
A table of contents for the *London Quarterly Review* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_london-quarterly-and-holborn-review_01.php

EDITORIAL

EDITORS OLD AND NEW

GREAT and successful editors are sometimes unknown, and sometimes well-known. How many people have realized that for the past 42 years the *Expository Times* has been guided by two of the children of its founder, Dr James Hastings? Through all the vicissitudes of those decades, they have quietly maintained its format, its traditions, its theological awareness, and, one suspects, its circulation. Now, Miss A. W. Hastings and the Rev. E. Hastings have retired. Their successor is Dr C. L. Mitton, Principal of Handsworth College, Birmingham. It is a remarkable compliment to English and Methodist scholarship that the chair of a periodical so redolent of the Scottish ministerial tradition should move south of the border.

A very different figure has just relinquished, after 25 years, the editorship of *Theology*, perhaps the most stimulating of all the religious reviews. Dr A. R. Vidler is one of the most brilliant theological personalities of our generation. He belongs to the company of pilgrims and explorers, rather than to those, no less able, who may discover a theological position early, and remain steadfast in its defence to the last. Alec Vidler has far more links with the home base of Catholic orthodoxy than his critics might perceive, but his intellectual progress has been fascinating. He began as an Anglo-Catholic but, during the war, came to a rare apprehension both of classic Protestantism and the dialectical theology of the Continent. His book, *Christ's Strange Work* (1944 and again 1963) is a fine example of this. Since then, he has gone on learning from humanists as well as Christians, and has become one of the midwives of the new liberalism, or, as he might prefer, 'liberality'. Though he has received little ecclesiastical preferment, and much censure from the *Church Times*, he is the Anglican *par excellence*, and anyone ignorant of the Anglican genius might well study his prolific writings. *Essays in Liberality* (SCM, 1957), and his own contribution to *Soundings* (Cambridge, 1962) would make a good start. Meanwhile, Vidler's mantle as Editor of *Theology* falls on the Rev. G. R. Dunstan of Westminster Abbey, a fellow-apiarist, who seems likely to wear it in his own way, while retaining the Vidlerian cut.

Perhaps some acquaintance with another Editor is necessary to complete one's Anglican education. For the past ten years, Bishop J. W. C. Wand has edited the *Church Quarterly Review*. He celebrates his 80th birthday this year, and has just published his autobiography, *Changeful Page* (Hodder & Stoughton, 25*s*.). He has a style which could serve as a model for the Editors of scholarly journals—easy, urbane, and clear as his own faith. One

envies the Lincolnshire tradesman's son, who was preaching and taking services while still in the sixth form, who progressed serenely, though not without hard work and thrifty management, to Oxford, three bishoprics (Brisbane, Wells, and London), and, in his mellow eventide, a Canonry of St Paul's. Bishop Wand confesses himself to be a natural conformist, and it will be interesting to see what *Prism* makes of his *Life*. He has known at least one great sorrow, and it is his kindness and lack of resentment which prevents him from dwelling more on anxieties, troubles and difficult personal relationships.

GORDON S. WAKEFIELD

A REMINDER

The main subject for October 1965 will be 'Myth and History'. For this we invite articles. They may be on any aspect of the subject, but should not exceed 3,500 words in length, and must be received in the office not later than *1st June, 1965*. Decision to publish will be taken by the Editor and a small group of experts. We hope that the result will be yet one more contribution to ecumenical dialogue.

IMMORTALITY AND RESURRECTION[1]

C. K. Barrett

THE SUBJECT I am obliged to handle in this lecture, which, in terms of its foundation, must deal with the soul's destiny, and the nature and reality of the life hereafter, is one that must needs evoke a good deal of anxiety in a lecturer who has a strong preference for subjects about which he is not entirely ignorant. Is there a subject that grips human imagination so tenaciously, and exercises the human spirit so deeply, as this one? And is there a subject where, I do not say the heathen, but the Christian, nourished in the revealed truths of his religion, is so completely uninformed? *That* Christ was raised from the dead, and raised as the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep, he may well believe; but, even at the cost of incurring Paul's rebuke, he may still find himself asking: 'But how are the dead raised, and with what kind of body do they come?'

There are questions to which we do not know the answers which it may, nevertheless, be profitable and edifying to discuss, and I do not propose simply to run away from the direct inquiry: 'If a man die, shall he live again?' I do, however, beg leave to approach it in my own way, and my way is not that of a philosopher or dogmatic theologian, but that of a historian. I shall have my feet firmly and reassuringly planted in this world if I may at least begin by inquiring and recounting what men have felt, believed, and said (and what they have said is to be found not only in works of theology, but in plays and pictures, on tomb-stones and in burial vaults) about what happens to them when they die. It may be that, at least for some, this will prove not only to be of historical value but also to provide as good a starting-point for our own thinking, and as practical a setting for our own faith, as a more philosophical discourse might afford.

Our historical study has all the more chance of issuing in a positive and useful result because it will have the New Testament at its centre. It would be easy indeed to fill the whole of a lecture with New Testament exegesis: there is plenty of material, and the material affords problems enough to keep the exegete busy, and substance enough to provide for the systematic theologian—to say nothing of the support it offers to the trembling mortal (whether theologian or not) who stands on the river's brink. But I intend (even though this means abjuring detail) to investigate a wider field: to look into some of the antecedents of the New Testament, and to ask what the next generations made of the New Testament.

I can best introduce my sketch in this way. For a generation or so it has been popular to draw a sharp contrast between the idea of immortality, and that of resurrection. The immortality of the soul, we have been told, is a philosopher's toy, with no better foundation than human speculation; not merely insubstantial, therefore, but positively misleading, since it encourages

man to find his eternal security in himself and not in God. The resurrection of the body, however, can be only the act of God; it is the divine miracle, exemplified in the resurrection of Christ himself, in which alone the Christian can properly put his trust. Christians, it is said, do not believe in the immortality of the soul, but in resurrection at the last day. This sharp distinction is often coupled with the distinction between Greek and Hebrew: the Greeks believed in immortality, which is wrong; the Hebrews believed in resurrection, which is right.

An outstanding exponent of these views is Oscar Cullmann. In referring to him I must first of all say that in his lecture *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?* (London, 1958) there is very much that any serious student of the New Testament must accept. Indeed, I suspect that Dr Cullmann takes a little too warmly, and attaches too much importance to, some of the criticisms of the original (Swiss) publication of his work. A great deal of it strikes the reader as familiar, and in many respects I am in agreement with him. I have, however, ventured to express a point of significant difference by using in my title not his disjunctive 'or' but the conjunctive 'and'—Immortality and Resurrection. But in saying so much I am anticipating my conclusion, and for this we are not yet ready.

For the erroneous notion of the immortality of the soul Dr Cullmann blames the Greeks. That we can respect and admire both Plato and Paul 'is no reason for denying a radical difference between the Christian expectation of the resurrection of the dead and the Greek belief in the immortality of the soul'.[2] Repeatedly Dr Cullmann refers to the 'Greek concept of the immortality of the soul'. In this expression there is concealed a serious oversimplification of the facts.

Early Greeks and early Hebrews were markedly similar in their outlook upon physical death and what lay beyond it. This is in fact well-known ground, and I need not linger over it. For both, death was the end of worthwhile existence. For the Hebrew, this meant Sheol, an undesirable abode of wretched shades.

> The dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. As well their love, as their hatred and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for ever in anything that is done under the sun . . . there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in Sheol, whither thou goest (Eccles $9^{5, 6, 10}$).
>
> As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away,
> So he that goeth down to Sheol shall come up no more.
> He shall return no more to his house,
> Neither shall his place know him any more. (Job 7^{9-10})

The Greeks thought of the underworld, the home of departed spirits, in a very similar way. Life and memory did indeed persist. This is part of the tragedy of the situation. In one of the most famous scenes in the *Odyssey* (xi. 465-540), Odysseus, permitted to visit the shades, addresses the dead Achilles, 'than whom no man, before or after, was more fortunate'.

> Formerly, in your lifetime, we Argives used to honour you equally with the gods, and now that you are here you exercise great power over the dead. Do not grieve about it, Achilles, now that you are dead.

He answered, Do not make light of death to me, noble Odysseus. I would rather be on earth a serf to a landless man, with small enough living for himself, than act as king over all these dead men who have perished. (484-91)

So far the thought of the primitive Hebrew runs parallel with that of the primitive Greek. We can take a further step. Each was capable of imagining a 'standing up of corpses' (as Hoskyns used to say ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν should be rendered, if we wish to feel the original force of the words), but each imagined it only to reject it. Such things did not, and presumably could not, happen. We have already seen some of the Old Testament evidence. More can be added.

> Wilt thou shew wonders to the dead?
> Shall the shades arise (LXX, ἀναστήσουσιν) and praise thee?
> Shall thy lovingkindness be declared in the grave?
> Or thy faithfulness in Abaddon?
> Shall thy wonders be known in the dark?
> And thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?

There is also David's explanation of his composure when he learns of the death of Bathsheba's child.

While the child was yet alive, I fasted and wept; for I said, Who knoweth whether the LORD will not be gracious to me, that the child may live? But now he is dead, wherefore should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me (2 Sam 12^{22-23}).

In a similar way the Greeks speak of the rising up of the dead as something that no one supposes can or will ever happen, even though the mind can conceive it (as it can conceive other absurdities). Thus Prexaspes to Cambyses:

I did what you commanded me, and buried him with my own hands. If dead men do rise up (εἰ μέν νυν οἱ τεθνεῶτες ἀνεστέασι) you can expect Astyages the Mede to rise up against you; but if things continue as they have been you will never have any further trouble from him [Smerdis] (Herodotus, 3.62).

Other writers reveal the same scepticism. Thus Achilles to Priam, when the latter comes to beg for the body of his dead son, Hector.

You will achieve nothing by lamenting for your son, nor will you raise him up (οὐδέ μιν ἀνστήσεις) (*Iliad*, xxiv. 550f).

With this we may compare David's despair of his dead child. Again, when the Chorus suspects the death of Agamemnon

I have no means of raising up the dead again in words.
(Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 1360f)

And similarly Sophocles: Electra will never succeed in raising her dead father from Hades.

But never by laments or prayers will you raise up (ἀνστάσεις) your father from the lake of Hades to which all go.
(*Electra* 137ff)

Thus, if we go back to the earliest stages of their histories and literatures, we find Greeks and Hebrews thinking alike about death, and what happens after it. A living dog is better than a dead lion; a living serf is better than a

dead king—they are agreed in this. Survival of a sort there is, but it is so wretched and poor that it would almost be better that existence should cease altogether.

It is true that neither Hebrews nor Greeks remained in this primitive stage and that subsequent developments did not follow identical lines. It is a commonplace observation that only towards the close of the Old Testament period was the national hope of a future for the people partially replaced, or supplemented, by the personal hope of a future for the individual Israelite. There are only a few passages in the Old Testament where this hope appears unmistakably.

> Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.
>
> (Daniel 12^{2})

> Thy dead shall live; my dead bodies shall arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust: for thy dew is as the dew of light, and the earth shall cast forth the shades.
>
> (Isaiah 26^{19})

After the close of the Old Testament period evidence multiplies, and for the moment one passage will suffice as illustration:

> They that fear the Lord shall rise to life eternal,
> And their life shall be in the light of the Lord, and shall
> come to an end no more.
>
> (Ps. Sol. 3.16)

It is often said that this new belief in resurrection to a new life in a new age came into Judaism from without, and especially from Persian sources, whence the idea was borrowed. I should certainly not wish to deny that Iranian influence can be detected in the later parts of the Old Testament and in post-biblical Judaism; but I believe that Dr Mowinckel is right in saying that 'Persian influence served as a catalyst'.[3] The real constituents of the late Jewish belief lay within the earlier religion, and fundamentally in the conviction that he who was the judge of the whole earth would not fail to do right.[4] We can see in the earlier wisdom literature how a growing individualism raised problems for those who held to this conviction, and these problems were brought to a head when Jewish martyrs accepted death, thereby renouncing all hope of earthly reward and any direct share in the national hope, precisely in order to maintain the national religion. It was in this context that Daniel 12^{2} (and possibly Isaiah 26^{19}) arose, and must be understood. In other words, it was in the light of human experience, illuminated by fundamental convictions about God, that Hebrew thought about man's future developed: Persian belief provided the mould into which this developing thought was poured rather than an essential constituent of the thought itself. In this process we cannot name any one outstanding thinker of unique personal insight and influence; not even the author of Daniel would qualify for such a description.

Not least at this point the Greek line of development differs markedly from the Hebrew; here there arises a figure so outstanding that even Dr Cullmann can speak of 'the Greeks' and 'Plato' almost as if these were interchangeable terms. This they certainly were not, for dominating as the Socrates-Plato

figure is to us, it was probably unknown to and without direct influence upon the majority of 'Greeks' in the Hellenistic world. As with Jewish developments, so here we must probably bear in mind the presence of non-indigenous (that is, non-Hellenic) religious beliefs, particularly the influence of Orphism. But I venture to think that, as in Judaism, the really decisive force is to be found elsewhere. It is surely no accident that the essential development of Plato's thought about personal future life is to be found in the dialogues that deal with the martyr-figure of Socrates. Plato's thought follows a more intellectual and less purely religious course than that which led to the development we have noted in Judaism. He does not argue: Socrates was unjustly condemned, and since he refused to take the opportunity that presented itself to escape the hemlock in this world we must suppose that he will receive true justice hereafter. Rather Socrates appears as the human instrument of those ideas whose eternity points to the immortality of the human soul: 'There is no change in him; only now he is invested with a sort of sacred character, as the prophet or priest of Apollo the God of the festival, in whose honour he first of all composes a hymn, and then like the swan pours forth his dying lay. Perhaps the extreme elevation of Socrates above his own situation, and the ordinary interests of life (compare his *jeu d'esprit* about his burial, in which for a moment he puts on the "Silenus mask") create in the mind of the reader an impression stronger than could be derived from arguments that such an one, in his own language, has in him "a principle which does not admit of death".[5]

We must not, as I have said, make the mistake of supposing that every Greek was a Plato, believing in the eternity of ideas and the immortality of the soul. Many in the ancient world had, as the inscriptions show, no hope for the future.

Non fui, fui, non sum, non curo.

πεῖνε, βλέπις τὸ τέλος

The badly spelt Greek points out the common man, and attests his belief—or unbelief. So far as hope penetrated to the unintellectual levels it did so by way of the cults; and it is well to remember that these rested in great measure upon a cycle, natural, mythological, or both, of death and resurrection.

Conditions in Palestine may not have been altogether different, but the Jews were an instructed people, and the more advanced beliefs of Pharisaic intellectuals probably spread farther downwards into society than Platonic speculation spread in the Greek world. And of the Pharisees Dr Schweizer has rightly written: 'The Pharisees believed in the immortality of the soul *and* in the resurrection. Both conceptions are so formulated that they are not mutually exclusive.'[6] That they believed in resurrection appears from the passage in the Psalms of Solomon that I have already quoted. And according to Josephus the Pharisees hold that 'every soul is imperishable, but the soul of the good alone passes into another body, while the souls of the wicked suffer eternal punishment'.[7] We need not dismiss this as simply Josephus's hellenistic version of the Hebrew doctrine of the resurrection of the body. Instead of cumbering this lecture with references I will simply quote Billerbeck: 'Of no less significance for the earlier conceptions of Sheol [than the separation of righteous and wicked in Sheol] was the doctrine of immor-

tality, which, from hellenistic Judaism, gradually pressed into Palestinian circles too'.[8] The same observation would probably be true with reference also to the Qumran type of Judaism.[9]

To sum up so far: we are guilty of an over-simplification so radical as to amount to falsification if we suggest that the background of New Testament thought about the future life is composed of 'Greeks' maintaining in intellectual terms the intrinsic immortality of the individual soul, and 'Hebrews' believing that at death man's whole being is extinguished and that he is miraculously raised up, body and soul, by God at the last day. The facts are far more complicated, and the distinction far less clear-cut. For both Greeks and Hebrews the common substratum of belief was the conception of Hades or Sheol—continuing, but quite undesirable existence. Many Greeks, and at least some Hebrews (the Sadducees as a matter of principle) did not go beyond this. Greek intellectuals developed the notion of immortality; Jewish mystics and apocalyptists looked for the resurrection of dead bodies. But many Jews believed at the same time in the immortality of what we may call the soul (whether they called it the soul or something else scarcely matters); and, on the other side, we must remember that Greeks could at any rate conceive the idea of rising up, that the cults were based on a death-resurrection cycle, that the Stoic belief in an ἐκπύρωσις and renewal of the universe involved something like resurrection, and that a similar implication may be found in the Orphic and Pythagorean notion of the transmigration and reincarnation of souls.

That the New Testament emerged from this background with a new and powerful conviction of life beyond the grave was due neither to some chance turn of the wheel in the syncretistic mixing-machine, nor to a new theory of the nature of the soul, the nature of the body, or the relation of the one to the other, but to the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Jesus was dead, and is alive for evermore: this is the unanimous conviction of the New Testament and the fact has consequences far wider than the subject at present under discussion, important as that is. It means that God has acted in history to deal with the total human situation, in which death is a symptom, with sin as its more fundamental cause. The death and resurrection of Jesus are represented by the New Testament writers as the means of God's decisive victory over the powers of evil, but they are never, I believe, used to vindicate one theory of body and soul against another; they issue in the defeat of death, but this fact does not in itself provide a history of what happens to a man after the death of his body. Here as in other fields men were left to bear witness to the new fact as best they could, using the categories and forms of thought that were available to them. Life and incorruption, not a ready-made new dogma, were brought to light through the Gospel.

At the centre of the New Testament treatment of our subject stands 1 Corinthians 15, and it is necessary at this stage to recall the contents of the chapter, though, when I have brought out some of its themes, I shall return to our sketch of the development of thought. After that we shall return (I hope, with profit) to the New Testament.

The centre of Paul's argument is the point that I have already mentioned as essential to the New Testament treatment of our theme: the connexion

between Christ's resurrection and ours. He was raised as the first-fruits of all sleepers (1 Cor 15^{20}); to deny, as some had done, the possibility of our resurrection was to deny the possibility of Christ's (15^{16}), and thus to exclude a vital element of the Christian proclamation, in which all preachers were agreed (15^{11}). If we ask in what the Corinthian error consisted, the answer is probably not an Epicurean denial of all life after death, nor a preference for the immortality of the soul over the resurrection of the body, but the belief (cf. 2 Tim 2^{18}, 1 Cor 4^{8}) that the resurrection had already, in a spiritual but complete sense, taken place.[10] This view accounts for the fact that Paul devotes a great part of the chapter to straightforward apocalyptic, describing what he expects to take place at the time of the end. This futurist eschatology it was necessary (from Paul's point of view) to ensure. The trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed (15^{52}). But this is not the only theme in 1 Corinthians 15. Paul's insistence upon the apocalyptic fulfilment of the work of Christ does not lead him to forget that the decisive work of Christ has already been accomplished. I note here especially the description of Christ as the new Adam ($15^{21-2, 45}$), who has become the head of a new humanity. Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead; for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. As is the heavenly man, so also are (or will be) the heavenly men. Now it must be remembered that Paul understood the inheritance which Adam had handed down to his descendants to be death. Through the sin of that one man death entered into the experience of men (Rom 5^{12}); Paul is, of course, dependent on Genesis 2^{17}. Correspondingly, the inheritance that the new humanity received from the new Adam was life and incorruption; from the heavenly man springs the race of heavenly men. The human race will not reach its goal until Christ has handed over the kingdom to the Father, that God may be all in all ($15^{24, 28}$); but already men have moved into the new age ushered in by Christ's resurrection, and their transformation —from glory to glory (2 Cor 3^{18})—has begun.

More light is thrown on Paul's thought by 2 Corinthians 5^{1-10}, where the same pattern of hope and anticipation recurs, though with perhaps a slightly different balance. The apocalyptic element remains: we must all appear before the judgement seat of Christ (5^{10}). But it is now more plainly stated that we already have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens (5^{1}), which, Paul says (with a sharp change of metaphor), we long to put on. It is because of this heavenly dwelling that he can speak of his desire to be absent from the body and present with the Lord (5^{8}; cf. Phil 1^{23}).

Paul's conception of the future life is thus two-fold, as is his conception of (for example) the moral life. Great and decisive things have already been done for men by God in Christ; yet an hour of judgement and of transformation is still to come. This complex doctrine sprang directly out of the person of Jesus himself, recognized by Paul as alive, yet still to be manifested in glory, overcome the last enemy, death (1 Cor 15^{26}), and thus complete his work. It is not surprising that it was simplified and distorted by men whose minds were less subtle and profound, and less firmly fixed on Christ, than was Paul's.

It was not long before the vital distinction which Paul draws between body and flesh was overlooked. Already the author of 2 Clement had failed

to see the point, and was insisting, as Paul does not, upon the resurrection of the flesh. 'Let none of you say that this flesh (αὕτη ἡ σάρξ) is not judged or raised up. Understand this. In what were you saved, in what did you recover sight, if it was not when you were in this flesh? We must therefore guard the flesh as God's shrine; for as you were called in the flesh, so also shall you come in the flesh' (9). A little later Justin makes the same point even more explicitly. There are, he says, men who say that there is no resurrection of the dead, but that immediately upon death their souls are received up into heaven.[11] Do not suppose, Justin goes on, that these men are Christians. They are no more Christians than Sadducees are Jews. All orthodox Christians know that there will be a resurrection of the flesh (σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν γενήσεσθαι ἐπιστάμεθα). Again, it is profitable to trace in the history of the Creeds the development of *resurrectio mortuorum* or *resurrectio corporis* into *resurrectio carnis*, and in due course into *resurrectio carnis hujus*; and I cannot forbear to add the statement of Bachiarius, who in the early fifth century defended his orthodoxy before the Pope in these terms:

> We confess that the flesh of our resurrection is an entire and perfect (resurrection) of this, in which we live in the present age, whether we are governed by good morals or give in to evil works, in order that in it we may be able either to suffer the torments of punishment for evil deeds, or receive the rewards of good things for good deeds. Nor do we say, as some most absurdly do, that another flesh will be raised up instead of this one, but this very flesh, with no member cut off from it nor any other part of the body abandoned.

It is easy to smile at this *naïveté*, but equally it should not be difficult to see the motives that lay behind it. One motive has already been brought out in the quotation from 2 Clement. If you remember that your flesh is to be raised up you will keep it pure. This is very close to Paul's argument in 1 Corinthians 6^{13-15}, except that Paul speaks not of the flesh but of the body—a distinction which Bachiarius was not alone in failing to grasp. A second motive appears in Ignatius. The resurrection of Jesus was a resurrection of the flesh, a fact which secures (against the Docetists) the reality of His whole fleshly ministry; and it was their conviction of, their actual contact with, His fleshly existence after His resurrection that gave the apostles their confidence and victory in the face of death. That is, they themselves looked forward to a fleshly (as well as spiritual) resurrection, and this hope was linked with a realistic and anti-docetic estimate of the person of Christ Himself.[12] Ignatius, indeed, has another interest in this matter, which appears when he describes the bread of the eucharist as the medicine of immortality, the antidote against death (*Ephesians* 20); but to discuss this would take us too far from our main theme.

Among Christians who would otherwise be described as orthodox there is a growing tendency to think of the future life in not merely corporeal but carnal terms. What lies before the Christian is a raising up of the flesh he now has. If he has kept it pure he will be rewarded; if not, in his impure flesh he will suffer.

A second line of development can be traced in early Christian thought, and this too has clearly discernible motivation. We have already heard

echoes of it, in (for example) Justin. The trend of gnostic thought was to reject the flesh as intrinsically evil (this incidentally is not really a Greek but an oriental view), and to look forward to its annihilation in death, and to the correspondingly brighter burning of the inward spark of divine life.

At its worst, Christian gnosticism was fundamentally unbiblical speculation destructive alike of Christian faith and Christian morals; but the whole phenomenon of gnosticism cannot be dismissed in these terms, and there are places where it seems to do more justice to the Pauline teaching we have glanced at than do some of the more reputable patristic writers. I propose to illustrate this briefly from some of the recently recovered gnostic texts.

It is characteristic of gnosticism that it individualizes the biblical eschatology. Thus we may compare with the New Testament parable of the Pearl of Great Price the variation, similar in form but decidedly different in emphasis, found in the Gospel of Thomas:

The kingdom of the Father is like a man, a merchant, who possessing merchandise [and] found a pearl. That merchant was prudent. He sold the merchandise, he bought the one pearl for himself. Do you also seek for the treasure which fails not, which endures, there where no moth comes near to devour and [where] no worm destroys.[13]

Contempt of the flesh appears in *Logion* 37:

His disciples said: When wilt thou be revealed to us and when will we see thee? Jesus said: When you take off your clothing without being ashamed, and take your clothes and put them under your feet as the little children and tread on them, then [shall you behold] the Son of the Living (One) and you shall not fear.

This is scarcely a scriptural outlook. But in *Logion* 51 there is a biblical truth which the Church too often overlooked:

His disciples said to him: When will the repose of the dead come about and when will the new world come? He said to them: What you expect has come, but you know it not.

This point may be taken farther by means of some quotations from the Gospel of Philip, which calls in question any facile understanding of death and life.

A Gentile man does not die, for he has never lived that he should die. He who has come to believe in the truth has found life, and this man is in danger of dying, for he is alive since the day Christ came.[14]

Saying 21 makes a similar point with regard to the resurrection of the Lord himself, and Saying 90 returns to the same theme:

Those who say 'They will die first and rise again' are in error. If they do not first receive the resurrection while they live, when they die they will receive nothing.

In other words, it is useless simply to look for an act of resurrection in the future; there can be no such act in the future if an act of resurrection has not already taken place. The decisive moment of vivification must take place before death; otherwise there will be nothing to look forward to after death. That this is related to Paul's own belief is clear, but in itself it might be no more than the error contained in the belief of Hymenaeus and Philetus (2

Tim 2[18]) that 'the resurrection' had already happened. The question is, what will take place as the third step, after the inauguration of new life, and the death of the body? An answer, obscure and not entirely satisfactory, but with an even clearer Pauline ring, is given in the Gospel of Philip.

