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

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

CONTENTS

Editorial

"OF the writing of books there is no end." So were we reminded on a recent Sunday in Church. With ardonable pride, we would remind readers that this volume commences the sixty-second year of the publication of THE CHURCHMAN. One day we hope to have an article about the giants of the past who have contributed to our pages, but meantime it is our pleasure to commend the present issue to readers.

We are glad to have an article in this number from our late Editor, Mr. Alfred Buxton, dealing as it does with the Return of our Lord and the relation of current events to it.

Following Mr. Buxton we have pleasure in introducing our readers to a fresh contributor to THE CHURCHMAN. Professor Ehrenberg is a personal friend of Dr. Karl Barth and so his contribution comes with added force.

Dr. Montgomery Hitchcock's contributions are always welcome, and we are glad to have another article from him.

An article by the Rev. J. E. Fison, at present a chaplain with the Forces, is arresting, as is all that Mr. Fison says and writes.

Miss Gertrude Farion, author of *The National Socialist Heresy*, writes with inside knowledge of the facts, and it is good to have following this Mr. Parsons interesting study of "Hitler's Forerunner." The Vicar of St. John's, Boscombe, has also reviewed for us *Romanism and Evangelical Christianity* and no doubt many will want to purchase and read a book which in Mr. Parsons' view is the greatest book dealing with the Roman question emanating from Ireland since Salmon's *Infallibility*.

We include also the first instalment of a valuable treatise on the "Epistle of Truth" by the Rev. E. Hirst, who has just been appointed by the C.P.A.S. Board of Patronage to the living of St. Peter's, Rushden.

Your Redemption Draweth Nigh

THE LATE ALFRED B. BUXTON, M.A.

A FEW days ago, speaking of these times with a little Jewish tailor, he drew my attention to a short article in the *Jewish Weekly*. This stated that as we look at the great Beasts portrayed in the visions of Daniel, whatever their mystery, we notice one thing, they all come to their end, and that to-day we may expect the Messiah.

To what passage have you turned in this crisis? One to which I have looked is Daniel xi., with its continual narrative of the King of the South, and the King of the North. Asked what I made of it, I replied I felt like Daniel, and "my cogitations much troubled me." Undoubtedly, however, Daniel xi. 21 to the close of the Book holds the secret which we need to-day, namely, the significance of the world events now happening.

The interpreters of the chapter consider that the King of the North represents successive Kings of Syria and the King of the South successive Kings of Egypt. They all agree that Antiochus Epiphanes is portrayed from xi. 21 onwards, and the "abomination that maketh desolation," was the climax of his conquest of Palestine by pollution of the Sanctuary and the erection of the image of Jupiter. This was all fulfilled in 168 B.C., and is recorded in the Book of the Maccabees.

In reading through these verses what strikes one most is the constant repetition of the two simple words, "the end." Take a red pencil and underline them from Daniel xi. 27 onwards to the close of the Book. Those two words occur about eight times.

This immediately links this passage with Matthew xxiv. Christ had said one stone of the Temple would not be left

upon another, and the disciples asked: "When shall these things come to pass?" "What shall be the sign of Thy coming and of the end of the world?" Take your red pencil again and mark those two words, "the end," occurring in the first fourteen verses. "The end" is obviously "the end." It must refer to the same event in both Daniel xi. and Matthew xxiv. But the disciples had first asked concerning the destruction of the Temple which in their own minds was connected with the end. Christ did not attempt to correct this, for it was "the end" of the Jewish dispensation which the Temple represented. He merely answered for both events—the end of the Jewish dispensation and the end of the times of the Gentiles. This latter is a parenthesis in Jewish history to enable the gathering of the people of God out of all nations (in order to fulfil the world-wide aspect of the Covenant to Abraham) and had not been revealed to the disciples. In fact, it was not revealed until Peter preached the Gospel in the House of Cornelius and the Holy Ghost fell on the Gentiles.

In the same way, though the latter half of Daniel xi. may have had a fulfilment in 168 B.C., yet it was to have another in A.D. 70 at the end of the Jewish dispensation, but awaits its final fulfilment at the end of the times of the Gentiles (Dan. xii. 1, 2).

In Matthew xxiv. our Lord links His own prophecy to Daniel's. Naturally He does not mention Antiochus because that fulfilment was already history, but instead speaks only of the still future fulfilments. Daniel as it turns out had made a prophecy which contained three fulfilments. Christ made a prophecy concerned with the last two of these fulfilments.

Since Daniel's prophecy serves three different events, it is obvious that some of the points will be true of all three events, others of only two, or even of only one. In the same way with Christ's prophecy, which deals with the last two events of Daniel's prophecy—some of it will be true of one event or the other, some of it true of both events.

Thus the Temple was destroyed in A.D. 70 and the Christians who were in Jerusalem did as Christ commanded and fled to the mountains, thus being saved. Whether, however, this command will be relevant in the circumstances of "the end" we do not know and we need not concern ourselves.

Our main need as preachers and teachers is to realize that the only fulfilment now left of these two vital passages is the final one at " the end," i.e. " the end of the world." The historic fulfilments of 168 B.C. and A.D. 70 are types of what will happen at " the end." These former fulfilments are on a small scale in the then known world, but the final fulfilment must be on a truly world-wide scale. These final events will not only affect the Jews (children of Abraham according to the flesh) and the small world in which they dwelt ; but they will affect the Universal Church (children of Abraham by the Spirit) and the whole wide world in which it is placed. For " God so loved the world "—His final purpose includes it all.

But the signs of the coming fulfilments of A.D. 70 and of the final " end " are in general the same. The Lord speaks of wars, famines, pestilences and earthquakes as the beginning of sorrows, but " the end is not yet." Next He speaks of the Church—false prophets, persecutions, and coldness. Then He gives the two key-signs. Firstly that the Gospel shall " be preached in all the world for a witness unto all the nations and then shall the end come " : and secondly He links with this in the next verse, " the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet."

These two signs are like the two pointers of the compass showing us where we are. Daniel also links these two events together. In one verse he says : " they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate " and in the next, " the people that do know their God shall be strong and do exploits and they that understand shall instruct many."

Christ's whole prophecy with these two key-signs was first fulfilled on a small scale between A.D. 33 (when the preaching of the Gospel began) and A.D. 70 (when Titus destroyed the Temple). Thus, at Pentecost Peter claimed that the outpouring of the Spirit on Jews and Proselytes was the fulfilment of what Joel said concerning " the last days." God promised to pour out His Spirit upon all flesh ; to show wonders ; to darken the sun ; to save whosoever shall call. Peter speaks of the " wonders " God had done through Jesus, the Crucifixion when the sun was darkened, and Christ exalted at the right Hand of God pouring out the Spirit. So he invites all to repent and believe in the Name of Jesus Christ for salvation. This preaching of the Gospel to Jews

and Proselytes " out of every nation under heaven " and the conversion of three thousand of them (coupled with the other signs) no doubt made Peter feel that Christ might return at any time. He did not know then what he began to learn when the Spirit fell on Cornelius and his household, namely that God had a far greater purpose for the world than the little calling out from Jews and specially Gentiles which had happened at Pentecost.

In Acts we read of a great famine, earthquakes, persecution of the Church, false teachers. But above all the first key-sign was fulfilled—the preaching of the Gospel throughout the known world. That this was really done in the full sense in which Christ meant, is shown by the fact that at the end of his life Paul wrote to the Colossians of " the Gospel, which was preached to every creature "—the very words of the great Commission. No wonder then that, remembering the signs of the end prophesied by Christ, the apostles wrote in their epistles of His possible immediate return.

Then a few years later the second key-sign was given. Titus entered Jerusalem and the Temple was defiled and destroyed, as Christ foretold. But Christ did not come. It was not " *the* end." This was only an " abomination of desolation." Titus proved to be only a type of " that Wicked " whom Paul has said must come before Christ returns (2 Thess. ii. 1). Instead other prophecies were fulfilled. The Jews were scattered, and the Times of the Gentiles began. God began calling out from all nations a people for Himself, so that his promise to Abraham would have a truly world-wide fulfilment.

In our day we have seen all these signs ***again*** coming to pass. But for the first time they are doing so in a truly *world-wide way*. As to wars involving the world. Consider the Great War of 1918, the Ethiopian War, the War between China and Japan (involving a quarter of the world's population), and now the present war. As regards pestilence, consider the world-wide influenza of 1919. As regards earthquakes, consider the world-wide chain, Messina, Kobe, San Francisco, Quetta, etc. As regards famines, consider the food shortage after the last war, the destitution of two or three million in China recently. As regards persecutions, consider Russia and Germany with their anti-God campaigns: consider the false prophets in the Churches.

As regards the preaching of " the Gospel for a witness unto all nations." Consider what Dr. Kilgour of the Bible Society writes in his new book, *The Bible Throughout the World*. He estimates that, if they were able to read, at least nine-tenths of mankind are now supplied with some portion of God's Word (and usually a Gospel is the first book of the Bible to be translated) in a tongue they could understand. That is the world-wide " witness " of the printed page, and how much more complete is the witness of the spoken word ! Therefore in the sense interpreted by Paul, the Gospel has probably now been preached " to every creature under heaven " and gone out " for a witness unto all nations."

In this connection there are two remarkable facts. Firstly, in spite of the war, the Government has continued to allow missionaries, including recruits, to go out to the foreign field. Secondly, the foreign Missionary Societies have continued to receive funds in a wonderful way. So much for the fulfilment of this sign of World Evangelization, which, as you remember, is one of the two key-signs.

As regards the second—" When ye shall see the abomination of desolation (spoken of by Daniel the prophet) stand in the holy place "—we cannot tell what form this will take before the actual return of Christ. But consider the things that accompany it—the King of the North and the King of the South. Consider Hitler and Mussolini. Read Daniel ii. 36, and 2 Thess. ii. 3-12, and then consider Hitler's boasting, his defiling of the churches, his allowing himself to be set forth as God, and his persecutions of God's people the Jews, and God's people the Christians. These may be only the leaves of the fig tree, not the summer itself.

We dare not be dogmatic. We were told to look for signs, not dates. We were warned that it is not for us to know " the times," any more than it was for Daniel or for Peter. The latter warns us that with God a thousand years is as one day. On that reckoning the crucifixion only happened the day before yesterday !

But having said all this we submit that it is hardly likely that there is any other fulfilment left for Daniel ii., or Matthew xxiv., than the final one. The signs are world-wide, and the world-wide Kingdom of Christ is at hand. It may be already Michael's war to cast out Satan has begun in Heaven (Daniel. xii. 1 ; Revelation xii.).

For us Christians the trend of events is obvious, but the central fact in the welter of all this remains: "They that do know their God shall be strong and do exploits." This is no time for timidity, for inactivity, for dejection; this is the moment for courage based on the hope of His coming, for active evangelism, for endurance to the end.

These are the days when, according to the interpretation of Joel's prophecy as given to Peter, we can expect a new outpouring of the Spirit on all flesh. This is not the moment to keep big reserves in the Bank; to husband resources; to consider long programmes. In a night all our endowments and accumulated funds may be gone. This is war—"war on the saints," and war by the saints. It is the moment to fight, to suffer, and then to conquer at the glorious appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is written of this end time "they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony, and because they loved not their lives unto death." Have we the vision, the faith and the courage for that?

THE CITY OF PEACE.

O Heavenly City, timeless dwelling-place,
Where we shall meet the Loved Ones, face to face,
To thee our thoughts ascend, our hopes aspire,
Whose bulwarks gleam, touched by no earthly fire.

Eternal are thy courts: immortal life
Bides there, triumphant over death and strife.
Sin cannot enter, and no sorrows come
To mar the glory of the Soul's true home.

Here, amid mortal mists, we grope our way;
There, shines the light of everlasting day.
Here, hate has power; but, in that City fair,
Love rules alone, for God is present there.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

The Inherent Problem in Barth's Theology

PROFESSOR HANS EHRENBERG, Ph.D.

THIS article is a very brief attempt to expound the aim of Barthian theology, the inherent problem involved in this aim, and the significance of this problem. The article falls into four sections.

I

THE AIM OF BARTHIAN THEOLOGY

Barthian theology began as a conscious "correction" of all previous theology. Even though all theologians may be the result of a reaction to previous theologies and hence may be in this measure regarded as correctors, in Barth "correction" is the fundamental purpose and the driving power of his theology; it was the point of departure and to some extent the goal of his theology.

What had to be corrected and *how* was it to be done? Barth set out to correct the self-assurance of theologies, and that is why his theology was called the "Theology of Crisis." For Barth the universal self-assurance of previous theology consisted in its failure to submit itself to the judgment of God; it proclaimed this judgment, but did not apply it to itself. Theology saw itself with the Word of God on the side of the judges, not of the judged. Barth saw that exactly this was the error of all theology and hence sought to dissociate it from that absoluteness God had given to His Word of revelation. It was Barth's work to explain that theology was just as much a work of man as all other works of man. Theology is subject to the truth of the Gospel, to which it testifies.

By this it must not be understood that Barth is dominated by the historical outlook, or that of relativity and scepticism.

No, theology must be subject to the same doubt that controls the conscience of a believing man, who works out his salvation with fear and trembling. Theology too, can only work and teach in fear and trembling. It is always in danger of losing its soul, like the believer. "Corrected" theology will do its theological work with a broken and a contrite conscience. Barth is concerned with a fundamental change in position for theological science; the situation in Germany after the last war was only the outward occasion for it.

Barthian theology wants to give full weight to two things at the same time; the Word of God is to be its sole subject, and yet it is to be completely dominated by its subject and led only by it. Hence practically theology stands *above* the Word of God, but essentially *under* it. Because of this double approach it is of necessity a dialectal (*dialektisch*) theology. It is continually correcting itself.

How is this correction to be carried out? Firstly, Barth took the supremacy of the Word of God absolutely seriously. Theology is valid only in so far as it is carried on under the control of the Word of God, so that the living voice of the Word ever and again casts doubt on the findings of theology. This turning against dogmatic theology is so altogether "anti-liberal" that it must lead to orthodox dogmatics, and, in fact, has done so.

This recognition of the supremacy of the revelation of God is not sufficient to complete the correction, for the subject-matter of theology is also affected by the intention to correct. This may sound hard to understand, but we can do so when we remember Barth's anti-pietistic position. The eschatologists of the nineteenth century, starting with Blumhardt, were Barth's teachers, and so he approaches the subject-matter of theology from a strongly eschatological position. Thus it is that the will to correct without ceasing finds concrete form. For many years the name of Barth's periodical was *Between the Ages* (*Zwischen den Zeiten*), i.e. between this world and that which is to come. John the Baptist can be called the sole patron saint of Barth's theological school; for a long time he provided an example for Barth's exegesis, preaching and teaching. At Colmar there is a picture of the crucifixion by Matthias Gruenewald, in which we see the Baptist pointing to the Crucified with an unnaturally elongated forefinger; this used

to typify the significance of the Baptist for Barthian theology, " He must increase, and I must decrease." Amidst the ruins of all theological knowledge, which followed the collapse of the positivist and liberal theological schools, the fact that the Gospel of Christ begins with the preaching of his forerunner became an unshakable rock and citadel.

During his first period Barth interpreted Paul altogether as though the epistles of the Apostle to the Gentiles had been preached by John the Baptist. Barth wanted to take away security from the conclusions of theology, so as to save it from the catastrophe that always overtakes false security. Never anticipate was the truly well-founded warning uttered by the will to correct. The aim of Barth's theology is valid. The fight against Barth's aim was a fight against windmills and was caused by the fear of theologians that they might be robbed of the security their systems had brought them. Barth demands a submission to the Lord and his rule that goes far beyond personal surrender, for it includes the objective submission of theological thought, knowledge and judgment.

