

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

# The Churchman

APRIL—JUNE, 1943

---

Vol. LVII. No. 2. New Series

---

<i>Contents :</i>		PAGE
" IT SEEMED GOOD . . . "		
The Editor	... ..	50
THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD AND HUMAN ACTIVITY		
The Rev. C. J. Offer, M.A.	... ..	51
JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH		
The Rev. R. J. Cobb, M.A.	... ..	58
TRENDS IN PRESENT DAY THEOLOGY		
The Rev. D. W. Cleverley Ford, B.D., M.Th.	... ..	62
CHRISTIAN EDUCATION		
The Rev. R. Perfect, M.A.	... ..	68
PUBLIC WORSHIP		
The Rev. Russell B. White, M.A.	... ..	74
BOOK REVIEWS	... ..	82

---

PRICE : ONE SHILLING

*" The Churchman," 1s. quarterly. Annual subscription, 4s. 6d. post free.  
The Church Book Room, Dean Wace House, Wine Office Court, E.C.4*

---

*" In some respects the MOST REMARKABLE BOOK ever written."*

—S.S.T. of Philadelphia.

**FIVE SHILLINGS** will bring you

## **THE MAN WHO DID NOT SIN**

by **NEWMAN WATTS**

It is the novel of the New Order, a story of romance and adventure in a world where all the anticipations of the Kingdom of Christ are realised and all the highest hopes of men are fully enjoyed.

Second Edition 5/- net.

**SPECIAL OFFER.** One copy of *The Man Who Did Not Sin* together with one copy of a companion booklet for 5/- post free.

**UPLIFT PRESS, 4a, Grove Road, Sutton, Surrey.**

---

## “It Seemed Good . . .”

**T**HE Authority of the Holy Spirit was a reality in the life of the Early Church. Following the great experience of Pentecost the Apostles were men who recognised His Sovereignty in all matters of faith and order, and His guidance was accepted without question as the revealed Will of God. Because they so absolutely trusted Him, bold decisions were taken and great experiments made which delivered the Christian Church from narrow Judaism and gave it that Catholicity in which “there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision. Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free.”

The recognition of this authority is clearly seen in the decrees of the first Christian Council at Jerusalem when their findings were summed up in those significant words “it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us.” His sovereignty touched their life and work at every point and it was the chief factor in the rapid extension of the Church throughout the Roman Empire.

The activity of the Holy Spirit has never ceased, and is the explanation of the amazing growth of the Christian Church to the uttermost part of the earth during the last 150 years or more. The whole story of Christian Missions is a glorious chapter of great things attempted by men and women who believed in the activity of God the Holy Spirit, and have dared to trust Him and follow His lead in the great activities of establishing the Church of Christ which “the gates of hell shall not prevail against,” and because God has blessed so wonderfully His work in the great countries of Africa, China and India, the Christian Church is now compelled to face the urgent call of Church Union.

It is with this background that we need to view the proposals for Church Union in South India. Those responsible for the scheme believe that the Holy Spirit is leading them in this matter and they are prepared to trust His guidance. They are honestly facing vital questions—“Is the Spirit of God leading and guiding this movement to Union? And is there the solid will and determination to follow where He leads?”

A careful study of the scheme will convince most people that it adequately safeguards the great doctrines of the Christian Faith and the true teaching of the Church of England. Even a severe critic of the proposals admits that “there is a clear and definite assent to the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation and of Justification by Faith and Salvation by Grace.” There is nothing in the scheme which is in conflict with the teaching of the Word of God and it stands with the Anglican Church in acknowledging the supremacy of Holy Scripture.

It is a vital issue, it challenges our willingness to acknowledge and to obey the authority of the Holy Spirit, and our faith to trust Him, of whom the Lord said, “He will guide you into all truth.” Above all it is a challenge for definite and persistent prayer on the part of all who believe that it is the Lord’s will “that they all may be one.”

THE EDITOR.

# The Sovereignty of God and Human Activity.

BY THE REV. C. J. OFFER, M.A., CAMB.

ONE of the outstanding features of the present situation in this country is undoubtedly the apparent elimination of God. Not that all men everywhere have entirely banished God from the world which He has created, but rather that He has been so persistently ignored in many quarters that He has ceased to count as the supreme factor in life. It is, of course, perfectly true that in more than one direction, lip-service is paid to Him even by such men as Hitler, though it is hardly necessary to point out that his idea of God lacks the content that marks the Christian conception. But to the vast majority of people to-day God has ceased to be either a Person or even a directive power.

Now there are undoubtedly a number of causes which have combined to produce this unsatisfactory state of mind but one at least, judging by much that is said and written to-day, is the apparent irrelevance of God to the life of man. Men do not see where He really comes into things, rather He appears to be an excrescence to modern life. And this attitude, widely diffused as it is, is in turn the product of other forces which have made it easier for man to "get on without God" as it is often put. For a whole generation and more, men have increasingly diverted their attention to science and, more recently, to economics than to Religion. And, in spite of the caution and hesitation that marked many of the utterances of the greatest scientists they assumed all too glibly that science had displaced religion as the guide of life. Other results followed. The Bible was discarded for the scientific text-book. History, instead of being the sphere of God's activity, was the record of the working out on the grand scale of impersonal forces. Man's redemption must be looked for in the economic sphere; and improved houses were of far greater importance than improved characters. Mechanization became more important than spiritualization; and the machine became the symbol of man's progress and emancipation. That, very briefly, was the situation when war, with all its inevitable spiritual, moral and intellectual disturbances, broke into life.

There is, however, one other factor which must be noted if only because of its disastrous repercussions in the intellectual sphere. Decline in the study of the Bible has long been a stock subject of clerical bemoanings. Its language, so familiar to our fore-fathers, sounds strange to modern man and, like the older terminology of religion, makes no appeal to him. As Prof. Hodges has so well pointed out, many religious people are almost totally unaware of the decisive cleavage between the religious person and the ordinary man of to-day. In many respects they are poles apart. As he puts it, Religion "appears as a voice from another and unusual world, talking in an unintelligible

language about things remote from reality." A direct consequence both of this cleavage and the entire neglect of Biblical knowledge is a terribly vague and indeterminate intellectual attitude. "Some think God exists, some think not, some think it is impossible to tell, and the impression grows that it does not matter." Could anything be much less satisfactory as a basis for an attempt to "vindicate the ways of God to man"? Yet the attempt must be made by the Church to-day lest the charge of utter irrelevance be regarded as established by the thought of our time.

If, then, such is one of the primary tasks confronting the Church to-day it is obvious that one essential preliminary to any re-establishment of the thought of God in the mind of man is to convince him that the Almighty Creator of the universe is not merely a "first cause" or "the supreme mind," but a divine personality existing from all eternity, the ever present author and sustainer of the world, of "infinite power, wisdom and goodness".<sup>1</sup> Such a conception of God must be regarded as axiomatic if only because personality is the highest category that we know. Right from the very beginning of Biblical history God reveals Himself as personal. "I Am that I Am." But that is only a preliminary though a vital one. Most people, if they have any religious ideas at all, get as far as that. But vagueness is the enemy of true religion. The idea of God must be amplified if it is to be a controlling force in a man's life. And that is the great need of the present time. It is not the mere existence of a personal God that needs to be stressed, but the attributes of God. Man must at all costs, if God is to mean anything to him at all, be conscious of God's infinite wisdom and power. To proclaim a God of limited power or range of action, apart from any self-imposed limitations of His own Being, would not be to proclaim One whom man could regard as his strength and stay in a world of strong temptation and besetting sin. The priority and all-sufficiency of God must be the starting point of any adequate thought about Him. And even then we are compelled to proceed to a further conception, namely that the all-sufficient God is not merely passive but active. A conception of God which stressed His passivity, regarding Him as spectator rather than participant, would be very largely to banish Him from His universe. No conception of God which regarded Him as the detached observer of His own creative achievements, unconcerned with any further development of them, is tolerable as a basis for belief. Its immediate as well as its ultimate effect would be to produce in man a feeling of apathy and despair. And as a matter of fact, that is precisely the attitude of vast numbers of people to-day to whom God has become the Great Unreality. It is the real basis of that profound indifference to religion which we all so frequently deplore.

When, then, we speak of God to the modern man we must put the stress first upon His infinite wisdom and power. To proclaim a God of limited resources and range of action, apart as we have said from any necessary limitations of his own being, would not be to proclaim One whom man must regard as his Saviour and Redeemer. He would be suspect on the grounds of capacity to the vast majority. In fact, right from the earliest times, God's power to act according to His own will has always been assumed. "In the beginning God created. . . ." Obviously,

therefore, He had the power from all eternity to express His mercy by creative acts. There was no compulsion to create. He did it simply because He willed to do it. And so the Christian Church prefaces its declaration of faith by a clear assertion of God's power. "I believe in God the Father, Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible." That is clear and categorical, the necessary postulate of any belief that is going to be at all helpful to man. Yet again we cannot be satisfied with a mere exhibition of power unless we can be sure that it is always and in all circumstances an infinite power controlled by infinite wisdom and expressing itself in a watchful and all-seeing Providence. For the moment we can ignore the implications of the word Father, vital as they undoubtedly are. The point we are emphasizing is that the omnipotent God, One, that is, who contains in His own nature all resources necessary for the expression of His own will, acts, and can only act, in accordance with His own nature which is perfect goodness and perfect wisdom. Thus creation was not only a pure and spontaneous act of God, but it was capable of being described as "very good." Well could the Seer exclaim, "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power, for Thou hast created all things and for Thy pleasure they are and were created." <sup>2</sup>

Now in stressing the goodness of God in creation we have reached the point when we can no longer refuse to use definite Christian categories. We ignored above the term which most concisely and effectively describes that character of God which it was the privilege of Christianity to exhibit to the world. "God is love," and in that briefest of phrases we find ourselves confronted with the highest conception imaginable of divine personality. It is in the light of that fuller and final revelation of God's nature that we must consider all His acts in the world which He has created and sustains. But the conception of God has a long history behind it. It is the great theme of the Old Testament where the sovereignty of God is already exhibited on the plane of history. "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel . . . I have made the earth . . . by My great power and by My outstretched arm; and I give it unto whom it seemeth right unto Me" <sup>3</sup> "For, lo, I will stir up and cause to come up against Babylon an assembly of great nations from the north country. . . ." <sup>4</sup> "I will render unto Babylon and to all the inhabitants of Chaldea all their evil that they have done in Zion in your sight, saith the Lord." <sup>5</sup> Such passages, and many more could be quoted, suffice to show that the idea of God active in human history, is explicit throughout the Old Testament. It is true, of course, that the Hebrew people had in the early stages of their history a much narrower and more restricted conception of God. But He was still active, even if the sphere of His activity were limited to Israel and Judah. Later, as the quotations show, a much wider idea of divine intervention holds the field. Yet it is all the time an activity governed by righteous principles. As Jeremiah in a splendid passage, very seldom noted, says: Thus saith the Lord, Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom . . . But let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth Me, that I am the Lord which exercise lovingkindness, judgment and righteousness, in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the Lord." <sup>6</sup> And this activity of a righteous

God showed itself most clearly in those judgments which were always regarded as expressions of the will of the Almighty.

And here was one of the great stumbling blocks of the Hebrew people. That God should judge His own people and visit upon them their iniquities seemed a monstrous perversion of His goodness and care. It was one of the hardest tests of the prophets to instil into their dull and prejudiced minds what was inevitably involved in God's intervention in history. "Shall I not visit for these things? saith the Lord: shalt not My soul be avenged on such a nation as this?"<sup>7</sup> But this was only part of a wider problem which persistently perplexes certain Old Testament writers and finds such poignant expression in some of the Psalms. This is the old problem of the suffering of the righteous and the prosperity of the wicked. Yet from whatever standpoint they write, the activity of God in history was assumed. And this activity was to find its highest and most complete expression in the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. This event is the culmination, though of course, not the end, of God's active intervention in history. Here God is indeed breaking into history and shattering the view that He is not "afflicted in the afflictions of His people." For a God who interferes in history to the extent of Incarnation cannot by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as being outside the historical process in the sense of entire detachment. As Dr. Whale rightly says: "Unless the eternal be somehow given to man in history, that is, in the only way which man can understand, God must remain for ever the unknown God."<sup>8</sup> And in this "givenness" God's eternal Son not merely "came down from heaven and was incarnate" but was "crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate." The Cross and all that was involved in it indicated that God refused to leave the problem where it was. Hitherto man had viewed God's intervention very largely as indicative of His wrath upon the essential sinfulness of man. The great lesson of the historic drama of the Old Testament is that man in his self-centredness tends always to regard "himself, his nations, his cultures, his civilizations, to be divine. Sin is thus the unwillingness of man to acknowledge his creatureliness and dependence upon God and his effort to make his own life independent and secure."<sup>9</sup> And the inevitable answer to all this is the judgment of God by which His righteousness is vindicated before the world. The wrath of the holy God had to be "revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men." But that was only one aspect of the divine nature. The full range of His purpose is yet to be revealed. God was much more than the stern judge, still less a disinterested spectator of the world's sufferings. It was judgment but it was, as He was soon to show, judgment tempered by mercy. Already, even in Old Testament times, the idea of redemptive suffering had been adumbrated by the greatest of the prophets. The Cross, therefore, at once revealed the all embracing love of God for man. "God so loved the world that He gave. . . ."<sup>10</sup> It was a decisive act of God. It was the supreme manifestation in history of God the Father vindicating the moral order of the universe in defiance of sinful man. God is here intervening in the most crucial fashion imaginable. And it all sprang from Love. "He bore our sins." Here was no selfish isolation from the sorrows and perplexities of human life. There

from the Cross with all its suffering and desolation springs the great hope of the world. The Cross as an exhibition of God's intervention in the life of man is crucial. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself."<sup>11</sup> The Cross is, then, the supreme exhibition of love, and love is the greatest power in the world. Love can transform and recreate when the greatest physical force will fail and fail miserably. Force, as the writer of the Epistle to Diognetus long ago pointed out, is contrary to the purpose of God. Force compels, love wins. It can, as Dr. Quick has said, "by a mysterious alchemy peculiar to itself, bring good out of evil, make evil itself, in spite of itself, subserve the purposes of good."<sup>12</sup> And as he proceeds to point out the Cross is the supreme example of the greatest triumph of evil and at the same time the one event which has changed most lives from evil to good. Thus the Christian, as he surveys the problems and perplexities, the sufferings and disappointments of the world, must ever bear this conception of God in mind. It is vital for a true understanding of human life. It is the truest safeguard against either apathy or despair.

God, therefore, is active in history. He is active, that is, not only in the human soul but in the whole process of historic movement. God is immanent in His creation—guiding, sustaining and upholding; but He is also transcendent. He rules over all, His divine immanence is shown by the laws of nature which are the expression of His own immutable will. On these man can rely, for with God, "there is no variability nor shadow caused by turning."<sup>13</sup> His purposive will thus, finding expression in natural laws, gives permanence and stability to the whole natural order on which scientists can base their observations and calculations. But this reliance on the fixity of the laws governing the universe must not be taken to mean that they cannot be used to achieve the high purposes of God. It is not to be supposed that we can "at all times and in all places" understand the activities of God. And it would not be good for us if we did. We are to walk by faith rather than by knowledge. For, as Dr. Temple long ago pointed out, "If God in fact intervened on every occasion, or on many occasions, when apart from His action, the normal process of events would lead to a calamitous 'accident', it may be doubted if the spiritual side of human nature would ever be able to assert itself."<sup>14</sup>

Now this activity of God in history has one immediate important result. For it demonstrates, so far as the Christian is concerned, that there is no such thing as secular history. All history is the sphere in which God carries out His purposes in the world. For it is precisely in what we call secular history that we are enabled to see God at work in His own creative process. It is this fact which gives importance and significance to the events of history which might otherwise be deemed of no particular value. Any supposed dualism between secular and sacred history has no justification in fact. When applied to historical events it involves the dangerous implication that God is at work only in special eras or under special conditions or for the attainment of special and sometimes limited objectives. Such a view, of course, is inconsistent with the Christian doctrine of God. But this must not be taken to mean that all historic events, however trivial or insignificant, constitute in themselves a special revelation of God. It is the great events that reveal the activity of God, and these in



turn are but the apogee of long processes to the making of which the whole series of previous historic events contributed their share. The declaration of war in 1939 was an event for which a vast number of subordinate occurrences of all sorts and conditions prepared the way. But it is the culmination that counts. It is in this sense presumably that Dr. Whale's definition of history as "the selection and interpretation of facts" <sup>15</sup> must be taken.

