
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

AESTHETIC JUDGEMENTS AND THEOLOGY[1]

Ulrich Simon

THE DEBATE between the theologians and artists has become curiously inaudible, but this should not lead us into the false belief that there is no problem, and we should be gratified that we clashed in taking sides: *pro arte* —and *contra artem.*

The debate when it occurs is marred by useless generalizations. Theologians are probably in a worse case than working artists, whether they are religious or not. Theologians are apt to speak of art in such an abstract, condescending manner that they show that they really know nothing about it. The term art is virtually meaningless, and it is useless in this discussion to cite beautiful music, exciting poetry, edifying sculpture, etc., for these terms of intended praise are self-defeating. Which beautiful music? Which exciting poetry? Which glorious monument? Æsthetic judgement cannot proceed along general lines. If we take seriously Malraux's dictum, 'The world of art is not an idealized world but *another* world', then we require not only a knowledge of the labour and craft which go into the making of a great work. We need direct knowledge of the work itself. If a discussion is of any use I would insist that it must spring from the particular and not the general.

Hence it would no doubt be best to play here and now a late Beethoven quartet, Op. 130 or 131 perhaps, because they epitomize for many of us religious truth, and more than dogma, worship, or anything which the religious tradition can give. But here we have not the time, nor would some of us feel that tape and disc quite succeed in yielding the truth which is essential to this argument. Polyphony is poorly served by endless recordings, and this debate must take the genuine particular, not the counterfeit.

Of these quartets it may be said with Cassirer that 'they retain and transmit the divine'. They must be distinguished in conception and effect from the general run of art and ordinary norms of music. Here we are confronted with the self-authenticating and self-contained 'transcendent' (if it be possible), beyond taste and praise, although not beyond analysis. Most of us would probably say that what we marvel at is *inspiration* under *firm control*, achieving a blending of the *objective* and the *subjective*, of form and passion; in the *hic* and *nunc* of sound we discern the Beyond.

If we were to formulate a thesis out of this one example it would run something like this: the individual and creative spirit is the highest expression of God known to us on earth. Or, perhaps even more incisively, Art of this dimension crowns Christian theology. This radical opinion would not shrink from the claim that the Christian religion only exists in order to find its crown in the cultural richness of the centuries. Examples to support this claim abound; let me be content with one. At this Epiphany 1965 endless sermons have been preached on the Three Kings: some demythologizing

[1] A paper read to the London Society for the Study of Religion on 9th February, 1965. —LQR1

the star, others allegorizing the kings, not a few moralizing about the gifts, and so on. This is by now the common stock of Christian preaching, and it is dull and unconvincing. But if you happen to hear, as I did, Bach's Cantata 65 '*Sie werden aus Saba alle kommen*', then the whole manifestation of God need not be explained away, nor defended: it is there: God appears. I need hardly labour the point that the act of transcendent Grace assumes the co-operation of every instrumentalist and singer and hearer.

Elsewhere I have examined the possible and generally acceptable 'forms of transcendent glory', fully realizing that they cannot be reduced to an agreed common denominator. I then excluded the merely elegant and socially delightful works, such as Jane Austen's novels. But I may have been wrong, for I have since been told that Charles Gore, on his deathbed, was found reading *Sense and Sensibility* (I believe), and on being questioned about his choice merely reiterated 'Transcendent Glory'. And with that view I now also agree. Certainly Comedy—and not only Dante's *Divine Comedy*—belongs to this self-authenticating class of transcendent glory. The proportion of error, masking, disguises, etc., on the one hand, of recognition on the other, of rude offences and forgiveness, of *adios* and reunion, takes us out of ourselves, changes our mortal frames, puts us on the edge of an eternal felicity which is religious through and through. The comic element is, in fact, so indispensable to the conception of eternal life that I subscribe to the view that without Shakespeare and Mozart we really do not know about the purpose of living. Mozart's *adios* and unions—from *Idomeneo* to the *Zauberflöte*—raise the soul to a state of self-contemplation which is infused with Grace. When Jack gets his Jill 'there is mirth in heaven when earthly things made even, atone together'. So Shakespeare, and with Prospero we are prepared to break the staff and drown the book. Through Comedy 'this rough magic we abjure' and find a contentment which religion hardly affords.

If this place accorded to comedy meets with your approval no time need be wasted on the indispensable merits of lyrical poetry. What do we know of love, for example, except from Dante or Shakespeare's Sonnets? Whenever one is tired of the imprecision of love commended from the pulpit, though the Song of all Songs could ensure an unending vista of Lover, Beloved and Love, with what relief does one turn to *La Vita Nuova*, to the endless varieties of affection and desires, hopes and disappointments, as enigmatically portrayed there?

Sweet love, renew thy force; be it not said
Thy edge should blunter be than appetite . . .

All the gradations of love are not only noted by Shakespeare but set forth creatively.

Time would fail me, to speak with the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, if I were to work out the revelatory worth of the epics and tragedies of the classical age. Who teaches us the poignancy of crisis, if not Homer? The siege and the fall of Troy and the wanderings of Odysseus move us because they reflect our madness, our destiny and homecoming. Right down the ages we are moved by pity and terror and acknowledge the Christian *Dei Pathein* motif as expressed by Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. True, these plays are still technically religious, and you may claim that the

catharsis afforded by them does not entitle us to seek a non-religious core on their stage, but already in Euripides, although the statues of the gods are invariably in their places, you must admit that the submission to the demonic is cut loose from the cultic moorings. It is the human condition which necessarily seeks its own tragic *dénouement*, and this was a fact to be reckoned with in Athens after Pericles. Similarly, in the Spain of Calderon, the England of Shakespeare, the France of Racine and the Germany of Schiller and Goethe: the plays enact the tragic reality which stands, alas, only too certainly on its own feet. Yet these tragedians are not yet secularists of the Ibsen type, or of our own theatre now, for they still transcendentalize the suffering and create new dimensions of redemption. I make bold to say, as did Kierkegaard of *Don Giovanni*, that the world is different after *King Lear, Othello* and *Hamlet*.

Most curious of all, even if the tragic muse denies the assurances of the Christian or any other faith, it still carries the authentic hallmark of a transcendent revelation. You find it in Hardy's novels, I think, and the effect is inexplicable. Dostoevsky creates new categories of self-transcendence which are only superficially Christian. When is a nineteenth-century theology comparable to the *Brothers Karamasov* or *The Idiot*? No wonder many of us believe that the essential disclosure has come and may still come from secular writers.

If then the nature of æsthetic experience is self-authenticating, ever-creative and revelatory, and not a matter of taste, why should we consider its place a problem in theology? The easiest answer and not altogether wrong is: religion envies art. 'The grapes are sour', says the theological fox who cannot get hold of inspiration. Or, the Church becomes obsessed with art, sells her integrity to obtain man-made glories and goes economically and politically bankrupt in the process of so-called patronage, as happened clearly in the century of Michaelangelo. But this is not the whole story, for there is after all a long tradition which represents more than a mere resentment as found in vulgar iconoclasm. The caution which Plato so uncomfortably articulates in the *Republic* against poets and poetry deserves at least calm examination. Inspiration, frenzy, 'madness', may destroy the best. Thus Saul among the prophets suffers defeat, thus also the terror of the Bacchæ culminates in the mother leading in the murderer of her son and king. Daimoneon, after all, is the divine essence and evil genius at the same time. In public affairs it is mostly the latter and incites the mob to ecstatic evil. Poetry and even music if a counterfeit of reality are therefore politically a danger. Book X (*Republic*) may seem to us very strange, but must be taken seriously—'if Homer had been able to help people to be virtuous. . . .'. There is the rub of the affair. Beauty and Truth are one, but art may be a defective form of imitation, and Plato quite logically demands censorship and safeguards.

It is, therefore, being naïve to a fault to shudder at the spectacle of concentration-camp commandants playing Mozart to their hearts' content. I do not know whether the story of the Verdi *Requiem* at Theresienstadt before the SS *élite* is apocryphal rather than historical; my own feeling is that something like that did happen. They enjoyed the unique performance

and granted the performers the privilege of dying together at Auschwitz-Birkenau. The ghastliness of this emphasizes at the finest point the moral irrelevance of æsthetic enjoyment.

Nor is this apparent paradox—if truth is beauty, the performance of beauty is by no means truth or goodness—solved by staking an extra claim for an enlightened minority. At least for those who stand in the Jewish Christian tradition such snobbistic concession will not be acceptable, since its revelatory gift is universal. That is the price we pay for our *semper, ubique, ab omnibus* conviction: we cannot sanction a club for the *Penumatikoi*, the *illuminati*, who sit in Gnostic superiority, enhanced by the creative act of æsthetic giving and receiving.

The ethical problem is residual not only in art but in the artist. Not a few would, I submit, echo Degas' statement: 'A picture requires as much rascality, malice and perversity as the perpetration of a crime.' Can a Proust recover lost time without having been deeply steeped in the mud? Can, on a higher plane, a Mozart create a Count Amalviva without ever contemplating adultery? One could go on for ever with examples.

We are approaching the real difficulty. The Hebrew prohibition of images stands at the head of it. I am not saying that Moses sanctions iconoclasm or that iconoclasm is more than a mass-hysterical outburst of a particularly unpleasant kind—such as the *Bilderstuermer*, whom Norman Cohn so aptly describes in his large canvas of fanatical pursuers of the millenium. The theological root of the matter moves on a higher plane. Images, say the prophets, are ludricous. Stones, jewels, peacocks' feathers hide the bankruptcy of the human self-adulation. In Jeremiah and, I think, in the New Testament this human arrogance (*zimah*) is to be contrasted with the true *tavnith*, i.e. the pattern of God's own perfection. St Paul did not exactly admire the Acropolis for its own sake. The hand-made things are always inferior to the directly derivative, and therefore the 'zeal of thine house' may eat up the true intention. There is an iconoclastic theology which by taking sin seriously cannot subscribe to salvation by art and modern iconoclastic art rules out salvation on principle. Here Gregory the Great's epoch-making plea against the breaking of images no longer applies for they do not wish to 'show the invisible through the visible'.

The problem, however, arises also in what we call classical art. Goethe, for example, who after all places virtue and restraint very high in his categories of education, and who would retain Christian morals for the lower orders—who indeed, like all great men, dreads disorder—nevertheless believes for himself in pagan sensuality as a liberating and glorious activity. Goethe in Rome and after Rome really must be opposed to that main Christian teaching which we call atonement. Simple and great nobility stands beyond the need of redemption. This æsthetic conviction, which Kant describes in a whole volume, is totally irreconcilable with atonement motifs. This '*æsthetische Urteilskraft*' certainly yields an apprehension of the '*Erhabene*' (Otto's *Heilige*) and stands above arbitrary impressions, such as matters of taste. It has nothing to do with revelation in history, covenant, atonement, etc. Mozart's *Magic Flute* gives us a typically Gnostic pilgrimage to illumination by wisdom, but not atonement. Tamino and Pamina get

through their fire and water in three blessed minutes; Magic Flute and Glockenspiel suffice. Yet only the most insensitive fool could denigrate Mozart and award him a black mark for lack of orthodoxy like the Dutch Calvinists who could never bring themselves to forgive Karl Barth for being Mozart's theological champion. What matters is not always what is said, but how it is said.

This distinction is not unknown in the biblical tradition. Why is David the sweet harpist, whereas the prophets denounce the feasts, the players of harp, pipe, and tabret (Isa. 5)? I do not believe that the Bible authorizes a clear Either-Or division as held by some Puritans and inferred by Kierkegaard and, of all people, worked out by Tolstoy. Their well-nigh pathological hatred of concerts, theatres and all kinds of shows (though not of music?) can easily be caricatured, as, for instance, so brilliantly by Ibsen in his *Brand*. This is Pastor Kierkegaard at his most horrific: even the child's clothes have to be burnt and utter darkness must be preferred to the light of culture and good living. Ibsen actually shows that Brand is not a fanatic who is merely a lunatic. He stands in that extreme tradition of seers, hermits, etc., who in their austerity obey God.

This paradox is best illustrated by the monks' attack on and subsequent defence of icons in the Orthodox Church. I shall not deal with the further irony that at times this extremism produces great art, almost in spite of itself. Mortification and asceticism are far more likely to favour the rise of great works than easy indulgence, if only by stressing the contrast. A van Gogh sees the light of Provence as he goes precisely because he is a son of the Flemish North and Protestant Sectarian austerity. On the other hand, Verdi accomplishes the final miracle of *Falstaff* at the age of eighty-two from the mature tranquillity and well-managed house of Sant 'Agata. Generalizations are here quite useless, except possibly one; that none of the really great artists are ever known to put themselves into the position of God and that not a few would probably acknowledge that their art is in some measure derived from the whole tradition which, naturally, includes religious power and even the sway of dogma. Even if Verdi does not believe in the dogmatic definitions which might be required by the *Requiem*, he knows perfectly well to whom he is indebted for the text.

Thus, to conclude, a drastic Either-Or (which stretched Gerard Manley Hopkins to breaking-point), seems logically impossible and culturally undesirable. Schiller, in a letter to Goethe, speaks of Christianity as the only æsthetic religion with its human incarnation of the holy Transcendent. Whether we can, however, restate for ourselves a doctrine of correspondence and thus articulate a place for art in the hierarchy of perfection may be doubted. Maritain says: 'St Thomas, who was simple as he was wise, defined the beautiful as what gives pleasure on sight, *id quod visum placet*,' and adds: 'the four words say all that is necessary: a vision, that is to say an intuitive knowledge, and a joy.' Splendour of form, the proportioned parts of matter, excite the transcendental soul, not only to imitation but to further creative endeavours. The eternal harmony requires no system but yields for some the evidence for God which history and tradition, reflection and experience, cannot supply.

MEANING AND MYTH

G. D. Yarnold

THE OBJECT of this paper is neither a conservative rebuttal of the view that much of the New Testament is properly to be described as myth, nor a radical acceptance of that thesis. The object is a critical appraisal of the category of myth—an examination of its meaning, its usefulness, and its limits, for purposes of faith or theology. We begin by noticing that the category is particularly wide: usage on the whole ill-defined. Myth, as understood in much modern theological writing, includes narrative forms as well as more purely conceptual elements. Its narratives may be peopled by gods, angels, men, or demons—in any suitable combination. Its concepts seem to range the whole way from the most primitive to the most profound of those ideas in terms of which man has sought to understand his true situation. But to join the words *myth* and *history* in a general umbrella-like title is implicitly to restrict ourselves to narrative forms. Related conceptual elements must then be described as mythical rather than as myth: unfortunately the longer word seems specially designed to discredit everything to which it is applied—from prehistoric monsters to quite highly developed notions in religion.

Myth then in the more restricted sense is a particular kind of narrative. Legend, chronicle, history are also narratives. How are we to distinguish them? It is commonplace to notice that truth is of different kinds, demanding different media of expression. Verbal communication (except from propagandists and liars) sets out to express truth under one of its aspects; and narrative is perhaps the most straightforward form of verbal communication. It expresses truth by describing occurrences, either actual or fictitious. And though the discernment of truth takes us much deeper than the mere discrimination between the actual and the fictitious, we can hardly avoid a preliminary classification of narrative forms somewhat as follows: *Myth* is what didn't happen to people who (perhaps) didn't exist. *Legend* is what didn't happen to people who did exist. *Chronicle* is what happened, with only so much interpretation as is implied by selection. *History* is a considered account of what happened, a mature interpretation of past events. Oversimplified, perhaps rather naïve—at least these are the idealized elements into which the spectrum of narrative seems to fall: though in modern usage, myth often covers legend, and history chronicle.

Of course, it is immensely difficult in speaking of the past to know precisely what happened; the conditions commonly exclude the possibility of verification; but our use of words at least implies the possibility of an

approach to factual knowledge of the past. In the absence of knowledge, however, a useful criterion between history and myth is the possibility of human observation. What is not observable cannot be historical.

* * * *

The questions we must tackle are these: What kind of truth does (narrative) myth express? and How does it succeed in communicating truth?

Few readers are interested in the bare facts of a narrative. To say that the bare facts are of purely academic interest is perhaps an unnecessary disparagement of the scholarly mind. Yet this is true to the extent that mere factual knowledge, for its own sake, may be only so much intellectual lumber. Narrative positively invites interpretation. If it means anything at all to the reader it is because he interprets it subjectively as he proceeds: and this is true whether the narrative is myth, legend, chronicle, or history. Here is something inherent in narrative form itself; independently of the subject matter, independently also of the distinction between the factual and the fictitious. Narrative, of whatever character, conveys to the reader something more than a knowledge of the plain events narrated, something over and above what it carries on its surface. Narrative evokes an attitude in the reader: approval, if it is a story of heroism; disapproval, if a story of crime or brutality; sympathy, if it tells of unmerited suffering; admiration and faith, if it recounts perseverance in goodness against odds. Narrative is a medium which leads the reader to recognize values, or their absence; to identify himself with, or to oppose himself to, what he discerns in the persons and situations described. Narrative enables him to see himself in the context of elemental forces and powers; and to commit himself, subjectively in the citadel of his inmost being, for or against what he recognizes. This, I believe, is true of all forms of narrative writing. It accounts for our interest in history, our enjoyment of fiction, our appreciation of the legends of antiquity, and supremely our evaluation of the narrative portions of the biblical literature.

Could the same result be achieved by any alternative form of discourse? I am very doubtful whether it could. The sophisticated reader can make something of a general discussion of human nature, liberally garnished with abstract nouns, analysing in general terms the attitudes and decisions which pertain to the human situation. Such writing, however, is already interpretative. Its full meaning is already on its surface. To read it with understanding requires mental effort rather than imagination: for the reader is asked to follow step by step the thoughts of another mind. Valuable as such writings may be for specific purposes, they inevitably lack the vividness of narrative, for the appreciation of which the reader must supply his own interpretation, and that at a deeply personal level. And for the unsophisticated reader such discourse is meaningless. Here we see the peculiar quality of narrative, for simple and sophisticated readers alike: for the discernment of meaning requires insight but not expertise. Narrative speaks directly, because it enlists the response of the whole person. It has a power possessed by no other form of discourse.

Clearly, myth has this in common with other narrative forms, that it

carries such truth as the reader can make his own through the medium of a story. The reader discerns its content by the use of his imagination, which enables him to see himself in relation to elemental forces and powers. To this extent the truth of a myth is independent of its factual accuracy as an historical narrative. Indeed over-concern with historical accuracy hinders appreciation by deflecting the mind from the discernment of truth. An unduly critical approach kills the narrative stone dead; so that it can neither do its own work, nor even stand on its own feet as a legitimate form of discourse. In particular, undue concentration on the antecedents of the early biblical myths, except in so far as it brings out the peculiar genius of the Hebrew writers, may very well discredit a literature of the greatest spiritual significance. If the meaning of myth is to find its target in the citadel of our being, we must avoid both the literalism which demands historical accuracy and the criticism which concentrates on the crudeness of the most primitive apprehensions of spiritual truth.

The most powerful myths of our religious tradition are peopled indeed by gods, angels, men, and demons; and the truth they have to declare is our own imaginative response to the (presumably) fictitious actions of their *dramatis personae*. In admitting the peculiar power of narrative form, we admit that the truth is effectively conveyed through this medium. Yet myth is not self-consciously devised by a sophisticated writer in order that he may convey truth expressible effectively through no other medium. (I very much doubt whether a modern theological scholar could write in this medium, even if he wished to do so.) Myth is essentially the product of the unsophisticated mind. The writer thinks, and therefore communicates, quite unselfconsciously in vivid images, personifications, and (hypothetical) dramatic action—and does so because these are the ingredients of effective narrative writing. He is presumably unaware that his narrative is not factually accurate. His mind does not move on that level when he thinks about those values which are ultimate for him. So far from accusing him of dishonesty we must admire the facility with which he handles the medium most natural to him; and to grasp his meaning we must be content to walk humbly with him, seeing the truth as he sees it.

Must we then conclude that the composer of myth is temperamentally unable to distinguish fact from fiction? that he would be incapable of giving a reasonably accurate account of contemporary occurrences? that he lives in the airy-fairy land of perpetual make-believe? By no means. The writer of myth falls back on this medium precisely when he is *not* talking of events which are contemporary. How does his community come to be in the situation which he discerns? There are no written records to tell him. His oral traditions are already legendary through the lapse of time, and in any case do not answer all his questions. But he has certain convictions of the real nature of things (partly through inherited traditions, partly through his own insight into the human situation); and it is *these* that he expresses in narrative form, without our modern inhibitions about factual accuracy, checking the references, confining himself to the observable, and the like. Where an ancient seer cannot relate his deepest personal experience directly and completely to his own tangible world, he turns naturally and unselfconsciously

to the vivid imagery, personification, and supernatural activity of which myths are made.

* * * *

Presumably we should all agree that the myths of the creation, the fall of man, and indeed all the material of the first eleven chapters of Genesis arose in this way within a community which was uniquely sensitive to the things of the spirit. These stories express (in terms of what was already for the writer a remote past) the seriousness and the quality of the spiritual situation in which he found himself caught up. And there is no need here for me to draw out the permanent elements of their meaning for a reader of our own time.

But, and this is a vital question for the study of the Bible today, does the same interplay of method and motive throw any light on those portions of the New Testament which the most radical scholarship is now anxious to classify as myth? Consider for instance the narratives of the Resurrection, with their apparently circumstantial detail of the Empty Tomb and the appearances. What is central here to the New Testament proclamation? The fact that Christ is risen. Here is a spiritual truth, which in principle *could* perhaps be held by the earliest followers of Jesus without objective evidence of any kind. We can admit this without necessarily compromising the faith. The deepest convictions of men are sometimes logically independent of observable facts which might count for or against them. But that is not the point. Men, even primitive men, do not employ myth when they speak or write of observable events contemporary with themselves. It is indeed conceivable that second- and third-generation Christians, sharing the *faith* of the first generation, could construct the stories of the Empty Tomb and the appearances as a means of expressing the spiritual situation in which they found themselves—a situation in which they knew the presence of the Risen Lord, and in the strength of this faith themselves faced death. It is *not* conceivable that the *first* generation of believers should express their faith by constructing stories of observable happenings which neither they nor any of their contemporaries had observed. All turns on the *possibility* of factual reporting. If factual reporting is impossible in principle (through the lapse of time) the spiritual truth of the situation might be expressed by means of myth: but not otherwise.

To show that the resurrection narratives are myth is to show *by independent argument* that they necessarily originate in a period, or a milieu, other than that of those who could rank as witnesses. This the radical scholars have not done. And if we detect mythical (i.e. non-observable) elements in the resurrection narratives (for instance, the presence of supernatural participants in the action) we must not be led *by this* to suppose that we are in contact with anything more than legendary accretions. We may grant that angels are non-observable; and consequently regard them as constructs of the mind which tells its story through suitable imagery. The alleged manifestation of the Risen Lord to the human senses, however, by no means falls necessarily into the same category of artistic imagery. In other words no fair assessment can treat the resurrection narratives as pure myth. The most

we can do is to recognize elements in them which are, or could be, mythical.

The student faces a group of related questions of some delicacy. What is the situation of faith, prior to the close of the New Testament period, which gives rise to the creation of resurrection myths? What are the myths to which this situation gives rise, and what is their meaning? In view of what is known of the dating of the several narratives, we are entitled to assert that the situation of faith includes belief in Christ as risen, together with genuine reminiscence or reporting of a limited amount of observable evidence—possibly the tradition of the Empty Tomb as a stark fact, and possibly a tradition of resurrection appearances simply told as in the credal passage of 1 Corinthians 15^{1-8}. The 'myth' would then consist in the embroidering of these observable elements by the second generation (if this can be established), i.e. the 'myth' of the Resurrection is to be identified with the legendary accretions.

If this is the truth, then quite legitimately we may argue that in this sense, and within these limits, myth was necessary in the first century as an expression of faith; as it is still necessary today as a means of communicating the faith. The resurrection narratives are not to be accepted uncritically as though they were factually accurate in every detail. Nor are they to be emptied of content by a too radical criticism. They are to be used with reverence and thankfulness for two reasons:

(i) because the observable[1] basis, even if slight, is secure; and

(ii) because faith in the Resurrection, as an attitude of commitment, is available to *us* as our own subjective interpretation of the New Testament stories *in toto*, and not otherwise. This is the meaning of the myth; and the meaning justifies the use of myth to this degree, and within these limits.

[1] The distinction between what is *observable* and what is *known to be factual* is vital to this treatment of myth.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

We are obliged to draw the attention of our readers to an impending increase in the price of THE LONDON QUARTERLY & HOLBORN REVIEW. Beginning with the issue for January 1966, the cost per copy will be 5*s*. and the annual subscription rate 22*s*. 6*d*. post free.

BIBLICAL MYTH AND MODERN WORLD-VIEW

John S. Roberts

THE ESSENTIAL contribution of the demythologizers has been to insist that modern scientific man must be treated as such by the Christian apologist and must not be compelled to abandon his thought-forms before he can begin to understand the Gospel. In spite of this influence, much Christian apologetic still blames modern man for not having the right criteria of historical truth. Thus G. B. Caird, in discussing the historicity of Luke's gospel, writes: 'Luke has made good his claim to be a trustworthy historian provided that we do not make the blunder of judging him by the canons of modern scientific historiography.'[1]

In other words, modern scientific man is told that he must not make the blunder of being himself. Even Bultmann can conclude a book with the words: 'Let those who have the modern world-view live as though they had none.'[2]

This attitude cannot be reconciled with Bonhoeffer's insistence that modern man has 'come of age' and that his modern world-view cannot be discarded. When modern man is confronted with the biblical stories he is bound to ask 'What actually happened?'; he asks what would have been recorded if it had been possible for the cine-camera and the tape-recorder to have been on the scene. The modern enquirer is capable of realizing that there are categories of truth beyond the raw materials of fact but he wants to be able to assess the residue of historical fact upon which the biblical writer has worked to produce the deeper truth.

Modern scientific man can accept the equation:

$$\text{Historical Truth} = \text{Fact} + \text{Interpretation}$$

and he realizes that myth can embody a valid form of historical truth, but he suspects that this only holds provided the 'fact component' does not become vanishingly small.

J. Macquarrie has analysed the inconsistencies in Bultmann's definition of mythology as 'the use of imagery to express the otherworldly in terms of this world and the divine in terms of human life, the other side in terms of this side.'[3] Macquarrie shows that as far as biblical myth is concerned this definition is too wide, and goes on to distinguish between mythology, analogy, legend, and primitive cosmology.

For the present purpose we shall define a myth more narrowly as 'a community's explanation of a present experience in terms of an historical event'. When the experience is a physical sense-experience, then mythology merges into primitive science and there is no difficulty in recognizing the myth as 'pure myth' which modern scientific man judges to have no 'fact component' (as when the visual experience of a rainbow is explained in terms of a promise made by God to Noah). The vital questions for modern man arise when the experience is not physical but existential—when the

myth expresses the continuing experience of God in the biblical community of the old or new Israel.

MYTH AND HISTORY IN COVENANT AND EXODUS

The predominant myth in the Old Testament is the myth of the Covenant at Sinai, with which may be associated the earlier promise to Abraham and the later promise to David. The very existence and the continuing preservation of Israel stem from this covenant relationship. Even the most important cultic theme of the Exodus is subsidiary to the Covenant, without which the history of Israel could not have been explained.

The story of the deliverance from Egypt clearly may have at least *some* factual basis, in the sense that part of Israel had in fact, at some time in their history, experienced such an escape from captivity. The Exodus story explains a present experience (the existential experience of continuing deliverance and protection by God) in terms of a historical event. The experience is consistent with faith in the God who had once acted thus in the history of the community. Even though the facts of the Exodus may have been elaborated in the cultic re-telling the Exodus need not be 'pure myth'. The myth of the Covenant, however, is logically entirely different from that of the Exodus; God cannot *in fact* make a covenant with men and any description of such a covenant can only be in the language of analogy. The only possible factual basis for the myth of the Covenant is that, at a certain date, the relationship between God and Israel was *interpreted* as a covenant relationship. Ultimately, all that covenant language can assert is: 'From our present experience and from the whole history of Israel, it is *as though* God has made a covenant with Israel.'

MYTH AND HISTORY IN THE RESURRECTION

The primitive Church explains its own existence in terms of the Resurrection. In the Old Testament, the events commemorated in the Passover were explained in terms of the Covenant; in the New Testament, the significance of the Eucharist (the new Passover celebration) and the nature of the 'new covenant' are understood in the light of the Resurrection (the new exodus). The problem for modern apologetics can be presented as the question whether the gospel narratives of the Resurrection have the logical status of the Exodus story or of the Covenant myth.