So much for Barth's aim. Anyone who cannot understand it will not be helped by the use of more words.

II

UNDERSTANDING AND MISUNDERSTANDING OF BARTHIAN THEOLOGY

Anyone who understands Barth realizes that his theology has no connection with the old antithesis between liberal and orthodox, even though its development has consisted in a new expression of true orthodoxy. He realizes too, that his theology began as " philosophical idealism with the sign changed." He realizes further that his theology had to dismay the liberals, and madden the orthodox, while the Pietists, who would have been so glad to listen to him, were reduced by him to despair. That is why we can find supporters of Barth in every theological movement and school, and in nearly every church. He will realize too, that his true pupils, theologically-minded youth, have often been a source of annoyance even to him, for a " theology of correction " is hardly a suitable theology for youth.

Anyone who misunderstands Barth will interpret the "absolute otherness" of God and the Word of his revelation in a metaphysical-philosophical, and not in an exegetical-homiletical sense. He will persuade himself that Barth is a modern Manichee denying the goodness of the act of creation; he will doubt whether any sound ecclesiastical system could be founded on his theology; he will consider that he sets too much store on objectivity, and will be afraid that his theology must radically depreciate the value of all religious experience and of the personal life of faith of the individual.

Some reject the dialectal element in Barth's theology because they wish to avoid the inner shock, or because they are too indolent for the exacting movements of the spirit, or because they are too obstinate and dogmatic in their theology, which may be orthodox or liberal, to yield themselves unhesitatingly to the radical working of the Word of reveltation. We must note though that conversely this dialectal element may be accepted for exactly the same reasons that cause others to reject it. Fear may cling to the shock, indolence may shrink from the cessation of constant motion, someone may wish to remain under the judgment of God to be saved from the danger of self-security. Thus there is also a "Barthian" hardness of heart, derived from dialectal reasoning, against which Barth has often warned us.

Anyone who has understood the aim of Barth's theology will need no further explanation of its character, and will defend Barth against all who misunderstand him, whether they reject or accept him, and against the whole storm of opposition and confusion that has been aroused by Barth's theology. Only when we have undertaken this defence, will that side of his theology where the problem is reveal itself to us.

III

THE PROBLEM

There is a problem inherent in Barthian theology that has quite a different source from those found in other theologies, and it cannot deny that it is there. It is a natural of its development from a "correction-theology" to an expression of theology in terms of dogmatics. Barth

himself has not said whether, or how far, he considers the characteristic of correction in his earlier theology could be a germ of his Dogmatics. I believe that all the serious difficulties caused to the real theologian by Barthian theology have their foundation in this question. I do not doubt, however, that Barth has been entirely successful in tracing his way from his starting point to dogmatics, and the correction element could become the seasoning to make his dogmatics tasty. But it should be no cause of surprise, if along this path there are causes of friction that must lead to a serious examination of Barth's theology.

When I met Barth again in 1925 in Goettingen, I drew him a picture of his theology, as it then was, and he in no way rejected it. I said, that according to Barth, man was swinging half-way between heaven and earth, suspended from heaven by his coat-collar, capable neither of reaching heaven nor of returning to earth, not even able fully to lift up his face to heaven. Once Barth had fully developed his dogmatics, such a picture was hardly applicable, but just because it is not, a question about the meaning of his theology as a whole arises, which could not have been asked earlier. Barth knows better than anyone else what it means to construct a system of dogmatics to-day.

In one of the prefaces to his Dogmatics, Barth says, " The theological questions of the Trinity and the Virgin Birth probe the depths of the mysteries in which the Christian Church has its third dimension." His theology based on dialectal reasoning claims that theology is capable of resisting the storm now sweeping through the world. This does not only mean that dogmatics must have as much profundity as possible, but also that it must have its roots in the whole Church. So we see that this fundamental weight and breadth of theological perception is the goal of a development that started with the determination to correct every form of theology by constantly referring back to revelation. Barth's theological thinking was rather one-dimensional to begin with, now at the last it is not merely two-dimensional, but has reached that third dimension of which Barth speaks. Has Barth with his " correcting " made his way through the whole Church, through its full tradition and entire substance ? Has he leavened the whole lump with his " correcting " as with leaven ?

Here and there in Barth's Dogmatics we find certain theses, conceptions, assertions and illustrations which force us to attribute a definite aim to him. There follow some quotations to illustrate these peculiarities of Barthian theology. Barth continually uses the three concepts, "Creation," "Reconciliation," and "Redemption," to characterize the three persons of the Trinity. He speaks of "God the Creator," of "God the Reconciler," and of "God the Redeemer." "The reconciliation which is to be believed here and now," he calls, "the redemption which is to be beheld there in the future." He says, "A reconciled world can only be conceived as a supplement (*Nachtrag*) to the existence of Jesus Christ." He explains that "The New Testament is a testimony of the revelation in which God is present to men as God coming." If he conceives of the Old Testament revelation under the conception of "expecting Christ" and of the New Testament under that of "remembering Christ," he is alluding to the fact of Easter, the fact of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, by which expectation is finally turned into remembrance; and he states that the transfiguration of Jesus on the mount represents a prologue (*Vorspiel*), and Paul's vision on the Damascus road an epilogue (*Nachspiel*) of the Easter story. The New Testament "having Easter as its Archimedean point, which in itself is *not intended to be eschatological*, is in all its other content and meaning intended absolutely and entirely eschatologically." John the Baptist, whose importance for Barth has been mentioned above, is almost equated with the Apostles in this context.

This whole group of ideas has a common denominator, viz. eschatology. In Barth dogmatic theology in the old sense and eschatological theology in the modern sense interpenetrate with the intention of producing a new theology, or rather *the* new theology.

Let us for the moment accept all this without criticism. But one and only one question insists on being answered; has not the essential matter of dogmatics been overshadowed by eschatology in the three concepts decisive for the whole of Barth's dogmatic theology, viz. creation, reconciliation, and redemption. Does the message (*kērugma*) of the New Testament really allow Church teaching to transfer the word redemption from the second to the third section of the

Creed? Barth realizes that he is in danger of over-emphasizing the coming Christ and under-emphasizing the Christ who has come; has he not made a kind of "retrograde step in salvation" by going back behind the consummation of the facts of salvation in Jesus Christ to their beginning? Will not dogmatics thus rounded off lose the balance between the prophetic, the high-priestly and kingly offices of Jesus Christ, a balance that can only be safeguarded by the central facts of salvation, the Cross and Resurrection? Although Barth most certainly wants to give us this guarantee, have we got it, if Easter is to be the "great exception" (*grosse Ausnahme*)? Barth adds this remarkable statement about Easter, "Just in this exception we are dealing with the most important thing of all." Surely it is a most suspicious and untenable statement, through which Barth in some measure betrays himself.

What is to be the relation between Barth's fundamental conceptions and our traditional trinity, Creation, Redemption, and Sanctification? Has Barth substituted Reconciliation for Redemption, and Redemption for Sanctification? Where is Sanctification to find a place, especially as even if the substitution of Redemption for Sanctification is explained by the eschatological concept of Consummation, the latter is never applied in practice? Reconciliation is only a means or instrument for the achievement of Redemption, yet has it not without any justification been inflated to the fact of salvation itself? These are quite definitely fundamental and not merely terminological questions.

If I am right and the true seriousness of Barthian theology and dogmatics can be understood only by one who seeks to apply them to the right preaching of the Gospel, we have to face the question, whether for the true proclamation of the Gospel of Christ the true teaching office of the Church can be established by dogmatics that have rearranged the facts of salvation in such a peculiar way. Do not such dogmatics transport the whole spiritual content of the Church into its porch? Has the subject of dogmatics really remained the same, as it has been since the time of the Apostles? Has a new breach opened here, for which we cannot feel sorry, but which demands healing? I wonder whether Barth has not actually mixed up the first and second Advent, although he keeps them, "the day when the time was fulfilled,"

and " the last day, the day of days at the end of the ages," so far apart that Easter has become for him the " exception." How is the Church of Jesus Christ to know, where she stands, i.e. at what point in the Divine working ? And in that case how is she to live? We cannot but put these questions to Barth and to all others who are free from the usual prejudices, misunderstandings and fears concerning Barth. At the same time we owe him undiminished thanks that it is just one question we have to put to him, and that it is one that concerns the full working out of salvation, and the relation between the second and the third section of the Creed.

IV

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

During the early years of Barth's theology I expressed my conviction, that its most important result would be a transformation of the study of Old Testament theology, and it has had the result I predicted. Almost over night previous " Old Testament theology " became out of date and the unity of the Biblical revelation, once so imperilled, was vindicated. This only became possible by a complete transformation of the scientific interpretation of the Old Testament (*alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*). Together with dogmatics " New Testament theology " has also entered on a period of enormous change.

This far-reaching revolution in " Old Testament theology " is one of method, and therefore affects its very principles. Till then, almost all writers on Biblical theology had approached their subject from an evolutionary standpoint ; Biblical history had been looked at with the eyes of a secular historian. The change was brought about by eschatology. At first, it too, served only as handmaid of the evolutionary and secular method, but (and this was Barth's doing) it broke through the critical method and conquered it. The secular historian, as he looks at the events of history, sees development upwards or downwards. Eschatology on the contrary culminates in a universal consummation ; it promises realization. Its categories are " Promise " and " Fulfilment," and they take one in one swoop right out of the

historical-critical school. In his Dogmatics, Barth has used the simple expressions, "Awaiting Christ," for the Old Testament, and "Remembering Christ," for the New Testament. "Towards Christ" (Old Testament), "From Christ" (New Testament), but the latter bound up with another "Towards Christ"—in his Second Advent—make a unity of the two Testaments. The inner meaning of the Old Testament for revelation is that it is Promise; but just as the New Testament still contains promises and is a Promise so the Old Testament contains fulfilments and is Fulfilment and proclaims Christ. None the less the emphasis of the Old Testament is on promise and that of the New Testament on fulfilment.

The method of Biblical exegesis which sets out to work with promise and fulfilment as its fundamental categories is called "evangelical" (German: *heilsgeschichtlich, Heilsgeschichte*, lit. history of salvation), in contradistinction to the "historical-critical" method. It was not discovered by Barth (how could it have been?) but he renewed and purified it, and grasped its fundamental meaning. Only a theologian who followed after the critical-liberal school could have done that.

It is altogether another question whether the way in which Barth uses the "evangelical" method is free from criticism. I have already given some quotations from his Dogmatics, which have aroused that doubt; the reason is more obvious than it might at first have seemed. Barth had above all to exclude evolution from "Biblical theology," and that is why the Old Testament and its connection with the New were the arena of the struggle aroused by his teaching. Let us take the story of Abraham as an example. If the full promise of God is proclaimed in it, the critical question put by the history of religion as to the date of patriarchal religion has become meaningless, for we are concerned with theology and not with the history of religion. The aim is altogether another, but it must free itself from the previous aim, for the latter has denied the validity of this new, genuinely theological aim. Thanks to its eschatological starting point and its evolutionary opponent Barth's theology takes its stand in the light of Biblical promise. This inevitably leads to the way marked by the words "not yet," which have played such an important part in Barthian theology, and

which have transformed themselves in his Dogmatics to that separation of reconciliation and redemption we have already criticized. In order to be able effectively to attack the popular, light-hearted and vain preaching on the fulfilment of salvation, Barth was just forced to proclaim his "not yet." He thus became simultaneously the opponent of evolutionary-critical science and of the uncritical and pleasurable Christianity of the Pietist. Undoubtedly he poured out the babe with the bath-water in both cases, but a certain exaggeration and over-tension do not concern us very much. We need no theological criticism of Barth in order to accuse him of taking up an unduly clear-cut position; it has always been the job of mediocrity to introduce the qualifications which are necessary in the work of great minds. We are concerned with something fundamental.

We would first recognize that Barth has been the source of a salutary and necessary discipline. We may hope that the days of unrealistic and false edification, which only hardened the worldly man, have passed. Now we are dealing with facts, facts of salvation, and not with psychic experiences. Barth's theology is a "theology of facts."

We would ask Barth whether he has himself extended the necessary discipline in exegesis to the facts that have to be interpreted. Has he not wanted to "correct" not only the theologian and the preacher, but also God himself? In other words, has he not so laid the emphasis on promise that we must ask ourselves whether he speaks of a fulfilment which has not only been promised but also accomplished?

Some will say, "That's just what I mean, when I refuse to follow Barth." Perhaps they do mean that (I hope they do), but they do not mean only that. With this reproach against Barth they want to free themselves entirely from his influence and stick to their old theology. Theologians can no longer return to where they were before Barth came. Even if this has been a justified reproach against Barth, we have not answered the question that arose in our critical study of his theology. A clever man once said, "Barth is quite right in the 'situation,' but he is not right in the 'fact'" (*Sache*)—this should be, "not altogether right."

What are we to understand by the words "situation" and "fact"? There is only one way to answer this briefly; let us think of some prophet in the Bible. In his case the

difference between what the historian and the theologian mean by " situation " is quite clearly seen. The historian investigates the circumstances of the time in which his prophecy was delivered; the theologian explains the call to which the prophet is ordained in this world. Both are " situation " ; in the former case it is the historical " situation " of world-powers; in the latter it is the " situation " between the revealed will of God and the obedience or disobedience of those to whom the revelation was given. Historically considered there is no difference between a true and a false prophet; prophetically considered there is no difference between a good and a bad historian. Barth may be a bad historian, if you so wish, but he does know something about prophecy, and it is from this standpoint that he is dealing with the " situation." His usual opponents from the so-called scientific ranks may be very good historians, but they really do not understand anything of the prophetic " situation " (even if they have raised the so-called " Religion of the Prophets " to the highest rank among religions).

When scientific historians of the religion of the Bible began to interest themselves in the " situation," as they understood it, and to investigate how the writers of the books of the Bible themselves understood what they had written, there arose others who began to study what were really the objective contents of the Biblical statements. That is how the " situation " in the prophetic sense was discovered—the " situation " between God and the world, viz. God's " situation " face to face with men. One who thinks in this way thinks " evangelically," and of its discoverers the most logical, able, and influential is Karl Barth.

A favourite question is, " Is he then something of a prophet ? " That is a silly and most unprophetic question. So much is certain; Barth is a theologian who knows about prophecy, believes in it, and draws knowledge from it, which he has used to build up his theology. I would never call him a prophet, but I would say that his theology is a prophetic theology—but not prophecy. It brings the " situation " between God and the world into theology, makes of it a subject of theology, makes of it a " fact." The very fact that Barth does this is the problem in Barthian theology. The only right critical question that one should ask him is

whether he is justified in so doing, or whether he has done it in the right way.

Is Barth right then in the " situation " ? We say, Yes, and the justification for our yes is to be found in the " evangelical " method of God Himself, which we find in the eschatological colouring of all Biblical assertions. Because all statements in the Scriptures refer to the fulfilment which is to take place at the end of the ages by the judgment of God, the " evangelical " " situation " is a real " situation " given by Divine revelation. Thus understood, all and every revelation is eschatological, and all and every theology should be anointed with a drop of prophetic oil. God Himself acts and speaks " evangelically." He sends His only begotten Son, *when* the time is fulfilled. He founds his Church at his appointed hour. He permits the end of all things to take place, *when* the promises concerning the end, which He Himself had given, have been fulfilled. That is *His* plan, *His* plan of salvation. Nevertheless, God always acts and speaks for all times. Nothing is valid only for the moment in which it makes its appearance " evangelically." All that God does and says is God's " fact." The task of a true theology is to find and give expression to the true relationship between God's " situation " and God's " fact." This is both what Barth's theology would do and the cause of our concern about it. He is right in the " situation," i.e., he has understood the signs of the times and has used them correctly as a foundation of his theology. He is incorrect in the " fact," i.e., he has not arranged the working out of the " situation " in the right order.