Such considerations bring us to a further point of importance. What should be man's response to the activity of God? Is he but clay in the hands of the Father, the apathetic material on which the divine power continually acts? The answer to such questions raises problems for which in some cases no adequate solution can be found. It involves the question of man's freedom which is so often taken for granted without any thought of the problems which it presents. Yet on the surface man appears to be perfectly free to determine his own life. He showed his freedom supremely in the great crisis of the world's history when he crucified the Son of God. The whole of the teaching of the Bible pre-supposes man's capacity to make decisions. Yet on the other hand we know, as a matter of experience, that our minds and wills are often distorted and deflected by forces quite outside their control—by social influences, heredity, education, and so on. These all play an immensely important part if not a decisive one. But even so they cannot be said to rob man entirely of this freedom. We dare not say that freedom is a mirage, deluding man with the idea that he preserves freedom while all the time he is really an automaton. As a mere matter of fact, man has, and must have, a considerable measure of freedom, otherwise morality would be a sham. It is the primary condition of moral behaviour that man has the capacity to determine his actions in accordance with the principles which he acknowledges. Yet anyone who knows human nature, especially as he sees it in his own heart, is compelled to acknowledge that man always finds himself confronted by forces which seem all too often to be determinative of his conduct. The self-centred ego is not entirely free. It is all too conscious of a power which persists in nullifying his noblest aspirations. This was the experience of St. Paul. "For the good that I would I do not, but the evil which I would not that I do" <sup>16</sup> And who has not had a similar experience? And to experience it is to be acutely conscious of forces at war within one's self which all too often bring to nought one's fairest hopes and finest aspirations. For the trouble is, as Dr. Temple has shown us, "That we are self-centred, and no effort of the self can remove the self from the centre of its own endeavour." <sup>17</sup>

From our standpoint, therefore, man cannot be said to enjoy real freedom. Rather he appears to be in the grip of a self-centred determinism which can only find emancipation in a spiritual context. In other words he needs deliverance from himself—his egotism, selfishness and pride. But it is just here that he realises his powerlessness. For in the language of the New Testament a man's will is vitiated by sin which "reigns in our mortal nature." And nothing is clearer in our experience than that we cannot save ourselves. It is the root heresy of our time that man supposes that he can achieve his own salvation. For to quote Dr. Temple again, "What is quite certain is that the self cannot by any effort of its own lift itself off its own self or centre and

resystematize itself about God as its centre. Such radical conversion must be the act of God. . . . It cannot be a process only of enlightenment. Nothing can suffice but a redemptive act."<sup>18</sup> In other words to achieve freedom man needs conversion. He needs to be brought within the sphere of the grace of God in a special sense. The barriers of self-centredness must be broken down before the will can attain that "perfect freedom" which comes from the service of God instead of the service of self.

In what sense, therefore, may we contend that only by the grace of God does man attain his true freedom? But before any attempt can be made to answer this question, there is another preliminary one; What do we understand of grace? For grace is one of those words which are often used without much reflection upon their true meaning. Perhaps one of the best ways of defining grace is to describe it as the active beneficence of God. It is "God's goodwill towards us." It is His eternal goodness in process of continual action in the heart of man—the immanence of the transcendent God. It is emphatically a supernatural endowment. "For by grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God. Not of works lest any man should boast." Hence we can see at a glance man's position of humble dependence upon God as the recipient of His goodwill. This grace found supreme expression in the Cross of Christ<sup>19</sup> whereby we are saved from the power of sin. For salvation is the achievement of God, not of man. It is God's great gift to us men. From the beginning to the end it is the act of God.

But this is only one, if the most important, aspect of the grace of God. For that beneficence is continually at work in the life of the redeemed. God's grace is still active in the souls of men. For "we stand either under the Grace, the favour of God, or under the Wrath, the dis-Grace of God."<sup>20</sup> Theologically, this activity of the grace of God, working ever in the hearts of men is called prevenient grace for its activity of necessity must precede any consequences in the way of repentance on the part of man. Yet grace must not be regarded as superseding the need of man's co-operation. Man must certainly "work out his own salvation," which at least means that he must not passively leave everything to God. On the contrary we are to be "fellow workers together with Christ" which means a measure of co-operation in the divine plan for our lives, though even so the true Christian will be conscious that his energy and power have a supernatural origin. "I live, yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me." "By the grace of God I am what I am . . . I laboured more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me."<sup>21</sup> No doubt in many respects the problem is one of those paradoxes which will remain unresolved so long as "we see through a glass darkly."<sup>22</sup> The sovereignty of God and the inalienable freedom of man, as Dr. Farmer has written, presents an "antinomy which it is ever beyond our minds to resolve into a completely satisfying theoretical unity."<sup>23</sup>

And so we are driven back again to the central event of all history, to that apparent tragedy from which has flowed the greatest hope of the world. It is precisely here, in what appears on the surface, to the "natural man",<sup>24</sup> the greatest defeat of goodness in the whole history

of man, that the Church grasps with the aid of faith the key to the world's greatest and most baffling problems. Out of the overshadowing darkness has "shined a great light." From man's greatest act of wickedness flows the world's redemption. Here is the supreme paradox of history, the greatest evil achieving the greatest good. Such is the amazing wisdom of the infinite God. And only in so far as we attempt to grasp something of this infinite wisdom can we expect even to begin to understand, still less to attempt to solve, the problems of God's historic action.

<sup>1</sup> *Article of Religion I.*

<sup>2</sup> Rev. iv. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Jer. xxvii. 4, 5. <sup>4</sup> Jer. i. 9. <sup>5</sup> Jer. li. 24. <sup>6</sup> Jer. ix. 23, 24.

<sup>7</sup> Jer. ix. 9. <sup>8</sup> Whale: *Christian Doctrine*, p. 59. <sup>9</sup> Niebuhr: *The Nature and Destiny of Man*. (Gifford Lectures) vol. I, page 148. *cf* Roms. I. 18.

<sup>10</sup> Jo. iii. 16. <sup>11</sup> II Cor. v. 19. <sup>12</sup> Quick: *Christian Beliefs and Modern Questions* p. 38.

<sup>13</sup> James. I. 17. <sup>14</sup> *Christus Veritas*: p. 197.

<sup>15</sup> *op cit.* p. 60.

<sup>16</sup> Rom. vii. 19. <sup>17</sup> *Nature, Man and God*. (Gifford Lectures). p. 243.

<sup>18</sup> *op cit*: p. 397. <sup>19</sup> Dr. Hardman in *The Christian Doctrine of Grace*: prefers to speak of the Incarnation as the "supreme act in the operation of grace," but since our salvation and deliverance from the power of sin depends upon the Cross, it seems more correct to apply those words to the Crucifixion. See *op cit*: p. 98.

<sup>20</sup> Syngé: *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*. A Theological Commentary. p. 7.

<sup>21</sup> I Cor. xv. 10. <sup>22</sup> I Cor. xiii. 12. <sup>23</sup> *The World and God*: p. 256. <sup>24</sup> I Cor. ii. 14.

## Justification by Faith.

BY THE REV. R. J. COBB, M.A.

WE live in a day when there is a fresh need to insist upon the fundamental truths of Christian faith, and none is of more importance than the fact of the righteousness of God. As in the days following the enlightenment the Reformers found a world ready to hear the proclamation of those truths which are based upon this conception, so now in a day of seeking a New Order (with all its discussion of social conditions) there must be put forward as fundamental the recovery of those conceptions which draw their inspiration from the conviction that the whole world can only be guided aright as the foundation of life is found in God Himself: and God is 'righteous in all His ways, and holy in all His works.' (Psalm cxlv. 17). But the distinctive message of the Reformation was that of declaring how man was brought into a new relationship with God and indeed 'accounted righteous by the merits of Christ alone.'

The Christian, then, is not merely a pardoned criminal, he is a righteous man, and this expresses in modern terms the foundation stone of the Reformation theology, and the secret of its power. Justification lies at the root of the Christian experience, not as the goal for Christian attainment. As Dr. J. G. Simpson has put it 'The distinction is not merely a matter of terms, but has an important bearing upon the Christian character. The provision of aids, however powerful,

for the attainment of justification must have an entirely different effect upon the daily life of the believer from the assurance of a reconciliation already fully won.' The liberating fact in the Reformation days was this realisation anew of the direct relation between God and the sinner forgiven in Christ. Luther's experience when the truth of Rom v. 1, 'Therefore being justified by faith,' came home to him was the expression of the fundamental spiritual experience of the Reformers.

In the first place, Justification is concerned with the standing of the Christian in the sight of God. It represents the new relationship which a man enters by faith in Christ. It can be viewed from the two aspects of the Divine action and the human experience, but essentially it is important to bear in mind that it has positive as well as negative aspects; it does not only consist in the forgiveness of sins, it also comprehends the fact of the imputation of righteousness. In short, it is here that we have the final answer to Job's question (a question that has occupied the hearts of men of all ages), 'How should man be just with God?' (Job. ix. 2).

The clearest New Testament example of the idea in this respect is in the chief reference to Justification in the Teaching of our Lord. The parable of the Pharisee and the Publican give us clear types of the two opposed attitudes of mind. The Pharisee—going about to establish his own righteousness—shows the attitude of a man to whom righteousness and justification is a matter for self-gratulation, but the Lord Jesus speaks the final word contradicting this in His final comment 'I tell you this man went down to his house justified rather than the other' (Luke xviii. 14). Such an experience can only come from God Himself—He and He alone can justify.

To Justify, then, means to 'account righteous': it is to introduce a confusion of thought to allow the suggestion of 'making righteous' to enter—for the word *δικαίωω* is essentially forensic in its implications and perhaps one of the LXX. occurrences of the term will best illustrate this, 'The judges . . . shall justify the righteous (*δικαιώσωσι τὸ δίκαιον*)' (Deut. xxv. 1). It represents the judicial declaration of acquittal and freedom from guilt. This is akin to the classical use of the term where we find 'to deem right,' and 'to choose what is right,' also 'to have justice done,' as instances of its meaning.

There is, then, a difference between Justification and Sanctification—the former is the act of God, complete, final and eternal; the latter expresses the experience of men who have entered into their standing as 'justified' in the sight of God, and are day by day experiencing His sanctifying power. We may grow in holiness, we are found righteous in Christ. This distinction is suggested in the very form of the words used: our English words are derived from the Latin which confuses a distinction quite clearly involved in the Greek Testament. Righteousness (Justification) is *δικαιοσύνη*, while Holiness (Sanctification) is *ἀγιασμός*. This latter form involves the use of a suffix which implies the idea of action or a process, while the former term is the substantive formed from the adjective, and Winer held that substantives ending in—*σύνη* denote 'qualities.' (It is interesting to note that the corresponding form *ἀγλωσύνη* does occur in the Bible:

it is used in the LXX. of God's Majesty, and in the New Testament only in Romans i. 4, II Cor. vii. 1, I Thess. iii. 13—all of them cases where the force is that 'quality' which might be described as 'final holiness': but the usual term involves the idea of a *process*. Justification on the other hand consists of that acceptance of the man by God, so that he stands with his sin forgiven, guilt removed, and restored to communion with God Himself.

Dr. Griffith Thomas (in his *Principles of Theology* as well as his book *Grace and Power*) draws attention to the series of questions in Romans viii. 33-35, as bringing out these three points: 'Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?' *No guilt*. Who is he that condemneth?' *No condemnation*. 'Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?' *No separation*. The New Testament conception of Justification is that of full and complete acceptance with God; nothing short of that is contemplated in the term.

Once we have seen the force of the conception of Justification, the unique claim of Christian revelation is plain: if 'to justify' means 'to account righteous,' such can only be the act of God Himself and only on terms which are consistent with His Nature—His Holiness and Justice, as well as His Mercy and Love. In fact, the idea of Justification is primarily related to the Justice of God, it is a forensic (a law-court) term. And it is this idea and stress on the absolute nature of Justification which brought the reformers into direct conflict with the Roman theologians. A large part of the discussions of the Tridentine Fathers was devoted expressly to the theme of Justification and the formulation of a definition which might be consistent with the Roman views of the Sacramental Nature of Grace. Their definition of the term extended to sixteen pages of which Lindsay in his *History of the Reformation* says, 'The result was that the Pope obtained what he wanted, a definition which made reconciliation with the Protestants impossible,' and 'Almost every page includes grave ambiguities.' In effect the Council of Trent made Justification to be the process of *making* a soul righteous by the infusing of virtues, and consequently dependent on the sacramental works of men. The Reformers took their stand with Paul, 'In Him all that believe are justified' (Acts xiii. 39).

Secondly we are to consider not only the idea of Justification, but that of Justification by Faith; having outlined the implications of Justification, we ask how the experience is entered. The Biblical answer has been plain since the time of Abraham, he 'believed in the LORD; and He counted it to him for righteousness' (Genesis xv. 6). It is in this instance that the establishment of a relationship between God and man on the basis of Faith first occurs in the Bible, and so it is not surprising to find the actual text quoted in the three main discussions of the subject—Romans iv. 3, Galatians iii. 6, James ii. 23. The fundamental issue, is, What does God require of man that he may be accepted in His sight? The answer can only be, Righteousness, and to that man in himself cannot attain. But the Bible makes it equally plain that God imputes Righteousness to those who believe in Him—here lay Israel's fundamental error, and indeed the error of many professing Christians for they 'sought to establish their own righteousness, not having submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God'

(Romans x. 3-4). The righteousness of God is that very standard which God requires in man—and there is a great gulf fixed between the righteousness of man and the Righteousness of God—cf. Deuteronomy x. 12 and Micah vi. 8, while the whole Law is the translation of this requirement into statutes and ordinances. In effect these statutes and ordinances have brought man into judgment, by shewing the nature and extent of the condemnation which results from sin, and man finds himself entirely without excuse before God.

The argument of the earlier chapters of the Epistle to the Romans is precisely that this condemnation extends to all mankind, and is shewn to be deserved by the universal corruption of the race; but this universal corruption is met by a universal Redemption, and on the ground of the Redemption accomplished by Christ on the Cross free Salvation is offered to all (Rom. v. 12-21). Christ has destroyed sin in the flesh and risen again in victory (cf. Romans iv. 25 and viii. 3-4). The demand of the Law has been met (Galatians iii. 13), Christ has fulfilled the Law and His fulfilment is that which becomes the righteousness of the believer.

Faith, then, is the sole condition of receiving the Gift of God's Righteousness. But it must be born in mind that Faith is an active principle, not simply an assent to a doctrine or creed, but an actual trust in God. Sometimes the simplest definitions are the most profound, and there may be no deeper and more satisfying definition of Faith than that of the Norwegian, Hans Hauge, who taught his people, "To have Faith is to come to Christ with your sins."

Thirdly, the Protestant statement of belief continues that Justification is by Faith alone: *e.g.*, *Article xi*, 'We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings: Wherefore, that we are justified by Faith only is a most wholesome Doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.' To quote Martensen, 'The evangelical principle that faith alone justifies (*sola fides justificat*) rests upon the presupposition that Christ alone justifies. It is only in virtue of the righteousness of Christ, in virtue of the new fundamental relationship with Christ, that man can be reconciled to his God; and by faith alone, as the profoundest act of susceptibility and subjectiveness on the part of the inner man of the heart, can Christ be appropriated; by faith alone can man obtain blessedness in its indissoluble completeness.' Christ alone received by faith is the Righteousness of man, in Him we not only perceive but we find perfection and are ourselves accepted (Ephesians i. 6).

The teaching of Justification by Faith alone resolves itself then into the assertion of Christ as a sufficient Saviour: for nothing we can be, or could do, can add to the full and sufficient nature of the Sacrifice He made for us on the Cross. If that sacrifice is sufficient, then the appropriation of its benefits is all that God can and will require; that appropriation is made by a simple and definite act of Faith, so Justification is by Faith alone.

It may be, and frequently is, asserted that such makes the experience of forgiveness too easy: that our absolution from sin ought to cost us something. If, however, we had any part to play in paying the price

of our sin, it would mean that the sacrifice of Christ was insufficient. God forgives as unconditionally as the creditor in the parable, 'When they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both' (Luke vii. 42). It is not the amount of the debt which is in question, it is the utter bankruptcy of the debtor. Man cannot meet the demands of a Holy God for Righteousness of Life; but God in Christ has provided the way of acceptance, and that is what we mean by Justification. The entry into this experience is well put in Bonar's words:

Thy work alone, O Christ,  
 Can ease this weight of sin;  
 Thy Blood alone, O Lamb of God,  
 Can give me peace within.

I bless the CHRIST of God,  
 I rest on Love Divine;  
 And, with unfaltering lip and heart,  
 I call this Saviour mine.

To quote from the Homily: Justification is not the office of man but of God. For man cannot make himself righteous by his own works, neither in part, nor in the whole; for that were the greatest arrogancy and presumption of man that Anti-Christ could set up against God, to affirm that a man might by his own works take away and purge his own sins, and so justify himself. But Justification is the office of God only; and is not a thing which we render unto Him, but which we receive of Him; not which we give to Him, but which we take of Him, by His free mercy, and by the only merits of His most dearly beloved Son, our only Redeemer, Saviour, and Justifier, Jesus Christ.'

