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

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

EDITORIAL: THE PRAYER OF HUMBLE ACCESS

THE Communion prayer which begins 'We do not presume to come to this Thy table' received the name by which it is generally known in the Scottish Liturgy of 1637, though it is there called 'this Collect of humble access to the Holy Communion'. It was, of course, composed by Cranmer in the 1540s as one of the Table Prayers to be added to the Latin Mass and said after the Lord's Prayer, immediately before the distribution. This is its place in the *Order of Communion* of 1548 and the first English Prayer Book of 1549. But the original form is slightly different:

> We do not presume to come to this thy table (o mercifull lord) trusting in our owne righteousnes, but in thy manifold and great mercies: we be not woorthie so much as to gather up the cromes under thy table: but thou art the same lorde whose propertie is alwayes to haue mercie: Graunt us therefore (gracious lorde) so to eate the fleshe of thy dere sonne Jesus Christ, and to drynke his bloud in these holy Misteries, that we may continuallye dwell in hym, and he in us, that our synfull bodies may bee made cleane by his body, and our soules washed through hys most precious bloud. Amen.

Stephen Gardiner, 'wily Winchester', as Cranmer described him, maintained that this prayer, said kneeling, after the consecration, taught the adoration of Christ's flesh in the Sacrament. This *argumentum ad hominem* was not the only reason but, in 1552, Cranmer removed it to its present position after the *Sanctus*. He also amended it into the version familiar to us.

The Prayer has had a chequered history. The Scottish Liturgy of 1637, unhappy with the rite of 1552, restores it to its 1549 position, though the *Agnus Dei* may be said following. Many Anglican revisions follow suit, and South India has it just before the fraction. 1928 includes it at the end of the Preparation, while the 1966 draft of the liturgical commissioners places it similarly, though even farther from the sharing of the bread and wine, since the offertory (though this term is not used) succeeds it. 1966 also makes the Prayer optional.

Anglo-Catholics of the nineteenth century liked the *Prayer of Humble Access* because they felt able to interpret it rather as Gardiner had done. For the same reason some twentieth-century Methodists are afraid of it. The Alternative Order of 1936 amends it thus:

> Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so by faith to receive Thy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, that the bread which we break may be unto us the communion of His Body, and the cup of blessing which we bless, may be the communion of His Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him and He in us.

This is not very happy. True, it attempts, clumsily, to translate St John into St Paul, which is legitimate enough, but in so doing it falls into a receptionism which overthrows the nature of a sacrament as much as does transubstantiation. It implies that if we have Christ already by faith, the Sacrament will be

efficacious, thus denuding the Eucharist of its proper objectivity. Christ meets with His people as they honour His command. He is no more 'brought down' by our faith than by the formula of an episcopally ordained priest.

But the great difficulty has been with the prayer that 'our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body and our souls washed through his most precious blood'. There is a valuable discussion of this in an appendix to Bishop John Dowden's *Further Studies in the Prayer Book*.[1] The doctrine is medieval and is found in St Thomas Aquinas, and earlier. Dowden quotes a Syriac form of the Liturgy of St James, which would not be known to the Reformers—'Vouchsafe, us, O Lord God, that our bodies may be made holy by Thy holy Body, and our souls made radiant by the propitiatory Blood'.

There is no doubt that behind this lies Leviticus 17[11]—'The life of the flesh is in the blood'. It could lead to an excessively high value being placed on the chalice and to this being restricted to the priests. Yet the Reformers accepted it, and indeed used it to justify communion in both kinds, witness Thomas Becon's use of the gloss on a Gelasian canon:

> The kind (i.e. species) of bread is referred unto the flesh, and the kind of wine unto the soul; when one is the sacrament of the blood in which is the seat of the soul. And therefore is the sacrament received under both kinds, that it may be signified that Christ took both the flesh and the soul, and the participation of the sacrament is profitable as well for the soul as for the body; so that if it should be taken under one kind, it should be signified that it profiteth unto the tuition and preservation of the one only.[2]

In the 1548 words of delivery it is specifically said:

> 'The body . . . preserve thy body. . . .'
> 'The blood . . . preserve thy soul. . . .'

No one these days is prepared to defend this dichotomy, and the most recent revisions abolish it. *The Liturgy of the Church of the Province of the West Indies* (1959) ends the Prayer 'that with bodies and souls made clean from every stain of sin, we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us'; South India has 'that our sinful bodies and souls may be made clean by his most precious Body and Blood', while the new English draft simply omits the offending clauses.

The late Dom Gregory Dix once decided, in conversation with a friend, that the *Prayer of Humble Access* must have been written by Cranmer on a summer's afternoon of almost poetic inspiration, and, like all such works, has been something of an embarrassment ever since. Perhaps this shows at once Dix's profound understanding and his propensity to be led astray by unscholarly hunches. The Prayer is a work of art and of Cranmer's genius, but only in the sense of T. S. Eliot's dictum 'Lesser poets imitate; great poets steal!'. Hardly anything of Cranmer's known to us is original and, as John Dowden realized, the sources of this Prayer are likely to be in the German *Kirchen-Ordnungen* of the 1530s, where they await the researches of some dedicated scholar.

Meanwhile, what should the Methodist revisers do about it? Last quarter

we adduced Professor Ratcliff to assure us that its 1552 position is not liturgically inept, but, granted that 1662 will remain in our new Service Book, ought we, in a revision for the 1970s, to include this prayer which has no inevitable place in the essential movement of the liturgy, which adds to the penitential element in what should be a feast of thanksgiving, and which horrifies some by its realism?

I doubt if it is possible to do more than make it permissive, though I am sure that, if so, it should be allowed after the new Great Prayer. The 'Parish and People' fashion of making it a congregational prayer does not appeal to me. It is most effective if said by the minister alone and very quietly (though in an audible voice) as a reminder that even in the transports of our joy in redemption, we still must come in humility and awe. No man who has any knowledge of his own heart even when it is most involved with others in seeking to share Christ's love (which is a modern periphrasis for 'holy') dare receive the Holy Sacrament in any spirit of complacency or pride. The shyness of the soul, portrayed in George Herbert's poem ('Love bade me welcome') is always appropriate.

As for the realism, the quarrel is not with Cranmer but with John 6. 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves.' The 'spiritual' Gospel uses this crudely carnal language because one of its enemies is docetism, the heresy that Christ only appeared to have suffered. Of this, in various forms, the Church is in constant peril,[3] not least, perhaps, in our attempts at happy family 'with it' worship. Christ went to the cross; we trip along to communion. God's commitment to the human race meant the flies and stench and wracking pain of Calvary. His mercy is not as the gentle rain from heaven but as the blood of a crucified man dripping to the ground. And we, who are always in search of some ideology or grand intellectual scheme to end our troubles are bidden leave our contemplations and find the hope of the world and our own immortality in the wounds of Jesus and in the fellowship of His sufferings, as we kneel to receive the bread and wine.

> He which hath said of the one sacrament wash and be clean, hath said concerning the other likewise, eat and live . . . these misteries doe as nails fasten us to his verie Crosse, that by them we draw out, as touching efficacie force and vertue, euen the blood of his goared side. . . .[4]

GORDON S. WAKEFIELD

[1] *The Prayer of Humble Access—Further Studies* was first published in 1908. Cf. E. L. Mascall, *Corpus Christi* (second enlarged edn. 1965, p. 208 ff.)

[2] Quoted Mascall, op. cit., p. 208 n.

[3] An interesting new book by Helmut Thielecke, *The Trouble With the Church* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1966) points out the danger of docetism in preaching.

[4] Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Politie*, v. 67.

THE METHODIST BOOK OF OFFICES

An Essay in Liturgical Revision [1]

John C. Bowmer

IT is not generally acknowledged, but it can hardly be denied, that of the many forces which went to the making of Methodist Union after 1932, one of the most significant was the use of a common Service Book.[2] The unification of traditions was no easy task for the negotiators. With regard to the Lord's Supper, for example, the Wesleyans used a Liturgy and permitted only ministers to administer. The Primitive and United Methodists seldom (if ever) used a liturgy and, especially in country circuits, appointed Local Preachers to administer. Both traditions, let it be said, highly esteemed the sacrament and sincerely held to convictions which were expressed in their practices. Any approach to sacramental usage in the united Church had to allow for both traditions and the resultant Book of Offices shows how this was achieved. It had to incorporate the rite to which the Wesleyans were accustomed (with such revisions as were thought necessary) and it had also to compile a new one which would be acceptable and viable to those unaccustomed to the use of set forms. It is not our task to attempt an appraisal of the Orders which were produced, but only to trace the stages through which they passed before reaching their present form, taking note also of the other services which go to make up the Book of Offices. It should be mentioned here that both the Primitive and United Methodists had their Service books but, except for the Burial of the Dead and for Holy Matrimony there is little evidence that they were used.[3]

Several years before Union, the Wesleyans were contemplating a revision of their Service Book. The Conference of 1929 appointed a committee whose brief was:

> to consider the question of the revision of the Book of Offices and to consult with representatives of other Methodist Churches.[4]

The members of this committee were the President (Dr. W. F. Lofthouse), the Secretary (Robert Bond), the Revs James Alley, Henry Bett, K. Harley Boynes, Wilfred L. Hannam, William H. Phipps, George B. Robson, Arthur Rudman, Ernest C. Tanton, William J. Tunbridge, H. Watkin-Jones, Alfred E. Whitham, and F. Luke Wiseman. This was, be it noted, an all-ministerial committee. It met on October 31st, 1929 with F. Luke Wiseman in the chair and agreed that, to begin with, the following offices be attended to—Holy Communion, Baptism, Marriage, Burial, Covenant, Ordination and the Reception of New Members. It also decided to make a start on Holy Matrimony and the Burial of the Dead. The method adopted was to appoint London and Midland sections of the committee and to ask each section to report separately on both services. Wiseman, Rudman, Boynes, Hannam, Phipps and John Telford (convener) formed the London section, while

Bett, Robson, Tunbridge, Watkin-Jones, Tanton and J. Alfred Sharp (convener) formed the Midland Section. At this early stage the other Methodist Churches were much in mind. The committee decided that after they had made their first revision and presented it to Conference they should obtain authority to confer with others.

This committee met on March 27th and May 22nd, 1930, considered the Burial and Marriage services as reported by the two sectional working parties, but no details are given of their judgements. In July, the Wesleyan Conference had before it these two revised orders of service and considered them in the Pastoral Session. Perhaps the committee had deliberately moved with caution, but the Conference thought they might have gone further. They accordingly referred the work back to the committee:

> with the instruction that greater regard be paid to the historic liturgies of the Church.[5]

At the first committee in the 1930-31 Connexional Year, a letter was read from the Rev E. Aldom French (Convener of the Methodist Union Committee) to the effect that the Uniting Conference in 1932 would be asked to appoint a special committee to prepare a Book of Offices, so this committee seems to have abandoned further revision. It did, however, appoint the following representatives to a United Committee, and did not meet again: The President, the Secretary of the Conference, the Book Steward, the Editor, the Revs James M. Alley, Henry Bett, K. Harley Boynes, Wilfred L. Hannam, George B. Robson, Ernest C. Tanton, William J. Tunbridge, C. Ensor Walters, H. Watkin-Jones, J. Alfred Sharp (Convener).[6]

On March 23rd, 1932—six months before actual union—a committee, composed of representatives from the three uniting Churches met in London. The Wesleyan representatives were as given above. The United Methodist representatives were the Revs R. H. B. Shapland, Henry James, E. C. Urwin, Harold Twyford, Messrs. W. S. Welch and Lawrence Crowther. There is no record of who attended on behalf of the Primitive Methodists. The Rev Henry James presided and it was decided:

(a) That for the interim period, the Ordination Service in use in the Wesleyan Methodist Church should be adopted for the United Church, and that each Church should use the forms to which it had been accustomed for the various services during that period.

(b) That sub-committees be appointed, as follows, to prepare a draft of various services for the next committee

Burial—William J. Turnbridge, K. Harley Boynes, Philip J. Fisher and H. Haimes. Convener: Tunbridge.

Marriage—Ernest C. Tanton, George B. Robson, R. Wilfrid Callin, Harold Twyford. Convener: Tanton.

Covenant—Henry Bett, H. Watkin-Jones, Joseph C. Mantripp, Henry James. Convener: Watkin-Jones.

New Members—Wilfred L. Hannam, J. Ernest Rattenbury, E. Aldom French, Samuel Horton, Henry Smith. R. Scott Frayn was later added.

The Uniting Conference also appointed a committee to deal with Infant Baptism, but records of their proceedings are not extant.

After the Uniting Conference, a short meeting was held on February 10th, 1933, but it was considered that such a subject as the Revision could only be dealt with "in some Retreat", so further discussion was postponed.

On April 4th, 1933, the first full meeting since Union was held and the main topic of discussion was the service of Holy Communion. It was introduced by Dr J. Scott Lidgett and from the ensuing conversation, the following points emerged:

(a) The present ex-Wesleyan form of service should be retained and an alternative order prepared to preserve the essential elements of the existing Form of Service, with the object of leading the Methodist people ultimately to accept the one Form.
(b) An abbreviated form of the present ex-Wesleyan order should be prepared.
(c) The holding of the Sacramental Service in towns in the middle of the morning service, preceded by a pre-communion address.
(d) The substitution of the Apostles Creed for the Nicrene Creed; and a careful revision of the pre-communion section of the present ex-Wesleyan Form of Service.

At this meeting the provision of services for the Visitation of the Sick and for the Recognition of Local Preachers was also mentioned, but no action was taken. It was decided, however, to proceed with the 'Preparatory and Educational Form of Service' of Holy Communion and the following committee was appointed to consider the matter: Dr J. Scott Lidgett, the Revs B. Aquila Barber, Ernest Barrett, K. Harley Boynes, J. C. Mantripp, J. Ernest Rattenbury, George B. Robson, R. H. B. Shapland, John Telford, Harold Twyford and Edgar C. Barton (Convener).

When this committee met—on May 15th, 1933—the main discussion centred on procedure, whether to compile (a) a completely new alternative service, or (b) simply an abbreviation of the existing Wesleyan form. In the end a completely new service was favoured, but a revision of the Wesleyan order was also thought desirable and the following were appointed to draft an Alternative Service: the Revs K. Harley Boynes, R. H. B. Shapland and J. C. Mantripp.

At the Conference of 1933, it was only a matter of Report by both the Book of Offices and the Baptismal Committees.

The next meeting was held on October 6th, 1933 and Dr J. Scott Lidgett was appointed 'Standing Chairman'. Drafts of a service for the Recognition of New Members was presented by Dr R. Scott Frayn, and the Alternative Communion Order was also considered.

From this point, it was simply a matter of revision after revision in the various committees until the production of the forms we use today. There is no need to trace here in detail the stages through which the various offices passed,[7] but it may not be amiss to notice what happened at the Conferences of 1934 and 1935 before the final version of the Book was approved in 1936.

In 1934, the Representative session had before it drafts of the services of Holy Communion, an Alternative Order of Holy Communion, The Public Recognition of New Members, The Covenant Service, Holy Matrimony and the Burial of the Dead. The Representative Session referred the matter to the Ministerial Session 'for judgement'. The latter gave their 'general approval' but referred certain suggestions back to the Committee. It further asked for an Order of Service for the Burial of a Child.

The Committee on Infant Baptism, which had been working independently of the main Book of Offices Committee, also presented an interim report to Conference.

The Conference of 1935 had the last opportunity to debate the Book. Apart from minor adjustments, some interesting points were raised:

1. It was requested that Orders of Service be drawn up for (a) Adult Baptism, (b) Thanksgiving of Parents (later altered to 'Mothers') and (c) Recognition of Local Preachers (subject to the approval of the Connexional Local Preachers Committee.

2. The Rev Henry Bett was asked to prepare a Preface and that it be 'of such a character as to commend the Book to those of our people who are not accustomed to Liturgical Services'.

3. Dr J. E. B. Kirtlan made a plea in Conference for the restoration of the Manual Acts as they were in some of the old Wesleyan Books.

4. There was considerable discussion on whether the Book should be sent to the Synods. In the end, Conference decided against such a procedure. Instead, they remitted it to the Pastoral Session, 'with power to act'. The latter phase proved to be ambiguous, for in the Pastoral Session it was suggested that 'power to act' implied power to remit to Synods if it though fit. Finally, 'power to act' was interpreted in the sense in which it was probably intended in the first place, 'power to approve any emendation it may care to make without going back to the Representative Session'.[8]

5. It received from the Committee a 'reasoned statement' as to why the Gloria should be retained at the end of the Communion Service and not be transferred (as had been suggested) to the beginning:

(1) It follows English Usage since 1552 and is retained in the Prayer Book of 1928.

(2) If placed in the ante-communion it would not be used at all where office follows another service.

(3) While Communion converges upon personal relations—'Given for thee', 'Shed for thee', the office is not the recapitulation of personal experience.

(4) The participation brings home the reality of an event of world significance, and raises the question of personal responsibility for the delay of Christ's triumph.

(5) Thus this cry for mercy is not out of place; we not only triumph in redeeming love, we are sorry, and cry for mercy because the world-wide triumph of Christ is not yet achieved. Our attitude is:
Remember, Lord, my sins no more,
That them I may no more forget.

Final arrangements for publication were made at a meeting on November 15th, 1935. Points raised and decisions made are full of fascination as an indication of thoughts and attitudes of the time. The following are of interest:

1. That an intimation be printed on the front page that the use of certain orders is optional. (Postponed until reports to hand.)

2. That publication be postponed altogether as 'the time is not opportune'. (Conference instructed the committee to proceed!)

3. That the word 'Offices' is archaic. (No action.)

4. Order of Service for Consecration of Deaconesses. (Referred to the Connexional Deaconess Committee.)

5. Miscellaneous requests:
   (a) An edition for service men, with Form for Parade Service (Referred to the Publishing House.)
   (b) Service for Ticket Renewal. (No action.)
   (c) Service for the Churching of Mothers. (Referred to the Baptismal Committee.)
   (d) Service for the Baptism of a Child likely to Die. (No action.)
   (e) Services for Flower Sunday, Harvest, Missionary, Easter, Whitsuntide. (Referred to *Divine Worship*.)
   (f) Special Prayers to be read at Conference. (This is in the hands of the President.)
   (g) Service for Sunday School Teachers and Officials. (No action.)[9]
   (h) Service for new Choir Members. (No action.)

6. Publication of Morning Prayer, Litany and Collects for West Indian Churches. (Referred to the Publishing House.)

7. That the Revised Version be used throughout. (Both A.V. and R.V. to be used on their merits.)

8. That there should be two editions—one with full text of Epistle and Gospel, another with references only. (Postponed.)

9. Services to be published separately. (Referred to Publishing House.)

10. That all editions have the same paging. (Referred to Publishing House.)

11. That 'Holy Spirit' be uniformly substituted for 'Holy Ghost'. (Each case to be decided on its own merits, but preference for the former.)

12. The Rubrics to be completely revised.

13. That all prayers begin with 'Our Father' instead of 'Almighty God', e.g. the Collects in the Holy Communion. (Not advisable.)

14. Capitals and Punctuation. The Editor was requested to ascertain the practices of the two University Presses and the King's Printer and report to the next Committee.

15. That the standard of production and format be high. (Referred to the Publishing House.)

16. 'Thou', 'Thee', 'Thine' be used exclusively for Divinity, 'You', 'Your', etc., elsewhere. (Declined.)

17. All references to hymns be omitted except *Veni Creator* in the Ordination Service. (Not accepted.)

18. That the reduction of the Responsive element throughout will facilitate the introduction of the Book into Methodism in Scotland. (No action.)

19. There is a too slavish following of the archaic Prayer Book Phrases. (No action.)

20. That needless repetition, as in the responses to the Commandments, be avoided. (No action.)

The sub-committees[10] met in December, 1935, and the full committee on February 18th-20th, 1936, but of the latter we have no minutes.

In July, 1936, the Conference:

> receives and adopts the Report. . . . and authorises the publication of the Book of Offices as now presented, with minor alterations.

It also thanked the Committee for its services and gave it an honourable discharge.

Thus was produced the Book of Offices which has served Methodism so well for thirty years.

[1] This article is the substance of an address which was delivered at a conference, convened by the Faith and Order Committee in December, 1964, to consider the revision of the Book of Offices.

[2] See the writer's *The Lord's Supper in Methodism 1791-1960*, pp. 43ff.

[3] For a study of the Non-Wesleyan Service Books see the writer's contribution to *The Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, xxxii, 145, and xxxiii, 1, and a further note by Dr Oliver A. Beckerlegge in xxxiii, 85.

[4] *Minutes of the Wesleyan Conference*, 1929, p. 260.

[5] *Minutes of the Wesleyan Conference*, 1930, p. 260.

[6] It ought to be said here that the Wesleyans had a committee at work on Baptism and the Baptismal Service, but we have no record of its deliberations.

[7] See Appendix.

[8] There was also a separate Rubrics Committee, but as its Minutes do not appear to have survived, we are ignorant of both its composition and its decisions.

[9] With regard to the service for the Dedication of Sunday School Teachers, Conference had not issued specific instructions for such an order to be prepared. Yet the Book of Offices Committee felt it desirable that one should be available and have the approval of Conference. The Connexional Sunday School Council thought such a service should be included in the Book of Offices. The Book of Offices Committee, however, had some hesitation in approving a service which provided for the administration of the Lord's Supper, unless it could be assured that the people receiving were fully and duly prepared. Accordingly, it reported to Conference:

> The Book of Offices Committee approves the inclusion of this Form of Service for the Dedication of Sunday School Teachers on the understanding that it is to be used for those who, after due preparation, are presented for this important work. This understanding they are led to entertain because the service provides for the administration of the Holy Communion to those who are now recognised, and it contains a solemn undertaking to lead scholars into the fellowship of Christ's Church. (Agenda, 1936, p. 285).

[10] See Appendix.

Appendix

The progress of the whole work of revision can perhaps best be seen if we were to set out the various committees, with their composition and time of meeting from November 10th, 1933, to the sub-committee which met from December 16th-20th to prepare the final version for the press. The inclusion of lay men and women should be noted.

1933	November 10th	Alternative Lord's Supper
	December 11th	Alternative Lord's Supper and the Admission of Members.
1934	January 2nd-4th	Alternative Lord's Supper Full Order for the Lord's Supper Covenant Service Admission of Members Marriage.

April 19th and 20th
Alternative Lord's Supper
Full Order for the Lord's Supper.
Covenant Service
Admission of Members
Marriage.

October 3rd
Alternative Lord's Supper
Full Order for the Lord's Supper
Covenant Service
Marriage
Burial of the Dead and Burial of a Child.
Ordination.
Several new sub-committees appointed :

Gloria in Full Order
J. Scott Lidgett
Edgar C. Barton
Frederic Platt
George B. Robson
J. Ernest Rattenbury
R. H. B. Shapland
J. C. Mantripp (Convener)

Recognition of Members
J. Scott Lidgett
Edgar C. Barton
Frederic Platt
J. Clark Gibson
J. C. Mantripp
Miss M. E. Byrom
Mr. Herbert J. Holloway
R. Scott Frayn (Convenor)

Marriage
J. Scott Lidgett
Edgar C. Barton
George B. Robson
R. Wilfrid Callin
Harold Twyford
Ernest C. Tanton (Convener)

Burial
J. Scott Lidgett
Edgar C. Barton
B. Aquila Barber
R. Wilfrid Callin
Philip J. Fisher
Ernest C. Tanton
William J. Tunbridge (Convener)

Ordination
J. Scott Lidgett
Edgar C. Barton
John H. Ritson
B. Aquila Barber
R. H. B. Shapland or Harold Twyford
J. Clark Gibson (Convener)

1935	January 9th and 10th	Full Order for the Lord's Supper Alternative Lord's Supper New Members Marriage Ordination
	February 28th	Rubrics Sub-committee
	November 15th	General Comments Sub-committees for Final Revision:
	December 16th	*New Members* As above with the addition of Dr. Leslie F. Church
	December 17th	*Ordination*, add: James M. Alley Henry Bett Leslie F. Church E. Aldom French Wilbert F. Howard Frederic Platt J. Ernest Rattenbury C. Ryder Smith H. Watkin-Jones
	December 18th	*Burial*—as above but delete Callin and add: John T. Newton Mr. A. B. Hillis *Covenant:* Ernest Barrett Samuel G. Haywood George B. Robson Mr. Atkinson Lee R. Wilfrid Callin (Convener) *Holy Communion* (virtually a new committee)
1935	December 19th	Leslie F. Church Samuel G. Haywood Wilbert F. Howard Ernest J. B. Kirtlan Frederic Platt J. Ernest Rattenbury George B. Robson R. H. B. Shapland C. Ryder Smith John Telford E. Clifford Urwin Mr. John Lewin J. C. Mantripp (Convener) *Reception of Local Preachers*
	December 20th	R. Wilfrid Callin John T. Newton George B. Robson Mr. Lawrence Crowther Mr. John Rounsefell Mr. Clifford W. Towlson

Samuel G. Haywood (Convener)
Ordination of Deaconesses
Ernest Barrett
Leslie F. Church
Philip J. Fisher
Miss Margaret E. Byrom
Mr. Lawrence Crowther
George B. Robson (Convener)
Marriage, as above with addition of
William J. Tunbridge
Mr. William S. Welch
On all the above committees, Dr. J. Scott Lidgett and Edgar C. Barton were members ex-officio.
The above sub-committees were due to report, but no minutes of this or subsequent meetings are extant.

1936 February 18th-20th

ABLUTIONS AND THE METHODISTS : SOME COMMENTS AND AN OUTLINE OF AN EXPERIMENTAL RITE

Gordon Rupp

I

AMONG the usages of the Methodists, none, it seems, has been more offensive to pious Anglo-Catholic eyes and ears than our treatment of the Elements which remain after Communion, which are either 'thrown away', 'put out for the birds', or 'poured down the sink'. Understandable, of course, this reaction from those to whom the sacred symbols not only represent, but really are, the Body and Blood of Christ. Implicit in this careless treatment (for which of course no rubrics have been written and no legislation ever passed) is, it is plausibly alleged, a view of the sacramental signs as *signa nuda*, and certainly that what is left at the end of the service is what was present at the beginning, namely bread and wine.