'Exodus status' would mean that the accounts of a bodily resurrection preserve some factual basis, however much they may have been elaborated. R. Bambrough speaks for many critics, both Christian and humanist, when he suggests that 'we ought to hesitate, if not refuse, to say that somebody really believes in the resurrection of Jesus Christ if he gives such an account of it that it no longer claims to have the kind of grip on external, factual, historical events that the doctrine had when it was propounded in its original and traditional form'.[4]

T. A. Roberts has analysed the meaning of the word 'historical' as used in the assertion that 'the Resurrection was a historical event' and has shown, by quotations from several prominent apologists, that the word is used in 'a very odd sense'.[5] The dilemma is that conventional apologetics assert that

the accounts of the Resurrection are factually true but also assert that, because of the uniqueness of the event, the historian's normal principles cannot be applied in testing the reliability of the evidence. At least it is clear that the apologist can never return to the 'detective story' approach in which the facts are reconstructed by sifting the evidence in the gospel narratives. It is increasingly realized that the Jewish Christian of the first century might not have shared our own demand for 'a grip on external, factual, historical events'; there may, indeed, be an important distinction between the 'original' form and the 'traditional' form of the doctrine of the Resurrection.

'Covenant status' would mean that we cannot go beyond the fact that at a certain date (about twenty years after the death of Jesus) the Church was proclaiming the Resurrection, although it is implicit that this proclamation had been continuous before the earliest written evidence of the apostolic preaching.

In van Buren's treatment of what he calls 'the Easter event' even the word 'resurrection' is largely avoided. In the language of van Buren, what happened 'on Easter' (*sic*) was that 'the freedom of Jesus began to be contagious'. The disciples had 'an experience of which Jesus was the sense-content. They experienced a discernment situation in which Jesus the free man whom they had known, themselves, and indeed the whole world, were seen in a quite new way.'[6]

Similarly, Knox regards 'the resurrection of Jesus, the coming of the Spirit, and the creation of the Church' as being 'three ways of referring to the same occurrence'.[7] Knox does not, however, agree with Bultmann's treatment of the Resurrection as pure myth, but asserts that 'when the creation of the Church is clearly recognized as being the true culmination, the essential meaning of the entire Christ event, a new dimension of objective truth is imparted to the resurrection of Christ, so that we become able to speak of it as belonging to history rather than to mythology only'.

By strict analogy with the Covenant myth, the Church's proclamation of the Resurrection would be equivalent to the assertion, 'From our continuing experience of Christ it is *as though* he had risen from the tomb'. The most radical solution of the problem of historicity is to accept that the qualification 'as though' would naturally be omitted in accordance with the Jewish attitude to historical truth.[8] The less radical solution, still consistent with the 'Covenant status' of the gospel accounts is to describe the Resurrection appearances as subjective visions. This theory is consistent with St Paul's failure to distinguish between the appearances of the risen Christ to himself and to the other apostles; it is also consistent with the essential honesty of the gospel narratives in not describing any appearances to non-believers. Critics of the 'subjective vision' theory have often missed the essential point that a convincing subjective vision is not regarded as subjective by the person who has experienced it; such a person would not say 'I have had a subjective vision of the Lord', but would simply say 'The Lord appeared to me'.

The 'subjective vision' theory has been treated more sympathetically by Burnaby[9] than by most other orthodox theologians. In conventional apologetics it is usually argued that the authorities would have been able to refute

the apostles' story by producing the body, but Burnaby points out that this argument is 'quite ineffective; for the sceptic will answer that the burial story is itself a legend, that the body of Jesus is most likely to have been thrown into a common criminals' grave and soon become unidentifiable'.

Nothing can be farther from the New Testament experience of the Resurrection than the attempt to make it seem more reasonable by appealing to the insights of modern science into the nature of matter. Thus J. Wren-Lewis writes: 'And the more science advances in its understanding of nature's workings, the less grounds there are for scepticism about the Easter story.'[10] The alternative 'pure miracle or pure myth' is preferable to such an attempt to accommodate the Resurrection within the modern world-view.

There is no doubt that, to the modern mind, 'His bursting from the spiced tomb' belongs to the same world of mythology as 'His riding up the heavenly way' and 'His coming at the day of doom'.[11] The urgent task of the Christian apologist is to provide a clear statement of what is being asserted about the Resurrection; the statement must respect both the modern understanding of historical fact and modern man's ability to appreciate other kinds of truth. The contemporary enquirer is hardly likely to be satisfied by an unenthusiastic, qualified insistence upon the orthodoxy of the physical resurrection, such as that found in *A Theological Word Book*—'Without committing ourselves to any crudely materialistic notions or any over-simple explanations of the mode of the resurrection, we may maintain that the doctrine of the physical resurrection conserves more of the unfathomable truth behind the mystery than does the denial of it. It is a fitting symbol of the truth that the redemption wrought by Christ includes the whole natural order, including the physical world. . . .'[12]

If he were confronted by such a statement, modern scientific man might be forgiven for being puzzled as to what, if anything, was being asserted. Is an insistence upon the factual truth of the gospel resurrection-narratives part of the inescapable 'foolishness of the preaching'?—or might this insistence involve the apologist, after all, in being found a false witness of God and retaining an occasion of stumbling for his contemporaries?

[1] *Saint Luke* (Pelican Gospel Commentaries, 1963), p. 28.
[2] *Jesus Christ and Mythology* (English edition, 1960), p. 85.
[3] *The Scope of Demythologizing* (1960), p. 199.
[4] *In Religion and Humanism* (BBC, 1964), p. 58.
[5] *History and Christian Apologetic* (1960), p. 157.
[6] P. van Buren, *The Secular Meaning of the Gospel* (1963), p. 126.
[7] *The Death of Christ* (1958), p. 180; see also *The Church and the Reality of Christ* (1964).
[8] An insight into the Jewish-Christian attitude to facts is provided by the writings of Werner Pelz, e.g. *God Is No More* (1963), p. 127; see also *The Guardian*, 17th April 1965.
[9] *The Belief of Christendom* (1959), p. 100.
[10] J. Wren-Lewis, *The Guardian*, 15th April 1965.
[11] 'I bind unto myself today' (*MHB* No. 392).
[12] Alan Richardson, in *A Theological Word Book of the Bible* (1950), p. 194.

THE HISTORIC JESUS AND ECUMENICAL ENDEAVOUR

Walter Gill

THE RECOGNIZED branches of the Christian Church are, in theory at least, united in one belief: that central to their faith stands a historic person, Jesus of Nazareth, in whom they put their trust as the Eternal Christ manifest in the flesh summing-up in himself the meaning of life. Whatever traditions they severally also recognize as authoritative, as being the work of the Holy Spirit, these are regarded not as additional to or improving upon that revelation but as elucidating or reapplying the truth of what the historic Jesus essentially was.

This seems so great a point of unanimity that it is small wonder the way forward to effective unity has appeared to be through a mutual willingness to 'share our treasures', out of which would inevitably arise a fuller vision of what Christ was and therefore is. It is a pretty theory; but somehow it does not quite work out when it comes to the necessary practice of setting out agreed compromises of theological statement on this very central subject. The Anglican-Methodist Conversations offer a case in point. Much of the public discussion of the Report has been as peripheral as prejudiced. Yet no one, not even the authors, has been able to stem this with the cry—'But look at the centre: look at the majesty and the marvel of the Historic Christ and his work that emerges here in what we have written through our mutual sharing of Catholic and Evangelical treasures!'

Truth to tell, the historic Person gets little more than a passing mention or two in the 'Theological Considerations' of the Report. We are assured that the divine revelation in Jesus Christ 'is unique, unrepeatable, sufficient', but the content of the same as embodied in him seems to be taken for granted requiring no further elucidation for purposes of unity between the Churches. The suggestion that for practical purposes we 'know it all' on this point is reinforced by the further declaration that 'the Word made flesh in Jesus Christ . . . speaks now through the whole life of the Church'. The word 'now' is to be noted: between the lot of us we already have what it takes; if therefore we were all organizationally united, the world would see that we have already got what it takes.

It may be protested that the purpose of the Report did not call for any fuller setting forth of the historic Jesus, and that secondly the representatives were not at any time during their period of special fellowship together aware of divergencies on the matter. If it is so argued, I accept the points. But in that case, the Report being concerned with the peripheral, there can be no grumble that so much of its discussion has been peripheral; and if no new richness of understanding of the mind of the historic Master appeared,

demanding to be set down, through this preliminary and scholarly sharing of Catholic and Evangelical treasures—what reasonable grounds have we to hope for such new richness resulting from the scheme of union going through?

But it would be unfair to pound the Anglican-Methodist Report on these grounds as if this alone and its producers were the culprits. These particular Conversations after all have but followed the general line of present-day ecumenical attitudes on the matter under discussion. It is in our implied assumptions that a revolution is required. An externally unified Church may still be a dead Church, as history shows; nor can we afford to ignore the apathy of the world to which we must minister to present unity moves, a judgement upon their irrelevance which could be correct.

In any age, not excluding our own, valuations relating to the historic Jesus previously attested by the Church can be found to have deteriorated. It is never enough merely to maintain his centrality and all-sufficiency, when all too often on this basis his image has been reduced to that of the main screw in a mechanical scheme of salvation. This tendency is a mark of every generation which has not discovered fresh meaning in the historic life. On the other hand we ought not to count T. R. Glover too old-fashioned to remind us that 'Where new value has been found in Jesus Christ, the Church has risen in power, in energy, in appeal, in victory.'[1] We are in sore need of that 'new value' for our own time; not least to aid the ecumenical endeavour.

But before we can hope to find the answer to our need, clearer recognition of certain facts is called for. These are, firstly, that the wearing of the label 'Christian' for no matter how many centuries is no guarantee that the body concerned is less at enmity with the purposes of God than some other body not so labelled. Secondly, that there must be readiness to follow the truth about Jesus of Nazareth as about anything or anyone else, even if this leads to the regretful rejection of him as not fully adequate to the real needs of the age in which we live. And thirdly, that, however great the seeming dangers, we must now endeavour to penetrate behind the kerygma, the assumed constant apostolical valuation of the historic Christ.

The latter point is the most controversial of the three. Twenty-seven years ago, that distinguished scholar, Professor C. H. Dodd, gave his considered judgement on the matter: 'Either the interpretation through which the facts are presented was imposed upon them mistakenly—and in that case few facts remain which we can regard as strictly ascertained—or the interpretation was imposed by the facts themselves'.[2] Partly no doubt because it was convenient, we have mostly been content to rest there ever since.

We can no longer honestly do so, however. In the first place, even Professor Dodd himself did not claim that this judgement was demonstrable, but merely declared it in his view 'not unreasonable'. Second, it would be unduly sceptical to maintain that *any* modification of the apostolic view must mean that the underlying historical facts are shattered. Thirdly, even on the traditional view, Jesus was greater than his intepreters who, honest men that they were, may be expected sometimes to have recorded where they did not understand: certainly the earliest Evangelist did so. And finally, much water has passed under the bridge in the last twenty-seven

years: the pressures of the new technological age and all that is involved in it are questioning the adequacy of the apostolic assessment as the touchstone for our time. It may be that Jesus of Nazareth had not merely a key but *the* key that our bewildered generation needs (I believe he had and has): but we may lose the possibility of its being found for our time if we do not venture more deeply into the historical question than hitherto.

Obviously there are dangers in such a task: the old-time liberal portraits of the gentle unworldly teacher are still near enough to scare us. Obviously too the questions involved are of great complexity in view of the massive researches on various aspects of the problem undertaken during the past century or so. But the dangers must be braved because of the even greater dangers of not doing so, and no matter how many new trees have grown it is still as important as ever to see the wood. What is now required is experimental approach to the records and the accumulated mass of background knowledge with a view to discovering a much more adequate understanding of the power of Jesus's impact on his generation and its nature that could give rise to the various and varied responses of the succeeding generation of followers before standardization and reflected in the New Testament.

Certain premises to such an approach should, by this day and age, be presumptive; notably in relation to questions of mythology and miracle. Mythical elements ought to be expected and are certainly found in the New Testament. Indeed they can be observed as growing from earlier Gospel to later, as for instance Christ's walking on the water in Mark (6^{45-52}) becoming Christ and Peter walking on the water in 'Matthew' (14^{22-33}). Such elements usually have their origin in fact of some kind, often decipherable with a reasonable degree of certainty. They are not in any case to be despised as historically valueless, since they throw light on the thought of the Early Church from which clues may be gleaned as to the historic Person they thought about. The question of miracle is closely allied to that of mythology. Again such stories may have grown from incidents that a modern observer would not regard as miraculous; but whether or not, their mention should no longer be the signal for barren arguments as to what is and what is not physically possible. If the quest for God is seen to be that of the character of Being, no manifestation of naked power will tell us anything of what we wish to know; though the truer miracle of the influence for good of one person upon another may well do so.

With these provisos in mind it is perhaps best within the limits of an article to indicate the particular experimental approach I personally have found most profitable and capable of illuminating the evidence. It may not satisfy all, but in that case it can stimulate others to better ones. The crying need today is precisely for more and more such bold experiments, rather than more and more exhaustive monographs on relatively small issues of which in truth we have had plenty for the time being.

We begin then with what can here be regarded today as indisputable, that central to Jesus's mission and message was his conception of the Kingdom of God. Our differences arise when we seek to understand what that conception meant to him. At one extreme we have the school of 'thoroughgoing eschatology' represented by Schweitzer's *The Quest of the*

Historical Jesus depicting him as an orthodox apocalyptist who believed himself to be the pre-destined Son of Man called to precipitate the end of the world and the establishment of the Kingdom by cataclysmic divine intervention. The permanent achievement of this school has been that never again can we ignore the undoubted apocalyptic elements in Jesus's thought and teaching of his central theme.

This in turn has given rise to the opposite extreme, 'realized eschatology' as represented by C. H. Dodd in *The Parables of the Kingdom* and later works, which maintains that Jesus completely spiritualized the thought-forms of his time into the conception of the Kingdom as an inward entity initiated by him as fully present in the here and now.

It is hard to deny elements of truth in both approaches since both are plainly represented also in the New Testament, the former for example in 1 and 2 Thessalonians and the latter in the Fourth Gospel. It is not surprising therefore that attempts have been made to reconcile the two, as when John Macmurray declared: 'The relation between the "ethic" and "apocalyptic" in the teaching of Jesus is the same as the relation between theory and prediction in science'.[3] Mostly, however, these reconciliations have been of a static rather than a dynamic nature: a goal of history (as yet not fully kicked) has been vaguely allowed in a dim future too distant to be worried about even since the advent of the megaton bomb. In the process we have been left with a Christ about whose concrete aims in his Ministry little can be definitely said beyond a determination on his part to die in order to release a method of self-adjustment to a sad bad hopeless world for the unadventurous who might desire it. Which is more or less back to 'square one' of the gentle unworldly teacher.

For a new experimental approach, therefore, I suggest a fresh look at that most frequently recorded incident of the Ministry in the Gospels, the Feeding of the Multitude. With what seem to be obvious doublets, we have no less than six versions. (The 5,000: Mark 6^{35-44}, Matthew 14^{15-21}, Luke 9^{12-17}, John 6^{5-13}. The 4,000: Mark 8^{1-9}, Matthew 15^{32-9}.) Hitherto attention has usually been taken up with whether or not this was a miraculous feeding, just as for a long time discussion on the Book of Jonah raged round whether a man could be swallowed by a great fish and emerge alive. As with the latter case the controversy for a long time blinded men to the real purpose and nobility of the book, so I am suggesting that discussion of the manner of the feeding has blinded us to the historical significance of this story of the Multitude. There is this difference, however: the author of Jonah knew the real meaning of his story; the Evangelists on their incident did not, and no doubt because even the Twelve themselves (as the setting suggests) never really fathomed it.

It is time we asked therefore—what was Jesus doing in a lonely place with some thousands of *men*? ('Matthew' alone, and in both his accounts, mentions women and children: fairly evidently editorial additions.) That such a gathering was, as suggested, purely accidental, seems less reasonable the longer we look at it. Mark's second account mentions that the crowd were with Jesus there three days (8^{2}): this looks still less accidental. The Second Evangelist also firmly links the story of the Five Thousand with the

aftermath of the Mission of the Twelve (Mark $6^{7-13/30-4}$), which raises another question—we are told how Jesus instructed the disciples if their message was refused, but what did he tell them to do about those who responded? Put the two together and it is a not unreasonable inference that by Jesus's invitation through the Twelve (or through a later larger mission if the Lucan story of the Seventy is reliable) those men who accepted their message were to meet him at some prearranged quiet spot, and that these were the 'Five Thousand'.

If the gathering was indeed prearranged, of necessity it becomes the key event as well as the intended climax of the Galilean Ministry. Once news of it broke, Herod Antipas would have been bound to act as he had already done so in the case of the Baptist. The prime significance then of the meeting is that *Jesus initially had a well-defined strategy for his Ministry*. What this strategy was is not at first easy to see, mainly because as hinted at in 'Matthew' (14^{22}) and Mark (6^{45}) and made explicit in 'John' (6^{15}) the intended climax became an anti-climax, the disciples evidently sharing in the bewilderment of the crowd.

Since this is intended as an experimental approach, however, and not an exhaustive monograph, suffice to say that the implications are that Schweitzer was right in suggesting Jesus felt called to precipitate the coming of the Kingdom with power as a revolutionary social event within his own generation, wrong in suggesting that it would come by special interventionist miracle; while C. H. Dodd was right in suggesting that for Jesus the life of the Kingdom was a present personal possession here and now, wrong in suggesting that therefore Jesus felt no compulsion forthwith to turn the world upside down: rather was it his intention to send out the 'Five Thousand' to do just that, conquering first the nation and then mankind by sheer infectious positive goodwill in action. Without obvious leadership, organization or reward, they were to return double good for every evil, joyfully enduring persecution as the 'woes of the Messiah', the birth-pangs presaging the world-wide triumph of the Kingdom which some of them would live to see.

This hope leading to action Jesus sought to convey to the Multitude of would-be disciples by something like the Sermon on the Mount—so different from his usual enigmatic parabolic teaching to the people at large. Those around him in the desert place ought to be able to see: alas, that they did not, seeking rather to crown him as leader of an orthodox violent revolution, leaving him to accomplish what he did by finally bearing the 'woes of the Messiah' himself alone.

I will not here detail 'proof' of this experimental approach. Suffice to say that it makes sense of so many of Jesus's sayings and actions when set against his background; it restores something of the magic of his personality so obviously felt in him by those ardent young spirits, the Twelve; it makes it possible for ardent spirits to feel it still. By others it will be criticized that such an understanding makes him a deluded failure. A failure—yes, but not deluded; for when the Kingdom comes with power, that is how it will have to come. And not even a failure really; for to go right through to the bitter end with such is better termed victory.

To return to where we began, the sphere of ecumenical endeavour. If we conceive of the Church primarily in terms of organization, there may well be plenty of prudential reasons why the denominations should get themselves joined together to produce a powerful Church in terms which the world understands as power. But whether these are the terms in which the historic Jesus understood power covers a very different matter. Unifying organizations by various species of compromise cannot be expected to produce for our day the vision of him who turned his back on compromise. On the other hand the fresh discovery of the Christ who is seeking to break into our time, as in Jesus he broke into his time, would indeed bring us what in our deepest hearts we are thus fumblingly seeking. He drew together decent young fishermen, nationalistic Zealots, publicans and sinners, by giving them the right which we too easily deny them to ask at the end—'Lord, will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?' (Acts 1[6]). Where he is really seen, he draws them together again; and not merely from our carefully prescribed categories with the correct label, and not to the negative cause of the defence of virtue. He sends them rather to act on their own initiative, by methods orthodox or unorthodox, blithely probing with a spear-like virtue the prison defences where men have walled themselves in with their fears and hates and greeds, never doubting there are crumbling places where the Kingdom can make its triumphant incursion.

We can no longer afford to ignore such things as 'The pathetic complaint of a teenager to her parish priest. . . . "You don't make Jesus real!" '[4] At the heart of the churches' faith today is a Christ-shaped blank. When it is filled afresh by him who was and is, we shall find the only unity that matters.

[1] *The Jesus of History*, p. 3.
[2] *The Gospels as History: A Reconsideration, Rylands Bulletin*, Vol. XXII, No. 1.
[3] *The Clue to History*, p. 87.
[4] Nick Earle, *What's Wrong With the Church?*, p. 27.

DEATH—THE SUPREME POSSIBILITY

W. Maxwell Cumming

ONE OF THE ablest interpreters of the thought of Martin Heidegger and Rudolf Bultmann is Professor John Macquarrie, of Union Seminary, New York, formerly of Glasgow University. His joint translation with Edward Robinson of Heidegger's *Being and Time* is a massive work, involving profound insight into a most difficult system of thought.

In his book *An Existentialist Theology* Macquarrie expounds the existential approach to theology by means of a comparison of the teaching of Heidegger and Bultmann, and shows the relevance of their thought to an understanding of the main themes of the Christian faith. Since existentialism and the teaching of the Bible are both concerned with human existence they have much in common. Both have a great deal to say about man's individual

responsibility, the possibility of losing himself and of being himself, the need for resolve or decision, his temporal existence and death.

Macquarrie's book *The Scope of Demythologizing*, as the title suggests, is an examination of the extent of the demythologizing of the New Testament undertaken by Bultmann, and of the attitudes of his critics. Bultmann's debt to Heidegger is shown in his method of demythologizing which calls for the interpretation of the New Testament in terms of human existence, and makes use of conceptions developed by Heidegger in his existentialist philosophy.

Bultmann regards the nature and healing miracles of Jesus as mythical and interprets them in the light of their existential possibilities, as indeed he does whenever 'a more or less mythical passage of the New Testament is involved'. The stilling of the storm on the Sea of Galilee is a case in point, and carries with it the meaning that Christ gives peace in the storms of life.

The story of Lazarus and the rich man is interpreted in terms of human need and the failure to meet it by those who are well able to do so. It was the existential understanding of this story that led Albert Schweitzer to take up his work in Equatorial Africa when he saw the diseased and pain-ridden African as Lazarus, and the affluent in Europe and elsewhere as the rich man.[1]

Bultmann acknowledges a historical basis for the crucifixion of Jesus, but rejects any mechanical or objective theory of the atonement. As 'a healing of the estrangement which belongs to man's sinful condition' atonement 'cannot be "outside of" man. . . . It is realized only as it is accepted, only as there is participation in the event which makes it possible."[2]

The resurrection is treated as mythical, and is to be understood existentially as the new life of the believer on acceptance of the Cross. While agreeing that there is a mythical element in the New Testament way of speaking of the resurrection, Macquarrie claims a historical basis for it on the grounds that (*a*) 'the Easter stories together with St Paul's appeal to witnesses make it undeniable that Christ appeared to His disciples after His death', and (*b*) 'to accept the resurrection as an existential-historical event seems . . . to make it necessary to postulate an objective-historical event additional to the Cross as its sufficient origin'.[3]

The eschatology of the New Testament is interpreted by Bultmann in relation to the here and now of our existence, when we are being judged by our own decisions and deeds; and this demythologizing had already begun in the New Testament in such statements as 'Now is the judgement of this world'.[4]

In spite of the extent of his demythologizing Bultmann holds to a decisive act of God in Christ. He regards the event of Christ as belonging to 'a wholly different order from the cult-myths of Greek or Hellenistic religion'. The *kerygma*, or proclamation of God's Word, is addressed to man in His saving acts in Christ. Regarded as revelation the saving event gives understanding of oneself in the new situation which revelation discloses. Viewed as grace it brings to man his authentic existence.[5]

Macquarrie's latest work, *Twentieth-century Religious Thought*, is a brilliant analysis of the philosophical and religious thought of many of the

main teachers in Europe and America from the close of the nineteenth century to the present time, including sections on existentialism and its influence on theology; and the author does not conceal his opinion that in the understanding of religion 'the criteria are best satisfied on the philosophical side in those philosophies of existence that have been developed by Martin Heidegger and other thinkers; and on the theological side in the related work of men like Bultmann and Tillich'.[6]

It is to one aspect of the thought of Heidegger, and in a lesser degree of Bultmann and others, that I wish to draw attention.

One of the main concepts employed by Heidegger in his philosophy of being is 'possibility',[7] by which is meant not 'mere contingency, something that may happen, . . . but a possibility of decision, a way of being which man, because he exists, can choose for himself'.[8] There are two fundamental ways of being open to man—what Heidegger calls, on the one hand, 'inauthentic existence', and on the other 'authentic existence'.[9] Man is living an inauthentic existence when he is estranged from himself and absorbed in the concerns of the world, when he flees from anxiety into the world and seeks security in it.[10] On the other hand, man is living an authentic existence when he is at one with himself, when he is freed from bondage to the concerns of the world, and 'when he has risen above the level of everyday existence to something great and heroic'.[11]

Inauthentic existence has, of course, its parallel in the New Testament when man loses his true self by living to the flesh or the world, while authentic existence is paralleled by finding himself in living to the Spirit or becoming a new creature in Christ Jesus.

Heidegger makes much of death as part of man's possibility. In his inauthentic existence man refuses to come to terms with death and avoids the very thought of it. Carlyle tells us that Louis XV 'would not suffer death to be spoken of; avoided the sight of churchyards, funerals, monuments, and whatsoever would bring it to mind'.[12] While this is an extreme case it illustrates the abhorrence of death which many people feel, and their inauthentic attitude to it. A more recent example of this attitude was expressed by Canon Howard Johnson, formerly of New York, who in stating the chief reason why Americans allowed themselves to be over-charged by undertakers said: 'Most of America seemed to be involved in a vast conspiracy to hush up the fact of death.'[13] This hushing up of death, however, is not confined to America, and is frequently expressed by referring to the deceased as having 'passed away' or being 'at rest'.[14]

A very different approach to the question of death is made by Robert Browning who thought of life as a battle-field on which we are contending for the mastery over adverse forces, and for whom death was but the last and most glorious fight of all, to be welcomed as proving the real stuff of which we are made:

> *I was ever a fighter so—one fight more,*
> *The best and the last!*
> *I would hate that death bandage my eyes, and forbore,*
> *And bade me creep past.*

No! let me taste the whole of it, fare like my peers,
The heroes of old.[15]

Here we are approximating to Heidegger's conception of death, according to which man faces it calmly and resolutely, anticipates it and takes it up into his possibility. Indeed, in Heidegger's thought man's attitude to death provides the clue to his authentic existence, and in summarizing his teaching on this question Macquarrie says: 'All possibilities are evaluated in the light of death as the capital possibility, and when one lives in anticipation of death, one lives with a resoluteness which brings unity and wholeness to the scattered self.' And again: 'When man ceases to run away from the disclosure of anxiety that he is thrown into death, and when he anticipates death as his supreme possibility, he reaches an unshakable joy and equanimity.'[16] (Thrownness being another concept of which Heidegger makes much, and which is used to indicate the idea of man as thrown into the world or existence and into death as one might be thrown into a river.)

Some forty years ago L. P. Jacks referred to death in similar terms when he wrote: 'The Challenge of Death is the summary challenge addressed by the universe to man. It is the spear-point of the Challenge of Life, not to be evaded on any terms, as the fashion now is with many who evade it.' He went on to say: 'Religion is the power that faces the Challenge of Life when it comes to the spear-point in the Challenge of Death, and by winning the victory there, wins it everywhere else.'[17]

This authentic acceptance of death as man's supreme possibility may be evidenced by one example out of many; and we are here following Bultmann's method in using a Heideggerian concept, while going beyond Heidegger's own understanding of it in setting forth the Christian attitude to death.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer, the German theologian and Church leader, suffered the supreme penalty in defence of the freedom of the Church and people in Nazi Germany. His *Letters from Prison* reveal how prepared he was for death, and in the Foreword to those letters the editor quotes an English officer, Payne Best, who was a prisoner with Bonhoeffer when the end came and tells how on 'Sunday, 8th April 1945, Pastor Bonhoeffer held a little service and spoke in a manner which reached the hearts of all.... He had hardly finished his last prayer when the door was opened and two evil-looking men in civilian clothes came in and said: "Prisoner Bonhoeffer, get ready to come with us." These words, "come with us"—for all prisoners they had come to mean one thing—scaffold. We bade him good-bye—he drew me aside—"This is the end," he said. "For me the beginning of life." Next day, at Flossenburg, he was hanged.'[18]

So that part of the supreme possibility of death for Dietrich Bonoeffer lay in his faith that it was not the end, but the beginning of life! It is true that the idea of life beyond the grave did not enter into Heidegger's conception of death as the supreme possibility; for he thought that 'wholeness is attainable within man's temporality itself',[19] and that death is the end of being, of being-in-the-world. Nevertheless, he made it clear 'that this did not prejudge the question whether man has another being after death, whether he can be elsewhere or in another world'.[20]

Moreover, the question may well be asked, Is wholeness possible of attainment within man's temporality itself? Do not even the noblest of men feel the need for another life in which the tasks and possibilities of the present may come to fulfilment? One is reminded of Browning's lines:

If this be all and other life awaits us not—
for one I say 'tis a poor cheat, a stupid
bungle, a wretched failure. I for one protest
against it—and I hurl it back in scorn![24]

Browning had a clear conviction that all the possibilities and hopes ot earth would come to fruition in a life to come:

All we have willed or hoped or dreamed
of good shall exist;
Not its semblance, but itself; no beauty,
Nor good nor power
Whose voice has gone forth, but each survives
for the melodist
When eternity affirms the conception of an hour.
The high that proved too high, the heroic for
earth too hard,
The passion that left the ground to lose itself
in the sky,
Are music sent up to God by the lover and the
bard;
Enough that He heard it once; we shall hear it
by and by.[22]

Is not this also the purport of Rudolf Bultmann when he writes: 'But to reckon with eternity means just this: to view our familiar life as a provisional, unfulfilled and unfulfillable life, and to live it in preparation for a future, fulfilled and true life which God wills to bestow on us'?[23]

L. P. Jacks did not consider that 'the Challenge of Life, brought to its point in the Challenge of Death, was to be met by the doctrine of Personal Immortality—certainly not by that alone'. The answer lay 'in a far deeper and more comprehensive thought, from which our personal immortality may flow as a sequence, but of which it is not the whole nor even the beginning.' He found it in 'the doctrine of Divine Immanence. . . . Entering through the Silence into conscious fellowship with the life of the Living Universe, we ask no further question about our personal immortality, for eternal life is already won'.[24]

We may not agree with Jack's pantheistic conception of the universe, but he is in accord with the teaching of the New Testament when he affirms that eternal life is already realized by those who are living in fellowship with the Divine.