## Trends in Present Day Theology.

BY THE REV. D. W. CLEVERLEY FORD, B.D., M.Th.

**I**T is apparent to the most casual observer that as regards theology we are to-day in a transition period. There is no one great broad movement which marks the day. We live in a reactionary period; yet for all this, there is a tendency which it is the purpose of this article to examine. In the broadest outline it may be said that there are three schools of thought, the fundamentalist, the modernist, and the most recent outlook commonly called "dogmatic" or "conservative."

The Fundamentalist view is ancient, it is not dead, but its ascendancy was in the past before the days of Biblical Criticism, so that with the rise of that study, its field of influence is now limited. In its extreme form this view declared that every letter, every word of the Bible was dictated as it were by the Holy Ghost. Bible Study showed this extreme view to be of no practical value since there are many passages in the Old Testament which make no sense at all as they stand.

We do not know what the original words were. In practice too, it is argued, the fundamentalists have had to bring to the Scriptures extraneous principles of interpretation to expound them and this usually takes the form of the traditional Protestant theology, which goes back to the Reformers. Not that the Reformers were fundamentalists in the later sense. Luther desired to omit the Epistle of James from the Canon and had some very bitter things to say about it, and Calvin too was a critic. The Reformers did, in fact, distinguish between the Bible as a series of words, sentences and books on the one hand, and the Word of God on the other.

The second great school of thought, or rather trend of theology, was modernism. We do not, of course, refer to that movement which originally had this title, namely the liberal movement in the Roman Church championed by Loisy and Tyrrell, but to that which is more popularly conceived as modernism. This of course, again is a reactionary movement. Biblical criticism so went on apace that Protestantism in its theological quarters began to look for a new dogmatic altogether. Encouraged by Harnack (who wrote his *History of Dogma* in seven volumes to prove his point) the Modernist alleged that from the first the Christian Church developed along wrong lines. The Apostle Paul first led the Church astray by introducing into the simple religion of Jesus, Greek religious ideas and phrases. Even the sacraments are the sacred festivals of the Greek Mystery Religions revised and adapted for Christianity; indeed the official Christianity was a kind of a lake produced by the various religions and faiths of the ancient world flowing as rivers into it. Paul then substituted the gospel *about* Jesus in place of the simple Gospel *of* Jesus. It is therefore necessary to separate the simple preacher Jesus, from Paul's dogmatic Christ; there is the Jesus of History and the Christ of theology and they are not the same. Even so, it is not enough to have separated out the simple historic person of Jesus in the Gospels; the very presentation of His person in the Gospels themselves has been overlaid, blurred, distorted and obscured. We must strip away these artificial garments if we would see the real Jesus, the essence of Christianity, for the garments are the product of Faith not of History. Form-Criticism will allow us to see that the gospel stories and miracles are little more than mere husks which husks nevertheless are valuable in that they do preserve the real and historical man Jesus. If then within the New Testament itself we see such corruption of the original Jesus, a confusion produced by the grafting on of alien theologies to the true and simple religion of Jesus, what shall we say of the theologies of the Fathers? What of the schoolmen? What of the systems of the Reformers? They have assisted the process of corruption! The Modernist then looks not for a re-interpretation of the doctrine of the Trinity, nor for a more lucid Christology, nor a doctrine of the Atonement, but for a radical reconstruction of the whole idea of Christianity, a new faith in scientific accord with the thought forms of the age.

All this is a far cry from the Fundamentalist view with its traditional theology. It is reactionary, indeed we can almost say it is the complete opposite, it is the swing of the pendulum. And yet we must admit there is value in both these views. The fundamentalist has, after all,



something worth while in his authority, he *can* speak almost as did the ancient prophet—"Thus saith the Lord." He preserves in his system the unique, the divine, the miraculous. The Modernist has something worthwhile in his system too. Scientifically he has sought the heart and root of Christianity, he has tried to separate out the unessential and the secondary; above all he has attempted to recover the Jesus of history Who may so easily be absorbed into the Christ of dogmatics. But neither Fundamentalist nor Modernist have come to possess the inheritance, they are superseded, or are being superseded in these days. Some may find difficulty in this thought of the perpetual flux of theological thought but we may note that theology has always developed on the Hegelian pattern. The root of Hegel's philosophy is that truth is to be found in a continual synthesis; an idea is presented, but truth is not there, nor is it in its opposite, but a nearer approach is to be found in a synthesis of the two contrary positions. And again this third term is not the truth but is only more nearly approached in the synthesis of itself and its opposite and so on. This is how theological truth has actually progressed in the Christian Church. The Antiochene school of Christology for instance with its protagonists Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius advocating the humanity of Jesus had not the whole truth; nor was the Alexandrian school of Christology, which opposed it, advocating the deity; a nearer approach to the truth was to be found in the resultant synthetic formula of Chalcedon 451 A.D. "very God and very man." Or again the Augustinian position that man's salvation is wholly due to the grace of God is not the whole truth; nor is its opponent Pelagianism with its notion that man's salvation is the result of his own efforts in imitation of the example of Jesus, but rather the truth is more nearly approximated to in the compromising view which persisted in the Church known as 'semi-Augustinianism.' And there is no doubt that a great deal of the strength of the Church of England has been due to the undoubted combination of the contrary positions of Calvinism and Arminianism.

We see then how a step nearer the truth is often obtained by this very process commonly expressed by the swing of a pendulum and how well it may be that the newer and more recent trends in theological thought are in very deed nearer to the truth than the contrary positions they combine, namely the Fundamentalist and Modernist, to name only two. For we must be well aware that this is an over-simplification. After all the immediate reaction to the liberalism of the 19th century was of course the revival of Calvinism in Barthianism against which this country again has reacted.

Before we examine in any coherent form the nature of the newer and growing dogmatic school of thought, let us look in a general way at the present trend of theological thought. Under the dominant liberal Protestant thought of the 19th century founded by Albrecht Ritschl it was customary to set the theology of the New Testament in a Greek mould. That way however has been superseded, the Greek has not wholly been dismissed but it is realised that the theology of the New Testament is chiefly Hebraic. This is not an academic question only, it is practically very important. On the face of it, of course, it is at once apparent that the New Testament is intelligible without a

knowledge of Greek philosophical thought categories. The categories of thought of Paul for example are Hebrew, that is to say the Bible is being seen once more as a complete whole. The Hebrew Old Testament is the necessary introduction to the New and this (not so much the Greek) constitutes the guiding principle to the interpretation of the New. We see then to-day not only a process of re-integration of the New Testament to which we shall make reference later, but indeed of the whole Bible.

But this change of emphasis has greater import than this, it alters the whole character of Christology. The God of Greek philosophy is  $\tau\omicron\ \delta\upsilon\nu$ , the Absolute, the unchanging, something passive, a constant principle behind the changing phenomena of time. The God of the Hebrews on the other hand is an active person, One Who *calls* Abraham, Who *delivers* Israel from the bondage of Egypt, Who *summons* the prophets, Who *sends* into exile, Who *turns* captivities, One Who *does* things on behalf of His people. The fundamental difference in the resultant Christologies is obvious. For liberal theology with its Greek categories, the man Christ Jesus is the mirror par excellence of the unchanging God, he is the supreme revelation. For the newer outlook on the other hand with its Hebrew categories God has finally acted in Jesus so that the significance of the acts of Jesus is that they are the acts of God. And this is the crucial point; a revelation may be rejected, there is no finality about it, logically there is no reason why there should not be a second Jesus. But it is not so with an act, there is finality in an act for it brings about the conditions for which it was performed so that a repetition is no longer possible nor indeed is it required. Finality, then, that is the keynote of the newer theology, the product of interpretation in Hebrew forms. God has acted in Jesus and there is finality about His act.

All this has far-reaching repercussions. Great emphasis used to be laid on the fact that Jesus was the last term in a long series of preceding events. He was the end and the crown of all the long Old Testament process, He was the ideal to which the saints of old looked forward and in Him they were summed up. There is truth in this view but it obscures the essential feature of the Incarnation which is that if history can be represented as a horizontal line, then the Incarnation must be represented as a vertical line cutting across it. There is something other about this event, something unique, something unknown to any preceding or succeeding events, it is the divine breaking in on the human, or in other words, there is finality about it.

And so interest has arisen in what was the primitive preaching the  $\kappa\acute{\eta}\rho\upsilon\gamma\mu\alpha$ . From the Petrine speeches in the Acts and from the traditions Paul received, and says he received, it can most easily be gathered (but by no means here only but wherever we look) that the early Christian preaching was centred on this act of God in Christ, the death and the resurrection which produced certain results and had reference to the last day, the day of Judgment.

So we see over against Fundamentalism and over against Modernism a strong modern tendency towards conservatism in theology and it exists too in Biblical criticism. We are not to confuse this with the Fundamentalist position. The conservative trend seeks to conserve

all that is essential in the Fundamentalist view, but it uses Biblical Criticism, it is not unscientific. Yet it does *not*, like the Modernist school, look for a completely new dogmatic, it respects the past, it reveres orthodoxy, it sees value in tradition and—this is distinctive—it does not want like modernism so to have lengthened its lines of communication in order to meet the newer conditions of modern life that it gets out of touch with its base. No army can fight separate from its base, if its base is lost the army is lost. Christianity cannot live without its base. But what is that base? asks theology to-day. And answering its own question it says—It is the essential element in orthodoxy. There is in Christianity that without which it cannot claim the name, it is fundamental, it is basic, or to introduce the technical word now being used—it is ‘dogma.’

Let us now turn to examine not the content of dogma—for that would be impossible in one article—but the form of the dogma. Let us examine the newer and conservative trend of thought, under three heads, Revelation, Dogma, Theology.

First of all Revelation. The Roman Catholics describe this as the imparting of religious truths to men by God either directly or through an angel. This revelation is immediate and mediate (that is through Creation and His handiwork). There is therefore a supernatural revelation and a natural revelation or, to put it another way, revealed religion and natural religion.

Dr. Temple has frequently pointed out that on the Continent the great controversy between the Roman Church and the Protestant has not been a Eucharistic one as might be supposed, but is a controversy about whether or not there is such a distinction between natural and supernatural revelation. He himself says categorically ‘No, there is not.’ “What is needed” he says in his Gifford Lecture, “and what plainly comes to pass before our eyes is the deliberate and total repudiation of any distinction of spheres as belonging respectively to natural and revealed religion or Theology.” That needs a little explanation. In former days it was held that certain truths about God—as that He exists, that He is Creator, that He is the provident disposer of the world’s affairs—might be known in the light of natural reason but that certain further truths concerning Him as that He is three persons in One God, that He is incarnate in Jesus Christ, that He has redeemed us by the blood of His Cross, could only be made known by supernatural revelation to the eye of faith and could never be discovered by man’s natural reason.

This is the distinction between a natural and a revealed religion which nowadays is rejected. Logic can tell us nothing about God. Logic says “If A then B.” Logic argues from certain premises. What undeniable premises are there for the arguments for God’s existence? In any case the arguments for divine existence are too vague and the product of their reasoning is the Absolute not the Christian God and there is about as much connection between the two as between the square root of minus one and the sunrise, as one writer expresses it.

And this distinction between natural and revealed religion is rejected because it speaks of ‘truths of revelation’ and describes revelation as the imparting of religious truth, its customary phrase being “truths of revelation.” But how can truth and truths be revealed? Truth is

abstract and if God revealed truth as it really is it would be absolute. Could we apprehend absolute divine truth? God must become flesh and truth must be expressed and therefore imperfectly represented in human language if we are to understand.

So we come to our point. What is Revelation? Certainly not truths, they are the intellectual formulation of revelation, not revelation itself. What is revealed? Who reveals? It is God Who is revealed and God Who reveals. The subject and object of revelation are one. God has revealed Himself in Jesus Christ. Christian doctrine therefore is the intellectual expression of the revelation of God Himself. And this revelation of God is as mediate as any other revelation of God in creation for Christ is Himself the Mediator.

Yet, of course, a distinction is asserted in the Christian faith. It is agreed God has revealed something of Himself to prophets, to philosophers, to poets. He has spoken to the prophets but in His Son He came, He has acted. The Incarnation then is the distinctive revelation, a revelation distinctive in kind from any other. It is not as if Christ's divinity were of a higher quality though of the same kind as that of the prophets and seers, it is distinctly other, it is the revelation of God distinctively; in Hebraic thought categories God is acting there—and here we may suppose we have come to the dividing line, the wall of partition between the Catholic faith on the one hand and the vague Christianised philosophies on the other, which offer themselves as the re-interpretation or as new dogmatic. Revelation then is of God and that supremely, uniquely and distinctively in the Incarnation.

So much for Revelation. What is dogma? To some the very word is an offence. They say there can be no static apprehension of truth—truth is for ever deepening. That is true; but some principles, some pre-suppositions like the law of contradiction can never be superseded, it is impossible for the thinking process to function without them. So too, if it were once true that Christ died for the sins of the world, it is always true, we cannot get along without it; however much interpretation may vary, that fact remains. This then is what is meant by 'dogma.' If dogma means only a theoretical explanation there will be no permanence in it, it may be superseded; but if dogma means spiritual fact then it cannot be superseded. And whatever and however insistent the demand may be for an undogmatic Christianity, this newer theological outlook of to-day will say—undogmatic Christianity is a contradiction.

But what is dogma? The Roman Church claims absolute finality for the statements of the Creed; even the cloak of infallibility extends to the words used to express the content. With this, of course, it is impossible to argue. But what is the Protestant answer, which rejecting an infallible Church necessarily rejects the infallibility of its statements? It is that dogma is the "Word of God," the Gospel; and Scripture, Creed and Theology have authority only as they express and convey that Word, that Gospel. The newer theology then has great reverence for the Bible, it has great reverence for the Creed, it respects the Fathers, and the older orthodox theologians, because they have conveyed in varying degree the Word of God, the essential Gospel, which is dogma. As regards these things it is conservative. And because it emphasises the Word, the Gospel, which constitute

dogma it is "dogmatic." We admit we have not defined what is the Gospel, that is impossible in one article, but what a paradox it would be if the Christian Church could not define its own Gospel.

So we come on to the third term, namely theology. What is theology and what is its relation to dogma? It may be expressed this way; dogma is the permanent element in the Christian faith and theology the transient. Theology is the intellectual interpretation of the Word—the Gospel. And the Gospel does not tell us simply what God is, it tells us what God has done. It records the mighty acts of God in Hebrew fashion, it can only be expressed in active verbs. God *sent*, He *came*, in Christ, He *reconciled*, He *took* our nature. And so it is that the Gospel can only be expressed in a story, the story of God's acts. That story is the essential, it is the Word, it is dogma; when we seek to explain, then we make theology.

So we have examined the Christian faith as it is being explained to-day with regard to its form. In short it is conservative, and we have examined it under three heads, Revelation, Dogma and Theology. This threefold stage has been illustrated by drawing attention to the poet in creation of some work. First there comes the blinding flash, the moment of inspiration, that is revelation. Next comes the arduous task of expressing that experience in language, which has to become the vehicle; necessarily something is lost in trying to transfer the revelation into language but choice is made of a suitable form and a poem results; it tries to capture the feeling as well as the idea at the moment of inspiration. The poem then is like dogma. Thirdly we have the paraphrase of the poem, enlarging upon it and explaining it—that is theology.

## Christian Education.

BY THE REV. R. PERFECT, M.A., CAMB.

*Headmaster, St. Lawrence College.*

**L**ET us begin with an attempt to define terms. What is "Christian Education?" Is it the same thing as "Religious Education?"

Let it be noted that the latter is invariably the term employed in official or semi-official publications and pronouncements on the subject. Is there any essential difference between the two terms? Does the adjective "Religious" in this context mean as much as, or less than, the adjective "Christian?" This is not mere splitting of hairs. There is a growing interest in this subject, which the Press in particular seems keen to foster, and in many quarters the interest is hardening into a clamant demand for action. Yet some of the definitions of "Religious Education," which are being widely broadcast through various channels, can hardly be said to apply *pari passu* as definitions of "Christian Education." Standing by itself, without further qualification or definition, the term "Religious Education" is capable of being watered down to such a pathetic thinness of meaning that it becomes in time little distinct from "Moralistic

Teaching," a sort of cousin several times "removed." Let me quote you an example of this kind of watering-down, which came to me through the post not long ago in a pamphlet produced by a group of Headmasters. They define in brief what they want "Religious Education" to mean in the Schools. "There can be no solution to this problem until the facts are squarely faced. What is needed before religious teaching can become effective in the schools is a re-interpretation of the Christian faith in the light of modern thought and knowledge. There is no difficulty over the "Sermon on the Mount," which should form the basis of religious instruction in the schools, but there are great difficulties, both for teachers and for senior pupils, over mediæval creed and dogma, which should be left to the Churches. The former should form the heart of the religious instruction in the schools; the latter should be left to the Churches."