God's history and the teaching of the Church! The tension between these two great forces controls the path of the Church from the time of the Apostles to that old Church we call Catholic ; it controls the relations between the Roman and the Lutheran churches ; outside Roman Christianity it controls the relations between Anglicanism and Nonconformity. Recently the same tension has controlled the strife that has begun about Barthian theology.

What connection have all these theological explanations with the German Church struggle ? It might seem that there were not much to say about it theologically, or that the Church struggle were only a practical test for Barthian theology. In fact, there was a closer connection. It stands

to reason that during the Church struggle it did not keep us busy, but it seems suitable to reveal it now. The Church struggle was concerned with a peculiar fusion both of the question about *the correct teaching of the Church* and *the right comprehension of God's hour*. The false path of the German Christians was the proclaiming of a false prophecy about God's hour as *the* teaching. It follows that the fight against such false prophecy and the false teaching derived from it was a fight for the right combination of the prophetic and teaching commissions of the Church. The task of the Confessional Church was rightly to combine the " situation " and the " fact " of the Church. In this measure its task was the same as the true problem of Barthian theology. Although Barth was never a real leader of the Confessional Church, and the majority of its leaders never really became his adherents, this circumstance, and this circumstance alone, gave Barthian theology an ascendancy in the Confessional Church.

The admirers of the German Church struggle only rarely understood its real meaning, and no blame to them. Anyone who has not been in the situation in which the struggle began, will find it very hard to get to the heart of matters. The more obvious questions round which the struggle was waged were the unity of the revelation in the Old and New Testaments, the connection between the Church and Israel, and specially the connection between God's history and the truth of the Church's proclamation. In its significance for the whole Church of Christ in the world the Church struggle is truly a full counterpart to the problem of Barthian theology concerning " situation " and " fact." The future theology of all churches will from now on almost automatically concern itself with the taking of the Biblical story of salvation (Biblical " evangelicalism ") into the doctrine of the church. That is the result both of the Barthian theology and the German Church struggle.

The problems I have dealt with will stir up many questions anew, but I must stop. This can be continued some other time. What we ask of Barth is that he should submit his teaching to the general " correction " he himself has demanded ; we know too, that he will agree. We are living at the beginning of a theological flood, and it was Barth who turned the cock to let the waters flow. That is his merit,

and merit it is, whatever doubts the timid may have. Is there anyone that thinks we can find refuge anywhere from the flood of unbelief ? In spite of all book-lined studies there is no dry land left now, and none of us knows the magic word with which to stop the flood of waters. There will be one difference as compared with the Flood in times of old ; there will be more than one ark and more than one Noah. But surely it was Karl Barth who was the first to build himself an ark for the coming theological flood.

My object in writing this article is to check the hardness of heart that goes hand in hand with Barthian theology, as it spreads through the churches. That is why I asked the question whether Barth himself bore some of the blame for this hardness, and if so how much and why. There must not be in the future a gulf dividing the Church of Christ with Barthian theology on the one side and, on the other, a regular chaos of theologies united only in the determination to have nothing to do with the correcting influence the Barthian theology is bound to have on them. If that happens, the Spirit will be quenched and grieved.

OUR DUTY TO GOD AND TO THE STATE

By A. D. Lindsay, C.B.E., LL.D. (Lutterworth Press.) 9d. net.

Many will be glad to have the text of the broadcasts by the Master of Balliol which now appears in this valuable little booklet. Matters which press on the minds of many in these days are considered in its four chapters. The author commences with a consideration of " The conflict between universal religion and national religion," in the light of the finality of God's goodness. " Our failure to believe actively in the goodness of God or, if you like, the infinity of goodness, does not come only from intellectual misunderstanding. It comes from our recurring moral failure—our readiness to live on the moral capital others have accumulated " (p. 16). " God and my neighbour " is considered in the light of the New Testament ; for, as the author says : " He is our neighbour who most needs the help which we are able to give." The relations of church, State and community, are then considered in turn, also the claims of each on the individual. " Cæsar," to whom we must render his due, is described as " the compulsion of the State " ; yet it is freely admitted that " we can't do without Cæsar." However, the author pleads for the leadership of true prophets to see that Cæsar is not given more than his due, and that God has the first place in all life.

E. H.

The Witness of Conscience to God

THE REV. F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.

IN the following pages certain facts about conscience will be stated. While the subject is chiefly approached from the practical side, the Divine origin of conscience and its rational basis are consistently maintained. This is, however, not a thesis on the origin of conscience and the moral ideas, but an attempt to set forth the power it has in controlling and shaping human character and conduct, and in the acquisition of these virtues that are developed in man and are necessary to his further development. Whatever its origin and however evolved, there it is now, and all thinkers must accept it as it is now, a well-developed and universally recognized faculty in human life. Its power and authority are always present with us. We cannot escape or evade them. And least of all Christians, whose postulate is that conscience is the voice of God, the force of the Divine Spirit indwelling in us, illumining our reason, controlling our will, restraining our feelings. But like the "good" it seems to defy analysis. Something apart from and distinct from other faculties, it manifestly was intended and it manifestly intends to govern them all. It is in itself a witness to the unity of the human personality. It and memory prove that we are not a mere bundle of thoughts and feelings, but that behind all such, is a thinking, willing, feeling centre; self-conscious, and therefore conscious of its faults and its past, its hopes and its future. And such a soul, we know from experience or direction from a higher source which must be obeyed, is as capable of receiving a rational law as of entertaining an emotional appeal from a rival source which speaks without such authority. For if God speaks to man through his reason, man speaks to man often through his feelings. Such a soul is capable too of judging its own motives and of weighing its own actions, capable also of a future, to the development of which soul natural life and powers may

afford help but may set no limit. As the expression of such a soul, or as its attitude towards motive and action we have—conscience. From the Christian viewpoint conscience is a witness to God and immortality. It helps us to realize that the basis of the authority of the moral law is outside us, and above us, in other words, objective not subjective, and, therefore, in the highest sense rational and real. For the " real " is the " rational " as Hegel said. We must believe that the universe is worked on rational lines, otherwise we could have no science. And ethics may be roughly described as the science of human conduct. In a non-rational universe there would be no physical order, no spiritual law, no authority, and no conscience. Conscience is, therefore, a witness to the rationality of the universe, and the presence of a supreme reason which has directed and is directing its movements, physical, moral and spiritual. It was in the sphere of the practical reason which we may regard, broadly speaking, as the conscience, rather than in the pure reason or understanding, that Kant found the grounds of belief in the immortality of the soul and the existence of a supreme law-giver.

There are many technical questions and philosophical problems connected with conscience which are beyond the limits of this essay. There have been many definitions of conscience given from time to time, which may or may not be adequate. We present a few. Bernard of Clairvaux (1091–1153) said, " Conscience is the book in which our daily sins are written." Our own Bishop Butler in 1736 said: " There is a superior principle of reflection or conscience in every man which distinguishes between the internal principles of his heart as well as his external actions, which passes judgment on himself and them, pronounces determinately some actions to be in themselves just, right, good ; others to be in themselves evil, wrong, unjust ; which without being consulted, without being advised with, magisterially exercises itself, and approves or condemns him, the doer of them accordingly ; and which if not forcibly stopped, naturally and always, of course, goes on to anticipate a higher and more effectual sentence, which shall hereafter second and affirm its own." He continues, " Your obligation to obey this law is in its being the law of your nature," and that it is " a moral faculty: whether called conscience, moral reason,

moral sense or Divine reason: whether considered as a sentiment of the understanding or as a perception of the heart; or, which seems the truth, as including both."

Bishop Martensen said: "Conscience is not mere impulse, the impulse of obedience of subordination, the aim of which is God and God's Kingdom: it is not mere instinct, which makes known to man what in an ethical respect is serviceable to him, and what he must avoid for the preservation of his soul.... It is also consciousness, knowledge, information, man's joint acquaintance with himself and with God. It is man's ideal, or the ideal man in us. Which here expresses itself, commanding or censoring in relation to the empirical man." This last was Kant's idea of man as *noumenon* giving the law to man as *phenomenon*, which was but another way of saying that the spiritual man governs the carnal. The late T. H. Green, the well-known Oxford philosopher, defined the individual's conscience thus, "Reason in him as informed by the work of reason without him in the structure and controlling sentiments of society." Martineau described conscience as "the critical perception we have of the relative authority of our several principles of action." Sidgwick said, "The authority of conscience is the authority of reason in its application to practice." He held that "conscience is essentially intellect or reason applied to practice!" Dr. Hastings Rashdall held that "Conscience is usually used to indicate, not merely the faculty of knowing what we ought to do, but also the whole complex of emotions and impulses which impel us to the doing of what we know to be right or deter us from the doing of what we know to be wrong. When we talk about conscience 'remonstrating' or 'rebuking' or 'enjoining' or 'impelling,' we clearly mean to imply some kind of emotional impulse or desire as well as mere knowledge."

In short, we may define conscience as a sense of obligation or consciousness of duty. An internal lawgiver, judge and guide. It is the man as he feels moral obligations, pronounces moral verdict, as he moves ethically *towards God*. "Towards God," one must add. For a sense of duty or obligation imposed upon us implies one to whom we are responsible for such. Duty is without its compelling power, lacks its authoritative voice when considered apart from the Divine imponent. That Divine Power for righteousness is

felt, registered and interpreted by conscience. Herein lies the greatness of the human personality that it can receive, feel, and respond to a Divine obligation. In spite of all opposition from his fellow, the man who listens and responds to that higher voice can hold out as an *Athanasius contra mundum*. He can defy the world, if backed by his conscience. For he is ultimately, in the last resort, and in the highest degree answerable to God. And it is within, in his own personality, where it is deepest and most private, that God has the seat of his authority.

Accordingly, we may regard our conscience as " our guide, philosopher and friend." A life directed and ruled by a fully developed Christian conscience—that is a conscience illumined by the Divine Spirit—offers therefore the best subject for a study of the philosophy of life.

Conscience often works subconsciously. It is not necessary that a man should have developed his self-consciousness sufficiently clearly to be able to reflect upon the workings of the Conscience, and to understand those workings, in order to obey its dictates. The Greek philosophers, who came after Socrates, made a special study of self-knowledge. They used various expressions for conscience that suggest thought and knowledge, e.g. *to suneidos*[1] and *sunnoia*,[1] thought or reflection: *sunesis*,[1] understanding: the phrase *sunoida emautō*,[1] " I am conscious to myself," or " with myself "; the word *suneidēsis*[1] which came to be used for conscience about one century before Christ, and is found in the Apocrypha, Philo, and the New Testament. Other words were in vogue to express " shame " (such as *aidōs*) which is a considerable element in " conscience," the saying being attributed by Stobaeus to Pythagoras—" one should feel shame most of all before oneself." But we are concentrating here upon the principal factor in the making and developing of " conscience," namely reflection.

The Romans adopted the Greek terms. Horace,[1] writing one generation before Christ, says: " To be conscious of no guilt, to grow pale through no fault " (*Nil conscire sibi, nulla pallescere culpa!*) using the verb. The noun

[1] Demosthenes, p. 231.
[1] Euripides: *Orestes*, p. 396.
[1] Euripides: *Andromache*, p. 805.
[1] Plato: *Republic*, p. 331a.
[1] John viii. 9, and frequently in Pauline Epistles and Hebrews and Philo, etc.
[1] Epistle i. 1-61.

" conscientia " was first used by Cicero. Various other expressions such as a " conscious mind " (*mens consia*) were used by Latin poets and writers. They had of course other terms such as " pudor " and " pietas," but these were not directly connected with conscience itself.

The Jews had no expression for " conscience." They used " heart " (" clean heart ") for it. They were perhaps more aware of its working than other nations. The very idea of conscience lies behind the moral development of man in the Old Testament. God's questioning of Adam and Cain and His message to David imply the possession of a conscience—something to be appealed to and to touch in man, and something that made him know his guilt, even if he did not *feel* it. The Story of the Garden is intended, among other things, to explain the Genesis of the moral sense of duty which cannot be developed in a solitude, but only in a society, and requires at least the presence of another person, an *alter ego*. (The Greek Book of Wisdom, xvii. 11, has a striking passage on conscience, " Wickedness condemned by her own witness, and being pressed with conscience [syneidsis], always forecasteth grievous things.") In the New Testament our Lord appealed to men's sense of right and wrong although He did not use the term " conscience." " Why even *of yourselves* judge ye not what is right " (Luke xii. 57). An appeal to their innate sense of right and wrong.

The Holy Spirit He declared would *convince* (or convict) the world of sin, of righteousness and judgment (John xvi. 8), using the very word convince or convict (" elencho ") that is used to describe the action of conscience in John viii. 9, " convicted by the conscience." Jesus Himself might be described as the embodiment of the human conscience, for He came not only to awaken it in others, but to reveal *it* in its highest form in Himself. The word " conscience " is used five times in the Hebrews and twenty times in the Pauline Epistles, where we have it defined as " a law written on the heart," a something that bears witness to the validity and authority of the moral law of God, amid the clashings of internal arguments *pro* and arguments *contra* (Rom. xi. 14 f.), thoughts that accuse and excuse one another. Conscience, to define it briefly, is like the needle of the compass that points towards the North. Conscience is our guide to what is *right*. For the former implies the latter. If a thing is good

it must be an end, not a means, something to be promoted or sought for its own sake, and for nothing else above or beyond it. It is therefore right to seek it and our duty to promote it. Thus the terms " duty," " good," and " right," are correlative terms or ideas which imply each other like the inside and outside of a curve or circle. It is with all three that conscience is associated. It is held by some philosophers, e.g. the late Dr. Hastings Rashdall, Mr. G. E. Moore, etc., that these ideas cannot be analysed, that they are ultimate, and that that is why we reason in a circle when attempting to define them, as we must, in terms of themselves. Suppose for example we were to define the good as " that which helps forward the human race in its onward and upward movement," we at once comprehend in our definition a number of things, such as surgical operations which are necessary and, indeed, are good as means, but which cannot be regarded as ends in themselves; that is things to be chosen for themselves and for nothing beyond or above them. And " an upward and onward movement," must mean a movement towards the good, so that we have not yet arrived at what the good is. The " evolution of humanity " by itself cannot be regarded as an end in itself. It implies a goal to be reached, as well as a course to be run. And the goal, as Christ suggests, that to which things are tending, might possibly not be good at all. It might, to take an extreme view, be a state of greater vice and misery.

Again, define the good with T. H. Green as a " state of desirable consciousness." This is the same as saying that the good is a state of consciousness which is right, is good, and therefore to be desired. This again is reasoning in a circle. It is true that as reason gives the ideal, or the idea of the end, that end must satisfy reason; but it confuses the means with the end. The perfection of mankind, the complete realization of one's own capacities, even if that involves the seeking for a like realization of the capacities of others (as T. H. Green held), cannot be an end in itself, can only be a means. For the question at once arises, What is this realization for? What is the use and purpose of it? To what does it lead?

The truth is that we are regarding humanity as an end whereas it is only a means. We must, indeed, treat men not as means, but as ends in themselves. But when we

attempt to define the good or the goal of humanity we cannot seek that good or that goal in humanity itself. The good and the bad are to be determined, therefore, by some standard outside us, some law above us, some will and mind greater than humanity. In fact, the idea of God is implied in that of the "good." The good, therefore, is the will of God and is attained in the service of God. Directly, or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously, there is in every judgment of value a reference to some such ideal standard or mind. Even if we cannot agree about our definition of it, whether we say it cannot be analysed or whether we analyse it into various supposed contributory ideas and sentiments, in every reference to the "good" we employ a standard and ideal that are in us, but not of us. This objective standard, the rule of duty, this "ought" involves of necessity a belief in a just God; a God Who has given us the laws and categories of rational thought, and the hope of a future life where the "good" will be realized, the ideal will become practical, and the rule of righteousness will be universally applied. In a word, conscience is not only the witness to man of a law that must be obeyed, and of a Divine Law-giver Who has given that law, it is also the witness of a future life, and a Divine Kingdom.

