penetrating than, conceptual understanding. The feeling in the other sense, that of emotion or affect, is rather the reverberation which the response to the fact apprehended sets up.[1]

His emphasis is therefore strongly against "subjectivism." And I think he has contributed not a little to the liberation of modern religious thought from an excessive preoccupation with the mood and emotional attitude of the "religious" person, in a word the tendency to study "religiosity" apart from its context in the total fact that is religion. This is a tendency to which some forms of evangelical Protestantism have shown themselves liable. We welcome a teaching which helps to swing back the centre of gravity away from man and his attitude to God and towards God and His dealings with man.

### (2) The Protest against Intellectualism.

This insistence upon the genuine awareness in feeling of a divine reality leads to the second contention I wish briefly to discuss. This is a protest against what for want of a better word may be called Intellectualism. The sub-title of *The Idea of the Holy* is "An Inquiry into the non-rational factor in the idea of the divine and its relation to the rational."

Here the common misunderstanding turns upon the meaning of the term non-rational (*das irrationale*). Dr. Otto is not, in pleading for a clearer recognition of a "non-rational factor in the idea of the divine," arguing the cause of mere obscurantism. He is not rebuking man's reason for presumptuousness in venturing upon sacred ground. He is not reviving the *Credo quia absurdum.*

[1] A single example may perhaps suffice to show how objective his approach is. He is dissatisfied with Schleiermacher's famous formulation of the core of religious experience: "the sense of absolute dependence" because it is too much concerned with the self and its self-consciousness and too little with the transcendent fact of deity. For Otto the primary fact is—the feeling of—not our dependence,—but the "numen," "felt" as supreme over against us. And it is *from* this essentially *cognitive* consciousness, this awareness of a transcendent reality, that our self-consciousness as absolutely dependent is derived, as subsidiary and essentially secondary.

A prefatory note which he added to the later impressions of the English translation may be worth quoting.

" In this book," [he writes] " I have ventured to write of that which may be called non-rational or supra-rational in the depths of the divine nature. I do not thereby want to promote in any way the tendency of our time towards an extravagant and fantastic ' irrationalism,' but rather to join issue with it in its morbid form. The ' irrational ' is to-day a favourite theme of all who are too lazy to think or too ready to evade the arduous duty of clarifying their ideas and grounding their convictions on a basis of coherent thought. This book . . . makes a serious attempt to analyse all the more exactly the *feeling* which remains where the *concept* fails." . . .

He adds:

" I feel that no one ought to concern himself with the *numen ineffabile* who has not devoted assiduous and serious study to the *ratio aeterna.*"

To the difficult question as to the relationship between the two aspects of the divine nature here recognised and distinguished (*numen* and *ratio*) I return in a moment. But in view of the above statement I do not think that the criticism sometimes made against Otto can be sustained, namely that he seeks to base a religious apologetic upon the failure and abdication of human reason.

Just as before, it is easy to be misled by the ambiguity of a term, here the term *reason.* In the widest possible meaning that might be given to the word it might cover the whole of man's cogitative faculty, his endeavour to grapple with experience in reflection so as to grasp to the utmost its inexhaustible significance. " Reason " would then be man's whole cognitive faculty in action, and as the opposite of knowledge is nescience so the opposite of the rational would be the nonsensical. Whatever then is relevant and meaningful for man would be included within the scope of reason. In this sense of the word (and here I quote from a passage in a letter of Dr. Otto's)

" God is naturally altogether a rational object; for God would be for us no concern if we could not in some way or other have knowledge of Him; He is for us only relevant in so far as he is knowable (*erkennlich*), whatever overplus of being he has in himself beyond what we can know. But this will make the contention that an object of knowledge or cognition must necessarily also be a ' rational object,' a mere meaningless tautology."

But the sense which the words *reason* and *rational* bear in Otto's thought is, of course, narrower than this. They refer not to the total span of human apprehension but to knowledge of a certain kind, knowledge which is capable of explicit formulation in clearly grasped concepts, knowledge that can be stated, assessed, analysed. And in contrast to this he is pleading that religion must admit as at least equally fundamental *another sort* of knowledge, for which as we see he finds the term feeling indispensable, but for which he also adopts another special term, *divination.* This divination cannot in the strict sense of the word be expressed or communicated. It has to make shift with figurative and symbolic means, hint and intimation rather than statement, just because its object cannot

be formulated. Otto's name for this object, the numinous, simply serves to point a direction. For the content of this term he can only refer his reader to his own unmistakable intuitions. If we are honest with ourselves, we shall, he holds, recognise certain such feelings, palpable though not definable, which *mean* something, and that what they mean is an essential part of the meaning of holiness or sanctity.

" The non-rational in the idea of deity " is not therefore that which is beyond knowledge, but that which we do *know* but cannot conceptually understand.

> " St. Paul " [he writes in the letter already cited] " speaks of a peace that passes understanding. He does not mean a peace of which man can know nothing, for that would interest nobody, but an eternal good that transcends our ' comprehension ' by conceptual thought, and which we at the same time *know* far better than all that we can grasp by the conceptual understanding. . . . ' Le cœur a ses raisons que la Raison ne connaît pas.' "

In quoting this famous challenge of Pascal, Dr. Otto does, I think, lay himself open to misunderstanding. Pascal was in many ways defiantly an *anti*-rationalist : he almost glories in the frustration of Reason when it attempted to plumb the abysses of religion. But Otto has no such disparagement for the activity of the mind operating with clearly grasped concepts. Reason is indispensable but insufficient, and there are religious realities knowable in other ways. Reason has its indefeasible rights and its honourable place in apologetic. It is against reason in the sense of a narrow and self-sufficient intellectualism that a protest has to be entered.

But the relationship between the two ways of approach, the rational and the non-rational, is not merely that the latter *supplements* the former. It is something far more intimate. This is a point of crucial importance in Dr. Otto's presentation, and it may be considered in connection with the third main protest which I recognise him as making.

### (3) The Protest against " Moralism."

In speaking of this as the protest against " moralism " I mean by this term the tendency which in its extreme form would virtually reduce religion to an ethic ; or, in a less extreme form, would interpret the meaning of holiness or sacredness virtually exclusively in terms of the values recognised in ethics.

Here more than before, Dr. Otto has perhaps risked misunderstanding by the exaggeration of his emphasis. If I am concerned to plead the claims of X, there will always be people found to accuse me of denying those of Y, whereas the fact may simply be that I have taken these as unquestioned. If it is true that Otto is not disparaging the intellectual reason, still less does he misprize the moral values. (As a matter of fact, his principal teaching for some time past has been, I believe, on Ethics.) But I think his statements do certainly almost suggest that he does. His argument in *The Idea of the Holy* is directed so markedly towards expounding the

limits of the bare ethical that it is hardly surprising that he has been held to disparage it.

The sort of one-sidedness against which he is contending may be illustrated by a quotation from a very typical representative of the " moralising " school, and the moralising period, namely the British Victorian age. Rather than refer to Matthew Arnold's famous dictum about religion consider some words of the hardly less characteristic figure of Froude. Religion, says Froude, is " the consecration of the whole man, of his heart, his conduct, his knowledge and his mind." This could hardly, perhaps, be bettered, but everything turns on the meaning given to the term consecration ; and we see what it means for Froude when we find him saying in the same paper, that " the religious history of mankind is the history of the efforts which men have made to discover the moral law and to enforce it in so far as it is known." Religious consecration, in fact, is whole-hearted devotion to the ideal of moral good. This implies that the holiness of God which claims our worship is simply his perfect and absolute " moral " goodness.

This position, which would probably be widely accepted, is emphatically rejected by Otto. He maintains that the feeling or divination of the numinous which cannot be thought out or thought home carries with it an appreciation of a value, which likewise cannot be exhausted by our moral conceptions of goodness, nor even if we add to that the other absolute values of the traditional triad, goodness, truth and beauty. This overplus of meaning can, he holds, be recognised if we let the import of terms like *holy*, *hallow*, *sacred*, make its full impact upon the mind. He has nothing more to say to one who, having in all sincerity exposed his mind to the full pressure of those meanings, yet finds nothing more there than what is contained in the idea of " perfect goodness."

Dr. Otto's exposition has, I think, been obscured and confused by an unfortunate terminology, drawn from Kant, which he employs in attempting to intimate the interconnection of " rational-moral " with " numinous " values which together make up the full meaning of " holiness." But he often contents himself with metaphor, and metaphor is here perhaps wiser than a parade of logical technicalities. Thus the two " moments," the " rational-moral " and the " numinous," are said to blend like notes in a chord ; or (a favourite figure) they are like the warp and woof of a fabric. They are at any rate distinct and yet not in essence separable.

There are difficulties of interpretation here which I cannot pretend to solve. A central one concerns the whole problem of religious development. For Otto, it is clear, the first beginning of religious apprehension is of the " numinous," " felt " as awe-inspiring (and therefore as possessing value), but not esteemed as possessing specifically ethical value. The supernatural is " awed " as holy before it becomes reverenced as good. But he will not admit the contention of some of his critics, that the progress in religious insight is precisely that by which non-ethical awe *passes into* ethical reverence ; that is, an object worthy of awe is found

to be an object demanding reverence. The sense or feeling for the "numinous"-holy is not a stage of almost animal susceptibility, outgrown as man grows into moral personality and increases in moral insight. Rather, the story of religious development is the tale of *both* a growth in "moral" enlightenment *and* (if I may so put it) a growth in "numinous" enlightenment. The difference between the sublimity of the God of high religion and the weird, unearthly, awed object of primitive cults is certainly an ethical difference; but it is not *only* an ethical difference. In the "holiness" apprehended by the higher religions, that of the God of Isaiah, or of Christ, there is "felt" a unique value over and above that of "moral perfection."

He puts this definitely enough thus in a letter:

"Let me say, then, that in the Holy a value quite of its own supervenes upon the merely moral value. And this is not merely a gradation of the moral value from mere relativity to absoluteness. . . . God Himself would not by the possession of all moral goods even in absoluteness be thereby 'the Holy One.' The words: 'Be ye holy for I am holy' do not amount to 'Be ye absolutely good, for I am absolutely good.' We have only to put the two sentences together to recognise the frantic absurdity of such a contention."

He goes on to urge that there is "something palpably anthropomorphic" in the attribution of moral goodness, the good will of Kant, to God.

"Still less is it possible, however, to say or to express in words or comprehend by the reason—what the real nature of an absolutely holy will is, and how it is characterised. As Christians we have a real and deep knowledge that it is and what it is, for we experience it by way of contrast in our own consciousness of sin (which is something more than the consciousness of moral delinquency). But we know it in feelings that cannot be expressed. Scripture itself shows this. It simply assumes that our conscience is aware of what God's holiness is, but nowhere is there any attempt made to state what it is—except in symbols, analogies, and figures that are manifestly anthropomorphic."

I do not feel that I can appropriately offer any criticisms of the point of view Dr. Otto is here putting forward.

"The judgment of the sacred," must, he would say, contain some unique recognition of an element that ordinary experience does not take into account.

### (4) The Protest on behalf of the "Supernatural."

This may seem a hard doctrine: it leads me to the last main point upon which I wish to touch, which has indeed been implied in the other three. I have spoken of Dr. Otto as standing for the claim of religion to be concerned with a supreme objective reality and not merely with a human attitude: as standing for the validity of a kind of knowledge which cannot be reduced to purely rational or conceptual terms, or judged at the bar of the reasoning intellect: and as standing for the reality of "values" which cannot be reduced to moral values, but contribute an indispensable part of its meaning

to the recognition of sanctity and holiness. And all this implies an emphatic and absolute rejection of secularism and naturalism, or whatever name be given to the view which holds that in the mundane nature, his own or that of the external course of events, with which man deals in his ordinary thought, is the final truth about the world.

A full generation ago, in 1904, Otto had joined issue with evolutionary naturalism (then more prosperous than to-day) in his book, *Naturalism and Religion* (translated by Sir J. Arthur Thomson), which I fancy has had fewer readers in this country than it deserves. In his later writings the same note is sounded most clearly in his reiterated insistence upon the *Ganz andere*, the aspect of inexhaustible otherness, transcendence, beyondness, incommensurableness, in the supreme divine supernature. I fancy that if there seems more than a touch of exaggeration in this emphasis, it is due to the fact that Dr. Otto was trying to correct what was at the time, and indeed still is, an over-dominant note upon the other side. The *Zeitgeist* is even now over-indulgent to easy accommodations between cultural humanism and a would-be scientific "deism," half-hearted alliances between a religion increasingly chary of the supernatural and a common-sense "science" not unwilling to borrow on easy terms all the "uplift" possible to assist its commerce with the natural: the result being, as Mr. Needham puts it,[1] a diluting of science and religion "or a mixing of them into one grey mass, where science is not very scientific and religion not very religious." Against this tendency, fatal to religion, some exaggeration of protest may be excused. And it should be remembered that Otto's most characteristic work preceded by some years the counter-attack by Karl Barth and his school against this naturalising of religion, a counter-attack in which, as it seems to me, the opposite position was extravagantly exaggerated. Had he been writing with the Barthian doctrine in view, Otto would certainly have put the stress elsewhere.

In concluding this short notice of Dr. Otto's teaching I will myself venture upon a similitude. If a man is to live as a physical being he needs food to eat and air to breathe. He must be capable of digestion and of respiration. And so with religion and the human soul. If religion is to revive and the soul of man not to wither, we need that grasp upon clearly comprehended rational and moral truth which is like the food without which we starve: but also and no less that acknowledgement of the burden of the divine mystery, that responsiveness to the further inspirations of its meaning which are like the air without which we stifle. And it seems to me that Dr. Otto's writings have done a real service in reminding us particularly of this latter need.

[1] In his book *The Great Amphibium*.

# THE ABIDING SIGNIFICANCE OF THE APOCALYPTIC.

By the Rev. John W. Oman, D.D., Principal of Westminster College, Cambridge.

IN history, as in science, the theory which can be summed up definitely in one statement may, by drawing attention to one aspect and excluding the disturbing influence of others, be, for a time, useful in research. Thus, in science, what is known as Newtonism—the theory that everything can be explained by the laws of motion and that all laws of motion are in the end the one law of inertia—was useful precisely by its limitation, and produced results which would have been impossible with anything more complicated. But, when it was thought that every energy of mind and every quality of the universe could be reduced to this law of equivalence of quantity, it became mere blinkers. In the same way, the theory of the Rule of God on the earth, as a crude material expectation of a catastrophic change by the fiat and election of God, was a useful instrument of research for a time. It explained many things in the Old Testament and helped to deliver from merely rationalistic interpretations of the New. But when everything is reduced to it—all questions of faith and of the character of God, and all questions of moral motive and ideal—it also becomes mere blinkers. Just as the true and whole reality of the visible world is its infinitely varied meaning in which we carry out infinitely varied purposes, so the religious world is the world of infinite eternal meaning and absolute eternal purpose. The prophets and Jesus and Paul may have cherished a near historical perspective, but that is a small matter compared with what is much more certain —that they were religious men of the deepest spiritual insight and the highest consecration, and not puppets pulled by the string of one obsession. While the very intensity of their faith in God's working in the world may have foreshortened their perspective of its full manifestation, they lived in a world of eternal realities which for them was already present, and it was this that has made them abiding moral and spiritual inspirations. No doubt it is necessary to realise that in many ways they thought differently in their age from what we do in ours, but it is also necessary to realize that, in essentials, spiritual and moral quality is the same in every age and that we can understand what was greatest in them only as we also live in the things unseen and eternal which are of every age.

But, while their expectation of a Rule of God on earth sprang from what is moral and spiritual, it, in turn, deeply affected the form of their moral and spiritual outlook. To show this adequately would require a treatise, and that by a person much better equipped for the task than I am. Yet merely to point out that there is

such a double relation and give some indications and illustrations may be of sufficient usefulness to justify a short paper.

The first point is that all prophecy rests on the view that civilisation is not an end in itself. It should serve spiritual and moral ends, and, if it do not serve these ends, it cannot be kept going. Hence, as the civilisation of the prophets' own age was not serving them, it was always exposed to disaster and might at any time be overthrown. Yet what makes this prophecy is not alone the conviction that such disaster comes by moral causes. It is still more that this would not happen were not good as active a power in the world as evil, and that calamity is as much for the manifestation of the good as for the destruction of the evil. If God pulls down and uproots, it is to build and to plant.

In all the prophets *the Divine Rule is in the World-Rule at once destructive and re-creative.*

The second point is what the Rule of God is. This concerns the ultimate spiritual order, and the new vision of it began with Hosea. A righteous world had been thought to consist in the exact equivalence of action and award, and a righteous God to be One who administers this law exactly and without respect to persons.

But the last thing Hosea desired was that his erring wife should receive the due reward of her deeds. What concerned him was the soul of the woman herself: and he boldly applied the same to God in respect of Israel. And, from this, it was easy to extend the principle to all God's erring children. In a word, *the ultimate order of the world was conceived to be redemptive, not legal.* The whole Rule of God might be far beyond man to know, but, if this was its method and its purpose, not only can we know what is essential in it, but we can serve it. Hence all morality as well as all faith was transformed. It was no longer a legal obedience to gain its reward, but a service of men which was a fellow-working with God for man's blessedness in God's Rule. This was and remains a judgment of the world as it is, yet it was and is a glorious end worthy of all material losses and tribulations, a world as it should be, for which we may be prepared to lose the world as it is. All prophetic and Christian expectation sprang from this redemptive not legal view of God's working.

The third point is that, out of this comes Isaiah's doctrine of the *Remnant, which was at once redeemed and redeeming.* This is the abiding life of the tree that is to be cut down. The second Isaiah is not merely attached to the first Isaiah by accident. The Servant of the Lord is this redeemed and redeeming Remnant, whereby the Rule of God is to come, as Jeremiah conceived it, as an order in which no one needs to say to his brother, "Know the Lord," for all shall know him and no one needs to legislate for his brother, for God will write his law on each heart. This was the culmination of prophecy in the Old Testament and the glorious liberty of the children of God in the New.