I suspect that most of you are fairly familiar with this kind of demand for a creed-less Christianity, purged of accretions and brought up-to-date, which often means brought into line with nineteenth-century thought that has been discarded for years by the best modern minds. Of course, it may be said that this is not the language of official sources, but merely of individual schoolmasters. True; but it still remains valid that however explicitly "Religious Education" might be defined by official sources (an unlikely thing to happen), the term is sufficiently loose and general to be interpreted, in the actual practice of teaching, in a wide variety of ways, some of which might be distinctly sub-Christian.

In this paper I shall therefore keep to the term "Christian Education," partly because I believe it to be in fact what most people mean and desire when they speak of "Religious Education," and partly because it conjures up a more distinct and definite picture of the end envisaged by the term. Having thus far "cleared the decks," let me go back to my original question. "What is Christian Education?"

I think it is not too much to say that few people possess a mental definition of the term which is on the one hand clear in its aim and on the other capable of being put into some sort of practice in the actual environment of a present-day school. There are two distinct points here. Let me take them separately.

### I. THE MEANING OF "CHRISTIAN EDUCATION."

Modern education is a specialised process. It is much more than the business of dividing up certain days and weeks in the year into a Time Table of school "periods," in which a fixed proportion of time is given to a settled number of subjects, the time allotted varying according to the importance of the subject. But I doubt whether most people not actively engaged in the profession go very far beyond that kind of mental picture of education, judging by some of the statements which are at present being voiced and written on the subject. The result is some seriously loose thinking when we come to consider the implications of "Christian Education." For on this limited view of the educational process considered as a whole, the requirements of a specifically "Christian" education seem to be met in the minds of many people when three conditions in particular have been satisfied :

- (i) That in every school, where conditions make it possible, the day's work shall start with a corporate act of worship by the whole school assembled together.
- (ii) That periods for religious instruction shall be given their due place in the school curriculum.
- (iii) That the "subject" of religious instruction shall be taught only by convinced and qualified teachers.

If we add to these three points certain supplementary conditions which naturally arise out of them, have we then got the "Christian Education" which we are seeking? In my own view, most emphatically we have not. We may have arrived part of the way towards a true definition, but not the whole way. Of course, it may be argued that this definition of "Christian Education" takes us as far as it is possible to go under the actual educational conditions with which we have to reckon. That is a reasonable contention, whether we accept it as valid or not; but we surely ought not to accept a definition of "Christian Education" which is less than the whole truth, simply because present conditions seem to prevent us in practice from realising a full ideal. In this matter, Christian people ought not to be content with a partial ideal; in other words, we must know what we mean by "Christian Education," in the full sense of the term, and then refuse to accept a limited meaning, even though necessity may compel us to accept a limited practice of our ideal.

Let me now try to justify my assertion that the ends and meaning of "Christian Education" are not adequately covered by the three conditions which I have just briefly enumerated. Two points are worth particular consideration, one of which is often entirely overlooked in discussions of this question.

In the first place, it has many times been pointed out by teachers, quite correctly and in justifiable self-defence against a good deal of uninformed criticism, that in a large number of the country's schools, whether State-controlled, State-aided, or independent, it is now and has been for years the rule that the day's work starts with an act of corporate worship, and that religious instruction forms an integral part of the curriculum. Moreover, the work has often been done in a spirit of deep sincerity and devotion to Christian principles. Yet I doubt whether any but a small minority of teachers would be so bold as to say that the work which they themselves were allowed and able to do in this way gave their schools as a whole any title to be called establishments in which "Christian Education" was practised. Education does not become Christian simply because it incorporates in a part of its system Christian worship and teaching.

This leads straight on to a second consideration, which is the really vital factor in the problem under discussion. Granted an opening act of corporate worship, sincerely and devoutly performed; granted also a full measure of religious instruction, carried out by devoted Christian teachers; it still remains true that a great measure of the good accomplished at these times can be almost entirely undone, and the whole position largely prejudiced against the Christian standpoint, by subsequent teaching given in another subject by another teacher. We must be entirely fair in this matter. A teacher who sincerely holds, for the sake of example, a strictly "scientific" or materialistic

philosophy of life can hardly be expected not to impart something of his views to his pupils in the classroom. With all the good-will in the world, restraint is impossible if his views, a vital part to him of the subject which he teaches, are strongly and sincerely held. Yet the results, from the Christian point of view, can be and naturally are sometimes disastrous. I would go so far as to say that, whenever it can be proved that boys and girls lose an incipient Christian faith through teaching given them at their schools, it is not normally due to incompetent or pernicious religious instruction, but much more often to frankly anti-Christian views propounded elsewhere in the curriculum, or absorbed through books which have been recommended for reading in connection with a given subject. This comment applies to the boarding-school system as well as to the day-school, though certainly the Chapel of the boarding-school, along with the varied opportunities for teaching and witness which it automatically admits, does provide a powerful corrective influence against anti-Christian teaching which may be absorbed elsewhere.

Do not misunderstand me. I am not saying that education as at present constituted is root and branch anti-Christian. Indeed, my gorge never fails to rise at the suggestion sometimes put forward that the pagan condition of much of the country's youth can be ascribed almost entirely to the shortcomings of education. The teaching profession as a body is tacitly admitting that all is not as it should be within its own camp, by the almost universal desire which its members are showing for religious worship and instruction to be incorporated in the daily routine of all schools. It is totally unfair to infer from this that the educational world alone is responsible for the widespread ignorance among the young of the elementals of the Christian faith. This is a digression, though it is worth making in the interests of fair-play.

To return to my point, I have tried to show you that an educational system is not ipso facto made Christian by the mere provision of times for worship and religious instruction. Undoubtedly the ideal of "Christian Education" is brought nearer, but it is not accomplished.

What then is "Christian Education?" It is very difficult to give a definition which is concise and at the same time comprehensive. Let me make the attempt, however, by saying that "Christian Education" is the synthesizing of all knowledge in the light of the Christian revelation. That involves the impartation of knowledge in a particular way. It means that all teaching about man, his nature, his development, his doings, the world in which he lives, his past and present achievements and his future hopes, will be given against the background of the essentially Christian doctrine of God's creative, purposive, redemptive activity, unfolding itself throughout the ages and culminating in the revelation of Himself given through His Son. This is not to say that explicit Christian doctrine is perpetually to be dragged into the History and Biology lessons, to take examples, but simply that "Christian Education," if the term is to have real meaning, must be fully comprehensive in its range and synthetic in its purpose; its aim must always be to impart knowledge in such a way that the various branches of truth are seen as an indivisible whole, unified by the only factor that ever unifies knowledge, namely, the comprehen-



sively redemptive purpose of God for man and his world of existence. The colours of the rainbow blend into a unity within the setting of the bow and against the background of the sky. In much the same way, the different branches of knowledge combine into a unity when they are viewed within the setting of the Christian interpretation of life. We must posit nothing less than this for the scope and purpose of "Christian Education."

One word should be added, before we leave this part of our subject. It is a commonplace that the business of education is not merely to implant the facts of knowledge, but equally to foster the full growth and development of personality. From what has been said so far, it should be perfectly clear, without further stress, that in "Christian Education" the proper development of the characters of the taught is a paramount obligation on the part of the teacher. It should hardly be necessary to add that in "Christian Education" the development of mind and character will proceed the more unitedly and harmoniously, just because of the Christian conception of the essential wholeness and unity of all truth, a conception which is fundamental to a Christian interpretation of life. The point need not be laboured, not because it is unimportant, (on the contrary, it is of cardinal importance), but because it so obviously follows from our previous premises, based on the true meaning of "Christian Education." Yet it must not be inferred from all this, as is sometimes done, that the development of Christian character, springing from conversion, is the sole or even the primary end of "Christian Education." That is supremely the responsibility of the Church and the home. Education's primary province is the mind, and its primary duty is to instruct.

In the Christian view, it is obvious that mental and moral developments are inseparable, but in admitting that we must not confuse the relative order of obligations to which "Christian Education" is committed as an educative process.

## II. THE PRACTICABILITY OF "CHRISTIAN EDUCATION."

I pass on now to a second consideration, namely, whether "Christian Education" as thus defined is attainable under the actual educational conditions with which we have to reckon now or in the future.

Clearly, this question answers itself; for "Christian Education," on the terms outlined, is only possible for teachers who are Christian, and these constitute only a part of the whole teaching body. "Christian Education" will be practised wherever men and women are teaching who have a Christian outlook on life, but only there, at least with any deliberate intention. To this limited extent only, therefore, the ideal is practicable and actually being practised. As in every other sphere of Christian living and witness, the problem centres itself in individual personalities.

The Bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich is reported to have said recently: "The best and highest contribution the Church can make towards the educational system of the country is to provide from among her members Christian men and women who will enter the teaching profession as a vocation." In my view that exactly hits the central nail on the head. It correctly focusses the essential problem of "Christian Education" and at the same time suggests

the right method for its attainment in practice. It stresses the direction in which the energies of the Church ought to be expended, and in my estimation has a clear bearing, for example, on the very vexed question of the Dual System in education. I cannot claim experiential knowledge in this matter, and therefore speak with some diffidence. Nevertheless, it seems to me that if even a part of the time and energy and money, which the Church at present expends in a frequently losing fight to keep pace with the demands of modern educational equipment, were diverted instead to the supply and training of Christian teachers, there would be a vastly richer return in the matter of "Christian Education." We must put things in their right order of importance, the spiritual before the material, the equipment of the teacher before the equipment of the establishment. If the Church cannot find the means for both these needs in her own schools, she should fearlessly concentrate on the more important, the human factor, and by so doing engage on her true, her essential task in this particular matter, to make the country's education as a whole more Christian by her constant supply of Christian teachers to the profession.

This argument gains increased weight from the present public demand that is being so insistently made, namely, that religious instruction and the opportunity for daily worship should be given in all schools of the country. The Church looks like being presented with an unparalleled occasion for service, if she can call out consecrated men and women to enter the teaching profession. The present demand constitutes the clearest imaginable invitation to the Christian community to exercise its real, its redemptive function in society. It is well to face the fact that in some quarters at least the present demand does not spring from the highest motives, being occasioned by mere fright at the juvenile delinquency figures and their obvious connexion with the loss of Christian teaching and moral standards. But that makes no difference to the scope of the spiritual opportunity in education which is likely to be offered to the Church in the near future, when the new Educational Bill comes to be drafted. In this connexion, consider also another equally insistent educational demand which is being voiced at the present time, namely, the demand for equality of opportunity in the schools. This demand is not being made specifically in the light of Christian principles, but few would deny that an essentially Christian principle is in fact involved in the demand, and the realization of equal educational opportunities for all would automatically present the Christian teacher with a more congenial atmosphere and a wider field in which to carry on his work.

Viewed from every angle, the challenge to the Church is very great, which is only another way of saying that she is being presented with an almost unprecedented opportunity to translate into action the ideal of "Christian Education." It would be mere blind optimism, and would go contrary to the facts of Christian experience, to suggest that the ideal of "Christian Education" can ever be fully attained; like every other Christian ideal, its effectiveness in practice is limited, being conditioned on the one hand by the supply of Christian teachers, and on the other by the imperfect human situation in which it has to be worked out. Yet we must not on that account either water down the ideal which is set before us in "Christian Education," or fail to

recognize the opportunity which is being offered to the Church to put the ideal into greatly increased practice, through the supply from its ranks of Christian teachers deeply imbued with a sense of their vocation.

To sum up, "Christian Education" is preferable as a term to "Religious Education," because it gives a more distinct and definite picture of what we mean and want as Christian people. By "Christian Education" we mean the process of imparting knowledge to the young against the background of the Christian interpretation of life, in such a way that all life and truth is seen to make sense and form a composite whole, through the unifying purpose of God's creative and redemptive activity in man and in his world of existence. To be able to educate the young in this sense, a teacher must of necessity himself possess the Christian outlook on life. Therefore in practice "Christian Education" can never be anything but a partially realised ideal, because there will always be some teachers who either in part or in whole do not subscribe to the Christian outlook. The Christian community must not on that account limit the embrace of its ideal; with a clear conception of what it means and wants by "Christian Education," the Church must strive to turn the ideal into an increasingly practised reality, by training and equipping members from among its ranks to enter the teaching profession with a full sense of engaging in a God-given vocation. In this way, the Church will not only be concentrating on the essential core of a problem which concerns her most intimately, but will also be answering the challenge of a remarkable opportunity which is being tacitly presented to her, to engage in the redemptive service which it is her essential function to give, in the name and power of her Master, Jesus Christ.

## Public Worship.

FACT—CAUSE—REMEDY.

BY THE REV. RUSSELL B. WHITE, M.A.

**W**E are constantly reminded in these days that the Christian Church is a minority movement, and that this minority tends to grow less rather than more. It is easy enough for us to imagine that the problem of church attendance is peculiar to our own time, especially when comparing the numbers who present themselves for public worship to-day, with those vast crowds who went tidily to church every Lord's Day during the Victorian era. Yet in essence this problem is one which like the poor "is always with us," in greater or lesser degree. Men sneered at the Psalmist (Ps. xxii), saying "He trusted in the Lord that He would deliver him, seeing he delighted in Him." The times of the prophets were times of neglect of public worship. So too in our Lord's own day, and throughout the whole course of subsequent history, even in spite of the seemingly harsh legislation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, there has never been a full worshipping community in the ideal sense.

Nevertheless, granted that this be true, we are passing through a period in which the habit of church-going continues to dwindle. As the Archbishop of Canterbury said in Convocation towards the close of last year—"There is yet no sign of a return on any considerable scale to habits of regular attendance at church services." It is perhaps correct to assume that on certain special occasions, Days of National Prayer, our Churches have been crowded to the doors, but this has been more in the nature of an emotional response to external circumstances of dire need and utter helplessness, rather than to any real desire to attend the House of God. Even these special occasions have shewn, by comparing the numbers who attended the first Day of National Prayer on May 26th 1940 with subsequent days of a similar character, that there is no deeply-seated urge to worship, within the professed Christian community of our country. Let me hasten to say that the blame cannot be laid wholly at the doors of the church. There has not been much encouragement upon the part of those in high places. Had a real lead been given say from the earliest days of the war by members of the government, we might perhaps have witnessed a return to institutional religion, which would have left its mark upon the people of this country for many years to come. As this has been lacking, we can but look for the ultimate solution to the problem in a revival of the spiritual life of our nation, and for this we must pray and work, and seize every opportunity to share in efforts towards this end. There then is the glaring fact, that although the situation is not entirely new, nevertheless the vast majority of our people to-day are outside the Christian Church.

Now worship in any form has always been the means of meeting some deeply rooted need or instinct of mankind. The study of anthropology makes this clear to us. In our western world, worship comes as a living tradition. Our noble cathedrals, our beautiful parish churches, the Houses of God built by men of all denominations, are evidence of this, Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregational, Baptist, Church of England, Roman Catholic, nor must we forget the Society of Friends, the Salvation Army and perhaps others; all these organised groups, recognise worship as, at the very least, one of their main activities. Yet, in spite of this, the numbers sharing in public worship to-day are lamentably small.

This is not the time nor place to trace the History of the Idea of Worship. That has been ably done in such tomes as Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, and also in "Christ and the Gospels." It is generally agreed that the idea of 'Christian Worship' sprung from the worshipping community of the synagogue; that although at first, there was a Daily Meeting (Acts ii. 46), the emphasis gradually came to be laid upon the 'First Day of the Week.' Worship then consisted of five main characteristics—*Prayer*: followed by "Amen" by all present, *Praise*: i.e., a Hymn such as the Benedictus, the Magnificat, the Nunc Dimittis etc., still used in the services of the Church of England, *Scripture Readings*: as in the Synagogue worship, *Instruction*: or if you like to call it so—the Sermon and what very speedily fell into disuse, *Speaking with tongues*. Now it seems to me that if Worship to-day is to satisfy the deepest instincts of man, these characteristics in some form or other must be present; and

although I do not wish to speak from any denominational bias, it is true that the Church of England in her formularies adequately provides for them. The question before us is—"How can we make them so vital, so real, that they will awaken in men's hearts a desire to worship God with their fellow-men?"

The answer to this question is not so easy, for every branch of the professing Church of Christ to-day, in spite of, and in the case of some more than others, the rich heritage they enjoy, is hidebound by traditions and shibboleths. In the Beveridge Report recently issued, suggesting a Utopia in this present world, and lulling the minds of people into a false security, these pregnant words occur. "In a moment of world ferment, this is a time for revolutions and not patchings." It may be that in the organised church to-day, we shall have to realise that something similar is needed, if we are to win back the people to our churches, "Revolutions and not Patchings."

