

1978

Vol. 105

No. 3

Faith and Thought

Journal of the Victoria Institute or Philosophical Society of
Great Britain



Published by

THE VICTORIA INSTITUTE

29 QUEEN STREET, LONDON, EC4R 1BH

Tel: 01-248-3643

June 1979

ABOUT THIS JOURNAL

FAITH AND THOUGHT, the continuation of the **JOURNAL OF THE TRANSACTIONS OF THE VICTORIA INSTITUTE OR PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF GREAT BRITAIN**, has been published regularly since the formation of the Society in 1865. The title was changed in 1958 (Vo. 90). **FAITH AND THOUGHT** is now published three times a year, price per issue £1.50 (post free) and is available from the Society's Address, 29 Queen Street, London, EC4R 1BH. The price of recent back issues (when available) up to the end of Vol. 100, is 80p (post free), thereafter £1.50.

FAITH AND THOUGHT is issued free to **FELLOWS, MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATES** of the Victoria Institute. Applications for membership should be accompanied by a remittance which will be returned in the event of non-election. (Subscriptions are: **FELLOWS** £7.00; **MEMBERS** £5.00; **ASSOCIATES**, full-time students, below the age of 25 years, full-time or retired clergy or other Christian workers on small incomes £1.50; **LIBRARY SUBSCRIBERS** £5.00. **FELLOWS** must be Christians and must be nominated by a **FELLOW**.) Subscriptions which may be paid by covenant are accepted by Inland Revenue Authorities as an allowable expense against income tax for ministers of religion, teachers of RI, etc. For further details, covenant forms, etc, apply to the Society. The Constitution and Aims of the Society were last published in **FAITH AND THOUGHT**, vol. 98, No. 1.

EDITORIAL ADDRESS

29 Almond Grove, Bar Hill, Cambridge, CB3 8DU.

© Copyright by the Victoria Institute and Contributors, 1979.

UK ISSN 0014-7028

FAITH AND THOUGHT

1978
vol. 105
No. 3

A Journal devoted to the study of the inter-relation of the
Christian Revelation and modern research

Editorial

At a recent meeting of the Publications Committee of the Victoria Institute it was decided to award the Schofield Memorial Prize of £40 for 1978 to Dr Martyn Baker for his paper on *Advertising* (this JOURNAL 103, 153) and for the excellent lecture given to the Society on which this paper was based. The original lecture was illustrated by slides and other material which it was not possible to reproduce in the JOURNAL.

Members are asked to note the change in the address of the London office of the Society.

News & Views

INTERVENTION

Some remarkable stories of God's intervention in the affairs of His people are circulating. The *Life of Faith* (Nov. 1978, p 7) gives a summary of a research report based on first hand interviews with Christians in Ethiopia where persecution of Christians is now

widespread. "In January 1978 soldiers burst in on the overflow congregation of the Birhane Wengel Church in Addis Ababa. Everyone was thoroughly searched, some were beaten, and the church building was closed and locked. Four of the church leaders were arrested and taken before a firing squad. But as the soldiers waited, their automatic weapons poised, the commander suddenly became mute and was physically unable to give the order to fire. At length, because he still could not speak, the leaders were taken to prison. The following morning some courageous members of the church went to the prison and demanded in the name of Jesus that their leaders be released. The astonished guards, recalling what had happened the day before, freed them immediately." On the following Sunday three overflow worship and praise services were held, unhindered by police. On another occasion a Christian leader in Addis Ababa was mistaken for a spy and a soldier was just about to shoot him. Suddenly the Christian called out, "In the name of Jesus I forbid you to shoot me!" and "the soldier's hand literally became paralysed on the trigger". "As far as I am concerned" he later said, "You are a dead man. Your God has saved you."

On Thursday, 15 Feb. 1979 Mr Humphry Berkeley, a former MP, was dragged from his hotel in Umtata (Transkei, an independent black homeland in S. Africa) by native police who were about to shoot him. In a 'last' prayer he asked God to forgive and bless them, whereupon they fled imagining, perhaps, that he had cast some sort of spell on them (*D. Telegraph*, 17 Feb. and BBC News).

In his extraordinary book *Strange Experience: The Secrets of a Hexenmeister* (Prentice-Hall Inc. 1971 p 265f) Lee R. Gandee describes a riot to kill Protestants in Mexico apparently around the early 1950s. Gandee quite understands their rage - "It's the heathenish use of blood in their cult that disturbs me", he writes, "I have stood outside the building (a Baptist chapel) and heard them. The priest works himself up into a frenzy calling upon those inside to wash themselves in the blood of a lamb, and they have a song about it. It is truly barbaric." The RCs outside decided on an attack, but just at the point at which it seemed that all those in the chapel would be murdered, the would-be attackers suddenly disappeared. Later they all explained that they had seen soldiers arrive with guns, yet careful enquiries confirmed that no soldiers had been in the area. The account is given in great detail and as a result, we are told, many of the RCs became Baptists.

This story is reminiscent of the many astonishing happenings at the time of the Boxer Rebellion in China in 1900. In a number of places the Europeans took refuge in the Legations. This happened at Peking to which the British with others sent an Expeditionary Force from Tientsin. The Empress Dowager, however, was determined that the whole foreign community in the British Legation should be killed and she ordered its immediate capture at all costs. Dr Chauncey Goodrich was present at this siege. The whole community, he says, was reduced to the utmost extremity and the Christians met together and cried to God for help. To quote Goodrich, "It happened to be my turn to do sentry-go on the wall, and from that vantage ground I was witness of the most amazing spectacle. Just when the enemy was within an ace of achieving his objective, suddenly the whole attacking force turned and fled in confusion, and the plain was soon littered with arms and accoutrements of every description. Later on, when the relief was effected and prisoners were brought up before General Gaselee for interrogation, I was acting as interpreter: and to the question I put, "Why was it that just as you were at the point of breaking through the walls you suddenly fled as if routed yourselves?", in every case I received the same answer, "We saw the walls of the Legation suddenly swarming with spirits in white, and we cried out, 'The gods are come down to fight for the foreigners, and our cause is lost.'" (Letter, A.E. Glover, *Daily Telegraph*, 14 Feb. 1939. See also Arthur H. Smith, *China in Convulsion*, 2 vols. 1901: reprinted by Irish Univ. Pr., Shannon, 1972.)

POPES

Pope John Paul's sudden death after a reign of only 33 days raised problems for RCs, some of which were discussed in the secular press (*Times* 2 Oct. 1978). His choice as the Pope led to the comment by Cardinal Hume that he was "God's candidate" and it was generally agreed that he had been chosen more by the Holy Spirit than by the cardinals. Why, then, did he die after so short a reign? RCs were quick to point out that God's ways are not always ours and that John Paul I, by his decision to scrap much of the extravagance formerly associated with Pope-crowning, may have done permanent good: certainly his successor has followed in his steps. Perhaps the wisest last word goes to the secularist Stephen Pilkington (*Times* 10 Oct) who speaks of John Paul as one of the most lovable and admirable of men but adds: "Nevertheless, for an unbeliever [and surely believers too!] there is no astonishment when a confirmed

cigarette smoker in his sixties has a fatal heart attack."

It is interesting that according to the prophecies of Nostradamus and of St. Malachy (apparently these are 16th century forgeries) there are only three more popes to come before the day of reckoning. Of the last, the 111th after St. Malachy, (12th century archbishop of Armagh) it is said, "In the last persecution of the Holy Roman church, Peter the Roman will reign, and in the midst of great tribulations he will feed his flock; then the city with its seven hills will be destroyed, and the dread Judge will come to judge his people." The Latin phrase associated with the late Pope John Paul I means, "From the middle of a moon" and it is pointed out that his name Albino Luciani (colourless light) might be taken to refer to moonlight and that he reigned for one month, dying roughly half way between two full moons! (Article in the *Times* 14 Oct, 1978).

D.N. Samuel of the Protestant Reformation Society draws attention to the increasing tendency of Protestants to assume that "in any future union of Churches the Papacy should be accorded a primacy of honour" and sees in the Archbishop of Canterbury's attendance at the enthronement of John Paul II a confirmation of this assumption. He reminds us that Papal claims go much further. The decree of Vatican I declared that the primacy of the Roman Pontiff is not a "primacy of honour only (let him who says so be anathema)", but of "true and proper jurisdiction". Vatican II did nothing to alter this claim, but endorsed it. (Letter, *Times*, 24 Oct. 1978).

In the ensuing correspondence Rev. T.M. Parker of Oxford argued that no Pope could be satisfied with a mere honorific primacy (*Times* 11 Nov.). Primacy, according to Jesus, depends on service (Lk 22:24f) "If, therefore... the Papacy may be accorded a primacy, it can only be because it performs some service in the church, as the traditional papal title *Servus servorum Dei* at the beginning of all papal decrees witnesses. And jurisdiction, which it is worth remembering, does not only mean issuing orders, but, even more importantly, pronouncing judgment on controversies, is a form of service" - a form of service which the Papacy has provided since its beginning. Yet according to Jesus, it is the kings of the Gentiles who like to think that they serve their subjects as 'Benefactors', "Ye shall not be so".

THE TURIN SHROUD

Our provocative remarks on the Turin Shroud (this Volume, p.115) provided a well-merited reproof from Mr D.C. Mandeville.

The Turin Shroud deserves a rather fuller and more serious treatment than it received in a recent number of FAITH AND THOUGHT. The provenance of this piece of cloth raises questions, but this much can be said. It is fairly certainly the piece that was brought home to France by a returning Crusader in the 13th Century. Then there is a big gap. There is an account of a cloth brought to Byzantium in the 9th Century from Asia Minor, where it had been discovered walled-up, possibly to protect it from fanatical Turkish rulers of earlier times. This cloth had had the imprint of a bearded man's face on it, and caused a considerable stir at the time — it is perhaps worthy of mention that early portrayals of Our Lord were uniformly beardless, but, from this time on, He was always portrayed with a beard. Then, right far back, there is an account of Our Lord's shroud-cloth being brought from the Holy Land to Asia Minor, and effecting a miraculous cure, in the 2nd Century.

The weave is consistent with cloth samples from Near East tombs of this period. A thorough pollen analysis has been carried out of the dust in the cloth, and showed pollens specific to the three areas (Asia Minor, including the Holy Land; Byzantium; and France) in this putative itinerary. Pollen analysis, unlike carbon dating, is a non-destructive form of test.

The authorities' reluctance to submit the Shroud to carbon dating is quite understandable. First, these dating techniques are being improved all the time. Originally carbon dating required the destructive testing of a sizeable sample. Things are better now. Then, the results are normally hedged about with qualifications that can confuse, even giving at times a (wrongful) impression of ambiguity. If I were Curator of the Shroud, I would hold out until the tests had ten or twenty more years of consistent achievement to their credit. For what is to be gained? The Shroud could be shown up, even today, as a certain forgery, if it were one. But that is really rather improbable. Suppose on the other hand that the test result were to show it probably of the 1st Century A.D., what *exactly*

is gained? Even to those who accept the marking to record a particular set of wounds on a human body, there is the massive difficulty that crucifixions were all too common just then. No, carbon dating has only a marginally significant contribution to make - and that can wait, for the present.

In the film about the Shroud that has recently been showing in London, and in which Dr. John ('Honest to God') Robinson confessed (at length) to being more than half convinced, the testimony that impressed me most was that concerning the 'wounds' themselves. The senior Post-Mortem Pathologist of a large city in the USA., confronted with a positive full-scale print of the markings on the Shroud, went over them systematically, identified each type of 'wound' and how it had been inflicted; and on being asked to put an age to the person that had suffered them, said: a young man, strongly built, in his mid-thirties. Evidence was offered too about the whips the Romans used, and the 'wounds' that might represent scourging.

It was the Pathologist too who pointed out a narrow band where the markings were indistinct, or missing, consistent with a piece of material having been passed under the chin (doubtless to prevent the jaw sagging), and secured at the top of the head. The argument in FAITH AND THOUGHT that there cannot have been a shroud passing over the head of Our Lord, because of the Gospel mention of the napkin that was about His head, really does not hold water. It is suggested that the custom of the time was to array a corpse (and a hastily-buried corpse at that) in some sort of *turban*. That seems most improbable! At the resurrection event, would not Our Lord step out of the Shroud, leaving it crumpled lying on the floor of the tomb, and only then remove the napkin round His head or jaw - and even perhaps Himself (for He was then in *no* hurry) fold it up and lay it in a place apart? It is, I feel, at least permissible, to think that He did so.

It seems that the Shroud had long been recognised as bearing marks that resembled a man's face, but there was always something odd about them, which had to await the development of photography, in order to be understood. It is this. The markings (and this of course gives the lie direct to the Ahmadis' specious argument) form a photographic NEGATIVE! Howadays, one has only to be shown this to recognise it to be correct. In other words, it is 'stained' where there are no 'wounds', and vice versa. So much for the Ahmadis! The USAF scientists

have elaborated this finding with the use of one of their latest image intensifiers - but I found it (in the film) to smack a little too much of gimmickry, to be really convincing.

Literature on the Shroud is abundant and it seems that, with so little evidence to work on, one can see in it what one wishes. Pictures of the shroud as published hardly bear out the detail which some say they can see depicted in it. In a recent book (*The Turin Shroud*, Gollancz, 1978 £5.50) Ian Wilson claims to see in it a wonderful proof of our Lord's resurrection. In some way, in a blinding flash of resurrection power, Christ miraculously left his imprint on the cloth. Rodney Hoare (*Testimony of the Shroud*, 1978, £1.50, Quartet Books) tries to prove that the body which was once in the Shroud did not die at all but went into coma. Perhaps some of the guess work will be removed before long. Dr Kane tells us he has heard that threads from the shroud have recently been given to two American laboratories for carbon dating.

In the early ages of Christianity, as Mr Mandeville implies, relics were highly prized and credited with miraculous powers of healing (cf. Acts, 19:12). If the early church, at any stage, had possessed a cloth which had covered our Lord's body, this would certainly have eclipsed all other relics in its fame and power - real or alleged. But with the one doubtful exception, mentioned by DCM, no such miracles are recorded.

The Shroud is made of linen (171 x 43½ in. with no seam at the centre). If it had ever covered a body it must have been unevenly "peaked up by the nose and falling away quite sharply on either side of the head. It could not be anything but uneven over the extended chest, the folded hands, the acutely bent legs". If in some way (perhaps due to vapour from myrrh and aloes the embalming materials) an imprint of the body was left on the Shroud, distortion would show up when the cloth was stretched out taut. "Yet there is no distortion" (C.D. Foley *The Holy Shroud*, Augustine Pub. Co., Chawleigh, Devon 1978 p.14). This suggests that the markings were painted on the cloth. No particles of pigment are present, but a dye (probably from a plant) may have been used. Dyes derived from natural sources are not very fast and this may perhaps explain why a possibly original positive picture now looks more like a photographic negative.

The evidence that the Shroud once covered our Lord's body is thus extremely weak. The artist who executed the work would

have painted the marks (made by the spear, the crown of thorns etc) in accordance with the Gospel story.

Much is now made of the discovery that some of the pollen grains on the fabric are those of Palestine. This is said to prove that at one time the Shroud must have been in Palestine, but such pollen grains might easily have been carried by pilgrims from the Holy Land and have become unintentionally transferred to the Shroud when it was exhibited. Over the centuries many tens of thousands of people must have been in its vicinity.

The view (favoured in the 1911 edition of the Catholic Encyclopaedia) that the Shroud was made in Byzantine days for use in some kind of religious ceremonial seems sensible.

It is difficult to discover exactly how corpses were prepared for burial in our Lord's day. There is no archaeological evidence: no trace of cloth remains on any of the bones in ancient Palestinian sepulchres. In the case of *Lazarus* bandage-like cloth seems to have been wound separately round the arms and legs ("hands and feet wrapped with strips of linen" NIV) with a cloth (*soudarion*) covering his face (Jn. 11:44). Matthew says that linen was wrapped round our Lord's body (Mt. 27:59) and John that the body was wrapped in linen cloths in accordance with Jewish custom ("Taking Jesus' body, the two of them wrapped it, with the spices, in strips of linen. This was in accordance with Jewish burial customs" Jn 19:40 NIV). It is very difficult to reconcile these statements with the use of a long cloth, like a sheet of double length, folded over the head and down to the feet at the front and back of the body. In addition, our Lord's burial was a hurried affair as burial could not be performed on the Sabbath (Jn. 19:42). It is difficult to think that in these circumstances a shroud, had one been used, would have remained unsoiled.

It is often said that "either the shroud-image is a painting, in which case it is a forgery, or it is authentic. There is no middle way" (Foley). This does not follow. There is no reason to think that the Christian artist who painted it claimed that it was other than a picture. At one time the reigning Pope forbade its exhibition unless the priest in charge proclaimed in a loud voice that the Shroud was *not* the cloth in which Jesus was wrapped (*Cath. Enc.* 1970 ed.)

DCM raises the question of the beard and long hair. This point is discussed in an informative article in *The Plain Truth*

(Jan. 1979 issue). Despite a claim that long hair was customary in our Lord's time, the reverse is the truth. Nazarites had long hair which easily identified them in a crowd: if Jesus had been a Nazarite there would have been no need for Judas to identify Him among His disciples. If our Lord had had long hair it is inconceivable that Paul would have said that it is degrading for a man to have his hair long (1 Cor. 11:14). In Eastern regions where the cloth was apparently painted, customs were different and long hair in a man was thought to be dignified. All the early pictures of Jesus, though they date only from *ca* 200 AD show Him of youthful appearance, beardless and with short hair. Bearded long haired figures do not appear until the fifth century.

The preservation of relics, which may easily lead to superstitious practices, finds no support in Scripture. Hezekiah smashed the brazen serpent made by Moses and "did what was right in the eyes of the Lord" (2 Ki. 18: 3-4).

(The Editor is indebted to Dr Colin Hemer and to Dr J.P. Kane for information. Also to Dr Alan Adair.)

ANTARCTIC ICE

Antarctic ice sheets are of two kinds. The bulk of the ice is in eastern Antarctica and lies upon land, or what would become land if the weight of the ice were removed. In Western Antarctica the bottom of the ice is below sea level, some of it grounded as deep as 2500 metres. In places where the ice is in contact with the bed of the ocean it is surrounded by large areas of floating ice. The Western ice sheet was formed much more recently than the Eastern and there is much evidence that in the course of geological time it has formed and melted a number of times.

In 1964 A.T. Wilson (*Nature*, 281, 147) suggested that in the past the cause of the onset of each ice age was a single massive surge of 10-20% of the total ice in Antarctica which slipped suddenly into the sea. However, it is now thought that ice ages can be otherwise explained and Wilson's theory is not accepted. Nevertheless, surges of large areas of ice may occur, for example, "sometime between 8000 and 7500 BP" there was an "extremely rapid disintegration of the central portion of the Laurentide Ice Sheet over the present Hudson Bay" [Did this coincide with the Genesis Flood?]

Rapid surges are only possible when ice is grounded below sea level and is protected by a fringing ice sheet. If this melts, or is broken up, a critical state develops and, depending on the smoothness of the sea bottom, the ice sheet may slip quickly into deeper water. A warning sign is the reduction in size of a fringing ice sheet.

If the total ice in Antarctica were to enter the sea, sea level would rise by 50 metres: if only Western Antarctica was involved the rise would be 5 metres. Fortunately the main ice sheet is stable and short of a major world calamity, would take millions of years to melt. Left to itself the Western ice sheet should be stable for perhaps half a million years after which a sudden rise in sea level might be expected.

Man, however, is now interfering with nature on an unprecedented scale. The burning of fossil fuels is increasing the CO₂ in the air and the resultant green-house effect is probably warming the earth. Extended calculations indicate that average summer temperatures at Lat 80°S could rise by a few degrees within fifty years unless drastic curbs are made in the burning of coal, oil and wood. This rise would be enough to break up the floating ice barriers and start a rapid deglaciation in Western Antarctica with a consequent rapid rise of sea level of 5 metres - (S.H. Mercer, "Catastrophic Rise in Sea Level Possible", *Nature*, 1978, 271, 321). The Western ice shelf is now under constant surveillance by the satellite LANDSAT: between 1966 and 1974 strong indication that floating ice is beginning to disintegrate became evident. 600 Km² or one quarter of the Wordie Ice Shelf broke away and the Ice Shelf in George VI Sound receded (*Polar Record*, 1977, 18, 390). Ice in these areas can be heard creaking and bending as it rises and falls with the tides - much energy is expended which, because the extent of the floating ice sheets varies in geological time, is believed to account for small erratic variations in the rotation period of the earth (*Nature*, 1978, 275, 304). This winter (1978-9) the temperatures recorded in Antarctica are the highest ever - eg. minus 14°C at the South Pole base on 30 Dec. 1978 (*Cambridge Daily News* 5 Jan. 1979).

We are promised in Scripture that the world will not again be destroyed by a flood. Nevertheless there are certainly hints that water will be involved in the judgments of the last days. There is a storehouse of snow and hail which God has "kept ready for the day of calamity, for war and for the hour of battle" (Job 38:22 RSV).

In Haggai's well known prophecy of a final shaking, the sea is mentioned; "Yet once... and I will shake... the sea... and the desire of all nations shall come" (2:6-7). Jesus speaks of the sheer terror which commotions in the sea will cause ("distress of nations, in perplexity for the roaring of the sea and the billows" Lk. 21:25) while at the second great earthquake described in the Apocalypse (Rev. 16:20) we are told that islands will disappear which certainly suggests a sudden rise in sea level.

EARTH'S ATMOSPHERE

The early history of our planet, alluded to several times in the Bible, is of interest to Christians. Most (though not all) astronomers think that the Earth was formed from planetesimals, say about 5 aeons (1 aeon = 1000 m years) ago. If so, argues V.S. Safronov (*Icarus*, 1978, 33, 3) its temperature in its earliest phase will have depended on the average size of the falling rocks. If these were small, the earth may have kept fairly cool, if large (say 1 km across, or more) its surface would have become very hot - in fact the outer few hundred km may have melted. (The rate of fall has little effect on the temperature.) In any case the early earth would have heated up later and any primordial atmosphere would have been lost. The present atmosphere is believed to have been derived from materials degassed from the interior.

M.H. Hart ("The Evolution of the Atmosphere of the Earth", *Icarus*, 1978, 33, 23-39) has fed equations for 16 variables on which the subsequent history of the atmosphere starting at 4.5 aeons may have depended, into a computer. He does not consider the pristine heat (still very much an unknown quantity) or the heat liberated by radioactive decay. He tries only to make assumptions and fix constants in such a way that, in the end, an ocean-atmosphere like the present one will emerge.

The general picture which results is that (1) a warm ocean formed rapidly (temperature 41°C at 4.0 aeons) and for a long time the earth was completely covered by cloud. (2) The early atmosphere consisted of CO_2 with 15% N_2 and water vapour. The CO_2 then diminished as it became fixed by rocks ($\text{CaSiO}_3 + \text{CO}_2 + \text{CaCO}_3 + \text{SiO}_2$ and similar reactions - Urey) while CH_4 (from hydrogen and CO_2 - see below) increased to a maximum at 3.5 aeons by which time the atmosphere was mostly methane) and then fell (to zero at 2.0 aeons).

(3) Decomposition of H_2O by uv light gave hydrogen (some escaped into space) and oxygen (removed by oxidation of methane, of ammonia which was mostly dissolved in the sea, of ferrous iron and of sulphides) until at 2.0 aeons free oxygen (providing an ozone shield) began to accumulate.

At 0.42 aeons enough oxygen (and so of ozone) was present to reduce the sun's uv light intensity to a level tolerable to life: photosynthesis now became possible on land and on the surface of the ocean, (as distinct from say 10-20 metre depths where uv light does not penetrate). Thereafter O_2 concentration increased rapidly, reaching the present level which is still rising (i.e. apart from man's activities).

By 2.0 aeons when free O_2 was present the average temperature had fallen to $7^\circ C$ (due to loss of greenhouse effect due to CH_4 and NH_3 - see below - and/or CO_2): it is $15^\circ C$ today. Large ice caps were now present.

The role of H_2O is important and interesting. The albedo of cloud is 0.52 (i.e. cloud reflects 52% of the sun's radiation), of rocks 0.15, of water 0.04 and of ice 0.70). A fall in temperature reduces cloud cover and so increases the heat received from the sun. But if T falls a little lower (to a calculated $5^\circ C$) ice sheets increase at the Poles and the net heat received from the sun falls, causing a further fall in temperature (because of the high albedo of ice), so runaway glaciation, which cannot be reversed, sets in. When a computer simulation was run with the Earth - Sun distance increased by only 1% the evolution of the atmosphere was the same up to 2 aeons but then runaway irreversible glaciation occurred.

On the other hand the reaction between silicates and CO_2 , which removes CO_2 from the atmosphere, cannot proceed at reasonable speed unless silicates are wet. Failure of water to condense to form oceans will cause a runaway greenhouse effect caused by CO_2 - as happened on Venus. Computer simulation showed that with the Earth - Sun distance 5% smaller, this would have happened on earth. (This confirms earlier work published in 1970 which gave 4-7%).

There is then a "habitable zone" (Huang) around a given star in which a planet must be situated for life to be possible. Main sequence stars increase their luminosity (the sun by 25% since 4.5 aeons ago) with time, so that habitable zones move outwards. The "continuously habitable zone" is "far narrower than the habitable zone at any one time".

