
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

JUST MEN MADE PERFECT [1]

G. B. Caird

A CHILD, obviously of Victorian upbringing, once said that he did not want to go to heaven, because that was the place where it was always Sunday. To him Sunday was a privation, an absence of the positive abundance of life which filled his weekday existence. Heaven was therefore reachable but repugnant. This child may perhaps help us to understand why belief in an afterlife has failed to command not so much the faith as the interest of our own generation, to which the present with all its solid achievements seems too vivid to be dismissed as a weary pilgrimage to a better land. At the other extreme there are those to whom heaven seems attractive but unattainable. Heaven is for the good, for those who can claim a first or at least a good second in the final examination, and is therefore as far beyond the reach of us ordinary mortals as the Order of Merit or a gold medal at the Olympic Games.

At a superficial reading the Epistle to the Hebrews appears to lend equal support to each of these antithetical notions. On the one hand it describes the true end of man as a sabbath rest (4^{9}), lying at the end of a pilgrimage through a world order which possesses only a shadow of the goods things to come (10^{1}), and it urges its readers to emulate the heroes of the past 'for whom this world was not good enough' (11^{38}). On the other hand it calls the citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem 'just men made perfect' (12^{23}), it castigates its readers because, unweaned from the milk of an infantile faith, they have failed to grow into the perfect maturity of Christian manhood (5^{9ff}), and it appears to hold them responsible not only for their own perfection, but for that of past generations as well. 'These also, one and all, are commemorated for their faith; and yet they did not enter upon the promised inheritance, because, with us in mind, God had made a better plan, that only in company with us should they reach their perfection' (11^{39f}). The Christian athlete is therefore required to run his lap of the relay race before the eyes of an audience with a personal interest in his success, because, if he should stumble or drop the baton, not he alone but the whole team would be the loser. The general neglect of this remarkable epistle is surely due at least as much to the rigour of its demand as to the supposed aridity of its unintelligible and unconvincing argument. As far as I can judge from the list of titles, no lecturer in this series has ever devoted a whole lecture to the Epistle to the Hebrews, and I propose therefore to re-examine the idea of perfection which is its contribution to the New Testament doctrine of immortality.

The author of the epistle sets out to achieve a pastoral purpose by means of an intricate theological argument, and the passage from which the title of this lecture is drawn is both the pastoral and the theological climax of this work. He writes with a passionate concern, which he can

barely restrain from irrupting into his discourse, because he is afraid that his friends are in imminent danger of drifting away from a genuine and adult Christian faith. They are, as Alexander Nairne has said, a company of bookish men, converts from Judaism who remain deeply at home in the Old Testament; and the danger to which they are exposed is that they should fail to grasp the full richness of the Christian revelation through a reluctance to cut their ties with a beloved and satisfying past and to go out in faith into the unknown, as once Abraham had done. What they must learn is that no man can be true to the Old Testament who tries to find in it his abiding city. Not only is the Old Testament an incomplete book, it is an avowedly incomplete book, written by men well aware that it was only volume one of the divine revelation, which pointed forward to the day when the God who had spoken in fragmentary and varied fashion through the prophets should speak fully and finally in a Son. This then is the thesis which our author undertakes to prove by a detailed exegesis of his four main scriptural texts.

The incompleteness of the Old Testament is illustrated first by Psalm 8. Our author takes this psalm to mean that in God's design man was intended to live for a short time in subordination to angels, specifically the angels through whom the Mosaic law was given, to whom God had entrusted the authority over that age of world history which was to last until the coming of his Son (2^{2-5}), but subsequently to be raised to a glory and honour higher than that of any angel, including authority over the whole subject creation. His first comment is, 'We do not in fact see the whole universe in subjection to man. But we see Jesus . . . crowned through the suffering of death with glory and honour' (2^{8f}), and in him we see one appointed by God to lead many sons to the glory he himself already enjoys. In other words, the Old Testament presents an ideal of human destiny, which in the nature of things could never be fulfilled as long as man continued to live under the authority of the Old Testament (lower than the angels), but which is now in the process of fulfilment. The second illustration is provided by Psalm 95, which shows that Christ is superior to Moses. Moses faithfully discharged the task that God had given him to do, led Israel out of Egypt, gave them the law, set before them a promise of entering into God's rest; but he was unable to elicit from his own generation a faith which could appropriate the promise, 'the word was not mixed with faith in those who heard it' (4^{2}). The psalmist, writing many years later, 'Today, if you will listen to his voice', discloses his own belief that the same promise remained at that time outstanding and unfulfilled, and is therefore witness to the superiority of Christ, through whom, as Christian experience attests, men are now able to enter the promised rest. Thirdly, the incompleteness of the Old Testament is shown by Psalm 110. At the heart of Old Testament religion was a priesthood derived from Aaron, whose function is was to offer sacrifices on behalf of the whole nation. The psalmist recognizes the ineffectiveness of these institutions, since otherwise he would not have looked forward to the establishment of a new priesthood in the succession of Melchizedek. Finally, there is Jeremiah

with his prophecy of a new covenant, about which our author simply and justifiably remarks: 'When he says "new", he renders the former covenant obsolete, and what is obsolete and ageing is near to disappearance' (8^{13}). The obsolescence of the old régime does not, of course, mean that the Old Testament was devoid of men with real and effective faith in God. But their faith was in the future. 'Faith gives substance to men's hopes and makes them certain of realities not yet seen' (11^{1}; cf. 11^{7}). All the men included in the cavalcade of the faithful lived by confidence in God's future act of grace and declared themselves citizens of a city as yet unbuilt. The Christian church, by contrast, is able to meet, not under the menacing slopes of Sinai, but in the calm confidence of the heavenly Jerusalem, whose citizens are 'the spirits of just men made perfect'.

The point which concerns us in all this lengthy argument is that perfection is treated throughout not as a human duty or achievement, but as an act of God, belonging only to his full revelation through Christ, and not even contemplated in the preliminary stage of the Old Testament. Four times in as many chapters the writer returns to this same theme. 'If perfection had been attainable through the Levitical priesthood, . . . what further need would there have been for the psalmist to speak of another priest arising in the succession of Melchizedek?' (7^{11}). 'Nothing was brought to perfection by the law, but by the introduction of a better hope, through which we draw near to God' (8^{19}). 'The offerings and sacrifices there prescribed cannot bring the worshipper to perfection by giving him a clear conscience' (9^{9}). 'The law contains but a shadow of the good things which were to come; it provides for the same sacrifices year after year, and with these it can never bring the worshippers to perfection for all time' (10^{1}).

You will notice that the author associates a clear conscience with the idea of perfection. But we must not therefore conclude that perfection is synonymous with moral goodness. For in three other places he speaks of the process by which Christ himself became perfect. 'It was fitting that God, the goal and source of all that is, in bringing many sons to glory, should make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through suffering' (2^{10}). 'Once perfected he became the source of eternal salvation for all who obey him' (5^{9}). 'The priest appointed by the oath which supersedes the law is the Son, made perfect for ever' (7^{28}). It is quite out of the question to interpret these three passages as though they meant that Jesus was at one time morally imperfect and had to be brought to complete goodness by the discipline of God. This author shared the common belief of the New Testament in the sinlessness of Jesus. Jesus was 'dedicated, innocent, undefiled, separated' (7^{26}). In his case at least therefore perfection implies some other form of growth to completeness.

The first of the three passages is concerned with Jesus as the fulfilment of human destiny. Man was destined by God for glory and honour beyond that accorded to the angels, and Jesus has now not only attained to that glory himself, but has become the Saviour, capable of leading many sons to glory. But in order to be this, he had to share to the utmost all

the conditions of human life. He must leave no human experience unexplored, and in particular he must fathom the very depths of temptation. Only if it can truly be said that

Christ leads me through no darker rooms
Than he went through before,

is he fully equipped to be the pioneer of man's salvation. He must be at every point put on a level with those he is to address as brothers. The sufferings he underwent are a part of that identification, and it is in this sense that he is said to be made 'perfect through suffering'. He is thus completely qualified for his calling.

But this is not the whole meaning. He is called pioneer, the trail-blazer who opens up a new path along which others can follow him. But in that case all his achievements must be such as are open to them also. He must not rely on powers on which they cannot draw. 'He who consecrates and they who are consecrated are all of one' (2^{11}); and he must derive his sanctity from the same source as they. Like them, he must live by faith and prayer. This point is further developed in the second of our passages. 'In the days of his earthly life he offered up prayers and petitions, with loud cries and tears, to God who was able to save him from death; and in the midst of his fear his prayer was heard. Son though he was, he learned obedience in the school of suffering, and, once perfected, became the source of eternal salvation to all who obey him' (5^{7-9}). Let me repeat, there is no question here of Jesus being at one time disobedient and having to learn to obey. From start to finish he was obedient. But he had to learn by personal experience what obedience involved, where in this dark world obedience would lead; and he could do this only because he was content to live by faith and to leave results in the hands of God. Even in the face of the horror and bewilderment of Gethsemane he must walk by faith. He is said to be perfected because he followed to the end the road of faith and obedience, though it led him into the uttermost depths of human darkness. All his victories were won, not by some innate power, but by faith in God; and it is this that has made him the pioneer of our faith (12^{2}). He is not only a man who has shared our manhood, but the most fully human person who has ever lived.

But still the most important thing remains to be said. This Jesus through death has passed into the inner presence of God, and has done this too as pioneer, in such a way that others may follow. In the central chapters of the epistle a contrast is drawn between the Levitical priesthood and the priesthood of Christ. In the earthly temple the presence of God was symbolized by the holy of holies, into which no man ever went except the high priest, and he only on one day of the year, the Day of Atonement. Our author takes this to mean that, as long as the earthly temple was the centre of religion, the way to God for the ordinary worshipper was barricaded, not indeed by the rules of temple ritual, but by the sin of which those rules were a reminder. This is the real heart of his meaning

when he says that 'nothing was brought to perfection by the law'. For man's perfection is achieved precisely when he stands in the presence of his Maker. But Christ has entered into the heavenly sanctuary, of which the earthly temple was but a copy and a shadow, and by his sacrifice of obedience has so dealt with sin that the humblest believer may follow along the new and living way which he has opened up.

We are now in a position to sum up what was involved in the perfecting of Christ and what is the perfection that he opens up for others. He himself was made perfect because he experienced to the full all the conditions of human life, because by a faith and obedience, a dependence on God which is open to all men to share, he won the right to enter God's presence, and won it not for himself alone but for all who were prepared to let him call them brothers. The citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem can be called just men made perfect for no other reason than that they have been admitted to the presence of God. The reason no man was ever brought to perfection by the law or the old covenant was that under the old covenant it was thought that man must be morally fit to enter the divine presence: he must have clean hands and a pure heart. The new covenant is more realistic. It recognizes that God himself is the only source of goodness and holiness, that only through vital contact with him can man become good and holy. Moral goodness is the consequence, not the precondition, of access to God.

Up to this point we have been following the clue of perfection as it threads its way through the thought of the epistle. Now we discover that, intertwined with it so closely as to form almost a single strand, is another thread, the thread of access or approach. 'Since therefore we have a great high priest who has passed through the heavens . . . let us boldly approach the throne of our gracious God' (4^{14-16}). 'Nothing was brought to perfection by the law, but by the introduction of a better hope, by which we draw near to God' (7^{19}). 'He is able to save absolutely those who approach God through him' (7^{25}). 'The law . . . cannot bring to perfection for all time those who approach God' (10^{1}). 'The blood of Jesus makes us free to enter boldly into the sanctuary by the new, living way he has opened for us . . . so let us make our approach in sincerity of heart and full assurance of faith' (10^{22}). 'You have not made your approach to the palpable, blazing fire of Sinai . . . you have made your approach to Mount Sion, and the city of the living God' ($12^{18, 22}$). The right of approach to the throne of our gracious God is the one perfection which carries with it all else that men can hope or desire. Amongst other things it carries with it, as we shall see, eternal life. Yet in the thinking of this author this is almost coincidental: what matters is not that we should live for ever, but that we should live with God.

It may be worth while to interject at this point a few words about the sacrificial imagery which plays so large a part in the language of this epistle, because this is one of the reasons that make it so foreign to the modern mind. The New Testament uses many kinds of picture to illustrate its doctrine of salvation. When it speaks of justification, it draws its

picture from the lawcourt; when it speaks of victory, from the battlefield; when it speaks of redemption from the slave-market. All this imagery is meaningful to us because we still have our lawcourts, battlefields, prisons and concentration-camps. But the practice of ritual sacrifice is no part of our modern experience, and imagery drawn from this source tends to leave our imaginations untouched. But in this way we are in danger of losing a very important part of the message of the New Testament. For each of these pictures corresponds to a different aspect of sin. If salvation is described as justification, then sin is being treated as guilt, with an emphasis on the responsibility of the sinner. If salvation is described as redemption, then sin is conceived as a bondage from which man cannot fight his way free. But if salvation is described in the language of sacrifice, then sin is regarded as a taint or uncleanness. The idea of moral evil as dirt, which disqualifies a person from the company of God or man, lies very deep in the psychology of the human race. The Old Testament emphasis on uncleanliness may strike us as a singularly undiscriminating one, but it was a reminder to men that there were elements in their common life which disqualified them from access to God. And this is surely the deepest level at which we can face the reality of sin. What the Epistle to the Hebrews asserts is that this barrier between man and God has been transcended, not by man's penitence or reformation, but by God's descent. Christ has become totally like, totally identified with his human brothers, bound to them by a tie of sympathy so complete and so permanent that they remain united with him when he enters the heavenly sanctuary.

The language of sacrifice and access is not, however, the only means used in this epistle to define the perfection to which the Christian is called. There are three other images which help to fill out the picture of the eternal life which begins now and continues hereafter. The first is the image of the sabbath rest, to which I alluded in my opening words. The word *sabbatismos* occurs in the course of the author's exposition of Psalm 95. The psalmist had called on his own contemporaries to listen to the voice of God and accept God's promise of rest, unlike Moses' generation who had lost their opportunity through unbelief. But what did the psalmist mean by 'God's rest'? He cannot have meant the end of the wilderness wanderings and settlement in an earthly home, because, though Moses failed in this respect, Joshua succeeded; and the psalmist speaks as though God's promise were still unfulfilled. He must therefore have had in mind a heavenly rest. At this point in his argument our author identifies the *katapausis* (which is the Greek word for rest used in the Septuagint version of the psalm) with another kind of rest, the *sabbatismos* or sabbath rest into which God is said to have entered on the seventh day of creation. In other words, the rest which is offered to men is not merely a rest which God gives; it is the very rest which God himself enjoys. We are here very far away from the childish distaste for a heaven where it is always Sunday. We need not entertain extravagant notions of God fretfully trying to while away the interminable hours of a wet Victorian sabbath. God's *sabbatismos* is the rest not of inertia, idleness and negation, but of positive attainment

and fruition. There may be fields of human experience where Stevenson's dictum holds good, that 'to travel hopefully is a better thing than to arrive', but there are certainly exceptions. It is not obviously better for the youthful pianist, let alone for those who must listen to him, to travel hopefully at his practice than to arrive at the capacity to play the Hammerclavier Sonata. There are many forms of enjoyment no less active, and certainly no less satisfying, than the laboursome process which made them possible. But the Christian who enters into rest does something more than enjoy the fruits of his labours. He is admitted to the joy with which the Creator himself regards the products of his own artistry and love.

From this we must now turn to the second image of heaven as a city. Abraham, we are told, even after his arrival in Canaan, refused to regard this as journey's end. His earthly travels to an earthly destination were but the symbol of another journey. He therefore continued to live in tents, refusing to find in this transient existence a permanent home; 'for he was looking forward to the city with firm foundations, whose architect and builder is God' (11^{10}). And again: 'God is not ashamed to be called their God; for he has a city ready for them' (11^{16}). I suppose the first deduction to be made from these citations is that the author of Hebrews believed in what the hymn calls 'social joys'. All that I have said about access to the presence of God might conceivably be taken to mean that salvation and the eternal life that issues from it are essentially individual experiences, an I-Thou relationship with the Almighty. (I cannot, by the way, understand the remarkable popularity among theologians of that singularly unchristian phrase. Surely the New Testament teaches us that even in solitary prayer the Christian ought to use the first person *plural* in his address to God.) Whatever individualism we may have inherited from the Age of Reason, this epistle has little room for it. The promise of sabbath rest is made to 'the people of God', and here as elsewhere in the New Testament heaven is pictured as a city. In the Pauline theology eternal life could hardly be other than corporate, since it is made possible only by incorporation into the body of Christ. Our author thinks rather of a family solidarity, established by that sympathy which prompted Christ to call men his brothers, but his idea of immortality is no less corporate than that of Paul.

At this point we encounter one of the most popular misconceptions about the Epistle to the Hebrews. The author declares in one place that the earthly temple was only a shadowy copy of the perfect heavenly temple which Moses had seen on Mount Sinai, and in another that the law with all its religious ordinances possessed only 'a shadow of the good things that were to come' (8^5;10^1). It has therefore been assumed that he was imbued with a Platonic world view, in which all earthly objects are but copies and shadows of the perfect patterns laid up in heaven. According to this view Abraham's faith consisted in his refusal to be satisfied with the realm of things seen and temporal, and the city to which he aspired was one not of this world. But this interpretation makes nonsense of the sentence which concludes the catalogue of the faithful heroes of the

Old Testament: 'these also, one and all, are commemorated for their faith; and yet they did not enter upon the promised inheritance, because, with us in mind, God had made a better plan, that only in company with us should they reach their perfection' (11[39f]). They died without having entered the promised land! But how could it be otherwise, if the promised land lay beyond the river of death? And what would then be the point of saying that God had a better plan in store for us?

The answer to these questions, as C. K. Barrett has clearly demonstrated in his contribution to the *Festschrift* in honour of C. H. Dodd, is that the two worlds of this epistle are not those of Platonic idealism; they are the two worlds of Jewish eschatology, the one following upon the other in historic sequence. The realm of shadow and transience is not here the whole phenomenal world, it is the world of the Old Testament, declared by its own prophetic writers to be obsolescent and near to disappearing. And the real world of which it was a shadowy anticipation is the new age introduced by Christ. The glory and honour with which Christ was crowned are the tokens of his authority over the world to come, which takes on a present reality in his person (2[5ff]). Christians are accordingly those who have 'tasted the goodness of God's gift and the powers of the age to come' (6[5]). This explains why it can be said that God had a better plan in store for Christians. To Abraham the city of God was only a vision of God's future, to which he clung in faith; but to the Christian it is a present fact. 'You have come to Mount Sion and the city of the living God' (12[22]). Christ has opened up a new and living way into God's presence and therefore into God's city. This is why Abraham and the rest could reach their perfection only in company with the writer of Hebrews and his fellow-Christians: in them, provided they held fast to their faith, the city of God had ceased to be wholly a vision of the future and had become, in part at least, a fact of the present.

To say all this is not to deny that the city of God is essentially a heavenly and eternal city, but it is a city which is related in a very intimate and special way to the world of earth and time. The city is but another name for the new order which has already supervened upon the old, not by way of negation or contradiction, but gathering up the past with all its shadowy anticipations into the final perfect consummation. The revelation which God gave to the fathers through the prophets in varied and fragmentary fashion has come to full expression in his Son; Christ has carried his own manhood, with all its inherent weakness, with him into the eternal order; the one perfect sacrifice of Christ helps us to see at last what earlier generations were groping after as they offered their bulls and goats, and the recipients of the letter are urged to move boldly out from the security of a well-loved past, in confidence that they will receive it back from God by a better resurrection.

This brings me to my third and final picture, the picture of the great earthquake. This cosmic earthquake is one of the commonest features in the Old Testament expectations of the Day of the Lord. What the origins of this symbol were does not here concern us. Our concern is only with

the use to which our author puts it. 'Then (i.e. at Sinai) his voice shook the earth, but now he has promised, "Once more and once only I will shake not earth alone but the heavens also." The words "once more and once only" imply the removal of what is shaken, inasmuch as they are created things, in order that what is not shaken may remain. The kingdom we are given is unshakable: let us therefore give thanks to God' (12^{26ff}). The point of this passage is not that all created things are transient, and that only the uncreated will ultimately survive; for how could men then expect to enter eternity? Christians, transient creatures that they are, have been given an unshakable kingdom, and they may therefore hope to survive the testing earthquake. In the midst of time they have been touched with eternity. In the person of Jesus they have come into contact with 'the power of an indissoluble life' (7^{16}). It follows therefore that whatever in the history of man has been touched by the divine presence has thereby been taken out of the category of mere creatureliness to join the ranks of the unshakable.

This conclusion is borne out by an observation about the typology of this epistle. Christ as high priest corresponds typologically to the priesthood of the Old Testament. What is not commonly recognized is that Christ is prefigured by two types, not one alone. There is Aaron, but there is also Melchizedek; and our author has two different words to distinguish their different relationship to Christ. Aaron and the whole system he administers is a shadow (*skia*) of the good things to come. Melchizedek provides a likeness (*homoiotes*) and he is said to be 'conformed to the Son of God' (7^{3}). The one possesses the form of priesthood without the effective substance, the other a genuine anticipation of the real thing. In the dawn of Israel's history Melchizedek really did stand on Abraham's Godward side, and through him Abraham really drew near to God. Nor does Melchizedek stand alone in the Old Testament. Whenever there were men of faith, finding no abiding city in the present order but trusting in God's future, there too was a *homoiotes* — a genuine anticipation of Christ. For faith is to be defined as the real grasping of the objects of men's hopes. Wherever there is faith there is a likeness to the Son of God; and wherever there is a likeness to the Son of God, there too is something that cannot be shaken, something which belongs to the ultimate and heavenly city. This is God's better plan, that only in company with those who have accepted Christ on earth should the past find the fulfilment of its hopes and aspirations.

Immortality, then, in the view of this writer, is not a quality inherent in the nature of man, nor even a prize bestowed by God on those who qualify for it. It is an attribute of God himself, which he imparts to those who approach him in the confidence that he is the rewarder of all who seek him. And if this writer seems at times to be harsh in the rigour of his warnings against apostasy and lapse, against drifting away from the living God, this is only because he himself has tasted the goodness of God's gift and the powers of the age to come, and he cannot for a moment imagine where else a man might turn if he chooses to shut his ears to the voice that speaks from heaven, to 'the mediator of the new

covenant whose sprinkled blood has better things to say than the blood of Abel' (12[24]).

[1] The Drew Lecture on Immortality delivered in Whitefield Memorial Hall, 4th November, 1965.

MORAL IMPERATIVES AND 'THE NEW MORALITY'

Douglas A. Brown

EARLY in the second lecture printed in *Christian Morals Today*[1] the Bishop of Woolwich protests against the 'slogan-thinking' that tends to bedevil discussion of 'the new morality'. He refers to the fact that he has been called an 'antinomian', and claims that this charge is false.

I believe his claim to be valid. Not only the lectures but also the relevant chapter in *Honest to God* show that the Bishop is not antinomian.[2] Nevertheless, I think the Bishop has only himself to blame that he has been misunderstood on this matter. 'Of course, we all need rules', he says, 'and from the very first there has been a tendency to turn the teaching of Jesus into a set of rules, a fixed code of conduct, valid for all Christians at all times.' If 'we all need rules' means what it says, then this 'tendency' is not only inevitable, but would appear prima facie to be commendable, yet it is being roundly condemned. The condemnation gains its appearance of cogency because the last three phrases of the sentence are apparently used as though synonymous. But there are at least two errors and one unexamined assumption here. First, the synonym for 'set of rules' (or at least a rough and ready one satisfactory for this context) would be 'code of conduct'. 'Fixed' introduces, with no attempt at justifying the step, a radical new factor that cannot just be assumed to be inherent in the notion 'set of rules'. Second 'at all times' introduces another new factor, whether it is a gloss on 'fixed' or a new notion entirely, certainly not self-evidently inherent in the original phrase. Both these point to the unexamined assumption that there is only one possible status or function for 'rules'

in ethical theory and moral practice, and that that status or function is known without being here described.

The consequence of this kind of confusion and lack of adequate analysis is that, in spite of the author's definite, and quite proper and valid claims to the contrary, almost inevitably the general impact of the two texts is that the author in rejecting one placing of imperatives in morality is denying to them any place at all in morality.

A major cause of this confusion is a subtle, complex and apparently unconscious shifting between different levels of argument. The titles indicate, and the texts make clear, that the author's concern is with moral practice. However, as in the passages already cited, he does not (and perhaps neither could nor should) keep himself to this level only. The discussion also ranges into the level of moral theory. But since the author wishes to resolve confusions in moral practice rather than to elaborate a moral theory he does not sufficiently see the importance of the shift, and, because of the urgency of his main concern, when he does raise questions of theory he only gives them a passing glance over his shoulder, so to speak. I am not suggesting that he should have written a metaphysic of morals instead of an allegedly plain man's guide to conduct: but rather that we, and he, should be clear about what he is doing, so that casual asides about moral theory are not given more weight or respect than they merit.

In this essay I propose to deal with the level of theory not that of practice, and I shall draw the distinction by using the term 'ethics' for the former and 'morals' or 'morality' for the latter. This is a quite arbitrary, but convenient, option. Further I am concerned only with the logic of the arguments under discussion: I am not concerned to support or deny the Bishop's main thesis whether at the level of ethics or morals.

1. *The Rejection of 'legalism'*

The kind of ethical position the Bishop is criticizing would seem to involve three basic propositions.

(i) Every 'moral' situation can be judged on the basis of general 'rules' or 'laws'—moral imperatives.

(ii) Moral imperatives are formalizations, in one of several possible ways, of the will of God.

(iii) Christian morality consists in a life of obedience to the will of God.

There are a number of imprecisions here, both within individual propositions and in their relationships with one another, but I think this is the clearest formulation derivable from the two texts being examined. For brevity I shall refer to these propositions in the rest of the essay by their numbers as above.

It is logically possible to hold proposition (iii) while rejecting propositions (i) and (ii). This is one way of stating the position the Bishop of Woolwich is trying to put forward, with an extended gloss on the phrase 'will of God'.[3]

But there are other aspects of their relationships that are unnoticed in our two texts. It will be seen on a moment's reflection that it is logically possible to hold propositions (i) and at the same time reject propositions (ii)

and (iii). That is to say, it is possible to hold that every situation is classifiable and amenable to being dealt with by previously laid-down rule(s), and also to be an atheist.[4]

Further, it is logically possible to hold proposition (ii) in one or more (but not in all) of the 'several possible ways' and at the same time to reject proposition (i). In a number of paragraphs the Bishop of Woolwich rather imprecisely implies that such a position is tenable: but he does not ever even hint at *how* it is tenable or which of several positions it is. This is the key reason why he looks like an antinomian: the view he rejects does require that propositions (i) and (ii) stand or fall together, but he rejects it so cavalierly and without recognizing the importance of that phrase 'several possible ways' that he commonly appears to be rejecting proposition (ii) in toto in every possible interpretation of it. I intend in the next two sections to examine this and to point the way to a constructive statement.

Thus, while there is need for greater clarity about the relations between these propositions, the main weaknesses of the texts concerns the propositions themselves. As our topic is the placing of moral imperatives, I shall not further discuss proposition (iii).

In the two texts under consideration there appear to be two lines of argument against what I have called legalism. The one is that, in line with the idea of God propounded in *Honest to God*, men can no longer be expected to believe that morality is based on laws ' "given", objectively and immutably'.[5] The 'type' of this way of thinking is taken to be Moses' masonry, divinely inscribed and divinely presented to him. On this view moral imperatives are 'commandments which God gives, laws which he lays down'.[6]

The second line of argument against legalism, that is, against the view that every moral situation is amenable to decision on the basis of already existing laws, is that, on the contrary, the value-claim of any situation can be discerned only by a consideration of the situation itself. Each such situation must be judged in its own right by a careful assessment of its own individuality.