Let us go on to consider what we call ordinary church services. If they are to prove of any real value to worshippers, certain things are required. They must be interpretative of the facts unique to Christian experience; they must be vital, that is, they must be relevant to the needs of the ordinary man; they must shew creative imagination they must be conducted in a sincere manner; and the Leader himself must be a truly converted and consecrated man, with some knowledge of 'Group' psychology. Let us take these points one by one.

1. *The services of the church must be interpretative of the facts of Christian experience*—the grace of God, forgiveness of sin, reconciliation with God, the surrendering of our lives to God's service through Jesus Christ, and newness of life through His resurrection power. Therein lies the core of worship, for in worship, man comes with all his human need and imperfections to meet with God. Worship can only be offered by the one who really seeks to come into contact with God. That is the peculiar content of Christian worship, the breaking through into God's Holy Presence, in prayer and in praise, that so there may be a greater response to the claims of God in all experiences of life. Divorce Christian worship from the basic facts of our Christian experience, and Christian worship is more or less denuded of its very right to exist. The so-called 'Popular' services of to-day, which have sprung up all around, not only in Churches of every denomination, but in Cathedrals as well, can prove of no lasting value, for they have no sheet anchor of doctrine, without which there can be little real satisfaction of man's natural instinct to worship.

2. *Public Worship must be vital.* It must be enshrined in such a frame-work that the average man understands religion to be something which has to do with his everyday life. Too often the public services of the church are looked upon, by those who are responsible for arranging them, as the requisite devotional exercise of the religious community. On the other hand, the average layman is seeking a mode of worship which will help him to apply his faith to his daily round and common task. There seems to be the crux of the whole problem. Creed (as expressed in public worship) and Conduct. Both of course are essentials, but whereas the average parson is looked upon as one who only cares about church worship, the layman fails just here, that he does not realise that the Christian life can never reach its

fulness, except through the acknowledgment of God in public worship. To relate the two,—public worship must express the sovereignty of God over every detail of life both in the realm of devotion and that of conduct. To listen to the services in some churches and likewise to the parson's peroration in his sermon, is sufficient to indicate what I mean. To use a trite saying—the parson himself must not be “too heavenly minded to be of any earthly use.” Whilst it is true that public worship must be based upon the fundamentals of our Christian experience, these fundamentals must be so applied, as that they will shew that there can be no redemption of international, national or social or individual life, except through the application of Christian standards and principles. Only so, can God's will be understood. Public Worship, if it is to realise its end, must be related to details of everyday living. We must seek to shew that Conversion is not purely a momentary experience, but a constant renewing of the mind in every attitude of thought and conduct.

The Tambaram Report (1938) seems to sum up the whole position so clearly, stressing as it does the relation of the individual to the community. It says—“Though the Christian's worship must be first of all, his personal and individual response to his Heavenly Father's love, he soon learns that in his Heavenly Father's presence, there can be no isolation, and his “I” “Thou” must always pass into “Our Father.” Corporate worship is the natural expression of our incorporation into the family of Christ.” We need to bear that in mind, especially in these days, when because we are so actively engaged in different forms of national service, we are inclined to forget our responsibility towards the family. But the report goes on—“The Christian is saved by an Incarnate Lord; therefore the tide of the daily common task of man must flow through his worship. That worship will not be fully Christian unless the needs and questions of his own day, the realities of social, economic and national life, are submitted to the light of God's Holy Spirit for conviction, for intercession, for guidance and inspiration.” It goes on—“The Christian is saved by a Crucified Lord; therefore his worship can be no mere escape from the harshness of life, but a dedication and empowering for witness and service.” Again, “The Christian is saved by a Risen and Ascended Lord, in Whose Name he prays with a sense of victory and triumph, in unison with the whole family in heaven and earth.” But we pass on.

3. *Public Worship must show Creative Imagination.* It is true that every nation and every denomination has something to contribute to the enrichment of Divine Worship. We have such a rich heritage, and we must never undervalue the traditional forms which have been handed down to us, for they have helped to mould the very best in our national life. But too frequently the services in our churches are lifeless and mechanical. It seems so tragic that anything done in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, should appear to the worshipper to be dull and uninteresting. I am writing after a meeting on Wednesday last of our Prayer Watchers Groups in my parish, of which I cannot say much now, but where as the result of the report of one of the Conveners, this very point cropped up. Worship, it is true, should be a giving, and not merely a getting. Yet how frequently those who come to church find the services boring and stuffy. Is it any wonder

that some go away asking "Is it worth while?" There is a lack of imagination on the part of those who are responsible for Divine Worship. Surely, even in those denominations where traditional forms are used, it is possible to allow our imagination to have such play, as will truly vitalise the very prayers we read and the praise we offer. Often the homely touch is all that is needed, for example a word or two before the Scripture Readings, an explanation of the reason why certain special prayers are to be offered, and so on.

4. *Public Worship must be evident of a truly sincere Christian spirit.* Here perhaps the clergy are to blame, although not entirely, for public worship should aim to be as congregational as possible. The Church of England is at an advantage on this point, for approximately two-thirds of its form of service is shared by those present. Nevertheless so much depends upon the personal element. The Leader of Public Worship must remember that he is there not to make the service a means of self-expression, for we can sometimes make hideous caricatures of our real selves by the tones and gestures we adopt, but to lead his people in worship into the presence of God. Of Archbishop Benson it is said by one who knew him intimately, "I never did and I believe I never shall see anything that spoke so loudly for the Church of England as never to be put away, as did the morning service in Eversley Church, whether he read or whether he preached." While the Master prayed, we are told that the fashion of His countenance was altered. So may ours be. And whether the congregation understand it or notice it, or not, this they ought to be able to say—"It is good for us to be here." This is something deeper than ritual or ceremony or even liturgical form, it is really the outcome of the Minister's life of devotion. I am convinced that the sincerity of the parson, who is intent himself upon the service he is rendering, is something of major importance in the conduct of Divine Worship.

I have been dealing with these points rather in the abstract. Let us now turn to the more practical issues. How can we so re-vitalise our Church services, so as to make it possible for the men and women of to-day to use them as a means of grace for everyday life?

1. *Candidates for the ministry in every denomination should receive more thorough instruction in the conduct of public worship.* A knowledge of theology and an understanding of Christian Doctrine are most important, but there is the practical side of our pastoral ministry as well. Every Ordination candidate should receive a special course of instruction in the method of conducting Divine Worship. This will not merely mean Voice Production, which is essential, but he should have some appreciation of English literature, so that in the reading of the prayers and particularly the Scriptures, the Word of God should be conveyed as a Living Power to the heart of every worshipper. Likewise as required in the Free Churches; he should be trained either in the art of framing prayers, which should always be in simple straightforward language, or to read set prayers in such a manner as that they will be a real spiritual uplift to all who are present. In this connection, the choice of a suitable post, that is whether after Ordination he should be appointed to a large or small church, ought to be decided, not only upon a man's academic and spiritual qualifications, but upon such concerns as to whether his voice will or will not carry.

This may seem a trivial point, but it is one of vital importance to those who worship in any particular church Sunday after Sunday.

2. *Creative Imagination.* Here it is imperative that Leaders of Public Worship should have at least an elementary knowledge of Group Psychology. It is quite obvious that a form of service suitable for a village congregation cannot possibly satisfy the spiritual needs of a worshipper in a town church. There are some who are especially gifted for the conduct of the one who are entirely unsuited to render Divine Service in the other. Further there are some whose qualifications are more academic than pastoral and vice-versa. Here again those responsible for appointments need to exercise greater care in their selection of men to fill vacancies. But even so, sometimes suitable men, who are quite capable of ministering to a congregation of average size, are a complete failure, when for a Parade Service, or say a Day of National Prayer, their churches are thronged with worshippers. It is here that Group Psychology comes in, and an understanding of the needs of the varying types of worshippers, who crowd to church on such a day. Creative imagination is required, and the service must be so arranged as to awaken a response in the heart of every worshipper.

Yet in the ordinary services the same creative talent is essential. Call it what you please, "Liturgical experimentation" if you like, but to meet the needs of a new age, every denomination, every school of thought, must be prepared to adjust its services accordingly. In the Established Church, we must use our Evangelical genius to produce new forms of worship, albeit entirely consistent with our heritage. It may mean the creation of special services. Youth, for example, is growing more and more impatient with set forms and traditional practice. There is nothing in the Church of England Prayer Book which caters for youth, and its special needs. Here then is a glorious opportunity to shew creative imagination. Youth must be allowed, under proper guidance of course, to take a considerable share in services which are arranged especially for them. Leaders of the Youth Groups in our parishes should be specially trained for this purpose. Of course, in the Free Churches, there is already opportunity for considerable experiment. But in all cases we must beware lest we yield too much to the sentiment of a generation which is inclined to scatter everything that speaks of tradition to the four corners of the earth. The same thought applies to special services for men, and perhaps even for women. Not that these services must be the end, but rather, having won the outsider to such a type of service, he may be led on to the more usual form of congregational worship. The trouble is that we are so bound by conventions and rules, that the unimaginative parson, I will not say the lazy parson, is perfectly content to carry on, living upon the heritage of a past age. Let the 'old men have their dreams, and hope for the best, but let the young men see visions of the glorious possibilities which are theirs,' and let them translate these visions into reality.

3. *Further, in regard to Public Worship, there should be some unifying element, some single thought, pervading the whole service.* Too often our hymns, our prayers and the sermon are completely divorced from one another. Let me give you an example of what I mean. I am speaking



from the angle of the Church of England Service. I have chosen for my Church's motto this year, "Be strong . . . for God hath power to help" (II Chron. xxv. 8) On the first Sunday of the New Year, at the morning service, I preached upon that text, but I tried to make its message the keynote of the whole service. The service opened with the hymn "Soldiers of Christ arise" with the verse "Strong in the Lord of Hosts. . . ." Then followed the sentence from Isaiah "They that wait upon the Lord . . . shall renew their strength." So we went to prayer, and then to the Psalm emphasising "God is our Refuge and Strength . . ." The first lesson was the chapter in which the motto text occurs, the second that incomparable passage from Ephesians, in which the verse comes "Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord. . . ." The Anthem which came later constantly repeated the words, sung in unison by a strong choir of voices with real conviction, "Be strong." Then followed prayers with the same theme, after which came the sermon upon the motto text "Be strong, for God hath power to help." At the close of the sermon, there was no hurried Ascription "And now to God the Father . . .," but a prayer that God would grant to us all a consciousness of His power to help during all the days of this coming year, whatever the future might bring. The service ended with a fine hymn written by Frances Ridley Havergal, which again stressed the same thought, and as the worshippers left the church, the organist extemporised upon the hymn with which we commenced the service, "Strong in the Lord of Hosts. . . ." I have reason to believe that no one present could fail to remember the underlying message "Be strong . . . for God hath power to help." Of course I know that it is not always possible to do this, especially if a visiting preacher is coming. It may be an ideal, but it is an ideal at which every service should aim, and for which we ought to strive. A single organic idea.

4. *Public Worship should allow for opportunities of Quiet before God.* Periods of silence might come either at the end of extempore prayer, or at the close of the said prayers, just before the prayer of St. Chrysostom. Sometimes at the close of the sermon a time of silent prayer will prove most helpful and effective. We need more waiting upon God. Extempore prayer demands a magnitude of concentration if the worshipper is to follow throughout, and often such prayer depends too much upon the mood of the minister who offers it. Set forms of prayer, in spite of constant repetition, and perhaps because of it, do allow the true worshipper who may follow the prayers in his Prayer Book, to enter the more easily into the spirit of each petition. On the other hand, it is vital that such set forms of prayer be said reverently and with meaning, and not rushed through as is the case in some churches. But granted all this, periods of silence enable the soul to recuperate, and prevent spiritual indigestion, which may be just as harmful to the soul as physical indigestion is to the body. Times of silence can sometimes seal the dedication of a life to God, who knows?

5. *Public Worship must be conducted upon dignified lines.* There must be no trace of slovenliness in the service. Too often clergy imagine that in order to make their service appeal, or as they say to have a more homely effect, dignity must be cast to the winds. But the contrary is the case. A single jarring note may spoil the whole

effect for one of the worshippers. I refer here to the outward setting, as well as to the conduct of the service. A Church, however poor architecturally the building may be, should be kept spotlessly clean, even to the hassocks in the back pew. There is nothing uplifting in a church which is full of dust and cobwebs, too often associated in the mind of the man in the street with church worship. Cleanliness is next to godliness, but too often the reverse is noticeable in our churches to-day. And in the conduct of the service. Is there any reason whatsoever why reverence and orderliness should be looked upon as the prerogative of the High Church Party. Surely as Evangelicals, we can present our worship to God, in however humble a building, in a manner worthy of Him to Whom we come to pay our homage. Again, there is nothing more distracting than that a Minister, who has left the List of Notices or his Sermon Notes upon the Vestry table, should leave his seat suddenly in the middle of a hymn, in order to recover them. Everything in vestment, in gesture and in posture should be so ordered as to bring no disturbing element into the mind of the worshipper. The Leader should be so engrossed in Divine Worship that all who see him will want to copy his example. That of course applies also to the surreptitious glances, which we sometimes cast over our congregations to see who is there and who is not there. I know that some people would be mortally offended if their Minister did not notice that they were present or absent, but let such a survey of the congregation be taken at a point in the service, where it will be least distracting to the greater number present. Remember in this respect the injunction of the Apostle, "Let everything be done in decency and in order." So likewise with special services, parade services for example. It is a very poor advertisement, apart from the confusion caused, and particularly to the Colonels of Units who are in charge, if there has been no careful preparation beforehand. It takes me weeks to arrange for the seating of 1,100 people in my church, but it makes all the difference to the smooth running of the service throughout. Remember, too, Punctuality, which Cecil Rhodes says is "the method of business." These are points which all affect the mind of the worshipper who would share in the worship of any church Sunday by Sunday.

Perhaps I have said enough. You may think that all this has centred upon the ideal rather than upon the practical. It may be so, so far as many of you are concerned. I have but related to you my own personal experiences in my parish church, which holds 940 people. Further, I have in mind that some of us are dealing with young people, who will be the backbone of our Church life in the days to come. For them we need to present Church Life and Worship at its very best. Let them see that our generation is taking this matter seriously, and they will want to follow in our tread. I plead for a new attitude towards public worship. "As it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be," might have been adequate for a Victorian age, but if we are to capture the interest and enthusiasm of a rising generation, we shall have to revolutionise our ways. The whole Church of Christ in this country will have to give heed to this urgent question. It is for that reason that I welcome criticisms of my Church Services. Not that I always agree, nor do I put into practise all the suggestions

that are offered. But I take a mental note of them all, endeavouring to weave any which may be helpful into the general structure of the service, and thus church worship becomes more and more the vital energetic channel of the grace of God, and worshippers learn the truth of the old dictum—"Man's chief end is to glorify God, and to enjoy Him for ever."

## Book Reviews

### PRAISE OF GLORY.

By E. I. Watkin. iv and 280 pp. Sheed and Ward, 1943, 10/6.

This commentary of thirteen chapters on Lauds and Vespers is by a Roman Catholic layman, who was received into the Roman Church at Downside at the age of twenty years. Mr. Watkin is known for his philosophical and theological writings and for his translation of Halevy's "History of the English People" and Maritain's "Introduction to Philosophy."

The Catholic News-Letter has pointed out that "lay scholars have exerted a very powerful influence upon the development of the Breviary," and it is therefore fitting that a layman should write a commentary showing such a keen understanding and appreciation of the Hours of the Roman Breviary. The Roman Church is fortunate in having a layman so well-informed and so well-versed in liturgiology that he is able to supply a running commentary on the Psalms and other parts of the two Offices, skilfully explaining the intricacies of the Common and Proper of Saints, proposing thoughts which will be helpful in interpreting the chief themes and in following the leitmotif of the days, and at the same time injecting little personal notes which considerably add to the interest of the book. It is essentially an endeavour to interpret to the layman the potential spiritual value in the Offices when they are prayerfully and thoughtfully followed, either privately or publicly.

Mr. Watkin is thorough-going in his acceptance of Roman dogma and superstition. The idea of the Mass, Mariolatry, and the sacerdotal system has thoroughly taken hold of him. The term "saint" is used in the non-Scriptural limited sense. "St. John Fisher" is quoted as such. On page 29 we read that "the Mother of Christ's physical body is also the Mother of His mystical body." The words of the Magnificat, "My Spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour" are skilfully interpreted, "For her complete freedom from sin was the choicest fruit of the salvation wrought by her Son. Not less, but more than sinners-pardoned was she saved." It is, however, good to see (p. 42) that the title "the Sword of the Spirit" is correctly applied to "the Word of God." An interesting interpretation of the *Benedicite* includes this statement, "I suggest that we should take the spirits and souls of the righteous to mean the holy souls in purgatory; the saints and the humble of heart to mean the saints in heaven." Imagination knows no bounds! In quoting the R.C. version of Genesis 3. 15, "She shall crush thy head," a footnote is added, "the literal meaning of the human writer of Genesis is not in question here, but the inner meaning, the meaning intended by the Holy Ghost."