Now no realist could deny that there is an ugly element of carelessness and slovenliness about worship which is discernible from time to time in Methodist chapels. (Not the norm, not the whole truth, but it occurs and it exists.) In the whole matter of the Eucharist the Methodist church suffers from an untaught

laity and uninstructed officers. There must be very many who hold and believe (though they could hardly articulate their belief) a sadly reduced and minimal view of the Lord's Presence and of the significance of the sacred symbols.

But one or two things must frankly be said. In the first place there can be an excess of reverence which itself leads to abuse. The period following the definition of transubstantiation, when from motives of reverence the cup was withdrawn from the laity led to a breakdown, as many Catholics now admit, of the wholeness of the view of the Eucharist as the communion of all faithful people, even though the practice could be theologically justified. And when one regards the disciplinary penalties and the measures resorted to, when the elements were spilled on the ground, we are in a realm where theology itself breaks down. The practice of the Priest consuming the bread and drinking the wine that remains has no scriptural justification, and might seem to challenge the whole ethos of the recovery of the thought of the *Laos*. Moreover, it can itself lead to what Methodists would consider scandal and irreverence.

At the Faith and Order Conference at Nottingham, the platform in the University Assembly Hall had to be used as a sanctuary, with the result that those administering were, as it were, set on a hill. At the end of the service, somebody seemed to panic and there was a most unsavoury sight of three or four clergy grabbing one chalice after another and throwing their heads in the air. They were godly and distinguished men, some of them my own honoured friends, but many of us thought we would never let our Anglican friends talk to us about irreverent behaviour and slovenliness again.

Now, naked signs and a Real Absence have sometimes been the prevailing belief among sections of Nonconformists and Anglicans, but this is not the view of the Methodists as expressed in their liturgy, and as I believe in the Book of Common Prayer. Rejecting transubstantiation because it overthrew the nature of a sacrament and annihilated the relation between sign and reality, the Reformers who must influenced the Prayer Book believed a True Presence of which the bread and wine were sacraments and symbols. For them faith on the part of the receiving faithful was an indispensable element, and like Luther they stressed that the presence is *in usu sacramenti*, that is, in the whole action of the whole liturgy and of the whole believing worshipping people of God and not in some special moment or act.

The result was that Reformers like Oecolampadius and Martin Bucer and Thomas Cranmer could use the extremely realistic language of Scripture (John 6!) and the Fathers, not as a deliberate ambiguity masking a 'reduced belief' but because this is the core of true, scriptural realism and not a mean, minimum belief about the Eucharist, but a rich and many-sided one.

What I am now going to say may be thought to be simply a rationalization of a haphazard and unfortunate custom, but in fact many of the liturgical acts of the church have begun in some such way and rationalized and theologized things which began quite accidentally. The custom of standing for the 'Hallelujah Chorus' which may have begun because the King happened to enter at that moment during a performance of the *Messiah* has many parallels in Christian worship.

And so, though any defence of throwing the bread to the birds may sound

like the worst kind of sentimental whimsy, or as grotesque and eccentric it does not necessarily belong to an Ella Wheeler Wilcox theology, and is, I judge, no more to be dismissed as romanticism than a good deal of nineteenth and twentieth century social gospelling about the meaning of the elements in relation to human work and labour in the fields.

Indeed, a theological attack on throwing the elements for the birds and pouring the wine into the ground will be very difficult to press home without falling into the very kind of pietism, the divorce between nature and grace, sacred and secular which Catholics accuse Protestants and Evangelicals of maintaining. Man as part of the wholeness of God's creation, the unity of nature and grace, our creation as well as our redemption in Christ—a whole series of prophetic thinkers from F. D. Maurice to Teilhard de Chardin at least prompt the thought that it is time we found liturgical expression for these enigmatic intuitions which we find in the New Testament, especially in the Letter to the Colossians.

What follows is rather an attempt to sketch the outlines of an experiment (at a time when we are urged to make 'bold and creative experiments') than an experiment itself. The first canon of such experiments is that they should be tried out, on many congregations of different kinds, before anybody rushes into print. And in this case, this has not been done.

I have thought of this as being performed but rarely, say, at a Harvest Festival or at the close of a Teaching Mission (more humbly perhaps, a course of lessons for Church Membership) and at any other time when it might be edifying to 'point up' the significance of the Elements. It has long seemed to me seemly and beautiful that the Orthodox Church should include the preparation of the elements within the action of the Eucharist and here is a place where the ministry of the laity (in the case of Methodists, Poor Stewards) can be suitably involved. The twofold action of scattering the bread and pouring the wine into the ground are gathered into the Great Commission as a sign of the outward turning nature of the whole of the Christian Gospel. There are perhaps profounder (and equally reverent) theological reasons for pouring the wine down a drain (nobody who has read Luther on 'did not abhor the Virgin's Womb' can deny that), but on the whole the outpouring of Christ's Blood upon the whole earth seems to me to be sufficiently realistic and good theology.

I find massive support for this in a striking place. In the Garden of Gethsemane there is a noble church, and thousands of pilgrims have marvelled how, at one point, the grey rock of the Mount of Olives itself bursts through the floor of the church, marking the place where the disciples slept. This patch of stone is walled off by a huge replica on the ground of a crown of thorns: but at intervals of every few feet there is a chalice, and from it a bird is drinking—the very sparrows which you can see outside in the Garden itself, pecking away under the trees,where once no doubt they fed on ground covered by the Saviour's bloody sweat. Perhaps it is not the Methodists, but their separated brethren who in this matter put asunder what God has joined, the birds of the air whom their Heavenly Father feedeth and him who by the blood of his Cross reconciled all things, in heaven and earth.

II

A SERVICE FOR THE PREPARATION AND DISPOSAL OF THE ELEMENTS ACCORDING TO A METHODIST AND SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE, FOR OCCASIONAL USE: AND FOR THE PROCLAMATION OF THE UNITY OF THE REALMS OF CREATION AND REDEMPTION.

1. THE PREPARATION OF THE ELEMENTS.

This short service shall be made available to the rest of the congregation—either by being included in the duplicated or printed order of service, or by being broadcast in sound, from the vestry to the church, or on closed-circuit television. Or, where the church is of convenient size, it may take place publicly at a side table.

Minister. Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost.
Stewards. As it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be, world without end.

While the bread is being cut, the Minister or a Poor Steward shall read the verses from Isa. 53. 6-7: 10-11a.

Minister. Behold the Lamb of God.
Stewards. Who takes away the sin of the world.

While the wine is being prepared, the Minister or a Poor Steward shall read the verses from Revelation 5.6-10.

Minister. Behold the Lion of the Tribe of Juda, and the Root of David.
Stewards. Behold the Lamb as it had been slain.
Minister. Lord have mercy upon us.
Stewards. Christ have mercy upon us.
All. Thanks be to God.

The following differences from the normal order of Service are to be observed.
Psalms for the Day. 10, 104.
Epistle. 1 Cor. 15.35-50.
Gospel. Matthew 6.25-34.

At the Offertory there shall be a Great Entrance of Minister and Stewards, with the Elements, while the Congregation sing 'Lo, He comes with clouds descending' or some other suitable hymn. The congregation remain standing for the prayer 'Glory be to God on High'.

2. SERMON

Suitable texts will be found in the Gospel or Epistle for the Day, or in Gen. 4.8-10 or 1 Chron. 11.17-20: or Lk 22.39-46.

3. THE DISPOSAL OF THE ELEMENTS

After all have communicated, after the usage of the ancient Church, a portion shall be kept for the sick, and the remaining wine poured into one chalice and the remaining bread put on one paten. The communicants shall then go in procession behind the Minister and Stewards and these officers or two children shall bear the chalice and paten. At the church porch or some other convenient place, the people shall be suitably arranged.

There shall follow a period of silent prayer.

Minister. We give thee thanks, Almighty, Heavenly Father who dost create all things for thy name's sake and dost feed the fowls of the air and the children of men, as thou hast bestowed on us spiritual food and drink and eternal life through thy Son. And as we scatter this broken bread upon the ground (Here he shall take the bread and scatter it.) so may thy Church be scattered to the furthest corners of the world that thy children may be gathered from the ends of the earth into thy Kingdom: for thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever and ever. Amen.

Then, taking the Chalice, the Minister shall pray:

We give thee thanks, Holy Father, for the Holy vine of thy son David which thou hast made known to us through Jesus thy son. And as he took the cup Thou didst prepare for Him, and sweat as it were great drops of blood falling to the ground, so here we pour out (Here the minister shall empty the chalice into the ground.) these holy symbols of his precious blood, that thy love being shed abroad in our hearts, we and thy whole Church may be made perfect in him who reconciled all things in heaven and on earth. Through Jesus Christ Our Lord.

Steward. And now as Our Lord has taught us let us say

People. Our Father . . .

Then shall the Minister dismiss the People with the Great Commission. Matthew 28.18-20.

The Blessing.

THEOLOGY TODAY[1]

William Strawson

MR PRESIDENT, FATHERS AND BRETHREN,

I WANT to talk about Theology Today, and I think I should begin by telling you what has led me to choose this subject. Firstly, because our message is, I believe, an essential part of our ministry. The contemporary emphasis on activity, involvement with the world, the servant church, and so on, good and right as it is, must not allow us to forget that we still have something to say to our world. Indeed, one of the distinctive features of our ministry is that we are called to teach the Christian faith; along with the pastoral office and the sacramental responsibilities of our ministry I would give an equal place to our teaching office. This requires adequate training, constant renewal of mind throughout our ministry, and continual awareness of the changing needs of our time. We do well to remember that when John Wesley called together his handful of helpers in their first Conference, the agenda they used comprised three questions—(1) What to teach. (2) How to teach. (3) What to do. If we kept to this outline we should spend at least three of the ten days of Conference in discussing our message, leaving still seven days for considering ways and means of doing our work. Anyway, this would seem to be ample justification for spending half an hour on theology.

Secondly, I want to talk about theology because I think this subject is widely misunderstood today, both inside and outside the church. The former Queen of the Sciences looks to some like a silly old grandma who won't realize that her day is past; the youngsters won't take any notice of her talk about what things were like when she was a girl—'Be quiet, grandma, you've had your day'. Some, however, see the former Queen behaving in a most unqueenly way, trying to be 'with it', thinking she can be rejuvenated under the guise of the New Theology, which sounds to them as indecent and dangerous as Queen Victoria doing the twist. In those two analogies I hope you can detect the view that theology is out-of-date dogma (didn't certain leading politicians once stigmatize out-of-date political concepts as 'theology'?) and also the widespread anxiety in the church about what these modern theologians are up to, and wouldn't they be better employed declaring the old certainties? Perhaps theology never has been popular in the church, and today many good people are seriously perturbed at the way 'modern' or 'South Bank' or 'radical' or 'ferment' theology seems to them to be giving away far too much of the old faith which has nurtured the church so far. It's easy for such people to point out that Billy Graham still attracts the crowds, and there's no new theology nonsense about him!

I do not propose to take sides in the controversy between old and new theology, because this seems to me to blur the issue. There's too much taking

[1] An Address to the Ministerial Session of the Methodist Conference at Wolverhampton 1966.

up of unalterable positions for my liking in Christian thought today; far better that we should think out the problems for ourselves, and not become meek followers of this or that school. What is needed is a continual process of reappraisal, a willingness to look again at old problems and solutions, in the light of the present situation. For I need hardly remind you that it is the continual changes in contemporary attitudes which require us to consider our theology afresh in every generation. Theology goes out of date, not because eternal truths somehow suddenly become untrue, but because they are applied in a false situation; we so easily suppose that people still ask the same questions, so we have only to give the same answers. It is this unwillingness to recognize what are modern attitudes which bedevil much Christian thought today. Instead of recognizing that often we are giving answers to questions which people are not asking, we defend ourselves by saying: 'Well, they ought to be asking these questions anyway.' In fact many of our questions have never been relevant even for ourselves—we ask our contemporaries, with an air of superiority, 'Do you know what life means?' This assumes at least two things—that the question is relevant, and that we know how to answer it. But when do we really ask the question, and do we really know the answer? All this suggests that we must be prepared to listen as well as talk, if we are to speak to the condition of our time. But here we face a great difficulty. How are we to discover what people do think, or indeed, if they think at all along the lines which might be a possible opening for our message? The easiest mistake to make is the assumption that people are not interested in religion, and therefore we might as well start from our own presuppositions, since the majority have none of their own. In fact, our contemporaries have plenty of presuppositions, only they are mainly quite unconnected with what we think of as religion. I am sure that one of the truths with which we have to come to terms is that for the vast majority of people today worship, sin, divine forgiveness, sacraments and so on—the normal stock in trade of our profession—are never considered at all. How then can we develop a theology which is relevant to our time, when there is so little upon which we can make any sensible comment? The fallacy in this is the supposition that those who don't think in our terms don't think seriously at all. One of the charges made against us by the humanists, which has an uncomfortable amount of truth in it, is that we suppose that Christians are the only people who think about life with 'high seriousness'. The increasing tendency of our day is that there are many people with no pretensions to a religion, who do think seriously about human problems, and these are the people who are exerting a great influence on society. Because of this, these are the people we should listen to, since they are articulating the unspoken ideas of the masses, as well as helping to form those ideas. The point at which the real issues are being joined today is in the thought of the philosophers and serious humanists, and in order to see what are the issues we should be facing, we must listen to them.

This, I take it, is one meaning of the idea that *the church must allow the world to write the agenda*; only thus can we hope to have a message which is relevant to our age. The agenda in this case is being written by logical and existential philosophers, and by those articulate humanists who, judging by

their literary activity, have lately taken a new lease of life. Please don't think that I suppose that the majority of people, the man in the street, the television 'nellies' and the bingo addicts are all conversant with the ideas of these thinkers; but if there is any modern thought with which we should be in dialogue, this is it. And remember, too, that agreeing to allow our contemporaries to write the agenda does not mean allowing them to dictate the conclusions we are to reach. I am sure we have more to say than just a refutation of modern thought, but our positive message should begin with the questions which they raise. If it does not, then theology remains isolated in its own special little world, making no contact with other ways of thinking and acting. This, incidentally, shows beyond any doubt that philosophy and theology are closely related. The day has gone when theologians could afford to ignore what the philosophers are saying, by taking refuge in their own interpretation of revelation. Even Biblical theology must listen to the questions of modern man, unless it is content to go round and round in ever-decreasing circles, speaking in its own specialized terms, which become little more than mumbo-jumbo to ordinary men. And furthermore, let's have done with the stupid notion that theology that is concerned with apologetics is somehow not very expert or at any rate only second-line stuff. John Macquarrie, whom I regard as one of the most valuable of contemporary theologians, insists that apologetics is not the poor relation of systematic theology; that, indeed, theology's greatest danger is of becoming a museum piece instead of a proclamation, not so much rejected as disregarded.

The first strand of modern thought I want to look at is the philosophy of language; formerly called logical positivism, now more accurately described as linguistic analysis. The vogue words used by these thinkers are 'meaning', 'verify and falsify', 'sense and nonsense', 'emotive' and 'evocative'. It is a philosophy which concentrates on the meaning of statements, often regarding its function as being closely related to but not confused with science. Science discovers the facts; this is not the function of philosophy, which has the modest but significant task of clarifying statements made by science, and examining the logic of sentences in order to discover what, if anything, they are really asserting. The attitude towards faith is usually very critical, mainly on the ground that statements about God, which are apparently essential to religion, are precisely those sort of statements which cannot be falsified or verified by empirical tests, and therefore they must rank as nonsense. Which means that all theology is an elaborate system of thought and speculation about precisely nothing. Various modifications of this all-out rejection of religion are proposed; Braithwaite, for instance, suggests that statements about God are really commitments to what he calls the agapeistic way of life; Miles thinks that the language of parable is the proper vehicle for religious statements. Others, like Frederick Ferré and William Hordern, indicate that while logical analysis is basically critical of the Christian faith, there are insights about meaning and the use of theological terms which are valuable to us. My purpose here is not to embark upon a critique of this philosophy, which would take too long, but rather to point out that this view raises certain questions for theology, which must be on the agenda, particularly the questions of the

reality of the supernatural and its place in Christian thought, and the significance of moral statements in the faith; that is, whether moral assertions are all that really matter in religious discourse.

When we turn to existential thought we seem to be in a more congenial atmosphere, and certainly it does seem easier to speak of Christian existentialism than it is to speak of Christian linguistic analysis. But the existentialists are not all Christians, and those who are raise significant issues for theology. Perhaps basically the main challenge is on the question of the metaphysical basis of Christianity. From the time of Kierkegaard onwards the existentialist approach has involved a rejection of the rigid metaphysical basis of Christian orthodoxy. All comprehensive statements of faith deny the essential individuality of belief, and produce an external view of faith, which can never be adequate. Rather each person has to deal with his own existence—by existing, not by being a spectator. As personal existence inevitably involves moods, fears, anxieties and the prospect of death, all these play a large part in the existential view of life. Some of the ideas of this way of thinking seem very close to Christian notions, especially when the difference between unauthentic and authentic existence is expressed in terms that are very close to Christian views about conversion. But even when the same ideas are being used there is often a challenge to faith, as for instance in the rejection of the Cartesian dualism of *res cogitans* and *res extensa* as explanations of the meaning of self, in favour of the view that the self is only known in activity; it is not a thing to be observed. This raises direct problems for that traditional Christian view of the self which is enshrined in the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, an eternally existent entity. And the existentialists talk a lot about death, yet in a way which is radically different from traditional or at any rate, recent Christian ideas. For they think of death as that which illuminates the meaning of life; only when a man realizes his being-for-death can he reach authentic existence. This concern with death may not be connected with any belief about what happens after it, as it must be in the Christian view. What I am saying here is that existentialism puts on the agenda of theology life and death, individuality and the meaning of faith, the necessity or otherwise of a comprehensive metaphysical system underlying Christian living.

The third aspect of contemporary thought which should be considered is humanism. While hardly to be compared with the two philosophical systems so far referred to, humanism does express the mind of a great many people towards the matters which are the stock in trade of religion. This 'practical decision to live on the assumption that man is on his own and this life is all', as H. J. Blackham describes it in *Religion in a Modern Society*, is at the same time 'a critique of all absolutes', a 'questioning of any metaphysical absolute' and 'acceptance of the conditional as the condition of human existence' (*ibid*). This latest book by Blackham does indeed illustrate an interesting development in modern humanism. No longer are we treated to an open refutation of Christianity, based on massive misunderstanding of the faith (although this is still not difficult to find in humanist writing); but here is a careful, and usually sympathetic assessment of the place of Christianity in modern society. The secularization of society means that religion has no place of privilege, and

must not make absolute and exclusive assumptions about its own essential place as the foundation of society. 'The proper place for religion in a modern society is in the superstructure, not the foundations; faith . . . belongs along with all ultimates of interpretation, choice, aim, dedication, aspiration, worship'. In other words, the humanist is quite happy to see religion continuing in modern society, but not as dominating society, only as a personal view, which people are entitled to hold, and should be expected to propagate. The church as a community of Christians has its proper place in society, but it must not assume that the state is a Christian community. The importance of humanism in modern society is not to be measured by the comparatively small membership of the British Humanist Association, but by the way in which a lot of Christians would substantially agree with the humanist view that 'ethics is much the most important part of any religion, and comes to practically the same in them all; that we don't know and cannot know about the ultimate questions about God and the Universe', and very many members of our churches really do accept the view that this life is all we can know anything about, and thought about life beyond death is so speculative and uncertain that it never enters into their religious or ethical judgements. The latest humanist slogan would, I fancy, evoke much sympathy in the minds of some of our most thoughtful and devoted members—'Leave heaven and hell to the eager believers; join the humanists to improve the here and now'.

So humanism to putting on the agenda the place of Christianity in a secular, open society, the alleged impossibility and irrelevance of belief in God, man as the measure of all things, rather than the helpless worm or frightened sheep which orthodox Christianity makes him out to be; the worth of the individual expressed in allowing him to choose his own end within a context of society giving him congenial conditions to do so.

This then gives some idea of the sort of agenda with which we are presented; but as every superintendent minister knows, having something on the agenda is not the same as coming to a decision in the meeting. Here the Christian point of view must be put forward with conviction and relevance.

The first item on the agenda is God. This no doubt will give welcome if illusory comfort to those among us who have always suspected that there is no new theology, and if you stand still in the same place long enough 'modern' thought comes back to the same point about once in every thirty years. But this would be false cynicism. True enough, the subject of God has always stood at the head of every theological agenda there ever was. But the subject must now be approached from a new angle. Against the background of the linguistic contempt for non-verifiable supposed entities, the existentialist emphasis on the subjective assumption of existence, and the humanist discovery that the concept of God is irrelevant, what do we say? Perhaps first a confession would not come amiss. Have we not encouraged the idea that God is an object; an object whose existence is to be proved by empirical, rational or experiential means? There is God, we have said, for look what he has done (miracles, ancient and modern, communal and personal); see how reason requires the existence of God for its explanation of all other existents (i.e., all 'proofs' which stem from ontology); or, most conclusively, look at me! My

experience of God shows that he must exist. What if all these arguments fail? There is no God? Not at all. There is maybe no Object, existing without any other existent, in lonely splendour. But there is God, in living relation with men. One of the most illuminating and formative statements of modern theology is that of Karl Barth, in an address to some Swiss pastors (yes, the occasion is significant; a profound theological statement in an apologetic setting; 'In him [Jesus Christ] the fact is once for all established that God does not exist without man' (*The Humanity of God*, p. 50). Even though Barth says this, it looks alarmingly subjective, and seems to involve the very difficulty that is felt about all existentialist theology: that it makes the being of God dependent on man's apprehension, and apart from that apprehension God does not exist. This criticism does not hold against Heidegger at any rate, for he insists in *Sein und Zeit* that 'Being is the transcendens pure and simple'. But the existentialist surely is right in insisting that the search for God on his own, a being without relation or significance to man, is a false search. If we want to use 'exist' of God, as I think we must, or we stand in great danger of being misunderstood, then we must recognize that this implies relation, for all existence involves relation; indeed maybe that is what existence is—being in relation.

However, the real basis of the Christian belief in God-in-relation-with-man is not the necessity of a particular type of philosophy, but the Incarnation. It is in Jesus Christ that this truth about God in relation is seen to be true, as Barth says. In Christ we know God only in relation to man; any other views of God we may have apart from Christ may or may not be true; we can only know their truth as we see it in Christ. This surely means, not that all 'natural knowledge' of God is false, but that we can only separate the false from the true when we have the criterion of the Incarnation by which to judge. Now this concept of God in relation with man means that any attitude which objectifies God is bound to be misleading. So not only are rational proofs and empirical demonstrations entirely inadequate, but our attempt to decide the fact of God before we decide whether to have anything to do with him is also erroneous. God is not a 'something' whose reality has to be established before we can consider having faith; as we may sensibly confirm if there is water in the swimming pool before we commit ourselves to a high dive. Every analogy like this fails, because God is only to be known with man—which includes man seeking to believe.

Modern theology is also being forced to a new appraisal of man, because of this conviction of God-with-man. Two mistakes are prevalent; one is to equate man and God, and then to assume that service of God is really the same as service of man, so let's get out of our churches, and get among men, where we shall find God; i.e., in effect humanity is God. It's well over a hundred years since William Arthur, of *Tongue of Fire* fame, carefully refuted this religion of humanity which was in those days being propagated by Auguste Comte. Now if we are not careful, faith in God is being wounded in the house of her friends. But the Incarnation doesn't mean God and man are the same; it means God and man are in permanent relation, neither being understandable without the other. So social service is not the same as worship, but the two are

closely linked by the God-man relation. Activity on the town council is not a substitute for a life nourished in the Christian sacraments, but often the two complement each other. Merely being among men is not the full service and work of God; but being among men in the power and under the guiding hand of God is true religion.

The other mistake is to denigrate man; to emphasize his wretchedness and need; to see all manner of horrible features beneath the veneer of respectability, using the more sordid tales of the psychiatrist to back up our disbelief in man. Again Barth has seen this most clearly. Man is not good; the word of God in Christ is a 'No' to man. But this 'No' is always spoken in the context of God's affirmation of man. The task of the Christian preacher is not to deride man in his helplessness, but to speak from God the word of hope and confidence. So we are wrong always surreptitiously to be looking for human flaws, so that we can prescribe the remedy; rather we should see in Christ the Almighty mercy which reaches to man and seeks to make him truly and permanently one with God himself. At any rate there seems value in speaking more of what God has done with man, and will do with him, than of what man does without God. The way of the gospel is love, not threat. We do stand rebuked when humanists talk so convincingly about the future fulfilment of the life of mankind; it's all very well for us to say that we stand for a larger and more satisfying development, but we haven't always spoken as if we really believed in the infinite possibilities of man with God. We have spent far too much time looking back; far too little time looking to the greater things that Christ promised would be done by those who believe in him. And surely this is the right, indeed the only, context in which to place our belief in man's future destiny. Fear of hell is no longer an effective deterrent to man's selfish ways—and a deterrent which does not deter is pointless. Nor is future destiny an acceptable substitute for present fulfilment. We cannot complain if the watchword today is 'Instant'—for we stand for 'Instant life', instant happiness, instant relation with God. We do not stand for 'pie in the sky when you die'—if one may say so with reverence, we stand for pie now! And because this is only known through relation with God, then we have the real clue to man's destiny. Not in human nature alone, which as I have argued, is as much an abstraction as God alone, lies our hope. But in God-with-man; so that our hope is not a last resort, but a natural continuation and completion of the relationship with God which is the secret of the Christian life now. And I suspect that the way to avoid the dreadful despair which being-unto-death generates is to see through being-unto-death to being-unto-life in Christ.