These findings, of course, greatly reduce the probability that inhabitable planets are widespread in the universe.

It was assumed in this paper that life arose on Earth after 800 m years and that it could only have evolved from inorganic materials in a reducing atmosphere. It was assumed, therefore, that the atmosphere must have been reducing and since methane is thermodynamically the most stable hydrocarbon, that it must have consisted largely of methane. The presence of this gas was assumed to arise from the reaction $\text{CO}_2 + 4\text{H}_2 = \text{CH}_4 + 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$ (with perhaps some help from the corresponding reaction starting with CO). There appears to be no convincing evidence for an early highly reducing atmosphere and these assumptions may be unjustified. There is much CO_2 on Venus and hydrogen is detectable in its outer atmosphere, but hydrocarbons are definitely absent. The geological evidence certainly supports the view that there was a great increase in the oxygen content of the atmosphere at around 0.42 aeon ago and that there was some oxidation of rocks at an earlier stage; CO_2 rather than CH_4 may have produced the greenhouse effect before 0.42 aeon. Photosynthesis must have started in earnest at this time, but the biomass at an earlier stage must have been very small on any view and would hardly have affected the computer results. It is still too early to assess a recent suggestion that volcanic gases contained a fair proportion of CH_4 which may still be entering the atmosphere: it seems unlikely that the general conclusions would be affected, though it might allow for an early reducing atmosphere.

The general picture which emerges fits in well with Genesis. With heavy cloud cover over a very hot ocean there is darkness upon the face of the deep. As cooling proceeds light is provided first, probably, by electrical storms but when sunlight passes through the clouds periods of darkness and light are distinguishable. Later the mist rises from the surface of the ocean leaving clear air (the firmament across which birds are later said to fly) which divides the waters below from the cloud cover above. Photosynthesis now starts in earnest. Only later do the lights of heaven (sun, moon and stars) appear when, for the first time, the Earth's cloud cover is no longer complete.

There is now substantial geological evidence that, as Genesis states, deep water was present very early — the compositions and structures of some very early rocks (*komatites*) indicate that they were extruded under water at a pressure of at least 1000 atmospheres

(D.H. Tarling, ed, *Evolution of the Earth's Crust*, Academic Press, 1978, Chap 1). At first Earth was ocean covered: land appeared much later (see this JOURNAL 104, 81).

THE SELF AND ITS BRAIN

There is a good deal of Christian interest to be found in *The Self and its Brain*, a joint work by Sir Karl R. Popper and Sir John Eccles, (Springer International, 1977, 597 pp.). Popper likes to call himself an agnostic and Eccles is a Christian (RC), yet it is surprising how far they are able to agree on many fundamental issues. Both are interactionists and repudiate materialism in all its forms, while a motive "for writing this book is that we both feel that the debunking of man has gone far enough — even too far. It is said that we had to learn from Copernicus and Darwin that man's place in the universe is not so exalted or so exclusive as man once thought. That may well be. But since Copernicus we have learned to appreciate how wonderful and rare, perhaps even unique, our little Earth is in this big universe; and since Darwin we have learned more about the incredible organization of all living things on Earth, and also about the unique position of man among his fellow creatures."

The book consists of three parts. In the first Popper gives an outline of philosophy. He discusses, *inter alia*, the four different types of materialism and why we should reject them, emergence, panpsychism, J.B.S. Haldane's argument that materialism is self-refuting (shown to be sound if carefully formulated), the idea of mind as the ghost in the machine, the impossibility of ultimate explanation, and so on.

Part 2, by Eccles, the neurologist, in a more technical section discusses such topics as structure and functioning of the brain, conscious perception, voluntary movement, the brain's language centres, experiments on exposed brains, the dominant and minor hemispheres, forms of unconsciousness, memory, and so on.

Part 3 takes the form of dialogue between the participants.

Only a few points can be mentioned here, mostly taken from Popper. On materialism he reflects that machines do not have a value in themselves: if there are too many of them we are prepared to pay to have them removed. Yet we value human lives even in an

over-populated country. We respect even the life of a murderer (p.4).

On evolution, one cannot avoid the impression that Popper accepts the doctrine because this is expected of scientists. Though he makes such statements as, "Evolution has produced much that was not foreseeable", "The universe, or its evolution, is creative" (p.15), and speaks of "... the universe that has created man" (p.16), he more than once expresses misgiving. For

"I would like to stress.. that evolutionary theory never gives us a full explanation of anything's coming into being in the course of evolution. We may say that in the course of evolution birds, for example, have developed from reptiles; but, of course, this isn't an explanation... In a sense, evolutionary theory is terribly weak as an explanatory theory, and we should be conscious of this" (p.560).

"It is incredibly improbable that life ever emerged; but it *did* emerge. Since it is incredibly improbable, it cannot be an explanation to say that it emerged because... an explanation in probabilistic terms is always an explanation in terms of a higher probability: that under such and such conditions it is *very* probable that such and such happens. That is an explanation, but we do not have such an explanation for the emergence of life, or for the emergence of the human brain." (p.561)

"I am somewhat critical of evolutionary theory and of its explanatory power, and especially of the explanatory power of natural selection." (p.566)

Popper argues cogently that no theory that makes atoms (or smaller particles) conscious or semi-conscious can explain self-awareness which he takes to prove that evolution is creative. The idea that there could be a power outside of, and independent of, the universe, at least the universe as discoverable by science, is not hinted at. One might have thought that, as an interactionist who holds that consciousness controls the body, it would be natural to think that a cosmic consciousness, or God, controls or can control what we call the universe.

There is, of course, some ambiguity here. The late Professor Charles Coulson often spoke and wrote as if the universe is creative. In correspondence with me he said that by the universe

he meant 'the whole show', all that is, including God. But this is not Popper's meaning, for he does not believe in God. We have here a good example of how believers and nonbelievers sometimes use the same language but mean very different things. I do not think that Coulson would have claimed that that part of the universe which does not include God is creative.

On p.28 Popper follows Monod (1970) in saying that the probability that atoms would combine in such a way as to make a living organism is indistinguishable from zero (see above). Though we can give some sort of explanation as to how the elements came into being "it seems that we cannot give an explanation for the origin of life; for a probabilistic explanation must work with probabilities near to 1, and cannot work with probabilities near to zero - to say nothing of probabilities virtually equal to zero". Even though we may have some idea of the conditions necessary for the coming of life, "an *explanation* of the origin of life may be insuperable... Much speaks in favour of the view that the event was unique."

In discussing the consciousness of animals, Popper reminds us that like other widely accepted hypotheses, this is a metaphysical idea because it cannot (at least at present) be confirmed by science and in particular it cannot be falsified (p.442). This does not mean that it should be rejected. "Metaphysical hypotheses are important for science in at least two ways. First of all, in order to have a general picture of the world we need metaphysical hypotheses. Secondly, in the actual preparation of our research we are guided by what I have called 'metaphysical research programmes'". These points are, of course, highly relevant to a belief in theism.

Like so many intellectual pagans, Popper thinks that all attempts to make eternal life seem attractive have failed. (To Christians such sentiments seem very odd. What could be more wonderful and enjoyable than an eternity spent with God and loving friends with interesting work to do and complete absence of jealousy and other sins, to say nothing of weariness and pain?) "The Islamic heaven, especially" he says "seems particularly intolerable as an ideal of eternal life. But most terrible of all prospects appears to be the prospect which the people who believe in spiritualism seem to offer. That is to say, a kind of ghostly semi-existence after death, and one... which seems to be intellectually on a particularly low level... This form of semi-survival is probably the most unpleasant form which has so far

been conceived." He then reflects that whatever may lie in store in the future, it is death which gives value to life here and now. To this Eccles replies, "I think that, Karl, you are put off by all the very crude attempts to describe life after death. I am put off by them too." In creative imagination, he suggests, the mind rises "superior to the brain". We came out of oblivion and "our ignorance about our origin matches our ignorance about our destiny". (p 556f)

NAZI CHRISTIANS

The liberal or modernist view that God reveals His truth not only in the Bible but in the course of history and in changes in the climate of opinion, so that Christians need to modify their views accordingly to the maxims of the age in which they live, has had some hard knocks recently.

James Bentley (*The Listener*, 16 Nov. 1978) has recently discussed the sad story of how many Christians in the German evangelical church supported Hitler on the Jewish question before WW2. JB finds that some of those who supported National Socialism were highly intelligent and deeply committed Christians. The Party's self-declared aim was to stand for positive Christianity without binding itself confessionally to any one denomination. This was linked with anti-semitism, the Party being engaged in a struggle against the Jewish materialistic spirit both within and without. Foremost among Hitler's theological supporters was the Professor of NT at the University of Tübingen, Gerhardt Kittel (1888-1948) whose scholarship was acknowledged internationally. The Scripture, Kittel argued, teaches rejection as well as redemption. By rejecting Christ the Jews had incurred God's rejection and he argued that the OT teaches that the mixture of races leads to decadence. It was Kittel who made antisemitism respectable, for he was well versed in rabbinics. He claimed to have no quarrel with individual Jews, only with world Jewry, and he advocated a separate Jewish christian church for those who had been converted to Christianity.

Kittel's views were made the more dangerous by his influence on the Cambridge theologian Sir Edwyn Hoskyns (1884-1937). Hoskyns persuaded the University of Cambridge to invite Kittel to lecture at Cambridge in 1937. Richard Gutteridge spread Nazi ideas about Jews. An argument of the day was that the pietism of the

Lutheran churches had led to a separation of faith from everyday life; the Germans had now learned how to integrate the two. At all times in history when the church has had to live in a new social environment, it has been forced to restate its faith. The church's duty is to adapt itself to its surroundings. The Nazis were guilty only of patriotic modernism. The rumour was spread that Hitler was profoundly religious and demanded a Christianity which was alive to the vital needs of the day. One such issue was that raised by the modernist movement in England - is the Scripture the only source of revelation? To many German Christians the Nazi party was a further source of revelation. For Kittel God's Holy Spirit was at work in Mussolini and Hitler as in all great movements of history. Bishop Barnes appears to have agreed with this. Allbright argued in reply that what happened to Germany can happen anywhere when Christians profess to see the revelation of God other than in the Scripture.

GOD AND COMMUNISTS

Karol Wojtyla, now Pope John Paul II, trained to become a priest at the seminary at Cracow after WW2. One evening, when he was taking his turn as porter, the door-bell rang. A Russian soldier had come asking if he could enter the seminary. He was invited in and they talked for a long time. "He did not enter the seminary" says Wojtyla "but I personally learned a great truth from our encounter: that God can penetrate the minds of men in the most unpromising situations, in spite of systems and régimes which deny His existence. This young man had scarcely ever been inside a church. At school and later at work he had been continually assured, 'There is no God'. And in spite of everything he kept on saying: 'But I always knew that God did exist... and now I should like to learn something about Him...'" (*Sunday Telegraph* 7 Jan. 1979).

By way of contrast - a USA army chaplain was present at the interrogation of a young N. Vietnamese soldier. He asked one question only - "Do you believe in God?" The man looked blank and then replied, "I have received no instructions, if I am told to believe in God I shall do so". (Arthur Lewis, *Christian Terror*, Rhodesia Christian Group, Salisbury, Rhodesia, 1978, p.67)

Dr David Brodeur, with whose articles in FAITH AND THOUGHT readers will be familiar, tells us (letter 31 Mar. 1978) that he has received a book, anonymously, written by A.R. Butz with the Title *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*. The gist of this substantial (315 pp) volume is that the Nürnberg trials were a hoax and that the Nazis killed only a few thousand Jews in WW2. The book which is undated purported to be published by The Historical Review Press, Reading, Surrey. A search in the three standard lists of British Publishers makes no mention of this press or company. It does not appear in the telephone book, or in Kelly's Directory of Richmond, or even in the 4-volume Publishers' Association's list of British booksellers. A copy in the Cambridge University Library was received (in 1976) by post, but not through the Copyright Agency.

An article in the *Times* (8 Aug 1978) summarises a report published by the London-based Institute of Jewish Affairs. It records that 50 books and booklets have recently appeared in the Western world claiming that no mass murder of Jews took place, or that Hitler did not know of it. It is frequently said that Jews invented the myth. These books have been translated into many European languages.

A Nazi mentality seems to be growing throughout the world. In Germany Hitler's speeches have been circulating as gramophone records — a law prohibiting their sale was recently passed.

Far away from Europe Australian aborigines have been denied their rights time and time again in the past and have to fight for their very existence. Investigation by the Community Relations Bureau of the Australian Government recently showed that there is great danger of a "de facto apartheid" attitude developing which will exclude them finally from ordinary Australian life. "One view repeatedly expressed was that the most practical solution would be to shepherd the Aborigines to an offshore island and bomb them." (*Times* 5 Jan. 1978)

GERALD T. HUGHES

SEXUAL ETHICS - Pastoral Care

This is the text of the fourth paper, given by Gerald Hughes, Director of Religious Studies at Rugby School, at the VI Symposium on Sexual Ethics held at Chelsea College on 20th May 1978.

A medical practitioner is trained to draw upon two resources in his work of maintaining health and curing disease: the general and the specific.

Within the area of the general lie those factors which we may call common-sense - adequate diet, sleep, exercise, etc. To neglect this general area and to concentrate exclusively on the specific realm of medical knowledge is foolish, and no good doctor would fall into such an error. The pastoral situation is similar. We approach our work with specific skills and that degree of specialist knowledge that has come to us from the nature of our training. But we also come with what we would call common-sense resources which are very much the product of the philosophical presuppositions undergirding our lives. There are certain assumptions we have about man, morality and the purpose of life which colour every department of our lives and when we are working in a counselling or pastoral situation these assumptions have a deep effect on the nature of our work. To ignore them or to fail to appreciate that they exist is to court disaster. In the same way, anyone who imagines that he can act in a pastoral role objectively, free from his presuppositions and prejudices, is fooling no one but himself. For all his training, the pastor is still human and his fundamental philosophy of life provides the general resource which both colours and supplements his specific skills and resources.

In this paper I am approaching the work of counselling and pastoral care from the position of a committed Christian and it is therefore Christian assumptions that will colour my approach to Sexual Ethics and the way I make use of the skills of counselling.

At the heart of any counselling work lies man's deepest need for unconditional acceptance. He wishes to be accepted simply as he is "warts and all" and not on the basis of some particular quality, social position or achievement. To be accepted unconditionally gives man a sense of Being and to develop this, acceptance must be sustained with good things within a relationship. Both these phases of input into the personality - acceptance and sustenance - result in providing man with a sense of identity; assuming, of course, that the input has been positive. On the growing sense of identity man can then proceed to achieve the good things that are appropriate to each particular stage of his maturation with a minimum of frustration. In pastoral terms this is what the Christian doctrine of Justification by Faith means to me and it is the way I try to relate my academic theology to human need.¹

One of the problems which I find most acute in pastoral work is that society seems to operate differently and offers acceptance on the basis of achievement. We are so often acceptable because we have done certain things which others approve of or say we believe things which toe a particular party line.

In sexual matters it is fairly common to discover that much emphasis has been put on performance. It is vital, so some would assert, that a wife must always achieve orgasm and the man who cannot help his wife to this goal is made to feel in some way inadequate and guilty. Anxiety follows when performance fails. Tensions arise and we are on the threshold of a sexual problem which, oddly enough has little to do with sex as such, but has a good deal to do with the rejection of one person by another. It is fascinating to note that Masters and Johnson in their approach to sexual therapy spend so much time trying to get married couples to relate to one another again. (We shall look a little more fully at Masters and Johnson's work later in this paper.)

As a pastor I am not primarily concerned with sexual problems but with people and it is with the problems of their acceptance and rejection that I try to work. Consequently, this paper gives little time to specific sexual problems, but a good deal of space to the nature of those relationships in which growth and creative change can take place. I make no apologies for this emphasis.

What general resources does the Christian bring to the pastoral situation? Very simply, he comes with the resources found within the body of Christ, viz: the scriptures, prayer, the sacraments, the discernment of the Spirit and Christ's love for people. He may not always employ these resources wisely, but they are available and when they are used well they affect the whole pastoral situation for the good.

In 1 Cor 1:30 St. Paul writes that Christ is our Wisdom and in so doing emphasises the Hebrew assumption that wisdom is not primarily to do with cleverness, but with a quality of life. For the Christian engaged in counselling the idea is important because it shows clearly that wisdom is not primarily a matter of intellect, but of life. The highest wisdom is not to be found simply where the cleverest intellects are at work, but where the highest life is to be found. For the Christian this life is found in Christ and it is nothing less than this life that the Christian claims to bring to people when he comes as a pastor. All helping - that is the sort that induces change - takes place within a relationship. Therefore, counselling techniques and intellectual skills are useful only in so far as they build a relationship in which creative change can take place and that wisdom which is the quality of the life of Christ is, for the Christian pastor, the vital element in that relationship.

This whole discipline of pastoral care as I see it depends on the truth of the Christian claim that in fellowship with God, through Christ and His Church, there are available personal resources which transform relationships and personality. We claim that there is, here, an inflow of being and well-being; or to put it in more concrete terms, there is an inflow of the fruit of the Spirit which is love, joy, peace. People who come to us seeking pastoral help need these resources above all others. They cannot love maturely, they are prone to gloom rather than joy and they are anxious, not at peace. If love, joy, peace are anywhere available this diet will cure them. St. Paul reminds the Churches constantly that these resources are now available. The tremendous power available to those who believe in God is the "same Divine energy which was demonstrated in Christ when God raised Him from the dead". This life of Christ has lifted men out of the old life and these "incalculable riches of Christ" are open to those for whom Paul prays, that they may know the inner reinforcement of the Spirit; that Christ may indeed live in their hearts by faith.

So, the pastor draws on two major resources - (1) The specific skills within the science of human relations, and (2) The general resources which spring from his own philosophy of life.

The work of the counsellor has been defined as "an art in which knowledge of the science of human relations and skill in relationship are used to mobilize capacities in the individual and resources in the community appropriate for better adjustment between the client and all or any part of his total environment".^{2a}

The relationship is therefore concerned with change in that it seeks to help the individual to make a "better adjustment" to his situation, but this adjustment can only be made when the skills of the counsellor and the resources of the community enable the individual to "mobilize capacities" within himself. In other words, the task of the counsellor is not to tell the client what he ought to do, but to provide a climate in which he sees that what he *ought* to do is what he *wants* to do. The client will only be able to accept his problem and do something about it if he is free to do exactly the opposite, to deny it, to fight against it. This truth may be something that is easier to understand than it is to practise. We long for a person to make what we are pleased to call the 'right' choice and we are inclined to push him in the way we feel he ought to travel. But, this can create a reaction which is unproductive and result in a tightening of the resolve not to move at all.

The Development of the Pastoral Relationship

We have already seen that real helping takes place within a relationship and this implies that the relationship must be two-way. The client must give to the relationship as well as the pastor. In fact we only get to know ourselves as we do so in relationship with others and so the giving and the receiving must involve both parties. At the same time we human beings are fearful of help; for we do not often wish to learn about ourselves. Why is this? So often we claim to have an eager desire to learn. On many occasions we demand help as if it were a right. But what we profess to want, ask for, or even demand is not real help or learning at all. What we are doing is asking for help on our terms - help that will not force us to change. It is in fact a way of warding off any real offer of help, a way of going through the motions, of pretending to ourselves, rather than getting real help. To appreciate this a little better we need to look for a moment at what it takes really to ask for help. It involves:-

1. Admitting that there is something wrong and that alone and without help I am impotent to cope with it.
2. A willingness to confess this weakness to another person. To allow him access to the real me that I am often inclined to keep hidden behind a mask of self-protection.

3. A willingness to submit myself — not my mask — to another. I therefore put myself in the power of another.
4. A willingness to change, to move into the unknown by giving up my present position, however hard it may be to do so, and to launch into some new area of living that may appear better, but may actually turn out to be worse.

In theological terms this means Repentance — the admission that I am a sinner in need of God's help. Confession, Submission and Faith — the evidence of things not seen.³

It is hardly surprising therefore that most of us will do anything to prevent ourselves from being helped.

Understandably therefore, when someone approaches us to ask for help he comes fearfully. There is fear of being rejected, of being judged and of changing — which implies unwillingness to take a risk. Fear makes people refuse to do what in all common sense has to be done. It is what makes people obstinate, hostile or stupid or whatever else may describe this incapacity to act. Frequently, people will say that they do not know what to do. Sometimes this is indeed true, and knowledge can be of use in deciding what we should do. More often, though, the basic problem is not one of knowledge. It is fear of putting that knowledge into action. The pastor's task in this situation is to establish the kind of relationship that can deal with the fear and set the person free.⁴

If a man is free it follows that help is not something that can be given; for it is not a thing like a pound of butter. It can only be offered. A relationship can be achieved between the pastor and the person who is seeking help that will make change and growth possible, but no one can guarantee that this will happen. We can clear the way and make it possible, but that is all. As was said earlier the choice to accept a problem and do something about it is only a positive choice for a person who is free to do exactly the opposite. Pastors need to beware of being too 'free' with advice. In the realm of sexual counselling especially the big temptation is to speak authoritatively and to play God in the lives of other folk and to make them turn in a direction they have not freely chosen.

What then is the role of the pastor in a counselling situation? As a pastor, I may be eager to listen, but how do I cope with the mass of words that can come tumbling out, or with the stoney silences when nothing is said? My first reaction may well be one

of panic - "What can I say?" - and the result may be that I fail to set the visitor at his ease. My second reaction may be that I ought at least to say something but then I may fall for one or more of the 3 major counselling pitfalls.

1. *I may talk about myself.* "You know, that's precisely how I feel". The moment we start this gambit there is a very real danger that the counsellor and his client will "swap hats" and the counsellor becomes the one who is being counselled. Such a manoeuvre may cause the real client to be both angry and frustrated. He had come for an entirely different purpose. Moreover, there may well be a further threat to him. If he sees that the counsellor can talk freely and easily about his own problems, yet he stumbles and is hesitant when attempting to do the same, then he can experience a very real sense of inadequacy which only adds to the original problem an unnecessary burden. A true counselling situation is not one where we as counsellors fully share ourselves. There is need for self-discipline and a willingness not to share everything within ourselves.

2. *I may begin by giving a personal opinion.* Here I may fall for the temptation to offer premature solutions so that my visitor goes away feeling unhelped. Or I may adopt a moral stance and tell the client what he *ought* to do. For instance, I may say, "Don't you think that you should change your job?" rather than allowing ideas of that nature to come up from the client. It is all too easy and rather dangerous to try to arrange other people's lives for them.

3. *I may try to minimize the symptoms.* Such an attitude reveals that I refuse to take the other person seriously. A common temptation is to remark, "Oh, surely, things can't be as bad as you say. Things never are you know. I remember once..." Or we may try to make people pull themselves together. "Snap out of it," we say, "and let's not have so much fuss."

How can the counsellor avoid pitfalls like these? What can be done of a positive nature?

People come to us as pastors with seven basic needs.^{2b} They need:-

- (a) to be treated as individuals
- (b) to express their feelings freely, especially their negative feelings

- (c) to gain a sympathetic response to their problem
- (d) to be recognized as persons of worth
- (e) not to be judged
- (f) to make their own choices and decisions
- (g) to keep secrets about themselves.

The task of the pastor is to be sensitive to these needs, to understand them and to respond to them appropriately. He can do this by getting his visitor to relax and to be relaxed himself. A flustered counsellor increases the feelings of tension within his client. The pastor must not be afraid of silence. Even the silences are saying something! Whilst it is valuable to know something about psychological types we must beware of trying to put people into pigeon-holes. Everyone is unique and we must be sufficiently sensitive to their uniqueness not to assume that the same approach will work in every situation and with different people showing similar symptoms. In these ways the pastor is seeking to build a relationship between himself and his client and then to utilize the relationship once it has been established to help the client to achieve a better relationship between himself and his environment. Once a client realizes that the counsellor is taking both him and his problem seriously, then there exists the beginnings of rapport.

It is important at this stage to remind ourselves of the fact that once rapport has been established and the client feels able to open the floodgates even a little and let the problem out, the emotions in the client elicit emotional responses in the pastor. We hope that the pastoral response will be appropriate, but we need to realize that our own anxieties and fears are often stirred by the client, so we must watch out for those moments when we want to change the subject, suggest that we might have a cup of tea or take a stroll round the park. At such times we need to be sure that it is not our own uneasiness that is at the heart of the suggested change. Therefore, the pastor must be someone who is not afraid to know himself, his prejudices, biases, attitudes and feelings. This is particularly important if we would avoid the false assumption that what the client feels about a thing is precisely the same as the way we feel ourselves.

At this point it is probably becoming clear that the art of listening is not an easy one and for a while I want to explore

the question why listening to others is not a simple but a difficult task that requires all the love and the skill that we can bring to it.