The fourth point is that a new conception of good and evil arose with the idea of a *Kingdom of Good and a Kingdom of Evil.* Sin

is not rightly described as being a religious and not a moral concern. Yet the moral depends on the religious. What is ultimate we may call worship, that is man's final and highest reverence. In essence sin is idolatry. We are either for what Paul afterwards described as the Anarchy of Darkness or for the Kingdom of the Son of God's love. Sin leads to transgression, which is rejecting what we know to be right. But in itself sin is being in the World-Rule and out of God's. What troubled the faithful was not acts of transgression, but that a rule opposed to God should be able to make itself so mighty in God's world. The later Jewish Apocalyptic was concerned mainly with the overthrow of this usurper. But I question whether, even in the most national Jewish Apocalyptic, it was ever a mere material transformation by outward might, wholly without Jeremiah's free and spiritual idea of the Kingdom.

The union of the idea that the Kingdom comes by the power of God yet is by the repentance and consecration of men was affected by this view that *the evil is one disloyalty and the regeneration one true worship*, because it could be thought that a change of rule might come by a change of mind at any moment.

*The Christian programme of it is the Lord's Prayer.* Schweitzer is quite right in saying that it is concerned with the Rule or Kingdom of God. But to make it a prayer for Schweitzer's kind of Kingdom, he has to do more violence to it than he does to the Beatitudes, which is saying a great deal. For example, he makes the fourth petition, Give us this day the future bread of the Kingdom. Apart from any question of interpretation, how does this fit in with the view that the Kingdom is wholly a future event? Nor is the view of Temptation, as the Messianic woes, more convincing. A prayer taught to common people is likely to have a plain religious meaning. The word translated *daily* I take to mean sufficient as opposed to a common word of similar form meaning abundant. The idea of the future in it is the philologist's error that popular words are made philologically. And Temptation may mean the great tribulation, but not as the woes of the Messiah.

The whole prayer is governed by the idea of our common Father who is in the heavenly things which unite us and do not, like the earthly things, divide. The supreme transforming need is reverence for this name. This is the Old Testament idea of the decisiveness of what we worship. Then the Father's Kingdom will be present in regard for His children; and with this His will can be done on earth as in heaven, which cannot mean merely perfectly, but fully and gladly. This may be in the future, and was expected to come by God's working, probably in some catastrophic form. But everyone who with others has God as their common Father and seeks God's heavenly things must, in some effective sense, be within the scope of these petitions now. And the last three petitions have certainly to do with the present. They concern living in a world where we have material needs, but hold them in due subordination to the spiritual; where we still require forgiveness, but realise it in mercy and peace as we exercise among our fellows the forgiving

spirit of our Father; where we are exposed to trial, but should be like our Master without anything in us to which the Prince of this World could appeal. All this means living now in God's Rule. And if this is the conception of the Kingdom, the way of expecting its coming cannot have been out of accord with it.

From this we can see how the Kingdom takes up in its most spiritual form the teaching of the Old Testament. It is doing God's will on earth with the same insight, freedom and consecration as in heaven. Over against it is a Kingdom of Darkness. If we reverence our common Father in the spiritual things which unite and bless men, we are in the one Rule; and if we worship worldly power which divides and oppresses, we are in the other. It is a moral rule, but the living in it is of religious insight, not moral effort. It is essentially serving God as Father and having His law as for our good always written on the heart.

With this we have in the teaching both of Jesus and of Paul the idea of sin as a moral state, but determined by religious sincerity. Sin in the Gospels is hypocrisy, resisting the appeal and will of God. In Paul it is resisting the truth in unrighteousness. It leads to transgression, which is conscious rejection of the right, and, when fulfilled, works degradation of the mind, the conscience and even the body. But sin is all failure to be committed wholly to the mind of God.

Equally evident is the doctrine of the Remnant. It consists of those who are wholly consecrated to knowing God's mind and obeying it: and the essential point is that they are not only redeemed but redeeming. Like their Lord they are for seeking and saving the lost. Living in a redemptive not a legal order, mere legal condemnation does not touch those who belong to it, so that they are not concerned about their souls, but about their service.

The tribulation of entering it is because of the nature of the Kingdom, as a spiritual victory over the souls of men, and not a mere change of outward conditions. It is the way of redeeming men from deceit and violence and of bringing in an order of peace on earth and goodwill to men. Considering their freedom in interpreting Scripture, we cannot suppose that either Jesus or Paul took the Messianic woes to be a mere useless appointment of God with no foundation but the announcement of prophecy. Jesus does not speak as if they were past, and Paul thinks he has still to fill up the sufferings of Christ for his body's sake. Moreover, while the Servant of the Lord, working in God's redeeming order and serving the kind of Rule which God seeks over the hearts of men, has to overcome the Rule of Darkness by suffering from it, the great and terrible day of the Lord, which prepares for the coming of His Kingdom has to do neither with the Messiah nor the Remnant, but with the lesson necessary for those who cherish it, of the destruction of the idolatry of the present World-Rule. Therefore, the idea that Jesus thought the Cross was a sort of forcing of God's hand by bearing for others the Messianic woes has no more foundation in prophecy than it has in the Gospels. Is there anywhere in the Old or New Testa-

ment where the woes are not conceived as the destruction of the World-Rule, as in Revelation? If, therefore, temptation in the Lord's Prayer means these woes, it is that we should be so under God's Rule as not to need this deliverance from the world's idolatry; and then it naturally goes with deliverance from the Evil One.

With this we have the question of what Schweitzer describes as the "interim ethic" of the New Testament. That Jesus or even Paul based the kind of moral life they taught on the view that men are to be meek and lowly now before God's requirements and be the servant of all, because if they are last in service now they will be first in honour when the Kingdom comes in power, and be the exalted magnates of God's administration, is not humanly possible. Surely we are to live now in that way because the new order is to be of that kind, an order in which service, and not dignity or dominion, is the true honour. While the World-Rule uses men as tools for gain and slaves for service, God's Rule is for the blessedness and liberty of His children, so that the Apocalyptic hope is just that men like the prodigal should come to themselves and see the folly of worshipping and serving an oppressive tyrant.

The Rule of God on earth may be summed up as the rule of love, if love is concerned with the perfect image of God in man. That this is in some form effective now is never separate from the expectation of a fuller manifestation, not in another world, but in this. If we compare this hope with the striving for Nirvana, with absorption in the One and all ceasing from troubling, or even with the hope of a Heaven in which we have individual existence, but on a plane which has no relation to our life in the body, we see its significance for both faith and practice.

Faith is concerned with knowing the mind of God in the situation in which He has placed us and not with intellectual construction of the Deity. Thus it delivers us from what Ritschl calls a metaphysical idol. If this Rule is His purpose, and if we accept it and are consecrated to it, and then, even if it be only as Paul saw it in a mirror darkly, discern that all things are working together for it, there is meaning in calling God Father. And, if beyond this life, we have the hope of knowing the rule of love which now knows us, this other life has content from what we are serving now, whereas an other-worldly religion is as empty for faith as it is uninspiring for service. But this hope of God's Rule on Earth weaves faith and ethics into one seamless garment, because every right human relation we establish now is at once an evidence of the presence of God's Rule and is taken up into its future fulfilment.

Our civilisation is no more eternal than any other, but if there is a higher order which will at once destroy the present order because of its evil, yet be the fulfilment of its good, we can both serve our age and look beyond it. The deepest concern still is not what men think of particular thoughts or do of particular deeds, but what they worship. The decisive question about our world still is whether it is a redemptive order, and about ourselves whether we belong to the redeeming Remnant. And in the end

we maintain no freedom or spiritual possession except as we do not fear them that kill the body, which is as neither the threats nor allurements of evil find anything in us.

For the general expectation of a Rule of God on earth this may suffice, and I shall give what time remains to the question of whether there is any abiding value in its definitely apocalyptic or catastrophic form.

But, first, we must consider what this form really was. It was not the creation by God's might of a world entirely in accord with His mind. For Paul it was what he calls the manifestation of the children of God. Even sympathetic exponents of Paul seem to think his psychology muddled and his idea of relation to Christ primitive, tribal, almost mechanical, and the statement that the final judgment will be according to the deeds done in the body inconsistent with his doctrine of being justified by faith. But Paul's psychology is clear and simple. Man consists of *νοῦς* and *σῶμα* which we might call the matter and the form of personality. But this partakes of two worlds, the spiritual and the fleshly. We may, body and soul, rise into the abiding unity of the spiritual, or, body and soul, sink into the chaos and corruption of the fleshly. In the lower or psychical we are bound together yet separate; in the spiritual we are at once truly ourselves and have undivided fellowship. When we are in the spirit, therefore, Christ is not separate from us because He is in Heaven. His coming in power is just the manifestation of this spiritual world. Those who are in the spirit will be seen to be in God's order, and Christ is to reign in it till he brings all things into subjection to it. The question of justification and of being called, concerns fitness to be with Christ in this task. The Kingdom is thus an expansion of the present missionary task, and, therefore, election is to service in it. To those who thus serve there can be no condemnation, but even they may build with wood and hay and stubble and not with gold and precious stone. Only after the missionary task of the manifested Kingdom is complete, comes God's final judgment: and that is by what men have been, according to their opportunities. This, if I am right in my reconstruction of the book, is also what is set forth in Revelation, and, in spite of all that has been said to the contrary, I question if Jesus had any other idea or thought of the Kingdom as the final consummation of all things.

There is no reason why we should not expect a day of the manifestation of God's order in His children, when the Remnant in whom it is now embodied shall no longer be crucified in weakness, but be manifested in power. But that is not what I have undertaken to discuss. Our question is whether there are any abiding principles in it for our strength and guidance in our own time.

First there is the question of our Civilisation.

It is right to cherish the hope that our civilisation will gradually regenerate itself, and to work to this end as the prophets did in their time. But in history, the highest in a civilisation never seems to emancipate itself from the lowest except by catastrophe

—and this is not far from Apocalyptic. And perhaps catastrophe does not come till there is at work in men's souls a higher order to be emancipated by the children of God being manifested. Whether we are to expect one final cataclysm or not, the destructive yet liberating effect of cataclysms are of the historical order.

The second point is the Remnant, and with it the moral attitude. How are we expecting a new creation? Is it by what Paul calls the bond written in ordinances, by safeguards of freedom here, and laws amended there, by national safeguards here and national concessions there? Or is our hope in a change of rule altogether and, before that, of reverence? Can we work for it otherwise than as we live in it? And have we not to commit the manifestation of it in the end to God?

There is a sense in which all true morality is an interim ethic. It is not being in accord with any order that exists, but for one that ought to be. All increasing vision of what is required and all sacred obligation to follow it in reverence for the highest and in regard for one another assumes, in one sense, the active presence now of what should be, and, in another, has merely to do what is our immediate call and leave the manifestation of it wholly to God.

But the Christian ethic is still more definitely interim; and it applies specially to the Church. It is to be the Remnant, who live in God's Rule and are working in the world as its leaven. This means that we should think only one thing supremely worth doing, to be ministers of reconciliation, beseeching men in Christ's stead to be reconciled to God of whom are all things. "Of whom are all things" is the essential, because it means so being friends with God as to see His mind and purpose as the interpretation of His world, and thereby all things in the world, even the worst, working for good. It is this entire change of Rule or nothing. Jesus did not think it worth while to cross the street to make the most disreputable Publican into the most reputable Pharisee, the very thing to which we give so much of our energy. His ethic rests on the belief that we cannot reform the world from without by stronger institutions or improved regulations, but only by a right worship, a transformation of reverence. And that faith is the substance of apocalyptic.

And even this change of mind is in a sense a catastrophic hope, a manifesting by God and not a working by man. It is our part to live as God's children, to be the redeeming as well as the redeemed, and God's part in His own time and way to manifest that the Rule we live in is His Rule.

What we believe is largely shown by what we do not believe. He that believeth shall not make haste, and most of the stunts in theology as well as in politics are mere attempts to force God Himself into making haste. There are such things as Days of the Lord, but they may be darkness and not light. Yet they are days of revealing for every high thought and purpose, if they find us as good servants, not striving, but serving our day and generation

by calmly and graciously filling our own place. To be crucified to the World-Rule is to hold the freedom of God's children dearer than life, but this is also to possess the world as well as to overcome it. When that is seen the Kingdom will be manifested in power. But will it be seen without the uprooting as well as the re-planting of a Day of the Lord?

---

CHRISTUS VICTOR: AN HISTORICAL STUDY OF THE THREE MAIN TYPES OF THE IDEA OF THE ATONEMENT. By Gustaf Aulén. Translated by A. G. Hebert, M.A. *S.P.C.K.* 6*s.* net.

The author of this book is Professor of Systematic Theology in the University of Lund. In March and April, 1930, he delivered the Olaus Petri Lectures and these are here translated by A. G. Hebert of the Society of the Sacred Mission, Kelham. No more impressive and important contribution to the study of the Atonement has appeared for a long time. Of theories of the Atonement there are, broadly speaking, two: one the Objective and the other the Subjective. The former regards the whole of the satisfaction for sin as made by God Himself in Christ. The latter looks upon the death of Christ as producing an effect upon the believer which in some way tends to make him a contributor to his own redemption.

The Objective theory says that Christ's atoning work brings about a change in God's attitude to the sinner. The Subjective theory suggests that by the death of Christ a change is wrought in the attitude of man.

Dr. Aulén's contention is that there is another view which he asserts is the typical view of the New Testament, of the Fathers, and of Luther—a view to be clearly distinguished from the other two.

The whole subject is discussed with considerable force and ability, and the book deserves serious attention, for it has in it the promise of great helpfulness.

---

PERSONAL PROBLEMS OF CONDUCT AND RELIGION. By J. G. McKenzie, M.A., B.D. *Geo. Allen & Unwin, Ltd.* 5*s.* net.

No subjects could be of greater interest and of more practical importance than those dealt with in these pages. Here are a few of the problems discussed: "What our young people are thinking." "Temptation and Churchgoing." "Christ and the World." "The delinquent child." The method employed is the application of psychological knowledge to concrete difficulties. Anyone who is concerned with practical Christian work will find much to help him in these bright, vigorous and sympathetic attempts to come to grips with some of the perennial problems of human life, though he may not be prepared to endorse all that the author says.

# PROFESSOR KARL BARTH AND THE THEOLOGY OF CRISIS.

By the Rev: A. J. Macdonald, D.D., Rector of St. Dunstan's-in-the-West

KARL BARTH, the son of a Swiss Professor of Theology at Berne, was born at Basle in 1886. He was educated at Berne, at Berlin (under Harnack), and at Tübingen (under Hermann). He became a journalist in the office of the *Christlichwelt* (1908–09) and developed a vivid dialectical style. He was assistant in a Swiss pastorate at Geneva (1909–11) and for ten years had charge of a Reformed church of his own. In 1921 he was made Professor of Theology at Göttingen. In 1925 he accepted the Chair at Münster, and in 1929 at Bonn. He comes from a distinguished academic family. He has three brothers: Peter, Professor of New Testament Theology at Geneva; Heinrich, Professor of Philosophy at Basle; while the third is a Doctor of Medicine.

The theology of Barth has become the material of what Brunner of Zurich has termed the theology of crisis, but Barth's teaching was not developed in the first instance to meet the situation arising out of the War. In one of his chapters in *The Word of God and the Word of Man* he describes the week-end crisis of the minister faced by the urgency of saying something effective to his people. Barth felt this crisis before the War, and during its early years when he prepared his sermons for his Swiss congregation. He took up the Epistle to the Romans and went through it, week by week, in a series of graphic expositions, which have now become famous in his magnificent commentary on that book.

Like every other prophetic mind Barth was early possessed by a spirit of discontent, which he learned to regard as divine. He perceived the breakdown of the theology of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It had ceased to be the embodiment of faith, it had lost its inspired content, it represented merely the workmanship of the human mind, using as materials, not the Word of God, but the conclusions of human philosophy, science and history.

"Our naturalism, our soulless historism, our æstheticism are mistaken. Whence arises the opposing fact that we are always in part refusing to ask after God—you take your biology! you take your history!—I have my religion!—you in your small corner and I in mine."—All this "converts the knowledge of God offered in the Bible into what it is not. . . . The failure of the relative type (of Christianity) consisting of experience, metaphysics, and history, is so palpably, so unmistakably before our eyes, and the demand for a something new, the Wholly Other, the reality of God, is so definitely upon our lips."

Note that all this was written in 1916 when the victory of the Germanic powers appeared to continental observers to be assured.

But Barth is not a fundamentalist, nor does he think meanly

of the gifts of intellect in the interpretation of the Bible and religion. We require the aid of criticism, history and science, but religion enters when these have done their work. It is something very far beyond and above the conclusions of the intellectualists in any branch of enquiry. So he condemns the modern tendency to "shake off theology and think what is intelligible" as "hysterical and thoughtless." To be ashamed of theology is "a children's disease." His quarrel with contemporary theology is levelled against its lack of spiritual insight, of spiritual content and power to inspire.

In this Conference we shall perhaps be more especially interested in what Barth calls the preacher's problem. He says:

"Once in the Ministry I found myself growing away from these theological habits of thought and being forced back . . . more and more upon the specific minister's problem, the sermon. I sought to find my way between the problem of human life on the one hand and the content of the Bible on the other. My intention is not to create a new theology, but to get at the trend of the revealed theology of the Bible, and make that a living message for the crisis of the times."

Although he makes use of every modern aid to interpretation, Barth is not a Modernist. He accepts the theology of the Creeds, but seeks to expound their living content, and finds it in the Bible message which they enshrine.

But he is aware also of the problem of the man in the pew.