It will be apparent that when the relation aspect of belief in God and in man is emphasized, a great stress falls on faith. For this relation is one of faith. Now there are new emphases in theology arising out of this, in which the old questions about faith seem to be less relevant than heretofore. For instance, our fathers asked 'Is faith a gift of God, or a human decision?'. If it is a human decision, this makes us our own saviours; but if it is a divine gift, on what basis is it distributed, for some have it, and some have it not. If the answer is predestination, we know how this has placed the gospel in chains and made God an immoral and irrational mystery. Yet the problem remains why some

believe and others do not, with which is linked that of discovering the ways by which faith is evoked. Another old question about faith, which many would not think of as anything but central, is 'Is justification by faith or by works?' Put in this way, the answer is certain. But is the question any longer significant? As we now understand faith, can it be a means to this metaphysical end called justification? Do we really think like this—'I have faith, and as a consequence of this, I am justified'? Surely we rather think 'I have faith—I don't know how or why; I don't understand it or its consequences; sometimes I have doubt, but still I have faith. There is no result of faith greater than faith itself, for this is relation with God, a living, challenging, rebuking relation. When we speak of faith, we are not so much speaking of that which has mysterious metaphysical consequences, but of that which is life itself. Ronald Gregor Smith has recently undertaken an existential analysis of faith in *Secular Christianity* in which he emphasizes the historical-eschatological dimensions of faith, and shows that faith is not a metaphysic, nor a mythology nor a morality, but an historical decision in Christ. Faith is more determined by its object than its subject; while it is based upon revelation, without it there is no revelation. This paradoxical mystery requires more attention by theologians, both in the realm of experience and of thought.

So much then for the bare outlines of the agenda of our dialogue with contemporary thought. As in any agenda, the question 'Is there any other business?' must be asked; and the Christian will no doubt wish to discuss many other matters. And these will no doubt prove useful points of debate, provided they are related to the modern situation and meet some of the problems of modern thought. But there seem to be enough questions that people are asking, for us not to be too concerned with those which they are not asking. A theology which listens before it dogmatizes, which deals with essentials of belief and practice, is neither a threat to the church, nor an irrelevance to the world. It is indeed the life blood of the Christian proclamation.

THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE LOCALLY ADAPTED

An essay in Anglo-Presbyterian relations

G. S. M. Walker

THE Lambeth Quadrilateral, from which the title of this article is quoted, shows great wisdom in recognizing that the episcopate has passed through many different forms in the course of Christian history. In the New Testament period there seems to have been a whole bench of bishops in each local congregation; this collegiate ministry may have survived for a time at Rome and for several centuries at Alexandria. St Ignatius of Antioch teaches that the rule of a single bishop is essential to the Church's unity, but some passages in his letters[1] appear to imply that this teaching is based on fresh guidance from the Holy Spirit and not on an original apostolic institution. Moreover, for St Ignatius, as for all the writers of the first three centuries, the bishop is the normal minister of Word and Sacraments, presiding at every Eucharist, baptizing every Christian in his flock, preaching himself Sunday by Sunday, and visiting all the sick in person, so that the Ignatian bishop is more like a Congregationalist minister than any other office-bearer in modern denominations, while the primitive presbyter does not normally exercise sacramental powers but is similar in function to a ruling elder. With the accession of Constantine and the conversion of the Roman Empire, the number of Christians multiplied greatly; when the bishop's flock increased in size, presbyters had to act as subordinate pastors in charge of its separate portions; and the episcopate was modelled on the lines of the imperial bureaucracy, with the result that a fully hierarchical system developed. At the same time, however, a very different development took place in areas where monasticism was strong. In Ireland for example, after the period of St Patrick, clerical duties were performed almost exclusively by monks: abbots, usually in priest's orders, were the rulers of the Irish Church; the episcopate was conferred on a senior monk, who was treated with respect but had no jurisdiction and was employed for little more than the ordination of clergy. Thus the presbyter-abbot of Iona had several bishops under his authority, and although Bede[2] is correct in describing this situation as *ordine inusitato*, it was not confined to Celtic lands but is also found in some other monastic communities. Scotland did not possess a diocesan episcopate until after the Norman conquest of England; before that date we hear of shadowy figures who are called Bishops of Alba, and it seems that there was then only one bishop at a time in the whole Scottish kingdom. During the Middle Ages, the right of appointing to bishoprics was hotly contested between Church and State. Both St Anselm and St Thomas à Becket were Free Churchmen in the sense that they explicitly fought for the freedom of the English Church against Crown control.

But with Henry VIII the State triumphed and at times Anglican bishops looked more like civil servants than Christian pastors. This State-appointed and State-controlled episcopate, so different from the bishops of the primitive Church, proved a cause of schism rather than a centre of unity; it provided the principal reason for much of the dissent in England, and it impelled Scotland, after the turmoil of the seventeenth century, to decide finally in favour of a Presbyterian establishment.

Consideration of this varied background doubtless inspired the compilers of the Lambeth Quadrilateral to enjoin, as the fourth point in their essential basis for reunion, 'the Historic Episcopate locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church'. This implies that episcopacy, as it has developed or may develop in Scotland, will take a quite different form from that which has emerged in England. From the Anglican viewpoint, the essential requirement is that clergy should be ordained by bishops who stand in unbroken succession from other bishops. Leaving aside for the moment the question of succession, it must be stated at the outset that the constitution of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland is demonstrably episcopal in character. Its classic documents, such as the Second Book of Discipline,[3] assert that the catholic threefold order of ministry is to be retained. There is actually a fourth order, that of doctors or teachers, but for present purposes this can be ignored. The important point is that, to restore the primitive pastoral character of the episcopate, the whole system is scaled down from diocesan to parochial level. The bishop is equated with the parish minister or pastor; the ruling elders form his council of presbyters; and the deacons revert to their primitive function of attending to the Church's temporal concerns and welfare work. The parallel is consistently worked through. A minister ordains elders and confirms first communicants, just as a bishop does; his right to compose his own prayers is the episcopal *ius liturgicum*; and just as three bishops are required to consecrate a bishop, so a minimum of three ministers is necessary at the ordination of a minister. Again the elders, who may be described as ordained laymen or even as 'part-time priests', have a pastoral and ruling power to assist the minister within the parish, and to take part at a higher level in the synodical government of the Church. This parallelism is noted by the episcopalian author[4] of the Bishop Paddock Lectures for 1917, who compares the present constitution of the Church of Scotland to that of the African Church in St Cyprian's day, and writes as follows:

> In Scotland there is a curiously exact reproduction of the external order of the Church of Africa. It is for the most part in miniature. Each Scottish parish represents an African diocese. Some of them are at least as large as St Augustine's flock at Hippo, but most of them are very small. Large or small, each of them has one minister, who corresponds very closely in function to the bishop of the third century; he has under him a college of presbyters or elders, and usually some deacons; the ministers of a district assemble in presbytery or in a larger synod, and the General Assembly answers to Cyprian's plenary council of the African provinces which dealt with the question of Baptism. The likeness is

pressed. The late Dr Lindsay, in his book on the ministry in the early centuries, ingeniously applied ecclesiastical terms now current in Scotland, spoke of Cyprian calling together his 'Kirk-session', and did not forget the 'congregational meeting'. I think he was justified in this.

This form of episcopacy may not be ideal, but it is at least more primitive and pastoral than the Anglican form, under which bishops spend an undue proportion of their time on administrative duties more properly undertaken by an archdeacon. And there is nothing novel or uncatholic in Presbyterianism considered simply as a system.

But the Anglican critic may reply that episcopal succession was broken at the Reformation so that, whatever gifts and graces are extraordinarily supplied through the Presbyterian ministry, God's appointment for the order of His Church has been frustrated. The surviving records of Scottish ordinations in the years following 1560 are probably inadequate to prove or disprove the case, but Scotland is not alone in suffering from this deficiency. Even at Rome the succession is so ill-documented for the very earliest period that there also the idea of unbroken continuity from the apostles is a matter of faith rather than of historically verifiable fact. Of the medieval bishops who served as superintendents in the Scottish Reformed Church only two had certainly received episcopal consecration—such was the disorder in the late Middle Ages—but these must have transmitted something of their episcopal authority. In Presbyterianism there has always been the intention to confer a ministry of Word and Sacraments throughout the Church Universal, and also to transmit the episcopal power of ordaining others in lawful succession. And it is fairly certain that there has been unbroken succession at least through presbyters. Now it is a recognized principle of Roman canon law and of scholastic theology that in certain circumstances any priest can validly ordain.[5] St Thomas Aquinas[6] holds that, since the ministry is ordained primarily for the service of the altar, bishops and priests, who both have power to celebrate, are of the same order, and a bishop is essentially a priest with extended jurisdiction. Since he possesses this jurisdiction permanently, the bishop is the normal minister of ordination. But most of the schoolmen believed that, if all the bishops lapsed into heresy or were killed by persecution, a valid succession could be perpetuated through priests. Moreover there have been four papal bulls, dating from the fifteenth century and one of them remaining in force until the end of the nineteenth, by which priests were granted a special authority to ordain, and it is a recognized tenet of the canonists that[7] 'a priest can by Papal Indult confer the sacrament of Orders'. When the Reformers abolished papal authority, most of them replaced it with the Crown as the source of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Hence, when the priest Bugenhagen was sent to ordain clergy in Denmark, Luther[8] said that he acted *quasi verus episcopus* because he had a royal mandate. Precisely the same view was held by the Church of England in the sixteenth century. From a mass of quotations one may refer to the statements of Archbishops Parker and Whitgift[9] that, if it had pleased the Queen to turn each Dean and Chapter into a presbytery with power to ordain, that would have been

perfectly legitimate, but since the Crown had decided to retain diocesan bishops, Englishmen should obey the public law of their own country. The medieval precedents from which this theory derived were still remembered and acted upon in the seventeenth century. In 1610 James I decided that the Church of Scotland should be brought into line with its Anglican sister by the appointment of diocesans. Three Presbyterian ministers were sent south for consecration in England, where Lancelot Andrewes urged that they should first be deaconed and priested; but Archbishop Bancroft[10] ruled that they must be accepted as the equivalent of priests, since otherwise the orders of all the Reformed Churches would be called in question. The three were therefore consecrated direct to the episcopate, and on their return to Scotland they consecrated others of their brethren; but no Presbyterian minister was re-ordained, and presbyteries, synods and assemblies continued to function as before. The result was a hybrid Church, not unlike that of South India, wtih the significant difference that it was in communion with the Church of England. This is the only Anglican precedent for dealing with such a situation; and when the Church of England refused to communicate with the Church of South India, it virtually denied its own tradition.

Still today it would be difficult for any Anglican clergyman to deny the validity of Scottish Presbyterian orders. Article XXIII asserts that 'those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent which be chosen and called to this work by men who have publick authority given unto them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard'. This Article was framed with particular reference to the Lutherans, and it is careful not to insist that diocesan bishops are essential for ordination; the one requisite is that the ordainer should have public legal authority, such as in Scotland is possessed by ministers of the Established Church but not by dissenting episcopalian bishops. The terms of subscription have been much relaxed, but every Anglican clergyman is still obliged to profess a general acceptance of the Articles as being in agreement with the Word of God, and to promise that he will not contradict them in his official teaching. Whatever private doubts an Anglo-Catholic may entertain, his subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles would prohibit him from publicly denying the validity of orders in the Church of Scotland. It would be a tremendous step forward in ecumenical relations if the Anglican authorities could return to the position held by their predecessors, and publicly accept this validity, for thus inter-communion between the two Established Churches would once again be resumed. So far as interchange of clergy is concerned, the legal barrier against appointing Scottish ministers to English benefices is a parliamentary enactment, the 1662 Act of Uniformity; this has caused most of the denominational differences in the modern world, for before it there was a continuity of medieval thought and practice; but what Parliament has enacted, Parliament might well be willing to rescind.

This validity of Presbyterian orders was not invented by the colleagues and successors of John Knox. Apart from medieval precedents in Western Christendom, there have been a few cases in Eastern Orthodoxy; it is very possible that all the Patriarchs of Alexandria prior to St Athanasius were

consecrated by presbyters,[11] and there was an occasion in India when, the services of a bishop being unobtainable, twelve priests formed themselves into a college to ordain. Nor have these ideas been invented by modern High Church Presbyterians to justify an otherwise uncatholic position; they have been maintained consistently since the Reformation. An anonymous tract, published at the time of the Westminster Assembly and entitled *Ius Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici*,[12] claims that

> a ministerial succession should be granted to be drawn through the Church of Rome ... For the Church of Rome (setting aside those particular persons among them that maintained damnable errors ...) continued to be a true Church of Christ until Luther's time ... before the Church of Rome by the juggling and subtilty of the abominable Council of Trent was so far corrupted as to patronize those errors which before were but personal ... The substance of true ordination ... cannot be annulled ... no more than the Baptism of the Church of Rome.

There are good historic grounds, on catholic principles, for claiming that a valid succession has been preserved in the Scottish ministry. And no other denomination in Scotland can claim any continuous succession from the medieval and Celtic past. Pockets of Roman Catholicism have survived in certain Highland areas, but a hierarchy of the Roman obedience[13] did not exist until about a century ago. The Scottish Episcopal Church was founded as an English colony in 1662, and it may not have possessed valid orders prior to the late nineteenth century.[14] Similarly the Methodist, Baptist and Congregationalist denominations are all imports from South of the Border. Only the Presbyterians have any indigenous succession linking them with the whole of Scotland's ecclesiastical past. And if catholicity implies continuity in time as well as universality in space, the Church of Scotland must be careful not to break the historic links which it still enjoys.

However, Presbyterians must realize that their system is bound to seem strange to many of their fellow-Christians, and that it would facilitate reunion if the Church of Scotland could for the future accept some method of ordination which would be immediately and universally acceptable. This need not imply that Anglican, Orthodox or Roman bishops possess any particular grace which is denied to Presbyterians; but such bishops do have the authority of the Universal Church behind them in a slightly clearer way. Should the Church of Scotland then adopt the historic episcopate in its Anglican form? The answer is that there is no moral, legal or constitutional manner in which this could be done. Every minister and elder promises at his ordination to submit to and concur with the Presbyterian government of the Church. Ministers and elders, corporately gathered in General Assembly, cannot alter what each has promised individually to maintain. Even if a majority of them felt that they could honestly do so, the constitution of the United Kingdom would prevent it, for the Presbyterianism of the Scottish Church is written into the 1707 Treaty of Union which brought the British Parliament into existence. Even if Parliament felt that it had power to amend this treaty, without convening the Scottish Estates to negotiate a new one, it is doubtful whether such action could receive the royal assent; for the first official act of a British Sovereign is a promise to

maintain the Presbyterian Establishment in Scotland. It cannot be God's will that His Church should be reunited by a process which would involve a breach of the most solemn oaths taken by the Scottish clergy and their Queen.

Thus the situation appears to have resulted in deadlock because, however unreasonable Presbyterians may consider it to be, Anglicans have repeatedly stated that they cannot conscientiously accept a union in which clergy would be ordained otherwise than by bishops whom they can recognize as such. The problem is to combine Presbyterian government with Episcopal ordination. And the remarkable fact is that precisely this combination has now occurred before now in Scottish history, in the Celtic form of the episcopate described at the beginning of this article. However unusual that form may have appeared to the Venerable Bede, it would be difficult for anyone to condemn it as utterly invalid, for this would be tantamount to saying that the orders of most of the Celtic saints were null and void.

A Celtic episcopate could be adapted to the present constitution of the Scottish Church in various ways. Basically it requires that a competent number of senior ministers should receive episcopal consecration, and that at every ordination of ministers one of these seniors should preside. While the details are relatively unimportant, it would probably be most appropriate that each year the Moderator of the General Assembly should be consecrated on installation to his office. The Moderator already possesses an episcopal designation, a distinctive dress, and court precedence in Scotland identical with that of Canterbury in England. He has been elected to his high office by the whole Church, which he represents on public occasions, and over whose supreme court he presides. During his term of office he performs the episcopal duty of visitation; and after the expiry of one year, though eligible for re-election, he would normally become a retired bishop, still available for episcopal functions when required. In order to avoid overburdening his time, it would be necessary to make ordination of ministers an act of Assembly, with the Moderator presiding, much as Methodists are ordained under authority of Conference; this would give to ministerial ordination a more obviously universal significance throughout the whole Church. A young minister, with the probationary year completed, would proceed at once to ordination, and then be inducted to his first charge by the local presbytery, as already happens in the case of ordained men. To deal with emergencies between the sessions of Assembly, a commission would require to be given to the Moderator, or an ex-Moderator acting for him in his absence, to preside at ordinations with a competent number of local ministers. In all this the Moderator would receive no greater authority than he already has; but he would confer on ministers that episcopal ordination which Anglicans, or at least the more vocal among them, state that they feel bound to require. There would be no significant change in the powers or function of any ecclesiastical court in Scotland, and the Church's legal constitution would remain unaltered.

It has long been felt that the installation of the Assembly's Moderator should have a more solemn and sacramental character. This would be

secured if he were to receive episcopal consecration from three ex-Moderators who had themselves been consecrated. In order to initiate the process, the assistance of bishops possessing the 'historic succession' would be required. These might come from England, America, Scotland, Sweden—perhaps even from the Eastern Orthodox and the Old Catholics—to witness that they were acting in the name and by authority of the Church Universal. Each would lay his hands with the appropriate formula on a competent number of ex-Moderators, who would then perpetuate an episcopal succession in Scotland. But this inaugural service of consecration should be arranged by the Church of Scotland, as an autonomous province of the catholic Church, and in order to preserve the local Scottish succession, a senior Scottish minister should preside over the whole service. This would not invalidate the action of the visiting bishops, because any defect in the principal consecrator can be made good by the assistant consecrators in canonical form. After the inaugural service, the assistance of other Churches would be unnecessary, but it might be appropriate that a bishop of the Scottish Episcopal Church should assist whenever possible at the consecration of each new Moderator.

One argument in favour of locating an episcopate in the General Assembly rather than elsewhere is that its Moderator would function to some extent as an archbishop, and the episcopal status of every minister in his own parish would be retained. Another argument is that the Assembly's Moderator already enjoys an almost archiepiscopal dignity, so that the changes involved in consecrating him would be slight. Moreover, all the other possible places for the bishop have before now been suggested and rejected. Permanent Moderators of Synod were disapproved some few years ago. Permanent 'bishops-in-presbytery' were scornfully dismissed after the Anglo-Presbyterian Report of 1958. It was right that they should be rejected, for permanent Moderators have no place in Presbyterianism; as Steuart of Pardovan[15] long ago insisted, parity of ministers implies among much else that every minister, if duly elected, is equally eligible to preside over any superior court of which he is a member. Further, if the bishop had been introduced at the level of presbytery, parish ministers would have sunk to the status of parish priests; and elders would have degenerated into deacons, without canonical authority to rule the Church or to attend its synods. The scheme of 'bishops-in-presbytery' would in fact have obliterated from the constitution of the Church of Scotland those catholic features which till now it has been careful to retain.

But an 'archbishop-in-assembly', holding office for one year, would in many ways sum up the whole ecclesiastical history of Scotland. He would function in a manner derived from the remote period of Celtic antiquity, hallowed by the name of St Columba. In his own person he would recall those lonely Bishops of Alba who were once the sole bishops in the kingdom. His archiepiscopal stature would reflect the later Middle Ages when Scotland, as a self-governing province, received its metropolitan. The bench of episcopal ex-Moderators would resemble that episode in the story of the Scottish Episcopal Church when its bishops formed a college without

individual sees. And the continued operation of all the ecclesiastical courts, with undiminished jurisdiction, would preserve the present constitution of the Established Church intact.

[1] E.g. Phil. 7: 'I learned it not from flesh of man; it was the preaching of the Spirit who spake on this wise, Do nothing without the bishop'.
[2] *Hist. Eccl.*, III, 4.
[3] II 2-9.
[4] T. A. Lacey, *Unity and Schism*, 98-99.
[5] See the articles by Prof. J. M. Barkley in *Scottish Journal of Theology*, IX, 135-60, and XI, 134-49.
[6] *Summa Theol.* Suppl. 37, ii, and 40, v.
[7] Fr. J. Bligh, S.J., *Ordination to the Priesthood*, 8-9; cf. Hans Küng, *Structures of the Church*, E.T. 1965, 187, note 67.
[8] de Wette, V, 88.
[9] J. W. Allen, *Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century*, 177; cf. N. Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyter*, 18 seq. For a number of cases, prior to 1662, when competent Anglican authority recognized the validity of non-episcopal ordinations, see Sykes, op. cit., 87 seq.; in particular Archbishop Grindal in 1582 accepted a Scottish Presbyterian minister as 'ordained to Holy Orders and the sacred Ministry ... by imposition of hands according to the laudable form and rite of the reformed Church of Scotland' (J. Strype, *Edmund Grindal*, II, appendix 17). Under Elizabeth I the Established Church of the Channel Islands was Presbyterian (Baron Fernand de Schickler *Les Églises du Refuge en Angleterre*, Paris, 1892, II, 412 seq.); if a similar establishment had existed in the American colonies, the problem of Wesleyan ordinations need not have arisen. This may be why, on 21st March 1956, the then Moderator of the English Free Church Federal Council was reported as saying, 'I believe we could all unite tomorrow on a Presbyterian basis'.
[10] Sykes op. cit., 101 seq.
[11] W. Telfer in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, III, 1-13.
[12] (1654 edn.) 264 seq.
[13] I use the words in the modern post-Tridentine sense; medieval Scottish bishops were sometimes very disobedient, braving a papal excommunication over the Declaration of Arbroath, and Scottish representatives played a prominent part in the conciliar movement, especially at the Council of Basel.
[14] See Gordon Donaldson, *Scotland: Church and Nation through Sixteen Centuries*, 87, note 1.
[15] *Collections and Observations*, etc. (1709 edn.), 48.

SALVATION: FROM WHAT—TO WHAT?

Wilfried Blötzli

SWITZERLAND is not just geographically a part of Continental Europe; she participates in the thought and in the whole Weltanschauung of that area. There is therefore no specifically Swiss answer to the question posed by our theme. Although this whole complex of questions is naturally of considerable current interest, and although we are well aware that the particular question before us, along with other critical ones, is determinative for the credibility of the church's proclamation, still this question 'from what—to what?' does not occupy the foreground of our attention. (It is not the debate about 'salvation' as such which stands in the foreground, but rather the debate about the *Salvator*—the Saviour—himself.) We are concerned less at this moment for the practical consequences, and much more for the causal relationships. You may say—and with some justification—that this is typically Continental, even typically German. But it seems to us evident that the question of what it is that the Gospel is offering men as 'salvation' is to be answered by way of the prior question of causality. 'From what—to what?' cannot receive an authentic answer until the ground of that salvation has been seen clearly once again. And precisely this seems today more than ever debatable.

Over the last hundred years, the content of the word 'salvation' has been going through a process of radical secularization, whose consequences for philosophical and theological thought, and therefore also for the practical affairs of life, we are just now really beginning to experience. The trend of this process is toward the general rejection of the metaphysical matrix of human life. Let us name some of the stages of this development:

Karl Marx (1818-1883): Marx, the son of a rabbi, who was converted to Christianity, looks for the salvation of man only within the secular sphere. Man is to be saved from selfishness, dishonesty, unconcern, and therefore also from the unjust distribution of both means and gains of production. The secularized 'from what—to what?' appears as the participation of all, with equal rights, in the duties and in the proceeds of production. 'Salvation' is for Karl Marx the creation, and entering upon, of messianic circumstances on earth—yet without a Messiah. Marxist humanity is to move toward redemption and freedom, and is to do it, by principle, under the exclusion of every metaphysical presupposition and dependency. Man must free himself of those notions of God, all too long maintained, which history itself has proved to be useless, and which have become a powerful weapon in the hands of the mighty to be used against human freedom. So must a humanity freed from all things metyphysical take matters in its own hands and create a secular condition of salvation. 'No higher Being, no God, no Emperor, no Tribune will save us; Only we ourselves can save us from this suffering!' (So runs the Internationale.)

Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900): This, the son of a Protestant pastor, is the other great questioner of the 19th century. He, too, is concerned about 'salvation'. But is the concept of salvation preached by the church tenable? Nietzsche lets Zarathustra put the question: 'You call yourself free? Your dominant thought is what I want to hear, and not that you have escaped a yoke.... Free from what? What does Zarathustra care about that? But the very light of your eyes should tell me: free *to* what?' These words are Nietzsche's abrupt 'No!' to a theology which pins the Christian Gospel of redemption to a mere forensic occurrence on the one hand (that is, that no sin can separate us from God) and busies itself, on the other hand, with freeing people from sins of deed, which it has defined with casuistic exactitude. For Nietzsche that could never be enough. Pushing the 'from what?' contemptuously aside, he threw his demanding 'to what?' into the fire of debate. To what is Man to be made free? He is to make himself free, free to himself and for himself. 'God'—a false concept—lies far behind him. 'God is dead.' Nietzsche combats the specifically Christian message of a salvation grounded on the Christ-event with a perfect hatred. Man himself, the masterful, the Dionysian, must break through to liberty. 'Dionysus against the Crucified!' (*Ecce Homo*). Man for himself is both cause and end of redemption. 'From what?' From an inhuman, servile bondage to an imaginary God. 'To what?' To himself, to free mastery, to 'azure loneliness'.

Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-): Here is the famous nephew of the even more famous Dr Albert Schweitzer. He, too, is for the liberation of Man. Sartre's Man has been tossed without purpose, without meaning, into existence. No metaphysical Will had anything to do with it, for there is no such thing. That God is not necessary to the process of becoming, being, and passing away is proof enough of his non-existence. Man lives, therefore, in confrontation only with himself and his own kind. 'God' is non-existent, so that man can have nothing to do with him, not even to get rid of him. Without guide or example, man is directed only by his own will. One can speak of responsibility only as over against the whole of humanity. Redemption comes about when man realizes himself, becomes himself. To ask 'to what?' is useless. In contrast to Marx and Nietzsche, Sartre sees man as without hope, acting among the chance circumstances of a history devoid of meaning. In that he acts and decides, he is man. That is all. ('*L'homme n'est pas—l'homme se fait.*') The 'how' of man's acting is, because of the disappearance of absolute norms, irrelevant. It is in acting that man frees himself and ceases to be a 'foam, a rottenness, or a cauliflower'. (*L'Existentialisme est un Humanisme.*) Man is his own saviour. To what? Finally, to nothing, into Nothingness!