The cultural climate in which most of us have been raised involves, from an early age, training in concealment. There are whole areas that we have been taught to avoid and if these "not-to-be-spoken-of" feelings and fantasies are going on inside us then we are expected to be ashamed of them. If we let them out into the open and actually speak of them, we are not given credit for being honest, but discredited, not so much for the hidden things in themselves as for the disgraceful and embarrassing situation created for the listener by our having spoken of such things. Growth in honesty, especially in religious circles, must take place at a reasonable pace. Too bold a growth in honesty produces an irrational and almost claustrophobic reaction in the listeners. By implication, they are being pushed by our disclosure to a place where unpleasant things are disclosed about themselves, whether they admit them to consciousness or not. It is like being forced into a new world where you cannot be sure that anything is hideable any more, where nothing is private. Such a painful place is avoided by any sensible person. Honest disclosure, therefore, does not simply tell us something about the teller, it also discloses the listener. It burdens him with knowledge that he did not want and does not know what to do with, not only about the other person, but about himself.

Listeners to disclosures of those things that are ordinarily hidden feel that they are being pushed towards the frontier of what our culture thinks to be the decent boundaries of silence. "What would some of my friends say if they knew that I was listening to this kind of unmentionable stuff?" Certain subjects, we feel, ought not to be talked of in decent society and he who breaks these rules is made to feel very much of an outsider. But here is the pastor listening to this stuff and moreover he can feel it rubbing off on him. He experiences a guilt by association so that he feels that he ought not to be listening at all. On top of all this, the material is very depressing and it so churns him up internally that he is going to become very anxious if he allows it to continue.

The task for the ego is to navigate in its world without anxiety and it does this by learning to choose actions that are satisfying and bring praise instead of blame. Only in this way can it earn the vital self-esteem that is a buffer against anxiety. Culture provides just those rules and customs, goals of conduct, that place right actions automatically at the individual's disposal.⁵

The self-esteem of the pastor depends, like everyone else's, on people feeling he is a safe predictable sort of person. Yet here he is listening to things that are not really decent and the experience is frightening.

The temptation now is for the pastor to blame the one who has come seeking help. "I hardly expected this from him. Who would have thought that he had such thoughts locked away inside? I've dined with him on many occasions and I really thought that I knew what he was thinking. It's pretty obvious that I've been mistaken. I can expect remarks like this from some people, but not from the men I normally associate with. I really wish he would stop talking; it is making me very uncomfortable. The next time I see him I shall have to avoid him altogether. This has quite ruined my day."^{6A}

We have to recognise that therapeutic listening, that quality of listening that brings relief and healing to the person who is prepared to disclose just what is the precise state of his being at the moment, breaks with the ordinary conventions of society. Society insists that there are certain boundaries over which we ought not to step if we have respect for the feelings of others. We have to learn not to submerge others with what may be uncomfortable private data. This is all very well as long as that which society demands we keep private is not invested with real or imaginary powers of destruction to the self should it leak out and give rise to hostility because others find it offensive.

While the pastor fears rejection if it should be known that he listens to painful and unpleasant disclosures, the one who wishes to tell his story is also fearful of rejection for five very good reasons.

In the first place he feels that perhaps he ought not to have "that kind of nasty stuff" inside him anyway.

Secondly, because he has this impulse to lessen his burden of alienation, by sharing his hurts, griefs, guilts with others thus halving his load, he is offending the social demand not to submerge others under a load of uncomfortable private information.

Thirdly, rejection threatens him because he can never be sure that he has not, by mistake, stumbled upon a non-listener who has given a false impression of readiness to come alongside and to listen patiently.

Fourthly, even if he has found a genuine listener, there is the understandable fear that the listener will be put off by what he has been told and before the end of the story he will turn away in anger and disgust and lay blame for the telling.

Finally, there is the reasonable fear that the eager pastor is doing the listening out of a sense of personal desire to be needed — a kind of self love. The pastor cannot or will not face his own weaknesses and unresolved problems that have been left over from earlier periods of his life. Since he cannot cope with his own bad side he displaces the whole problem. Further, unaware of his own inner refusal to come to terms with his own bad side he becomes aware of an intense need to help the miserable person facing him. By this sleight of hand he 'proves' that he is not a failure by succeeding in the helping of others. This helper is someone really to be afraid of; for there is no genuine love here to give. The whole exercise is merely an expression of a need for love rather than a *gift* of love.^{6b}

The Elements of Effective Pastoral Care

At the start of effective pastoral care, the counsellor needs to appreciate that, like his client, he is a fallible human being who, if not capable of the particular weaknesses under review, is capable of many others. So he approaches his visitor sensitively seeking to develop the relationship around the interests of that person. He does not seek to be admired as a counsellor, nor to control the situation. He seeks rather to exhibit non-possessive warmth allowing the needs of the client to take priority over things like the good of the group, public morality, or what the neighbours might say.

The counselling interview to be described consists of three important stages:-

1. An initial self-exploration.
2. An intermediate self-understanding.
3. A final emerging direction leading to action.

These three stages are developments of two major movements which are:-

- A. Downward and inward, which incorporate 1 and 2 above.
- B. Upward and outward, which covers 3 above.

Into this general movement of the interview the pastor seeks to bring six basic dimensions to enable the client to be able to undertake his own self exploration and understanding in the company of the helper. If all goes well in these areas then the client may be able to take the route of emerging into positive action. In this movement the pastor merely accompanies his client and allows him to take the lead. The six basic dimensions of effective counselling, due to R.R. Carkhuff⁷ - are set out on p.180 in diagramatic form for ease of study. This type of counselling is known as Non-directive and we need to examine it for a while; for some may feel that such an approach, involving as it does, non-judgmental attitudes, must of necessity be indifferent to social, legal, and moral attitudes. However, the non-judgmental attitude does not mean indifference to or rejection of value systems.

The non-judgmental attitude is a quality of the casework relationship; it is based on a conviction that the casework function excludes assigning guilt or innocence, or degree of client responsibility for causation of the problems or needs, but does include making evaluative judgments about the attitudes, standards, or actions of the client; the attitude, which involves both thought and feeling elements, is transmitted to the client.^{2c}

The pastor withdraws from judging the guilt or innocence of the *client*, but he is prepared to evaluate the *attitudes, standards and actions* of the client. The client feels hurt when *he* is judged, but he is less likely to feel hurt if his *behaviour* is evaluated. The reason the pastor seeks to evaluate the behaviour of his client is to understand and not to judge him. The pastor is interested in the causes of behaviour only in so far as this understanding is an aid in furthering the present and future adjustment of his client.

Standards and values are not only compatible with a non-judgmental attitude, they are indispensable for effective counselling.

In the first place the pastor has a social responsibility. His task is to help the individual within the basic values of a society based on a belief in God.

Secondly, no-one is really helped if it is felt that the counsellor is indifferent to the antisocial, illegal or immoral attitudes that brought trouble to the client.

Finally, the counsellor must maintain his own integrity and he cannot remain indifferent to standards which are contrary to his own. He cannot be expected to change his philosophy of life to suit every case. He must remain true to himself. He has a right to his own sense of social, moral and spiritual values, personally and professionally. However, this does not necessarily mean that the pastor will be moralistic with his client. Every man has a right to follow his own conscience. In some instances, however, where a subjective interpretation of morality would result in antisocial, or illegal behaviour, the limitations to the client's right to self-determination need to be recognized and applied. The non-judgmental attitude of the pastor needs to be felt by the client, but there are no formulae for transmitting an attitude. It is conveyed mainly in the tone and manner of the interview rather than in direct statements. In some cases of course it may be necessary to verbalize this attitude, but only if it complements the internal feeling. No words can convey a non-judgmental attitude if the pastor does not possess it.

Up to this point I have tried to cover those principles of counselling and pastoral care that are applicable to every counselling situation and not exclusively to the care of people with sexual problems. Now I want to turn our attention to a recent trend in sexual counselling.

Masters and Johnson's Approach to human sexual Problems

In 1954 William H. Masters and Virginia E. Johnson began an eleven year study of human sexual problems. Their work began in America and it is only in fairly recent years that they have been studied and their ideas used in this country. Their major report⁸ was published on 19th April, 1966, and was sold out within three days. Although it was a medical book, it quickly rose to the second place on The New York Times non-fiction best seller list. Their research led them to report that "Sociocultural deprivation and ignorance of sexual physiology, rather than psychiatric or medical illness, constitute the etiologic background for most sexual dysfunction". This quotation is from their second book, (1970, p 21). One of the basic assumptions underlying their approach is that human attitudes and ignorance rather than any mental or physical illness are responsible for most sexual problems. The implication is that a short-term educational effort combined with supportive psychotherapy is likely to be a reasonable approach to the treatment of sexual inadequacy. This kind of therapy is what Masters and Johnson attempt to do. They work only with both partners in a

marriage because it is their firm conviction that there is no such thing as an uninvolved partner in any marriage in which there is some sexual problem. All the results of treatment reported in their second book were obtained by two therapists, one of each sex, working with each couple. The reasons for this dual therapy team are:-

1. Both partners have available in the therapy team someone of the same sex who can support and explain that person's point of view during the discussion sessions.
2. A dual therapy team removes the feeling of being overwhelmed that one partner in a marriage might feel if the sex-ratio was to his disadvantage.
3. The possibility of getting biased information is lessened if there is a member of each sex working with the married couple.
4. In any form of psychotherapy positive and negative feelings felt by the client for some significant person in his life can be transferred to the pastor. Masters and Johnson feel that to allow the transference of positive sexual feelings to occur between a client and a helper of the opposite sex have no place in their work and is destructive of the marriage relationship. Dual-sex teams therefore have a tremendous advantage in dealing with this type of transference.
5. So far teams of helpers have been composed of a physician and a psychologist and therefore both medical teams are at once available to the couple.

The nature of this type of sexual counselling is highly directive and the first step is to forbid at the outset of the treatment programme any sexual activity not instigated at the direction of the therapists.

Patients come to the Clinic for two weeks and they are asked to make no other commitments during that time. In this way they are free from business and domestic worries and they have the chance to communicate with one another without interruptions. When patients come for therapy they are asked to commit themselves to be available for follow-up study for five years if their two-week short term therapy is successful.

On the first day the couple meet with their co-therapists and in the brief interview the programme for the first few days is discussed. They are told during this interview that all their

sessions will be recorded. Having the interviews proceed without the need for note taking leaves the therapists free to concentrate on the interview itself.

The couple are then separated and the husband talks with the male helper and the wife with the female. Questions are asked about the nature of the problem, what has been done about it to date and what he thinks normal sexual functioning is. Also during this interview the basic chronology of the patient's life is recorded. It is also seen to be necessary to develop an accurate idea of the patient's philosophy and life style because any change in the behaviour of the patient, if it is to be permanent, must fit in with his way of living.

At the end of the first day the co-therapists have a chance to look over their first interviews and prepare for the second day in which they structure their interviews around those areas that begin to appear to have most significance. On the second day concentration is on what motivated the patients to come for treatment and help.

The third day brings a medical examination and the taking of a medical history. Masters and Johnson believe that there is no excuse for treating a physical problem with psychotherapy. After the medical examination and the tests are completed the four meet together to examine the significant findings from the history taking sessions and from the medical examinations. The therapists emphasise at this point that neither partner is considered "the patient" even if one is obviously dysfunctional and the other is not. What is stressed is that it is the relationship between the partners that is the patient. On day three, Masters and Johnson believe that the couple are now ready for physical direction. The emphasis here is on touch as a means of human communication and that touch gives meaning to sexual responsiveness for both men and women. Tenderness, affection, comfort, understanding, desire, warmth - almost any feeling can be conveyed to the partner by touch. The idea therefore is that by means of touch the two partners give to and receive pleasure from one another.

These experiences are discussed on the fourth day and they are then told to try the therapy of touch for two more occasions before the fifth day. But on the fourth day the nature of touching and response is progressively developed. On day five, the therapists and the married couple begin to deal with the specific problem which brought the couple to seek help.

As we can see from this brief outline of the first five days of treatment, the approach pioneered by Masters and Johnson is very highly structured and directive but their claim is that it is more successful than any available alternative.

In the Spring of 1974 it was disclosed that the Government had given to the National Marriage Guidance Council in Britain £16,000 to carry out research into the Masters and Johnson method of sexual care to see if Marriage Guidance counsellors could learn to use what was essentially a non-counselling method to treat effectively some sexual problems, without undermining their existing skill in counselling. There was a secondary aim which was to obtain some idea of the number of people who suffer from sexual dysfunctions so that some estimate could be made of the size of the service that might be needed. The National Marriage Guidance Council published a report in January 1977. Some 300 people were referred for treatment during the two years of the project. Treatment was undertaken over a period of 3 months, unlike the 2 week intensive therapy sessions set up by Masters and Johnson. The Marriage Guidance sessions were not conducted with the couple in residence for this three month period and much of the work in which the married couple were involved together was undertaken privately in the homes with regular visits to a counsellor at a Marriage Guidance centre.

In the second year of the project, Marriage Guidance decided that it was important to discover whether a trained person could successfully carry out treatment without a co-therapist. Three of the people who had been trained in the first year, together with the Project Director, acted as single therapists and although they complained that they felt that they were more isolated in their work, there was no evidence that they were any less or any more successful than those who worked as co-therapists. The report says that while signs are encouraging it is too early yet to be quite sure that single therapists will prove generally satisfactory in practice. At least it "merits further trial", says the report.

It is obviously early days for a full critique of this approach to be made. The National Marriage Guidance Council does feel that here is an important and exhilarating addition to their resources and that it is one that need not be divisive, but may indeed strengthen the whole Marriage Guidance work. "Our main impression is that counsellors in general are already more alert to the presence of clients' sexual problems and better prepared to deal with them. We believe this owes something to the widespread discussion of the project among counsellors throughout Marriage Guidance."⁹

In this paper I have tried to focus attention on some of the basic principles of pastoral care that can and should be used by all of us who are engaged in any way with people in need whether that need be sexual or some other. Secondly, I have tried to show recent trends both in the United States and in Britain that reveal new and interesting methods in the treatment of particular sexual problems.

REFERENCES

- 1 I am indebted to Dr. Frank Lake, Director of the Clinical Theology Association for introducing me to this basis model of human need.
- 2 Felix P. Biestek, *The Casework Relationship*, 19
(a) Quotation from Swithin Bowers, *The Nature and Definition of Social Casework*, 19 ; (b) p. 17; (c) p. 90.
- 3 Alan Keith Lucas, *The Art and Science of Helping*, 19 .
4. It is worth noting that the most commonly used and important Hebrew word translated in our English versions by Salvation and allied words is *Yasha'* which means to "bring into a spacious environment" or "to be free to develop without hindrance". It is the opposite of *Tearar* which means to "be in discomfort and cramped".
- 5 Ernest Becker, *The Birth and Death of Meaning*, Penguin 2nd Edition, 19 , p. 86.
- 6 Frank Lake, *Listening and Responding* C.T.A. Leaflet No. 1,
(a) p. 4; (b) p. 5.
- 7 R.R. Carkhuff, *Helping and Human Relations*, 19 .
- 8 W.H. Masters and V.E. Johnson, *Human Sexual Response*, 1966;
Human Sexual Inadequacy, 1970.
- 9 David Barkla, *An Account of the National Marriage Guidance Council Marital Sexual Dysfunction Project*, p. 16.

SIX BASIC DIMENSIONS OF EFFECTIVE COUNSELLING.

(After R.R. Carkhuff. "Helping and Human Relations". Holt, Rinehart and Winston).

THE TWO PHASES OF THE INTERVIEW.	A) Downward and Inward		B) Upward and Outward
	The 3 stages of the interview	1. Initial self-exploration	2. Intermediate self-understanding.
<u>EMPATHY.</u> Being accurately aware of the feelings of others staying with them and expressing them.	Counsellor feels into what is being said and plays it back. Client can say, "No I don't think you've got the point" if he feels Counsellor is missing the point.	Counsellor extends range and depth, assists re-owning and recognition of deeper feelings. "Let's go into this situation together. Tell me what it's like."	When client begins to see someone in the situation who brings hope then he can begin the upward and outward movement. Empathy is implicit rather than expressed.
<u>RESPECT.</u> Values and presupposes love of the truth in the other.	Unconditional acceptance. "You are free to be exactly who you are without risk or blame."	Positive regard, warm affirmation especially of the positive and creative aspects.	Selective affirmation of creative directions. Carkhuff "respects honesty and work."
<u>CONCRETENESS.</u> Being real, definite and specific.	Specific. Counsellor models and asks for directness. Avoids woolly talk. The general must give way to the particular.	General. Explores shadowy feelings definitely. The particular is put into its general context.	Specific again. Alternative tasks explored in specific detail. "What exactly do you propose to do?"
<u>GENUINENESS.</u> Openness, lack of facade and mannerisms. Counsellor must not play a false role.	Minimize the playing of a role. Be yourself.	Counsellor discloses his true feelings. He models an adult, appropriate openness.	Feels real concern and expresses own reactions to proposed directions if this would be appropriate.
<u>CONFRONTATION.</u> Drawing attention sensitively to ambiguities in behaviour and unnoticed resources.		Speaks tentitively of contradictions and discrepancies as matters of fact. "You said x, now you are saying y. Which is it?"	Facing up to discrepancies in the direction now being taken. Holds fast to adult responses.
<u>IMMEDIACY.</u> Awareness of the "here and now" put into words.		Useful at the end of an interview. "What do you feel we've done? What is going on between you and me just now."	Models adult sureness about what is going on in relationships, including this one.

O. R. JOHNSTON

**THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT
of
CHRISTIAN SEXUAL ETHICS**

This paper, of which the title is self-explanatory, is one of the four given at the recent VI symposium on sexual ethics.

In this paper I shall assume without debate that a Christian ought to be guided by the teaching of the Scriptures on sex, as on other matters affecting personal conduct.

I understand the biblical teaching on this subject to be, put very briefly as follows.

Human sexuality, a manifestation of a wider polarity running through nature (or at least living nature) is a God-given and glorious complementarity between the sexes and is essentially good. (There is a wonderful passage in C.S. Lewis's *Peregrinatio*, which makes this point when the two Oyarsa appear to human eyes¹.)

The Creator's standard for fulfilment by man of his sexual potential is an exclusive and life-long pledged commitment between one man and one woman which we know as marriage, in which the physical union of this covenant is only the expression, the sign and seal, of a deeper 'one-flesh' union. The Bible, reserves the physical, genital expression of sexual potentiality for marriage, and sets a standard of total physical restraint elsewhere.

Expanding somewhat, we note that certain sexual practices are condemned. These are the various perversions listed in the Old Testament, and echoed in the New — adultery, fornication, sodomy, bestiality, incest (in various degrees) and prostitution.

All these are forbidden — all six in the Old Testament attracted the death penalty, although in the case of prostitution only when the girl was the daughter of a priest.

With regard to sexual attitudes, we may note three points. Firstly, the Bible is very positive, in that it encourages the mutual delight of husband and wife in each other. And this in at least four dimensions; (1) companionship, that is, mutual social interchange, conversation, shared action, the making of the home and so on. (2) There is in this delight an element of aesthetic admiration, husband and wife finding each other lovely, beautiful, admirable. (3) There is physical enjoyment of nearness and union, and (4) there is loving delight in self-sacrifice (as in Ephesians 5 and other passages). The negative side of this wonderful, positive delight in one another is seen when the particular human instinct upon which it is founded becomes focussed in other directions. The destructive power of male lust is clearly recognised in Scripture, from the story of Samson right through to the Sermon on the Mount and the warnings of the Epistles. Marriage canalises the God-given sexual instinct but we are all too well aware, also, of its immense potential for evil. In a limited sense marriage can be viewed as a safeguard against the abuse of sex.

According to the teaching of Scripture, there is a certain temporary, dispensable quality in all human relationships. Jesus taught very clearly that if there is a clash between allegiance to Him and allegiance to husband or wife or any one else, then He must come first. He also taught that in heaven there is neither marrying nor giving in marriage. In other words, sex recedes, though it must be added that sexual complementarity as a fact is not therefore abolished, even in eternity. After all, if Galatians 3:28 (which says there is neither male nor female) applies to the Church on earth, and yet the Church does all sorts of things — marrying and encouraging people to acknowledge, respect and enjoy the complementarity of sex in every legitimate way — then it is reasonable to suppose that *some* awareness of this created structure will (or at least may) persist in heaven, just as there are hints that national differences will somehow be wonderfully preserved and glorified. Paul would prefer Christians, in certain contexts at least, to be unmarried, but realises (as Jesus taught) that celibacy is a gift — some have it, others have not.

Further, the Bible teaches that there is a certain hierarchial order in the relationship between man and woman. There is order as well as equality. This aspect of Christian sexual ethics often goes against the grain today, but Christian marriage and church order clearly imply a hierarchial principle, with the man as 'head' set over the woman. In a challenging passage C.S. Lewis wrote "I do not believe that God created an egalitarian world". For Lewis there is always order. "I believe in the authority of parent over child, husband over wife, learned over simple, to have been as much a part of the original plan as the authority of man over beast."²

I

Having outlined, briefly, what I believe to be the biblical teaching of sex, I shall now review, chronologically, the way the Church has understood and reacted to this teaching. Five stages may, I believe, be distinguished.

The first century was a time of moral uncertainty in the ancient world, the world in which the Gospel was first preached. The Church took over the challenging Jewish sexual and family ethic. Though this was austere, it conformed to a perennial pattern which is to be found in all human societies which know the necessity for human sexuality to be to some degree confined and controlled for the good of all. This is as we should have expected. Grace does not abolish nature but perfects it, as Aquinas pointed out. What the Christian Gospel did was to take, to refine, to elevate, and to clarify what the Jew accepted on God's authority and the good pagans already dimly sensed about sexual ethics.

The Graeco-Roman world of course tolerated prostitution, pederasty and sodomy; the gods which the ancients worshipped were no better. Yet there was also a longing and a yearning, often lived out in the lives of many good pagans, particularly in the school of Stoic philosophy beginning from the third century BC onwards. We find a search for a calm detachment which would renounce the following of instinct and passion, a groping for a dimly glimpsed pattern of standards of disinterested virtue which, it was believed, somehow harmonised with a Universal Reason. This ethic, particularly in the writings of Seneca, finds many echoes in New Testament ethical injunctions, though Stoic principles do not form a constellation with the total pattern, motivation and vision which Christian ethics show. But this

stoic philosophy, though an available option in the pagan world, proved inadequate for the normal person. The human spirit cried out for something more challenging, more colourful and more exciting. This was provided by the mystery religions and cults emanating from Eastern sources, whose worship contained orgiastic rites and whose origins can be seen fairly clearly in the fertility cults of the primitive communities centuries before. These elements produced confusion and conflict in sexual ethics in the first century world. Into *this* world entered the clarity and the stern challenge of the Judaeo-Christian standard. Professor Bruce has pointed out that "it was in the sphere of relations between the sexes that even the highest pagan ethic of the time fell far short of the Jewish and Christian standard ... Experience proved that insistent injunctions ... were by no means superfluous for Christians converted from paganism."³

II

Very soon the Church found itself confronted by *Gnosticism*, which became a perennial challenge. There are hints in some of the NT Epistles that gnostic errors were already infiltrating Christian thinking while the Apostles were still alive. The roots of Gnosticism are probably to be found in Persian and Indian myths and legends. The chief feature of gnostic teaching is the doctrine that the material universe is intrinsically evil. Therefore the physical body of a man or a woman is an evil thing, an impediment, a burden. Life in the flesh is a kind of imprisonment, for man is caged in by matter; something within us which is better and higher cannot get out, cannot fully express itself. As gnostic influences spread, Christianity was seen more and more as a way of escape from material entanglement. One of the early heresies was that of Marcion; Marcionites demanded celibacy or (for the married) marriage without sexual expression. This teaching could easily be grafted on to a facile, superficial understanding of the teaching of Romans 8, or of 1 Corinthians 7, though deeper exegesis shows that this is not what these passages are saying. However, gnostic influences in a modified form took root almost everywhere in the early church: the view of the early Fathers, almost to a man, is that marriage is some sort of encumbrance and very definitely a second best. This was underlined by the way marriage made martyrdom less acceptable to a Christian and increasingly in those times of persecution Christians were called to die for Christ. A cult of 'spiritual heroism' developed,

in which the positive value of self-denial, which is a basic Christian virtue, became attached particularly to the denial of marriage and sexual relationships. One commentator has called this rather nicely "the doctrine of conspicuous renunciation".

By the early fourth century sexual renunciation was deemed the highest peak of spiritual achievement and virginity intrinsically superior to married life. Hence the double standard - clergy, the superior class of Christians, were often expected to remain without any form of sexual expression: the laity were free of this restriction, but were reckoned second rate Christians. The development of monasticism from the late third century onwards underlined this division. At first many of the Christians who chose celibate lives became hermits who lived alone. Later the hermits began to congregate in groups, which led to the monastic movement. Clerical celibacy itself only became obligatory in the 11th century, but its seeds were sown six or seven centuries earlier. The ideal of celibacy was quite definitely held to be meritorious from the fourth century onwards. At this point any Bible Christian will immediately begin to see the red light. To teach that there is more merit, or that we *deserve* a better reward for living in a particular way is a denial of God's free grace. The Gospel is undercut by this kind of teaching. Augustine, the greatest teacher of the early Church (some would say the greatest teacher of the Church in any age), certainly had a little of this in his bones. His background was Manichaen; the Manichaen heresy involved these gnostic elements of scorn for the flesh and a denial of the body. Augustine taught that there was inevitable sin in marriage, an extra sin which was quite inescapable because marriage involved passion, passion involved various kinds of bodily expression, and this was essentially sinful. He taught, however, that it was conveniently covered by the sacrament. And the sacrament of marriage put a person back into more or less the same position as if he had committed an ordinary kind of sin as distinct from a mortal sin. This then is the challenge of gnosticism, the stress on the evil of matter, but of which arise notions of the exaltation of virginity, marriage as second best, clerical celibacy and the double standard.