"On Sunday morning when the bells ring to call the congregation and minister to church, there is in the air an expectancy that something great, crucial and momentous is to happen. Here is a building, old or new, of which the very architecture, even apart from the symbols, paintings, and appointments which adorn it, betrays the fact that it is thought of as a place of extraordinary doings. Here are people, only two or three . . . or perhaps even a few hundred, who, impelled by a strange instinct or will, stream towards this building, where they seek—what? . . . and their being here points to the event that is expected . . . or was once expected here.

". . . here above all is a man (the preacher) upon whom the expectation of the apparently imminent event seems to rest in a special way. —he will pray—he will read from the Bible—he will enter the pulpit and—here is daring—preach; that is, he will add to what has been read from the Bible something from his own head and heart. . . . He must speak of God—God *is* present. The whole situation witnesses, cries, simply shouts of it, even when in ministers or people there arises questioning, wretchedness or despair." . . .

Karl Barth's theology springs from this overpowering sense of the individual preacher's *need*—"Not until our preaching arises from need will our work become a *mission*. Mission alone can legitimize preaching." "Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel." It is no use for the preacher to contemplate resignation under the sense of unworthiness or unfitness—

"Shall we say farewell to the ministry, give up our positions, and become what all the others are?—But the others are not happy. . . . If we were not ministers others would have to be . . . giving up the ministry would be as sensible as taking one's life; nothing would come of it, absolutely nothing."

How does Barth solve the problem? His reply takes us to the heart of the Barthian system. It must be "remembered as we look forward to our task that only God *Himself* can speak of God. The task of the minister is the Word of God," and he weaves the maxim into his first formal theological work (the first volume of the *Dogmatik*) written when no longer a parish minister, but when occupying the Chair of theology at Münster. He defines "dogmatics" as the "effort towards the recognition of the legitimate content of Christian speech about God and Man." Human preaching can only be a *ministerium verbi*, a service towards this original Word-itself. His idea contains the notion of the Word, the Logos Himself being in the preaching, "its content can be no other than the Word of God itself." The human word of the preacher is merely the instrument of the Word of God, empowered and directed by the same Word of God which declared itself in Holy Scripture. So the sense of burden is removed from us by the recollection that our preaching is not our own—it is a manifestation of the Word of God.

"Obviously the people have no need of *our* observations upon morality and culture, or even of our disquisitions upon religion, worship and the possible existence of other worlds. The theme of preaching is not 'psychology, morals, biblical history, public utility, ecclesiastical tradition, personal experience,' but the . . . 'Cross, the Resurrection and repentance' —and this is what the people expect to hear. If the congregation brings to church the great question of human life and seeks an answer for it, the Bible contrariwise brings an answer."

We have to speak of God, or better, let God speak in us. What, then, is Barth's view of God? His conception of God is primarily transcendental although its transcendentalism is balanced by the immanentalism of his doctrine of the Holy Spirit. "God is in Heaven; we are on earth—to use the language of human symbols." There is a distinction between God and ourselves which cannot be traversed —surely a healthy challenge to the vague subjective teaching which inspires our preaching, our religion, our psychology to-day—all, be it observed, an inheritance from two hundred years of theologising and philosophising and now of psychologising. This is the angle of approach of prophetic men, of Isaiah and Jeremiah, of Paul and Luther and Calvin. It is Barth's challenge to the immanental theology of our day. The necessary prerequisite for every soul which would get right with God is to realise God as completely and distinctly *other* than himself, not to be grasped by any subjective movement of thought, only to be understood by movement from the other side, by revelation from God, indeed as Barth has recently shown, in his little book on the Holy Spirit, by the agency of the Holy Spirit. So completely does Barth draw a distinction between man and God, that he defines God as "non-being" in contrast with the existential life of man, as Plato taught and as, we may add, John the Scot in the ninth century taught, although under the different phrase "no-thing." Hence S. Paul speaks of the unknown God. Yet there is no Gnostic nihilism in this conception. God is

only described as "non-being" in contrast with the material nature of human beings; "spiritual being" would express Barth's meaning just as well. The loftiest human conception or experience of God falls short of apprehending His reality because we, as material beings, cannot approach to a true conception of the spiritual, of God. "The divine is on the further side of the human last." Barth is content to state the *fact* of God, and he calls upon us to be content with that; man cannot define the attributes and qualities of God, especially as God seldom speaks of Himself in revelation.

How does man become conscious of the fact of God—how does man know that God is there? Not through any movement of man towards God, but of God towards man. There is no way from man to God, but from God to man. This is another fundamental Barthian concept. Man is incapable of finding out God by his own efforts. God seeks man and finds him. I think Barth is right. God the Word came seeking man, came down from Heaven, was incarnate. The process of the Incarnation is God seeking man, making a way from God to man, not *vice versa*. Man must place himself in the way of the seeking God. That is our part in the process. "Seek ye the Lord" means "go out and on to the way where the Seeker may find you." So Paul says "work out your own salvation—for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to work for his good pleasure (Phil. ii. 12 f.), a piece of antithetical dialectic which Barth accurately reflects.

The medium of our knowledge, or consciousness, or experience of God is revelation. Human thought and reason cannot find Him. Even the mystic cannot find God, apart from the self-revelation of God to his soul. This revelation is granted by the Divine Word, the Logos, the Son. If the Word of God is laid upon the lips of the preacher "that happens through the monarchical Word of God Himself." That which is Revealed and the Revealer are the same, God the Father, God the Son. God's work is the function of speaking or revealing, so the Son of God is the Word. Revelation is not a gradual response of God to man as man slowly thinks his way towards God through the centuries. Revelation is a breaking-into history at definite points, in the prophets, in Jesus. Revelation envelops history at both ends. It was there waiting, before human history began. It will be there after human history has ended. So it is pre-history, and post-history. So in the person of Jesus, the Word of God was revealed. It crashed into human thought in the midst of its blind stumbling course. The same process takes place in individuals to-day. The revelation of God to us is a coming of the Word to us. We are found by God. God is not immanent in us save in the gift of the Holy Spirit: He is made imminent to us by the revealing Word. The *Kenosis* teaching of S. Paul does not mean that Christ emptied Himself of divinity, it means, that He came down and took to Himself humanity. It was no mere raising of the human up to the divine, but a coming down of the divine to the level of the human. The novelty of revelation and

reconciliation is that God unites human existence to Himself in time at the Incarnation. The humanity of Jesus is a " predicate of God, of the Lord as mediator functioning for us, assumed in incomprehensible condescension." Hence the Incarnation cannot be interpreted as a mere event in history. It is the manifestation on the field of human history, of pre-history. It can only be comprehended theologically. From the point of view of human history it may be a miracle, from the point of view of pre-history and eternity, it is a natural divine event which we shall expect. In theology it is no marvel or miracle. In precisely the same way the book of Genesis speaks to us of God, because it contains the record of the revelation of God to Abraham. It records a breaking-in of God upon the theatre of history in the consciousness of Abraham, and what concerned Abraham concerns us. So the Incarnation and the faith of Abraham are incomprehensible to the observer who does not regard them with something more than the equipment of the historian. They are only comprehensible to an observer endowed with faith. By this method Barth has no difficulty in grasping the scriptural account of the process of the Incarnation—the Virgin-birth. It is a straightforward account of the entry of the revealing Word into history, into time. Thus while it is an historical event, it differs from all other historical events, because it is the point at which pre-history, the divine, is revealed on the plane of the human. The Word of God actually " *becomes* " for us at the Virgin Birth. This is the miracle from the human standpoint. Our theological knowledge prevents it from being a myth. It is not a fact in the ordinary sense, but a fact of which God is the doer. The real miracle is not in the method of the birth of Jesus, but in the fact that the Son of God came to earth.

If the function of the Word of God or Son of God is that of the Revealer, the Word is also revelation itself. The function of the Holy Spirit in Barth's theology is to enable men to grasp the revelation, and to produce its fruits in the human soul. Barth dissociates the human spirit from the Holy Spirit. The human spirit is not a spark of divinity, as some of the old Greek thinkers taught, it is absolutely other than the divine Spirit. The human spirit cannot find God without an indwelling of the Holy Spirit. The indwelling Holy Spirit re-creates the Spirit of man, and reconciles it with God. He does this by the gift of grace. " Spirit is only recognized by Spirit, God by God. The Word of God speaks in us through the Spirit of God, and the same Spirit hears in us." Thus the special function of the Spirit is that of interpretation, interpretation of that which is revealed by the word, although Barth does not actually use this term interpretation.

The Holy Spirit is set up in the human subject as a newly constituted subject with the human " I," and imparts its divine influence to the soul . . . so that we have peace with God and entrance to his grace. Barth appears to identify the presence of the Holy Spirit so closely with the believer's spirit, that the " ego " remains not " I " but becomes " we "—" *we* have peace with God " means

"I and the Spirit within me." This union of the Holy Spirit with the human spirit is effected through faith, which itself is the gift of the Holy Spirit. Grace is not mere sanctification, it is also a gift of God, imparted by the Holy Spirit. "The eternal source of grace is the Holy Spirit. Grace is more than favour, more than sanctification. It is the life itself in the form of the infusion of the Holy Spirit, an inpouring of the Lord of Life Himself." This emphasis upon the indwelling Spirit should remove the charge that the Barthian theology passes over the doctrine of divine immanence.

Baptism is an endowment with grace—not with the Holy Spirit. The Spirit gives grace in baptism, in baptism man is put under the sign of grace. The mere human and material concomitants of baptism do not secure the grace. The dynamic of baptism is the Holy Spirit.

The Holy Communion is a physical appropriation of the bread and wine, and a spiritual appropriation of the true Body and Blood of the Lord. But there is no union between substance and symbol, between the material elements and the spiritual reality. In the Lord's Supper the Holy Spirit adds spiritual substance to the symbol, and revelation to the witness of revelation, poured out according to his own free pleasure.

According to Karl Barth, the Bible is not merely the literature of a religion, or of the Church. It is the source of authority for personal religion. There is no way from God to our souls save through the letter of that writing. This view does not exclude the necessary criticism of the text. It is the function of criticism to arrive at the inner meaning of the letter. If the Bible contains the Word of God spoken to us, it is a collection of human documents, demanding educated human efforts for the elucidation of the text. But scholarly criticism and explanation of the text is one thing; feeding the soul on the Word of God is another. The latter begins when the former ends. In the Bible we find a new world—the world of revelation. "There is a river in the Bible that carries us away, once we have entrusted our destiny to it—away from ourselves to the sea. The Holy Scriptures will interpret themselves, in spite of all our human limitations. We need only dare to follow this drive, this Spirit, this river, to grow out beyond ourselves towards the highest answer. This daring is faith. The Bible unfolds to us as we are made to grow by the grace of God."

If the Bible is not meant to teach us history, neither does it teach us mere morality, for the simple reason that the new world of the Bible is not concerned with the doings of man, but with the doings of God. It is a world in which morality is dispensed with, because it is taken for granted. The real issue is spiritual. Nor is the Bible a text-book of natural science. The biblical idea of creation is intended for "a solemn marking of the distance between the cosmos and the Creator, and precisely not for a metaphysical explanation of the world. God *said* Let there be! That is all. All being awaits upon the Word of God." Sir James Jeans has

recently said a precisely similar thing: "The whole story of creation can be told with perfect accuracy and completeness in the six words: God said, Let there be light.'" [1]

"It is not the right human thoughts about God which form the context of the Bible, but the right divine thoughts about men. God purposes nought but the establishment of a new world. Who is God? The Son who has become the mediator for my soul, but more than that—for the whole world, the redeeming Word—the redeemer of a humanity gone astray. . . . The whole Bible authoritatively announces that God must be all in all, and the events of the Bible are the beginning, the glorious beginning of a new world. Who is God? The Spirit in his believers . . . which will and must break forth from quiet hearts into the world outside. So God is immanent in the believer."

Thus the Word of God is revealed to us in the speaking Word through the written word, *via* the voice of the preacher. Christian preaching is the Word of God by virtue of its grounding in Holy Scripture. Holy Scripture is the Word of God by virtue of its grounding in the revelation of God. Revelation is the speech of God grounded in itself. It is the Person of God Himself. The Word of God is God in His revelation.

Barth will have no concentration upon the mere human character of the life of Jesus. Jesus as God is his message—a healthy reaction against a mere Christocentric theology, against the school represented by Glover's *Jesus of History*—a vindication of Alexandrian against Antiochene Christology.

If Barth discounts the effectiveness of human reason as the instrument for discovering, by itself, the revelation, he allows room for the function of reason in apprehending that which God offers. The Word of God is the speech of divine reason to human reason, and imparts knowledge. He appears to mean that God as Word is not integrated for man, until He is received by us, that God needs for His adequate functioning human recognition. This is something more than the illumination of human intellect, it is an actualizing of the Word of God in the reason. But the two must always be kept distinct—revelation and faith on one side—religion and reason on the other.

The function of the Church in the Barthian system is to preserve the preaching ministry and impart the sacraments. This it does by preaching. The material of preaching is dogmatics or Christian doctrine, which is a formal statement of the written Word of God in Scripture, to enable a clear and concise preaching of Scripture. The practical test of doctrine is, "Can it be preached?" The Trinitarian doctrine in the form of doctrine is the work of the Church. Here I disagree with Brunner, and I think that Barth would disagree with him, when he says that the Trinity cannot be preached. It has not been my experience. But both Barth and Brunner emphasise the statement that the Church mediates the Word of God in the form of Church doctrine.

[1] *Mysterious Universe*, p. 78.

So far as the Church fails to fulfil this function she comes under the lash of Barth's invective.

" What is the use of all the preaching, baptising, confirming, bell-ringing and organ playing, of all the religious crowds and modes, the counsels of ' applied religion ' . . . the community houses with or without moving-pictures . . . the efforts to enliven church singing, the respectably tame and stupid . . . Church papers ? "

They might take note of this in Liverpool. He continues: " The attempt of the Christian middle-ages to *clericalise* society may perhaps be undertaken once more, and once more meet the success it deserves. Already there are signs of a disposition to make the experiment. . . . Surely we shall resist this temptation to betray society ; it is no easier to bring it to Christ, than Christ to it. For it is God's help that we still have really in mind ; and we shall deceive society about it if we set to work building churches and chapels and do not learn to wait upon Him in a wholly new way." English readers may note that Otto's mysticism is heavily criticised.

The canon of scripture was formed under the agency of the Holy Ghost. Scripture is a whole, and the Old and New Testament are parts of one whole. All scripture is inspired. So while he declines the seventeenth-century theory of verbal inspiration, he inclines to a view of plenary inspiration, although without being bound by the letter of any particular text. The Church has authority in imparting to us the context of Scripture, but it is a mediate authority, the original authority is in Scripture itself. So the Church is a teaching Church, a function not confined to the hierarchy, but shared by the whole Church of God. The Church cannot do or teach what it likes, only what it is ordered to do by God.

The conscience of man is free to accept or refuse what the Church teaches, what the Word of God speaks. The authority of the Word of God is not causal. There is only true freedom where conscience allows itself to submit and trust to authority. Authority as an overpowering causality would be a bare operation upon man. If man actually submits himself to God and actually trusts Him, that will be his own true act, an act of faith and obedience, not because he is compelled to do it, but because he does it himself. If I do not accept Scripture as a revelation of God, it becomes mere literature like that of Homer and Goethe. I have to make a decision on the truth which approaches me. But I have the Spirit's aid for this purpose.

On the doctrine of election Barth pares down the sharpness of Reformation teaching. Election to bliss or condemnation he recognises within the authority of the divine will. But man cannot decide one way or the other, and no man can say either way, what his condition is. There is never a No ! not accompanied by " Yes ! " in human destiny.

This uncertain note in his teaching is abandoned when he deals with the Resurrection. Although the Resurrection of Christ was an historic event, it is vastly more. It was not the summit of a development of the human spirit. The Resurrection is a divine

event which "down-came" on to the theatre of human life, like an electric current into a dead wire. If you think of the time-series of human history as a continuation of lengths of connected wires, and then conceive of a contact being made with a power-house at one point, in one of the lengths of wire, you have a crude illustration of the Barthian idea of the Resurrection. Reality now enters the wires, and gives power and meaning to the whole length. It is a manifestation of the sovereignty of God. In the Virgin Birth the revelation was concealed; in the Resurrection it is manifested. So the Resurrection of Jesus introduces a new principle into our life—which makes all things new. In the Resurrection of Jesus the reality of existence is revealed. Human existence, including death, is shown to be a mere paper envelope of the inner reality, which bursts through the envelope at the Resurrection of Jesus, and will burst through the human envelope enclosing every one of us.

What is in time must die in order to enter into life. So death is not to be shunned, we should welcome it. The other miracles of the Bible illustrate this miracle. Some day people will smile at the pictures of Jesus which we have made acceptable to the cultured by purging them of miracle, even more than our eighteenth and nineteenth centuries have smiled at the miracle stories.

Resurrection means a new *corporeality*. If there is one Creator of all things, there will be one redemption of all things, even of our body. As the body participates in the incomprehensibility, the vexatiousness, and distress of our existence, it must also participate in the new possibility beyond the boundary of our existence. This is, I think, a strikingly new idea. The material, the corporal, the temporal, the very terms which describe our bodily existence are finally concerned with the spiritual. Because created by God, the corporal must be resurrected by God, by virtue of an inner unity of God's function as Creator and Redeemer. There is an inner necessity in our creation which can only be fulfilled by Resurrection. We shall rise from the dead because we have been created by God. Creaturehood carries with it Resurrection as part of its nature. Human corporeality must be redeemed and resurrected because it has been created, and cannot escape the natural *dénouement* of its existence. "This corruptible must put on incorruption as surely as it is corruptible, as surely as it must die."