These two arguments are often intertwined without any serious attempt to distinguish between them. Indeed it is doubtful whether they are recognized to be distinguishable, for they are both associated with another formulation. It is argued that moral judgements must be arrived at inductively, not deductively—by attending to the particular instance and not to a general rule. Both the arguments I have indicated can be subsumed under this formulation—but only at the expense of clarity and precision; and in any case the terms 'inductively' and 'deductively' are used much too loosely.[7] If we disentangle the two arguments from this kind of language, we are, as shown above, able to exhibit their distinctiveness, and to recognize that they are logically quite different. The former challenges proposition (ii) in some but not all[8] of the 'several different ways', and the latter challenges proposition (i). Thus, parallel with the distinctions already drawn between the two propositions, we can see that the rebuttals are not interdependent. It is logically valid to hold that moral laws are not 'given, objectively and

immutably', without holding that every moral situation must be judged in the way just described, and vice versa. That the distinction holds 'vice versa' is not, I agree, quite so readily evident, but that it does hold will become clear, as we go along, for some but not for all of the 'several possible ways'.

These considerations demonstrate that the placing of moral imperatives in an ethical theory is a much more complex and difficult task than is even hinted at in either of our two texts, and that arguments that reject one placing cannot just be assumed to reject other placings.

The contention that moral situations must be dealt with inductively and not deductively[9] has another aspect. It is taken to imply that each moral agent takes, as the subject matter for forming moral judgements, his own moral experience in general and his present experience and situation in particular: he discerns in the depths of it its 'given' value claim for him. But it is also held that other people's moral experience is relevant for him, embodied in 'rules'.[10] Three observations occur here. First, this idea that moral experience is the subject matter both of morals and ethics is no very new idea.[11] Secondly, the relation between the 'rules' derived from the cumulative experience of oneself and of others and the immediate existential inductive procedure cries out for some explanation, particularly in the light of the author's manifest desire to offer practical guidance. This question is the crux of the whole matter, once the traditional legalism is rejected: yet it receives no attention. Thirdly, it would seem that altogether too simple a view is taken of the relation between moral experience and ethical theory. No experience is entirely uninterpreted—a kind of raw chaos existing prior to the imparting of cosmos to it by a process of discernment-in-depth. All experience is in some sense dependent on 'theory'. The mutual interaction and interdependence is irregular and constantly changing, but it is always two-way.

2. *The retaining of moral imperatives: (a) The differing functions and derivations of moral imperatives*

There is, then, a place of some kind in ethics for 'rules', and now we must try to see what that place is. Let us start from an everyday, non-moral example. At a busy junction, at the wheel of a car, a learner driver, perhaps out for the first or second time, is, panic-ridden, frantically trying to work out from first principles the complicated task of restarting the stalled engine, finding the right (what is 'right'?) gear, getting the car in motion again without bouncing it off its springs, and making a right-hand turn without testing out the laws of momentum and inertia by encountering a traffic bollard in the process.

But the situation is more complicated than that. 'Restart the engine'? Oh, yes—see the gear is in neutral, the handbrake on, the ignition switched on, and then pull, or otherwise operate, the starter switch. But what is this about gears . . . and ignition . . .? The hapless creature has enough to do without pursuing every one of these 'given' rules back to its ultimate derivation in a vast array of scientific first principles as to what is the motive force in a road vehicle, and what are the mechanical, electrical and other principles under which motion is initiated and maintained.

It is impossible to deal with this situation, except by accepting, without probing to their ultimate, certain basic rules; and indeed the difference between an embarrassed, highly inefficient beginner, and an accomplished driver is precisely that the latter has organized the basic rules into a hierarchy of accepted and (by practice) unconscious actions-to-rule which are the condition of survival in modern traffic. This is an example of the very comprehensive principle that in a very large number of situations the agent simply must, in order to live, act directly and almost automatically 'to rule'.

A large part of the moral situations in which we ordinarily find ourselves daily, fall into this class.[12] They not only can, but if life is to be at all tolerable, they must be dealt with by simple application of a straightforward and generally accepted rule. The situations of which this cannot be said, immediately and obviously, to hold are not the norm—they are abnormal. And this holds even within the area of some topics that are heavily charged emotionally. For the large majority of married couples (to take the Bishop's main illustration) at any given time divorce is not a live option. We can go even further: the Bishop agrees[13] that even for that minority of couples for whom it is a live issue, in 99 cases out of 100 'divorce' is 'wrong and sinful in itself'. Thus only a very tiny minority even of relevant cases present any real problems of judgement. The passage then goes on to say that 'sex relations before marriage' and 'divorce' are wrong and sinful in themselves for 'even 100 cases out of 100, but they are not intrinsically so, for the only intrinsic evil is lack of love'. In other words the Bishop is not trying to say, here, that sex relations before marriage or divorce may sometimes be right: he is prepared to say that 100% of cases are wrong. But the wrongness resides not in their being 'sex relations outside marriage' or 'divorce' but in their being denials of or failures of love. He is not concerned to assert that a 'rule' (e.g.) 'you must not fornicate' is wrong. He does not, that is, offer a morality consisting in a different act (namely, fornication instead of chastity) but merely a different account of the source and nature of the rightness and the wrongness of such acts. This is simply a matter of advocacy not of the rejection of 'rules': but it must be admitted in the general context, and similarly elsewhere, to look uncommonly like rejection of 'rules', and this appearance is reinforced by the taking of a highly non-typical situation (and a highly emotive one)[14] in which it is widely recognized there do in fact exist two points of view about which kind of act should be commended.

Let us return to our learner driver. His situation is still more complicated than we have yet admitted. We have seen that 'restarting the stalled engine' assumes a very great deal. But what of the other phrases that follow? What about that traffic bollard for example? WHY should he seek to avoid it? Here enter a whole series of physical and pragmatic matters that would ordinarily be dealt with by offering a set of 'rules' or 'laws'. A collision between a moving vehicle and a stationary bollard will result in damage to one or both of an extensiveness directly proportional to the momentum at impact.' 'Damage to your car will cost you a lot of money to put right.' And the reply would also include statements that move into the area of morals—'You will also have to pay for a new traffic bollard.'

Here is a whole complex of moral and legal and pragmatic considerations: and the rules or laws involved will be seen to be of different kinds, operating at different levels in the total word picture (which we have of course only indicated, not elaborated in any detail) and having different functions in respect of the morals and psychology of the hapless agent. There are scientific laws that are partially inductive generalizations. There are financial affirmations partly derived from past experience of the whole community, and partly based on knowledge of elementary economics. There are statements that are simply descriptions of a community 'option' (it would be possible to put another 10d. on the Road Tax and use this as a fund from which to repair bollards). Further, while none of them prescribes in any necessary way, or enforces, a specific course of action, they have differing degrees of value-claim upon the agent.

I do not offer this as a precise parallel to the status and operation of moral precepts: to give an exhaustive account of the different levels of moral laws in an ethical theory would be a difficult task and is beyond the scope of this essay. But it shows us how a corpus of 'rules' or laws can contain a whole range of differing kinds: and it would seem to be a major weakness of the texts in question that they offer only slight and confused hints that there are such differences.

The clearest reference is in *Honest to God*—'such an ethic [i.e. as now being outlined by the author] cannot but rely, in deep humility, upon guiding rules, upon the cumulative experience of one's own and other people's obedience.'[15] This clearly shows that in rejecting laws 'given, objectively and immutably' the author allows a different place and different function for imperatives. But the form of the statement suggests that 'cumulative experience . . .' is the only logic of the phrase 'guiding rules'. He may, and I think he does, want to hold this, and I do not raise the question whether or not he is right in holding that this is in fact the only place imperatives have in ethics: I want simply to point out that logically they could have other placings, and therefore some justification for the placing claimed should be given.

Anyway, other passages imply other placings. The last lecture in *Christian Morals Today*, on 'Authority and Freedom', has an interesting discussion in the paragraph on page 44. In the second part of it the series of questions and the sentence following all assume that a moral law is a moral sanction —that is, serves as a dissuasive from certain courses of action. True, a moral law can have this function, just as, for example, most talk about capital punishment assumes that a law providing for such punishment is dominantly a deterrent to emulation rather than in the stricter sense a punishment of this offender. But this is not the necessary nor the only function of every such law.

In the preceding lecture on 'Law and Love', there are two paragraphs that seem to be the kernel of the thesis of the lecture. An ethic of 'Law plus love or law qualified by love' is rejected, and law is placed 'at the boundaries not at the centre.'[16] We can now see that this simply will not do as an analysis of the varieties of possible relation between the two. In any specified

ethical theory the relationship, may, it is true, be one of law plus love, or qualified by love. The reverse also may be true: moral imperatives in a specific system may operate as additions to love or as subtractions from love. But if none of these systems is held to be satisfactory, placing law 'at the boundary' is not the only remaining alternative. Not only may love be the primary principle, but imperatives may also function as specific crystallizations of, expressions of love and its implications in particular contexts, not simply as additions or subtractions, external to the functioning of the love-principle itself.

It is recognized that the ten commandments may be seen as an ethical basis on which love builds, and such a view is rejected. Then also the view that love contradicts the commandments is rejected. The ground is then thought to be clear for simply asserting that love in fact 'summarizes and deepens them' (i.e. the commandments). But the alternatives offered are far from exhaustive. We have just seen that the relative priorities may be reversed: the commandments may be additions to or subtractions from love (we will agree now to reject these alternatives along with their opposites), or they may be seen as, not summarizing love, but as an attempted expression of how an ethic of love works out in practice. This sheds a little light back on the passage already quoted, from *Honest to God,*[17] in which Moses is referred to. Whatever the 'classic mythological statement' may be, has the Bishop of Woolwich ever thought that the ten commandments in fact originated as a bit of divine sculpture? If not, how does he think they originated? Is it not likely that they represent an attempt to 'summarize' the commandment of love, and not vice versa? Even allowing for uncertainty of the dating of some Old Testament texts, it seems probable that the concept of the divine *'ahabah,* and perhaps even that of the divine *chesed,* predates the origin of the ten commandments. Whether this is so or not must be left to the biblical scholars, but that it is a logically possible relation is quite clear. Therefore the whole argument in our two texts in this context is unsound: and if this point had been recognized, a very much more satisfactory account of the placing of moral imperatives could have been given.

The next page[18] is equally beset with logical confusions. The second paragraph begins by talking about commandments, then says 'equal retribution . . . can be translated into law: but turning the other cheek can never be'. To which the reply seems to be: but turning the other cheek *is* law—it doesn't even await translation! 'If someone slaps you on the right cheek, turn and offer him your left' is a law on any recognizable logic of language. Then why is it said not to be? The paragraph goes on to draw a distinction between adultery and murder on the one hand, which can be 'codified as crimes', and anger and lust on the other, which cannot: and refers to 'perfectly valid legal distinctions'. It becomes apparent that what the writer is really saying is that turning the other cheek cannot be (to use his phrase) codified as law because it is not amenable to a proof, as in a law-court, as to whether or not it has been broken. In this respect it is like anger and lust, whereas 'an eye for an eye' is like adultery and murder. But this 'merely

confuses perfectly valid distinctions'—between 'law' as part of the civil and criminal code of the country, and 'law' as a moral imperative, or, in the Bishop of Woolwich's own words, as 'working rules . . . as guides to conduct'.[19] The limiting factor on civil and criminal statutes is that they must in principle be enforceable on the basis of evidence and proof in court: this is no part of the definition of a moral imperative.

The crucial weakness of the two texts on this matter is that the function of what I will call the principle of love, is no more adequately analysed than is the wide variety of functions of moral imperatives. We can bring this out by looking at a passage from the same lecture.[20] If our 'working rules' (sexual ones, n.b.) are questioned by young people we must base them[21] 'not on law ["Fornication is always wrong"] but on love, on what a deep concern for persons as whole persons, in their entire social context, really requires'. Now there is here implied, but neither here nor elsewhere stated or defined, a distinction between 'working rules' and 'laws', which, being apparently a novel one, should have received some explanation. It does not appear to be a very useful distinction. The working rule in question here can be translated 'Thou shalt not fornicate', where 'thou' indicates a specific moral agent, and 'shalt not fornicate' a specific moral situation. The 'law' can also be translated 'Thou shalt not fornicate', where 'thou' indicates any moral agent, and 'shalt not fornicate' any moral situation in which the predicate is meaningful. The generalizing of the apparent 'working rule' into an apparent 'law' is doing no more than leaving the variables in the moral-algebra, instead of giving them a determinate quantity and therefore a range of application limited by that determination. The worthlessness of trying to commend non-fornication by offering the so-called 'law' is not that there is anything suspect about 'law' as such: merely that it is nothing more than a masked tautology. Here is a needless opening for antinomian labels.

But what of the alternative offered? It is, the basis of 'love'. Now, what is this basis? It is to do with a 'deep concern for persons as whole persons'. But if we keep a foot on the ground and remember we are talking about dealing with the queries of young people, what does this amount to, in practice? What, in fact, is 'a Christian driven back' to doing with, say a young man who is inclined not to accept the working rule. (I would have thought that saying 'the working rule is a working rule for other people as well as for you' is not as useless as has been suggested: but we have looked at that point.) You must not say, 'Because fornication is wrong—always, or in itself': you must refer to love, to a deep concern for the young lady as a whole person. You say to him: 'You must not treat her as a thing but as a person' (another working rule). 'Why must I?' 'Because your concern must be for her not just for the emotional and other ingredients of this present context.' 'Why must I have a deep concern for her?' 'Love requires it' or 'If you love her that is how you will regard her'. 'What has love got to do with it?' 'You must always act in love.' At every point we use moral imperatives —working rules. If we are to posit a young person questioning working rules we must be rigorous in our self-criticism: if he questions the working rule already put up, we must not assume he will simply accept the first

alternative we find. And at the crucial point we find, however we mask it verbally, when 'driven back' to love itself, that love can be integrally introduced into the situation only in a moral imperative. 'Nothing prescribed—except love.' But this agrees that love is *prescribed*. Thus, as already indicated in a different context, the law/love antithesis is not a specially accurate one.[22]

'Nothing prescribed—except love' is, as the author knows, virtually a paraphrase of the *Shema*, and Jesus's quoting of it. A great deal of debate has gone on around the problem as to the sense in which love can be commanded. Much of the problem is already solved (though not all of it) when it is clearly seen that this is a moral imperative. To commend love, or declare it to be morally good, is not the same thing as ordering it, or trying to enforce it. Joseph Fletcher is quoted in *Honest to God*[23] as saying of morality, 'it is love which is the constitutive principle—and law, at most, is only a regulative one, if it is even that'. The author should make up his mind whether or not 'it is even that', and either omit the phrase or enlarge on it. Leaving that, however, I cannot see how, *in morals and in ethics*, law has ever been held to be more than regulative. There is here real confusion about the logic of the term 'law'. It is seen according to its logic in such language as 'the law of the land', 'the criminal law'; and as 'scientific law', 'Natural Law'. But there cannot be *moral* law *in this sense*, or it is not moral but either scientific or forensic. The area of morality presupposes the liberty of the agent to reject the 'law', and this is precisely what is not open in the case of 'natural' law, and only in a specially defined way in the case of community laws. In *Honest to God* the Bishop seems to, and in *Christian Morals Today* he obviously does, use the term 'law' only in the way it is used in jurisprudence and science. Though arbitrary this is allowable; but the writer then goes on as though everyone else writing about ethics has used the term in that specialised way—that is, has not used it ethically at all.[24] Once again we can only say that the source of antinomian accusations is in the confusion of the texts themselves.

3. *The retaining of moral imperatives: (b) Their application to particular contexts*

We have indicated lines along which the phrase 'in several possible ways' in proposition (ii) might be analysed, thus providing for an account of the differing functions and derivations of moral imperatives. We must not turn to the problem as to how rules, or laws, or imperatives are related to the individual moral situation and to the process of arriving at moral choices. This question concerns proposition (i).

In *Honest to God* is a comparatively extended statement as to what the new 'theonomic'[25] ethics is. 'It means accepting as the basis of moral judgements the actual concrete relationship in all its particularity, refusing to subordinate it to any universal norm or to treat it merely as a case, but yet, in the depth of that unique relationship, meeting and responding to the claims of the sacred, the holy and the absolutely unconditional.' 'Love alone,' the same passage goes on later, 'is able to embrace an ethic of radical

responsiveness, meeting every situation on its own merits, with no prescriptive laws. In Tillich's words, "Love alone can transform itself according to the concrete demands of every individual and social situation without losing its eternity and dignity and unconditional validity". . . . It is prepared to see every moment as a fresh creation from God's hand demanding its own and perhaps wholly unprecedented response."[26]

Now I submit that this section of two or three pages cannot fail to be understood as meaning that to any specific moral situation one brings nothing but love—no other principles of judgement, no preconceived ideas about this or that being right or wrong, no 'prescriptive laws'. I would add, as an assessment of its logic, not its ethics, it deserves to be so understood.

But the writer does not *intend* this, and in *Christian Morals Today,* after the storm has blown up, clearly asserts that he does not. We have already quoted passages affirming that moral imperatives have some valid relationship with the process of forming a moral judgement in a specific moral situation,[2] but again, as in most other respects, the nature of the relationship does not emerge.[27]

The reason the Bishop writes as he does in *Honest to God* is made clear enough in *Christian Morals Today.* At the beginning of the third lecture he says of 'the old morality' that it seeks 'to do full justice to the facts of experience. But . . . the principles come first: persons . . . have to be brought under them.'[28] We can set out this position in two propositions:

(*a*) either 'principles' must be sacrificed in the interest of persons, or vice versa; and

(b) uniformly 'principles' must take precedence over 'persons'.

The Bishop cannot accept this because he is deeply concerned to champion the cause of persons as persons. However, in *Honest to God* he tacitly accepts the proposition contained in (a): he writes as though for the new morality too it is valid. Therefore his refutation of the old morality is simply to reverse grammatical subject and object in (b). For the new morality, that is, according to this argument, persons must take precedence over 'principles'. Thus the 'failure' discerned in the old morality, to give a rightful place to persons, is replaced in the new morality, by a logically identical 'failure' to give a rightful place to 'principles'. The relative status of the two is simply reversed, not modified or adjusted. This analysis shows that what might fruitfully have been considered is whether (a) is valid: that is whether either principles or persons necessarily have to go. The Bishop on further reflection between the two works wants to answer this question, 'No'; but the logic of his formulation of the problem, in the passage cited, implies the answer, 'Yes'.

If this question had been looked at, the appearance of antinomianism could have been mitigated. It could have been avoided altogether if a more radical logical error in this argument had been observed and removed.

The two terms 'person' and 'principle', used in opposition to one another do not have in fact the same logic—their placing in the language is at different levels of abstraction. If 'person' is to be related to the process of

arriving at moral decisions in the same way as 'principle' then it must be as pointing to some specific person—the agent, someone obstructing the agent, a patient, and so on. But in the passage in question, and in others, the term is used to indicate an abstraction operating in the mind of the agent in the same way as some particular 'principle'. What in fact is being opposed to the 'principles' of the old moralists is a proposition of the form, but not necessarily of the precise content: 'You ought to give priority, in making moral decisions, to the claims of persons involved—yourself and others, whether few or many—as persons', or 'Treat people, including yourself, as people not as things.'[29]

This analysis reveals that we have here in fact another principle. We are not opposing to principles an entity labelled 'persons', but another, presumptively over-riding, principle to do with the value claims upon us as persons. And 'persons' is simply a bit of easy but trouble-making shorthand for that. There is nothing in *Honest to God* or in *Christian Morals Today* to suggest that this principle is not always and universally applicable and much to imply that it is. It is one way of formulating, at a slightly less abstract and generalized level, the command to love. And where the more abstract command to love is discussed the same point holds: it is implied that the command is always and universally applicable. Thus we see that under very indirect and misleading language what is being questioned is not the applying of principles to individual moral problems, nor the applying of a special class of principles that are always and universally valid. What is being questioned is what specific principle(s) may be considered universally and always valid.

We cannot solve our problems then by dismissing principles and dealing in persons. We are therefore compelled to return to our question: how are principles, including that (or those) setting out the personal claims of persons, related to the task of forming a moral judgement in a specific situation?

I have referred to the persons-principle as an abstraction. All moral rules, principles, and laws (and also scientific and forensic) are abstractions—that is unless the variables of their algebra are quantified in the way indicated in the earlier discussion of 'Thou shalt not fornicate'. That is to say, they draw attention to some one element (or more) in a total situation. They do not purport a priori to be a total ethical evaluation of a situation. In any one particular case it may be found that one principle is a sufficient moral delineation. Examples were given at the beginning of section 2. But a second class of moral situations was noted where more than one imperative, often several, is relevant, each drawing attention to some different moral aspect of it. This is the crux of the matter. This is the factor of our moral experience that gives rise to such perplexity, and in extreme cases such as those much cited by the Bishop of Woolwich even much anguish.

Now this has been analysed in detail and with some skill by W. D. Ross in 1930.[30] He speaks of moral imperatives as formulating 'duties'. He indicates their abstractive nature by saying that they are strictly speaking not 'duties' proper, but only 'Prima Facie' duties or conditional duties. Human

relationships are so complex that many moral situations are instances of two or more morally significant kinds of act, and the agent is therefore confronted by two or more prima facie duties, none of which is a duty proper because the obligatoriness of each is qualified by the presence of the others.[31] The decision as to the duty proper in any situation is arrived at by weighing the respective value-claims of the situation. Ross considers that prima facie duties do not all have the same 'weight' so to speak: some are more obligatory than others. Now there are real difficulties about Ross's position; and he himself gets no further than an atomism of discreet prima facie duties. But our analysis in the preceding section gives us a means of meeting this difficulty. On the basis of that analysis we can see what the Bishop calls 'working rules' as formulations or elaborations, at varying levels of concretion and abstraction, of the basic command to love as it works out in certain contexts. They are thus integrated and related, and we can see them as related to actual moral situations in much the same way as Ross's prima facie duties.

We said at the outset that we did not wish either to support or deny the Bishop's contentions, and our subsequent analysis has introduced no ethical principle not implicit in the texts under review, and refutes no essential part of the writer's main contention. We have, first, shown right through the essay, from the texts themselves, that the Bishop is not antinomian in intention. And by an analysis of some of the logical weaknesses of the texts we have shown two further points. The one is that the antinomian accusation finds a fruitful source in the texts themselves both through the use of misleading language, and through the failure to make or even indicate the possibility of a valid analysis of the placing of moral imperatives. The other is an indication of the lines along which there might be developed a logically valid account of that placing, that does not clash with the Bishop's main contentions—placing in respect both of their derivation, and of their relation to the forming of specific moral choices. This indication has, moreover, been offered on the basis of detailed discussions of the problems involved, published prior to the two texts themselves.

[1] S.C.M. Press, 1964, p. 21.

[2] e.g. Op. cit. p. 17 'Of course, we all need rules . . .' Ibid, p. 26, 'The deeper one's concern for persons, the more effectively one wants to see love buttressed by law'. *Honest to God*, p. 119, 'Such an ethic (i.e. an ethic of love as indicated earlier in the paragraph) cannot but rely, in deep humility, upon guiding rules'.

[3] 'Nothing prescribed—except love'. *Honest to God*, p. 116, and see the whole section of which this is the cross-head.

[4] No one, so far as I know, has claimed divine origin for Air Ministry Orders or the Post Office Directory, and these operate on the conviction that, within the field in question, every situation or action can be provided for prior to its occurrence, by precise and binding rule.

[5] *Honest to God*, p. 107. In passing it should be noted that in the discussion on this point, little distinction is drawn between 'what men may be expected to believe' and 'what is the case': a not unimportant distinction. It is one thing to demonstrate that the climate of opinion is against a thesis, and quite another to demonstrate that the thesis is false.

[6] *Honest to God*, p. 106.

[7] The misuse of these terms seems to be based on an altogether too simple understanding of the nature of scientific method—see *Christian Morals Today*, p. 35.

[8] The force of this qualification will become clear in section 2.

[9] We have already drawn attention to the unsatisfactory way these terms are used.

[10] *Honest to God*, p. 119.

[11] See for example Ross, *The Right and the Good*, p. 39; F. H. Bradley, *Ethical Studies*, Cap. 1.; Butler, Sermon III; Hume quoted by Stevenson *Ethics and Language*, p. vii.

[12] There is brief general recognition of this in *Christian Morals Today*, the middle of p. 12.

[13] *Honest to God*, p. 118

[14] The place in the argument as a whole, of examples concerning sexual morality calls for examination. Alasdair MacIntyre is approvingly quoted (*Christian Morals Today*, p. 17)—as remarking that it is odd how the unbreakable rules propounded by Christians always turn out to be about sex and not about war. These texts might have profited by that observation, instead of merely commending it, unless the writer's real aim is to put right what he holds to be wrong in sexual morality, in which case he should have dealt with that subject explicitly, not under the guise of a total morality. Though many other examples are cited, sexual ones predominate and are much the most fully discussed. Thus 'sex' tends to become the paradigm, instead of simply an illustration, of moral situations.

[15] p. 119, but see also the remainder of the paragraph.

[16] p. 23

[17] p. 106.

[18] *Christian Morals Today*, p. 24.

[19] Ibid, p. 16.

[20] p. 32f.

[21] Note that the Bishop wants and intends to 'base' them, not reject them.

[22] The reference to Prof. Moule on the place of the worshipping community in this matter—*Christian Morals Today*, p. 33—does not secure the concrete ethics that the Bishop seeks, and he does not seem to appreciate that this concretion is secured only by formulating the community's critical listening as moral rules.

[23] p. 116.

[24] Stevenson, *Ethics and Language*, 1944, is a detailed and sensitive analysis of the varieties of meaning and usage of ethical language. Once read and grasped, that work alone should not only prevent this particular linguistic confusion, but also the over-simplification of the view the Bishop opposes and the equal over-simplification of his own argument.

[25] p. 114, 'Theonomy' is a term taken from Tillich, and its significance here is sufficiently indicated by the quotation from Tillich on p. 113f and the comment on it.

[26] p. 115.

[27] The clearest place is *Christian Morals Today*, p. 32. 'I recognize to the full that all of us . . . have to have working rules.' The phrase 'working rules' could be held to imply a specific relationship, but not with any precision.

[28] p. 35.

[29] On sexual morality and 'persons' see A. D. Lindsay, *The Moral Teaching of Jesus*, 1937, p. 145.

[30] W. D. Ross, *The Right and The Good*.

[31] p. 39ff. Ross gives examples that help to expound this account.

THE SONS OF THE PROPHETS, THE DERVISH, AND THE CHRISTIAN

K. H. Henrey

FROM TIME to time we may read studies by Old Testament scholars of the relationship or supposed relationship between the early Hebrew Prophetic Guilds and the Dervish Orders of Medieval Islam. The Swedish writer, Geo. Widengren,[1] extended such a study to the great prophets of the southern kingdom of Judah. Examples, however, are almost entirely taken from biographies of Sufis of the Middle Ages. It might be of some interest to offer examples from dervish life of modern times.

In his periodical study-paper, *Operation Reach*, for Jan-Feb 1959, Canon K. Cragg opens a study of The Soul of a Sufi[2] with the question: 'But which Sufi shall it be?' And we may well ask at the beginning of this article, which Sufi shall it be? Shall it be the one who has acquired a reputation for wonder-working, for finding lost articles, for miracles? Shall it be the one who pursues his life in a secular profession in the world, but who is attracted by Sufism, spending part of his leisure in the society of members of a Brotherhood? Shall it be the one who is a whole-hearted mystic and spends his life in the search for God within the framework of a Dervish Order? If we can, it had best be all and everyone for each will throw light on our thesis. We can find parallel illustrations in the stories of the Old Testament, but much of the general background is not portrayed to us. Wherein lay the appeal of the early prophetic guilds to the ordinary man? How much true spirituality was intermixed with wonder-working? I venture to suggest that a closer knowledge of contemporary Sufiism will help us to divert our minds from an over modern or western outlook, and to recreate imaginatively the situation in e.g. the Book of Samuel and even later books. I will not press comparisons too closely, but in the main leave the reader to form his own judgement as to their validity.

There are two leading questions to which we need to find answers. The first is: Wherein lies the appeal? The second is: What is the nature or degree of true spirituality involved? The one merges, of course, into the second. In regard to the first question, there is the appeal of the Brotherhood as a centre of a social group, an element which we must neither ignore nor undervalue. Man was created a social creature, and his love of society is real and legitimate. Many a man (and indeed many a woman) attaches himself to a Brotherhood more or less loosely because it supplies fellowship, light and colour so to speak, and a sense of community. In a sense we can say that it also supplies entertainment.