III

The third section in this survey covers the epoch *Rome to the Renaissance*. After the decline and fall of the Roman Empire an interesting new factor came with the Germanic invasions of the so-

called Dark Ages and the establishment of the feudal system. The Teutonic social structure produced a society based upon land tenure as the key factor, as the most important of the factors operating. This undoubtedly strengthened the tendency to regard the wife as part of the possessions of the husband. For the feudal system, property defined status. The wife became an item of the husband's property. The struggle to keep the clergy chaste and celibate continued throughout the Dark Ages and the Middle Ages, one expression of which was the tremendous proliferation (well known to students of medieval literature) of legends stressing renunciation, virginity, the incredible achievements of those men and women who had kept themselves free of sexual entanglements, and not merely adulterous or promiscuous ones, but free from marriage itself. There is a constant disparagement of sex and marriage in all the most popular religious manuals and literature, though grudgingly marriage was conceded to be no barrier to salvation.

In the end a reaction was inevitable. Firstly in the 11th and 12th centuries we note the rise of the ethic of courtly love. There is still considerable discussion amongst scholars as to where this new outlook came from. Some suggest Arabian sources, others Celtic legends (Tristan certainly came from the Celtic roots), others suggest neo-Platonism. Wherever it came from, we know what it was. The courtly love ethic dignified passion, the very thing that Augustine so hated. It exalted woman, it put the beloved on a pedestal above man, gave her superior status and worshipped her from afar — at least for most of the time (many men had their precise physical aims and objectives which sometimes they managed to achieve in the end) as a superior being. Typically, the troubadour or the poet of love admired a married woman, often the wife of his liege lord, a woman who was therefore by definition, at least officially, inaccessible to him. And his poem or his song was a hymn to the unobtainable woman. This created and dignified male longing and tension. This male devotion to the distant beloved was, of course, in sharp contrast to marriage. Indeed, the courtly love ethic still retained a rather scornful view of marriage, just as the Church had done. In marriage husband and wife are one, and the woman is not put on a pedestal. In marriage husband and wife are satisfied, there is none of the unrequited yearning which was the basis of courtly love. Husbands and wives tend to take each other for granted, and the unrewarded devotion which is the mainspring of the poetry corresponds to no normal marital experience.

The 13th century saw a renewal of the cult of Mary, which is particularly important for sexual ethics. The roots of the devotion to Mary go back to earlier centuries. One key step was the Council of Ephesus as early as AD 431, when Mary was officially given the title of "Mother of God" (*Theotokos*) and became chief of the saints, most elevated of the glorified believers. As the practice of saying prayers to saints gradually increased, so Mary became a principal focus of devotion and prayer. By 600 AD she was regularly prayed to, as is evidenced by all the contemporary manuals of prayer. The climax of this centuries-long development can be seen in 1854 and as late as 1950. In 1854 it was declared by the Church of Rome that Mary was immaculately conceived and in 1950 that after death her body was taken into heaven (the bodily assumption of the Virgin Mary). It is natural to see the cult of the Virgin in the 13th century as a baptised version of courtly love - because the result is precisely the same as *l'amour courtois* achieved. Woman, in this case a particular woman, is set high above man on a pedestal. Naturally the image of the Virgin Mary thereupon became a tremendous support for the cult of virginity, because it was believed she was perpetually virgin. The brothers and sisters of our Lord who were mentioned in the Gospels were taken not to have been her children and therefore the place of the perpetual Virgin, almost within the Godhead, became a support for the superiority of virginity.

Love in marriage, in our modern sense, is not unknown in the Middle Ages (as the story of Héloïse and Abelard demonstrates), though it does not appear consistently in the literature and fiction of the period. Virginity is always best. And the heart of marriage lay in its sacramental nature, i.e. what the Church did to make it spiritually and morally tolerable, rather than in any positive interchange and delight such as the Bible clearly encourages in the Song of Solomon and in other places. Marriage, in other words, needed Church blessing, institutional form and purification. Renaissance Italy was a kind of early *de facto* secularisation of culture and one of the results of this certainly was increased sexual licence. This licence penetrated into the Church itself because of the severe restrictions upon what Biblical Christians would see as the right use of sex. Never has the sexual practice of Christians in official positions, Bishops, Cardinals, Popes and so on, sunk so low as in Renaissance Italy.

IV

The Reformation made one essential contribution; this was to remove the stigma attached to wedlock. The inferiority of marriage was denied, since it could not be found in Scripture, and the defiling nature of marriage as a doctrinal belief completely disappeared in the writings of the theologians of the Reformation. The Biblical ethic almost *in toto* was rediscovered. And this is summed up, like so many other aspects of the Reformation, by the experience of Luther himself. It is not our intention to suggest that Luther in person gave the Reformation its characteristic shape, because that was given by the Bible. Nevertheless, in a remarkable way Luther's own experience does mirror almost all the great truths that the Reformation rediscovered. Celibacy is a burden for most men, for example, and Luther felt it himself. He was not psychologically disturbed, as some of the Roman Catholic church historians of the 20's and 30's tried to make out, but certainly like nearly all of the priests of his day, he found himself strongly tempted in the sexual field. When he visited Rome he was appalled by what he found there. We have no reason to disbelieve his own statements that as far as actions were concerned, he remained chaste. As he studied his Bible he discovered what was to become a commonplace in Protestant theology - marriage as a remedy for sin. In his own early experience he clearly found the sexual instinct a disruptive urge; it interrupted what he knew to be the spiritual standards he wanted to follow, and as a result his stress naturally comes upon marriage as a remedy. This teaching has good roots in 1 Corinthians 7, a passage stressed in his early writings. Certainly when he married a nun who had left the Church of Rome, Katherine von Bora, he not only discovered a new source of great personal happiness, but he found this was indeed in one aspect, God's remedy for sin. As he looked around at the contemporary Church after that experience, he frequently made strong comments on clerical concubinage which was so common. This he saw as simply resulting from the failure to recognise that God had provided marriage, open to all, to put instincts in their proper place.

Luther went further, however, in stressing the essential goodness of procreation. He rediscovered for Christendom the positive value of home life and restored the family to a prime place in Christian ethics. The home, Luther taught, is a school for character. Certainly his own home, not only with his own children but with the constant to and fro of visitors, students

and other youngsters, whom Luther and his wife delighted to entertain and to teach, gave him this first hand experience of what an 'open' Christian home could offer. As some theologians have put it, the home became for Protestants what, previously, the monastery had been for Catholics. It was God's order (normative pattern) for man, and in this order sex found its proper place. As regards the relationship between husband and wife, we do not have a strong stress upon what we would today call romantic love in marriage. Luther stresses more the companionship, the joy, the sadness too, and also the inevitable strain and tension. Luther was always realistic, as is admitted even by those who disagree with him. There is certainly no idealised, ethereal wife-figure in Luther's experience and teaching. The wife is made of flesh and blood and is fallible, just as the husband is. He often spoke in his pastoral writings of the wife as a man's nearest neighbour.

The English Puritans of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries represents our own particular brand of Reformation teaching and ethics, a wonderfully rich vein of scriptural pastoral teaching. They constantly stress in their practical writings the fact that husband and wife are 'heirs together of the grace of life', as the New Testament puts it, and as such they should be spurring each other on to spiritual progress. They should be a help to each other in the Christian life - watching over each other's progress and correcting each other's faults in love. To some degree this stress does de-sexualise marriage. There is very little attention paid to the narrowly sexual dimension of marriage in the ethical manuals. The total pattern of home and family responsibilities is realistically treated. In Richard Baxter's *Christian Directory* there is a passage in which he urges Christians to think hard about marriage before they actually enter into it. First he provides a long list of all the burdens, the difficulties and the problems. Only then does the picture brighten as Baxter says in effect, "Now if you still want to go on with it, let me tell you some of the good things that there are about marriage". Though not unaware of the blessings and joys, he does in fact put the difficulties first and he puts them very strongly. Romantic love is certainly recognised by the Puritans and the Quakers too, though it is for them an item which naturally blossoms after marriage rather than a factor which must be there as a prerequisite before marriage is undertaken.

V

I turn now to the modern period — 1700 onwards, which is the period of secularisation. Europe begins to break free from both the Catholic and the Protestant normative ethical concepts. We can pinpoint eight movements or influences, key factors which, although wider than sexual ethics, certainly impinge upon the way in which Christian sexual ethics have developed.

The first of these eight factors is the *Enlightenment*, the rise of rationalism in the so-called Age of Reason. Beginning at the end of the seventeenth century, this trend totally rejects the religious frame of reference for 'modern thinking men'. In the early years of the Enlightenment, both in this country and on the Continent, only physical science was affected and there was not much change in other ways of thinking. It was supposed, naively as we now see, that there would be no loss in simply dispensing with the external theistic framework, the traditional assertions which said that God created the universe and every creature in it. God as Creator may be completely denied, it was said, or merely retained in the back-ground as the great original Instigator. Either way it makes no difference to what men think or believe to be right or wrong, or to the way society is organised. Jettisoning full-blooded Christian supernaturalism (it was claimed) freed man of an intolerable ecclesiastical tyranny, where the Church decided everything that should happen and everything men do and believe. The Enlightenment liberated man from childish superstition — belief in miracles and in the incarnation, in particular. The clear, simple and lucid 'laws' of nature discovered by Sir Isaac Newton appealed irresistibly to the leaders of the Enlightenment. The new-world picture simply retained God as the Person who set the whole show going, and perhaps dropped some oil on the wheels occasionally, but who certainly was not necessary for understanding how it worked or for enabling man to live tolerably successfully within it. Reason was perfectly adequate. So reference to God or to the Church or to Christian teaching in ethics became increasingly rare.

On the surface there was no immediate or dramatic change. Marriage, for example, was not dealt with by rationalist thinkers in any different way. As regards those relationships which were regarded as 'best' and fruitful, it was simply assumed that things would more or less stay the same as they did when the Church ruled over everything in the field of morals and behaviour. With

hindsight we can see that if the doctrines of creation and judgment, of sin and Redemption, are deleted from the common awareness of a community, things are bound to begin to change. But certainly men in the age of Locke and the French Encyclopedia had no idea of this.

The Enlightenment was followed by *Romantic Movement*, a predictable reaction against an excessively intellectual ideal. The rationalists had advocated conscious control of feeling and a civilised elegance of taste in architecture, dress and manners: the Romantics in contrast emphasised the priority of emotion. The individual, must be fully himself; he must seek fulfillment as a unique person, no matter what social norms or civilised society may say. In one sense Romanticism was a protest against the civilised, sophisticated manners of the town - we remember Rousseau whose ideal educational protégé Emile was a young boy brought up in the country, suckled by a countrywoman far from the corruption of urban life, introduced only at adolescence to the world of the city. Romanticism was a protest against rational, intellectual, philosophical domination of thought and feeling - 'back to nature', 'express yourself' were typical watch words. But in the kind of culture which emerged, deprived of all reference to the divine, man inevitably begins to make his own deities, including deities in the sexual sphere. As Romanticism develops, the inescapable desire to worship returns, and who better to worship than woman? Goethe's *Faust Part 2*, though in some sense pre-romantic but having an immensely wide influence amongst the early Romantic thinkers, finishes with the words: "The eternal Woman draws us upwards" - a feminine principle seen in the seat of Divinity calling the best out of man and drawing him onwards and upwards. In the music-dramas of Wagner you will know the figures of Senta in the *Flying Dutchman*, of Elizabeth in *Tannhauser*, of Brünnhilde in *The Ring*, all of whom represent redemption through woman - woman drawing the best out of man and finally by self-sacrifice achieving his salvation. What we have here is a secularised form of the Virgin Mary, brought back because of a deep desire for some kind of redemptive philosophy.

The lives of the romantic poets, painters and musicians were lives of indulgence. Certainly this involved sexual indulgence, sometimes of a very strange and perverted kind. We can no more rejoice at the way Wagner treated women, than at the way he treated his creditors. (He borrowed money all over Europe with no intention of paying it back.) We may perhaps be grateful for his music but as Christians we reject the sort of behaviour that he

felt free to indulge in to achieve success. The Romantic ideal, then, set woman too high, and in the end it too had to collapse.

From the nineteenth century also comes a third influence — *Marxism*. According to this ultra-masculine, aggressive philosophy, traditional patterns of sexual differentiation, particularly marriage, must be viewed as devices for domination of man over woman. In the sexual ethics of the Marxist, woman becomes the equal of man, sexual differences are down-played and all human beings are seen as individuals in quest of freedom from economic exploitation. In the new communist economy they are free to be themselves. Here Christians will feel a certain measure of agreement, as they do with many other aspects of Marxism in its justified protest against exaggerated exploitation of all sorts. Marxists, for example, constantly speak of bourgeois marriage and prostitution in the same breath, as does Engels in his *Marriage, Property and Society*. There is more than a grain of truth in this analysis, as one can see in the darker sides of earlier societies. But the whole tone and temper of this view of sexuality is distasteful to the Christian conscience. It is a new 'hard' form of egalitarianism, which denies any kind of essential difference in social function between the sexes, which marriage and motherhood certainly demand. The theory led to the most ghastly and costly experiments in the 1920's and 30's in early Soviet Russia — experiments which have ultimately been rejected. The USSR tried abortion on demand and the complete abolition of the marriage contract or marital relationships as in any way needing social sanction; they have since pulled back from this on account of the social dislocation it caused.

Because, in earlier societies, woman was seen to be nothing but the property of man, all the scorn that Marx and Engels poured upon private property was also poured upon bourgeois marriage. Yet they had little positive to put in its place. They advocated no positive ideal of complementarity, no model of feminine behaviour to offer, for them marriage was seen simply as a bourgeois invention to be dispensed with. It has been noted by later sociologists that marriage is ultimately hostile to any kind of political theory of this type, because marriage and the home are the great enemy of the collectivist state. Like all other kinds of totalitarian social engineering from Plato onwards, the Utopian social engineer in Marxist socialism can only flourish when the individual as an independent, creative source of moral judgments (and therefore possibly of a critique of the existing order) has been destroyed. Where else does the individual develop

his own particular identity more successfully than in the home? The home is made in physical terms by private property (land and a dwelling), in non-physical terms it consists of the bonds between husband, wife and children. There is an interesting and moving passage in a symposium written by a number of Soviet writers, most of them still living in the Soviet Union (and therefore in some cases referred to by pseudonyms or initials). One of them is a mathematician and a Helsinki monitor called Igor Shafarevich, who writes: "One of the fundamental characteristics of human society is the existence of individual relations between people. As the excellent behaviourist researchers of the past decades have shown, we're dealing here with a phenomenon of very ancient pre-human origin. There are many kinds of social animals and the societies they form are of two types: the anonymous and the individualised. In the first, for instance, as in a shoal of herrings, the members do not know each other individually and they are interchangeable in their relationships. In the second, for example, a gaggle of wild geese, relations arise in which one member plays a special role in the life of another and cannot be replaced. The presence of such relations is in a certain sense a factor which determines individuality and the destruction of these individual relations is one of the proclaimed goals of socialism; between husbands and wives and between parents and children⁴".

Fourthly in the setting of secularisation comes *Freudianism* — especially in its popularised form. Freud, a Jewish atheist, like Marx, has a pessimistic view of human nature and its potential. Freud is influenced firstly by his own dogmatic materialism, very popular in the Vienna of his early days, and secondly by his clinical examination of a limited number of disturbed individuals. The new model of man which Freud developed, which has been immensely influential, is a model which seems to send out the following two messages: 1 — Sex is bigger than you think; 2 — Sex restrained is more dangerous than you suspect. As for the first — there is certainly an all pervasive stress in the writings of Freud upon the powerful, deep and almost inevitable involvement of the sexual instinct in every kind of pathological condition that he examined. And therefore, Freud would say, in every aspect of the life of every human being. Secondly, sex restrained is more dangerous than you suspected. Popular Freudianism sees sex as a thing which must be released — you cannot put it down or put a brake on it. If you do you induce neurosis. Restraint leads to the break-up of character. Therefore, the first step is to admit you've got sexual hang-ups — the very fact that you deny it shows that you have (a lovely argument which works both ways!):

secondly, rid yourself of sexual hang-ups by some form of sexual self-expression. The build-up of instinctual pressure needs release, otherwise you will do yourself untold damage. This is of course something of a caricature! But it is the *popular* Freudianism of today in this country from the 1930's onwards which has had such immense influence. Scholarly readers know that *repression* in Freud is a highly technical term; it doesn't mean simply saying 'no' to sexual indulgence whenever you're tempted. We know that *sublimation* is a real possibility, a term for the use in all sorts of creative ways of that energy which perhaps in its roots is sexual. Scholarly readers know that Freud wrote quite clearly that restraint in sexual matters is the only basis — a fragile one perhaps — for the development of great art, great science, and what we know as civilisation. He may be wrong here, but that was what Freud taught. And therefore, even in his terms, restraint has tremendous positive social functions. But these are the messages which have not penetrated. It is the earlier caricature which has become so current. And the impact on our culture has been to produce a crudely materialistic reductionism — this is all man is, this is all you're really after, whatever you say you're after. It is Freudian thinking which has dealt such a crushing blow to the romantic idealism which, in a secular sense, helped to keep woman on her pedestal.

The fifth secularising trend of today is *Existentialism*, the end-product of all the systems which have attempted to do without God. Let us face the fact, says the existentialist, that we exist in a meaningless universe. There was no God to start it off in the beginning; no absolute ethical imperatives of any kind whatever make demands of us. As an individual all I can do is to try to be myself. How do I become myself? I find something to do which is genuinely me, uncaused and unconditioned, something which is authentically my own. Preferably I will discover something which cuts across convention, across what father and mother taught me, across what sanity is telling me to do — in fact, the more aggressively different it is the more I can be sure it is authentically my deed. Very often this search for authenticity can be neatly linked with the pursuit of pleasure in some new and special way, irrespective of whether it harms my neighbour or not. This is the existential hedonism so perfectly portrayed in "Last Tango in Paris" and in later films. It is the dominant mode of ethical thinking outside the Christian church today among agonised intellectuals and many others too, though they would not all know it by this name. And it is without principle or criteria — a complete relativism in ethics.

We must now note three other developments under this broad heading of secularisation; items which differ slightly from the five '-isms' just mentioned.

The sixth development is the result of *technological advances* which have influenced sex ethics. Techniques of contraception and abortion have been known since ancient times. Now, however, they are safe, cheap and well publicised. Contraception enables the personal and procreative aspects of sex to be separated. In earlier ages, outside and within the Christian Church, it was much debated whether the two aspects — the love-relational and the generational — should always be connected. What was never considered was whether man could or should separate them completely. Techniques of contraception enable this to be done. As regards abortion, it is now possible to destroy quite easily the unborn child in the womb and this surgical procedure has been made widely available both privately and on the National Health Service. Socially agreed ethical criteria for the right use of these new techniques are weak or non-existent.

The background to these developments helps us to understand what has given them such impetus. We note factors such as the over-population scare: world population is said to be increasing so swiftly that our resources may eventually come under impossible strain, therefore procreation needs to be controlled. Then there is a subtle tendency in the scientific mind which implies the principle that 'because we can we should'. If we are able to do something, we ought to go ahead and do it. This drive put man on the moon and in an earlier decade contributed to the development of the atomic bomb. There is no doubt that technological possibilities have decisively altered the social context in which sexual discussion and sexual decisions take place.

Seventhly, there is what we may call *permissive social neutrality* adopted as a deliberate policy. This is a new phenomenon in Britain, brought to the fore by a trend in legislation since the 2nd World War. It is as if there is a tacit agreement to regard sexual activity as a sphere in which the Government says, "Look — we are granting you freedom to do exactly as you wish in your private life in order to compensate you for the tighter grip with which we shall hold you in other directions". This explains the liberal policies now in vogue in what is called the "private area" — the area of sex and entertainment in particular. Government speakers (no doubt reading carefully prepared scripts prepared by civil servants who do not change with the party in

power) assure us that "these are matters of conscience on which it would be inappropriate for members of the House to expect party leadership or for the Government to give guidance." In this sphere, beginning in 1959 and working through the late '60's, we noted the changes in laws relating to obscenity, abortion, divorce, homosexuality, theatre censorship, capital punishment and Sunday observance. All the changes carry the message that this country is no longer prepared in any institutional way to commend Christian standards. Effectively Government began to ignore the Christian moral tradition, and implicitly to deny that the function of the law is to uphold moral standards of behaviour.

Our eighth and final influence in the age of secularisation is the *mass media*. Technological development in connection with newspapers, magazines, cinema and TV, have made it easy for those in positions of influence to be increasingly overt in the portrayal of sex. The moral "messages" about what sexual activity should or should not be are confused, and invasions of the private realm which earlier generations would have found horrifying and distasteful are almost *de rigueur*. Perhaps our predecessors were wrong. But there is no doubt that, traditionally, Christians have stood for a certain degree of reticence in public discussion, reporting and display of sexual matters. There are, we must concede, degrees of reticence that are unbiblical, and matters in which Christians have been too mealy-mouthed. But this modern trend is resulting in the destruction of sexual activity as a private matter — it is now for millions of people a matter for spectator interest. What the psychiatrists refer to as the "voyeur role" is encouraged. And here we must leave our fifth and final era — the age of secularisation.

Conclusion

Where do we stand today? At the risk of over-simplifying we may say that present-day educated Christians take one or other of two diametrically opposed view points. The first, is that of the (wrongly called) 'new morality'. This development belongs again to the early '60's. The former Bishop of Woolwich, John Robinson, testified for Penguin Books at the Lady Chatterly trial in 1961. Then came Robinson's *Honest to God* in 1963; *Soundings* from a group of Cambridge academics in 1961; *Towards a Quaker View of Sex* 1963, and so on right up to our media favourites of today from Cambridge — Norman Pittenger, Don Cupitt and others. The

view common to these writers represents a blend of theological liberalism with a very cavalier attitude to the Bible — but it attempts to communicate with the existential hedonism which society around us increasingly adopts as its standard (if indeed it can be called a standard). The 1960's also brought a decade of popularity for Alex Comfort, and for the Reith Lectures of Carstairs, both of which gave a much more permissive, non-Christian direction to sexual ethics. A typical quotation summarises this trend as it took root in the Churches. John Robinson said when lecturing in Liverpool Cathedral in 1963 — "There is no such thing as a Christian ethic", and later "there is no ethical system which can claim to be Christian".⁵ Robinson, like many of this group, adopts a position which involves a rejection of theism itself, of God as transcendent Creator, Ruler and Lord, of God as Law-giver, of propositional revelation, including the positive Old Testament law as well as the specific commandments of the New, of the reverence for the Torah, which God has given in His kindness to guide us, to save us from hurting ourselves and our neighbours. This position also involves rejection of the concepts of transgression, guilt and justification as taught in the New Testament, and therefore of the Gospel itself. It is scarcely surprising therefore that Gosepl ethics also disappear with the Gospel itself.

A second group of Christians, recognising difficulties in traditional beliefs, demands renewed scholarly study of the Scripture to ensure that exegesis is correct so that what God has said may be applied in everyday life. This is the only reverent, authentic Christian way forward. It is not always easy. But we have a line of distinguished thinkers in the field to help in matters of sexual ethics. C.S. Lewis died in '63, just before the great wave of relativism, but his writings are full of penetrating insights. We may note *Christian Behaviour* (1943) and particularly his *Four Loves* (1960). The last book falls below Lewis's usual standard of lucidity and consequently is not as popular or as widely read as most of his other works. V.A. Demant's *Christian Sex Ethics* (1963) is a splendid little book. A short but perceptive historical survey is provided by Luther scholar R.H. Bainton in *Sex Love and Marriage* (Fontana 1958). From the medical profession we have *Venereal Disease and Young People* (1964), a BMA Report. This was caricatured by the BBC the morning it came out, and having been condemned by the media it was relegated to obscurity and is little known. Two paperbacks which analyse contemporary trends and hit back hard are *The New Morality* and *The Cult of Softness* by Arnold Lunn and Garth Lean (1964 and 1965, Blandford). Their brilliance and accuracy are unbeatable.

Predictably they were ignored by the media. Pioneer work has been done by the Roman Catholic psychiatrist Jack Dominian who, in a number of his books, writes from a wealth of clinical and counselling experiences on marriage and marital relationships. In 1971 the Scripture Union produced an excellent book, *God, Sex and You*, by the Canadian Christian psychiatrist M.O. Vincent. A rather unusual book, full of excellent material but also with more than a dash of traditional Victorianism is Larry Christenson's *The Christian Family* (1971): this has become second only to the Bible in this area for many in the Charismatic movement. Certain issues of the Grove Ethics booklets are outstandingly helpful; David Field on *homosexuality*, Paul Ramsey on *One Flesh*, and Oliver O'Donovan on *abortion* must be mentioned, but others in that series are much less helpful. The two Anglican official reports on *Marriage and Divorce* (1971 and 1978) also produced much helpful material, especially in the field of close textual study of the Bible (though not always with orthodox views about Scripture) and with a rich historical dimension. Even for Christians who put themselves under the authority of the Bible, the permitted conditions of divorce and the possibility of remarriage for divorced persons whose former spouse is still living are issues on which agreement has not been universally reached.