> Some are afraid lest they rise naked. Because of this they wish to rise in the flesh, and they do not know that those who bear the flesh [it is they who are] naked; those who . . . themselves to unclothe themselves [it is they who are] not naked. 'Flesh [and blood shall] not inherit the kingdom [of God].' What is this which will not inherit? This which we have. But what is this which will inherit? That which belongs to Jesus with his blood. Because of this he said: He who shall not eat my flesh and drink my blood has no life in him. What is it? His flesh is the logos, and his blood is the Holy Spirit. He who has received these has food and drink and clothing. For myself, I find fault with the others who say that it will not rise. Then both of these are at fault. Thou sayest that the flesh will not rise; but tell me what will rise, that we may honour thee. Thou sayest the spirit in the flesh, and it is also this light in the flesh. But this too is a logos which is in the flesh, for whatever thou shalt say thou sayest nothing outside the flesh. It is necessary to rise in this flesh, in which everything exists.[15]

The divergence of a gnostic heresy, which nevertheless preserved some of the truths of the New Testament faith, and an anti-gnostic orthodoxy, which nevertheless petrified where it did not deny fundamental Christian conviction, is the great tragedy of the post-apostolic age. It is well illustrated by the particular theme of this lecture. The story I have sketched may be roughly compared to a converging beam of light. A variety of rays, the sombre half-light of Hades and Sheol, the intellectual conception of the immortality of the soul, the often crude notion of reawakened corpses, is brought to a blazing focus, where all half-truths find their full realization, in the resurrection of Jesus. But no sooner is the focus reached than it is passed, and the beam of light fans out again, and not without distortion, so that some confine themselves to a grossly materialist conception of the resurrection of this flesh, others to mystical abstractions or sacramentarian realism. The Christian man who is bereaved of his loved ones, who in the end himself faces the last enemy, can be satisfied with nothing less than the full content of New Testament teaching; and our study has been pure antiquarianism if we are not now prepared to grasp this teaching more firmly and completely.

What we have seen in our historical sketch has been, first, the development among Greeks and Hebrews of a variety of categories in which men's hope for a blessed life after the death of the body could be expressed, and second, the disintegration of the New Testament conviction of the victory of Christ into partial and doctrinaire statements, expressing now one aspect, now another, of a comprehensive belief, according to the taste and preconceived notions of believers. The New Testament (taken as a whole) called on the full range of pre-Christian categories, and needed to do so, because its own conception was many-sided and demanded a wide range of expression. Its writers all accept, and in a variety of ways develop, the fact that Jesus of Nazareth, having truly died, was truly raised from the dead—a fact of history, but a fact without precedent or parallel, and of unique significance in the

history of mankind. Equally, they accept, in varying forms, as a fact of the future, that the work of Jesus will be consummated in final victory. The life of Christians is an eschatological existence, totally determined by its position between these two poles, and it follows that, for the individual Christian and for the human race as a whole, the divine gift of life may be viewed under two aspects. God has given life to men, and he will give it; God has raised them from the dead, and he will raise them from the dead. And the gift that has already been given, and the resurrection that has already happened, though not final, are more than metaphorical. If any man is in Christ, there is a new act of creation; old things have passed away, new things have come into being (2 Cor 5^{17}).

The New Testament does not borrow precisely the old Jewish conception of the rising up of corpses (though before long, Papias for example, was to do so, in the crudest way imaginable). In a passage we have already studied Paul insists that the resurrected body, though continuous with the natural body, is not identical with it, since it is a spiritual body (1 Cor 15^{44}). Similarly the New Testament does not simply reproduce the 'Greek' notion of the immortality of the soul, since it makes clear that what man has inherited from Adam is death. As man and sinner he can expect no other wage. The New Testament writers commit themselves to no ready-made doctrine; but just as, beyond question, they use and adapt the notion of resurrection so also they may be said to use and adapt that of immortality, though the latter is less widespread in the New Testament than, and is secondary to, the former. Man as man is not immortal; neither as man is he assured of resurrection. As Christian, as the new man, he receives a present life that assures him of future life, and a preliminary resurrection that assures him of final resurrection; may we not say, he receives a kind of immortality in the assurance that God will raise him up at the last day? Man may be said to become immortal, not in his own right, as being, or having, a soul, but because God assures him that He will raise him up at the last day. It is this pregnant compound of gift and promise that gnostics and orthodox, from the second century onwards, were to rend in two. It must be remembered that the New Testament itself uses the term immortality, and its near synonym incorruption. Immortality belongs in the first instance to God alone:

> The blessed and only potentate, the king of those who reign as kings and lord of those who exercise lordship, who alone possesses immortality (ἀθανασία), dwelling in light unapproachable, whom no man ever saw, or can see (1 Tim 6^{15-16}).

But men may seek incorruption (ἀφθαρσία, Rom 2^{7}), and God in giving men the Gospel, has brought to light the incorruption they seek (2 Tim 1^{10}). The passage in which these words are used most frequently (1 Cor $15^{42, 50, 52-4}$) looks unmistakably to the future, to the last day when God will raise the dead in a state of incorruption, and miraculously transform those who still survive. But as we have already seen, we must put 2 Corinthians 5 along with 1 Corinthians 15, not to contradict it but to supplement it, and 2 Corinthians 5^{1} speaks of an eternal dwelling already existing in heaven.

The fact that the New Testament hope is thus, in some sense, related both to the idea of personal immortality and to that of resurrection, accounts for

the apparent inconsistencies in the Pauline epistles. It has often been pointed out that whereas in 1 Thessalonians 4 and 1 Corinthians 15 Paul draws an apocalyptic picture of a future resurrection, thereby implying that the Christian unfortunate enough to die before the *parousia* can hope for nothing more than sleep in a bodiless nakedness (in Sheol perhaps) until the last day, in 2 Corinthians 5^{10} and Philippians 1^{23} he implies that death is gain, since immediately the departed Christian is at home with the Lord—which is very far better. It must be granted at once that in these two groups of passages Paul is not saying the same thing. This is because he is applying a rich and diverse doctrine in different directions for different purposes. For the Thessalonians, what really matters is that their dead will not miss the joy of those who survive till the *parousia*. In Corinth, denial of the future aspect of the Christian life had to be countered by its reaffirmation. But elsewhere we find a Christian man face to face with the question: 'What happens next?' And Paul at least is confident that life in the future will mean what life means now—Christ.

A further key to these apparently inconsistent statements is perhaps to be found in the idea of sleep. The significance of this metaphor has been sought by Dr Cullmann (and by Shakespeare before him) in the thought of 'what dreams may come', but it may rather be found in the notion of timelessness. Sleep is essentially timeless. Between the moment of falling asleep and that of waking five minutes or five hours by the clock may intervene, but the sleeper himself passes instantaneously from the one to the other. So after death the intervals of time lose their relevance; for those who are in Christ, there is only a 'for ever with the Lord'. And the Christian may well be thankful for the manifold complexity of his hope. It is not grounded in himself—his intellectual processes, his virtues, or his religious observances —but in God alone. Yet God Himself has assured His creatures of the future, first by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and secondly by implanting in man, in virtue not of his creation but of his redemption, the seed of immortality. But this immortality is not an intellectually and individualistically conceived survival, but a hope that is realized only in the completed people of God in the timeless life beyond the last day.

[1] The 1964 Drew Lecture on Immortality (New College, London) given on 6th November.
[2] Cullmann, op. cit., p. 7.
[3] *He That Cometh* (Oxford, 1956), p. 273.
[4] I had written this sentence before I saw the Drew Lecture for 1963, and am glad now to be able to appeal to Dr N. H. Snaith's 'Justice and Immortality' (*Scottish Journal of Theology*, XVII.(1964).309-24).
[5] B. Jowett, *The Dialogues of Plato* (Oxford, 1875) i.423.
[6] *T.W.N.T.*, VI.377.46ff.
[7] *Bell. Jud.*, ii.163.
[8] S.B. iv. 1017.
[9] See M. Black, in *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology* (Cambridge, 1956), p. 175; also *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (London, 1961), pp. 138f, 190f; and Millar Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London, 1958), p. 346.
[10] See the note by W. G. Kümmel in his revised edition (Tübingen, 1949) of Lietzmann's *An die Korinther I, II*, pp. 192f.
[11] *Trypho*, 80.
[12] See especially *Smyrnaeans* 3.
[13] Logion, 76.
[14] Saying 4.
[15] Saying 23.

RECONCILIATION AND SCHEMES FOR UNITY

Substance of the Speech delivered at the First British Conference on Faith and Order, Nottingham, 1964

J. Robert Nelson

ALL CHRISTIANS, to be sure, do not find themselves impelled by faith in Jesus Christ to believe and anticipate this unity which is visible, palpable, organic, truthful, sacramental, organizational, local, and ecumenical. Many are not only apathetic about unity, or unconvinced of its urgency; they are forthrightly opposed to it.

In this connection, we may observe that perhaps never in modern times have monsters been so prominent in the public imagination. From Rome and Hollywood especially come countless films about fantastic, horrible, anthropological monsters. Magazines and so-called comic books abound with them. And rather intelligent tourists still gaze upon the waters of Loch Ness in hopes of beholding a blood-chilling spectacle. Psychologically considered, this phenomenon of our time may be just the easiest way for people to give shape and form to their subconscious anxieties, their awareness of gross but invisible evil, their sense of being threatened by radical and perhaps painful charge.

Now, there are church members in large number who, in effect, think of church unity, or chuch union as a grisly ecclesiastical monster. The settled order of church life, the old familiar patterns of organization, the comfortable vocabulary of one's own denominational tradition, the well-worn ruts of memorized incantation in prayers and homilies—all these elements of the unchanging churchly landscape are indeed threatened by the present ecumenical revolution, and especially by all efforts to bring this movement to bear upon denominational divisions.

For such fellow Christians we can have real sympathy. And yet, I feel sure, we must look upon their abhorrence of church unity as a distinctly retrospective and retrogressive mode of thought. Or, it could be said, their thought is not sufficiently retrospective. For if they indeed looked far back to the sources of our faith, as found in the New Testament and appropriated in the Early Church, and if they faced without prejudice the implications of God's work of reconciliation in Christ for the historic life and mission of the Church, they might come to regard the unity movement, not as a monstrous threat, but as a veritable opportunity for a more faithful Christian life.

UNITY IS RECONCILIATION

When we Christians speak of the unity of Christ's Church on earth and in history, we are talking about God's gift of reconciliation. People may not always be aware of this when they discuss issues of unity: but it must be so. The Church is the outward and visible form of the divine grace of reconciliation between man and God and between man and man.

In America I find that, among Christian students, the most oft-cited passage of the New Testament is Paul's great affirmation in his *Second Letter to the Corinthians* (5[19]): 'God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself.' This is justly popular because of three emphases in the statement: (a) the 'world', of which we want very much to be a part; (b) 'Christ' as the divine Saviour; (c) and the act of reconciliation, which makes a great new difference to the world we live in.

Certainly this aspect of our faith answers some of contemporary man's most urgent personal needs. We know what these are, because we see them in the experiences of our friends as well as of ourselves: ruptured personal relationships, hostility toward others or alienation from them, broken marriages and uprooted families, social strife and civic division—and over all, a dark sense of the strangeness of God. Is there a way of healing and restoration. Yes! the Gospel promises us: for that is what God's coming to man in Jesus Christ is all about; and that is what the church is about.

I mention these basic ethical elements of our faith because I believe them to be most relevant to our discussion of the Church, the divisions within the Church, the present relations of denominations, and the new promise of unity. To be sure, the New Testament can tell us nothing in particular about denominations. The reason is that it knows nothing of denominations as we have them today, but only of divisive parties in the one church. Even so, the rich biblical meaning of reconciliation has much to tell us about inter-denominational relations and church unity. What does it tell us?

Reconciliation means the wholeness of communal living in the love of Christ, with faith in him as Saviour, by the divine power of the Holy Spirit. But within the entire earthly family of faith there are no permanent barriers to this wholeness of living which are tolerable. Reconciliation by Christ means that all barriers—including the ones we have erected as denominational boundaries—are marked for demolition. Reconciliation does not mean merely that separate groups of Christians are free from mutual hostility. Call them churches, communions, denominations—they are not entitled by God to a mere co-existence or mutual toleration. Church unity is a positive expression of the corporate Christian life, rather than a neutral or negative expression. Unity is affirmative and requires positive forms of unfettered community just because Christ has *made* us all one, because he has truly reconciled us in his one body.

This effect of reconciliation can be readily perceived where personal relationships are involved. But can we properly speak of the reconciliation of Christian churches or denominations, as we know them mainly in the Anglo-Saxon countries of the world? Yes, we can; but only if we are prepared to believe and profess this reconciliation as the work of God, rather than as our clever merging of disparate religious institutions. Amalgamating two industrial corporations, or joining together two newspapers or football clubs or even two nations is a strictly human affair.

With respect to churches, however, we feel compelled as a matter of our faith to assert that God has a special concern in this matter, and further, that the grace of God and the effectual work of the Holy Spirit can alone suffice to heal the divisions of his church.

Yet churches also have institutions, just as business interests and nations do. Dare we hold that God is indifferent to the institutional forms of the churches? If we do, we are in peril of seeming to evacuate the Incarnation itself of reality, of disavowing God's interest in human history, and espousing a view of the Church as a purely invisible entity, being 'of such stuff as dreams are made of'.

In a literal sense, the ordained ministry is an institutional matter. It has a form, a character, an historical continuity, and even a sociological aspect, all of which can be described. As we all know very well, there are diverse and contrasting definitions of the ordained ministry; but in almost all churches or denominations, this ministry can be classed as institutional. So our main question is: How can the ordained ministry be regarded as within the sphere of God's reconciling work? Or, more precisely, is God showing us how to overcome the barriers to unity which remain because of strong disagreements over the ministry?

Let us frankly admit that a great many Christians have by now become weary of worrying about the ministry, wherever churches of the Anglican Communion are involved with other Protestant denominations. It is not a very exciting field of study, after all. The scholarly books about ordination and episcopacy are, for the most part quite tedious to read; and after plodding through a number of them, one begins to feel like a water buffalo going round and around an Asian water wheel.

So people are prone to ask, Isn't it an illicit eccentricity, a gross distortion of the faith, to give the ministry such singular prominence as it has received? Does the ordered ministry really touch the heart of our faith in Christ? Or does it not rather belong on the periphery, as just a question of ecclesiastical housekeeping? These are not careless, impertinent questions. For so the question of ministry seems to many church members.

So, must our discussions of church unity invariably lead to the question of bishops?

It would indeed seem to be less difficult to converse about unity if all churches held the view of the Lutherans. Their Augsburg Confession states the basis of unity very simply *satis est*—it is enough to agree on the Gospel. But in reality this is not so simple as it appears. And it is well known in ecumenical circles that Lutherans have been notorious for defining in such exquisite detail the constituent elements of the Gospel that even among themselves the divisions have remained unheeded.

Among the major denominations stemming from Great Britain, however, a satisfying agreement (*satis est*!) on the meaning of the Gospel has been achieved with facility. And it is of these church families—Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational—that the greatest number of church union negotiations are composed. These are namely in ten countries: the United Kingdom, Canada, India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Australia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Ghana and the United States. But the Lutherans are found in such union negotiations only in South India and East Africa.

Or, some Christians are convinced that both doctrine and ministry are clearly subordinate in difficulty to the reconciling or uniting of the differing structures of the churches. Theologians tend to scoff at this sociological

approach, and to dismiss structures as 'non-theological' factors. But, when one reflects on the intricacies of our church bureaucracies, he begins to perceive how knotted and snarled are the lines needing to be straightened. Property rights, legal corporations, publishing interests, hospitals, homes, foreign mission societies, schools, theological colleges, boards and agencies for numerous particular purposes—all these at present bear denominational stamps. And let no one underestimate how hard it is to bring these into what may be called a reconciled state. As Professor James Gustafson of Yale University rightly warned after studying the United Church of Christ in America, 'The unification of churches at the institutional level is created and takes place in the context of tension' (*Institutionalism and Church Unity*).

Furthermore, I am sure there are numerous Christians who hold that the crux of the problem of unity is simply to get church members who live in the same neighbourhood to recognize their true Christian neighbours, to discard foolish denominational prejudices, and to get cracking on the witness and service which Christ requires of 'all in each place' who by faith and Baptism are his people.

However much truth there may be in these views of the way to unity, we find ourselves returning again and again, for better or for worse, for richer or poorer, to the factor of ordained ministry and the episcopacy. This may be deplorable. But it is just a fact that there can be no real union, nor even communion, between episcopal and non-episcopal churches until a large measure of concord is attained. Perhaps instead of regretting the vast amount of energy and time which Christians have expended on discussing, disputing and debating the ministry—thus distracting themselves from actual ministry in the world!—we should feel grateful that we have to face no other issues of comparable intractability.

So let us move on to consider how diverse views of the ordained ministry and episcopacy arise in various ways to make clamour for reconciliation.

CAN DIVERSE MINISTRIES BE RECONCILED IN UNITY?

The answer to this question need not be theoretical. It is actual, factual and practical. Yes. Diverse ministries—meaning episcopal and non-episcopal—*have* been reconciled in South India.

In truth it cannot be said that the reconciliation is one hundred per cent. There are still some anomalies. One of these is the refusal of certain congregations to permit the non-episcopally ordained presbyters to celebrate the Lord's Supper with them. This is their privilege according to the constitution. Another anomaly is the conditional recognition accorded the Church of South India by several Anglican bodies elsewhere. These terms of recognition draw distinctions between those C.S.I. ministers who are episcopally ordained and those who are presbyterally ordained. The Synod of the C.S.I., including a good many former Anglicans, of course, was not disposed to accept such distinctions. When asked about these anomalies, however, the C.S.I. Christians are now accustomed to point out that the perpetual denominational divisions in Great Britain and North America are still more serious anomalies than theirs, and so they can live with them.

Since the C.S.I. is the first accomplished union of its kind, a great many

people want to know how it was achieved. In the very detailed and rewarding history of negotiations by Bishop Bengt Sundkler (Lutheran, Tanganyika), it is astonishing to read that among the first advocates of the episcopal ministry in 1919, when discussions began, was the eminent missionary, Sherwood Eddy—a Congregationalist!

Early in the conversations, when the question of ministry was broached, someone suggested a simple solution: let all the ministers of the Methodist Church and the (Congregational-Presbyterian) South India United Church be plainly ordained by an Anglican bishop. This proposal was promptly rejected—as it was to be rejected later in Canada and elsewhere. This would clearly be absorption, not union, even if the name 'supplemental ordination' should be applied.

Next it was suggested that the ministries of the uniting churches could be brought together by an act of common penitence for division and of mutual commissioning for serving in the united church. This, too, was rejected for fear of ambiguities of interpretation which seemed inherently inescapable in it. As we know, however, Christians in the North of India and in Ceylon did not share that fear.

At last in 1947, after painstaking deliberations and a good deal of faithful trust in God and in one another, the Church of South India was inaugurated. And the agreement on ministry was briefly as follows:

(a) The historic episcopacy in constitutional form would be normal.

(b) There would be a forensic (verbal) acknowledgement and recognition of the reality, validity or genuineness of the ordained status of every minister in the uniting churches.

(c) After the union, all subsequent ordinations would be at the hands of bishops.

(d) During a 30-year period of 'growing together', the church members would come to a decision about the future of the ministry.

The question in many minds, and especially in the minds of Anglicans, was: would this procedure secure for the C.S.I. an episcopally recognized ministry. We all know in varying degrees of knowledge how difficult it has been for Anglicans to answer this. However, for the five Anglican bishops then at work in South India it was possible readily to give a guarantee of their decision. As one of them, Bishop A. M. Hollis, recalls their statement made before the union took place: 'After the inauguration of union we, as Bishops of the Church of South India, shall be ready ourselves to receive communion at the hands of any Bishop or Presbyter of the United Church' (*Unity, Hope and Experiences*, p. 12). For them, at least, all doubts and ambiguities about reconciling the ministries had been removed.

What the C.S.I. pioneers had decided could not be done was to effect at the time of union a unification of the ministries in such wise as to satisfy all the churches directly involved as well as those indirectly related by denominational bonds. But the planners of union to the north in India and West Pakistan as well as those to the south in Ceylon made their decision to attempt this by God's gracious help. Their many critics have called the effort irresponsible, promethean, naive, and ambiguous. Yet there can be no question that these Christians, studying and planning and praying together

for more than 30 years, believe themselves to be faithful to the Gospel, dependent upon God, and respectful of one another's convictions.

While many conference hours have been spent in working out the form, procedure and wording of the Representative Act of Unification of the Ministry, the basic order and intention are rather simple to keep in mind.

(a) The inauguration of church union comes first. Union is the consequence of common consent. It is not the result of a unification of ministry, but the precondition.

(b) The purpose of this unification is 'for the removal of barriers to complete reconciliation within the united church, and for the avoidance of hindrances to inter-communion between it and other churches'.

(c) The proposed Act of Unification is unique and unprecedented. It should not be likened to, nor confused with, any known Christian rite. By intention, as specified, it is an act of transparently simple faith in God's grace. It is a supplication to God for 'whatever of the fullness of Christ's grace, commission and authority each (minister) may need for the performance of his proper office' in the united church.

(d) In the Plan for North India/Pakistan it is asserted plainly that this act is not intended to deny the reality of ordinations previously received; 'it is not re-ordination'.

Some persons have charged that the wording of the Plan is 'deliberately ambiguous'. The opening clause of a critical paragraph seems to invite this charge: it says: 'While recognizing that there may be different interpretations of this rite . . . etc.' Principal William Stewart of Serampore, who for many years has been a devoted apostle of unity in India, has recently refuted this charge of calculated ambiguity. He explains that the clause I just cited really belongs to an earlier proposal, which after 1957 was discarded. The clause itself, pleads Stewart, ought now to be deleted. Ambiguity of meaning and intent, whether deliberate or not, must if at all possible be avoided (*Church Union News and Views*, February 1964, p. 14).

As expected, reactions to this plan have been mixed. Presbyterians are generally in support of it. Methodists have by slight majority vote held back. Anglicans in Pakistan are largely in favour of it; in India they hold a negative position; in Ceylon they lack unanimity. Despite a lack of unanimity of the Church of England, however, the Convocation of Canterbury and York have given their approval by majority. Prospects for adoption are therefore good.

But in Nigeria, where a very similar mode of unification is proposed, the prospects are even better than good. The positive vote taken recently by Anglican diocesan synods greatly enhances the prospect of a union at the end of 1965.

It is interesting to note how the ecumenical ship in Nigeria shifted its sails according to Anglican winds. In 1957 they were prepared to adopt the pattern of South India. But when the bishops assembled at Lambeth in 1958 breathed approvingly on Ceylon, the Nigerians came about and made a tack toward the act of unification.

Now it is to be seen that the same churches in Ghana—Anglican, Methodist and Presbyterian—are following in the wake.

It would now be tempting for me, but not very helpful for you, to discuss the important negotiations in the United States known as the Consultation on Church Union. Six large denominations began in 1962 to confront the problems of possible union: The Protestant Episcopal (Anglicans—the only large American church body named 'Protestant'), Methodist, United Presbyterian, Evangelical United Brethren, Disciples of Christ, and United Church of Christ. (Note that four of the six are already the resultants of previous unions!)

It is worth mentioning, however, that the influence of the Ceylon and North India plans has already been felt in the American discussions, although no plan of union has as yet been drafted. During the coming year it is the question of the meaning of the ministry which will occupy the 54 delegates to the Consultation.

An even more exciting influence is being exerted upon churches of the world by the bold planners of union in Australia. Here there has been superlative theological preparation for the uniting of Methodists, Presbyterians and Congregationalists. Their statement of the Christian faith and proposed basis of union merit careful reading by us all; they are a first-rate contribution to ecumenical understanding.

How does the Australian proposal deal with the ordained ministry? Here we encounter something quite new.

There is first presented a detailed exposition of the whole concept of ministry, drawing upon the best recent studies in respect to the New Testament, church history, and theology. In this I can take hardly any exception to what is written, nor do I mark anything of consequence which is omitted. The Australian writers have not been content to accept the ministries of the three uniting denominations and let matters stand with that. They have carefully re-worked the entire concept of ministry for the coming united church (to be called the Uniting Church in Australia). Had they wished, they could have avoided the whole question of episcopacy. But they look to the future when, as both a united church and a uniting church, they may enter into conversations with the Church of England in Australia. (And the Anglicans have recently asked if they may send observers to the union meetings). It is not for this reason alone, however, that they have considered episcopacy. Their own studies have led to the conclusion that the church of necessity should have proper *episcope* (or oversight). *Episcope* belongs first to Christ as the Head of the Body. But Christ exercises pastoral oversight through persons. So *episcope* is both a *corporate* and a *personal* ministry. On both congregational and trans-congregational levels there is exercised an *episcope* by community (the ministry of faith), and also *episcope* by individuals (ordained ministers). For *episcope* even more than one congregation they foresee the presbytery (as the corporate expression) and the bishop (as the personal).

But how do three non-episcopal denominations secure bishops? They could, of course, merely hold elections! But then, whenever the time should come to commence negotiations with the Anglicans, they would be up against the familiar wall. So they have looked to the northwest as far as South India. Despite the thousands of miles which separate them from India,

the Australian Christians have already begun to sense an affinity with churches there, as well as with churches of south east Asia. They see their future tasks of mission and service as being more and more in common. Moreover, the C.S.I.'s episcopate was brought in 1947 into the historic succession as generally understood or admitted by Anglicans. (The consecration of our distinguished conference chairman to the episcopal office is a testimony to this recognition. Among the consecrators of Dr Tomkins were the Bishop of Mysore (N. C. Sargent) and the Bishop of Madurai (Lesslie Newbigin), as recorded in Crockford's.)

Why not, then, make a *concordat* between the three uniting churches and the C.S.I.? This would be more than co-operation and less than merger. It would mean, too, that bishops and presbyters of the C.S.I. would take part at the inauguration of the Australian union, and would unite their episcopate with that of the new Uniting Church.

On the proposal for such a concordat, the signatories were not unanimous. Seven of the twenty-one favoured proceeding with union to be sure, but holding the idea of relations with the C.S.I. in abeyance.