The rhythmical chanting of most Orders and the music of the flute are felt by many to be deeply moving. Furthermore, and here we move into the answer to our second question, there is the attraction of a power, a contact with the supernatural. On its lowest level this is the attraction of a power which supposedly can work magic on your behalf; an intriguing, rather fearsome and yet withal a fascinating — and sometimes very useful — power. Modern examples can be given of claims of levitation. I was told in Acre that the Sheikh of the Shadhiliyya Order set out one day to walk to Haifa. A motorist who set out before he did, suddenly, to his surprise, saw the Sheikh ahead of him on the road. The dervish who told me this believed the Sheikh to be able to practise levitation giving it as an impressive example of his greatness. The following story presents parallels to the power of the mantle in I Kings 19[19]. Round about 1935 I knew a journalist in Beirut whom I had thought of as a young man of 'modern' outlook and ideas. One day he fell very ill and later made a wonderful recovery. His mother told me (what I had not known) that his father had been the Sheikh of an Order whose mantle had been preserved in the family as a holy treasure. The young man, when ill, begged that this mantle should be thrown over him and to this everyone attributed his return to health. The man himself was not unresponsive to deeper spiritual matters. He combined such beliefs as I have indicated with serious thoughts about Christ although to my knowledge he never remained other than a confirmed Muslim.

On its higher level, this attraction of spiritual power, this contact with the supernatural, is the appeal which the Sufi life holds for the man or woman who is conscious of a need for a closer walk with God. The supernatural comes to mean God, and thaumaturgy becomes overshadowed and replaced by His love. Many a Sufi may practise hypnotism or the finding of lost articles, yet there is no doubt that there are those amongst them who are not far from being saints. We must beware of watching the former so closely that we miss the latter.

Perhaps here a word on thaumaturgy will not be out of place. We may class it under superstition, but with qualifications. Within Sufiism it is a very real thing. It would be worthwhile to make a close study of these real or alleged powers, so long as we keep them in their right perspective. Some are due to very clever sleight of hand, as I realized (as have many others) when watching a *dhikr*[3] of the Naqshbandi Order to which I had been invited in Damascus. Some are due to hypnotism. It is possible that no one who has not experienced the hypnotic power that can be exercised by an influential Dervish leader of strong personality will realize its force. Some may be due to that strange gift of second sight which is heard of in many countries. It is possible that there is sometimes a measure of thought-reading. But the need, the search, for a walk with God is so often an equally real thing, and may become the greater thing.[4]

While living in Beirut, about 1935, I was privileged to be invited to attend the weekly *dhikr* of a group of women attached to the Shadhiliyya Order. Early in the afternoon the women, by twos and threes, would

drift into the house of their leader (the Sheikha) and engage in social intercourse for about half an hour. They came from very different social backgrounds. Some came from poor and uneducated homes. Some, such as the wife of a teacher, and another the wife of a Custom's official in the Port of Beirut, were of course better off and more educated. The husband of the latter was a 'modern' young effendi who was a member of the men's circle of the same Order. At a sign from the leader they drew up into rows, and the meetings began with chanting from the Qur'an followed by reading from a book written by the founder of the Order, after which all rose and began the actual *dhikr*, the reiteration of the Divine Name together with praise of His Unity. They swayed from side to side, and backwards and forwards, in the conventional way, their voices becoming increasingly strained and loud, and their movements increasingly violent until, hoarse and worn out, they sank to the ground. The leader was an elderly woman whose friendship I highly valued. I often visited her at her home where we spent many cool evenings in her garden, conversing together, during the heat of a Beirut summer. She had been a pupil at a Mission school where apparently the result of Christian teaching, to which she admitted a debt, had been to enrich her Muslim spiritual heritage. She told me that she had always felt the call to a 'consecrated life' and had therefore refused marriage. When in Beirut in 1946, I sought out the same group and found that she had died during the war. Some of the women were still meeting weekly.

Another woman of a similar type was the teacher of a small school in Damascus. When a companion and I were first shown into her room, she was praying. We turned to leave, but she broke off her prayer urging us to wait until she had finished, saying that we should not disturb her because when she prayed her thoughts were wrapped up in God. She continued praying for about twenty minutes during which time some of her friends came in and sat around. When she had finished, she came and sat down amongst us and explained that, when she prayed, her whole being was moved. She said that there were always veils between the soul and God, that she was always striving to get nearer to Him, yet there were ever veils to penetrate. This woman had a somewhat humble background. I met another, however, of a rather wealthy city type when she was visiting her nephew in a Damascus village. He was the teacher at the local Government school and had been trained at the Damascus Teachers' Training College. He was rather sophisticated and expressed himself as something of an agnostic. His aunt was attached to a Damascus women's group of the Qadiriyya Order. She maintained a long conversation by explaining rather glibly and at length the duties and stages of the Sufi life, but without conveying an impression of any unusual spiritual perception.

Love and Unity are, of course, two governing ideas of Sufiism, as of mysticism everywhere. I once read aloud to a dervish part of St John 17. He listened to the great prayer for Unity with amazed delight, and although the Christian theology could mean nothing to him, the beauty

and conception of perfect unity so gripped him, that he stood with hands and eyes uplifted in the attitude of Muslim prayer. The following words were written by a Turkish Sufi in a book published in 1940.[5]

Oh my God. . . . I swear to Thy love which has set every particle of my being alight like a torch, that my eyes are blinded, unable to bear the excess of Thy beauty. Maybe that is why I see nought else but Thee. Within my being, I am conscious of no other desire than to worship Thee, to prostrate myself before Thee. This love, this love which created me and all the world . . . behold I hid from it; I fled and hid. Thy love alone is existence for me and for all the universe. Look into my eyes and see Thyself. Thou alone art to be seen; Thou alone art to be worshipped; there is no beauty, no life, no power but in Thee.

I ask nothing of God. What has He not given me that I should desire it? What good has He not given me that I should lift up my hands and cry to Him?

Who is my Beloved? When I come to describe Him, my words are meagre and dry and powerless. And yet let all the world know that no standard has yet appeared by which my love can be measured.

These words, for all their beauty and piety, reveal one of the weaknesses of Sufiism, a weakness from which Hebrew religious thought sharply diverts. It is usually deeply pantheistic. None the less, here again we must beware of dogmatic assertions. The Sheikh at one time of the Shadhiliyya Order in Beirut, the leader of a large group and in close touch with the Head of the Order then in Acre, was a man who had been trained at the Azhar in Cairo. He thought of God, or at any rate expressed himself as thinking of God, in terms of the utmost transcendence. God was practically, if not entirely, beyond man's reach and comprehension. (But there is often so much duality in their thinking, two contradictory elements kept unresolved and apart, that the idea of extreme transcendence and of extreme immanence can exist in one man's mind.)

A modern autobiographical account of the relationship between a disciple and a spiritual guide is rare. I have translated the following extract from a Turkish book because it introduces us to a realm beyond Islam and beyond most early Hebrew thought, a realm where the Christ is, and yet is not, yet where one seems to hear faintly the distant sound of His wings. Will He ever break through the mists of the wrong road taken in error and ignorance and reveal the Way and satisfy the thirsty soul or can that not be until men see clearly in another life what they have only dimly perceived in the here and now? In such a case it is impossible to tell. The writer who works on the Turkish Press is a journalist and gives a personal experience.[6]

'I was a person wandering in the valleys of unbelief and rebellion. I had no rest in my soul. I was unhappy, blind to all beauty; I was a child of that generation for whom the old values, the old framework of life, had been destroyed. The new values had not appeared and the new framework had not been built. I was restless, unstable and in the dark. I longed to have something to hold on to; a strength on which to lean; I longed for a source of nourishment. I was seeking a light to lighten my heart in the darkness, for the hand of a true and sincere helper. I did not know why I had come into the world. I had no purpose for my life.

'And thus Kenan Rifai (the Sufi leader and guide) found me. Certainly, as one individual, I had no importance. I was a nobody. I was a type of a generation at war with itself, at war with the world, ignorant of God. Hocam Kenan Rifai found me, as he found a number of his disciples. He was not angered by me. He did not make me feel ashamed. He did not despise me. But he understood me; not just as myself but as representative of a whole generation. The first instruction he gave me was:

' "First of all, read the book of your own existence. See yourself." Later, I understood that by this he meant: "First of all, believe in yourself." And later on, I understood that the one who believes in himself is the one who knows the limits of his own possibilities. But the meaning of this is, in short: "The one who has faith."

'One day he asked me to give a lecture at a certain place. I made an excuse to refuse. He interrupted me with, "Why?"

'I said: " I have not the time."

'Then I understood that he was displeased with me. He said:

' "For years you have been educated. I also have tried to teach you. But the purpose of all this nourishment, these endeavours, was not that you should be like a horse going round and round in a field. Our duty is to give to the one who seeks, to speak to the one who listens, to fill the outstretched palm. It is incumbent on you to serve others. How can you neglect their request of you, whatever that request may be?"

'What did not I learn from him? Every stone in the building-up of my existence was laid by his hands.'

Kenan Rifai resembled every saint (*veli*') and I could relate many stories of his miracles which I myself have witnessed. But I am not going to relate them. I believe that his greatest miracle was the friendship which he showed to people. He once wrote thus in a letter:

I am like a spring which ever gushes water out of itself. Everyone who wills may quench his thirst from me. I care not whether he bring a large jar or a small cup to be filled. I fill whatever vessel he may bring. I refuse no one, and I make no distinction between persons.

Kenan Rifai was a great lover (i.e. in the mystical sense, a lover of God). His love, and the undying love of Mevlana, welled up from the same fountain. They were men who drank of the same waters. They were both lovers of God. But they saw God in mankind and loved Him in mankind. One day, he made a confession to his disciples out of the fires of his heart. 'I have nothing of my own, I have no desires, no earthly passions, no desire for enjoyment. But I have one love. I have ardent yearning for Him.'

Kenan Rifai was a true and polished mirror to each one who gazed into his face. The gazer then saw himself as he truly was. He said once:

'Many teachers train their disciples by imposing on them struggles, fastings, various kinds of painful disciplines. I however bear their sufferings myself.

'Many a time I asked myself: "Who is my beloved Master? Who is he, this man who is ashamed of our sins in our place, who suffers the

pains of our ignorance, who bears our sorrows in order to make life easier and more beautiful for us?"

'When he was withdrawn from us (i.e. when he died) we were not left alone. Our guide is ever present with us, and ever directing us. When we are awake, his eyes are upon us. In our dreams and in our dreamless sleep, he is watching in the background. I can still hear his voice;

' "You are never alone. In the past I was always with you. In the future I shall be with you."

'His promise stood, for he is faithful.'

Where does all this lead us? In the first place, while the Muslim saints and teachers have never reached the heights of the great Hebrew prophets in perception of Truth and in preparation for Christ, I think the subject of this article does show how the early prophetic guilds could gradually produce men who attained increasing spiritual stature. And we might suppose that just as the Sufi Sheikh touches for good — and ill — an infinite number of ordinary lives, so in Hebrew society there must have been a very similar spread of influence, a gradual leavening of the population, about which we are given no details.

In the second place, I would suggest that we are led towards the conviction that, however, valuable and necessary is a specialized study of Judaism or Islam or Christianity, we do not wholly understand the one without a comparative study of each and all. This applies especially to those whose work is connected with the Near East, and who are apt to limit their studies to the religion of the particular area in which they are engaged. (One objection to this will be that it involves learning two foreign languages, e.g. Arabic and Hebrew; and that it is hard enough to find time to learn one. But I am sure that the time has come when this ought to be considered, especially since the areas of the Near East are no longer as self-contained as they used to be.) It is a platitude to say that Judaism, Islam and Christianity stem from the same roots. But that is deeply true; each has influenced and still influences the other. To what influences or modifications will life in modern Israel give rise, where all three religions exist side by side? How can we deal with the political and racial hatred on both sides (Arab and Jewish) unless we have a deep and sympathetic understanding of both peoples, both religions, added to our Christian beliefs and convictions? What have Judaism and Islam to teach about Religious Community and what do we think about it, as Christians? What about ways and means of Worship? And what part do the Eastern Churches play? Where can we find the Christ active though unrecognized, and where and how do His ways differ from ours?

Such words as *dialogue, confrontation,* have become common coin today. In connection with the relationship between the Christian, the Jew and the Muslim, a good term can be found in the old Turkish word *yoldash,* the one who walks with you along the road, the one with whom you travel. Given the search is an honest one, and given each travelling companion allows freedom to his fellow to express his own ideas and ideals, two lines from a poem by the famous Medieval Turkish mystic,

Yunus Emre (whose influence today in Turkey is very strong), may provide us with a fitting close.

'Come and let us two be comrades (*yoldash*), Come and let us seek the Loved One,
Come and let us two be helpmates, Come and let us seek the Loved One.'

1 *Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets*, by Geo. Widengren, English Translation, Uppsala, 1948.
2 *sufi*, a mystic.
3 *dhikr*, the reiteration of the Divine name and praise of His unity.
4 For an interesting friendship between a dervish leader and a Christian see *Call to Istanbul*, by C. E. Padwick, Longmans, 1958, pp. 138, 139 (the life of Lyman MacCullum, the Representative of the American Bible Society). Cf. also Halide Edip, in her novel *Sinekli Bakkal*, in which she has created the attractive figure of the Mevlevi dervish, Vehbi Dede. In a certain conversation there are two speakers: 'Perhaps a new era needs fiery men who will destroy . . . In order to rebuild, the old crowd must be swept away . . . But if, in a society, there were no people like Dede, what would happen, I wonder?' 'Why must there be men like Dede?' 'In a world of suffering and cruelty the spirit of man sometimes needs peace, beauty, comfort.'
5 *Mabette bir Gece*, by Samiha Ayverdi, Istanbul, 1940.
6 *Anadolu Evliyalari*, by Nezihe Araz, Istanbul, 1958. The book was given to me by the author.
7 *veli*=Arabic *wali*, a saint, but the stress is laid not on good action, but on relationship, on personal relationship with God. The veli lives 'in the presence of God'.

DID ST MARK 'REMEMBER'?

A. J. Jewell

THE WORD ἀνάμνησις occurs only four times in the New Testament. Of these occurrences the 'outsider' is Hebrews 10^3, where the writer argues that the continual sacrifices of the Jewish religious system constitute 'a *reminder* of sin year after year. The remaining three contexts are Eucharistic, the word being found once in the Lucan account at 22^{19}, with regard to the bread alone, and twice in Paul at 1 Corinthians $11^{24,25}$, over both elements. The version in Luke has many complications of its own, but it seems generally agreed, since the second edition of Jeremias's *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (Blackwell, 1955), that the form which includes the words, 'which is given for you . . . Do this in remembrance of me', is to be preferred to the shorter 'Western non-interpolation'. Apart

entirely from the textual evidence, which argues strongly in favour of the longer reading, Jeremias claims that the un-Lucan style of vv19-20, with its difficult grammar, is its own vindication, the words being quoted by the Evangelist from the traditional liturgical formula. It is noteworthy that Paul too expressly states that he owes the words of institution to tradition (1 Cor. 11^{23}).

The absence from Mark's account of the Last Supper of the injunction to 'do this in remembrance of me' is notorious. Two closely connected words do, however, appear in his Gospel though once only respectively. Both having the same root μνη. The first is the noun μνημόσυνον ('memory' or 'memorial'), which is used of the record of the annointing of Christ's head by the woman of Bethany preserved by Mark in chapter 14^{1-9}. It is perhaps significant that this account occurs in close proximity to the story of the Last Supper (14^{17-25}). The second is the verb μνημονεύω, having the double meaning 'to call to or hold in mind' and 'to make mention of', which is found at Mark 8^{18}.

It is with this second word that we shall be concerned, and about it I want to claim three things. The first is that it is a Eucharistic word in a Eucharistic context. Since the days of the New Testament church, the word ἀνάμνησις has acquired an exclusive technical sense which there is no reason to think it may not originally have shared with its cognates. The 'activity of remembering' is eminently appropriate to the Jewish Passover, which it was the duty of the Israelite both to 'call to mind' and 'to make mention of' to his children (Ex. $13^{3,8,9}$). Now the plain evidence of all the synoptic Gospels and of St Paul places the Last Supper in a strongly Paschal context (Mt. 27^{17}; Mk. 14^{12}; Lk. $22^{7,15}$; 1 Cor. 5^{7-8}). Indeed, it seems justifiable to view the Eucharist as the Christians' Passover (as against Dix's presentation of it as deriving from a Jewish charubah meal), since both activities are conjoined to God's great acts of deliverance. Significantly, the verb μνημονεύω is found elsewhere in the New Testament in three main contexts, having a 'semi-technical' meaning:

(i) Of the Exodus, i.e. of the deliverance of the Jews (Hebrews 11^{15}, 11^{22}).

(ii) Of the Gospel message, i.e. of the testimony to the Christians' deliverance (2 Tim. 2^{8}, Rev. 3^{3}).

(iii) With reference to the words of Jesus, c.f. his words of institution at the Last Supper (Jn. 15^{20}, 16^{4}, Acts 20^{35}).

The setting of the word μνημονεύετε in Mark 8^{18} supports our case, for it forms part of Jesus's rebuke of his disciples on the Lake after the Feeding of the 4,000. Both Feedings were traditionally connected with the Christian Eucharist, as is seen especially in St John chapter 6, where the discourse following the story of the 5,000 is evidently a commentary on the words of institution (especially v53, et seq.). This connection readily suggests itself because of the four-fold action of taking, blessing, breaking, and giving, which is common to all three accounts. In both the Feedings of the multitudes, the disciples play the part of the deacons

of the primitive church, setting the elements before the people. In addition, Vincent Taylor (*Mark*, p. 325) has pointed out that the word κλασμα ('fragment') used in both stories occurs also in the Didache of the broken bread of the Agape and Eucharist. Now there is reason to believe that this Eucharistic association is intensified in the story of the 4,000. The word for 'blessed' in the earlier account, εὐλόγησεν (6[41]), is replaced by the participle εὐχαριστήσας. And, I would venture to suggest, the word μνημονεύετε is included in v18 as further Eucharistic colouring.

My second contention is that this detail in v18 comes from Mark rather than from Christ. In fact, this whole section of the Gospel is highly suspect. The complete sequence of 8[1-26] bears a close resemblance to that of 6[30]-7[37]. Some commentators suggest that the second Feeding has been contrived as a sign to the Gentiles, in contrast to the Feeding of the 5,000 which took place among the Jews. The use of the saying about 'the leaven of the Pharisees' as a 'bridge passage' following the second Feeding is awkward, and the disciples' reasoning in v16 is bizarre. In addition, W. L. Knox has pointed out that the verb εὐχαριστέω, noted above, appears rather late in Greek literature, with a formal, often religious, connotation.

Of course, it may still be claimed that the rebuke attributed to Jesus in vv17b-18 represents a genuine memory of his actual words within what is conceivably in large measure a Markan construction. This may be accepted, but with one important qualification. Like the prophets before him, Jesus was not infrequently led to remark upon the lack of perception which afflicted his hearers (cf. Mk. 4[12]). In fact, the expressions here employed are a direct quotation of the prophetic words (cf. Isa. 6[9ff]; Jer. 5[21]; Ezek. 12[2]). But the actual quotation ends after mention of the eyes and the ears. The reference to 'remembering' is an entirely new factor, added, we may presume, by the Evangelist. Recognition of this addition to the quotation has been reflected in the punctuation and verse numbering suggested for the passage. The British and Foreign Bible Society text (1958 edition, Nestle-Kilpatrick) ends Christ's sequence of pungent questions at ἀκούετε and reads the words, 'do you not remember', in connection with the following verse. Vincent Taylor and Moffatt actually include the words in question in verse 19. But in favour of reading the question as the climax of verse 18 are Souter, A.V., R.V., R.S.V., Weymouth ('Have you no memory?'), Knox and N.E.B.—though this latter obscures the specifically Eucharistic reference by translating, 'Have you forgotten?' The punctuation does not, of course, directly affect the Eucharistic allusion which lies in the word, but more prominence is given to it if we follow this second group of authorities.

Thirdly, from the above evidence I conclude that Mark was in fact acquainted with the 'Pauline' version of the words of institution. We have seen that it is highly likely that the 'remembrance clause' was to be found in the language of the Eucharistic liturgy and cannot be looked upon as an invention on the part either of Paul or of Luke. Indeed, the inclusion of the injunction to repeat the acts of the Last Supper might well have seemed superfluous to Mark, on P. Benoit's dictum (quoted by Jeremias and

others): *'On ne récite pas une rubrique, on l'exécute.'* But in all probability Mark does make a passing reference to it at 8^{18}.

Yet there is real homiletic value in the Evangelist's placing of this word at the climax of Christ's rebuke of his disciples, after the accounts of the two Feedings, even if that of the 4,000 is a doublet from the tradition he used or even his own construction. We are perhaps astounded that the disciples can take an active part in two successive Feedings and yet show such little understanding. But it is possible for us too to come to the Lord's Supper *again and again*, as a matter of course, automatically, and yet not 'remember' as we have been bidden—remember when and how it all began, and who it was who instituted it. 'Do you not remember?'

However, we can perhaps be a little more positive if we transfer our attention for a moment to St Luke's Gospel and his Emmaus road narrative (24^{13-35}). Here Christ again rebukes his disciples for their dullness of heart (v25). Here is another 'feeding', another supper. Jesus again carries out that four-fold act. And then it is that their eyes are opened and they recognize who it is. There was that about his way of doing it which made them instantly 'remember' the last time he had broken bread. This was a re-enactment of the Last Supper. He who was crucified came alive for them in the breaking of bread. They did more than 'remember' in the rather non-committal sense which that word has in English—they realized that He was present with them. This is surely what should be most true of every Christian Eucharist. It is no dull, repetitive act, but one characterized by true 'remembrance', when Christ comes alive for his disciples in every age. Perhaps we are nearer now to an understanding of Gregory Dix, when he declares that the word ἀνάμνησις in a Greek-speaking church would mean a 're-calling' or 're-presenting' of a thing so that it was regarded not so much as being absent but rather as itself 'presently operative by its effects'. Only that which is 'present again' and 'presently operative' is Jesus Christ himself.

A CHRISTIAN READS MARTIN BUBER

T. S. Gregory

IT HAS BEEN SAID that Martin Buber had a greater influence among Gentiles than among Jews. Whether this is true or not, he has certainly interpreted his religion to Christians in such a way as to illuminate their own religion, as it were from the inside. The reason is that he practised his own religion with such intensity that he often transcended its particular custom and symbolism and revealed its universal truth. 'Religion', he said, 'is essentially the act of holding fast to God. And that does not mean holding fast to an image that one has made of God, nor even holding fast to the faith in God that one has conceived. It means holding fast to the existing God.' Thus in the name and spirit of ancient Hebrew monotheism he breaks through the theories, the theological idola, the abstractions and images, which we are always creating for our human convenience, to the holy mystery. We cannot properly talk *about* God; we can listen to Him; we can of His grace address Him; we cannot make Him a third-personal absentee. Religion is 'the genuinely reciprocal meeting in the fullness of life between one active existence and another'. It is an I-Thou relation. Faith is entrance into this reciprocity 'as binding oneself in relationship with an indemonstrable and unprovable yet knowable Being from whom all meaning comes'. In spite of Buber's grotesque and, as it seems, wilful misinterpretation of St Paul, the Christian will readily find an instance of this direct encounter in St Paul's experience on the Damascus road. 'Who art thou, Lord?' 'I am Jesus whom thou persecutest.' And if, for the moment, we read this sentence without the word Jesus, 'I AM whom thou persecutest', it becomes a divine judgement upon all religious enmity and an index of the divine presence in the clash of human hate.

In various contexts, Buber illustrates this religious encounter with three words, *lishmah, yihud, emunah. Lishmah* means 'for the sake of the thing itself . . . man should learn the Torah for its own sake and not because of what it yields; he is to fulfil the commandment for its own sake. . . . The only thing which matters is that everything should be done truly for God's sake, from love to Him and in love to Him'. *Yihud* is the 'dynamic form of the divine unity itself', 'the continually renewed confirmation of the unity of the Divine in the manifold nature of His manifestations'. 'It is brought about through man's remaining true in face of the monstrous contradictions of life and especially in face of the quality of good and evil'. *Emunah* is 'active fidelity and receptive trust' which binds Israel to God 'by such love of the whole heart, the whole soul and the whole might of the being, as one can only be related to One who cannot be represented . . . who cannot be confined in any outward form'. The Christian will turn to the beatitudes, which, as Buber rightly claims, are Jewish, and remember that the pure in heart see God. For Buber's theme is essentially purity of heart: Hear, O

Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy might. Thus he transcends the utilitarian ethics of the Gentiles, their controversial divinity and theoretical 'belief' in God's Word and man's response.

It is a soul thus trained upon the divine unity, and made unanimous by this training that he turns upon human life and human situations. 'The original man of the Bible found eternity, not in the super-temporal spirit, but in the depth of the actual moment. The Jesus of the genuine tradition still belongs to that, but the Jesus of theology does so no longer'. Here indeed the Christian would dispute with Buber, for the Jesus of Christian theology is the incarnate God and it is precisely within the actual moment, in the temporal and carnal situation that the Christian would expect to encounter Him. Christianity is nearer to Buber's Judaism than he is inclined to admit. 'From my youth onwards', he says, 'I have found in Jesus my great brother' and claims as a Jew a nearer access to the Jewish mind of Jesus than is given to Christians who make Him God. 'I firmly believe', he says, 'that the Jewish community, in the course of its renaissance, will recognize Jesus; and not merely as a great figure in its religious history, but also in the organic context of a Messianic development, extending over millennia, whose final goal is the redemption of Israel and of the world'. Many men who have claimed the title of Christian have made no greater claim for Christ than this. But, to return to the human aspect of I-Thou religion, he sees 'lived concreteness as the meeting-place between the human and the divine'. 'The meaning of existence is open and accessible in the actual lived concrete, not above the struggle with reality, but in it. . . . Meaning is to be experienced in living action and suffering itself, in the unreduced immediacy of the moment.' 'The believing man steps forth into the everyday which is henceforth hallowed as the place in which he has to live with the mystery. He steps forth directed and assigned to the concrete, contextual situations of his existence. That he henceforth accepts the situation as given him by the Giver is what Biblical religion calls "the fear of God".' But it is no less what the Christian religion attributes to 'the Word made flesh'. 'Whether field of work or field of battle, he accepts the place in which he is placed. He knows no floating of the spirit above concrete reality; to him even the sublimest spirituality is an illusion if it is not bound to the situation. Only the spirit which is bound to the situation is prized by him as bound to the Pneuma, the Spirit of God.' And so he reaches the position that 'the realer religion is so much the more it means its own overcoming. It wills to cease to be the special domain "Religion" and wills to become life. It is concerned in the end not with specific religious acts, but with redemption from all that is specific. Historically and biographically, it strives toward the pure Everyday. Religion is in the religious view the exile of man; his homeland is unarbitrary life in the face of God'.

Here in the midst of this divine humanism—so much more convincing in Buber than in some modern Christian endeavours after the same theme—a sinner of the Gentiles may pause to ask what Buber makes of the I-It relation which composes most of the life of 'everyday'. He says indeed that

'to drive the plowshare of the normative principle into the hard sod of political fact is a tremendously difficult undertaking, but the right to lift a historical moment into the light of superhistory can be bought no cheaper'. True, but what constitutes the hardness of political fact? What of the innumerable historical moments which of their nature cannot be raised into the light of super-history? Most men fall short of this *emunah*. Their delight is not in the Torah. They do not realize the 'actually lived concrete in its unforseeableness and its irrecoverableness, in its undivertible character of happening but once'. They do live in abstractions, in 'subject-object relations', in a 'reality that is presented to them as past'. Two kinds of people might reasonably complain that while Buber has illumined the road of essential religion, he has ignored the irreligious road of 'everyday'—the irreligious or half-religious mass who transact the ordinary business of life and the scientific minority whose vocation is to explore phenomena, not 'thou' but 'it'. While Buber has much that is cogent and moving to say of the sacredness of the secular, he does not understand its secularity. So intensely does he perceive the reality of the real that he never does justice to its insignificance. In his world there ought to be nothing mechanical, impersonal, dull or mercenary. His flesh is never quite flesh. And he does not sufficiently consider the world of hypothesis, observation and analysis. He will not even concede the belief of Franz Rosenzweig that divine truth will be given to him who prays with the double prayer of the believer and the unbeliever. His 'standpoint is the narrow ridge' to which most men cannot climb. If it is true that he lacks influence in modern Israel, this may be part of the reason. It is sufficient for him that God wills to hide Himself, but for the Israelite indeed this divine reticence is a form of divine revelation; he never comes quite down from the mountain to the plain of unaspiring humanity who need the 'rigidity', the 'objectivization' of law. 'Hasidism teaches that rejoicing in the world, if we hallow it with our whole being, leads to rejoicing in God.' True indeed, but it is a very big 'if'. How much of life can we hallow with our whole being—when do we and how can we?