This is no less true of Bultmann, for whom—in spite of the scope of his demythologizing—the revelation and saving acts of God in Christ open up the possibility of an authentic existence in this world which triumphs over death. It is a transcendent God who speaks and acts in Christ, bestowing an eternal quality to the life which is rooted and grounded in Him. Just as

judgement belong not only to the future but also to the here and now of our existence, so eternal life is not only future but present, a quality of life that is not won by human striving, but is God-given.[25]

It has been noted that Heidegger is limited by his view of the temporality of human existence, but a factor in his teaching which helps to point the way to understanding of the Christian doctrine of eternal life is his concept of anxiety or dread which belongs to the nature of man's being, and which gives rise to an uneasiness which no absorption in the concerns the world can ever wholly allay.

Macquarrie here draws attention to Heidegger's opinion that it is 'no accident' that ontological anxiety has been a chief study of Christian theologians, and goes on to say that 'at this point the existential analytic has brought us to the threshold of religion, and that the concept of anxiety demands a religious interpretation—and with it the whole concept of human existence'. The reason for this is 'that in this uneasy restlessness, this feeling of not being at home in the world . . . man has an alternative to that flight into an inauthentic existence of surrender to the world, namely recourse to God who is the ground of being, Creator of both man and the world'.[26]

It may be deduced, therefore, that if man is not at home in the world it is because his true home is in God, as expressed by Augustine in his famous saying. 'Thou hast formed us for thyself, and our hearts are restless until they find rest in thee'; and in the language of the New Testament that the men of faith are 'strangers and pilgrims on the earth' who 'desire a better country, that is, a heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he has prepared for them a city'.

According to Heidegger, in the mood of authentic anxiety the world of entities sinks to 'nothing', and this 'non-entity' or 'wholly other to all entities' manifests itself as Being which Heidegger describes simply as trancendence. Moreover, as Macquarrie indicates, there are affinities of Being with the Christian idea of God inasmuch as 'Being reveals itself to man, it is gracious towards man, it makes man the guardian of Being, just as in the Christian religion too, God is said to reveal himself, shows himself gracious to man, and constitutes him, in St Paul's words, the stewards of the divine mysteries'.[27]

While Heidegger goes no farther in his concept of Being, however, he does concede that 'it is the poet rather than the philosopher who is likely to achieve insight into truth'. This view is borne out by Sir Henry Jones, himself one of the outstanding philosophical teachers of his day, who, in his book *Browning as a Philosophical and Religious Teacher*, wrote: '. . . these great ideas, these harmonies of the world of mind, first strike upon the ear of the poet. . . . What we find in Goethe, we find in a manner in Browning; an insight which is also foresight, a dim and partial consciousness of the truth to be, sending its light before it, and anticipating all systematic reflection. . . . The poet soon passes his glowing torch into the hands of the philosopher. . . . The intuitive flash grows into a fixed and steady light, which rules the day. The great idea, when reflected upon, becomes a system. . . .'[28]

So Browning divines the answer to Saul's deep-seated mood of anxiety, and to man's basic uneasiness which all his preoccupation with the concerns

of the world is unable to relieve, when he puts on the lips of David the words:

'Tis the weakness in strength that
I cry for! my flesh, that I seek
In the Godhead! I seek and I find
it. O Saul, it shall be
A Face like my face that receives thee:
A Man like to me,
Thou shalt love and be loved by, for ever!
A Hand like this hand
Shall throw open the gates of new life to thee!
See the Christ stand!'[29]

We are thus brought back to Bultmann's belief in a decisive act of God in Christ, expressed in St John's gospel as 'the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us', and re-enacted, so to speak, in the lives of men whenever that Word is proclaimed or presented and received in faith and obedience. 'This living Word of God is not invented by the human spirit and human sagacity; it rises up in history. Its origin is an historical event, by which the speaking of this word, the preaching, is rendered authoritative and legitimate. This event is Jesus Christ.'[30]

In this event the *death* of Christ is of supreme significance. 'For', as Professor Macquarrie has said, 'the death of Christ is the most striking illustration of the positive character of death. Here in a pre-eminent degree death becomes a possibility in the Heideggerian sense—that is to say, not just a misfortune that happens to a victim, but rather something that he takes up into his existence, and in which he . . . achieves a significance that could have been reached by no other route. For here is an absolute and final character attaching to the possibility of death that does not attach to any other possibility, . . . it brings into finite human existence something like an absolute. For instance, in the case of Jesus, his death becomes an absolute expression of love in a way that even an endless series of relative acts could never become.'[31]

In the light of the event which is Jesus Christ, culminating as it does in His death which becomes the absolute expression of love, it is difficult to understand why, for Bultmann, the resurrection does not become credible as an historical fact, in keeping with St Peter's declaration on the day of Pentecost: 'Whom God raised up, having loosed the pangs of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it.' Surely, the climax of the event is the resurrection of Christ as witnessing the transformation of death and the bringing of 'life and immortality to light'.

But the significance of the resurrection lies, no less, in its being an eschatological event; in its meaning for the here and now of our existence; in the new life imparted to the believer by the living Christ. As Dean Inge once wrote: '. . . The believer today, whether he knows it or not, infers that Christ arose because he feels and knows that He is risen. In his humble measure he can say with Paul: "It pleased God to reveal His Son in me".' And it is this new life, experienced here and now, which is the pledge and promise of life to come.

[1] John Macquarrie, *The Scope of Demythologizing* (S.C.M.), pp. 16-17.
[2] Ibid., pp. 85-6.
[3] John Macquarrie, *An Existentialist Theology* (S.C.M.), p. 186f.
[4] *Jesus Christ & Mythology* (S.C.M.), p. 33.
[5] *The Scope of Demythologizing*, pp. 12, 23, 25.
[6] John Macquarrie, *Twentieth-century Religious Thought* (S.C.M.), p. 374.
[7] *Being and Time* (S.C.M.), p. 68, etc.
[8] *An Existentialist Theology*, p. 33.
[9] As with concept of 'possibility', Heidegger defines the various aspects of authentic and inauthentic existence throughout *Being and Time*.
[10] Anxiety can be authentic as well as inauthentic. See *Being and Time*, p. 235, and *An Existentialist Theology*, p. 145.
[11] *An Existentialist Theology*, p. 162.
[12] *French Revolution*, Thomas Carlyle.
[13] *Daily Telegraph*, 10th July 1964.
[14] *An Existentialist Theology*, p. 119.
[15] *Prospice*.
[16] *Twentieth-century Religious Thought*, p. 354.
[17] *The Faith of a Worker* (Hodder & Stoughton), pp. 24, 27-8.
[18] *Letters and Papers from Prison*. Deitrich Bonhoeffer.
[19] *Twentieth-century Religious Thought*, p. 354.
[20] *An Existentialist Theology*, p. 117.
[21] *Paracelsus*.
[22] *Abt Vogler*.
[23] *This World and the Beyond* (Lutterworth), p. 153.
[24] *The Faith of a Worker*, pp. 30-3.
[25] *This World and the Beyond*, p. 245.
[26] *An Existentialist Theology*, pp. 70-1.
[27] Lecture by John Macquarrie at Vassar College on 'Heidegger's Conception of Death' pp. 14-16.
[28] (T. Nelson & Sons), pp. 43-4.
[29] *Saul*.
[30] *Jesus Christ and Mythology*, p. 79.
[31] Lecture on 'Heidegger's Conception of Death', pp. 17-18.

DANTE AND HUS

Geoffrey F. Nuttall

SEVEN HUNDRED years ago last May Dante Alighieri was born at Florence. His birthplace, though the house has been restored, is shown and the anniversary of his birth was duly celebrated earlier this year. In this country a new translation of the *Divina Commedia* has come from Faber, the British Museum has mounted an exhibition of Dante manuscripts and editions, and *The Times Literary Supplement* has had a whole-page article entitled 'From Arno to Thames'.

Five hundred and fifty years ago last July John Huss, as we call him, was burned at the stake at Constance. A manuscript of some years later is shown crudely picturing the scene, with the heretic's soul caught away by devils; but a small cross has been let into the pavement of the cathedral at the place where Hus stood when on trial and where he received the sentence of death. A Scottish visitor seeing this thinks of the cross let into the cobbles outside St Salvator's at St Andrews, where Patrick Hamilton was burned for heresy in 1528; an English visitor of the cross in the roadway at Oxford, outside

Balliol College, where Bishop Latimer and Bishop Ridley were burned in 1555.

'The *Divine Comedy*', to quote the Catalogue of the British Museum Exhibition held two years ago in illustration of the history of Western civilization, 'is one of the few works of which it may truly be said that its influence has no limits'. Though he may never have read a line of it, anyone claiming a shadow of cultivation knows Dante's name. Few educated men, however, few instructed Christians even, now know anything of Hus.

This was not always so. The Reformers were proud to stand in Hus's succession. Luther's enemies were quick to blacken his name by bracketing it with the accursed heretic's, and 'the Saxon Hus', as they called him, while dissociating himself from some of Hus's positions, openly acknowledged others to be truths of the gospel: 'We are all Hussites without knowing it,' he said. Hussite utraquism (the giving to all of communion in both kinds, the cup as well as the bread) was one of the banners under which the Reformation entered city after city; and a sixteenth-century woodcut, still medieval in its concern for a relationship of the spirit rather than for chronological contemporaneity, shows Luther and Hus side by side, administering the cup to the laity. When in 1550 the first printed edition of Hus's works was published at Nürnberg, it bore commendations from Luther, now one with Hus in the Church Triumphant.

'The spiritual pedigree, Wycliffe—Hus—Luther—Tindale', Professor Greenslade has said, 'is one of the most romantic truths in Christian history'. Our friendly Anglicization of Hus's name shows how well known among us his place in the golden chain once was. Scholars differ over the extent to which he was dependent on Wyclif. In some doctrines he did not go all the way with Wyclif but retained the theological conservatism characteristic of a deeply religious man of peasant stock. That Hus and all Bohemia received much from Wyclif and *de benedicta Anglia*, as Hus wrote in gratitude to a leading Lollard, there can be no doubt; nor that the English Reformers were well aware of what they, in their turn, owed to Hus. 'The Bohemian Huss' has his place in *Areopagitica* no less than in Foxe's *Actes and Monuments*. In the seventeenth century Milton is, in fact, more unusual in being acquainted with Dante, to whom, he wrote to a friend in Florence, he would go eagerly as for a feast.

To-day Hus is still remembered with reverence and admiration by the Czech people. Fifty years ago, when their country was still under an Imperial and Roman Catholic Governor, Hus's anniversary was celebrated by the erection of statues throughout the land, with an especially fine memorial in the Great Square at Prague. When in 1918 the Czechoslovak Republic was formed, its founders drew vigorously on the tradition of Hus as a national hero. The Republic's first President, T. G. Masaryk, had written a book on him and was a member of the revived Evangelical Church of Czech Brethren, which by 1926 was a quarter of a million strong. The date of Hus's martyrdom was celebrated annually as a national festival, and with him in mind the Republic took as its motto *Pravda vítečí* (*Veritas praevalet*). The present ruling powers neither share nor wish to encourage Hus's religious faith but they cannot afford to abandon Hus, and the author of a book published in

Prague in 1958 points to 'socialist Czechoslovakia' as the realization of Hus's appeal for genuine social and economic equality.

The earlier history of the Moravian Church runs largely underground. When at the beginning of the eighteenth century the Bohemian Brethren sprang to new life through the band of exiles received by Zinzendorf at Herrnhut in Saxony, they still regarded Hus as their father in the faith. A portrait of Hus preserved in the archives at Herrnhut forms the frontispiece to a new edition of a *Life* of Hus published in 1921 with a foreword by the Czechoslovak Minister in London.

It is perhaps unlikely that Hus knew of Dante; though he may have done. Some of those involved in Hus's trial did so. It was while they were present at the Council of Constance that Robert Hallum, Bishop of Salisbury (who died during the Council and whose memorial brass adorns Constance Cathedral), and Nicholas Bubwith, Bishop of Bath and Wells (to whom we owe the Vicars Close at Wells), persuaded an Italian bishop, Giovanni da Serravalle, to provide an extended paraphrase or commentary on the *Commedia* in Latin. If Hus, we may suppose, was not familiar with Dante, it is harder for readers of Dante to believe that Dante was not familiar with Hus and does not tell us in what circle of the Eternal World he is to be found. Dante seems to know everyone worth knowing on earth, and his acquaintance with past and present is so assured that we forget that the one thing closed to him was the future! Hus would no doubt be in Hell, among the heretics; but it is characteristic of Dante's independence that the heretics' place in Hell is fairly high. Certainly the Emperor and the prelates who betrayed Hus despite the safe conduct he had received would be in a circle well below him. In Dante's vision a traitor's sin is far greater than a heretic's. Like Hamlet, Dante knew that the last word is not always with churlish priests.

Per lor maledizion sì non si perde,
che non possar torna l'eterno amore
mentre che la speranza ha fior del verde.[1]

From Beatrice (we never remember that 'Beatrice' is Dante's own creation!) this son of hope, as Beatrice calls him, had learned that even the mirage is a mirage of the real; that in falsehood what attracts and distracts may still be a trace of the Eternal Light misunderstood but shining through,

alcun vestigio
mal conosciuto, che quive traluce.

There are, in fact, a number of things which Dante and Hus, the great Catholic and the great heretic, have in common. Both were patriots, men devoted to their homes, who yet died far away, the one safe from his enemies but in an exile's bitterness of spirit, the other rejoicing in God amid the flames his enemies kindled. Both were pioneers in the use of the vernacular. Of Hus's many works—the Prague Academy of Sciences has recently published volume XXII of his *Opera*—thirty-six were composed in Czech. He also wrote an *Orthographia Bohemica* and introduced the diacritic signs still in use in modified form. He worked at the translation of the Bible into Czech and defended the people's right to possess the Scriptures in their own tongue. Dante had much earlier abandoned Latin for Italian as the language

appropriate for the *Commedia*. Milman remarks what 'courage, firmness, and prophetic sagacity' this decision required. Perhaps, Milman suggests, Dante chose Italian partly as 'the assertor of the universal temporal monarchy': he perceived that 'the papal and hierarchical Latin' would, in time, withdraw. It is a comment of some interest at the present time.

However this may be, Dante and Hus are also at one in that, in the uneasy tension between Church and Empire, each, in the different way appropriate to his manner of witness, put his trust in the Empire and the Emperor. It is easy here to let our vision be distorted anachronistically. There are those who see Dante as fundamentally conservative, interested only to preserve a state of affairs which had never been more than an ideal and insensitive to the realities of the future or even the present. This may be fair criticism of the *De Monarchia*; but the *Commedia* is not a political manifesto. Politics, which shaped Dante's life, have marked his poem indelibly; but what we have in the *Commedia* is the temporal framework of law and order given by God, through which life's moving chiaroscuro is kept in place and all life's rich variety may be enjoyed and offered to God again. The universalism characteristic of the Middle Ages which pervades the *Commedia* would not be possible, were it not undergirded by what in writing of medieval architecture M. Emile Mâle calls *cette foi dans la durée*. Dante's absorbing interest is religious; his purpose (he says himself) is moral; and he writes of what ultimately affects all men equally in every generation. His writing in Italian shows sufficiently his faith in the future, a future which he helped to create.

Conversely, there are those who see Hus primarily as a forerunner of modern secularism. Hus certainly, like Wyclif, attacked the pride and avarice of the Church and its leaders. So did Dante. The grasping, too, are worse than heretics.

O avarizia, che puoi tu più farne . . . ?
O superbi Cristian miseri lassi . . .
O insensata cura dei mortali . . . !

A spirit of Independency or of Erastianism (to use terms from a later century), critical of the Church on religious grounds, may broaden, in course of time, into a secular spirit of independence on merely human, or humanist, grounds. Only in this sense may Hus be seen as a modern, even a Protestant, let alone a secularist. To attack ecclesiastical abuses, and the worldly Church which can permit them, it is not necessary to be a Protestant. Dante is witness sufficient.

What links the two men more positively is their vivid vision of the truth and their fidelity to their vision, cost what it might. 'Dante has all the fervour and passion of the Mystics; he is Bonaventura as well as St Thomas.' This is sufficiently wonderful; but his attention to earthly things is as sharp as to heavenly. For this 'penetrating truth of observation', his 'stern self-restraint', his compression of what he has to say into 'the fewest possible words', Milman compares him with Tacitus. Macaulay remarks that 'there is probably no writer equally concise'.

It is hard to think of a writer more different from Dante in his whole manner than Macaulay. Yet 'I believe that very few people have ever had their minds more thoroughly penetrated with the spirit of any great work',

Macaulay wrote when in Florence in 1838, 'than mine is with that of the Divine Comedy'. So far does Dante's influence extend. Macaulay came 'very near shedding tears' as he stood by Dante's monument in Santa Croce and 'thought of the sufferings of the great poet'. He was right. The suffering behind vision and its expression in poetry so continuous and so controlled is immeasurable. However exalted his genius, in composing the *Commedia* Dante gave his life-blood no less truly, only less literally, than did Hus.

The *Commedia* will always attract readers by the power of its poetry. Yet 'when we read Dante', Macaulay had written fourteen years earlier, 'the poet vanishes': 'the strong impression of reality' surpasses all else. This too is true. Dean Church makes the same point when he says that what makes Dante 'pre-eminent even among his high compeers' is 'the gift of being real'. Here again Dante is at one with Hus in Hus's inflexible stand for truth. 'Few scenes in history are more touching or ennobling', Dr Workman wrote, 'than the fidelity with which Hus refused to swerve from absolute truth, even to save his life'. 'For Hus truth was supreme'. *Pravda vítězí!* 'Seek the truth, listen to the truth, learn the truth, love the truth, speak the truth, abide by the truth, and defend the truth unto death' used to be written up on walls in many parts of the Czechoslovak Republic.

'Truth is called tymes doughter', Bishop Gardiner wrote once to Thomas Cromwell; 'tyme wil have childe at the last, but it is long first'. In 1965 we may appropriately commemorate, and thank God for, Dante and Hus together. There is room in thy father's house.

[1] 'By curse of theirs man is not so lost that eternal love may not return so long as hope retaineth aught of green'. *Temple Classics*—Thomas Okey.

THE BIBLE CHRISTIANS, 1815-?

Glyn Court

IN THIS 150th anniversary year the Methodist Church has suddenly become aware of one of its choicest though long-neglected traditions, the Bible Christian. Twelve months ago it was a living reality only to West Countrymen, but now it is known to Methodists from the less favoured counties, and enough has been written of the foundation of the movement by William O'Bryan at Shebbear in 1815 to make further repetition here unnecessary, for the Rev. Thomas Shaw, in his recently published study, has created a mosaic of history which every Methodist home should possess.[1] Familiarity, however, can dull the edge of wonder, and the magnitude of the achievement of those early days should again be measured against the conditions, both material and spiritual, of the age—and both would have defeated a movement any less vigorous that the Bible Christian. E. J. Thompson has suggested that periods of religious revival have followed periods of social oppression, revolt and eventual defeat;[2] but even if this be generally true, the rise and development of the Bible Christian Connexion

shows no such readily identifiable trend, for the revivals which marked its progress were too frequent to allow any chronological connection to be established with the more irregular phases of social oppression; conversely, and to anticipate, the slight improvement in the living standards of some country workers in the later years of the century did not in the least cause the enthusiasm of the Connexion to wane.

Modern town-man likes to think that there is still something in him that cries out for the country; consequently he tends to see rural life as a year-long idyll. It requires a prodigious effort of the imagination to accept that for most country-dwellers, even today, life is no idyll, but hard work, and that 150 years ago it was misery. In the years following Waterloo, few people were so obstinate as to starve to death, but few were free from hunger, and even fewer survived to old age. In the West Somerset hundred of Carhampton, out of 7000 who lived there in 1821, only 345 had contrived to reach their seventieth birthday;[3] and in this, at least, the families of substance shared the fate of the humble, for the epitaphs which old Savage transcribes for our incredulity show time and time again that the possessors of such heroic if improbable virtues died when they should have been at the height of their physical powers. But if disease struck all classes, behind these noble epitaphs there glide the ghosts of those who had no memorial, the pallid phantoms of the poor.

In 1815 ours was a nation drained of its gold by war, a countryside half-emptied of its people by the new industrial towns. Wages varied from place to place, but for the agricultural labourer they were throughout the century pitifully low. Even as late as 1914 an Exmoor labourer, with a lifetime's skill in his sinews, might count himself fortunate if he received anything over a half-sovereign a week, and some of this meagre allotment would be paid in kind. Alfred Brind, a Wiltshire shepherd, started work even in 1900 as a farm-boy for a wage of five shillings.[4] The laws, particularly the game laws, were harsh and the magistrates often inexorable.[5] A recommendation to mercy implied, at best, transportation for life. Up to 1870 schools for the labourer's children were rare; moreover, the three pence a day his child might earn in the fields could not be foregone. The water supply for his cottage was often a stagnant, slime-covered pool; the cottage itself small, insanitary and verminous;[6] his children, numerous and often ailing, would be herded into one bedroom,[7] where any epidemic would consume them like a swaling-fire. His food was scanty and monotonous: beans, barley bread or bannocks, potatoes or turnips, with meat no more than once a week, in the shape of fat bacon. And at the end of this existence, the workhouse, hated and feared, with good cause, more than all his other suffering.

Why, with such misery, was there no new Peasant's Revolt? Were they deterred by the knowledge of the savage penalties for failure, as the Somerset folk, after their gallant rebellion under Monmouth, could not be tempted to follow a better leader in William three years later? Was it the knowledge that the forces of property—the law, the squirearchy and the Established Church—were too strong? Was it a supine acceptance of their lot, knowing that they were born as brothers to the ox? Or was there, in spite of all, a pride in skilled work ill-rewarded but well done,[8] a feeling that they and

their masters understood one another and that, as an old Buckinghamshire labourer said, 'Better to work for a hard master that understands you than a kind one who does not?' At all events, it was only in the darkest night of despair, in those years of European revolution, 1830 and 1831, that the labourer turned to revolt. At all other times, the rigidity of the system in which he lived, the impossibility of improving his lot except by the education he would never have time to acquire, the discouragement of his unending struggle against starvation, seem to have created in him a sense of hopelessness. Even his few recreations, on a Sunday, were often of the lowest kind, bull-baiting, cock-fighting and a form of wrestling far removed from the contrived manipulations of modern times; and if the drunkenness of a lord was proverbial, in this, if in nothing else, the servant could show that he was as good as his master. Moreover, in the West of England neither the Anglican nor the Nonconformist Churches, even where they offered an active ministry, had a message which could restore to labouring men their dignity.

This was the background against which the Bible Christians proclaimed the Gospel. The spread of the Connexion may be briefly described. By 1819 the original membership of 22 had increased to 2,389, but was still confined to Devon and Cornwall, where the movement had sparked off revivals in the surrounding Wesleyan and Baptist Churches. In 1821 the first mission in Kent was opened, and in the next year the Missionary Society was formally established 'for the purpose of sending Missionaries into dark and destitute parts of this and other countries, as Divine providence might open our way.'[9] The founding of the various missions may conveniently be tabulated:

	Home		*Foreign*
1821	West Somerset		
1822	London		
1823	Monmouthshire Guernsey, Jersey, Northumberland		
1824	Glo'stershire (Membership now 6200)		
(1829	O'Bryan leaves the Connexion)		
		1831	Missionaries sent to Canada West and Prince Edward Island
		(1843	Plans for New Zealand)
		1846	Wisconsin and Ohio (offshoot of Canadian mission)
1851	Huntingdonshire (Yaxley)	1850	South Australia, expanding into
1859	Westmorland	1854	Victoria
		1864	Illinois, Michigan
1870	Cumberland	1865	Queensland
		(1868	Plans for Ceylon)
1874	Durham		
		1876	N. Yorks (Cleveland)

1876	New Zealand	1877	W. Yorks (Bradford)
		1878	Derbyshire (Chesterfield)
1885	South West China	1888	Lancashire (Blackburn)
		1889	„ (Bolton)
1904	Mission to the Miao.	1894	Birmingham

The visible success attending these efforts varied: South Australia and Canada, for example, were eminently successful; Queensland and Huntingdonshire were abandoned. Success seems to have borne no relationship to the nearness to home or ease of administration, and apparent failure seems not to have been attributable to the poverty of the members of the Connexion. Briefly, the areas at home in which least progress was made were those in which Primitive Methodism was already flourishing. The two types were so similar that, in fact, there was hardly room for both, as the Primitives themselves found during their unsuccessful mission to North Devon in 1829. Economically speaking, such missions were unjustified; but fortunately for their souls, both churches knew better than to judge by economic viability. There was little rashness in the sending forth of missionaries, and decisions were taken only after long consultation in Conference; nor was there anything arbitrary in the choice of fields, for behind the decision to send a missionary stood, in nearly every instance, the figure of a man from Macedonia, in the guise, perhaps, of a Plymouth carpenter in Chatham dockyard, a Devon farmer in Ohio or a group of Cornish miners in South Australia.

The missionary fervour in which the Connexion was born remained with it to the end, being manifested not only in large-scale revivals but also, except for two brief periods, in steady increase and consolidation, matched by sacrificial giving. There is something infinitely touching in the sight of the Missionary Society accounts of seventy years ago, with score upon score of small sums set against the names of little children; 'For China'. Yet there is no denying that the 1907 membership of some 34,000 compared with the Primitive membership of 220,000 does not point to enthusiasm. It must be remembered, however, that while the rise in the birth-rate in Victorian times was uniform over the country, the population increased most rapidly in the industrial areas, where the Primitive Methodists were established, while the rural areas of the South and West, in which the Bible Christians were strongest, were continually being depopulated as a result of bad harvests and emigration to the mines and industrial towns of the North and the colonies. Besides, the Connexion suffered most grievous losses by the union of the various Methodists Churches in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. But if the B.C. Connexion was numerically the smallest of those which contributed to the Union of 1907 (and if, indeed, some societies, even in 1965, can be said to have united), it was none the less distinctive, and the tenacity with which some of the former B.C. congregations in Devon and Cornwall maintain in common speech even the name of the Connexion is due not to a fear-ridden resistance to change but to the conviction—whether founded or not—that the Church has lost more by Union than it has gained. Contrasting the steady increase in membership

in the days of independence with the equally steady decline since Union, they draw the obvious conclusion. Now the obvious conclusion may very well be the wrong one, but no argument, whether sociological or demographic, can prevail against it. They firmly believe that they are preserving the customs and beliefs of a purer type of Methodism than obtains today, against the time when the world will again be ready to receive it.

A valid question, however, is whether the Connexion was fully Methodist. The circumstances of its origin and the exclusion of its founder from his Methodist society have no bearing here, for it may be justifiably held that, if Methodists are as Wesley defined them, "a people who profess to pursue (in whatever measure they have attained) holiness of heart and life, inward and outward conformity in all things to the revealed will of God", then no expulsion from society on disciplinary grounds, as distinct from moral or pastoral, is legitimate; and a Methodist, though expelled from society, may still be truly a Methodist. Like O'Bryan himself, even after his expulsion, they were devoted to Methodist ideals, and their doctrines differed in no important respect from those taught throughout Arminian Methodism at the time. But the early fathers felt no closer kinship with the older body than with any other body of Christians. Samuel Mayne wrote:

> 200 persons were added to our society in the four weeks; and the rest went with the Methodists. Some more of the young converts would have met with us, only they lived too far away; while others were induced to join the Methodists because they were more respectable, &c.... I have heard that some have said that our connexion is made up of runaway Methodists; but it cannot be said to be so in this neighbourhood;... for every Methodist who has joined us, there are fifty with the Methodists who have been converted to God in our chapel.[11]

William Reed wrote in his diary in 1823:

> One temptation has been to think too highly of myself, another to imbue my mind with prejudice against the Methodists, and a third, indulging the flesh. I fear I have not always resisted these temptations as I ought.[12]

By 1849, however, Matthew Robins could apply, in quotation, the term 'Methodists' to his fellow-members with no more than a slight bridling,[13] and in 1868, when a change in the connexional name was convassed, two correspondents to the Magazine (one a pleasingly high-spirited woman) could write: 'We do hear Methodists saying that they are Bible Christians, and Bible Christians saying that they are Methodists, and we have never heard either party contradicted'; and, 'In doctrine, government, &c, we are Methodists. In every sense we are a branch of the great Methodist family.'[14] But at what stage of their history this opinion may have come to be universally held is doubtful: the probability is the late 1870s, about ten years before 'Methodist' was included in the official name. We may note, also, that right up to the end the word 'Methodist' was parenthesized.