The theological atheism debate has raised a whole set of questions sharply and decisively. The leaders of the movement in Germany are Braun and Metzger. In England, Bishop Robinson has attempted to state the problem in a popular fashion. It is clear that these men, too, are concerned about the existence, freedom, and total well-being of mankind, that is to say, about salvation. But this salvation is no longer regarded as the result of the intervention of the transcendent into the immanent. In this concept of salvation,

the word 'God' functions only as a working hypothesis, and carries as meaning only the 'I ought' and 'I may' of the realm of human interpersonal relationships. (This is according to Braun.) There exist, then, for all practical purposes, only the self and the neighbour, whose relationships with each other are to be regulated by a certain sort of fairness, to which one could attach the name 'God'. Robinson, a churchman, did not wish to be so radical. He grants, therefore, that the saving of a man cannot take place without metaphysical or divine help. But Robinson does not locate the 'divine Other' there, where the official teaching of the church does, but rather in the 'Depth of Being', that is to say, in the essential cognition of the individual person. (Robinson ought to think it over and tell us whether the Pope has this 'Depth of Being', or whether the totality of the members of a church have it, and what it means when such 'Depths of Being' produce absolute assertions!) Salvation, then, is from God—and I myself am that God. I am my own saviour, stand as such among my neighbours, and before—Nothingness. Thus it is clear that Braun and Metzger—Robinson, too, really—are rubbing shoulders with—Sartre! Robinson again has much less in common with Bonhoeffer whom he quotes more gladly than he himself thinks, for Bonhoeffer really never denied the Saviour as a personal Other. Generally speaking, then, we may regard Robinson's attempt to tell the 'old, old story' in new words as a failure, for the new words simply miss the point of the old story.

So today the fronts are no longer straight, but have become all tangled up in each other. Friends are fighting in the uniform of the enemy, and some of the enemy are wearing the uniform of friends. Who is friend, who enemy? Chaos seems complete. What should we Methodists say to all this? Should we speak to it at all? Is there anything in our theological heritage, which, making common cause with the New Testament, would provide a valid answer?

Methodism springs not from existential philosophy, but from New Testament theology. For Methodism, God was and is that eternal and personal Other who confronts Man, distinguished from the latter (in the Kierkegaardian sense) by an 'infinite qualitative difference.' Salvation is therefore never the work of man, for it must bridge that infinite qualitative distance from God to us.

> Of yourselves cometh neither your faith nor your salvation: 'it is the gift of God' (Ephesians 2^8); the free, undeserved gift; the faith through which ye are saved, as well as the salvation, which He of His own good pleasure, His mere favour, annexes thereto (J. Wesley, Sermon on 'Salvation by Faith', V. 13).

True enough, that is a forensic event that takes place between God and me, but it is to be understood existentionally, relevently, *hic et nunc*:

> Whatsoever else (salvation) imply, it is a present salvation. It is something attainable, yea, actually attained, on earth, by those who are partakers of this faith (ibid., p. 10).

Wesley cuts to the core of our problem with a fascinating formulation out of one of his letters:

> If we could bring all our preachers, itinerant and local, uniformly and steadily to insist on those two points: 'Christ dying for us' and 'Christ reigning in us,' we should shake the trembling gates of Hell (Letters, VI, 134).

That is doubtless the New Testament in brief; it is Methodist theology in a single sentence. When we interpret this sentence by means of the foregoing quotations, we find in it three basic, and for the current debate, indispensable and decisive truths:

1. The causal event of salvation is the death of Jesus Christ. The end of his life was not just another tragic death with no special meaning beyond itself. Golgotha is set apart from all other deaths; it is a death unique in intent and purpose. Human history reveals, among countless other crucifixions, no other of similar meaning. The death of Jesus Christ is without parallel or analogy, for it possesses a comprehensive salvatory character: '... for us' (ἀντὶ ἡμῶ). Here is an act in proxy from both sides: the divine and the human. He died in our place, so that that existence of ours that had lost its meaning could end, and be replaced by an existence under free grace. 'Christ dying for us' is a forensic event; its universal and eternal significance is expressed in the words 'for us'. To insist on this in our preaching: this is to shake the gates of Hell; this is the fitting proclamation of the message of salvation.

2. Salvation is existential, in that Christ reigns in us. Jesus Christ, the present and divine Other who confronts me, sets me free just there, where sin has separated me from God. He frees me in very concrete life situations. I experience liberation in an unending series of events and particular decisions: liberation to God, for God and for His Kingdom. Christ present acts graciously, redemptively upon my practical daily life, here and now. And He does this, not as Bultmann thinks, in that I make responsible decisions in line with the Biblical intention. Christ present reigns, liberates, redeems in that he confronts me personally and acts upon my life and will to transform them. The Bible calls this the work of the Holy Spirit 'Christ reigning' —that is, Christ himself is the active, liberating, redeeming subject. 'In us' —we as believers are willing to be led by him; we are those who are, in every decisive situation, redeemed by him. This 'in us' is not the same as Robinson's or Tillich's 'Depth of Being', that is, it is not a portion of myself; it refers to me as a whole person, who may live in the salvation of a present, eternal Redeemer.

3. 'Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and today, and forever' (Heb. 13^{8}). Both phrases—'Christ dying for us' and 'Christ reigning in us' point to one and the same Christ. Salvation, both in the forensic and in the existential sense, and also in its absolute scope, presupposes the identity of the historical Jesus of the cross with the suprahistorical, exalted, and present Christ. This Saviour, and only this Saviour can guarantee salvation. Nothing that is sought or hoped for aside from this Saviour—be it Nietzsche's 'azure loneli-

ness' of the Superman, or Marx's messianic world, or Sartre's freedom in the face of Nothingness, or the simple humanitarianism of the atheism debate —no one of these can ever deserve the name of salvation. These things do not pierce to the core of life; they only scratch about on the surface. Therefore Marx's messianic world must end in the soulless massing of humanity. Therefore Nietzsche's freedom ends in wild and bestial wantonness. Therefore Sartre's man frees himself into meaningless Nothing. Therefore Robinson, Braun, and others, find themselves confronted, not by a genuine salvation, but by themselves. All in all there remains after the change of names the same old bondage.

Most of what I have said is, of course, preliminary and introductory to our actual theme. But it is precisely at this point that a most exciting and excited battle is being fought on the Continent. We shall not find any valid answer for the 'from what—to what?' until we can see through the powder smoke more clearly. We cannot shake the gates of Hell, until we can insist unequivocally upon these two points: 'Christ dying for us'—'Christ reigning in us.' Salvation comes only through that Saviour, who died for us on the cross, who confronts us personally here and now as the eternal and yet daily Redeemer.

METHODISM AND THE CHARTIST MOVEMENT

Michael S. Edwards

'The Charter springs from Zion's Hill,
Though opposed, go on it will,
Will you serve its sacred cause,
And receive its equal laws?'

(verse of a Chartist Hymn, 1839.)

I

CHARTISM was essentially a mass movement of the working classes seeking economic redress by political means. Only when the people controlled the Government, the Chartists reasoned, would the Government legislate for the people. The political democracy of the People's Charter was not new. Universal manhood suffrage, annual Parliaments, the abolition of property qualifications for M.P.'s, equal electoral districts, payment of M.P.'s, and ballot voting had been advocated as far back as 1780. The difference between the demands of the Westminster Committee of 1780 and William Lovett's Peoples Charter of 1838 was the difference created by the Industrial Revolution. The Chartists wanted democracy as an indispensable preliminary to the relief of the working classes. Their National Petition of 1839 dwelt more on 'public and private suffering' than on abstract political rights.[1] Carlyle was right when he saw the 'Condition of

England Question' as responsible for Chartism; its aim was social justice, its method was Parliamentary democracy, and its driving forces were hunger and hatred.

The Chartist movement was basically unstable. It was an uneasy alliance of various sectional and local causes, and this resulted in a weak organization, an unrealistic strategy, an inept leadership, and a divided rank and file. Three of its component parts arose in the industrial North. The leaders of the Factory Movement and the Anti-Poor Law Agitation were Christians and Tories shocked by social conditions and by their justification in the Philosophic Radical doctrine of *laissez-faire*; they were not concerned with the political issue of democracy, which as Tories they disliked.[2] The Trade Union leaders were Owenite Socialists—and therefore secularists—and democrats. Two more movements that were absorbed in Chartism were mainly political—William Lovett's London Working Men's Association and Thomas Attwood's Birmingham Political Union. They revived political agitation, which had been dormant since the passing of the Reform Act of 1832. There was not always mutual understanding between these various groups, and Chartist unity proved precarious.

Chartism was essentially a class movement. Feargus O'Connor, the most influential Chartist leader, constantly attacked the middle classes in his 'Northern Star' newspaper as the 'millocrats' and the 'shopocrats' who had 'betrayed' the working classes by denying them the vote in 1832.[3] Attwood's movement was soon alienated, while Lovett's viewpoint was increasingly suspected of being too middle class; later, there could be no co-operation with Richard Cobden's Anti-Corn Law League or Joseph Sturge's Complete Suffrage Union. Every attempt to widen the appeal of Chartism was defeated by this class consciousness, though without the alliance that had carried the Reform Act of 1832, there was no hope of Chartist success.

There were many differences within the working classes themselves. There was little cooperation between Chartists of different regions. The interests of skilled craftsmen, factory operatives and domestic outworkers were not always the same. Some Chartists—mainly from the factory areas—favoured 'physical force', which might mean anything from possession of arms to insurrection; others wanted 'moral force', the way of persuasion by propaganda, meetings and petitions. Often, Chartists swung from one to the other according to circumstances. There was no general agreement about ultimate aims when the Charter had been carried. Some, like O'Connor, wanted a return to an idealized pre-Industrial past; others, such as the Owenite Socialists, accepted the Industrial Revolution and sought to humanize it. Lovett wanted gradual reform through an educated electorate, while Harney and Jones, the last leaders of Chartism, were influenced by Karl Marx. These differences were bound to result in a quarrelling leadership; they counted far more in the internal politics of the movement than the personal bid for power by O'Connor.[4]

It is not surprising that the widest views existed on the Chartist attitude to religion. Chartism arose at a time of growing working class secularism. Not since the rise of the industrial town had many adult workers attended

a church.[5] The Religious Census of 1851 showed that less than a quarter of the total population of many large industrial towns attended worship on Census Sunday.[6] The deepest hopes of hungry and desperate men were increasingly identified wholly with political and social reform. To the Leicester framework knitters, Chartism meant 'a renovation of all things—a regeneration of the social state—a political millenium'.[7] Yet not all Chartists were secularists. The 'Northern Star' admitted that there were Chartist '... Churchmen, Dissenters, and no-Church-at-all men ... differing in their views of political economy, morals and religion wide as the poles asunder'.[8] Christians such as Dr Wade the Anglican and Arthur O'Neill the Baptist worked alongside unbelievers such as Holyoake and William Lovett.[9] Perhaps most Chartists echoed the sentiments of Henry Solly's Chartist who said, 'There was very little enmity against it (Christianity) ... we only thought it a humbug, and not worth a sensible man's troubling his head about'.[10]

All Chartists attacked the churches as a manifestation of class. O'Connor declared, 'Every monied class has its distinct religion—the religion of land is the state church, the religion of Money, Steam and Manufactures is Dissent—not conscientious dissent from the Law Church but jealous rivalry for that religious support which has been so successful in creating political ascendancy—the religion of Retail and Shop is Methodism—charity, humility and self-denial are all requisite marks for those who buy cheap and sell dear, put sand in the sugar and water the beer'.[11] Chartists contrasted the words of Christ with the practice of the Anglican Church, and the poverty of the people with the incomes of the higher clergy; they sought the separation of Church and State, with the confiscation of Church temporalities.[12] They dismissed Dissent, which was absorbed in internal issues, and hated Wesleyan Methodism for its Conservatism. Gammage, a Chartist who became the movement's first historian, wrote, 'If there is a body of men in England who are in the service and uphold the principles of despotism, that body is the Wesleyan Conference'.[13] Chartists opposed religious education in schools; above all, they could not understand how any Christian Church could reconcile the *status quo* with the prophetic denunciation of social evil in Scripture.[14] The Christian Chartists tried to restore this prophetic emphasis at the many Chartist meetings and by the formation of Chartist Churches. Some of them declared 'that St. Paul was a Chartist, that St. Peter was a Chartist, and that Christ Himself was a Chartist', others that 'the founder of Christianity was the greatest and purest democrat that ever lived'.[15] The entire emphasis of the Chartist Christians tended to reduce Christianity to an ethical cult'.[16] It is difficult to believe that they influenced Chartists who were not already Christians; the first mass movement of working class self-help was largely secular in inspiration and outlook.[17]

II

Wesleyan political attitudes were moulded by the views of Wesley and the interpretation of his 'no politics' rule. John Wesley was a Tory; Jabez Bunting, the greatest and most representative Wesleyan of his age, declared in

the Conference of 1839, 'We are, as a body, Conservative'.[18] The 'no politics' rule, framed against an eighteenth century background of 'Political Dissent', said, 'None of us shall, either in writing or in conversation, speak lightly or irreverently of the Government under which we live. The oracles of God command us to be subject to the higher powers; and "honour the king" is there connected with the fear of God'.[19] Although the Connexion was fast becoming a Church, its original discipline was not to be changed; the 'no politics' rule was to be literally enforced despite a new ecclesiastical and political situation.[20] Here was an attempt to maintain Wesley's views at a time when Wesley's world was vanishing.

Wesleyan Methodism was thus politically neutral with a strong Conservative bias. It could stomach moderate constitutional reform, but it reacted strongly against the strange, new radicalisms of the French and Industrial Revolutions. God was the source of power, not the people; democracy was therefore 'infidel', as well as being 'inconsistent with good government'.[21] While the Reform Act of 1832 was cautiously welcomed,[22] the *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* warned its readers against 'the passion for great and fundamental changes', and urged them not to vote for 'one who is in theory an enemy of the Constitution as established in the three estates of King, Lords and Commons'.[23] Wesleyan leaders constantly accused the various Methodist reformers of political motives. James Dixon in 1835 attacked the Wesleyan Association in this spirit. 'The democratical theory that the *people* are the fountain of all power in the state, so delightful to the pride and vanity of the age, is here borne triumphantly from the world into the Church, and placed as the new order of things in Christianity. We remind the fond advocates of this principle that there is such a book as the Bible'.[24] Although Methodist historians have followed the Wesleyan leaders in confusing Methodist political attitudes and internal disputes,[25] it is clear that Wesleyan hostility to political democracy would be strengthened by opposition to the various Methodist reformers.

Chartist economic and social aspirations were even more alien to Wesleyan thought. The Conference of 1833, in the midst of the Trade Union disputes, warned Wesleyans against 'Associations which are subversive of true and proper liberty, employing unlawful oaths and threats and force to acquire new members and to accomplish purposes which would tend to destroy the very framework of society'.[26] No help was given by Conference to the Tolpuddle 'Martyrs' of 1834, who were mainly Wesleyans. Radicals were expelled, for as Bunting said, they 'are inconsistent in joining Methodism'.[27] Wesleyans seemed unable to contemplate the problems of an industrial society; the only time the Conference of 1837 heard about the prevailing trade depression was in a passing reference to the profits of the Book Room.[28] Oastler's Factory Movement was forbidden to use Wesleyan chapels for its meetings, partly because of its alleged 'High Church' tendencies.[29] Oastler, an ex-Methodist whose father had known Wesley, replied, 'Wesley would not have been silent on this question, I know he would not, nor would he have refused his chapels . . . no matter who had rented the front seats in the gallery'.[30] The Wesleyans were silent as Oastler

asked, 'Is the Bible to be forgotten because Malthus has written a book?'; but Wesleyans only remembered the Bible when Robert Owen wrote a book. Owen's secularism was attacked, socialism equated with infidelity, and the inhumanity of an industrial society ignored.

The changing social composition of Methodism was one reason for this. Class distinctions, pew rents, and Conservative politics were eroding Methodist working class support. It is not surprising that Bunting in 1843 attributed a membership decrease to 'Radicalism, infidelity and Socialism'.[31] The deeper reason was that Methodists, in common with other Christians, lacked a theology of society; they saw the Kingdom of God through Benthamite blinkers. Redemption of the individual, not reform of society, was the Christian message. The Magazine in 1839 declared that 'the riots of infidel democracy' would cease, and 'mankind form one vast and happy brotherhood', when the world was evangelized.[32] The result was to immerse Methodists in a cosy world of familiar activities; 1839 meant for many of them the Centenary of Methodism, not the year of the Chartist Petition. The ex-Methodist Chartist Joseph Barker illustrates the disastrous effect of this attitude. 'Formerly I thought it wrong for a Christian to meddle in political matters. Formerly I thought it the duty of Christians to unite themselves together in churches, to shut themselves out from the world, to constitute themselves a little exclusive world, and to confine their labours to the government of their little kingdom and to the increase of the numbers of its subjects. I now think differently. I have no faith in church organisations. I believe it my duty to be a man; to live and move in the world at large; to battle with evil wherever I see it, and to aim at the annihilation of all corrupt institutions and at the establishment of all good, and generous, and useful institutions in their places'.[33]

Wesleyan Methodism was unbendingly hostile to Chartism. James Dixon was loudly clapped in the Conference of 1839 when he said, 'I should be sorry if we could fraternise with Chartists'.[34] There was no such intention. The Bath Wesleyan District expelled Wesleyans who were Chartists.[35] The Leaders Meeting of Wesley's Chapel that expelled James Ardrey in 1840 recorded that it 'regards the principles and practices of the Chartists as being directly contrary to the precepts of the Word of God and the rules of the Wesleyan Methodist Society'.[36] The Conference of 1843 attacked 'infidels and irreligious men' who blamed policies and institutions for the widespread suffering. The *Watchman* in 1848 hailed the Chartist fiasco on Kennington Common as 'one of the most contemptible failures in the whole history of abortive attempts of disloyalty'.[37] Chartist unbelief, radicalism, violence, educational and ecclesiastical policies were all abhorred.

The younger branches of Methodism also opposed Chartism, contrary to what is often stated.[38] The 'no politics' rule was observed in all of them, though weaker connexional authority made its enforcement less effective. The official pronouncements of the Methodist New Connexion and the Wesleyan Methodist Association were unsympathetic to Chartism.[39] Socialism was dismissed as 'contemptible' and full of 'loathsome rottenness' by the *New Connexion Magazine*.[40] The Primitive Methodists and Bible Christians

seemed to ignore Chartism, although it was significant that Hugh Bourne had once expelled a 'speeching Radical' from the Conference because 'the Scripture required us to be in subject to the Government under which we lived'.[41] Conference in 1835 and 1836 passed regulations against Primitive Methodist participation in politics.[42] The political outlook of the reformed Methodist connexions was coloured by their differences with the Wesleyan Conference, but this would not have made them allies of Chartism. Thomas Pope Rosevear, a Wesleyan Association leader in Cornwall, thought that the aim of the Wesleyan Conference was to 'keep back the Methodistic mind from the onward march of public improvement, whether in civil or religious society',[43] but this wealthy merchant despised the lowly social origin of the Wesleyan ministry—'those ci-devant knights of the thimble, the hatchet, the clock-bench, the awl, and the plough'.[44] Nothing could be further removed from the Chartist outlook.

All this applies equally to the Wesleyan Reformers of 1849. They were not the religious counterpart of Chartism. They were concerned with Church polity, not Parliamentary Government; they were not necessarily political democrats, and certainly not social democrats.[45] James Everett would not have seen himself as a Methodist Feargus O'Connor. If William Griffith was a Chartist, he was in any case considered an extremist by the Reformers; Samuel Dunn, who declared he never meddled with politics,[46] was more typical. The non-Wesleyan Methodist reaction to Chartism was more moderate than that of the Wesleyan Conference; but the difference was a matter of degree rather than of kind. The Wesleyans were politically neutral with a Tory bias, the non-Wesleyan Methodists were neutral with a Whig bias; both were out of sympathy with a movement like Chartism which impartially condemned the 'tryannical plundering Whigs' and the 'tyrannical plundering Tories'.[47]

The differences within Methodism caused by the Chartist challenge were not between Wesleyans and non-Wesleyans, but between leaders and led.[48] Methodists of almost every tradition were not all persuaded by their connexional viewpoint. The 'no politics' rule meant nothing to an unemployed Methodist worker; democracy offered him a prospect of better conditions. Some felt that the problems of an industrial age ought to be a concern of the Christian faith. They came to believe that 'the Charter springs from Zion's Hill', and that 'though a man may be a Chartist and not a Christian, a man cannot be a Christian and not a Chartist except through ignorance'.[49]

The most important of these 'rebels' was Joseph Rayner Stephens (1805-79), a Wesleyan minister expelled in 1834 for his advocacy of Disestablishment. Like his ally Richard Oastler, the Anglican, he was a Tory radical demanding social redress while rejecting democracy; in some ways, he was a far truer exponent of Wesley's Toryism than Bunting.[50] He anticipated the Christian Socialist movement by ten years.[51] A brilliant orator, an insurrectionary, and a social revolutionary, his essential greatness was his ability to interpret the struggles of his time in Christian terms, and to offer a faith broad enough to cover social issues while remaining true to Scripture. He saw the industrial scene not in political or class terms, but in Christian

terms. 'It is the battle between God and Mammon . . . The question is, whether God shall reign in England, or whether Satan shall domineer—the question is, whether the laws of Heaven and the institutions of mercy are to be the laws of a Christian land and the institutions of a Christian people, or whether laws begotten below and born here on earth are to be the laws and institutions to which a once Christian land and a once Christian people are to be compelled to submit'.[52] He was the first in the Methodist tradition to challenge the individualism of Protestant theology; he revived Wesley's peculiar blend of uncommitted Toryism and pioneering social concern,[53] and applied it to the new conditions created by the Industrial Revolution.

Two other ex-Methodist ministers became Chartists, Joseph Barker of the New Connexion and John Skevington of the Primitive Methodists.[54] Barker was an erratic man concerned more with doctrine than with politics; he became a Chartist in 1846 and edited a Chartist newspaper. Skevington was far more stable. He was the leader of Loughborough Chartism throughout its existence. Many local preachers became Chartists. Among them were Thomas Cooper, the shoemaker, teacher, lecturer and journalist, Ben Rushton the handloom weaver of Halifax, Joseph Capper of Nantwich, Abraham Hanson of Huddersfield, and John Markham of Leicester. The New Connexion and the Primitive Methodists seem to have had the most Chartists, the Wesleyan Association the fewest;[55] the Bible Christians had none at all. Although only Stephens amongst them became a national leader, many of the others were leaders of local Chartist branches. Methodism had trained them well in the art of leadership, and these men were among the most reliable in the Chartist movement. Their Methodist convictions did not influence Chartism to any great extent. Chartism breathed a secular air, and it was no accident that men like Cooper and Barker lost their faith altogether in their Chartist days. They had a greater impact on the churches that expelled them, for eventually Methodism was to honour her social prophets, of which they were amongst the first.

Much has been made of Chartist meetings on Methodist premises, and Chartist borrowing of Methodist organization.[56] The meetings were illegal, and the borrowings were strictly limited to organization. Chartist Camp Meetings, Love Feasts, Class Meetings and District Meetings may be a tribute to Wesley's powers as a Church builder, but it was a wholly unintentional one. The influence of Methodism on Chartism must not be exaggerated; if Chartism borrowed Methodist organization, it caught little of its spirit.

III

The Chartist movement proved remarkably fruitful. After its collapse, its political aims were eventually achieved by Conservative and Liberal Governments. Five out of six of the Charter's points became the law of the land. The economic and social aims of Chartism were separated from the political aims and were overshadowed in the 'golden age' of British Capitalism from 1850 to 1875; but they eventually re-emerged in the

Socialist organizations, especially the Independent Labour Party of 1893.[67] The Chartists successfully forced all subsequent thinkers to examine the assumptions of *laissez-faire* Capitalism, and stimulated a trend towards Government intervention in economic and social affairs. The Christian Chartists too had their successors, and Christianity was never entirely divorced from later left-wing movements.

Methodist political attitudes also changed. Directly stimulated by the Chartist challenge, Frederick Denison Maurice and the Christian Socialists rediscovered the social nature of the Kingdom of God. Maurice's criticism of the Tractarian social outlook applied equally well to Wesleyan Methodism: 'Their error I think consists in opposing the "spirit of this age" by the spirit of a former age, instead of the ever-living and active spirit of God'. Maurician teaching was eventually accepted in a changed Wesleyan Methodism through the preaching of Hugh Price Hughes, and the writings of John Scott Lidgett and S. E. Keeble. Wesleyans came to understand through the painful political and ecclesiastical controversies of the early nineteenth century that Wesley's attitudes could not be maintained. A greater toleration of minority viewpoints and the realization that the strict discipline of a sect was not altogether appropriate for the broader requirements of a Church created the atmosphere for more radical Christian social appraisal. A further factor was the far greater willingness of the Methodist middle classes to consider the Chartist political programme once the Chartist organization had collapsed and its social aims divorced from it. They began to take their place in a more radical Liberalism to demand reforms inspired by Chartism.

The final legacy of Chartism to the churches was its secularity. The Chartist period moulded the form of modern class consciousness in this country. It provided the last opportunity for the churches to convince the working classes as a whole that their plight was of concern to God, and that God in Christ had an answer to it. The churches' failure here was disastrous. Chartism, as the first mass movement of working class self-help, hardened into a binding tradition the assumption that Christianity had nothing to offer the working classes. It confirmed the alienation already begun.

[1] 'British Working Class Movements-Select Documents, 1789-1875', by G. D. H. Cole and A. W. Filson, pp. 353-5.

[2] Two of these leaders were Richard Oastler and Michael Sadler, Anglicans who had been Methodists.

[3] O'Connor was not the only Chartist leader who attacked the middle class. O'Brien and Lovett did so as well.

[4] *Feargus O'Connor*, by D. Read and E. Glasgow, 1961, is the first attempt to give a more balanced view of these controversies.

[5] *Church and People in an Industrial City*, by E. R. Wickham, 1957, pp. 14, 87-8.

[6] *Labouring Men*, by E. R. Hobsbawm, 1964, Chapter 3, 'Methodism and the threat of a Revolution in Britain'.

[7] Quoted in A. Briggs, *Chartist Studies*, p. 129 (1959). From *Leicester Chronicle*, April 8th, 1848.

[8] Quoted in Asa Briggs, *Chartist Studies*, p. 262 (1959). From *Northern Star*, February 26th, 1842.

[9] William Lovett, despite his early attachment to the Wesleyans and the Bible Christians in Newlyn and Penzance, 'could never work up his imagination to believing his sins were forgiven' (*Life* by himself, 1876, p. 22), and later became a free thinker in the secular atmosphere of London radicalism.

[10] *James Woodford*, by Henry Solly, 1881, p. 214.

[11] *Northern Star*, October 5th, 1839. (Supplied by courtesy of Mr. B. Trinder.)