It is the practical reason, reason in its judgments upon conduct and character, not the speculative reason, or reason in its theorizings and logical processes, that helps us here. It is this practical reason which considers and promotes the "good" of mankind, that gives a standing or position to the findings or theories of reason in its speculative work. It is this practical reason that establishes the necessity and objective reality of God, free will and immortality: whereas about these speculative reason theorizes in a detached and aloof manner, as if not personally interested. Why? Because practical reason (which is another expression for conscience), man's personality in its ethical and practical aspect, has a practical and living interest in these things. While pure reason is wondering whether they are necessary to thought or merely self-contradictory propositions; practical reason declares that they are essential to life as well as to thought. The clue to the meaning of it all; the answer to the great question of speculative reason is given by the practical reason which finds in its own consciousness of

goodness and rightness a revelation of the purpose—the rational and spiritual purpose that is being worked out in the Universe.

This purpose every rational and spiritual being must promote. Our conscience, in a word, leads us to God, and reveals God to us and in us. God intends us, and wills us, to advance along His lines. The sense of dissatisfaction that follows our failures is partly the result of our own judgment that we have failed, and partly the result of an intuition that we have displeased God. And both these, the judgment and the intuition are activities of our conscience. It is at once the faculty by which we learn the will of God, and the faculty by which we judge and condemn ourselves. Are we not, therefore, justified in holding that God speaks to man through his conscience? May we not consider that conscience forms a portion of what was meant by "the image and likeness of God," in which man was originally made? Such is represented in Scripture as that which distinguishes man from the beast, and as that which was perfectly revealed by Christ, Who is described by St. Paul as "the image of the invisible God" (Col. i. 15, cf. iii. 10).

Writers like Darwin on evolutionary ethics, who hold that the conscience or moral sense is the result of a long and chequered process of development, would regard the chief difference between man and the beast as consisting in the moral sense. But even this difference they would consider as one of degree, not of kind. To exalt the animal creation thus is to disparage the human race. Animals can be taught to obey and to learn that disobedience is wrong and will be punished. Through association with man and his methods of discipline they may acquire a crude idea of rightness and wrongness. But the recognition of duty as duty cannot be found among these.

It is here that we have the highest proof of the divine origin and eternal future of man. It is his reason illumined by the Spirit of God; his conscience as it interprets the Word of God, and his prayer as he holds fellowship with God that makes man divine. As man may serve as a conscience to the animal he domesticates, Christ is the conscience not only of those He leads and saves but also of those whose lives are indirectly influenced by his teaching, who live in the atmosphere of morality and spirituality created by His example and His Divine Spirit.

Pride, Prejudice or Principle

THE REV. J. E. FISON, M.A.

I

IN this time of war many people find their habits altered by force of circumstances. In reading, it is doubtful if anyone is sticking just to his peace-time routine.

Is not this an opportunity for getting to grips with the really great Christian classics, and for doing away with the potted second-hand devotional and theological summaries of other people's views? I believe we all agree with this in our Bible reading. Those who are at all interested in the Bible want to read it itself and not merely books about it. There is a real desire to get to grips with the Word of God Himself.

Is there the same desire to grapple with the great Christian classics outside the Bible? Are "Catholics" really grappling with Thomas Aquinas? Some are. Are Evangelicals really getting to know at first hand the Fathers and the great Reformers? I can only speak for myself. I have felt the need of doing this and to some extent have discovered recently the joy of undertaking a far too long deferred duty. Let us tap the springs of life. And let us examine our great inheritance at first hand.

And it is here of the utmost importance that we should know not only the great authorities of our own tradition, but also the great authorities to which others refer when they oppose us. Is it any exaggeration to say that, apart from John Oman, the only living Protestant theology of to-day is the work of Barth and Brunner, or work influenced by them? The reason of this is twofold: (1) Barth and Brunner have really grappled with the Bible and taken its revelation seriously. (2) Barth and Brunner really know the early Fathers and St. Thomas Aquinas as well as the great Reformers, Luther and Calvin. One great consequence of this is that the Church of Rome really takes them seriously: it realizes their strength a great deal more clearly than many Protestants do.

Now if Karl Barth at Basle, within sound of the guns as long as France was fighting, can go on with his great Dogmatic Theology, cannot we Evangelicals in this country dig the deep springs of life again? Can we in time of war afford time on miserable second-hand "Theologies without Tears"?

II

As a practical illustration of this may I give my own experience? I have recently read right through for the first time the *Letters of Igantius*, Bishop of Antioch at the close of the first century, and almost certainly martyred at Rome during the reign of Trajan. Now Ignatius may not be one of the greatest Church Fathers, but he is one of the earliest, and in the allegorical or platitudinous sub-apostolic writings his work (with perhaps the Didache) stands out as definite, bold and original. Opinions vary about him enormously. But his letters were written to the main Christian Churches of Asia Minor as well as to the Church of Rome. They were written by a man who was Bishop of Antioch within fifty years of St. Paul's first Missionary Journey. They were written by a contemporary of Polycarp, and by one who, like him, must have overlapped St. John. Polycarp writes of these letters that they 'contain faith, patience, and all the edification which pertains to our Lord.' And the Churches concerned preserved them: a fact which proves that they had a high regard for them and their author.

In view of all these facts these letters should be taken seriously by Evangelicals, even though they may not like their teaching. Therefore I propose to summarize what Ignatius says on the more controversial questions which are still with us to-day—very well-known passages, often bandied about in controversy, but all too seldom read in their living context.

First as to the Episcopate and the Ministry, Ignatius is very emphatic. He says: "It is written, 'God resisteth the proud': let us then be careful not to oppose the bishop that we may be subject to God," and again, "it is clear that we must regard the bishop as the Lord himself"; and again, "let all respect the deacons as Jesus Christ, even as the bishop is also a type of the Father, and the presbyters as the council

of God and the college of Apostles. Without these the name of ' Church ' is not given."

Then as to the Church and the Eucharist, he says : " Let no man be deceived : unless a man be within the sanctuary (thusiasterion) he lacks the bread of God." And again he speaks of those who are " inseparable from God, from Jesus Christ, and from the bishop and the ordinances of the Apostles. He who is within the sanctuary is pure, but he who is without the sanctuary is not pure : that is to say, whoever does anything apart from the bishops and the presbyters and the deacons is not pure in his conscience." In a passage, which may be compared and contrasted with Ephesians iv. 4-6, he writes : " Be careful therefore to use one Eucharist for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup for union with his blood, one altar (thusiasterion) as there is one bishop with the presbytery and the deacons my fellow servants." And finally, " Let no one do any of the things appertaining to the Church without the bishops. Let that be considered a valid Eucharist which is celebrated by the bishop or by one whom he appoints. Wherever the bishop appears let the congregation be present : just as wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church. It is not lawful either to baptize or to hold an ' agape ' without the bishop." "... Obey the bishop and the presbytery with an undisturbed mind, breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality, the antidote that we should not die, but live for ever in Jesus Christ."

III

These are strong " Catholic " statements, though it would be utterly false on any view to read back into first century words twentieth century meanings. One view is that they mark the beginning of " Catholic apostasy." It is possible that the writing called the Didache comes from Syria and from the same time as Ignatius, and, if so, it may represent a Primitive Evangelicalism which was stamped out by a monarchic Episcopate. In writing to Smyrna, Ignatius tells the members of that church that they " ought to appoint for the honour of God a delegate of God to go to Syria and congratulate them (i.e. the Syrian Church) that

they have gained place and have recovered their proper greatness and that their proper constitution has been restored." Does this refer to the suppression of the evangelical liberty and freedom and variety of church order which some find in the Didache? It is possible. But this is A.D. 100, not A.D. 325 or A.D. 451. This is not the squabbling political hair-splitting of the later Greek theologians. Ignatius was alive when St. John was alive. His letter to Ephesus must have been read to a church which knew St. John personally. Is it not possible that on the greatest problems of Protestant and Catholic controversy we need to remember Charles Simeon's words: "The truth is not in the middle and not in one extreme but in both extremes. . . . So that if extremes please you, I am your man: only remember that it is not one extreme we are to go to but both extremes"? This quotation was followed in the *Record* of October 4th by another, even more striking, "I should be cautious of making up my mind strongly on anything that is not clearly defined in Holy Scripture. Nothing is easier than to lay down an apparently good principle and to err in following it. Many think the opposite to right must be wrong; but the opposite to right may be right. . . . I know I may be called inconsistent and unstable, and be represented as conceding too much to the opinions and prejudices of men. But I should account it a small matter to be judged of man's judgment, if only I approved myself to God and to my own conscience. . . . The human mind is very fond of fetters, and is apt to forge them for itself."

Simeon would be the last person to deny the reality of the differences among Christians. No one could accuse him of compromising Evangelical truth. His words might well make us pause before we easily argue that our old controversies still have reality to-day. Battle fronts change. And human sin often makes us conceal the real points of difference behind the traditional positions. Let us dig the springs of life again—first in the Bible, then in the great Church Fathers of the Early Church and of the Reformation, and finally in a frank and open-minded facing-up to God as He speaks to-day in unexpected places and through unexpected people. The wind still only "blows where it lists." Jerusalem never expected that wind to blow from Galilee and when its power could no longer be denied, it

committed the unforgivable sin of denying its goodness. Let us take warning and not be afraid to " launch out into the deep," remembering that in the storm—and we are all in the storm now—there is a safety on the ocean which will never be found by hugging the shore. " Go to it," evangelicals, for God's sake, for " only when the ship is in motion does the helm guide." It is one of Ignatius' greatest words which says : " He who has the word of Jesus for a true possession can also hear His silence."

(Quotations from Ignatius are from the Loeb Translation.)

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD :

Church and Society in England from 1800. Vol. III.

By M. B. Reckitt. ***(George Allen & Unwin) 7s. 6d.***

We have here a book " not intended for scholars in the more restricted sense of that term, but for those who have not the leisure or the opportunity to devote much time to the reading of standard works upon the subject." The author traces historically the attitude of the Church to social problems from the time when Evangelicals and others alike as a whole would have little concern with what are termed social evils to the Oxford Conference on " Church, Community and State," and the present day. One of the most heartening things that the ordinary reader will find in it is the effect that this altered view-point has had on the attitude of the working classes to the Church, alienated seriously by the latter's assumption of indifference. In this connection Mr. Reckitt instances the courageous appeal of Archbishop Davidson for the use of conciliation in the General Strike of 1926. In his opinion, " The Church of England came nearer at this moment to popularity with the labouring classes than at any time since the Reformation." In this respect it is a heartening narrative that is told, as is the growing recognition of the need for united action by the Christian bodies in this country, in these as in other questions, if any result is to be obtained. The story is as absorbing as it is vital, and, as told, an intensely interesting one. Theological difficulties are not shirked. It only remains to add that the book is necessarily well documented and the author's comment throughout is sane. It has a bibliography at the conclusion of each chapter, and an epilogue on the contemporary situation and its problems in which are included totalitarianism and pacificism, but, perhaps wisely, not capitalism. It is just the book needed to give a right perspective to those problems, and that within the compass of 250 pages.

L. J. M.

Hitler's Forerunner

By The Rev. A. W. PARSONS.

(*Vicar of St. John's, Boscombe.*)

THE title of this article recently appeared outside my Church as a subject for a Men's Meeting. I based what I wanted to say about it on a text in Deut. viii. 2 : " Thou shalt remember all the way the Lord thy God hath led thee." I began by explaining that when I was in Leicester I was invited by a body of Trustees to preach a special sermon. The invitation to do so was accompanied by this little note. " Thomas Hayne of Christ Church, London, by his will dated the 28th September, 1640, gave 20s. yearly for a preacher in Leicester, for a sermon to be preached in some Church near the midst of the Town of Leicester, near the time of the year in which the Spanish Armada was defeated in 1588, for a thanksgiving to God for that great victory to this land."

I wondered whether Thomas Hayne had served as a very young man in the fight against Philip of Spain. Did he leave money fifty-two years afterwards because he felt that the people of his own day had already forgotten one of God's greatest interventions in English history? Did he recall the words of Shakespeare : " God's goodness hath been great to thee. Let never day nor night unhallowed pass but still remember what the Lord hath done " ? At all events Thomas Hayne left his money, and so a poor preacher now gets more than one pound to remind Leicester people of the way the Lord their God had led them. At that time Leicester only boasted of a military force of ten pikemen, yet two thousand men of Leicester Town and County were fitted out and sent to Tilbury Camp! Whether Thomas Hayne was one of them or not he was quite right in taking steps to have such a marvellous deliverance from invasion remembered. There is a religious use of memory. Not only in the time of Moses but to-day God is calling His people to recollection. " O God, we have heard with our ears, and our Fathers have declared unto us, the noble works that

thou didst in their days, and in the old time before them," is the best foundation for our further prayer: "*O Lord, arise, help us, and deliver us for thine honour.*" I believe if we are faithful as a nation to God that He will do for us in these days what He has done in the past. Our statesmen go on warning us of the danger of invasion. Our gallant and high-hearted airmen go on bombing the invasion ports; our seamen and our soldiers and home guards keep watch and ward. It may hearten some of us to remember what happened over three hundred and fifty years ago. It should help us to realize the guiding hand of God. Religion simply means the guiding of God in History and in the Individual Life. The late Bishop Creighton once wrote something like this: "The best cordial for drooping spirits is a good dose of history." History is His Story. Readers of THE CHURCHMAN believe that "God is working His purpose out as year succeeds to year." This is clearly seen in the remarkable event which happened in the last week of July, 1588.

Queen Mary of England breathed her last on November 17th, 1558. Dr. Wylie, in his *History of Protestantism*, gives the following account: "The Parliament was then in session, and Heath, Archbishop of York and Chancellor of England, notified to the house the death of the Queen. The members started to their feet and shouted out: 'God save Queen Elizabeth.' The news of Mary's decease speedily circulated through London: in the afternoon every steeple sent forth its peal of joy: in the evening bonfires were lighted, and the citizens rejoiced. Men, as they met on the highways, grasped each other by the hand and exchanged mutual congratulations. The nation awoke as from a horrible nightmare. It saw a future approaching in which there would be no more spies prowling from house to house, officers dragging men and women to loathsome gaols"—England it seems, under a Catholic Queen, had its own Gestapo—"executioners torturing them on racks and binding them with iron chains to stakes and burning them; no more Latin Litanies, muttered masses, and shaven priests; it saw a future in which the Gospel should be preached in the mother tongue of old England and quiet and prosperity would again bless the afflicted land."

In the following year, 1559, the Prayer Book, then only

ten years old, was restored and for the next eleven years Protestantism gradually took root in England. Then in 1570 the Pope (Pius V), struck a blow at Queen Elizabeth by excommunicating her, and deposing her from her throne. These are some of the words of the Bill: "Supported, therefore, by His authority whose pleasure it was to place us, although unequal to so great a burden, on this supreme throne of justice; we do, out of the fulness of our Apostolic power, declare the aforesaid Elizabeth, being a heretic, and a favourer of heretics, and her adherents in the realms aforesaid, to have incurred the sentence of anathema, and to be cut off from the unity of the Body of Christ; and, moreover, we do declare her to be deprived of her pretended title to the Kingdom . . . and we do command all and every the noblemen, subjects, people and others aforesaid, that they presume not to obey her, or her monitions, mandates, and laws, and those who shall do the contrary, we do involve in the same sentence of anathema." One John Felton, was caught in the act of affixing this Bill on the gate of the palace of the Bishop of London. He was hanged as a traitor; but Pope Leo XIII, selected the Jubilee year of Queen Victoria, to beatify this man branded as a traitor, as a martyr of the Roman Church.[1]

Plot after plot to murder the Queen was discovered and Lord Acton, a Roman Catholic, in a letter to *The Times*, of November 9th, 1874, says: "Pius V, the only Pope who has been proclaimed a Saint for many centuries, having deprived Elizabeth, commissioned an assassin to take her life." In a second letter dated November 24th, Lord Acton adds that he had "long been tempted to doubt the accuracy of the story" (the suggested assassination of Queen Elizabeth by an instrument of the Papacy), but he adds that the objections to it are not valid.