But the bold idea is becoming better known in the northern hemisphere. And in my judgment it is the best illustration thus far produced in this ecumenical era of the interdependency of churches of different countries in the movement for unity.

In view of all these developments among churches of the commonwealth, and even beyond, we can perhaps better evaluate the *Conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church* in this land. It is worth noting that these are the 'mother churches' of all the Methodists and Anglicans elsewhere. But, as you know better than I can, they are in England set in a much older historical context, more encumbered by old customs, and uniquely related to national traditions and institutions. (See the fine book, *Anglican-Methodist Relations*, edited by W. S. F. Pickering, as part of the study on Institutionalism by the W.C.C.'s Commission on Faith and Order.) Moreover, the proposals differ from all the others we have been considering in an important regard. This is not a plan for union at the outset, but for two stages of approximation: first, a period of full communion, with a time for growing closer together; second, union in one church. It is suggested that the two churches pledge themselves to carry through this union once the first stage has been attained.

Because of the two stages, the proposed Service of Reconciliation is necessarily of an order different from the acts of unification of ministries which we have just been examining. It would not, of course, follow the inauguration of union, but be antecedent to union in an indeterminate future.

Many persons have either commended or criticized the proposed Service of Reconciliation. As an American Methodist with personal experience of church unity movements in various lands, I may be permitted to add my evaluations to those already published.

(1) First, I wish sincerely to praise the purpose, form and goal of this Report. If there are any two divided communions which should rightly be one, they are the Anglicans and Methodists. Since the end of the 18th century, when separation took place, each has been much affected by contrasting

influences: the Anglo-Catholic Revival on the one hand; and 19th-century Evangelicism on the other. But their affinities remain strong especially in worship and doctrine. In this century they have felt two other influences. Both communions have been modified by the impact of the Ecumenical Movement and its insistent call to unity. And their related churches in Australia, New Zealand, Asia, North America and Africa are either united already or are deep in the process of negotiation.

(2) Likewise I commend the two-stage plan, because it is a realistic way to provide for two things: growing together while in a relation of full communion, and making the monumental changes which will be required especially in the structure of the Church of England. Some critics of the Report, most notably the former Archbishop of Canterbury, Lord Fisher of Lambeth, have urged the acceptance of full communion as a satisfying goal for the present. This can suffice for a rather long time, he says, as the two churches continue their separate but more intimate histories. But may not exception be taken to this suggestion, on the theological ground that the full communion agreement has small value if the people in both churches do not wish to become one? Among many denominations there have been for generations no barriers to communion, but these churches have nevertheless remained in division. So I would identify myself with the writings on this subject by Professor Geoffrey Lampe, the Bishop of Woolwich and others, who justify inter-communion, or full communion, only as a way towards full union. And if I understand a portion of its report correctly, I can cite the Lambeth Conference of 1958 in support of this view. The bishops encouraged conversations with Methodists only on condition that full union would be the ultimate goal.

(3) The Report has been criticized, furthermore, for making the reconciliation of ministries a prerequisite for full communion. So one of your theological 'brain-drain' scholars, Professor Philip S. Watson, contends. By clear implication this appears to reinforce the belief that there is a defect in the Methodist ministry which needs to be corrected. Surely some Anglicans believe this, and they say so. But in the other plans and schemes for union which are before us, this kind of implication has been explicitly disavowed.

The defence of this sequence which seems most cogent is appeal to the fact that this is to be, not a one-stage, but a two-stage union. In full recognition of the convictions and scruples of many Anglicans in Great Britain, I can appreciate the difficulty of coming to full communion simply by mutual consent. This is what Methodists would doubtless prefer. And it is well known that some of Anglicanism's leading theologians share the view that communion is *now* possible and justifiable with most of the Free Churches. (Note the famous 'Open Letter' of 1961.) But we will meet this question shortly in another context.

(4) Fourthly, I cannot help wishing that the drafters of the Service of Reconciliation had been disposed to bring closer to parallel the explicit words and the implicit meanings to be expressed by representatives of the two churches. It is true that much careful work has been invested in this Report. The intended purposes of the conversationalists have been set forth repeatedly to show that their dependence upon God's grace and guidance are

matched by this interdependence upon each other's beliefs and convictions. Even so, the critical and attentive reader of the Report will notice differences of wording in cognate parts of the Service of Reconciliation which tend to arouse more suspicion and opposition than they ought to.

In the interest of contributing to the eventual acceptance of this report by both churches, as an *amicus unitatis*, let me draw attention to three instances which tend to cause difficulty.

(i) In the prescribed *Declaration of Intention* (p. 38) it is said that the Anglicans will share the 'precious gift', which is the tradition of episcopal consecration and ordination.

The Methodists will share their 'calling', which is to emphasize God's universal grace, the assurance of the Holy Spirit, and the power of the Spirit to make us perfect in love.

Now, sharing is a much valued Christian act: it is the well-known *Koinonia* of New Testament Greek. But is there not a marked disparity of treasures to be shared? They are of very different species.

Anglicans will share a particular, institutional form of ministry, a 'continuity of commission', which must be conveyed by a deliberate action.

Methodists will share an insight into the meaning of the Gospel which is generally accessible by faith, without action or solemn covenant, to all Christians, regardless of denomination.

Without disparaging at all the value of these 'spiritual heritages', one wonders whether there is not some worthy aspect of Methodist discipline and order which the Church of England might wish to share. We think, for example, of the proposal arising from the Anglican-Presbyterian discussions that the Anglicans take the eldership into their system.

(ii) There seems to be a possibility of serious misunderstanding arising from the discrepancy of words used in the act of mutual reception of clergy and laity (p. 42f). The Bishop addresses the kneeling lay representatives of the Methodist Church as follows: 'We receive you . . . into the fellowship of the Church of England.'

A little later the Methodist minister says to kneeling Anglican laymen, with a characteristically robust adverb: 'We joyfully welcome you . . . into Fellowship with us in Christ's Church.'

Now, the issue is not whether the Anglicans are received joyfully and Methodists received without passion!

The reader cannot learn from the text of the Report that this latter formula is taken from the Methodist Service for Reception of Members. He can know only what he reads. Two observations may be made here.

This disparity encourages the idea that reconciliation means absorption into the Church of England, a criticism levelled by the dissentient Methodists, but heartily denied by the defenders of the Report. Indeed on p. 12 of the Report is the explicit disavowal of absorption as the way of union.

Conversely, one might say that these formulas make the Methodists seem to be more magnanimous than in fact they are, in that they make no mention of their own church, but only of Christ's Church.

(iii) We come next to the acts of receiving ministers into the respective

Churches. Two prayers are offered, one by the Bishop, one by the Methodist minister.

The Bishop's supplication is for God to 'endue' each Methodist minister 'with grace for the office of priest in the Church of God' and to 'administer the sacraments'.

Then the Methodist prays God to give each Anglican bishop and priest renewed 'blessings . . . for the work of a minister in the Church'. And there is no reference to the Sacraments.

Is it intended here that the ministry and the Sacraments as practiced in the Methodist Church are defective, and that an Anglican bishop's prayer is required before God will provide the needed grace to make up for deficiencies. Some may believe this to be the meaning; and they may point to the lack in the Methodist minister's prayer of a reference to Sacraments as warrant for their reading of this service. But surely this is not intended. It would contradict the Declaration of Intention.

To be sure, some Anglicans have doubts about the regularity and authenticity of the Sacraments as administered by Methodists, and they are entitled to hold such judgments. But no Methodist would reciprocate such a judgment on Anglican ministry and Sacraments.

This temporary suggestion of disparity is suddenly removed, however, as we proceed to the next act, which is the mutual reception of ministers. Here is a satisfying sense of equality; the formulas in each case are the same: 'We receive you into the fellowship of the ministry in the Church of England.' And the same 'in the Methodist Church'. Nothing could be more plain.

So much for questions about *words* in the Service. Now about *actions*.

In this portion of the Service when ministers are mutually received, there is a rubric governing the laying on of hands by the Bishop and then by the Methodist Minister, each upon the heads of ministers in the Church other than his own. It says they shall remain *in silence*. Then it is *after* the placing of hands that words of reception are spoken. This is significantly different from the procedure in the other church union plans. It honours the inferred recognition (p. 24) that Methodist ministers are, after all, truly ordained to the Word and the Sacraments.

Thus I want to agree, and do agree, with Lord Fisher when he writes that by this action the Methodist minister is *not* ordained into the Church of England. So long as the two churches remain distinct, albeit in full communion, it is proper to think of two kinds of ordained ministry—which even though now mutualy recognised, must eventually by some other act be brought together into one. And the agreed means of maintaining that unity of ministry will be the *subsequent* episcopal ordinations.

We have noted how in comparable services in India, Ceylon and Nigeria, care has been taken to show that the act of unification does not constitute ordination of the non-Anglicans by a bishop. When the Anglicans met in Calcutta in 1960, they unfortunately went on record as holding the act of unification to be an episcopal ordination. They thus expressed an opinion which, if pressed, would have perhaps shattered the plan in North India. But under stress of criticism, their publicly announced interpretation was gently explained away.

In the present Service of Reconciliation, too, nothing other than episcopal ordination can be seen by some Methodists and by some Anglicans. These include the eminent Methodists who dissented from the Report; also such a noted Anglican scholar as Dr Eric Mascall, and a good number supporting them.

Where is to be found the factor which strangely brings the Methodist 'left' and the Anglican 'right' to the same interpretation? Where lies the mischief-maker?

In the thinking of many persons, the answer might well be given with an appropriate German idiom, *Es liegt auf der Hand.* Quite literally, the difficulty is 'at hand'. Misunderstanding arises because of the prescribed use of their hands by the Bishop and the Minister.

About the antiquity and diverse scriptural meanings of laying hands on another person's head we know a good deal. Anointing, blessing (Mt. 19[15]), healings (Acts 9[12]), imparting the Holy Spirit in Baptism and Confirmation (Acts 8[17]), commissioning for special service (Acts 13[3]) and perhaps ordination (1 Tim. 4[14]; 2 Tim. 1[6]) all these are clearly mentioned in the New Testament. So no one can possibly claim that laying on hands with prayer has a single meaning, either in the Scriptures or in church history.

Nevertheless, some find that in the context of a service of unification or reconciliation of separate *ministries*, it is inevitable that the imposition of hands connotes or refers to *ordination.* However vigorously this may be disclaimed by the text of the service or by its interpreters, and despite the silence of the Bishop during the imposition, the danger of such an implication can hardly be avoided.

Some Christians can accept this as lightheartedly as did the late and great American Methodist, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam. He often expressed willingness, on a reciprocal basis, to submit to the imposition of the hands of Bishop Henry Knox Sherrill, his good friend who was then the Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church. 'After all,' explained Bishop Oxnam, 'it is just like receiving an honorary degree!'

But for many Christians the matter is not that easy. The hand-laying constitutes a grave stumbling block. I recall three years ago, speaking to a Methodist conference in Jabalpur, India, about the Plan of Union for North India. And I tried to explain the diverse meanings of laying on of hands, and to emphasize that this need not be considered an ordination.

Afterwards I was most gratified when a man, who was reputed to be a most zealous antagonist of the union, said that this interpretation had changed his mind in favour of the Plan.

The planners of the C.S.I. were aware of the danger of misapprehension of this act. Bishop Hollis remarked: 'While recognizing that blessing through prayer and the laying on of hands is a very ancient and scriptural practice not necessarily confined to ordination, it was determined that in our circumstances neither the laying on of hands nor the giving of a Bible was to be used at the receiving of the ministers of the uniting churches into the ministry of the church of South India' (*op. cit.*, p. 125). While the reconciliation of ministries was actual and factual, it was not tactual!

In North India/Pakistan, Ceylon and Nigeria the rite of hand-laying has

been retained, but with the inevitable conflict of interpretation as well as negative psychological reaction. Thus the four Methodist dissenters to the English Report say exactly what the Anglicans said in Calcutta: 'It is impossible to doubt that whatever else the rite implies it confers episcopal ordination.' And this in spite of the rubric of silence and the absence of a prayer at that moment for the imparting of the Holy Spirit.

In response to this judgment I believe that most of us would find it entirely unreasonable and contrary to faith to think that episcopal ordination, like a contagion, can be conferred upon any man who neither expects nor desires it. This was Principal William Stewart's answer to the Anglican resolution in Calcutta, and I am sure that still holds true. To maintain that ordination can be bestowed surreptitiously, apart from or even against the clear intention of a man, is indeed an invidious and indefensible position. It is then truly vulnerable to the charge so often made carelessly in this debate of descending to trust in magic (as was first illustrated by Simon the Magician, who wanted to buy from St Peter and St John the power to control the Holy Spirit with his hands—Acts 8^{18}).

Why, then, it has been asked, should hands be laid on heads at all? Are hand really indispensable to the achievement of mutual reception of the ministries?

Indeed, we note two other manual motions in the proposal service. At the time of reception of ministers, four Anglican priests stand by the Bishop with their right hands stretched out towards the Methodists. But strangely enough the rubric does not say when they are to lower their hands, nor give any hint as to the meaning of this act. And only the Bishop a few moments later touches the Methodist heads.

Another instance: Just before the act of mutual reception at the end of the Litany of Thanksgiving and Penitence, the Bishop and the Methodist minister clasp right hands in the ancient, scriptural symbol of agreement, mutual recognition, brotherhood and peace. So did the apostles James, Peter and John give 'the right hand of fellowship' to Paul and Barnabas (Gal. 2^{9}).

Is it worth perhaps worth considering whether, in place of the laying on of hands on each other's heads, the participants could clasp right hands? Surely this would remove the cause for any charges of ambiguity or deception about ordination? Possibly it would eliminate the offence felt by some Methodists and other Free Churchmen who have focused their criticism on this very point.

But it is clear that the weight of opinion among those who have been deeply involved in this attempt at reconciliation is in favour of the presently proposed method of reception.

It is pointed out that when laymen are reciprocally received by the imposition of hands, this is not construed as an act of confirmation. Neither must the ministers be regarded as being ordained in the service. Moreover, this whole service would be in error if it were not carried through in an attitude of trust—of two-fold trust. Not only the actual participants, but those many Christians they represent, should trust that unity is God's will, and that God will lead his divided people into that unity if they faithfully and openly seek it. But the trust must be among men and women as well: the confidence

that neither church is intending nor attempting to win points against the others, that neither is slyly deceiving the other, nor desiring to engulf the other.

Let us never forget that in this service, as in every unitive effort, our intention is to secure true reconciliation. This is reconciliation between divided church bodies, and among us who are members of them.

Why should we question the need for this? It is God's will.

Why should we doubt the possibility of this? It is God's promise.

Why should we hesitate to accept the power of Christ's reconciling love and truth? It is God's deed in Christ for us men—for *all* of us—and for our salvation.

A REPLY TO Dr NELSON

Leslie Davison

NO ONE COULD have listened to Professor Robert Nelson at the Nottingham Faith and Order Conference without being captured by his engaging personality, the range of his vision, and the facility of his expression. His address was one of the highlights of the Conference.

Because I appreciate so much many of the things he said, it is with the utmost reluctance I venture to take up some of the points he made when in the last part of his address he turned to the Anglican-Methodist union proposals. I would be happy if I could persuade him to look again at some of his judgements.

For instance, he makes much of the fact that in the Declaration of Intention the Anglicans affirm that they will share their 'precious gift' of the historic episcopate, while the Methodists offer their 'calling'. Nelson says there is grave disparity here. We ought to match the Anglican gift with some other structure, such as the eldership of the *Anglican-Presbyterian Report.*

But he has misunderstood the time-table. This is a Two-Stage Scheme. The First Stage has one objective. It answers the question: 'How can Methodism take episcopacy into its system?' The Intention is to provide Methodism with an episcopal structure and to unify the Ministeries. We are not at this stage forming a united Church. That will come after years of negotiation at Stage Two. Then a new constitution will be created involving many alterations in present Anglican forms and structures. Those who are familiar with the Leslie Paul *Report* will know the reforms there advocated for the Church of England, and will also know that some of the most important of them are already normal Methodist practice. At this stage all we can offer as Methodists is our spiritual heritage. But it is as important as the episcopacy and he entirely misreads Church history who underestimates the contribution of a spiritual heritage. We have only to study the history of the United Church of Canada to see what happens when our spiritual heritage is shared. At Stage One it is Methodism that is to take Episcopacy and so modify its Order. Thereafter there will be two parallel Churches in Full Communion, but at

Stage Two Anglicans will take Methodism into its system and both will be recreated in the New United Church.

In any case the Act of Reconciliation was not drawn up on a *quid pro quo* basis. It was not a question of What do I give up? or, Am I giving something more than the other? It was What is the Will of God for us? Here where the divisions started they can be healed only by forgiveness and reconciliation. This is a family matter, not a legal issue. Children too long estranged are seeking each other, and in such moments the actual reconciliation is more important than the words. It is an emotional moment, when old wrongs are forgiven and bitterness expunged, not a business merger, or piece of hard bargaining. There is a place for the legalities, but they must be kept firmly in their place.

Dr Nelson next notes the discrepancy between the words used in receiving each other. The Anglicans state specifically that they receive us 'into the fellowship of the Church of England' while we in our turn welcome them 'into fellowship with us in Christ's Church'. I ignore the playful knock that we do so 'joyfully'. The point Dr Nelson misses is that here Methodism is claiming its place in the Church of Christ. We admit the Anglicans to fellowship with us, i.e. in the Methodist Church, but affirm that we see this as part of the Church of Christ. The point is not as Dr Nelson jokingly suggests, that we are implying that the Church of England is not the Church of Christ. We are referring directly to the First Assurance of the three stipulations on which the whole Conversations depended, that our discussions were within the Christian Body. There are those who would not regard Methodism as a 'real' Church. These words are not only a quotation from our Service of Reception into Membership, which would be a sufficient justification, they emphasize that the reconciliation is between equal parties, children of the one Household, and the words point to the great Body of which we are both unworthy members.

But neither of these are all-important issues on which to judge the merits or demerits of this great union scheme. We need to raise our sights higher and to ignore minutiae, if we are to form any sound judgement, more especially since no one pretends that the precise phrasing as it now stands is the last word. All that is now sought is approval in broad outline. Any improvement that anyone can suggest will be welcomed.

Dr Nelson knows this. His serious criticism begins when he turns from the words to the actions and expresses his belief that the laying-on of hands is the main cause of offence. He suggests that since the Act of Reconciliation is not an act of ordination, the ambiguity would be removed and the intention demonstrated with crystal clarity if the extension of the right hand of fellowship were to replace this particular manual act.

He is right. The ambiguity would be removed, but so would the Act of Reconciliation. For the Anglicans would not be there. Once more I must repeat that the whole object at Stage One is to unify the Ministries by Methodism taking episcopacy into its system. This step will create, not a United Church, but two parallel Churches. When they come together in organic union we can shake hands as much as we like. But now, at this point, we are proposing a way, and as we who signed the majority *Report* believe,

the only feasible way by which in the present state of Church relations in Britain, this can be done. We may be wrong, but I have yet to hear of any real alternative which can break through the barriers, as our proposed solution does. If we do not want the historic episcopate then we shall, of course, vote against the scheme. But if we do want it as one of the vital steps in reconciliation, if we are ready to receive it as a gift, fully reserving our own right of interpretation, and declaring that we cannot accept the imposition of any particular theory of episcopacy on us, then we must receive it in the only way the Anglicans, or any other Church who possesses it, can give it.

Dr Nelson reminds us that some eminent Anglicans emphatically declare that the Act of Reconciliation is not Ordination and he agrees with them. He also refers to other distinguished Anglicans like Dr Eric Mascall who are equally emphatic that it is. Now they cannot both be right. Or can they? I believe that both are partly right and both are partly wrong. The contradiction is explained when we remind ourselves that in both Churches the Act of Ordination has two aspects both conveyed by the one manual act of the laying-on of hands. One is the actual ordination, and the other is the commissioning, or authorization, to exercise the powers conveyed by ordination.

This raises an issue debated at length, I believe, by our Roman Catholic friends. At what point in the Ordination Service is a man ordained? If he died during the service after what point would he be a priest? The somewhat surprising answer of the theologians, I understand, was 'He would be ordained after the Prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit', not at the laying-on of hands. For it is God who ordains, not men.

In drawing up the Act of Reconciliation, as far as it is possible the words used in the aspect of ordination have been omitted, while the words relating to authorization or commissioning have been retained.

Thus the Act of Reconcilation is very close to an Ordination Service. It must be if it is to be an effective Commissioning.

But there is another factor that must be taken into account. Methodism, no less than the Church of England, possesses episcopé, but it is distributed. It is shared by the President, the Conference, Chairmen and Superintendents. When we ordain a man, Conference first approves by a standing vote and then the Conference decides the time and place of the ordination service and the persons who shall officiate. The Ordination Service is itself a session of Conference. No Ordination can be held without Conference approval. If and when we go to the Act of Reconciliation we shall need Conference approval. It will be an Act of Conference. Thus by our distributed episcopé we shall receive the ministers of the Church of England into fellowship with us.

But the Church of England cannot do it this way. With them episcopé is personalized in the bishop, not distributed. Only a bishop can ordain and authorize. No convocation or ecclesiastical court, not even Parliament, can do that. The bishop ordains and commissions by the laying-on of hands and he cannot do it in any other way. If we want to unify our Ministries this is the only way it can be done here in England. I would be interested to hear of any satisfactory alternative. As far as I know the bishop cannot commission us to an effective ministry in the Church of England in any other way.

I have divided the two aspects of ordination and commissioning, but this is like dividing Siamese twins. In fact the virtue of the Act of Reconciliation is that it has all the equivalent value of ordination in the eyes of the law, and this is important for it endows the minister with certain legal rights, such as authority to marry people, celebrate communions, etc., in Anglican Churches. And these rights can be transferred in no other way known to us at the moment. Yet at the same time everybody knows that no man can be ordained against his will. The Anglicans are not asking us to come to ordination. The Intention declares emphatically that both Ministries are real and effective and have been used and blessed by God. The Act of Reconciliation is not a trick of cunning men to ordain us without our knowing what has happened? It is a great Act of Faith which places both our Ministries before God and asks Him to make up of His grace what is lacking, and who would claim to possess all God's gifts? It is essentially an Act of Authorization, and this mutual extension of each other's authority which is an almost inseparable part of the ordination service, is received in the same way.

It is quite true that we Methodists receiving an accredited minister from another Church would not reordain him. We would ordain if he had not already been ordained. But in our Act of Reconciliation we go far beyond what we would normally ask of an Anglican minister seeking to enter our Ministry. It could equally be argued that the Act of the presiding Methodist minister who will be authorized by Conference to act in laying his hands on the Anglican clergy amounts to a Methodist ordination. Yet this is not what we intend. It is the parallel way in which at this vital point we authorize each other.

Unless I am much mistaken both Churches will need Acts of Parliament before they could proceed to Stage One. This need not worry us. The ecclesiastical lawyers who will draw up the Bills are there as the servants of the Churches to carry out their will to unify the Ministries. I do not doubt that they will declare the Act of Reconciliation to a full and effective equivalent of ordination so that no Methodist minister who shares in it would be subsequently required to be ordained if he transferred to the Anglican Church during Stage One.

But that does not make it re-ordination for a Methodist. Nor does it alter the case that in the eyes of some Anglicans it will be regarded as re-ordination. They are as entitled to their opinion as we to ours. The proper place to resolve this debate is, as Nottingham suggested, after we come together. To us it is extension of authority and reconciliation.

Dr Nelson must forgive us if he thinks us trapped in history. We cannot escape our heritage. This is not a new land like Australia, Nigeria, or Ghana. British Methodism is seeking reunion with the Church of Wesley and that is a very old Church which did not begin at the Reformation, though it was profoundly modified by it. The centuries still speak here and we are trying to preserve our treasures while at the same time to adjust ourselves to the grim struggle for faith which is raging in Western Europe.

We are grateful to him for all his help and his brotherly thought. Perhaps out of our travail may come a Church in England more worthy of our Lord.

A DOCTRINE OF INTENTION AND THE ECUMENICAL PROBLEM

A Tentative Inquiry

Reginald Kissack

'Non est opus intendere quod facit ecclesia romana, sed quod facit vera ecclesia, quaecunque illa sit, vel quod Christus instituit, vel quod faciunt Christiani.' Bellarmine: *De Sacr. in Gen. 1, 27.*

'NO need to intend what the Roman Church does: only what the true Church (whichever that is) does—perhaps by way of what Christ instituted, perhaps by way of what Christians do.'

Could that isolated jewel of the post-Tridentine Jesuit thought of St Robert Bellarmine become the seed idea of Christian unity?

We have never yet looked into the field of the doctrine of Intention for a solution of the ecumenical problem.

This is perhaps understandable, for on first sight it has played a divisive rather than a unifying part in ecumenical history.

It was a defect of Intention that condemned Anglican Orders at the bar of the Vatican in the '90s. And in the context of Anglican-Methodist Conversations it has appeared among the criticisms of the proposed Service of Reconciliation (cf. Simmons, *Order or Chaos*, Holy Cross Soc., 3rd edit., p. 15).

It is a doctrine linked with an objective, *ex opere operato* view of the Sacraments. Classical Protestantism has never concerned itself with the problem of Intention. Following Luther, it has been generally felt that the validity of a sacrament concerned the state of mind not of the giver, but of the recipient.

However, although the doctrine appears to have a merely peripheral place in the ecumenical debate, and to concern only those whose thinking followed the line of the Catholic wing, and then only in a negative way, the fact is that Intention is a problem native to the situation of divided Christianity. It is significant that its earliest appearances centred in the controversies of Augustine's time (the baptism of heretics) and in that of Innocent III (the Eucharist in the circumstances of converted Waldensians). It was an important issue at Trent, precisely because of a rival sacramental system in Protestantism.

It is thus a doctrine whose roots lie essentially in the terrain of the ecumenical question.

It is possible also that its relevance has been hidden by the fact that hitherto it has only been considered on its negative side. It has concerned itself with the problems of the possible effects of a *wrong* intention—with

what we might term its malevolent aspect, if a celebrant was careless, or even deliberately intended something personal and irregular.

We have never considered the complementary, benevolent aspect of the doctrine. We have asked to what extent *wrong* intention could invalidate undoubtedly valid form and matter. We have not asked to what extent *right* intention could over-rule and validate uncertainties in form and matter; indeed whether form and matter have essential significance at all apart from intention.