One senses a certain reluctance in this, a certain unwillingness to identify the connexion with every institution of Methodism, and a keen suspicion of formalism. The Quaker element was laudably strong, for O'Bryan himself

came of good Quaker stock, and a due concern for the tender of conscience was shown in the Minutes of the Fourth Conference, held in 1822:

Q. 12: As some have scrupled at prefixing *saint* before names of places, what are our thoughts on that subject?
A. After investigating the subject, we agreed to decide it by vote and the majority are of opinion, that although we all agree that it originated in superstition, yet as it is only used by protestants to distinguish one place from another, it can be no harm to use it; especially as some are a little puzzled to find out the name when the St. is left out: but if any one thinks this is following the Roman Catholics too far, he is at liberty to follow his own judgment.[15]

Indeed, for over fifty years, until the death of James Thorne, the ministers refused the title 'Reverend'. Yet it seems an almost invariable rule that ecclesiastical movements, even those in which the Holy Spirit is most patently at work, should in due course lose something of their first fire and, if they are not to fade away, form themselves into institutions. Nor is this process necessarily harmful. The workings of the Spirit are not to be forecast; and when His visitations seem to be less frequent, and the memories of early glories grow dimmer, the effects may be in large part preserved by the pursuit of holiness in the fellowship of the members; and one measure of success or justification of a church, particularly a Methodist church, is the degree to which its members attain holiness.

Without considering the Bible Christians as repositories of all the virtues, and recognizing that while all Christians are called to saintliness, not all—even Bible Christians—arrive there, it can be claimed that for the followers of William O'Bryan a living experience of the Holy Spirit was the great fact of existence. Other privileges came to the zealous Bible Christian, but just as the foundation of the Connexion came from a free outpouring of grace, so did the transformation of their own lives. This living experience they strove to renew continually. They did not live upon a past conversion but continually, by class meetings, love feasts, by study of the Word of God, but most of all by fervent and effectual prayer, they sought to press on toward the mark of their high calling: scriptural holiness, and sanctification to the service of Christ. Even in the first Conference this was made clear:

Q. 31: What do we understand by holiness, or entire sanctification?
A. An entire destruction of all evil propensities, unholy tempers, and inordinate affections; and an entire renewal of the soul in the image of God....
Q. 32: Is this attainable in this life?
A. Yes, unless we limit the Holy One of Israel; for in the first place Christ hath purchased it for us....
Q. 33: Is this gradual or instantaneous?
A. We conceive it both; for when a person is justified, if he is *faithful*, he continually grows in grace, and dies to sin: Notwithstanding which, there must be a moment when sin is *destroyed*.
Q. 34. How is this obtained?
A. By believing in the promises of God; that He both *can* and *will perform* that which he hath *promised*.[16]

This belief, though on occasion interpreted in such a manner that the purity of holiness was more readily apparent than its beauty, was tenaciously held throughout the history of the Connexion. (One feels that Dr Sangster would have been at home.) If the earliest leaders spoke with this voice, certainly we have known men and women of the latest generation whose every act was a witness to the power of the Spirit, and who won others to Christ less by words than by the beauty of their lives.

The Bible Christians, then, shared the common heritage of Methodist doctrine and, in spite of their Quaker background, accepted the Sacraments. All branches of the family taught that men must be borne again, but the Bible Christians and Primitive Methodists seem to have stressed this the most fully, and to have looked as a matter of course for a decisive and self-evident conversion. The immediacy of their experience, the heightened sense of personal dignity which came from their converse with God, shaped their conception of the church polity. They were one family, in which all were equal—and to their very great credit, the ministers proclaimed this as firmly as any. With the example before them of the ecclesiastical Toryism of the ministers who had attempted to discipline their founder, they were ready to resist when O'Bryan himself began to assume quasi-episcopal powers. No doubt the political atmosphere in 1829, just before the Reform Bill, influenced the Connexion to this end; but the point was well taken, and no similar threat ever recurred. So deeply held was the conviction of equality, that when in 1884 the Bible Christian societies in Ohio found themselves isolated from the parent church in Canada by Methodist union, they found it quite impossible to unite with the Methodist Episcopalian Church. 'It needed but a formal vote to settle the matter. Discussion, however, made it clear that the church's only hope was in abiding by her long cherished principles of equality and self-government.'[17] They chose instead to unite with Congregational churches.

Holding these beliefs, the Bible Christians allied themselves from early days gladly and irrevocably with the Nonconformist Churches and supported the long campaign for disestablishment. In 1885 F. W. Bourne, the most influential B.C. minister of his generation, quoted with approval a judgement of the *Methodist Times*:

> Those who imagine that farm labourers, as a whole, will vote for the maintenance of the Establishment, must be gentlemen who have never listened to the genuine sentiments of an English peasant's fireside. There is even less doubt with respect to the votes of the Wesleyan Methodists. It is probable that the rank and file of our people were always Dissenters. But for a long time our most influential ministers and laymen were warm friends of the Establishment, as such.
>
> (*Plus ça change. . . .*)
>
> But a silent revolution has long since been completed. (Liberal and thoughtful men) are convinced that the disestablishment of the episcopal denomination is the necessary preliminary to some wide and catholic reunion on anti-sacerdotalist and evangelical lines in the happier days that are coming.[18]

Loving their own church, the Bible Christians were no bigots, and were willing to preach and worship wherever Christ was honoured. William

O'Bryan and James Thorne, in the Address to the Members at the Eighth Conference, warned them,

> Let us avoid bigotry, and thinking, or speaking, lightly of any who do not follow with us, even though they may speak unkindly of us; not returning evil for evil, but contrariwise, praying for those who may be inimical to us, as those who peculiarly need it;[19]

and half a century later, in his charge to the brethren in 1884, Peter Labdon spoke:

> You are Bible Christian ministers. I am not so foolish as to claim any exclusive excellence for the church of your choice. We wish all churches 'God-speed'. But you are to minister in the Bible Christian Church; a church that has a 'heritage of sound doctrine, and a clean history'. I want you ever to remember what you are. Keep your vow.[20]

(In passing, the ordination of Bible Christians ministers was of such scriptural simplicity and manly dignity that a present-day Methodist theologian has doubted whether, 'by the normal tests', it really constituted an ordination at all.[21] It is possible that these same ministers, their work blessed by the conversion of many, would not have been too greatly disturbed.)

The Bible Christians lived in an age of oppression but also of the beginnings of social reform, and although conscious that they had no abiding city, they were deeply concerned with justice in the present. Their support of temperance and, later, total abstinence principles is well known; but the pages of the *Bible Christian Magazine* form a continuous record of their concern over man's inhumanity to man: the slave trade, the Inquisition in Rome, the Fenian murders, the horrors of revolution and civil war in Spain; and those who followed the lead of James Thorne and F. W. Bourne fervently supported such causes as the abolition of capital punishment, international arbitration, free State education, the Evangelical Alliance, and Liberalism. In their later days, beneath the glory of Gladstone, they were Liberals almost to a man, for they could not and would not keep their Christianity and politics separate. It is strangely apposite that Sam Pollard's last words to his friends as the train steamed out of London were not a message of spiritual counsel but: 'Mind you deal with the House of Lords!'

One proud distinction remains, and in that the Bible Christians were so far ahead of their time that the rest of the Methodist Church still lags behind and, everything indicates, is determined to lag. No body of believers except the Friends has so closely followed its Master in its honouring of women. From the beginning they realised that women had a special contribution to make to the service of God beyond the power of any man, a contribution of understanding and sympathy, and in a day when women were regarded as inferior to men they founded the ministry of the maiden preachers. Admittedly they did not take the final step of appointing them to the superintendency of circuits, but it is abundantly clear that in every other respect they were regarded as the equal of their male fellow-pastors.

One may of course query to what extent the theology and opinions uttered

by the leaders of the Connexion were appreciated by the members, but the widespread lack of formal education was no barrier to understanding; indeed, with men of original genius the way to the heart was more direct, and the evidence is that very many of them had thought and felt deeply on the great questions of man's destiny. Was much of the preaching too chiliastic for modern ears? Were not many conversions obtained by fear, by vividly describing the terrors of hell? It may be so, and at least modern preaching is more generally innocent of the charge of achieving conversions. If in the early days, before a broader humanity had infused their opinions, the preachers were indiscriminate in their condemnation of the world, they were alive to the pervasive menace of sin, and they pointed unmistakably to where the answer lay. *'Il paraît clairement,'* says Pascal, *'que l'homme, par la grâce, est rendu comme semblable à Dieu et participant de sa divinité, et que, sans la grâce, il est comme semblable aux bêtes brutes.'* By grace? Some of us have been privileged to know Bible Christians of the generation born in the 1870s, and born again at the end of the century; we know that by grace the lives of these men were lives transformed.

[1] T. Shaw, *The Bible Christians, 1815-1907* (Epworth Press, 1965).
[2] *The Making of the English Working Class* (1963), reviewed in *W.H.S. Proceedings*, June 1965, p. 55).
[3] James Savage, *History of the Hundred of Carhampton*, p. 28.
[4] Alfred Brind, *The Old Shepherd.* (Broadcast of 26th Dec. 1961, South and West Home Service).
[5] W. H. Hudson, *A Shepherd's Life* (London, 1916), p. 153.
[6] F. E. Green, *The Tyranny of the Countryside* (London, 1913), p. 138.
[7] R. Sellick, *The West Somerset Mineral Railway* (Dawlish and London, 1961), p. 64, and F. E. Green: op. cit., pp. 140-141.
[8] W. H. Hudson, op. cit., p. 138.
[9] Missionary Society Annual Reports, successive.
[10] Final North Country dates from Shaw: op. cit., 83
[11] *B.C. Magazine*, 1836, p. 113: *'Memoir of Samuel Mayne'.*
[12] J. Thorne: *Memoir of William Reed* (Shebbear, 1869), p. 58.
[13] *B.C. Mag.*, 1849, p. 22.
[14] *B.C. Mag.*, 1868, pp. 81-83.
[15] Minutes of the Fourth Annual Conference, 1822.
[16] Minutes of the First Conference, 1819.
[17] Rev. Frank M. Whitlock , (from) *Ohio Church History*, in *B.C. Mag.*, 1890, p. 661.
[18] *B.C. Mag.*, 1885, p. 238.
[19] Minutes of the Eighth Annual Conference, 1826.
[20] *B.C. Mag.*, 1885, p. 8.
[21] *London Quarterly*, July 1964, p. 215.

THE MISSIONARY CONTROVERSY 1889-1900

N. C. Sargant

THE MISSIONARY Controversy began in 1889, and reached its climax in the following year at the Bristol Conference of seventy-five years ago. There were several causes for the Controversy such as the writings of W. S. Caine, a Baptist Member of Parliament (*A Trip Round the World in 1887*), the activities of the Salvation Army, the arrival of the *Joyful News* missionaries in India, the tensions within Methodism, the criticisms of Indian Christians, and the personality of Dr Lunn (as he was then known).

Henry S. Lunn was born in 1859 at Horncastle, Lincolnshire and entered Headingley College in 1881. He was ordained by the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in 1886 and graduated in medicine at Dublin University in 1887. He was appointed as a medical missionary, but before he sailed for Madras in 1887 he took part in a General Election Campaign on behalf of the Liberal Party and in support of Irish Home Rule, in which he had become interested during his stay in Dublin. He had just started on his election tour when he received a telegram from the Mission House in London, 'Stop political action'. This involvement in politics brought him to the notice of the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, editor of the *Methodist Times* and the leader of the Forward Movement in Methodism.

At the Third Indian National Congress, which met at Madras in 1887, Lunn met patriotic, well-educated, and professionally qualified Indian Christians and became sensitive to their criticisms of missionary work. He also met at Madras the officers of the Salvation Army and in Tiruvallur, where he was stationed, saw two European Officers clad in Indian dress, selling copies of *War Cry*. They told him that they had adopted Indian dress on grounds of economy and because they believed that this was the right way to propagate Christianity. Lunn had no time or chance to go deeply into such matters or to experiment himself because in November 1888 he returned to England prostrated by repeated attacks of fever. Such experiments were about to be made by *Joyful News* missionaries.

The head of the *Joyful News* Mission was Thomas Champness of Rochdale. He had met with great success training lay agents for the Home Missions of Methodism and having been himself a missionary in West Africa he had sanguine news about the possibility of training men for Foreign Missions who could live as simply and cheaply. Through his paper *Joyful News* he raised money to send missionaries to Africa, India and China. It had been arranged, with some misgivings to the Missionary Society and its missionaries, to send a *Joyful News* missionary to the Mysore District of South India. Actually two arrived, Simpson and Edlin, and although indoctrinated with the idea of hard work, plain living and not exposing themselves to the sun, they knew nothing about protecting themselves from malaria. When they fell ill, complaints were made that the other missionaries at Shimoga had to

look after them (*Methodist Recorder*, 18th April, 1889). Champness's letter of reply to this criticism closed with a postscript that Edlin was no more. The death of Edlin was a great blow to the methods advocated by Champness and *Joyful News*.

Meanwhile Lunn's articles on missionary policy had begun to appear in *Methodist Times*. He had become Hugh Price Hughes' assistant at the West London Mission. Hughes was also editor of the *Methodist Times*, the organ of the Forward Movement in Methodism, which regarded the Missionary Committee as the stronghold of mid-Victorian Methodism. When Lunn disclosed to Hughes his conviction that missionary work in India was on wrong lines, Hughes suggested that Lunn should write a series of articles for the *Methodist Times*. These articles were called 'A New Missionary Policy for India' (*Methodist Times*, 4th, 11th, 18th and 25th April, 1899) and were made more offensive by an editorial preface to the first article which declared that the great Protestant missionary societies had pursued a mistaken and disastrous missionary policy in India, and that nothing could save them from the increasingly popular distrust and financial embarrassment except 'a frank and prompt return to the methods followed by our Lord and his disciples'. The final article was also safeguarded by another editorial broadside: 'Many have held these convictions but have hesitated to state them. . . . We assume entire responsibility. . . . Any future attack upon their supposed author will therefore be due either to wanton vindictiveness or to a secret consciousness that his arguments are unanswerable'.

What were the contents of the articles? The first set out what Lunn thought to be the disastrous results of Alexander Duff's educational work in Calcutta, which initiated a policy of missionaries working among the high-caste and wealthy people, instead of among the outcaste and common man. The second article showed how the missionaries' social position became separate from the people among whom they lived and worked. In the third article, called 'The untrodden *Via Media*', Lunn recommended that the missionaries should adopt the style of living midway between their present style and that of the Salvation Army. The last article called 'The Secret of Missionary Finance' did not call for any adverse comment in the controversy which followed.

The timing of the articles also gave offence, for Hughes and Lunn had not only appealed to the Methodist people over the heads of the Missionary Committee, but even did so during the weeks which preceded the May meetings. Lunn himself was the preacher at St James' Hall, Piccadilly, on Sunday, 29th April, when he not only declared his authorship but restated his main contentions. At the Breakfast Meeting on Saturday 28th, speakers had vigorously defended educational work in India, and at the Annual Meeting on Monday, 30th, the Chairman attacked Champness for publishing in *Joyful News* the tabular statement, based on the 1881 census and already published in India, which seemed to show the comparative failure of Wesleyan Missions in India. 'When our Brother Champness was told it was a damaging statement and the proper place to discuss the matter was the Committee, he declined to avail himself when offered the means to do so,' said T. Morgan Harvey, the Chairman. The attacks on Champness were

deplored by the *Methodist Times* and its correspondents, one of whom wrote (after mentioning Edlin's death): 'Thomas Champness deserved something better than an official pelting and pounding before such an audience.'

How were the articles received in India? There was much alarm and bitterness because they had been quoted and commented upon by the London Correspondent of the Madras *Hindu*. The missionaries believed that Lunn himself was the Correspondent and were determined not to let the matter rest. The Chairman of the Madras District, James Cooling, writing to the W.M.S. on 15th May, said among other things: 'Lunn gets paid for these letters. . . . What are we to think about the man who writes about missionaries' luxurious living?' The Chairman of the Mysore District, Josiah Hudson, also wrote to the W.M.S. on 8th June, 'We are simply disgusted with Lunn', and on 22nd June, Henry Haigh, editor of *Harvest Field*, 'If Lunn is the author, then he is not only disloyal to missions, but he is a traitor to his own colleagues in the fight.' *Harvest Field* was published at Bangalore by the Wesleyan missionaries of the Mysore District. It was then very influential and is even now a first-rate source of printed material. The whole June number was devoted to replies and scathing comment on Lunn's articles, and also attacked Hughes for assuming responsibility.

The volumes of *Harvest Field* and the letters in the Archives of the M.M.S. tell us about what was going on in India. We may also learn what was going on in England from the files of the *Methodist Recorder*, the *Methodist Times* and *Joyful News*. Henry Gulliford's Diary, now deposited in Church History Archives of the United Theological College, Bangalore is also an excellent source of original material. Gulliford was an editor of *Harvest Field* and reached London on furlough about 15th June, 1889. He was informed by the local minister (W. D. Walters), 'The quarrel on the missionary question was confined to very few persons'. Gulliford probably had special instructions to meet Champness and Hughes and warn them of the action which the missionaries intended to take if they did not withdraw. He did indeed meet them at Hughes' London house on 21st June, and learnt that both of them were very sore about the treatment they had already received at the hands of the Missionary Committee. On 22nd June Gulliford met Curnock, the editor of the *Methodist Recorder*. It was decided to eliminate Lunn himself and the articles in *Hindu*, because it had since been proved that Lunn was not the correspondent; also to eliminate the vexed questions of missionary stipends, which could not be discussed in detail. It was decided to raise the discussion on the education question to a higher level. This in fact was the official line which was adopted by the *Methodist Recorder* in its editorial of 27th June, 1889. At the Missionary Committee next day there were hot words and Gulliford 'feared our efforts to stop the personal element will have been futile' but at the end Hughes and Champness were persuaded to withdraw their resignations. Leaving the room Gulliford heard one Committe member say to another that some of the opposition to Hughes was 'devilish'.

But when the Conference met at Sheffield a letter was read on 24th July from the missionaries of the Madras District complaining about the articles

and asking that if those charges could not be substantiated, they should be withdrawn or that if they were found to be true, they themselves, the missionaries, should be recalled. The Conference appointed a weighty committee which included seventeen present or former missionaries and Hughes himself. Hughes went out of the chapel muttering that he would be driven out of Methodism. The full reporting in the *Methodist Recorder* conveys the heightening tension and excitement of the debate on 30th July 1889, when the special committee reported to Conference that it had received with satisfaction the assurance that Hughes and Lunn were willing to make and publish a declaration (i) repudiating the construction put upon their works by the missionaries, (ii) denying these opinions involved the conclusions assumed and (iii) regretted unintentionally causing pain. The committee recommended sending to the missionaries a message of confidence, sympathy and love.

Dr Geden, supported by Gulliford, proposed a much sterner amendment. At this stage Lunn, who was in the gallery of Carver Street Chapel, was heard to say that he stuck to his point. There were calls for him to make his defence, which he did standing in the corner of the gallery. Lunn's words about being expected to engage a butler and buy a carriage when he arrived in India stirred up great wrath. W. L. Watkinson said that this was the most extraordinary speech he had ever heard. Lunn must either substantiate that speech or pay the penalty and go. Hughes jumped to Lunn's defence, and concluded his speech with the words: 'If the conference cannot distinguish between holding an opinion and bringing a charge, it may result in the expulsion of Dr Lunn and myself.' In a great state of excitement the Conference accepted the special Committees' report, and next day (1st August) sent to Madras a telegram: 'Love, sympathy, Confidence', and laughed when the reply to this was read: 'Warmest thanks all Indian Brethren Cooling'. Cooling was the name of Madras Chairman. The missionaries were not really thankful nor were they willing to let matters cool off.

On 5th and 7th August, at the Representative Session of Conference, some laymen moved resolutions requesting the missionary committee to prepare a statement on (1) Evangelistic and Educational Policy, (ii) Employment and pay of native agents, (iii) The allowance and style of missionaries, and (iv) Results of the Society's work. All this made the missionaries feel that Conference had yielded to Hughes' threat to resign instead of definitely and emphatically rebutting the assertions of the *Methodist Times*. In August 1889 *Harvest Field* contained an open letter to the editor of the *Methodist Times* headed 'Prove or Retract', and in October 1889 it contained an article, 'Why the Missionary Controversy must continue'. It was also decided to call a General Conference of the representatives of Wesleyan Missions in India. This met in Bangalore in November and called upon the Missionary Committee to set up a commission to investigate the grounds on which the *Methodist Times* articles were based. The Bangalore Conference also appointed a strong committee to draw up a document. This included elaborate tables, exhibiting in detail all the items on which a missionaries' stipend was expended 'from the price of firewood and washing to the cost of a modest Table'.

It was not until March 1890 that *Harvest Field* announced in its headlines: 'The Commission Granted'. It was decided to send home W. H. Findlay and G. Patterson (of the Madras Christian College). Some doubts were expressed about Patterson by Josiah Hudson (25th February 1890) because of the personal nature of his controversy with Lunn. It was believed that Patterson was the person whose pretentious style of living Lunn had in mind in writing his articles. He was always called Professor Patterson in the reports of the enquiry which followed. But there was disappointment when the Missionary Committee could not appoint a Commission. Instead it appointed from its members a Sub-committee of investigation. At the special meeting of the Missionary Committee on 24th April, 1890, Patterson spoke in defence of the missionaries, and Lunn and Hughes brought before the Committee a Summary Statement, which they also published, called *The Proposed Missionary Policy*. In accordance with the decision of the special meeting, the President of the Conference, Charles H. Kelly, nominated the Sub-Committee, which consisted of four other ministers and four laymen, which included a Member of Parliament (The Rt Hon. H. Fowler, M.P.; after Lord Wolverhampton), a Justice of the Peace (Mr John Clapham J.P. of Manchester) and a Barrister at Law (Mr H. Arthur Smith of Lincoln's Inn).

The Sub-committee commenced its sessions on 27th May 1890 and sat each day until 30th May and examined many witnesses, confining its attention to the second and third of Lunn's articles. It completely exonerated the missionaries from the charges of luxurious and seclusive living, but recommended that in future their stipends should be paid in the silver currency of India rather than in the gold currency of England, which would mean that there would be a reduction of £57.10s. or Rs 700 per annum in the case of an unmarried missionary without children. In the next number of the *Methodist Times* Hughes claimed this a victory for the *Via Media*, which greatly annoyed *Harvest Field*. The adjourned Meeting of the General Committee met on 1st July 1890 and endorsed the verdict of the Sub-committee and passed the resolution which was finally accepted, after a great debate by the Conference which met that year at Bristol: 'That this Committee expresses its great satisfaction that its missionaries in India have been thus so completely exonerated, and records its profound regret that charges so grave and so unsustained should ever have been brought against them.'

A complete transcript of the evidence given before it and the report of the Sub-committee were printed and delivered *gratis* with the *Methodist Recorder* on 1st June 1890, showing the enormous interest attached to the Controversy. On 10th July 1890 the *Methodist Recorder* published a letter from Hughes and Lunn to the President of Conference containing the following: 'We cannot withdraw charges we have never made. . . . You and your Committee have put a construction on the articles which did not occur to us and which we never intended. But the fact that you have done so proves that they are capable of the objectionable meaning you find in them. . . . We now formally and deliberately withdraw all the passages to which the Sub-Committee object; once more we express deep regret at any unintentional pain we have caused good men.'

On 14th July 1890 the Missionary Society issued *The Missionary Controversy*. It contains 388 pages beginning with the *Methodist Times* articles of April 1889 and concluding with the Minutes of an Adjourned meeting on 1st July 1890, an extraordinary feat of printing. It had been widely circulated (10,000 copies it was said) before the Conference met at Bristol. Dr Lunn's case came up under stations on 24th July 1890. Lunn had been transferred from the West London Mission to the Great Queen Street Circuit so that he could be the chaplain of the Regent Street Polytechnic. It was over this appointment that the storm broke. Is Dr Lunn to be stationed at all? Is Dr Lunn to receive an appointment to minister to 7,000 young men? Can a discredited man like Lunn retain his ministerial status? These were the questions that were asked. The special committee appointed to deal with the matter produced a report expressing its grief and displeasure about the articles for which Hughes and Lunn were jointly responsible, but agreed to permit Lunn to labour in London in connection with another religious organization. When challenged in Conference, members of this committee confessed to a change of heart, consideration for Hughes and a dread of a cleavage within Methodism. After much debate the proposals were accepted with a few verbal changes.

Neither Hughes or Lunn attended Conference. Lunn's *Chapters from My Life* (1918) and *The Life of Hugh Price Hughes* (1904) tell the effect these resolutions had upon Hughes implying strong condemnation of his conduct. On 30th July 1890 the President, Dr W. F. Moulton, announced that he had received a letter from Hughes, the contents of which he did not disclose. But Gulliford's Diary records that the Conference was otherwise informed that Hughes was in a sad state of mind and had threatened to commit suicide. It is also mentioned that there was a letter of resignation. But by the time that the report on Foreign Missions came before the Representative Session on 15th August 1890 there had been a strong wave of sympathy and support for Hughes. Not only did one layman, Bainbridge of Newcastle, give notice of a resolution which was to be a vote of confidence in Hughes, but two other laymen, R. W. Perks, and S. R. Edge, proposed and recorded an amendment to the official resolution of the Missionary Committee (as passed by the Adjourned Meeting on 1st July). The proposed amendment expressed dissatisfaction with the financial and general state of the Missionary Committees' Indian Missions. Speaking to this amendment Perks (afterwards Sir Robert Perks) condemned the enterprise and zeal of the Indian missionaries in matters which so directly affected their own remuneration and status, and suggested that the two missionaries who had come on this business should go back quickly to their work in India.

This amendment stirred Patterson to a tremendous oration. When he commented unfavourably on Hughes' withdrawal, he was called upon by the President to clarify his remarks, Patterson said: 'I hold at the present time that Mr Hughes has withdrawn nothing, and his letter is not a withdrawal or a retreat but a going into ambush.' As some had feared before, Patterson in the end overplayed his hand, for he was followed by H. W. Fowler, M.P. (a member of the Sub-Committee) who began: 'I deplore although I admire the speech Mr Patterson has made. It has not carried conviction to my

mind. . . . I deplore the spirit and temper in it.' Fowler went on to say that it was really a question of missionary policy and this was not raised in the first instance by the *Methodist Times*. It had been raised before at Wolverhampton in the Church Assembly by a Canon Taylor. It had been raised by a member of Parliament who went to India. Finally Fowler gave his own testimony to the work that Hughes was doing—'Preaching to public men like myself that what is morally wrong cannot be politically right'. Appealing to Perks and Edge to withdraw their amendment he said: 'Let us bury this miserable personal controversy and go straight like a great Church'. The Conference did this and voted for the Missionary Committee's report, which contained the resolution (previously quoted), which expressed satisfaction that the missionaries had been exonerated and regret that the charges should ever have been brought. The Conference also directed the Missionary Committee during the year to consider several suggestions by the Sub-Committee, and also to prepare the statement called for at the previous Conference about evangelistic and educational policy, the employment of native agents, the allowances of missionaries etc. When this was done the *Doxology* was sung with great feeling and the Conference adjourned.

The results of this re-examination of the work in India caused B. Sundkler (*The Church of South India* (1954), p. 25) to write: 'The most spectacular case of re-examination was that of the Wesleyans arising out of the criticisms offered by a young missionary doctor, Henry Lunn. The Wesleyans analysed in India and England what they called their 'comparative failure' in mission work. If there was failure, the new century brought them an unprecedented harvest.' This was indeed true. The work in all the South Indian Districts, Madras, Mysore, Hyderabad and Trichy, flowered with an extraordinary vitality. The senior missionaries became more tolerant of the criticisms and aspirations of the new missionaries. Men like D. G. M. Leith and J. S. M. Hooper of Madras protested against the segregation of the mission compound and were permitted to live in densely populated parts of Madras.