On December 21st, 1585, a remarkable scene took place in the House of Commons. Sir Christopher Hatton proposed that before the members separated they should join him in a prayer for the Queen's preservation. The four hundred members all rose and knelt on the floor of the House repeating Hatton's words after him, sentence by sentence. Almost at the same time as this scene took place in Parliament, the famous Jesuit, Father Parsons, drew up an account

[1] See Art. John Felton: *Dict. of National Biography.*

of the condition of England, for the use of the Pope and Philip II of Spain. Here are some extracts: "There is now no orthodox Catholic in the whole realm who supposes that he is any longer bound in conscience to obey the Queen. Books on the occasion have been written and published by us, in which we prove that it is not only lawful for Catholics, but their positive duty, to fight against the Queen and heresy *when the Pope bids them.*" Again, he wrote: "Various Catholics have tried to kill her at the risk of their own lives and are still trying." It is hoped that Herr Hitler may not believe the next statement: "An invading force can be landed with ease." . . . "The expenses shall be repaid to His Holiness and the Catholic King out of the property of the heretics and the Protestant clergy." In response to this appeal, for the next three years a stream of prayer ascended from the churches, cathedrals, and oratories of Spain and Rome. Every noble family in Spain sent one or more of its sons to fight against Elizabeth. The King of Spain, assisted by the Fuggers, emptied his treasury. The Pope contributed his blessing. Neither time, nor toil, nor money was spared to fit out such a fleet as the world had never before seen. Hume tells us that the long line of coast extending from Cape Finisterre to the extreme point of Sicily was converted into one vast building yard. At intervals along this line of 1500 miles, might be seen keels laid down of a size deemed colossal! The entire seaboard rang without intermission with the clang of hammer and axe, and the voices of myriads of men employed in building the mightiest navy yet known to bear the legionaries of Spain, the soldiers of the Inquisition, over the seas to heretical England. The English navy consisted of about twenty-eight sail. The Armada numbered more than one hundred and thirty vessels, great and small, equipped and provisioned for six months. On board the vessels were about 8,000 sailors, 2,088 galley slaves for rowing, 20,000 soldiers besides noblemen and gentlemen volunteers and 2,650 cannon. There were also 180 priests on board the ships, but only 85 surgeons and surgeon's assistants for the whole fleet! The Armada set sail on May 14th. Froude says: "Infinite pains had been taken with the spiritual state of everyone on board." In *English Seamen* (p. 247) he remarks: "No impure thing, specially no impure woman, was to approach the yards or

ships. Swearing, quarrelling, gambling, were prohibited under terrible penalties. The galleons were named after the apostles and saints to whose charge they were committed, and every seaman and soldier made his confession and communicated on going on board." Katherine Anthony in *Queen Elizabeth* (p. 201) says: "Hundreds of camp-followers went on board, as they would have done in the Middle Ages. But at the last moment the Duke of Medina, though himself a court gallant, ordered all the prostitutes on land. The tears of the frivolous 'were comforted with the report that there were comely wenches in England,' the Pope's vicar gave his blessing, and the Armada sailed."

In spite of the pains taken to make the expedition spiritually worthy of its purpose there was much less care taken of its material provision. Nobody had thought of the possible carelessness and roguery of the contractors and purveyors. The water had been taken in three months before the fleet sailed. It was found foul and stinking. The salt beef, pork and fish were putrid, and the bread was full of maggots and cockroaches. They had to put back for fresh supplies and thus it was not until July 23rd, 1588, that the proud Armada streamed across the Bay of Biscay with a fair wind for the mouth of the English Channel. News was brought of the approach of this fleet, disposed in the form of a crescent, the horns of which were seven miles asunder. When this news arrived the English naval officers were playing bowls. Drake's reply to the messenger: "There will be time to finish our game and beat the Spaniards too," is typical of the cool courage of our people. There was no panic, for all were filled with the desire to fight for home and faith and freedom. The Queen herself visited the troops stationed at Tilbury, under the command of the Earl of Leicester, and in a speech declared that she would perish in battle rather than survive the ruin of the Protestant faith, and the slavery of her people.

On July 29th the Armada was off the Lizard. Warning beacons blazed on every hill to announce its approach.

"Far on the deep the Spaniards saw
Along each southern shire,
Cape beyond cape in endless range,
Those twinkling points of fire."

The last Sunday in July broke (July 31st), and on that day the little navy of Old England manned by about nine thousand hardy seamen, hung on the rear of the great fleet, and: "The feathers of the Spaniard were plucked one by one." "We shall miss the meaning of this high epic story," writes Froude, "if we do not realize that both sides had the most profound conviction that they were fighting the battle of the Almighty. Two principles, freedom and authority, were contending for the guidance of mankind." So history repeats itself to-day.

The Armada was not a navy; it was a transport fleet carrying soldiers to fight in England. The Spanish soldiers expected to board our vessels and fight on deck; afterwards they hoped to land and give battle on shore. They had no idea of English vessels, English strategy, or even of Englishmen themselves. They were as unaware of what they had to meet as Herr Hitler has proved himself to be. The little English ships outsailed the great Spanish galleons and their guns could fire five shots to the Spaniards' one. Had it not been for the Queen's parsimony over rations and powder, the battle in the Channel would have been fought to a finish. As it was, the English vessels followed until their food and ammunition gave out. But there was, in fact, no longer any need to continue the pursuit. In the words of Katherine Anthony: "A great storm had arisen and the south wind had become a tearing, racing hurricane whose dread anger far outran the wrath of the Englishmen. The superstitious Spaniards ceased to struggle against their fate. They were half dead in spirit before they perished by shipwreck on the shores of Scotland and Ireland. In hundreds and thousands their naked bodies, robbed by the barbarous natives of the last stitch of clothing, lay, like white enormous larvae, thick along the beach. Only one third of the vessels and one half of the men ever reached Spain. The flower of Spanish chivalry had perished never to revive again."

The tragedy of the Armada was a great sermon preached to all nations of Europe as, in our day, the heroism of the small Greek army is proclaiming to a decadent Europe that men whose institutions are free will prove victorious over men who are simply regarded as pawns and puppets in the hands of a dictator. The text of that sermon was that

England had been saved by a Divine hand. All acknowledged the skill and daring of the English admirals, sailors, and soldiers, but all confessed that these alone could not have saved England. The Almighty arm had been stretched out. When the Queen went in State on the appointed Day of Thanksgiving to St. Paul's Cathedral, Dr. Pierce, Bishop of Salisbury, preached from the text: "Thou didst blow with Thy wind, the sea covered them; they sank as lead in the mighty waters."

To-day we are inclined to refuse to see the Hand of God in natural phenomena. The late Professor David Smith thought otherwise. He wrote: "Survey the course of history, and see if there has ever been a physical convulsion which did not synchronize with moral and spiritual commotion. There was an earthquake when the Lord was crucified; and even as He predicted, so contemporary history records that in the ensuing generation the Empire far and wide was visited by frequent earthquakes and "incessant dearths." England was seething with indignation at misrule and the humiliation which it had brought upon her, when the Great Plague, "a pestilence surpassing in horror any that during three centuries had visited the island, swept away in six months more than a hundred thousand human beings." It was in 1755, on the very eve of the Seven Years War, that Lisbon was engulfed by a tidal wave and an earthquake. In 1923, when humanity was shuddering at the devastation of the Great War, Japan was wrecked by an earthquake, and seven years later New Zealand was likewise visited; and other nations, rent with civil strife, were swept by floods and wasted by want. The outbreak of the present war was followed by one of the worst winters Europe has ever experienced. Herr Hitler recently pounced on Roumania's oil wells and God intervened with a destructive earthquake. We are learning to appreciate the declaration of Holy Scripture that when man sinned the very ground was cursed for his sake, and ever since "the whole creation has been groaning and travailing in pain together." It is no mere devout imagination but a law of nature, attested by age-long experience, that only when the peace of God possesses the hearts of men will the whole earth be quiet and at rest. Writing as I do on the verge of the Advent season I do not forget that earthquakes, eclipses, tempests, and other

natural phenomena are to be the heralds of His approach. "Thou shalt remember all the way the Lord Thy God hath led thee." In the same book (Deut. xxv. 17), we find: "Remember what Amalek did unto thee by the way." Amalek had tried to do to Israel what Catholic Spain tried to do to England, and Catholic Italy is doing to-day! Israel was not to forget it; it was to be remembered not for vengeance but for wisdom. There are persons and peoples and institutions that have shown their true character in history and they are not to be trusted any more. We know that in our own day there are parties and movements which, in the very soul of them are powers of darkness and of bondage, and can never be anything else, and that the Lord will have war with them from generation to generation. And it is not uncharitable to remember that and to make no terms with them. During the last war the editor of the *National Review* wrote a little known book, packed with facts, about the Pope, under the title: *The Roman Mischief Maker*. In Elizabeth's day there was treachery in Ireland, and we know how it is with the South of Ireland to-day. Catholic Italy also is against us, and if the Pope has not blessed their arms at least he is afraid to curse them. That is not uncharitableness or unchristian. It is just getting the heart of wisdom, which God means us to get from our experience.

Thou shalt remember! To remember is to feel gratitude. The Israelites were always forgetting. "They forgot God their Saviour." That was the burden of their prophets. Let us not forget. Let us remember that God's goodness hath been great to us and let us yield to Him thanksgiving. Then we shall await the onslaught of Hitler's hosts with trust in Almighty God and confidence in the courage of British men on sea and land and in the air, for "God is with us."

SPIRITUAL RELIGION

By Sir James Baillie, M.A., D.Phil. (*Allen & Unwin*) 1s. *net.*

A study of this essay, reprinted from *The Hibbert Journal* of April 1932, will be a help to many people. It falls into three parts, seeking to answer three questions: What is Spiritual Religion? What is the Procedure of Spiritual Religion? What is the Primary Condition of its maintenance? The answers to these questions are set out clearly and concisely with a conviction that in the bosom of the Christian Faith Spiritual Religion can best be realized.

The Epistle of Truth

A STUDY OF THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN

THE REV. EDWIN HIRST, M.A., A.R.C.M.

INTRODUCTION

THE Second Epistle of St. John is one of the briefest books in the Bible. Its brevity might give the impression that it is of little importance, but that such an assumption is false is shown by the measure of light that it throws not only upon certain tendencies of thought which were prevalent at the time of its composition but also upon the organization of the early Church.

Several short compositions were received into the New Testament Canon, and to have found a place alongside the longer writings that were included, this epistle must have been revered and treasured from the first. Its writer must have given to it an influence from his own authoritative position and personal character.

THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

In a study of this small compass, it is not desirable to open up the whole question of the Johannine Literature, but it would be unwise to ignore the critical outlook altogether.

Whilst the early Church was spreading, reference would continually be made both to the collected sayings of our Lord and to the writings of the apostles. The Gospels would naturally have the first place as the authoritative records of Christ's life and teaching. At the same time, Christian public worship was developing on the lines of synagogue services in which the reading and exposition of the Law and the Prophets had a place. Several indications of this custom appear in the New Testament. Christ Himself read and taught in the Synagogue at Nazareth. St. Paul was invited

to speak in the Synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia after the public reading of the Law and the Prophets. The Christian assembly would naturally continue to observe such a custom. St. Paul gave direction in one place, " When this epistle hath been read among you, cause that it be read also in the Church of the Laodiceans ; and that ye also read the epistle from Laodicea."[1] It seems that, under such circumstances, the custom of reading apostolic communications developed, for these letters would be received as having a measure of sacredness and authority. Thus, the Gospels and these letters provided the Churches with a series of documents to which they could refer as a final court of appeal in all questions of faith and conduct.

In course of time, many letters and other works were in circulation. Some received a larger measure of recognition than others, whilst some were held in greater esteem in certain regions than they were elsewhere.

When the Canon was finally settled, the Christian was furnished with a wider scope of reference than was the Jew. At its birth, the Church inherited the Old Testament with its authority. To this collection of scriptures was added those of the New Testament. The formulation of the Canon was a long process, but the guiding hand of the Holy Spirit is evident throughout. Later generations are able to study both of the two Testaments knowing that " every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness ; that the man of God may be complete ; furnished completely unto every good work."[2]

It is interesting to note any indication concerning the process by which the Canon of the New Testament was settled. Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, the Christian historian, is very helpful in this connection, for he gives three categories of the many works then in circulation, and in some cases he mentions them by name. First, there were those books which were " among the accepted writings " acknowledged by all. Secondly, there were those which he describes as " disputed writings which are nevertheless recognized by many." Thirdly, there were " the rejected writings " regarded as spurious. Of this last class he says that they

[1] Col. iv. 16.

[2] 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

" are all of them to be cast aside as absurd and impious." Broadly speaking, the test applied to any writing was that of apostolic usage, " and both the thoughts and the purpose of the things that are related in them are so completely out of accord with true orthodoxy that they clearly show themselves to be the fictions of heretics."[1]

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN

The Second Epistle of St. John was amongst those of the second category, although the First Epistle was included in the list of " accepted writings." However, it seems that Eusebius himself fully accepted the Second Epistle in his own list of accredited writings. Fluctuations in the standard of its acceptance were doubtless due to its shortness and personal character. These circumstances would naturally limit its suitability for use in the Church's public worship. Nevertheless, the Epistle was widely accepted as apostolic. Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, so regarded it. Clement of Alexandria was evidently aware of its existence, as is shown by his reference to John's " larger epistle." The " Muratorian Fragment " recognizes it.[2] These circumstances indicate that the inclusion of St. John's Second Epistle in the Canon was due to the recognition of its apostolic character.

It is clear that the three Epistles which bear John's name have a common origin. This is apparent both in their similarity of style and in their theological outlook. For all their personal character, the Second and Third Epistles alike display their author as one in authority. Their similarities led Jerome to speak of them as " twin sisters." Yet these are also related to the First Epistle, even though this is more like a treatise, or homily, than a letter. Unlike the Second and Third Epistles, this has neither greetings, farewells, nor any other personal allusions. The spiritual outlook, however, is similar in all three. Emphasis laid upon certain virtues cannot escape notice, be it upon obedience and love, on fellowship with the Father and the Son, or the necessity of knowing, upholding, and remaining in the truth. There are also warnings against deceivers and

[1] *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. iii, chapter xxv.

[2] This " Fragment " is part of a Latin list of the books of the New Testament usually dated about A.D. 180.

false teachers. Readers are cautioned against the reception of such persons into their homes, for that would implicate both themselves and their households in a participation of error.