"Eternity is set in the heart of man, set in the new man who is to be put on, made in the image of God . . . it is the God-fearing individual who is the first to be touched. *Thou* art the man—*thou* art marked for it—it is *thy* concern, of *thee* is perseverance demanded—*thou* art the arena where the issues of Resurrection, the issues of God are determined. Observers of God there are none, as surely as there are no officious collaborators with God. There may, however, be children of God who are what they are by His Grace. There are our God-given selves, which *do not* yet appear what they shall be. This is our experience, yours and mine, which may always become the experience of God—this is the meaning of Easter."

In conclusion may I emphasise the fact that the teaching of Barth and Brunner is not the creation of a new theology. It is a revival of the spiritual content of Reformation Theology, with many of its crudities removed. No better service can be rendered in this country during the next year or two, when we shall be celebrating the fourth centenary of the dawn of the Reformation, than a close and sympathetic study of the Barthian movement. This movement is already world-wide. It has been clearly and concisely described by Dr. Keller, of Geneva, in his book, *Der Weg der dialektischen Theologie durch die kirchliche Welt.* But Barthianism does not go back merely to the Reformation. It is a revival like the Reformation, of the spiritual religion of the Bible, and of the best periods of ancient Church history. Therefore it is really a Catholic movement in the true sense. It is more, it is the most striking manifestation to-day of the Spirit's activity within the Churches. It blesses all who receive its precious teaching. It brings life to the individual soul, and supplies the tired preacher with a burning Evangelical message.

---

THE BEAUTY OF JESUS. By John Merrin, M.A. With Foreword by the Bishop of Manchester. *R.T.S.* 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Christian work is most effectively done when men and women are brought into direct contact with Jesus Christ. This attractive volume of over 200 well-printed pages sets forth the " Beauty of Jesus " in many aspects, and as a simple contribution to Christian evidences it should be very useful. It is clearly written with no flights of fancy or efforts at originality. A special interest attaches to the book in that the author was called into the presence of his Lord within a few days of its publication. It is therefore the final tribute of love and praise from one whose life work it was to gather souls into the Kingdom and to build up the living Church.

---

A GUIDE TO THE STUDY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. By Canon A. R. Fausset, D.D. *London: Thynne & Co. Ltd.*

The generation that knew the scholarly writings of the late Canon Fausset has almost passed away, but through the enterprise of the publishers we now have a re-issue of this manual on the Prayer Book to which we give a cordial welcome. It contains a great deal of valuable information—the Bible and the Prayer Book are shown to be in complete harmony, and the story of the book and its compilers is told, together with an account of the successive revisions and the story of the XXXIX Articles, while it is furnished with a useful Index. Incidentally there are biographical notices of some of the leading Reformers and it is to be hoped that the book will (at 2*s.*) have a wide circulation.

# THE GRACE OF GOD.

By the Rev. G. F. Graham Brown, M.A., Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford.

IT is in line with the traditions of the Oxford Conference that some aspect of the Reunion of the Churches be examined, and if necessary reported on; and in this connection I would recall some words of the Bishop of Gloucester: "To speak of Churches is erroneous. . . . We ought to speak of the Anglican schism, the Roman schism, the Wesleyan schism, and so on. . . . We are separate divisions or schisms of the Body of Christ."

It is a wise, and I believe a significant, change of approach, that we consider aspects of doctrine rather than reporting on schemes of Reunion which have issued from various sources. The consideration of the doctrine of Grace is not only one of the most thrilling subjects, but also one of the greatest magnitude. In fact, we might say, negatively, "No Grace, No Gospel"; positively "By the Grace of God I am what I am."

For reasons I need not mention here, the time which I set apart for the writing of this paper was commandeered, with the result that all that I hold dear has been pierced with an awl to the gateway of that city outside of which the verification of the Christian message was established. Again I realize that bond-service which is perfect freedom.

Had I been able to give the time to this subject, critics of this paper might have spoken of it as "a monument of the praiseworthy industry of a wholly uninstructed person"; if it be a monument at all, it can only be that of a blameworthy nostrum.

However that may be, we are fortunate that at this moment we have some outstanding books dealing with this subject of Grace. The two most important are, *The Doctrine of Grace*, edited by the Bishop of Gloucester, in which seventeen theologians investigated the differences between the Churches and gave it as their conviction that, provided the Churches agree in holding the essentials of the Christian faith, such differences would form no barrier to union between them; and, *Grace in the New Testament*, by Dr. James Moffatt. In the bibliography that he gives he states: "On the positive content of the idea, there is no better book in English or indeed, so far as I am aware, in any language, than Dr. John Oman's difficult and rewarding *Grace and Personality*."

To this last book I feel I owe more than I can say, and find in reading it over again that it has formed the background of much of such theological thinking as I have been able to do. Further, for this paper I have received considerable help from the Rev. G. F. Allen, Chaplain of Lincoln College, Oxford, Rev. L. B. Cross, Chaplain of Jesus College, Oxford, and the Rev. D. E. W. Harrison, Chaplain of Wycliffe Hall.

In the book on the *Theology of Grace* I find that there seems to be an insufficient examination of the doctrine set forth by Karl Barth, and in view of this let me state some of what would seem to be the more important points in this "existential" thinking on this subject.

1. The Trinity as Personal, rather in the sense of active in three personal ways in self-revelation than as three distinct centres of self-consciousness.

2. The Holy Spirit as transcendent, not to be equated with any faculty immanent in man, and present as an abiding possession of man.

3. The Holy Spirit as the subjective possibility of revelation; i.e. God reveals Himself as Word, and God acts as Spirit in man, that man may have ears which do hear and do receive the Word.

4. Eschatology; the eschatological now; the coming moment at which eternity overshadows time, and at which God from eternity meets man in time.

From this the existential truth of God's grace may be considered as

(*a*) the graciousness of Christ in forgiveness;

(*b*) the graciousness of the Spirit, enlightening man to receive the Word of forgiveness;

(*c*) an eschatological conception; grace as the moment in which God is gracious and reveals His graciousness. Grace is not a quasi-physical enduring possession of man, but is the graciousness of God in the moment of self-revelation.

Further there emerges

(*a*) Grace as sanction. The graciousness of God in Christ provides a sanction to which man can only respond in gratitude, and before which having done all he will still be an unprofitable servant.

(*β*) The Word and the Spirit in guidance. The ethic of grace as distinct from the ethic of the law, i.e. the ethic of codes and principles, means listening and obeying from moment to moment in the concrete instant what God in this instant would have me do.

(*δ*) The Word spoken in a neighbour calling me aside to serve. The Spirit in conscience, not as a human faculty, but as the eschatological enlightenment of God. The graciousness of God in leading me in the concrete instant into action which is well pleasing in his sight.

The fact that Karl Barth claims that he has no system, and feels that a system is the ruination of theology, makes it difficult to criticize his point of view and teaching. It might be helpful to put forward some of the criticisms that are being made, but in doing so we realize that Barthianism is itself passing through a crisis, and in one sense it is never here and now, but is always becoming, and that what is said to-day by way of criticism may have to be withdrawn to-morrow.

Even if Barthianism has not got a theological system, yet it maintains that the single word of God occurring alike in revelation,

Scripture and preaching is the theme of dogmatic theology, and we are entitled to find out what is the fundamental philosophy behind this teaching. Clearly it is Transcendentalism, and that although God does strike down perpendicularly into this world, yet He only crosses the horizontal line at one point, and in a sense never touches the world. This is paradoxical, but it is quite in keeping with the Barthian view.

The Christian Church as a whole has moved away from the philosophy of transcendentalism, and probably it is just because so much of our thinking nowadays is an over-emphasis on the immanence of God, reaching practically to pantheism, that this extreme corrective has been developed. Ritschl's "value judgments," Troeltsch's religious "a priori," Otto's category of "The Holy," are all instances of this over-emphasis, and the value of Barthianism is the return to the thought of God as transcendent.

However, the merely transcendental view of God is not orthodox Christian doctrine. Because "the Word became Flesh and dwelt among us" we are compelled to view God both as transcendent and as immanent. "The Word became Flesh" is one of the keynotes of Barthianism, and Karl Barth definitely corrects the idea that Immanence and Incarnation are one and the same. Why is it that we feel Karl Barth's view of the transcendence of God also needs correction? While we may grant that the world is God's utterance, that the world depends on Him, that the world is other than God, though in Him we live and move and have our being, while (and this is very important) possessing the gift of freedom which must be used; and also grant that the world exists not merely in the sense in which ideas exist for a mind, but is Actual, and there is no real causation other than God's: yet there is an activity which is seen, for instance, in free will, and a relative independence of God permitted by Him; and therefore, any view of the relation of God to the world that merely regards God as transcendent, or even touching and yet not touching the world, lacks the fullness of the Christian revelation.

The relation of God to the world is not only transcendent, but immanent. This immanence does not mean identity, nor does it mean that the universe as we see it is merely an appearance of God, nor that the universe as it is is only caused by Him. Further, immanence does not mean that God is present everywhere, like a policeman, even if it be merely to guide the traffic, or that He is in the world as an architect is in the building, and never considers it again after its construction. In relation to transcendence, the immanence of God is seen in the maintenance of the world order as a whole by His action on all animate and inanimate objects, which are the constituent and relatively autonomous parts of the universe.

In fact, the reasons for positing the immanence of God in nature are similar to and connected with those for establishing and maintaining belief in God and His transcendent and creative activity. No one branch of science may in its limited scope suggest that there

is no immanence of God; but Christian Theism, as it covers a wider range than any one of the sciences themselves, and in its comprehensive survey of the connection of things in the world, requires this immanence of God in nature to explain the universe.

From this it will be seen that Barthianism, and the question of Grace in his exposition, depends, as do all basic differences in theology, on the conception of God and of His relation to the world and to man. It hardly seems possible to criticize the Barthian view of Grace without criticizing the whole of this complex of ideas. The problem has been put very clearly for us by Dr. William Adams Brown, in his Memorandum on *The Theology of Grace*. The differences which are felt are:

(1) Whether God is to be thought of as completely transcendent of Nature so that His entrance into His universe in the sphere of religion, either in revelation or redemption, is purely miraculous; or whether there is an element of kinship between God and the creature which makes his immanence in man in reason and freedom not only actual but natural.

(2) Whether God's self-revelation is purely of spirit to spirit, or does sense play an essential part in the communication of God's will to man and the mediation of His Grace?

(3) Are we to think of God's self-revelation, as distinct from His contact with man through nature, as primarily given to individuals, or as socially mediated? Does God deal with men one by one, speaking directly to each person the revealing and saving Word he needs, or has God provided in the Church a social medium through which His Will is authoritatively interpreted to each succeeding generation?

(4) Is the special revelation when it comes complete and final from the first so that nothing needs to be added to it, or is it given bit by bit as man is able to bear it? Does the Bible in its existing form, apart from oral tradition, contain all that man needs to know about God for his salvation, guidance and happiness; or is there need of a continuing interpretation such as Orthodox and Roman Catholics believe to be given through tradition, the creeds and the theology of the Churches?

But these differences apply to the whole subject. May I state (I have no time to do more), by way of information if not of warning, further criticisms that are being made regarding Barthianism?

It is held by some eminent theologians that this system is a thorough-going Dualism, a dualism not only in religious but also in philosophical thought. Some interpret Barth as identifying the world with the Devil, and as maintaining that everything human is a misleading travesty of the divine. Human knowledge is not the gift of God, nor acquired by His gracious relationship; it has no part in religion. The human mind cannot in any way lead a man to God. God leads only through the Word, which may or may not be found in the Bible. The great question in thinking about Barthianism is, "Where is the Word of God to be found?" This,

for Barth, is a conception of vital importance, and yet is nowhere distinctly defined.

Further, this dualistic philosophy, if it be dualistic, can only lead us into Gnosticism, and put in its extreme form, the Word of God can only be heard and known by Barthianism, and so they have the Revelation. It is a simple step from this to conceive of the Word of God as being one of the æons emanating from a far-off God.

The insistence on spiritual knowledge, knowing and hearing the Word of God, has its value, but in the way in which the Barthians conceive of this knowledge being imparted, it is argued that man must almost become a vacuum. There is no guarantee of being filled with the Word of God, and if an individual claims that he possesses at one moment either the Grace of God or the Spirit of God, then assuredly that individual does not possess the Grace or the Spirit of God.

Again, in the exposition of the Word and the exigesis of the Bible there is a tendency for the Barthians to feel that they possess absolute truth, and there is a resort to an infallibility, and the evils connected with that conception are sure to follow, such as the enthronement of private judgment.

In view of all this, let us return, as Evangelicals always do return, to the revelation of God Whom our Lord perfectly revealed, as recorded in the Bible, and pray that the Holy Spirit may illuminate and may teach us the meaning of Grace. For us, the Grace of God, or as probably we should say, the Grace of God in our Lord Jesus Christ, is the Gospel, and the whole Gospel. A discussion of this simply means a discussion of the whole of theology, and we turn to the loving personal relationship of the Father to His children, who are redeemed by the precious blood of our Lord, and are sanctified by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

Further, we who are set apart for the ministry remember that we are set apart to the ministry not only of the Word but of the Sacraments. So far Barth has not expressed his views as to the relation of Grace to the two Sacraments as instituted by our Lord, and so it would not be fair to criticize his teaching on Grace in the light of what we believe regarding these.

---

THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND. By F. J. Foakes-Jackson, D.D. Vol. III., Part II of *The Christian Religion*, edited by J. F. Bethune-Baker, D.D. *Camb. Univ. Press*, 1931. 2*s.* 6*d.*

A useful little book, written for schools, but presenting a clear sketch of English Church history, which adults can read with profit. It is defective in the brief account given of the Norman settlement of the English Church. Lanfranc is not even mentioned. The estimate of the Reformation is not quite sound. Something more than horror created by the Marian persecution lay behind the popular attitude to Protestantism. From Stuart times onwards a most useful sketch is supplied. A. J. M.

# DR. FRANK BUCHMAN AND THE GROUP MOVEMENT.

By the Rev. J. Thornton-Duesbery, M.A., Fellow and Chaplain of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

IN preparing this paper I have tried to keep steadily before me the words of the invitation which has brought us together. "The great purpose of this Conference is to be practical in character. It has chosen as its subject 'The Way of Revival' in the hope that its papers and discussions may prove of practical help to the clergy in reaping in their parishes the fruits of quickened spiritual life."

Accordingly, I shall make no attempt to give specific answers to those criticisms of the Group Movement which have from time to time been made. Rather, after giving some historical account of the origin and growth of its work, I shall endeavour to describe and analyse its "influence in revival thinking and practice," and to set forth positively the contribution which it is making to the understanding and acceptance of the Christian Teaching on Ruin, Redemption, and Regeneration in modern life.

But I must ask you to remember that my task is somewhat different from those of Dr. Macdonald and Professor Harvey. For Dr. Buchman is not the author of a *Römerbrief* or a *Das Heilige*. If you speak of a Barthian theology or a theology of Rudolf Otto, you can make definite reference to their writings. Dr. Buchman has written nothing. Firmly grounded as he is in the best traditions of Lutheran theology, he is primarily an intelligent evangelist, proclaiming the Good News of the Reign of God. Other voices have joined in with his, building up a full symphony upon this simple theme. But even so the score has thus far only in part been written down, and though I shall quote frequently from literature which has gone out with the full authority of leaders of the Group behind it, and though I have discussed this paper with several of them, including Dr. Buchman himself, the responsibility for this interpretation of the teaching of the Group must rest with me alone. Our "theology" is simply the theology of the Bible and the Creeds.

* * * * *

The Oxford Group received its name from South Africa four years ago (in 1928), when six Oxford men and a Dutchman went out to travel in the Union and share what Christ meant to them. They became known throughout the country as "The Oxford Group," and thence the name travelled back to this country and spread across the Atlantic to America. But, like other spiritual movements, the story of the Group goes back to the personal experience of "Jesus Christ and Him crucified," which came into the life of one man twenty-four years ago.

Dr. Frank Buchman comes of a Swiss family which migrated to America in the middle of the eighteenth century, and was born

at Pennsburg in 1878. As happens to so many, he was ordained (as a Lutheran minister) without knowing the white heat of Christian experience. For three years he had charge of a Church in an artisan district of Philadelphia, and then was head of a Home for working boys.

The year 1908 found him in England, at the Keswick Convention. He had resigned his position in protest against what he felt to be inadequate maintenance and feeding for the boys in his charge. But a feeling of resentment against the Trustees of the Home robbed him of peace; what power there had been in his ministry had left it; he had no message for other men.

It was in this mood that he wandered one day into a little Cumberland chapel. The congregation was but a handful, the place bare, and the whole setting outwardly uninteresting. But something in the words of the preacher (a woman) caught his attention and brought before him the vision of the Crucified Christ. He saw then the cost of the pride which had nailed his Master to the Cross, and went out from the little chapel a new man.

That night he wrote a full apology to each of the Trustees, setting at the head of each letter the first verse of the hymn "When I survey the wondrous Cross." Not one of those six men ever replied, but Frank Buchman had received God's forgiveness at the foot of the Cross, and not only forgiveness but a recommissioning for the warfare of Christ. Before that day ended he had been used to bring another man into the same experience, and with this new-found message he returned to America.

There for five years, at the suggestion of J. R. Mott, he was Y.M.C.A. secretary at a State University. With an openly hostile student body and a politely sceptical faculty, there was only one thing to be done. Through one of those romantic series of events which have the touch of apostleship about them, he was led into the lives of the three key-men of the place, the agnostic dean of the College, an undergraduate who called himself a Confucianist, and the "bootlegger" who supplied the students with illegal drink. Bill, the bootlegger, was won and became an active witness among his fellow-professionals. The Confucianist resolved to try the religion which had transformed Bill, and when a visiting Bishop addressed a great meeting and asked those who were ready to decide for Christ to stand up, he was the first to rise. Finally, the agnostic dean, impressed by all that was happening in the College, came to the same point of surrender.