Hugh Price Hughes died suddenly in 1902 at the age of fifty-five. He became President of the Conference and made the voice of the Nonconformist Conscience heard with such effect in 1890 that Mr Gladstone, the Prime Minister, withdrew his support of C. S. Parnell, the Irish Nationalist Leader. Lunn resigned from the Wesleyan Methodist Ministry in 1893, but holds a special place of honour in the history of the Reunion Movement. He was the founder of the Grindelwald Conferences and member of early Faith and Order Committees. In 1914 Conference met at Leeds, where a photograph was taken of Lunn, Findlay and Patterson in order to commemorate the election of Sir Henry Lunn (as he had then become) as a lay representative to the Conference and the burial of the Missionary Controversy. He was the founder of a famous firm of Travel Agents, and himself travelled round the world bringing to his ambitious effort to promote Reunion the same infectious optimism with which he had sought to reform Indian missions in his youth. He died in 1939.

ARTHUR SAMUEL PEAKE: 1865-1929

John T. Wilkinson

I

ARTHUR SAMUEL PEAKE was born on 24th November 1865, at Leek in the county of Staffordshire. This present year is therefore the centenary of his birth, and it is fitting that something of the man and his work should be recalled. Originating in that county the family was closely associated with Methodism from the days of its foundation. His paternal grandfather was converted under the Primitive Methodists and became a local preacher. Two of his sons entered the Primitive Methodist ministry, and the younger of these, the Rev. Samuel Peake, the father of Arthur, was deeply religious and a fervent evangelist. Peake's mother, although she belonged to an Anglican background, also experienced conversion under the Primitive Methodists. A woman of beautiful character, she died when her son was but ten years of age. He ever regarded her with the deepest affection and spoke of her profound influence upon him.

Educated at the grammar schools of Ludlow, Stratford-on-Avon and the King Henry VIII School at Coventry, in 1883 Peake went to Oxford with a Close scholarship from St John's College, and a school exhibition from Coventry. In 1885 he gained a Third in Classical Moderations. In 1887 he was elected Casberd Scholar at St. John's and in the same year secured a First Class in the Honours School of Theology. In 1889 he was elected Denyer and Johnson Scholar—the most valuable prize that Oxford had to offer; in 1890 he gained the Ellerton Essay Prize on 'The Relation of Montanism to the Doctrine and Discipline of the Catholic Church'.

In the same year he was appointed lecturer at Mansfield College, Oxford, where he lectured on Old Testament History and Theology and Patristics. In the October of that year he was elected to a Theological Fellowship at Merton College—the first Nonconformist layman to be so honoured.

Whilst at Oxford Peake came under the stimulating influence of five great scholars—Cheyne, Driver, Sandey, Fairbairn and Hatch—and from all these he gained an insight into the historical approach to biblical study, a field in which in after years he was to excel. During this period also he became a local preacher and a teacher in the Sunday School, the latter foreshadowing his later pioneering efforts for Sunday School reform.

In 1892 Peake was appointed tutor at Hartley College, Manchester, the theological college associated with the training of the Primitive Methodist ministry. Thus began his outstanding contribution to Primitive Methodism. This opening was made possible by the foresight and liberality of Mr (afterwards Sir) William P. Hartley, who had met Peake in Oxford, and who was deeply concerned in the matter of ministerial education. Naturally Principal Fairbairn was anxious to retain Peake at Mansfield, but with fine insight he realized that it was Peake's duty to serve the call of his own church. He wrote:

> My own feeling must be made strictly subordinate to your sense of duty. And I feel what a great opportunity may come, nay has come to you in your own Connexion. It seems to me as if you had been specially raised up and trained for the very work that is most in need of being done for it. And you are in many ways the only person that can do the work. You may lift up their idea of the ministry, of the Church, may open their minds while in no way cooling their piety, and may attain a position and influence any bishop might envy.[1]

Thus began a college tutorship of thirty-seven years. Alongside this he became lecturer at Lancashire Independent College (1895-1912) and for the latter part of this period also at the United Methodist College in Victoria Park.

In 1904 he was appointed to be the first John Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis in the University of Manchester, a post which he held to the end of his life, and which widened his scope of influence and gave him an assured place in the theological world. Thus he became the chief formative influence in the newly-founded Faculty of Theology and was its first Dean (1904-8). In 1925 he became Pro-Vice-Chancellor of the University.

II

Peake's literary output was enormous, both in books and countless articles and reviews. For a long period he continued a correspondence in the pages of the *Primitive Methodist Leader*, by which a vast amount of biblical and theological influence was disseminated, for he believed that he had a vocation to mediate the findings of scholarship to ordinary folk.

In connection with the John Rylands Library, Manchester he fulfilled a great service. Elected in 1899 to the Council of Governors, he eventually succeeded to the Chairmanship of that body. Members of that Council were often astonished at the extraordinary range of his knowledge of literature in fields other than his own.

Peake's first book, *A Guide to Biblical Study* (1897) was typical of his work, for almost all his output centred in the exposition of Scripture. The late Professor T. W. Manson once told me that in his judgement Peake succeeded in becoming what none other would have attempted, namely, equally expert in both Old and New Testament fields. To name some of his major writings is sufficient to illustrate this. For the Old Testament we have his *Job* (1905) and *Jeremiah* (1910-12) in 'The Century Bible'; his Hartley Lecture (1904) on *The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament*; his posthumous work, *The Servant of Yahweh and other Lectures* (1931). In the New Testament field his *Critical Introduction* (1909); his commentaries on *Hebrews* in 'The Century Bible' and Colossians in the *Expositor's Greek Testament* (1903); *The Revelation of John* (Hartley Lecture, 1919) and his numerous lectures on Paul, in particular his *Quintessence of Paulinism* (1917). Further he was concerned with theological exposition and wrote *The Religion of Israel* (1908); *Christianity: Its Nature and Truth* (1908); *The Bible: Its Origin, Significance and Abiding Worth* (1913) and *The Nature of Scripture* (1922). Many other works might be added to these, for he was a prolific writer.

III

Peake also possessed fine editorial gifts. The one-volume *Commentary* (1919), which rightly bore his name, shows his editorial skill, for apart from his own contribution, covering all sections of the book, he provided additional notes, the revised bibliographies to the separate sections, and now and again even a mild *caveat* when he felt it was required. He himself went through the *Commentary* no less than eight times in order to ensure its accuracy. It is significant that when the *Commentary* was entirely revised and rewritten in the light of more recent scholarship in 1960, under the editorship of Professor H. H. Rowley and Professor Matthew Black, it was issued with the original title: *Peake's Commentary on the Bible.*[3]

Other works showed the same standard of editorial skill. In 1925 he edited *The People and the Book*, a volume of Essays written by members of The Society for Old Testament Study, of which Society he had been President a year earlier. Also in 1925 (along with Dr R. G. Parsons) Peake edited *An Outline of Christianity*, a five-volume work in which over a hundred authorities contributed.

It is fitting that in this centenary recollection particular reference should be made to Peake's work as editor of the *Holborn Review*, for this present periodical embodies a two-fold inheritance in terms of Wesleyan and Primitive Methodist traditions as signified by its title: *The London Quarterly and Holborn Review*. It was in 1919 that Peake accepted the appointment as Editor of the *Holborn Review*, which was the quarterly periodical of Primitive Methodism. In so doing he introduced new elements which greatly increased both its value and its circulation. In order to secure the service of contributors of distinction he created a monetary fund for the purpose of reasonable remuneration for those who wrote; he initiated a policy of celebrating centenaries of famous people by series of articles; he introduced a Study Circle in 1923 which provided syllabuses for study-courses widespread throughout the denomination. But the two most eminent features of the *Review* were the large sections on 'Current Literature' and Peake's own 'Editorial Notes'. There were many who bought the *Review* because of the long and numerous reviews, many of which were written by Peake himself and which at times occupied half the issue. On this account the *Review* became in particular an invaluable guide to ministerial reading. Peake's 'Editorial Notes' not only recorded observations on current biblical and theological subjects, but also frequently brief sketches of famous scholars and well-known preachers, many personally known to Peake himself. These *causeries* were collected and edited in 1938 by Dr Wilbert F. Howard in *Recollections and Appreciations by A. S. Peake* in the 'Preface' of which he indicates their value:

> Some of these appreciations were obituary notices; others were written to celebrate the jubilee of some famous worker in his field of study. But they were detached estimates; they were personal, reminiscent, reflective.

IV

Peake was a man of profound ecumenical sympathies. In a letter written in his undergraduate days there is early evidence of this:

> I can never be satisfied till we have gained an organic unity. This unity will never be gained till we consent to sink differences of belief and make Christ the foundation on which we build. . . . For myself I don't care to be called either Methodist, or Church of England, or Protestant or any name except Christian.

This conviction deepened with the passing of the years and it was on this ground that he gave abundance of time and effort to the cause of union in all the after years, during which he was recognized as a true guide both in regard to the union of the Methodist Churches and the more general reunion of Christendom. He declared:

> Our first duty to those who are separated from us is not to refute but to understand them. Of all qualities in this connexion that of sympathetic imagination is most to be prized, the quality which enables us to step out of our theological and ecclesiastical prepossessions and to survey the situation from the standpoint and with the eyes of those from whom we dissent.[8]

This indicates the width of Peake's vision far beyond his own generation.

Peake's scholarship inevitably won recognition. In 1906 he received the honorary degree of D.D. from the University of Aberdeen, and in 1920 the D.D. of his own University of Oxford, being the first nonconformist layman to be given this distinction.

V

In the recollection of those of us who knew him many memories come to mind. It was the combination of scholarship and piety that gave him so great an influence with those of us who were his students. His quiet self-effacing dignity, his scintillating humour, his willingness and unending patience with any seeking mind, his firmness against frivolity or inattention when in his lectures he was dealing with deep issues, for with him no student could take undue liberties. His profound and sincere piety revealed itself nowhere more strongly than in his preaching, yet perhaps even more in those days at the Great Western Street Church, Manchester, when in the prayer-meeting at the close of the evening service he was caught up by the Spirit in supplication. There emerges the memory of his supreme goodness, his many unrecorded acts of kindness, and his unswerving loyalty to the Church to which he belonged and to the people he loved. His greatness as a scholar had a deeper source than natural endowment, for the religious quality of his heart and mind was abundantly clear. He possessed great magnanimity of spirit. Though unable to share the point of view of the conscientious objector in his book *Prisoners of Hope* (1918) he made a moving appeal for toleration at a time when dispassionate judgement was rare.

Surveying his life one who knew him well summed up the greatness of his achievement:

> Perhaps it was Peake's greatest service not merely to his own communion but to the whole religious life of England that he helped to save us from a funda-

mental controversy such as that which had devastated large sections of the Church in America. He knew the facts which modern study of the Bible had brought to light. He knew them and was fearless and frank in telling them, but he was also a simple and consistent believer in Jesus, and he let that be seen too; therefore men who could not always follow him were ready to trust him. . . . If the Free Churches in England have been able to navigate the broken waters of the last thirty years it is largely to the wisdom and patience of trusty and trusted pilots like Arthur Samuel Peake that we owe it.[4]

It was not given to him to reach length of life for he died on 19th August 1929 in his sixty-fourth year.

[1] W. P. Selbie, *Life of Andrew Martin Fairbairn* (1914), p. 244.
[2] Principal C. Leslie Mitton reviewing the new volume in the *Expository Times* (vol. lxxii p. 330) wrote: 'The [earlier] work proved itself a weighty factor in the battle for freedom of thought in relation to the Bible and served its own day and generation with conspicuous success. . . . No higher tribute to the status of the earlier volume could have been paid more than this desire to retain the name. It suggests that the new volume hopes to do for this generation the same high service that the older one did for its contemporaries.'
[3] From an address on 'The Reunion of Christendom' given to the Unity meeting of the Wesleyan Conference at Sheffield in July 1922.
[4] *The Times*, 20th August 1929.

BIRTH CONTROL AND CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

John Peel [1]

DESPITE the high hopes expressed both in Catholic and non-Catholic quarters, the Vatican Council has failed to reverse, or even to modify, the Church's traditional teaching on contraception. Nor has the torrent of statements and counterstatements, of articles, pamphlets and books which the debate has provoked, served to clarify the major doctrinal issues which are at stake.[2] The purpose of this paper is to examine what has emerged as common ground amongst the Catholic contributors to the debate, both 'liberal' and 'traditionalist', and to assess the logical and theological validity of these assumptions.

The starting-point for most discussions has been the 1930 encyclical of Pius XI which states that the Roman Catholic condemnation of contraception derives from a 'Christian teaching . . . handed down uninterruptedly from the beginning'.[3] The scriptural precedents are to be found in Genesis, which might reasonably be described as the beginning, but apart from interpretative comments by St Augustine and St Thomas Aquinas and practical injunctions in medieval penitentiary manuals, the subject seems to have received little official attention until the nineteenth century. For the medieval Church contraception, being associated with prostitution and perversion,[4] represented a danger of which it needed to be wary, but which was not widespread or important enough for any special decrees to be promulgated or Papal pronouncements made.

By the nineteenth century it had become necessary for the Church to take a more positive stand. The spread of contraception, particularly in France, together with the development of the condom as an efficient contraceptive,

challenged the moral authority of the Church which retaliated by standing firm by its traditional teaching. Between 1816 and 1916, in response to specific enquiries by priests, the Sacred Penitentiary issued twelve condemnations of contraception on the ground that it contravened natural law and was intrinsically evil.[5] In theory, at least, the only legitimate alternative was abstinence.

In practice, as always, the Catholic Church was more flexible. When, in 1853, the Bishop of Amiens asked the Sacred Peniteniary how to advise a married couple who were confining intercourse to the *tempus ageneseos* or infertile period, he was told not to interfere provided that the couple did nothing to impede conception. In 1880 the Sacred Penitenary suggested that the use of the *tempus ageneseos* might be permitted when all other attempts to dissuade from 'Onanism' (*coitus interruptus*) had failed. To soften the harshness of its basic teaching, the Church was now prepared to admit the use of the infertile period, but only as a last resort.

It is not difficult to see why the Church sanctioned the use of the infertile period, though Catholic spokesmen had difficulty in explaining the moral difference between this and condemned forms of contraception.[6] Apart from the difficulties of principle involved, there were pressing reasons for allowing married couples some alternative to the use of contraceptives. Every factor which contributed to the general adoption of family limitation made obedience more difficult for the faithful Catholic. Looked at from another angle it would have been surprising indeed if the Catholic Church had forbidden the avoidance of the fertile period. To consider this sinful would have appeared ridiculous to a celibacy-minded Church and impossible in its specific confession-remission procedure. Consider what the penitent must say: 'I did refrain from sexual intercourse at a time when I might have conceived'—surely, a restraint worthy of commendation rather than condemnation. The use of mechanical and chemical contraceptives, on the other hand, involves specific material actions which are well suited to the confessional.

Until the early 1930's, however, when the Ogino-Knaus discoveries seemed to offer reliable techniques for calculating the infertile period, this approved method of birth-control was played down by the Church whilst on the major issue it gave no ground at all.

Pius XI's 1930 encyclical was a reiteration of the traditional doctrine in which the condemnation of contraception was based on the Roman Catholic doctrine of marriage. 'Matrimony is by nature a divine institution,'[7] its laws are binding on Catholic and non-Catholic alike. 'Not men, but God, the Author of nature, and Christ our Lord the restorer of nature, provided marriage with its laws, confirmed it and elevated it; and consequently those laws can in no way be subject to human wills.'[8]

The particular law which is contravened by the practice of contraception is cited by Pius XI, using the words of the Canon Law 1013: 'The primary end of matrimony is the procreation and education of offspring.'[9] Contraception strikes at the heart of this doctrine of marriage: 'The conjugal act is of its very nature designed for the procreation of offspring, and therefore those who in performing it, deprive it of its natural power and efficacy, act

against nature and do something which is shameful and intrinsically immoral."[10] No matter how serious the motive for contraception there can be no mitigating circumstances: 'But no reason whatever, even the gravest, can make what is intrinsically against nature become conformable with nature and morally good."[11]

Pius XI cites scriptural precedents for his statement that offspring are the prime purpose of matrimony: (i) God's command in Genesis 1[28]: 'Increase and multiply and fill the earth' and (ii) St Augustine's interpretation of 1 Timothy 5[14].

'The Apostle testifies that procreation is the purpose of matrimony when, having said, 'I will that the younger woman should marry', he adds immediately as though he has been asked the reason, 'so that they may bear children and become mothers of families."[12] The Pope finds chapter and verse for his condemnation of contraception in the Old Testament story of Onan, and again gives St Augustine's interpretation. 'Sexual intercourse even with a lawful wife is unlawful and shameful if the conception of offspring is prevented. This is what Onan, the son of Juda, did, and on that account God put him to death."[13]

Pius XI reinforces his appeal to scriptural authority by arguing that contraception is against nature. Contraception 'vitiates the act of nature'; it interferes with a natural process. 'Any use of matrimony whatsoever in the exercise of which the act is deprived, by human interference, of its natural power to create life, is an offence against the law of God and of nature. . . ."[14] Contraception, 'This criminal abuse', is an act 'against nature' and is therefore immoral.

It does not follow from this line of argument, says Pius XI that in marriages where through natural causes, procreation is impossible, the conjugal act may not be performed. 'Nor are husband and wife to be accused of acting against nature if they make use of their right in a proper and natural manner, even though natural causes (due to circumstances of time or to certain defects) render it impossible for new life to originate."[15] Procreation is the primary purpose, but 'Both matrimony and the use of the matrimonial right have secondary ends—such as mutual help, the fostering of reciprocal love, and the abatement of concupiscence."[16]

Before turning from this summary of Pius XI's attack on contraception to a criticism of his case, an ambiguity, which later proved significant, should be noted in the above passage about the use of the conjugal right in barren marriages. Pius XI spoke of 'circumstances of time' which make conception impossible. He may have been referring to intercourse between couples who are too old to bear children. He may equally well have meant the so-called 'infertile period' of each menstrual cycle. Whatever he meant, in the light of subsequent events, it was a felicitous ambiguity.

In Pius XI's encyclical *Casti Connubii* we have the fullest authoritative statement of the Roman Catholic view on birth-control before the development of the Ogino-Knaus 'safe period' theory and the recent oral contraceptive. So it seems appropriate at this stage to consider the arguments on which the case rests.

The scriptural precedents, quoted above, are few and their relevance is not

entirely obvious. God's injunction to Adam and Eve (and again to Noah and family) to be fruitful, etc., would seem to have been reasonable at that time when the world was reputedly empty, but has little relevance to a world threatened with calamitous over-population. The only test Pius XI quotes from the New Testament, whence Christianity derives, is from Paul's first Epistle to Timothy (of doubtful authorship). After criticizing the foolish behaviour of young widows the writer goes on to make the quoted recommendation: 'I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully' (R.V.). To extract from this, as St Augustine did, the law that procreation is the purpose of matrimony is surely to read into the verse more than the context warrants.

It is indeed difficult to find any specific support in the New Testament for the view that procreation is primary. Christ's own words stress the unitive and not the reproductive aspect of marriage (Mt. 19^{4-6}).

The Old Testament story of Onan is the only scriptural evidence which appears to support the Roman Catholic view on contraception. Even this rests on what seems to be a misinterpretation of the text.

Onan was commanded by his father to marry his eldest brother's widow, in accordance with Levirate custom. 'And Onan knew that the seed should not be his, and it came to pass, when he went in unto his brother's wife, that he spilled it (his seed) on the ground, lest that he should give seed unto his brother. And the thing which he did displeased the Lord: wherefore he slew him also' (Gen. 38^{8-10}).

St Augustine and Pius XI after him, assumed that Onan was punished for committing *coitus interruptus*, but it is at least as likely that he was punished for breaking the law—i.e. for refusing 'to build up his brother's house'.[17] In any case the time and social situation are remote, and a reference from Genesis, with a gloss by St Augustine, quoted by a Pope in 1930 do not convincingly constitute 'a Christian teaching handed down uninterruptedly from the beginning', as Pius XI asserts.

Pius XI's arguments that contraception is against nature seem at first to be based on reason rather than authority. Leaving aside for the moment the interpretation of what is meant by 'nature', it is true that contraception involves interference with a natural process. It is difficult to see why this should be 'intrinsically immoral'. Nearly all scientific advance involves interference with natural processes. Whereas in the past such discoveries as vaccination against smallpox and anaesthetics, were condemned by the Church on just these grounds of interference with nature, etc., today they are welcomed as God-given knowledge. To say that contraception is immoral because it interferes with a natural process is not consistent with the Church's general approval of the application of scientific knowledge—e.g. to avert the natural processes of disease and death.

Pius XI's argument that contraception is against nature in a wider sense appears to have greater force. He finds that contraception frustrates the primary purpose of marriage (offspring) and is therefore unnatural. But it is logical to condemn contraception only if one takes this premiss regarding the primary purpose of marriage to mean *unlimited* procreation. But in this

case Canon Law 1013 is self-contradictory. For parents cannot fulfil their duty to educate their children if at the same time they must procreate to the physical limit. Pius XI's very stress on the educative duties of parents implies a duty to limit procreation. And if this is admitted, contraception might be considered as an aid to marital duty rather than as an impediment. Yet it is only by allowing this interpretation of procreation as 'unlimited procreation' to stand that Roman Catholics have appeared to sustain their case.

Leaving aside the contradiction involved in fulfilling the primary purpose of marriage, let us consider the 'secondary' ends of marriage. These according to Pius XI and the Roman Catholic marriage service are mutual help, reciprocal love, etc.[18] Why should the priorities be ordered in this way? Restricting oneself to observation of what happens 'in nature' it is obvious that in marriage the act of intercourse occurs far more frequently than is necessary for the creation of even the largest family and that it is impossible for every act of intercourse to result in conception. May not the act of intercourse have other purposes, besides the occasional one of procreation?

To see how dogmatic Pius XI's attack on contraception is, one has only, as A. W. Sulloway has suggested, to alter the above premiss for different conclusions to follow. He suggests, for example, that if the primary end of marriage is held to be the fostering of mutual love, then if the wife has some reason to fear pregnancy, she may have an aversion to intercourse and the mutual love of husband and wife may be threatened. In this case to safeguard the primary purpose of marriage, the use of contraceptives may become a duty.

But even if one accepts that the primary end is procreation (whether unlimited or not), it does not follow that the marital act cannot have other functions. sometimes simultaneous with the reproductive one, sometimes separated from it.[19]

One suspects that the Roman Catholic disapproval of isolating the pleasurable and unitive function of intercourse with the reproductive one owes something to the preferences or lack of experience of a clergy which traditionally places a higher value on celibacy than on the married state. Further it must be some association with the idea of original sin which leads Pope Pius XI to condemn contraceptives as *intrinsically* evil. When evaluating other 'aberrations' such as stealing or lying, the motive or intention is important. Circumstances have to be taken into account, except when it is a question of sexual morality, which seems to suffer from a special kind of apartheid.

A basic difficulty in following Pius XI's reasoning is to know what he means by the phrases 'unnatural', 'natural law', 'against nature', etc., and to understand why 'unnatural' should be equated with immoral. The word 'nature' is capable of many contradictory interpretations, *e.g.* the physical world as opposed to the spiritual: the essence of a thing, as opposed to its appearance; the primitive state as opposed to the civilized or the unregenerate as opposed to the regenerate. Which of these, if any, did Pius XI mean to imply?

He provides an answer by saying that God is the author of Nature and that for marriage to be restored to its original and natural state it must return

to the divine ideal. Thus 'against nature' comes to mean 'against the laws of God'. In spite of this, there is still a suggestion that these laws can be ascertained by the use of reason. 'If marriage, then, is to be restored to its normal condition, all must meditate on the divine plane concerning it and endeavour to shape their conduct accordingly'.[20] But even this is a mirage, for Pius doubts that 'All men are able with ease with certainty and without any admixture of error to ascertain what these laws are'.[21] Men cannot be left to discover these laws 'by the light of reason alone'. So in order to avoid the illusions and errors which would arise if people were left to work out their own individual interpretation of God's laws, the Pope reminds the faithful that, 'He (Christ) has appointed the Church to be the guardian and teacher of all truth concerning faith and morals'.[22]

The argument from reason turns out to be the argument from authority in disguise. Nature is not something evident to all, it is the 'divine plan', individuals cannot arrive at a knowledge of it by using their reason. They have to rely on revelation as interpreted by the Church. So the whole of the case against contraception, as presented by Pius XI rests on the infallibility of the Church's interpretation of a few ambiguous quotations from Scripture.

Pius XI does not conceal that the Church's condemnation of contraception, whilst a question of doctrine, has important practical consequences. 'Christian parents are called to give children to the Church to beget fellow-citizens of the Saints and members of the household of God, in order that worshippers of our God and Saviour, may increase from day to day.'[23] The matter was more plainly put in 1926 by Cardinal Bourne in his presidential address to the National Catholic Congress. Speaking of 'the horrors of immoral birth prevention', he rejoiced that 'Our people are a growing force owing to their observance of God's laws.'[24]

Reverting to the historical development of the Roman Catholic attitude to contraception, it is noteworthy that from 1930 to 1951 there were no Papal statements or official decrees perhaps because the situation was too fluid. For the Catholic world was thrown into great excitement in 1932 by the publication of the Ogino-Knaus theory that it was possible to calculate exactly the days on which a woman could or could not conceive, thus making possible a method of birth control which Catholics were not slow to find 'natural', and, therefore, legitimate. The existence of the infertile period had been known and its use condoned by the Roman Catholic Church in the past. What was new was the possibility of accurate calculation. The timing of the discovery seemed providential, for economic hardship was causing many Catholics to question the wisdom of the Church's teaching on artificial birth-control. There followed a spate of books for Catholic theologians, expounding the new 'Rhythm' method as it was called. The title of one of these reveals the reversal of Catholic attitudes which was taking place at this time: *Lawful Birth Control According to Nature's Law, in Harmony with Catholic Morality.*

For a Catholic to speak of lawful birth-control before 1932 would have been a nonsense, yet this book, published in 1934 and written by an American priest, the Rev. A. O'Brien, refers to 'the ideal of rational fecundity' and explains the moral difference between the Rhythm method and 'artificial'

methods of birth-control. 'Now modern science comes along and corroborates the stand of the Church, it shows that God working through the laws of nature has made possible the regulation of the number of offspring by using her laws instead of abusing them.'

At last a way had been found for Roman Catholics to limit their families in a rational manner without running the risk of mortal sin. The 'artificiality' and 'unnaturalness' of regulating marital relations by the calendar, and of restricting intercourse to the time when the woman may least desire it, seem to have been ignored. All the dangers which Roman Catholics had insisted were inherent in family limitation when achieved by contraception—ill-health, immorality, economic disaster, race suicide etc.—were conveniently forgotten when the same end could be achieved by so-called 'natural' means. In fact, the Roman Catholic Church and the advocates of birth-control were agreed in all but method.

Official and public sanction of the Rhythm method came in October 1951 when Pope Pius XII addressed a Congress of Italian Catholic Midwives. Pius XII upheld his predecessor's 'hard sayings'[25] concerning contraception. Nevertheless this Address represents a considerable shift of emphasis. Whereas in 1930 it is doubtful if the safe period is mentioned at all,[26] in 1951 Pius XII devotes an important part of his advice to Catholic midwives to be well informed about this theory and to give professional advice based on scientific fact. Whereas his predecessor could find no reason whatever, not even extreme poverty, for frustrating the procreative end of marriage, Pius XII allows that there are serious reasons for refraining from childbearing: 'Serious reasons often put forward on medical, eugenic, economic, and social grounds, can exempt from that obligatory service even for a considerable period of time, even for the entire duration of the marriage. It follows from this that the use of the infertile periods can be lawful from the moral point of view.'[27]

For those unfortunates for whom the safe period is not sufficiently reliable, Pius XII recommends the traditional course—abstinence. The aforementioned 'serious reasons' are not sufficient cause for using contraceptives which remain 'forbidden and banned in conscience'.

These anomalies aside, the 1951 Address makes two important concessions. Firstly, that there may sometimes be good reasons for limiting the number of children, and secondly that the use of the infertile period is lawful and should be made known. The fact that Pius XII was talking to midwives is of practical importance since it means that a Roman Catholic birth-regulation service would be available in all countries having a midwifery service containing Catholics.

A month later in November 1951 Pius XII reiterated his approval of the Rhythm method, adding that the limits of a regulation of offspring were 'in truth very wide'.[28] He expressed the hope that medical science would provide this lawful method with 'a sufficiently secure basis'.