In 1971 there also emerged a concerted Christian movement expressing concern at the national decline of Christian sex ethics, especially in the mass media. Beginning with a huge demonstration in Trafalgar Square on September 25th and a mass evangelistic meeting the same evening in Hyde Park (where it is estimated 80,000 people were present), the Nationwide Festival of Light became transformed in three years into a small central information and advice service on behalf of those wishing to take Biblical standards in social life seriously, and in particular to uphold the sexual ethic of Scripture as the national norm. Though more usually seen as a voice of protest (which it has been on many occasions, and to some effect in the mass media) its ongoing work is geared to teaching and informing Christians so that they more adequately engage in witness to, and (where necessary) conflict for, the values God has given.

In some ways the Churches have an unhappy legacy in the field of sexual ethics. Firstly the idea that sexual activity is a sin of a special and peculiarly reprehensible kind is unbiblical. But it dies hard, and frequently it is still attributed to us. Secondly, our standards of reticence over sexual matters have exceeded the modesty which the Bible encourages, and both our

children and our enemies have reached wrong conclusion from our silence or our evasions. We have not taught plainly. It is ironical that at the very moment when we are freeing ourselves from both these impediments, society is drifting further away from its Biblical moorings, thanks to the strenuous efforts of a tiny minority and the ignorance and apathy of the majority. How much of our Christian heritage of social morality - God-given and therefore good for *all* men and women - can be saved for the stability and happiness of future generations remains at present problematic. Even the leadership of many of our churches seems unsure of the note to sound. To take the most obvious example: strident voices are raised demanding the church's approval of homosexual practice as a permitted expression of 'love' between two men, despite clear Scriptural prohibitions. It is perhaps at this point that Christians sexual ethics may prove to be the most divisive item of all within the visible church. Are our people equipped for an era of such confusion?

O.R. JOHNSTON

[formerly lecturer in Education,
the University, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
at present Director of Nationwide
Festival of Light.]

REFERENCES

1. *Perelandra*, Ch. 16.
2. C.S. Lewis, 'Membership' in *Sobornost*, No.31, June 1945.
3. F.F. Bruce, *New Bible Commentary Revised*, p.1158.
4. In *Under the Rubble*, Fontana, 1976.
5. Printed in *Christian Freedom in a Permissive Society*, SCM, 1970, pp.13, 17.

Reviews

W.J. Christman, *The Christian File*, St. Andrews Press, 1978, 191pp., PB, £1.98.

The author became incumbent of the church at Richmond Craigmillar, near Edinburgh, in 1965. In this very readable, chatty but not very encouraging book, he tells of the trials and difficulties he experienced in trying to build up a lax church where few of those who were nominally members attended church and where criticism was rife what ever he did. Parents wanted their children baptised for the following reasons only - they had been baptised and/or married at the church themselves, they were lapsed RCs and thought that without baptism their children would suffer in Limbo, they wanted an excuse for a party, a friend had donated a robe for the ceremony which, if delayed, would no longer fit the baby! Attempts at visiting were often frustrated by the ear-splitting noise of Coronation Street on TV. When at long last the young came for instruction and joined the church, nearly all left within a year - many left the district, others "had hoped to find a fellowship which echoed the teachings of Jesus. They found instead a *cliché* which used gossip and inuendo as weapons to maintain its rights." This personal account of the difficulties which must be attendant on much church life will serve as a challenge to many.

The binding is rather poor, -- pages are apt to fall out for lack of glue! - but the printing is good.

REDC

Joyce G. Baldwin, *Daniel*, (Tyndale OT Commentaries) IVP, 1978, 210pp., PB, £2.65.

Daniel has for a long time been the battleground between traditional orthodoxy and liberal criticism. Joyce Baldwin comes down firmly on the side of traditional orthodoxy, cogently arguing for a sixth century BC date.

She finds the linguistic arguments for a later date unconvincing. S.R. Driver claimed, "The Persian words presuppose a period *after* the Persian empire had been well established: the Greek words *demand*, the Hebrew *supports*, and the Aramaic *permits*, a date *after* the conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great (BC 332)". The author points out that there are only three Greek words in Daniel all of which refer to musical instruments. We would expect many more especially as archaeology has shown that inscriptions in Palestine were almost exclusively Greek from the third century BC. She quotes Kenneth Kitchen to the effect that the Persian words are all *old Persian* belonging to a period before 300 BC and that the arguments from Aramaic are equally precarious.

Critical scholars usually argue against the sixth century date because of the accuracy of the 'prophecy' relating to Antiochus Epiphanes. They maintain that Daniel was issued as a 'tract for the times' written to encourage the Maccabean freedom fighters in their struggle against Antiochus. It is history written in the guise of prophecy accurate up to about 166 BC (Dan. 11:39) when the book was presumably written. After this the writer gets it all wrong because Antiochus died in Syria and not in Palestine as Daniel maintains (11:45). Miss Baldwin points out that predictive prophecy was known in Babylon from an early time and questions the interpretation of chapter 11:21-45 exclusively in terms of Antiochus. She favours the view of the early Church Fathers that there is a reference to a future ruler who will be more opposed to God than was Antiochus (cf. the Anti-Christ of Revelation). This is in line with the general outlook of the book which portrays the progressive defiance of God by pagan Kings. She notes that the early chapters are difficult to reconcile with the uncompromising stand of the Maccabees for in them Daniel and his companions adapted to the language, literature and customs of the conquerors. Perhaps the most telling argument against a late date for Daniel is the evidence from Qumran. Daniel appears among the Dead Sea Scrolls and was extremely influential in the community. If, as has been recently argued,

the canon of the Old Testament closed in the Maccabean era it is surprising for an allegedly pseudonymous work to be accepted into the Scriptures and startling if it was accepted so soon after it appeared.

Miss Baldwin sees the Four Kingdoms of chapters 2 and 7 as Babylonia, Medo-Persia, Greece and Rome. She writes, "We believe the early Christian commentators were not mistaken in seeing the fourth Kingdom as Rome, and the death and resurrection of Christ as the focal point to which chapters 2 and 7 were looking ... The book of Daniel had future relevance for the church even if at one level the prophecy seemed to have been fulfilled in the second century BC. The end was 'not yet' for the task of proclaiming the Kingdom throughout the world had yet to be carried out (Mt. 24:14). If, therefore, our western minds want a yes-or-no answer to the question we ourselves pose, 'What does the fourth Kingdom stand for?', we may be asking the wrong kind of question". (67-68)

As to the historical problems she sees the solution to the 'third year of Jehoiakim' in terms of the use of different types of calendar. Belshazzar was probably the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar and she follows Wiseman in identifying Darius with Cyrus.

There is a useful section on apocalyptic, which is seen as a natural development from the prophetic literature. She rejects the view that its source lay in Zoroastrianism which in all probability post dates both Daniel and Christianity. There are also notes on the title, 'Son of Man' and the intricate problems involved in interpreting the 'seventy sevens' of chapter 9.

The commentary of the text is clear and precise. Miss Baldwin carefully weighs alternative interpretations where necessary but avoids too great an attention to detail. She is concerned at all times to bring out the relevance of the message of Daniel to the modern reader. The commentary is highly recommended for the Bible student who desires a greater understanding of this difficult but nonetheless extremely relevant book.

R. S. LUHMAN

Pastor Nicoli (a pseudonym?), *Persecuted but not Forsaken; The Story of a church behind the Iron Curtain*, Foreword and Epilogue by Malcolm G. Mackay, Judson Press USA, 1977 and St. Andrews Press Edinburgh, 1978, 176pp., PB, £1.95.

This is a beautiful and most readable book, telling of the sufferings of Christians in the mountains of Eastern Europe - perhaps Yugoslavia.

At the start we are told: "The incidents in this narrative are true ... everything recorded actually happened ... The sequence of events and the identity of the persons and places are altered and disguised for obvious reasons" for the people spoken of "are still there". The hero is the young baptist pastor Kladimir Kurel who falls in love with the daughter of a Party member, and who manages, usually successfully, to outwit the corrupt communist village authorities. The book, which is very moving, rings true, except for the last chapter. Here the style changes, the pastor and girl marry happily, senior communist officials visit the villages, uncover all that has happened and punish the corrupt police and communist officials who have persecuted the Christians. All of which makes nonsense of the claim that it is dangerous to publish the names of the Christians concerned.

Implicitly the book raises the question whether Christians in a communist atheistic state ought to be loyal to that state and to obey its laws. Ingenious ways of circumventing the laws are described when the laws interfere with Christian work but there is deep respect for the state and for officials who, though atheists, are often fairminded.

REDC

Alan Litherland, *War Under Judgment*, Fellowship of Reconciliation, 9 Coombe Road, New Malden, Surrey KT3 4QA, 57pp., £0.90.

Dr. Litherland, a christian pacifist, writes in an objective, clear and always extremely sensible way about the problem that war poses for modern man, and especially for the Christian. No

one will read this booklet without learning a good deal that he did not know before, nor will it be at all easy to put it down in the middle of a reading! The stark madness of the gigantic war expenditure throughout the world - contrasted with the pitiful resources given to the UN to stop war (about £2 for every £1000 devoted to the war machine) - will come as an eye opener to many. The failure of Christians to work effectively for peace, the salt having lost its savour, is well treated and the book closes with constructive suggestions, based on past experiences in history. Stress is placed on the fact that biologically it is unnatural for animals, man included, to kill his own species. It is a fact that in actual fighting in modern times a large proportion of armed forces simply refuse to use their weapons to kill, even in extreme emergency. For example when 1000 men were ambushed on Makin Island, only 370 actually attempted to use their weapons, and in Normandy only 25 per cent of the best airborne troops in fact fired their guns. (I remember on one occasion discussing the subject with a veteran of WW1 who told me that he always fired over the heads of the Germans and he believed that many of the other soldiers did the same). This inborn reluctance to kill can, says Litherland, be organised and he cites remarkable instances in which this was done.

REDC

Paul Badham, *Christian Beliefs about Life after Death*
SPCK, Large PB No.34, 1978, 175pp., £3.50. (Reprint of
hardback of 1976)

This book sets out to demolish historic christian beliefs about the resurrection and attempts to develop the theme that at death people will receive new bodies in another mode of being.

Discussion starts with the development of ideas of the afterlife as portrayed in the OT. The next chapter deals with the resurrection of Jesus: here all possible difficulties, none of them I think new, are underlined. As it stands, says Badham, the story lacks self-consistency and is unbelievable. If Jesus rose in true bodily form, how did He manage to appear and disappear, passing through shut doors, or rise in the air as at the Ascension? How did He get hold of clothes, or did the clothes resurrect too? If, on the other hand, He was a spirit, why was the tomb empty and

how did He manage to eat fish and allow Himself to be touched? Paul says plainly that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God but "If the body of the risen Christ could be handled, and if he truly ate food, then ... flesh and blood manifestly did inherit the kingdom of God" (Quoted from Lampe and Mackinnon, *The Resurrection*. Some muddled thinking here, one might suppose! Are we to assume that Jesus inherited the kingdom of God when He rose from the dead?) "Hence I conclude that the traditions which imply that Jesus' corpse was raised from the grave should be rejected as internally incoherent" (p.38). After all the 'discovery' was only made by the female sex "notoriously invalid witnesses according to Jewish principles of evidence" (Let us forget about Peter, John, the Emmaus walk etc.). Were the resurrection appearances purely subjective, then? Not necessarily, for they may have been telepathically imposed upon the disciples by Jesus from the spirit world. Finally, since Jesus did not rise from the dead in the way supposed by past Christians, there is no need to suppose that at the last day believers will do so either.

To the reviewer this entire line of reasoning is unconvincing. Assuming that we may divide the world into two disparate domains, the physical and the spiritual (or soul-like), what reason have we to deny that they interact? It is obvious that to every dualist that they *do* interact - in the human brain. In physical science the various domains are usually self-contained yet they sometimes impinge upon one another. Magnetic fields are not usually evident save in the presence of ferromagnetics and moving conductors: nor wireless waves save in the presence of radio or TV sets. Gravity is all pervasive, but does not reveal itself in chemistry, though in stars it can become the predominant force. We know nothing of the quasi-physical quasi-spiritual nature of our Lord's resurrection body, but the NT stories are entirely consistent with the OT theophanies. Science has done nothing to explain psychic experiences - mental or physical - but there is evidence that mental or psychic forces can influence physical happenings as in well attested poltergeistic phenomena (e.g. the Rosenberg case, recently discussed on TV). It would be easy to argue that a metal cannot be bent by psychical means, without physical contact, because a metal belongs to the material realm and psychic powers to the spiritual; a more sensible approach is to ask whether in fact this ever happens. Likewise it is wrong to argue that the body of Jesus after His resurrection must have been either material or spiritual: if the former He could not have

entered a closed room, if the latter the grave would not have been empty and He could not have eaten fish with His disciples. Badham seems to sense the weakness of his argument when he seeks to bolster it with the assertion that "If Jesus did not need to eat, then this smacks of a supernatural conjuring trick of the kind he adjured during his life" (p.37-8), a remark which could hardly be more irrelevant. The purpose of eating was not to impress by conjuring, but to reestablish fellowship with His dearest friends.

In Part 2 the evidence offered by ancient church fathers for the resurrection of the self-same body as we now possess is regurgitated. Cannibals will give up the food they borrowed from their rightful owners; the phoenix rises from the dead, a "sufficient and undeniable example of this [resurrection] hope, for it is a breathing thing subject to death ... Shall men perish once for all while Arabian birds are sure of rising again?" (Tertullian) But science, we are assured (evolutionary science in particular) has destroyed all these wonderful arguments of a past age.

Of course all this makes for entertainment, but in view of the fact that Paul so explicitly denies that in the resurrection the body that rises is the same as the body that died, one wonders of what possible value such arguments can be. Or is the object merely to prejudice the reader against NT teaching?

The book closes with a discussion based on the suggestions of H.H. Price (largely followed by John Hick) who has tried to picture what an existence outside the body might be like. Price's suggestions are helpful and it seems not to be realised (or at least not stressed) in this book that what happens just after death is not the primary hope of the Christian believer. Not that it is unimportant for a "virtue of Price's theory is that it can do justice to the Christian conviction that in the next world God will be much more real to us than He is in our present existence." (p.145)

At the end one is left in a state of confusion as to what the author does think. The somatic body which he postulates which bears some kind of identity with the present body appears to be spiritual and to be in line with the teaching of spiritualists. But in the end he concludes that resurrection can be interpreted in "in terms of re-creation on another planet in another [why not this?] galaxy" But if the body is spiritual, why does it need a planet?

Would not empty space do just as well? If a new body is actually to be provided, then this is indeed a resurrection: why the weak statement that it can be so interpreted? It seems odd that this, the climax of existence, is dismissed in a sentence.

The book is well printed, easy to read and well referenced.

REDC

F.F. Bruce, *The Time is Fulfilled*, Paternoster Press, 1978, PB, 128pp., £1.90.

Now that he has retired, we hope that Dr. Bruce will have plenty of opportunity for writing, although his pen has never been idle, and scholars of all shades have welcomed what he has given us.

This present book consists of five lectures delivered at Moore College, Sydney, on the subject of the fulfilment of the Old Testament in the New. The first chapter sets the scene in the Palestine of Jesus' day, with its background of history and expectation. In the light of this, which Old Testament Scriptures did Jesus single out as marking the Messianic age, and in particular what use did He make of the Son of Man picture in Daniel?

Chapter II leads on to "It is they that bear witness to me". Jesus is seen as the prophet like Moses (Deut. 18), unique when considered alongside the recognised prophets, and probably referred to as 'the prophet' in John 6.14; 7.40; and perhaps 7.52 (following an early MS). Dr. Bruce, however, does not say how Christ uniquely resembled Moses. The reviewer believes that, like Moses, Jesus had instant face-to-face communication with God, whereas all other prophets had to wait for the word of the Lord to come to them, sometimes for many days (e.g. Jer. 42.7). Other witnesses in this chapter are what used to be called 'types', and the chapter deals very clearly, and without fancy applications, with the manna/bread, living water, the passover lamb, and the shepherd king.

Chapter III is an analytical treatment, worthy of entry in an encyclopedia, of the concept of Abraham our father in the New Testament. Chapter IV returns to typology with the theme of shadow and substance. This means a discussion of the Epistle to

the Hebrews with its application of sanctuary and sacrifice as shadowing the reality in Christ's sacrifice and also shadowing a heavenly reality.

The final chapter on 'the spirit of prophecy' discusses briefly the place of prophecy in the early church, and then deals at length with the Book of Revelation. This is a real stimulus to Christian thinking. In fact one excellent feature of the whole book is that Dr. Bruce does not simply produce an academic treatise, although he provides good scholarly material, but he opens for us doors through which he himself has entered for spiritual profit.

Finally one must call attention to the fine quality of presentation by the Paternoster Press.

J. STAFFORD WRIGHT

Alan P.F. Sell, *Robert Mackintosh: Theologian of Integrity*, European University Papers, Peter Lang, Munzgraben 2, Bern, 1977, 107pp. Price not stated.

This is a thesis type of tribute to a theologian well known in his day (1858-1933). The trouble is that the field of theology is always moving on, and the older names with few exceptions, soon become like dinosaurs, interesting but rather out of date. Mackintosh was required reading when this reviewer read theology at Cambridge, but it is unlikely that he is much read today.

Nonetheless this book gives a clear outline and assessment of Mackintosh's life and thinking. He fell out with Calvinistic Presbyterianism and became a Congregationalist minister. But his primary work was as Professor in Lancashire College. He was basically orthodox, and certainly Trinitarian, but he shunned a static view of Scripture and the fetters of creeds. He held firmly to the objective atonement, but not to any penal interpretation. As a philosopher he found the traditional arguments for the existence of God to be unsatisfactory, but did not dismiss natural theology entirely. "God is revealed in his handiwork", but "we cannot validly argue from his handiwork to God".

The author's thoroughness is seen in his 411 note references, and naturally he includes what must be near enough to a complete list of Dr. Mackintosh's books and many articles.

J. STAFFORD WRIGHT

John de Satgé, *Christ and the Human Prospect; the unity of existence here and hereafter*, SPCK, 1978, PB, 145pp., £3.75.

This book has as a subtitle, *The unity of existence here and hereafter*. An evangelical will find himself enthusiastically praising some of the book, and equally reading other parts with suspicion. It is hardly likely that anyone will be led to change his point of view, although the author will stimulate the thinking out of what one holds already, and the book can be commended for this.

The author is basically evangelical and conservative. His chapter on *The edges of mystery* is along the lines of Edward Norman's 1978 Reith Lectures, i.e. he criticises so-called secular theology for its handling of the supernatural and spiritual, and for its limiting Christianity by science and humanistic morality. The author sees beyond this material earth, not only in relation to the unity of the Church in Christ, but also highlighting the unseen world of fallen and unfallen angels, and of departed spirits, who are rightly distinguished from angels.

It is his treatment of the Roman Church and the Virgin Mary that evangelicals will find difficult. It may well be that, if one read his earlier book on Mary, one would better understand what he writes here concerning not only devotion to Mary but also prayers to and for the departed. When he has set out his arguments, one wants to ask whether the New Testament Church would have followed him, since, while quoting from the 2nd Vatican Council, he does not produce any Scriptural evidence. In discussing terms for union with Rome, his hope lies in something like the Uniate Churches for the Church of England. The reviewer cannot see further than grassroots fellowship between true

Christians of all denominations, which is more effective than a search for documented unity in high places.

J. STAFFORD WRIGHT

R. Lafflamme et M. Gervais (eds.), *Le Christ hier, aujourd'hui et demain; Colloque de Christologie tenu à l'Université Laval, 21 et 22 mars 1975*. Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1976. 487pp., \$18.00.

Christology, the study of the Person of Christ, and especially the union in Him of the divine and human natures, has understandably been the major concern of Christian theology since the New Testament itself. Fathers and Church Councils, Schoolmen and Reformers, right down to our own days, theologians have wrestled with its problems. Even since the publication of the symposium under review we have had C.F.D. Moule's *Origins of Christology* and I.H. Marshall's *Origins of New Testament Christology*, not to mention, from another point of view, *The Myth of God Incarnate*.

Le Christ, hier, aujourd'hui et demain brings together papers read at a seminar of Canadian catholic academics. Because of its origin, two characteristics will strike the reader. Firstly, it is a collection of papers, not a systematic study of the theme as a whole. No attempt is made even to arrange them in any logical sequence. There are two introductory essays; a survey of Christology since 1951, the fifteen hundredth anniversary of the Council of Chalcedon by Fr. Bernard Sesboué; then an examination of the methodology of Christology today by Fr. Bernard Lonergan well-known on this side of the Atlantic for his *Method in Theology* (1972). The remaining twenty papers, mainly doctrinal but some historical and exegetical, are arranged in alphabetical order of their authors' names. Lonergan's paper plus one of the others, incidentally, are in English; the rest in French.

Secondly, all the writers are Roman Catholics, writing for an audience of their coreligionaries. This is not to suggest that they are biased, or that each one 'écrit pour son couvent'. But it does mean that footnotes more often refer to catholic works likely to be less familiar to readers of FAITH AND THOUGHT than many protestant works which are not mentioned. As an example, Fr. Sesboué in the introduction already mentioned includes a very

selective reading list of seventeen catholic titles and only four protestant, including one by Pannenberg and two by Moltmann. Nevertheless, non-catholic readers will no doubt find much of interest in this view from the other side of the road.

As might be expected, there is much common ground between Christians not only on Christological doctrines but also on avenues of approach; in this volume there is much that will have a familiar ring. Frederick E. Crowe's article (in English) on the mind of Jesus begins with an investigation into Jesus' consciousness of His own identity and messiahship. Fr. J.-M. Archambault's contribution on 'L'obéissance de Jésus; Révélation de la Personne du Fils' has a thorough consideration of the Johannine references to 'the hour'. Two studies are patristic or mediaeval: those on Nicolas of Cusa, 1401-64 (J. Doyon), and Ignatius of Antioch c.35-107 (E. Robillard); while at the other end of Church history G. Langevin examines the Christological teaching of Karl Rahner, and Louis O'Neill the political dimension of the life of Jesus, linking it with contemporary liberation theology and citing in an interesting annotated bibliography Gutierrez, Helder Camara and Martin Hengel. It is not the task of the reviewer to transcribe the list of contents, but these few indications will give some idea of the breadth of perspective.

What picture of contemporary catholic Christology emerges? By its nature, Christology is always in tension between the divine and human aspects of the Son of God who is also Son of man. In the earliest days the deity was probably more emphasized; catholics have also probably been more concerned with Christ's deity than His manhood. But since Vatican II profound influences have been at work; the reader will find in these pages trends he would not have expected to find a century ago. Space will not permit a detailed analysis of all these differences; one must serve as an example.

Traditional Christian theology has always regarded Jesus as the pre-existent Son of God, made incarnate. Several contributors to this seminar however lean to the ancient heresy of adoptionism. R. Lapointe sees the divine Sonship as beginning during Christ's earthly life. While admitting that the New Testament (Jn.1.1, Col.1.15-8, 1 Tim.3.16, etc.) and traditional catholic teaching (Aquinas etc.) regard the Son as pre-existent, he claims the authority of Karl Rahner and other post-Vatican II for saying that this no longer seems to meet the need of today's thinking.

Jean Richard adds that the New Testament often uses the title 'Son of God' metaphorically, not literally, and asserts that Rom.1.4 supports the idea of a resurrection adoption. He adduces various texts to demonstrate that adoptionism was the most ancient New Testament christology. But in these and other passages where adoptionism is expounded one cannot escape the feeling that to do so the learned divines have to stand scripture upon its head!

The value of this symposium is in its panorama of the christological thought of catholics today. Like this JOURNAL it is printed in fac-simile typescript, and is handsomely and accurately produced.

LAURENCE E. PORTER

Ralph P. Martin, *New Testament Foundations. A Guide for Christian Students. Vol. 2: Acts-Revelation.* Eerdmans and Paternoster Press, 1978, 463pp., £9.

Dr. Martin's book occupies a bridging position between those introductions written specifically for the needs of beginning students and those which set out to be scholarly handbooks for study of questions in the area of introduction. While Dr. Martin works with the classroom specifically in mind (p.xi), the scope of his study allows fresh suggestions to be offered and defended.

The work opens with a brief chapter designed to orient the student to the study of the epistles: "What to Look for in the Epistles". Then follow chapters on the Roman Empire and the religious and philosophical framework of the first century. (This chapter includes a number of primary texts at some length, with Greek text, English translation and detailed notes. One wonders whether the space would not have been better given to a more detailed setting out of some of the philosophical views.)

Acts is treated as "Cameos of the Early Church". The purpose, leading themes, dating and authorship are briefly dismissed in a single chapter (seventeen pages). Seven chapters then follow which use the framework of Acts for historical reconstruction of development within the early church. This approach is ideally suited to classroom presentation. However, it does considerably less than justice to Luke's own understanding of

the material he presents. For example, Dr. Martin's judgment that 'the Jewish Christian concurrence [to the evangelization of Cornelius] is given on the tacit understanding that Cornelius is a unique case, not the first in a new army of converts to the faith" (p.101) may be historically accurate, but it is certainly not the way Luke sees it. Under Luke's hand the Jewish Christian recognition that "to the Gentiles also God has granted repentance unto life" (Acts 11:18) is programmatic. Thus, Luke interrupts at Acts 8:4 his account of the scattering following Stephen's death, to resume it at precisely this point: Luke's concern is to bring the witness to Greeks in Antioch into a relationship with this recognition of God's interest in Gentiles. Dr. Martin's treatment of Acts is the poorer for lack of interaction with J. Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, Minneapolis, 1972.