The author confesses that there is no attempt to correct the numerous mis-translations of the Vulgate Psalter by reference to more accurate versions. Instead the line is taken that the Psalter actually in use has been hallowed by the centuries, and that therefore spiritual truths should be sought from the text as it stands. Mystical interpretations abound. However, reference is made to the new translations and Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley's books are mentioned. The author dislikes the word "sweetness" and suggests that the word "should have no place in an English religious vocabulary."

Cranmer's literary genius is praised on page 27 for its replacing the Latin rhythms of the Collects by the longer rhythms of English prose, instead of an attempted literal translation. It is added, "Lord Bute in his translation of the Breviary had the wisdom to make use of Cranmer's Collects whenever an Anglican Collect translates a Catholic." The author, who was educated at St. Paul's

School, testifies to the value of being made to learn the collect each Sunday while at school.

On the controversial question as to which is the culminating point of the sacrifice of the Mass, Mr. Watkin sides with Father Parsch that it is at the People's "Amen" rather than at the elevation.

Here and there are some rather unfair generalisations. The writer, like most Roman Catholics, classes the Hammer and Sickle, like the Swastika and Fasces, as the mark of the Beast. He several times classes Communism with Hitlerite totalitarianism in such close juxtaposition that some resentment is felt. "The Spanish Reds," it is asserted "proscribed God's worship," and "were supported by many who professed faith in God, because their victims were Catholics." Franco's treatment of Protestants is not exactly exemplary!

The book bears the Imprimatur of Dr. F. J. Spellman, Archbishop of New York, recently in the news because of his secret mission to Rome. Except for some weak punctuation the book is well-printed and it is attractively bound.

G.D.S.

#### TAKEN AT THE FLOOD.

*By Kenneth Ingram. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. 6/-.*

Thoughtful people in all the allied countries are now trying to understand the full significance of current events. It is no easy task and it can only be accomplished by becoming almost completely detached from one's present environment and set free to take a long-term view of the future. In other words this world war must be contemplated in its widest perspective. This is the aim in the thought-provoking book of Mr. Kenneth Ingram. He is mainly concerned "to discover what qualities we shall require if we are to survive the storm which has descended upon us . . . and what sort of vitality we must manifest if we are to carry out the immense task of building a new civilization."

He deals with it in six chapters in which the present world conditions are brought up to date in close relation to its background. This is done under the headings of Twilight of a Civilization, In Search of a New Religious Synthesis, The Church faces Social Problems, Beliefs—Ancient and Modern, Devotional Practice—Old and New, and finally, Apologia Hea. Each of these chapters is packed full with suggestive thoughts and many clergy will be glad to ponder over them and in due course pass them on to their congregations. The last chapter is concerned with Mr. Ingram's spiritual pilgrimage. In his youthful days he became strongly attached to a well-known Anglo-Catholic Church which was then basking in the sunshine of a comparatively new and vigorous and popular spiritual movement. There were then no Sunday cinemas or other amenities in serious competition, and Anglo-Catholicism was attracting many who were entirely uninfluenced by those great preachers in London who, unconscious of their waning authority, had made no attempt to move with the times. In the opinion of Mr. Ingram the "young men whom Anglo-Catholicism had gathered round itself were not particularly devout. We were attracted to the church because we enjoyed its services much more than any of the recreations with which we might have occupied our Sundays. . . . In this phase a series of congresses at the Albert Hall were a spectacular demonstration of strength, and in this atmosphere I was conscious at first of nothing which distracted me from my youthful loyalties." But before very long, disillusionment came and his Anglo-Catholic enthusiasms weakened, and he was conscious of a growing sympathy with the principles of Socialism which deepened into the belief that the Soviet Revolution was the biggest and most important Movement in the world. "The former religious issues had become irrelevant because the process of history was throwing up new issues of a far more crucial nature . . . It was not a dramatic apostasy since it involved no formal renunciations and no break of communion with the Church." Later on he came in contact with John MacMurray and he became convinced that "the forces which were impelling me to take a more active part in the struggle to achieve a new order, were themselves innately religious." He found he was not alone in this search after Ultimate Reality and he is now associated in the organization known as "Common Wealth" which is a development of Sir Richard Acland's "Forward March." He believes that a door has been opened into a new and better world and those who go in "to explore and employ the potentiality of human personality" can do so without the abandonment of any essential element in the Christian gospel."

This book is a particularly interesting study for those who are endeavouring to think out the ultimate implications of the recent addresses of the Archbishop of Canterbury and Christian statesmen of the calibre of Sir William Beveridge.

J. W. AUGUR.

#### SCIENCE, CHRISTIANITY AND TRUTH.

By A. E. Baker. (*Eyre and Spottiswoode. Price 6/-*).

This book might be described as a popular work in Religious and Christian Apologetics. At present, Religion in general and Christianity in particular are under a cloud. The assumption of Science that to arrive at truth we must tread the way of doubt has so commended itself to the popular mind that doubt and unbelief has infected all our thinking. The need for a statement on the 'right relation between science and religion' is therefore a very pressing one, and Canon Baker's book is 'a contribution to this, stated in untechnical language.'

What is Science? It is, as Canon Baker implies, the application of the idea of causality to the sequences of nature with a view to knowing how things work. In Science 'we are dealing only with physical entities, that is, matter and energy.' Since, however, 'men become what they study,' the scientific interest in, leads to the scientific attitude towards, the universe. The scientist treats the universe as a machine which 'has no constructor and serves no purpose,' and in consequence comes to believe that this is the whole 'truth' about it. Canon Baker bids us look in turn at the universe, at life, and at man as a religious being, with the aid of scientific spectacles, and while he continuously commends the scientific spirit to his readers, he never fails to warn them against the scientific, that is, the materialistic temper and to present them with the view of reality, seen through the spectacles of religion. In an excellent chapter on 'The Limitations of Science' the conclusion is reached that scientific 'truth' is not intrinsic but instrumental. Science 'is an artificial creation of the mind, devised, not to obtain knowledge or provide truth, but to control Nature.' In the light of this conclusion, the social relations of Natural Science are discussed. Finally, the 'truth' of Religion and of Christianity is presented and assessed in two chapters, one unhappily headed 'Is there a God?', and the other 'The Truth of Christianity.'

Canon Baker's account of Science leaves little to be desired, but the same cannot be said about his treatment of Religion and Christianity. In the first place, he seems to assume that the presence of Religion as a "fundamentally unique element in human nature" justifies the conclusion that 'all the different religions . . . involve a unique kind of contact with reality,' so that 'Religion . . . is fellowship with God.' Such a conclusion, however, is not necessarily true at all. Religion may mean fellowship not with God but with 'demons,' that is, with powers other than God. Indeed, as regards much Religion, the criticism of the psychologist that it 'speaks of the nature of man, not of the nature of reality,' and of the sociologist that it is 'a witness to (the) need of God, not a witness to the existence of God' is relevant. As Professor H. G. Wood remarks in his book 'Christianity and Civilisation,' 'religion may be and is often a form of escapism' in the bad sense of that term. There is thus 'bad' Religion as well as 'good,' so that we cannot make religion as such the starting point of a spiritual apologetic.

Again, Canon Baker makes much of the doctrine of the so-called 'autonomy of Religion' usually associated with the name of Schleiermacher. Apparently he means that Religion is one avenue to truth among many. In that case we seem to be landed in a kind of departmental approach to truth, and the result is not necessarily one of harmony among the departments! Even our author deplors the result of such an approach, for he writes that, in the modern world, 'Religion tends to become one activity among many.'

The fact is that not even 'the great stream of Christian experience which is the Catholic Church' can be made the basis of anything more than 'natural authority . . . comparable to the authority of natural science,' once we take Religion as such as our basis. Canon Baker sees this clearly, and so, for a 'supernatural authority' he falls back on something which 'the Church claims over the life, and belief, and devotion of its members,' for to him even 'the authority of the New Testament is that it contains the classical statement of the Christian *experience* (the italics are mine) of salvation through Christ,' and this experience, we are told, 'began in unmediated relationship with Incarnate God.' Surely, however, the authority of the New Testament is that it contains the

apostolic witness to the Word of God Incarnate, and, far from being 'unmediated,' this witness is mediated through that of the Old Testament Scriptures, as these find their fulfilment in the life, death and resurrection of the Word Incarnate. In other words, there is in the apostolic witness what Dr. John Baillie has called 'a conjunction of immediacy with mediacy.' By substituting 'experience' for the prophetic and apostolic witness to the Word of God, and then falling back on the authority of the Church as 'the direct authority of Christ present in the Body,' Canon Baker would appear to have seriously departed from the true Biblical basis of Christian 'Truth.'

E.S.

#### THE HOLY COMMUNION: AN ATTEMPT AT A DEVOTIONAL STUDY.

*By Canon Spencer Leeson, Headmaster of Winchester College. Longmans. 2/6.*

For more than thirty years the former Bishop of London had asked each year some prominent Churchman to prepare a book which might be useful for Lenten reading. Many of these books reached a high standard of excellence in this class of literature, and some of them we should have been sorry to have been without. Only a very small number of them, however, were written by Evangelicals. The new Bishop of London has continued now for two or three years the custom of his predecessor, but we are still looking for one to be the work of an Evangelical. We should have been particularly pleased to have had a devotional study on the Sacrament of Holy Communion from another point of view than that which lies before us.

There is very much that is helpful in Canon Leeson's book, and we have been greatly inspired by some of its thoughts. Unfortunately, however, there are many things in it which prevent us from recommending it without a warning, to our readers. For example, the first chapter begins with an enumeration of the "seven sacraments." There is no suggestion that the term sacrament, in the fullness of its meaning should be limited, as it is in the Church Catechism, to Baptism and Holy Communion. There is also a frank acceptance of the view that the memorial that is made in Holy Communion is a commemoration before the Father. Naturally, therefore, we find constant use of the word 'altar' as applied to the Holy Table. Latin hymns of Thomas Aquinas such as *Pange Lingua* and *Adoro te devote* (used in the Roman Service of Benediction) are much praised. There are references here and there to 'Father' Wignam and 'Father' Benson. One thing pleased us. The writer gives an account of the service of Holy Communion, and in doing so follows the 1662 book. He gives his reason for this—"It should be noted that the Alternative Order, not having obtained the approval of Parliament, cannot be said to be authorised in the sense in which the 1662 form is authorised" (page 63).

While we appreciate the spirit in which it is written, it is impossible for us to give a whole-hearted recommendation to it.

#### STUDIES IN LIFE. BY AND LARGE.

*By Stephen J. Brown, S.J. The Richview Press, Dublin. 8/6.*

Whenever we see "By and Large" we wonder in what sense the speaker or writer uses it. In its nautical usage it means "on the wind and off the wind," as the vessel sails well *by and large*. The prevailing wind in this book blows, as one would expect, from the Roman quarter but it is surprisingly "off the wind" in some ways and can be read with pleasure by a convinced Protestant because its author, *by and large*, has much to say that is profitable. *By and large* also means in all respects; in every way; as to consider the matter *by and large*. These studies in life are very comprehensive. Yet only certain aspects of life are dwelt upon and these are aspects which "had long occupied the writer's thoughts and had for him a peculiar appeal." The first of these is a plea for childhood which shews fine understanding and wide reading. In this chapter he quotes from St. Hilary of Poitiers, St. Leo the Great (in Latin), St. John Chrysostom, Cardinal Bellarmine, Cardinal Newman, another Oxford convert, Canon Oakeley, Ruskin, Stopford Brooke, Archbishop Goodier, Wordsworth, Browning, Francis Thompson and amongst others Dr. David, the Anglican Bishop of Liverpool!

His views on life and happiness and his knowledge of books and poetry make this a most interesting book. He has a decided bias for Roman Catholic writers

and this comes out in quite incidental and even irritating ways for Protestant readers as when he remarks: "There is also the Pilgrim's Progress." He has some fine things to say about the influence of women but the good Jesuit's words, coming as they do from a celibate, seem strange to Protestant eyes. "Christianity is neither misogynist nor feminist. From the first page of the Christian revelation to the last, but in a far nobler way after Christ than before, woman appears as man's helpmeet and complement." We like best his chapter on "Was"—"Is"—"Shall be" in which he studies the three types of men as they look mainly towards the past, the present or the future. Here he has a number of quotable things. Take this; "The bird is in the egg; Conservatism would leave the egg unbroken, leave everything as it is and has been: it will get an addled egg. Radicalism would impatiently break the shell to let the imprisoned captive free; it will get a dead bird. Christianity breeds the egg and the bird breaks its own shell." There are quite a number of printer's errors, we are sorry to see. Are Irish printers more "throughother" than English printers *by and large*? Nevertheless we commend this book to the notice of readers of THE CHURCHMAN who are not afraid to read a book written by a Jesuit because in spite of its bias it is singularly broadminded, anti-modernistic and cultured, and, on the whole, Christian. A. W. PARSONS.

#### EUCCHARISTIC DOCTRINE IN ENGLAND FROM HOOKER TO WATERLAND.

By C. W. Dugmore, B.D., M.A. S.P.C.K. 7/6.

To cover the Eucharistic doctrine of three centuries, as does this Norrissian Prize Essay of 1940, is a marvel of compression and we congratulate the author on a useful introduction to one of the creative periods of Anglican thought on the Eucharist. It is mainly on the score of compression that an historical essay of this kind can well be criticised. There is an obvious danger that compression may spell suppression or at least over-simplification. Within the limits of his space Mr. Dugmore has evidently striven to avoid both dangers and the plethora of references and quotations, for which such an introduction as this is perhaps overweighted, make us all the more willing to follow his guidance.

Beginning with "The Elizabethan Settlement," the author surveys the teaching of 'High' and 'Puritan' Churchmen under the Stuarts, passing to what he calls "The Evolution of Central Churchmanship," "The Conflict of Ideas from the Restoration to the Revolution," "John Johnson and the Non-Jurors" and closes with a chapter on "The Influence of Deism and the Triumph of the Via Media." Opinions will no doubt differ as to the doctrinal alignment of particular writers of this period but there will be substantial agreement with the author on the part of those not disposed to attach exaggerated importance to *obiter dicta*. Too often utterances of this kind are given the weight of doctrinal judgments.

We cannot quarrel with an academic thesis that it fulfils the purpose for which it was written but it is impossible to read the great writers of this period without trying at the same time to compare the quality and scope of their teaching with the rigidity and narrowness of some popular Anglican *cultus* and doctrine. We find ourselves in entire agreement with the strictures Mr. Dugmore passes, e.g., on Thorndike and others, that "it is not legitimate to halt in the pursuit of Truth until the human mind has exhausted its capacity for grappling with ultimate Reality, and has explained so much of the Truth as it is capable of understanding." The sponsoring of the opposite opinion as "the strongest and most characteristic tradition of Anglicanism" by no less a document than "The Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine" (p. 170) has too often *in practice* the baleful effect of a materialistic doctrine of Divine Grace, not to speak of an arbitrariness we cannot associate with divine Love. For the re-statement of Eucharistic doctrine we may perhaps be allowed to add that the writers of this period, like the members of our own "Commission on Christian Doctrine," were too hag-ridden with the necessity of refuting the sophism of Transubstantiation to speak with relevance to this modern world of 1943 and all that.

While Eucharistic doctrine is shamefully neglected by the present generation of Evangelicals—and even the infinite suggestiveness of the bread and wine constantly overlooked—they can at least take the undeserved crumb of comfort that the doctrine of the Eucharist implicit in their teaching and *cultus* is much more in consonance with the teaching of the Anglican divines of these centuries than

that of some who lightly dispute the right of Evangelicals to call themselves Churchmen. A perusal of this volume will make many a reader re-echo the words of Dr. Darwell Stone in his masterly history "It is touching to notice the language of devotion which men of the most divergent beliefs have used in reference to the rite as to the explanation of which they have widely disagreed" (p. 649, Vol. ii. *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*). Best of all, let us hope that it will lead others to read, and not read *about*, the greater Anglican divines of this creative period. A.B.L.

#### SETTLEMENT WITH GERMANY.

*By T. G. Dunning. S.C.M. 2/6.*

Mr. Dunning begins his book by quoting some words of Chiang Kai-Shek: "If we perspired more in peace, we should bleed less in war." In war, united by one compelling purpose we are willing to sacrifice our all. If we are to win the peace we shall require a similar spirit of sacrifice, and if there is to be this spirit of sacrifice there must be a real sense of moral responsibility among our people. It is clear that there are many who do not yet realise the amount of sacrifice that is going to be necessary if we are to do all we should to help the devastated countries of Europe after the war. We shall have to send them food and economic help immediately the war ends. This means that we shall have to put up with restrictions and food rationing for a considerable period. As Christians we must be ready to do so.