Since 1951 Roman Catholic thinking on this subject seems to divide in two directions. There are the traditionalists who still consider the large family as the ideal even in the most difficult circumstances. Dr Richard M. Fagley in his recent book quotes A. F. Zimmerman as saying 'The Family

which courageously and even heroically rears a large number of children in an overpopulated area merits special praise for its virtue.'[29] Summarizing the attitude of this group Dr Richard Fagley says 'The tendency . . . is to cast doubt on demographic predictions as far as possible, to generate the hope of economic miracles from such favourable indications as can be selected, to put the blame for particular population pressures on the lack of international solidarity and charity, to avoid at all costs support for family limitation as a solution, and to fall back on trust in divine providence when all else fails'.[30]

Development in the other direction, towards the idea of responsible parenthood involving a thoughtful spacing of births and a totally family size in accordance with the well-being of the individuals concerned and society at large, is now well advanced amongst some theologians if not so well understood at parish level. This position is summed up by Father S. de Lestapis, S.J., professor of family sociology at the Institut Catholique in Paris who was the Holy See's representative at the United Nations World Population Conference in Rome in 1954. 'The Catholic Church . . . teaches that there is in principle a right or better, a duty, to practice a form of birth-regulation based on careful thought provided that this regulation is inspired solely by motives of genuine charity, and that it respects the order of values inherent in the sexual function and also the pattern of its structural factors.'[31] People in this group, to quote Dr Fagley again, 'favour more serious Catholic study of population problems and trends, more objective consideration of economic and social development, more liberal or realistic interpretation of the 'various reasons'—for the regulation of fertility—and more vigorous efforts to provide scientific reinforcements in the licit method.'[32]

The unfortunate fact about the Rhythm method up to the present time is that for many women it is by no means reliable. If scientists could invent a simple test which would accurately predict the date of ovulation or cause ovulation to occur on a given date the Rhythm method would have much wider application. Dr John Rock and others, after studying this method at a ryhthm clinic in Massachusetts, concluded after more than ten years' observation in 1951: 'The conclusion appears justified that the rhythm method offers a satisfactory degree of protection against unwanted pregnancy to rigorously selected and carefully instructed wives, who, with their husbands, are intelligent and strongly motivated. For others and for those to whom pregnancy would be dangerous, the effectiveness of the method in preventing conception is not considered adequate.'[33]

Recent developments in the field of oral contraception have brought the possibility of making the Rhythm method more reliable whilst at the same time raising further problems for Roman Catholics.

The pill, as it is commonly known, can be one of two kinds. One type known as MER-25 which is still undergoing tests, causes a fertilized ovum to be eliminated before implantation. This comes under the traditional condemnation of abortion by Roman Catholics (and other denominations). The second which was approved for marketing as a contraceptive in the United States in the early 1960's is a steroid compound which when taken by a woman daily for twenty days inhibits the secretion which releases the ovum and thus suppresses ovulation. Apart from making it impossible for a

woman to conceive during the cycle when she takes the pills, they also have other effects: they regularize menstruation which has important implications for the Rhythm method; they may be useful in cases of frequent miscarriages; have a beneficial effect in some menstrual disorders, and, in the long term, seem to improve fertility (once having stopped taking a course of pills a woman seems to become more likely to conceive than before she took the pills).

Considered as a sterilizing agent the pill could not fail to be condemned by the Church. In his far-seeing 1930 encyclical Pius XI had affirmed that the individual may not render himself incapable of his natural functions except when there is no other way of providing for the welfare of the body as a whole.[34] His successor in his 1951 Address to Catholic midwives referred back to the wartime Decree of the Holy Office (1940) condemning sterilization whether permanent or temporary as unlawful, and himself reiterated this doctrine.[35] In 1958 when the pill was still undergoing field trials in the United States, Pius XII considered the pill in relation to the teaching on sterilization and pronounced its direct use as a sterilizing agent unlawful.

Nevertheless Pius XII made a point of distinguishing between the above illicit use of the pill and its regulatory, medical use in uterine disorders where sterilization is a secondary, unintended effect. 'Is it licit to use pills to prevent ovulation, as a remedy for certain exaggerated reactions of the uterus and other organs though these pills while preventing ovulation, may also make conception impossible? May a married woman still desire to have relations with her husband despite this temporary sterility? The reply depends on the person's intention. If a woman takes these pills not to prevent conception, but simply on medical advice, as a necessary remedy for a disorder of the uterus or other organs, she is bringing on sterility *indirectly*, which is licit according to the principle of double effect. It would however be causing sterility *directly*, which is illicit, if the pills were taken to stop ovulation in order to protect the uterus and other organs from the consequences of a pregnancy which they could not survive.'[36]

This might seem to be the end of the matter. But the external and internal pressure on the Roman Catholic Church to modify its attitude is so strong that there seems to be a possibility that this is not the last word. The present time is witnessing a great debate within the Church which may yet result in a change.

The debate broke surface in 1963 when Dr John Rock, one of the American pioneers in the development of the pill and a Roman Catholic gynaecologist, argued in his book *The Time Has Come* that the contraceptive use of the pill should be acceptable to the Catholic conscience. Yet his book was not condemned when it appeared in 1963 but was, on the contrary, given a guarded welcome by Cardinal Cushing in whose diocese it was published. The silence of the authorities in Rome since 1958, like that which followed the discovery of the Ogino-Knaus Rhythm method, indicates that a fierce internal debate is in progress. In spite of Pius XII's condemnation, must the pill fall under the traditional veto on mechanical and chemical contraceptives or has it more in common with that 'lawful method of birth-regulation', the Rhythm or periodic continence?

In common with the Rhythm method the pill gives parents the opportunity to space births, and thus to rear and educate children according to their Christian duty. In the last thirty years more attention has been paid by Roman Catholic theologians to the second part of Canon Law 1013, quoted by Pius XI in *Casti Connubi*, concerning the duty of parents to educate.

Where for 'serious reasons' the procreative obligation must be set aside either temporarily or permanently, the pill, less hazardously than the Rhythm method, enables a married couple to pursue the secondary ends of marriage.

But it will be remembered that the great virtue of the Rhythm method in Roman Catholic eyes, is that it is 'natural'. Unlike mechanical and chemical contraceptives the use of Rhythm involves no artificial barriers, and unlike *coitus interruptus*, it preserves the intrinsic nature of *coitus*. Yet the Rhythm method is by no means free of artificiality. By sanctioning its use with its reliance on calendar and thermometer rather than on 'natural' feelings, the Church has admitted that artificial aids to birth-regulations are acceptable provided that *coitus* can take place in the 'natural' manner. The question of whether there is a fertilizable ovum present or not has not been thought essential. In fact, for the Rhythm method to be effective it is important that the ovum should be absent.

There is a parallel here between the Rhythm method and the pill: both involve the use of artificial aids to calculate or control ovulation, whilst at the same time preserving the 'intrinsic nature' of *coitus*, hitherto an essential part of Catholic teaching.

So far the pill can be seen to have much in common with the Rhythm method. There is a charge against it which appears to align it with contraceptives, namely that the pill interferes with a natural process (ovulation), and causes temporary sterility. Both these effects are illicit according to the precepts of Popes Pius XI and Pius XII.

For a few Catholic theologians notably Canon Janssens, professor of moral theology at the Catholic University of Louvain, to use the pill to suppress ovulation is not to cause sterility since the ability to conceive is not destroyed but postponed. Dr John Rock argues in the same sense when he says that the pill is merely a 'deferment of reproductive functions'.

Nevertheless the pill does constitute interference with a natural process and a frustration of 'nature'. It is unnecessary to rehearse here the argument about the meaning of nature as construed by Roman Catholic theologians except to say that the doctrine of 'natural Law' which derives from St Thomas Aquinas is susceptible of different interpretations. An American scholar, Dr F. E. Flynn, sometime professor of ethics at the Catholic college of St Thomas in St Paul, Minnesota, is quoted by Dr J. Rock as saying that St Thomas's view is that 'The mode of existence which is "natural" for man to use his reasoning faculties to solve the problems with which a blind and irrational nature confronts him.' Dr Rock himself expounds this view as it applies to use of the pill. 'They (the steroid compounds) merely offer to the human intellect the means to regulate ovulation harmlessly, means which heretofore have come only from the ovary, and during pregnancy from the placenta. These organs supply progesterone at those times when nature seeks to protect a fertilized ovum from jeopardy. Since the intellect is also part of

a woman's natural being, surely it too is charged with the duty of protection against potential danger. The ovary and placenta respond automatically to remove the internal danger to mother or foetus which would stem from a second fertilized ovum. But only the intellect can perceive the external dangers to mother and children, which would derive at a particular time in a marriage, from an additional pregnancy. Indeed, the serious consideration of medical, eugenic, economic and social indications for family limitation (Pius XII, see note 27) can be undertaken only by the intellect. It is difficult not to believe that God gave man his intellect to safeguard him whenever his inner biology is inadequate. . . .'[37]

The Catholic dilemma over the legitimacy of the pill was brought into focus recently by Archbishop Heenan speaking for the Roman Catholic hierarchy of England and Wales on 7th May, 1964. He left open the question of the legitimacy of using a pill which might help to predict the time of ovulation but agreed with the Dutch bishops that the contraceptive pill which suppresses ovulation was no more acceptable than mechanical and chemical contraceptives; which are against 'the law of God'.[38] On the following day a Vatican theologian Father Bernard Haring, disagreed with the English and Welsh hierarchy in an interview with *The Guardian*. Father Haring, a German professor of moral and social theology at the Alfonsian Academy and the Lateran University in Rome, is secretary of the commission which is preparing the Ecumenical Council's *Curial Schema*, 'The Church and the Modern World'. After a telephone call from the secretary to the Hierarchy of England and Wales, Father Haring courteously softened the tone of his criticism but his argument remains unchanged. He agrees with Archbishop Heenan in condemning contraception 'in the strict sense of the word', but insists that the modern pill creates a new situation. It differs from the older type of contraception in that it does not interfere with the act of intercourse. Father Haring feels that 'future discussion must take more cognizance of intention'. He mentions cases when the pill might be licit 'if the unity of conjugal love were threatened by another pregnancy ' or where the Rhythm method might be inapplicable, e.g. in the case of migratory workers home for short periods who have good reasons for limiting the size of their families. 'The Church', says Father Haring, 'is preaching responsible parenthood' and 'must and will consider the dangers from overpopulation in the world. That too is a problem as new as the pill.'[39]

Father Haring seems to regard the pill as a substitute or supplement to the Rhythm method, justifying it by the consideration of 'serious reason' in the same way as the Rhythm is justified.

This open debate besides confusing the faithful is arousing bitter controversy amongst Catholic intellectuals. Many people hope that the hierarchy will legitimize the use of the pill in the next few months. It took the Church a hundred years to sanction the Rhythm method and it seems unlikely that the debate about the pill, which has not yet spanned a decade, will be speedily concluded. Yet there is a feeling abroad that a decision will be taken at the Ecumenical Council this year. It is being pointed out that the Church's teaching on moral questions is not unchanging and infallible (the attitude to usury is a case in point), that Papal encyclicals are not pronounced

ex cathedra and that the Church's role is to interpret rules of conduct afresh in the light of changing circumstances.

A recent interview with the Head of the Holy Office, a law-making body, confirms the hope that a decision about the pill will be taken soon.[40] This distinguished theologian, Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani, well known for his conservative views, instead of condemning the pill outright, which would have been in character, asked that theologians should cease making statements about questions under review: 'On any question so seriously and widely debated as this the final word should be left to the supreme *magisterium* and not to any single party, be he cardinal or bishop.' This seems to imply that a decision may be imminent.

The pressures on the Church to modify its attitude are increasingly strong and undeniably urgent. In the first place there is the attitude of the Roman Catholic Laity, increasing numbers of whom, if Roman Catholic birth-rates in Western countries are any indication, are ignoring the Church's veto on any but the Rhythm method of birth control. The case of Dr Anne Biezancek is indicative.[41] This Roman Catholic doctor found the Rhythm method unreliable and after bearing seven children faced the breakdown of her marriage and family brought about by her own ill-health. Against the advice of her priest, she decided to take a course of contraceptive pills. When her health was restored by this means she put her desire to help other women in similar straits into practice by opening a family-planning clinic in Wallasey. Dr Biezancek has been refused the sacraments in her own parish.

This extreme case highlights the dilemma of the parish priests. Many of them have made obedience on the birth-control issue 'a salient test of clerical authority', as Paul Johnson has put it. They may try to persuade their parishioners to use the Rhythm method but it is notoriously ineffective. They may commend the licit use of the pill to regulate the menstrual periods and 'make the safe period safer', but must forbid the illicit use of the pill to suppress ovulation. How are the priests to make these subtle distinctions of method understood, when the motivation and consequences are identical?

The greatest and most urgent pressure is, of course, the world population-explosion. The attitude of the Roman Catholic Church here is vital to Catholics and non-Catholics alike owing to the power of Catholic countries and countries with large Catholic minorities which have blocked all attempts by the World Health Organization to assist governments in programmes of fertility-control. Hitherto the only acceptable method has been the Rhythm method which in spite of its cheapness is unsuitable for illiterate densely crowded populations, as was shown in India in 1951. It is essential, not only for the sake of the Catholic conscience, but for the sake of mankind that the theologians will facilitate a speedy attack on this crucial problem.

[1] The writer is grateful to the University of Sheffield Research Fund Committee for financial assistance in carrying out research for this paper and to Professor A. T. Hanson for helpful criticisms of an early draft.

[2] *Casti Connubii* (Catholic Truth Society, 1930), page 28.

[3] See P. Aries in the symposium *La Prevention des Naissances dans la Famille* (Paris, 1960).

[4] Ibid.

[5] See A. W. Sulloway, *Birth Control and Catholic Doctrine* (Boston, 1959).

[6] Evidence to Birth Rate Commission, 15th January, 1915, published in *The Declining Birth*

Rate (London, 1916), p. 391.
[7] Ibid. p. 401.
[8] *The Ethics of Birth Control* (London, 1925), p. 55.
[9] T. Slater's *Manual of Moral Theology*, II, p. 363. (Printed by printers to Holy Apostolic See with official *Nihil Obstat* and *Imprimatur*.)
[10] 'What Catholics practise is not Birth Control.' See Cardinal Bourne *Birth Control News*, May 1931.
[11] Reproduced in *Birth Control News*, V. 12.
[12] Ibid. p. 10.
[13] Ibid. p. 28.
[14] Ibid.
[15] Ibid. p. 29.
[16] Ibid.
[17] Cf. Deuteronomy 25^{5-10}, Ruth 4, 5.
[18] *Casti Connubii*, p. 29.
[19] See Anthony Flew, 'Contraception and Catholicism', *Family Planning* (April 1954).
[20] *Casti Connubii*, p. 48.
[21] Ibid. p. 50.
[22] Ibid. p. 51.
[23] Ibid. p. 10.
[24] *Birth Control News*, V. 6.
[25] Pius XII, Address to the Congress of the Italian Association of Catholic Midwives. Catholic Truth Society Revised edition 1960.
[26] *Casti Connubii*, p. 28.
[27] Pius XII, Address to Catholic Midwives, page 19. Pius XII, Address to the Family Associations, Catholic Truth Society, p. 35.
[28] Ibid. p. 35.
[29] A. F. Zimmerman in *Overpopulation*. Catholic University of America Press, 1957.
[30] In *The Population Explosion and Christian Responsibility* (New York, 1960), p. 184. Dr Fagley is Executive Secretary of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, set up by the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council lay non-Catholic body.
[31] *Birth Regulation: The Catholic Position*. S. de Lestapis, S.J., translated by Reginald F. Trevett. London, 1916, with *Nihil Obstat* and *Imprimatur*, p. 91.
[32] *The Population Explosion and Christian Responsibility*, p. 185.
[33] John Rock, *The Time Has Come* (London, 1963). p. 118.
[34] *Casti Connubii*, p. 34.
[35] Pius XII, Address to Catholic Midwives, p. 16.
[36] Pius XII, Address to International Congress of Haematology, 12th September 1958.
[37] *The Time Has Come*, p. 101.
[38] *The Guardian*, 8th May 1964.
[39] *The Guardian*, 9th May, 1964.
[40] Interview published in Italian magazine, *Vita*, quoted in *The Guardian*, 28th May 1964.
[41] *Family Planning*, January and April 1964.

THE END IS NOT YET

G. R. Beasley-Murray

THE TWENTIETH century has witnessed a proliferation of books on eschatology, especially in the area of biblical studies—so much so we might even call it the century of eschatology. Yet there has been a marked reluctance to produce a systematic statement of the doctrine of the Last Things. The Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches provided a temporary impetus for theologians, but we have had no counterpart in English to Althaus' great work, *Die letzten Dinge*. The editors of the Library of Constructive Theology have sought to meet the need and present in their series an exposition of The Last Things by Ulrich Simon, *The End is Not Yet*.[1] As the title indicates, this is a sober work by one who deems his subject of great importance but who would put the brake on all eschatological enthusiasm. It brings to a climax his earlier publications and years of work.

The biblical and historical aspects of the subject are briefly stated under the title, 'The Growth of a Tradition', i.e. the classical Christian tradition relating to eschatology. The review of the Old Testament contribution is excellent, as well as succinct, that of the New Testament thought less adequate (in particular I thought the relation of Church and Kingdom was not too happily stated). A rapid tracing of developments in Christian thinking on the Last Things culminates in a description of the exposition of eschatology provided by St Thomas Aquinas. Why it should be thought that the dogmatic development of this theme comes to rest in St Thomas Aquinas puzzles me. While it may be true (the matter isn't argued) that the Reformers make no radical departure in the realm of eschatology, at least their stress and accent were not the same as St Thomas's, and it can hardly be said that there has been no significant interest or advance in eschatological thought since their time. To take no account of these developments is surely a weakness in a presentation of the history of thought on this subject.

Dr Simon probably feels that his lack is more than atoned for by his including a series of discussions on eschatological issues by representatives of radically differing viewpoints. He has adopted the dialogue method, so that varying interpretations of eschatology are presented by (fictitious) representatives of differing schools of thought and they are made to confront and react on one another. Five such participants are introduced—an English Liberal Protestant, an American Protestant Sectarian, a French Catholic Dogmatist, a Russian Marxist and a Swiss psychologist. Whether this division of interests can be considered as just is a moot point (e.g. Lutherans and Reformed would be pained at a division of Protestants into thoroughgoing Liberals and sectarian Adventists!), but undoubtedly a genuine diversity of thought is consistently presented over a wide range of topics. I found this mode of presentation very interesting and ingenious. If it makes the

going slow at times it nevertheless enables the reader to appreciate the clash and the contribution of different disciplines to the subject under review.

The dialogue is followed by what many readers may well find the most valuable section of the book, namely a consideration of the Symbolism of the End. Dr Simon points out that our times have witnessed not only a spectacular advance in scientific thought but also a revival of interest in symbolism, with a new understanding of its significance. 'In the first place this has been caused by the methods of analytical psychology and the needs of clinical treatment. But symbolism is by no means only a part, and an obscure one at that, of medical studies. Its transcendence of geographical, racial, and religious barriers and its firm foothold in contemporary art, writing, cinema, and aesthetics proves that only a materialist with colossal blinkers can afford to ignore the evidence from symbolism itself'.[2] Our lives are guided and moulded by symbols, it is said, and it is imperative that we do justice to their importance, complexity and adequacy to convey real meaning. Accordingly it is maintained, 'To translate an image into a concrete terminology by restricting it to any one of its frames of reference is to do worse than mutiliate it.' Simple identification of parables as literal, allegorical, etc., will not do. 'In the Christian context of the end two reservations may, however, be made: First the symbols are expressing in sense-images a spiritual reality, so that what is seen is meant to convey more than what is seen. Secondly, the act of apprehension in the cultic context supplies this necessary extra'[3] This is a very different line from that advocated by those who would de-mythologize the Gospel, as our author is fully aware, and it is a valuable and needed corrective of that approach. Dr Simon goes on to discuss the major symbols of eschatology and pays special attention to those that appear in the Book of Revelation.

The work concludes, in Wittenberg style, with *95 Theses*, but the author sets them forth much more reluctantly than the German Reformer nailed his to the Church door. He would have preferred to leave the symbols to speak their message than to reduce them to doctrinal definitions. I sympathize with Dr Simon, but on reading his theses I could tear my hair, for in them he has really formulated propositions for a discussion that ought to have followed them. It can by no means be claimed that they summarize positions reached in the body of the book. For example, some clear statements are made concerning the effect of the Copernican revelation on eschatology, including the improbability that a universe of the dimensions we now know it to be will in any way be affected by human affairs. We are therefore not to look for 'new heavens and a new earth' in the manner formerly postulated. But Dr Simon gives no indication whether or why in the eschatological End the earth is of any consequence at all. Resurrection, he says, is surviving personality. What has it to do with the material universe? The relation of eschatology to history is not at all clear. The millennium is viewed as inherently absurd. But the purpose of history, apart from its possessing an 'end', is far from obvious. It is strange that with all Dr Simon's acute perception of the value of symbols he can see nothing in the idea of a millennium but an inspiration of cranks. Far more important, the relation of the End to the redemptive activity of Christ is, to one reader at

least, ambiguous. It is not enough to affirm, of the final Kingdom, 'In the centre of all sacrificial loving and giving stands the Crucified as King and it is he who heads the throng of martyrs and men defeated in the cause of righteousness on earth. The meaning of human history is at the End made clear by the simple act of reversal: The abasement of the proud and the exaltation of the humble.' What significance attaches to the parousia of the Christ? What is its relation to history, to the phenomena of evil, to judgement, to the Kingdom? I do not learn this from Dr Simon's debaters, and his theses do not make the answer plain. I suspect (I hope wrongly) that he, in common with British theologians generally, has failed to see that in New Testament theology the parousia of Christ is joined to the incarnation, death, resurrection and ascension as one indivisible activity of the Redeemer in the emancipation of mankind, and that it is no more to be subordinated to the ministry and death of Christ than the resurrection is (despite the theology of Bultmann!), but along with them possesses a significance of such importance that without it, one must say, there is *no* real redemption. It may be that such thinking is not inimical to that of Dr Simon's but it indicates the desirability of his Theses receiving an extension.

It would be unjust to conclude an assessment of this book in a negative manner. Dr Simon has stepped out of the common paths in his presentation of the doctrine of the Last Things; in content as well as in method he has made a distinctive contribution of his own to our understanding of it. His book is sure to set discussion moving along less familiar lines with a view to making it relevant to men and women outside the churches, and it will encourage the employment of other disciplines in order to enrich the understanding of those within the Church. If it achieves all that, his book will have achieved much.

[1] James Nisbet & Co. (London 1964), pp. xvii and 221.
[2] Ibid. p. 157.
[3] Ibid. p. 159.

THE MAMMON OF UNRIGHTEOUSNESS[1]

Phyllis Hartnoll

Alas, for the day!—Joel

I, grown old in your service, come to the temple
Seeking comfort and ease.
Not on my knees,
But proudly upright I stand
And hold out my hand
To receive the assurance of help
That has never yet failed.

All that you gave me I used, to your honour and mine.
Base metal to silver was turned, and silver to gold;
And here now, behold!
I pour it all out on your altar
And grudge not the gift.

I have walked in your laws all my days,
And followed your ways
As you bade me, and now I am old.
Turn not your face from me,
Hear the last prayer I shall make,
For your righteousness' sake.

Other gods there are here;
None but you I held dear,
And Mammon alone I have worshipped since worship began.
I whored not after Allah or Christ,
I was not enticed
By their promise of life after death,
For I knew that my God
Would give me my reward in this life,
And I proved his word true.

I have been known as a man
Honest in thought and in deed,
Impartial with rich and with poor,
Faithful in all to your creed.
I have not regarded the plea
Of the weakling, the timid, the meek
Turning the other cheek.
I despised all such waverers, strong in the strength of my right.

I have encouraged no beggar or masterless man;
I know it is part of your plan
That all men should work for their bread.
I have been deaf to the cry
Of the widow mourning her dead
And the fatherless child,
Leaving them both to the mercy of Mammon, giver of gifts.

Have I not even
Sacrificed to you my child,
My first-born, the wild
Untameable spirit that would not bow down in your house?
Where is he now? And where are my parents, my wife,
The friends of young days—
All dead, all dispersed,
Gone unregarded while I was about your concerns,
Withered away like the flowers
I spurned, like the useless and profitless flowers—
Have I not merited praise,
Having thus set them aside that you might be first
In my thoughts, in my working, laborious hours?

Who are these men who crowd to the temple today,
With their drab ragged coats and their lustreless eyes,
Hemming me in
With their faces so ravaged and gray?
Who are these women, tight-lipped, talon-clawed,
Whose beauty has faded away?

Why are their movements uncertain,
Their voices so thin?
What canker, what sin,
Drives them to enter the precinct, and when they would pray
Clogs their reluctant tongues as they falter and fail
And cannot find words to begin?

And am I even as they?

They drift to your feet like dead leaves,
They are brittle and sere.
Once all who worshipped you here
Were my equals in beauty and strength,
Shining in thick silken coats, with the flash of deep fire
From their jewels, the gleam of bright gold from the wall,
While the silver lamps shone on us all.
We were confident then. We knew that our God was almighty,
Omnipotent, changeless, and all that we did
Was to glorify him and was good in his sight.

But now comes the night.
The lamps are extinguished,
The golden walls tarnished,
From your image no sign, and in terror we grope—
Give us light, give us hope!
In the darkness a cry of despair,
Our words are as empty as air,
Mammon, are you there?
Where?

Now while I pour on your altar my offering of gold
Why am I lonely—and cold?

[1] English Prize Poem on a Sacred Subject, University of Oxford, 1965.

SHORTER SURVEY

John T. Wilkinson

THE POST-TRACTARIAN phase of the Oxford Movement is commonly described as Ritualistic, yet it is a mistake to think that it was mainly concerned with ritualism as such. For its exponents it had profound doctrinal significance. 'A gorgeously conducted service . . . means that the Holy Eucharist is the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood—the Body and the Blood of Christ under the form of Bread and Wine.' So declared Fr Alexander Heriot Mackonochie in 1867. For this truth the ritualists fought and suffered. In *Martyr of Ritualism* (Faber & Faber, 50*s*.) Mr Michael Reynolds presents a study of the Ritualist Movement with Mackonochie as the central figure. As a young priest in London's Dockland, he was involved in the notorious riots at the Church of St George's-in-the-East, and later, as vicar of St Alban's, Holborn, singled out for persecution by ultra-Protestant organizations, he faced a series of law-suits covering a period of nearly twenty years. Narrowly escaping imprisonment, he was eventually driven from his benefice a broken man. A cross of Scotch granite marks the place in Mamore Forest, Argyllshire, where his body was found lying in the snow. Mr Reynolds does not afford in any fullness a view of the contribution of these devoted men towards social betterment, nor does he give any final estimate of the difficult part of Archbishop Tait in this crisis, yet this book, which is illustrated, is a very valuable study with new insights upon the movement.

In the Service of the Lord (Faber & Faber, 36*s*.) is an English translation of the autobiography of Karl Frederich Otto Dibelius, Bishop of the Evangelical Church in Germany for Berlin and Brandenburg, and one of the Presidents of the World Council of Churches. Written at the age of eighty

it was published in Germany in 1961. Although an autobiography the Bishop seeks to describe 'not a life but a ministry' in the belief that 'some might find it useful to learn how a man in a position of responsibility within the Church conceived of his office in times of appalling upheaval and tried to carry it out'. In 1933, preaching before members of the government at Potsdam, Dibelius declared: 'The dictatorship of a totalitarian state is irreconcilable with God's will.' Although forbidden later to preach, he continued his defiance of the Nazi régime and upheld the Confessing Church Movement against the State-organized Church which spread Nazism. Seeking to unite German Protestantism, he had to face the problems of being chief pastor in a divided city, and challenging the Soviet policy in East Germany by his demands for religious freedom, he was eventually denied permission to cross the border. It is a story of complete dedication to the call of the Gospel, and is told with deep insight and fine charity. The book will long remain an important document of Protestant witness.

John Milton: Man, Poet and Polemist (Blackwell, 50*s*.) is a translation of M. Emile Saillens's *John Milton: poete combattant*, published in 1959. Obviously written for the French public largely unaware of even some of the major works of Milton, it is intended to serve as an introduction to Milton's life and writings. The last biography of Milton in French was written as far back as 1868, and M. Saillens's purpose is to unfold Milton's life by means of a careful examination of the whole of his writings. So for the most part he does not enter into the field of Miltonic criticism, though there are interesting comparisons between Milton and French authors, particularly Pascal. To the English reader, therefore, much of the contents of this book is already familiar, and a large portion of it is given to the summarizing of Milton's writings. Nevertheless, it forms an illuminating study and can be warmly commended, particularly for those English readers whose knowledge of the subject is limited.

There is widespread lack of knowledge in England concerning the story and significance of the Church in Scandinavian countries. Such lack of information is now remedied in a volume of essays written by eminent clerical and lay authorities of the church concerned, and edited by Dr Leslie S. Hunter, formerly Bishop of Sheffield. In *Scandinavian Churches* (Faber & Faber, 35*s*.) there is a most valuable picture of the life and development of the Churches in Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. These essays include discussion of the relationship of Church and State, worship and liturgy, education and the churches and a survey of the ecumenical movement and mission in these communities. The late Fr Gabriel Hebert, S.S.M., presents an English view of some Swedish theologians. This book, which is attractively illustrated by photographs, provides a most fascinating and comprehensive survey of a hitherto neglected field.