Just as these three Epistles disclose an unmistakable unity, so a like unity is to be observed between them and the fourth Gospel. Key words appear in each, such as love, light, life and truth. Identical phrases also frequently occur, like being " of the truth," " of the devil," " of the light," and " of the Father." This choice of word and phrase cannot be attributed to mere coincidence. It is so obvious that Archbishop Bernard says " We hold that the cumulative evidence thus available from the style and diction of the two short letters sufficiently prove that they are written by the same hand that wrote the Gospel and the First Epistle."[1]

THE AUTHOR

Tradition has connected these four works with the name of the Apostle John. It is noticeable, however, that in each of them the writer withholds his name, yet in the Second and Third Epistles he designates himself as " The Elder." With an authoritative tone he cautions his people of danger, and assumes the right to regulate Church matters in organization and teaching either by written direction or personal visit. Writing to Gaius (in the Third Epistle) his authority is perhaps even more assertive. Here he rebukes the tyrannical attitude of Diotrephes, who evidently had declined to accept the writer's authority set forth in a former communication. This Diotrephes, who evidently was an Elder, did not receive " the brethren, and them that would he forbiddeth, and casteth them out of the Church."[2] In the Old Testament, the term " Elder " is used to designate an official class having jurisdiction both civil and religious; and, in his " Bible Studies," Professor Deissmann has shown that the Septuagint used the term " Elder " (" presbyteros") where the original implied an official position. This usage, he tells us, is to be " explained by the fact that they found " presbyteros " already used technically in Egypt for the

[1] *Commentary on St. John*, vol. i, p. 63.

[2] 3 John verse 10.

holder of a communal office."[1] Dr. Milligan gives an instance of yet another usage of the term in his " Selections from the Greek Papyri," citing a report of an enquiry made by five " Elder-priests "[2] into the conduct of one of their brother-priests serving with them in the temple of the crocodile god Socnopaeus. This title is one of dignity, for each of these elder-priests had supervision over one of the five courses into which the priests were divided for ministerial duties.[3] A similar use of the term is found in Asia Minor, showing that " Elder " could indicate a position of importance in the religious world of that age. It would be easy and natural for the idea thus expressed to be carried over into the Christian Church of the Apostolic Age. That such was the case is indicated in the words of Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis: " When a person came in my way, who had been a follower of the Elders, I would enquire about the discourses of the Elders—what Andrew, or Peter, or Philip, or Thomas, or James, or John, or Matthew, or any of the Lord's disciples said, and what Ariston and the Elder John, the disciples of the Lord, say." In this connection, the Rev. H. P. V. Nunn's conclusion seems to be correct. " To him (Papias) the Apostles were plainly the ' Elders '."[4] When writing his First Epistle, St. Peter styles himself as a fellow-elder with other Christian ministers.[5] Further, as scholars usually date the Second and Third Epistles of St. John at about the close of the first century, and agree that they were written from Ephesus, the evidence points to the conclusion that the writer's position was one of prime importance in that area such as could be held only by one of Apostolic standing.

The early Church recognized certain qualifications for the Apostolate. These were indicated quite early, for they were set forth when the necessity of filling the place of Judas presented itself. " Of the men therefore which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto the day that he was received up from us, of these must

[1] *Bible Studies*, p. 154.

[2] *Selections from the Greek Papyri*, p. 83. See also *Here and There Among the Papyri*, p. 66.

[3] See St. Luke i. 5-8.

[4] *The Son of Zebedee*, p. 10.

[5] 1 Peter v. 1.

one become a witness with us of his resurrection."[1] These qualifications are most comprehensive, and it certainly seems that the writer of the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles could meet all these demands. From his profound knowledge of the Old Testament, together with the details he gives of Jewish ceremonial and social customs, we gather that the writer was a Jew. His knowledge of Palestinian geography in general and of Jerusalem in particular lead us to the conclusion that he was a native of the country he describes. The record has the authentic stamp of that of an eye-witness who truly " went in and went out " with Christ and His disciples. There is, in the narrative, a feeling of confidence born of an intimate knowledge of Christ's life and teaching. Although the writer of the Fourth Gospel treats his material in a manner that differs from that of the Synoptists, there is a relationship between his record and theirs which is truly complementary. The Eternal Sonship of Christ is set forth in the Fourth Gospel from the very first ; and the Gospel draws to a close on the same note. " These (signs) are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God ; and that believing ye may have life in his name."[2] In the last chapter, which bears the character of an appendix, the same truth is emphasized : " This is the disciple which beareth witness of these things, and wrote these things ; and we know that his witness is true."[3]

Although by no means so prominent, the same truth of Divine Sonship appears in the synoptic records. " All things have been delivered unto Me of My Father : and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father ; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him."[4] Christ had been thanking the Father for the spreading of His message and for His revelation of the Father by means of the mission of His followers. It would seem as though the vision of a fully redeemed humanity had opened before Him. Knowing His unity with the Father, and being conscious that all had been delivered into His hands, He felt that He could receive all

[1] Acts i. 21, 22.

[2] St. John xx. 31.

[3] St. John xxi. 24.

[4] St. Matt. xi. 27. See also St. Luke x. 22, and St. Mark xiii. 32.

mankind into His embrace. Out of that consciousness He uttered His invitation: "Come unto me."[1] It is a most sublime claim which Christ makes. A study of the original Greek is most instructive. The word translated by "have been delivered" is in the aorist tense, and "the act indicated by the aorist is placed in the eternal past, where the notion of time is lost, but as an eternal fact may be regarded as ever present, this aspect of the aorist is properly represented by the English present tense"[2] as it is in the Authorized Version. This outlook is in harmony with the thought of a pre-existent Messiah, which had a place in Jewish hope. The expectation of a human Sovereign endowed with supernatural powers is very distinct, but in his Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel, Dr. Plummer points out several instances of this loftier ideal.[3] "The Elect One standeth before the Lord of Spirits, and His glory is for ever and ever."[4] The Fourth Book of Esdras has: "no man upon earth can see My Son."[5] The thought of a pre-existent Christ, an Eternal Son, is definite in the New Testament. It is clearly stated in the Pauline Epistles[6] and in Hebrews.[7] Although its fullest expression is in the Fourth Gospel, it is clear that the Synoptists had the principle in their minds. These instances have a likeness to the claim in the Fourth Gospel, where Christ says "I and the Father are One."[8] Strictly, the word means "one thing," for the neuter pronoun is used indicating not one individual or one person, but an "unity"—"one thing." Yet for all his emphasis on the Eternal Sonship of Christ, the Fourth Evangelist gives a place to the human side of His nature. It was a weary and a thirsting Christ who rested by the well of Sychar.[9] His emotion at the grave of Lazarus drew from the onlookers the spontaneous remark, "Behold how He loved him!"[10]

[1] St. Matt. xi. 28, 29.
[2] *St. Matthew.* A. Carr, p. 175.
[3] *Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel.* Dr. Plummer, p. 169.
[4] Enoch xlix. 2.
[5] Enoch xiii. 52.
[6] Rom. viii. 3, viii. 32; 2 Cor. iv. 4, viii. 9; Col. i. 15-19; Gal. i. 16, etc.
[7] Heb. i. 2, iv. 14, vi. 6, etc.
[8] St. John x. 30.
[9] St. John iv. 6, 7.
[10] St. John xi. 36.

His spirit was shaken at the thought of His betrayal and His Passion.[1] The divine and the human appear in the portrait of Christ which is penned in each Gospel, and these are complementary, the one to the other. When the Fourth Evangelist plainly states, " We beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father,"[2] and in the First Epistle says, " That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and our hands handled, concerning the Word of life (and the life was manifested, and we have seen, and bear witness, and declare unto you the life, the eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us) ; that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you,"[3] we must understand him to mean what he says. Of this " beholding " (the same word occurs in both Gospel and Epistle) Archbishop Bernard says that the verb is never used in the New Testament of spiritual vision, while it is used twenty-two times of " seeing " with the bodily eyes.[4]

In these considerations the attempt has been made, first of all, to show the unity which exists between the Gospel and the three Epistles which bear John's name. Secondly, that no one but a person of Apostolic standing could have written the Epistles. Thirdly, that there is a real connection between our Four Gospels, each contributing to the portrayal of Christ's person as we know Him, to His teaching and His mission. Fourthly, that the contribution of the Fourth Gospel is the outcome of personal experience, personal intimacy, and personal conviction.

It seems that there is but one person of the Apostolic band who could have done this—St. John, the Beloved Disciple, the Son of Zebedee.[5] There is no lack of evidence to support such a view. The evidence is derived from tradition, from the testimony of Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, from Polycarp of Smyrna, from the general acceptance of the Gospel as authentic by so many of the Fathers, from its

[1] St. John xii. 27, xiii. 21.

[2] St. John i. 14.

[3] 1 John i. 1-3.

[4] *Commentary on St. John*, vol. i, p. 21.

[5] " Though the enigma of the Fourth Gospel remains unsolved, even here the historical basis of its narrative is widely admitted and the authorship of the Apostle John is not regarded as out of the question." *Essays in Construction*. W. R. Matthews, p. 110.

place in Tatian's Harmony of the Gospels, and from the long residence of St. John in Ephesus.

THE ADDRESSEE

Because of its personal character, some scholars have suggested that this letter was sent to a private individual; some have maintained that it was addressed to a Church; whilst others are cautious, leaving it an open question. The possibility has been put forward that the introduction should read "The Elder unto the elect Kyria and her children," and that the Greek, Kyria, is a proper name, the equivalent of the Hebrew Martha. If this is so, verse five should read, "And now I beseech thee, Kyria, not as though I wrote to thee a new commandment, but that which we had from the beginning, that we love one another." Verse ten seems to harmonize with this view, which certainly is the most simple aspect, whether the person addressed be the lady Kyria, or even as some have thought, "the lady Elekte."

Differing from this view, there is that of many who consider that the mystical interpretation best fits the sense of the letter, and that it was addressed to a Church. To support this hypothesis, it is pointed out that no actual name is given, whilst in the Third Epistle, Gaius is named as the recipient. Yet, even in this Epistle, a Church is indicated in verse nine, which has: "I wrote somewhat unto the Church." The symbolic interpretation of the salutation has support in St. Peter's message: "She that is in Babylon, elect together with you, saluteth you,"[1] which means literally, "the co-elect in Babylon saluteth you." Dr. Weymouth boldly translates it by: "The Church in Babylon chosen like yourselves by God sends greetings." If the mystical interpretation is accepted the salutation might well read, "The Elder to the sister Church."

The view that Kyria is a proper name seems to be challenged by the evidence of the papyri. In a recovered letter of the first century, a man named Hilarion, writing to his wife Alis, sends greetings by her "to the lady (kyria) Berous."[2] Here, kyria seems to be a term of respect, and not a proper name. Further, if an individual is addressed in the Second Johannine Epistle, it is rather strange that the

[1] 1 Peter. v. 13.

[2] Milligan: *Selections from the Papyri*, p. 32

writer should add to his own expression of esteem, " whom I love in truth," that of others, " and not I only, but also all they that know the truth." Verse four does not read as though one family is implied—" I have found certain of thy children walking in truth." The last greeting, " the children of thine elect sister salute thee," sounds rather like that of a greeting from one Church to another than a family message, where the children send their salutations to an unnamed aunt, and deliberately omit from their greeting any mention of their mother.

Still another view is that the letter was addressed to the Church at large ; but that idea has never had any appreciable measure of acceptance, and does not seem to be suitable at all.

It might be possible to blend the two first views regarding the destination of the letter. The New Testament has several references to Churches which met in private houses. Buildings dedicated for Christian worship do not seem to have appeared before the third century. This was due to the need for secrecy in some cases and to poverty in others. It would appear that the wealthier members of Christian congregations put one of their rooms at the Church's disposal for the purpose. In Jerusalem the Church seems to have met at the house of Mary, John Mark's mother.[1] In Ephesus, the home of Aquila and Priscilla served as a Church.[2] This is to give but two instances out of several. It might even be that there were more centres than one in a city, for two verses in the Epistle to the Romans seem to suggest this.[3] The New Testament has one instance where a private letter was sent to an individual member of a Church together with a public letter which was addressed to the whole Christian community.[4] These are that to Philemon and the one to the Colossians. Both of these letters were carried by the same person from the Apostle, and it is probable that " Philemon's house was the one meeting place in Colossae, which was a comparatively small town,"[5] for St. Paul sends a message of greeting by Philemon to the

[1] Acts xii. 12.
[2] 1 Cor. xvi. 19.
[3] Rom. xvi. 14, 15.
[4] Col. iv. 15 ; Philemon verse 2.
[5] Moule : *Colossian Studies*, p. 304.

Church which meets in his house. It may be that in the Second Epistle of St. John we have two similar types of messages merged into one letter and addressed to a Church meeting in a private house. Hence, what would read naturally to the original recipients presents difficulties to us who look back down the vista of time.

DATE AND PLACE OF WRITING

It would be interesting to know when and where this Epistle was written. But there is little other than tradition to instruct and help in any attempt to fix either date or place. Verse twelve mentions a projected visit on the part of the writer. If this was to be a tour of inspection and supervision, it is probable that this letter was written from Ephesus, the centre of the Asian circle of Churches. It seems that these pastoral tours of inspection were quite customary. In Acts 15. 36, St. Paul says: " Let us return now and visit the brethren in every city wherein we proclaimed the word of the Lord, and see how they fare." It is quite possible that the second Johannine letter was sent to prepare the way for such a visit. Showing, as it does, the calm counsel of age, mature experience, and seasoned judgment, the letter suggests an author who knew the truth of Christ and was stirred with the consuming earnestness of the true pastor, jealous for the safety of his flock. He cared greatly for the souls entrusted to his safe keeping. With our present knowledge, it is possible only to conjecture both as to time and place of writing, as well as the Epistle's destination, which might well have been, and was most probably, one of the Churches of Asia Minor.

THE OCCASION

In the first century, converts to the Christian faith were drawn mostly from the poor, the uneducated, and the oppressed. St. Paul well knew " that not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble "[1] were called. The inclusion of these within the circle of the Church constituted a real problem. Slaves found a new dignity in their Christian manhood, and, noting this, men would wonder how they would use or misuse their spiritual liberty. But

[1] 1 Cor. i. 26.

we know that "every obscure little Christian charcoal-burner was taught to know the dignity of his calling, that he was a fellow-citizen of the saints, called, by the mercy of God, out of the darkness of his bleak, lonely individualism to share the inheritance of the saints in light."[1] It was a most wonderful thing that Christ worked in men's souls. Yet there were dangers, for privileges are ever accompanied by responsibilities. Having little education, many would be liable to error, and thus they needed sound supervision when attempts were made to mingle corrupt doctrines with the clear Gospel. The Epistles show how sorely such supervision was needed, and, under the circumstances, it is almost miraculous that the deposit of truth was not greatly adulterated. The saving hand of Providence is seen in this act of preservation.

The Gospels show what was taught in the first age, but the Epistles possibly show it more vividly; for in them truth and untruth are often set forth side by side, so that the Christian might be guided to reject the one and cherish the other. Teaching would necessarily be oral in character at first, but this was soon supplemented by the written document designed to confirm the teaching already given. The Gospel of St. Luke was avowedly so planned. "It seemed good to me also, having traced the course of all things accurately from the first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus; that thou mightest know the certainty concerning the things wherein thou wast instructed."[2] In most cases the Epistles dealt with contemporary problems and those real dangers which surrounded the infant Christian Church. The old religions of the Roman Empire were decaying, and yet it was not necessarily an irreligious age. There seemed to be abroad a general desire for a new religion. Judaism attracted some followers, but other religions in the field claimed the power of satisfying men in their search for knowledge and for God. The mystery religions offered a symbolic cleansing from sin, yet lacked moral power in life. Moreover, the flow of eastern faiths into the West constituted a real danger. They spread rapidly and found enthusiastic supporters. Their teaching was materialistic. In practice they were corrupt, sensual, and immoral. Springing from

[1] Barry: *St. Paul and Social Psychology*, p. 58.

[2] St. Luke i. 3-4.

Eastern nature worships as they did, they could not be otherwise. When these faiths impinged upon Christian doctrine, they tended to subvert the truth of Christ; but as long as Christianity preserved its purity all was well, for it rested, and still rests, upon belief in a moral God. Thus the Christian faith could offer to the world of that age both true knowledge and moral regeneration.