The treatment of the main Pauline letters is more traditional. Dr. Martin inclines towards the South Galatian view. The visits to Jerusalem are to be identified with those in Acts 9:26-30 and 11:27-30. The troublers in Galatia are to be understood against the background of the "pressure [on Jews] to declare themselves loyal Jews at a time of a fierce nationalistic upsurge" (p.155). The authenticity of 2 Thessalonians is defended and it is dated later than 1 Thessalonians. 2 Cor.10-13 is accepted as part of 2 Corinthians, while Dr. Martin is far less confident that 6:14 - 7:1 form an original part of the letter. Romans is seen as Paul's Testament, which nevertheless addresses specific church problems in Rome. Rom.16 is to be connected with Ephesus and not Rome. Colossians was written during an Ephesian imprisonment. An attempt is made to preserve for Ephesians, Pauline authority without Pauline authorship: "It was Luke who published [Ephesians] under the apostle's aegis, either during his final imprisonment or after his death" (p.224). It is not clear whether Dr. Martin considers the letter to have been authorized by Paul (p.230), but, if Paul is dead, it is difficult to see how Dr. Martin's view can account for the request for prayer in Eph.6:19.

Then follows a series of chapters on special issues in the Pauline Corpus (Paul as letter writer, sources, authority of Paul's letters, church and state, Gnosticism motifs) to which is relegated the discussion of the pastorals. Dr. Martin makes the interesting suggestion that the pastorals have been written up (by Luke?) on the basis of sets of abbreviated notes from Paul which had earlier been used by an amanuensis as the basis of letters to Timothy and Titus. This suggestion makes an interesting parallel

to the kind of editorial freedom taken by the synoptists in reproducing some of the *verba Christi*. Dr. Martin seems to imply (p.306) that not only the original notes, but also the final documents, as we have them, were directed to Timothy and Titus. However, this is a detachable aspect of the hypothesis.

The penultimate section deals with the remaining N.T. books. The Petrine authorship of 1 Peter is accepted. In the treatment of Hebrews it is not at all clear why a baptismal homily (p.350) should be "addressed to a world-weary and discontended church" (p.355). The Johannine literature is given all too brief treatment. 2 Peter is written by a later Petrinist whose use of the apostle's name is an indication of his commitment to faithful reproduction of Petrine theology.

As was the case in vol.1, sample exegetical notes are provided in a final section. In the view of the present reviewer, the notes indicate in a large measure the extent to which exegesis can successfully be carried forward without the prior solution of the questions of introduction.

At points Dr. Martin presents his material in unduly compressed form, which can only confuse the beginning student. However, this is less true of the present volume than of vol.1. There are also occasions on which the author fails to adduce evidence for positions adopted. On p.164 there appears to be some confusion in the presentation of Michaelis' argument.

Dr. Martin's sensitivity to the needs of the classroom and his wide competence make this volume a valuable addition to one's NT library.

JOHN L. NOLLAND

I. Velikovsky, *Ramses II and his Time*, Sidgwick and Jackson, 1978. xiv - 270pp. £6.95.

This is the fifth volume to appear in Velikovsky's *magnum opus*, *Ages in Chaos*, of which the first was published as long ago as 1952. The author has sustained an extended and well-publicised controversy with other historians concerning the chronology of the ancient world, and he continues in similar vein in this work.

Despite the extent of his work, however, Velikovsky has always been a lone voice crying in the wilderness, and the reviewer has to say at the outset that this latest publication gives no indication that any wider acceptance of his theories is likely to be forthcoming.

The book certainly makes some astounding claims. The reader is immediately confronted with the proposition that the Pharaohs Ramesses II and Necho II were one and the same person, and that his main opponent in the ancient world was known as both Nebuchadnezzar II of Babylon and Hattusilis III of the Hittites! Thus some 700 years of Egyptian history and the entire independent existence of the Hittites (the "alter egos" of the Chaldeans) are removed at a stroke, though the theory also has implications for the rest of the ancient Near East.

Velikovsky works out his hypothesis in some detail, even though it is frequently based on the flimsiest of evidence. Several attempts are made to assimilate the lives of the two Pharaohs, despite the fact that Ramesses' reign was roughly four times the length of that of Necho. Strenuous efforts are made to equate Ramesses' defeat at Qadesh by the Hittites with Nebuchadnezzar's victory over Necho's army at Carchemish, on the grounds that Qadesh is simply another name for Carchemish. Ramesses' detailed accounts are neatly dovetailed with other carefully chosen texts, especially from the prophet Jeremiah, concerning the divisions of the Egyptian army, the treatment of fugitives, and the course of the battle. It is assumed that Nebuchadnezzar must have concluded a treaty with the Egyptians prior to the final siege of Jerusalem, and that the text is preserved in Ramesses' famous treaty of his 21st year with the Hittites. On the Hittite side, Hattusilis' autobiography is regarded as a description of the life of Nebuchadnezzar. Thus Nebuchadnezzar's return from Syria to take his deceased father's throne is interpreted as though he had to defend himself against the charge of coveting the kingship of Babylon! Examples of other amazing reinterpretations include Nebuchadnezzar as the violator of Ahiaram's tomb, a Hebrew rather than a Phoenician origin of the alphabet, and the revelation that Merenptah was a Pharaoh of the exile rather than the Exodus.

The book in fact abounds in guesswork, inaccuracies, and impossibilities, though evidence to support this conclusion can only be given briefly here. Comparisons between Ramesses II's

treaty with the Hittites and Old Testament references to the late pre-exilic period can only be sustained on the basis of generalizations so vague as to be meaningless. The verses quoted by Velikovsky from Jeremiah and Kings do not even mention the mutual extradition of refugees and prisoners of war between the Egyptians and their enemies, even though this is a major subject of the treaty. The equation of Qadesh (also known as Kizza, Kinza) with Carchemish is difficult to reconcile with Egyptian texts from the reigns of Tuthmosis III and Ramesses II which refer to them as separate localities. Similarly, the existence of a letter of Hattusilis III addressed to Kadashman-Enlil II, king of Babylon (KBo I 10) makes it very hard to accept that Hattusilis III and Nebuchadnezzar II were the same person. Furthermore, if Nebuchadnezzar's life is really portrayed in Hattusilis' writings, it is impossible to reconcile the Babylonian Chronicle's statement of Nebuchadnezzar's return to Babylon within months of his father's death to assume kingship with the long gap between the Hittite success at Qadesh and Hattusilis' accession, a gap where the later years of Muwatallis and the seven year reign of Mursilis III have to be fitted in. Velikovsky's solution of inventing two Babylonian kings between Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar is both unnecessary and unconvincing.

Apart from these specific details, the book also exhibits several weaknesses in its basic approach. In the first place, the material is selective in the extreme, and vast areas of very relevant information are totally ignored. For instance, the only Hittite rulers mentioned are Hattusilis and his immediate predecessors, while the rest, including Mursilis I who sacked Babylon c. 1530 BC, are dismissed without so much as a hearing.

Secondly, there is an almost pathological desire to explain and fill in the gaps in our knowledge of the ancient world, even though the existence of such gaps is inevitable in view of the irregular nature of archaeological discovery. Although both Egyptian and Hittite chronology is still problematical in many respects, our understanding is slowly improving, as exemplified in the recent work of Kitchen and Bierbrier. This however, is unknown to Velikovsky, who by contrast, rather naively places blocks of information from quite unrelated contexts wherever a gap occurs in our extant sources. Such a procedure is employed more than once. The sparsely documented reign of Necho II, for example, is amplified by the wealth of material from Ramesses II,

with no real attempt at integration, and Velikovsky seems quite unaware that our comparative ignorance of Necho II is a problem common to the whole Saite dynasty, a problem probably due to the site of the capital Sais being now lost. Wider factors of this nature, however, are either unknown or deemed irrelevant to Velikovsky, whose determination to find solutions leaves actual evidence far behind.

Perhaps the most distinctive aspect of the book is the use of duplicate names, and it is only by a random and quite profligate application of this practice that Velikovsky is able to muster any support at all. But it is one thing to quote the documented examples of Tiglath-pileser III who was also known as Pul or Pulu, or Joseph whose Egyptian name was Zaphenath-paneah (Gen. 41:45), or even the Egyptian statute that the Pharaoh should have five names, and quite another matter to assume wholesale identifications for which no shred of independent evidence can be adduced. The author's brief elucidation of this subject (pp. 99-102) forms a hopeless and unsubstantiated discussion which only serves to underline the fundamental weakness of his main argument. One can only conclude on the basis of these factors and others that the ages in chaos belong to Velikovsky and not to those whom he criticises so severely.

M. J. SELMAN

Martin Hollis, *Models of Man: Philosophical Thoughts on Social Action*, Cambridge University Press, 1977, 198pp., £7.00. PB £2.50

C. Stephen Evans, *Preserving the Person: A Look at the Human Sciences*, Inter-Varsity Press (USA), 177pp., PB, £4.95

"There is no shirking the great hypotheses which divide metaphysicians." This sentence, occurring at the end of *Models of Man*, is one with which both authors agree. The point is this: Over against Durkheim, who believed that sociology could somehow be neutral in metaphysical territory, Evans and Hollis insist that all human and social sciences rest on a view of personhood. The answers to the questions 'who am I?' and 'why am I here?' to a large extent determine the orientation of social theories.

Hollis' elegantly written book 'surveys the social sciences through a philosopher's monocle'. For the purposes of discussion, he divides theories of society into two general types; those which have as focus Plastic man, and alternatively, Autonomous man. With Alan Dawe (whose seminal article, 'The Two Sociologies' appeared in the *British Journal of Sociology* in 1970) he traces the tension between Plastic and Autonomous man to Enlightenment thought. There, he asserts, the key notion was perfectibility through science, the contradictions of which bred these alternative conceptions of social explanation.

Plastic man is the unheroic, passive individual of Durkheim's sociology, whose conduct is produced by constraining social facts. The individual is moulded, and thus does not rationally assent to that process. He is, in short, a programmed feedback system.

Autonomous man, on the other hand, has a substantial self. He is a rational creature in a natural world of cause and effect. And it is Autonomous man for which Hollis opts as the subject for science. To cut the fairly difficult (not long) story short, Hollis offers this cryptic summary of his thesis: "rational action is its own explanation."

As one might expect, this philosopher of social science uses epistemology as the umpire in the contest between Plastic and Autonomous man. Few people like to think of themselves as Plastic men - as mere intersections of a complex of laws. Hollis suspects the individualism which might lurk behind such a sentiment, but agrees that, for stricter philosophical reasons, Autonomous man is a better bet than Plastic as the subject for science. (Nevertheless, when trying to account for institutions, he sees the passive view as having more in its favour. Institutions are more than the intended or unintended results of individual negotiations.)

The social action of Autonomous man "occurs on a stage built of shared meanings and norms." So far, so good. But reasons which may be articulated in relation to action are the explanation, not the cause of rational action. Social action, continues Hollis, can only be understood in the end as the rational expression of intentions within rules. (Geoffrey Hawthorn, in his *Enlightenment and Despair: A History of Sociology* makes a similar point in regard to the construction of sociological theories.) The context (of rules etc.) may be very

complex, but does not determine action. Moreover, the rule of the social game may be altered *via* concerted action, which in turn reinforces the argument for Autonomous man.

The Christian philosopher would doubtless find points of dispute with Hollis. I do not claim close familiarity with the philosophical terrain. But Hollis' choice of Autonomous man is a suggestive starting point for Christian critique. For while he acknowledges that moral evaluation is part of action, he fails to relate it to any scheme for the Good Society. This failure cannot be atoned for by the claim that this is merely a technical, philosophical work. His unwillingness to plump for any eternal truths leaves us with nothing outside the immanent horizon. Autonomous man presumably does what is right in his own eyes.

In a sense, Evans' piece begins where Hollis leaves off. Again, like Hollis, Evans is examining the human sciences as a philosopher, but his assumptions are somewhat divergent. For him, the person is a responsible agent, which fact is known both via Christian revelation, and also through an everyday common-sense understanding of the world. But although Evans would not veil his standpoint in revelation (even of 'eternal truths'), this does not mean that he forecloses the possibility of a science of persons.

Evans' argument is that human sciences (including sociology, psychology, and brain physiology in particular) have tended to de-personalize man because of their foundation in a particular view of science. The prevalence of scientism in Western culture is blamed for the aggravation of this depersonalization trend. He traces this insidious process through brain science, psychology (both Freudian and Skinnerian) and sociology, concluding that much is at stake, epistemologically, morally, and politically.

The view of personhood here expounded and applied assumes several important characteristics. Persons are agents who make conscious decisions, and can reflect upon their lives. They may evaluate action (and here he goes beyond Hollis' explicit contentions). Persons have unique significance, but may not properly be conceived in isolation from the communities in which they have a part (and which are part of them). Lastly, persons also have unity (are whole) and continuity (in time). Taken together, these are features of Evans' 'personalistic framework'.

It is Evans' effort to deal with the 'crisis of the person' (by means of 'ideal type' analysis) which is of greatest interest. With regard to the scope and method of science, Evans sees two forms of Scientism (that science gives truth about the whole of reality, and that it deals with ultimate reality) and two variants of the 'Unity of science' idea (that there is one method for all science, and that it is empiricism). Possible responses to these positions are as follows. 'Reinterpreters' of science accept both scientism and the unity of science, but either argue that personalism is compatible with mechanism, or that it must be subsumed under it. 'Limiters' of science reject scientism, and 'Humanizers' of science reject the unity of science, in either of their forms. (In terms of these categories an ambivalence is found in McKay's *Clockwork Image*. He is seen to hover between Reinterpreting and Limiting science in Evans' discussion in chapter 9.)

Evans argues cogently for his position of synthesizing Humanizing with a (Perspectival) limiting of science. That is, he does not accept that there is only one scientific method, but does maintain that science may speak about all reality, though not in an ultimate way. The Christian, he suggests, will find this a congenial position (though he admits other possibilities), for it preserves the creatureliness, transcendence, and unity of the person, along with the integrity of science.

The kind of debate engaged by Hollis reflects movements taking place (albeit at a less rarefield level) in academic sociology today, which is why his work of clarification is important. But Evans' work is of more use to the Christian scholar working in the human sciences. He aims to heighten reflexivity, and a general awareness of what is really at issue: how to contend for biblical personalism in a world which refuses to transcend so-called rational autonomy.

DAVID LYON

James Churchill and David V. Jones (eds.), *An Introductory Reader in the Philosophy of Religion*, SPCK, 1979, 235pp. £4.50.

For me one of the encouraging trends in modern philosophy is the increasing attention once more being given to the neglected field

of metaphysics. This is particularly so in the philosophy of religion where the age-old questions about God, evil and immortality are being examined with renewed vigour. As a consequence courses in the philosophy of religion have been introduced not only at undergraduate level but also for sixth formers. It is to assist the latter that this Reader was prepared. The editors felt that, "Many of the recommended books were too advanced (and too expensive) for our students. What was required was a book which brought together in concise form a variety of opinions on certain specific topics". They realise the obvious limitations of such a Reader which may do less than justice to the authors cited but hope that one of the results of reading it "will be to stimulate the reader to go back to the original 'unabridged' sources and so be able to judge the arguments for himself". To this end each section ends with a graded guide to further reading, as well as a series of questions in the form of study topics which will prove useful to student and teacher alike.

My first impression was one of disappointment and perplexity. In a book purportedly devoted to the philosophy of religion nearly one half is taken up with scientific questions. To be fair the extracts quoted do have a bearing on religion, but it seems a pity that there is no consideration of the arguments for the existence of God or the problems associated with the afterlife which have featured prominently in the philosophy of religion throughout its history and also in recent years. Perhaps the Editors are not entirely to blame as their choice of topics might have been determined by the requirements of the 'A' Level Syllabus.

The opening section of the nature of religious language is good, especially the extracts from John Hull, although the 'A' level student will no doubt find the sections by Hick and Donovan on Tillich and Ramsay respectively quite difficult. Part of Braithwaite's *Eddington Memorial Lecture* is included as an example of the non-cognitive view. It is a pity that there are no extracts from the writings of D.Z. Phillips whose influence has, if anything, been more influential than Braithwaite's.

There is a section on Revelation with extracts from the Church Fathers, D.M. Baillie, Karl Barth, William James, Flew, Hick and Macquarrie. The topic is important but the reader may well find this section tedious. The sections on the problem of evil and miracles are particularly good if somewhat brief.

The section on scientific presuppositions contains extracts from Coulson, Barbour and Peacocke. The issue is sketchily presented and one is surprised not to find an extract either from Kuhn or from a writer summarising his views. Barbour's book, *Myths, Models and Paradigms* is referred to in the bibliography. I would like to have seen extracts from this book which has a direct bearing on the relationship between science and religion. The section on origins is mainly concerned with the relationship between creation and evolution and that on modern biology and theology considers some modern developments in biology such as transplantation, extending life and medical engineering. The final section is devoted to modern physics and theology and gives extended extracts from Schilling dealing with the problems of time and the nature of physical reality. There are two useful extracts from Barbour on complementarity and Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle.

R.S. LUHMAN

Ulrich Simon, *A Theology of Auschwitz*, SPCK, 1967, 1978 (paperbk), 160pp., £2.95.

I cannot remember ever having a book so difficult to review. Not that the style is anything but smooth, although, when I read "we put Hitler and his companions in their respective bowges" (73), I looked in four dictionaries before I found that the last word means *leather knapsacks*. But the difficulty lies in the theme, where Dr. Simon struggles to express the inexpressible, and one has to reread continually to ask exactly what he is saying.

Most of us get by with the standard answers to the problem of suffering so long as we are not involved in some enormous tragedy in ourselves or others. Dr. Simon's father died in Auschwitz and other relatives elsewhere, so it is little wonder if, like Job, he boils over as he struggles to find meaning in the meaningless. How could God in any kind of way be involved in Auschwitz? Here he finds no formal answers, but his book does not shirk the realities.

Dr. Simon, of course, writes as a mature Christian. God certainly showed Himself in the behaviour of Individual Christians and Jews, who showed love and fortitude to the point of increasing

their own privations. But what answer can there be for the vast multitude who went like sheep to the slaughter, innocent of any crime and without trial? The book sets this horror alongside the horror of the arrest, trial, death and resurrection of Jesus. There are similarities; there are differences; and in both God, although seemingly aloof, was indeed present, but without overruling the terrible freedom of man.

I am not clear what Dr. Simon believes about the guards and the responsible heads of the nation. On p.71 he writes, "I do not myself believe that there can be forgiveness for Auschwitz", and he applies Christ's words about the unpardonable sin to those responsible. Yet on p.111 he writes, "Auschwitz... can now be forgiven, because the torment has not only ceased but is established in the divine life itself".

The concluding chapters show how Auschwitz opened the doors for many Jews to return to Israel, and how its shocking witness to the brutality of power at least aroused many human consciences. And yet, one is bound to add, the horrors of Auschwitz still continue, similar in quality though less in quantity. How long, O Lord?

J. STAFFORD WRIGHT

AN IMPORTANT WORK

Colin Brown (ed.), *Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, vol.2, G to PRE, 1977, 1023pp., £14; Vol.3, PRI to Z, 1978, 1481pp., £26; Paternoster Press, Exeter.

This magnificent dictionary, of which volume 1 appeared in 1976 (see this JOURNAL, 102, 113) is now complete. The work is based on *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament* (Wuppertal, 1965 onwards), but has been extensively revised and enlarged. The aim is to make a ready reference book to all the key theological words used in the NT, these being arranged in English and in alphabetical order. The usage of each key word in classical and secular Greek, in the OT, in Aramaic and Rabbinic writings and in the NT is discussed. The referencing and cross-referencing are extensive. The indexes cover Hebrew and Aramaic

as well as Greek words. The work is written for the ordinary English reader: even in the indexes Hebrew and Greek words appear in Roman characters. The articles and entries are always concise and to the point.

Volume 3 contains a general index to the entire work. This index is extraordinarily complete - so complete, indeed, that one feels that perhaps its potential usefulness has been reduced, even though the more important references are in heavy print. Was it necessary, for instance, to list *every* page on which the word *Jesus* appears (359 page references, only 2 in heavy type), or *Gospel* (217 references, 1 in heavy print) - most of these references being quite incidental? But an index which is too complete is preferable to one which is incomplete!

The labour involved in the compiling of this work and in its printing and proof reading must have been immense. The trouble with so many theological books these days is that, after a few years, they become dated. Though most of the old material is still relevant, hundreds of new references to theological books and journals need to be added. Organic chemists were faced with this problem a century ago and solved it neatly. As those who use it are well aware, the early editions of Beilstein's vast *Handbuch* (which costs thousands of pounds) never date. The later editions repeat none of the matter of the earlier editions. Though subsequently the system became complicated and a special volume was necessary to explain how to use the work, the basic plan is that the pages of later editions are headed with the volume number and page of the first edition where, had the new material been available at the time of publication, it would then have appeared. Colin Brown's Dictionary would seem to lend itself well to a procedure of this kind, in which case it need never be revised or go out of date. Meanwhile here is a work which every theological or general library should possess. For individuals, of course, the price is high but the work is well worth the money.

REDC

★★★★★★★★★★★★★★

CUMULATIVE INDEX VOLS. 101 to 105

Abbreviations: Asterisk (*) - the first page of an article;
c - correspondence; d - contribution to a discussion;
f - and pages following; r - review; rw - writer of a review.

To save space titles of papers and headings are indexed under key words only and not given in full. Also '10' is omitted in volume numbers: eg. 3-107 indicates volume 103 page 107.