What of Germany? What settlement are we to make with her? The Atlantic Charter has laid it down that all nations, victors and vanquished alike, should have access to the raw materials that they need. It should be abundantly clear to all that while one nation is impoverished, none can prosper. The nations must work together if there is to be a healthy economic system. Mr. Dunning reminds us of the vast steel and iron industries of Germany, industries which in the past only found a satisfactory outlet in the production of armaments. He suggests that these industries, which are a menace to other countries, might well be placed under international control.

The re-education of the corrupted youth of Germany will be a hard and difficult process. Mr. Dunning stresses the value of personal contacts after the war between the British and German people, the interchange of scholars, holiday fellowships and so on. The Church will have a vital part to play in all this work. It will be the task of the Church to establish contact as soon as possible with the Church leaders of Europe, and to help them in every possible way. Even in the midst of this terrible war there is a growing realisation of the reality of the Universal Church. This is one hopeful sign for the future. O.R.C.

#### THE ABOLITION OF CHRISTIANITY. THE DIARY OF A DISTURBED SOUL.

*By John Maarten. (Translated by W. A. Whitehouse). (S.C.M.) 3/6.*

Those who have read John Maarten's other book, "The Village on the Hill," will be disappointed in this one. It is not an easy task to criticise this new book. The critic is in the invidious position of appearing to be hitting back because he feels uncomfortable under the author's attack. It may be that other Christians will feel differently about the book, but the present reviewer believes that the author has spoilt what would otherwise have been a helpful and searching book, both by his style of writing, which consists of sentence after sentence in epigrammatic form, and also by many of his statements which would have been true if they had been put moderately, but which carry little conviction in their present sweeping form.

The book is a devastating attack on any form of institutional Christianity. The author voices the feelings of a group of earnest men, with whom he is in intimate contact. In his eyes organised Christianity has completely failed, and there is no hope for it. If it truly faced all the implications of faith in Christ, it would be automatically dissolved.

Many Christians will agree with the fact that the various Christian Churches have been, and still are, very imperfect mirrors of their Master. But few would take up the author's extreme view that all that is called Christianity must be swept away, especially when nothing is offered in its place except a general reference (from Kierkegaard) to a "little band of real Christians" who "will take up the cause." Who these are is not stated. Earlier in the book the



author states "I have a desire, a burning desire, to meet one real Christian here on earth." Now Mr. Maarten professes to write as one who realises that he is not a Christian in the Bible sense, an attitude which might make an uncharitable reader wonder whether his book is really sincere or written merely for effect. For if he knows what real Christianity is and sees its tremendous necessity, why do not he and his group become Christians? Institutional Christianity might reply in its defence that until these critics try to live out the Christian ideal for themselves, they cannot appreciate the difficulties under which Christianity labours. One is driven to suspect that Mr. Maarten and the group for which he writes are on the point of breaking away from organised Christianity, as other keen Christians have done before. Unless they then exist as isolated individuals, they will be forced to organise as a new group or denomination; and the result may be something much nearer to institutional Christianity than they imagine at present.

In contrast to the general attitude of Mr. Maarten, many other Christians, seeing the weaknesses of much present day Christianity are praying for revival. Revival has come in the past within institutional Christianity. It can come again. J.S.W.

## THE DOCTRINE OF OUR REDEMPTION.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY'S LENT BOOK, 1943.

By Nathaniel Micklem, D.D. Pp. viii. and 96. Eyre and Spottiswood. 4/6 net.

When the present Archbishop of Canterbury (then of York) wrote the Introduction to the Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine, published under the title of *Doctrine in the Church of England*, he pointed to a shifting of emphasis from what might be termed an Incarnational theology to a theology of Redemption. "If," he wrote, "we began our work again to-day, its perspectives would be different. But it is not our function to pioneer. We may call the thinkers and teachers of the Church of England to renewed devotion of their labour to the themes of Redemption, Justification, and Conversion. It is there that, in my own judgment at least, our need lies now and will lie in the future." Prompted no doubt by this conviction, as much as a desire to complete, as it were, the preceding volume, the Archbishop has sponsored a work dealing with the great subject of Redemption. And it is interesting that he has turned for an author to a distinguished Non-conformist. Dr. Micklem has already won a place for himself as a writer who is capable of presenting the doctrine of Christianity in a clear, lucid and even unconventional fashion. His book on Christian Doctrine, published in the S.C.M. Religious Book Club volume, is probably one of the outstanding contributions to the series, and it has prepared us to expect great things of the present work.

The present study has come at an opportune moment. There is a great need for a fresh presentation of the gospel of Redemption. To the clergy especially, on whom rests the burden of proclaiming the gospel, it will prove a real help at the present time. The method of treatment, not altogether surprisingly, is somewhat unconventional in that each chapter is preceded by a résumé of its contents including (a) several of the more valuable books dealing with the subject matter of the chapter, and (b) Questions for discussion. This is a new, and much to be welcomed, departure in the Series. It enables the book to be used in discussion circles of students and educated laity. And such the Author makes clear in his Preface he has in mind.

The book is written on historical lines commencing with the question What is Redemption? This question Dr. Micklem attempts to answer by examining a series of lives who in one way or another convey the impression that they have been redeemed. "It is," he says, "victory over the world, over its drudgery and over its suffering. It is reconciliation, not only with God, but also with the life which God has appointed for us. Our redemption covers both the work of Christ for us and the work of His Holy Spirit in us." This would not be regarded by everyone as a complete definition of what we understand by Redemption; and we wonder how many of the laity would grasp his meaning, when he goes on to say that after our baptism "we must walk the purgative, the illuminative and the unitive way." These technical terms of the spiritual life are not understood by all Christian people.

In subsequent chapters, Dr. Micklem deals with the Old Testament foundation, the New Testament fulfilment, and then he proceeds to show (in the words of the Archbishop's Introduction) "How Christians in different parts of the world and different epochs of history have approached the central theme in accordance with their own general experience and the prevalent habit of contemporary (to each age 'modern') thought." And he goes on to add, "They have always seen something and missed much." The treatment is adequate and characteristic and needless to say, satisfying. Dr. Micklem does not attempt to solve the historic problems connected with the doctrine of the Atonement, but he does bring out in each successive chapter the salient features of the teaching either of a particular Church, *e.g.*, the Eastern Church (chs. iv. and v.) or of a particular individual, *e.g.*, St. Augustine (chs. vi. and vii.) or of a particular age. To refer to these sections of the book in detail would be quite impossible, but attention must be drawn to one or two points.

Particular interest, we venture to think, will be aroused by the chapter on "The Saviour of the World" in which the Author wrestles with the question raised by the fact that "many passages in the New Testament point to a cosmic and universal salvation wrought by our Lord." He stresses the urgency of the problem which arises from the circumstances of the war when so many are dying nobly who yet cannot be numbered amongst the "elect." The treatment of the subject is helpful, and from the Epilogue to the volume the subject is obviously one that haunts Dr. Micklem, and he refuses to believe that such "are passing beyond the scope and efficacy of His redeeming blood." Furthermore, Dr. Micklem believes that "our new sense of social solidarity and the agonies of the present hour are forcing us back to neglected elements in the teaching of the Bible and in the theology of those Fathers, especially in the East, who expounded for us what it means that our Lord took our human nature upon Him and thus became the Saviour of the world." Here we must leave the discussion of a most fascinating if somewhat speculative subject.

The book is a refreshing treatment of a great theme and as such, we cordially commend it to the modern Christian.

CLIFFORD J. OFFER.

#### TOWARDS A CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY.

*By Leonard Hodgson, D.D. Pp. 195. Nisbet and Co. 10/6 net.*

Many will extend a very cordial welcome to this volume by Canon Hodgson, not merely on account of the author's well deserved reputation as a writer of real distinction, but also out of a very real sympathy with him in the destruction by "enemy action" of the entire stocks of two of his previous works. The present volume is not a complete new work but a revision of "those parts of two of them which" as he puts it, "I am still conceited enough to think of as pointing the way for philosophers and theologians alike." And for that decision many we are sure will be extremely grateful, for there is much in it which is worthy of the most careful study.

Essentially the book is a plea, as the title indicates, for the place of philosophy in religion. Hence the reader will find no disparagement in these pages of reason, rather he will discover a full appreciation of the part which it can and should, in the author's estimation, play in religion. As we should expect, therefore, there is a real divergence between the standpoint of the Author and of those modern and in many cases, younger theologians who as he puts it, "claim to be the mouthpieces of a revelation which is beyond human criticism." Yet, as Canon Hodgson is careful to point out at the beginning of his work, this radical difference of viewpoint cuts across all existing ecclesiastical divisions. He claims to be "advocating a view which is held in every one of the great Communion of Christendom." To the mind of the Author, the Christian Revelation must not be above the criticism of human reason. "It is surely," he maintains, "more in accord with all that our faith teaches us about God to believe that He calls us away from . . . miserable makeshifts to the honest exercise of our minds, that it is His will to submit His revelation to the arbitrament of our reason." Or as he puts it later on in the volume, "If the Church has turned a deaf ear to the questionings of philosophy and contented itself with preaching a gospel which it refused to submit to criticism, it would have lost its right to speak in the name of Him Who is the truth as well as the way and the life."

Such is the point of view from which the Author proceeds to discuss some of the outstanding problems of modern theology; but unfortunately, space forbids

any examination of the discussion. But attention ought to be drawn to certain aspects of the work which will no doubt appeal to many. One question that is of perennial interest is that of the relationship between Reason and Religion. There have been times when theologians have endeavoured to separate the two. Some modern theological tendencies, as we have seen, strive to accentuate the divergence. This is partly due no doubt to an effort to lift Revelation above the scrutiny of a merely human and possibly irreverent criticism. But Canon Hodgson makes it perfectly clear that the gulf can be bridged. "They represent," he says, "neither two different methods of arriving at the same truth, nor two different methods each appropriate to discovering a different kind of truth, but the obverse and reverse sides of the one and only method of discovering truth at all." And he proceeds to illustrate this by using the terms "general revelation" and "special revelation." As an example of the latter, he writes, "a man who has entered into that knowledge of God which He has given us in the historical development of the Christian religion has, *as a matter of fact*, received a special revelation which others can only share by sharing with him in the method of discovery." (Author's italics).

The work is divided into three parts. Part one is concerned with certain Presuppositions, the second part deals with material for thought and the last part has as its title "Towards a Christian Philosophy." The second part deals amongst other problems, with such highly disputable themes as Grace, Freewill, Providence, Compromise, etc., on all of which the Author has much to say that is helpful. We would draw special attention to what Canon Hodgson says about Grace on p. 99 and Predestination on p. 107. In fact, it is very tempting not to go on quoting because he so often puts clearly what many feel but fail to express adequately must be the solution of some of these pressing problems of modern religious thought. In the chapter on "The Witness of Faith" he has quite a long criticism to make on Brunner's "Mediator" which many will read with considerable interest. The main point of his criticism is that he finds himself differing from Prof. Brunner on "important aspects" in their respective conceptions of the "God of the Biblical revelation." Here of course, we see that divergence of view as to the nature and authority of revelation referred to already. Canon Hodgson insists all through on the legitimacy of the reaction of human reason to the revelation of the transcendent God.

And here we must leave this extremely valuable and illuminating volume. Not everyone will agree with all that the Author sets out so clearly but no one can read it without benefit. And in any case it is only fair that the other side of this great problem of the place of human reason in apprehending and interpreting divine revelation should find adequate and effective expression.

CLIFFORD J. OFFER.

### THE JUDGMENT OF THE NATIONS.

*By Christopher Dawson. Sheed and Ward. 8/6.*

Here is a study in which the author presents a searching analysis of the circumstances which led up to this second world war in which we are now embroiled, and from which he passes on to suggestions for the reconstruction which must come at the close of the conflict. These two themes form the subject matter of the two parts of the book—"The Disintegration of Western Civilisation" and "The Restoration of a Christian Order." Incidentally, although the book does not claim it to be such, one gathers that it is intended to be a statement of the aims and basis of the Roman Catholic "Sword of the Spirit Movement."

In the first part, the author traces the circumstances which led to the rise of the totalitarian states, and enumerates them as the break up of the Mediaeval Church which had given a stable background to Europe, the failure of eighteenth and nineteenth century Liberalism, and the secularisation of western culture. If the author's premises are accepted, it is easy to reach his conclusions; but many will not be able to accept them. It is to be feared that the voice which speaks in these chapters, particularly in the one devoted to "The Religious origins of European Divinity" is the voice of the loyal son of the Papal Church rather than that of either the historian or the philosopher. It is argued with forcefulness that the outlook of Luther and Lutheranism has prepared the ground for the willing submission of Germany to the regimentation under which she has lived for so long. It is not pointed out, however, that the same outlook has produced a different kind of effect amongst the Norwegians, the Dutch, and

the Swedes. Moreover, his thesis does not hold regarding those areas of Germany where Romanism is dominant. He seems to be on surer ground where he argues that the democratic ideals of the Anglo-Saxon would have been influenced by the Calvinist-Puritan tradition which, to some extent, has moulded the thought of England and the United States of America. We feel, too, that he has misunderstood the English Reformation as we read his remarks on pp. 69 and 124. Again, it is stated: "We cannot insist too strongly that the totalitarian idea was not Fascist or Italian or German in origin. It was a distinctively Russian re-action which could not have arisen without the centuries of cultural segregation and politico-religious unity which formed the Russian national consciousness" (p. 25). Yet history clearly shows that the Mediaeval Papacy was totalitarian in ideal, outlook and method, even while claiming to be above the conflicts of nationalism. Another statement seems to be in conflict with the facts: "The belief in the ethical basis of social and political life which was the inspiration of Western democracy finds its justification in the teaching of the Catholic Church and the tradition of Western Christendom. It is opposed to-day by the unethical natural law of race and class and the Machiavellian realism which makes power the supreme political value and which does not shrink from the blackest treachery or the most brutal cruelty to gain its ends" (p. 37). If this is so, we must ask why that Church remained silent at the bombing of Guernica, Warsaw, Rotterdam and London, and during the rape of Abyssinia. Whilst his first part of the book has much which is of real value and is the result of much thought, it will often be found inadequate for its stated purpose. Furthermore, the reader is often confused by the absence of any strict definition of "the Church."

The second part of the study offers reasoned proposals for a planned culture (a word which is used "to cover the whole complex of institutions and customs and beliefs, as well as arts and crafts and economic organisation, which make up the social inheritance of a people" [p. 64]); Christian Social Principles; the Sword of the Spirit Movement; Christian Unity; and a Christian Order for Europe and the New World. This is the most interesting and constructive part of the book; but even so, the limitations mentioned above have unfortunately not been removed. On the matter of unity among Christians which is envisaged in the Sword of the Spirit Movement he says: "We can take part in it by prayer, by study and by action. It is not necessary to say much about the first and last of these, for all Catholics understand the importance of prayer, and all Englishmen understand the importance of action. But both Catholics and Englishmen are inclined to neglect the second intellectual aim and to undervalue the importance of the power of thought" (p. 109). We hope that the author does not intend to suggest that English people who are not Romanists neglect prayer. We fear, too, that his plea for "a re-ordering of all the elements of human life and standards by the power of the Spirit: the birth of a true community which is neither an organic mass of individuals nor a mechanised organisation of power, but a living spiritual order" (p. 110), implies an unity under the Papacy. Our fears on this subject seem to be confirmed by the attitude of the Vatican to the Sword of the Spirit Movement which seems to have been imposed on the late Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster who inaugurated the movement. Again, we are not convinced that the Encyclicals imply a recognition of an "affirmation of the right of religious freedom" (p. 114). The action of the Roman Church towards other Christian bodies in Spain since the revolution, in Portugal at the present time, and in Abyssinia after the Italian invasion do not give the author any ground for his assertion, nor yet does the silence of the Vatican on the definite aspect of Religious Freedom as embodied in the Atlantic Charter.

Those who differ from the author in a number of his conclusions will echo his statement on p. 153: "Religion is the only power that can meet the forces of destruction on equal terms and save mankind from its spiritual enemies. The world mission of Christianity is based on its conception of a spiritual society which transcends all states and cultures and is the final goal of humanity." Yet we envisage a unity which can be secured, not as a hard uniformity, nor yet as a visible unity under one living head, but a unity of the Spirit which is expressed in and under the bond of peace.

Here is a book which should be studied. There is no question that it will be hailed by members of his own communion; and it will enhance his popularity in the Roman Catholic circles of the United States. Yet we fear that for many thinking people of these islands, it will raise far more questions than it answers.

## THE JEWS IN A CHRISTIAN SOCIAL ORDER

By Olga Levertoff. 66 pages. S.P.C.K. 2/-.

This little book (the Dean of Canterbury in his Preface quite rightly calls it an essay) has proved a genuine disappointment to us. We can best compare it to part-worked blocks of marble in the sculptor's studio. Looking at them individually we can get a sense of beauty that could be. But the studio as a whole gives an impression of chaos. So it is with Olga Levertoff's work. It abounds in provocative thoughts, and keen insight into some of our greatest problems, but they are not worked out, nor is there any clear connecting link between them.