It was during this period that Dr. Buchman began his practice of setting apart an unhurried hour of quiet waiting upon God early in every day. I have often heard him tell the story of how that habit revolutionised his ministry as he was thus guided into vital, personal contact with individual men. By the time he had left that formerly hostile University, twelve hundred men were meeting for voluntary Bible study.

In 1915 Dr. Buchman toured India, China and Japan with Sherwood Eddy, becoming an extension lecturer at Hartford Theo-

logical Seminary in 1916 and returning to the Far East in the following year. It was here, at Kuling in China, that the first "house-party" was held in the summer of 1918, when about a hundred Chinese and missionaries met for a fortnight to renew, or to find for the first time, a personal experience of God, sharing frankly together both the failures of the past and the appropriation of forgiveness and victory through Christ.

Since that time such house-parties have been held all over the world. But this Kuling meeting was momentous in that a contact formed there led to the opening up of the work of the Group in this country.

Dr. Buchman had already reached the conclusion that the English-speaking Universities on both sides of the Atlantic were at once the most neglected field of intelligent Christian evangelism and the most potential source of recruiting for that Fellowship of Witness which is the Christian Church. Now he gladly fulfilled a promise to look up the Cambridge sons of two Evangelical Missionary Bishops.

During that Cambridge visit the thought was constantly coming to him, "Revival throughout England." Walking down the street one day he was suddenly conscious of an inward urge to return to his rooms. He obeyed, and found waiting for him a prominent athlete whom he had met a few days before. The brief talk that ensued led on to another, long and intimate, on the following Sunday night, and the man put his life in Christ's hands asking for cleansing and victory.

Such an experience, once really possessed, cannot be kept unshared. To quote from the Rev. Sherwood Day's *Principles of the Group*:

"'There is no vital sustained experience of Jesus Christ where there is not adequate expressional activity.' Every word in that sentence counts. It means that no high level of contagious life can be maintained without trying to pass that life on to others. A person may be very busy in good works and have practically no expressional activity. . . . We really come to know God as we share Him with others. An experience that is not shared dies or becomes twisted and abnormal. This is the reason for a type of very pious but very unattractive Christian who constantly tries to superimpose his will and way upon others. For such people religion is more often a hobby than a life. Expressional activity does not mean sitting on many committees or dashing madly about seeing that the poor have better houses, good as these things may be—it does mean using one's spiritual muscles to maintain spiritual health."

That principle Dr. Buchman always explains at once to those who surrender to Christ. He explained it now. Very soon this Rugger Blue was witnessing naturally and powerfully to his friends. More lives were changed. The torch was carried over to Oxford, where the same thing happened again. Upon the unshakeable rock of a personal experience of Jesus Christ the foundation of an enduring structure had been laid.

* * * * *

That was twelve years ago. I cannot now describe all that has

happened since then—how in the hard school of experience, by discipline and team-work, these changed men and many others have grown into mature and far-sighted leadership; how some in "full-time" work, others in business or profession, are still passing on the good things they have received; how ordinands have caught a deeper significance in their message; how clergy and parishes alike have received a new inflow of life. Teams have gone throughout this country and to every part of the world. The widow of a great Scottish divine said to me the other day that she felt the Group was helping positively towards the solution of some of the great problems of the day—Church Unity, Marriage, the position of Women in the Church, and World Peace. I think of house-parties in Polo Week at Providence in New England, or for the smart set in Cairo at an hotel under the shadow of the Pyramids last November; I think again of a converted Communist leader settling down to work for His Master in a Glasgow slum. A group meets week by week in a drawing-room in Harley Street, and another in a Northern gaol. All are one in Christ Jesus, and to us all in the Group there has come an ever-deepening realisation of the everlasting truth that all things are possible with God, and that from these small beginnings, from the seed of personal salvation, there may even now be growing a revival which will spell salvation for every nation, class, and race. It is all as old and as constant as Christianity itself; and now, as always, it is gloriously fresh and new.

Some day, no doubt, the history of these years will be written. It will be a romantic document. Meanwhile, to have had a share in them has been to enter into a new understanding of the Acts of the Apostles and the letters of the Early Church.

* * * * *

Our present task, however, is to consider the significance of all this for the "revival thinking and practice" of the Church of England. The opening session of this Conference has already affirmed the Centrality of the Cross and the necessity of Conversion. With this, and with much of the theology both of Barth and of Otto, the fundamental teaching of the Oxford Group is in profound agreement. It "takes for granted the great Bible truths concerning redemption" (I am quoting again from Mr. Day's pamphlet); like Otto and Barth it emphasises the "otherness" of God, the necessity of Divine action in the Incarnation and Atonement; its metaphysic tends towards transcendentalism while remaining firmly Christian; its theology is essentially supernatural.

Otto has pointed us back to the possibility of mystic communion with the Holy; Barth has pricked the bubble of humanistic Liberal Protestantism. But how is their message to be translated for the simple understanding of the ordinary man who does not read the mystics nor comprehend the categories of the dialectic theology? Here, I believe, the experience of the Oxford Group supplies a positive answer.

The coming of the Word of God into a man's heart is always a

mystery, a miracle. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh or whither it goeth, so is every one that is born of the Spirit." In the ultimate analysis every conversion is a secret between God and the individual soul; every true soul-winner and pastor knows of the moment when his part in the work is done, when he has said all he has to say, and in the silence of prayer he stands aside, as it were, while the protagonists in this oft-repeated drama come face to face. But the experience of the Group may cast some light upon the understanding of this miracle, and I shall group the things I have now to say round our three key-words—Ruin, Redemption, and Regeneration.[1]

## I. Ruin.

My theological tutor, Dr. Kenneth Kirk, told me once that he believed 75 per cent. of modern English sermons were Pelagian in doctrine, giving no Good News but simply Good Advice. If that is true, we are showing a strange disregard of the teaching of the Articles. "Original sin is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man. . . . Man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit" (Article IX). "The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith and calling upon God. Wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ, preventing us that we may have a good will and working with us when we have that good will" (Article X).

If there is one thing more than any other that I have learned through working in the Oxford Group, it is the essential truth of those words. "Fearless dealing with sin" is one of the principles of the Group explained by Mr. Day:

> "While the first great fact of history is Jesus Christ, the second is the presence of sin. Whether or not we like that word, few of us would deny that all is not well with mankind. We know this to be true within ourselves —we are so often 'divided, inferior, unhappy,' when we long to be 'united, superior and happy.' Now and again something within us flares up in anger, passion or utter selfishness and makes us afraid of the future. Life is so often drab and people boring. What is it? The Bible calls it Sin and the 'Group' has no better word. 'Anything that separates me from God or from another person is for me sin' is the simplest and most thorough definition that I know."

All this, of course, we have accepted all our lives and indeed have known from bitter experience how true it is of ourselves, along with what is further said at the close of Article XV; "All we the rest (although baptised and born again in Christ) yet offend in many things, and if we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us." But somehow my friends in the Group have known how to make this personal and concrete. They have insisted upon a fourfold standard of Absolute Honesty, Purity,

[1] i.e. The three words forming the sub-title of the Oxford Conference.

Unselfishness and Love as being the standard of Christ Himself—"absolute," notice, not merely relative and conventional. "Anything that separates me from God is sin"—anything, therefore, that stops God from using me exactly as He wishes in the furtherance of His Purpose that all men may be saved and come to a knowledge of Himself. That carries you down to a deep analysis of the roots of pride and fear. Self-consciousness is sin, if it prevents the natural easy flow of Divine Grace through me to needy men. The very multiplicity of good works is sin, if it hinders me from the exercise of my vocation "to be a Messenger, Watchman and Steward of the Lord, to teach and to premonish, to feed and provide for the Lord's family, to seek after Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad, and for His children who are in the midst of this naughty world that they may be saved through Christ for ever." And that charge is surely given of God not only to "such as come to be admitted priests," but to every member of the Fellowship of Witness to which we belong in Christ.

There is a raising of the standard here, a growing recognition of how far we all fall short of the glory of God—so much further than we thought when we first believed. And that is altogether true to the lessons Christ teaches: He is ever "making as though He would go further" and calling us to follow Him. "There is yet very much land to be possessed." More and more we realise the truth of the words addressed to us at our ordination, "Ye cannot have a mind and will thereto of yourselves; for that will and ability is given of God alone."

Further, the Group teaches that we have not only to be ruthlessly honest with ourselves under the searchlight of God's holiness, but also to cease taking others for granted, to be ready (at whatever cost to our own pride and comfort) to face the fact of sin in them. While it remains absolutely true that "love is always eager to believe the best," it is only a poor pagan love that is blind to the sins of men. I quote once more from Mr. Day:

"The Bible frankly faces the fact of sin, but does not end there. It offers a cure. Jesus Christ took men exactly as they were. He had no glorified picture of them. 'He knew what was in man' and yet He was not bitter or disillusioned. He faced them honestly and fearlessly, gave them courage to do the same with themselves, and then showed them the way out. 'Sinners' understood all this and came gladly into His presence. The Pharisees did not understand and were afraid of Him. To-day there is a pathetic lack of honesty among Christians as to their own experience of sin—a lack which makes it utterly impossible for them to be used in dealing with sin in others. 'Bear ye one another's burdens' has far deeper meaning than merely writing sympathetic notes in times of sorrow or sending flowers to those who are ill. We would never look for help from a physician if we felt he avoided facing our physical problems, and the world does not trust a follower of Christ who, either through fear or pure laziness is unwilling to face the facts of his own life and those about him. Applying a pleasant-smelling ointment when the need is for a major surgical operation may have higher æsthetic values, but may also be criminal negligence. 'I came into the world to save sinners'—not to salve them. Getting the *facts* and facing them is necessary to the experience of truth in the material world. It is just as necessary in the spiritual."

All this is costly. Much of our dealing with people fails just here. We will not pay the price of taking people where they are. I am told that Prebendary Carlile, after a long lifetime devoted to seeking Prodigal Sons, is spending his last years in search of their Elder Brothers. They are ever with us, in our homes, on our committees, in our Parochial Councils. It is so easy to take them for granted. We are all so frightened of each other and cover it all up with a smoke-screen of respectability, but deep down, both we and they are really longing for the honesty that will face sin, bring it to the light and so let the gracious forgiveness of God fall upon it from the Cross. There is no cure for sin save that forgiveness through the Death of Christ, but slipshod diagnosis on our part is not likely to help the patient committed to our charge.

We have to face facts. An Oxford ordinand spoke to me the other day of "the intervals between the times of getting tight." Another in America, after coming for the first time into the true experience of forgiveness, said to Dr. Buchman as he was leaving, "I'd have damned you if you hadn't met my real need to-night." Recently another undergraduate came to me with a story of personal problems for which there is just no *human* solution at all. Faced with things like this, if I could not point beyond all human good advice to the Good News of God, I would resign my Fellowship here and cease to use my Orders in the Church.

## II. Redemption.

But the Good News of God is true. And here again as we turn to the second word, Redemption, let me repeat that I owe it primarily (though not solely) to the Group that I have come into personal realisation of what I knew in theory long before. God *did* so love the world that He gave His only begotten Son and those who accept Him in faith *do* find eternal life here and now.

In the Church of Christ—I am bold to say among Evangelicals also—there are many theories of the Atonement. The Article leaves scope for freedom: "Christ truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried to reconcile the Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt but also for all actual sins of men."

I have been at pains to ask Dr. Buchman specifically whether he accepted those words as true. I want to put his vigorous affirmative answer publicly on record now. You may find representatives of different *theories* of soteriology within the Fellowship of the Group; you will find fundamental agreement upon the all-important *fact.*

"It is well to remember" [says Mr. Day] "that it is never possible to find Life—peace with God—victory—Power—whatever names you use, by merely trying to follow out principle. That Life comes to one as a possession through but one gateway—a personal experience of Jesus Christ and Him crucified."

That and no psychological device, no new method of moral reformation, is the foundation upon which the work of the Oxford Group is built.

"Christ and Him crucified." That is the Christian Gospel. But what does it mean to preach the Cross of Christ? Some years ago the Rev. W. E. S. Holland was to take a Mission in Oxford, and a Quiet Day was held for members of what was then the Devotional Union before Term began. After tea some thirty of us were sitting in the Principal's drawing-room at Wycliffe talking over plans. "Tell me," asked Mr. Holland of each of us, "what it was that led to your conversion—the vision of Christ in His perfection challenging you to follow Him, or the realisation of your personal sin?" Thirty emphatic answers were given—half on each side. Mr. Holland had asked his question to obtain guidance on the character of his mission addresses. The answers seem to give it not only for that mission but for all Christian evangelism.

The old phrases from the Bible, from the Reformers, from our own immediate fathers and teachers in the faith, honoured and loved though they are by us for their wealth of rich association, may mean little or nothing to this modern generation which talks a different language. We have to explain what we mean by "The Cross of Christ," "The Precious Blood of the Lamb," "Justification by Faith." Too often, I think our very theological training causes us to fail some people here.

"We want to take them where we are—we superimpose what we want instead of dealing with what they want. Pedagogy knows the futility of that kind of dealing and one of its major premises is to proceed from the known to the unknown. It never begins with the unknown. So in the spiritual life; sin, failure, aspiration, longing are known to all; Christ is known to only a few. If we would lead men to Christ we must begin from where they are, and bridge for them the gap between what they know (sometimes only too tragically) their sin, and what they have not known—Jesus Christ."

Personally, what I look upon as the decisive moment in my own conversion came to me at Keswick through Bishop Taylor Smith before I knew anything of the Oxford Group, and it came through just such a concrete dealing with the known fact of sin, focussed in one particular sin, in my own life; from that I was led on from my powerlessness to seek power from the One I knew only in theory, Jesus Christ. Of the divine validity of that experience I have no doubt. It was followed by some of the authentic marks of re-birth—the discovery of the Bible as a new Book, a new experience of prayer, the beginnings of a message for my friends. Yet, notice this. Both then, and still more afterwards as a theological student, I had considerable intellectual acquaintance with soteriology. But it was not till nearly eight years later, during a Group house-party in Scotland, that a bitter realisation of my jealousy of others more richly used by God than I, as a betrayal of Divine Love and Trust brought me to a personal apprehension of what Christ had done on Calvary for me.

### III. Regeneration.

Such considerations lead naturally to the last part of our subject, "Regeneration," with which we have indeed already been to some

extent engaged. " We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our works or deservings." So runs the eleventh Article, and such is the foundation upon which the Oxford Group would build.

But this tells us little of the steps by which the believer comes to be justified, a point which so many excellent sermons leave obscure. It is necessary to explain and give content to the expression " by faith," to examine in greater detail the human side of that regeneration which is made possible, and made possible only, through the Atoning Work of Christ.

Here, I think, the meaning and teaching of the Group can hardly be better expressed than in some words of Professor E. F. Scott speaking of Jesus' teaching on " Entrance into the Kingdom of God." " It belongs to the essence of the message," he says, " that everything depends on one great decision. The one thing necessary is to surrender one's will to the will of God and all else will follow of its own accord." [1]

This is indeed a theology of crisis. " To be twice born is to be well born." However this surrender be approached, whether from a glimpse of the Cross, from attraction to the Person of Christ, or from a sense of personal failure and despair, the first element in it is Repentance. " Metanoia " is etymologically just a " change of mind " ; but in its Christian sense it means far more than this ; it implies " the expulsive power of a new affection," the re-orientation of the whole personality, the removal (even the violent removal) of life from its old selfish paths to the new path of following after Christ in whole-hearted obedience.

But all this is mere language until it is related to the facts. I may perhaps be permitted to quote what I have written in a pamphlet entitled *Sharing*, which was printed after careful checking with a number of leaders in the Group.

" We are in desperate need of forgiveness, and in the last resort, whatever aids we may use to help us to reach it, we must come to the place where we stand before God face to face, confess to Him our sins, and receive the forgiveness He so freely gives. There is no other way to fullness of life, and in our hearts we know it.

" Now, ideally, such confession as this would be made direct to God, without the need of any human assistance. But, unfortunately, we men and women are not ideal, and experience has shown the value of sharing with some Christian man or woman, as a help towards reaching this relationship with God. Let us be quite clear about it. Theoretically, there is not the smallest reason why a sinner should not confess his sins direct to God and receive, and know that he is receiving, God's forgiveness then and there ; obviously, in fact, this has happened and happens time and time again. But in practical experience, and just because we are not ideal, instance after instance could be quoted to show that there are very many who need the help of sharing with another, in order that they may come directly face to face with God. For them sharing is a practical necessity. Only so do they grasp the reality of their confession, of the God to Whom they confess, and of the forgiveness which He bestows. The forgiveness itself does not

[1] *The Kingdom of God in the N.T.*, p. 82 : cf. T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, p. 295, which reads almost as a reminiscence of Scott.

depend upon the sharing; its appropriation by the individual constantly does. . . .

"Once again, willingness to share with another person is an indication of true repentance. Experience shows that many go on verbally confessing the same sin to God times without number, but with no lasting victory. They may never have learned the difference between mere remorse and real repentance, while sharing with another person may be the means of bringing them to the latter. There are indeed cases in which the refusal to share has been the last stronghold of the pride which blocks the path to God; for such there can be no life until that stronghold has fallen.

"Such sharing as this naturally takes place with some individual who inspires trust and a conviction that he can help. It is private, and obviously a matter of strict confidence. Hence it can be detailed in character, and detail is usually imperative. In all cases such sharing finds completion in direct personal confession to God."

The cost of all this to God—the Cross planted in Time on Calvary and the Cross set from all Eternity in His Heart—may or may not be immediately realised by the penitent. But in every case the cry of the Prodigal is answered by the Father. The door has been opened; the Lord comes in to sup. We may trust Him, by His Spirit, to guide the new disciple into all truth in His own time and way.