THE LIFE OF THE EARLY CHURCH

If we conclude that this Epistle was written at the close of the first century, it throws a measure of light upon the development of the Christian Ministry of that period. The writer simply styles himself "*The* Elder," and we know that this name (presbyteros) and that of bishop (episcopos) were interchangeable terms in the New Testament for the same office. The Apostles naturally took the lead in administration, but apparently not in an attitude of independence from the whole Church. Thus, the decisions of the Council of Jerusalem were promulgated on the initiative of "the apostles and the Elders, with the whole church."[1] The Apostles "act as leaders of the Church and give shape to its resolutions, but those resolutions go forth with the authority of the Church as a whole."[2] The authority exercised by the Church in making this decision was derived direct from Christ, and not through a body of administrative officials. But the Church soon extended her borders, and, as she spread, her ministry had to extend with it. However, as the New Testament stands, it is plain that there is no higher office than that of Elder, "and the New Testament Episcopus is a man with the function of the Elder."[3] As the Apostles rendered their account to God one by one, provision had to be made for the future. It is how that provision was made that we wish to know more precisely, but information is scanty. Dr. Sanday says, "The Christian Ministry, like most other administrative forms, it is probable, rather grew than was made. And that by a process which if we could have seen it we should very likely have described as quite simple and natural—though because natural it is

[1] Acts xv. 22.

[2] Sanday: *The Conception of Priesthood*. p. 45.

[3] Griffith Thomas: *Principles of Theology*, p. 337.

not to be supposed that it is any the less Providential."[1] In our view, the Elder who wrote this letter was the last of the original disciples. Yet whilst writing as an Elder, or rather The Elder, he assumes a position of authority as something taken for granted. He has evidently no need to assert his position, for it was well known and acknowledged. This is clear from the directions given in this Epistle, and also in the Third Epistle, by his intervention in the high-handed actions of Diotrephes. These facts have led to the conclusion that, in all probability, Church administration and the Ministry had reached a stage in Asia Minor where an Elder-President presided over a group of Churches, each local Church being supervised by its own Elder. Whilst remembering that Elder and Bishop are interchangeable terms in the New Testament as embracing the same office, we are inclined to the view that the writer of these letters had both a position of eminence and a measure of supervisory authority over the Churches around him. Although he contests the Johannine authorship of the Epistles, Canon Streeter says: " Partly as President of the mother church in Asia, partly, perhaps, in virtue of the personal influence he enjoyed, he assumes the same kind of responsibility for the smaller churches of the province as Clement's epistle shows the Roman Church exercising at about the same date over churches within its sphere of influence, or which Ignatius wields a little later in the region of Antioch. We note, however, an essential difference. Clement writes merely as the anonymous mouthpiece of the Church of Rome; the Elder writes, like Ignatius, in his own name. Indeed, to describe his office, the title ' Archbishop ' would—of course, without the formal implications of later canonical law and usage—be even more appropriate than that of ' Bishops.' "[2]

Danger of departure from the truth was the occasion of this Epistle. We, too, need to know more and still more of God's truth for which we pray in the beautiful " Prayer of St. Chrysostom." Perhaps it is fitting that this prayer—which in all probability was penned by St. Chrysostom himself within the communion of the Eastern Church, where so many of the errors which attacked the faith once delivered to the saints were contested one by one—should still inspire

[1] Sanday: *The Conception of Priesthood*, p. 59.

[2] *The Primitive Church*, pp. 88-9.

us to seek those two blessings on which happiness in both worlds depends—" knowledge of Thy truth " and " life everlasting."

Whilst considering the manner in which this Epistle contributes to a clearer understanding of contemporary thought in the period when it was written, it is as well to remember that it has a message suited for all time. Conditions of life vary and modes of thought change, but principles endure. Human nature is much the same to-day as it was in the day of the " Apostles," although the conditions of life have vastly changed. This fact establishes the truths set forth in St. John's Second Epistle as being of vital import now, even as they were when the epistle was first penned.

The Epistle speaks of the truth of God, and we know that " he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is the rewarder of them that seek after him."[1]

Then there is the truth of the Incarnation. Christ said of Himself : " he that hath seen me hath seen the Father."[2] Apart from Christ, our knowledge of God is but fragmentary ; hence it is on the Word made flesh that we fix our trust—the Word in all the glory and fullness of His Divine Person, both for redemption in this world and for the bliss we anticipate in the world eternal.

Great emphasis is laid in this Epistle on the truth. The question " What is truth ? "[3] was once asked in an attitude either of despair or cynicism ; it may be that in it both dispositions were blended. But the Apostle was not in doubt as to the truth, for he had known Him who claimed to be " the way, and the truth, and the life."[4] He also knew the power of His spiritual presence in the soul ; so that to abide in the truth was to have " both the Father and the Son."[5]

If it was necessary to abide in the truth, it was equally necessary to beware of untruth. Truth and untruth are not blank forces. Truth is of God ; untruth is of antichrist. Both truth and untruth are personally directed, and must

[1] Heb. xi. 6.

[2] St. John xiv. 9.

[3] St. John xviii. 38.

[4] St. John xiv. 6.

[5] 2 John verse 9.

have a relation to personality if they are to be personally apprehended.

As these principles are of an enduring quality, and as human nature with its untold possibilities for good or ill remains much the same as it was centuries ago, this Epistle must have a message for mankind until time gives place to eternity, and our present imperfect understanding is at last illumined in the glorious presence of the Lord.

WHAT ABOUT HEAVEN?

By W. Graham Scroggie, D.D. (*Pickering & Inglis*) 6*s.* 6*d.*

This helpful book has a touching dedication by the author, the well-known preacher and Keswick speaker, Dr. W. Graham Scroggie, to his wife Florence who for over thirty-nine years was his constant companion and best friend, and who made possible his world-wide ministry.

After dealing with pagan and Hebrew ideas of Life after Death showing strong beliefs in an after life among many nations, the author passes on to Christian ideas quoting a number of hymns with thoughts of joy and reunion.

He then goes on to the Answer from Revelation, and speaks of the Intermediate State before the Second Advent.

This state shows the persistence of the human spirit, and its consciousness, though many Scriptures call it a period of Sleep. He discusses the place of Paradise, the unclothed condition of the Spirit and its powers.

From this contemplation he passes on to the ultimate State which he believes will be ushered in by the Second Advent, and in this section speaks of Resurrection, Judgment, Progress and Glory.

This book has a very firm Scriptural basis, the bulk of the references being to the Word of God! There are also quotations from non-canonical books, early Fathers and modern writers.

The chapter on Judgment is specially striking, as here is clearly pointed out the difference between the Bema at which all Christians will appear for reward or loss, and the Great White Throne of Revelation xx. To the Christian there is no question of Salvation or condemnation, that is already settled. No Christian will appear before the Great White Throne. He also refers to the Judgment of the Nations.

This is a book for believers. Little is said even as Scripture says little about the unbeliever in the world to come.

The weakest point seems to be the argument that the departed saints may pray for us.

The chapter on Resurrection is helpful and richly suggestive.

The book should be a great comfort to mourners, and would be a valuable gift at a time like this.

H. A. E.-J.

The National Socialist Heresy

GERTRUDE FARION

THE National Socialist theory can be called a heresy in the fullest sense of the word. Grown on the soil of a predominantly Christian civilization, it has used its Christian heritage to lend weight and dignity to forces of an entirely alien origin. In doing so it has, in the manner of all heresies, indeed emphasized some truths which had not been sufficiently stressed in the preceding age. But it endeavoured to do so with illegitimate means. Its success can only be accounted for by the depths of the need it professed to meet.

There can be no doubt to-day that the age of liberalism has come to an end. Its conception of man and his part in the universe is being replaced by one of distinctly different character. What distinguished the liberal era from its predecessor and from the age which we have only just entered upon is its excessive individualism, its subjectivism, and the strangely dessicated quality of its spirituality. Especially on the Continent these elements were found in the extreme. The autonomous personality of the Kantian philosophy had developed into an isolated atom, unable to penetrate to the reality of things, unable to establish contact with the world. Dim thought impressions, which did not justify any conclusions as to its real nature, were the only undeniable evidence of the outer world. This isolated individuality was similarly excluded from the reality of his fellow beings. Each was shut off from the other by an impenetrable wall, a fact regretted by some and gloried in by others. In himself the individual presented no harmonious whole. Philosophy and psychology had taught him to look upon himself as a mere bundle of qualities: will, emotions, and intellect, all unco-ordinated. The reality that man's personality is built round a centre, that each faculty has its separate function and that their co-operation depends entirely upon the relation of that centre to its Creator, was known to only a few. Instead, one of the faculties, the intellect, was granted precedence over the others. Training was, in all departments,

devoted solely to its development. The truths it was, by its very nature, unable to grasp did not exist, and reality was limited to the intellectually perceptible. That the individual, cut off as he was from all reality, should have indulged in a veritable orgy of subjectivism, was the inevitable result of this attitude. If reality as such was unattainable to him, nothing could prevent him from presenting the wildest conjectures as a solution to the world's problems.

Yet this whole attitude eventually led to its own defeat. Reality began to assert itself, and the barrenness of pure intellectuality was revealed. The experience is well described in a passage by Philipp Hoerdt, one of the National Socialist educational authorities, in his book: *Der Durchbruch der Volkheit und die Schule* ("The Eruption of Nationality and the School.") "We doubt the spirit, we doubt our ability to grasp reality. We have been too cruelly led astray in nearly all departments of life by the deceptive veil of our ideas, our thoughts *about* things. In the State and in economics, in ethics and in science, the experience was too terrible that the whole edifice of our tenets, doctrines and beliefs crumbled to pieces because it was incapable of even encompassing reality, to say nothing of mastering and shaping it. Is not this the famous "collapse of idealism," which is being discussed in all streets, that the impotence of thought when faced with reality, the absolute gulf between the two was made unmistakably manifest? Do not our hearts involuntarily assent when we read in a criticism of the "bourgeois idealism" that it replaced reality by metaphor, deeds by phrases, thoughts by quotations; it cannot bear truth, and least of all the truth that death stands at the end of life" (p. 38).

Gradually the spirit of the age swung back from the atomism, individualism, and subjectivism of the past towards a greater sense of harmony, unity, and a new orthodoxy. The first thing to be destroyed was the isolation of man. In Germany, this discovery was closely connected with the Youth Movement, which dates as far back as the last decade of the nineteenth century, and brought to young people of all classes the realization of the existence of nature as well as that of their fellow beings. Nature was now no longer a collection of disconnected impressions, but a hard reality to be fought, to be enjoyed, to be loved. And

suddenly a bridge was found from man to man, and the true meaning of fellowship discovered. To this new sense of community all the great corporate movements of our day bear ample witness. In the discovery of a reality outside him, man became aware of his own nature as a thinking, willing, and feeling whole. He no longer experienced the shattering sensation of frustration which invariably follows upon the attempt to approach life with one faculty alone. And inasmuch as the quest for reality had led him to the feet of his Creator, he became aware of that unification of his being round a God-centred heart. What could then be more natural than that this sense of harmony and relationship with the world and his fellows should find expression in a new orthodoxy. In the years following the defeat, efforts were made to reinterpret the great Christian truths in a language intelligible to earnest seekers, because it was adapted to the needs of the day. For it was clear from the outset that only Christianity can really meet man's spiritual need. However, this promising development was overshadowed by the coming of National Socialism.

It cannot be emphasized strongly enough that National Socialism started on the basis of " positive Christianity," as the party programme has it. However little the reality of National Socialism might tally with this claim, the fact remains that this is the standard by which it must be judged. In shrewd appreciation of the situation, National Socialist theorists endeavoured to supply the spiritual need of the people. They attempted the threefold task of tearing man away from his isolation, providing fulfilment for his entire personality, and giving a meaning to his life. The roots of man's isolation were seen to lie in the barren intellectualism of the preceding age, and it is in realization of this fact that a ruthless struggle against the spirit was carried on. On the one hand this struggle was directed against the corrosive effects of unbridled intellectuality, on the other against those democratic, pacifist, and internationalist tendencies which, far from arising from the cold intellectualism of the " liberal age," were in reality part of Europe's Christian heritage. This must not be forgotten whenever mention is made of the Nazi's violent opposition to everything democratic countries hold sacred. Its origin lies in the fear of the spirit. In its endeavour to counteract this barren intellectuality, National

Socialism developed the most fateful emotionalism. Once the safe ground of reason was left, the way was open for the most fantastic interpretations of life. "Blood" took the place of "reason," "myth" the place of "philosophy." The people had become so weary of theories about things which left their hearts cold that they were ready to believe at any price. What, then, could be more satisfactory than the mystical qualities of the "blood" and the strange inexplicability of life? They were the only indestructible realities which could not be thought to pieces and made themselves unmistakably felt. Blood and soil are the two things against which the destructive efforts of the intellect are of no avail. In close communion with the soil men now hope to recapture that simplicity and harmony which, in the depths of their hearts, they know to be their birthright, yet for whose loss they have made the spirit responsible. To this stronghold man fled when he despaired of finding an explanation of life and his own part in it. Here his starved emotions and all the other hitherto neglected qualities could find full play. In the belief in the saving qualities of pure blood, he found a solution to the world's problems, which led him to a closer fellowship with his racial equals. Moreover, the very forcefulness with which this new creed was preached, its narrowness and onesidedness recommended it to the wearied people as the new orthodoxy they so ardently desired.

The racial theory which is the centre of the National Socialist heresy contains both nationalist and vitalist elements. It has been correctly termed a vitalistic pantheism. National Socialism still retains the belief in God. But he is not the transcendent God of Christian revelation, awful in His holiness, the God from whom the world fell away, and Who came to seek it in love. The God who figures in National Socialist writings, and whom Adolf Hitler still invokes, is nothing more than a vague spirit pervading the world and lending his divine sanction to all that the German nation and their leader, whom he chose for them, may think fit to do. This God is emptied of all his qualities of power and holiness, and therefore constitutes no serious challenge to the human soul. As he has no grace to bestow, he is unable to loose man from the coils of sin. Nor is there any possibility of real community between the creature and this

divinity. In fact, the homage paid to him resembles more the obeisance of a mighty noble before his liegelord than the abasement of the creature before his Creator.

It is only a consequence of this conception of the deity that man's redemption should be laid into his own hands. Self-redemption is a word frequently occurring in National Socialist writings. This revival of the Pelagian heresy, the belief in man's redemption without the aid of grace, indicates how far this new creed is removed from Christianity. It is the creed of the creature which is emancipating itself from God and seeks to find complete fulfilment in this world. The Germanic hero, of whom Faust is the prototype, finds salvation by his own efforts. The very fact that his aspiration is as immeasurable as it is comprehensive would seem to ensure his final success. When he has roamed the world and drained the cup of experience, his innate vitality of spirit will earn him an eternal reward. According to this theory a mystical quality of perfection lies in the German blood itself, by virtue of which the pure Aryan can be redeemed. This new belief is described by one of its exponents, the cultural dictator of Germany, Alfred Rosenberg, in his *Twentieth Century Myth*, and here what originally seemed mere folly, becomes blasphemy. " To-day there is rising a new belief, the myth of the blood, the belief that in the blood the divine character of man is being defended; the belief, enshrined in the clearest knowledge, that Nordic blood represents the mystery which has overcome and replaced the old sacraments " (p. 129). Such are the saving qualities of this blood that whoever belongs to the chosen race has the key to the secrets of the universe and the right to master all peoples. Yet before the day of final victory comes, the most terrible of struggles has to be fought.