[12] *Chartism and the Churches*, by H. U. Faulkner, pp. 34-5, prints the full Chartist programme adopted by the Convention of 1851.

[13] *History of the Chartist Movement*, by R. C. Gammage, 1894, pp. 55-6.

[14] See Faulkner, p. 32.

[15] *Some Working Class Movements of the 19th Century*, by R. F. Wearmouth, 1948, pp. 185, 186.

[16] Even the founder of the Chartist Church movement, Arthur O'Neill, later left it in 1846 because 'He thought the worldly term "Chartist" should not be an appendage to the heavenly term "Christian" ' (see Wearmouth, *Some Working Class Movements*, p. 176).

[17] For another view, see Wearmouth, 'Some Working Class Movements,' p. 173-198. He gives many examples of Methodist Chartists preaching at Chartist gatherings, and assumes that this is the whole story.

[18] *Sidelights on the Conflicts of Methodism, 1827-52*, by B. Gregory, 1899, p. 274.

[19] Rules of 1797, quoted in Faulkner, p. 84.

[20] As part of the Plan of Pacification in 1795, the preachers reasserted their loyalty to the rules in Wesley's 'Large Minutes'. (*A New History of Methodism*, Vol. 1, p. 386.)

[21] *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*, 1839, p. 1021, 1845, p. 295.

[22] Ibid., 1832, p. 533.

[23] Ibid.

[24] *Wesleyan Vindicator*, 1850, p. 129.

[25] The divisions of Methodism had a theological origin, not merely a political-sociological one, as is so often assumed.

[26] *Methodism and the Working Class Movements of England*, by R. F. Wearmouth, p. 188.

[27] *Sidelights*, p. 225.

[28] *Sidelights*, p. 249.

[29] *The Factory Movement*, by J. T. Ward, 1962, p. 56.

[30] Ibid., p. 85.

[31] *Sidelights*, p. 346.

[32] *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*, 1839, p. 1021.

[33] Quoted by Faulkner, p. 27.

[34] *Sidelights*, p. 274. Dr. Maldwyn Edwards attributes this remark to Bunting; it does of course exactly illustrate his sentiments. (See *Methodism and England*, p. 32.)

[35] Quoted in *Henry Vincent*, by W. Dorling, 1879, p. 12.

[36] Proceedings of Wesley Historical Society, 1942, Vol. 23, p. 121.

[37] *Watchman*, April, 12th., 1848, p. 174.

[38] Those who stress the 'radicalism' of the non-Wesleyan bodies forget there was a contrast between the views of the connexion and those of a section of the rank and file. Joseph Barker (*Life*, p. 109) points out the 'complete division' between the rich and the poor in the New Connexion. There was also a strong strain of 'otherworldliness' about the Primitive Methodists and Bible Christians that from the radical point of view was almost as exasperating as the Wesleyan Toryism.

[39] The New Connexion address to the societies in 1842 entreated 'our poorer brethren to place no reliance in the specious theories of social amelioration which, while they often disguise the grossest infidelity, tend to disunite and alienate the various classes of society from one another'. The 1843 address spoke of the New Connexion as 'the exemplars of order, loyalty, and patriotism'. The Wesleyan Association Annual Assembly in 1842 warned the societies against 'the arrogant claims of ambition and the vain assumptions of human authority'; members were advised not to take part in 'political agitation', but to avoid 'strifes of faction'.

[40] *Methodist New Connexion Magazine*, 1839, p. 272.

[41] *History of the Primitive Methodist Church*, by H. B. Kendall, Vol. 1, p. 339.

[42] Wearmouth, *Methodism and the Working Class Movements of England, 1800-50*, p. 192.

[43] 'The Rise and Progress of the Lamentable Dissentions among the Wesleyan Methodists in the Camelford Circuit, Cornwall', MS. by A. Barber, ps. 199-208.

[44] Ibid.

[45] One of their chapels at Illogan, Cornwall was called 'the top hat chapel'—hardly a symbol of social democracy!

[46] Griffith said, 'If I am a Chartist, my Bible has made me so'. (*Life*, by R. Chew, p. 179) Dunn, in the *Wesley Banner* wrote, 'I have never meddled with party politics . . . we have never advocated . . . universal or all but universal suffrage.' (Quoted in Wearmouth, *Methodism and the Working Class Movements of England, 1800-50*, p. 191.)

[47] *Chartist Studies*, by A. Briggs, p. 372.

[48] See ref. 38.

[49] The words are the Primitive Methodist John Skevington's (quoted by Kendall, Vol. 1, p. 337).

[50] In the sense that he combined Toryism with a genuine passion for the social condition of the people. Wesley would not, of course, have approved of Stephens' violence, or his views on disestablishment. See also ref. 53.

[51] Ward, *The Factory Movement*, p. 246, says that Maurice's Toryism was 'curiously akin' to Oastler's. Both saw Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Socialism as part of Christianity. The same could be said of Stephens, who like Maurice disliked the political programme of Chartism.

[52] Sermon preached by the Rev. Mr. Stephens at Charlestown on Jan. 6th, 1839, p. 4.

[53] Wesley's Toryism and his tendency to theological individualism were tempered by his tracts, letters and good works displaying a practical sympathy with the lot of the people. His views on War and slavery sprang from a Christian social concern. His successors shared his Toryism and his theological individualism, but forgot his adaptibility in meeting the social needs of the moment. Stephens shared Wesley's Toryism, and revived his social concern 'to meet the present age'.

[54] Other Chartists have been described as Methodist ministers, but mistakenly, e.g., the Rev. James Scholefield (or Schofield) is called a Bible Christian minister by Faulkner, pp. 28, 90, 113, 115. In fact, there was a Swedenborgian company of that name, and Scholefield was one of their ministers.

[55] A list of Methodist Chartists is bound to be incomplete, but of twenty-seven names, only one came from the Wesleyan Methodist Association.

[56] Especially by Dr Wearmouth in his two works.

[57] *Learning and Living, 1790-1960*, by J. F. C. Harrison, 1961, pp. 253-9.

'ALDERSGATE' AND WESLEY'S EDITORS

Frank Baker

AT a society meeting in Aldersgate Street, London, on 24th May 1738 John Wesley felt his heart strangely warmed. This experience has proved both an inspiration and an enigma to later generations, perhaps especially our own. Although Wesley seems to have thought of it in terms of conversion, clearly it was not conversion in the conventional sense. Yet it was undoubtedly an epochal event, of such importance to Wesley himself that when he came to this date in his published *Journal* he took time out to present a spiritual autobiography, one of the longest connected passages in his *Journal*. This (or a small part of it) is perhaps the best known of his writings, yet has probably suffered more than most at the hands of his executors and admirers. A careful study of the literary transmission of this particular record will help towards a better understanding both of the significance which 'Aldersgate' held for Wesley himself, and also of the serious problems which face any conscientious editor of his writings.

It is known that Wesley was plagued by careless printers. He also suffered from careless editors, as well as over-zealous ones. In their defence it must be pointed out that he presented later generations with some literary problems difficult if not impossible to resolve neatly and consistently. Even in a definitive scholarly edition of Wesley's *Works* such as is now being prepared for publication by the Oxford University Press it is by no means as simple as at first sight it appears to prepare a text which accurately represents Wesley's most fully deliberative presentation of his thought.

Minutiae of spelling, capitalization, and of punctuation may at first seem of little concern to the general reader or the theologian, or even the historian. Wesley's thought may well make its fullest impact if he comes to us

clothed in modern dress, rather than distracting our attention to tricorn hat or knee-breeches, as would be the case if the full antiquarian flavour of his early editions were retained. Fashions in these matters change; they changed even in Wesley's lifetime, so that he used fewer capitals and italics in his later publications than in his earlier ones. Each generation reprinting his works, therefore, is likely to introduce minor variations in styling, and this is relatively unimportant provided that his original words are preserved in such a way as to convey what he originally meant by them. All such modernization, however, must be approached cautiously. His punctuation especially must be treated with care. Most modern readers prefer 'open' punctuation, which omits all punctuation marks except those absolutely essential to make the sense clear. Wesley's system was fairly 'close', attempting to mark the pauses introduced both for syntactical and for rhetorical purposes. Nevertheless, his original punctuation is sometimes far more modern, far more lucid, than that of his later editors. Occasionally, in fact, the latest edition is the worst rather than the best. Before any editors of Wesley's works cast his commas or even his colons to the winds they must be sure that they understand both his thought and his literary mannerisms.

Certainly a scholarly editor is never at liberty to alter the actual words or syntax of his author without a clear indication of what has been done. Nor may an editor omit words or passages which seem to him obscure, or unnecessary, or mistaken, nor introduce words or phrases which he believes his author intended to say or should have said, unless in each rare instance he makes it clear how he is intruding himself between author and reader. In fact, however, Wesley's editors through the centuries have taken all these liberties and others with his writings, sometimes with the very best of intentions, sometimes (apparently) with the worst, and often with no intention at all, sinning in ignorance.

This is true even of the classical Aldersgate autobiography, which may thus serve as an exemplar and a warning for both editors and students. Most of the scores of variations in the two dozen different editions here summarized introduce no basic change in the general tenor of the narrative, but they have the general cumulative effect of sandpapering down its idiosyncrasies of style so that it becomes more like a machine-made article than the work of an individual craftsman. Much of the real Wesley is thereby lost. True, his portrait does not in the process become a caricature—merely a touched-up print for mass-production in the glossy magazines. His features are made to appear more regular than in fact they were, and one of his prominent warts has been painted out.

THE HISTORY OF THE TEXT

Before examining in some detail how this has happened it is desirable to familiarize ourselves with the history of the text in general. We know that Wesley's *Journal* was in fact a series of 'extracts' prepared for publication sometimes long after the events which they described, prepared on the basis of a shorthand diary that recorded the bare facts, supplemented by occasional memoranda, lengthy letters in the form of connected accounts, pos-

sibly a fuller consecutive journal, and of course by Wesley's memory. He published twenty-one such extracts. The first covered the period (as the title-page announced) 'from his embarking for Georgia to his return to London'. It is the second part that concerns us here—*An Extract of the Rev. Mr. John Wesley's Journal from February* 1, 1737-8, *to his return from Germany* [on 16th September 1738].

This was first printed for Wesley by William Strahan of London in 1740, though no record of it appears in Strahan's ledgers. The second edition appeared from the Bristol press of Felix Farley in 1743, and the third also was printed in Bristol, by William Pine in 1765. From 1743 onwards the first and second parts were always printed together, though they were usually paged separately.

In 1771 Wesley began to issue his collected *Works* in periodical numbers which made up thirty-two volumes. The closing volumes contained the *Journal*, Part 2 occupying pages 242-359 in volume 26 (1774). A most important addition to this volume (missing from many copies) was the errata leaf in which Wesley added some mature comments about his religious experience—Wesley editing himself, as well as correcting his printer's errors, which were many. This version of the second extract was almost certainly regarded as the fourth edition, and the next to appear was therefore described as the fifth. This was printed by Robert Hawes of London in 1775, and was apparently closely supervised by John Wesley himself, errors being corrected and supplementary footnotes added. The last separate issue of this extract was published by the Methodist Book Steward, George Whitfield, in 1797, prepared apparently by George Story, who served as Connexional Editor from 1794-1804.

Meantime John Dickins of Philadelphia had set on foot an uncompleted collected edition of the twenty-one extracts. Volume 1 appeared in 1795, containing Nos. 1-3, and volume 2 in 1806, adding Nos. 4-6. This task was again attempted (successfully this time) by Robert Napper of Dublin, who in 1809 issued the *Journal* complete in six volumes. Joseph Benson had succeeded Story as Editor in 1804, and to him we are indebted for the second edition of Wesley's collected *Works*, in seventeen volumes (1809-13). For his opening six volumes he used Napper's edition of the *Journal*. Upon Benson's edition of the *Works* was based the 'First American Edition' of 1826-27, in ten volumes. Thomas Jackson followed Benson as Editor, serving from 1824 to 1842. He republished the six-volume edition of the complete *Journal* in 1825, and in 1827 compressed it into four volumes. A reprint of these four volumes formed the opening section of his third edition of Wesley's *Works* (1829-31). Jackson's edition of the *Works* was reproduced in the 'First Complete and Standard American Edition' of 1831 except that the material was rearranged and compressed into half as many volumes, the *Journal* itself occupying volumes 3 and 4. Most subsequent editions have been based on Jackson's, and it is sad to state that although in many ways he greatly improved the presentation of Wesley's writings, in others they suffered badly at his hands.

Very few major changes were made by later editors, though there were a

few minor improvements. Jackson himself supervised the fourth edition of the *Works* in 1840-42, and there have been at least twelve subsequent editions under the general editorship of George Cubitt (1842-51), William L. Thornton (1851-56), Benjamin Frankland (1865-75), Benjamin Gregory (1875-93), William L. Watkinson (1893-1904), W. T. Davison (1904-5), and John Telford (1905-32).[1] The numbering of the editions is chaotic. Cubitt introduced a 10th in 1849, apparently with the idea of including all American as well as British predecessors. To the 11th in 1856 Thornton added as volume 15, Wesley's *Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament*. This was followed by the 5th in 1860-61, an unnumbered edition of 1872 (recently reproduced by the Zondervan Press), and still another 5th in 1877. In some cases the reigning editor probably had little hand in preparing the text, and we are left with the conviction that Jackson's imprint is on all later editions of the *Works*, which have remained substantially unaltered into the present century.

Meantime separate editions of the *Journal* only, both complete and abridged, continued to appear on both sides of the Atlantic. Of these probably the best known was the Everyman edition in four volumes, first published in 1906. In 1909-16 came the monumental Standard Edition of the *Journal* in eight volumes, edited by Nehemiah Curnock, and 'enlarged from original MSS, with notes from unpublished diaries, annotations, maps and illustrations'. Curnock's preface claims: 'The utmost care has been taken to preserve unaltered Wesley's own phraseology, even to the grammatical peculiarities which he shared with other writers of the day.' He admits, however, that occasionally he has substituted for Wesley's printed text 'a more vigorous or picturesque phrase, borrowed from another copy in Wesley's handwriting'—though this was not possible with the second extract, for which no manuscript has so far been found. Curnock noted and followed far too literally Richard Green's advice that 'in the preparation of a Standard Edition the first edition should be practically discarded' because it was 'full of inaccuracies, as indeed were all the editions published during Wesley's lifetime', including that in the 1771-1774 *Works*. Benson, Curnock went on, had made 'no serious attempt . . . to produce a strictly accurate text', as well as overlooking Wesley's errata. Similarly, in spite of higher literary ideals and closer application, Jackson had retained far too many factual errors, not all of which were eliminated in subsequent issues. As his basic copy-text, therefore, Curnock took the fifth edition of the *Works* (1860-61), corrected and expanded with the aid of much manuscript material and the diligence of a host of scholars. The *Journal* is immeasurably richer for the labours of the editor and others in this Standard Edition, but the serious student may justly complain that far too many undocumented liberties have been taken with the text published by Wesley himself, and that by relying almost exclusively on a posthumous edition something important has been lost. This will be illustrated from the vicissitudes of the first edition of the Aldersgate narrative, which with all its shortcomings we will quote as our basic text. Wesley's methodical numbering of the eighteen sections will provide us with a reference system adequate for our purpose.

THE PROBLEM OF ITALICS

The most frequent problem in reproducing Wesley's text for modern readers is caused by his use of italics for three completely different purposes: to distinguish names of persons and places, to denote quotations (especially from the Bible), and to secure emphasis.[2] What we may call his appellative use of italics causes little trouble. Even during his own lifetime such proper names were increasingly appearing in the roman type that is normal for them today. In a few cases, however, some doubt remains as to whether he intended to use a word emphatically rather than descriptively, as in *'Mystick'* (§8) and *'Presbyterians'* (§11), and even *'by-word'* (§6). All these retained their italics until Jackson transformed them to roman.

Much more complicated is the matter of quotations. Wesley almost invariably italicized scriptural quotations, and frequently passages (especially brief phrases) from other works. Obvious and accurate quotations from known sources seldom caused his editors any trouble, most of them remaining in italics until Jackson's pen enclosed them with the quotation marks which were usually accepted uncritically by his successors. Many of Wesley's italics, however, denoted quasi-quotations, either inexact or incomplete in some particular, or general reminiscences of some scriptural passage or passages. A typical example comes in the opening paragraph, where *'washing of the Holy Ghost'* represents 'washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost' of Titus 3^5. No editor has been pedantic enough to mark the ellipsis here or in similar passages, and it is very doubtful whether this is indeed desirable. Nevertheless there is a problem here of editorial accuracy, rendered more acute by the necessary interposing quotation marks to replace the use of italic type.

Section 9 of the Aldersgate narrative contains a catena of quotations from Romans 7^{14-23}, two-thirds of this paragraph being italicized in the early editions. Whitfield's edition of 1797 placed several of these phrases in quotation marks, but failed to distinguish them either from each other or from Wesley's link words. Jackson tidied up this situation, but retained one other minor error that had been introduced as early as 1743, when the correct 'even the *Law in my . . . Mind*' had been altered to 'even *the Law in my . . . Mind.*' Two other quasi-quotations distinguished by Wesley with italics were run into the roman text by Jackson and thus lost: 'I rejoiced that *my Name was cast out as Evil*' (§6, cf. Luke 6^{22}), and 'All the time I was at *Savannah* I was thus *beating the Air*' (§9, cf. I Cor. 9^{26}). Jackson at least partially atoned by marking as a quotation one ignored by Wesley—'to show me "a more excellent way" ' (§8, I Cor. 12^{31}). It cannot be too much stressed that where Jackson led Curnock was almost sure to follow, for although Curnock used other manuscript sources he deliberately discarded Wesley's own editions in favour of Jackson, and thus perpetuated errors that he might have corrected.

There is one particularly interesting quotation that was lost by Jackson because (we assume) he could not trace it. It occurs in §12, and the fact that it is indeed a quotation is made quite clear by the intrusion of the word 'other' in roman into the otherwise italic type. Wesley is describing his

search for faith, 'by adding to *the constant Use of all the* other *Means of Grace,* continual Prayer for this very Thing, Justifying, Saving Faith.' From the evidence of the concordance this does not come from the Bible, nor have I so far been able to find it elsewhere, though I am convinced that it will be found in some Anglican devotional work. Of the importance of the sentiment to Wesley we need no convincing. The importance of the quotation itself may be underscored by the fact that he used the same passage, again in italics, in the spiritual retrospect on landing in England with which his first *Extract* closed: 'Does all I ever did or can, *know, say, give, do* or *suffer,* justify me in his Sight? Yea, or *the constant Use of all the Means of Grace?* (which nevertheless is meet, right and our bounden Duty).' (This latter quotation from the *Book of Common Prayer,* strangely enough, is *not* shown as a quotation—though surely not because Wesley felt that he had used too many italics already.) Whether in fact the phrase was italicized for emphasis or as a quotation, however, it must surely be differentiated from the remainder of the text in order to show that for Wesley at least it held particular significance.

Our loss in the matter of italicized quotations is comparatively slight. It is more serious when we turn to Wesley's use of italics for emphasis. Here we must still further subdivide into two main categories, which we may describe as the summarizing or *synopic* use, and the specific or *accentual* use. One of his most important devices was to summarize the argument of a paragraph by placing a key phrase in italics—a practice akin to the provision of frequent subheadings within an article, so that the principal points can be seen at a glance. By this means Wesley emphasized what he regarded as the salient features of his spiritual pilgrimage, providing such summaries for most of the early sections of the Aldersgate narrative.

Jackson did not realize what Wesley was doing. In two cases he treated these passages as if they were quotations: '[I had been] carefully taught that I could only be saved *by universal Obedience, by keeping all the Commandments of God*' (§1), and 'so that now, *doing so much, and living so good a Life,* I doubted not but I was a good Christian' (§4). In other instances Jackson (followed by Curnock) ran the italicized passages into the text in roman type. It seems worth while to recover more of these key phrases of Wesley's self-analysis: 'And what I now hoped to be saved by, was, 1. *Not being so bad as other People.* 2. *Having still a Kindness for Religion.* And 3. *Reading the Bible, and going to Church, and saying my Prayers.*' (§2); '. . . I hoped to be saved by . . . *Repentance*' (§3); 'And by my continued *Endeavour to keep his whole Law,* Inward and Outward, *to the utmost of my Power,* I was persuaded, that I should be accepted of him, and that I was even then in a State of Salvation.' (§5); 'I knew not that I was *wholly void of this Faith;* but only thought, *I had not enough of it.*' (§11)[3]; 'Then was I taught, that *Peace and Victory over Sin, are essential to Faith in the Captain of our Salvation: But, that as to the Transports of Joy* that usually attend the Beginning of it . . . GOD *sometimes giveth, sometimes with-holdeth them, according to the Counsels of his own Will.*' (§15)[4]; 'I have *Now Peace with* GOD: And *I Sin not to Day*' (§17)[5].

Wesley also used italics for the more specific emphasis given to words or phrases singled out from their context for marked accentuation in speech, and in this more familiar usage he was more prolific than is considered desirable in our own day. Indeed it seems clear that he used these accentual italics to denote varying degrees of emphasis, whereas we tend to reserve them for only the most vehement stress. This creates a serious problem for editors living in such a different literary environment, a problem illustrated in section 7 of the Aldersgate narrative, where he describes the influence upon him of the anonymous 'contemplative man': 'I cannot but now observe, 1. That he spoke so incautiously against *trusting* in *Outward Works*, that he discouraged me from *doing* them at all. 2. That he recommended . . . *mental Prayer*, and the like Exercises . . . Now these were, in Truth, as much *my own Works* as visiting the Sick . . . , and the *Union with* GOD thus persued, was as really *my own Righteousness*, as any I had before persued, under another Name.' Here again Jackson and Curnock make no attempt to represent any of the italics except in one instance, *'mental prayer'*, which in any case should probably be modernized by using roman type within quotation marks rather than by retaining Wesley's italics. Wesley's 'trusting' and 'doing' are clearly italicized for accentual emphasis alone, and in these cases the italics should be retained. 'Outward works' and 'union with God' do in fact refer back to earlier phrases in the 'contemplative man's' argument, and therefore need quotation marks, as does probably 'mental prayer', and perhaps 'my own works', 'my own righteousness'—phrases taken up again (without italics) in the following section. Similarly in Section 9 Wesley's opening phrase neatly characterized his attempts to seek salvation through mystical discipline as being nonetheless a form of salvation by works—a *refined* Way of trusting to my own Works'. This also Jackson and his successors reduced to roman type.[6]

Other emphases were lost for a time by Wesley's editors, and later replaced. Such was the case in §11: 'I well saw, no one could . . . have such a Sense of Forgiveness, and not *feel* it. But I felt it not.' 'Feel' appeared in roman type in Jackson's 1827 edition, was briefly reinstated in italic in 1829, only to reappear in roman in the fourth and subsequent editions of the *Works* until finally restored to the original italic in 1872. The same unhappy fortune temporarily befell the italics in two far more important passages, related to each other in their echo of Luther's emphasis upon the personal pronouns of salvation: 'a full reliance on the Blood of CHRIST shed for *me;* a Trust in Him, as *my* CHRIST, as my sole Justification, Santification, and Redemption', and 'an Assurance was given me, That He had taken away *my* Sins, even *mine*, and saved *me* from the Law of Sin and Death'. (§12, 14.) Other minor emphases which suffered a temporary eclipse were 'the *literal Interpretation* of those Scriptures', and 'dependence upon *my own* works' (§12). Granted that Wesley's use of italics is far too liberal for modern taste, something must surely be done to represent his nuances of thought—even when the editor is not absolutely sure what specific nuance is intended in a particular instance.

VARIATION IN SUBSTANCE

Although his editors have sometimes obscured the finer shades of Wesley's meaning, only rarely have they altered the substance of his words. In the Aldersgate narrative these substantial variations are mainly confined to the second edition of 1743, which Wesley almost certainly touched up himself. Two phrases were made a little crisper by changing 'the while' to 'this while' and 'the little light' to 'that little light' (§3), but less specific in another case, where 'that Sense of Forgiveness' became 'the Sense of Forgiveness' (§11). One word was subject to frequent changes. In 1740 Wesley claimed that the carelessness of his university years was punctuated 'with some Intermissions and short Struggles, especially before and after the Holy Communion' (¶3); in 1765 'intermissions' became 'intermission' (probably through a printer's error), and remained thus in the 1774 *Works*, being restored to the original plural in 1775; Jackson, however, preferred the singular form, and so it has remained.

The only major alteration which was clearly tendentious in character was made in the first American edition of Wesley's collected *Journal* (1795). Wesley's description of his childhood introduced the idea of baptismal regeneration. John Dickins (if indeed he were responsible) felt that this unevangelical note must at all costs be avoided, and set about a careful rephrasing. The text before him ran: 'I believe, till I was about ten years old, I had not sinn'd away that *Washing of the Holy Ghost* which was given me in Baptism, having been strictly educated and carefully taught, that I could only be saved *by universal Obedience* . . .' (§1). All reference to baptism was expunged, and the sentence was amended to read: '. . . I had not sinned away that *initial grace* which was given me in infancy, having been strictly educated . . .' Perhaps this was a sign of the growing pains of American Methodism's theological infancy, for later American editions loyally followed Wesley's text.

A few of Wesley's original words and phrases have been lost by the editors, either through oversight or by intention. The word 'both' disappeared from the preamble as early as 1743, and should surely be replaced. The first edition read: 'Let him that cannot receive it [i.e. this narrative], ask of the Father of Lights, that he would give more Light both to him and me.' A similar error probably led to the disappearance of the first 'had' from 'meeting likewise with a religious Friend, which I had never had till now' (§4): this was in fact restored in 1775 and continued through to Napper's edition of 1809, but was dropped from Benson's edition of the *Works* that year, never to be replaced. Much more important is a lengthy omission from a piece of Wesley's invective: 'In this *refined* Way of trusting to my own Works and my own Righteousness (so zealously inculcated by the *Mystick* Writers, who I declare in my cool Judgment, and in the Presence of the most High GOD, I believe to be one Great Antichrist) I drag'd on heavily . . . .' (§8). Surely it must have been as a result of 'cool judgment' cooled even farther that this was toned down in 1765 by omitting all within the parenthesis after 'Writers'—but what a pity that this passage completely disappeared from his edited works, and that no exploration of the early editions

by Jackson or Curnock brought it to light! Curnock's Standard Edition of the *Journal*, indeed, is itself guilty of introducing a new omission in a sentence which originally ran: 'I disputed . . . that Faith might be where these were not: Especially where that Sense of Forgiveness was not:' (¶11). Clearly through an oversight the important clause 'Especially . . . not' has been dropped from the standard *Journal*.