Both language and title give an insight into the essential weakness of the book. Most will find it difficult reading and that, not because of the thoughts, but because the writer would seem almost to be the slave rather than the master of the words she uses. The title is completely out of place. Beyond one of those attacks on the present order, which are so common these days, there is no discussion either of the possibility of a Christian social order or of the form such an order would take. Much less is there any consideration of the Jews' place in such an order. The writer falls into a very obvious pitfall. She is so concerned with proving that racial anti-Semitism is un-Christian, that she does not really ask the question whether anti-Semitism may not have other and more vital roots.

We do not doubt that she is correct in claiming that the responsibility of presenting Christ to the Jew is primarily that of the Jewish Christian, but we find it hard to accept her definition of him. Just as the type of Christianity for which Dr. Paul Levertoff stands has its place in the body of the Church universal, so that form of Jewish Christianity which accepts his views has its place in presenting Christ to the Jew. But just as we cannot confine the Church to those sharing Dr. Levertoff's views, so we cannot insist that vital Jewish Christianity must accept them either.

H. L. ELLISON.

## THE GOSPEL AND INDIA'S HERITAGE.

By A. J. Appasamy. S.P.C.K. 8/6. 270pp.

On the outside cover it is stated that this book was written at the request of the National Christian Council of India in order "first, to present the Gospel story in a form which will appeal to Indian readers: secondly, to bring it into relationship with the best traditions of Indian religion."

In the introduction the author gives us the clue to the strong and the weak features of this book. His father was baptised at the age of 24, and became a keen evangelist, becoming president of the Indian Missionary Society.

He retired from the legal profession at the age of 54. "In his sixty-seventh year a strange new passion began to consume him, the passion to see God." Coming into contact with a Hindu *Yogi* he began to practise *Yoga*, the Hindu method of seeking absorption in the Divine essence, by means of abstraction, together with restrained breathing and other physical means. The son, then fresh from studies in Oxford, sympathised with his father's aspiration, and regretted that he received so little help from his Christian teachers, whose "sermons were all meant only to deepen the sense of sin and to show that God's forgiveness is available for men."

Whilst at Oxford, the author, who obtained there the degree of doctor of philosophy (as well as the M.A. degree at Harvard) wrote a thesis on the Gospel of St. John and Hindu *Phakti* literature; evidently making a very thorough study of the latter. With this background, Mr. Appasamy defines his object as being "to study afresh the life and teaching of Jesus as they are recorded in the gospels, and to explain them in relation to the spiritual heritage of India."

This fairly describes the contents of his book: there are chapters on the teaching of Jesus on God, the Holy Spirit, Sin, Forgiveness, Fellowship with God, Ethics, the Church, and the Future Life. On all of these subjects there are full quotations of Christ's teaching from the Gospels, together with others from selected Hindu writings, ancient and recent, with comments on the parallels and differences between them.

What Mr. Appasamy takes for the "spiritual heritage" of India, is viewed from a special point of view, that of the *Bhakti* or mystical school of thought.

In the introductory chapter he rules out Islam as outside his scope, and disregards polytheism and idol worship, which of course form the real religion

of India, with the remark that "ordinary people . . . are not clear in their minds as to the relation between all the numerous gods and (the) one God." He also leaves aside the main streams of Indian philosophy, which are either atheistic or pantheistic, and confines his attention to writings of the theistic *Bhakti* school, one which of recent years has been increasingly brought into prominence by men like Swami Vivekananda, who have defended Hinduism, importing into it Christian ideas, and in their translation of ancient writings into English using Christian terms which give an appearance of similarity to Christian thought which is not present in the original.

It is all to the author's credit that he has made a deep and sympathetic study of these *Bhakti* writings, and brought out from them all that can be regarded as true and helpful; and the experienced missionary will be able to make good use of this part of the book. But the English reader must be warned that Hinduism is here seen through *very* rose-coloured spectacles, and even the quotations, in their English form, often give quite a different idea from the original. As examples *Dharma* (duty, especially caste-duty) is translated by "righteousness"; and the Hindu *Nirvana* (non-existence) is assimilated to the Christian doctrine of union with God.

A more serious matter is that the writer's outlook on Christianity is that of the modernist school. It can only be regarded as extremely unfortunate that a book appearing under the auspices of the National Christian Council, and designed for translation into the Indian vernaculars, should tell its readers that the gospel of John is "not reliable" in its history, and that Matthew and Luke contain stories which are only "pious beliefs of earnest Christians of what Jesus was likely to have taught and done". We are told likewise that "in some important directions" Christ rejected the teaching of the Old Testament about God. It is on a par with this that in a chapter on "Jesus the Incarnation" there is no mention of our Lord's wonderful Birth.

After the same fashion the Epistles are very rarely quoted, and then sometimes with the introduction that this was what Peter "thought," or what Paul "taught". It is true that the unique claim of Christ to be the Incarnation of God is defended, and that the Resurrection is stated as a fact, but there is a marked disposition to avoid "the offence of the Cross."

Christ's own teaching is fairly and fully given, and has been evidently studied with insight and sympathy, but the presentation is of Christ as Teacher, rather than as the Saviour from sin. The "gospel story" here given is assimilated to those philosophic discussions dear to the mind of the Hindu: it lacks the apostolic notes of hatred of sin and passion for righteousness, of glorying in the Cross and in persecution for Christ's sake, of defiance of the world, and of the triumphant hope of the Saviour's return and the heavenly inheritance.

We lay the book down with a sigh, and with the hope that the good which it undoubtedly contains may not be undone by those defects to which we have called attention.

CYRIL BARDSLEY, *Evangelist*

By Joan Bayldon. 9/- S.P.C.K. 213 pp.

The numerous friends and admirers of the late Bishop Bardsley will welcome the publication of this excellent biography. It was undertaken at the request of Deaconess Bardsley by Miss Bayldon, to whom the Bishop was engaged, when his unexpected illness and death occurred.

She has given us in this volume what her readers would most desire, a vivid and illuminating picture of one whom the Bishop of Sodor and Man in his foreword well describes as a true servant of God, a great worker and a faithful friend.

The greater part of the book is taken up with the years of his episcopate, first at Peterborough and then, after the division of the diocese which he carried through with characteristic energy and enthusiasm, as Bishop of Leicester.

The portrayal, as the title indicates, is of the man rather than of his work. It is well done, and we are made to see his singleness of purpose in any course which he was convinced was right; his abounding energy, leading him time and again to overtax his strength; his joy in life and his love of games, of happy gatherings and of children. We can hear again his resounding laughter, as he tells some story against himself, as of the bridegroom who after his wedding address thanked him for his "beautiful words of sympathy," or that of the

child in a school which he visited as Bishop, who thought he must be "the new curate," on which he remarked, "that sort of thing cheers one up!"

His zeal for missionary work lasted through his life, both before and after the years he gave as honorary secretary of C.M.S. He immensely enjoyed his visits to the Mission Fields, to Japan, China and India. At his first contact with the mass movement in S. India, he rejoiced to see the hundreds of converts, the men cheering, and jumping as they cheered, and described the scene as "most moving." These visits provided him with precious memories, of which he made full use in his constant and successful efforts to stir up missionary enthusiasm wherever he went.

He had great gifts of friendship, displayed either to the men of the great Bible Class which he inherited and maintained at St. Helen's, or to the members of the staff at Church Missionary House, for the clergy and laity in his diocesan work, for his fellow-passengers on a voyage, or for the poor and the children wherever he met them.

Throughout his life he combined an earnest belief in prayer with a deep and sincere spirit of humility. It was his intense desire to be like His Master, and this is not the least of the reasons why we can heartily endorse the remark made in the foreword that there could be "no finer incentive to a youth contemplating the work of the ministry" than the reading of these pages. G.T.M.

### REVIVAL AND RECONSTRUCTION.

#### TO CHRISTIAN ENGLAND

*By John Armitage. Longmans. 5/-.*

#### THE DAY IS AT HAND

*By Alec Boggis and Kenneth Budd. George Allen and Unwin, 5/-.*

Both these books have dust covers. We wonder about them! The book publishers won some consideration from the Government. Ought they to use paper for dust covers? These books seem to need reform on the outside. Which thing is an allegory! Much of what we find, particularly in the second book, is dreadfully superficial. John Armitage makes quite definite and practical suggestions for action but most of these are based on some of those hastily convened, hurriedly planned and inadequately represented conferences which have been such features of the life of the Home Church in the fateful years since the last war. Their weighty tomes of findings, speeches, and resolutions lie unheeded in many a library and may be found long after the event still uncut in second-hand bookshops. How many of them went up to Heaven in the smoke of Paternoster Row! But Mr. Armitage does not suggest more Conferences, Many will rejoice at that. He pleads for the establishment of a research station, adequately staffed, which will face the task of creating an informed Christian opinion throughout the country. This book, however, should be read. The writer really has something to say. The other book consists of letters from a layman to a parson. Judged from the literary standpoint much of the writing is excellent but as the Bishop of Sheffield says in his foreword: "The true answer to some of these questions lies at a deeper level and requires a study of Christian theology." The padre writes replies to the layman's criticisms. They are models of appeasement and truly Anglican since they endeavour to keep the mean between two extremes. The layman asks in one letter: "I am aware that sanitary inspectors and various laws exist to protect employees, but was the Church responsible for any reform of this nature?" Surely the answer is that there is no machinery in a Democracy which would enable the Church to become directly responsible for such reforms. If he means indirectly, has he never heard of Lord Shaftesbury, or read "The History of Social Christianity" in two volumes? The Church has its job. It has something better to do than inspect drains. All the problems of the better order are problems of the better man. Let the Church stick to her last and preach and practise her Gospel. Other things will be added unto her. A. W. PARSONS.

#### THE ETERNAL KINGDOM

*By Professor C. J. Wright. James Clarke and Co, Ltd. 142 pp. 5s. net.*

A day of universal chaos and conflict demands of all who profess a religious faith the most honest and serious thought of which they are capable. Is there

any background of eternal life and purpose which can give meaning to the apparently disordered and tumultuous rush of temporal events? Has human life any destiny other than that which so obviously overtakes and overwhelms a vast multitude of human lives? These are questions which cannot be allowed indefinitely to go by default, and to refuse to face them is to take sides, for all practical purposes, with despairing agnosticism if not with virtual atheism. It is to help us toward a positive understanding, in days such as these, of the faith we profess that this admirable book has been written.

Early in the development of his thought, the author makes the quite deliberate assertion that "so far from the ideas of the Kingdom of God and Eternal Life being mutually exclusive or distinct, neither has any meaning apart from the other. They are different phrases giving expression to different aspects of the essential nature of Christianity as it was incarnate in the life and set forth in the teaching of our Lord." Whatever else Mr. Wright has to say is directly related to, and for the most part grows out of, this promise. In the opinion of the present writer it is substantially true, and therefore, indispensable for any proper understanding or presentation of the Christian faith relative to our time. In Jesus Christ both the fact and the nature of the Eternal Kingdom have been revealed and may be "discerned" by the man whose vision and faith are consequent upon the light and leading of the Holy Spirit. By its inevitable reaction and relentless opposition to Him the rule of this present world-order exposed and condemned itself. And the same absolute opposition will always be manifest when the Church which is the age-long Body of Christ, and therefore the incarnation of the Eternal Kingdom, is true to her essential nature and mission. At one and the same time she represents and releases the Eternal and all that is merely of this present world rushes to judgment. Yet on the other hand, "we may serve Mammon as much in Church as in State, as much in the things we call 'secular' as in those we call 'sacred.'" The apostasy to this worldliness of standards and aims is the ever-present, as it is also, the most dangerous, temptation to the Christian Church.

The qualitative relationship of the Eternal Kingdom to "this world" offers the key to a practical consideration of the problems of eschatology. These are Mr. Wright's concern in the last chapter of his book. Faith always has a forward look, and the faith of "the son of the Kingdom" "assures him that the Divine Father's Rule has the quality of eternity within it," and nothing else has! Toward that he can look, and for it he can live. But for it he must also *work*, for it is no less true that "he has no right to believe in a future celestial Kingdom if he does not seek here and now the things of eternity." In a word, his belief in the ultimate vindication and supremacy of the Eternal Kingdom must be so vital that he lives by it and in it *now*.

Not the least merit of this book is the fact that it combines in a quite unusual degree sound scholarship and devotional insight. It will be read with profit both by the theologian who is something of a saint, and the saint who is something of a theologian. And none of us should be content to be only the one or the other!

T. W. ISHERWOOD.

#### SOCIETY: NATURAL AND DIVINE

By A. P. Carleton. S.P.C.K. 6/-

The present book is an attempt to work out the relations of the Church with the world, anticipating the problems of reconstruction and re-union of the Churches. It is written with care and reveals a wide knowledge of Holy Scripture. The author presents a case which is worked out with clear logic, and his conclusions are inescapable if his premises are accepted, yet the book betrays a doubt about the general acceptance of his premises, particularly in the chapter on "the Church and Natural Society." The book shows a desire for re-union with the unreformed Churches, but makes no real contribution to the problem of re-union with the Free Churches, for courteously as the differences are stated, the reader is always aware of the underlying, offensive patronage of one who clearly holds a mechanical theory of Apostolic succession and its consequent emphasis upon the Eucharistic aspect of the Lord's Supper to the expense of its inner aspect of Communion. In the preface, there is a significant phrase following a statement that the M.S.S. had not been first submitted to the Superior of the Community to which the author belongs: "If, however, I have unwittingly written anything contrary



to Catholic Truth or likely to cause pain to my brethren, I will willingly withdraw it." Under such an outlook, what is the use of the right of private judgment?

E.H.

#### "THE ETERNAL FRONT"

*By Elizabeth Castonier. James Clarke. 3/6.*

In this little book of 125 pages we have been given a simple, but a vivid statement of conditions in subjugated Europe; a statement which anyone can appreciate and understand. It tells how, "in spite of terror and oppression, in spite of ruthless persecution by the Gestapo which the New Order brings upon Nazi-subjugated humanity, a new front has arisen to fight Godlessness and to hamper and forestall the New Order doctrine." This new front is named "The Eternal Front," for it is a front in which the Christian Churches and all Christians are fighting to defeat Nazism.

The first chapter is a brief analysis of the rise of Nazism and the vaunted New Order which has been built upon broken solemn pledges. It also shows its awful corruption of misled youth and its inherent hostility to the Christian Faith by preaching and enforcing the new myth of the "German nation, in its blood and soil and in its creator, Adolf Hitler." Then, quoting documentary evidence, we are shown how the "Eternal Front" is in action, fighting only with the weapons of the Spirit, in Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, and France. It is a heartening story, and it makes us pray for our Christian brethren on the continent of Europe in their struggle. E.H.

#### CHANGE HERE FOR BRITAIN

*By Cecil Northcott. S.C.M. 2/6.*

Few can doubt that a Social and Moral Revolution is happening here in our own country as well as in all other countries in the world. In some cases the transition is already completed and "the privileged classes" to-day are those who are engaged in industry and the average workman is better off in material comforts than those who were the privileged class in the early Victorian Age. Whether this is good or bad for the country in general, time alone can tell, but this Modern Revolution which has put Labour Leaders into the Cabinet and given the "man in the street" a plethora of "social services" for his enjoyment, provides plenty of matter for the serious consideration of those who want to understand the trend of present legislation and the results which will follow after the War.

It is along these lines that Mr. Cecil Northcott has provided some excellent pabula for our spiritual digestion. Religion and Life Weeks are now being held all over the country and they will be prepared for and followed up by Discussion Groups which will try to consider our present problems from every angle of approach. This book is written from the definitely Christian standpoint and it will be of real service to those who are anxious to see the world "reborn into the Christian Faith. . . . The Church is the oldest organisation we have and it is the most comprehensive. . . ."

The clergy will find much worth reading in the chapter on What about the Church. The opinions of the "outsider" in St. Albans are a fair summary of what is thought about it in the average provincial town. (London's gross irreligion stands in a class by itself and the combined influence of all the churches there is not nearly so strong as is customary in the provincial towns). It is not true to say that "80% of Britain is out of touch with organised religion" and it is not right to assume that bishop's palaces and incomes are "a fruitful source of agnosticism." The chapter however, as a whole, is crammed full of topics fairly treated and admirably suited for general discussion.

The book is divided into eight chapters dealing with the following subjects: Britain Thinking, Hope for the Family, Education for Everybody, Work, Land and Leisure, Partners in Empire, Material for a New World, What about the Church? and A Living Democracy.

The admittedly "enormous area of life and politics which has been covered" needs to be digested in carefully planned discussions and, excellent plans for this are provided in the last fifteen pages of the book.

J. W. AUGUR.