Meanwhile to those who find the 'contradiction a theophany' Buber expounds the image of the Servant in Deutero-Isaiah. The Servant is not a person nor a people but rather a living principle embodied and re-embodied during the history of the people of God. He is first the arrow kept close in the divine quiver. Then he undertakes affliction. Thence, he emerges to establish the covenant and to bring in the divine kingdom of peace and justice. 'The real way from the Creation to the Kingdom is trod not on the surface of success but in the deep of failure. . . . The real work is done in the shadow, the quiver.' So Jesus 'understood himself under the influence of the conception of Deutero-Isaiah to be a bearer of Messianic hiddenness'. Buber accepts Wrede's theory of the Messianic secret and regards as the most authentic of the recorded predictions of the Cross the saying in Luke 17^{25}. But first must he suffer many things and be rejected of this generation. This, indeed, looks more than the other predictions, like a reference to the Scripture. Buber couples with it the prediction in Matthew 24^{27} of the universality of the Messianic revelation, 'For as the lightning cometh forth

from the east and is seen even unto the west, so shall be the coming of the Son of man.' And both the present hidden and the future revealed condition of the Son of man are summed up in the words of the Psalm (118^{22}). 'The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner.' The Servant is thus the Messianic principle rather than the Messianic person, a principle upon which God works His redemption of man. And thus it is that Jesus takes his place in 'the organic context of a Messianic development'. 'But I believe equally firmly', Buber says, 'that we will never recognize Jesus as the Messiah Come, for this would contradict the deepest meaning of our Messianic passion. . . . there are no knots in the mighty cable of our Messianic belief which, fastened to a rock on Sinai, stretches to a still invisible peg anchored in the foundations of the world. In our view, redemption occurs for ever, and none has yet occurred. Standing bound and shackled in the pillory of mankind, we demonstrate with the bloody body of our people, the unredeemedness of the world. For us there is no cause of Jesus; only the cause of God exists for us'.

Yet the difference between Buber's Messianism and the Christian belief is perhaps not so profound and irreconcilable as Buber suggests. For if the Christian meant by redemption what Buber means, and if, moreover, the Christian believed that the Servant who suffered on Golgotha was the final word of God upon human history, he would perforce agree with Buber that the world has not yet attained the economy of peace and justice which declares the reign of the Messiah. The Christians also believe in a future Advent and, looking into the past, will find its first open promise, if not on Sinai, then in the call of Abraham. Nor is there any 'knot in the cable of the Christian Messianic belief'. They hear the word of Jesus that not one jot or tittle shall pass from the law till all things be accomplished. They believe that in Christ the ancient covenants were not annulled but consummated, and the union of man with God accomplished so that all human things can be and in the end will be, as it were, deified in this union. In Buber's words, 'this very world, this very contradiction, unabridged, unmitigated, unsmoothed, unsimplified, unreduced, this world shall be—not overcome—but consummated. . . . It is a redemption not *from* the evil but *of* the evil, as the power which God created for his service and for the performance of his work'.

But it is the world that is to be redeemed, not only the people who received the Torah and did and heard it and delighted in it. 'The supposition for a decision between faith or unbelief', says Buber, 'is lacking in the world of Israel, the place for it is as it were missing because the world of Israel grew out of covenants with God.' And this is the restriction of Buber's message. The reader is sometimes conscious that though as a Gentile he finds the message illuminating and emancipating, it is addressed not to all mankind but to a chosen people. 'The separation which is announced in Israel's scriptures cannot be between those who have faith and those who have not, because there is no decision of faith or unbelief. The separation which is here meant takes place between those who realize their faith, who make it effective and those who do not.' That is between

good Israelites and bad ones. But what of the immense multitudes who have no faith, no memory of Sinai, no knowledge of the way the Lord their God has led them and have not been included in the covenants? 'Ye were at that time separate from Christ, alienated from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of the promise, having no hope and without God in the world.' There is the problem; and Paul meets it as follows, 'But now in Christ Jesus ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ. For he is our peace who made both one and brake down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, the law of commandments in ordinances; that he might create in himself one new man, making peace.'

Suppose we dismiss the Pauline solution, the problem remains. What solution (apart from a 'decision between faith and unbelief') avails? This is the question which Buber does not answer. Nothing in history is more certain than that an answer is needed, not only as between Jew and Gentile, but for all the profound and spiritual divisions which deface the human community. 'An Israel striving after the renewal of its faith through the rebirth of the person', says Buber, 'and a Christianity striving for the renewal of its faith through the rebirth of nations would have something as yet unsaid to say to each other and a help to give to one another—hardly to be conceived at the present time'. Yet one might think upon the history of three thousand years, that of all the world's religions Christianity was *par excellence* the nation-maker. Judaism as conspicuously has failed to make a nation between the days of Jereboam II and our own. Buber's indeed is a personal religion, a personal I-Thou relation. As such it comes home to the Christian. It reinforces the conviction that Christianity as we know it needs Judaism, and the world in its present uncovenanted confusion needs the Torah, the word of the Lord. When by mutual charity Jew and Christian can share without any diminution the revelation vouchsafed to each, they will establish in the world the Kingdom which Buber recognized in the message of Jesus whom the Christians recognize as Christ.

ISAAC WATTS AND HIS *LYRICAL HOURS*

Elizabeth R. Harding

IN 1706, a year before the publication of his *Hymns and Spiritual Songs*, Dr Isaac Watts published *Horae Lyricae*, or 'Lyrical Hours', a volume of poetry which, he says, was written in his leisure time to entertain himself and his friends. Although he is modest about his powers and anxious to assure us that poetry is not the chief business of his life, *Horae Lyricae* is in fact a significant work, for it is part of an undercurrent of religious enthusiasm which flowed from the seventeenth-century Puritans to the Methodist revival of the mid-eighteenth century and thence, in a different channel, to the Romantic movement. It was evidently popular, for in 1709 a second edition appeared with many additional poems, and there were altogether eight editions in Watts's lifetime.

The Preface to this work is an eloquent plea for poetry, 'whose Original is Divine', to be used in the service of religion. Watts hopes to appeal in his own poems to 'Young Gentlemen and Ladies whose Genius and Education have given them a Relish of Oratory and Verse' and not only 'to gratify innocent Fancy' but 'to allure the Heart to Virtue'. He believes strongly in the importance of inspiration and emotional fervour in poetry.

The poems are divided into three sections, dedicated to Devotion, to Virtue, and to the Memory of the Dead. A number of them, particularly in the second section, are imitations of Latin odes written by the seventeenth-century Polish Jesuit Mathias Casimire Sarbiewski, whose work was popular throughout Europe at the time and much admired by Watts; Casimire's odes are themselves imitations of Horace and reflect not only Christian ideals but also Horace's Stoicism and his love of country life. Three poems are imitations of seventeenth-century French works: 'True Learning' and 'True Wisdom' are from a poem[1] by Pierre Poiret, a French Protestant minister who was forced to flee to Holland during the religious persecution of that time; and 'The Humble Enquiry' is from a poem by Desbarreaux, whose theme, the contrast between the sinners' deserts and Christ's mercy, is a favourite with Watts. Many of the devotional poems in the first section are inspired by passages in the Bible.

The precepts laid down in the Preface to *Horae Lyricae* are put into practice in the poems. 'The Adventurous Muse' extols inspiration and freely expressed emotion:

Give me the Muse whose generous Force
Impatient of the Reins,
Pursues an unattempted Course,
Breaks all the Criticks Iron Chains
And bears to Paradise the raptur'd Mind.

Watts favours those metres that seem to give the imagination most freedom, such as the blank verse of Milton (whom Watts greatly admired), which had

come to be associated generally with the 'Sublime'. He can use this skilfully, having the good sense not to copy Milton's style slavishly, as many of his contemporaries did. The poem dedicated to 'Sarissa', his sister Sarah, seems to be the first example of the kind of meditative blank verse developed later by Cowper and Wordsworth; these lines indicate its style:

Farewel, ye waxing and ye waning Moons,
That we have watch'd behind the flying Clouds
On Night's dark Hill, or setting or ascending,
Or in meridian Height: . . .

'The Dacian Battel' is a fine narrative poem with a vigorous Miltonic style, as this extract shows:

. . . with adverse Edge
The crooked Fauchions met; and hideous Noise
From clashing Shields, thro' the long Ranks of War,
Clang'd horrible . . .

. . . O rude Effort
Of Harmony! Not all the frozen Stores
Of the cold North when pour'd in rattling Hail
Lash with such Madness the Norwegian Plains,
Or so torment the Ear . . .

Watts applies many of the principles of Miltonic blank verse to his rhymed verse, too, achieving variety of movement with run-over lines and varied pauses, as in 'Launching into Eternity':

Such is the Soul that leaves this mortal Land
Fearless when the great Master gives Command.
Death is the Storm: She smiles to hear it roar,
And bids the Tempest waft her from the Shore:
Then with a skilful Helm she sweeps the Seas,
And manages the raging Storm with Ease . . .

One of his favourite metres is that of the Pindaric Ode, of the free type developed by Cowley (who did not observe the Classical structure), and highly disapproved of by Dr Johnson, but which seemed to Watts to 'give a Loose to the devout soul, nor check the Raptures of her Faith and Love'. Sometimes this type of ode does degenerate into mere formlessness, but Watts can use it very effectively, making the movement correspond with the thought, as in 'The Adventurous Muse', 'The Law given at Sinai' (a dramatic account of the descent of God in fire, striking the Israelites with terror), and 'The Incomprehensible', which describes how

. . . The whole Race of Creature Souls
Stretch'd to their last Extent of Thought, plunge and are lost in Thee.

Like Cowley, Watts allows himself extra licence in his Pindaric Odes; he gives rein especially to his love of metaphysical conceits, as in this delightful example from 'Happy Solitude':

My busy Eye-balls inward roll,
And there with wide Survey I see

All the wide Theatre of me,
And view the various Scenes of my retiring Soul.

In 'The Fairest and the only Beloved' he describes religious emotion in terms of Harvey's theory of the circulation of the blood:

The Passion reigns
Thro' all my Veins,
And floating round the crimson Stream,
Still finds him at my Heart.

He is fond of striking phrases and images: in 'The Law given at Sinai', Pharaoh 'swallows Fate with swimming Eyes', God's 'radiant Eyes' 'scatter'd dreadful Light', and the 'Majestick Sounds' of His voice are 'all arm'd and feather'd' with Flame. This kind of diction contrasts with the hymn-like language often to be found in his poems of simpler metre.

A favourite theme of these Pindaric Odes—it occurs elsewhere in his poetry, too—is the 'cosmic voyage'. This was a popular literary theme during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (though it originated much earlier) and was probably connected with the current interest in space travel. Watts pictures his poetic imagination soaring through vast spaces unconfined in 'The Adventurous Muse'. Writers of elegies loved to picture the soul's flight from earth to heaven, as Watts does in the elegy on Thomas Gouge, and in 'Paradise', where he refers to the 'Spheres' of the old cosmology and to the Milky Way:

And now by swift Degrees
I sail aloft thro' Azure Seas,
Now tread the milky Road:
Farewel, ye Planets, in your Spheres;
And as the Stars are lost, a brighter Sky appears . . .

The sky is a 'sea' in which the soul 'sails', through 'trackless Seas of Light', and in Paradise 'Noon stands Eternal', symbolizing the spiritual illumination of Heaven, for which the poet yearns.

Watts has the seventeenth-century sense of the illusive and transitory nature of earthly life, which he expresses especially vividly in his imitations of Casimire, calling the body a 'cage of clay' from which death is a welcome release, in the Neoplatonic (as well as Puritan) manner. When writing on this theme he is not always merely conventional; the poem addressed 'To the Discontented and Unquiet' has some striking lines about Sylvia:

Haunted and hagg'd where'er she roves

by the 'eternal Thorn' of her discontent; in vain does she

. . . mount the whirling Sky,
Or ride upon the feather'd Wind . . .

Here, Watts uses couplets in the eighteenth-century manner, to give a gently ironic picture:

Sylvia has left the City Crowd,
Against the Court exclaims aloud,
Flies to the Woods; a Hermit-Saint!
She loathes her Patches, Pins and Paint,
Dear Diamonds from her Neck are torn . . .[2]

Although he believes the path of life is full of thorns, he advocates not passive acceptance of evil but active resistance, telling Sarissa to

Tread the Thorns down, charge thro' the Foe;
The hardest Fight is highest crown'd.

He enjoys the thought of braving the storms of life and triumphing over adversity, and in 'Launching into Eternity' he pictures the soul voyaging over death's stormy sea

Exulting on the Edge of thousand gaping Graves.

Many poems in *Horae Lyricae* show Watts's delight in created nature. He loves to show how God's power and wisdom are revealed through nature and, in spite of his interest in the science of his day, his conception is that of the Psalmist and the writer of the Book of Job. He marvels at the way the 'unwieldy Weight' of Earth is held up in the 'feeble Air' and the rain-clouds are kept aloft

On the thin Air, without a Prop.

The laws of gravity had been explained shortly before by Newton, whose work Watts knew and admired. Scientific explanations, however, though interesting, do not affect Watts's belief; like the writer of Job (and like many writers of his own time) he attributes the wonders of nature to the power of God:

Thou bulky Globe, prodigious Mass,
That hangs unpillar'd in an empty Space!
While thy unwieldy Weight rests on the feeble Air,
Bless the Almighty Word that fixed and holds thee there.

Inspired by the Genesis story, he loves to imagine the time of Creation, when

Fire, Air, Earth, and Sea heard the creating Call,
And leapt from empty Nothing to this beauteous All;

when, as Milton says, 'order from disorder sprung'.

He sees the whole Creation praising God:

With thy loud Name, Rocks, Hills, and Seas,
And Heav'n's high Palace rings.

He admires the rose and lily which

. . . free from Pride, their Beauties spread,
To shew thy skilful Hand . . .

but adds sadly,

But Pride, that busy Sin,
Spoils all that I perform . . .

The sky is 'glorious to behold' and the earth is full of a profusion of good things for man's use, the

. . . fruitful Source
Of all our Raiment, Life and Food,

where

Tall Oaks for future Navies grow.

Nature is a Book in which God's glories are

Inscrib'd with Beams of Light
On Flow'rs and Stars . . .,

though

. . . when I try to read thy Name, a Dimness vails my Sight.

'A Song to creating Wisdom' praises God's care in giving every creature a useful purpose and a place in

. . . the whole Harmony of things
That form this noble Universe.

The microscope was revealing the wonders of minute creatures, and Watts notes how even

Insects and Mites of mean Degree

are

Moulded my Wisdom's artful Hand.

He is inspired even more by the sublimity of the vast universe revealed by the telescope, and in 'Fire, Air, Earth and Sea, praise ye the Lord', he likens the intricate movements of the countless myriads of stars and planets to a dance. Even the violent aspects of Nature have their place in the general harmony. Watts delights in the 'glorious Rage' of the thunderstorm no less than in the 'Sweet Waters wandring thro' the flow'ry Fields'. He loves to imagine storms and tempests, whose power is in such contrast to his own frail body, as in 'The Day of Judgment', where the storm

Rears up the Baltick to a foaming Fury;
And the red Lightning, with a Storm of Hail comes
Rushing amain down.

This love of wildness in nature seems almost a foretaste of Romanticism; but for Watts, storms, lightnings and hurricanes are admirable chiefly because they are the instruments of God's power, as in 'Divine Judgments', where

Sublime on Winter's rugged Wings
He rides in Arms along the Sky.

The seventeenth century, like the present day, was a period when thrilling scientific discoveries were changing men's concepts of the universe and causing doubt and bewilderment as well as exhilaration. In spite of his delight in natural beauty and grandeur, Watts feels that God alone is unchanging and incorruptible:

Thy Voice produc'd the Seas and Spheres,
Bid the Waves roar, and Planets shine,
But nothing like thy Self appears,
Thro' all these spacious Works of thine.

He yearns to see Christ face to face and nothing else can really satisfy him:

Who could ever bear to be
Curst with Immortality
Among the Stars, but far from Thee?

His appreciation of the splendour of the universe enhances his view of the majesty of God, who is the

Eternal Power! whose high abode
Becomes the Grandeur of a God;
Infinite Lengths beyond the Bounds

Where Stars revolve their little Rounds;

and it gives particular significance to his conception of Christ, who is the central point and pivot of the universe, and whom the whole cosmos acclaims:

Infinite Grace! Almighty Charms!
Stand in Amaze, ye whirling Skies,
Jesus the God, with naked Arms,
Hangs on a Cross of Love, and dies.

The language of the 'nature' poems often contains periphrases typical of eighteenth century 'poetic diction'. Some of these phrases were originally intended to instruct, and were used by scientists as well as poets: phrases like 'Watry Kingdoms', 'finny nations' and 'scaly Monsters' relate a species to its place in the chain of Being and show how it is adapted to its environment. Others reflect Biblical (especially Old Testament) ideas: thunder and lightning are God's 'Artillery' and 'Bright Arrows'; God is the Artist and Builder whose hand has 'Spread the Sky', whose skill has 'Ting'd' it 'with a Blue of heavenly Dye' and who can 'array the Fields in charming Green'. Birds have 'soft enamell'd Wing', the 'gay attire' of serpents has 'rich Embroidery', insects are 'curl'd and painted'. Such periphrases were also popular at the time because they were considered elegant, fit to 'charm innocent Fancy'; though when used too often they became hackneyed. Many of them were Classical in origin; Virgil was a pervading influence in the early eighteenth century and Watts's 'smiling' meadows, 'gelid' (frozen) skies and 'painted' birds come from him.

Watts was familiar with the Classics and his descriptions often have Classical overtones (which his educated readers would have appreciated). The vivid acount of Winter in 'Divine Judgments' is strongly reminiscent of Horace and Virgil:

Old Boreas with his freezing Pow'rs
Turns the Earth Iron, makes the Ocean Glass,
Arrests the dancing Riv'lets as they pass,
And chains them moveless to their Shores;

and the description of the storm at sea in 'Launching into Eternity' is very like that in Horace's Ode 'To Virgil setting out for Greece'. Often his poetry has both Classical and Biblical echoes. 'Grace shining and Nature fainting' is based on the Christian interpretation of *Solomon's Song;* but its first stanza (especially in the 1706 version, entitled 'Sick of Love'), with its pastoral setting, the lover sighing beneath the shade of a tree and the fainting sheep seeking shelter from the blazing beams of the sun,[3] is in the manner of Virgil's Eclogues and Horace's Odes. The ox that 'snuffs up the wind' in 'Divine Judgments' reminds us of the scene in Virgil's first Georgic and of the wild asses which, we are told in Jeremiah, 'snuffed up the wind like dragons'. In 'True Riches', Watts describes his soul as a garden; these charming lines have more Biblical than Classical allusions:

Rich as Eden's happy Ground,
And with choicer Plenty crown'd;
Here on all the shining Boughs
Knowledge fair and useful grows . . .
Here in a green and shady Grove,
Streams of Pleasure mix with Love:
There beneath the smiling Skies
Hills of Contemplation rise . . .

In passages like this, with their simple, direct vocabulary and strong visual imagery, drawn largely from the Bible, Watts sounds very much like Bunyan.

The devotional poems in *Horae Lyricae* often have a mystical quality. One of the best of these is 'The Incomprehensible', which expresses, partly in the imagery of the *Song of Solomon*, Watts's mystic sense of the unknowableness of God:

Far in the Heav'ns my God retires,
My God, the Mark of my Desires,
And hides his lovely Face;
When he descends within my View,
He charms my Reason to pursue,
But leaves it tir'd and fainting in th'unequal Chase.

A similar feeling is expressed, in different imagery, in 'The Infinite':

Thine Essence is a vast Abyss,
Which Angels cannot sound,
An Ocean of Infinities,
Where all our Thoughts are drown'd.[4]

God is surrounded by light so dazzling that we cannot look upon it:

We gaze, and we confound our Sight,
Plung'd in th' Abyss of dazling Light.

'The Incomprehensible' expresses also rapturous love and desire for God, who is 'th'Eternal Fair', 'The Mark of my Desires', whose 'lovely Face' 'charms my Reason'. Such phrases are used more often by Watts with reference to Christ, especially in those poems, in section I of *Horae Lyricae*, 'Dedicated to Divine Love', in which he describes his feeling for Christ in symbols drawn from human love, in the language of the *Song of Solomon*. In 'Come, Lord Jesus', Christ is

Thou absent Fair, thou dear Unknown,
Thou Fairest of ten thousand Fairs.

During the seventeenth century, poets delighted in *Solomon's Song* and the practice of interpreting it allegorically was still general; but in the eighteenth century taste was changing and Watts's poems were evidently criticised, for he included a vindication of them in his preface to the second edition.

Many of them are expressions of the mingled pain and joy of mystical love for Christ. 'The Fairest and the only Beloved' describes the 'wound' of love, which delights in spite of its pain:

A thousand Arrows from his Eyes
Shoot thro' my Heart with dear Surprize . . .[5]

In 'Grace shining and Nature fainting' he speaks of being 'faint' and 'overcome' with Love. (In the first version, he is 'Scorch't' and 'Languishing'.) He cannot bear the beams of God's glory and yet he desires them:

My sinking Spirits feebly strive
T'endure the Extasy;
Beneath these Rays I cannot live,
And yet without them die.

This is the language of St John of the Cross and St Teresa, and of several seventeenth century mystics, notably the Roman Catholic Richard Crashaw, who in his 'Hymn to St Teresa' speaks of 'delicious Wounds', 'sweet and subtle Pain' and 'intolerable Joyes'.

Watts tries to express his longing for union with God also by using ocean imagery (as the French mystic Mme. Guyon often does). In 'The Fairest and the only Beloved' he says,

Thou art my Ocean, thou my God!
In Thee the Passions of the Mind
With joys and Freedom unconfin'd
Exult, and spread their powers abroad.

Here the surging movement of the lines, reaching a climax at 'Exult', expresses vividly his sense of joyous release. The longing for loss of himself in God is expressed, too, in 'Mutual love stronger than Death':

But, Saviour, let me taste thy Grace
With every fleeting Breath,
And thro' that Heaven of Pleasure pass
To the cold Arms of Death;[6]
Then I could lose successive Souls
Fast as the Minutes fly;
So Billow after Billow rolls
To kiss the Shore, and die.

These poems have been much criticised, but at their best they have a fine devotional quality; shown, for example, in the last stanza of 'Grace shining and Nature fainting', the first three lines of which are reminiscent of George Herbert:

Dear Lord, forgive my rash Complaint,
And love me still
Against my froward Will;
Unvail thy Beauties, tho' I faint . . .
Then shall I gaze with strength'ned Sight
On Glories infinitely bright,
My Heart shall all be love, my Jesus all Delight.

'Come, Lord Jesus', inspired by the thought of the Second Coming, has a lyrical movement and a visionary quality that foreshadow Blake:

Our airy Feet with unknown Flight
Swift as the Motions of Desire,

Run up the Hills of heavenly Light,
And leave the welt'ring World in Fire.

Watts finds liberation of the spirit not through science or philosophy — though the breadth of his culture enables him to appreciate these things — but through his experience of the love of God. This is why his poetry has a depth of emotion and personal feeling, unusual in the early eighteenth century, and nobly expressed in the last stanza of 'The Incomprehensible':

Great God, behold my Reason lies
Adoring; yet my love would rise
On Pinions not her own:
Faith shall direct her humble Flight,
Thro' all the trackless Seas of Light,
To Thee, th' Eternal Fair, the Infinite Unknown.

[1] Poiret's poem, apparently his only one, was written, he says, to fill up the blank pages at the end of his prose work *L'Oeconomie Divine*, and its theme, that true wisdom is to be found in God alone, is taken from *De Imitatione Christi*.

[2] This seems to have been influenced by Dryden's translation of the third book of Lucretius.

[3] cf. Charles Wesley, 'Thou Shepherd of Israel, and mine . . .' (M.H.B. 457). Wesley admired Watts's poems and there are numerous echoes of them in his hymns.

[4] cf. Charles Wesley, 'Thy ceaseless, unexhausted love . . .' (M.H.B. 49, lines 11 and 12): 'A vast, unfathomable sea, Where all our thoughts are drowned.'

[5] cf. Revelation $I^{14,16,17}$.

[6] This is echoed in John Newton's hymn 'How sweet the name of Jesus sounds' (M.H.B. 99, st. 6):

'Till then I would Thy love proclaim
With every fleeting breath;
And may the music of Thy name
Refresh my soul in death.'

HENRY BULLINGER, 1504-75

A sketch of his life and work, with special reference to recent literature

David J. Keep

BULLINGER'S name is met in most works on the English Reformation, but he is so rarely discussed that it is possible to read Modern History under the impression that he was an Englishman. This error is fostered by the article on Henry Grey in the *D.N.B.*, which states that the Swiss was entertained at Bradgate. Yet the successor to Zwingli was the best known and possibly most respected reformer in his own time. His correspondence, only parts of which are printed, exceeds that of Luther, Zwingli and Calvin together: to their 9,500, the Zwingliverein in Zürich has indexed over 12,000 for Bullinger already, about a quarter from his pen. He published over a hundred works, mainly practical and occasional, and left about three hundred more in manuscript which are still being sorted. He entertained scholars, diplomats and refugees from all over Europe, and included Lutherans, Romans and Socinians among his friends. He was generous, tolerant and moderate, and it is partly due to these virtues that Calvin's reputations has eclipsed his since the violence of the Counter-reformation. Yet it was Bullinger who saved the Swiss movement after the deaths of Zwingli and Oecolompaedius and who still laboured on for eleven years after Calvin's decease. His *Confessio Helvetica Posterior* can be compared with the Frenchman's *Institutes* for its enduring usefulness, if not for its massive profundity. Yet his work has almost been forgotten.

There was a revival of interest in Bullinger in the first half of the nineteenth century. In England selections from his works were published by the Evangelicals, and the Parker Society found it necessary to include him among the Fathers of the English Reformation. On the continent his *Reformationsgeschichte*, an important source in its own right, was printed for the first time (Frauenfeld 1838-40) and several biographies appeared. The best of these was Carl Pestalozzi's *Heinrich Bullinger, Leben und ausgewahlten Schriften* (Elberfield 1858). This is still the standard work on Bullinger and the basis of much of this essay. It is to be hoped that its speckled gothic-laden pages will soon be replaced! For the quatercentenary of his birth in 1904 his diary was published by E. Egli and also a long biographical essay by von Schultess-Rechberg. Since then a trickle of dissertations and articles has appeared, which in the past few years has become a stream. Professor Fritz Blanke of Zürich wrote the first of the modern books, *Der Junge Bullinger*, 1942, and has guided subsequent scholars. There is no hope of a comprehensive modern work until Bullinger's own writings have been fully catalogued and at least a

selection printed in the *Corpus Reformatorum*. As a first step towards this the Zwingliverein hopes to publish a bibliography of printed and unprinted words prepared by Dr Joachim Staedtke in 1964.

This essay, then, can only indicate the importance of the chief minister of Zürich, a title which he did not himself use, and mention new works where available. These are referred to by their authors and listed in the bibliography of current literature below.

1. Youth

Henry Bullinger was born at Bremgarten, a village to the west of Zürich on 18th July, 1504. He was the fifth and last son of the Dean through an illicit but accepted relationship with Anna, daughter of Councillor Wiedekehr, the Miller. He was educated locally until at the age of sixteen he joined his brother John at Emmerlich, the last German town on the Rhine. Life there was hard, because the Dean wished his children to learn the value of food and clothing. Henry received two suits and thirty-six guilders in three years, enough for lodging and tuition. He had literally 'to sing for his supper'. Professor Blanke can find no evidence for Pestalozzi's statement that he was influenced by the Brethren of the Common Life in Emmerlich, but he was attracted to the cloister by Jerome's letters and the poems of Baptista of Mantua.