Strangely enough passages have also been *added* to the Aldersgate narrative from Wesley's manuscript notes, yet lost to users of the standard *Works* and the standard *Journal*. They occurred in sections 5, 6, and 11, and in each case the effect was to modify Wesley's early scorn for his pre-Aldersgate religion. In §5 Wesley described his reactions upon reading Law's *Christian Perfection* and *Serious Call*: 'the Light flow'd in so mightily upon my Soul, that every Thing appeared in a new View.' His renewed endeavour to keep the whole law of God persuaded him that he was 'even then in a State of Salvation', though the later narrative denounced this as a delusion. In 1775, however, he added the confirmatory footnote: 'And I believe I was.' This was retained in two subsequent editions, but omitted from Benson's edition of the *Works* (1809). Benson did retain, however, a similar footnote to §6, which thus reached the 'First American Edition' of Wesley's *Works* in 1826, only to be removed by Jackson. In this case Wesley had written in the main narrative, 'not imagining I had been all this Time building on the Sand', adding in the later footnote, 'Not so: I was right, as far as I went.' The other comment was added to a passage upon assurance (a 'Sense of Forgiveness') as a proof of faith: 'If then there was no Faith without this, all my Pretensions to Faith dropp'd at once' (§11). The footnote here read, 'There is no *Christian* faith without it.' This was sadly weakened by Benson's failure to italicize 'Christian', and thus continued into the 'First American Edition', but once more with Jackson it disappeared from the scene.

All this is very strange in view of the fact that Jackson had himself rescued and inserted similar comments from the errata to volume 26 of Wesley's *Works* of 1774. It seems clear that he had not deliberately suppressed them, but simply missed them. These particular footnotes first appeared in 1775, and thus were almost contemporaneous with the 1774 *Works* errata. They constitute Wesley's mature reflections on those earlier years when he had so roundly declared 'I was not a Christian till May the 24th [1738].'[7] Now he corrects such rashness. Perhaps his best modification was a sentence in one of the 1774 errata which was also incorporated as part of a footnote (in a different context) in this same 1775 edition of the *Journal*. On 25th April 1738 Thomas Broughton objected, said Wesley, that 'He could never think that I had not Faith, who had done and suffered such Things.' To which the aged Wesley added the comment: 'He was in the right. I certainly then had the Faith of a *Servant*, tho' not the Faith of a Son.'[8]

The collation of the varying recensions of the Aldersgate narrative enables us to see more clearly its significance for Wesley. Not only was it his considered opinion in later years that in his early enthusiasm he had somewhat exaggerated the magnitude of the transformation and misread the theological content of the experience, but he wanted this to be known by

his followers. To issue a recanting pamphlet on the subject would have been both too dramatic and too drastic, to suppress every over-enthusiastic reference impracticable. What he had written he had written. He had given an accurate account of his earlier views. Even though these had now changed in detail, his main position remained the same. He therefore added comments at several of the key points in what he designed as the definitive edition of his spiritual autobiography, carefully prepared for his collected *Works*. Possibly because he had only lately arrived at his spiritual re-assessment, possibly through some oversight or printer's error, six of the corrections imparting the revised viewpoint missed publication in the text of volume 26, and were buried in the errata.[9] He hastened to put things right by reprinting the crucial first two parts of his *Journal*—and only these—incorporating therein similar yet independent footnotes, for the most part in different contexts, so that we are forced to the conclusion that in revising the 1775 edition for the press he did not have the 1774 volume of his *Works* at hand but, simply an urgent memory that emendations were needed. Yet these too were overlooked by his later editors. And so the Aldersgate event became a legend, no longer subject to the interpretation of its central figure.

An enquiry such as this, however, has a wider significance. It proves that no serious student of Wesley's writings dare depend slavishly upon his later editors, even those like Jackson and Curnock who have provided us with valuable 'standard' editions. The first editions must be fully used, for they are likely to retain the sparkle of Wesley's original emphases, the occasional suppressed passage, and the word or phrase omitted by accident. Nor can the 1771-1774 *Works* be relied upon to supply us with Wesley's last word, no more than his best word. Whichever basic text an editor takes for Wesley's writings he must engage in constant, painful, yet occasionally profitable collation with those editions which preceded and those which followed.

[1] For fuller details see Frank Cumbers, *The Book Room*, Epworth Press, 1956, pp. 115-25.

[2] He also occasionally uses what might be termed 'italics of substitution', familiar in liturgical services, where 'give *him* grace' might equally be read according to the occasion as 'give her grace', 'give them grace', etc.

[3] From the second edition of 1743 onwards the italics ended at 'enough'.

[4] This contains several reminiscences of Scripture, and the 1797 placed the whole passage, including link-words, within quotation marks; it seems almost certain, however, that the main purpose of the italics here also is that of general emphasis.

[5] Jackson (and Curnock) placed the first phrase within quotation marks, and ignored the second. This undermined Wesley's insistence upon the importance of present experience rather than the past or the future—an insistence essential to understanding his teaching both on assurance of salvation and on Christian perfection. If the first passage only were to be distinguished, and distinguished as a quotation from Romans 5[1], at the very least Wesley's additional *'now'* should be placed in italics, rather than presented as if it were a part of Paul's phrase.

[6] In this they had been preceded by the 1774 edition of Wesley's *Works*, though this was almost certainly a printer's error which was put right in the 1775 edition.

[7] *Letters*, Standard Edition, 1931, 1262.

[8] *Journal*, Part 2, 5th edn, 1775, p. 17; the *Works* erratum refers to Wesley's soliloquy summarizing his Georgia ministry, see *Works* (3rd edn, 1829) 1.76, and *Journal* (Standard Edition) 1.423.

[9] At least one related emendation was correctly entered, the comment '(Not so.)' after an account of Zinzendorf's equation of justification and regeneration, which Wesley independently corrected in the 1775 edition with the footnote 'No: this is a mistake.'

SHORTER SURVEY

John T. Wilkinson

The History of the Lollard movement prior to the failure of Sir John Oldcastle's rising in 1414 is fairly familiar. The later phase of the movement, however, has remained largely unexplored. Based on episcopal registers, court-books and public records, Dr John A. F. Thomason has now produced a scholarly work in the Oxford Historical Series—*The Later Lollards: 1414-1520* (Oxford University Press, 42*s*.)—and this takes the story on to the time when English nonconformity became touched by the new influences of the Continental Reformation. With great skill he endeavours to disentangle examples of pure Lollard heresy from other heretical tendencies, and shows that the movement was mainly centred in small communities in some regions, whereas in other districts the movement ceased to exist. Not seldom it survived merely by virtue of a family tradition. His survey is regional, not chronological in character, covering Bristol and the West Country, the mid-Thames Valley and the South, the Midlands, Eastern England, London, Kent and the South-East, Scotland and the Universities. Two final chapters are concerned with the proceedings of investigation and the trials, and with Lollard doctrines and beliefs. It is a story of a long resistance not seldom involving persecution: there were brandings and burnings and sometimes the imposition of a red cross embroidered upon the garments and to be worn for life. A thoroughly competent piece of work, this important book covers a field largely unexplored.

Although Protestantism is the faith of more than one-third of the Christian population of the world, there has been an almost complete lack of general histories on the subject, though various aspects have been treated. The work of the French historian, the late Professor Emile Léonard—*Histoire Générale du Protestantisme*—was intended to meet this need. Under the careful editorship of Professor H. H. Rowley (a sure indication of the importance of the work), the first volume has now been translated into English and is published by T. Nelson under the title *A History of Protestantism: Vol. I, The Reformation* (90*s*.). In a concise introduction dealing with the influence of Savonarola and the Christian Humanists, Colet and Erasmus, it is argued that the movement was an ultimate development rather than a denial of Roman Catholicism. The major portion of the work deals with the significance of Luther, giving a summary of his writings and theological position, and this is followed by a study of his relation to social issues. Further chapters are concerned with the organization and spread of Lutheranism, the check to it arising out of the humanism of Erasmus; the stemming of the Lutheran tide and the Roman Catholic counter-attack. The final chapter covers the life and work of John Calvin, who created 'not so much a new theology, as a new man and a new world'. This book is a solid piece of historical writing, eminently readable and of basic importance. With his amazing bibliographical skill Dr Rowley has revised and completed the immense bibliography which covers

nearly eighty pages. Two further volumes are to follow and will be eagerly awaited.

A smaller work by Professor Robert McAfee Brown, entitled *The Spirit of Protestantism* (Oxford University Press, N.Y., 12*s.* 6*d.*), forms a useful summary for the general reader. The first part deals with misunderstandings of Protestantism, examines its varieties and defines its 'spirit' as that of 'constant renewal at the hand of God'. Central Protestant affirmations are summarized—grace and the life of faith, the authority of Scripture, the sovereignty of God, the priesthood of all believers and the worship of God. The final section deals with 'ongoing Protestant concerns'—in particular the relation between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. The book was written in 1960 before the Second Vatican Council, and in the introduction to this edition in 'Galaxy Books' the author declares that what is written 'betrays more timidity than subsequent events have justified' because 'from now on it is unthinkable that Roman Catholicism and Protestantism will proceed without reference to one another'.

The contemporaries of Philip Melancthon (1497-1560) spoke of him as the 'praeceptor Germanica'—the teacher of Germany. Despite this importance, however, in the development of the Reformation the amount of material for the English reader is small. This has now been adjusted by an authoritative volume from the pen of Dr Robert Stupperich, Professor of Church History at the University of Munster, who is probably the world's greatest living authority on Melancthon. It is entitled *Melancthon* (Lutterworth Press, 25*s.*). Mainly responsible for the Augsburg Confession (1530), the author of the first ordered presentation of Reformation doctrine and also an indefatigable negotiator in the many conferences between theologians and statements in his concern for the peace of the Church, as a scholar Melancthon left his mark upon the schools and universities. Yet he was misunderstood. For the English reader—perhaps for the first time—Melancthon is placed in true perspective in this biography, which reveals his historical importance. A useful postscript together with an index of his writings and a bibliography should stimulate the study of this subject.

In contrast, the amount of material on John Calvin (1509-1564) is immense, opinion being broadly divided between those who are his supporters and those who are his critics. It is important that Calvin should be removed from much of the misinterpretation from which he has suffered. Such corrective is to be found in a collection of eleven essays forming the first volume of a series —the 'Courtenay Studies in Reformation Theology'. Published by the Sutton Courtenay Press (36*s.*) and edited by G. E. Duffield, *John Calvin* is the work of several British and Continental scholars of repute and seeks to present a true picture of the man and his work. These essays deal with Calvin from his early humanist outlook to his maturer days as theologian, biblical commentator and ecclesiastical statesman. Perhaps the most fascinating essay is by Professor Jean Daniel Benoit, of Strasburg who writes of Calvin as a letter-writer.

Believing that only by detailed local study a real picture of how the upheaval of the Reformation affected the life of ordinary folk, Dr James E.

Oxley has written an important work on *The Reformation in Essex: To the Death of Mary* (Manchester University Press, 45*s*.). The county of Essex was not only particularly open and vulnerable to the influences reaching England from the Continent in the sixteenth century, but it is exceptional in its possession of a greater abundance of records than any other county. This book is a work of thorough research, fully documented and with statistical appendices concerning religious houses, benefices and financial accounts. Dr Oxley begins with a clear picture of the organization of the Church and the various religious foundations in relation to the community, and this is followed by an assessment of the dissolution of the monasteries begun by Wolsey and continued further by Henry VIII and Edward VI. Under Mary the modified form of the Reformation which had been imposed suffered reverses, and Dr Oxley gives a detailed account of the martyrdoms in this reign. A final chapter is an assessment of this tumultuous half-century in terms of gain and loss.

> At the end of Mary's reign the Church in Essex was in a sad state. The clergy were time-servers, unprincipled and for the most part uneducated men. If Mary's reign had given new hope to Romanism, Protestantism was still a force to be reckoned with, a force which had become more extreme after five bitter years of persecution. (p. 166).

This is an impressive book and could well form a pattern for similar studies of other counties.

In *Religious Controversies of the Nineteenth Century*, by A. O. J. Cockshut (Methuen, 35*s*.), there are twelve selections from basic texts of the period, chosen in order to indicate the trends of religious thought and regarded as necessary for an understanding of the century. As some of these will become more difficult to procure as time passes, this selection will afford ready access to the material and will prove invaluable for students. Amongst the rarer documents included are extracts from Coleridge's *Church and State* (1820); Newman's *Tracts for the Times* (Nos. I, XI and XC) (1833-1841); pieces from *Essays and Reviews* (1860); letters dealing with the Hampden Controversy (1847); an extract from Colenso's *Preface to the Pentateuch* (1862-1879); Temple's Bampton Lecture (1884) on the *Relation between Religion and Science*. Mr Cockshut supplies a short introduction to each extract and in a general introduction gives a masterly survey of the period as a whole.

The subject of Christian Unity is still much to the fore. In *Christian Unity: Some of the Issues* by John Huxtable (Independent Press, 6*s*.), the author states his clear conviction that unity is 'one of the tasks which God has set this generation of Christians and is therefore an imperative'. To regard it as only 'spiritual unity' is inadequate: 'without spiritual unity the body is dead: without a united body spiritual unity is not easily recognizable and is practically ineffective' (p. 21). Consequently there must be standards of belief, the scope and peril of which must be understood. Further, some 'legitimate ambiguity' and 'proper compromise' are involved, and in this connection Mr Huxtable examines the Service of Reconciliation set forth in the Anglican-

Methodist Conversations *Report* and holds it to be 'an uneasy compromise'. On the problem of episcopacy he writes wisely:

> Ought there not to be an ecumenical sharing of experience of an *episcope* which we all know, which we cannot and do not want to avoid, which in its various forms is essential to the life of the Church? Out of our combined Christian experience of this essential element in church life might we not be led to an understanding of what it is for a church to be episcopal much deeper and more satisfying that any one communion has known hitherto? (pp. 100-1).

From the St Andrew's Press conjointly with the S.P.C.K. comes the *Report of the Anglican-Presbyterian Conversations* (6*s*.), agreed upon by the four panels appointed by the Church of Scotland, the Presbyterian Church of England, the Church of England and the Episcopal Church in Scotland. It is to be remitted to the four Churches for study and comment. The questions at issue are clearly delineated: the meaning of unity as distinct from uniformity in Church Order; the meaning of 'validity' as applied to ministerial orders; the doctrine of Holy Communion; the meaning of the Apostolic Succession in relation to the last two questions; the Church as a royal priesthood; the place of the laity in the Church. This *Report* marks a new stage in discussion between the four Churches and has an important place in the ecumenical dialogue now proceeding in the Churches of Britain. It is a lucid document marked by true Christian charity.

In the foreword to *Cambridge Sermons of Christian Unity* (Oldbourne 5*s*.) the Bishop of Ripon declares that one of the main reasons for the slowness of progress to Christian unity is ignorance. To increase understanding of each other was the purpose of this course of sermons preached at the regular morning service at Little St Mary's, Cambridge, when each preacher had the opportunity of telling a predominantly Anglican congregation something about his own Church. The list of visiting preachers included the Eastern Orthodox, the Roman Catholic, Methodist, Congregational, Presbyterian and Baptist. These non-Anglican contributors were asked to express what they considered to be the fundamentals of truth conserved in their particular tradition and to which they would naturally require full expression to be given in the worship, doctrine and practice of a united Church; also if there was anything in contemporary Anglicanism which on their principles they might find it difficult to accept. The value of this experiment was increased because the respective contributions were delivered in *the context of normal worship*. The cause of Christian unity would be greatly stimulated by similar practice throughout the land. These discourses breathe the true spirit of Christian charity throughout. In the words of the Anglican who preached the final sermon in the series: 'Christ prayed for unity in order that the world might believe. . . . The Church is the instrument of Christ's continuing mission to the world.'

An important contribution to the understanding of ecumenical history, *The Age of Disunity*, by Dr John Kent (Epworth Press, 30*s*.) consists of a series of essays published previously over a period of years and now brought together

in one volume. The first essay is on Methodist Union, a detailed and authoritative account—indeed, the first serious study of the subject—which explodes the commonly accepted notion that Methodist Union encountered no doctrinal difficulties, whereas in fact doctrinal factors presented the major problems. The next three essays deal with some of the misinterpretations of nineteenth-century Methodist history and are concerned with 'The Doctrine of the Ministry in early nineteenth century Methodism'; the exposure of Elie Halevy's 'Errors of fact concerning Methodism' in his *History of the English People* (1924); and 'Historians and Jabez Bunting'. From these essays is precipitated a true picture of this dominating figure. The next essay is an excellent study of 'Methodism and Politics in the Nineteenth Century'. The following chapter on 'Anglican Episcopacy and Anglican-Methodist Relations' bears upon the present situation and by its lucid analysis may well be the most important contribution of the book towards the ecumenical future. In a brief final chapter Dr Kent rejects the notion of 'federation' as distinct from 'union'. 'Christ is more than the President of a Federal Republic of Christian Associations: He is the Head of the Body which is His Church.' This work should be a valuable corrective for many misunderstandings concerning Methodism both as to the past and in the present. Brilliantly written, fully documented and constantly stimulating to the mind, these essays gather themselves into a distinct whole and rest upon the foundation of sound historical learning.

A further study marked by ecumenical concern is *Wesleyan and Tractarian Worship*, by Trevor Dearing (Epworth Press S.P.C.K., 27*s.* 6*d.*), in which the author demonstrates a similarity of outlook and unexpected emphasis in these two movements of such diverse origin, the source of affinity being the vital influence of the Non-Jurors upon both movements, although other pressures were also at work—in the case of Wesley the Moravians and to some measure the Puritans; in the case of the Tractarians some features of Roman Catholic worship. Differences between the movement are shown to be of a supplementary rather than a contradictory nature. The views of Wesley and the Tractarians (Newman, Keble and Pusey) are compared in regard to sacramental worship and the Daily Offices, the worshipping community, the need of some form of confessional and the practice of prayer, meditation and personal discipline. This is a valuable study and it has undoubted ecumenical significance for the developing liturgical movement which is slowly acting as a unifying factor upon the worship of both the Methodist Church and the Church of England. It is important, however, to realize that a pattern of complete uniformity of worship is an ideal impossible to achieve, human nature being what it is.

Also of ecumenical significance is a recent collection of the hymns of the Wesleys compiled jointly by two Anglican scholars, A. H. Hodges, Professor of Philosophy at Reading University and A. M. Allchin, the Librarian of Pusey House, Oxford and entitled *A Rapture of Praise* (Hodder & Stoughton, 30*s.*) .The idea of the book was conceived more than ten years ago—before the Anglican-Methodist conversations began—and it arose from a conviction that these hymns contain spiritual and theological teaching largely unknown

to Anglicans, and by the knowledge of which Anglican inner life could be enriched. The present discussions between Anglicans and Methodists make the issue of the book the more relevant. A lengthy and valuable introduction forms an attempt at theological assessment of the distinctly Methodist teaching of the hymns, and though written chiefly with Anglicans in mind, it affords much for those who are Methodists. In the arrangement the hymns of the first section are planned according to the liturgical pattern of the Christian year; the next section is on the Christian life and is of similar arrangement to that of John Wesley in the Large Hymn Book of 1780, though with modernization of headings; the third section consists of twenty-seven hymns on the Sacraments, indicating an outline of eucharistic theology. In all some 140 hymns are reproduced and 'read with understanding these hymns will be found to be a source of theological instruction on the central truths of the faith, a manual of vocal and effective prayer, a text-book for meditation and a stimulus to the silent flights of the spirit'.

'Only through symbols can the realm of mystery be livingly attested.' This assertion by Dr F. W. Dillistone, as editor of *Myth and Symbol* (S.P.C.K. Theological Collection No. 7, 16*s*.), indicates the purpose of this collection of essays, whose writers include not only the Editor but such distinguished scholars as Paul Tillich, who writes on 'The Religious Symbol' and Professor Ian T. Ramsay, whose subject is 'Talking about God: Models, Ancient and Modern'. In contemporary religious debate the question is often asked: Are the traditional symbols outmoded today? Is it possible to discover new symbols related more closely to the modern cultural structure? This collection of essays seeks to give some answer to this problem.

The Hope of Immortality, by W. R. Matthews, Dean of St Paul's (Epworth Press, 8*s*. 6*d*.), is a revised edition of a book published in 1936, of which the first three chapters formed a record of broadcast talks. Marked by that lucidity which is typical of all his writings, in the first chapter Dr Matthews deals with the hope of immortality in general terms moving in the second to the statement of some reasons for believing that there is reasonable foundation for the hope, and in the third showing that the Christian revelation confirms and enlarges such belief, already resting upon rational grounds. The final chapter seeks to answer questions on the subject which resulted from a letter in the *Daily Telegraph*, and which indicated that the subject was as much in people's minds now as thirty years ago. This is a strengthening book.

In 1946 an eminently scholarly work under the title *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience* came from the pen of Dr Geoffrey F. Nuttall, of New College, London. It was 'an historical study of a specialist nature'. A year or so later Dr Nuttall wrote a smaller and simpler book dealing with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and this is now reissued—*The Holy Spirit and Ourselves* (Epworth Press, 4*s*.). With each chapter skilfully moulded around the emphases in Harriet Auber's 'Our blest Redeemer', it is a fresh and penetrating study of the subject. Based upon sound scholarship and theological understanding it is eminently suitable for private devotion and group study, and in some cases it may well prove to be a solvent of mistaken ideas about

this doctrine. An appendix supplies biblical passages for study and a list of recommended books for further reading.

Readers of *The Expository Times* will recall two series of articles which recently appeared in that journal: the first a collection of twenty-one articles written as appreciations of contemporary theologians; the second a series of twelve articles concerning the Christian approach to some of the great moral problems of our time. Edited by A. W. Hastings and E. Hastings these articles have now been published in book-form by T. & T. Clark: *Theologians of our Time* (16*s.*) and *Important Moral Issues* (12*s.* 6*d.*). In this useful and convenient form they will be welcomed by many.

From Cambridge University Press come two further volumes in the 'Cambridge Bible Commentary' on the text of the *New English Bible*. The *Acts of the Apostles* (18*s.* 6*d.*; paper ed., 11*s.* 6*d.*; schools ed., 9*s.* 6*d.*) is from the pen of J. W. Packer, Headmaster of Canon Slade Grammar School, Bolton, whose twenty-five years' teaching experience lies beneath the clarity which is a mark of this commentary. One distinguishing feature is the many clear maps inserted in the text: e.g. for each journey of Paul a separate map. The further volume on *The Pastoral Letters* (15*s.*; paper ed., 8*s.* 6*d.*; schools ed., 9*s.* 6*d.*) covering I and II Timothy and Titus is by Professor A. T. Hanson, of Hull University, who asserts that they show a marked difference from those letters usually regarded as Paul's. Though these Pastoral Letters may well include genuine Pauline material, for Professor Hanson the amount is less than other scholars would suggest. He regards the letters as giving insight to the Church at the beginning of the second century.

Three biographical studies have reached us. Christina (1626-1689), Queen of Sweden, the only surviving child of Gustavus Adolphus, became a woman of exceptional ability and throughout her life continued to be a masterful personality. In Sweden she actively promoted educational reform and encouraged learning. Her religious interest turned towards the Roman Catholic faith; in 1654 she gave up her throne and a year later was received into the Roman Catholic Church and settled in Rome where she became the centre of a group of intellectuals. Developing certain eccentricities in her later years, she became the subject of many rumours and it is not surprising that false pictures of her were put forth. Her latest biographer, Sven Stolpe, a distinguished Swedish writer, has had access to hitherto unpublished material, and in his book, *Christian of Sweden* (Burns & Oates, 50*s.*), he reveals the untruth of many of the accusations laid against her and long perpetuated in the earlier records. This is a well-written account of this mysterious woman and from these pages a new and authentic portrait emerges.

Robert Murray McCheyne, minister of St Peter's Church, Dundee, died in 1843, in his thirtieth year, but his short ministry made a deep impression on the evangelical movement in Scotland. Within twenty-five years his *Memoirs*, first published in 1844, went through one hundred and sixteen English editions, and in 1910 it was estimated that (including translations) not less than half-a-million copies were in circulation. *Robert Murray McCheyne: Memoirs and Remains*, by Andrew A. Bonar, is now republished by the

Banner of Truth Trust (25*s.*) and is a book to enrich the soul and may well stand as a shelf-companion to Rutherford's *Letters* and Boston's *Life*. It may be recalled that the hymn 'When the passing world is done' (M.H.B. 643) is from his pen.

The religious order known as Oratorians grew out of the community of priests that had gathered round St Philip Neri in 1564, the name being probably derived from the oratory at S. Girolamo, in Rome, where they held their 'Exercises'. In 1575 they were erected into a congregation and in 1612 their constitutions were sanctioned by Paul V. The movement spread rapidly through Italy, France and Spain. Although they almost disappeared during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, they have revived in many countries and in 1965 there were fifty-three congregations. John Henry Newman introduced the Oratorians into England in 1847 and the first settlement was in Birmingham a year later; in 1849 a congregation settled in London eventually under the leadership of F. W. Faber. In definition an oratory is 'a community of secular priests who live a religious life but without vows and serve a church in a town'. The story of the Oratorians has recently been told by Father Raleigh Addington, a priest of the London Oratory, in *The Idea of the Oratory* (Burnes & Oates, 30*s.*), which incorporates for the English reader hitherto unpublished material.

Two recent books are concerned with the communication of the Gospel to the present age. Dr William Barclay has gathered together eight lectures under the title *Fishers of Men* (Epworth Press, 7*s.* 6*d.*). Originally independent of each other, these lectures are concerned with the spreading of the Gospel by preaching, teaching and writing and are marked by the author's sound scholarship and deep Christian understanding. They possess a dynamic quality.