It would be under the hitherto unexplored implications of a positive aspect of the doctrine that we should need to look for relevance in the problem of the unity of Christians.

Involved in such an inquiry would be questions such as these: To what extent is the matter of the union of Christians in a Service of Reconciliation a legitimate field of operation for the doctrine of Intention? What are the theological principles that underlie the doctrine? How are those principles to be stated and applied in a positive form?

THE RELEVANCE OF INTENTION TO THE PROBLEM OF CHURCH UNITY

Is the union of Christians a proper subject for sacramental expression? We must ask this because the doctrine of Intention is theologically concerned with sacraments.

The act of union between Churches could not be called in itself a sacrament, on the basis of either Catholic or Protestant theology. However, it has a sacramental character, in so far as it would form the context of several sacramental acts, and could only find a true expression through these acts.

What is more, union would not just form *the context of these sacraments*; but it would give them their special and particular *meaning*. The Service of Reconciliation includes two acts whose form is the sacramental one, in one case Ordination, in the other the Eucharist, and a third which is symbolic and representative of another sacramental act, Confirmation. The reception of Methodist ministers by Anglican bishops, and of Anglican priests and bishops by representatives of the Methodist ministry, as well as the reception of representative members of one Church by the ministry of the other, would mean something quite different, if they were done out of this context of unity, and on their own. It is only the fact that the ensemble is an act of reconciliation and unity that can hope to save the occasion from being the 'ordination' or 're-ordination' and 'confirmation' that some would contend it is. Only the context can make the Eucharist in which it culminates, a true intercommunion, and not an occasional act of open communion.

It seems, then, that an Act of Reconciliation between Churches might legitimately be considered to fall within the field of the doctrine of Intention, because it is capable of sacramental treatment.

One might suggest further that one particular sacramental act furnishes a particularly useful analogy—Marriage. This is particularly so in the light of the Catholic doctrine that in marriage the true officiants are the two parties themselves, and it is the sincerity of their consent that makes the contract valid.

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE DOCTRINE OF INTENTION

The next task is to analyse the doctrine, and state its principles in a positive rather than a negative form.

There would be little objection on either Protestant or Catholic side to defining a sacrament as the means whereby a blessing intended for us by Christ is offered to and appropriated by his faithful people.

The Catholic doctrine of the Sacraments, however, lays greater stress than the Protestant on the part played by the ministrant.

Indeed Protestantism lays no stress at all on his part. It conceives the sacrament as being concerned entirely with the faith of the recipient, and so being in no need of being given, but only of being received in the name of the Lord. (It is for this reason that classical Protestantism never confines the administration of the sacraments necessarily to the clergy.)

The Church of England has in its time looked at the doctrine of Intention, but has been content to leave things as they stood with Bishop Jewel, who called that kind of questioning 'the very dungeon of uncertainty'. 'The heart of man is unsearchable. If we stay upon the intention of a mortal man, we may stand in doubt of our own baptism.'

The Church of Rome does not minimize in any way the importance of the state of mind of the recipient, but the elements that are dealt with under the head of Intention in the ministrant are naturally covered in the recipient by the Catholic doctrine of the 'obex', which concerns itself with the obstacles which a wrong state of mind can effectively oppose to the work of grace. It is indeed generally admitted by Catholics that in the nature of the case more is demanded by way of right intention from the recipient than from the ministrant of the sacrament.

It is the fact that the Catholic puts any sort of emphasis at all upon the necessity of a proper human ministrant for a valid sacrament that makes possible the doubt: How can I be sure that in any given sacrament I really receive the blessing promised by God in sacraments of that particular kind? The minister might not believe that the rite is of any value. Or he might maliciously withhold the intention to convey the blessing. Or perhaps have accidentally omitted a vital word or gesture.

The doctrine of Intention is the attempt made to meet this concern lest an imperfection in the will of a human ministrant could make a sacrament invalid. The current doctrine of the Church of Rome is that for a valid sacrament, it is necessary to have a real internal intention to act as a minister of Christ, or to do what Christ instituted, or what Christ instituted the sacrament to effect, i.e. *truly* to baptize, absolve, etc. It would be idle to pretend that the liberal Bellarminian formula applied today. Trent had required as a minimum 'to intend what the Catholic Church intends', and Gasparri in 1894 in nailing down the coffin of Anglican orders displayed the Church's mind in declaring an ordination 'wholly invalid if the minister while intending indeed to do what the Church of Christ does, should at the same time will by a positive and explicit act of his will, not to . . . do what the Roman Church does.' (One may note in passing the extreme negative form of the doctrine here, and wonder whether, should the moment come when the Roman Church willed positively unity with other Christians, a way

forward might not be found here even in that difficult context of Church relationships.)

However, the constant recurrence of the problem of Intention since Augustine's time shows how difficult a Catholic finds its solution. The drift of the debate suggests strongly that it can never be solved while certain Roman elements in the conception of Church and Sacrament remain.

The incertitude that the doctrine tries to remedy is of course a distemper, endemic in a concept of Church too high for the human element in its composition to attain to. By making the Church the dimension of the incarnation that makes it contemporary with each moment of history, the Catholic equates its human element with the humanity of Christ. This is a fallacious analogy, for while the flesh of Christ was never imperfect and sinful, priests and prelates (to say nothing of Church members) in their humanity are very much so. As a result, the Church's claims to inerrancy are constantly being challenged by events, and while controversy and uncertainty in the fields of faith and morals have been countered by dogmatic claims to infallibility, other uncertainties have demanded other remedies. The doctrine of Intention is a prescription against sacramental incertitude. It stands like a medicine bottle on the chimney-piece to reprove the Church for too facile a use of terms like indefectable, inerrant or infallible. If not a *memento mori*, it is a *memento aegrotare*.

It is for this reason that solutions offered so far all tend to flow in the direction of ideas held by both Orthodox and Protestants (though in different forms), in contradistinction to Rome, *viz.*, that the ministrant plays no personal part in the matter. The Orthodox see him as a mere organ of the Church, which is herself the true officiant. The Protestants regard him as a mere instrument of the true officiant, who is Christ himself.

The drift of the debate also suggests that as long as the ministrant plays any essential part, the visible institution of the Church (in as much as it is the aggregate of the human ministrants) lies under the same shadow of doubt. Who can say to what extent defects may not have undermined the whole sacramental structure? Who can be *sure*, say, of the unbroken continuance of the sacramental apostolic succession? In the face of the historic facts of division and schism, of pope and anti-pope, incertitude about the validity of the Church's sacraments can never be wholly dispelled.

Hence (as Bellarmine's words show) real assurance of sacramental validity is proportionate to the assurance felt about the Church's 'truth', i.e., only the problematic 'true Church' can possess the infallibility that conveys certitude about its sacraments. The Roman, like the Protestant, must fall back to the mind and intention of Christ himself, as the only basis of certitude. A Church can only be certain of itself in so far as it is certain it is doing what Christ intends doing.

Thus the only link between the action of the ministrant of the sacraments and the indubitable source of blessing is to be found in the identification of the intention of the ministrant with that of Christ. The only antidote to human fallibility is the sincerity of human intention to see done, not its own will or conception, but the will and conception of Christ. Such in sincerity is rooted in a humble recognition of its own fallibility. The

one ultimate 'obex' to right intention is the claim of human infallibility.

Perhaps, then, we can express the positive implications of the doctrine of Intention thus:

It represents the Church's anxiety for assurance, in the form of assurance that its sacramental acts really will obtain from God the grace they are meant to secure. It finds this assurance only by depressing the importance both of the form and matter of the Sacrament, and of the status of the human ministrant, below the point at which there enters the humble and sincere will of the human ministrant that his intention be simply that of Christ. In its ultimate analysis, what makes the sacrament is simply the sincere intention to reproduce in sacramental form the intention of Christ.

It represents also the Church's consciousness that, despite all claims of infallibility, there is an inscrutable, imponderable element inherent in the very idea of sacrament. It is the strength, not the weakness of a sacrament, to recognize that at a certain point all passes into mystery, and that the human ministrant, far from feeling frustration that here all goes beyond his control, joyfully accepts his own inadequacy, and relies no more on his own ability to be precise and correct, but on the declared mind and intention of Christ.

There is in the nature of the case in the field of every sacramental action a 'zone of silence', a 'blind spot', a point at which the human ministrant must say: 'We do not know; our certitude derives from our assurance that Christ intends a grace and a blessing.'

The very phrase '*ex opere operato*' seems like a Catholic recognition of this. It is the 'sealed black box' (as it were) that covers the mystery of a mechanism we men did not devise, and cannot comprehend. Yet we have the assurance that if our humble intention runs straight and true with that of Christ from the Godward side, connection is made, and it brings grace from Christ to where we want it.

NOT KNOWING HOW WE OUGHT TO PRAY

But in the context of the ecumenical problem, the incertitude in the sacramental act of union would not turn on malice, inefficiency or laxity, but on genuine uncertainty about the relationship of the uniting parties to one another, and each separately with God. They do not know if the churchmanship of each is equally valid in the eyes of God. They do not know if there is a defect of order on one side or the other. (One side or the other may of course *believe* they are themselves quite right, and the other wrong, but if they have a *common* mind and intention, it is agnostic.)

From this uncertainty comes uncertainty about what they must do and say in order that they may be one. All they are sure of is that they intend what Christ intended, viz., that they be one (Jn 17^{20}), and that the 'true Church whatever it be' must intend the same (1 Cor. 12^{12f}).

We must ask whether this sort of uncertainty is legitimate material in a sacramental act to be handled under the doctrine of Intention. Can we feel confident that Christ would sacramentally grant the grace and blessing of unity to those who do not know even the terms in which to frame their prayer for it, nor the form in which to receive it, if only they know what they intend, and are united in intending it?

Yet, does not such a mood correspond exactly with the state of mind described by Paul in Romans 8^{24-7}? Even though we humans can contribute to our prayer nothing but hope, aspiration and that inarticulate yearning to have this blessing from Christ (the 'groanings that cannot be uttered'), yet the Holy Spirit's express office is to know our intention, and (if it accords with the will of God) to turn it into articulate prayer with God for us, and obtain the grace desired.

THE 'BAPTISM OF DESIRE'

Yet even if Roman Catholics have not developed the doctrine of Intention in the ecumenical context, Fr Gregory Baum has recently written briefly on the relevance of the allied doctrine of the Baptism of Desire in *The Ecumenist* (vol. 2, No. 4, p. 66 ff). He does not indeed apply his suggestion to the classical ecumenical situation of the search for unity among Christians, but relates it to the wider realm of the Church's dialogue with non-Christian cultures and our secularized contemporaries, i.e., to the type of mind addressed in *Honest to God*, and to those who answer our evangelism with: 'I just can't think in the religious categories you Christians use, but I feel warm and sympathetic to all that the words "Jesus Christ" convey to me.'

For all that, one cannot read such sentences as these in which he suggests that the doctrine applies to such, without feeling how it could be related even better to our present contention:

> It was generally taught that while the Sacraments are the normal means of grace, the perfect disposition to receive them created by faith and charity would already communicate justification. Since such a disposition was ordained toward the sacrament by a *desiderium sacramenti*, the justification prior to the reception of the sacrament was regarded as a kind of sacramental grace.

And, referring to the Boston Letter from the Holy See in 1949:

> It is Catholic doctrine that under certain circumstances ... an implicit desire to belong to the Church is sufficient for salvation, as long as this desire is inspired by a supernatural faith and alive with the love of God, in other words as long as this desire is the work of God himself in the heart of man (loc. cit., p. 66).

In inter-confessional relationships, this 'desire to belong to the Church' is explicit; it corresponds exactly to our ecumenical intention; and who would doubt, of such an intention, that 'the desire is the work of God himself in the hearts of men'?

The Roman Catholic Church's doctrine of the Baptism of Desire has traditionally been limited to the case of those who died unbaptized though seeking baptism. This seems envisaged in the *loci classici* in both Fathers and Trent. However the scriptural justification for it seems indeed capable of being extended in the direction of Father Baum's article. It is, for instance, called '*baptismus flaminis*', *Flamen* indicating the Holy Spirit. It is also related to the promises of Christ in John 14, where the object of the promises is 'If any one loves Me'.

If then the sincere and indisputable love of Christ might count indeed, on occasion, for baptism, is it not relevant for people who have already had baptism, but who are yearning after a more perfect unity with each other? If it is the work of the Holy Spirit to substitute for baptism where the heart

is rightly disposed, may we not be confirmed in our hope that he will make of our 'groans that cannot be uttered' for unity, a liturgy acceptable to God, and so obtain validly the blessings of unity in sacraments other than that of baptism?

Our common ecumenical intention seeks a valid sacramental act in which sincere desire substitutes not indeed for the form and matter of water and the baptismal words (we probably all have baptism by water), but for what has been done for us in our divided state by episcopal confirmation or some other initiatory rite of adult membership of the Church. May we not recognize this common desire in all our different individual hearts as the work of God in all of them, and, taken in conjunction with the actual possession of baptism, find in it sufficient authority for the removal of the fences we have put round our Tables, so giving a new and unsuspected meaning to the text, 'With desire have I desired to eat this passover with you'?

APPLICATION

It remains to relate the doctrine of Intention to our situation. How may Christians desirous of unity, but divided in order and sacrament, unite in a valid sacramental act?

Jewel's classic phrase about Intention, 'the very dungeon of uncertainty', indicates that the doctrine centres in a situation where there is an element of doubt not to be resolved otherwise. In the negative aspect under which the doctrine has so far been considered by Christians, this uncertainty was a veritable dungeon.

But under the positive aspect we are now attempting to study, it need not be so dark. It may be a state of mind illuminated by humility, forgiveness and reverence. If both sides would agree not to ask that the other as a precondition of unity accept a theory of order or sacrament alien to them, the doctrine of Intention, positively applied, might be the very palace of ecumenicity.

In the greater ecumenical debate there are three areas in which all efforts for agreement over unity have been frustrated: the nature of the Church, the limits of its membership, and the constituents of its ministry. Canon Hodgson (at Lund) defined the great divide as between those who primarily visualize the Church as 'a divine creation gathered by God's will and action', and so having given shape, and those who see it in terms of the 'response of individuals in faith and obedience to the gospel'. The Catholic wing have a clear idea of the given norm in the '*vestigia ecclesiae*' of the early centuries. Those who regard history less as a valuable patina of antiquity than as a dimension of the activity of God the Spirit, claim that the evidences of God's use and blessing of Churches that have disowned apostolic succession and historic episcopate, have rendered those ancient hall-marks obsolete. Which can be *sure* he is right? Neither Scripture, Reason nor Experience can provide any infallible criterion to decide the issue.

Neither side can turn his back on the other; rather the desire to express and articulate the unity in Christ of which they are conscious, grows stronger. Christ prayed 'that they may be one', that they might be 'perfected into one'. Each side feels of the other: We without them cannot be made perfect. Each side seems to wait for the other to cross the divide over to them. Yet each

really seeks a formula to unite them, in a search as fruitless as that of those who seek a formula for squaring the circle.

An analogous zone of incertitude lies at the heart of the Anglican-Methodist Conversations: Are Methodist Orders good in the Church of God or not? But in this case a formula is proposed in the Service of Reconciliation, and the uncertainty is made to be the substance of the formula.

It is recognized that the formula reconciling the Methodist ministry to the Anglican may be interpreted as an ordination by Anglicans so minded, and may equally be interpreted by Methodists so minded as no ordination, but as a mere commissioning for service in a new sector of a Church that is throughout in schism.

The formula would resolve uncertainty by equivocacy.

THE DOCTRINE OF INTENTION AND THE SERVICE OF RECONCILIATION —THE NEGATIVE ASPECT

But if the doctrine of Intention has any meaning at all, it confronts us here in all its old negative sense.

It will hardly do for serious Anglican theologians who wish to push ahead with uniting the Methodists with themselves to declare that the doctrine of Intention does not enter the issue. It cannot be argued that Anglican theology follows the general Protestant line in not having developed a doctrine of Intention. That would only be plausible if the Anglicans had a full scale Protestant doctrine of the Sacraments, which would have determined their validity entirely by a consideration of the state of mind of the recipient. But the Anglicans have consistently refused a truly Protestant theology of the sacraments—otherwise they could not be at all concerned with the historic episcopate or the invariability of episcopal ordination for anyone who pretends to administer validly the sacraments of communion, confirmation or ordination. Anglicans must therefore in all consistency watch carefully the implications of the doctrine of Intention for the Service of Reconciliation.

If then the relevance of the doctrine be admitted, it is hard to see how the service as it now reads, with a deliberate equivocacy at its heart, must not defend itself against a *prima facie* case of defect. For though the Bishop *must* (if he is to keep on the right side of the law of the land) intend really to *ordain* Methodist ministers, quite a number of Methodist ministers will not consider they are receiving ordination. The situation seems on all fours with that condemned by Augustine: *'Quid enim prosit animus veraciter dantis fallaciter accipienti non video'* (The sincerity of the giver cannot help the insincerity of the taker).

One might perhaps evade the full force of this objection by following the traditional Catholic line that declares that, provided the proper form and matter are followed, it *could be assumed* that the Methodist was opposing no fatal 'obex', if he did not declare it in so many words. But unhappily for this possibility, the Service of Reconciliation contains a Declaration of Intention capable of meaning that the Methodist minister declares his state of mind as *not* believing he is being ordained. The conclusion seems inevitable: the Service of Reconciliation, designed largely to satisfy the scruples of the Catho-

lic wing of the Church of England, must stand condemned in its present form for defect of intention.

THE POSITIVE ASPECT

But if we could apply the doctrine of Intention in a positive way, the matter would appear quite differently.

Then, each side would confront the essential incertitude with a common humble confession: We cannot tell if the ordination we have received (however sure we are that it was valid in the past) is valid for the new condition of the Church, which by this act we desire that Christ should create for us. It would of course be fatal if either side assumed infallibility, and claimed to be the true Church, entire and whole and perfect. Each may feel: We think we have the better of the case, but each must allow that the other *might* be right. Each need only say: We cannot tell. Reverent agnosticism would be a true basis of common intention.

Divided Christians can neither know how they could truly become one, nor what properly to do to effect it. However, in the very Eucharist they do not know 'how the means transmit the power'. What they do know there is that Jesus said: Do this. And so they do it.

Here we know that Jesus intended that those who believe on him through the word of his disciples should be 'perfected into one'. Our action is his intention.

What does it matter if Christians confronting the problem of unity are at this point in a state of 'groanings that cannot be uttered'? Their theological perception, their historical situation, their psychological and emotional condition, all prevent them from knowing *how* to become one.

Yet we groan within ourselves waiting for it.

Of one thing only within ourselves are we all certain—we want it sincerely, in spirit and in truth.

Of one thing only outside ourselves are we equally certain—that Christ wants it, and 'the True Church, whatever it may be'.

Of one act only are we capable—to ask the Holy Spirit who can frame our prayer, to do this for us.

If then, we make an act of unity, believing the promise 'If two of you shall agree on earth to ask Unity in my Name, it shall be done for you of My Father which is in Heaven', and if the Service of Reconciliation were made a liturgical expression of this thought:

We know Christ intended of his disciples: That they be one. Whether an episcopacy in the historic succession or any other element of Church Order be essential to this unity or not, we cannot tell.

But what Christ intended, that we intend to be done here. Then let our laying on of hands, the one on the other, be our common affirmation that we are One in Him in a common ministry.

—could we doubt that such an Act of Reconciliation will be a valid sacramental act, efficacious in obtaining from God the blessing of unity which Christ intends should be ours?

And it would also be an act free of any negative defect of intention inherent in equivocal acts of ordination.

RECONCILIATION—A NEW BEGINNING

It may be that the present scheme for Anglican-Methodist unity will fail, and that a new beginning must be made.

Possibly it will be found that one weakness was in trying to do too much at the first step, in seeking to unify ministries before unifying the Church. It might then be well to ask whether we should not seek the unity of Christians (as individuals kneeling at the communion rail) before we seek the unity of the ministry (as officiants at the communion table).

The approach to unity through the doctrines of Intention and Desire would enable us to do just this.

The strong emphasis in current ecclesiology on the notion of Body in the concept of Church has perhaps overlaid the fact that the correct disposition of individual Christian hearts is a factor no less essential to the Church and its unity. The doctrines of Intention and Desire give full value to this factor.

To make our approach to Church Unity from this side means that we can move forward, at least for a while, over ground unencumbered by specifically ecclesiological problems. An immediate first step suggests itself.

The natural and proper way for one Christian to express the unity he intends and desires with another is to welcome him to a place at his side as he kneels at the Communion Table. Let us then begin by making that possible.

Let us make an Ecumenical Convention between our Churches:

1. Not to repel from their Tables any individual Christian of an alien confession who presents himself, taking his very act of self-presentation as the earnest of a true disposition in intending and desiring to obtain there all the blessings intended by Christ, in the unity intended also by him.
2. Not to discipline members of their own communions who similarly present themselves at the Tables of other confessions, but to recognize the fact of their going to any Table in Christ's name as an intention to receive there all the blessings that they believe they obtain at their own Table.

This first tentative step would stop short of any consideration of the validity *per se* of our various ministries. We should not ask about the churchliness of our various Churches, but only assure ourselves of the disposition towards Christ of our hearts, satisfied that we all alike confess 'Jesus is Lord', and intend what Christ intended.

Intercelebration and related ecclesiological questions would remain for a later stage. No minister would receive from the Convention any faculty, let alone mandate, to celebrate at any Table other than the ones his ordination opened to him. He would only accept a passive mandate not to repel alien Christians. Nor would any individual Christian be obliged ever to communicate anywhere except in his own confession; he would merely have the faculty to communicate in any church as he wished, although he too would have a passive mandate not to object to the presence of alien Christians who presented themselves with him.

If such an initial Convention were possible, it would give Christians this measure of Intercommunion—it would recognize the unity of intent and desire in individual Christians as sufficient qualification to receive Christ

together at every Christian Table. It would remove the prime scandal of Christian division, and enable all subsequent ecumenical dialogue to take place *inside* a visible frontier of Christian unity. When previous arrangement of all ecclesiological differences is no more the pre-requisite of kneeling together at the Lord's Table, those very ecclesiological differences will appear in a very different light.

REGINALD KISSACK'S THEORY OF INTENTION

Henry Cooper

THE DOCTRINE of Intention in the Sacraments is doubtless one of great difficulty, and Jewel's dictum that it is 'the very dungeon of uncertainty' is surely true if one havers between so-called Catholic views of the mind of the Officiant being crucial, and so-called Protestant views of the mind of the recipient being so. But is this a proper way of thinking of the doctrine at all? A sacrament or sacramental act is never a matter between officiant and recipient simply. Indeed, the idea of a 'recipient' at all destroys the nature of a sacrament, which is an act of God in which the Church shares and into which each conscious member is drawn.[1]

It is a kind of acted prayer, but much more than that; it is a prayer prayed with authority, and a sacrament which has no authority (and therefore no certainty) is no sacrament. The very purpose of a sacrament is assurance. It is axiomatic that God is not bound by his sacraments although we are, and so-called acts of 'spiritual communion' (the phrase is very inaccurate) suffice when sacramental communion may not be had. The same is true of all sacraments, including 'Baptism of desire'. Charity compels us to go farther and to say that sacraments of desire are possible to those who oppose no '*obex*' and can be held to be in invincible, that is, non-culpable ignorance. But what God does or will do with those outside the visible, sacramental system which is both a part of and only operates within the known, visible Church, is beyond our judgement. Reverent agnosticism, yes; or even the assurance that knowing the mind of Christ by sharing his charity brings, applies here.

Just as the sacrament itself is an act of God within the Church (not, surely, even in the Orthodox Churches, simply an act of the Church) so the intention of it is his intention expressed through and by the Church. There would be no assurance in any sacrament if its intention were either that of the human officiant or of the human 'recipient'; it must be that of the Church, and in order that it may be known to be that of the Church three other factors are traditionally needed—the right officiant, the right form, and the right matter. If the desire of both minister and partaker is to do what the Church does, which is what our Lord commanded, we need have no doubt that God gives all the grace that is expected and more, but if one, two or three of the other factors are present the assurance of His grace is the greater. The traditional

demand for all four of the marks of a sacrament gives a completeness of assurance to those who accept the tradition. Admittedly, those who do not accept the tradition cannot have this kind of assurance, and it might be argued that the tradition (in the sense of what has been handed on from the beginning) is really the assurance. Here we come to a deadlock, for the acceptance or not of a continuous tradition preserved intact is just the difference between 'Catholic' and 'Protestant'. It is because the Catholic wing of the Church of England claims that their Church is Catholic in this sense that they can never accept the Quick-Headlam theory that in divided Christendom all Churches, their ministries, and therefore their sacraments, are in some sense defective.

Mr Kissack is blessedly right when he says that there is a certain point at which a sacrament passes into a mystery. But the Holy Mysteries have always been thought of as the points at which the known and the unknown, the visible and invisible, the earthly and the heavenly, the temporal/spatial and the eternal touch. The important thing is to be sure that they do really meet. High Anglicans would readily admit that in Methodist sacraments they do, as they are sure that there is contact in the Catholic sacraments they claim, but they do not find the same assurance for themselves in Methodist sacraments, and would not communicate, for instance, unless the minister were episcopally ordained. This seems perverse to others, but assurance is or is not a fact. They find the fact lacking.

It is with the second half of the article, however, that issue will be joined. Anglicans who believe in inter-communion now, do so because they think that when there is a conference or common service with the purpose of reunion in mind there is a sufficient intention of unity, and a sufficiency of unity in fact and in purpose to justify it. Anglicans who cannot inter-communicate at all, and they are many, refrain because there is a defect in the assurance because of the lack of a minister in the traditional order. (Factors like individual cups, inadequate liturgy, lack of belief in the Real Presence strange in Methodists but evidenced by the ablutions or lack of them, and strangenesses of ceremony irritate and distress some, but are small beside the order of the minister.) An uncertain sacrament is no sacrament: it fails at the very point of its purpose, which is to convey certainty about an act of God. To inter-communicate now would be to introduce an element of uncertainty for some Christians. Is this what its advocates really want? Of course they do not; but it would be so.