In 1519 he moved to the University of Cologne where Aquinas had studied and Scotus taught, and which was then the leading school of the old scholarship and a centre where Carthusian life could be seen at its best. From the lectures on the classics and the Epistle to the Romans Bullinger proceeded to read widely, including Lombard's *Sentences* and Gratian's *Canon Law*. The Dominican bonfire kindled an interest in Luther and he found the reformer's writings more in tune with the Fathers than were the Scholastics. So finally he came to the New Testament itself. When Melancthon's *Loci Communes* appeared in 1521 they formulated Bullinger's own intellectual, protestant conviction.

In April, 1522, still not eighteen, he took his M.A. and returned home from his six-year training. He continued to read Luther. The next year he became schoolmaster at the Abbey of Kappel, now excused from the once desired orders which he had come to consider unbiblical. Only on Sundays did he attend the services, and then prayed privately. His extra lectures on the New Testament greatly influenced the small company of monks and scholars. Blanke comments on page 64: 'The Expository School which Zwingli founded in Zürich in 1525 was not the first on Swiss lands. Already two years previously had Henry Bullinger called his Prophesying to life in the peace of Kappel.'

This preaching led to the clearing of the church and the replacement of the Mass by the Lord's Supper, a little later than but quite independent of the city. The school became a seminary for pastors. A new form of daily service emerged consisting of Bible-reading with exposition and Psalm-singing, the pattern enshrined in Anglican Matins. Bullinger began to lecture in German and Kappel became first the spearhead for the

reformation of inner Switzerland and then the battlefield where Zwingli fell in 1531.

Two years before that blow Bullinger had returned to Bremgarten to assist his father, who with the majority of his parishioners had embraced the new teaching. The Kappel pattern was repeated and it seemed that the new movement would triumph throughout Switzerland until Zwingli proposed to further this by war. On 10th August, 1531, he had a secret, fruitless consultation with Bernese envoys at Bullinger's house. The conservative five Forest Cantons defeated Zürich in battle, and Bremgarten was part of the spoil. The reformed ministers were expelled and on 24th November came to Zürich with their families.

Bullinger was not unknown in this the largest Swiss city. From 1525 he had listened to Zwingli, Leo Jud and Konrad Pellikan and had come to know them personally. He took the minutes of Zwingli's disputation with the anabaptists in 1525 and was present at the colloquy in Bern which established the reformation there. Zwingli considered Bullinger's summary of the case against the anabaptists conclusive. His writings against these sectaries have recently been examined by a Mennonite historian, Heinhold Fast. In April 1528 he had taken the oath of a preacher in the Zürich Synod, and the next year was invited to accompany Zwingli to Marburg. He had already published several books, and his early thought has been thoroughly examined by Joachim Staedtke.

Before turning to his long ministry it is convenient to glance at his personal life. He had never been a monk like Luther, nor even a priest like Zwingli. This allowed a free mental development, but he still needed the encouragement of the Abbot of Kappel to marry. His bride was Anna Adlischwiler who had been sent to a convent as an orphan. The marriage lasted thirty-seven years. His home life was rich and full. He used to act as St Nicolas for his children and make rhymes. His household embraced not only his eleven children and his parents, but also students. He cared for Zwingli's family too. Plague, always active in the city, deprived him of his wife and three children in 1564, as it had taken a son and his friend Leo Jud in 1542. His own health — and handwriting — were marred by working late in artificial light, and in later years he needed visits to local health resorts to sustain him. Yet he remained at his post till his fatal illness in his seventy-first year.

2. *The Crisis of the Zurich Reformation*

In 1531 it was not certain that Protestantism would continue in Switzerland, for it was a movement of the cities and the villages had been victorious in battle. With Zwingli had fallen a hundred citizens, ten per cent, twenty-six members of the two Councils and twenty-five ministers. Pestalozzi wrote of Bullinger's arrival (p. 68): 'It was no more the same Zürich which he had so often previously visited, no more the same that Zwingli had left on the morning of October 11th. Everything was changed.' The motives of an oligarchy are less obvious than those of princes, but it is clear that some supporters of Zwingli were having second

thoughts about protestantism while many more were determined that the church should never again direct the state. What this middle group wanted for the pulpit of the Grossmunster was a 'safe' man. Of the two obvious successors to Zwingli, Oecelompaedius died of grief and Leo Jud was unwilling to leave St Peter's. But the refugee Bullinger was also a minister of the Zürich Synod and refused invitations from Basel, Bern and Appenzell in case he should be needed. His sermon in the Grossmunster on 23rd November, arranged by Leo Jud, made a powerful impression on the citizens. Oswald Myconius noted: 'It seemed to many that Zwingli was not dead, but like the phoenix, risen again.' According to Ludwig Lavater, Bullinger's son-in-law and biographer, Zwingli had designated the young man his heir, and on 9th December, the two councils elected him People's Priest.

This was not an unqualified protestant victory, however, for the new minister was referred to the article in the constitution which confined spiritual duties to preaching God's word and truth, and stated that ministers should not interfere in temporal matters. Bullinger asked for time to consider this basic problem of an established church and consulted his brethren. On 13th December he accepted this reservation, since God's Word dealt in the New Testament with moral issues and in the Old with political. His plea for the freedom of the pulpit moved the councils. It showed that the twenty-seven-year-old divine was not only a learned teacher but also had a grasp of the role of the church in the world, and of the technique of keeping the balance between the two. So had Zwingli acted in his early years in Zürich.

Bullinger was elected, but the struggle was not yet over, for he had to forge the *via media*. He tried to justify the protestant defeat to Zwingli's old adversary, Faber, now Archbishop of Vienna, by comparing this with Israel's wars. He anticipated Calvin in his economic thought and argued that church property was intended for the parish, not to clothe wood and stone. The catholic party was confident, however. A councillor, Peter Füssli, took Easter Mass at the popular shrine at Einsedeln, and it was also celebrated in a city cellar. The Confederation expected Zürich to return to Rome. The leading ministers saw that a further step was necessary. Leo Jud was radical. He wished for a watch committee, as was later set up in Geneva, and advocated the complete separation of church and state, but with excommunication automatically depriving the offender of citizenship. Bullinger agreed with this in principle, but was more moderate in practice. Since the state was composed of Christians, he argued, godly magistrates would be chosen. He was afraid that by separation the church might become a sect. In May 1532 the Great Council issued a mandate which fitted his views. It confirmed the law of 1530 that all should hear one sermon on Sundays. The mass was forbidden for the peace of the state, but communion was never made a test of loyalty to the state in Zürich. Exile was the penalty for public disorder. This displeased Jud, who but for the loyalty of his colleagues might have been expelled for criticising the compromise in a sermon. It also angered the Confederate

Assembly at Einsedeln which in March 1533 accused Zürich of destroying the true catholic faith and weakening the Confederation. The Zürich councils feared a fresh war, but the ministers, who controlled public opinion, assured them of their support as the May Synod. A fresh crisis threatened at Bern where the mayor reverted to catholicism, and Bullinger wrote to Hyconius that the end of the world must be near. Protestantism survived there, however, albeit with Lutheran tendencies, and the confederation has continued, though religion partly accounts for its looseness. The religious boundaries were not adjusted again after 1531 because the Zürich protestants under Bullinger were steady and moderate.

3. The Zürich Church

By 1533 Bullinger was the virtual head of the Zürich Church, but this was still reformed only in theory. He was accepted as a patriot and a pacifist, but he was above all a pastor who worked prodigiously to build up the church by writing, teaching, organizing and opposing schism. His work was centred on Christ, as is seen in the motto which is found on the title-page of many of his works which Christopher Froschover printed:

'This is my beloved son, hear ye Him.'

These writings were at times diffuse, but from their form were intended to edify, or to defend the truth. Most of his works for instruction were in sermon form like *The Hundred Sermons on the Apocalypse* or the *Homilies on Daniel.* As at Kappel and Bremgarten he had expounded most of the New Testament, in the Grossmunster he dealt with most of the Bible. Even his systematic theological work, *The Decades,* is in sermon form. Other works answered Catholics and Lutherans. He was a close friend of Bibliander who filled Zwingli's other office as professor, and who was one of the most liberal men of his age, translator of the Koran and advocate of missions to Islam. In 1532 Bullinger persuaded the city to increase to six the scholarships on the Grossmunster charity, though this had been earmarked for the war indemnity, and in 1538 he obtained a house for students. He encouraged scholars to study abroad and commended them to patrons where possible. It is to his credit that there were usually Zürich students at Wittenburg.

It was not enough to educate new ministers, however for some form of 'episcope' was needed over those already in office. This was found in Zwingli's Synod, first called in 1527 and continued twice yearly. It consisted of all the ministers, the mayor and eight councillors. In 1532 Bullinger and Jud introduced an examination for candidates and decided to retain the laying-on of hands at ordination. In the early years there were cases of drunkenness, unruly homes and immorality. Two wives were imprisoned for a couple of days, John Bullinger was rebuked for violence and in 1535 Henry himself was criticised for being too mild in his preaching. By the middle of the century the Synod had reformed ministerial manners, had made the manse an example of family life and was concerned with public behaviour. Drunkenness was opposed and now cost a minister his office. It was only decided after a long debate that

respectable dancing should be allowed. Sunday became a special day with two services, the morning containing the Lord's Prayer, Creed and Decalogue and the afternoon free prayer, an address and catechisms for the young. Both Bullinger and Jud had prepared these before the famous Heidelburg Catechism was published in 1563. The press had been free since 1523 but with a censorship of licentious or dangerous works which once in error banned the Latin edition of the Anglican Forty-two Articles! This whole effort was to help men to faith and good living. One of Bullinger's most popular books was the *Christian State of Matrimony*, which had four German and ten English editions. This system was much less rigorous than Calvin's at Geneva.

The whole question of church and state was much less critical in Zürich. The tension there was not over public morality, but over church property officially secularized in 1523, but which some thought should be reserved for the ministry and the needy. This question came to a head in 1555 when a preacher caller Hüskin attacked appropriation, citing Old Testament examples. Bullinger protected him from expulsion and the councils argued that they had provided a hospital, new churches, manses and schools despite the large war indemnity. Thus the freedom of the pulpit was again vindicated, but so too was the alienation of church property. The state was to act as an arm of the church in providing for public need and disciplining the unruly, a basic tenet of the theology of the Volkskirche.

An important question not asked often enough is how a reformer achieved his ends. In a bourgeois oligarchy it was not simply a matter of winning over a prince as Luther did, but of working with a group of men with varied interests. Bullinger's influence was personal. He was friendly with leading citizens like Diethelm Reist, mayor from 1524-44, whose family had held that office with short breaks since 1469, and with Rudolf Lavater who was mayor from 1545-57. His influence was also moral. Not only was he a fine preacher — it was reported that not ten people left the church before the end of his sermon — but he was also a devoted and open-homed pastor who was not afraid to visit houses stricken with plague. Finally his position was strengthened by his patriotism and firm advocacy of neutrality, even when a war might have seemed likely to further the protestant cause.

Bullinger's influence in the state was the greater because he was a consistent opponent of the anabaptists as well as of the Romans. Helmut Kressner, in *Schweizer Ursprünge des Anglikanischen Staatskirchentums* (1953), traces the progress of Zwinglian thought, via Rudolph Gwalther, assistant and successor to Bullinger, through Bern to England, especially Whitgift and Hooker. The identity of Christian Church and Christian Commonwealth was fundamental to Bullinger's opposition to the sectaries. Fast describes his unflinching criticism even of those who were orthodox except in respect of the state, in contrast to Jud's leanings towards Schwenkfeld of Zofingen. Bullinger claimed, in *On the Origin of the Anabaptists* (1560), that the sect did not begin in Zürich, but in Lutheran Germany. This attempt to destroy the sects throughout the protestant Cantons was always

by argument, never force. It is to Bullinger's lasting credit that not one person was executed for heresy during his ministry in Zürich.

4. The Protestant Church

The only works of Bullinger at present in print in English are his sermon 'On the Holy Catholic Church' and a summary of the Second Helvetic Confession. This is a pity, but at least these properly indicate the important place of the church in his thought. He saw not only the value of the state church but also the unity of the invisible body of Christ and the need to give this form. However, there proved to be a gulf between Wittenburg and Zürich which even the at times unscrupulous but always ecumenical Bucer of Strassburg could not bridge. It is commonly stated that Calvin and Beza modified Zwinglian theology, but Bullinger had already done this and the differences between Geneva and Zürich were only of expression. André Bouvier in his massive and rather discursive work on Bullinger's relations with the French pointed out that in the Calvin Correspondence Bullinger is third only to Farel and Viret, and that Calvin five times visited Zürich. Their disagreements were over how strict a discipline was to be used against heretics and the absolute nature of predestination. In both Bullinger was more moderate. Rather than a pale reflection, Zürich was a pattern for Geneva. During Bullinger's lifetime he was the model for the reformed churches outside French spheres of influence, and only the violence of the counter-reformation, with the fall of middle and East European protestantism, led to Geneva's ascendancy.

There were two periods of ecumenical discussion. The first under Bucer with the Lutherans which showed the finality of the Marburg differences; the second between Calvin and Bullinger. The Swiss position was stated in the creed which Zwingli sent to Augsburg, which was not considered and in that which Oecolompaedius wrote for Basel, accepted there in 1534. Zürich had as yet no statement, however, and felt a common reformed symbol would be useful to present to the Lutherans. In 1536 a conference at Basel adopted the 'Second Basel' or 'First Helvetic Confession', which was in the main Bullinger's work. This was adopted by the Churches of Basel, Biel, Bern, Mülhausen, St Gallen, Schaffhausen and Zürich. It has twenty-seven sections and concentrates on matters peripheral to the historic creeds, in particular scripture, man, faith and sacraments, which are taken as 'signs and verities together'. Bucer had just made the 'Wittenburg Concordia' with Luther and this creed under his careful guidance proved acceptable to the Germans. Bullinger corresponded with Luther and Melancthon. Melancthon was more gracious but also more suspect, as he had half an eye on Rome. For a time agreement seemed near, but this creed was only printed in the English translation of George Wishart in the sixteenth century and in 1539 Luther renewed his attacks on Zwingli, comparing him with Nestorius, the anabaptists and finally the Turks. He sent Froschover scant thanks for his gift of the Zürich Latin Bible in 1543, stating that he wanted no more books of the

sacramentarians. Bullinger pointed out to Bucer the impossibility of agreement, and as in 1536 he had published Zwingli's *Short Exposition of the Christian Faith* so now in 1546 he issued his complete works as the best reply to Luther. This division is still not resolved, despite the Uniate Churches which have appeared since 1945.

In the year of the 'Second Basle Confession', Calvin left that city and was constrained to settle in Geneva. In 1541, when the breach between Zürich and Wittenburg was complete, he returned there at the invitation of the Christians in Geneva. Although he had been influenced by Bucer and corresponded with the Germans, he was reformed in theology and practice, and has been so influential not because he was more moderate than Zwingli and his successors but because he took thought and action to their logical extreme. He and Farel were welcome guests at the Zürich Synod of April 1538, which ratified the new symbol, while Bucer and Capito were unpopular. Thereafter relations between Calvin and Bullinger were cordial, frank and moderate — virtues which contrast with Bucer's methods and Luther's character. Their agreement was made formal when Calvin sent Bullinger twenty-four propositions on predestination and the sacraments in 1548. Bullinger annotated these and replied: 'You say that you differ from us so little and you are practically no different from us in meaning . . . But I cannot in fact see where you do differ from us . . .' The reformed churches of Lower Germany had fallen, Upper Germany was shamed by the Interim of Augsberg and only the Swiss cities stood firm. Calvin and Farel again went to Zürich and the important 'Consensus Tigurinus' was signed in 1549. This was at once accepted by Schaffhausen, St Gallen and Lausanne where Beza cried: 'This agreement will last for ever'. Basel and Bern, suspicious of too many creeds, followed later. Hooper welcomed it in England and Melancthon stated that it had given him his first real insight into the reformed view of sacraments.

This was not yet the end of the process of reconciliation, however, for Beza did not yet share the conviction of Bullinger and Gregory Nazianus that Synods hoped for more than they achieved. Despite the harsh treatment of the reformed refugees from London by the Lutherans, Beza joined in another round of talks beginning with the Colloquy of Worms in 1557. These failed as the German leaders under Brentius were even more closely tied to the interests of their princes. Meanwhile Bullinger kept on good terms with Melancthon and invited him to Zürich.

The remaining small reformed area of Germany kept on good terms with Zürich. Within four years the two definitive symbols of the reformed churches were produced. In 1563 two court theologians published the ubiquitous Heidelburg Catechism. The previous year Bullinger had written a fuller and clearer confession than that of 1536 for his own benefit, which Peter Martyr endorsed just before his death. Frederick III, the Elector Palatinate, also accepted it and had it translated into German. Its history is not clear, but in 1566 Beza came to Zürich and subscribed to it. This 'Second Helvetic Confession' was published widely and accepted by all reformed churches except Basel which held aloof until 1646. Its clauses

follow the same pattern as the former, though with more reference to the basic dogma. It is still weak on the Holy Spirit. It defines sacraments as: 'secret true signs, or holy uses, or consecrated acts which are established by God himself.' In its usefulness this can be compared with Calvin's *Institutes*, and if for nothing else, Bullinger should be remembered and honoured for his role in clarifying reformed doctrine.

The later years of his life saw the divisions between reformed and Lutheran finally and incisively drawn. Truth and unity had proved incompatible. Bullinger had always conducted himself with grace and courtesy, keeping to what he had written in 1532: 'I will burden no man with my writings as canonical books nor force the decisions of gentle and learned men. If another have a better point of view, I shall never deny him' (Pestalozzi, p. 168).

5. Influence Abroad

The international breadth of Bullinger's correspondence and the references to contemporary history in his 'Diary' show how widespread his concern was for the good of the church, but his effect on any one country has not yet been worked out. The fullest account is Bouvier's on his correspondence with France. Thus it is only possible to illustrate his activities. In the East he sent a book to the King of Poland in 1548 and from 1556 to 1560 corresponded with John a Lasco who had returned to his own country in a vain attempt to bring order to the reformation there. In the North-West his theology took deep roots, particularly in Holland, where translations of his works continued long into the seventeenth century. The *Decades* were commended to the pious, read in church, and exported to the East Indies and the Americas. In the South, Locarno began to play the same role in the infiltration of Italy that Geneva played with France. The movement was never very strong there, however. The only outstanding Italian theologian was Peter Martyr. There were also heretics, like the Socinii. Bullinger corresponded with Venice and protected refugees after the first martyrs had suffered in 1544. Locarno remained his chief care and hope, and nearly caused another religious war. In 1550 the Catholic Cantons decided that Locarno must return to their fold and they implemented this policy in the winter of 1554-55. Over a hundred people made a terrible journey over the Alps to Zürich where they were warmly received. They have since played an important part in the city's life. There is a full account of this for the quatercentenary in *Zwingliana* Vol. X, No. 3. It required all Bullinger's moderation not to kindle the war party, but he realized that the gospel could not be furthered by the sword. Italy was lost to Curia and the Council of Trent, which Bullinger did not acknowledge, as it was not free and willing to seek a common way.

(The movement was never strong in the Austrian Empire but the 'Second Helvetic Confession' is still prescribed in the churches there and early translations of Bullinger's works are still to be found in the libraries at Cracow and Budapest.)

More is known of his relations with England, Germany and France. The

king of France was helpful to the new forces outside his boundaries but the French scholars were also sympathetic. Bouvier divided the part of his thesis which dealt with these into correspondence with ambassadors and with humanists. Of the envoys, de Bellay, brother of the Archbishop of Paris worked for understanding among the protestants, while his successor, Morelet, was even more sympathetic. The third, de l'Aubespine, only sought to renew the system of mercenaries. During his mission the five students of Lyons were martyred in 1557, despite protestant pleas, and feelings towards France hardened. Du Fraisse attempted to bribe Bullinger, but like his successor had to listen to his plea for toleration. The Swiss became a close friend of Coignet who arrived in 1557 and had his son in his home, but subsequent ambassadors had no sympathy with protestantism. Bullinger also wrote to de Cousin and other scholars in France, sent Peter Martyr to the Colloquy of Poissy and encouraged Coligny. He cautioned the French against making their Church government too democratic and the danger of the word 'substance'. He received exiles, including in 1574 Henry Bourbon, the young Prince of Condé, whom he advised against renewing the war. Bouvier was incorrect, however, in stating that the Synod of Rochelle accepted the 'Second Helvetic Confession'. He admired the French Church, honoured its martyrs, but was disappointed at the violence of the persecutions in the light of France's sympathy for protestants —and Turks of course—abroad. The distribution of translations of his works cannot be surveyed since these were published in the free protestant cities, but there are still copies in Paris.

Relations with Germany depended on the sacramental quarrel, the value of neutrality to the confederation and the experience that war achieved nothing. The reformed cities of the south fell in 1548, and though Constance, where Bullinger's friends the Blaarers lived, held out for a long time, Zürich could not have helped very much, as the catholic cantons would have joined the other side. Zürich welcomed the refugees, as it was so often to do. These losses were due to the divisions of the protestant princes, and a minister can scarcely be criticized for pacifism. His main effect was in theology. His writings were welcomed in Cologne and by Brentius. He corresponded with Philip of Hesse, but would not countenance his bigamy. In 1553 he advised the Pfalz Church not to use the strict Geneva excommunication, and in 1563 the authors of the Heidelburg Catechism acknowledged his influence. Although it was considered too dangerous for Bullinger to leave his home, his pupils and sons travelled widely to study. In 1553 his eldest son, also Henry, was in Strassburg and in Vienna under his mother's name. Throughout his ministry there were Zürich students in Wittenburg.

He was possibly more influential in England than anywhere, despite the lack of a thorough reformation there. More of his works are in English than any language than his native Latin and German. As early as 1537 English students were with him in Zürich and took Rudolph Gwalther to England. He returned with a long letter from Cranmer. (His Diary is in *Zwingliana*, Vol. 8, No. 8.) The following year Bullinger's work *De Scrip-*

turae Sanctae Authoritate was dedicated to and warmly received by Henry VIII, but Coverdale's translations, which began in 1541, were systematically proscribed. Under Edward VI, Bullinger had friends in the hierarchy, especially in Hooper, who had studied in Zürich (their relationship has been described by Dr W. S. M. West in an unpublished thesis), in the chaplains to the protestant nobility, particularly in the household of the Duke of Suffolk, and in Swiss students like the obsequious John ab Ulmis. Under Mary the more moderate churchmen visited Zürich and continued to correspond and receive his books on their return. His views on vestments were published by the bishops in 1566, without his consent, and he was invited to write the definitive reply to the Papal Bull of 1571. After his death his 'decades' were used as a text book for clergy, and his 'Catechism' was required reading at Oxford. So far as the sixteenth century is concerned, the name of 'Bullinger' should often be substituted for that of 'Calvin' when reformed influence is described, but by the reign of James I the Genevan's role was pre-eminent and only one further edition of Bullinger appeared, and that, *Look from Adam*, anonymous.

6. Theology

The only full study of Bullinger's theology so far was published in 1888, in Dutch (A. J. Van 't Hooft: *De Theologie van Heinrich Bullinger in betrekkung tot de Nederlandische Reformatie*). There are three recent monographs in German which help towards an appreciation of his thought, but until an edition of his works is available it will be difficult to get a full picture. Of the three, the newest, Joachim Staedtke's thorough study of his theology to 1528 is a companion to Blanke's biography. The most important single work so far is Walter Hollweg's study of the *Decades* in which he traces the history and spread in thirty-four editions of seven languages in seventy-five years, examines the content and translates four sermons into modern German. These, with Staedtke's translation of *The Highest Good* and the *Second Helvetic Confession* are the only works available in German. The doctrine of predestination has been studied by Peter Walser during which he covers the doctrine of God, His reign and redemption.

Because of the limited material, and also because Bullinger was orthodox even to the Pauline authorship of 'Hebrews', it is only practicable to indicate some of his particular emphasis. Like Zwingli, he tended towards universalism. The controversy over predestination in 1560 is dealt with in *Zwingliana* Vol. 9, No. 9. With his failure to accept the double decree went his belief in the salvation of the philosophers and patriarchs before Christ. Thus he argued that the 'Old Faith' was given to Adam because he trusted in the woman's seed. He portrayed Christ as the 'summum bonum' of the Greeks —a common image in reformed hymns. His part in the development of the concept of covenant as it moved from an Old Testament hermeneutic principle to a basis of political thought has yet to be assessed. Finally, he was a firm believer in the holy catholic church, the universal and during schism invisible Body of Christ. Staedtke closes his article on 'Bullinger's meaning for the Protestant World' in *Zwingliana*, Vol. 11, No. 6, with the

words: 'Henry Bullinger had been able to labour for over half a century in different places, day by day, for the building up of the Church of Jesus Christ, not only in Zürich, but in many other states and countries until greatly honoured and beloved, after a painful and hard illness, on the 17th of September 1575 he thankfully gave back his life to his Creator.'

BIBLIOGRAPHY of works in print

A. ENGLISH

1. One sermon from the *Decades*, Book 5, No. 7, 'On the Holy Catholic Church', is available in *The Library of Christian Classics*, Vol. XXIV, and *Zwingli and Bullinger*, ed. G. W. Bromily, Philadelphia and London 1953.
2. An outline of his life and work, with a summary of the 'Second Helvetic Confession', is found in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, New York 1877, etc.
3. Brief notes are found in *Britannica*, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Church*, and *The Mennonite Encyclopaedia* 1953, which has a good account of his relations with the anabaptists. The fullest account is in J. T. McNeill, *The History and Character of Calvinism*, New York 1954.

B. FRENCH

4. André Bouvier, *Henri Bullinger, le successeur de Zwingli, d'après sa correspondence avec les réformés et les humanistes de langue française*, Neuchâtel and Paris 1940.

C. GERMAN

5. *'Zwingliana'*, *Beatrage zur Geschichte Zwinglis, der Reformation, und des Protestantismus in der Schweiz* (1897, Zwingliverein).
6. Hildebrandt und Zimmerman, *Das Zweite Helvetische Bekenntnis*, Zürich, Zwingli-Verlag 1938.
7. Fritz Blanke, *Der Junge Bullinger*, Zürich 1942.
8. Bullinger, *'Das Höchste Gut'*, herausgegeben von J. Staedtke, 1955.
9. Walter Hollweg, *Heinrich Bullingers Hausbuch*, Neukirchen 1956.
10. Peter Walser, *Die Prädestination bei Heinrich Bullinger in Zusammenhang mit seiner Gotteslehre*, Zürich 1957.
11. Heinhold Fast, *Heinrich Bullinger und die Täufer*, Pfalz 1959.
12. Joachim Staedtke, *Die Theologie des jungen Bullinger*, Zürich 1962.

PENTECOSTALISM

Its Historical Background and Recent Trends

William Parkes

THE ENTRY of the first entirely Pentecostalist Churches into the World Council,[1] at the New Delhi Assembly, significantly marks the end of the first era of their 'Confessional' existence. The Pentecostalist image must now be sharply revised, and the movement's sharpest critics within the major Churches can no longer indiscriminately bracket them with the semi-Gnostic, sub-Christian, or plainly anti-Christian cults that plague and challenge the life of the twentieth-century Church.[2] If an initial adventure into the life of the main stream of the World Council be a fair standard of judgement on the sincerity of their desire for catholicity, then they must now rate considerably higher than many Churches whose orthodoxy, if not their narrow level of ecumenical encounter, is above criticism.

I

Leaving aside the phenomena associated with Irving's Catholic Apostolic Church in the last century, the date of the rise of the modern Pentecostalist movement has been variously given from 1900 to 1906.[3] It is now clear, however, that the revival of glossolalia, which 'descended' on the flock gathered at the Asuza Street Holiness Mission in Los Angeles, in 1906, was the real focal point for the future spread of the testimony. Dr John Kent's observation that 'One obvious characteristic of a new sect is the charismatic leader with the will to separate'[4] is hardly true of the rise of Pentecostalism. There was no outstanding leader, no immediate denial of other expressions of Christianity, and no clamour for separation from the main flow of the life of the Church. The chief figure appears to have been a relatively unknown coloured minister, from an equally unknown Wesleyan Association of Holiness Churches, Charles Seymour.[5] A little earlier in Houston, Texas, he had witnessed scenes that were later to be duplicated in his own Church.