- Aberfan 2-102
acceptance 5-165
achievement 5-165
Adair, J. 4-183r
Adam 2-93; 3-178
Adcock, A.C. (Essays - Lucas)
4-157*
- advertising, (M. Baker) 3-153*
- Agarwal, A. 2-171
- aggression, (T.B. Poole) 1-209*;
human and animal (G. Barnes)
2-22*; learned? 1-219;
patterns of, 1-21
- Agrest, M. 3-2
- Ahmadis 5-15
- Albigenses 1-222
- alchemy 1-192; 3-121
- al-Ghazali 2-11, 154
- Alice 3-35
- Allen, G.E. 3-18
- America churches, 5-68f;
creationsim, 4-77; myth and
history, 2-166
- Amin 4-94
- amygdalin 3-130
- analogy 1-114, 2-23f; 3-102,
125f. Magic and, 3-60
- Anderson, K.C. 5-92
- Anderson, Sir N. 2-1, 93r;
3-1, 132
- Angood, O. 1-161d
- animals; Experiments 3-19; human
understanding of (Cansdale)
1-33*; St. Francis, 2-91;
talking, 1-14, tools used by,
1-24; trials, 2-92; in war,
1-8. See Aggression
- Anselm, St. 4-180r
- Anstey, R. 2-172
- Antarctica 3-42; 5-153
- anthropomorphism 2-53; 4-101f
- antichrist 1-116; 4-93; 5-6,
202
- antimony 3-122
- Antiochus Epiphanes 5-201
- apostolicity 5-139
- archaeology (T.C. Mitchell)
1-142*; 4-181; 5-143r
- Ardrey, R. 2-38
- Argyle, L. 4-154f
- Argyle, M. 1-123
- ark. Noah's 1-124; cages, 2-96;
bird navigation, 2-103
- armaments 3-10; 5-131r
- Arnold, M. 1-242f
- Arnott, D.W. 1-107
- Arrhenius, S. 1-7
- art. Aztec, 1-201
- astrology 2-106, 3-60
- astronautics 2-104f; 3-33f

astronomy. Organic molecules,
 4-7B. See atmosphere,
 cosmology, Mars, planets etc.
 Aswan dam 2-100, 138
 atheism. Rare, 1-91
 Atkinson, B.F.C. 4-168
 atmosphere. Early 2-46;
 3-160f; 5-155f
 atom war 2-169, 173
 atomic energy. Resignations,
 3-55
 atonement 5-87 esp.
 Atrahasis, 1-142f
 Auden, W.H. 1-257f
 Aulen, G. 1-265f
 Auschwitz, 5-222r; gas
 (D.D. Brodeur) 2-197*
 Austin, W.H. 4-249r
 Australian aborigines 5-163
 authority 1-278; (M.J. Newby)
 3-87*
 autism 1-24
 Averroes 2-155
 Ayer, A.J. 2-105
 Aztec art 1-201

 Babylon 1-126, 231, 2-170
 background radiation 1-119; 2-107
 Bacon, F. 5-19
 Badham, P. 5-204r
 Baker, Eve 5-21
 Baker, M. 5-145; (conversion)
 1-127*; (advertising) 3-153*
 Baldwin, J.G. 5-201r
 Balfour Declaration, 1-62f
 Balfour, A.J. 4-208
 Ball, J.A. 1-7
 Banham, D.G. 1-205* (ethics,
 war) 1-205r*
 Banks, R. 1-275r
 baptism 1-14; 3-25; 4-175r;
 5-201; 4-176. Prenatal, 4-167
 Barbour, I.G. 2-83r
 Barclay, O.R. 2-96r; 4-162r*
 Barkun, M. 2-178
 Barnaby, F. 1-188; 5-5; 131r
 Barnard's star 4-80
 Barnes, E.W. 5-64

 Barnes, G.E. 1-93r; 2-21d;
 3-18rw, 69rw; (aggression)
 2-22*; (Chairman's report)
 3-50*
 Barr, J. 3-111
 Barth, Karl 1-80f
 Bavinck 5-85
 Baxter, R. 5-190
 Bazlinton, J. (Cults) 5-119*;
 5-133rw
 Beast. The, 5-6
 beauty in nature 5-24
 behaviour 1-17f; 2-30f
 being 3-74
 Bejorot, N. 1-203
 belief. Varieties of, 1-86r
 Beloff, J. 2-85r
 Bender, H. 2-86
 Bentley, J. 5-161
 Berger, P. 2-73
 Berkeley, H. 5-146
 Berkhof, L. 5-95
 Berkouwer, G.C. 2-77; 5-138r
 Berlin, I. 1-194
 Bernal, J.D. 2-42, 53
 Berry, A. 4-79
 Berry, R.J. (Environment) 2-131*;
 4-90rw
 Bevan, E. 1-28
 beyond two cultures (Poole) 1-242*
 beyondism, 1-181
 Bible. 5-133r; archaeology,
 5-143; effect of, 1-275;
 Jesus and, 1-88r; misuse
 4-237; reading, 3-133;
 towards a new, 1-6
 Biblical Creation Society, 4-77
 big bang, 2-107; 3-7
 bigamy 3-5
 binding 1-112, 185; 2-98
 biology. Dangers of research,
 1-192; of God, 2-180;
 philosophy of 1-93r
 Birchfield, J.D. 3-136r
 birds 1-214; homing, 2-181;
 navigation 2-103; song 1-22
 black holes 1-4; 2-105; 4-79
 Blackstone, W.E. (Brodeur) 1-44*

blood 5-146; Liquifies, 3-63
 Bloufeld, J. 1-199
 Blumrich, J.F. 2-114r; 3-2
 body. The, 1-113
 Bohm, D. 4-86
 boiler scale 1-196
 Bok, B.J. 3-61
 bomb droppers, 4-197
 book of nature 3-124
 books received 3-21; 4-71, 259
 Borlaug, 2-133
 Box, S. 2-71
 Boxer rebellion 5-147
 Boyle, R. 3-121
 brain 5-158, Size of, 1-125
 brainwashing 1-131f
 Braithwaite, R.B. 3-103 etc;
 5-30
 Bray, G.L. 3-83rw
 Brecher, K. 5-4
 Bridge, D. 4-175r
 Bristlecone-pine 1-122, 165
 Britain in decline. (Walker)
 4-109*
 Brodeur, D.D. 5-163; (Blackstone)
 1-44*; (Auschwitz gas) 2-197*
 Brooks, J. 1-117r
 Brown, Colin. 2-113r; 5-224r
 Bruce, F.F. (Origin of NT) 1-158*,
 276r; 4-251, 5-55, 140r, 184,
 207r
 Budd, S. 2-64
 Buddhism 1-273; 4-247
 Bultmann 1-79f
 Burdick, C. 1-124
 Burgess, A. 2-81
 burial customs 5-152
 Butler, Samuel 3-14f
 Butz, A.R. 5-163
 Byrt, J. (Bible & Creation)
 3-158*
 Cade, C.M. 3-59
 Cadoux, C.J. 5-84
 Calder, N. 2-104
 Calvin, M. 2-42
 Calvinists 5-96
 Cambell, C.A. 3-103f
 Cambridge, 4-162f; 252r
 Campbell, R. 4-180
 Canaan. Conquest of, 5-12
 cancer. 3-58. Of liver, 2-174;
 test, 4-93
 canon of NT, (Bruce) 1-158*
 Cansdale, G. (understanding,
 animals) 1-33*
 Caporeal, L.R. 3-9
 carbon-14 dates 1-228; 3-176
 care. Commitment to, 5-124r
 cargo cults, 4-103
 Carkhuff, R.R. 5-174f, 180
 Carlyle, T. 3-153
 Carnell, E.J. 5-97
 Carter, President 4-92
 catacombs 5-27
 Catal Huyuk 1-238
 catastrophe 4-190
 catholicity 5-138f
 Catt, I. 2-7r
 Cattell, R.B. 1-181r
 causality, 4-120
 Cayley, A. (Sir) 2-15
 celibacy 5-185
 chain from heaven, 2-158
 Chain, Sir E. 2-6
 chance 3-128; 5-129; necessity
 and, 2-9, 3-22r
 change v Gaia, 2-16
 Chardin, T. de, 1-270
 Chargaff, E. 3-68, 133
 chariots and credulity (Poole)
 3-33*
 charisma 4-239
 charts (Pearce) 2-19, 20
 cheating, 2-6
 chemistry. Special, 2-56
 Chen, P.S. 2-112
 cherts 4-82
 Chester, L. 3-3
 children. Beliefs of, 4-198;
 foundlings, 2-91; solve
 problems, 1-87
 Chilver, H. 4-191
 chimpanzees 5-17
 China. Astronomy, 4-193; students
 from, 1-195
 chirality 2-15, 32, 106
 choice 1-10

Christ. Bible and, 1-88r; human prospect &, 5-210r; Person of, 5-211r
 christians. Early English, 5-38
 Christianity. Organised - cruelty of 1-221
 Christman, W.J. 5-201r
 christology. NT, 4-182r
 church, 4-183r; Fellowship for Psychical Studies, 4-239; life, 5-200; unity, 1-90
 Churchill, J. 5-22r
 CICCUC, 4-162r*
 Cicero 5-56
 cities in space 1-189
 civilisation. Early, 2-101f
 Clark, G.H. 5-134r
 Clark, R.E.D., 3-85r; 5-131r. (Creation & design) 4-99*; (magician God) 2-151*. Review Essays, 1-83; 170; 2-114; 3-142; 4-162, 243. Also all unsigned reviews and most of News & Views.
 Clark, R.W. 1-101r
 Cleobury, F.H. 1-86rw; 3-73rw; (subjective trends) 1-71*
 Clissold, S. 4-179r
 Clockwork Orange, 2-81
 closed mind 3-36
 coacervates, 2-55
 coherence 2-105
 Coleridge, S.T. 4-134
 Columbus 3-143
 comets 4-189
 Common Sense philosophy 3-125
 communication 4-97
 communists. God and 5-162
 complementarity 2-84; 3-12, 128
 See MacKay
 computers 2-8, 101
 comradeship 1-217
 Comte 2-66
 conditional immortality 2-88
 consciousness. Atomic? 4-85
 conservatives, liberals and the gospel (Sell) 5-62*
 continuity 4-86
 contradictions 5-130
 controversy 1-91r
 conversion, (Baker) 1-127*
 Cook, C.L. 4-167
 Cook, E.D.(Ecology), 2-184*
 Coppedge, J.F. 1-179r
 copper alloys 1-235
 corruption 4-199
 cosmic constants 4-88
 cosmic rays 5-15
 Coulson, C.A. 1-14; 3-17; 5-159
 counselling 5-164f, 169
 courtship 2-24
 Cousins, P.E. (Bible and Sex) 5-41*
 Cox, H. 4-114
 creation, 2-90, (Clark)*, (Boyd, poem) 182, 189; 3-7. Bible and science (Byrt) 3-158*; days of, 4-176r; design in (Clark) 4-99*; epic, 1-142f; *ex nihilo*, 4-86
 Cross, F.L. 2-92
 crucifixion. Place of 3-10, See shroud
 cults (Bazlinton) 5-119*
 culture. Eastern 1-195
 cultures. Beyond two 1-242*
 Cupitt, D. 2-81r

 Dale, R. 3-66; 5-23
 Dali, S. 1-193
 Daniel. Book of, 5-201r, 226r
 Däniken, E. von 2-114; 3-2, 11, 33*; 4-200
 Darwin, C. Christians and, (Sell), 4-202*; design and, 4-103; on emotions, 1-18
 Darwinism 3-64
 dating 1-122, 179, 228f, 3-167f; 4-94. NT (Hemer) 3-145r*
 Davidson, R. 5-59
 Davies, D.R. 5-64, 102
 Dead Sea 3-10
 death 3-15
 Deck, N. 1-201
 DEGESCH 2-198
 demons 1-198, 204; 3-144; 4-172f, Power of, 1-96
 Denbigh, K.G. 4-84, 193

deprogramming 5-120
depth theology 1-78
Derr, T.S. 2-188
descriptions of events 2-25
deserts 4-95, 199
design. Argument from, 1-92;
(Clark) 4-99*, 5-138;
levels of, 4-103f
determinism 5-14
devils at large, (Clark) 3-142*
Dichter, E. 3-154, 157
dictionary. Christian Church,
2-92r; NT Theology, 2-113r,
5-224
diffusionism 1-166
Dirac, P.A.M. 5-24
disaster, 2-185. Syndrome, 2-178
disease 4-198
dishonesty. Grants, 5-21;
religious words, 5-23
divination, 4-147, 152
divorce 5-49f
Dixon, B. 1-14
DKS keyboard 2-9
DNA, 2-44, 50
Dobbs, B.J.T. 3-121r
Dogon 3-11
dogs, 1-39
dolphins 1-8
Dooyeweerd, H. 3-83; 4-113
Douglas, J.D. 2-92r
Drane, J.W. 5-140rw
dreams, 1-100, 176r; 3-133
drugs 1-201; 3-130; ergot 3-9
dualism 2-145
du Bois Reymond 2-103
Duhem, P. 2-84; 3-127
Duncan, J.E. 2-93r
Duncan "Rabbi" 5-102
Dunne, J.S. 3-73r
Durkheim 1-247
Dutch Calvinism, 3-82f

earth. Age of, 1-180; 4-199;
early, 1-117; 4-81, 188;
5-157
earthquakes 1-13; 4-195.
Prediction, 2-102
Ebla 5-144

Eccles, J. (Sir) 5-158
ecology, 2-89; 131f. Theology
and (Cook) 2-184*
Eddington, Sir A. 2-105
Edison, Thomas 3-55
Edmunds, V. 3-131
education. History, 1-246; religious,
3-87f; self-defeating, 5-27
Egypt. Archaeology of (Pearce)
1-120*. See Aswan dam
Einstein 1-101r
electrons 2-106
Eliot, T.S. 1-245, 250f
Ellis, D.J. 1-111w; 2-93rw;
3-80rw; 5-128rw
Ellison, H.L. 3-2
Ellul, J. 3-6
emanation 3-124
emergence 4-86
Emerson 4-135
Endor, woman of 4-153
energy 2-139
Eniwetok 2-107
enkephalin 2-177
Enlightenment 5-191
Enroth, R. 5-119r
entertainment, a right 5-27
entropy 4-84. Of universe 3-7
environment 2-100, 184f. Attitudes
to (Berry) 2-131*
enzymes 2-104
ergot 3-9
erosion 2-171
eschatology. Change as sign, 4-111
ESP 1-176r. Pre-battery stage,
5-9; Russian, 1-125, 170*r
Etchells, R. (Model of Making)
1-250*
ethics. Evolutionary, 3-69,
medical, 3-130. See also
Luhman
Ethiopia 5-145
ethology. Behaviour and (Young)
1-17*
etymology 3-111
equality and liberty 4-198
evangelicals 2-172. See 5-62f
Evans, C.S. 5-217r
Evelyn, J. 2-132

evidence 2-94
evil. Problem of, 2-178, 4-198;
5-124, 127
evolution, 1-94r, 179r; 2-7;
3-158; 4-166. Complaint to PM,
5-26; cosmic constants, 4-88;
defined, 2-68; emergent, 4-211;
historical, 4-202*; neutral,
2-104; Popper on, 5-159; in
theology, 5-89. See homology,
Thorpe.
Ewing, A.C. 5-31
excavations 1-147f
excitement 4-96
existentialism 5-195
exorcism, 1-99; 4-221f (esp. 229);
5-29. See possession
explanation, 1-175; 2-105, 162;
5-159f
Ezekiel's spaceship 2-114*r; 3-2

faith. Immoral! 1-92; reasons
for, 2-96r; suppression 1-123
falsification. Spectrum of, 2-83
Faraday, M. 2-15; 4-102
Farmer, F.T. 2-108r; 3-85rw
fat 4-90
fate 1-96; 2-13
fear 3-142
feedback in ESP 5-9
Feld, B. 2-173
Ferguson, J. 4-247r
Ferreira, I. 4-172
feudalism 5-186
fighting. Ritualized 1-211
Filby, F.A. 1-90r
Finlayson, R.A. 5-93
Finney, C.G. 5-69
Flew, A. 2-83
Flood. of Genesis 1-124, 142f;
2-102; 5-153-4. Archaeology
and (Pearce), 1-228*, 2-120*;
geology, 3-173
fluctuations 4-192
Foley, C.D. 5-151
food. Clean/unclean 1-203;
supply, 2-106
football 1-9
footprints 3-173
forgiveness 4-158f
Forsyth, P.T. 5-64, 93
Fort, C.H. 3-2
France, R.T. 3-78rw; 4-251
Francis of Assisi 2-91
Frazer, J. (Sir) 3-129
freedom and grace (Adcock)
4-157fr*
freewill 5-128
Freud, S. 1-96r; 5-194
fulfilment. Of OT in NT 5-207r
Fuller, J.G. 1-202; 3-9
fundamentalism 5-73 esp
Funk, R.W. 3-108
Gager, J.G. 1-13
Gaia 2-16f
Galaty, D.H. 2-103
Galton, F. 1-99
Gandee, L.R. 5-146
gaps 2-152; 4-243
Garvie, A.E. 5-86
Gaulist effect 1-178
Gauquelin, M. 3-60
Geller, Uri, 2-5f; 3-35
general strike 4-169
genetics. Insanity and, 2-2
genes. Behavioural, 3-65
Genesis. 3-162f; 4-82, 176r, 197;
5-41
genetic engineering 3-68, 133;
4-94
germs and disease 2-102
gestalt therapy. (Whitfield)
3-26*
gestures 1-24
Ghosts in graveyard, 1-170*r
gifts. Engender hate, 1-77
gifts of the Spirit 1-162, 203;
of God, 1-178
glossolalia 1-203
Gnosticism 5-184
God. Analogies, 1-115; belief in,
1-123; beyond nature 5-132r;
belief declining, 3-61;
clockmaker 5-131; conception,
4-101; gaps 3-17, 37; God's
Truth, 5-133r; goodness of,
2-111r; ground of being, 3-17;

God - *continued*
 immaterial? (see also Priestley) 5-27; in nature, 2-9f; Islam, 2-154; Magician? 2-151*; new look, 2-112r; philosophy and, 5-124f; proof 1-82, 91; 3-65; savage 2-81r; search for, 3-72r, 73r; talking about, 3-100*; theory of 4-192; universe and 1-262. See proofs, Providence
 Golden Bough 3-129
 Goncourts 4-108
 Goodrich, C. 5-148
 Gore, W.H. 2-180
 gospel. Advertising, (Baker) 3-156
 Gospels 3-80
 Goudzwaard, R. 3-84r
 Gough, H.R. 4-17
 Govett, R. 2-170
 Grant, C.K. 5-7
 gravity 4-100
 Great Instauration 5-19
 Griffiths, T.R. (Let the Earth...) 2-40*
 Grivas, 1-207
 Guthrie, M. 1-107
 Gutteridge 3-5
 Gwyn-Thomas, J. 4-177 rwf

 Haber, F. 2-198f; relatives of 2-209, 213
 Haber product 2-200
 Hagland, Ake 1-195
 Hahn, O. 2-202, 211
 Hahn, R. 3-72
 hair of head 5-152
 Haldane, J.B.S. 4-89
 Halsey, A.H. 5-6
 Hanlon, J. 2-6; 5-7
 Hanson, A.T. 3-86r
 Hapgood, C.H. 3-41
 Hardy, A. (Sir) 2-180
 Hargraves, R.B. 4-81
 Harnack 5-81

 Harrington, R.S. 5-18
 Harris, R.J.C. 4-94
 Hasted, J.B. 5-10
 Hawton, H. 1-91r
 Hayward, A. 3-174; 5-133r
 healing 3-54; 4-225f, 239f, 245
 Hechler, W. 1-44f
 Hegel 4-127f
 height of man 5-26
 hell. Victorians and, 2-88r
 Helm, P. 1-86r; 3-81rw; 4-180rw
 Hemer, C. (Redating NT) 3-145*r; (Rotas Square) 5-36*
 Henry, Carl 5-100, 102; (science and faith) 4-53*
 Hepburn, R.W. 3-105
 heresy hunting 2-179
 hermeneutics, (Thiselton) 3-108*
 Hesse, M. 2-84
 Hesselink, I.J. 5-101
 Heyerdahl, T. 2-146
 Hick, J. 4-95, 186; 5-206
 Hinduism 3-8, 78; 4-247
 Hirst, P. 3-91
 Hitler 3-4
 Hoare, R. 5-151
 holiness 5-71
 Hollis, M. 5-217r
 Holmes, A.F. 5-137r
 holons, 1-84
 homology argument 2-23, 104
 honesty. Danger of 5-171
 Honorton, C. 2-86
 hooks or nails, 4-94
 Hopkins, H.E. 1-275rw; 2-88rw; 3-77rw; 4-183rw, 252r
 Horne, R.A. 2-51
 Howard, L. 1-37
 Howkins, K. 3-36
 Hoyle, F. 4-188; 5-26
 Hozelitz 3-45
 Hudson, L. 1-247
 Hughes, G.T. (Sexual Ethics) 5-164*
 Hughes, J. 2-177
 Hume, C.W. 1-34
 Hume, D. 4-99, 103, 119
 Humphreys, W.S. 3-67
 Huxley, A. 3-142

- Huxley, T.H. 1-242
 hydrocyanic acid 2-148, 198f, 207
 hypnotism, 4-187

 ice 5-153
 ice ages 2-16; 3-62; 5-252
 I Ching 4-244
 idolatry, 3-125; Indian, 3-8
 Ilon, B. 3-3
 ilonator 3-3
 images 1-99r
 immanentism (Sell) 4-119*; 5-91,
 130
 immortality 1-88
 incarnation 3-80
 India 1-188; 4-83; paranoia in,
 4-11, 97; untouchables, 3-8
 infinity. Popper on, 5-24
 influenza. From space, 5-26
 Inglis, B. 5-8
 Ingram, G. 4-168
 innovation, 1-102r
 insanity. Genetics and, 2-2
 inscriptions 1-151f
 insecticides 2-174
 instinct. Aggressive, 1-220
 integrality 4-84
 intelligence, 1-124; blacks and,
 3-133
 interaction 1-12
 intervention 5-145
 interview. Counselling 5-173
 intimidation 1-28
 intuition 1-113
 invention. Uniqueness of, 1-169
 Ireland 1-12
 Issacs, J.D. 3-57
 Islam, 1-34; 2-11f; festival,
 3-6; philosophy, 2-155;
 views, 2-11
 isomers 2-15
 isotope ratios 4-82
 Ives, H.E. 5-126
 Ivimy, J. 1-178r

 James, W. 1-127f
 Jaki, S.J. 2-109r
 James, Wm. 3-144; 4-173
 Janov, A. 3-28f
 Jansen, J.J.G. 2-174

 Januarius, St. 3-63; 4-26
 Japan 1-186, 273
 jargon 3-11
 Jeans, J. (Sir) 5-17
 Jeeves, M. 3-139r
 Jenkins, E. 5-28
 Jericho 5-13
 Jerome, L.E. 3-60
 Jesus. Demons recognize, 1-201;
 resurrection, 5-205
 John. Gospel of, 3-145, 150
 John Paul II 5-162
 Johnson, W. 3-38
 Johnston, O.R. (Development of
 sexual ethics) 5-181*
 joking 1-114
 Jones, D. 1-269
 Jones, D.V. 5-220r
 Jones, R.V. 1-113f
 Joseph. Father 3-142
 Josephson, B.D. 4-191
 Joshua 5-13, 19
 judgment 1-101; on society, 4-112
 Jukes, T.H. 4-161
 Jung, C.G. 1-84; 2-61; 4-244
 Jupiter. Red spot, 4-78

 Kalsbeek, L. 3-83r
 Kammerer 1-84
 Kant, I. 1-71f; 4-99, 119f
 Katz, S.T. 5-134r
 Kelsey, M.T. 4-243
 Kelvin, 1-7f; 2-159. age of
 earth, 3-136r
 Kennedy, John F. 2-178
 Kerkut, G.A. 3-159
 Ketterer, D. 3-2
 Key bending 5-10
 Key T.D.S. 1-203
 Kidner, D. 5-43f, 59
 Kierkegaard 5-30
 Kimura 2-104
 Kingsley, C. 3-14
 Kirlian, S.D. 1-172, 175
 kirlian photography, 4-243
 Kitchen, K.A. 5-143r
 Kitson, Brig. 1-206
 Kittel, G. 1-263f; 5-161
 Kline, P. 1-96r
 koan 1-273; 5-21

Koestler, A. 1-83; 2-85
 Koran 2-174f See Islam
 Körner, W. 2-15
 kraft 2-103
 krypton-85 3-134

 Lack, D. 1-27, 37
 laetrile 3-130; 5-24
 Lafflamme, R. et al, 5-210r
 Laithwaite, E. 1-113
 Landau, Dom 4-221
 language, 2-159; 3-111; 5-17, 35;
 Bible, 3-123; religious 1-248
 Laplace 3-72
 latchkey bending 5-9
 Laurie, P. 3-10
 lavas. Dating of 1-180
 Laver, J. 2-38, 39
 law 5-142
 law of nature 5-129; Biblical,
 2-13
 Laycock, H.T. 4-186d
 Leach, K. 4-177r
 Leakey, L.S.B. 3-129, 177; 4-163
 Leakey, R. 3-178
 leap of reason 3-81r
 least action 2-161
 Leavis, F.R. 1-242f
 Lefebvre, M. 4-95
 Let the Earth bring forth,
 (Griffiths) 2-40*
 Levitt, Z. 3-142r
 Lewis, C.S. 3-105; 5-181, 183;
 Society, 3-53
 Lewis, J. 3-22r
 liberal theology 5-63f, 73f
 life. Defined, 2-141; after
 death 5-204r; early, 4-82;
 elsewhere, 1-7, 2-107;
 emergency of, 5-159; habitable
 zone, 5-136; Martian? 4-161,
 5-16; origin, 1-116f; 3-17,
 59f, 4-107, 188; science,
 3-18r
 lightning 4-195; 5-14. Ball,
 3-59
 Lilly, J. 1-9
 Lindsey, T. 5-78
 literature's death 5-28

 Litherland, Alan 5-203r
 Livermore, T.L. 4-171
 living creatures 3-3
 Lloyd-Jones, M. 1-134
 Loch Ness 2-173
 Locke 2-136
 locusts 1-3; 4-87
 Loewe, M. 4-193
 Loisy, A. 5-75
 loner 3-44
 Longuet-Higgins, C. 4-105
 Lorenz, K. 1-18f, 37
 lots 3-128; 4-150, 238
 Lovecraft, H.P. 3-2
 Lovell, Sir B. 2-107
 Lovelock, J. 2-17
 Lovelock, R. 4-97d
 Lowell, P. 4-194
 Lowen, A. 3-30f
 LSD 1-202; 4-197, 223
 Lucas, J. (Adcock) 4-157r*
 Luhman, R.S. 1-157d; 2-21d;
 5-202rw; 5-220rw; (Morality...) 5-29*
 Luther, Martin 1-278; 5-188; ethic
 of, 3-5
 Lyell, C. (Sir) 3-136f; 4-204
 Lyon, D. (Society...) 2-60*; 3-2d;
 4-258rw; 5-218rw
 Lyons, H.A. 1-12