From the Cambridge University Press come additions to the 'Cambridge Bible Commentary' on the text of the New English Bible, in which the results of modern scholarship are made available for the general reader. The volumes are particularly designed for those who are preparing for school examinations. Historical background and theological content are discussed and each volume is so arranged that, following an introduction, the text

and commentary alternate. The intention is that the book in each case shall be read consecutively in order to produce a sense of unity. Useful maps are provided and footnotes are avoided. *The Gospel according to Luke* (17*s.* 6*d.*) is by Professor E. J. Tinsley, who, in indicating the main theme of the Gospel, brings out the literary aspects and is especially lucid on the parables as allegorical accounts of the meanings of the mission of Jesus rather than mere 'stories' to illustrate his teaching. *The Gospel according to John* (17*s.* 6*d.*) is by Professor A. M. Hunter, who, in an excellent introduction, declares that this Gospel is of far greater historical value than until recently has been allowed, also argues that whilst it is unwise to magnify the theological differences between John and the Synoptics, this Gospel was in touch with an independent tradition about the events of the life of Jesus. In *1 and 2 Corinthians* (17*s.* 6*d.*), Margaret E. Thrall discusses with clarity the difficult problem of the unity of the Corinthian correspondence and at the end of the volume gives a valuable theological summary of the significance of the Corinthian Letters for today. The Bishop of Leicester (Dr R. R. Williams) is responsible for the *Letters of John and James* (15*s.*) and gives a common introduction for the Johannine writings and for the Letter of James its own introduction, in which he expresses some hesitancy about James, the brother of Jesus, as its author. In the *Revelation of John* (15*s.*), Dr T. F. Glasson deals skilfully with the most difficult book in the New Testament for the modern reader. With great clarity and insight he unfolds its background in history, analyses its structure and indicates its permanent value.

It should be noted that all these Cambridge commentaries are issued in special school and paper-back editions at lower prices.

The Service of God, by C. E. B. Cranfield (Epworth Press, 7*s.* 6*d.*), is a collection of five papers marked by careful exegesis and penetrating application in terms of Christian ministry. The first deals with the biblical concept of worship in its divine and human aspects; the second is a Cambridge University Sermon on Matthew 25^{31-46} as an exposition of διακονία ; the third is a study of the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10^{25-37}); the fourth on 'The Watchman' of Ezekiel 33^{1-16}; the final paper is on 'The Christian Political Responsibility according to the New Testament'. This is a discerning and fruitful book.

In *Speaking with Tongues* (Epworth Press, 17*s.* 6*d.*), Morton T. Kelsey, an Episcopalian clergyman and a student of Jung's psychology, seeks to analyse the phenomenon which is so widely current in America and elsewhere, believing that it cannot be dismissed as 'just fraud or meaningless irrationality'. Beginning with the problem of glossolalia as presented in apostolic times, he surveys this subject of religious ecstacy historically through the centuries with special enquiry into the experience within the Pentecostal Churches, but noting also its appearance in various traditional communities. He illustrates by means of case-histories. Finally he attempts an evaluation of the movement as a whole and concludes that speaking with tongues is 'a true Christian phenomenon' which must be 'allowed its place in the repertory of Christian gifts'. Some readers will disagree, but here is a careful enquiry into a perplexing subject in the realm of spiritual experience.

For the general reader who wishes to learn about the unfolding history

of man, alike as to his development religiously and intellectually, *Life and Thought in the Ancient World* (Peter Smith, Derby, 17*s.* 6*d.*), by Dr Cyril Eastwood, minister of the Muswell Hill Methodist Church, London, is to be warmly recommended. First, Dr Eastwood deals with the origins of religions and civilization and then goes on to survey the history of the Near East and the Mediterranean area—the culture of the Hebrews, the Babylonians, the Assyrians, the Persians and the achievements in Greece and Rome. Then follows a simplified evaluation of the philosophic and religious thought of the ancient world. This excellent book, skilfully written in a most lucid style, is remarkable for its comprehensiveness and is the officially approved text-book for the Diploma of Biblical Studies in the University of London, for which purpose it could hardly be bettered.

From the Lutterworth Press a new series of 'Ecumenical Studies in History', the purpose of which is 'to examine afresh problems of Church History . . . for the sake of Christian Unity', is to be welcomed. The subjects are to be drawn from different periods and treated by those of differing communions. The first in the series is *The German Church Conflict*, by Karl Barth (10*s.* 6*d.*). Written whilst he was Professor of Theology at Bonn, he deals with the important issues for Christian faith fought out in the decade 1933 to 1943, and these nine papers are the more significant because they come from one who from the beginning was closely implicated in the conflict between Church and State. The heart of the church-struggle lay in the confession of Jesus Christ, which under the Third Reich meant the denial of Neo-German paganism on the one hand and the German-Christian heresy on the other. Barth's resistance to the attempt by the State to unify the Church in Germany formed a challenge to the policy of 'reunion at any price', and was an assertion that ultimately the basis of all true union must be that of confession to Jesus Christ alone. The second in this series is *The Future of John Wesley's Methodism* (10*s.* 6*d.*) by Henry D. Rack, who has recently been appointed Tutor in Church History at Hartley Victoria College. It is an attempt 'to see Methodism in its historical perspective and also to discover what its essential mission is at the present day'. The effects of the movement for Christian unity upon Methodism are clearly outlined and finally an attempt is made to show that the current union proposals in England 'do not conflict with the essential concerns for which Methodism was created, but, on the contrary, offer a way of fulfilling them in a form appropriate to the future' (p. 5). This thoroughly sound piece of historical writing has an immediate and highly important relevance to the present situation for both Methodist and Anglican communions.

None will doubt that we are living in an age of revolution in Christian thought, in which by some people the very existence of God is questioned and by many others is regarded as inexplicable. In *The Real God*, by Alfred B. Starratt (S.C.M. Press, 6*s.* 6*d.*), the author attempts to use the insights of process-philosophy to interpret the Christian faith. An American Episcopalian parish priest in Baltimore, he writes with intense honesty out of his search for truth, and seeks to present a view of 'ultimate reality' which is compatible with the scientific outlook. For him 'God' is 'the one ultimate

reality known in abstract and theoretical scientific construct as the energy which differentiates itself into all the numberless variety of forms of the universe, and known in the personal experience of the loving individual as one infinite, creative, living consciousness which is an unlimited Self including all other selves as well as all creation'. Dr Starratt insists that such a view is not pantheistic and seeks to assert the Divine transcendance: 'That which is truly infinite must of necessity transcend all existence and this means that God is more than the universe.... He is beyond all matter and all space' (p. 34). Although Dr Starratt has disbelief in the gospel miracles—including the physical resurrection of Jesus—he vigorously asserts the reality of Christ. 'To the degree that we are able to love we know he lives precisely because we recognize God in him' (p. 56). Honest and radical in its approach, this book makes difficult reading, however, and with only a certain type of reader is it likely to fulfil its sincere purpose.

Fifty years of thought and pastoral ministry lie behind Dr F. R. Barry's recent book, *Questioning Faith* (S.C.M., 7*s.* 6*d.*), which is intended for those people whose outlook on life is 'coloured and conditioned by a deeply secularist culture', and for whom in the modern world 'belief in God is extremely hard to come by, and for some, it may be, virutually impossible'. Always with clear discernment of essentials, Dr Barry is critical of some elements in orthodox theology, believing that 'faith in God does not consist in swallowing a dose of abstract theological propositions but in personal commitment to a Person'. This is a sound and convincing book, and could not be bettered as a study-book for those seeking to know what Christianity stands for and why. In similar form—for in both books there is a question-mark at the end of the title of each chapter—and with the same emphasis, is *Believing in God*, by Daniel Jenkins (Carey Kingsgate Press, 6*s.*), in which the author seeks, at perhaps a rather simpler level but with equal insight, to answer the same questions. Again a useful study-book for a discussion group.

'Your thought of a speaking and then highly personal God is mythology incompatible with disciplined thought: but even if it were still thinkable it would be unwelcome, as a hindrance to life.' A penetrating challenge to this widely prevalent attitude thus expressed is to be found in *The Word of God and Modern Man*, by Emil Brunner (Epworth Press, 7*s.* 6*d.*), the purpose of which is not the development of theological doctrine but the presentation of the point of view of a believer to those who cannot understand why men should believe at all. It declares the central truth: 'Jesus Christ is not an episode but the fullness of the times, because he is the turning point of the ages. Therefore, it is only through Jesus Christ that historical existence became decision for every individual.' Originally published in Germany in 1947, this is the first English translation.

Christian Faith and Practice (Epworth Press, 11*s.* 6*d.*), by Prof. Leonard Hodgson, is a series of seven lectures delivered annually in the University of Oxford with the purpose of providing a synoptic view of what Christianity is. After an introductory discussion of the meaning of Faith, Creed, Revelation, Dr Hodgson examines the Christian doctrines of Creation, Atonement, Incarnation and the Trinity, with two concluding lectures on 'The Church'

and 'The Christian'. The book is profound, yet marked by the author's customary lucidity of thought and expression. As a result, it has the great merit of being entirely comprehensible to any serious-minded reader.

The design upon the jacket of *Religion and Humanism*, edited by Hubert Hoskins (B.B.C., 12*s.* 6*d.*), is a precise symbol of the new relationship between Christians and many non-Christian Humanists at the present time. Two slightly intersecting circles indicate a positive attitude of mutual enquiry, discussion and dialogue. The book consists of a series of ten broadcast talks on the Third Programme in 1964 between Christian and Humanist speakers who are theologians and philosophers and shows a growing awareness that Humanists and Christians can share a view of man as both rational and religious. It is concerned with the fundamental question as to 'whether God is and whether in speaking of him and to him in the language of transcendence we act according to what is the case with regard to God, men and the world' (p. 8). These talks reveal the highest standard of debate, and are expressed with complete charity in a concern to conserve whatever Christian essentials are possible.

In an Inaugural Lecture under the title *Religion: Its Reality and Relevance* (Oxford University Press, 4*s.*), given in the University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Professor Robert Craig declares that 'normative religion has, in its high estimate of human nature and destiny, and its awareness that the spirit of man was made for something beyond the flux of things, sought those human values—intellectual, moral, æsthetic, social—without which man is less than human' (p. 29). Because of this, it holds resources of progress and reformation—a truth which, although applied in this lecture particularly to the African situation, is of universal significance.

In *20th Century Defenders of the Faith* (S.C.M. Press, 9*s.* 6*d.*), Dr Alec Vidler, Dean of King's College, Cambridge, selects five theological movements for evaluation: Liberal Protestantism, as represented by Harnack, Reville and the 'New Theology' of R. J. Campbell; Roman Catholic Modernism, by Loisy, Tyrell and Le Roy; English Liberal Catholicism by the successors of the *Lux Mundi* school, namely J. N. Figgis, O. C. Quick, W. Spens of Corpus Christi College, and A. E. J. Rawlinson, Bishop of Derby; Neo-Orthodoxy, by Barth, Sir Edwyn Hoskyns and Reinholt Niebuhr and D. R. Davies; Christian Radicalism by the 1963 controversies as expressed in *Soundings, Objections to Christian Belief, Honest to God* and van Buren's *The Secular Meaning of the Gospel*. Engagingly written, this thoroughly informative book illustrates the importance of learning constantly from what all sorts of people both affirm and deny, for such is 'the providential method of our education', theologically or otherwise.

The two volumes of Bultmann's *Theology of the New Testament*, first published in English in 1952-55, are now available in a cheap edition from the S.C.M. Press (Vol. 1, 21*s.*; Vol 2, 16*s.*)

From those who hold the more conservative attitude to the question of reunion in England further material continues to appear. Stimulated by the discussion at the Nottingham Conference of 1964, and in particular by the Anglican-Methodist proposals, seven Anglican and Presbyterian Evangelicals endeavour to evaluate the ecumenical situation in the light of Evangeli-

cal principles. In *Evangelicals and Unity*, edited by J. D. Douglas (Marsham Manor Press, 6*s.* 6*d.*), they state their common conviction that Evangelicals cannot and do not wish to stand outside the ecumenical discussion and they then express their hopes and fears—not least their concern as to the risk of compromise of essential biblical truth. From the same press comes a larger work: *All in Each Place: Towards Reunion in England*, edited by Dr J. I. Packer (18*s.*) which, from the same viewpoint, is specifically concerned with the Anglican-Methodist *Report*. All ten writers are Anglican and in addition three Free Churchmen—one Congregationalist, one Presbyterian and one Methodist—write as 'commentators' stating their own reactions. Considerably attracted by the South India type of reunion scheme, the book takes further the criticism of the *Report* stated in the Open Letter to the Archibshops and Bishops in 1964, and in addition offers a constructive alternative to the proposals of the *Report*, pointing to 'a pattern for church union in England . . . sound in principle and viable in practice'. These writers believe 'the way of ambiguity' as set forth in the present scheme is not tolerable, being below the ideal of Lambeth 1920, and further proceed to discuss the doctrine of the ministry and the problem of doctrinal standards. The work is the result of earnest thought and deep conviction, and calls for serious consideration by both Anglican and Methodist, but any reader should bear in mind that since the book was written, meetings of the Anglican Convocations and the Methodist Conference have agreed to form a Joint Negotiating Committee for the purpose of clarification of the very issues raised in this volume, and he should therefore await the result of these further deliberations. A similar approach applies in the reading of another series of essays published by the Methodist Renewal Fellowship under the title *Towards a United Church* (4*s.*), in which the same issues are for the most part also stated.

Believing that the opinions of those working in ordinary parish and circuit life are of vital importance for the issues involved in the Anglican-Methodist Conversations, the Methodist Connexional Church Membership Committee decided upon a sociological survey of four towns—Rugby, in Warwickshire; Trowbridge, in Wiltshire; Ellesmere Port, near Birkenhead; and Bromley, in Kent. The result is a fascinating document now published jointly by the Epworth Press and the Church Information Office (10*s.* 6*d.*). It is entitled *Survey of Anglicanism and Methodism in Four Towns*. Its importance can perhaps be best expressed in the words of the Bishop of Middleton, who writes in the Foreword: 'Clearly there is an Anglican and a Methodist approach to things that need to be noted. Some are "theological" and some are "non-theological" and they need to be sharply distinguished. . . . There are issues requiring hard thinking and self-analysis. . . . The study reveals the strength of habit, of tradition and of "feeling" in the formation of attitudes—rather than in the strength of criticism and judgment. . . . It suggests that Christians need to recognize this subjectivity and thinking by habit, and to be freed to recognize the element of "given-ness" in Christian truth.' This document is a most valuable piece of work to be studied with the caution that statistical findings always demand, yet with serious consideration.

RECENT LITERATURE

Edited by John T. Wilkinson

Wisdom in Proverbs (Studies in Biblical Theology, no. 45, by R. N. Whybray). (S.C.M. Press, 13*s.* 6*d.*)

Dr Whybray is a priest in the Church of England, spent two years in the U.S.A., lectured for thirteen years in Japan, and is now returning to a lectureship in this country. The sub-title of the volume is 'The Concept of Wisdom in Proverbs 1-9). These chapters consist of Ten Discourses. The problems are: what connexion is there between Hebrew Wisdom and similar ideas in other countries, notably Egypt? Who and what is this figure of Wisdom? Is it a personification? Has it a mythological origin? Was there a Canaanite goddess of wisdom and, if so, has the Hebrew figure of Wisdom anything to do with her. And in any case, whatever the answers to these questions, how did 'Wisdom' develop into the 'Fear of the LORD'? The monograph is a technical, detailed and scholarly study, but a detailed and technical knowledge of the subject and of the Hebrew language is not essential to the reading of the book. It is a careful and valuable addition to the literature of the subject.

N. H. SNAITH

The Servant of God (Studies in Theology, no. 20, revised edition, by W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias.) (S.C.M. Press, 18*s.*)

This volume, in stiff paper covers, is a revision of a monograph originally published in English in 1952, itself a translation of the article on *Pais Theou* in the Kittel *New Testament Wörtherbuch*. It is, as the title shows, a study of the figure of the Servant of God and the association of that title with Jesus. Professor Zimmerli deals with the Old Testament and Professor Jeremias with the New Testament and late Judaism (i.e., after the Septuagint period). The Hebrew word *ebed* had its profane and its religious usages, and these are discussed; followed by the Septuagint translations of the word, especially the translation *pais* (child). The Old Testament double religious usage of 'child' and 'servant' persists and thus 'servant of God' can also mean 'child of God', which is the way by which the title could be used of the Divine Son. The differences between the two editions concern the influence of the Dead Sea (Qumran) texts, the abandonment of the derivation of the use of *pais* in Acts from Deutero-Isaiah, and further evidence that Jesus referred chapter 53 to Himself. The volume is for the student rather than the general reader, and a knowledge of both Hebrew and Greek is helpful, though not essential for the reading of the book. My own opinion is that it is wrong to speak so much about the Servant of Isaiah 53 and so virtually limit the association of Jesus with the Servant to the Passion. Further, the Servant was not 'a suffering Servant', but a triumphant Servant' in spite of the sufferings. We point out also that it is only partially true to say that (apart from two references) Jesus uses the phrase 'Son of Man' when He first talks about suffering. He talks about rising again also; the suffering is a preliminary to the triumph. But the authors follow the general modern orthodox point of view in these matters, and everything they say is thoroughly well documented.

N. H. SNAITH

The Ras Shamra Discoveries and the Old Testament, by A. S. Kapelrud. (Basil Blackwell, paper, 14*s*.)

Professor G. W. Anderson has translated Professor Avril Kapelrud's lectures at Oslo on the connexion between the tablets found in North Syria and the Canaanite religion which Israel found on entry into Canaan. For many of us these finds on the site of the ancient city of Ugarit are far more important even than the Dead Sea scrolls. This little book is admirably suited to the general reader who wants to know. It contains eleven photographic reproductions of the site and of tablets and reliefs which have been found there in the 38 years since the site was first found. The author gives, first, the story of the find by the Syrian peasant and how he quickly brought in the French archæological experts; next, a description of the Ugaritic texts which have been found written with a cuneiform alphabet (not syllabic); then, the deities and the cult. Any student of the Old Testament should know about the Ugarit pantheon and about what we can deduce concerning the kind of worship there. Here we read about El and Baal and 'Ashtaroth' and Asherah and Anath. Books on the earlier Israelite religion are old-fashioned since the Ugarit tablets were deciphered, and many passages in the Old Testament have new meanings and are better understood. Scholars seem nervous of writing a new 'Religion of Israel', so that it is necessary to read a book like this and make one's own adjustments. The book is well worth the cost, high though that seems to be.

N. H. SNAITH

The Miracles and the Resurrection. (Theological Collections No. 3.) (S.P.C.K., 13*s*. 6*d*.)

Resurrection Then and Now, by J. McLeman. (Hodder & Stoughton, 16*s*.)

No. 3 of the S.P.C.K. Theological Collections opens with Prof. I. T. Ramsay's Inaugural Lecture at Oxford (1951) on 'Miracles: An Exercise in Logical Map-work'. 'Miracle', it is held, has no place in the vocabulary of science. Historical language and the logic of 'person' words are called in to help determine the logical statue of 'miracle'. There follows a carefully balanced assessment by Dr. G. H. Boobyer of 'The Gospel Miracles: Views Past and Present', which cannot but help the reader to form his own views (as the writer insists he must) about the worth of the miracle stories. The final comments deal with the idea that faith can validate what historical research has left doubtful. Two following contributions are slighter. F. N. Davey writes on 'Healing in the New Testament' and M. C. Perry sensibly discusses 'Believing in Miracles', and follows it with some comments on preaching the Resurrection. Finally we are given H. J. Cadbury's Ingersoll Lecture (1959) on 'Intimations of Immortality in the Thought of Jesus'.

The approach in the second volume by James McLeman is far more radical than any of the above. With fine lucidity and relentless argument he contends that the doctrine of resurrection is not a deduction from fact but a creation of faith, and that what lies at the heart of the New Testament traditions concerning the resurrection is not an objective (corporeal) event but 'a conviction arrived at by normal process'. The emergence of the Hebrew belief in life-after-death is traced in Part I. This provides the historical setting for the resurrection faith of the New Testament, where resurrection is closely linked with Messiahship, and neither can be traced back to Jesus himself. Part III examines in detail the resurrection narratives, with particular attention to the significance of their discrepancies. Part IV treats of orthodoxy and the modern critical tendency which is to break the traditional ties between the efficacy of belief in the resurrection as a Christian experience on the one hand and an event in history called the rising of Jesus from

the dead on the other. This is an important study and likely to be of influence because of its admirable clarity. It embodies the views of more radical New Testament scholarship than is usual in books with a popular appeal, whilst scholars also will have to take note of it.

A. W. HEATHCOTE

The Authorship and Integrity of the New Testament (Theological Collections No. 4). (S.P.C.K., 15*s.* 6*d.*)

Are the writings of the New Testament to be ascribed to the persons named therein as their authors? Or is the author's name in some instances a pseudonym? If so, does this not imply a measure of deception by the writer or of error by the Church, or both of these, so that the writing does not merit a place in the canon of Scripture? Or are we to say, on dogmatic grounds, that canonicity excludes pseudonimity? In the second paper in this collection, Donald Guthrie seems to move in the latter direction. He traces the idea of pseudonymity in canonical writings from the German critics of the early nineteenth century, outlining the views of F. C. Baur, Holtzmann, Jülicher, and those of their successors, Moffatt, Dibelius, Goodspeed and others, in this connection. He brings into question some of the assumptions of the pseudonymity view, and calls for more evidence to support them. Was this, indeed, a recognized and legitimate practice, and does it not raise ethical difficulties? The final view which Guthrie criticizes is that of Prof. Kurt Aland, presented in the first article in this collection. He finds the key in the authority of prophecy in the early Church whereof the Holy Spirit is the real author and the prophet merely the instrument. The question, then, when we pass from the earlier oral to the later writing stage of development is to explain why any author gave his real name—though this never applied to genuine letters, for here the identity of the writer was important.

The third article is a clear elementary introduction to the use of statistical analysis, now possible on a large scale with the aid of computers, for determining the integrity and authorship of New Testament writings. Whether A. Q. Morton's exuberance is justified remains to be seen; his strictures on pre-computer scholarship certainly are not. The presuppositions of the new technique are interestingly high-lighted when his bold assertion that 2 Corinthians 'is not a homogeneous document' (and the fragments are at once stated) is put alongside Prof. Bornkamm's careful study of the origin of the so-called Second Letter to the Corinthians—and Mr Morton has added that 'so far no literary theory has even acknowledged that the intrusions present a problem, never mind suggesting a reason for them'!—and that attempt by A. M. G. Stephenson to defend the integrity of the Epistle.

Two useful articles remain. Prof. M. H. Shepherd, Jr., studies carefully the parallels between the Epistle of James and the Gospel of Matthew, and concludes that the Epistle was written in a Church somewhere in Syria-Palestine for which Matthew alone was the accepted Gospel. (The reference on p. 112 should be to Matt. 18^{15-19}.) The Bishop of Woolwich argues persuasively that the Prologue to the Gospel of John was added some ten or twenty years later by the author at the time when he was writing his epistles. If this is so, the Logos theology belongs to the environment of the Gospel rather than to its background, and hence cannot be used to impugn the Palestinian background of the tradition, nor can it be used to support the view that in this Gospel history is subservient to metaphysics.

In sum, we have here a most worthwhile collection of reprinted articles.

A. W. HEATHCOTT

The Moral Agument for Christian Theism, by H. P. Owen. (Allen & Unwin, 16*s*.)
He is a bold man who announces: 'I hope to show that morality gives us firm grounds for believing in a transcendent, personal and holy God.' It is true that, later in the book, the author states that the 'indications' which he has offered (which at times he appears to treat as 'proofs') do not constitute 'objectively coercive proofs'. It is, however, not always clear whether, with F. R. Tennant, he would be satisfied with showing the reasonableness of Christian theism, or whether, as his preface suggests, he attempts more than this. If the remark is not taken too literally, it may be said that one could imagine Aquinas writing this book after studying Kant and reading (regretfully) A. J. Ayer and Nowell Smith and (appreciatively) Newman and A. E. Taylor. Mr Owen's argument rests upon his attempt to establish the 'objectivity of moral values'. He rightly affirms that the crucial meaning of that somewhat ambiguous term refers to 'goodness' and 'rightness' as belong 'to X objectively as X's physical properties belong to it'. Painstakingly he seeks to answer objections to this 'objectivity'. From that starting point he seeks to show that, whilst the cosmological argument is a more direct way of establishing proof [*sic*] of God's self-existence and creative power, the moral argument has many distinctive merits. He then becomes more cautious and sets forth this argument as pointing to God and to the gap which faith must leap by intuition based on spiritual experience. 'The initial concept of God in Christian theism is derived from Biblical revelation.' It is difficult to see what the difficult journey has achieved. However, when Mr Owen comes to write about duty, goodness and (especially) beatitude he says much that is fresh and valuable. Readers who are not convinced by the 'proof' may learn much from this later discussion about what an *ethical* theism implies. And in the end, the author makes clear that his main purpose is to encourage inquiring minds to ask whether Christian theism can alone explain and unify the moral life. That, at least, is a purpose which we may hope he will achieve.

FREDERIC GREEVES

The New Reformation?, by J. A. T. Robinson. (S.C.M. Press, 6*s*.)
Christ and Methodism, by John J. Vincent. (Epworth, 8*s*. 6*d*.)
A New Theology?, by David A. Pailin. (Epworth, 2*s*. 6*d*.)
An unkind critic might suggest that the radical theologians, like certain inhabitants of New Guinea, flourish by feeding on each other. Robinson reviews Vincent in PRISM. Vincent replies to Robinson. Pailin writes about *Honest to God*. And so the merry-go-round continues. The only conspicuous absentees from the debate so far are the agnostics and outsiders on whose behalf the books are being written. If this is disappointing it is not meant to under-estimate the real hope which this movement affords. All three books in this particular selection are extremely valuable. Like most exploratory writings, they can be criticized for inconsistency and inconclusiveness but to my mind they are worth any dozen sound academic treatments of biblical theology or what you will.

The Bishop of Woolwich, hard on the heels of the phenomenally successful *Honest to God* (world sales about 800,000), has put together a lecture series on radical theology and church structure and topped it off with appendices on atheism and the religious nurture of the young. 'Starting from the other end' is the title of the main theological chapter. Here Robinson argues that 'the way in' to communicate the gospel to our contemporaries is through the gracious neighbour rather than through a gracious God. It is through presenting Jesus as the Son of Man before speaking of Him as Son of God. Vincent would agree that the old formula of the gospel as good news to the individual of release from the guilt of

his sin is out of the question. He proposes Jesus as Lord instead of Jesus as Saviour. He, too, calls for a programme of Christian action around social and political concerns of the day to embody or placard what Christ means for us today.

Theologically Vincent is much more Christological than Robinson. Indeed he criticizes him for being prepared to reduce the gospel to what the pagan, non-Christian Englishman now does, provided it is interpreted with adequate depth. Robinson is right in accusing the church of traditionally presenting Jesus as God and starting from the end of faith. Creeds, hymns and liturgies undoubtedly do this, though sermons and the conversation of individual Christians much less. The problem is that Jesus has often been admired as a man and no more—no gospel, no claim, no authority. As outlined in *The New Reformation?* Robinson's position here lacks dynamic and only functions as a counterweight to a false emphasis in the past. By contrast Vincent calls for 'a Christology, based not upon the forensic problem, but upon Christ as the new man, the Servant, the Master, who calls men into discipleship, wholeness and renewal and whose office as Victor is relevant to the complex world of society and politics as well as to personal ethics and devotion' (p. 23). This is tougher stuff and probably ultimately more profitable, but the Bishop has a lot more readers.

In castigating the Methodist emphases John Vincent is on a very easy wicket. Perfection and assurance now look as archaic as a coelecanth. Any attempt to use these categories demands so many elaborate explanations and re-interpretations that what one ends up with can be described neither as Methodist nor an emphasis. These cannot be our offerings to the ecumenical movement. Of course, anxiety about such matters is a glorious example of that attempted self-justification which is the absolute opposite of real faith. Justifying faith, he points out, can so easily become a religious work designed to tie down God just as much as any system of sacramental control of grace. In one illuminating passage he writes of 'a reformation more basic than that of the sixteenth century, by recognizing the futility of human endeavour to attain God *volitionally, religiously, or sacramentally*, and by an abandonment "in faith" to a search for God who continues to do in the world the deeds of Christ—a realization that God has attained man *practically, materially and hiddenly*'. If Vincent can take statements like this further he will be doing a real service to us all and at a deeper level than any of the experiments described in the rest of the book.