* * * * *

Yet the Christian is not born fully-armed and mature, but as a babe; and as the physical body needs Food and Air and Exercise for its growth, so the spiritual life requires the Food of Sacraments and of the Word of God, the Fresh Air of that true prayer which is communion and conversation with God, and the Exercise of sharing with others the new life that has been received.

This is an essential part of "revival thinking and practice." George Buchanan, conducting a retreat preliminary to a mission in which I took part last year, kept reiterating this point: "You must think from the first what will happen to the lives that have been changed after you have all gone away."

(*a*) These new-born children need Food. They must be taught to read their Bibles. In the Group we try to do it by our Bible study hour at house-parties, by fellowship for such study in parochial life, by suggesting the use of such courses of reading as are provided by the Bible Reading Fellowship. Teaching on the Holy Communion is less easy to give owing to the interdenominational character of the Group Fellowship, but many of us seek every opportunity of bringing home the meaning of our Lord's command to those with whom we come into touch.

(*b*) Secondly, the new-born children need Air. Let me quote Mr. Day for the last time:

"'The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him': such was the experience of Samuel, of Isaiah, of Jonah, of Paul, of Ananias, and of many others whose records are to be found in the Bible. All down through history like experiences have come to those who were willing to take time and undergo the discipline necessary for hearing the 'still small voice.' In listening to God the general movement is from God to man—not from man to God—a movement which is distinctive of Christianity and was clearly manifest when the 'Word became flesh and dwelt among us.' In all other religions

man tragically, though often honestly, attempts to climb into the presence of God. In Christianity alone does God triumphantly flood through to man. Guidance is simply the experience of God flooding into a man's life, to give him direction and power. It is man in touch, not with the un-natural but with the supernatural—man in touch with God."

(*c*) Lastly, the new-born children need Exercise. I have already spoken of this in the first part of this paper, and need only add here that the Group is teaching valuable lessons in team-work. For truth is presented more adequately through a group than through an individual. A united front made up of various personalities presenting a single message carries conviction where an individual may not appeal.

* * * * *

I will close, if I may, upon a note of urgency. Whatever we may think of the Oxford Group, it has thrown a challenge to the Christian Church. Time and again, half-humourously, half-pathetically, clergy, both Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals, have said to me, "There must have been something very wrong with the Church if this Group had to arise." And I am afraid that this is profoundly true. The Group is no new method; it has no new theology; it comes with the old Good News of Jesus, mighty to save. And it flings its challenge to the Church that professes His Name to experience that saving grace afresh, individually and corporately, and so go out to battle in the world.

We are moving on from a long period of trench warfare, out into an open war of movement. Christianity and Communism stand face to face. The battle is being joined all along the line, even in placid, respectable, academic Oxford. I may be wrong in seeing behind the abolition of "Divvers" a reasoned step in a steadily accelerating process of secularisation. It is a fact that the "October Club," founded here last term, exists for the serious propagation of Communism. Its members are not just silly undergraduates; they believe in the doctrine they preach and would suffer martyrdom for it. One of them, a charming boy from one of the most famous Public Schools in England, talked to me for over two hours. I wish I could see such ardour and passion in my theological pupils.

That is the situation which we are going out to face, and the Oxford Group, as I see it, is simply the Church at work, alive to the nature of the combat that is to come. As Communism plants "cells," so Christianity must plant its fellowships of vital witness—and that is good Reformation doctrine, for it is exactly the "Kerngemeinde," the kernel-fellowship, of which Luther speaks. What are we doing? There is no room for compromise. The only vital people in the world to-day are those who are right out *for* God or right out *against* Him.

# THE CONVERSION OF SIMON FISH.

By John Knipe.

## 2. SHROVE TUESDAY AT PAUL'S (February 11, 1526, O.S.).

DURING Simon's exile the Widow Necton was kept busy burning his love-letters which she contrived to intercept unknown to her daughter, as they were brought over by Endhoven's trading vessel and delivered at her door by a Dutch seaman who pocketed his silver piece for handing them to her or her elderly maidservant. Madam Necton destroyed Simon's tender beseeching billets ruthlessly unread, but on Shrovetide Eve as she sat alone by her kitchen fire she remembered one that she had forgotten which lay at the bottom of a locked coffer in her bedchamber. She took a candle and went to fetch it, but to do so she must go through Margery's tiny room, scarce more than a recess in the wall. She went softly and secured the letter which she thrust into her gown-pocket. Shading the light the mother glanced at the girl's bed. Her eyes grew fond, for Margery lay fast asleep, all lines of secret trouble smoothed into innocent peace, her soft brown curls framing her face, her round cheek flushed and a smile on her slightly parted lips. Jane Necton could not resist bending over to kiss her daughter. Then Margery stirred and sighed in her sleep. "Simon!" she murmured. "My dear Simon!"

The widow's face hardened and she turned and carried his letter straight to the dying fire, pulled it from her pocket and thrust it against the red embers. Christmas to Lent and the young man had not forgotten her daughter nor would she lightly forget him. The paper curled up and in Simon's neat clerkly hand words were plain. "So, dear heart, I am become a Gospeller even as thou, converted in this my bitter exile by reading of the New Testament done into English by Sir William Tyndale, a most holy and learned priest, known to thy friends." Here the paper was charred, but the widow's horrified eyes saw further—"our love hallowed by like Faith into yet closer bonds—such marriage of souls e'en Death can never dissolve . . ." "The runagate has turned heretic!" muttered the widow, as she pushed the last shreds of Simon's letter to catch the flame—and she swore to herself that she would find some way to end that youthful folly of her girl's troth-plighting. She would write to her cousin the Sheriff-elect of Norwich and ask his counsel.

Who was this learned priest named Tyndale? She wondered how Margery should know of him through her friends? Could he be the same as the preacher at Saint Dunstan's-in-the-West whom Humphrey Monmouth received for a time in his house as an honoured guest?

Musing thus the widow reflected how grave her little wench was become, how she disliked certain rites and customs, in particular votive offerings and Requiem Masses, and how she did shrink from

her religious duty of confession save at such great days as all must attend when a young girl's innocent shrift was passed quickly over in the common press.

"Well, I've not done my duty by my child," thought Madam Necton finally. "She shall go up early to-morrow and if there be not time then to make a clean shrift I'll speak to the priest to bid her come again for proper Lent penance. Aye! She must needs confess I've forbid her troth to yon railing rogue who dared mock my Lord Cardinal!"

But the bell ringing from Paul's reminded the widow of the great Shrovetide Sermon which the citizens were bidden to hear. And soon after seven o'clock she and Margery were hurrying along Candlewick Street, past London Stone, Budge Row and Watling Street to enter by the Saint Augustine Gate of the churchyard. Here were crowds streaming towards the West Front and a fat jolly greyfriar advised them "to go round by Paul's Cross for they'd never get sight of my Lord Cardinal and the brave show now at the West doors." He rattled a wooden box asking "Alms for the Poor Souls in Purgatory!" He blessed them when the widow put in a groat. "Your fair wench looks a dove bred for the cloister," he said. He smiled meaningly at her pure still face and serious brown eyes. But she shrank back and Widow Necton retorted—"Not she! 'Tis a wilful lovesick maid, good brother! Thank the Saints! I've an arm stout enough to keep her from her folly!"

"*Parce flagellum!*" laughed the surprised friar. "She looks so soft and meek! Heed thy loving mother, my child. She knows best," he said sagely. "*Pax vobiscum!*"

Margery's cheeks were flaming at such public rebuke without due cause, but she dared not question her mother, whose lips were pressed into a thin line in a face grown hard and shrewish. She would have slapped her daughter like a naughty child in her irritated mood, and Margery followed meekly until the press made Madam Necton turn to grip her by the arm, even as the girl recoiled white-faced, staring at what she saw in a gap where the folk parted before wooden rails in front of the Northern Rood.

"Dear Lord!" gasped Margery. "'Tis for a burning!"

A slow fire was kindled in the midst of the railed-off space and round it was ranged reed baskets and hampers heaped high with books, pamphlets and papers.

Madam Necton nipped her arm and whispered sharply: "Peace, ye ninny! Leave high matters be! Come within!"

Then a rough voice muttered good-humouredly: "Tush! There be no stake! They burn books, not men! Look not so scared, little mistress!"

She heard in great comfort and recognised Roger, Master Monmouth's staid oldish man, escorting Madam through the crowd, who smiled and beckoned them and the widow followed gladly through the *Si Quis* door until Roger found them a clear space in the nave, and seats for the two dames against a pillar at the end of a narrow bench.

Roger stood by Margery and put his lips to her ear: "Mark yon high platform hung with red? 'Tis for my Lord Cardinal and the bishops—yon's his Throne. T'other low scaffold be for his Grace's prisoners. They must abjure openly but he spares their lives. His Eminence hates burning folk for heresy. Nay! Ye'll see naught frightful."

She nodded whispering: "Who must abjure, good Roger?"

"A parcel o' Steelyard men—foreigners—'Lutherans,' they say."

The great church was crowded from end to end and most of all in the nave before the pulpit, the citizens sat, if they could, or stood leaning on each his neighbour, or clung to wall and pillar like flies. Gaily clad for the Shrovetide Feast when they moved the dim interior of Old Saint Paul's seemed covered with a vast close-woven tapestry of human figures blown in the wind from the open doors north and south, and streaked like gold thread from the rays of the pale sun.

As eight o'clock struck on the great bell Roger muttered: "They're opening the West doors! Hark to the shouting! From Paul's Wharf! My Lord Cardinal comes from his barge!"

The girl stared eagerly in curiosity and dislike, to catch a glimpse of the Great Cardinal who had robbed her of Simon, and thought in wonder how strange it was that such a lowly soul as herself should suffer under my Lord Grace of York's displeasure against her own dear lover.

Chanting that swelled louder and nearer, a glimpse of the white-robed choristers, a tall gold cross borne solemnly ahead of the procession, the religious in their habits, monks, nuns and friars, priests in glittering copes, mitred bishops and abbots and priors, all vested in the sombre penitential purple hue of that Solemn Act of Reparation to be offered God in His Church of the Holy Apostle Paul, then a passing of six men clad in sackcloth, the foremost holding a great wax candle, and the Cardinal's own escort, his golden mace, his high silver crosses borne by the tallest priests he could find, his pillars, his pole-axes, his red hat on gold-fringed red velvet cushion, his superb crozier, and last his Eminence, walking slow under his red-and-gold canopy, clad all in scarlet, his long gloved hand raised solemnly, great ruby ring glittering on uplifted finger—hand blood-red as he blessed the kneeling citizens. Margery counted eighteen mitred bishops, and as many abbots, while his Grace's doctors in damask robes sat below where they could.

Margery stared. Was that short, waddling, fleshy, sallow-faced man seating himself on the Bishop's Throne in the midst, he of the hard dark eyes, the right had a hideous cast, that cold proud face and arrogant demeanour, was he verily Thomas Wolsey of Ipswich, the Cardinal Archbishop of York and Lord Chancellor of England? He Simon's enemy! She sickened and turned her eyes to that other scaffold, mean and black, and bit her lips as she recognised the tall spare form of the man who held a great wax candle, the Austin Friar, the preacher whom all London flocked to hear as he expounded Wyclif's Bible in English; aye, surely the great Divine

of Cambridge, Doctor Barnes. And in horror she observed the like faggot was bound to his shoulder as the rest bore!

He had recanted! Barnes had denied his Lord! Hot tears ran down the girl's cheek as she hung her head in shame, shame for him and loathing of the fat proud Cardinal sitting in bloated pomp, like a monstrous red spider eyeing poor flies in his web.

The Choir finished singing a Penitential Psalm. A black and white robed Dominican Father Prior rose from his seat on the platform, bowed to the Cardinal, and turning to the Church's prisoners, he uttered a Latin form.

The six men fell on their knees and repeated the *Mea Culpa* and made confession after in English. She heard little, for the people shifted and coughed—something of "their having erred . . . fallen into the deadly Sin of Heresy . . . they begged humble pardon of the Catholic Church for their high crimes and offences."

They ended. A stillness like death held the crowd.

"Dear Lord Christ!" prayed Margery. "They do not truly mean what they say for fear of the terrible fiery death."

She looked up. A rustle of robes, the Lord Cardinal's hand uplifted as he signed the Cross over all present—and again gave a second silent blessing to those who had abjured—he turned to depart with his train of attendant bishops—all save one who went now to mount the pulpit-steps.

John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, a tall, spare, ascetic man, whose thoughtful face was severe, and his deep-set eyes burned with more zeal than Christian charity as his clear hard tones harangued the citizens of London. He bade them "take warning by this example the Church made of one to whose words in that same pulpit they had listened." "Not," cried the bishop, "as a savour of Life unto Life, as saith the Holy Apostle Paul, but as he saith further, of Death unto Destruction!"

Margery looked at the miserable Doctor Barnes and thought of his last sermon there—how he called aloud to those same Londoners "Come unto Me!", how lovingly he had spoken of the Lord Christ's care. Yet here was the great Lord Bishop of Rochester who denounced that sermon as heresy!

"Then am I a heretic?" puzzled Margery, and she lost much of the bishop's grave discourse in her bewilderment.

A sudden stir like the ripple of a long wave. Heads turning and folk craning their necks—at the bishop's bidding poor miserable Doctor Barnes turned to face those Londoners and Margery saw his face, livid save for a burning patch on each cheek-bone, his eyes swollen and restless, his hand shaking so that the candle dripped grease in a rain of drops.

"Good people!" he began—in a dry husky voice, which was harsh as he forced himself to utter phrases which were plainly dictated—"I confess that I have grievously erred—and I pray that no poor souls may be lost through my great fault—and if any here be led astray let them return as I do—and seek mercy, for I am more charitably and gently entreated than I do deserve—my heresies,

being so heinous and detestable . . ." He tried to continue, but his voice broke, his words were inaudible, though he stood there a moment, leaning one hand on the low rail, his throat working painfully, his eyes regarding them in a beseeching look of such utter misery that sobs of pity rose from many present.

The bishop stood immovable, waiting for some further word. Suddenly Barnes dropped on his knees and hid his face, weeping bitterly, while a groan burst from him, like one on the rack.

"Better be burned than so shamed!" cried a woman's shrill voice. "Thou hast denied like Peter! Aye! Thou may'st well weep!"

John Fisher leaned over the high pulpit and his eyes swept the congregation, while he signed to the Knight-Marshal below the penitents' platform. He looked sternly towards the bold unknown voice. He gestured for silence. His thin thoughtful face grew gentle.

"A broken and a contrite heart," said the bishop softly, "shalt Thou not despise!"

His words were the signal for the Choir to chant the *Miserere*, and the six men in sackcloth were led down and escorted to the north door, Barnes pausing to offer his candle while the faggots were unbound from their shoulders—and the people watched them led within the rails to walk around the fire and each cast in his faggot—and stood aside while the hampers of heretic books were thrown into the flames.

Then the doctor and the poor Steelyard men were brought to the chancel screen to kneel on the lowest step before Bishop Fisher, whose clear voice pronounced the "*Absolvo Te!*" over each bowed head, and he declared them re-admitted to full Communion with the Catholic Church. And the bishop raised his fingers and blessed all there, and so ended the Shrovetide Sermon and the Public Penance done at Paul's.

## The Return of Simon Fish.

"Well!" said the Widow Necton comfortably to Madam Monmouth, as she finished a second pancake brought off the fire—they were at dinner at the clothier's house. "'Twas a sorry sight, my neighbours, but to my mind a burning o' live folk at Smithfield be a deal sorrier, though yon silly woman cried out contrarywise! Fire be hot and pain great." She shrugged her plump shoulders and glanced at Margery's tense face. . . . "Come, my wench, needs not look so down," she added.

Margery said nothing. She had scarce spoken since they left the great church.

"Mass! Ye may well call it so! Sad as sorry!" burst out Master Monmouth. The worthy merchant was impetuous when hot. "A parcel o' godfearing men and a grand Gospel preacher to be put to open shame in Paul's! They did no crime! The Steelyard men sold Gospel books and tracts . . ."

"One was straitly forbidden," interrupted the widow, "*The*

*Wicket,* a book of that dead heretic, John Wyclif! I saw it thrown on to burn."

"Look ye, dame! Why be the bishops so set against the Scriptures being sold here in the vulgar tongue? 'Tis not so in all lands. They keep to their Latin mumble-jumble. Why?"

Madam Necton shrugged. "How should a plain simple woman know?"

"Because the Word is pure," returned Monmouth, "and all men do know the King's Court has a foul name. 'Tis a sink of wicked pleasures. The bishops wink at the same. Aye! Even John Fisher must. Poor man! He knows the great Lord Cardinal himself to be no better than any libertine lordling of a courtier. How can my Lord of Rochester alone stand against Cardinal Wolsey, the Pope's Legate!"

The widow stared and let her pancake grow cold. Margery slid her hand under the board into her godfather's grasp.

"Come thy ways, Humphrey, dear heart!" laughed his wife. "Jane, take a fresh pancake. 'Tis good the 'prentices hear ye not, my master!"

A second great dish heaped in gold-brown pancakes was pushed through the buttery hatch. Monmouth served his friends.

"Margie, thou ought to be merrier," he said. "Master Serjeant and Tom Moyle be released. Great folk at the Court spoke for 'em behind the Cardinal's back."

The girl gave him a demure smile.

"E'en at that monstrous wicked place."

Monmouth roared. "Aye! But the Cardinal was crafty! When he heard who had the King's ear he hastened to free 'em, and told the King's Grace he did it to please Canterbury, who had sent Master Golde his chaplain to him with this word, 'My Lord Archbishop is sorry such a matter as a Misrule Frolic should be taken in earnest.'" The clothier smiled and patted her curls. "Thou wilt soon be seeing thy Simon back."

The widow smoothed her best black damask and coughed.

"What mean ye by saying how when his Eminence heard who had the King's ear?" she asked quickly.