The Preacher's Integrity and Other Lectures (Epworth Press, 18*s.*), a collection of essays by the Rev. John Huxtable, includes the A. S. Peake Memorial Lecture for 1965. These are penetrating studies written with the author's forthrightness and glint of humour. Preaching is rightly defined as 'proclamation based on exposition'—which demands from the preacher 'the three-fold work which the expositor must do in order to open the Word of God to his hearers: linguistic, historical, theological'. There is also much more in this book which may well cause any preacher to search his own heart.

Illustration of the importance of the foregoing is to be found in two recent volumes. In *This is Living* (Lutterworth Press, 16*s.*) Dr Leonard Griffith, until recently minister of the City Temple, London, presents a series of expositions based on a six weeks course of studies of the *Letter to the Philippians* given to his congregation on Friday evenings. Arising from his conviction that this Pauline letter clearly seems to answer the question 'What is a Christian?', these studies open up the course of daily living in the present world. This is indeed 'proclamation based on exposition'.

The second volume contains twenty discourses by Dr R. Leonard Small, the distinguished minister of St Cuthbert's Church, Edinburgh, under the title *No Other Name* (T. & T. Clark, 21*s.*). Starting with a study of Acts 4^{12}, a three-fold pattern develops: The Fellowship of the Name; Believing on His Name;

Living in His Name—and as the discourses proceed there is a distinct and cumulative impression of the greatness of Christ. This is dynamic preaching indeed!

We note the publication of a *Cumulative Index of the Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society*, compiled by Douglas C. Sparkes—a work which will be welcomed by all historical students.

RECENT LITERATURE

Edited by John T. Wilkinson

Worship and Mission, by J. G. Davies. (S.C.M., 8*s.* 6*d.*)

The urgent need for providing forms of worship which express the sense of mission is recognized on all sides: but it is easier said than done. Furthermore, while lip-service to this idea is general, the literature about it is meagre. This little book by Professor Davies is therefore most welcome. It is not without weaknesses—there are far too many quotations and the style of the middle chapters tends to be heavy—but it is nevertheless a valuable introduction to the whole subject, and it draws attention to a number of studies which have received far less attention from liturgical students than they should have done. It is obvious that the author has drawn a great deal on a report entitled 'The Missionary Structure of the Congregation' and produced by the Western European Working Group of the World Council of Churches' Department of Studies in Evangelism—indeed, one suspects that he has played a major part in drawing up that Report: and he also clearly owes much to a symposium of essays on 'Worship in Scripture and Tradition' by members of the North American Section of the World Council's Theological Commission on Worship (edited by Massey H. Shepherd Jr in 1963).

Professor Davies begins by discussing the relationship between worship and mission, pointing out that whereas in the New Testament they are seen to be unified aspects of God's relation with man, over the centuries this totality has been fragmented. They have become isolated facets of the Church's life, thereby impoverishing both the worship of the Church and also its sense of mission. He then proceeds to examine the meaning of Mission. We are reminded of a truth which many Christians are prone to forget—that 'there is no place to which Christians can go, no boundary they can cross, before God' (p. 30): and this is supported by a telling passage from E. L. Smith's *God's Mission—and Ours* (p. 58): 'The task of the Christian Mission is to help men to open their eyes to the Christ who is already their Saviour ... We are not *summoned* to minister to the pagan because he is without Christ. The very summons comes from the Christ who is already there, who has dwelt with the person long before we ever arrived.' Certain views on Mission are then examined in the light of this thesis and are found to be defective, after which the author turns to worship.

Just as Mission is something which God does, although we are called to share in

it, so also worship is something which God does, in which we are called to share. Baptism initiates us into Mission, with its pattern of life and death: to die and rise with Christ in baptism is to be numbered with those who are sent to be a suffering body in the world, showing forth the Lord's death till he come, effecting a ministry of reconciliation within the broken communication of the world. To be baptized with the Spirit is to be swept into the movement which could take the Gospel to the uttermost parts of the earth. Again, baptism enables man to be truly secular, since it sets him free from the distortions and the deification of the secular order, so that he can see it as it really is and so engage in it. Then in the Eucharist we offer ourselves to God in union with the unique sacrifice of Christ, a self-offering which is a renewal of that consecration to Mission which was effected in Baptism. Consecration itself is an act of thanksgiving to God for what he has done; and the eucharistic consecration, embracing bread and wine and congregation, is a thank-offering for what God has done in Christ and therefore for our share in the mission Dei.

Professor Davies then turns to the practical issues of relating the sense of mission to forms of worship—in prayer, in creed, in confession, in the ministry of the Word, and so on: and it is clear that what is needed is not so much the creation of new forms as the rediscovery of the riches which our present forms possess. The Lord's Prayer, for example, he describes as 'essentially a missionary prayer', while 'the creed may be accepted as a summary of the Gospel and as an indication of the meaning of the serving presence of the Church in mission'. Here is a call to look afresh at a very great deal in our forms of worship which we take for granted and to discover their true meaning and significance. But this in itself raises an issue to which Professor Davies fails to produce a satisfactory answer. We would agree with him that in liturgical revision the missionary dimension must find its place, and we would agree that it is not enough to confine oneself purely and simply to liturgiology. But how can we in practice make all this clear to the man outside the Church? Is it really practicable to expect the 'outsider' to be a reliable critic of forms of Christian worship? Christian worship is tied to the Bible; and, this being so, there are biblical ideas and expressions which must appear in liturgy and yet which are strange and difficult for the outsider to understand. Professor Davies himself describes the Lord's Prayer as 'essentially a missionary prayer'; yet to many an outsider it will be strange and unreal, and will mean nothing at all. What are we to do about it? On this point I could wish that the author had said more. But we must not be ungrateful for what he has given us; and the concluding sentences of the book put it all in an admirable nutshell: 'The temptation which faces the Church today is not that of embracing everything within mission but of including nothing within it—it being seen as just one function among many. To offset this there has to be a strong contemporary emphasis upon mission, not with the idea of saying that nothing but this is important but of declaring that *this* too is so important that it can be neglected no longer. The purpose of his short study has been to provide something in the way of a counter-balance, to protest against introversion and to plead for a real engagement of Christians in the world, which is the object of God's love, through worship and mission. The Liturgical Movement has led to a rediscovery of the pastoral character of the liturgy; it is now the task of its adherents to find again its missionary character in the outward-looking sense we have sought to define' (p. 155).

R. C. D. JASPER

The Stranger Inside You, by Edward V. Stein. (Allen & Unwin, 16*s*.)
The Ability to Love, by Allan Fromine. (Allen & Unwin, 30*s*.)
The Family and the Sexual Revolution, ed. by Edwin M. Schur. (Allen & Unwin, 40*s*.)

A great deal is being written these days about identity. It is an important theme. The words of the Delphic oracle ring down the centuries: 'Know thyself.' A man must know who he is if he is to understand what life is about and if he is to manage his relationships with others.

Allen & Unwin present us with three volumes which in different ways are concerned with this basic question 'What is man?' *The Stranger Inside You*, by Edward Stein, is written by a man who has for some years taught psychology—one imagines very effectively—to students in a Presbyterian seminary. In his Introduction he says: 'The author hopes you have picked up a book that may be pertinent.' That is precisely what the book is, and the chapter titles indicate the direct and positive approach of the writer. 'Sex was God's idea' is a case in point. This down-to-earth section seeks to put sex back into focus by relating it to the whole context of our life and relationship with others.

The Ability to Love by Allan Fromine is really first class. The admirable clarity and simplicity of style almost obscures the sound scholarship that lies behind it. The author's concern is to help men and women to cultivate meaningful relationships. The word 'love' occurs in the title of all the nineteen chapters. But, though the approach is analytical, the book is warmly human and is bound to be of tremendous help to the pastor and counsellor.

The background of Dr Fromine's book is American, but much of what he says is equally applicable to Britain. Indeed, some of the colourful transatlantic allusions serve to highlight points we had not, perhaps, seen so clearly before. There is, for example, a fascinating discussion of the effect on individuals and society of the habit of almost excessive cleanliness—a bathroom on every floor. Cleanliness, and its corollary privacy, have encouraged the habit of physical separateness and obscured the significance of the body as a means of communication. Instead, small boys are taught that the most approved use of the body is to express hostility. There is much to think about here.

The Family and the Sexual Revolution, edited by Edwin Schur, is a very uneven compilation. The revolution is real enough, and it would be difficult to exaggerate its significance, but not all the authors are equally coherent, and some of the contributions are rather dated. One of the best chapters is by Marya Marnes on 'Female Intelligence'. She wittily observes that it is a great mistake for a woman to suppose that, in order to be interesting, one has to say interesting things. She thinks this is 'possibly the greatest miscalculation since the charge of the Light Brigade'. The truth is that the Emancipation of Women will not be finally achieved until it is seen that the movement which secures it is equally for the Emancipation of Men.

If you can only buy or read one of these books, go for Allan Fromine's.

KENNETH G. GREET

Honest Religion for Secular Man, by Lesslie Newbigin (S.C.M., 7*s*. 6*d*.).

This is one of the most fair-minded treatments of the current debate about secularization, a process which Bishop Newbigin defines in this way: 'Negatively, it is the withdrawal of areas of life and activity from the control of organized religious bodies, and the withdrawal of areas of thought from the control of what are believed to be revealed religious truths. Positively it may be seen as the increasing assertion of the competence of human science and technics to handle human problems of every kind.'The Church and the Bible in fact have been a major factor

in producing this secularization. Behind the progress of modern science lies the essentially biblical conviction that the material world is neither to be despised nor worshipped, but treated with reverence by man, the high priest and steward of creation. When western historical thinking is adopted, the static and cyclical view of history is replaced by the dynamic view, which derives from the Bible. Over against the facile idealization of this process (for example in Harvey Cox's *The Secular City*, an influential piece of recent Christian positivist thinking) Bishop Newbigin sets three queries. First, why is it that side by side with an increasing mastery of the physical world, there is also a growing sense of 'something like meaninglessness and even terror as man faces his future': we must attend to the writers and psychiatrists as well as to the technicians if we would understand our age. Secondly, no man can long live on the 'how' of life alone: doctrine, dogma and ideology cannot be avoided. Thirdly, the Bible set God over and above all human authority, and so created the prophetic consciousness; but how can the secular state find its critics, if all sense of the transcendent God is lost? (The Archbishop of Canterbury in his recent *Sacred and Secular* adds a further dimension to the critique.) Bishop Newbigin then goes on to make some penetrating comments on Christian writers like Bultmann, van Buren, John Robinson and Harvey Cox: 'the question between theists and non-theists is a question of substance and not simply a question of language. It is the question whether I am in the last resort accountable to another who is not myself—not even the depths of my being—and whether this accountability is not in fact what constitutes the humanity of man.' The rest of the book is less original, but there is a useful chapter on what we mean by 'knowing' God, and some reflections upon the changing structure of the Church, derived, as one would expect, from a knowledge of the Church throughout the world.

ALAN WILKINSON

Slavery and Methodism; A Chapter in American Morality, 1780-1845, by Donald G. Mathews. (Oxford University Press, 60*s*.)

It is a pity this moderately sized book should cost so much, because it is not a book for libraries and specialist students only. In a manner not even covered by the sub-title, the author has shown by a detailed study of the currents and cross-currents in American Methodism between 1780 and 1845 the mood of the young nation struggling between its conscience and those economic realities which seemed to call for expediency. No previous book of any significance covers this ground and since this moral issue of slavery has divided the nation as well as the Church, the subject matter makes what was originally a doctoral thesis into a book for the general informed reader. An English reader would like a more detailed examination of Wesley's views as expressed, not only in *Thoughts on Slavery* but his support of Wilberforce, Sharpe and Clarkson. When Thomas Coke, a fiery abolitionist to the end, and Francis Asbury went to see George Washington to express their abhorrence of slavery, John Wesley in spirit walked beside them. Long before he died, however, Asbury had found that a rigid opposition, whilst just possible in the North, only weakened gravely the strength of Methodism in the South; and almost insensibly he passed through the stages of opposition and then caution to compromise. In the Conference following his death, the Committee on Slavery recorded that 'under the present existing circumstances in relation to slavery, little can be done to abolish the practice so contrary to the principles of moral justice'. This was the accepted line until 1830 when in the mood of undue compromise the Church did not even demand laws to govern the humane treatment of the slaves. In the South where more general acceptance of the institution of

slavery caused conscience pangs, a 'Mission to the Slaves' (1824-1844) was supported with enthusiasm and yet, as the author shows, how trite a solution it was, since piety was regarded as more significant than emancipation. Another sop to conscience, both in the North and South, can be found in the eager promotion of colonization. For the missionary angle on the founding of Liberia one must turn to the three volumes on the History of Methodist Missions. Whilst it was supported by men like Bishop William McKendree, David Reese and Wilbur Fisk it was, in itself, no answer to the problem but 'a gentle, wistful hope of readjusting social dislocation painlessly'.

So came the only radical alternative to slavery in the rise of Methodist abolitionism (1832-1836). This is an exciting story splendidly told by Dr Mathews, and the great protagonist, Orange Scott, comes vividly to life. What a grim commentary on fading hopes that even in the North the paucity of support led him to a secession in which the new Wesleyan Methodist Church was founded on abolitionism and Christian Perfection.

The upsurge of abolitionism in the North thoroughly alarmed the South and the concluding chapters of Professor Mathews' book are concerned to show the gulf widening as Northerners, without the same stake in slaves, grew less tolerant of the Southern Methodist acceptance of slavery as a normal 'fact of life'.

The author handles well the vital issue of Bishop J. A. Andrews being a slave-owner and the historic Conference of 1844 when the whole issue was discussed at prodigious length and it was finally decided by 110 to 69 votes that Bishop Andrew 'desist from the exercise of his office so long as he remains connected with slavery'. This was a decision the Southern delegates could never accept and the next year they seceded from the Methodist Episcopal Church (1845). It was almost a century before North and South met again in General Conference. How easy to understand the secession of the South from the North in the Civil War when those within the one Methodist Church were divided so bitterly over the issue. In a terse but convincing Epilogue, the author summarizes the different standpoints of North and South, but he might well have underlined the truth that when economic expediency is given moral justification and New Testament imperatives are shrugged off because they seem impracticable, this failure of vision cannot only split a great Church but affront the conscience of men.

This is a first-rate book for those who would understand some factors that have gone into the making of modern America.

MALDWYN EDWARDS

Philosophy in America, by Max Black. (Allen & Unwin, 42*s*.)

This recent addition to the Muirhead Library of Philosophy is an interesting introduction to the work of some of America's younger philosophers. Professor Black in his editorial preface says that he tried to exclude philosophers whose writings are well known on both sides of the Atlantic. So, though it does not represent the work of the most prominent American philosophers, it is perhaps all the more representative of American philosophy inasmuch as we are given new examples and so are better able to form a picture of American philosophy. One important feature of contemporary American philosophy is the prevalence of the kind of philosophy that has been characteristic of the British scene for some time, namely linguistic analysis; and this fact is very evident in these papers. Not that they can be described as adopting a party line; for, as Professor Black rightly says, they are as representative and diverse in their styles, methods and preoccupations as could reasonably be expected. Indeed, one of the reassuring features of the book is the way in which some hard-and-fast distinctions and dogmas are challenged.

Thus, in the very first paper (W. P. Alston, 'Expressing'), the reader will find a very delicate piece of analysis, the conclusion of which is that there is no basis for the sharp distinction between expressing and asserting.

It would be foolhardy to attempt either to summarize the contents of these volumes or to offer a comment on all the papers. Let me therefore simply note that there are here many papers which will be of interest to the theologian even if he fails to muster up interest in 'Frege's theory of numbers' or 'Quantum physics and the philosophy of Whitehead'. These can be grouped under three heads: the papers on problems of or related to ethics, the papers on aesthetics and the papers on problems of logic such as inference and predictability. Professor Plantinga's discussion of the 'Free Will Defence' (in Theodicy) will obviously interest the theologians, and it is exciting to see this once again restored. All in all, this is an interesting and useful book.

J. HEYWOOD THOMAS

Justification: The Doctrine of Karl Barth and a Catholic Reflection, by Hans Küng. (Burns & Oates, 45*s*.)

This is an excellent translation of an outstanding book first published in 1957. The first part offers an astonishingly lucid exposition of Barth's teaching. In Part 2 Küng considers questions presented to Roman Catholic theology by Barth's work. The result is that Barth affirms not only that Küng has rightly expounded him, but also that if what is here presented is Catholic teaching he is in agreement with it. With the addition of an appendix on Barth's teaching about the Word of God this volume provides an invaluable summary of much of Barth's voluminous teaching. It must, however, be emphasized that we have here an exposition of both justification and sanctification which stands in its own right as a major contribution to systematic theology. When the Protestant reader has recovered from the shock of finding, in a volume bearing the Roman *imprimatur*, a superb exposition of *sola fide* and an account of the Church (as the bride of Christ and the Church of sinners) in terms of an *ecclesia* which is *simul justa et peccatrix*, he may settle down to study this searching exploration of the scriptural meaning, the theological interpretation and the implications for salvation of justifying and sanctifying grace. In a day when we are tempted to think so much about communicating the Gospel that we have little time to seek to receive and understand it more fully, Dr Küng calls us to our first task and shows us how to fulfil it. A brilliant additional essay on the theological meaning of pre-existence is added. A Methodist is specially interested to find, in the main theme of this book, many sentences which could be paralleled almost precisely by quotations from John Wesley. It may be, however, that it is the attitude of mind which prompted this immensely learned and yet very readable volume which will contribute most to that unity of Christendom which its author so humbly and hopefully seeks.

FREDERICK GREEVES

Structures of the Church, by Hans Küng. (Burns & Oates, 42*s*.)

The dominating convictions of this latest book by the Roman Catholic Professor at Tübingen reflect the dominating affirmations of Vatican II in ecclesiology: the Church is the whole people of God; ecclesiastical office 'is not dominion over the Church but service to the Church'; the papacy 'means not absolute power over the

Church but, in union with the college of bishops, selfless and loving service'. Fraternity not paternalism should characterize the life of the Church; freedom of the children of God not 'legalistic juridicism'; 'the Church's frailty and proneness to sin' not the old idealistic triumphalism. To replace the old monolithic and monochrome pictures of the faith, he reminds us that the one faith has often existed under different formulations; there are after all four Gospels in the New Testament, not one. The Uniat patriarch of Antioch (the Uniats are Orthodox who retain all their customs, the Eastern liturgy, communion in both kinds, married clergy, etc. while united to the Pope) said roundly at the Vatican Council: 'We must therefore begin to convert the Latin West to catholicism ... a levelling confirmity is not reconcilable with catholic universality.' Much of the great detail of the book is concerned to demonstrate how much more varied is the tradition than the Latin Church of the West has cared to remember in the last few centuries, so intent as it has been to interpret unity as uniformity. This interpretation of unity has also characterized a good deal of Western Christianity as a whole. He is keenly aware that a 'truth pronounced for polemical reasons borders particularly on error', and he valuably interprets many of the Reformation controversies in this light, as readers of his remarkable book on *Justification* will know. For example he writes, 'when Luther raised the question of participation at councils with an appeal to the universal priesthood of all believers, he was setting forth an authentic Catholic point of view.' It is also illuminating to follow the familiar Anglican-Free Church discussions on episcopacy in another country between different participants. It is valuable to be able to study a Lutheran declaration on episcopacy which shows the mutual willingness of German Lutherans and Roman Catholics to abandon slogan theology. Much of the debate in Germany has been dominated by the phrase 'early Catholicism' since the days of Harnack. It is momentous that Käsemann, a leading Protestant New Testament scholar writes: 'The New Testament canon does not stand between Judaism and early Christianity but provides in itself scope and foundation to both Judaism and early Catholicism'. Küng shrewdly comments: 'The dilemma of the Protestant theologian is obvious: either to accept early Catholicism as an element of the New Testament and thereby to embark on the road to "late Catholicism", or else to reject early Catholicism as an element of the New Testament and correct the canon accordingly.' A frequent characteristic of Küng's thought is the distinction he draws between eternal essence and accidental historical appearance. ' "Roman apparatus" and the "Roman system", external unevangelical pomp and power, Byzantine court ceremonial, baroque forms of expression, and absolutist methods of governing make it very difficult for the Christians separated from us to recognize the fisherman of Galilee again in the Pope.' But the essence of the Petrine office 'should not be concerned with its rights, authority and power but with ministering to the brethren'. Küng is least convincing when he discusses the whole concept of infallibility; he faces frankly all the criticisms, and he makes strenuous and eirenic efforts to minimize it and define it correctly. But however limited in scope, however carefully defined, it cannot help looking like the occasional transubstantiation of the Church in the papal office, which corresponds to that transubstantiation of the Word in Protestant biblical fundamentalism. But let no one ever begin to write a sentence beginning 'Roman Catholics believe' without reading this and other works of this author, otherwise they will almost certainly be incorrect or out of date. The warmth of his eager Christian love for all his Christian brethren fortunately even penetrates through the turgid nature of the English translation.

ALAN WILKINSON

The Rule of Qumran and its Meanings, by A. R. C. Leaney. (S.C.M. Press, 50*s*.)

The subject of Dr Leaney's important book is *The Manual of Discipline*, perhaps the most important of the discoveries, to date, at Qumran. The form is that of the standard biblical commentary. A long introduction is followed by a translation of the text, divided into sections each with detailed comment. As such it is a considerable contribution. We already have a vast flood of books *about* Qumran. Dr Leaney's long and well chosen bibliography represents but a small fraction. Far too few deal with the actual content and meaning of the scrolls and not a few seem designed to make Christian flesh creep with exaggerated claims and ominous hints as to the destructive impact on the historic basis of the faith. Here we have the text *en clair* of the Qumran *Rule*, with mature, detailed, and objective exposition. For this alone Dr Leaney deserves our gratitude. However, by the spirit and manner in which he has discharged his task, he has given us even more. This applies both to the preparatory chapters dealing with 'The World of Qumran' and the commentary itself. To convey something of this we cannot do better than summarize Dr Leaney's account of his five-fold purpose. The first intention is to show how the *Rule* fits into its historical setting between the Testaments and so illuminates the history of religious ideas in the period. Secondly, he seeks to show the relevance of the document for biblical students, especially of the NT. This point is stressed by the inclusion of the volume in the S.C.M. 'New Testament Library'. Thirdly, he demonstrates that we have to dig very deeply into the past if we are to understand the rock from which the men of Qumran were hewn. The fourth purpose is to expose the characteristics of their thought as herein revealed and that we may appreciate the intellectual and moral, if limited, virtues which excited both the opposition and admiration of their contemporaries. Here we are helped to understand the ideas of Qumran for their own sake. The final aim, of a different kind and approached with diffidence, is to do something for the eventual healing of the tragic breach between Judaism and Christianity, through the understanding of the character of the sect elsewhere described as 'an elder brother to the Christian Church within the family of Judaism'. It may well seem to many, as it does to one reader, that these purposes have been well fulfilled. Some may wish that Dr Leaney had devoted a special section to discussing and evaluating the parallels to and comparisons with the New Testament. He has chosen not to do this separately but rather to embody it in the fabric of his treatment. How thoroughly he has followed this, the better way, can be judged from the fourteen columns of NT references in the splendid and comprehensive index.

MARCUS WARD

The Foundations of New Testament Christology, by R. H. Fuller. (Lutterworth, 50*s*.)

Professor Fuller first examines the terms and ideas which the Christian Church selected from its environment, and shows how these contributions from Palestinian Judaism, Hellenistic Judaism and the Graeco-Roman world were shaped and blended as they were used of Jesus. He deals also with what can be learned of Jesus' own understanding of himself and his mission. He then shows how the Christology of the Church developed from simple emphasis on the two foci of the historical ministry and the parousia, to the awareness in Hellenistic Jewish circles of the necessity for some account of the present Lordship of Christ, and finally to the complete pattern in the Hellenistic Gentile world of pre-existence, incarnation, exaltation and parousia. In this last section there is a particularly valuable treatment of the great Christological hymns of the New Testament.

The author makes full use of the work of modern criticism so that his demonstration of continuity between the historical Jesus and the message and witness of the post-resurrection Church is the more impressive. The chapter on the self-understanding of Jesus is particularly important, for this accepts the views of M. D. Hooker and others that Jesus did not think of himself as the suffering servant of Isaiah.

The book will be of great service to all concerned with the New Testament basis for the doctrine of the person of Christ. It should of course be read critically. Among matters open to question is the result of treating the confession of Peter as an expanded pronouncement story. For it is a very odd story which has as its pronouncement 'Get behind me, Satan!' It is also doubtful if the equating by Paul of the powers defeated by Christ with sin and the law can properly be described as demythologizing.

VINCENT PARKIN

The Position of Women in Judaism, by Raphael Loewe. (S.P.C.K., 12*s.* 6*d.*)

Few Christians know much about Judaism. This is strange in view of the common origins of the two faiths, and dangerous since ignorance easily leads to prejudice. This little book provides much useful information. First the source material is listed and the main English translations given, and the general approach of Judaism is explained. In the main body of the book Jewish teaching about women is systematically set out. The tone is perhaps a little defensive in face of the modern viewpoint of complete equality between the sexes. One of the most attractive features of the Jewish way of life is the high value placed upon the family, and Mr Loewe emphasizes that 'Judaism sees the function of womanhood essentially as that of a home-maker.' He would defend the consequence of this, that women should not take a fully equal part in the life of the society, on the grounds of the differences between men and women. One point is of special interest. This booklet originated as a memorandum which was requested by the commission appointed by the Church of England to consider the ordination of women. There is no discussion of ordination as such, but Mr Loewe makes the observation that to authorize as priests only women who choose to forgo marriage would be to make nonsense of a positive Christian evaluation of family life. 'It might well be the case that, if ordination of women were countenanced, marriage might be, on the contrary, an essential precondition.'

CYRIL S. ROOD

The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, by Joachim Jeremias. (S.C.M. New Testament Library, 40*s.*)

This is not just a repetition of the earlier English edition but contains much additional information. The pattern however remains the same.

The evidence for considering the Last Supper to be a Passover meal is fully and persuasively presented, while the objections to this identification are carefully considered. The New Testament accounts both of the Last Supper and of the institution of the Lord's Supper are examined in an attempt to discover the oldest form of the tradition of the words of Jesus. The final chapter is on the meaning of these words.

The book presents in convenient and readable form a wealth of information, and it seems safe to say that no one concerned with the understanding of the New Testament, or with the institution of the Lord's Supper, should neglect it.