The equivocal character of the service of reconciliation may be debated. It is said that the two sides, or some of the people concerned, have different meanings in their minds, but this is always so in an Anglican ordination. It would be impossible to base the certainty that a man is or is not a priest on this. The 'intention' is the Church's intention, which is Christ's, and this is expressed in the rite itself, and made even more clear in the Preface. The reconciliation service makes it absolutely clear that the resultant of the service will be priests (or presbyters, if the name has objectionable associations) in the traditional Catholic order. Unlike the Ordinal attached to the Book of Common Prayer, it says nothing and makes no implication as to what they were before. If it did Anglicans could not share in it, and nor

could Methodists. Is it an 'Ordination'? The question is avoided because the word has different connotations for different Churches and for different people. The result is what matters. If that result is what is intended (desired), namely, that all should be of the same kind, all should have the complete assurance of being in the one Catholic ministry of the Holy Catholic Church as it has been traditionally known, and that as a consequence all their ministerial actions will be accepted with assurance by all to whom they minister, then there is no equivocation.

I am sure that Mr Kissack's way of approach is a good one, and many will be as grateful as I am for his work on the doctrine of Intention and his stress upon its positive rather than its negative uses, but it would seem to be unable to bear the conclusions he draws. We all long, or ought to long (and perhaps in accordance with his own thinking the desire may in some way serve for the fact) to be able to communicate together, but unless we can do this with the assurance that we are accustomed to find in our own Churches we shall be worse rather than better off if we do so right away. To use the sacraments simply as acts of friendliness or as experimental essays in unity is to degrade them. God's acts are always beyond our full knowing, and sacraments always do more than we appreciate, but they do provide a common assurance for all who fall within their conditions of acceptance. Let us not endanger that assurance by omitting any of the conditions, but rather let us take steps to make the conditions, all of them, truly common to us all.

[1] I recognize the difficulty of the Catechism where the phrase 'verily and indeed taken and received' occurs, but this refers to the inward counterpart of the 'matter' of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The whole Sacrament is, of course, reciprocal: it is primarily an act of God responded to by grace. It cannot be merely 'received' for it is essentially the deepening of a relationship.

THE BIBLE AND TRADITION[1]

Rupert Davies

IT IS EVIDENT from the Anglican-Methodist *Report* that the question of Bible and Tradition is one of the crucial points of difference between the signatories of the *Report* proper and the signatories of the *Dissentients' Report*. Hear the *Report* proper: 'Holy Scripture is and must always be the supreme standard of faith and morals in the Church because it embodies the testimony of chosen witnesses to God's saving action. . . . The Church has not made up its gospel from its own experience, but has received it from witnesses, and the Holy Spirit assures us that their witness is true.' In exposition of Articles VI, XX, XXI and XXXIV of the Thirty-nine Articles, the *Report* says: 'Thus the Bible is the rule of faith, but within it there is such latitude as may be consistent with the definition and maintenance of a fixed standard of reference. . . . It is further recognized that where Scripture gives no clear guidance, and where there is permitted the exercise of human authority, it is the Church and not the individual who decides what is to be done.' Then, later on, it proceeds: 'The fact that the Christian faith rests on a series of historical events interpreted as the very work of God in the world "for us men and our salvation", and that we live in an historical period different from and later than the events themselves, makes tradition, in the sense of the handing down of the faith from one generation to another, both inevitable and inescapable. But what is to be handed down, without perversion or addition or alteration, is in the first place the apostolic testimony of Scripture . . . every tradition, whether of teaching, custom or institution, will enrich the Church from age to age, therefore, just in so far as it witnesses to Christ as the deed of God in the world and as the source and centre alike of Christian faith and Christian community. . . . We are coming to see that Scripture and tradition ought not to be put over against one another. Both are gifts and instruments of the Holy Spirit within the Church. . . . It was these considerations which enabled the Edinburgh Conference in 1937 to define tradition as "the living stream of the Church's life". We consider this continuing flow of Christian existence from one generation to another to be of great significance, and it would be intolerable to suppose that it could have come into being apart from the work of the Holy Spirit.'

On this side, then, we have a clear insistence on Holy Scripture as the norm of the Church's teaching, liturgy and life, together with the assertion that Tradition in so far as it conforms with Scripture is the work of the Holy Spirit and a necessary means for the elucidation of doctrine and the establishment of Christian institutions, worship, and practice.

Now hear the dissentients, more briefly, under the heading of 'Scripture and Tradition': 'The discussion of this fundamentally important subject (in the main body of the report) does not recognize adequately the pre-eminent and normative place of Scripture, or set out satisfactorily its relation to

tradition. All Churches have traditions, for no body of men can exist long without accumulating them, but they are of mixed value, containing both truth and falsehood, good and evil. They are thus not without use, but must continually be sifted, and tested by Scripture. It is true that Scripture interprets (and not infrequently condemns) tradition rather than that tradition interprets Scripture. In a word, tradition represents the worldliness of the Church, Scripture points it to its supernatural origin and basis. All Christians have much to learn from the past, but it is their perpetual obligation to bring their inherited customs, institutions and traditions to the bar of Scripture, by which Christ rules in His Church.'

It is oddly true that there are considerable similarities of wording between the two statements. The *Report* proper says that 'Holy Scripture is and must always be the supreme standard of faith and morals in the Church. . . . What is to be handed down, without perversion or addition or alteration, is in the first place the apostolic testimony of Scripture'. The dissentients speak of 'the pre-eminent and normative place of Scripture'. The *Report* proper claims that within the conception of the Bible as the rule of faith 'there is such latitude *as is consistent with the definition and maintenance of a fixed standard of reference*' (italics mine), and the minority *Report* insists that the traditions of Churches are 'not without use, but must be continually sifted, and tested by Scripture'. But under this similarity of phrase there clearly lies a very different theological position. The majority assert the normative position of Scripture, but regard tradition as being also the result of the Holy Spirit's operation, and refuse to set Scripture and tradition over against each other. The minority, having asserted the normative position of Scripture, and having acknowledged that Churches in the course of history inevitably grow traditions, deliberately set Scripture and tradition (or as they more characteristically express their position, traditions) over against each other, pointedly omit all reference to the Holy Scripture in relation to tradition, and clinch their argument in the phrase which conceals more assumptions, equivocates on more definitions, and is likely to provoke a greater number and intensity of contrary passions than any other words in the two *Reports*: 'Tradition represents the worldliness of the Church'—which, whatever it precisely means, and about this I am in doubt, certainly rules out tradition and traditions from any part or say in formulating or establishing the teaching or order of the Church. In strict conformity with this, the minority *Report* makes no mention of tradition in its discussion of episcopacy, ordination, priesthood or sacraments, which are the remaining matters which it treats.

I do not suppose for a moment that this difference of opinion corresponds to any difference in theology between the Church of England and the Methodist Church, or indeed to any theological difference between Churches. Rather it is a difference which is to be found within each Church. It is not for me to speak of the Church of England, but I suspect that in that Church there are many from the Evangelical camp who would subscribe with enthusiasm to the view of the dissentients. The complaint has frequently been voiced in recent months that the Conservative Evangelicals were not represented in the Anglican team taking part in the Conversations, and I have no doubt that if they had been their representative or representatives

would have signed the minority *Report*, with an especial approval for the part of it which we have been discussing. In my own Church, the minority view on this point, which is a kind of sophisticated fundamentalism, would gain acclaim well beyond the small groups committed to the ordinary sort of fundamentalism, but would certainly not command a majority of those who are theologically articulate. But I must add that it *seems* at first sight to fit in well with the traditions—I use the word deliberately—of a Church which claims to set little store by tradition and to rely wholly on the pure Word of God. In fact, I think it can be said that it rationalizes with great plausibility a view which many Methodists unconsciously hold, with the result that when they read the minority *Report* they say: 'Aha, this is what I have always believed! Who are these modernist crypto-catholics who are trying to bring back what our fathers died to expel from the Church?' (A highly romantic view of Methodist history, but none the less influential for that.) This is, of course, the great danger of the view in the eyes of those who support the majority *Report*; and since I do not believe it to have any necessary connection with Methodism, or with Protestantism in general, I propose now to adduce reasons why I believe it to be untenable.

The dissentients did not have the space, obviously, as they point out, to develop at length their view of the Bible and tradition, and could easily answer any strictures which I pass on it by saying that I have not got it right. Since indeed I may have got their view wrong, I shall try to bring arguments which militate against any view which opposes Scripture to tradition and excludes the Holy Spirit from any share in the creation or development of tradition, and will not expressly claim to have dealt with the view of the dissentients, who, indeed, may well differ among themselves on the matter.

(*a*) Surely this view implies a very curious doctrine of the work of the Holy Spirit, who, according to the testimony of Scripture, is to lead the Church into all the truth. Is it really consistent with what the New Testament teaches about the Holy Spirit to say that He does nothing so far as the teaching and order of the Church are concerned except dot the *i*s and cross the *t*s of what He has already disclosed in Scripture? Had He nothing to do with the development of the eucharistic liturgy in any Church in Christendom? Nothing to do with the formulation of any doctrine of the Sacrament of Holy Communion (for all doctrines on this matter are virtually post-biblical)? Nothing to do with the creation of new forms of Church life and order at the Reformation or in the Methodist revival? Nothing to do with the answer which the Church has given or may give to the doctrines of National Socialism, Communism and scientific humanism? Nothing to do with the theology of the Schoolmen, or the present ecumenical dialogue? Is all theology simply and solely biblical exegesis, and does the Holy Spirit never lead us an inch beyond what is written?

No one outside the Roman Orthodox Churches wishes to put his finger on any deliverance of tradition and say: '*This* is purely the work of the Holy Spirit, with no admixture of human fallibility or ignorance.' We know that everything in tradition must be set to the touchstone of Scripture. And even Roman and Orthodox theologians are very careful to delimit quite narrowly the 'holy tradition' which must be accepted without question. But it is one

thing to admit that all tradition is the mingled work of the Holy Spirit and fallible man; it is quite another thing to deny the presence of the Holy Spirit to the Church as it fulfils its task of worshipping God and proclaiming the Gospel.

(*b*) Such a view deprives the Church of help without which it cannot well live in innumerable predicaments which were not contemplated by the biblical writers. I do not myself think that the Scripture tells us whether we ought to have the hierarchy of bishops, priests and deacons or not. Nor do I find in Scripture any blueprint for the constitution of the Methodist Conference. Yet it is surely beyond question that the Spirit took some part in the foundation of the Conference and the creation of the triple ministry; and this is true whether you believe or not that either of these institutions is valid for all time and every place. If He did not, He has certainly left us most sadly to our own pitiable devices—and I say this although Anglicans know perfectly well how often their ministers, sometimes all in a body, have grievously erred, and Methodists know perfectly well how often the Conference must come under the judgement of the same Spirit who brought it into existence.

(*c*) Whereas in some matters of moment such a conception of *sola scriptura* as we are discussing leaves the Church without essential guidance, in others it simply plunges us into endlesss perplexity. In Reformation times Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Episcopalians all thought that the Scripture laid down their own particular form of government as the rule for the whole of the Christian Church. It is now fairly certain that the New Testament gives encouragement, greater or less—and the amount I will not go into—to all three forms of Church government, and no Communion can claim the exclusive title to a scriptural order. The same difficulty presents itself, even, when we consider whether we ought to have an ordained Ministry at all. Most of us would assert that the ordained Ministry is plainly enjoined in Scripture; but I heard no less a scholar than Eduard Schweitzer maintain in Montreal—unless I misunderstood him—that the New Testament gives very doubtful authority to the idea of an ordained Ministry in our sense; all it does, he said, is to speak of the ordination of men to specific functions and tasks. In other words, the Scriptures speak to us on these matters with a divided voice.

Where do we go from here if the Spirit has excused himself from participation in the forming of tradition? It is tempting, of course, to say that the Pastoral Epistles, which alone in the New Testament really give much support to monarchical episcopacy, are post-Pauline, and therefore belong to tradition rather than Scripture. Probably they are post-Pauline; but if we rule them out of court on this ground, we have retracted our scriptural criterion and introduced another one into Scripture itself, initiating a process which is certainly precarious and may turn out to be endless. Who shall tell us what is Scripture and what is tradition?

Furthermore, (*d*) any attempt to oppose Scripture to tradition is made increasingly more difficult by present-day studies of the New Testament. It becomes clearer every year that within the New Testament itself, and not least within the Synoptic Gospels, there are unmistakable traces of the operation of what can only be called tradition. That is to say, the Church (usually, of

course, unconsciously) took in hand the editing of large parts of the Gospel narrative before the Gospels reached their present form. It selected the incidents and sayings which were to be preserved, and allowed the rest to fall into oblivion; it supplied the sayings and parables of Jesus with settings, and the parables with meanings, which are almost demonstrably not the original ones. The New Testament consists of those writings which *the Church* after the death of the Apostles deemed to be essential for the building up of the Church, and it is written down, very largely, in the form, setting and order which *the Church* in the same period deemed appropriate for the purpose. We may say, if we like, that the Church when it was doing this editorial work was acting as an author of Scripture, and not as the moulder or bearer of tradition, but the distinction has become very artificial, and it is surely better to draw the obvious conclusion that in the Scriptures the apostolic testimony is already fused with the tradition of the Church, and that it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to disentangle them. If so, the opposition of Scripture to tradition scarcely makes sense any longer.

The final argument under this head, (*e*), is admittedly *ad hominem*, and, alone of all that I have used, applies specifically to the dissentients. It is that the dissentients themselves find it impossible in practice to maintain the opposition of Scripture, as pointing to the supernatural origin and basis of the Church, to tradition, as representing its worldliness. For when they come to speak of the phrase in the Service of Reconciliation, 'Take authority to exercise the office of a priest', they mention, it is true, the fact that the Greek word for priest, *hiereus*, is never used of ministers in the New Testament, but they employ as their principal argument certain statements from the Methodist Deed of Union. Not even its warmest admirers would claim for the Deed a status higher than that of being part of *the tradition* of the Church. This, apparently, is what comes of belonging to a Church whose tradition it is to sit loose to tradition! The dissentients are traditionalists after all!

The formulation of a statement on Scripture and tradition which is not liable to objections as damaging as those which I have ventured to lay at the door of the view which I reject is certainly much more difficult than the laying of such objections. Anyone who took part in the recent attempt at Montreal to make such a statement will certainly echo that sentiment! But in all honesty I must try to do so, and particularly because on the possibility of such a statement depends in part the achievement of a theological as distinct from an ecclesiastical reconciliation of the two Churches here involved. I start from the presupposition that the Holy Spirit is present in the Church at all times to guide it into the truth, as the truth is in Jesus Christ, and I also assume that He does not limit His activities to any particular Communion within the Holy Catholic Church, but grants His guidance to the whole Church, in which the Church of England and the Methodist Church, among many other Communions, hold and cherish a true place. This double presupposition does not require me to hold that the Spirit guides the Church and every part of it always in the same measure and in the same way, or always discloses truths of the same importance for the salvation of

mankind and the building up of the Church; still less that the response of the Church is always to the same degree obedient, or even always obedient at all. Nor do I hold any of these things. Rather I assert that to the apostles and their personal associates, and to the Church under the leadership of these men in the apostolic age, the Spirit disclosed all vital truths, that is to say, all truths necessary for the life which the Spirit gives, and all truths necessary for the effective proclamation of the Gospel and the building of the Church as the guardian and proclaimer of the Gospel. I assert further that such was the faith and obedience—themselves the gift of the same Spirit —of those to whom these truths were entrusted that they preserved them and wrote them down substantially, though not literally, as they were disclosed to them. And from these two assertions I draw the conclusion that all doctrines and practices alleged to have been disclosed by the Spirit to the Church in later ages must be sifted and tested by the Scripture. By that I mean that there are many matters of faith in the Scripture which are clearly and definitely stated. These are the central truths of our religion, and nothing which is in conflict with them is to be accepted. But where Scripture itself gives two views of a matter without finally settling for either, as it does probably on the issue of free will and predestination, on the fate of the wicked, and on the chief forms of Church order, the Church and individual Christians have liberty, and the further guidance of the Holy Spirit to the Church is to be awaited. And where Scripture is wholly silent, as it is perhaps on the doctrine of the Eucharist, on the relation of the Church to the economic order, on the sacrificial functions, if any, of the Christian minister, or on the truth of the doctrine of apostolic succession, we ought to expect the guidance of the Holy Spirit, though we cannot accept it as indubitably as such until and unless this is the verdict of the whole Church.

Thus the Holy Spirit is to be recognized as disclosing true doctrine and correcting false doctrine, as amplifying and elucidating what is only adumbrated in Scripture, and revealing new truth, wholly in conformity with the old, to the whole Church.

The whole of this complex process, still proceeding, is, from the human standpoint, rightly called the process of tradition; for the Spirit is at every point speaking to the Church, and the Church is handing down to its members, and to succeeding generations, what it receives from the Spirit. By a certain ambiguity of language the results of the process are also called tradition. On these lines and within this process it is possible to distinguish four forms of tradition.

The first form of tradition is the apostolic testimony, alias the Holy Scriptures. I have already said enough to show how hopeless and useless it is to try to set Scripture apart from tradition. On the contrary, Scripture is tradition *par excellence*, Tradition with a capital T, the great Tradition. It was because the Bible itself is part of tradition, and indeed the most important part, that it was seriously proposed at one stage of the Faith and Order Conference at Montreal in 1963 that *sola traditione* should be put in the place of *sola scriptura* as the key phrase to indicate the source of the Church's doctrine. The proposal was ultimately withdrawn, no doubt because it was liable to be shocking in some quarters, and misunderstood in most, but the

fact that the proposal was made shows the way in which we cannot at present help casting our thoughts.

The Apostolic Tradition falls in general into three parts. Primarily it contains the central affirmations of the faith, the great saving truths of our religion, testified to by prophets, law-givers, psalmists, historians, apostles and teachers; the being, character and activity of God, his holiness and his grace; His preparation of Israel to be the vehicle of the Messiah; the incarnation, the ministry, the death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ for the salvation of all mankind; the person, presence and power of the Holy Spirit; the commission, mission and fellowship of the Church; the coming of the Lord in glory, the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting. Secondly it contains those statements of parallel, complementary and sometimes apparently contradictory truths which it does not go on to reconcile, and which remain to form the great paradoxes of the faith, and are likely so to remain until and unless the Spirit shall otherwise ordain: such as, freedom and election, the present judgement and the judgement to come, the punishment and the annihilation of the wicked, the necessity of personal faith and the necessity of the sacraments, the rule of the Church by those whom God appoints and empowers and the right of each congregation gathered in the name of Christ to express its will. And thirdly it contains, on its fringe, as it were, statements of individual bibilical authors which are not borne out by the Scripture as a whole and therefore await the further revelation of the Holy Spirit: such as the primacy of Peter, the practice of baptism for the dead, the superiority of the celibate to the married state. This is not, of course, to say that this third part of the contents of the Apostolic Tradition is to be rejected, either in whole or in part, but simply that its statements remain in the status of candidates for confirmation, and that no Church is entitled to make these out to be truths necessary for salvation or articles of a falling or standing Church.

You will have noticed there are many parts of the Bible and many of its affirmations which I have not included in any of the three sections. This is in most cases because I do not venture to do so, partly because of the wrath which I might provoke, and partly because there must remain real uncertainty as to the section of the Apostolic Tradition to which they should be assigned. It is the continuing task of biblical scholarship to attempt such assignments, and to do so if necessary against the vested interests and spirited defence of this denomination or that. In the ecumenical age, which is also the age of radical enquiry into the biblical documents, we may all expect to find ourselves in the position of discovering that one of the most surely believed doctrines of our communion possesses only a peripheral justification in Scripture.

The second form of tradition may be called the Catholic Tradition. This is the development, clarification and defence of the central affirmations of Scripture in the writings of the great theologians, ancient, medieval and modern—in the Fathers, the Schoolmen, the Reformers, the Anglican divines and Wesley, and perhaps in modern writers such as Barth (though it was somewhat premature on the part of the BBC to salute him as the greatest theologian since St Thomas); in the liturgies of the great Churches of

Christendom; in the ecumenical creeds, and the creeds, confessions and articles of the various Communions. This form of tradition is necessarily more fluid than the Apostolic Tradition, and (to change the metaphor) its edges more ragged. Because of the divisions of the Church, and differences between theologians, the Catholic tradition is at many points confused with other forms of tradition, and sometimes, perhaps, with plain error. In fact, it is only in the Creeds of the undivided Church (as the Orthodox so rightly say) that the Catholic Tradition stands in pure form, uncorrupted and unadorned (and even there some Christians see the Descent into Hell and the Virgin Birth as accretions from other sorts of tradition). Yet both the historian and the man of faith (if I may for the moment distinguish the two) can discern amid the turmoil of Church History the persistent survival and enrichment of the steady stream of Catholic truth, not confined to any one denomination or group of denominations, but blessedly available to all who enter by faith the People of God.

The 'ecumenical traditions' constitute the third form of tradition. I give notice that I here use the word 'ecumenical' in a lesser sense than that to which it is entitled, rather in the sense of 'world-wide', purely for my own convenience; and I point out that the word tradition has now gone into the plural. For here we come into the area of traditions spread over the world and over many centuries, but developed independently of each other, and, until the present generation, engaged in conflict, sometimes life-and-death conflict, with each other. I refer to such things as the 'Catholic' and 'Protestant' traditions, and the Orthodox and Roman traditions, of Church Order and Government, of the doctrine of grace, of sacramental belief and observance, of authority and freedom, of personal and corporate devotion, of liturgical and free worship; I refer to Arminian and Calvinist doctrines of man, to various doctrines of the Atonement, and many other matters. In each case one element of biblical teaching has been over-emphasized and developed, to the under-emphasis or even the denial of others (within what I have called the paradoxes of Christian faith), and great schools of theological thought, and world-wide denominations have been founded upon them. This conflict of traditions has been the most potent of all causes of Church division; for the over-emphasis of one truth leads to the counter over-emphasis of another—and in due course we have the split between East and West, the Reformation, the proliferation of Protestant denominations; and always on both sides the battle has been for the truth. In our day we must, of course, continue to live within our traditions, until the great Church comes; but we need, thank God, no longer be the prisoners of our traditions; indeed, we can with increasing ease be the friends, guests and even the interpreters of traditions of which once our fathers were the sworn and inveterate enemies.

And finally there are the denominational traditions, the peculiarities and idiosyncrasies of each denomination in belief and practice. These peculiarities (I use the word in the strict sense, of what is the particular possession of one person or group) are nearly always harmless, usually useful, and for the most part derived from individual teachings of Scripture, or individual interpretations of Scripture—such as the Methodist Covenant Service and

the Anglican Confirmation Service (in fact, the Book of Common Prayer is an outstanding example of the confluence of the four forms of tradition—the Apostolic, the Catholic, the Anglican-ecumenical, and the Anglican-denominational or -peculiar). Sometimes they are the baptized contributions of secular society, such as a Methodist Circuit Rally, or the clothes of the Anglican priest, or the appointment of Anglican bishops by the Crown (it is not quite certain how far the baptism has 'taken' in the last case). These traditions are held and observed by the denominations as valuable to themselves, but also in trust for the whole Church, until such time as the Holy Spirit shall indicate to the whole Church whether he wishes them to belong or not to the life of the whole Church (in the case of the appointment of Anglican bishops it appears from the *Report* that he is about to declare himself against the method at present employed!).

The relation of Scripture to tradition in the categories of modern biblical scholarship and the ecumenical conversation is intricate and devious, as you will by now have seen, if you did not know already. I can only hope to have set before you certain faint indications of the way in which, perhaps, we ought to straighten out our thinking. I hope also that I have done something to end the opposition of Scripture to tradition now shown to be meaningless, and to indicate that they belong together within the Spirit's bounty to the Church.

[1] A paper delivered to the conference of Friends of Reunion in Cambridge, September 1963.

AWAKENING IN ASIA

Graeme C. Jackson

THE WEST HAS learned to listen to Asia during the past quarter of a century. Men of the stature of the late Mr Nehru, of U Thant, of Chou en Lai and Radhakrishnan, to mention but a few, have convinced the West that leadership and statesmanship are no longer the prerogative of the West and that we cannot regard Asians as being either beholden to us or under our tuition.

There are Asian Christian leaders of comparable stature and ability, but for some reason it is taking the Western Church longer to shed the old 'guardian' mentality towards the Churches of Asia. Most of us have heard the name of Dr D. T. Niles and recognized his enormous clarity of thought and vision; but outside missionary circles who in England knows of the stature of Dr Devanandan whose recent death was a loss to the world Church, or of M. M. Thomas whose work in India on the relationship of the Church to the world is so significant? Who knows of the work of reinterpreting the Gospel in the thought-forms of the East which is being done by such men as the Rev. L. A. de Silva of Ceylon and Dr C. H. Wong of Taiwan? And yet these men are doing work as profound and significant for the Christian Church as is anyone in the West.

Our lack of knowledge of such people is not, perhaps, surprising, since much of their work is done in local languages and is of specifically local application. Our lack of interest is more reprehensible, because it is an indication of the same attitude of mind that labelled the Churches of Asia (and Africa) Younger Churches. Many of them are younger in years: we assume too easily that they are equally younger in wisdom. Are they? When they differ from the Western Church, whether it be in their estimate of the importance of denominationalism, or in their analysis of the value of the Western parliamentary form of democracy, or in their understanding of the nature of the missionary task of the Church, where is the source of wisdom —in the West or with the Holy Spirit? May it not be that He is saying something to us through them today—things which we are either too busy or too set in our own ways of thinking even seriously to listen to?

The East Asian Christian Conference is an association of the Churches of Asia—a sort of equivalent in the Church to the Bandung Conference. Once every four years it holds an Assembly to which delegates come from all parts of Asia together with a few leaders from the West to consider God's call to the Church in Asia and its response to it. The second such Assembly was recently held at Bangkok. A booklet entitled *The Christian Community Within the Human Community* has just been published, embodying some of the more important statements and reports adopted by the Assembly. It is

available from the Rev. Frank Short, Edinburgh House, 2 Eaton Gate, London.