Monmouth glanced at the girl and replied curtly:

"Mistress Nan Boleyn. 'Tis said she hates the Lord Cardinal," he added. "He calls her the 'Night Crow.'"

The elder ladies looked deeply interested, but the merchant turned to Margery, whose radiant face showed where her thoughts had flown, far from King, Cardinal or Court lady.

"Sweetheart, hast Simon not told ye how of late he met our good preacher Sir William Tyndale at Mynheer van Endhoven's house?"

The girl flushed deeper, but she answered at once in a low troubled voice, without looking at anyone, her downcast eyes on her platter:

"No, godfather. I have had no word from Simon at all."

"Marry come up!" exclaimed the clothier vehemently. "The ship-master sent ye all the young man's . . ."

"Humphrey!" intervened his wife quickly.

Monmouth bit his tongue. He stared at the furious eyes of the widow, whose face was crimson, and from her the clothier looked again at Margery, whose bowed face was now hidden in her hands. Humphrey Monmouth laid his broad hand on her shoulder.

"There, little love," he said tenderly. "Come in the garden with thy old gossip and pluck Lent lilies for thy pretty grass green gown."

But Madam Necton detained him.

"Master Monmouth, the girl is a dutiful wench. I forbade her to have his letters for her own good. And my child knows it well. 'Twas a silly trothplight, for she was over-young. But I let it pass for the year until the youth's own folly broke it on his side. 'Tis no contract, no binding pledge. I asked my cousin John Necton, who is Sheriff-elect of Norwich. He says that in law no man who forswears the Realm can claim a pact of betrothal to a chit of seventeen."

"Law can't make me break faith!" cried Margery, her eyes shining through tears, her cheeks flushed and her soft voice quivering. "I love Simon! Oh, Mother, I have obeyed ye in this! But I can't break my word to him! I'd sooner die!"

"So! That's how it stands," muttered Monmouth shrewdly.

His wife, rising from the table, suggested that Margery should come into the garden with her, and her husband might like a word apart with their friend. She threw him a warning look as she went out, her arm round the girl's waist.

"So, ye stopped his letters—have ye kept them?" asked Monmouth.

"Nay. They were burned. I didn't read a line save by chance." The widow pursed her mouth. "I've a better match for my girl." She nodded. "Robert Necton, my cousin's youngest brother. Not too nigh akin and a sober quiet man of thirty. He spoke for her."

"Thirty! Thirty-six if he's a day!" fumed Monmouth. "More'n twice her age and a widower! Simon's twenty-six!"

"A staid, kind, pious man," the widow returned. "In a good repute and has his lands, his business, a fine house and wants no dowry. She will be dowered but slenderly, Master Monmouth."

"For that, as my godchild, I'd make up her portion," he replied so warmly that Madam Necton must needs thank him, though she disliked it.

That night Master Monmouth wrote a long letter to Simon in Antwerp. It was delayed, for young Fish was now a trusty messenger and go-between of the exiles of his new faith. He had confessed himself to Tyndale as many there did, and the Reformer was warmly interested in the bold, impetuous, devoted former Student of Gray's Inn. Though Simon had not been formally expelled from the Inns of Court, Tyndale warned him that his beliefs would make the law no career for a Gospeller. He approved Simon's resolve to help forward the sale and spread of the New Testament in

London, where the citizens were eager to read it. Endhoven had offered him a place in the export trade, and Simon hoped to visit London for his work, if he could not live there the whole of the year.

So he accompanied Tyndale to Worms on Endhoven's business, and learned more of his new bookcraft, and after he had spent some months at the work, Simon, having received Monmouth's letter, sought out William Tyndale and humbly offered to undertake the dangerous task of receiving in bulk copies of Tyndale's Translation in London, where the citizens and Essex men were longing impatiently to read the Gospels in English.

It was clear summer twilight. In the cool of the day Tyndale, as he loved to do, was walking by the banks of the Rhine. He looked earnestly at the young man's keen face.

"Hast heard the Master's call, friend Simon?"

"I trust so, sir," answered young Fish. He paused and the Reformer's calm reflecting eyes watched his disciple's hesitation.

"But not—to be a priest," Simon said. "There is a young maid—my betrothed—who is of the Christian Brethren. I have written to her of my changed purpose in life, and received no answer. To-day I learn that her mother is unwilling. Sir! Sir! Must I give her up—she, my dear love?" His voice broke, and he looked away at the distant fields of green corn in the flat open spaces beyond the town.

"I think if ye be already betrothed, 'tis for ye to ask that of her own mouth," Tyndale said slowly, a kindly smile in his eyes. "A marriage contract is a sacred bond if her mother allowed it openly."

"'Twas at the Christmas Feast in her mother's house," Simon said eagerly. "Madam Necton seemed willing, and Master Humphrey Monmouth signed the contract as my witness."

"I know him. A good man and a true. One who loves the Word," Tyndale said.

"He writes that my offence is forgotten. The Cardinal bears no more grudge. Neither is he so sure of his own footing at the Court."

Simon paused. "Mynheer van Endhoven will pay for my lodging while I sell his books. And I have money at home now naught will be seized."

"Go in peace, friend. See thy betrothed and work if 'tis in thy heart," Tyndale answered. "But remember to count the cost. 'Tis death by fire to circulate the Holy Scriptures in the mother tongue in England if once being denounced ye refuse to abjure. All are not required to risk in such peril liberty and life. Ye are a young man. Therefore I say take heed and be sure that a great danger is the Lord's will. For bread eaten in exile has but a sour taste." And the Reformer looked earnestly at him.

Simon bent his head. "I am ready," he said, with humility. "Only pray for me, sir, that I may be steadfast to the end."

"The Lord keep thee!" Tyndale answered. He was much moved, and he laid his hand affectionately on his convert's smooth dark hair.

Simon left Worms that night, taking boat up the Rhine to Cologne, and there he found merchants going to Antwerp, who knew Endhoven. The printer's trading vessel, a fast Flemish hoy, took him across to London, and after a good passage, Simon leaned next day on the bulwark in the prow to gaze eagerly as they passed Greenwich, watching for the first glimpse of The Pool and London Bridge, seen in the warm haze of twilight after heavy rain. He sprang to the quay of Billingsgate, and ran up Pudding Lane, leading to Great Fish Hill, and down the familiar ways of Candlewick Street, turning confidently into the little court where was the widow's house. Here, to his amazed eyes, he found the low-browed door fast closed, the tiny windows shuttered, no smoke rising from the kitchen chimney, and no voice responded to his knocking and his loud calls. At last a neighbour's gate opened in the street above, and a man dressed as a porter came into the lane and demanded his business.

"Necton? The Chandler's widow, sir? She has left. That house is for sale. A daughter was sick—she died there and the woman, thinking the place unwholesome in the heat, why, she sold up the home and is gone for good."

"Died!" gasped Simon. "Was the daughter grown? A fair maid, soft-eyed and quiet in her ways?"

The man said he did not know. He was new to that place. Nor where they had gone, but he thought to her folk in the country. He nodded, said a civil word, and walked back whistling.

Simon stood still and hid his face, leaning on the closed door weeping by the empty house. Then he moved away, thinking, a terrible ache at his heart, until suddenly he remembered Humphrey Monmouth! He ran to Little East Cheap, and never stayed until he reached the clothier's house in Tower Ward, hard by the Church of All Hallows, Barking. Simon Fish had a bitter home-coming from his exile, but at least he knew that he was sure of a kindly welcome from the generous man who was her godfather.

Monmouth was at supper when Simon, his eyes wild, his hair rough, and his manner disordered by grief, staggered into the hall.

"Simon Fish!" exclaimed Monmouth. "Welcome, thrice welcome, man!"

But Simon stood stock-still, his eyes so frantic that the clothier wondered if the young man were mad or drunk. He went to him and put a friendly arm round his shoulder.

"See! Madam Monmouth waits to greet ye," he said gently.

Simon gazed at him, the apple in his throat working like one in a convulsion.

"Margery?" he gasped in despair.

"Well, very well! Staying in the country," Monmouth assured him.

"Where?" demanded Simon suspiciously. "Art lying? She's dead! The house is shut up."

"Neither dying nor dead," returned Monmouth. "So cheer

ye, friend. Margery is staying at Norwich with her mother and their folk."

"God be praised!" muttered Simon, and he staggered back and would have fallen but for Monmouth's arm.

"So! 'Tis a faithful-hearted gallant!" said the merchant. "Give me a cordial, good wife. He is swooning."

Simon drank. He sighed and smiled, then bowed to Madam and let himself be led to the table.

"I have come straight after your letter, which reached me at Worms," he said. "Will ye lend me a saddle-horse for Norwich?"

"Aye, to-morrow," Monmouth laughed.

*(To be continued.)*

---

THE MINISTER THE METHOD AND THE MESSAGE: SUGGESTIONS ON PREACHING. By Harold Adye Prichard. [x + 303 pp.] *Charles Scribner's Sons.* 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Some hold a deep conviction that a certain lack of pulpit power is the root cause of the decline in public attendance at places of worship. Whether that be so or not preaching occupies the primary place in the duties and privileges of ordained ministers of the gospel. There is still an immense sphere of influence open to the spoken word. This volume is intended to lead ministers of the gospel to take more seriously the responsibility of the opportunity afforded in the pulpit. Canon Prichard is a student of the art and offers material that is valuable. Rightly he places for prime consideration the life of the preacher himself, his life with men and with God, his life in the world of books and his discipline of mind and body. For the method of the minister Canon Prichard has considered the methods used both in preparation and delivery by nine of the most prominent and effective preachers of America. Each has his own method which he has found to be most suited to his own temperament and personality. They are given as suggestions for less-gifted men, and valuable suggestions they are.

The third section of the book deals with the message which the preacher has to deliver. Primarily his business is to preach Jesus Christ. There we join issue with the writer. His Christ is not our Christ. "The preacher cannot stop with Christ because He is not and can never be entirely sufficient." "Christ is not the journey's end, but is the way." "I do not find in him the ultimate consummation of hopes and longings and ambitions." That certainly is not the message of St. Paul. "We preach Christ crucified." "That Christ may be all in all." F. B.

---

*To the Editor of* THE CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—

I see that in my review of *Frederick II* (Kantorowicz) in the April number of THE CHURCHMAN, I have stated that Innocent IV was driven into exile at Avignon. This is wrong. I should have said Lyons. I regret the blunder. A. J. M.

# REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGIOUS TOLERATION IN ENGLAND. By W. K. Jordan, Ph.D. *Allen & Unwin.* 21s.

In view of the appointment by the Church Assembly of a committee to enquire into the relations of Church and State, this book has made a timely appearance. It should be read by those who wish to be properly informed on that important question. Dr. Jordan's impartial survey covers the period from "the beginning of the English Reformation to the death of Queen Elizabeth." Its calm and measured judgment is reminiscent of the great works of Troeltsch and A. J. Carlyle. It shows a somewhat defective knowledge of the influence of the Middle Ages, and of continental political and religious movements upon the Elizabethan programme. These are only the *lacunæ* in the knowledge of a young writer, who, on his own field, reveals a masterly grasp of his subject. There are some points of harshness in his American diction which might well be removed from a second edition, for example, "pled" for "pleaded"; "factual" for "actual"; "gingerly."

English thought down to 1558 was more uniformly intolerant than continental thought on the question of heresy, although a change of attitude began under Edward VI. The tendency to simplify dogma assisted the development of toleration, and the Reformation finally destroyed the logical basis for the theory of persecution, although this did not become apparent until its second stage, when the reformed churches abandoned an attitude of intolerance. While in the first year of Elizabeth's reign no general analysis of the problem of toleration was made, the Government kept the way open for its development, and indeed, important advance was made. After 1568 the Government was compelled, by the appearance of militant Roman Catholicism to modify its policy in defence of the throne and of the public peace. Moreover, it found its action harassed by the growing opposition of the Puritans to the religious settlement of 1559.

After 1576 the repression of Roman Catholic Recusants became necessary, but there was no hatred and no zeal in the policy of the Government. If there were a few acts of injustice, these were far outnumbered by acts of leniency and by a refusal in many cases to take notice of offenders. Although the Puritan spirit was intolerant, yet by setting up the principle of private judgment, it contributed to the development of toleration. Jesuit influences prevented Roman Catholic thought from making any definite contribution, although, if the English secular priests and Roman Catholic laity had been left to themselves, the need for repression would never have arisen. The necessity for civil supervision of conflicting religious bodies, and of Roman Catholic propaganda is clearly made out. Lay thought, especially Unitarian, was always ahead of ecclesiastical during this period.

The work contains useful summaries or " conclusions " of the argument at the end of the several sections, which make it a useful handbook for the busy reader.

A. J. M.

---

ARNOLD OF BRESCIA. By G. W. Greenaway, M.A. *Cambridge University Press*, 1931. 8*s*. 6*d*.

This scholarly yet readable little book offers for the first time in English a life of the Brescian reformer of the twelfth century. Mr. Greenaway has searched every possible source of information for the life and work of Arnold. He arrives at the interesting conclusion that Arnold's aim was rather reform of the Church than reform of political conditions. His association with the *commune*, first at Brescia and then at Rome was due to expediency. The civic democrats of those cities offered him support for his ecclesiastical programme. In the end the Roman democrats abandoned him to his fate under Pope Adrian IV.

In a preliminary sketch of conditions in Italy Mr. Greenaway adopts the prevalent English estimate of Gregory VII. This we may pass over, but surely we ought not to continue to allege that Hildebrand was responsible for the Election Decree of 1059. That was the work of Humbert.

This volume illustrates yet once more the discontent with spiritual and religious conditions even at the very centre of the administration of the medieval Roman Church. Three centuries before the Reformation broke out Arnold of Brescia gave his life in the interests of religious reform.

A. J. M.

---

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF KARL BARTH. By John McConnachie, M.A. *Hodder & Stoughton*. 1931. 6*s*.

Unlike Mr. Birch Hoyle's more philosophical and comprehensive book (*The Teaching of Karl Barth*, Student Movement, 2nd Edit.), which devoted much space to Brunner and other writers of the Barthian circle, Mr. McConnachie confines himself to Karl Barth, and deals with him only as a theologian. Indeed, Mr. Hoyle and Mr. McConnachie might have exchanged the titles of their books, with advantage to the reader. However, here we have a plain statement of Barth's teaching which makes a serviceable contribution to the interpretation of the Swiss preacher to the British public. The few writings of Barth so far translated convey a very indifferent impression of his message, but with the happy union supplied by the philosophical insight of Hoyle and the theological zeal of McConnachie, a real Barthian repast for the English reader has been supplied.

The Scottish divine surveys the whole of Barth's writings to date. He does useful service by drawing attention to the necessity for learning Barth's terminology. Fortunately this is no difficult

matter on the whole, and where it is obscure, Mr. McConnachie renders aid, for example, in his explanation of the phrase "existential." He deals in a helpful way with current criticism of Barth, and draws a useful comparison between Barth's teaching and that of Jeans. This we had already observed, but it is good to have it emphasised. The writings of Barth are well summarized in this book. The strength of his teaching on the Holy Spirit; on the contact of God and man and nature; his refining down of the sharpness of Calvin's doctrine of election, and other matters on which Barth is supposed to be deficient, are well stressed. But Mr. McConnachie repeats the widely current notion that Barth's teaching sprang from the crisis of the war. It did not—as may be clearly proved from Mr. McConnachie's own sketch of Barth's career. It sprang from the preacher's crisis when faced with the necessity of teaching his people. The great commentary on the Romans was being preached to his Swiss parishioners before the war broke out. The effect of the war on Barth was to widen the range of his outlook, so that he was able to pour the deluge of a torrent, already in being, over wider fields. Thus, whether a preacher was active during the war period or not, Karl Barth strikes a note which cannot fail to enlist his sympathy and attention, and Mr. McConnachie has done good service in bringing the Barthian theology within the range of the ministers of all the English-speaking churches.

A. J. M.

---

A HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN THOUGHT. By A. C. McGiffert. Vol. I. Early and Eastern. [x + 352 pp.] *Charles Scribner's Sons.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

This is the first volume, from the pen of Professor McGiffert, of a history of the origin and evolution of Christian thought. The second volume is already in the press, while a third, and possibly a fourth volume, is proposed. The present volume covers the period from Jesus to John of Damascus, from the beginning of Christianity to the Eastern Church in the Middle Ages. There are chapters dealing with the Apostle Paul and his theology, the Gnostics, the Montanists, the doctrine of the Trinity, the Nicene Council, etc.

Professor McGiffert has produced a scholarly and thoughtful contribution to a fascinating study. It is carefully written, with the emphasis rightly placed, and made as readable as such a work could well be. He gives for the student, with each chapter, a valuable bibliography, made more valuable by a concise appreciation of the merits and limitations of his authorities.

Not all will agree with his statements and opinions, or find adequate his view of particular teaching and belief. Least adequate, as we see it, is his view of the teaching of our Lord. "There is no evidence that he (Jesus) went beyond his countrymen in emphasising the divine fatherhood or that he interpreted it in a novel way." That is not our view.

F. B.

THROUGH THE PRAYER BOOK. By Dyson Hague. *Longmans, Green & Co.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Dr. Dyson Hague's name is well known both in this country and throughout the Dominion of Canada for his works in liturgiology. In this new book from his pen he excels himself by writing in a somewhat different vein from that which obtains in his previous publications. In his *Story of the Prayer Book*, his *Protestantism of the Prayer Book*, and his *History of the Reformation* he is known as a strong writer with very definite views, which he asserts with considerable polemical ability; but in this new work his style is quite different, and there is nothing polemical in the exposition of the teaching and language of the Prayer Book which he gives us here. We have in these thirty-six chapters, which occupy nearly 400 pages, a happy combination of scholarly accuracy with that freshness and enthusiasm which carry the reader easily along, and Dr. Hague is to be congratulated on this new achievement, which serves as a very admirable climax to his previous well-known publications.