It is an integral part of National Socialist teaching, which herein follows a traditional line of German thought, that the essence of life lies in a continuous struggle against all forms of evil. Here the hero proves his manhood, while the coward is overcome. In the Nazi fight, however, the " evil " is most narrowly interpreted as any political opponent who might contest the Nazi party's claim to complete domination of the nation, and subsequently, the world. Thus what was originally a metaphysical struggle of gigantic dimensions, moreover a struggle which had its definite place in the

Christian interpretation of the world, was misrepresented as a political struggle against foes both inside and outside the borders, and the German nation conceived as a solitary fighter, encircled by an army of powerful foes.

In this situation closest unity within and intense stiffening of the reserve forces seemed essential. Here the State became of supreme importance. In the struggle for existence in which the nation was engaged to save its precious racial heritage, only a totalitarian organization seemed powerful enough to meet all assaults of the enemy. Hence the demand that no centrifugal tendencies should be allowed to weaken the striking power of the State. No department of life can be left outside its interference, and the entire existence of the citizen is submitted to its influence. From birth to death the member of the Totalitarian State lives in organized slavery. He has no private life. He cannot withdraw even into the sacred sphere of religion. The State does not leave even this untouched in its attempt to mould man's very soul. He is robbed of all individuality, for the State has use only for the unquestioning obedience of the soldier. The soldier ideal has indeed become dominant, and the variegated individualism of the past has been replaced by the uniformity of one type with selected qualities, to be brought forth by careful breeding. The physical fitness, courage and ability of the soldier, his ready obedience and unquestioning loyalty to the leader are valued far beyond any of the specifically Christian virtues such as humility, gentleness, patience, and charity. These are, in fact, discredited as subtle attempts of the enemy to undermine the nation's morale and lead it to self-destruction. The true National Socialist is taught to turn a deaf ear to such pleas.

In this simple fighter ideal, which ranges man side by side with his brother, he finds community with others and a double opportunity to transcend the limits of his personality. In the experience of his own insignificance as a mere unit in a vast army of fellow-fighters with the same goal, he finds his self strangely enriched. And through the surrender of his will to the leader, which relieves him from personal responsibility and provides the experience of complete fulfilment, he achieves that inner unity which is the ardent desire of all men.

Thus the genuine experience of community in the Church

of Christ was counterfeited, and man tricked into the belief that the solidarity of those fighting for the same cause was identical with the community of corporate worship. Moreover, the devotion which man owes alone to Him Who is the firstborn of a number of brethren, is lavished on the personality of a political leader. With all the unscrupulous propaganda of which the Third Reich is capable, the personality of Adolf Hitler has been surrounded by the glamour of a messianic mission. His humble origin, the long years of obscurity, his sudden rise to power and astonishing successes, the very fact that he appeared at the right moment to save the nation from profound humiliation, were all interpreted as proofs of his divine origin and message. Such, indeed, was the desolation of the people that they were satisfied to receive spiritual as well as temporal salvation at the hands of a mere man. National Socialists are taught, when in doubt, to act as the *Fuehrer* would, who is believed to be the supreme incarnation of the German spirit. In some mysterious way Hitler is identified with the idea of Germany. And in their frenzied nationalism the vanguard of the Nazi fighters teach that his appearance in history is to be ranked higher than the coming of the Son of Man. To this spirit the following prayer, taught instead of the creed in an elementary school at Wannsee, near Berlin, and written by one of the masters, Dappe, bears ample witness: "I believe in Germany, in the other elder son of Germany, master of himself, conceived under the Nordic sky, born between the Alps and the sea, suffered under Papists and the servants of mammon, calumniated, crushed, reduced to misery . . . tempted by devils of all kinds, risen after decades of public and national misery, ascended to the moral and spiritual universe of Eckehard, Bach, and Goethe, sitting with his elder brother of Nazareth at the right hand of the Almighty, whence he shall come to judge those buried alive and the dead."[1]

Of the "positive Christianity" of the party programme nothing but the drapery of vain words remains, empty husks filled with an alien spirit. It is the spirit of Pride which ever haunts the soul of man, tempting him with the old temptation of the *eritis sicut deus*. This is an ever-present menace.

[1] Translated from the French. To be found in L'Enseignement Primaire et l'Education Raciste en Allemagne. Paris, 1940.

And the contemplation of the fall of Germany may well cause us to hesitate and ponder our own position. Such searching of hearts will lead us to a profound thankfulness and kindle that spirit of humility in which alone the urgent task before us can be approached : the task of rebuilding a Christian Europe.

PSYCHOLOGY, PSYCHOTHERAPY AND EVANGELISM

By Professor J. G. McKenzie. (*George Allen & Unwin Ltd.*) 236 *pp.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

Despite its title this is not a book for specialists and experts only, but for the ordinary reader, being a most valuable analysis of the ways of God with the human soul, obviously written by an ardent disciple of the Master, steeped in the Pauline epistles. The tone throughout is consistently high and the book deserves a very wide circulation amongst evangelists and evangelicals.

Prof. McKenzie contends that man needs more than an intellectual credence, there must be a real conversion, sudden or gradual, resulting in a balanced personality sanctified by the spirit. Without this recognition of a God-centred life of service to man founded upon an *experience* of the love of God no psychological treatment of what is commonly called " nerves " will avail much.

Early psychologists were content to show a distressed patient the root cause of his troubles when traced to source, but it needs St. Paul's doctrine of the Atonement, the Reconciliation, the Cross, and the ultimate identification and unity with Christ to restore a sinner to sanity. Another useful point so ably stressed is that there are many people, possibly the bulk of Church workers, who have never experienced a deep conviction of sin (they may in fact be just honest, good folk in the ordinary meaning of the word), and yet are conscious of a something lacking, some unsatisfied longing, not even an active rebellion against their environment, but frequently only too conscious of a lack of harmony within and having no practical experience of contact with the living God : such need careful, prayerful handling to bring them into union with Christ.

Half-way through the book is a short section on " Moral Disease and Sin," which every Christian worker should read and digest, together with two other short articles on " Sanctification " (pp. 202 to 209), for they contain most excellent food for thought.

May we quote from the last page but one : " Knowledge of our complexes, of behaviour-tendencies that are a source of temptation, humbly accepted and never consented to, may lead and does lead to a stronger reliance upon God, a profound gratitude for His saving power and forgiveness, and an ever-growing desire to put on the Lord Jesus Christ as the one true means of sanctification and fellowship with God."

F. N. D.

Book Reviews

ROMANISM AND EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANITY

By F. J. Paul, M.A., D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton) 16s.

It is a pleasure to introduce readers of THE CHURCHMAN to this extremely interesting and well-written examination of the origins and development of the Roman Catholic and Protestant interpretations of Christianity. It embodies the Cunningham Lectures which were delivered by Dr. Paul in the Martin Hall, New College, Edinburgh, in the year 1938. Karl Barth was delivering the Gifford Lectures in Aberdeen about the same time on " The Knowledge of God and the Service of God according to the Teaching of the Reformation." These lectures have also been published in uniform binding with Dr. Paul's volume by the same publishers. They are both notable contributions to Evangelical thought and witness. Alas ! the present war will make a vast difference in the steadily growing strength of the Evangelical churches and in the literary output of its scholars.

The author begins by telling us that he received his first communication from Sir William Robertson Nicoll about twenty years ago. That distinguished journalist and bookman told him that he wished Dr. Paul to write a book on this subject since he had so many distraught appeals from parents and guardians asking him to recommend a good book on the subject. " Since that date several books have appeared, some of them able and learned works, but," says the author, " I do not think they have met the want felt by Dr. Robertson Nicoll." What did the Editor of the *British Weekly* feel was wanted ? He felt the need of a book which would approach the Roman Question from the historical point of view. " The real argument against the Church of Rome seems to me "—(he wrote)—" the argument derived from her history."

Twenty years have passed and Dr. Paul has continued those studies which made Dr. Nicoll, the discoverer of men like Sir James Barrie, feel that he was the man for this task. He is Professor of Church History and Principal of the Presbyterian College, Belfast. He is obviously equipped by scholarship and experience. It is not often that a work of first-class theological importance issues from the " Isle of Saints," and " The School of Learning." This is easily the most notable book produced by any Irish theologian since the publication of *Infallibility*, by the late Dr. Salmon.

The present reviewer had, more than thirty years ago, the great and priceless opportunity of being able to make a close and intensive study of Roman Catholicism in Ireland where he lived and worked for eight years. Dr. Paul, as we have noted, is in Ireland and he also mentions quite incidentally on page 261 that he was once a student in Madrid. He has seen Romanism at close quarters. Romanism in England differs profoundly in culture, outward toleration, and

courtesy from the variety which is found in so-called Catholic countries, and, just as Canon W. P. Hares is discovering the true nature of Rome by his contacts in India with its aggressions and false claims, so Dr. Paul writes with first-hand knowledge.

We think he is right in his belief that the best point on which to compare the two conceptions of Christianity is in their doctrine of the Church. Nevertheless he begins with the attitude adopted by the Romans and Evangelicals to Holy Scripture. " In the Roman Church," he says, " tradition dethroned Scripture in the sixteenth century ; in the nineteenth century (1870) Tradition in its turn is vanquished by the Papacy. The Pope is the *tertius guadens* who, when Scripture and Tradition have mutually weakened each other, emerges victorious over both." He then proceeds to examine the doctrine of the Church in Romanism with reference to its Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity, and Apostolicity, and also the further " note," according to Roman dogma, of its Infallibility. Speaking of the use of Latin in her services he writes : " The Church in which all the most important rites are performed, throughout the world, in a ' dead language ' may impress the unthinking, but valuable elements are absent from her services which are present in an American negro meeting round a camp fire." He finds after a careful historical review in which he exhibits his understanding and grasp of all the literature of the subject that the Papal Institution has been put in the place of Christ. The Sacraments then come under review and there is a specially interesting chapter on Indulgences. Others follow in which the places of St. Peter, the Papacy, the Priesthood and the Virgin Mary are discussed as well as the use of Relics and other superstitious devotions.

We are struck by the freedom of this book from bias and bigotry. No Roman Apologist would write so fairly of Protestantism as Dr. Paul has done of Romanism, yet he puts his finger mercilessly and unerringly on the historical facts and failures which have made the Church of Rome threaten Protestants with hell because we refuse to believe what we know to be untrue. His closing remark seems perfectly just : " Such a hell is less to be feared than the heaven she promises me for ' believing a lie.' "

The book consists of nearly five hundred pages, and it is difficult to see how it could have been abridged. We venture to say that we think its size and, alas, its price (though it is worth the money !) will militate against its widespread use by the kind of people the author and the late Sir William Robertson Nicoll had in mind. Would it be too much for a sympathetic and appreciative reviewer to suggest that some of the lectures in the book might be printed in pamphlet form and sold separately ? The book itself would be improved by a bibliography. Here and there the author, who usually explains and defines his terms and references, fails a reader unfamiliar with Roman documents and leaves him, for example, wondering what the *Catechismo* is, who publishes it, and where it can be seen !

This volume ought to remain a standard work on its subject for many years to come. It will be a very great pity if the war causes it to be overlooked and unread by the clergy and ministers who rejoice in

the name "Evangelical." It is the kind of book which a wealthy warden, for example, might present to his vicar or to the new curate whose sermons are deficient in the historical sense.

A. W. PARSONS.

BEGIN NOW

A letter from the Archbishop of York. (*S.C.M*) 3*d*.

In this pamphlet Dr. Temple is primarily addressing Dr. Oldham, as editor of the *Christian News Letter*, which, as the Archbishop observes, has secured over 10,000 subscribers. In that publication the editor and others have analysed the present world situation. The Archbishop of York feels that we do not need much more analysis: "We need two things: a gathering together of the great mass of Christian sentiment which undoubtedly exists, and the direction of this towards some definite goal." This goal, Dr. Temple expresses in the words: "We must work for the end of international anarchy, and the establishment of international law, made and upheld by an international authority. In other words," and here the Archbishop seems to relapse into indefiniteness: "one form or another of Federalism must be our goal." Dr. Temple does not believe, however, that "a federal system can of itself secure justice or even abolish war, unless the economic life of men is ordered on principles more expressive of fellowship than at present."

The pamphlet closes with a statement drawn up at a group consisting of Anglicans, Methodists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, and Friends, and had the assent of them all. It is headed Doom, Deliverance, Unity. From the premise, God reigns, the statement proceeds to recognize our present troubles as a just doom, acknowledges Christ as Lord and Deliverer and affirms a fellowship in Him which is unbroken by any earthly division and persists beneath even the wraths of war.

Multitudes of Christians would admit these propositions but the difficulty is to see how they may be made to work. All the problems of the better order are problems of the better man, and "the soul of all improvement is the improvement of the soul." The great difficulty seems to be that the Federal system internationally cannot function as a Christian thing any more than the League of Nations did. Would it be wiser for the Churches to push on with Missionary Work and so increase the number of the people in whose heart He reigns—"extending His rule by the energy of His love constraining them"? That seems to be the Master's way. Why is it not ours? What might not happen if we made it ours?

A. W. PARSONS.

PRAYERS OF CITIZENSHIP

By Kenneth Henderson. (*Longmans Green.*) 3*s*. 6*d*.

The author is a working journalist and also an Anglican parson—a combination which evidently works in Australia, as it did in the primitive Church when even the Archbishop made tents. The author has wanted to "fashion prayers out of the concrete situations in which

we serve and live." Excellent. He is convinced that " Christian worship is becoming a foreign language," because of the absorption of men in their immediate anxieties. Christian worship must accompany them into those problems. So he gives us prayers for old age, middle age, youth, work, democracy, students, doctors, nurses, farmers, soldiers, marriage.

It would be ungenerous to criticize these prayers harshly because Mr. Henderson himself is as conscious as anyone who attempted to make a prayer of how difficult it is. When you try to be particular, as he does, you are caught by the difficulty that particular objects are usually prayed for extemporally and seem somewhat strange when written. These prayers are written by a liberal Churchman and so lack the gospel promises which evangelicals know to be the essence of prayer. What is prayer without our Lord Jesus Christ as Author and Finisher ? It is interesting that the prayers are made with " the help of poets " in order to retain dignity, to make " the language belong to the situation," " to keep the words within the margin of sincerity." (Certainly the twenty pages about the Situation, Prayer, War, and written by the journalist are as valuable as the sixty pages of prayers written by the parson.) The prayers (except the one for " friends departed ") will anyhow be suggestive. But besides the sixty pages of prayers written by this parson-journalist there are interspersed twenty pages of excellent comment by this journalist-parson on such subjects as the Situation ; Prayer in War-time ; the Regeneration of Democracy, etc. In each there is something worth the price of the book : for example, " Prayer is the Acceptance of the Not-Yet, the quest of a power not now in things as they are."

THE CHURCH IN GERMANY IN PRAYER

Translated by Walter Kagerag and R. A. S. Martineau. Foreword by the Archbishop of York. (Mowbray & Co.) 2*s.* 6*d.*

In the book reviewed above Mr. Henderson says, " Prayer is the way to Reality, and the way to Reality lies through Realism." Our brothers in Christ who breathed, or rather cried out, these prayers were enduring the fire of persecution and suffering. They are the cry of Jonah in " the belly of hell " ; the outburst of Paul in the prison. They achieve what Henderson aspires after. The prayers are short ; they use Scripture ; they analyse the need of the Spirit ; they are the Psalms rewritten with New Testament light.

VISION, WORK, SERVICE

Compiled and written by Reginald Wilde. (George Allen & Unwin.) 3*s.* 6*d.*

Two pages of meditation and prayer for every day of the month. There is a good deal of Scripture, poetry, thinking aloud and prayer for myself and the people of this everyday world. A book that has taken great labour to compile. Much to commend but little understanding of the work of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Here are three books of Prayer. Then Pray, and again I say, Pray.

A. B. B.