Unlike the Church in the West, the Church in Asia lives everywhere amidst a culture upon the formation of which Christianity has had little influence, and surrounded by religions which are more or less hostile to it. It is a situation to which the early Church was accustomed and one to which the Church in at least some parts of the West may have increasingly to accustom itself in the future. One might expect, therefore, that what the Churches in Asia have to say about their obedience in this situation might be worth pondering in the West. And this turns out to be the case.

Right at the beginning of the booklet it is made clear that it is with the Church as a whole 'whether they are gathered in places of worship on a certain day of the week or are scattered amidst society pursuing different occupations' that the reports are concerned. It is also made clear that the reports are concerned with Christian obedience: 'Those who bear Christ's name are those who have been called out of the world, but are sent to the world and are placed in it. . . . The need is for this people to become more . . . aware of the meaning and implication of the Christian presence in the situations and occupations in which they and their fellow men are set by God. The call is to every Christian individually and to the Christian community as a whole to indicate by word and example the new age that Christ has ushered in.' The introductory report from which those quotations are taken goes on to expound the need for lay training and to make suggestions as to the content and method of such training.

There follows a document entitled 'The Christian Encounter with Men of Other Beliefs'. This is a profound statement which manages to bypass most of the old chestnuts, perhaps mainly because it speaks of a real encounter between people rather than an encounter between systems of thought which Christians are expected to evaluate. The first sentence reads: 'The Christian encounter is by its very nature an encounter of men with men', and the document throughout recognizes that we bear our witness to others from within our common situation as men who live under both the providence and judgement of God. It recognizes that all religion, even the Christian one, is shot through with men's sin; that we have to bear our witness not only within a religious, but also within a secular context. There is a lot here which is relevant to the situation in 'Post-Christian Europe'.

The next document speaks of how the Christian community bears its witness to the Kingship of Christ in the realm of the political, economic and social life of the nation. Readers in the West will find here, perhaps, less that is immediately relevant to the situation in Europe, but a great deal that will give them an understanding of how the situation in Asia, where parliamentary democracy is a rare plant, looks to Asian Christians. The view expressed here is more optimistic, though none the less realistic, than that usually taken in the West. There is a positive evaluation of nationalism and of the need for strong government in countries which are divided religiously and ethnically and which face poverty and economic stagnation. There are constructive suggestions of lines of action in the way both of co-operation and criticism for the Christian community. Both the analysis and the sug-

gestions for action are the result of a long and careful study of the situation informed by a Christian understanding of the meaning of man's life—a study carried on by such institutes as the Christian Institute for the Study of Religion and Society in South India. The general view of the nature of God's control over and action within history that lies behind this document is succinctly and brilliantly expressed in two papers by Philippe Maury and M. M. Thomas in the *South-East Asian Journal of Theology* under the title 'The Tides of History', which were given as lectures at the second Assembly of the East Asian Christian Conference.

The next document discusses in summary fashion some of the more urgent issues of international relations. There is an appeal to Asian Governments to join other non-nuclear nations in renouncing the possession of nuclear weapons, and this is followed by a discussion of the role of International Law and of the United Nations in contributing to world peace and order. There is a recognition of the failure of the Churches of Asia to act as mediators in tension between nations within Asia. There is a discussion of some of the issues raised by the giving and receiving of foreign aid and technical assistance, and finally a word about Christian involvement in politics which is seen to have been inhibited both by a 'minority' consciousness among the Churches and also by a perfectionist ethics which is not applicable to politics. The final sentences will be pondered by many: 'The acceptance of a legalistic ethics (which is not) informed of the reality of sin and the need of divine forgiveness at every level has been the bane of Christian witness in political life. Political life has its own structures and dynamics of behaviour which can be discovered, corrected and renewed not from outside, but only by active involvement. Our need is for the rediscovery of the true mission of the Church in the secular sphere of compromise to enable us to have a serious evangelistic encounter in political life.' How much that says to many who talk and think about the Christian in politics!

The second part of this booklet speaks of the renewal of the Church which is necessary if it is to fulfil its task in the world. The first document is entitled 'The Call to Holy Living'. 'Holiness means in the first place being set apart from the world to be constantly confronted by the Holiness of God; and in the second place a total commitment to the participation in God's purposes in the world. . . . Holiness is not something apart from the secular', and 'The call to be separate is not a call to a life to be lived apart but a call to a distinctive manner of life.' The holy and the secular are joined both in participation in worship and also by the spirit of prophecy which points the relation between the Divine Purpose and the activities of the world. The Christian's distinctive manner of life is described on the basis of our Lord's life. It includes both the practices of austerity and also the sharing in the joys and frustrations of the life of society. There is a tendency in Western thought to see the distinctiveness of Christian living as consisting in a strictness of ethical life. This document insists that our ethical life must be grounded both in the saving activity of Christ and the sanctifying activity of the Holy Spirit, and so be the fruit of our relation to God rather than the result of our effort. Our attention and effort must be directed both to Christ who calls us and to our neighbour whom we must love; our distinctive man-

ner of life must be congruous with the particular way in which we are called to work out that love in service, though it is also recognized that some may hear a specific call to celibacy and poverty.

The next document, though brief, is one of the more important in the booklet. It is concerned with the Call to Renewal in the Churches of Asia. The first section is entitled 'Self-criticism'. There is here a radical and searching self-criticism which is not the petulance of despair but surely the result of the Holy Spirit's movement among the Churches. We have to be penitent in the West as we read and realize that some of the weaknesses of the Churches of Asia are a direct result of missionary policy—of both our paternalism and our insensivity to the difference between the worlds of Asia and of Europe or America. The next section calls for a renewal of the being of the Church—of its inner life with God. A further section is concerned with the renewal of the Church in function: it is concerned that the Church should be a sign of God's new Creation in Christ, which means that it should exist for the sake of others in service and intercession and that it should be a sign of the wholeness which God gives man in Christ by living in unity together in each place. Finally there is a call for renewal in its structure so that the congregations of the Church are no longer places where Christians, gathered into their denominational groups, escape out of the world to become communities concerned mainly with their own spiritual pilgrimage to heaven. The document bases its hope for the coming of renewal both on the promises and faithfulness of God and also on the very fact of the existence of the demand for renewal of which this document is a result: this demand is the result of the pressures of the Holy Spirit already active for renewal within the Church—the herald of the dawn.

This is a challenging and humbling document which gives the lie to those who say that the Churches of Asia left by themselves will not be adequate to the task that lies ahead of them. And it gives real point to what is to my mind the document which ought most to search the hearts and minds of Christians in the West, namely the document on Confessional Families and the Churches in Asia. This deals with the problem raised for the Churches in Asia by the development and strengthening of groupings such as the World Methodist Council, the Anglican Communion, the Presbyterian World Alliance and others. Why are such movements a problem? Basically, because of the conviction increasingly firmly held in Asia, that the Churches in a particular country or region of a country belong fundamentally together as the Church in that place; that whatever denominational loyalties they have, their prime loyalty under God is to their sister-Churches in the same place. This conviction is expressed again and again when Church leaders in Asia meet together. There is an increasing sense of a mission laid by God on the total Christian community in any one place. Whether it is in the realm of indigenization of the life of the Church, of service, of evangelism or of giving expression to Christianity in terms of local thought-forms, more and more Church leaders and ordinary Church members in Asia are feeling that they must do these things together. This conviction is apparent not only in Churches whose leaders have become figures in the World Council of Churches but also in Churches of very different persuasions. There is the

sense that whatever relevance they may have elsewhere denominational groupings make little or no sense among the Churches in Asia. This is not to say that Christians in every country in Asia are just about to rush into each others' arms in Church-union schemes. No! The difficulties in the way of Church union there are as great as anywhere and renewal in this area of the Church's life will be slow to come. But there is a sense of the rightness of this desire for unity and of the need to work more and more in mutual consultation and openness to each other even before actual union. And as long as the strength of world confessional movements grows, so long will they exert a different and a divisive pressure on the Churches in Asia—inevitably. The pressure is exerted unwittingly and unintentionally, but it is exerted none the less. It is exerted partly through the healthy and good ties of friendship which exist between Churches in Asia and those Churches in the West whose missionaries originally brought them the Gospel. It is exerted also through the financial help which the Churches in Asia still need and which is pouring into them from the West, often largely through denominational mission-boards. It is exerted when doctrinal conformity is a condition of inter-communion between the parent Church in the West and a Church in Asia. It is exerted whenever a missionary goes to serve in a church in Asia from a church of the same denomination in the West. The countries of Asia in which these Churches live are very different in their ways of thinking, in their political, economic and social life from the countries of the West. As this booklet shows, the Churches of Asia are beginning to realize how unfitted they are to carry out their task in these countries; how irrelevant their life and witness often is. They see the need for a renewal which will involve them in profound changes and will include a measure of unity with their sister Churches that the West has not known for centuries. They are asking in this document that the Churches of the West allow them freedom to respond to the pressure of the Holy Spirit upon them for renewal. It will be a measure of our trust in God whether we listen and learn and accept their plea or not.

(As a footnote to the last paragraph, I give a quotation from 'An Advisory Study' for the Commission on Ecumenical Mission and Relations of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. It is significant as underlining what has been said above and, since it comes from within the context of a denominational study, as a signpost for the thinking of other Western Churches:

'Whatever the historic justification of denominationalism in European Christendom, it represents an irrelevant pattern for the younger Churches which cannot be made indigenous, because it is not rooted in the Gospel nor related to the soil in which these Churches exist. The situation in which the Church is called to take form in these lands is not that of Europe of the sixteenth century, but of the modern world of nation and nations, of religious and political ideologies which offer bases for unity. We see in the Church-union movement among the younger Churches a great sign of the renewal of the Church, moving toward a missionary community in the context of the nation and nations. And we view world confessionalism with great apprehension and concern, lest it turn back the clock and so hinder the development of an authentic missionary community in each land.')

Two other signs of renewal in the Church in Asia are given in the remaining documents. One is about relations with Roman Catholics which have changed out of recognition in the past few years; though the document reminds us also of the deep differences which continue to divide us. The other is a document which was produced to meet the needs of the missionary movement within Asia which has sprung out of the life of the Church there. There are over 200 Asian Christians now serving as missionaries in churches of other countries, often across borders which are politically troubled and within churches of differential denominational ties. The document is an attempt to bring order into the still haphazard way in which these missionaries are sent and received and is another instance of the seriousness and vitality of the Churches of Asia.

POEM FOR RALPH LAWRENCE ON HIS ORDINATION TO THE PRIESTHOOD

F. Pratt Green

i

Here in our northern city, as snow falls
on a minster so old
It never escapes now disfigurement of
ladder and scaffold,
I offer a Dissenter's thanks for servants
of the Word made flesh,
And for yourself, already revered and
reverend, and wish
That York were Canterbury and I at your
priesting, to raise
My hand in schismatic blessing, my voice
in unity of praise.

ii

Today you kneel, in a cathedral rich in
prelatic ghosts,
With the young men who give all, not
knowing what all costs,
You, Christ's pensioner, whose only gift
is the precious little
That's left; not life's ashes at bedtime,
but a gay committal
To Christ of a lifetime's harvest and a
harvester's rest.
The youngest never gave himself with so
infectious a zest.

iii

Thinking to follow, from afar, the vows
a priest makes, I turn
In my boyhood's prayer-book to the Ordinal,
there to burn
My fingers on the dull ashes of a past
that has kept its heat
These fifty years. I hear again the bells
of Childwall calling
Across cornfields when my life lay fallow,
waiting for the falling
Seed of the Gospel, a high bell scolding
my Sabbath-sullen feet.

iv

How majestic the Te Deum! How tedious
the Litany! How old,
Older than God, the Rector! How warm a
hand in mine! How cold
The crumbling sandstone effigies! Say it
was a false start
Or firm foundation; that chance, or
providence, drew me apart
Into another sheep-fold, where, wanting
to give all,
I stumbled towards an ordination sans
bishop and sans cathedral.

v

Rashly I ask: down episcopal fingers
travels what grace
And authority? Is this magic? or the
Unfailing Source
Channelling Himself to us through swamp
and desert? Or nothing worse,
Or better, than the dressing-up in cope
and mitre of a commonplace
Process? Or is it true, as the Dissenter
in me contends,
That each of us is a priest on whom God
has laid His hands?

vi

Consider Cranmer; how, trapped between
Tudor patronage
And the Bloody Tower, he framed these
liturgies for an age
When words were the deadly swords men
fenced with. Without the least
Doubt he ordains you, in this rite, both
minister and priest—
A Genevan minister, a Roman priest,
which of us knows?
So well he cultivated his hybrid Anglican
rose!

vii

It troubles me that at worship's centre,
at Altar and Table,
The priesthood separates us, speaks only
discomfortable
Words, forbidding me to kneel with you
before Christ the Host,
Except by a circumvention. If I were to
invite you,
Would you kneel at my side? Should we be
able to break through
These impregnable positions, if we loved
to the uttermost?

viii

Small wonder He warned the Twelve a divided
house would fall;
But they, like us, were too busy disputing
their apostolical
Pretensions to listen. What conflicts,
waged in His name, besmirch
The unrepented centuries! How near to
falling is His House!
Is the sin yours or mine? Or are we all
without excuse?
Christ, by Thy Body broken, unite us, Thy
broken Church!

ix

A truce, then, to controversy. It is
prayer spans the abyss
Of our separation, is the deep therapy
that must cure this
Sickness of Christ's Body. Freed from
entanglement of words,
I pray for all who dispense Word and
Sacrament in the Lord's
Church; for all who seek out His sheep
that are dispersed abroad;
For all who, not following with us, serve
compassion's Lord.

x

Hearing you sing VENI, CREATOR SPIRITUS,
I confess
That all is mystery. The Spirit, blowing
where He lists,
Fans the weak flame of our faith into a
consuming fire
Of devotion, moves mountains of doubt, is
tireless when we tire,
Sets us apart for His use, with an iron
tenderness
Shapes our vocation like a potter the
clay resists.

xi

To be set apart is our benefit and dis-
ability. To some
We shall be ambassadors of a country alien
as Siam;
To some parasites, imposters, figures of
fun; to others
Fathers-in-God and confessors, fellow-
labourers and brothers-
In-Christ. And what are we? Ordinary
men seeking to please
God, whose haloes, hollow as crowns, do
not hide our unease.

xii

Ours is no sheltered life. After the
Dove's descent, the Devil
Waylays us in a wilderness where images
of good and evil
Are blurred. Though we shall never rig
a balance-sheet to cheat
An investor, or stand with the workless
in a hungry street,
Or sleep in beds of adultery, we shall
confuse stones
With bread, showmanship with sincerity,
pulpits with thrones.

xiii

Our voices ring out in a square chapel
audaciously, or echo
In gothic rafters with a more subtle
insistence, as the ego
Exalts itself in preaching. Like Jonah
in Nineveh, we enjoy
Our sadistic denunciations, are quick
to resent
A God less ready than we are to punish
or destroy,
Who patiently waits for a godless city
to repent.

xiv

Today, as priest, you receive that key
which unlocks the door
Of a confessional that to Christ's rebels,
and His unpriested poor,
Is never (I trust) locked. But, Lord,
the thing which confounds
Us is to be shown those running sores,
those self-inflicted wounds
We hide under gown and cassock; what
comforts us is to be
Both shepherd and sheep, offering, and
having need of, Thee.

xv

Once upon a peaceful time we should have
shepherded the flock
Of Christ by the still waters, in the
shadow of the Rock,
With the Wolf for adversary. Now, alas,
our Holy Land
Lies open to the invader; every outpost
must be manned
Along forgotten frontiers. Driven from
familiar pastures,
Our divided flock dwindles, miraculously
endures.

xvi

Surely this is a time to rejoice in, never
to bemoan!
Even in York, where masons are renewing,
stone by stone,
The great Church of Saint Peter, where
gargoyles keep their grimaces,
An unpredictable future boldly and
brashly replaces
The past. A new age beckons us from
inter-stellar spaces.
And shall not the Eternal God claim this
age as His own?

xvii

So wherever you go, my friend, whether
into the thick
Of the battle in the ding-dong streets of
a city parish,
Or to lovely decaying villages where men
also perish,
Or to the plum of a living plucked from
a suburban tree,
May the Lord bless you and keep you, and
may the angelic
Hosts watch over you, the blessed saints
be your company.

xviii

At last the ceremonious afternoon, the
priesting, ends;
And here, city and minster blotted out,
I quietly sit
In contemplation of that bond, closer
than between friends,
That mystical unity wherein every
Christian soul
(O make more tangibly effective, more
visibly whole!)
Abides in the One God, the Father, Son,
and Holy Spirit.

SHORTER SURVEY

John T. Wilkinson

IN his book *Introducing Old Testament Theology* (S.C.M. Press, 9*s.* 6*d.*) Dr J. N. Schofield, of Cambridge University, provides a brief and lucid treatment of the subject. Following the opening chapter on the nature and contents of the Old Testament comes a study of 'the God who acts' in creation and history and also of 'the God who speaks', particularly through the prophets. Next God's kinship with man is expounded and the final chapter is on the glory of God, His 'otherness', involving man's dependence upon Him. This book should be of great value both to preachers and laymen, especially if access to the larger works (of which several have recently been published) is difficult. In the series of Tyndale Commentaries, the first to be published for the Old Testament is *Proverbs: An Introduction and Commentary* (Tyndale Press, 8*s.* 6*d.*) by D. Kidner, Warden of Tyndale House Theological Research Library, Cambridge. Following a brief introduction there is a set of 'subject-studies' bringing together the teaching scattered throughout the book; at the end is a short concordance to facilitate reference to the text. In between is the verse-to-verse commentary, and the whole forms a useful manual for the expositor.

Two small books well worth notice are concerned with the 'Sermon on the Mount'. *The Challenge from the Mount*, by Ernest G. Loosley (Epworth Press, 10*s.* 6*d.*) is a useful exposition which focuses its thought upon the summons 'to repent', and so the Discourse is treated as embodying an open and prophetic challenge as Jesus begins His ministry. The second book is from the pen of Swami Prabhavananda, a renowned author of books on Hindu religion and philosophy, and is entitled *The Sermon on the Mount according to Vedanta* (Allen & Unwin, 16*s.*). This book interprets the Sermon, not, as most Western readers, in terms of 'a far-off scarcely attainable ideal', but as setting forth a practical programme of daily living and conduct, and extols its message as though it were a Scripture of the author's own tradition. It is a moving meditation by one who is neither a Christian nor, as he confesses, familiar with the interpretations of great Christian scholars.

Jeremy Taylor once declared that he would rather men should enjoy the sacrament than dispute about it. Differences of interpretation however would seem to be inevitable, though happily in recent days this discussion is marked by a more eirenical atmosphere than formerly. This spirit marks *The Eucharist in the New Testament*, by Norman Hook (Dean of Norwich) (Epworth Press, 16*s.*), the thesis of which is to establish that in the New Testament there is probably a single and coherent eucharistic doctrine. He argues that the Last Supper was an unorthodox Passover-feast, without a lamb; that the Dominical words (the Lukan-Pauline text) do not refer to the

person of the Lord, but the bread and wine are 'covenantal signs'. The Dean proceeds to show that 'in view of the Hebraic nature of the Fourth Gospel . . . and the clear association of its sixth chapter with the Passover background its realist language does not entitle us to think that its eucharistic doctrine is anything but the Hebraic doctrine of the Synoptists and of St Paul.' So the New Testament writings present 'a consistency of belief'. Divergence came later, when the language of John 6^{53-6} became dominant 'without the qualifying spiritual safeguards of verses 62 and 63'. By the time of Ignatius and Justin this realistic language had become commonplace and ever since has been a divisive influence in the Church. The Dean's final chapter deals with doctrinal implications with special reference to the doctrines of the Eucharistic Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice. This is a book which rightly demands careful study—not least in the interests of ecumenical concerns.

Primarily intended for theological students, *The Theology of Karl Barth: An Introduction*, by H. Hartwell (Duckworth's Studies in Theology, 15*s*.) provides as basically and simply as possible an exposition of the monumental writings of this greatest of all contemporary theologians. It contains an excellent summary of the achievements of Barth's theological position, together with the major aspects which are open to criticism. The extensive footnotes (at the end of each chapter) provide useful collected references to the discussion of the main doctrines scattered throughout the pages of *Church Dogmatics* and other writings. This is not an easy book, but is a reliable guide. *The Heidelberg Catechism for Today* (Epworth Press, 12*s*. 6*d*.) contains two studies from Barth's own pen and forms a fitting commemoration of the 400th anniversary of one of the classical documents of the Reformation and which (on November 15, 1563) in the hope of securing the unity of the church and its worship was declared by the Elector Frederick III of the Palatinate to be a confessional church order. This catechism became for centuries (and so far still remains) the manual of German, Dutch, Hungarian and Swiss Reformed Christians. It is a document which expresses 'a general evangelical comprehension'—'a positive statement of what Christians believe'. The first of these studies was a series of lectures delivered at the University of Bonn in 1947: the second was given to Swiss teachers of religion in 1938. Not only are these an exposition of this important Reformation document but they also afford a glimpse into Barth's own theology.

John Wyclif has long been a controversial figure in the history of the Christian Church. By some regarded as 'The Morning Star of the Reformation', a recent writer speaks of 'his catastrophic incompetence as a practical reformer'. A new volume entitled *John Wyclif and Reform* (Lutterworth Press, 25*s*.) by John Stacey (who is a Methodist minister) sets Wyclif upon the background of his time and attempts to show that whilst he could not achieve the things that Calvin and Luther were to do later on, his contribution as a formative influence was important. 'To look at Wyclif through post-Reformation eyes is the one temptation which must be resisted. . . . Enough that almost single-handed he should have established a bridge-head for the forces still to come'. Fully acquainted with Wyclif's Latin and English writings, Mr Stacey has given us a scholarly, well-balanced and eminently readable book.

Those who have read Dr V. H. H. Green's *The Young Mr Wesley* will welcome his recent work *John Wesley* (Nelson, 25*s*.) in which he gives an account of the whole life of Wesley, and in so doing provides a concise, clear and balanced one-volume study of the subject. Slight differences of emphasis appear, e.g. 'He did not emerge from the Aldersgate Street meeting a radically changed or altered man.... The characteristic features of his personality remained the same: his virtues and his weaknesses were unchanged' (p. 61). But the book reveals again the qualities of the author as historian and throughout its pages a lively interest is maintained. Wesley also finds a rightful place in a new American series entitled *A Library of Protestant Thought* in which 'the voices of Protestantism are allowed to speak for themselves, with only as much introduction, comment and exposition as will in fact allow them to do so'. In *John Wesley* (Oxford University Press, N.Y. 52*s*.) Professor A. C. Outler gathers together extensive and representative selections from Wesley's writings so as to provide an opportunity for exploring his mind at first-hand. Theological in its emphasis, this anthology falls into three sections: 'The Theologian self-interpreted'; 'Theological Foundations'; 'Theologies in Conflict'. Although not an original speculative theologian, 'Wesley's chief intellectual interest and achievement was in what one would call a folk-theology; the Christian message in its fulness and integrity, in "plain words for plain people" '. This massive volume of more than 500 pages shows the greatness of Wesley's contribution to Christian thought.

In the same *Library of Protestant Thought* is a further volume, the inclusion of which may seem a little surprising, but which is defended by the editor as 'to some extent an essay in Protestant self-criticism'. Entitled *The Oxford Movement* (Oxford University Press, N.Y., 50*s*.), it is edited by E. R. Fairweather, who believes that the Movement is 'partially akin to more or less contemporary movements in Lutheran and Reformed Christianity'. Some of the most essential documents for a first-hand study of the Movement, e.g. Keble's Sermon on National Apostasy, and also the 'Tracts for the Times', are not easily available, but this anthology virtually supplies all such essential sources. Lesser known but important writings are included, e.g. Ward's *Ideal of a Christian Church* and Robert Wilberforce's *The Doctrine of the Incarnation*, 'a great synthesis of Tractarian teaching'. Divided into five sections, this volume presents in accessible form the material necessary for any serious study of the origins of Anglo-Catholicism within the tradition of the Anglican Church.

The attainment of Dr Schweitzer's ninetieth birthday has naturally brought forth further studies of this remarkable, though often misunderstood, figure. *Albert Schweitzer: The Man and His Work*, by Werner Picht (Allen & Unwin, 45*s*.) is a study by one who has been his close friend for half a century. Of it the author writes: 'It is certainly not another attempt at a biography: it is instead an attempt at an adequate elucidation of the phenomenon Schweitzer, which has only too often been sentimentalized and obscured by uncritical affirmation' (p. 10). A book of deep insight, it nevertheless shows that 'reverence is not incompatible with criticism' and it may well be the best interpretation so far of this exceptional man. In the appendix there are two self-revealing sermons preached by Schweitzer at St Nicolai

Church, in Strassbourg, in 1906. A further work, *Schweitzer: His Life and Thought: Ninety Years on* (Religious Education Press, 10*s.* boards, 12*s.* 6*d.*), by Magnus Ratter, also a long-standing friend of Schweitzer, is an intimate and comprehensive study, though on a smaller canvas, of this remarkable man whom Churchill has described as 'the genius of humanity'. It could prove very useful for a study-circle.

In Body and Mind: Readings in Philosophy (Allen & Unwin, 52*s.*), the editor, E. N. A. Vesey, Lecturer in Philosophy in the University of London, has gathered together representative extracts from the writings of more than forty philosophers beginning with Descartes and reaching down to the present time. This collection is timely because 'the problem of the relation of body and mind . . . is coming to have a new significance with increasing awareness of the possibility of explaining differences in human behaviour in terms of the functioning of a material organ, the brain, and of constructing machines which simulate man's most treasured possession, intelligence' (p. 11). This volume is a source-book for the study of the history of this important problem, and students of philosophy should find it an admirable introduction to further reading.

Two printed lectures come to us from the University of London (The Athlone Press), each 4*s.* 6*d.* In *Man and Nature in the New Testament: Some Reflections on Biblical Ecology* (The Ethel M. Wood Lecture, 1964), Professor C. F. D. Moule argues that 'the Bible regards it as man's duty to use nature, not to abstain from using it; but that he must use it as a son of God and in obedience to God's will; and that his use or abuse of nature has far-reaching results in the whole structure of the world, inanimate as well as animate' (pp. 4-5). The John Coffin Memorial Lecture, 1963, by Canon E. F. Woods, of Downing College, Cambridge, entitled *Contemporary Cynicism* voices the concern that in our time 'if we become infected by pure cynicism, we may lose our spiritual lives. It is not a danger simply to some unimportant outworks of our personal life, but to its inner citadel' (p. 7). This penetrating study in the field of Christian ethics is based upon the conviction that 'contemporary cynicism is a threat to the human spirit far more in being an unrealized cynicism about God than in being an explicit cynicism about man'.