Returning to his own people in the Asuza Street mission, he shared his impressions without either stressing or pressing 'the blessing'. Unwilling to accept his account of glossolalia as being true, they judged him to be both mad and dangerous, and withdrew his ministerial standing over them. The President of the association of Churches to which the mission belonged not only accepted the account of what Seymour had witnessed, but also its validity as a genuine and desirable Christian experience. Reinstated into the charge of the mission, Seymour actually claimed the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and spoke in tongues a few weeks later. Neither he, nor the President who had supported him, had any significant place in the subsequent history of the Movement. An examination of the writings of many Pentecostalists

has not even produced the name of the President in question, and we certainly look in vain if we seek among the Asuza Street group, '. . . a man or woman who seems to be driven by the need to set up a personal spiritual empire'.[6]

II

The Movement had its birth and received its early nourishment from the supporters of Holiness Associations and Churches, so widely spread at that time throughout the United States. These groups existed to extend the witness of 'second blessing' holiness, or, as they would have put it, 'The Wesleyan teaching'. Organized Wesleyan perfectionism began with the creation of the National Association for the Promotion of Holiness in 1867. Though of an inter-denominational character, the leadership was largely Methodist, and for a period at least, received the unqualified support of prominent Bishops.[7] By 1879, however, the first notes of doubt concerning the work of these agencies was being strongly expressed within American Methodism. Too often they had become isolated from the larger life of the Church, and their strength together with certain separatists tendencies was causing great concern. It was becoming all too obvious that American Methodism was becoming divided into two major parties, the Holiness people, and the Non-Holiness people, a division that was almost synonymous with rural and urban Church life. Division, though actively opposed by the leaders of the Associations, was a factor almost from the beginning. Bishop R. S. Foster, ever a friend of the Holiness group, said of many of the early Methodist Holiness dissenters: 'They have been driven to separate and class effort from the indifference and coldness of their brethren, and in many instances of the Pastors.'[8]

The measure of separation was unquestionably large. Secessions were spread over at least three decades, and its real proportions could only be seen when the distinctively Wesleyan Holiness denominations were formed, sometimes years after a schism had taken place. Timothy L. Smith gives four factors which eventually decided the future home of the Holiness people, within or without the Methodist Church: '(1) the persistent opposition of ecclesiastical officials to independent Holiness Associations and publishing agencies; (2) the recurrent outbursts of fanaticism among persons who were members of the Associations but not of the Church; (3) the outbreak in the 1890s of strenuous attacks upon the doctrine of sanctification; and (4) the increasing activity of urban Holiness preachers in city missions and social work.'[9] The spiritual descendants of those who remained within the Methodist Church (and in spite of the heavy losses this was probably the majority) are the present supporters of the numerous Holiness Camp Meetings that remain within the Church in a semi-official capacity. From 1880-1900 at least eleven separatist Holiness bodies were organized,[10] leaving behind their loyalist Methodist colleagues '. . . whose passion for holiness was never as strong as their devotion to discipline'.[11] Some of these bodies have continued as independent Holiness missions, but over half have been gathered through the years into the ranks of the Church of the Nazarene.

Many others eventually linked with the Pilgrim Holiness Church.[12] The loss to the Protestant Churches in general, and Methodism in particular, must have been very great. 'The Movement made large inroads on Methodism, drawing off multitudes of members . . . as indeed perfectionist and "pentecostal" groups continue to do.'[13]

III

It was from among this mass of Perfectionist agencies that the distinctive Pentecostalism of tongues, prophecies and healings gathered its motivation and early membership in America. M. E. Redford sets an adequate picture of the link between the purely Wesleyan and the more ecstatic elements of the Holiness Movement. 'It should be kept in mind that the Holiness Movement came to consist of two wings, the right wing composed strictly of those who held the Wesleyan doctrine of entire sanctification, and the left wing composed of those who taught that the believer was not baptized with the Holy Spirit unless he had the evidence of speaking in other tongues.'[14]

It is true that the Pentecostalists still stress the work of 'entire holiness' as a distinct work of the Holy Spirit, but the further work of 'signs following', and more especially speaking in tongues, receives by far the greater attention. A statement of faith, originally ascribed to T. B. Barrett, occurs frequently in slightly different forms in Pentecostalist literature. 'Regarding Salvation we are Lutherans, as to water baptism we are Baptists, in regards to Sanctification we are Methodists; in aggressive evangelism we are Salvation Army, but in regards to the baptism of the Holy Ghost, we are distinctly Pentecostal.'[15]

The prefix 'Pentecostal' was much beloved by the Wesleyan Holiness people, and when the embarrassment of being associated with the tongues movement had reached proportions that they could no longer ignore, it was with great regret that it was eventually dropped. As early as 1907, Britain's Reader Harris, leader of the holiness Pentecostal League, entered the battle against the usurpers,[16] but all was in vain, as his once powerful Wesleyan Holiness group became the League of Prayer. The Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene became the Church of the Nazarene by action of their General Conference in 1919.[17]

It is worth noting that the Wesleyan Holiness Churches, the moderates in the controversy, have without exception stood aloof from the World Council of Churches, whilst the radical 'extremists' have taken their first seats in its Assemblies.

IV

In 1906, Thomas Ball Barratt (1862-1940)[18] a Presiding Elder of the Methodist Church in Norway, visited the United States on a fund-raising tour. The capital was required to erect the new central Methodist Church in Oslo (then Kristiania).[19] This aspect of the trip was far from successful, but whilst in New York he claimed a wonderful experience of the Holy Spirit on October 7th, 1906. He became convinced of a divine call to spread the Pentecostal message throughout Scandinavia.

A Cornishman by birth, his parents had left Britain about 1867 to seek employment in Norway. A great deal of his youth was spent in Britain, and he was educated at Queen's College, Taunton. Barratt was without question the greatest representative of the Movement in its first decades, and when he died Norway gave this adopted son a grave among its greatest and highest. Gee does not overstate his influence. 'It would be difficult to over-estimate T. B. Barratt's services to the Lord in connection with the Pentecostal Revival, especially in Europe, as pioneer, preacher, pastor, author, musician, and honoured leader of tens of thousands . . . his ministry was truly apostolic.'[20] In Sweden as well as Norway, the Filadelfia Pentecostal Churches are numerically second only to the State Lutheranism.[21] From 1914 onwards the growth of the Movement in Scandinavia was only rivalled by the phenomenal increase in South America.

V

The rise of the Movement in Britain was the result of circumstances quite different to those that operated across the Atlantic, and in Scandinavia.

One outworking of the Welsh revival was the creation of many inter-denominational prayer meetings throughout the length and breadth of the country. Alexander A. Boddy, the Evangelical Vicar of All Saints, Sunderland, presided over one of these meetings. Boddy had heard of the work in Oslo under the leadership of Barratt, and himself went to Norway early in 1907 to witness its precise nature for himself. He had worked with Evan Roberts in Wales, yet had seen nothing of the measure of the Oslo work. He returned thrilled, and 'under the blessing' himself. At the Keswick Convention in the same year he testified to the experience, and distributed a pamphlet he had compiled, *Pentecost for England*. It began 'It is said that 20,000 people today are speaking with tongues, or have so spoken . . . yet not more than perhaps half-a-dozen persons are known by the writer to have had the experience in Great Britain'.[22] Thus it was in September 1907, at the invitation of the Vicar, that T. B. Barratt commenced a Pentecostal Mission in the Parish Hall. Before he returned to Norway in October, many far distant places from Sunderland were aware through personal and press reports that something remarkable, be it of God, man, or the devil, was taking place in that town. Only the Christian Press, as Gee says, 'maintained a frigid silence'.

A stone set in the Parish Hall marks the spot where it is generally considered that British Pentecostalism was born. It reads: SEPTEMBER 1907 WHEN THE FIRE OF THE LORD FELL IT BURNT UP THE DEBT. The debt in question was a very large one that had troubled All Saints for many years. Handley C. G. Moule, evangelical, scholar, and Keswick Convention leader, was then Bishop of Durham. Although he must have known of the proceedings in All Saints, he in no way sought to hinder the work. Apathetic as Pentecostalists are towards Episcopacy, they might well believe that God had his right overseer, in the right place, at the right time. Smith Wigglesworth, evangelist, and a mighty figure in early British Pentecostalism, obtained his 'blessing' during Barratt's meetings.

The Pentecostal Missionary Union, the first arm of the Movement, was formed in Sunderland in 1909. Created on the pattern of the China Inland Mission, it sought to strengthen the existing Faith Missions, and establish new work overseas. The test for all recruits was 'The Baptism of the Holy Spirit with the Scriptural Signs'. Cecil Polhill, one of the 'Cambridge Seven',[23] and a fellow worker with C. T. Studd, was on the council of the Mission. No attempt was made to isolate Pentecostalists from their own Church loyalties; indeed, the early pattern was that of seeking to infiltrate the Churches with the Pentecostal testimony, rather than the creation of separate assemblies. Boddy and Polhill remained Anglicans to the end of their lives, as did another clergyman leader, Thomas Hackett of Bray.

But not for long could the revival be retained within the framework of the established Churches. The 'come-outism', that had been such a feature of the American Holiness revival, was a path duplicated by the vast majority of British Pentecostalists. By 1923 a multitude of Pentecostal mission halls existed as a protest against the formality and 'coldness' of the larger Churches. In the following year, at a gathering in Birmingham, many of these scattered independent missions effected a loose denominational union, which has gained by constant accession through the subsequent years. This group, the Assemblies of God, is the largest Pentecostal group in Britain, and its American counter-part holds the same position. The government of the Assemblies is largely congregational in principle. In 1925 the Pentecostal Missionary Union became the Missionary arm of the Assemblies, and thus the last link with the original Pentecostalists who retained their membership in the major Churches was broken. Boddy (d. 1930) and Polhill (d. 1938) had long lost their influence within the Movement, and had severed their connection with what had become yet another Church.

Present Pentecostalist Churches in Britain have diverse backgrounds, differing polity, and a long history of internal schism. The single common factor is the specific Pentecostal testimony, and apart from isolated extremists, a large measure of co-operation is achieved through the British Pentecostal Fellowship. As early as 1921, in Amsterdam, an attempt was made to set up a World Pentecostal Confessional agency. It was only in 1947, however, that such a World Assembly was created. In all these attempts for a greater degree of World Pentecostal fellowship, British leaders have taken a prominent part. This is especially true of Donald Gee (Assemblies of God), the Principal of Kenley Bible College and historian of the Movement to date.

In order of organization, the Elim Foursquare Pentecostal Alliance (1915) has the priority. Originally it was the Elim Evangelistic Band under the leadership of George Jeffreys. In 1918, in Belfast, it became incorporated as a distinct group. Somewhat on the right wing of the Movement, the present Elim Church has a polity closely akin to Methodist connexionalism. The Apostolic Church (1916) was the child of Dan P. Williams, of Penygroes. It is largely a Welsh expression of the Movement, and in former days of a far more exclusive nature than is true today. The Assemblies of God (1924), already briefly mentioned, often use different local titles. The Full Gospel

Testimony Church is the result of the labours of Evangelist Fred Squire during the 1930s. It is strongest in the Midlands. The Bible Pattern Church (1940) arose through dissension in the ranks of the Elim Alliance. George Jeffreys led this group until his death. The Pentecostal Holiness Church is a recent American 'export' to this country. As its name suggests, it strongly stresses entire sanctification, and is thus a 'second' and 'third' blessing Church.

IV

Beginning on an ecumenical note, we shall conclude in the same manner, but from a rather different approach.

In October 1962[24] it was reported that twenty or more ministers, and several hundred laymen of the American Lutheran Church, had received experiences of 'speaking in tongues', after a meeting with Episcopalians. One such minister is quoted as saying: 'It is quite evident that Pentecost is not a denomination, it is an experience'. The American Lutherans set up a Commission to look into the reported phenomena, which has so far reported that 'Tongues is one of the Lesser Gifts', a statement that is hardly over-critical. Further reports[25] suggest that the Pentecostal influence is becoming increasingly widespread. Especially is this true of the Episcopalian and Lutheran bodies. It is of interest to ponder the thought that the large majority of these Anglicans are Anglo-Catholic in churchmanship, and that the American Lutheran Church is hardly the most evangelical of the American Lutheran bodies. Since the middle of 1963 severe criticism of this 'Pentecostalism without secession' has been expressed, and, for the time being at least, the movement appears to have abated somewhat. Apart from the Episcopalians and American Lutherans, all the major Churches have been affected in localized areas. If there is an exception it is the Methodist Church. Are they still too near the disruptions that so disturbed them in the early years of this century?

In Britain, the Evangelical Alliance has called for conversations between leaders in the Pentecostal Churches and Clergy and Ministers who believe that they too have been the recipients of 'the gifts of the Spirit'.[26]

It would certainly appear that Pentecostalism is here to stay, whether it be of the Confessional form or as a distinctive expression within Protestant and Reformed Christendom. One thing is certain, we cannot ignore the largest Protestant Church in the sub-continent of South America, and the body of Christians that has shown the highest rate of growth in the world in recent years—the Pentecostalists.

[1] The Methodist Pentecostal, and Evangelical Pentecostal Churches of Chile, with estimated communities of 250,000. Cf. I. L. Holt and E. T. Clark, *The World Methodist Movement*, Nashville, 1956, p. 141, also Donald Gee, *The Pentecostal Movement*, London, 1949, p. 56ff., and New Delhi Assembly Reports.

[2] Some have sought to rehabilitate the Pentecostal 'image' for some time, e.g. Leslie Newbiggin in his *Household of God*, nearly a decade ago.

[3] Cf. Gee, *op. cit.*, p. 11ff.

[4] *London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, April 1963, p. 117, article 'Christian Sects in the Modern World'.

[5] E. T. Clark, *The Small Sects in America*, New York and Nashville, 1949, p. 101, gives a different picture of Seymour ('. . . a somewhat erratic negro') and states that the Asuza Street

Mission was in fact a Methodist Church. I have followed Gee in the view that it was an independent Holiness mission.

[8] Kent's article, p. 117.

[7] John L. Peters, *Christian Perfection and American Methodism*. New York and Nashville, 1956, pp. 134ff.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 139.

[9] Timothy L. Smith, *Called Unto Holiness—The Story of the Nazarenes*. Kansas City, 1962. *op. cit.*, p. 27.

[10] Cf. Peters, *op. cit.*, p. 148ff.

[11] Cf. Smith, p. 30.

[12] Frank S. Mead, *Handbook of Denominations in the United States*, New York and Nashville, 1956, p. 186. Cf. Clark, p. 76.

[13] Cf. Clark, p. 73.

[14] M. E. Redford, *The Rise of the Church of the Nazarene*, Kansas City, 1961, Foreword.

[15] Article by D. Clarke, in *Redemption Tidings*, the Assemblies of God weekly, May 19th, 1961, for form presented here. E. Molland, in the article on Pentecostalism in his *Christendom*, London, 1961, p. 303, attributes it to an unnamed Norwegian Pentecostalist (Barratt ?). He adds, '... to make the description complete it should be added that the government is Congregationalist'. This is not strictly correct, e.g. The Elim Alliance.

[16] See articles growing in their degree of opposition against the new movement, in *Tongues of Fire*, 1907, The Pentecostal League monthly (bound copies in possession of E. H. Bates, Esq., Sheffield).

[17] Cf. Redford, p. 44.

[18] There is no adequate biography of Barratt in English. Gee's summary is good.

[19] W. C. Barclay, *History of Methodist Missions*, iii, New York, 1961, p. 955n.

[20] Cf. Gee, *op. cit.*, p. 189. Also article by Gee in *Redemption Tidings*, July 20th, 1962. Also, K. S. Latourette, *Christianity in a Revolutionary Age*, iv, London, 1962. '... Pentecostals ... owed their inception to T. B. Barrett [sic], of English birth, a product of the Welsh Revival.' This last statement might well be true, but the writer has found no evidence that it was so.

[21] Cf. Latourette, p. 323.

[22] Quoted in Gee, p. 20ff. Much of what follows the writer owes to Gee.

[23] Cf. J. C. Pollock, *The Cambridge Seven*, London, 1955.

[24] See *The Herald*, of Louisville, an evangelical Methodist weekly, October 17th, 1962, quoting *The Lutheran Standard*.

[25] See *The Life of Faith*, November 1st 1962.

[26] *Life of Faith*, March 28th, 1963.

SHORTER SURVEY

John T. Wilkinson

THE EXCELLENT enterprise of the publication of a translation of John Calvin's Commentaries on the New Testament under the editorship of Drs D. W. and T. F. Torrance (Oliver & Boyd, 30*s.* each) is a valuable service to the present time, for in these writings there is a rich deposit of exegetical material for the preacher and teacher. Two new volumes are now available: *The Acts of the Apostles 1-13*, translated by J. W. Fraser and W. J. G. McDonald; *The Epistles of Paul to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians*, translated by T. H. L. Parker. For any serious reader of the Scriptures these Commentaries contain a deep well of insight and devotion.

The Torch Bible Commentaries, combining sound scholarship and brief exposition, have been found deservedly useful. The S.C.M. Press has now issued a selection of these Commentaries as 'Torch Bible Paperbacks', and the following are to hand: *Jeremiah*, by H. Cunliffe-Jones (13*s.* 6*d.*); *Amos and Micah*, by John Marsh (7*s.* 6*d.*); *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, by Bishop Glyn Simon (8*s.* 6*d.*). Later volumes will be warmly welcomed.

In the series of 'Epworth Preacher's Commentaries' another volume is to hand: *The Gospel according to St John* (16*s.*), by Owen E. Evans, of Hartley Victoria College, Manchester. Written concisely, the method adopted has been to divide the Gospel into its natural sections, and then to provide exposition of the text, and in addition (printed in smaller type) there are suggestions as to how the material can be used by the preacher. It is an excellent piece of work, and as one would expect from this author, it bears the stamp of accurate scholarship.

From the Cambridge University Press comes an addition to the 'Cambridge Bible Commentary' on the text of the *New English Bible*. The *Gospel according to Mark* (15*s.* Paper ed. 8*s.* 6*d.*; Schools ed. 9*s.* 6*d.*) is from the pen of C. F. D. Moule, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in Cambridge. Though primarily intended for students and laymen it will be welcomed by scholars. The introductory pages explain the chief features of the Gospel, and, following the pattern laid down for the whole series, sections of the text are followed by detailed comment together with lucid discussion of the theological questions raised by the Gospel itself.

During the four years since its publication in 1961 some six million copies of the *New English Bible* have been sold. Although originally and primarily designed for private reading it has come to be widely used in public worship and in schools. The general reception, on balance, was definitely favourable. Naturally with the passing of time scholars have been able to give a more detailed scrutiny to this new translation, and in *The*

New English Bible Reviewed, ed. D. Nineham (Epworth Press, 21s.), a selection of reviews has been gathered together, representative of scholarly, aesthetic and doctrinal viewpoints. Those written by New Testament specialists are generally speaking favourable; those written by literary critics perhaps less so. A considerable number of these reviews have been deliberately chosen from American and Canadian sources. One thing is emphasized, namely that the translators did not translate any of the existing printed Greek texts, but produced an 'eclectic' text through discussion of each textually difficult passage. It may be noted that these textual results have been incorporated into a complete Greek text of the New Testament by Dr R. V. G. Tasker, one of the translators—*The Greek New Testament* (O.U.P. and C.U.P.).

History and Chronology in the New Testament forms No. 6 in the series of 'Theological Collections' published by the S.P.C.K. (17*s.* 6*d.*) and is the work of eminent scholars in the New Testament field. It contains essays on 'The present position concerning the Jesus of History', by D. E. Nineham; on 'Recent Questions in the historical study of the Gospels', by Allan Barr; on 'The Gospels as evidence for First-century Judaism', by A. R. C. Leaney; on 'The Historicity of the Birth Narratives', by C. S. Mann; on 'The Chronological Framework of the Ministry', by H. E. W. Turner; on 'The Chronology of the Last Supper', by G. Ogg; on 'The Trial of Jesus', by A. N. Sherwin-White; on 'The Empty Tomb and the Resurrection', by W. Lille; on 'What was the Ascension?', by Archbishop Ramsey; on 'Church History in the Acts: Is it reliable?', by Bishop R. R. Williams. As New Testament scholarship is now emerging from the period of Form-criticism—which for many brought a measure of historical scepticism—the older question of historicity and chronology in the gospels arises afresh, and these essays form an important contribution to the debate.

In *Son of Man Son of God* (S.P.C.K., 7*s.* 6*d.*) Dr E. G. Jay, of McGill University is concerned with the doctrine of Christ's Person. In small compass and with great clarity in writing he gives first an account of the biblical material—strongly dissenting from the position held by 'Bultmann and his school'—and then traces the discussion about Christ's Person which eventually crystallized into the Chalcedonian Definition of A.D. 451. In the last portion of the book he deals with modern criticism of this Definition and presents four recent Christologies—D. M. Baillie, The Bishop of Woolwich, Dr W. R. Matthews and Canon Hugh Montefiore. The book covers a wide field in a short space and could well form the groundwork for a seriously intent study group.

Edited by M. E. Marty and Dean G. Peerman, *New Theology No. 2* (Macmillan Co. N.Y.) is a collection of articles and essays selected from various recent journals with the purpose of representing the variety and richness of recent theological thought. These eighteen articles, which form a very useful collection, are classified into five sections: The Problem of God, Nature and Law, The Church in its Relations, Biblical Trends and Extensions of Theology. (There is a misprint on p. 9 where 'Daniel Jenkins'

should read 'David Jenkins' as elsewhere in the book. David Jenkins is the author of an article—'Whither the Doctrine of God now?' in the July issue of the present *Review*.)

Two major pieces of writing have been re-issued by the S.C.M. Press in their 'Cheap Editions' of works of outstanding scholarship. *An Existential Theology* (18*s*.). by Professor John Macquarrie, of Union Theological Seminary, N.Y., when it first appeared in 1955 was described as 'the best and most balanced account of Bultmann's theology that has so far appeared in English'. *Ethics and the Gospel* (9*s*. 6*d*.) by Professor T. W. Manson consists of six lectures published in 1960 after his death. Of this work Dr A. R. Vidler wrote: 'Seldom have we seen so much wisdom and learning so beautifully distilled.'

Religion and Reality : The Theology of John Oman, by Professor Healey, of Westminster College, Cambridge (Oliver & Boyd, 30*s*.), is to be welcomed as the first and much needed conspectus of Oman's thought and writings available for us. Oman's books were written at a time when the flood of continental theology was becoming a dominant and determining force, and they represented a philosophical alternative to Barth and his school. Professor Healey discusses Oman's books in chronological order—beginning with the translation of Schleiermacher's Speeches on Religion which was significant for Oman's development—and then gives both comment and criticism. Oman's examination of the nature of religious experience has considerable relevance for us in the midst of the confusion of thought which marks many modern 'despisers of religion'. This book, which is fully documented, has in addition an interesting biographical account of Oman and also a complete list of his writings. Professor Healey is to be warmly thanked for providing so lucid and penetrating an estimate of one who was described by F. R. Tennant—his contemporary at Cambridge—as 'one of the most original, independent and impressive theologians of his generation and of his country'.

Biology and Personality : Frontier Problems in Science, History and Religion, edited by Ian T. Ramsey (Blackwell, 30*s*.), is a collection of fourteen papers read at an Oxford Conference, which arose out of a paper on 'Christianity and Biology' by Dr C. E. Raven, read to the Annual Conference of the Modern Churchman's Union. (Dr Raven died on 8th July 1964, but it is good that for this present volume he had written before his death the first paper on 'The Continuing Vision' dealing with the modern Christian attitude to evolution.) The ten major contributors to this work include, in their diversity, a molecular biologist, two neurologists, a medical psychologist, two zoologists, a geneticist, two philosophers and a theologian together with others who contributed to the discussions. The question is: 'How far do developments in molecular biology drain human personality of any distinctiveness?' This book provides what for the ordinary reader is the largely inaccessible scientific background upon which the relation between molecular biology and personality rests—and goes a considerable way towards an answer to the above question. Few books could be more

stimulating and in the final essay by Professor Ramsey there is the suggestion that evolutionary theory requires 'a supplement outside itself'—and this 'in the direction of theological discourse'.

In *The Roots of Experience and its Interpretation by Science, History and Religion* (S.C.M. Press, 9*s.* 6*d.*), by R. C. Walton—who for many years was engaged on BBC programmes for schools on the philosophy of religion—the author takes the three disciplines which are specifically concerned with seeking truth about the universe and the events within it, and suggests that this seeking implies ultimately a search for some universal pattern. 'The quest for a web of experience lies behind the activities of scientists, historians and men of religion, for without coherence our experiences are, in the final analysis, meaningless' (p. 105). The basic hypothesis of the religious man is faith—that all experience is ultimately derived from one source—from the activity of God. 'The scientific "frame of the world" and the spider-thread of history both have their roots in the divine activity'. In theological language it is that in Christ 'all things hold together'. So the task for the future is plain: 'Man's real choice, to which all other decisions contribute, is the choice between living within or standing outside the divine pattern of unity and reconciliation'. This is a well-written and stimulating book.

Studies in Church History (vol. 2) ed. G. J. Cuming (Thomas Nelson, 70*s.*) follows the first volume under the same title and published in 1964. It contains papers read at the winter and summer meetings of the Ecclesiastical History Society during 1963. The twenty-four contributions vary in length and covering a very wide range of subjects, come from some of the most distinguished ecclesiastical historians. Because the papers throughout are of so high a standard of scholarship, to select any for special notice seem almost invidious, yet as of particular interest to readers of this *Review*, the following papers may be noted: 'The Study of the Origins of the Eucharist' by the President of the Society, Professor C. W. Dugmore; 'The Unit of Pastoral Care in the Early Church', by Professor S. L. Greenslade; 'Puritanism: The Problem of Definition', by Basil Hall, of Cambridge; 'A Corpus of Elizabethan Nonconformist Writings', by Professor L. H. Carlson; 'Wyclif's Theory of Dominion and Grace', by M. Wilkes, University of London. Other important papers are 'The Greek Church under the Ottoman Turks', by Stephen Runciman; 'The Papacy as an Institution of Government in the Middle Ages', by Dr Ullman, of Cambridge. The 'shorter communications' cover many subjects from the Great Persecution in the Early Church to Thomas Arnold; from Bible Illustration to the Role of Women in the English Reformation.

The Early Church, by Dr W. C. H. Frend (16*s.*), is a further volume in the 'Knowing Christianity' series published by Hodder & Stoughton. It is an excellent piece of work and provides a very readable account of the growth of the church from a primitive community to A.D. 461. It has ample notes, full bibliographies at the end of each chapter, and an extensive chronological table of events. The work is based on lectures given in Cambridge since 1954 for the Certificate in Theology and it adds to the reputa-

tion of its author as a church historian already established through his earlier works on *The Donatist Church* (1952) and *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church* (1965). The book is a model of compression and original sources are used with great skill. It is written with great clarity, not least illustrated in the sections on Gnosticism and on the Arian Controversy. It is a valuable text-book and one to be enjoyed!

Although a pamphlet of only thirty-one pages, *An Apologeticall Narration* (1643 Old Style) is an important document in the history of Congregationalism. In July 1643 the Long Parliament convened the Westminster Assembly of Divines which was entrusted to make recommendations to Parliament for a settlement of religion in the country. Early the following year in order to explain their adherence to 'the Congregational Way', five of the 'Dissenting Brethren' produced this pamphlet, giving reasons for dissenting from the Presbyterian view of the majority. As orthodox in their Calvinism as any others in the Assembly, these men dissented from the rest only concerning the doctrine of the Church. This important pamphlet has now been issued in facsimile by the United Church Press, Philadelphia ($1.95)—obtainable from The Independent Press, 15*s*.—under the editorship of Dr Robert S. Paul, who provides a detailed commentary on the text together with valuable essays on the background of the complicated political and religious events of the time. For the modern reader this makes the text more intelligible and provides a useful introduction to what is a basic document in Puritan studies.