 McCrea, W.H. 3-62
 McCreery 1-99r
 MacDonald, J. 2-179
 MacKay, D.M. 3-23r, 22rw; 4;250;
 5-129r, 221
 Mackintosh, H.R. 4-122f; 5-96, 98
 Mackintosh, R. 4-121; 5-208r
 MacNeice, L. 1-252f
 madness 1-194
 Magee, B. 2-176
 magic 2-153
 magnetic field 3-55
magos 4-151
 Major, H.D.A. 5-74, 91
 Malachy, St. 5-148
 Malamet, A. 5-12
 Mallowan 1-232
 Malthus 4-206

mammoths 1-121
 man, 5-217; Alone in galaxy?
 4-80; characteristics of,
 5-17; origin, 3-175
 Manderville, D.C. 3-3; 4-97d;
 5-149d
 mandrake 4-151
 manna 3-66; 5-23
 Manson, C. 2-81
 Manuel, F.E. 3-122r
 Marcion 1-159
 marriage 5-182
 Mars 3-135; 4-161, 194;
 Invasion from, 1-136; Life on?
 5-16
 Marshall Plan 1-178
 Marshall, I.H. 4-182r, 250r
 Martin, C.P. 4-77
 Martin, D. 5-7
 Martin, R.P. 3-78r; 5-213r
 Martineau, J. 5-79
 Marx, K. 2-66
 Marxism 2-176; 5-192; in
 universities, 5-6
 Mary 2-82; Cult of, 5-187
 Mascal, E.L. 5-23
 Maser, W. 3-4
 Masters & Johnson. On sex
 5-175
 materialism 5-158
 mathematical proof 3-65
 Maugham, S. 5-27
 Maurice, F.D. 2-88; 4-135
 Maxwell J. Clerk 2-160, 3-125f;
 4-87
 Mayer, J.R. 3-73r
 meaning 2-105
 medical ethics 3-130
 Medici M. de 3-142
 meditation 1-274
 megaliths 1-163f, 178
 membership of VI 1-106
 memory 1-16
 Mendelssohn, K. 1-123
 Merle, R. 1-9
 messiahs 1-203
 metaphysics. Value of 5-160
 meteorites 1-5
 meteorology 2-16; 3-134
 micelles 2-55
 Midelfort, H.C.E. 1-15
 Milgram, S. 1-223, 278; 2-108r;
 3-20
 military stratagems 5-13
 military dress 1-213
 Millard, A.R. 4-181r
 millenium 3-62; 5-20, 71
 Miller, Wm. 5-72
 Mills, Ivor 4-96
 Mills, W.H. 4-165
 Milton, 2-93r; on polygamy, 3-5
 miracle 2-162; 4-125; 5-129;
 'Explained', 3-66; physical
 aspects, 1-184c
 mirages 3-67
 Mitchell, T.C. (OT Archaeology)
 1-142*
 Mitroff, I. 1-120
 model of making, (Etchells) 1-250*
 modernism 5-74f
 Moltmann, J. 1-269
 molybdenum 1-8
 monism 4-133
 Monod, J. 3-22, 69
 monsters 2-173
 Moody, D.L. 5-70
 Moon, Sun Myung 5-119f
 moral determinism, 4-16
 morality 2-142. Catastrophie and,
 4-96; Political, 3-6; and religion
 (Luhman) 5-29*; science, 5-21;
 wealth and, 2-180
 Morgan, E. 5-58
 morphine 2-176
 Morris, D. 1-18f, 27f
 Morris, H.M. 3-172
 Morris, L. 1-275r; 5-55
 Moses 1-13; 5-207
 Moslems. See Ahmadis, Islam
 moths 3-159
 Mozley, J.K. 5-110 etc.
 Muggerridge, M. 4-84
 Mulkay, M.J. 1-102r
 Murray, G.R. 2-170
 Mussolini 3-4
 mustard gas 2-205
 Myers, F.W.H. 3-14f; 16
 mysticism 3-77r; 5-21, 134r

mystics, 4-179r
 myth 4-95; USA, 2-166

naive realism, 2-84
 nakedness 5-45
 nationalism 2-176
 naturalists in history 1-36
 natural theology, (Clark) 4-99*
 nature. Beauty 4-106; control,
 4-195; laws 2-9; responsibility
 for, 2-89r, 131f
 navigation by birds, 2-103
 Nazi Christians 5-161
 Nazis at large 5-163
 Nebuchadnezzar 5-216
 Necho II 5-215
 Needham, J. 4-167
 Nernst, W. 2-199f
 Nessie 2-173
 neutrinos 1-10
 Newby, M.J. (Authority...) 3-87*
 Newcomb's paradox 5-128, 130
 Newman, F.W. 1-137; 4-164
 New Testament. Origins, (Bruce)
 1-158*
 Newton, I. (Sir) Alchemy 3-121;
 religion 3-122
 New York blackout 4-96
 Nicholson, Wm. 4-170
 Nicoli, Pastor 5-203r
 Niebuhr, H.R. 5-87
 nitrogen in air, 2-48
 Nineveh 1-232
 Noah's birds, 2-102
 noise, 4-10, 97
 Nolland, J.L. 5-213rw
 Nolte, D.J. 1-3
 Norman, Edw. 5-210
 Nostradamus 2-168; 5-148
 nova 4-193
 NT Foundations, 3-78r;
 interpretation, 4-250r;
 redating (Hemer) 3-145*r;
 theology (dictionary) 5-223
 nuclear dangers 1-115; war 1-187
 numbers 3-40f

Oatley, K. 2-102
obh 4-152f, 154

objectivity of science, 1-120
 observables 1-11
 occasionalism, 2-11
 occult. Beliefs, 2-95r; Bible and,
 (Wright) 4-146*; explosion,
 (Richards) 4-221*; superstition,
 4-237. See demons, devils,
 parapsychology, possession,
 witchcraft
 oceans 2-49; covered earth, 4-81;
 temperature, 4-82. See 5-156
 Olson, R. 3-125r
 O'Neill, G. 1-189
 ontological argument 4-180r
 Oparin 4-188
 Ophir 1-153
 Opie 5-70 esp, 107
 optimization, 4-191
 order and organization 4-84
 ordination 1-90
 Orme, J.E. 2-101
 Orr, J. 4-214f
 Ostrander, S. 1-170r
 Otto, R. 3-94
 ozone 1-189

pacifism, 3-85r; in world's
 religions, 4-247r
 pain 2-176; 3-1
 Pannenberg, W. 4-117
 pantheism 4-126
 Papias 1-158
 parables 3-110
 Paracelsus 5-21
 paradise 2-93
 parapsychology, 1-99r, 125, 107r;
 2-85r, 101, 106; 3-16r; 4-185;
 5-7. Russian 1-125, 170r. See
 precognition, ESP, occult,
 psi theology, poltergeist,
 reincarnation, soothsayer,
 spiritualism, UFO
 Parker, T.M. 5-148
 Parrinder, G. 3-77r
 patents 5-20
 Passmore, J. 2-89r
 Paul, St. 1-113; 5-140r; on sex,
 5-52f; on women, 5-57
 PCB 3-10

peace. Discovery of 1-277
 Peakcocke, A.R. 2-1, 9; 3-22;
 4-85
 Pearce, E.K.V. 2-19fd; 3-21r, 129.
 (Prehistoric Culture) 1-163*;
 (Flood) 1-228*; (Flood)
 2-120*
 peck order 1-215f
 Peddie, J.C. 4-240
 Perls, F. 3-26f, 133
 permissiveness 5-195
 personal experience 4-224
 personalizing 2-53
 persuasion 3-154
 Peters, R.S. 5-34
 pets 1-42
 Pettward, C. 4-172r
 philosophy. Christian, 3-83r;
 5-137r; Oxford, 4-157; of
 religion, 5-221r; Scottish,
 3-125r
 phoenix 5-207
 Phipers, D. 4-175r
 physicists, 4-191
 physics. Philosophy and, 3-125;
 spiritual, 4-192
 physiologists, 19th cent. 1-130
 Piaget, J. 3-128
 Pippard, B. 4-200
 planets. Formation, 5-17, 155;
 rarity, 4-92
 play 1-269
 Plowright, B.S. 5-93
 pluralism 3-82
 plutonium 4-92; 5-28
 poem. Making of (Etchells)
 1-250*
 pollution 2-100, 171; 3-68
 poltergeists 2-86
 polygamy 5-46; a sin? 3-5
 Pompeii 5-38
 Poole, M. (Chariots) 3-33*
 Poole, T.B. 2-23f; (Aggression)
 1-209*
 Pooley, R. (Two cultures)
 1-242*
 popes 2-170; 5-148
 Popper, H. 4-254rw
 Popper, K. (Sir) 3-92; 5-158
 population 2-134; 4-83; 5-23.
 Density, 1-218
 portents 4-193
 Porter, L.E. 5-210rw
 possession 1-197f; 4-172r, 197.
 See exorcism
 posterity, 2-91, 101, 148, 195
 Powell, Baden 4-107
 Poythress, V.S. 4-254r
 prayer 1-87
 prebiotic chemistry, (Griffiths)
 2-40*
 precognition 2-101
 predestination 3-15.
 pre-established harmony, 2-12
 Presbyterians 5-66f
 Price, H.H. 1-87r; 5-206
 Price, L. 4-185. (Superstition etc.)
 4-237*
 pride 5-4. Scientific, 1-16, 99
 Priestley, J. 1-15; 5-26, 78
 prizes 1-184; 3-1, 53; 4-77
 prize essays. (Griffiths) 2-40*;
 (Berry) 2-131*; (Baker) 3-153*
 progress 2-132f
 proofs 3-66; 4-100
 prophecy 1-145f; 2-100. Sun, 1-11;
 Newton, 3-124. See Nostradamus
 prophets 4-149
 Protestantism. Nazis and, 3-5;
 5-161
 Protocols of... Zion 1-65
 providence 2-48, 177; 5-130
 Prussian blue 2-48
 prussic acid, 2-48, 198f, 207
 psi theology 4-243*r
 psychical research. See parapsychology
 psychoanalysis 1-97
 psychology. Christianity and,
 3-139r; magic in, 2-156
 Puritans 5-20, 190
 Queen of Sheba 2-181
 Quinlan, K. 3-131
 Quinton, A.M. 3-92
 qwerty 2-7
 Rabin, M. 3-66
 race 1-124; 3-133

Rad, G. von 5-41f, 58
 radar 1-114
 rainbow 4-87
 Ramesses II 5-214r
 Randall, J.L. 2-86; 3-16r
 Raven, C.E. 4-164
 reactions. Computers and 2-57
 reason. Defined, 4-135
 'Red Sea' crossing, 3-67
 red shift 2-180
 reductionism 2-103
 Reformation. Radical 4-175
 Reich, W. 3-30f
 Reid, H.F. 2-102
 Reid, R. 4-96
 Reid, T. 3-125
 reincarnation, 1-172f; 4-186
 relativity 5-125
 relics 5-151, 153
 religion 5-29. Deviant, 5-7;
 philosophy of, 1-86rf;
 primary, 3-88f; sociology as,
 2-63
 religions 4-247
 Renfrew, C. 1-163r
 research 5-22
 resurrection 1-160, 184
 Revelation. Book of 3-149
 revival. Critics of 5-107
 revolution 2-178; French, 1-15,
 177
 revolutionary war (Barnham)
 1-205*
 RI in schools, 4-198
 RIC 1-279r
 Richards, J. 4-238; 5-25
 (Occult Explosion & the Church)
 4-221*
 Ricoeur, P. 3-116
 Ridpath, Ian 5-25
 Ritschl 5-62f
 Roberts, Robert 4-166
 Robertson, R. 2-66
 Robinson, I. 1-248
 Robinson, J.A.T. 3-145r
 Roll, W.G. 2-87
 Roman Catholicism, 4-95. Nazis
 and, 3-4; sectarianism, 5-25
 Romanes, C.J. 3-14f
 Romantic Movement 5-191
 romanticism 4-133
 Rose, S. 1-18; 3-65
 Rosenhead, J. 4-190
 rotas-sator square (Hemer) 5-36*
 Rothschild, E. de 1-45f
 Rouvray, D.H. 2-15
 Rowell, G. 2-88r
 Rowell, T.E. 2-29
 Royal Institution 1-113
 Russell, B. 3-75r; 4-150
 Russia. Parapsychology in, 1-125,
 170r; psychology, 4-201;
 scientists, 3-134
 Rutherford, Lord 4-199
 Ryder, R.D. 3-19r
 Ryle, J.C. 5-65

 saccharin 4-93
 Sagan, Carl, 4-78, 194
 St. Anthony 1-202
 Saint Raphael's Guild 4-229
 Salem trials 3-9
 Sampson, R.V. 1-277r
 Samuel, D.N. 5-148
 Sargant, 1-127f
 Sassoon, G. 3-66
 Satge J. de 5-209r
 Saussure, F. de, 3-111
 Sawyer, J.F.A. 3-108
 Sayers, D. 1-261f, 270; 2-12
 scares 4-93
 Scheidegger, A.E. 4-190
 Schelling, 4-128, 134
 Schleiermacher 4-123f, 141
 Schlesinger, G. 5-126r
 Schmidt, H. 2-85, 96
 Schur, M. 1-96r
 Schutter, W.L. 4-182rw
 Schwarz, H. 3-72r
 science. Anti-science, 3-46;
 chance and providence, 5-129r;
 Chinese, 2-110; creation,
 2-109r; distraction 2-206;
 faith and (Henry) 4-53*;
 Indian, 2-14; innovation,
 1-102r; limits of, 4-200; moral
 problems, 4-96; morality from,
 1-181r; 2-63; motivation 1-101;

science, continued
 4-195; persecuter, 2-180;
 prestige of, 4-190; religion
 of, 2-63; science and religion,
 3-14r; 5-126r; stability, 2-16;
 subjective element in, 1-120;
 4-192; superstition, 2-5;
 theology and 1-101; 4-249r,
 254r; unity of, 5-221; writers,
 1-190
 scientism 5-221
 Scott, Sir Peter, 2-173
 Scripture. Newton on, 3-122
 Searle, G.F.C. 4-170
 Seccombe, D. 3-85rw
 Second law 3-138
 secret knowledge 1-191
 secularisation (Lyon) 2-60*;
 4-114
 seeing 1-100
 Segal, S.J. 1-99r
 self-sufficiency 5-5
 Sell, A.P.F. 5-209r. (Immanentism)
 4-119*; (evolution), 4-202*,
 (conservatives...) 5-62*
 Selman, M.J. 5-143rw, 214rw
 semantics of Bible (Thiselton)
 3-108*
 Seneca 2-132
 seriality 1-84
 Sermon on the Mount, 1-275
 sex. Bible and (Cousins) 5-41*
 sexual ethics. History
 (Johnston) 5-181*
 SF 4-78; Calvary 2-3
 Shah, V.H. 2-14
 Sharman, I.M. 3-12rw
 Shaw, G. 1-117r
 Sholes, C. 2-9
 Shroud of Turin, 5-15, 149
 Sidgwick, H. 3-14, 16
 Simeon, Chas. 4-252r
 Simon, U. 5-222r
 sin. Sexual 5-56
 sin 1-92
 SIPRI 1-188; 2-174
 Sirius 3-11
 size 4-89
 size myth 2-140
 Sladek, J. 3-95r
 slavery 2-172; 3-86. To sin, 3-28
 sleep. How tested? 1-100
 Smart, N. 3-87f
 Smartt, T. 3-11
 smells 4-14, 97
 Smith, J. Maynard 2-9; 3-69
 smoking 1-96f
 Snow, C.P. 1-242f
 social gospel 5-76
 social Darwinism 3-64
 social work, 4-258r
 sociology and secularization.
 (Lyon) 2-60*
 sociobiology 3-64
 Sodom 3-2
 soil. Immutable 2-91
 Soleil, Mme 3-61
 Solomon 1-148
 soothsayer 4-147
 sorcerer 4-148
 soul 1-194
 'soup', 2-52
 Spanner, D.C. 3-165
 Spanish civil war 1-222
 specialisation 2-141
 Spencer, Herbert, 2-67f; 4-209
 sphere sovereignty 4-113
 spiritualism, 2-87; 4-173, 187;
 christian, 4-239; Popper on,
 5-160
 spirituality, 4-177r
 square (Hemer) 5-36*
 star of Bethlehem 4-193; 5-22
 stars from heaven 5-19
 steady state universe 3-7; 5-25
 Stent, G.S. 1-193f
 sterilisation 4-83
 stewardship of nature 2-90, 144f
 Stewart, Dugald 3-125
 Stockwood, M. 2-180
 Stoics 5-183
 Stokes, G.G. 2-158
 Strauss, F. 2-166f; 5-83
 struggle cosmogony 1-202
 Stunt, F.F. 4-76; 5-2
 Sturch, R.L. (Talking of God)
 3-100*; 4-97
 Sturdevant, W.D. 1-201

subjective trends (Cleobury) 1-71*
 subscriptions 1-108
 suggestion 3-39
 Sumerians 1-230
 sun. Age of, 3-137; variations, 4-92
 supernova of AD 1006, 5-22
 superstition 3-18. Bible and (Wright) 4-146*; and occult (Price) 4-237*; occult explosion (Richards) 4-221*
 survival 2-87
 Swaminathan 2-14
 Swann, M. (Sir) 1-13
 Swinburne, R.G. 2-105
 symbols 3-103f
 synchronicity 4-244
 Szasz, T.S. 1-194

 tachyons 1-10, 204
 tantalizer 1-186
 Target, G. 3-21r
 Tart, C.T. 5-8
 Tasker, J. 1-242
 Taylor, J. (Sir), 1-15
 Taylor, John 5-10
 telepathy. Velocity of, 2-86
 temperature scale 5-24
 Temple, R.K.G. 3-11, 134
 teraphim, 4-150
 territory 2-28
 TESTA 2-197f
 terrorists 1-205
 testimony 2-173
 theft 2-101
 theologians. Lawyer among, 2-93r
 thermodynamics 3-73
 third world 3-133
 Thiselton, A.C. (Biblical language) 3-108*; 4-251
 thixotropy 3-64
 Tillich, P. 1-78
 time 3-74; 5-24. Fulfilled, 5-207r; geological, 3-136r

 "time, gentlemen, please", 4-108
 Tims, N. & R. 4-258r
 Tolkien 1-267f
 Tolstoy 1-277r
 tombs. Megalithic, 1-164f
 tongues 1-203. See gifts of Spirit
 tornadoes 3-55, 57
 Torrey Canyon 2-132
 transcendence. Personal, (Whitfield) 3-26*
 transmigration of Souls 3-9
 Trench, B. Le P. 1-6
 Trinity 5-130
 truth. Marxism, 5-7
 Tunguska event, 1-4
 turban or biretta? 4-26
 Turner, C.E.A. 2-6
 Turner, Dean 5-124r
 Turner, F.M. 3-14r
 TV 1-25; 4-96
 typewriter keyboard 2-9
 tyrian purple, 1-124

 Ubaidians 1-230
 UFOs 1-6, 7, 204 (Devils at large) 3-142*; Conspiracy, 5-25, controversy, 2-179
 Ullman, S. *et al* 1-176r
 uncreation 2-191
 Unification Church 5-119
 Unitarians 5-78
 universe. Cyclic? 2-109r; 3-7; 4-80; inventive, 4-84; order in, 1-119
 untouchables 3-8
 Urim and Thummin 4-150
 Urquhart, D.S. 3-45
 USA, Myth of, 2-166
 Usdin, G. 1-176r
 Uzzah 3-42

 Vant Hoff, J. 2-15
 Velikovskiy, I. 5-214r
 Veness, T. 2-38
 Victoria Institute. AGM 1-105;

Victoria Institute *cont.*
 2-97; 3-49; 4-73; 5-1;
 Constitution 5-3
 Vidler, A.R. 5-104
 Vietnam 2-174
 violence. 1-205f, 279. Towards
 animals, 1-34; perspectives on,
 1-176r; TV 1-13; 4-201
 virgin birth 4-90
 virginity 5-55, 185
 viruses 4-189
 vivisection 3-19r
 volcanoes 3-161; 4-196
 Voltaire, 2-185

 Waddington, C.H. 1-26; 3-69
 walking on water 3-67
 Wallace, A.R. 3-14f
 Walter, J.A. (Britain in
 Decline) 4-109*
 war 2-173. Conduct of, 4-95;
 nuclear, 3-10; and peace,
 4-247r; under judgment,
 5-203r; winnable, 5-5, 131
 War and Peace 1-278
 water. Albedo, 5-156; Israel,
 3-10; magnetic etc. 1-196
 Watson, J.B. 1-99
 Way, R. 5-134r
 weather 2-16
 Weber, Max, 4-115
 Webster, Chas. 5-19r
 Weizmann 1-58f
 Weizsäcker C.F. von 5-5
 Welch, C. 5-103
 Weldon. J. 3-142r
 Wilson, Edw. 3-64
 Wilson, Ian. 5-151
 Wiseman, P.J. 4-176r, 197r
 witchcraft 1-15; 2-64; 3-86.
 Trials, 3-9
 Wittgenstein 3-114
 Wollaston, W. 2-158
 woman. Creation of 5-43f
 women. In Islam, 3-6; In Christ's
 time, 5-57; witches, 4-241
 wood 2-171
 Woolfson, M. 5-18
 words. Mere, 4-101

 Worden, A.M. 2-181
 work 2-156
 Worsley, P. 2-63
 Wright, J.S. 3-85rw; 4-90, 244,
 250rw; 5-207rw; 208rw, 209rw,
 222rw; Bible and superstition,
 4-146*; 5-133rw
 writing. Ancient 1-155

 Yeats, W.B. 1-257f
 Yen Fu 4-249
yiddeoni 4-152f
 Yokoi Carp 1-187
 Young, D. (Ethology and Behaviour)
 1-17*; 2-23f
 Young, J.Z. 1-29
 young earth, 3-171
 Yugoslavia 5-203

 Zaehner, R.C. 2-81r
 Zen 3-27
 Zimmermann, M. 1-279r
 Zionism. Christians in camp of
 (Brodeur) 1-44*
 zoo hypothesis 1-7
 Zoo. Israeli 4-199
 zyklons 2-198f, 206f

 ★★★★★★

THE VICTORIA INSTITUTE

or

THE PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF GREAT BRITAIN

FOUNDED 1865

PAST PRESIDENTS

1865-1886	The Right Hon. The Earl of Shaftesbury, K.G.
1886-1903	Sir George Gabriel Stokes, Bart., D.C.L., F.R.S.
1903-1921	The Right Hon. The Earl of Halsbury, P.C., F.R.S.
1921-1923	The Very Rev. H. Wace, M.A., D.D., Dean of Canterbury
1927-1941	Sir Ambrose Fleming, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S.
1941-1946	Sir Charles Marston, F.S.A.
1946-1952	Sir Frederic Kenyon, G.B.E., K.C.B., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A.
1956-1965	Professor F. F. Bruce, M.A., D.D., F.B.A.
1966-1976	Professor R. L. F. Boyd, C.B.E., F.I.E.E., F.R.S.

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL

PRESIDENT

Sir Norman Anderson, O.B.E., Q.C., M.A., LL.D, D.D., F.B.A.

VICE-PRESIDENTS

The Rt. Rev. H. R. Gough, O.B.E., T.D., M.A., H.C.F.
Professor R. J. C. Harris, A.R.C.S., B.Sc., Ph.D.
The Right Honorable Lord Denning, the Master of the Rolls.
Professor F. F. Bruce, M.A., D.D., F.B.A.
Professor D. J. Wiseman, O.B.E., M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A.
Professor R. L. F. Boyd, C.B.E., F.I.E.E., F.R.S.

TRUSTEE

U.K. Evangelisation Trust Inc.

THE COUNCIL

(In order of original election)

Robert E. D. Clark, M.A., Ph.D.	P. E. Cousins, M.A., B.D.
Francis F. Stunt, LL.B.	David Mitcheson, B.Sc.(Econ), A.T.I.I.
Paul Helm, B.A.	Professor M. A. Jeeves, M.A., Ph.D.
Professor R. L. F. Boyd, C.B.E., F.I.E.E., F.R.S.	Colin A. Russell, B.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.I.C. <i>Co-opted</i> , Michael J. Collis, B.Sc., Ph.D.

Vacant *Honorary Treasurer*

David Mitcheson, B.Sc., *Secretary to the Council*

Brian H. T. Weller, *Assistant Secretary*

Adrian C. Burton, *Meetings Secretary*

EDITOR

Robert E. D. Clark

AUDITORS

Metcalfe Blake & Co., Chartered Accountants.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL	145
NEWS AND VIEWS	
Intervention	145
Popes	147
The Turin Shroud	149
Antarctic Ice	153
Earth's Atmosphere	155
The Self and its Brain	158
Nazi Christians	161
God and Communists	162
Nazis at Large	163
ARTICLES	
Gerald T. Hughes, B.D., Director of Religious Studies, Rugby School, <i>Sexual Ethics - Pastoral Care</i>	164
O. R. Johnston, M.A., Dip.Ed., Dip.Th., Director of Nationwide Festival of Light, <i>The Historical Development of Christian Sexual Ethics</i>	181
REVIEWS	
W. J. Christman, <i>The Christian File</i>	200
J. G. Baldwin, <i>Daniel</i> , by Dr. R. S. Luhman	201
Pastor Nicoli, <i>Persecuted but not Forsaken</i>	203
A. Litherland, <i>War Under Judgment</i>	203
Paul Badham, <i>Christian Beliefs about Life after Death</i>	204
F. F. Bruce, <i>The Time is Fulfilled</i> , by Canon J. S. Wright	207
A. P. F. Sell, <i>Robert Mackintosh</i> , by Canon J. S. Wright	208
J. de Satgé, <i>Christ and the Human Prospect</i> , by Canon J. S. Wright	209
R. Lafflamme et al, <i>Le Christ hier, aujourd'hui et demain</i> , by L. E. Porter	210
R. P. Martin, <i>NT Foundations Vol. 2</i> , by Prof. J. L. Nolland	212
I. Velikovsky, <i>Ramses II and his Time</i> , by Dr. M. J. Selman	214
M. Hollis, <i>Models of Man</i> , by Dr. Davin Lyon	217
J. Churchill and D. V. Jones (eds.), <i>Introductory Reader in the Philosophy of Religion</i> , by Dr. R. S. Luhman	220
Ulrich Simon, <i>A Theology of Auschwitz</i> , by Canon J. S. Wright	222
Colin Brown (ed.), <i>Dictionary of NT Theology, Vols. 2, 3</i>	223
CUMULATIVE INDEX, VOLS. 101-105 inclusive	225