In this time when more universities are being established and colleges of advanced technology are being given university status, a booklet—*University and Humanity*, by Dr Alan Richardson (now Dean of York) (S.C.M., 2*s.* 6*d.*) is a salutary and thought-provoking reminder that 'a university is no university without the liberal arts' (quoted from the *Times* leading article, February 8, 1956). This is a necessary word well-spoken.

Several books of sermons deserve notice. In *Sowing and Reaping* (Epworth Press, 10*s.* 6*d.*), the distinguished theologian, Emil Brunner, in ten sermons delivered from the Fraumünster Church, Zurich, expounds some of the Parables of the Kingdom. It might well be used for bible-class teaching as well as providing material for the preacher. It has many new insights. Similarly *God's New Age: A Book of Sermons*, by Dr Nels F. S. Ferré (Epworth Press, 12*s.* 6*d.*) opens fresh interpretation of vital themes, in terms of startling simplicity. The main thought running throughout is that 'there is no real

hope for human beings or for history apart from the God who came as the fullness of time in the universal love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord'. To quote Donald Macleod, of Princeton: 'This is the preaching of an original mind and a radiant spirit.' The present writer's association with Dr Ferré during his exchange professorship in 1957 at Hartley Victoria College, Manchester, fully confirms this encomium. *The Anvil of Faith*, by W. H. Bridge (Epworth Press, 16*s*.) contains some twenty discourses preached to the congregation of the Central Methodist Church, Eastbourne—the general theme being inspired by a sentence quoted in John Buchan's *Memory Hold the Door*: 'The Faith is an anvil that has worn out many hammers.' These sermons reveal an energetic, clear and well-grounded proclamation of the Gospel. We note also *A Sangster Anthology* compiled by A. Clifford Morris (Epworth Press, 16*s*.) which will be warmly welcomed by very many people. It is a carefully chosen selection from which, for example, 'something might be picked up at the beginning of the day as a word of uplift and inspiration'. This hope of the compiler will undoubtedly be fulfilled.

Further material concerning the Anglican-Methodist Conversations continues to appear. In a privately printed monograph, *The Survival of Methodism*, J. Brazier Green presents in great detail an analysis of the nature of Methodism, and, as an alternative to the *Report* on the Conversations, urges 'the survival of Methodism exactly as it exists now but within the embrace of the Church of England, as an "Order" or "Society" devoted to certain aspects of Christian witness and service'. This alternative he suggests would follow the pattern in Wesley's mind, and would be 'the more excellent way'. *The Church of England and the Methodist Church: A Consideration of the Recent Anglican Methodist Report* which comes from a group of 'conservative evangelicals' in the Church of England is the fullest criticism yet evoked by the proposals for uniting the two churches. The strictures in this tract—and they are many—are answered in his inimitable way by Professor Gordon Rupp in *Consideration Reconsidered* (Epworth Press, 3*s*. 6*d*.).There are also additions to the series of *Conversation Booklets* (Epworth Press, 2*s*. each) as indicated in the list of 'Books Received'.

RECENT LITERATURE

Edited by John T. Wilkinson

The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, by D. S. Russell. (*The Old Testament Library Series.*) (S.C.M. Press, 60*s.*)

A few years ago Principal Russell, of the Northern Baptist College, Manchester, produced a small but useful work on the apocalyptic writings entitled *Between the Testaments*. He now gives a much ampler account which may well serve for years to come as the recognized book on this important subject. A generation or so ago, R. H. Charles was the industrious pioneer who did so much to place the pseudepigraphical writings in the hands of British scholars; and the two volumes of his famous Oxford edition have recently been reissued. But much has happened since they first made their appearance. The documents discovered at Qumran have thrown much light on the Jewish situation, and it is clear that the Qumranites themselves had a special interest in apocalypses. Moreover, a number of the judgements of Charles and his contemporaries have for various reasons been abandoned or modified. There was need for a new and definitive survey, and this D. S. Russell has admirably supplied.

His account of the apocalyptic literature takes the term with sufficient wideness to include *Jubilees, Psalms of Solomon* and other works which are not strictly apocalypses but are nevertheless usually included in surveys of this kind. Their characteristics and their origin are explained; and there is a particularly interesting chapter on 'apocalyptic inspiration' in which some of the psychological factors are discussed. A special section (pp. 40-8) is devoted to the Qumran texts and account is taken of their teaching throughout. In the latter part of the book the main themes and message of these writings are expounded under such headings as 'Angels and Demons', 'The Messianic Kingdom', 'The Son of Man' and 'Life after Death'. At various points he discusses foreign influence (especially in his final chapter) and maintains that Iranian influence has probably been greatly overestimated (p. 386); at the same time he believes that in some matters 'Greek influence is clearly to be detected'. He rightly stresses that what the Jews saw in other faiths led them to new developments in line with their own religious convictions. One cannot help wondering if the inclusion of Slavonic *Enoch* is justified. The author is aware of the weighty arguments in support of a date very much later than the first century A.D., but he gives 'the benefit of the doubt to the earlier dating' (p. 61), and there are some scores of references to this book scattered through the volume. W. F. Howard once wrote that the later dating was 'now generally seen to be beyond question'. Similarly Kirsopp Lake said that the arguments for a date not earlier than the seventh century were 'entirely convincing'. There is much to be said for disqualifying this work from any place in discussions of the period 200 B.C. to A.D. 100, in which the other books find their setting. The matter is not purely one of date, but affects doctrinal development. However, the author nearly always indicates the existence of different opinions in matters where scholars are disagreed; and the extensive references will enable students to pursue their own investigations and form their own conclusions. The book is in fact a mine of information on all the relevant themes, and one of its best features is the full and accurate documentation in numerous footnotes and

in the excellent 25-page bibliography topically arranged. Principal Russell has given us a most valuable book, showing wide research and sound judgement, and every Bible student will be well advised to have it on his shelves.

T. FRANCIS GLASSON

The Structure of Luke and Acts, by A. Q. Morton and G. H. C. Macgregor (Hodder & Stoughton, 21*s.*)

Type and History in Acts, by M. D. Goulder (S.P.C.K., 27*s.* 6*d.*)

Three Crucial Decades: Studies in the Book of Acts, by F. V. Filson (Epworth Press, 10*s.* 6*d.*)

Two of these books seem to me to do nothing to advance our understanding of Acts. It was, perhaps, inevitable that they should be written, but it is hardly necessary that they should be read. Mr Morton, having dealt with the problems of John and the Pauline Epistles, not unnaturally turns to Luke and Acts. Using the Proto-Luke hypothesis, he begins with the theory that Luke consists of a primary source (Proto-Luke), expanded by a new beginning and a 'secondary enlargement'. Since Acts was written by the same author, we may suppose that there was a corresponding Proto-Acts, similarly expanded. If not, he asks (twice, on pp. 12 and 23), Why not? Harnack's famous source-analysis (Mr Morton seems unaware of Dr Jeremias's refutation of a great part of it) is pressed into service here. But why did Luke combine his sources as he did? Because he was constrained by the space available in his papyrus roll. This far from new suggestion (up to a point entirely true) is elaborated in mathematical terms, on the ground that an editor would need to plan his material. The calculations made are held to correspond with source-divisions in the works under consideration; but not even the arithmetic can conceal the fact that the estimates of (original) paragraph lengths, and the isolation of emendations and the secondary source, are entirely subjective. Possibly New Testament scholars with mathematical qualifications (Mr Morton is not the only one) will be most sceptical of this kind of criticism. Mr Goulder follows a very different line, and applies to Acts the typological and numerological methods of exegesis made famous by his teacher Dr Farrar. His book is more readable than Mr Morton's, but if possible, even less convincing. The essence of his argument is that Luke, believing that Jesus Christ now lived in the Church, His body, represented the story of the Church as a series of cycles all following the same pattern, in which death and resurrection are the key (but not the only) events. With immense ingenuity, and persistent disregard of the principles of sound scholarship, these recurring features are discovered throughout Acts. The arguments employed are too often of the same order as Fluellen's trump card, 'There is salmoss in both'. Thus Eutychus falls down three storeys, 'as Christ had gone down three days into the tomb' (p. 50); the widows are fed 'by the inspired ministration of the Seven, as the multitude were fed in Numbers with quails from heaven' (p. 170); as Paul approaches 'the final passion, the fatal number four dogs his footsteps' (p. 217). Mr Goulder's reading in the literature of Acts seems to be limited; but far more serious than this is his forcing of evidence, for example, the Greek language. Wherever common words such as *egeirein* and *anistanai* occur they must suggest the resurrection of Christ; *krabatton* (*sic*) is described as a rare word, whereas it is merely low-class Greek; *eklegesthai* must be (to suit an argument) a 'strong' word. On p. 152 Mr Goulder will not (in Acts 2^9) follow Tertullian and Augustine in reading Armenia (in place of Judaea) because this is 'against all the MSS', but then (against all MSS., VSS., and fathers, but to fit his exegesis) he proceeds to dismiss 'Cretans and Arabians' as a 'scribal insertion' (p. 157). No: some typology there may be in Acts, but Mr Goulder's attempted demonstration

is wholly unconvincing. The third book, Dr Filson's, looks much less exciting than biblical arithmetic and typology, but it is far more profitable. To start at the lowest level, Dr Filson has at least taken the trouble to read classical and current literature on Acts, he knows Greek, and he practises historical and literary scholarship with honesty and ability. Under the headings: Scope, Purpose, Impact; Preaching and Teaching in the Apostolic Church; Peter and the Twelve; James and Jewish Christianity; Paul and the Gentile Mission, he covers most of the topics raised by the study of Acts. Inevitably he does so briefly, and he does not always have new observations to make—indeed, in comparison with the other two it is not the least merit of his book that it discloses no itch to be original. Dr Filson keeps on the whole to the middle of the road, holding that Luke really did intend to write history, and that in doing so he is not infallible but 'a generally dependable guide'. Particularly impressive is the discussion of the so-called 'Apostolic Decree' and the relation between Acts 15 and Galatians 2, which has certainly made me think again on a number of points, and may yet prove convincing. This is a book to read; the others are curiosities.

C. K. BARRETT

The Theology of the Samaritans, by John Macdonald (The New Testament Library Series). (S.C.M. Press, 60*s*.).

There has been in recent years a revival of interest in the ancient religion of the Samaritans, a community which has survived from Old Testament times to the present day and whose beliefs, though now largely fossilized, reveal a continuity of development over a period longer perhaps than in the case of any other religion. In this country the main centre of Samaritan researches has been the Semitics Department of the University of Leeds, where they were instigated by Professor J. Bowman (now of Melbourne). Dr Macdonald is a member of the staff of this Department and has been prominently associated with the development of Samaritan studies there. He has already published scholarly and valuable editions and discussions of some of the more important works of Samaritan literature, and in the present work he has opened up the whole subject to a much wider public. This is the first book ever written to be devoted wholly to the theology of the Samaritans, and as such it will deservedly take its place as an indispensable work of reference for students of both Old and New Testaments. A long introductory chapter traces the origin and history of the Samaritans and deals with the influences on their thought, with their literature and their creed. It shows clearly how different the Samaritans' own account of their origin and early history is from that with which we are familiar from the Old Testament. Their creed is shown to be based on five tenets of belief—in God, in Moses, in the Law, in Mount Gerizim, and in the day of punishment and reward. The main body of the work consists of a careful examination of the doctrines of this creed under the headings: God and the World; Moses, Lord of the World; The Life of Man in the World; Eschatology; The World to Come. Finally there is a valuable assessment of Samaritan religion, including a fascinating chapter on the parallelism between the Samaritans' belief in Moses and Christian belief in Christ. This is shown to be due largely to the influence exerted upon Samaritan thought by Christian teaching. The author concludes that Samaritanism is 'Israelite religion developed over two thousand five hundred years, with some aid from the Greek philosophies and, after the advent of Christianity, with considerable help from Christian teachings'. Indeed it 'reads in a great many respects like a half-way point between Israelite religion and Christianity'.

OWEN E. EVANS

Essays on New Testament Themes, by E. Käsemann. (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 41.) (S.C.M. Press, 18*s*.)

Studies of the Historical Jesus, by E. Fuchs. (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 42.) (S.C.M. Press, 21*s*.)

Both volumes are translations of collections of essays already published in German. Professor Käsemann's range in date from 1947 to 1953, and he confesses that he would now reformulate much that is in them. He fears that the English reader may find their radical probing very provocative. Perhaps; but what he will certainly find is lucid argument and many illuminating reflections. The problem of the historical Jesus (ch. 1) arises, we are told, because 'the exalted Lord has almost entirely swallowed up the image of the earthly Lord and yet the community maintains the identity of the exalted Lord with the earthly'. A detailed life of Jesus is out of the question, yet 'there are still pieces of the Synoptic tradition which the historian has to acknowledge as authentic'. Biblical miracles, studied in ch. 2, are signs and not objective proofs. The ministry in the NT (ch. 3) is traced from the Pauline concept of *charisma*, to the abandonment of this view under the pressure of Gnosticism and the acceptance of the Catholic idea of an institutional ministry guaranteed by tradition and legitimate succession (in the Pastorals and Acts). The onset of early Catholicism is further demonstrated in a study of faith, heresy and eschatology in 2 Peter (ch. 8). The Pauline doctrine of the Lord's Supper is the subject of ch. 5, where it is seen as a deliberate rejection of the notion that it is a guarantee of salvation. In ch. 6 the passage in Acts 19^{1-7} concerning disciples of John at Ephesus is used as clue to Luke's theological presuppositions, for it is held that they lead here to a reshaping of the historical material. In ch. 7 it is argued that Colossians 1^{15-20} is a primitive Christian baptismal liturgy. In the second volume Professor Fuchs, an authority on hermeneutics, presents ten essays (1956 to 1960) most of which reflects this his dominant interest (e.g. What is a Language-event?; Translation and Proclamation; The Essence of the 'Language-event' and Christology). The longest, on Jesus's Understanding of Time, is an enquiry into the teaching of Jesus. This is a highly important volume conveying profound insights; but unfortunately they are buried in much obscurity! 'The certainty of faith is rather the consequence of faith in faith, not after faith'; and three pages farther on: 'As is well known, demythologizing does not mean rationalizing, but derationalizing of those mythical statements which, as mythology, have already fallen victim to rationalization'; and so we continue. If the translator had been allowed to summarize the aim and argument of the essays he would have placed us much farther in his debt.

A. W. HEATHCOTE

The Meaning of Sanctorum Communio, by Stephen Benko. (S.C.M. Press, 16*s*.)

The Virgin Birth in the Theology of the Ancient Church, by Hans von Compenhausen. (S.C.M. Press, 12*s*. 6*d*.)

These are two further contributions in the series, *Studies in Historical Theology*, of which Jeremias's monograph on Baptism was the first. It is surprising that no detailed treatment of the Credal reference to 'the communion of the saints' has previously existed. In this admirably presented thesis Dr Benko seeks to establish that *communio sanctorum* must be understood as neuter and not personal. It refers, he argues, to participation in the sacraments and he claims that, although only a few contemporary theologians (mostly patrologists) seriously consider this interpretation it is both historically correct and theologically preferable. The first part is a historical examination in which much that is of great interest is said about the development of the third section of the Creed. He sees entrance into the Creed

of the clause under examination as the outcome of thought about post-baptismal sins and the relation of the Eucharist to forgiveness. Secondly a detailed linguistic study of *sanctus* (or, rather *sancta*) and *communio* is made; by this he claims to provide strong support for the argument of the first part. A summary of medieval and modern interpretation shows, among other things, how vague has often been the to us more familiar personal interpretation. It is to be hoped that scholarly examination will be given to this thesis.

There has been no lack of previous writing about the Virgin Birth. Hans von Campenhausen limits his study to the development of teaching about the Virgin Birth from the New Testament times to Ambrose and Augustine. The main interest of this work lies in its sorting out of different attitudes towards the significance of the Virgin Birth. The author finds distinction between the theological interest of Luke and the apologetic concern of Matthew. He traces the influence of these views in Ignatius and Justin and their coming together in Irenaeus. There are valuable chapters on the influence of ascetic thought and the dogmatic developments in the West.

FREDERIC GREEVES

Myth and Reality, by Mircea Eliade. (Allen & Unwin, 16*s*.)

This book is the latest addition to that excellent and stimulating series known as *World Perspectives*. The author, Professor Mircea Eliade, is well known among students of religion for his numerous books discussing the importance of myth both for an understanding of religion, and for the apprehension of Reality. He treats of myth, of course, not as the word is popularly understood, i.e. as 'fiction', and therefore something that cannot be true, but rather as the word is understood by ethnologists, sociologists and historians of religions, i.e. as 'sacred tradition', 'primordial revelation', 'exemplary model'. Understood in this way, myth, as experienced in archaic societies is 'true history' because it is 'sacred history', and because it always deals with realities. The foremost function of myth is to reveal the exemplary models for all human rites and all significant human activities. Having dealt with the structure of myths, Professor Eliade deals in turn with myths as they are concerned with creation, renewal, eschatology, time, being and history. He shows how it is through myth that 'the world can be apprehended as a perfectly articulated, intelligible and significant Cosmos'. For where myth is a living force, the knowledge of the myth and its ritual re-enactment gives a sense of participation in the sacred, and this brings meaning and value to daily life. Myths reveal that the World, man and life have a supernatural origin and history, and this history is significant, precious and exemplary. Regarding the important question of the relation between Christianity and mythical thought, Professor Eliade claims that, though Christianity is rooted in history, mythical elements abound in the Gospels. Furthermore, Christianity early assimilated symbols, figures and rituals of Jewish or Mediterranean origin. In proclaiming the incarnation, resurrection and ascension, Christians are employing the categories of mythical thought. The recognition of this in no way detracts from Christianity, for myth, properly understood, is the very language of religion.

D. HOWARD SMITH

Church or No Church? by Reginald Kissack. (Epworth Press, 16*s*.)

The Doctrine of the Church, edited by Dow Kirkpatrick. (Epworth Press, 25*s*.)

Mr Kissack is uneasy about the Anglican-Methodist proposals and disturbed by current ecumenical trends; that, I think, is why this book has been written. Originally given as lectures to Waldensians and Methodists in Rome, it claims to be 'a historic study of how the Methodists have thought, either directly, or (more

often) indirectly, about the Church', but it is more than that. The core of the book is a compressed account of Methodist thinking through two centuries. We proceed from 1727 to 1937, spending most of the time with John Wesley, but much of it with Alfred Barrett, Benjamin Gregory, and Hugh Price Hughes, all interesting companions. The last two chapters are controversial. What is called 'Federal' Ecumenism is strongly preferred to what is designated 'Catholic' Ecumenism. In my opinion, Mr Kissack is over-optimistic about the former and unduly critical of the latter. There is a minor error in a footnote on page 103, where it is stated that Conference consists of ministers and laymen in equal numbers 'elected by lay and ministerial members of Synods voting together'. What, I wonder, is the justification of an opinion expressed on page 115? Complaining that the pastor does not have enough authority, Mr Kissack comments: 'This is less the fault of the theology of the Deed of Union, than of the practice that gives the laity a perhaps over-weighted share in the stationing of ministers.'

The volume edited by Dow Kirkpatrick has been prepared under the direction of the World Methodist Council. It consists of eleven papers presented to the 1962 Oxford Institute on Methodist Theological Studies. There is one non-Methodist contributor, Dr C. H. Dodd, who writes on 'The Biblical Doctrine of the People of God'. The other papers come equally from British and American Methodists (assuming that Philip Watson is American by adoption); they deal with the Ministry, the Reformation, Baptism, Confirmation, Ordination, the Lord's Supper, Discipline, Unity, and the Church and Modern Man. The contributors from this side of the water are C. K. Barrett, E. Gordon Rupp, H. J. Cook, A. Raymond George and Frederic Greeves; these names should suffice to show that the book contains careful and stimulating essays.

J. LESLIE WEBB

Truth as Encounter, by Emil Brunner. (S.C.M. Press, 22*s.* 6*d.*)

'"Truth as Encounter" is a concept of truth unknown to philosophy and science. In this book it receives its first expression and systematic formulation.' With these confident words Dr Brunner begins a fifty-page introduction to a republication of his 1937 lectures, published here in 1943 as *The Divine-Human Encounter*. This new introduction shows how his subsequent work was a development of the same theme. Brunner claims to have established a way of thought which avoids the two errors of Objectivism and Subjectivism which, he holds, have led Christianity astray from the post-New-Testament period until today. The Reformation was a brief moment of insight, followed by a rapid return to error. The new introductory chapters make no attempt to reply to criticisms of Encounter-theology. Believing that the best defence is attack, Brunner accuses Barth of deserting 'the insight of Luther, that "God and faith belong together"' by (among other alleged false steps) adopting 'the ancient Catholic doctrine' of the Virgin Birth and basing his *Dogmatics* upon the doctrine of the Triune God. Bultmann, through connection with Heidegger, mutilates the New Testament witness to Jesus Christ. Brunner, who emphasises the responsibility laid upon Christians to engage in philosophy, is confident that his own interpretation of Christian faith is based upon neither philosophical nor theological premises but is self-authenticating and plainly biblical. The merits and the defects of Brunner's life-work are manifest in this book. It would be a pity if criticism prevents current discussion of a theology which is firmly Christocentric. Incidentally, Brunner exemplifies the fact that theologians are usually on firmer ground in their affirmations than they are in their denials.

FREDERIC GREEVES

Gospel and Church, by Gustaf Wingren. (Oliver and Boyd, 50*s*.)

Whilst this volume is intelligible in itself, it is the climax and completion of Wingren's massive work on preaching (*The Living Word*) and his *Creation and Law*. Repetition partly accounts for the length and cost of this profound study in biblical theology, but the author ranges widely over the central themes of the Gospel and the Church. In so doing certain emphases stand out. He believes that it is essential to regain the primacy of the Sacrament of Baptism, to understand the Gospel against the background of Creation and the Law, to recognize the supreme importance of Preaching and to see the Word as creative of the Church and the law of God as the motivating force in man's daily work. (Wingren is also the author of the best modern work on Vocation). These inter-twined themes are discussed with equal attention to Scripture and the present situation of the world and the Church. Whilst there is reference to English writers, there is debate with Scandinavian authors whose work is little known here. Superficially this book may appear far from discussions that are current among us at this time, but in fact, at many points, Wingren speaks to these controversies. It would be a pity if the cost of this book and its leisurely method prevent British readers from paying attention to this distinguished Swedish theologian. There is much here about the Gospel itself and about the life and mission of the Church which is all the more timely because it is not chained to passing fashions of thought. Too few theologians are attempting a biblically-based theology which is also contemporary and directed to existing needs; we cannot afford to ignore one who is so doing.

FREDERIC GREEVES

A New Introduction to Moral Theology, by Herbert Waddams. (S.C.M. Press, 16*s*.)

Canon Waddams has attempted to write for the non-specialist and succeeds in being readable. Whether he succeeds in providing an introduction to moral theology is to be questioned. He begins with trenchant criticisms of Lutheran criticism of Roman moral theology (Thielicke) and of views represented by Lehmann and C. D. Moule. It may be doubted whether this is the best way to introduce his readers to the theme of this book. It is much more difficult to be sure what the author himself considers to be the nature and role of moral theology, which he wishes to distinguish from Christian ethics. His discussion of the question about natural (moral) law helpfully brings out different meanings given to this concept; I hope I am not unfair in saying that it is difficult to know precisely what he himself means by it. His chapter on conscience has usefully absorbed the teaching of C. A. Pierce, though it fails to do justice to all the implications of that important study. There is a lengthy but, by now, somewhat familiar criticism of H. A. Williams. Most of the book consists of examination of specific moral problems. There is much that is interesting in these pages. But upon what basis the author reaches his conclusions is not always easy to see. He often begins by setting forth pronouncements by individuals and by denominational 'authorities'. These he criticizes and he offers his own answers. Some of these appear a little naïve and others highly questionable. He makes much of man's power to choose between right and wrong and seems to hanker after generally accepted moral principles, although he has shown that these no longer exist. It is not uncharacteristic that he should say that the questions whether man is totally depraved, retains power of choice 'by an immediate act of God's grace', or retains some power of discerning truth from a lie are (or as he puts it 'is') 'academic'. The effect, he writes, is the same. As one Christian's expressions of opinion about some of the

more obvious moral questions this book invites study. As a contribution to the difficult but necessary task of establishing a moral theology for non-Roman Christians today it is somewhat disappointing.

FREDERIC GREEVES

Faith and the Philosophers, edited by John Hick. (Macmillan & Co. Ltd, 35*s*.)

This book contains papers read at Princeton in 1962 at a colloquium of philosophers and theologians—Protestants plus two American Jesuits. Each symposium is opened by a philosopher: others reply and there are short extracts from the recorded discussions. The topics and speakers are well chosen and three at least of the four symposia are of very great interest. (1) H. H. Price (Oxford) reflects on the position of a philosopher who realizes 'with surprise perhaps' that he cannot help believing in God. His statement is at the same time very Biblical and very empirical. He attacks recent views which seem to him to deny the existence of 'the inner life'—without which there would be no religion at all. Virgil Aldrich (Kenyon College) argues that Price has misunderstood these discussions of 'the inner life', and insists that Wittgenstein was correct in holding that the inner life is empty unless it connects with public behaviour. (2) William Alston (Ann Arbor) asks whether Freudian explanations of how we come to hold religious beliefs, can or must shed doubt on their validity. He concedes (in various asides that only *look* unimportant) that Freudian explanations could undermine faith: but concludes in principle that they do not touch the question of the truth of religious beliefs. This must be settled by examining *reasons*. Norman Malcolm (Cornell) thinks it is 'unrealistic' to speak of reasons here. Belief in God has and needs no reasons. (3) Alasdair MacIntyre (Oxford) asks whether the unbelieving critics of religion can be supposed to grasp the concepts of religion. Do anthropologists understand the Azande and the Kachin? How it is that beliefs which seem to us utterly incoherent did not seem so in the Middle Ages? MacIntyre believes that Christian concepts once expressed a distinctive morality relevant to life. He claims that this is no longer the case—although admitting that it was the case in Germany under the Nazis. (Too close to be comfortable!) (4) Brand Blanshard (Yale) delivers an indignant attack on Barth's irrationalism: two Princeton theologians reply.