Howel Harris (1714-1773): The Last Enthusiast (University of Wales Press, 12*s*. 6*d*.) consists of three lectures delivered by Dr Geoffrey F. Nuttall at the University College of North Wales, Bangor in 1965. Harris, who was one of the pioneers of the early Evangelical Revival in Wales, has been much neglected by English writers. The first lecture provides a fascinating 'portrait of an enthusiast', for which Dr Nuttall has used freely the material from the Harris diaries, and by this means has unfolded the depth of Harris's religious experience. The second lecture reveals Harris's association with other Evangelical leaders both in England and America—the Wesleys, Whitefield, Zinzendorf, Boehler and Latrobe amongst others—and, in particular, his connections with Lady Huntingdon's College at Trevecca. The third lecture shows Harris's 'deep concern' for Christian unity. 'We should . . . espouse only the name given us in Scripture—Christians' and Dr Nuttall examines further the nature of the 'enthusiasm' which characterized Harris's religious experience. Of Harris it has been said: 'He found a nation slumbering; he left it awake'. Like all Dr Nuttall's writings this book is marked by meticulous scholarship, is heavily documented and fully indexed. In this book more than in earlier studies we see Howel Harris in true perspective.

The nineteenth lecture under the auspices of the Friends of Dr. Williams's Library bears the title: *Friends of Humanity, with special reference to the Quaker William Allen, 1770-1843* (Dr Williams's Trust, 5*s*.), forms an attempt to survey 'some of the ways in which, under the influence of the

Evangelical Movement, Christians of different traditions found themselves bound together in a network of witness and relationship while working on behalf of deprived and downtrodden men and women' (p. 7). An examination of the witness of the above-named Quaker provides illustration of these social concerns. A brilliant scientist and practical philosopher, he was in close touch with the 'Clapham Sect'. This lecture forms a useful and compact introduction to the life and work of one whom Thomas Clarkson in 1822 described as 'the greatest man in Europe: he does more good than any man living'.

At first sight it would seem that the writers of the Gospels were largely indifferent to Jewish politics. Professor G. B. Caird, of Mansfield College, Oxford, believes that this does not mean that Jesus shared their indifference. In *Jesus and the Jewish Nation*, The Ethel M. Wood Lecture, 1965 (The Athlone Press, University of London, 5*s*.) he contends that 'the Gospels contain a very large amount of material which links the ministry and teaching of Jesus with the history, politics, aspirations and destiny of the Jewish Nation' (p. 5). 'The truth must be that he regarded his own teaching not first as a religion for the individual or for a church within the nation, but as a national way of life which the nation could disregard only at its mortal peril' (p. 11). This is a brief but rewarding study.

Three further writings are concerned with the Jewish people in relation to the death of Jesus. Stemming from ancient ignorance and blind passion, there has long been a tradition which has declared that the whole Jewish people bear responsibility for the Crucifixion of Jesus. This position, however, has recently been definitely and officially repudiated by the Vatican Council, as also by the Archbishop of Canterbury. *The Jew and the Cross*, by Dagobert D. Runes (Philosophical Library, N.Y., $2.75) is a bitter indictment of the Christian Church—'Catholic, Eastern Protestant, Ecumenical'—in this matter. It is not however in any sense an indictment against Jesus himself as a great Jewish Prophet. It argues that through the preached antagonism of the Jews as 'killers of Christ', Christian communities throughout the world have come to look upon the Jew with suspicion and derision. The same theme is dealt with in *The Christian Roots of Anti-semitism* (Council of Christians and Jews, 2*s*. 6*d*.) though by a much more restrained and dignified approach. This lecture by Professor Jules Isaac was given at the Sorbonne. He believes that 'only education can undo what education has done; education in contempt has lasted too long' (p. 14). Two appendices give documents considered by Professor Isaac and agreed upon by an International Conference of Christians and Jews in Switzerland, which indicate a way forward for the churches in the fight against anti-Semitism. This lecture is indeed for our times. An attempt to answer the question of the so-called responsibility of the Jewish people for the death of Christ is to be found in *Why was He killed?*, by Guy Schofield (Epworth Press, 15*s*.). It is a vivid reconstruction of the last week of Christ's life, and seeks to interpret the motives of those who were directly concerned in the crucifixion. To speak of 'the guilt of the Jews' is 'a multiplication of untruths'. This is a book to be pondered.

Unity is not enough, by Mark Gibbard SSSE (Mowbray, 8*s*. 6*d*.) is the outcome of a visit by the author to the Church of South India by invitation of the Moderator. It is not only an interesting record of travel, but a vivid picture both of the successes and failures of CSI. Fr Gibbard writes of the richness of the South India Liturgy, the loyalty of its ministry, the appreciation of the new episcopacy, and the adaptation of the new Church to the Indian background. 'Journeys to the East do not leave men unchanged.' Fr Gibbard has heard a great deal concerning the practice of Christian unity, and in this book has much to say about it to us who are at home.

The word *sobornost* is the Russian translation of 'catholicity' with the special meaning of 'togetherness'. Hence *We belong to one another* (Epworth Press, 7*s*. 6*d*.) is a fitting title for the five essays—Methodist, Anglican and Orthodox—in this book, which is edited by A. M. Allchin, Librarian of Pusey House, Oxford. It reminds us that it is important to remember that the ultimate goal of the ecumenical movement is the unity of *all* Christians, and therefore it is vital that there should be constant effort to discern the workings of the Spirit of God in the manifold traditions of the Church. This book should help towards the securing of the perspective of the wider view of unity. 'There is an ecumenism in time as well as in space.'

RECENT LITERATURE

Edited by John T. Wilkinson

A Guide to the Old Testament, by G. Gilbert Yates. 25*s*.
A Guide to the New Testament, by Arthur W. Wainwright. 25*s*.
The Preacher's Handbook, No. 9, ed. by David N. Francis. 12*s*. 6*d*.
Preaching the Gospel from the Gospels, by G. R. Beasley-Murray. 12*s*. 6*d*.
All four books are published by the Epworth Press. The first two are the new text-books for Local Preachers on Trial, but it is hoped that they will appeal to a much wider constituency; they should do so both because of the excellence of the production and the quality of the contents. The books look 'good', the lay-out is an aid to reading and assimilation, the maps are clear, the indices are adequate, and the suggestions for further reading are valuable. I noticed but one mistake in each volume, and I understand that the flaw in the Old Testament volume is to be corrected by an erratum slip. Both printers and proof-readers are to be congratulated on their care and accuracy. Mr Yates obviously loves the Old Testament, and successfully communicates his enthusiasm to the reader. The big brush with which he paints large backgrounds and the little brush with which he picks out small details are both deftly wielded. To him 'The Old Testament is a fascinating book, pulsating with life', and he really conveys to the reader something of his own excitement as he describes the history of Israel, and as he indicates the characters and achievements of some of its great men. There is devotional enrichment, too, especially where some of the Psalms are woven into the narrative. Mr Wainwright's book has a different pattern, and is largely careful commentary on the first five books and on selected passages from the other New Testament writings. Here and there, I thought, he stressed the obvious, but sound

scholarship is wedded to lucid exposition. Both books will be first-class tools in the hands of the preacher who wishes to become a good expositor and interpreter of the Holy Scriptures. The Handbook maintains the high standard set by its predecessors. It is in three parts, Lay Witness, Corporate Worship, and Biblical Studies. There are interesting articles by Mr Yates and Mr Wainwright on the way in which they wrote the above books. Mr Russell Shearer in a helpful article on The Planning and Leading of Worship mentions the Methodist Lectionary, 'where Old and New Testament Lessons are arranged in a sequence covering three years'. Should it not be two? Mr Douglas Hubery, dealing well with Family Worship, might, on reflection, wish to alter one sentence: 'Indeed, there is nothing more impressive than to see a Bishop mount the cathedral steps of his pulpit at that point in worship when God's Word is about to be proclaimed', and Dr Glasson might desire to revise 'It will be remembered that the letter Q is used to indicate material common to Matthew and Luke'. These, however, are minor defects in a handbook which preachers will welcome.

Dr Beasley-Murray's book, dedicated to the Lay Preachers of London, acknowledges a debt to the Form critics and is based on the conviction that what was written in the Gospels was, first of all, preached, and, therefore, provides admirable material for preaching. Many preachers will find illumination and stimulation in the way in which the life of Jesus, His miracles, His teaching and His parables are presented, and applied to man's life today. I found the chapter on 'The Gospel in the Parables of Jesus' particularly rewarding.

J. LESLIE WEBB

Irony in the Old Testament, by Edwin M. Good. (S.P.C.K., 30*s*.)

The value of this book is in the new 'edge' it gives to stories with which we have been long familiar. It makes the characters live again, but with a quirk that is strangely half-mordant and half-tender. I kept thinking of the end of Thomas Hardy's novel: 'The President of the Immortals has finished his sport with Tess', and yet, shining through it all, there is a God who is exactly the opposite. Professor Good is Associate Professor of Religion and Hebrew at Stanford University, U.S.A. He is interested in true literary criticism, the study of literary style and of the media which the writers used. Here he deals with Irony as a means of getting the message across. The first chapter explains what is meant by 'irony'; low-comedy, in which the flat-footed nobody (the *eiron*) unaccountably wins at last; Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, that devastating satire on war; the great Greek tragedies such as the *Agamemnon*, and ending with the David-Bathsheba story, where the child dies after all! The author gives in detail six Old Testament examples. The first is Jonah, doubly the son of Amittai (truth), the man who reckons really to be a prophet. His first response is, overawed by the reputation of fabulous Nineveh, to run to the other end of the earth. His second response is gladly to prophecy doom, but when Nineveh miraculously repents, he is angry. This is not the sort of thing that ought to happen to a first-class prophet! The climax is: If you are sorry for the gourd, up in a night and dead in a night, why am I not to feel sorry for Nineveh with its tens of thousands of helpless little mites? The other examples are: Saul, the tragedy of greatness; Genesis, the irony of Israel (all the greatness of Joseph ended with a Pharaoh who did not know him); Isaiah, faith on the brink; Ecclesiastes, the limits of wisdom; Job, the irony of reconciliation, with a concluding chapter on how Faith can laugh, but with the right sort of laugh, not with that of Hardy's President.

NORMAN H. SNAITH

The People of the Covenant, by Murray Lee Newman. First British edition. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 25*s*.)

This book, as the sub-title indicates, is 'A Study of Israel from Moses to the Monarchy'. The book was originally published in the U.S.A. in 1962 by the Abingdon Press, and it sprang from a thesis for a Th.D. degree at the Union Theological Seminary, New York City. The problem is: how did the tribes which traditionally sprang from the twelve sons of Jacob become the Kingdom of David and of Solomon, and then broke up into two distinct and mostly antagonistic groups? German scholars such as Professors Noth, Procksch, and von Rad have given much time and thought to this problem. Dr Murray Newman's book is inevitably built on the work of these German scholars, but he has exercised his own judgement on the problems, and has written a thoroughly interesting book. Many details are necessarily 'probable suggestions', but they do seem to be extremely likely, and the whole scheme makes sense. It is certain that the cleavage between North (Israel) and South (Judah) was deep, and that it dates back long before the time of David. Dr Newman thinks the clash came at Kadesh between two Hebrew groups who even before that time had their separate ways. The Moses-led group broke off from the rest taking with them the Ark, which was their cult object. The others stayed behind, but later migrated to Hebron, taking with them the Tent, which was their cult object. All were the people of the Covenant, but there were originally two groups and two covenants, both with Yahweh and both through Moses, since both covenants were associated with Kadesh, though later one with Shechem and the other with Hebron. And so the story unfolds: how there came to be a twelve-tribe grouping, how kingship emerged in Israel, how there came to be a king in Jerusalem, and why was it that the first true southern prophet was Isaiah of Jerusalem, and he appeared only when the North was in its death throes. The book is well written, and has all the fascination of an 'Agatha Christie'.

NORMAN H. SNAITH

The Epistle to the Hebrews (New London Commentary on the New Testament), by F. F. Bruce. (Marshall, Morgan, & Scott, 30*s*.)

The Epistle to the Hebrews (Epworth Preacher's Commentaries), by R. Williamson. (Epworth Press, 12*s*. 6*d*.)

These commentaries are vastly different in size and considerably different in purpose, but they are both rewarding to read. Professor Bruce's book is a full-scale commentary on the English text of the epistle to the Hebrews, and in its footnotes it also discusses the major issues which arise in connexion with the Greek text. It provides a detailed examination of the background to the letter, and, as may be expected, points out the parallels with the teachings of the Qumran community. Professor Bruce has the happy art of illustrating fully his references to the background. He does not indulge in fanciful speculations but gives a fair and comprehensive account of the varying interpretations of the epistle. He argues that it was written shortly before A.D. 64 and that there are indications in the letter itself that Jerusalem had not been destroyed and that the Neronian persecution of the Christians had not yet broken out. He claims that the people to whom the letter was addressed were Hellenistic Jewish Christians, and that the author was a second-generation Christian whose name is unknown to us. The strength of Professor Bruce's commentary, however, is not confined to his discussions of background and origins. He gives a lucid and readable account of the great theological themes of the epistle and shows how it 'makes its proper and indis-

pensable contribution to the canonical literature of the Christian Church'.

Mr Williamson's commentary is much shorter than Professor Bruce's and makes no claim to be as detailed and exhaustive. It is designed for preachers, and it fulfils its function admirably. Mr Williamson loses no opportunity to show the reader how the letter is relevant for the modern world and especially for preaching to the modern world. This is not a book for someone who wishes to read about Hebrews without studying the letter itself. It is for someone who wishes to study the letter carefully, though without going into all the detail which is rightly found in Professor Bruce's type of commentary. It is a very helpful book not only for preachers but for anyone who wishes to make a careful study of a letter which is often neglected outside the world of professional scholars.

ARTHUR W. WAINWRIGHT

Jesus in the Qur'ān, by E. Geoffrey Parrinder. (Faber & Faber, 32*s.* 6*d.*)

The purpose of this book is to show what the Qur'ān says about Jesus and to examine the significance of its reference to Him. It is prompted by the increasing opportunities for dialogue between world religions, and by the writer's conviction that traditional Muslim teaching about Jesus has arisen from later commentary and interpretation rather than from the Qur'ān itself. Accordingly, his book presents a compendium of Qur'ānic sayings about Jesus comparing them with similar sayings from the Gospels, in the hope that it may help to remove misunderstandings between, and lead to deeper appreciation of Muslim and Christian faith. Jesus is always spoken of in the Qur'ān with reverence, Dr Parrinder maintains, and in support of this statement he reviews first of all the various names ascribed to Jesus in the Qur'ān. It gives Him more honourable titles than any other figure of the past. 'Son of Mary' (one of the commonest, possibly because of Muslim objections to 'Son of God'), 'Messiah' (messenger), 'Servant' (in which the implication is shown to be one of complete surrender to God), 'Prophet' (in the succession of the great Hebrew prophets), 'Messenger' (the description 'only' a messenger is meant not to depreciate this mission, but to place Him in the context of other missions from God—Muhammed, too, is described in the same phrase), 'Word' and 'Spirit'. There is deep veneration for Mary, the mother of Jesus (she is the only woman whose proper name appears in the Qur'ān), and discussion of the birth of Jesus refutes any suggestion of unchastity by Mary, or mythical accounts of generation by divine coupling with a woman. The birth-stories, not unnaturally, bear some resemblance to apocryphal legends which grew up in the first centuries. Dr Parrinder devotes a long chapter to the death of Jesus, examining the questions as to whether Jesus really died, whether a substitute suffered in His place. He reaches the conclusion, supported by an outstanding modern Muslim writer, Dr Kamel Hussein, that 'the idea of a substitute for Christ is a very crude way of explaining the Qur'ānic text'. Indeed, he argues that the cumulative effect of the Qur'ānic verses is strongly in favour of a real death and complete self-surrender. The fundamental doctrine of Islam is the unity of God, and inevitably, Christian faith in Jesus as the Son of God and in the Trinity, is impossible for a Muslim to accept. This book does not evade the difficulties and differences, but it suggests that they are not as great as traditionally believed. Its purpose is to encourage mutual understanding and discussion. It certainly stimulates fresh thinking about the attitude taken by the Qur'ān to Jesus. There are three good indices: general, Qur'ānic and Biblical.

JOHN W. BISHOP

Speaking of God, by William Hordern. (Epworth Press, 21*s*.)
The Language of Faith, by Samuel Laeuchli. (Epworth Press, 21*s*.)
The time has arrived when we must ask whether a new book about theological language makes a fresh contribution to the debate. Each of these volumes passes that test in different ways. Dr Hordern's success lies in the clarity with which he expounds the nature of analytical philosophy and its relevance for all who speak about God. I know no book which is more likely to hold the attention and arouse the interest of a reader who is wondering what is the reason for all this fuss about the meaning of words and statements. The more experienced student will also find much enlightenment from this survey of the birth and development of analytical philosophy. The author proceeds to work with one of Wittgenstein's analogies, namely that between games and varieties of language. If one becomes a little weary of talk about 'language-games', this at least contributes to readability; it may also tend to false simplification. Hordern's exposition of religious language as that of the community of faith and his chapter on 'mystery' help the reader to recognize some of the peculiarities of theological speech. The closing chapters expound the religious language-game in terms of personal relationships. What is often termed 'encounter' or 'I-Thou' theology is set forth as being adequate to the challenge presented by the linguistic analyists. Whether the author fully meets difficulties about this notion of encounter, such as are discussed in F. Ferré's *Language, Logic and God*, and whether he is right in his concluding insistence that, whilst philosophers of language can help Christians to speak more clearly, no philosophy can ever feed theology, readers must be left to judge.

For many reasons it is imperative that none should imagine that semantic difficulties are peculiar to our generation. It is equally necessary to recognize that these difficulties result from the very nature of Christian faith itself. For this reason Dr Laeuchli's scholarly and eloquent work is to be greatly welcomed. He expounds the semantic dilemma of the early Church as it met Gnostic language. The many kinds of language used by Christians during the post-apostolic period are described in a chapter that adds fresh dimensions to T. F. Torrance's exposé of that epoch. The noteworthy work of Tertullian is then brought to our attention. All this makes highly-specialized reading, but the main issues are never lost in details and the volume concludes with a chapter on the language of faith which reaches rare heights in both style and content. It is to be hoped that many readers will ponder this chapter which is full of sentences that cry out for quotation. 'Blessed is the generation in which the spirit of grace blows through the barricades of speech.' 'We shall not be intimidated by the fear of using the wrong language as long as we stand in the biblical word and struggle for relevance in the contemporary one.'

FREDERIC GREEVES

The Theology of P. T. Forsyth, by John H. Rodgers. (Independent Press, 36*s*.)
The sub-title to this able study is 'The Cross of Christ and the revelation of God'. If Mr Rodgers makes Forsyth appear a somewhat more systematic theologian than readers of Forsyth's works may have suspected, this is because he helps us to see the dominant concepts which give a unity to Forsyth's thought. He was pre-eminently a theologian of the Cross. Rodgers' chapter headings (apart from a valuable introduction and a closing critique) are: 'The Cross as the fulfilment of God's redemptive action in history'; 'The Cross as Word of Revelation'; 'Personal participation in the Fact of the Cross'. Always, for Forsyth, the real action of a real God in gracious, personal dealing is what matters most. The

theologian who said about the spiritual crisis in his own life, 'I was turned from a Christian to a believer, from a lover of love to an object of grace', long before it was said that as men do not seek a gracious God we must meet their (alleged) longing for a gracious neighbour, challenged his readers to try to understand what 'grace' means. In a day when we too easily run away from theology into somewhat easy talk about 'love', we are reminded by Forsyth that 'the Church is not first of all a working Church'. It is a communion of saints and lovers, a company of believers, a fellowship of spiritual realists.' Years before the current debate about religious language, he said about words like grace, sin, redemption, sacrifice, faith: 'No words of less volume than these can do justice to the meaning of God, however easy their access to the minds of modern men'. What he had to say was, in his own time, too radical for the conservatives and too conservative for the liberals. Will history repeat itself for readers of this study? I do not know, but it will not be the fault of this gifted young American scholar if the question is not raised in the minds of his readers and the information needed for judgement provided.

FREDERIC GREEVES

The Kingdom of God Today, by Otto Karrer. (Herder-Nelson, 28*s*.)
Even a cursory look at this Roman Catholic volume will reveal the close attention paid to the New Testament and the gracious charity with which it is written. More careful reading deepens both these impressions. Now that dialogue has begun between Roman Catholic and other Christians, this is the kind of book which will prevent us from too readily assuming that we know 'what Rome says'. It may also help us to speak the truth in love. A Protestant reader will turn with special interest to what is said about 'the priesthood of all the faithful', and, perhaps with a somewhat different interest, to the chapter on 'the image of Mary'. In the latter he will note the care with which the author seeks to safeguard his readers against idolatry (though he does not get to grips with the dogma of the Assumption). A brief note is not the place for either criticism or detailing questions that are suggested by this book. The gaps between Methodist Doctrine, for example, and the doctrine here so humbly and simply expounded are not slight. But I think that many Protestant readers will find that some gaps are less wide than they expected. More importantly, they may receive hope that love for Christ and devoted study of the New Testament may help us not only to differ in love but also to walk together in Him.

FREDERIC GREEVES

The Philosophy of Religion, by Thomas McPherson. (Van Nostrand, n.p.)
In a period when so many new ideas are circulating it is good to find a book that takes stock and that looks again at the traditional problems of the philosophy of religion in the light of contemporary discussion. The days when a text-book like Galloway's *Philosophy of Religion* could serve generation after generation of students has gone. Mr McPherson's *Philosophy of Religion* will not last as long as Galloway's but for the present it would be difficult to find a handier text-book. He deals with all the usual topics of Philosophy of Religion listed in the London B.D. syllabus and similar courses. The student, who is not content to be a man of one book in every subject, will find that the excellent bibliography not only leads him to original sources but to some valuable articles buried in learned journals. Mr McPherson defends the right of the reasonable man to talk sense about religion against the opposition of Barth and the positivists. These are not

easy times in which to philosophize about religion but this volume helps to sort out some of the current problems and enables the reader to see what he can expect and what he must not expect from the study of the philosophy of religion.

BERNARD E. JONES

The Meaning of Salvation, by E. M. B. Green. (Hodder & Stoughton, 30*s*.)
Mr Green is a lecturer in New Testament at the London College of Divinity. He has been a speaker at the Keswick Convention, and the foreword is by Professor F. F. Bruce of Manchester. Like most writers of this 'school', he gets the right answers, though sometimes in what many would call 'old-fashioned terms'. The answers are those of true, sound, Protestant evangelical doctrine, with its fundamental theme that Salvation is by grace, through faith (Ephesians 2^8). But I do not always like the way he gets there. The argument is scholarly, but I do not accept some of the premises and I sometimes do not like the way he uses Scripture; nor do I always agree that the steps in his argument are logical. But, as I say, he gets the right answers; and this must be counted to him for righteousness. 'Conservative evangelicals' will welcome the book. The transliterations of Greek words in the text are correct, but there are many mistakes in the printing of Greek words in the notes.

N. H. SNAITH

Crisis for Baptism, Ed. by Basil Moss. (S.C.M. Press, 10*s*. 6*d*.)
The Baptismal Liturgy, by E. C. Whitaker. (Faith Press, 9*s*. 6*d*.)
At the Parish and People Conference of 1962 the Bishop of Wakefield commented that a fruitful eucharistic life in the Church (about which Parish and People had been chiefly concerned for a generation) could not be founded upon unsatisfactory baptismal practice. In 1965 Parish and People held a Conference on this theme, and the papers, contributed by a Roman Catholic, an Eastern Orthodox, Anglicans, Free Churchmen and a Quaker, are here reprinted in *Crisis for Baptism*. In our post-Christendom situation, the general demand for infant baptism, though falling, remains high. But the majority of those who seek baptism for their children are not asking for it as an entrance into the active communicant life of the Church. What then is the Church to do? Should it combine increasing discipline with instruction and pastoral care exercised by the whole congregation; should it abolish infant baptism altogether; or should it baptize liberally as a sign of the the universal love of God? Of these three alternatives it is the first which has been gaining widespread support in the Church of England in the last few years. Then, how is baptism related, pastorally and theologically to the whole pattern of Christian Initiation—to confirmation and the eucharistic life? Is it true with F. D. Maurice that baptism proclaims that the child already belongs to God ('Christ has preached at the fonts, when we have been darkening counsel in pulpits'), or is baptism necessary to *make* him a child of God? Does Maurice then make baptism a celebration of natural birth rather than the means for a new birth? How can the traditional symbolism of baptism be made more effective by ceremony and architure and liturgical reform? These are but some of the questions which are raised by the papers. The tendency to theological neatness of some of the papers was wisely pierced by the pastoral theology of Eric James in some final comments. It is not theological logic, he said, which brings the parents to seek baptism, but an inchoate desire to express gratitude, wonder, mystery, hope. How can this desire be best built upon without cheapening baptism? There are Appendices of parochial and diocesan surveys, an experimental form of baptism, and one for the

blessing and naming a child when infant baptism is considered inappropriate. Reports are included from groups who discussed Preparation for Initiation, Restoration of the Lapsed, the Liturgical Setting of Initiation, and Indiscriminate Baptism. There is also a full bibliography. The whole book is a most thought-provoking contribution to the great debate. It faces the urgent problems which ought to be shared with every congregation.

The Baptismal Liturgy surveys the liturgical history of baptism in the Western Church from New Testament times to the 1662 Order of the Book of Common Prayer. As the author writes at the end of his book, since we believe in the Communion of Saints, what Christians did in Syria in the third century or in France in the seventh still matters to us today, because they are our fellow Christians. To be aware of the history of the baptismal liturgy is a very necessary preliminary to any decisions we make in our day as we face our baptismal crisis; and this book by E. C. Whitaker is an admirably concise and illuminating study.

ALAN WILKINSON

Pastoral Problems in First Corinthians, by J. Stanley Glen. (Epworth Press, 18*s*. 6*d*.)

A Pastoral Preacher's Notebook, by D. W. Cleverley Ford. (Hodder & Stoughton, 15*s*.)

The Celebration of the Gospel, by H. G. Hardin, J. D. Quilliam and J. F. White. (Epworth Press, 15*s*.)

Dr J. Stanley Glen's interpretation of the First Corinthians came out of his teaching-interest in psychology and theology, and his desire to show the relevance for life today of the problems with which St Paul had to deal. Exegetical detail has been kept to a minimum, and emphasis is upon the themes that run through the letter. Conditions in Corinth had similarities with the situation of the modern church—e.g. idolatry of leaders and the cult of personality, sexual irregularities, the nature of freedom and the status of women. Behind most of the problems is the problem of freedom. Worldly wisdom, which in the Corinthian Church was probably a mixture akin to theosophy and gnosticism, was, and is, the real competitor of the Gospel. St Paul's appeal was not to wisdom, but to faith in Christ. His answers to problems are 'Christological interpretations with a personal orientation'. The individual and the community are not ends in themselves, but part of the 'cosmic eschatology'. The Resurrection is the culmination of St Paul's evangelical answer. What men think of the end determines what they do today. Part of the trouble today is due to the fact that sin is regarded as a moral rather than as an eschatological category. The theme that runs through the whole letter, and which comes to the surface in chapter 13 is the significance of agape (love). Agape is a synonym for Christ and for the living Word. It has its source in God, and there are always eschatological significance and perspective, and its characteristics are normality, stability and finality. If the 'hymn of love' were the liturgical norm, there would be a check upon irresponsible freedom, false sacramentalism and the unintelligible speaking with tongues. Love is essential to control discipline, to check spiritual libertinism, to set limits to the tolerance of the corruptive insidious influence of evil, and to prepare the way for the final transformation and glorification through confirmation to the image of Christ.

The book by the Rev. D. W. Cleverley Ford is the third of his published 'notebooks' with, respectively, expository theological and now pastoral emphasis in preaching. The writer has built up, largely through his preaching, churches at Hampstead and South Kensington. He has travelled far to talk to clergy, and is

Director of the College of Preachers. The introduction explains his approach; preaching is part of pastoral activity. The book consists of twenty-one sermons. There is a wide variety of themes; six are about shepherds and sheep; there are Bible studies concerning Samuel, Elisha and Philip; twelve are individual sermons, seven of which have Old Testament texts and five from the New Testament. The style is clear; sentences are short; introductions are arresting and illustrations from life and literature are used freely and effectively. It is not surprising that congregations listened to what the preacher had to say about running away from God, the value of law, real miracles in God's ordering of events, loving to the point of weakness, and the confusion of moral distinctions.