We have here the origins and contents of the various services enthusiastically explained, and there are informing notes through the various chapters written with all the freshness which comes from a constantly-renewed youth, concerning the respective merits and peculiarities of the Canadian Prayer Book, the Prayer Book of the Church of Ireland, the Scottish Prayer Book, and the last chapter contains some very interesting references to the "Deposited Book," lately rejected by the English Parliament.

One or two examples of Dr. Dyson Hague's treatment will give the reader a fair idea of what he may expect in this volume. On page 67, dealing with the Absolution at Morning and Evening Prayer, he writes: "There has been no little speculation amongst scholars as to the sources of the Absolution. Where did the compilers get the idea of it? Where did they borrow it from? . . . Cranmer may have got a phrase or two or a possible idea from Bucer, or Pollanus, or Quignon, but as a whole the General Confession and the Absolution are really owing to Englishmen, to the spiritual genius of Cranmer and the first compilers of our Prayer Book." Or again, take his opening section on the Lord's Prayer, page 69: "One of the most significant signs of the ecclesiastical times is the increasing tendency of the non-Episcopal churches to use forms of prayer. As a rule they all innovate with the same thing. All begin by using the prayer which was called 'the prayer of the faithful,' and abandon their long protest against so-called formal prayers by employing that very form which our Blessed Saviour introduced as a cure for formalism. We hail this tendency with Christian pleasure. If the Methodists universally were to use the liturgy which John Wesley abridged from our Prayer Book for their Church services, and if the Presbyterians universally were to do what the Church of Scotland did from 1557 to 1564, and use the English Book of Common Prayer of 1552, we should have in a measure at least the fulfilment of the dream of Cranmer in compiling

our Anglican Prayer Book. To alter slightly the words of his letter to his friend John à Lasco, the desire of his life was 'to present to posterity a true and explicit form of worship, agreeable to the rule of the Sacred Writings, so that there may not only be set forth among different nations an illustrious testimony respecting our doctrine, but that all posterity may have a pattern to imitate.'"

There is an admirable index to this book, and it will be found of abiding helpfulness and service to clergy, students, Sunday-School teachers, and also to the men and women in the pew. The publishers are to be congratulated on the printing, paper and entire production.

R. M. W.

---

CALVIN AND CALVINISM. By B. B. Warfield, D.D., LL.D. *Oxford University Press*, New York, 1931. 20s.

A more useful memorial to his life and work would have been secured by the late Professor Warfield if he had left the endowment, on which some ten volumes of his own writings are being reprinted, for the production of new work. At a time when publishers are compelled to refuse valuable original work, on the ground of high modern costs, it is distinctly a work of supererogation to reprint writings, no matter how valuable, which are already accessible. Perhaps some justification for this reissue lies in the fact that all of the articles first appeared in American journals.

The present volume, the fifth of the series, contains chapters on John Calvin and his work; his doctrine of the knowledge of God; the doctrine of God; the doctrine of the Trinity; the doctrine of creation; a general account of Calvinism, and an account of the literary history of the *Institutes*. These papers are written in a dull, heavy and somewhat obscure style, but they contain a reliable appreciation of the theology of the great Reformer, which is of the utmost value to-day when a revival of interest in Luther's and Calvin's work has been created by the Barthian movement. Both Barth and Brunner are getting students together for the study of Calvin, and we shall do the same here, if we are to obtain a proper understanding of the modern dialectical theology. English students have ample material in this book for months of study and discussion. Calvin's doctrine on the Holy Spirit is of special interest to-day.

A. J. M.

---

HILDEBRAND (GREGORY VII). By A. J. Macdonald, D.D. [ix + 254 pp.] *Methuen & Co.* 7s. 6d.

A series dealing with "Medieval Churchmen" must of necessity include a volume on Hildebrand, who has frequently been described as "the greatest man who ever sat upon the throne of the popes." As a constructive politician he has been accounted one of the greatest minds of Western civilization. For the writing of such a volume Dr. Macdonald has special qualifications. He has already given to the world careful studies on *Lanfranc*, *Berengar*, etc., and in so doing has delved deep into the history of this particular period.

Further intensive study of the correspondence between Hildebrand and his arch-foe, Henry IV, has enabled the author to present a picture of the great pope, more accurate probably in its lights and shadows than those hitherto accepted as authentic.

Let it be said at once that Hildebrand's own high moral character has never been seriously questioned. Equally beyond dispute was his zeal for the reformation of the clergy, strengthened probably by the influence of Cluny. Simony, concubinage, immorality of the clergy, misuse of Church property, the appointment of unsuitable clergy—all these rampant evils found in him a determined enemy, even before he found himself in high place. His unceasing attempts to remedy them after his enthronement brought difficulties innumerable and raised up against him enemies on every side. His campaigns against the marriage of clergy, a practice approved, in many cases, by long custom, met with sustained opposition. His attempts to ban intercourse with the excommunicate likewise brought him into rough water.

It must be accounted a tragedy of history that one who might, in other directions, have achieved great things for the quickening of spiritual religion, and the reformation of life and morals, should have been seized by one overwhelming ambition, and even in pursuing that should have been so lacking in the imagination and vision, the statecraft and policy that alone could have brought success. To have the ball at one's feet only to kick into touch is hardly a sign of outstanding greatness.

Hildebrand was born into a world in which the dominant sovereignty was the Church expressed through the papacy. In very early life his imagination had been captured by the glamour of the papal institution and all its inherent possibilities of power. It later became his passionate ambition to make the chair of St. Peter the final source of all sovereignty and to bring within the range of its authority all Western nations and peoples. That was the pulsing passion that throbbed through his designs and activities: it was the rock upon which his own career finally shattered.

Every proffered opportunity to extend the temporal and spiritual power of the papacy was seized. To France, Spain, England, Denmark, Scandinavia, Poland, even to Constantinople, Gregory's messengers carried his imperious claims and offers. "The foundation of the vast appellate jurisdiction of the medieval Church was being laid down."

It was to be expected that such extensive claims should sooner or later bring him into collision with princes and rulers and particularly with King Henry IV, claimant of the imperial crown, and with it privileges and rights in things ecclesiastical which Gregory would concede to none. The clash came with little delay, and ended only with the Pope's death. Reading Dr. Macdonald's detailed and careful account of the struggle, one's sympathy is summoned to the side of Henry IV. Again and again he extended the olive branch. With "words full of sweetness and obedience, such as we cannot recollect either he or his predecessors have ever

sent to the Roman Bishops" (Hildebrand's own words), Henry sought an agreed solution of difficulties that pressed. Gregory temporized, summoned to his aid Normans and Lombards, and encouraged Henry's rebellious subjects and neighbours. At one time he beguiled with smooth promises, at another he flourished "the sword of general anathema." So events led to Canossa where Henry, barefoot in the winter snows, waited, a penitent, upon the Pope's pardon. If it appeared to be a spectacular and triumphant end to Hildebrand's dreams and schemes, it had within it the seeds of complete disillusionment. Tricked and defrauded, as he conceived himself to be, Henry ere long appeared before the gates of Rome to persist until Gregory VII was deposed and excommunicated, Clement III enthroned in his stead, and Henry and his queen invested with the imperial crown. Gregory's ally Guiscard, with his army of Normans, arrived to succour: they stayed to sack and burn, and left the imperial city in ashes. And yet, almost to the very last an honourable accommodation between Henry and Gregory had been the former's steadfast desire.

A year or two later Gregory died, a discarded pope, an exile from Rome, doomed by his own lack of wisdom and charity, his schemes apparently buried beneath the ashes of Rome: but the principles for which he fought remained and became the foundation of the power of the medieval papacy, an "ignis fatuus," luring Gregory's successors into morasses of trouble.

Dr. Macdonald has told a great story in a scholarly fashion and in a way that carries conviction to the reader. There are minor blemishes which might well be removed in another edition and there are suggestions which might with advantage be expanded, but these are small details in a book of real worth.

F. B.

---

JESUS CAME PREACHING. By Dr. Geo. A. Buttrick. [xii + 239 pp.] *Charles Scribner's Sons.* 8*s.* 6*d.*

The author of *Parables of our Lord* has once again placed the Christian public under a debt of gratitude for a volume of real merit. Designed especially for preachers, it can, with profit, be read by all. Its language, its wealth of illustration, its deep insight, its suggestiveness are as choice as they are refreshing. The difficulties and objections which teachers and preachers encounter are kept constantly under review. The chapter entitled "The Preacher's Place to-day" alone makes the book an acquisition. This is only one of many excellent chapters.

The art and science of preaching Christ to the minds of people to-day, in the social order, and to the individual, furnish some of the themes in these lectures on preaching.

Like the wine at the feast, the choicest comes at the end. "The preaching of the Cross" is the product of a soul that has searched deep into the mysteries of Divine compassion and love, having first known the awful sinfulness of sin. "We preach Christ and

Him crucified. God forbid that we should glory save in the Cross of Christ our Lord "—fittingly ends such a book.

If only it were possible to place this book in the hands of all engaged in preaching Christ's Gospel, the world would be the richer.

F. B.

---

CHURCH SERVICE SOCIETY ANNUAL, MAY, 1931–32. *Blackwood.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

This periodical of the Higher Church School of the Kirk of Scotland begins with a description and photographs of the new St. Andrew's Church at Jerusalem. There are articles on preaching, liturgical services, the behaviour of the minister in worship, etc. It is gratifying to Anglicans to find that so many of their forms of prayer are recommended, particularly as regards intercessions. Ancient and modern liturgies are largely quoted, and the future of the public worship of the Kirk is discussed, with pleas for reverence, dignity and beauty in the services.

---

THE ROMANCE OF DEATH. By Canon Spencer H. Elliott, M.A., Vicar of Bolton. *London: S.P.C.K.* 1*s.*

A glimpse into the future life from the pen of one who was—quite early in life—called upon to look through life's windows into the life beyond. Like other preachers he has found that no congregations have been more crowded than those which have come together to hear sermons on this question. The chapters on the Resurrection and on Heaven and Hell, etc., will be read with the keenest interest.

---

THE SAINT OF TOULOUSE. A Study of a great religious Personality. By Helen Clergue. *London: Mitre Press.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Saint of Toulouse, as the Capuchin monk Pere-Marie Antoine, was from his early youth, and still is called, was one of the notable men of modern France, for he lived into the present century. He was endowed with rare gifts and qualities and his career was striking and abnormal. He was a great character in the Roman Catholic Church; indeed, efforts are now being made to secure his canonisation.

---

MYSTICAL STUDIES IN THE APOCALYPSE. By the Rev. H. Erskine Hill, D.D., Provost of St. Andrew's Cathedral, Aberdeen. *London: Elliott Stock.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

The author's view-point is somewhat unusual. He believes that the Apocalypse was "never intended to be an obscure and cryptic narration of concrete earthly events," but that it is rather an unveiling of what earthly events look like when seen from heaven. He regards it as a complete and intelligible whole, embodying a progressive revelation deliberately given by our Lord through the agency of Angelic beings impressed on the inner consciousness of

the seer. This negatives the theory that the book belongs to the whole body of apocalyptic literature about which the late Archdeacon Charles, of Westminster, wrote so much.

---

CATHOLICITY. By Herbert H. Kelly, S.S.M. *S.C.M.* 4*s*.

"Catholic" and "Evangelical" will read this book with some surprise. The "Catholic" because it is so evangelical and the "Evangelical" because it is so truly Catholic. The author claims to be a member of the Catholic Party, though his "early religious life was narrowly evangelical." His main contention is that while there can be a Catholic party yet no party can be Catholic. A party stands only for part of the truth but is entitled to the name of that aspect of the truth for which it stands.

"There are people who seem to think that they possess the Catholic faith, but that is absurd. No one man, no one nation can be Catholic."

On the Roman claims the author is trenchant. "Is Romanism Catholic? By any definition I know how to frame, a unity by agreement is a denomination . . . that the Pope is the Vicar of Christ . . . seems to me an appalling doctrine. I do not in the least believe that God is absent, nor that any man, or system of men, can be in any way a substitute for God. It makes the faith of the Holy Spirit meaningless."

The following quotations are interesting as coming from an extreme High Churchman: "I do not think we can understand Confirmation at all, unless we realise that it was not a sacrament by itself; it was part of baptism." "I have heard people talk as if God could not act outside the Sacraments. . . . I do not think they really meant it." "It is plain that the Act of Baptism no more takes the place of Conversion or ensures a Christian life than the act of marriage ensures or takes the place of love and faithfulness." The author refuses to quarrel with those who differ from him and readers will find it difficult to quarrel with one who is so large-hearted and humble.

---

THE RENEWED CHURCH OF THE UNITED BRETHREN, 1722–1930. G. W. Addison, Ph.D. [228 pp.]; *S.P.C.K. for the Church Historical Society*. 12*s*. 6*d*. net.

As Dr. Addison points out this book is not intended to be a history of the Moravian Church. It is rather an account of the renewed Unitas Fratrum followed through two centuries of development, keeping in view the main ideal and intention of the "Renewer," Count Zinzendorf, namely, the ideal of assisting the movement from a "plurality of churches" to "the unity of the children of God." Dr. Addison fulfils his purpose admirably well. He brings to his task that sympathy, understanding, and appreciation which is essential in one attempting such an account.

Zinzendorf was a remarkable character, as may be evinced from the fact that as a young student of nineteen his chief concern was

with the state of the Christian Church. His aim at all times was not separatism but real unity. His own life was marked by a deep devotion to the person of Christ and a passion for the realization of His desire "that they may be all one." This ideal he kept before him to the end, despite difficulties and opposition and even when sometimes, separation seemed to be inevitable. His ideal was to foster within the various Protestant Churches groups drawn together to converse on things spiritual and bound together by their desire for richer fellowship in the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The result, as he saw it, would be revival within the Churches and the paving of the way to that union of Christians which he so greatly desired.

The author pays particular attention to the English province, centring round the Fetter Lane Society, following it through Parliamentary recognition and towards devolution. He traces through a hundred and forty years the growth of provincial independence and the breaking down, almost inevitably, of Zinzendorf's ideal of non-separation. The final chapter is concerned with the Renewed Unitas as a possible via media for reunion, and traces up to 1930 the various negotiations, in this connection, between the Moravians and the Church of England.

This scholarly book is based upon a thesis presented for the doctor's degree at the University of London. For its publication we are indebted to the Publication Funds of the University of London and of the Church Historical Society.

F. B.

---

THE KING'S BOOK, 1543. With an introduction by T. A. Lacey. [xx + 165 pp.] *S.P.C.K. for the Church Historical Society.* 6s.

This edition of "necessary doctrine and erudition for any Christian man" is reprinted by photographic process from Bishop Lloyd's edition of *Formularies of Faith put forth by Authority during the Reign of Henry VIII* (1825). The volume was prepared for publication, with an introduction, by the late Canon Lacey, and is issued through the generosity of Viscount Halifax, partly as a "modest memorial to a great Churchman and scholar."

Canon Lacey claims, as against Gairdner, that *The King's Book* is much more than a revision of *The Bishops' Book* issued six years earlier. He shows that whole sections were omitted and new work introduced. He gives some interesting examples of marginal comments made by Henry VIII on the bishops' answers to posed questions.

F. B.

---

PIONEERS OF ENGLISH LEARNING. Thomas Allison. [xix + 105 pp.] *Oxford: Basil Blackwell.* 5s.

We are grateful to the "scholarly friend" whose suggestion inspired Mr. Allison to attempt this little treatise. It is not so

much a dissertation on English learning as individual portraits of learned and pious men of the seventh and eighth centuries, men of Kent, Northumbria and Wessex chiefly, men not perhaps of learning equal to that of Bede, but worthy followers or fellow-labourers. It is obvious that there was throughout the seventh and eighth centuries a " succession of men eminent for piety and sometimes for learning, of which any Church might well be proud."

Mr. Allison has done a real service by putting into print the result of his researches.

F. B.

---

A TRAFFIC IN KNOWLEDGE—an International Symposium on the Christian Message. *S.C.M.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

The Students' Christian Movement seems to be seeking a basis of truth for students of all countries to rest upon, and a method of co-operation in Christian work; but are not both these already provided by the Holy Spirit in the creeds of the Christian Church?

The Editor, Dr. Visser 't Hooft, introduces us to writers expressing various national aspects of the approach to Christianity. The French point of view (Pierre Mauray) is, of course, logical and orderly, and looks to our Lord as the revealer of truth. The American (Reinhold Niebuhr) is concerned with social and industrial problems, and regards Him as the reconciler of men. Morality is, of course, the chief concern of the Chinese writer (P. C. Hsu); he finds in Christ the only one who can save the Chinese character from the destructive effects of Western science and modern nationalism.

All these incomplete presentations of the Person of our Lord produce a very chilling effect on the reader, who is glad to find some warmth in the Russian Orthodox essayist (V. V. Zenkovsky), who directs us to Christ as the Saviour of mankind: only He can satisfy men's needs and men's ideals; the Church is the organ of Christ's Spirit, through which grace and truth come to us.

These varied ways of approach (and there are many others) make us realize the " fulness of Christ," towards the fulfilment of which every nation and every civilization must bring its contribution.

---

PARSON AND PEOPLE. By Edward S. G. Wickham. With a Preface by the Bishop of Whitby. *London: S.P.C.K.* 2*s.*

Here is a collection of experiments and experiences in parish work. Mr. Wickham is one of the many parish priests who discern in our system a growing tendency towards " Congregationalism " and the breakdown of the old parochial system, and he discusses, very freely and fully, new conditions. Marriage, Confirmation, Recreation, Church Finance and other practical subjects come up for consideration. Those who like the author are called upon to minister in populous parishes will find the book full of suggestions that will help them to evolve methods such as his own parish bristles with. The little volume would certainly be a florin well spent.