The emphasis of *The New Reformation?* falls upon the church and its need to find new forms and structures. Although much of the material is derived from Albert van den Heuvel and Colin Williams, the Bishop has many creative suggestions to offer. Most important is the need for a lay theology. It is not enough to have a theology of the laity. We must have a theology which is structured around the questions which laymen face in their secular vocations. This in itself will involve listening before speaking, asking before answering. So far we lack any sustained attempt by the church *qua* church to listen to the laymen in this way. The air is full of talk of 'training the laity' but such training cannot merely consist of telling the layman that he is important or that his ecclesiastical status has been up-graded. It must itself be in the form of a dialogue and it must be centred on the application of the gospel in concrete situations in this world. We are in great danger of substituting salvation by lay training or stewardship for salvation faith. A lay theology and serious theological training for the whole chuch in dialogue with the world demand a reshaping of our institutions so enormous as to elude the imagination. The Bishop's formula for his own church is the ending of the 'clergy line', the abolition of patronage and of the 'professional' minister. A similar formula for Methodism could involve the abolition of the circuit as the normative

unit, the amalgamation of the separate connexional departments and the giving up of all non-functional meetings in the local church apart from one service a Sunday. The development of lay academies with good equipment and sound theology is one obvious way forward into the ministry in the public sphere for which Colin Williams and many others are pleading. When it comes to the local church one feels that Vincent, probably for lack of resources, is proceeding on fairly traditional lines, i.e. is concentrating on bringing people on to church premises. The question may well be asked: 'Who is to sustain a ministry which does not gather a congregation in such a way that financial support can be extracted from them?' Is not this where the universality of the church, as in Acts, must come in, if this is a genuine communication of the gospel? Radical redeployment on a precarious financial basis is only irresponsible in the context of the prevailing secular death-wish which grips our leadership. If we believe in it, we can pay.

David Pailin's booklet is a clear and perceptive analysis of Dr Robinson's earlier book. It is an excellent guide for individuals or groups who are studying *Honest to God*. The author ends with six useful comments of his own. One is worthy of further attention: 'The brute fact of the matter,' he writes, 'is that hardly any theological position has been embarrassed by a failure to acquire biblical support. . . . Indeed, so numerous and so mutually contradictory have been the interpretations of Christianity read into the Bible that we may wonder if the appeal to the Bible has any significance in a debate between Christian thinkers' (p. 25). It is hard to disagree.

ROBIN SHARP

The Jewish Christian Argument: A history of theologies in conflict, by Hans Joachim Schoeps. (Faber, 30*s*.)

This is a 'tract for the times' if ever there was one! In an age when, to quote its author, 'the Church is experiencing the bitterness of being "only" a wanderer on the face of the earth; experiencing its Babylonian captivity—quite differently, much more concretely, than the Reformers ever thought', it is surely not fanciful to suggest that Jews, who have learned during two thousand years something of the meaning of *galuth* or exile, may be able to teach Christians how best to meet the circumstances of such an age. But there is so much to unlearn as well as to learn. And who better qualified to teach than Professor Schoeps, who combines with outstanding Jewish scholarship a rare insight into Christian origins. The first half of his book is a lesson in how not to engage in dialogue. It treats of the centuries in which the Christian approach to the Jew was from a position of assumed superiority. Lack of understanding was mutual. Starting from different premises, using the same or similar terms with different meanings, and pre-judged from the outset in favour of Christianity (it was a game in which, *ex hypothesi*, the Jew could not be allowed to win), the Jewish-Christian argument resulted only in widening the gulf between Church and Synagogue.

The contribution of all this to the growth and persistence of antisemitism, though another story, cannot be left out of account in assessing the dangerous futility of this kind of religious disputation. Happily there is another side to the story. The second half of Professor Schoeps' book begins with the controversy between Moses Mendelssohn, the father of the 'Enlightenment', and Johann Caspar Lavater, which the author describes as being 'of exemplary importance since, for the first time in the history of these debates, one can speak of "toleration", of "understanding", and of "mutual appreciation" '. This was in 1769, and the process

thus begun continued until in 1933 Martin Buber and Karl Ludwig Schmidt, an evangelical theologian, took part in a religious dialogue under the auspices, significantly enough, of the Jewish Academy in Stuttgart. From that moment the issue ceased to be of mere academic interest. With Hitler's seizure of power in 1933 began the nightmare period of concentrated antisemitism which ended with the extermination of between five and six million Jews. This tragedy is reflected at a deeply personal level in the dedication of this book to the memory of his parents, both of whom died at the hands of the Nazis. It underlines the need for the pursuit, not of argument, between Christians and Jews, but of a dialogue which Canon Hugh Montefiore defines in his Introduction as 'a readiness to listen before speaking', and whose object 'is not to score points but to understand the other person at a deep and creative level'. To that end, so vital and so urgent, this book, written with scholarly authority, infused throughout with deep and charitable human insight and enhanced by some twenty pages of valuable notes, is a splendid contribution.

W. W. SIMPSON

Has Christianity a Revelation?, by F. Gerald Downing. (S.C.M. Press, 35*s*.)
This is a rich and rewarding book, valuable for the biblical theologian, the systematic theologian and the philosopher of religion. Because it is thus very difficult to review briefly, I propose to give as full an account as possible before evaluating the argument. The thesis is that an affirmative answer to the question 'Has Christianity a revelation?' must be hedged about by so many qualifications that confusion inevitably results and so an alternative formulation of the Christian claim—in terms of 'salvation'—is desirable. Mr Downing defines his difficulties in the opening chapter as the two problems—(a) the difficulty of using the term 'revelation' logically and coherently, (b) the difficulty of finding a biblical basis for this expression. The difficulty arises because 'revelation' means the removing of some obscurity, and, when used without qualification, it suggests complete lucidity and comprehension. From a survey of the background to the Christian use and of the Christian use itself Mr Downing concludes that the New Testament writers never explicitly say that 'God reveals himself (in Christ)'. It is only in the sense of the possibility of obeying God that the New Testament speaks of 'knowing' God now, and its expectation of revelation is the expectation that Christ will be visible. This conclusion Mr Downing supports by a brief and hurried survey of the Christian use of 'revelation' from the New Testament onwards. Turning now to the more philosophical part of the argument Mr Downing begins by discussing the testing of religious language; and, though he regards theological language as primarily performative, he insists that where it talks of facts it must be verifiable. Next he discusses a crop of problems concerning knowledge and revelation, the main point being that we cannot be said to know God and therefore if God intended to reveal himself, he has failed—which is to say that this was not his intention. Talk of 'revelation' produces such muddles as the problem of whether knowledge of God is revealed or natural, an excessive intellectualism and, finally, too great an emphasis on consciousness. In conclusion, Mr Downing offers an answer to his problem, and this is the choice of 'salvation' as an 'alternative' to 'revelation', the former term having all the advantages and none of the disadvantages of the latter.

Clearly this is an important book—at any rate I found it very profitable. Yet I feel that its importance lies more in the detail of the argument than in its thesis —more, if I may so put it, as the revelation of a theologian than as a theological position. Obviously if one defines 'revelation' as Mr Downing does, it is perni-

cious nonsense to pretend that we have a revelation of God. But is he not here turning his back on the very method he seeks to employ? Does his case amount to anything more than a redefinition of 'revelation'? It seems to me that Mr Downing is peculiarly insensitive to language at this point, and many of his examples are forced into a Procrustean bed. Even if it were true that the use of the word by contemporary theologians is contrary to the Biblical use, this is not a decisive argument. In any case, Mr Downing seems to me to reduce the meaning of 'revelation' by making it at all times intentional (cf. p. 235), whereas this is surely the hall-mark of the theological as distinct from the non-theological use. Some typographical errors I noticed were: 'imminence' and "iminent' for 'immanence' and 'immanent' respectively (p. 160) and 'Mac Kinnon' for 'Mackinnon' (passive). The punctuation of line 1 on page 192 makes nonsense of the sentence.

J. HEYWOOD THOMAS

The Christian Understanding of Human Nature, by W. Norman Pittenger. (Nisbet, 10*s.* 6*d.*)

This study of the Christian doctrine of man is by the Professor of Christian Apologetics at the General Theological Seminary, New York. It is complete and balanced but rather dull. Man is created dependent, for fellowship with God and for community with other men. A body-soul unity, it is natural that his relationship to God should be sustained sacramentally. Because of his body-soul nature his sexuality can never be only physical. Man is estranged from God, but God draws him back to himself through the saved and saving community, where 'salvation' means wholeness, integration and fullness of life. A true understanding of human nature must include the fact that man is made for eternity. He quotes Kierkegaard, who said of himself that one day it would be written that 'he died of a mortal disease, but poetically speaking he died of a longing for eternity'. I don't find that it much supplements, or in any way supersedes, Dr Mascall's much fresher and original book on the same subject, *The Importance of Being Human.*

ALAN WILKINSON

Christian Existentialism, A Berdyaev Anthology, selected and translated by Donald A. Lowrie. (Allen & Unwin, 55*s.*)

'God is a subject with whom existential relations exist.' So Berdyaev wrote in *Slavery and Freedom* and this provides the text for Lowrie's anthology, which contains quotations not only from Berdyaev's twenty-nine books, but also from untranslated articles and hitherto unpublished letters. About a fifth of the text appears in English for the first time. A brief biographical sketch introduces the anthology and helps the reader unfamiliar with Berdyaev's political background to understand his position. Berdyaev's writing was spread over half a century—a half century in which Europe was twice torn by war and Russia involved in both wars experienced her revolution. Berdyaev himself lived close to his country's history and moved in a circle of thinkers influential in the social and intellectual life of Russia. Critical of the revolution, he remained in Russia till 1922 when he was presented with an order of banishment as 'hopelessly inconvertible to communism'. Although he was not cradled in orthodox Christianity, Berdyaev became a Christian and made his great contribution as a Christian philosopher.

The anthology is well conceived, the passages being grouped under twelve heads. After a section in which we are given Berdyaev's answer to the question 'What can we know about the world?' there follow excerpts on God, Man and Society. Our attention is then directed to Philosophy, Metaphysics and their

relation to Religion. Finally Lowrie introduces us to passages on Christianity, the Church ('God between four walls'), the State and Culture. There are trenchant and relevant criticisms of Marxism and penetrating insights into the nature of history. It is a book for today. This is not a book to be read systematically except by the diligent student, but rather a bedside book to be dipped into and pondered. The many aphorisms of Berdyaev's work are more noticeable when pinpointed where man meets God.' 'Pure truth could burst the world apart.' 'Suffering is the basic theme of all religions of redemption.' 'God has laid upon man the duty of being free.' 'God is the Lover and he cannot and does not wish to exist without the loved one.' One is tempted to make an anthology of an anthology. Such thoughts as these can start a train of others leading to a deeper understanding of oneself and the world and of Berdyaev's particular brand of Christian existentialism.

BERNARD E. JONES

The Enforcement of Morals, by Patrick Devlin. (O.U.P., 25*s*.)

The recent discussion on homosexuality, arising from the recommendations of the Wolfenden Report, has pin-pointed a number of problems for the moralist. In his capacity as lawyer and judge Lord Devlin has been concerned with law and order and the enforcement of morals and such a man has a peculiar contribution to make to the current discussion. The book consists of a series of papers delivered on various occasions linked together by the underlying question of how far it is possible to enforce the observance of moral standards by law. 'There must remain,' the Wolfenden Report declared, 'a realm of private morality and immorality which is, in brief and crude terms, not the law's business.' The report urged, and Lord Devlin substantially agrees, that the spheres of crime and sin should not be equated. Crime is an offence against society, where sin is an offence against God or the personal conscience. Adultery, for instance, is not a crime, while bigamy is.

The Old Testament moralists found no such difficulty, for laws involving personal behaviour and public welfare were equally recognized as being the will of God. In the secular world of today even a Christian must recognize that there is a distinction between the realm of freedom and the realm of public obligation. John Stuart Mill analysed the problem and much of Lord Devlin's book is concerned with the exposition and criticism of Mill's *On Liberty*. To be moral a man must be free and the state can only intervene where the well-being of society is involved. Hence it is logical to make homosexuality involving juveniles a crime while leaving homosexuality between freely consenting adults in the realm of freedom. This in no way involves the approval of society though the alteration of the law may be so misunderstood. Lord Devlin's case is summed up in the sentence: 'You cannot draw a line which keeps the intervention of the state to a minimum; you can only beg it to remember why it is there and urge it not to go too far.'

BERNARD E. JONES

English Philanthropy, 1660-1960, by David Owen. (Harvard University Press, London: Oxford University Press, 70*s*.)

This is a book of six hundred pages, handsomely produced, heavy to hold, easy to read. The author is Gurney Professor of History and Political Science in Harvard University. The survey was undertaken through the sponsoring initiative of the Ford Foundation in the hope that the findings would be useful in American experiments. A Sabbatical year was used for research. Though there is a mass of detailed information, there is no difficulty in following the main line of investiga-

tion and argument. The stages in development are clearly noted, and the changes in the climate of opinion explained. There are four sections: The Age of Benevolence (1660-1780), The Age of Improvement (1780-1860), Private Philosophy and Public Responsibility (1860-1914), The Welfare State (1914-1960).

The origins of English charitable enterprise were in the 'extraordinary outpouring of wealth from the merchant aristocracy and gentry in Tudor-Stuart times'. Private charity was the solution for major problems of society. The Evangelical Revival strengthened ideas of obligations, and of the stewardship of wealth; charity was the characteristic virtue in the eighteenth century. From individual and corporate effort came the charity school movement, the hospital system, foreign missions, the Bible societies, Sunday Schools. These were splendid achievements, but the primary concerns were sin and redemption rather than poverty and social distress. Except for the protest against slavery, there was 'myopia towards public issues'. Benevolence was not socially constructive. Economic changes, population explosion and accumulation of data showed the inadequacy of voluntary effort and the need for positive social activity. The bad years of the 1880s and 1890s led to a new comprehensive state policy. There was a change in emphasis from humanitarian concern for the relief of the Poor to the abolition of Poverty. The campaign for old age pensions in the 1890s and the social legislation between 1905-1911 prepared the way for the Beveridge Report, a Blue Print for the work of 'Messrs. Attlee, Bevan & Co.'. In the book, there are pages appreciative of well-known and less-known philanthropists. Valuable sections deal with legal and fiscal matters—the remodelling of Ancient Trusts, City of London Charities, Poor Law and Charity Commissioners, the Village Trust of the Rowntree community in York, and schemes of co-operation in Liverpool. Judgements are perceptive and evaluations sound. The thoroughness of the investigation is illustrated in many detailed references, e.g. the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel raised £90,000 in 1861; the almshouses at Chipping Campden are an interesting architectural survival; comments of the Earl of Longford, Labour Peer in the House of Lords, are quoted with approval. The Nathan Report of 1952 points the way to the future. Rationalization of Charity Law and Administration is necessary. Voluntary contribution is a permanent integral part of the machinery of the Welfare State. The undeveloped countries hold new opportunities for 'the new philanthropy'. The book will be a worth-while addition on the shelves of libraries—college, school and public.

FRANK M. KELLEY

The Social Hope of the Christian Church, by Stanley G. Evans. Hodder & Stoughton, 30*s*.)

The Chancellor of Southwark Cathedral has put us all in his debt by writing a scholarly and eminently readable book on a theme of first-class importance. The Christian hope can be described in terms too narrowly pietistic, and it often has been. But there has been a sweep and grandeur about the fullest expositions of it which challenge the mind and thrill the spirit. The vision of a whole society, based upon love and justice, and thus fulfilling the will of God, is one which has haunted the minds of men through the ages. But the vision comes and goes, and the ideas of men concerning the social content of the Gospel have varied according to their grasp of the significance and relevance of the Christian message for the times in which they lived. Often the most enthusiastic of social reformers have been strangely limited in their outlook. So the outstanding eighteenth-century philanthropist, Hannah More, on reading Mary Wollstonecroft's *Vindication of the Rights of Women*, exclaimed: 'Rights of Women! We will be hearing of the

Rights of Children next!' Canon Evans begins with the prophets of the Old Testament whose social hope is well summarized in the words of the Book of Enoch: 'I will transform the earth and make it a blessing.' The centrality of the Kingdom of God in the teaching of Jesus is expounded, and then there follows a most competent historical account of a developing tradition. The latter half of the book is not as balanced and clear in the treatment of the theme as the material contained in the opening chapters. But the author never loses sight of his central conviction—that the gospel is social in its very nature and essence. In a final chapter on 'The Hope of the Future' there are brief notes about the Christian approach to four major problems which must be solved if the world is to have a future at all. They are the problems of peace, of racial equality, of social and economic order, and of man's relation to nature.

KENNETH G. GREET

The Ethics of Sex, by Helmut Thielicke. (James Clarke, 30*s*.)

Professor Thielicke begins his solid and scholarly work on sexual ethics with an engagingly honest reference to the well-established view that German professors usually require their readers to plough through inordinately long introductions before they get to the point. He adds 'certainly in this book the German professor is by no means completely concealed'. By no means indeed! But forewarned is forearmed, and the reader who is prepared to persevere with the somewhat massive approach of the author to his subject will be rewarded by many rich insights. As might be expected, the Biblical basis of the Christian estimate of sex and marriage is expounded and its importance stressed. Sex is seen not so much as what we do but as what we are. The purpose of God in making us male and female is not narrowly procreative, but creative in a much wider sense. Sexual polarity is concerned with the deepening of human relationship and with the total quality of life. Thielicke's concern is not merely with theory and doctrine. The later sections of the book deal with practical issues such as divorce and remarriage, birth control, abortion, artificial insemination and homosexuality. In dealing with marriage, he emphasizes the importance of what Thedor Bovet described as 'the erotic atmosphere' which is essential to all true marriages. There is also an interesting treatment of the problem of the equality of the sexes—a popular phrase, the meaning of which needs to be more adequately explored. This is not a book to be read through in a brief interval between two committees. It is weighty stuff. But, because the treatment is so thorough, it will be the kind of book to which reference can repeatedly be made with profit.

KENNETH G. GREAT

BOOKS RECEIVED

ALLEN & UNWIN: *Christian Existentialism: A Berdyaev Anthology*, tr. by D. A. Lowrie, pp. 329, 55*s*. Derek Ingram, *Commonwealth for a Colour-blind World*, pp. 224, 30*s*. J. G. Emerson, *The Dynamics of Forgiveness*, pp. 203, 21*s*. (ed.) Max Black, *Philosophy in America* (Muirhead Library of Philosophy), pp. 307, 42*s*.

A. & C. BLACK: G. F. Woods, *Contemporary Theological Liberalism: An Inaugural Lecture*, pp. 12, 5*s*.

BURNS & OATES: A. J. Loomie, S.J., *The Spanish Elizabethans*, pp. 281, 42*s*.

B.B.C.: R. Hepburn, D. Jenkins, Ninian Smart, H. Root, R. Bambrough, *Religion and Humanism*, pp. 104, 12*s*. 6*d*.

CAREY KINGSGATE PRESS: D. Jenkins, *Believing in God* (Layman's Theological Library), pp. 94, 6*s*. J. B. Coburn, *Prayer and Personal Religion* (Layman's Theological Library), pp. 96, 6*s*.

EPWORTH PRESS: Emil Brunner, *The Word of God and Modern Man*, pp. 87, 7*s*. 6*d*. D. B. Clark, *Survey of Anglicans and Methodists in Four Towns*, pp. 115, 10*s*. 6*d*. D. T.

Niles, *Whereof We are Witnesses*, pp. 78, 7*s*. 6*d*. C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Service of God*, pp. 66, 7*s*. 6*d*. Gordon S. Wakefield, *The Mystery of the Transfiguration*, pp. 27, 2*s*. Morton T. Kelsey, *Speaking with Tongues: An Experiment in Spiritual Experience*, pp. 252, 17*s*. 6*d*. Colin Williams, *What in the World?*, pp. 105, 6*s*. 6*d*. *Where in the World?*, pp. 116, 6*s*. 6*d*. Leonard Hodgson, *Christian Faith and Practice*, pp. 112, 11*s*. 6*d*. Hendrikus Berkhof, *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, pp. 128, 12*s*. 6*d*. S. Laeuchli, *The Language of Faith: An Introduction to the Semantic Dilemma of the Early Church*, pp. 269, 21*s*.

FABER & FABER: Murray Boston, *Prophet and Poet: The Bible and the Growth of Romanticism*, pp. 204, 30*s*. S. L. Frank, *Reality and Man: An Essay in the Metaphysics of Human Nature*, pp. 238, 42*s*. Bp. Otto Dibelius, *In the Service of the Lord: The Autobiography of Otto Dibelius*, pp. 280 +plates, 36*s*. M. Reynolds, *Martyr of Ritualism: Father Mackonachie of St Albans, Holborn*, pp. 304 + plates, 50*s*. *Scandinavian Churches*, pp. 197 +plates, 35*s*.

FAITH PRESS: Antony Snell, S.S.M., *Truth in Words*, pp. 168, 27*s*. 6*d*.

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: H. Debrunner, *A Church Between Colonial Powers: A Study of the Church in Togo* (World Studies in Christian Missions), pp. 386, 27*s*. 6*d*. Boards 35*s*. G. B. Duncan, *Mystery in the Storm*, pp. 150, 8*s*. 6*d*. Karl Barth, *The German Church in Conflict* (Ecumenical Studies in History), pp. 76, 10*s*. 6*d*. H. R. Rack, *The Future of John Wesley's Methodism* (Ecumenical Studies in History), pp. 80, 10*s*. 6*d*.

MACMILLAN: Tr. B. Wall, *Priest and Worker: The Autobiography of Henri Perrin*, pp. 247, 25*s*. COLLIER-MACMILLAN: W. R. Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Review*, pp. 38, $10.00.

MARCHAM MANOR PRESS: Ed. J. I. Packer, *All in One Place: Towards Reunion in England*, pp. 237, 18*s*.

METHODIST REVIVAL FELLOWSHIP: I. H. Marshall and others, *Towards a United Church: A Biblical Approach*, pp. 63, 4*s*.

MOWBRAYS: G. D. Yarnold, *By What Authority?*, pp. 160, 21*s*.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: David Owen, *English Philanthropy: 1660-1960*, pp. 610, 70*s*. H. F. Guite, *What Kind of Classics? An Inaugural Lecture*, pp. 27, 4*s*. R. Craig, *Religion—Its Reality and Relevance: An Inaugural Lecture*, pp. 29, 4*s*.

REVIEW & HERALD PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION, Washington, D.C.: Le Roy E. Froom, *The Conditionalist Faith of Our Fathers*, Vol. II, pp. 1341, n.p.

S.C.M. PRESS: A. R. Vidler, *20th Century Defenders of the Faith* (Robertson Lectures, 1964), pp. 127, 9*s*. 6*d*. R. N. Whybray, *Wisdom in Proverbs* (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 45), pp. 120, 13*s*. 6*d*. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (2 vols.) (cheap edition), Vol. I, pp. 395, 21*s*.; Vol. II, pp. 278, 16*s*. A. B. Starratt, *The Real God* (paper-back), pp. 124, 6*s*. 6*d*. F. R. Barry, *Questioning Faith* (paper-back), pp. 192, 7*s*. 6*d*. G. S. Hendry, *The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology* (The Preacher's Library), pp. 169, 21*s*. Harvey E. Cox, *The Secular City*, pp. 276, 21*s*. Alfread Shands, *The Liturgical Movement in the Local Church* (enlarged ed.), pp. 160, 8*s*. 6*d*. W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias, *The Servant of God* (revised ed.) (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 20), pp. 126, 18*s*. Richard R. Niebuhr, *Schleiermacher on Christ and Religion* (Library of Philosophy and Religion), pp. 267, 45*s*. N. Porteous, *Daniel: A Commentary* (Old Testament Library), pp. 173, 30*s*. Kathleen E. Morgan, *Christian Themes in Contemporary Poets*, pp. 208, 21*s*. Max Warren, *The Missionary Movement from Britain in Modern History*, pp. 192, 21*s*.

S.P.C.K.: W. A. Shotwell, *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr*, pp. 136, 19*s*. 6*d*. Joan A. Tooke, *The Just War in Aquinas and Grotius*, pp. 337, 63*s*. (ed.) R. R. Williams, *Authority and the Church* (S.P.C.K. Theological Collections No. 5), pp. 94, 15*s*. 6*d*.

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

The Expository Times, May 1965
- Life after Death: V. Israel and the After-Life, by S. H. Hooke.
- Contemporary Music and Congregational Worship, by Ivor H. Jones.
- Ventures in Liturgy: III. The Celebration of Holy Communion as used in the Abbey Service of the Iona Community.

The Expository Times, June 1965
- A Contemporary Trend in North American Theology: Process-Thought and Christian Faith, by N. Pittinger.
- Life after Death: VI. The Extra-Canonical Literature, by S. H. Hooke.
- Ventures in Liturgy: IV. The Experimental Liturgy.

The Expository Times, April 1965
- Death of a Modern Martyr: The Witness of Dietrich Bonhoeffer, by Franklin Sherman.
- A Dilemma in Christology, by John Macquarrie.
- Life after Death: IV. The After-Life in Ancient Egyptian Faith and Practice, by S. G. F. Brandon.

Harvard Theological Review, January 1965
- Mortality and Contemporary Literature, by A. N. Wilder.
- The Delphic Oracle: Belief and Behaviour in Ancient Greece—and Africa, by C. R. Whittaker.

Reformed Doctrine in the Collects of the First *Book of Common Prayer*, by J. A. Devereaux, S.J.
Dreams and Guilt, by Manfred Weidhorn.
Teilhard de Chardin and the Christological Problem, by C. F. Mooney, S.J.
Symbolism in the Dura Synagogue, by E. J. Bickerman.

Harvard Theological Review, April 1965
Context versus Principle: A Misplaced Debate in Christian Ethics, by James M. Gustafson.
Abraham De-Bet Rabban and his Role in the Hermeneutic School of Nisibis, by A. Voobus.
'Ašrê in the Old Testament, by Waldemar Janzen.
Bultmann on Collingwood's Philosophy of History, by Jasper Hopkins.
Newly Discovered Temples on Mt. Gerizim in Jordan, by R. J. Bull and G. Ernest Wright.

Hibbert Journal, Spring 1965
Young Mr Martineau, by Alfred Paget.
F. W. Newman and Religious Freedom, by J. D. Bennett.
D. H. Lawrence's Sternest Critic, by J. A. Bramley.
Social Work in East Africa, by W. Clifford.
Puritan Studies.

International Review of Missions, April 1965
Major Issues in Industrial Mission, by M. J. Jackson.
Mission to Metropolis: A Total Strategy, by H. C. White, Jr., and R. C. Batchelder.
New Frontiers of Encounter and Witness, by R. M. Fukada.
A New Frontier for the Church in India, by M. A. Z. Rolston.
Some Bases for a Christian Apologetic to Islam, by R. M. Speight.
An Ecumenical Hymn-book, by Robert A. Nelson.

Interpretation, April 1965
The Church: An Ecumenical Perspective, by Stephen Neill.
The Use of the Bible in Christian Ethics, by E. L. Lon, Jnr.
Minister and Congregation in the light of II Cor. 4^{5-7}, by C. E. B. Cranfield.
Charismatic and Official Ministries, by Dale Moody.
Against Luxury and Licence in Geneva: A Forgotten Fragment of Calvin, by F. J. Battles.
Interpretation in Contemporary Theology. VI—Reconciliation—New Testament Scholarship and Confessional Differences (Pt. I).

Scottish Journal of Theology, March 1965
Nature, by Paul Evdokimov.
Philosophical Biblicism: The Teaching of the Westminster Confession, by C. K. Robinson.
Critical Empiricism in the Theology of Albrecht Ritschl, by D. D. Deegan.
The Role of Jesus in Bultmann's Theology, by G. E. Ladd.
Divine Forgiveness in the Psalms, by H. McKeating.
Methods of Christian Education and Theology, by John Gray.

Scottish Journal of Theology, June 1965
Creation and Redemption: Attempt at a Theological Interpretation in the Light of Contemporary Understanding of the World, by W. Dantine.
Saint Augustine on Time, by W. B. Green.
The Ghost in the Machine or the Body of the Resurrection, by D. W. Grundy.
The Teaching of John Owen concerning the Lord's Supper, by S. Mayor.
The Message of James, by C. E. B. Cranfield.
Calvini Opera sed non omnis, by T. H. L. Parker.
The Word, the Faith and the Computer, by Cameron Dinwoodie.

Theology, May 1965
The Church of England and the Methodist Church, by the Bp. of Oxford.
Ecumenical Worship and the Holy Communion, by Bp. Michael Hollis.
Worship in a Reunited Church, by H. J. M. Turner.
Roman-Catholic Self-criticism, by Henry St. John, O.P.
God, Time and Process Philosophy, by J. Richmond.
The Next Lambeth Conference, by H. Waddams.

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 4s 6d. net per copy (postage 6d.) or 20s. per annum, post free.