The third book is about worship. It is the product of the close co-operation of three professors at the Perkins School of Theology, Dallas, Texas, and it will be useful for group discussions amongst ministers, students and laymen. There is a glossary of seventy-four words and a useful bibliography. Widespread interest in the liturgical movement has made the writers feel the need for a basic study. Worship is the celebration of the Victory of Almighty God through Jesus Christ, and must be the celebration of the whole Gospel of our Lord. Chapters deal in detail with the Christian Year (which includes Kingdomtide), the orders and patterns of worship, the sacraments, weddings and funerals, and the symbols and the setting of worship.

FRANK M. KELLEY

The Church and the Criminal, by J. Arthur Hoyles. (Epworth Press, 16*s*.)
Crime and Punishment have been subjects of concern to Christians and to the Christian Church down the centuries. It could not be otherwise recalling the emphasis the Founder of Christianity placed upon love for the weak and the wicked. (Incidentally, there are many more weak than wicked to be found among the prison population.) In his book *The Church and the Criminal*, the Rev. J. Arthur Hoyles has traced with care the way in which this concern has expressed itself. Mr. Hoyles has been a student of penology for a considerable period, has an extensive practical knowledge of the prison system, in not only this, but other countries, and is at present serving as Co-ordinator of Methodist Prison Work under the direction of the Prison Committee of the Methodist Church. More than most men he is fully aware of the underlying tensions which have characterised the relationship between Church and State in the attitude to, and treatment of, offenders. Law and morality, punishment and forgiveness, correction and conversion, are all spheres in which this tension operates, as Mr Hoyles shows by many pertinent illustrations.

Partly because of its lack of unity and partly because of the emotional reaction which the whole subject arouses, even in the minds of many professing Christians, the writer indicates how the Church has been handicapped by an inability to know its own mind, and by lack of a clear idea of its purposes, when it has tried to deal with the criminal. Nowhere is confusion of thought more widespread among Christians than on the question of punishment. This Mr Hoyles brings out with many apt illustrations. He quotes the axiom that 'crimes are more certainly prevented by the certainty than by the severity of punishment'. He might well have developed this statement by showing that to-day it is not detection so much as the conviction of crime which really deters. The reluctance of juries to convict is not now only a feature of those cases relating to driving under the influence of drink. This is given point by a letter to *The Times* on 7th December, from the Chief Constable of Leicester who adduces evidence to show that the

proportion of acquittals in England and Wales is now between one-third and a half of all those cases which go before a jury; and he points out that no case comes to a jury before most careful sifting and unless there is a very considerable body of evidence of guilt. This is further indication of the moral confusion from which not only Christians, but the whole community seems to suffer.

While Mr Hoyles rightly concludes that any penal system which precludes forgiveness is defective by Christian standards, he is fully aware of the all too prevalent idea that the forgiveness means 'letting off'. He would, I think, recognize that those convicted of offences against the law must face a sentence which — and he quotes a resolution of the British Council of Churches — 'reflects society's condemnation of the criminal, is deterrent in effect and makes provision for the rehabilitation of the offender and the protection of the community'. A feature of the chapter on 'Correction and Conversion' is the number of illustrations showing that Christian conversion does play a very real part in the rehabilitation of the offender. Mr Hoyles pleads, however, for fuller co-operation between the Church and those who are engaged professionally and scientifically in the many remedial services which are now associated with our Prison Service. This is a most readable book. It should be of particular value to those who serve as Prison Chaplains, Prison Visitors, Magistrates, Probation Officers and Welfare Workers, and others who wish to understand more clearly the relationship between the Church and the State in one of the most pressing problems of our time.

J. MORRISON NEILSON

A Study in Survival, by William C. Fletcher. (S.P.C.K., 22*s*. 6*d*.)
The Soviet World, by Luca Pietromarchi. (Allen & Unwin, 42*s*.)

Dr Fletcher has produced a work of scrupulously exact scholarship. His theme is the attempt of Patriarch Tikhon's successor Sergii, from his profession of complete political loyalty to the Soviet regime in 1927 to his death in 1943, to preserve the ecclesiastical and canonical structure of his Russian Orthodox Church. Dr Fletcher gathers together the slender harvest of known facts, winnows others from the lush growth of propaganda, and where a fact or its interpretation is uncertain is careful to say so. Deliberate concentration on the narrow theme gives the book authority and coherence, but also makes it a curiously calm study of a period of violent persecution and bitter suffering. The argument is that Sergii was buying time, hoping for a turn in events that would make the Church useful to the State and so give a basis for negotiation. He had to wait until 1941. Was the choice he made in 1927 the only wise and expedient decision? Did the Church survive through his skill — or through the courage of believers? Above all, was the ecclesiastical structure worth preserving when every year made it more alien to the forms of Soviet society? These are not easy questions to answer; but most of the evidence on which a judgement can be framed is in *A Study in Survival*.

The second book is a much more general and comprehensive study by a former Italian ambassador to the Soviet Union. It is particularly good in its analysis of the way in which practical necessity has steadily shifted Communist practice away from Marxist doctrine. There are some excellent vignettes of Soviet political leaders, including those who are now in power. The tone is sympathetically critical. The general impression is that a land of great potential resources and a people of great natural ability are being slowed down by an antiquated ideology. This is a book that can be commended to those who want to

know about Soviet economics and politics as they are now, and not as they were in Stalin's day. But the general reader should be warned that, no doubt in an endeavour to cover all the ground, Signor Pietromarchi has included a very poor chapter on religion.

EDWARD ROGERS

Fundamentals of Christian Sociology, by Joseph Höffner. (Mercier Press, 21*s*.)
It is an interesting exercise for a Methodist to compare the several Declarations on Social Questions endorsed by the Conference of his own Church with similar pronouncements of other religious bodies. The volume by Joseph Höffner presents an outline of Christian Social teaching prepared in response to the appeal of Pope John XXIII in the encyclical *Mater et Magistra*. This appeal was addressed to Roman Catholic laymen and entreated them not only to study Christian Social teaching, but also seek to apply it to everyday life. Höffner wrote this book before he became Bishop of Muenster and while he was still a professor. It is very much a book for students, and those who complain of the heavy style of Methodist Conference Declarations are hardly likely to turn to this treatise for light reading. The first part of the book expounds basic principles and is somewhat ponderous. In dealing with natural law, characterised as universally valid, immutable and recognizable, the author looks briefly at the objections raised against the concept by Protestant theologians. But over against the thunderings of Karl Barth and Thielicke with their insistence on the penetrating quality of sin and its effect on human powers of reason, is set the opinion of those who, like Von Dietze, believe that Protestant ethics would get nowhere without the essentials of natural law. The second part of the book is more readable. It seeks to apply the teaching to the various areas of social life; marriage and the family; the world of work; the economic order; the state; and the field of international relations. It is good to read in the section on marriage so clear a rebuttal of those pessimistic misinterpretations of sexuality which have so often dominated the teaching of the Church Fathers. It is also encouraging to note a reference — though all too brief — to the question of celibacy. Strangely though, it is entirely concerned with the single woman and there is no mention of the unmarried man. In the section on the ethics of war there is a clear statement of the right of Christians to refuse to bear arms and of the duty of the State to give legal recognition to conscientious objectors. One would have liked, however, to see a fuller recognition of the complete inadequacy of the traditional doctrine of the just war in an age when nuclear weapons proliferate.

KENNETH G. GREET

The Sociology of Religion, by Max Weber. (Methuen, 30*s*.)
At the present time there is a deepening interest in the interconnection between religion and society. It is being recognized that the gospel cannot be preached in a vacuum, that we must have regard to the social and cultural factors which affect the hearer. Surveys are being produced on the social factors affecting Church attendance. Although we think of the social sciences as still very young, it is as well to remember that Max Weber, who may be regarded as the founding father of social science, died in 1920. He left incomplete a vast work on economy and society. The present volume is a massive section of that larger work translated by Ephraim Fischoff. It is concerned with the relations between the ideas of religion and the various aspects of human conduct and social organization. The Introduction by Talcott Parsons provides the reader with some clues

to the understanding of Weber's system of thought. The point of departure is the fact that there is no known human society without some sort of religion. Weber then proceeds systematically to explore the ways in which religious ideas have brought about social change. The massive erudition of the author is immediately evident in the chapters with which the work opens. He traces the evolution of religious ideas, dealing at length with primitive religious, moving on to Judaism and Christianity, and in a final chapter examining the attitudes of the other world religions to the social and economic order. From the tightly-packed pages, there is room here to quote only one passage. It concerns the preaching and pastoral aspects of ministry. 'Preaching and pastoral care differ widely in the strength of their practical influence on the conduct of life. Preaching unfolds its power most strongly in periods of prophetic excitation . . . Pastoral care in all its forms is the priests' real instrument of power, particularly over the workaday world, and it influences the conduct of life most powerfully when religion has achieved an ethical character.' It is an interesting judgement and maybe instructive for the present day. Not all of Weber's judgements will be acceptable today. Indeed, as Talcott Parsons points out, the usefulness of Weber's theoretical framework is limited by three considerations. The application of it to concrete problems requires the flexibility and erudition of a Weber: a rare phenomenon indeed. Then the religious situation, especially in the U.S.A., has greatly changed since Weber formulated his hypothesis. Finally, sociological theory itself has advanced since Weber's death. But he himself would have wanted his work to be regarded as a stepping-stone to further advance.

KENNETH G. GREET

Christian Marriage Today, by Mario Colacci. (Angsburg Publishing House, $1.95.)

The reader who glances at the title of the book about to be reviewed may be excused if he exclaims 'What! Surely not another one.' But this book is different from so many of the recent books on the subject, the number of which has multiplied so rapidly that we may soon be in danger of a literary population explosion. Dr Colacci has produced a very readable comparison of Roman Catholic and Protestant views. On the whole he has made a good job of a difficult task. The task is difficult for a number of reasons. It can never be easy for a Protestant to expound with scrupulous fairness the doctrines of the Roman Church with some of which he profoundly disagrees. Dr Colacci, himself a former Roman Catholic scholar and now a pastor of the American Lutheran Church, has given us a remarkably dispassionate account. Almost as demanding is the attempt to present a general concensus of Protestant judgement on controversial issues like contraception and abortion. The summaries contained in this volume of Protestant teaching on marriage will not be wholly acceptable to all branches of the Protestant Churches, but Methodists will find little to object to. Incidentally the author does not appear to have paid much attention to Methodist statements on the subjects with which he deals. One final difficulty lies in the fact that the book was written before the Second Vatican Council had completed its work, though the author forecasts with fair accuracy some of its conclusions. The main purpose of the book is practical: to help those contemplating marrying across the Roman Catholic/Protestant line of division to see the issues clearly, and to assist those called upon to give pastoral advice in this situation. The book confirms the advice which many of us give: such unions are best avoided, but if this cannot be, look very carefully at the important

questions to be settled by those contemplating such a marriage. The progress of the ecumenical movement is bound to bring Christians of all traditions closer together. The issues raised will be increasingly important. A very useful addition to the chapters on the specific teachings of the Churches on marriage is a section summarizing the basic theological differences between Roman Catholicism and Evangelical Protestantism.

KENNETH G. GREET

The Faith of the Counsellors, by Paul Halmos. (Constable, 30*s*. net.)

This is undoubtedly an important book within its field. It is certain to arouse comment and controversy within Counselling circles, which is all to the good. It is also the first book to be written surveying the field as a whole. Professor Halmos takes in his wide embrace everyone who in any way is professionally cultivating personal relations: he starts with the clergy and doctors and ends with child guidance and marriage guidance Counsellors. Hitherto all we have had to help and instruct us have been fugitive articles in learned periodicals or else studies like those of John Wallis and Michael Balint. But these, perhaps because of necessity, have dealt with isolated pieces of the jigsaw and have not seen the problem as a whole. Now Paul Halmos, who is Professor of Sociology at University College Cardiff has examined Counselling as a new and relevant service in our welfare state. He has looked into the basic motives that impel all Counsellors, of whatever type, to question their underlying beliefs, not only about themselves but about the people they try to help, and has sought to establish them in their own right. This is a new departure in the literature of the subject and one greatly to be welcomed. The book begins by pointing out that to-day so many people of all shades of opinion are disillusioned with politics as an answer to personal problems. The breakdown of religious faith has left them shepherdless and opened the way for the coming of the secular Counsellor. He then goes on to examine the Counsellor's faith. This he defines as love triumphing over hatred in therapeutic skill and has something very pertinent to say in this connexion, about the present fashionable theory of non-directiveness. He ends with a chapter on The Counsellor and Western Morals, in which he displays rather nakedly his own inability to make up his mind on which side of the ethical fence he is going to come down. He obviously does not know much, and perhaps cares less, about the pastoral work of the clergy. He talks about what he calls 'the fervently judgemental attitudes of the pastoral Counsellor'. This is a fiction diligently promoted by those who oppose the Christian position, but it has, nowadays at any rate, little foundation in fact. Professor Halmos should have known better. One suspects his dislike of committing himself to the Christian position is his 'Achilles' Heel'. Yet, on the whole, the book is on the side of the angels. Essentially, though often all unknown to themselves, Counsellors of whatever hue are motivated by the Christian Agape. Counselling means 'loving', it is entering supremely into an 'I-Thou' relationship. This means that the current allegiance to non-directiveness cannot always reign supreme. This section is perhaps the freshest and most alive in the whole book. He points out that research on counter-transferences shows that it is virtually impossible to remain neutral. This is well said and needed saying. The Counsellor's very 'presence' amounts to a subtle direction of the client, who often needs guidance as well as a passive reception of his condition. Counselling is always a moral initiative. He draws a fascinating analogy between Christian mystical teaching and secular counselling faith to-day. But

again, his definition of Christian faith is deficient. What theologian to-day would talk about the 'credo quia absurdum'. This section shows what foolishness happens when a sociologist strays from his last. To define the 'archtype of all faith' in this way displays a lamentable ignorance of what present day theology is saying.

But despite these and other defects, the book should be read and pondered. It delivers fierce blows at mechanistic behaviourist psychology. Professor Halmos cannot bring himself to name the Christ. But nearly everything he says is indirectly supporting the Christian ethic. We are tempted to say of him, as we finish his last page, 'Thou art not far from the Kingdom'. For him even secular counselling is the *opus Dei*, the inspiration of which is in the Beatific Vision.

JOHN CROWLESMITH

Healing for You, by Bernard Martin. (Lutterworth, 25*s*.)
Cure or Heal, by E. Graham Howe. (George Allen & Unwin, 28*s*.)

This book is written about caring for the sick in the pastoral ministry. The approach is rich with insights from many sources and this Pastor Psychiatrist Swiss author covers the most recent development in this field. The basis of his thinking may be discerned from this quotation: 'Human knowledge today has reached such a magnitude that it is much more difficult than formerly to find one's bearings, and as pastoral care is concerned with a person who is at one and the same time a physical being and a spiritual being, it would be necessary, to be truly effective, to be simultaneously doctor, psychologist and pastor.' He goes on to emphasize the need for the healing professions to work in the closest harmony. The author writes with a wisdom gleaned from learning and experience and deals in a most helpful way with such subjects as sin, sickness, confession, visiting, Healers, mental illness, transference intercessory prayer, laying on of hands, and so on. The place of faith and spiritual power is central and is a valuable corrective to the non-religious approach in so much English writing on this subject. Though the spirit of the book is liberal and tolerant, there is a positive approach which is both illuminating and inspiring. This is a book with important implications for healing work both in the Church and wherever the sick are visited.

I have listened to many lectures by Graham Howe and agree with the final words of Dr Ronald Laing's foreword, 'It would be a pity for us if we are not to recognize that here is a distillation of a master psychologist'. But the acceptance of this fact doesn't imply that his reasoning and concepts are necessarily wholly comprehensible. This is no orthodox psychological manual (if such a thing exists) as the author is learned in philosophical and religious expressions and particularly of existentialism and Zen Buddhism. His approach is demandingly creative and exhilarating but the flow and power of his style prove, at times, too much. He is a master of symbolic interpretation, but his style can be difficult for those unfamiliar with such a medium. Dr Howe, in his quite unique way, gives a vista of a comprehensive psychological interpretation of whole man and provokes much new thought on the nature of healing. We have moved from the doctor doing something to an object (the patient) to 'This new attitude of healer towards disease disclaims all power over the other. If the wholeness of life is to be renewed and the patient healed, the healer becomes a catalyst at a place of needed sacrifice and suffering, mystery and death-into-rebirth'. This is no book for casual readers but rather for those who are able and willing

to learn a new language of experience and who are prepared to enrich their lives with some of the wealth of a man who finds life noble and satisfying.

WILLIAM KYLE

The Spanish Elizabethans, by Albert J. Loomie, S.J. (Burns & Oates, 42*s*.)

In this book Father Loomie has explored the fortunes of five assorted personalities among the exiles at the Spanish court during the reign of Philip II. One is a pensioner of that court who was able to secure assistance for others also. Another is an 'Intelligencer', suspected of being a double agent. Another is a Lady caught in the struggles for leadership among the exiles. Another is a soldier who dreamed of the re-conquest of England. And finally there is a Jesuit 'Seminarie' engaged in the training of priests for the re-conversion of the country. By putting these accounts together the author has achieved a fairly detailed picture of a group of exiles who had high hopes but, in fact, were able to achieve nothing. What emerges from this account is that, in fact, the Elizabethan exiles had very little hope of winning active support from Spain. Spanish policy was far more concerned with the Netherlands than with England, and the Armada's fate only confirmed, of course, the opinions of those who felt that the English schemes were a dangerous diversion. In these circumstances the exiles, never in any case a very coherent group, fell victims to petty mutual rivalries, scratched around for what support they could find, and, leaderless, degenerated into rather a pathetic bunch of hangers-on. The story is a sad one, but the author has illuminated a little known chapter of history.

H. MORLEY RATTENBURY

Prophet and Poet. The Bible and the Growth of Romanticism, by Murray Roston. (Faber, 30*s*.)

The purpose of this interesting study is to examine the debt of English Romanticism in literature to the new interest in biblical poetry. The title is misleading; the author (writing from a University in Israel) confines himself almost exclusively to the Old Testament: this is a disabling limitation. The rediscovery of the Bible as literature helped to wean the eighteenth century poet from his classical models, and so fostered the growth of interest in things primitive and oriental, while the free metrical forms of the Bible gave authority and precedent for the break with strict classical forms. Like the biblical prophet to whom he felt a kinsmanship, the Romantic poet sought his images from the world around him. Wordsworth attacked the artificial paraphrases of the Psalms, and pointed to the Bible as a model for poetry; he pointed to biblical parallelism as the primary source for his own use of incremental repetition. The Romantics were able to invoke biblical authority for their rejection of sophistication. Wesley drew deeply upon the intensely personal experiences of some of the Psalms. Coleridge wrote of the Hebraic origin of sublimity. The ethical didacticism of Wordsworth was but one sign of his debt to the Bible, and the spirit and forms of Hebrew prophecy permeated the writings of William Blake.

ALAN WILKINSON

BOOKS RECEIVED

ALLEN & UNWIN: E. G. Howe, *Cure or Heal A Study of Therapeutic Experience*, pp. 238, 28*s*. Muhammed 'ABDUH, *The Theology of Unity*, pp. 164, 25*s*. E. V. Stein, *The Stranger Inside You*, pp. 152, 16*s*.

BARI: Lino Graneri, *Origine e Sviluppo della fede*, pp. 264, L.1600.

BLACKWELL: Otto Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (tr. by P. R. Ackroyd), pp. 861, 70*s*. Ian Ramsey (ed.), *Biology and Personality: A Symposium*, pp. 212, 30*s*.

BURNS & OATES: Hans Kung, *Structures of the Church*, pp. 358, 42*s*.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: E. Best, *The Temptation and the Passion: The* Markan Soteriology, pp. 227, 32*s*. 6*d*. (Cambridge Bible Commentary on the New English Bible). C. F. D. Moule, *The Gospel according to Mark*, pp. 124+map Paper, 8*s*. 6*d*.: Schools ed. 9*s*. 6*d*.

CAREY KINGSGATE PRESS: M. Newman, *The People of the Covenant*, pp. 207, 25*s*.

CHAPMAN & HALL: N. Weiner, *God and Golem Inc: A Commentary on Certain Points whereby Cybernetics impinge on Religion*, pp. 95, 18*s*.

CONSTABLE: P. Halmos, *The Faith of the Counsellors*, pp. 220, 30*s*.

COUNCIL OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS: Jules Isaac, *The Christian Roots of Anti-semitism*, pp. 30, 2*s*. 6*d*.

DE PAUW UNIVERSITY: Eleanore Cammack (ed.) *Indiana Methodism: A Bibliography*, pp. 64, n.p.

EPWORTH PRESS: J. Mole, *The Time of our Lives*, pp. 164, 18*s*. 6*d*. G. Schofield, *Why was He killed?* pp. 135, 15*s*. J. A. Hoyles, *The Church and the Criminal*, pp. 110, 16*s*. P. Barraclough, *Playing with Atheism*, pp 10, 1*s*. 6*d*. D. Nineham (ed.), *The New English Bible Reviewed*, pp. 160, 21*s*. A. M. Allchin (ed.), *We Belong to One Another: Methodist, Anglican and Orthodox Essays*, pp. 96, 7*s*. 6*d*. Owen E. Evans, *The Gospel according to St John* (Epworth Press Commentaries), pp. xx, + 225, 16*s*. T. S. Gregory, *According to your Faith*, pp. 110, 6*s*. 6*d*. E. G. Rupp and R. F. Davies (ed.), *A History of the Methodist Church in Great Britain:* Vol. 1, pp. xl+332, 63*s*.

FABER & FABER: G. Parrinder, *Witchcraft in Europe and Africa*, pp. 215, paper 8*s*. 6*d*.; cloth 25*s*.

P. E. Hughes, *Theology of the English Reformers*, pp. 283, 30*s*.

FAITH PRESS: E. C. Whitaker, *The Baptismal Liturgy*, pp. 94, 9*s*. 6*d*.

HODDER & STOUGHTON: E. M. B. Green, *The Meaning of Salvation*, pp. 256, 30*s*.

P. E. Hughes, *Theology of the English Reformers*, pp. 283, 30*s*.

HUTCHINSON'S UNIVERSITY LIBRARY: R. M. Grant, *The Formation of the New Testament*, pp. 196, 15*s*.

INDEPENDENT PRESS (for UNITED CHURCH PRESS) (ed.) Robert S. Paul, *An Apologetical Narration*, pp. viii+134, 15*s*.

LEE (Exeter): Robert Hamilton, *Testament*, pp. 174, 42*s*.

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: Bernard Martin, *Healing for You*, pp. 194; 25*s*. Bengt Sundkler, *The World of Mission*, pp. 318, 30*s*.

MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS: J. E. Oxley, *The Reformation in Essex to the Death of Mary*, pp. xii+320, 45*s*.

MARCHANT MANOR PRESS: C. S. Kilby, *The Christian World of C. S. Lewis*, pp. 216, 24*s*.

MERCIER PRESS: Ida F. Gorres, *Is Celibacy outdated?* pp. 95, 5*s*.

MOWBRAYS: M. Gibbard, *Unity is not enough*, pp. 145, 8*s*. 6*d*.

NELSON, THOMAS & SONS: G. J. Cumming (ed.), *Studies in Church History*, vol. 2, pp. 337, 70*s*.

OLIVER AND BOYD: C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Commentary on Romans 12-13* (Scottish Journal of Theology Paper No. 12), pp. 98, 10*s*. 6*d*. E. A. Mendiata, *The 'Unwritten' and 'Secret' Apostolic Traditions in the Theological Thought of St Basil of Caesarea* (Scottish Journal of Theology Paper No. 13), pp. 70, 10*s*. 6*d*. J. Calvin, *The Acts of the Apostles 1-13* (trans. by J. W. Fraser and W. J. G. McDonald), pp. 410, 30*s*. and *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians*, (trans. T. H. L. Parker), pp. 369, 30*s*.—both in 'Calvin Commentaries'. G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology: Vol. II. The Theology of Israel's Prophetic Tradition*, pp. 470, 45*s*.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: J. A. F. Thomson, *The Later Lollards 1414-1520* (Oxford Historical Series), pp. 272+3 maps, 42*s*. David Daube, *Collaboration with Tyranny in Rabbinic Law* (Riddell Memorial Lecture), pp. 104, 15*s*.

S.C.M. PRESS: B. S. Moss (ed.) *Crisis for Baptism*, pp. 189, 10*s*. 6*d*. W. Kunneth *The Theology of the Resurrection* (Preachers' Library), pp. 302, 42*s*. Violet Madge, *Children in Search of Meaning*, pp. 140, 13*s*. 6*d*. Torch Commentaries Paperbacks: J. Marsh, *Amos and Micah*, pp. 128, 7*s*. 6*d*. H. Cunliffe-Jones, *Jeremiah*, pp. 286,

13*s.* 6*d.* Glyn Simon, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 157, 8*s.* 6*d.* R. C. Walton, *The Roots of Experience and its Interpretation by Science, History and Religion*, pp. 128, 9*s.* 6*d.* T. F. Torrance, *Theological Reconstruction*, pp. 287, 45*s.*

S.P.C.K.: W. C. Fletcher, *A Study in Survival: The Church in Russia*, 1927-1943, pp. 169, 22*s.* 6*d.*

UNIVERSITY OF WALES PRESS: G. F. Nuttall, *Howell Harris: 1714-1773: The Last Enthusiast*, pp. 87, 12*s.* 6*d.*

VAN NOSTRAND: T. MacPherson, *The Philosophy of Religion*, pp. 207, n.p. Library edition available.

DR WILLIAMS'S TRUST: L. H. Doncaster, *Friends of Humanity with special reference to the Quaker, William Allen, 1770-1843*, (Friends of Dr Williams's Library Lecture, No. xix), pp. 35, 5*s.*

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

The Expository Times, October 1965
Theologians of our Time: xxi. Oscar Cullmann, by J. J. Vincent.
Life after Death: IX. The Future Life in Contemporary Theology, by W. Strawson.
Second Thoughts: IX. The Semitic Element in the New Testament, by Matthew Black.

The Expository Times, November 1965
Expounding the Parables: I. The Defendant, by G. B. Caird.
First Aid in Counselling: I. The Bereaved, by W. L. Carrington.
Important Moral Issues: X. Advertising, by Edward Rogers.

Harvard Theological Review, October 1965
An aspect of the Emperor Cult: Imperial Mysteries, by H. W. Pleket.
The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History, by W. E. Lemke.
The Third Chapter of Abot De-Rabbi Natan, by J. Goldin.
Monopolar Theism and the Ontological Argument, by H. C. McDonald.
The Christian God of Philosophy, by J. W. Keating.

International Review of Missions, October 1965
Witness and Service in the Mission of the Church, by G. Linnenbrink
Witness and Service in East Harlem, by G. W. Weber.
Wrong Strategy: The Real Crisis in Mission, by D. McGavran.
The Evangelistic Missionary's Role in Church Growth in Korea, by R. E. Shearer.
Joint Action for Mission in Wilmington, Delaware, by E. M. Jewett.
Education for Mission: Experiments and Experiences of the Protestant Church in Westphalia, by H. Lohmann.
The Evangelisation of West Africa Today.

Interpretation, October 1965
Abraham and the Nations: Blessing and World History, by J. Muilenburg.
Love and Justice in Deuteronomy, by L. E. Toombs.
The Church in the World, by W. C. Robinson, Jr.
Religious Pluralism and the Churches, by E. C. Gardner.

Scottish Journal of Theology, December 1965
Luther's Doctrine of Grace, by R. L. Greaves.
Rudolf Bultmann and his successors, by J. G. Gibbs.
Myth and Symbol, by Klaus Rosenthal.
Is Newman a mystery? by J. Heywood Thomas.
Dilige et quod vis fac, by W. Lillie.
Exposition of Isa. I, verses 10-17, by D. Jones.

Studies in Philology, July 1965
Alcuin's Versus de Cuculo: The Vision of Pastoral Friendship, by P. D. Scott.
An Unpublished Allegory of the Hunt of Love, by M. Thiebaux
The Canon's Yeoman's Alchemical 'Mass', by J. E. Grennen.
The Use of Oratory in Sidney's *Arcadia*, by Lorna Challis.
The Structure of Milton's 'Epitaphium Damonis', by R. W. Condee.
The Abdiel Episode: A Contextual Reading, by M. Tung.
Thematic Patterning and Development in Johnson's Essays, by A. T. Elder.

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 5*s.* net per copy (postage 6*d.*) or 22*s.* 6*d.* per annum, post free.