KARL BRITTON

Music and Holiness, by Charles Cleall. (Epworth Press, 12*s*. 6*d*.)

From very early in his book, Mr Cleall gives the impression of being a strict Evangelical and fundamentalist. The present reviewer accordingly approached the book with great reserve, expecting to find it a restatement of the usual 'puritan' philistinism, with aesthetic values so subordinated to moral and spiritual ones that any sentimental horrors would be held justified if they were serviceable in the salvation of souls. But it proved quite otherwise. Mr Cleall does indeed strictly subordinate the aesthetic to the moral and the spiritual, but in quite a different way. He is very far from holding that the religious value of music lies in persuading people into church and then softening them up for the Gospel by a mawkish bawling of 'well-loved tunes' in 'a good sing'. Quite the contrary, he is even prepared to accept the sneer that 'what musicians are after is beautiful music in an empty church', if beautiful church music cannot be had on any other terms. Church music is for the impersonal, objective, worship of God; and for this nothing but the best, and (what Mr Cleall rightly insists may be another thing) the truly religious, music will do. Hence in church only plainsong, the simpler Bach, and music in that tradition, can be allowed: the more elaborate parts of

Bach are suspect, Purcell is altogether too secular, Verdi is 'positively ungodly'; and attempts to Christianize jazz and jive, however evangelistically intended, are no more than aids to young people for indulging in disguised sexual orgies. Unmusical members of the congregation need not and should not often attempt to sing: if the music is beyond their competence, they should 'join in silently' while the experts praise the Lord worthily. The present reviewer has nothing but approval for these fully Catholic conclusions, though he was amazed to watch them emerging from so Evangelical a background; besides, he thoroughly enjoyed seeing them presented in a really hard-hitting argument. This book may not much affect the pundits: it is too short and too readable for that—not to mention its spiky theology, its occasional lapses of scholarship and even of good sense, and the shallowness (though width) of the reading behind it. Yet it is an important book. It opens up a fresh line of thought, and puts a firm foot down upon much current nonsense.

JOHN F. BUTLER

The Secular Promise, by Martin Jarrett-Kerr. (S.C.M. Press, 18*s*.)

This is the sixth book in the *Christian Presence* series, which is based on the conviction that the contemporary world offers Christians, if they will look at it from inside, a unique opportunity of demonstrating and understanding their Gospel. Father Jarrett-Kerr's area is secular humanism; his qualifications are wide reading in the human sciences and modern literature, openness and zest. After a critical survey of the claim to autonomy in modern social and ethical studies, he comes to the nub; the nigger in the humanist woodpile is Freud; and against the facile euphoria of the neo-Freudians and the general humanist confidence in social engineering, what Freud discloses of the anarchic and rebellious in man is confirmed by the 'lie-detectors' of any culture, the imaginative artists. Or rather the works of art, since the artist may deceive himself. The proof of the pudding lies in the reading (looking and listening also) which the author suggests. The pudding itself requires a deal of mastication. It is a bewildering hotch-potch of quotations, fascinating in themselves but hardly integrated; fewer ingredients and more cooking would have made a better book. But it is still an admirable introduction to an area where Christians tend to be ignorant and on the defensive. Of many disturbing and exciting issues, perhaps the most important is that raised by the series as a whole: does repudiation of an earlier 'war-dance over the symbolic corpse of humanism' (p. 184) spring from loss of nerve, or from a true theology of creation?

J. P. M. SWEET

The Nature of Healing, by Arthur Guirdham. (George Allen and Unwin, 28*s*.)

In 1957 Dr Guirdham, who, with first-rate qualifications, has practised psychiatry for thirty years, published his book, *A Theory of Disease*, which I found not only interesting but fascinating. But I am disappointed in this book. It is of value in that it asserts that 'there are innate gifts of healing which function independently of the science and art of medicine', but it quite fails to sustain its main thesis that all such healing 'occurs on the plane of the soul and in a timeless medium'. The margins of my copy are strewn with question marks. For instance it is said: 'There is evidence that the majority of natural healers are women.' Where? and what evidence? Further, the author never seems to have heard of 'odic force' or 'radiaesthetic energy' or be familiar with the literature on this relevant subject. Again: 'The Church has taught for centuries that men can be changed radically in the course of a single lifetime.... No one dealing with the sick could possibly

entertain such an illusion.' (p. 41) Why? The very opposite has been proved repeatedly, as many who deal with the sick would agree. The Anglican Church is praised for being 'open minded on the subject of healing' (p. 53) but, says the author, 'some of the Free Churches have plunged back into the waters of Jordan with frenzied splashings. . . .' Which? The Free Churches, and especially the Methodist Church, have guarded and emphasized the Church's ministry of healing for thirty years and have led all the Churches in this field. In a footnote on p. 161 the author refers to the Church of England and adds pathetically: 'I am unfamiliar with healing as practised by other sects.' One wonders whether an author should write on a subject about which he knows so little. In regard to Christ we are told (p. 55) that, 'He Himself was, more than all others, divested of human personality.' I should have said that more than all others He revealed and expressed human personality. On p. 56 we are told: 'It is impossible to organize religion.' John Wesley's Class Meetings triumphantly deny that nonsense. On the next page we read, 'The latent homosexuality associated with clericalism . . . which was so strong a feature of Christianity, rendered the Church all the more hostile to anything initiated, conducted and achieved by women.' My comment is 'Nonsense!' Much in the book is deduced from the writer's acquaintance with four unqualified 'healers'. All are women. One I know myself. I am amazed that such a scholarly scientist as the author should base important deductions on *four* cases. Would the *British Medical Journal* think such a slender basis adequate for any worth-while conclusions? The book contains much of interest. The acceptance of the idea of reincarnation interested me. 'This girl was reliving in her dreams an experience from a past life' (p. 97). This girl acquired her enlightened attitude to religion in some previous experience of life' (p. 98; cf. pp. 104 and 126). But the author gives none of the evidence for reincarnation. The basic idea seems to be that what the author calls 'natural healing' is a process, induced by a gifted and unusual healer, by which we enter the sphere of 'universal mind' and recover wholeness. 'We accept its living presence and return to our original essence' (p. 145). But I found the idea vague and nebulous and the book full of the marks of ignorance about religion (e.g. the nature of faith on p. 153) and about the whole subject labelled: 'Spiritual Healing.' Incidentally our author will have nothing to do with co-operation between parson and doctor (p. 168), a co-operation becoming more and more significant as is illustrated by one new 'Institute of Religion and Medicine' of which the Archbishop of Canterbury is president.

Almost the author's last sentence is: 'It is quite possible that my views on these matters may change. I have only thought on these lines for a couple of years.' Let us hope for such a change, for two years thought is a frail basis for the dogmatisms of 180 pages at 28s.!

LESLIE D. WEATHERHEAD

Automation and the Future of Man, by S. Demczynski. (Allen & Unwin, 32*s*.)

Planning Prosperity, by Ronald Brech. (Darton, Longman & Todd, 25*s*.)

Mr Demczynski has written a most unusual, and stimulating, book. He describes clearly the actual and potential abilities of computers and electronic self-regulating machines; arguing that they are the tools of a second Industrial Revolution that will be, economically and socially, genuinely revolutionary. But what he is basically concerned with is the relationship between man and machine in the approach to the revolution. He ranges widely, taking into his survey, among many other things, psychosomatic illness, disarmament, advertising, and ideological conflict. He is level-headed about computers. They can perform the lower mental functions with tremendous speed and accuracy. In centuries to come they may, over a wide but

still defined range, be superior to human brains; but are not likely ever to give a comparable all-round performance. Yet the questions he is perpetually asking are: 'What is the purpose of economic progress?' and 'What is the true nature of man?' He touches briefly on the anti-science of religion. He concludes that 'it is love and co-operation which are the natural modes of existence of mindful creatures, living at the stage of development where the effects of cultural revolution prevail over their purely biological counterparts'. There is something here for the theologian to get his teeth into.

Planning Prosperity sticks more closely to economics, but it deals with the same basic question. Mr Brech's explicit intention is to argue that material prosperity can be planned, and to show how. He does so with a refreshing disrespect for the sacred cows of the nineteenth century economics of scarcity. (The new economics is becoming the moderately cheerful science). For the most part his method is descriptive, so that the argument can be grasped with ease by the non-specialist in economics. Even the analytical Chapter 3, on the dynamic economic model, is fully intelligible. In effect, he says that when we compare what the academic theorists tell us about how and why the economy works with what actually happens the chastening truth is that there are a terrible lot of things of which we are disgracefully ignorant. But his conclusion is that, in the last analysis, all depends on integrity; practised as well as preached. 'The Christian way of life must not run away from (technological progress) but learn to dominate it—to use it for the benefit of mankind and for the glory of God'.

EDWARD ROGERS

Living Standards, by Edward Rogers. (S.C.M. Press, 9*s.* 6*d.*)

When Jesus was born there were approximately 150 millions living on our planet; in 1961 there were 3,000 millions; by the end of the century there will be 6,000 millions. Anyone who is interested in such facts and concerned with the problems involved should make a careful study of *Living Standards*. Mr Rogers is able to write about the hungry millions without losing sight of the individual. He sees the need for political action on a world scale without neglecting personal responsibility. He deals with the whole man, recognizing the individual's basic need of 2,500 calories a day and 200 dollars a year, at the same time asserting the ultimate necessity of a personal response to a personal Saviour. Wesley first set Methodists the task of translating perfect love into terms of social responsibility; Mr Rogers has done a lot of the homework for us, but leaves us in no doubt as to the stupendous nature of the tasks facing the world. Yet it is not a depressing book as so many of the books and articles on the population explosion are. He does not believe the problem is intractable and recognizes that economics and education are as much a part of God's purpose as evangelism. There is a particular obligation upon the Christian to study world problems as well as the New Testament if he is to express the will of God in this little overcrowded planet. In these days when *Christian Aid* has become an integral part of local ecumenical activity, a book such as this is doubly welcome for it underlines the true motives of *Christian Aid* at the same time recognizing its limitations. It should be compulsory reading for the organizers of local Christian Aid efforts. The artist who designed the dust-cover catches the spirit of the book with the portrait of a hungry child with out-stretched hand against the background of the mounting graph of world population and world hunger. It is a book about millions of individuals trying to live in a small world. It deserves the widest possible circulation. *Living Standards* is published in America under the title *Poverty on a Small Planet.*

BERNARD E. JONES

Education in Sierra Leone, by D. L. Sumner (The Government of Sierra Leone. 21*s.*); obtainable from The Crown Agents, 4 Millbank, London, S.W.1.

The author's intention in writing this book is 'the systematic presentation of facts relating to the development of Education in Sierra Leone'. No large-scale work on this topic has been undertaken and the author has assembled his materials over a period of fourteen years. Using hitherto unpublished material from many sources (which adds to the historical as well as educational value of this book) he surveys in great detail the advance of Education from the founding of the Colony of Sierra Leone in 1787 to 1950. He begins with the first efforts of education made by the Africans who landed in Sierra Leone in 1792 and were quick to establish classes for the instruction of their children. He notes that wherever religious worship was instituted by these Negro converts some educational effort was also set on foot. The book traces methodically the various stages in the control of education; the period 1787-1868 is called 'the Period of Philanthropy' when education was in the hands and by the goodwill of the Missionary Societies with little or no Government control. With introduction of Government grants-in-aid in 1868 the period of 'Incipient Government Action' begins, and continues until 1909. It is followed by a period of intensified Government control which in 1928 reached a stage of complete governmental control of education throughout Sierra Leone. The history of Fourah Bay College (now the University of Sierra Leone) is depicted in all its changes of status and location, and in its impact upon the educational life of the country. Every aspect of education and educational policy is given careful historical consideration and its development shown clearly in this book. A series of useful appendices gives sketches of the lives of important contributors to education in Sierra Leone, and also the text of the major Education Ordinances from 1867 onwards. Tables of Educational Statistics and maps add to the interest and usefulness of the book, as do a meticulously presented index and bibliography. Mr Sumner has succeeded admirably in his aim of systematic presentation of facts and in doing so has produced a book which for many years may well be the standard in this field. He has also given us a fascinating account which will be of absorbing interest to educationalists and non-educationalists alike.

DOUGLAS H. PRESCOTT

Josiah Stamp—Public Servant—The Life of the First Baron Stamp of Shortlands, by J. Harry Jones. (Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons Ltd, 50*s.*)

The format of the book and the literary style are a worthy vehicle for the story of an outstanding man, who lived at a time when great issues emerged, and whose contribution was of incalculable value. It is the story of service to the community, and of personal achievements from boy clerk to Surveyor of Taxes, member of Royal Commissions and European committees, from civil servant to chairman of industrial concerns and director of the Bank of England. Lord Stamp became the greatest authority in the country on economic statistics, and by 1929 was 'universally acclaimed in the English-speaking world'. It was in the nineteen-twenties that his greatest opportunities came. There were problems of taxing wealth arising out of the war, the magnitude of the national debt, and the need to investigate the general financial position. 'The Committee without Stamp would have been like Hamlet without the Prince.' The supreme task of his life came when he shared in the preparation of the Dawes Report on Reparations. Great patience and skill as a negotiator were required. There was a more severe struggle when the Young Committee met for the revision of the Dawes arrangements and for a final settlement of the reparation problem. By those who knew, Stamp was regarded as the saviour of Europe.

In the record of great achievements, the man himself is revealed. For him, Christianity was a reality; religion was the heart of life; religion and science were part of an organic whole, though the economist and the Puritan were sometimes in conflict. The centre of life was the family, and it is very fitting that the book should end with the simple statement: 'Lord and Lady Stamp, together with their eldest son, Wilfred, were killed in their own home by an enemy bomb.' A filial tribute is added as an epilogue.

FRANK M. KELLEY

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

The Expository Times, October 1964. (75th Anniversary Number).
James Hastings, by the late Prof. A. J. Gossip.
Old Testament Survey, 1939-64, by G. Anderson.
New Testament Survey, 1939-1964, by A. M. Hunter.
Theology, 1939-1964, by Bp. Stephen Neill.
The Key to Pauline Theology, by J. Jeremias.

The Expository Times, November 1964.
Second Thoughts: VII. Papyrus Finds, by N. Turner.
Theologians of our Time: XVIII: The Theology of Emil Brunner, by D. Cairns.
Nottingham, 1964, by A. Marcus Ward.

The Expository Times, December 1964.
Life After Death: I. The Modern Situation, by Vincent Taylor.
Extremism without Extremity, by Nels F. S. Ferré.
Important Moral Issues: IX. Race, by F. B. Welbourn.

Harvard Theological Review, October 1964.
Gnosticism, by A. D. Nock.
The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert, by F. M. Cross, Jr.
Prolegomena to a Dissolution to the Problem of Suffering, by G. D. O'Brien.
Ordination and Appointment in the Period of the Temple, by H. Mantel.
Ezeekial viii. 17: A Fresh Examination, by N. M. Sarna.
Some Problems in John Milton's Theological Vocabulary, by W. B. Hunter, Jr.
Cranmer as a Nominalist: *sed contra*, by W. J. Courtenay.

Hibbert Journal, Autumn 1964.
Existentialism: Five papers.
New Testament Studies: Recent Books.
A Forgotten Children's Book (Mrs. Barbauld's *Hymns in Prose for Children*).

International Review of Missions, October 1964.
The Three Selves Formula, by P. Beyerhaus.
Indigenization in the African Church, by W. H. Crane.
A Dynamic and Flexible Form of Ministry, by Olav Hanssen.
The Middle Way: The Reality of the Unreal, by T. N. Callaway.
What is the Gospel, by Markus Barth.

Interpretation, October 1964.
Creating an Opening: Biblical Criticism and the Theological Curriculum, by Robert W. Funk.
The Rider on the White Horse: A Study of Rev. vi. 1-8, by M. Rissi.
Divine Commitment and Human Obligation: The Covenant Theme, by D. N. Freedman.
Interpretation in Faith: The Theological Responsibility of an Old Testament Commentary, by B. S. Childs.
Sign and Sacrament: John vi, by V. Ruland, S.J.
Interpretation in Contemporary Theology: IV. Paul Tillich and the Bible, by G. E. Foley.

Studies in Philology, July 1964.
The *Cursor Mundi* and Herman's *Bible*: Some Additional Parallels, by P. Buehler.
On the Mode and Meaning of Traherne's Mystical Poetry: 'The Preparative', by A. L. Clement.
Restoration Comedy as Drama of Satire: An Investigation into Seventeenth Century Aesthetics, by C. O. McDonald.
Coleridge and Milton, by Elizabeth T. McLaughlin.
Blake's Lost Letter to Hayley (4th Dec., 1804), by G. M. Harper.

Studies in Philology, October 1964.
Chaucer and the *Thebaid* Scholia, by P. M. Clogan.
Three Spanish Translations of Epictetus, by D. G. Castanier.
The Function of the 'Infant-Eye' in Traherne's Poetry, by H. G. Ridlon.
The Nature of Milton's *Moscovia*, by J. R. Gleason.
Defoe's Theory of Fiction, by M. E. Novak.
The Sad Wisdom of the Mariner, by A. M. Buchan.

Scottish Journal of Theology, December 1964.
Kant's View of Immortality, by A. C. Ewing.
Time, Eternity and Contemporaneity with Christ, by A. R. Gualtieri.
The Theatre of Parouisa, by S. Smalley.
The Symbolic Theology of Paul Tillich, by H. D. McDonald.
In Common Honesty, by A. A. T. Ehrhardt.
The New Testament Doctrine of Ktisis, by G. W. H. Lampe.
Exposition of Isaiah i. 1-9, by D. R. Jones.

Theological Education (Vo. I. No. 1. Autumn 1964).
The Theologian and the World of Contemporary Thought, by Stanley D. Frost.
The Christian Minister and the Social Problem of the Day, by G. W. Webber.
The Academic Teacher and the Practical Needs of the Clergy, by J. Bright.
The Seminary—Academy and Chapel, by J. Robert Nelson.

BOOKS RECEIVED

ALLEN & UNWIN: Werner Picht, *Albert Schweitzer: The Man and his Work*, pp. 288, plates, 45*s*. A Guirdham, *The Nature of Healing and Extra-Sensory Phenomena*, pp. 181, 28*s*. Joel Goldsmit, *Spiritual Interpretation of Scripture*, pp. 235, 15*s*. Mircea Eliada, *Myth and Reality*, pp. 204, 16*s*. Axel Hägerström, *Philosophy and Religion* (Muirhead Library of Philosophy) pp. 320, portrait, 45*s*. J. Park, *Bertrand Russell on Education*, pp. 148, 25*s*. Nils Block-Hoell, *The Pentecostal Movement*, pp. 256, 35*s*. W. R. Miller, *Non-Violence: A Christian Interpretation*, pp. 380, 35*s*. J. H. Evans, *Churchman Militant: George Augustus Selwyn, Bishop of New Zealand and Lichfield*, pp. 298, plates, 40*s*.

BASIL BLACKWELL: Emile Saillens, *John Milton, Man, Poet and Polemist*, pp. 371, plates, 50*s*.

BANNER OF TRUTH TRUST: Patrick Fairbairn, *The Interpretation of Prophecy*, pp. 532, 25*s*.

BEACON HILL PRESS, KANSAS CITY. John Wesley's, *Concept of Perfection*, pp. 227. $3.50.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: Kathleen Lonsdale, *I Believe....* (The 18th A. S. Edington Memorial Lecture), pp. 56, 4*s*. 6*d*. Bertil Gartner: *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (Society for New Testament Studies), pp. 164, 25*s*.

DELL PUBLISHING CO. N.Y.: A. J. Bahm, *The World's Living Religions*, pp. 384, 75*c*.

EPWORTH PRESS: *Christianity and Nursing Today:* A Report, pp. 39, 3*s*. 6*d*. Nels F. S. Ferré, *God's New Age*, pp. 141, 12*s*. 6*d*. E. G. Rupp, *Consideration Reconsidered*, pp. 59, 3*s*. 6*d*. Charles Cleall, *Music and Holiness*, pp. 134, 12*s*. 6*d*. D. A. Palin, *A New Theology: Some Comments on Honest to God*, pp. 30, 2*s*. 6*d*. Epworth Press Conversation Booklets: each pp. 24, 2*s*. (9) Cambridge Anglican and Free Churchmen, *A Fresh Approach:* (10) R. A. Letch, *A Summary of the Conversations:* (11) J. Aldwinckle and B. Parsons, *The Scandal of our Divisions:* (12) J. Brazier Green, *Three Paces Forward:* (13) William Strawson, *Salvation—by Faith or by Bishops?* (14) R. F. Ducker, *Ministers and Priests.*

FAITH PRESS: (ed.) A. J. Philippou, *The Orthodox Ethos: Essays in Honour of the Centenary of the Greek Orthodox Archdioceses of North and South America*, pp. 268, 27*s*. 6*d*.

FORTRESS PRESS, PHILADELPHIA: Philip Jacob Spener, *Pia Desideria* (trans. by T. G. Tappert), pp. 131, $1.75.

HODDER & STOUGHTON: J. McLellan, *Resurrection Then and Now*, pp. 256, 16*s*.

MACDONALD & EVANS: Mairin Mitchell, *Friar Andrés de Undaneta*, O.S.A. (1508-1568), *Pioneer of Pacific Navigation from West to East*, pp. 182, plates, 25*s*.

MARCHANT MANOR PRESS: (ed.) J. D. Douglas, *Evangelicals and Unity, Six Essays*, pp. 96, 6*s*. 6*d*.

METHODIST PUBLISHING HOUSE, ZURICH, (ABINGDON N.Y.): G. F. Moede, *The Office of Bishop in Methodism*, pp. 277, no price.

NELSON, THOMAS, & SONS: (ed.) C. W. Dugmore and C. Duggan, *Studies in Church History*, Vol. I, pp. 257, 42*s*.

OLIVER & BOYD: Gustaf Wingren, *Gospel and Church*, pp. 271, 50*s*.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Philip J. Lamb, *The Drama of the Bible*, pp. 206, 30*s*.

PRIVATELY PRINTED, J. Brazier Green, *The Survival of Methodism*, pp. 64, 3*s*. 6*d*.

RAKESH PRESS, DELHI: Yogi Raushan, *New Dimensions of Yogi*, pp. 358, Rs. 15.

RELIGIOUS FOUNDATION PRESS: Magnus Ratter, *Schweitzer: His Life and Thought: Ninety Years On*, pp. 192, paper, 10*s*.; boards, 12*s*. 6*d*.

S.C.M. PRESS: M. Jarrett-Kerr, *The Secular Promise*, pp. 224, 18*s*. H. W. Hertzberg, *I and II Samuel*, (Old Testament Library), pp. 416, 50*s*. Emil Brunner, *Truth as Encounter*, (The Preacher's Library), pp. 210, 22*s*. 6*d*. Jacobslav Pelican, *Obedient Rebels: Catholic Substance and Protestant Principle in Luther's Reformation*, pp. 212, 25*s*. Geoffrey Curtis, C.R., *Paul Couturier and Unity in Christ*, pp. 366, plates, 35*s*. Helmut Gollwitzer, *The Existence of God as Confessed by Faith* (Library of Philosophy and Theology), pp. 256, 35*s*. Floyd F. Filson, *A New Testament History* (New Testament Library), pp. 436, maps. 42*s*. R. E. Clements, *Prophecy and Covenant* (Studies in Biblical Theology No 43), pp. 135, 13*s*. 6*d*. William McKane, *Prophets and Wise Men* (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 44), pp. 136, 13*s*. 6*d*. M. Noth, *Leviticus* (Old Testament Library), pp. 208, 35*s*.

S.P.C.K.: K. Aland, D. Guthrie, A. Q. Morton, J. A. T. Robinson, G. Bornkamm, A. M. G. Stephenson, M. H. Shepherd, Jn. *The Authority and Integrity of the New Testament* (S.P.C.K. Theological Collection No 4), pp. 112, 15*s*. 6*d*.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY: G. Wingren (trans. J. A. R. Mackenzie), *The Main Lines of Development in Systematic Theology and Biblical Interpretation in Scandinavia*, pp. 23, no price.

WAHRMANN BOOKS, JERUSALEM: Ze'ev W. Falk, *Hebrew Law in Biblical Times*, pp. 179, $3.60.

DR WILLIAMS'S LIBRARY TRUST: J. A. Newton, *Methodism and the Puritans* (Friends of Dr Williams's Library 18th Lecture), pp. 19, 4*s*. 6*d*.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

G. K. BARRETT is Professor of Theology in the University of Durham, author of *A Commentary on St John's Gospel* (S.P.C.K.), etc. etc.

HENRY COOPER is Master of the Royal Foundation of St Katharine, London, E.14.

RUPERT DAVIES is Tutor in Church History at Didsbury College, Bristol, Secretary of the Faith and Order Committee of the Methodist Church, and a prolific writer on ecumenical and Methodist subjects.

LESLIE DAVISON is Secretary of the Home Mission Department of the Methodist Church and was President of Conference 1962-3.

F. PRATT GREEN is Superintendent of the Sutton (Surrey) circuit, author of *The Skating Parson*.

GRAEME C. JACKSON is Superintendent of the Matara-Tangalle circuit, Ceylon.

REGINALD KISSACK, author of *Church or No Church?*, is Superintendent of the Colwyn Bay and Llandudno circuit, and was formerly Missionary Committee representative in Italy.

J. ROBERT NELSON is Professor in the Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio, and was formerly Secretary of the Faith and Order Committee of the World Council of Churches. Author of *The Realm of Redemption*, etc.

Printed in Great Britain by The Sidney Press Ltd., Bedford, and published by
The Epworth Press (Frank H. Cumbers), 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1.
Price 4*s.* 6*d.* net per copy (postage 6*d.*) or 20*s.* per annum, post free.