There are, however, places where one might disagree with Professor Jeremias. He states that Paul began his missionary work in Corinth in the autumn of 49. This

is not impossible, but unless Gallio held office for two years, which seems less probable than that he was proconsul for one year, Paul is unlikely to have reached Corinth as early as the autumn of 49.

The assumption that at the Last Supper Jesus spoke of his death as the vicarious death of the suffering servant takes no account of the work of Morna D. Hooker. And although Professor Jeremias refers in a footnote to the article by D. Jones in *J.T.S.6* (1955) on Anamnesis he takes no account of its argument but repeats his own views of '. . . that God may remember me' as if neither this article nor that of Professor W. C. van Unnik (to which he does not refer) had ever been written.

VINCENT PARKIN

Simone Weil, A Sketch for a Portrait, by Richard Rees. (Oxford University Press, 30*s*)

Simone Weil, Seventy Letters, by Richard Rees (ed.). (Oxford University Press, 30*s*.)

As far as I know, Simone Weil never read Baron von Hügel, and this seems to me to be an infinite pity. 'There are so many things outside it' she complained about the Church, and 'The love of those things which are outside visible Christianity keeps me outside the Church.' A non-orthodox Jewess, she was never baptized, despite a profound experience of Christ given while meditating upon George Herbert's poem 'Love bade me welcome'. Hügel wrote: 'what is the worth of the homage I pay to Jesus by the refusal to admire and thank God for, say, Aristotle's doctrine of the Unmoving *Energeia*, or for Plotinus's grand demonstrations of the spaceless character of God?' He stressed the importance of the institutional element in religion as a vitally necessary complement to its mystical and intellectual aspects. He exposed the chief danger of religion as that of 'allowing the fascinations of grace to deaden or to ignore the beauties and duties of nature'. He wrote of Christ as uniquely uniting 'the clearest, keenest sense of all the mysterious depth and breadth and length and height of human sadness, suffering and sin, *and*, in spite of this and through this and at the end of this, a note of conquest and of triumphant joy.' He said the rosary each day to keep in intimate touch with the devotion of the people. To mention and quote von Hügel here seems to me to expose the frightening imbalance in the teaching and life of Simone Weil. The strange complexity of her character is indicated by one incident. When she was working on a plan for employing women in the front line in 1940 with all the intense fervour of her passion for self-immolation, she was engaged in a long correspondence with her brother about the effects of the discovery of incommensurables in the fifth century B.C. She died in England at the age of 34 in 1943, because characteristically she refused to eat anything more than the rations allowed to her French compatriots at home, despite her illness and exhaustion. An intellectual through and through, she deliberately worked for a time at hard manual work in factories. In the volume of her letters there are several to industrialists and trade unionists which amplify her attitude to industrial society so memorably set forth in her major work *The Need for Roots*. Some of her practical suggestions for the reform of industrial relations are still very striking, and could well be put into practice. Seven years later she wrote of that sense of servitude which this factory experience had created in her, that 'still today whenever any human being, whoever it is and in whatever circumstances, speaks to me without brutality, I cannot help having the impression that there must be a mistake.' Other letters discuss abstruse mathematics, Christianity, plans for making Greek poetry available to the masses, how she would react if tortured by the Nazis and the

strange beauty of England to which she came at the beginning of the war. She suffered for years from acute headaches and various types of exhaustion, all that she summed up in the word *malheur*, affliction, and from the self-hatred that this created. 'This is so much the case that I absolutely cannot imagine the possibility that any human being could feel friendship for me.' T. S. Eliot wrote in the Preface to *The Need for Roots* 'We must simply expose ourselves to the personality of a woman of genius, of a kind of genius akin to that of the saints.' I doubt whether she should be approached in this manner.

ALAN WILKINSON

Marriage in the Modern World, by Bernard Häring. (Mercier Press, 35*s*.)

Bernard Häring's book on Marriage in the Modern World is described on the fly-leaf as vast and comprehensive. It is a fair description, for the Table of Contents itself takes up seven pages. The author has combined a wealth of sociological insight and knowledge with a pastoral sympathy which in places is quite profound. Indeed, the somewhat massive proportions of the book, which at first sight may be daunting to the prospective reader, are off-set by the down-to-earth and sensible advice which keeps breaking into the scholarly exposition.

The book falls into three main sections dealing with the sociology of the family in the service of theology and life; the nature and functions of the family; ideal and reality; and the family in its environment. Father Häring is on the whole clearest when he is discussing practical matters of behaviour and the sort of pastoral counsel the priest should offer. He tends to be most obscure when examining some of the basic questions about the distinction between what is permanent and what is changing in marriage and the family. For example, the precise conclusions we are expected to draw from the discussion in the second part of the book of the place of authority within the home and the meaning of sex equality are not immediately obvious. In fairness it should be added that on some of these matters we should not perhaps expect more than that the questions should be accurately framed and the complex issues clarified.

It is, however, where Father Häring is most clear and dogmatic that often the non-Roman Christian reader will want most strongly to disagree with what he says. One would have expected a rather more open attitude on the question of contraception. It really is quite incredible that an author, so sensible in other ways, should compress so much nonsense into a few pages when writing about what he calls 'the unreason of a mechanical solution'. We are treated once again to the completely erroneous assertion that those who use contraceptives are 'saved any effort at self-control'. This is the sort of statement which can only be made by anyone who is ignorant about the actual experience of being married. We are also presented with a dark picture of the evil motives of the birth-control societies who are said to be running a 'cold war against conceiving children'. A little more knowledge of the real situation would reveal the great compassion which has motivated many of the pioneers of birth control; it would also bring to light the important work being done by those same societies to improve the treatments available for the sub-fertile.

Those who believe that Roman Catholic teaching is, on some matters, profoundly foolish will perhaps concede that on others it is profoundly wise. Both aspects are to be found in this book. It is worth reading for the wisdom it contains. But it is also worth commending because it reflects a great church endeavouring to set forth the truth about some of the basic facts of life in a rapidly changing situation.

KENNETH G. GREET

Situation Ethics, by Joseph Fletcher (S.C.M. Press, 25*s*.).

For English readers, the initial interest attaching to this book is that Bishop Robinson described it as 'the most consistent' exposition of the subject he knows. The treatment is certainly thorough, and competent. Ethics can be a dull subject, but this author introduces many illustrations from real life. Nor can he resist the occasional anecdote like the one about the Republican taxi-driver in St Louis. Asked if he was going to vote for the Republican candidate at the presidential election, he replied: 'No, there are times when a man has to push his principles aside and do the right thing.' Dr Fletcher says that this cabbie is really the hero of his book!

The main contention is that there is no such thing as a Christian system of ethics. What the book describes is a method, not a system: a method of 'situational' or 'contextual' decision-making. The distillation of this method may be summarized in six propositions. They are: (1) Only one 'thing' is intrinsically good; namely love : nothing else at all; (2) the ruling norm of Christian decision is love : nothing else; (3) love and justice are the same, for justice is love distributed, nothing else; (4) love wills the neighbour's good whether we like him or not; (5) only the end justifies the means; nothing else; (6) love's decisions are made situationally, not prescriptively.

Situationism, thus defined, lies in between legalism on the one hand and antinomianism on the other. The situationist is content neither to be bound by inflexible laws nor to reject inherited ethical maxims as valueless. Those maxims are to be respected as illuminators of the various problems of conduct and decision which confront him. But in any given situation he is prepared to set them aside if love seems better served by doing so.

It is doubtful if this theme has anywhere been more cogently expounded than in this very readable book. There is one fact which may leave the reader wondering whether quite enough has been said about the value of rules at least as educative devices. It is the fact that so many of the illustrations of complex situations where rules seem quite irrelevant are descriptions of quite extraordinary cases such as those beloved of the Sunday newspapers, and, therefore, hardly typical.

KENNETH G. GREET

The Elements of New Testament Greek, by J. W. Wenham, based on the earlier work by H. P. V. Nunn (C.U.P., 18*s*. 6*d*.).

Key to the Elements of New Testament Greek, by J. W. Wenham (C.U.P., 6*s*.).

An Introductory Grammar of New Testament Greek, by A. W. Argyle (Hodder & Stoughton, 21*s*.).

By a strange coincidence two new Grammars of N. T. Greek designed for beginners have appeared almost simultaneously. They make an interesting contrast in scope and treatment, though each in its own way is an excellent piece of work. Mr Argyle teaches New Testament Greek in the Faculty of Theology at Oxford University, and his book is admirably suited to the needs of the more academically capable student. One of its chief merits is the ample provision of exercises, many of which are in the form of continuous prose rather than short sentences. The general run of students, however, will find Mr Wenham's text-book more suited to their needs. The author is Vice-Principal of Tyndale Hall, Bristol, and as such is naturally concerned chiefly with providing for the average type of theological student. Like many who have had to teach Greek in theological colleges, Mr Wenham regarded Nunn's *Elements* as 'incomparably the best book of its type

published in this country', though (again like others) believing that it 'revealed many possibilities of improvement'. Having been asked to undertake a complete revision of Nunn, he discovered so many possibilities of improvement that the result in the end is not so much a revision as 'a new book, leaning heavily on Nunn, yet without risking the charge of plagiarism'. In a valuable Preface Mr Wenham summarizes the relationship of his book to its predecessor under the headings of omissions, additions and rearrangements. As for the omissions, though the purist will be horrified at the decision not to print accents except where necessary to distinguish pairs of words otherwise the same, most teachers will agree with Mr Wenham's decisions. The additions also are well-conceived and supply most of the deficiencies of Nunn (e.g. the use of *tou* with the infinitive, and *hina* in noun clauses). The many additional aids to assimilation (e.g. the summaries of morphology and syntax, the use of heavy type and the graphic representation of the notion of tense) are also a great improvement. It is in the matter of rearrangements that opinions will differ as to whether Mr Wenham has improved on the old Nunn. Much of his work here is admirable (e.g. the revision of the 'English Grammar' section at the beginning, and transferring to the text of matter previously found in footnotes). Experience in teaching from the new book (after years of teaching from Nunn) has, however, suggested to the reviewer that some of the rearrangements have added to rather than diminished the difficulties of the average student. The following are examples: too many prepositions are concentrated together in Lesson 16; the subtlety of questions introduced by *ou* and *mē* appears too early in Lesson 18; the more complicated infinitive constructions, which Wenham includes where the student first encounters the infinitive, are better postponed (as in Nunn) until a later stage. All this rearrangement has meant the almost complete rewriting of the exercises; here again experience has left one with the impression that the new exercises are at many points less suitable for the student's needs than Nunn's admirable graded series of exercises. The result is that, whilst acknowledging that in very many respects the new book is a considerable improvement on the old (in format and arrangement of material on the page it is very much more attractive, quite apart from other more material improvements), one wishes on the whole that Mr Wenham had stuck to his original intention of providing 'a radical revision' rather than writing a new book. As in the case of Nunn, a key to the exercises is provided in a separate volume, for the guidance of students who have to work through the grammar without the help of a tutor. Provided it is kept out of the reach of students who have the benefit of a tutor's guidance, this will no doubt perform a useful service.

OWEN E. EVANS

The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition, by H. E. Tödt (The New Testament Library, S.C.M. Press, 63*s*.).

The author of this work is Professor of New Testament at Heidelberg and belongs to the group of German scholars who have come to be known as 'post-Bultmannians'. Owing an incalculable debt to their master, Rudolf Bultmann, and building solidly on the foundations he laid in his researches into the history of the synoptic tradition, these younger scholars have in many cases reached conclusions which differ to some extent from those of Bultmann himself. Professor Tödt's exhaustive and painstaking examination of all the synoptic 'Son of Man' sayings is undoubtedly one of the most important books to have come from this latest move-

ment in German New Testament scholarship. Like most of the output of this school, the book is (for English readers at least, in spite of its being well translated by Dorothea M. Barton) rather tedious to work through, but for anyone who wishes seriously to study the development of Christological understanding in the primitive Church it is absolutely compulsory reading. After a brief survey of the teaching about the transcendent sovereignty of the Son of Man in Jewish apocalyptic literature, Tödt follows the now familiar threefold classification of the Son of Man sayings, dealing first with those concerning the coming Son of Man, then with those concerning his activity on earth and finally with those concerning the suffering and rising of the Son of Man. A further chapter discusses the mutual relationship of the three groups of sayings, and finally attention is drawn to the absence from the synoptic sayings of the elements of pre-existence and exaltation. Like Bultmann and many important modern writers on the subject (including A. J. B. Higgins and R. H. Fuller), Tödt accepts as authentic utterances of Jesus only a few of the sayings which refer to the coming, eschatological Son of Man and claims that in these Jesus was referring to someone other than himself. An important difference between Tödt and Bultmann, however, is that whereas the latter held the application of the title to Jesus in his earthly life and passion to be the work of the Hellenistic Church. Tödt believes it to have been made by the Palestian community. This community took the title 'Son of Man' (which Jesus had used in a soteriological and not a Christological sense, as referring to the eschatological guarantor of attachment to Jesus on earth) and used it to designate 'Jesus as the one who acts on earth with full authority'. Thus Tödt finds in the synoptic tradition a Christology of *exousia* that must be carefully distinguished from the Christology of the famous hymn of Philippians 2. Those of us who have been brought up on the prevailing view of modern British scholarship, namely that 'Son of Man' was Jesus' own chosen form of self-designation and that the majority, at least, of the sayings which contain the title are substantially authentic, cannot but find the study of this book a searching experience. We shall have no right to hold on to our cherished position until we have honestly sought to face the formidable arguments with which Tödt's conclusions are presented. And that will be no easy task. May we hope that someone will write yet another book on the Son of Man, an equally scholarly treatment but this time from a less radical standpoint?

OWEN E. EVANS

Children in Search of Meaning, by Violet Madge. (S.C.M. Paperback, 13*s.* 6*d.*)
This book is in line with the most recent movements in religious education, and will doubtless prove of value to teacher, Sunday School worker and all interested in religious education. Very wisely religious educators are pursuing the path of the experimental approach. They begin with the child where he is and not where they think he ought to be. This book makes the assumption that the child is really seeking for a meaning to life. The questions, the drawings, the imagination and the play are all part and parcel of the child's probe into the universe. Somewhere there must be the answer and it is the task of the religious educator to help as unobtrusively as possible to find the answer. Part One is on making discoveries about the world and people, and Part Two gives some reflections on children in their search for meaning. Primary school years are studied and numerous examples given of the grouping of the infant mind and the gradual approach to faith, though at the end it will remain the mystery of mysteries. The book is a helpful contribution to the experiential approach to religious education.

LEONARD EMERSON

BOOKS RECEIVED

ALLEN & UNWIN: George Unwin (ed.), *What I believe*, pp. 236, 25*s*. M. Lings, *Shakespeare in the Light of Sacred Art*, pp. 133, 25*s*.

BANNER OF TRUTH TRUST: A. A. Bonar, *Robert Murray McCheyne: Memoirs and Remains*, pp. 654, 25*s*.

BAPTIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY: D. C. Sparkes (ed.), *Cumulative Index of the Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society*, pp. 209, n.p.

BURNS & OATES: R. Addington, *The Idea of The Oratory*, pp. 224 + plates, 30*s*. J. R. Geiselmann, *The Meaning of Tradition*, pp. 123, 15*s*. H. R. Schlette, *Towards a Theology of Religions*, pp. 151, 16*s*.

BLACKWELL: Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Worship in Israel*, pp. 246, 37*s*. 7*d*.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS. (Cambridge Commentary on the *New English Bible*) J. W. Packer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 233 + maps. 18*s*. 6*d*. (Schools ed., 11*s*. 6*d*. Paper, 9*s*. 6*d*.) A. T. Hanson, *The Pastoral Letters*, pp. 126, 15*s*. (School ed., 9*s*. 6*d*. Paper, 8*s*. 6*d*.).

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY: (Vatican Council Documents) *Decree on Training for the Priesthood*, pp. 24, 1*s*.; *Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation*, pp. 24, 1*s*.; *Declaration on Christian Education*, pp. 16, 6*d*.

CLARK, T. & T.: R. L. Small, *No Other Name*, pp. 182, 21*s*. A. W. & E. Hastings (ed.), *Theologians of our Time*, pp. 224, 16*s*.; *Important Moral Issues*, pp. 128, 12*s*. 6*d*. N. Turner, *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament*, pp. 198, 27*s*. 6*d*.

EPWORTH PRESS: P. Barraclough, *Playing with Atheism*, pp. 10, 1*s*. 6*d*. T. Wieser (ed.), *Planning for Mission*, pp. 230, 12*s*. 6*d*. W. R. Matthews, *The Hope of Immortality*, pp. 67, 8*s*. 6*d*. G. F. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit and Ourselves*, pp. 63, 4*s*. T. Dearing, *Wesley and Tractarian Worship* (with S.P.C.K.), pp. 166, 27*s*. 6*d*. Philip Martin, *None but He and I—and Other Poems*, pp. 56, 5*s*. M. J. Skinner, *The Sermon on the Mount* (Manuals, of Fellowship 4th series), pp. 32, 2*s*. 6*d*. John Huxtable, *The Preacher's Integrity and other Lectures* (includes the A. S. Peake Memorial Lecture 1965), pp. 189, 18*s*. Douglas Thompson, *Out of the World*, pp. 78, 5*s*. Pauline M. Webb, *Are we yet Alive?*, pp. 67, 5*s*. Nels. F. S. Ferré, *The Living God of Nowhere and Nothing*, pp. 237, 35*s*. (The A. S. Peake Memorial Lecture, 1966, and other Lectures.) Claud Westermann, *The Praises of God in the Psalms*, pp. 172, 17*s*. 6*d*. J. H. Chamberlayne, *Man in Society* (Fernley Hartley Lecture, 1966, pp. 256, 35*s*. Maurice Nesbitt, *Where No Fear is; A Study in Neurotic Psychology related to the Christian Experience*, pp. 112, 13*s*. 6*d*. Gordon S. Wakefield, *Methodist Devotion: The Spiritual Life in the Methodist Tradition: 1791-1945* (*Wesley Historical Society Lecture* 1966), pp. 120, 16*s*.

HODDER & STOUGHTON: H. A. Hodges and A. M. Allchin (ed.), *A Rapture of Praise: Hymns of John and Charles Wesley*, pp. 160, 30*s*. P. Scherer, *The Word God Sent*, pp. 272, 16*s*. James Richmond, *Faith and Philosophy*, pp. 224, 16*s*.

INDEPENDENT PRESS: John Huxtable, *Christian Unity: Some of the Issues*, pp. 101, 6*s*.

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: A. Gilmore, *Baptism and Christian Unity*, pp. 108, 18*s*. 6*d*. L. Griffith, *This is Living: Paul's Letter to the Philippians*, pp. 159, 16*s*. R. Stupperich, *Melancthon: The Enigma of the Reformation*, pp. 175, 25*s*.

MARCHAM PRESS: P. E. Hughes (ed.), *Churchmen Speak: Thirteen Essays*, pp. 128, 15*s*.

MERCIER PRESS: B. Haring, *Marriage in the Modern World*, pp. 492, 35*s*.

METHODIST DEPARTMENT FOR CHAPEL AFFAIRS: W. D. Phillipson, *A Methodist Church Builder's Decalogue*, pp. 12, 2*s*. 6*d*.

METHUEN: A. D. J. Cockshut, *Religious Controversies of the Nineteenth Century: Selected Documents*, pp. 264, 35*s*.

NISBET: Bernard Martin, *Paul Tillich's Doctrine of Man*, pp. 221, 17*s*. 6*d*.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: R. Rees, *Simone Weil: A Sketch for a Portrait*, pp. 161, 30*s*. D. G. Mathews, *Slavery and Methodism: A Chapter on American Morality: 1780-1845* (for Princeton University Press), pp. 329, 60*s*. A. J. Heschel, *Who is Man?* (for Stanford University Press), pp. 119, 25*s*.

OLDBOURNE: Various Authors, *Cambridge Sermons on Christian Unity*, pp. 92, 5*s*.

PITTSBURG: CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY: *Six Satirists* (by Members of the Department of English), pp. 100, 2*s*.

S.C.M. PRESS: K. F. Nickle, *The Collection: A Study in Paul's Strategy* (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 48), pp. 176, 16*s*. M. Boutlier, *Christianity according to Paul* (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 49), pp. 127, 18*s*. W. Kramer, *Christ, Lord and Son of God* (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 50), pp. 238, 25*s*. K. Kitamori, *Theology of the Pain of God*, pp. 182, 22*s*. 6*d*. Hans-Ruedi Weber, *Asia and the Ecumenical Movement: 1895-1961*, pp. 319, 50*s*. H. Berkhoff, *Christ and the Meaning of History*, pp. 224, 35*s*. John McIntyre, *The Shape of Christology*, pp. 180, 30*s*. G. Ebeling, *The Lord's Prayer in Today's World*, pp. 140, 7*s*. 6*d*. D. Webster, *Yes to Mission*, pp. 128, 9*s*. 6*d*. A. Richardson, *Religion in Contemporary Debate*, pp. 125, 6*s*. 6*d*. I. T. Ramsay (ed.), *Christian Ethics and Contemporary Philosophy* (Library of Philosophy and Theology), pp. 400, 50*s*. J. Fletcher, *Situation Ethics* (Library of Philosophy and Theology), pp. 176, 25*s*. W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the*

New Testament (New Testament Library), pp. 444, 50*s*. Jerald C. Brauer, *Protestantism in America*, pp. 324, 30*s*.

ST. DAVID'S COLLEGE, LAMPETER: D. Simon Evans (ed.), *Trivium I*, pp. 224, 35*s*.

S.P.C.K.: F. W. Dillistone (ed.), *Myth and Symbol* (Theological Collection No. 7), pp. 112, 16*s*. 6*d*. Raphael Loewe, *The Position of Women in Judaism*, pp. 63, 12*s*. 6*d*. Eta Linnemann, *Parables of Jesus: Introduction and Exposition*, pp. 216, 35*s*. T. Dearing, *Wesleyan and Tractarian Worship* (with Epworth Press), pp. 166, 27*s*. 6*d*.

SUTTON COURTENAY PRESS: G. E. Duffield (ed.), *John Calvin* (Contemporary Studies in Reformation Theology, No. 1), pp. 228 + plate, 36*s*.

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

The Expository Times, April 1966.
Expounding the Parables: V. The Tower-Builder and the King going to War (Lk. 14. 25-33), by P. G. Jarvis.
The Pre-existence of Christ, by J. Macquarrie.
Theological Objections to the Ordination of Women, by Leonard Hodgson.

The Expository Times, May 1966.
First Aid in Counselling: V. The Clergyman's Role in the Alcoholic Emergency, by H. J. Clinebell.
The Image of God, by R. G. Crawford.
Expounding the Parables: VI. The Sheep and the Goats, by H. E. W. Turner.

The Expository Times, June 1966.
First Aid in Counselling: VI. Problems of Adolescence, by M. H. Duke.
The Neglected Truth in Pantheism, by A. B. Starratt.
Was Zacchaeus really Reforming?, by N. M. Watson.

Harvard Theological Review, April 1966.
On the Meaning of 'God': Transcendence without Mythology, by G. D. Kaufman.
Ames, Ramus and the Method of Puritan Theology, by K. L. Sprunger.
Jonathan Edwards and 'The Way of Ideas', by C. A. Smith.
The Rabbinic Interpretation of Psalm 82 and the Gospel of John: (John 10, 34), by J. S. Ackerman.
Cranmer's Nominalism Reaffirmed, by E. K. McGee.

International Review of Missions, April 1966.
Missionary Responsibility in the Anglican Communion, by J. V. Taylor.
Dilemmas of World Confessional Groups with respect to Engagement in Mission and Unity, by P. C. Empie.
Mission, Unity, World Methodism and a Board of Missions, by T. K. Jones, Jr.
Engagement in the Mission and Unity of the Church, by W. Niesel.
Confessional Families and the Churches in Asia.
PanAfrican Conference of Catholic Education, by P. Feuter.
'Devolved Missionaries': Church Peace Corps or Prophet-Priests?

Interpretation?, April 1966.
The Kerygma of the Yahwist, by H. W. Wolff.
I Corinthians 13: Its Interpretation since the First World War, by J. T. Sanders.
An Exercise in Hermeneutics: Jeremiah 31, 31-4, by John Bright.
An Interpretation of Romans 11. 25-32, by R. Batey.

Scottish Journal of Theology, March 1966.
Talk about Religious Talk, by J. H. Gill.
Created Soul—Eternal Spirit: A Continuing Theological Thorn, by K. Hamilton.
Lessing's Problem and Kierkegaard's Answer, by R. Campbell.
The Protestant World and Mariology, by G. A. F. Knight.
Stewards of God, by W. Tooley.

Scottish Journal of Theology, June 1966.
The Mission of the Church, by T. F. Torrance.
Faith and Truth, by N. H. G. Robinson.
A New German Theological Movement, by D. P. Fuller.
The Nature of Christ in Origen's *Commentary on John*, by Williamina M. Macaulay.
Romans 8. 28, by C. E. B. Cranfield.
Πειρασμός The Lord's Prayer and the Massah Tradition, by C. B. Houk.
Wilhelm Herrmann, by D. L. Deegan.

Studies in Philology, January 1966.
Aucassin et Nicolette as Parody, by R. Harden.
'Gentilesse' and the Franklin's Tale, by L. A. Mann.
Fragments of Antonio de Guevara's Lost Chronicle, by J. R. Jones.
Authorship of *The Second Maiden's Tragedy:* A Consideration of the MS. Attribution to Chapman, by Leonora L. Brodwin.

The Influence of Alexander Pope in 18th Century Spain, by S. H. Effross.
Letters of Matthew Arnold: A Supplementary Check-list, by R. L. Brooks.

One in Christ: A Catholic Ecumenical Review, Vol. 11, 1966, No. 1.
The Decree on Ecumenism: An analysis, by T. F. Stransky, C.S.P.
Prayer for Unity and Holiness, by Benedict M. Heron, O.S.B.
De Ecclesia: An Anglican Comment, by Victor de Waal.
The Origin of the Eastern Patriarchates and their relationship to the Power of the Pope, by W. de Vries, S.J.
A Plea for a Single Code of Canon Law for the Church, by Archbp. Ignace Ziadé.
Agape Celebrations, by the Bishops of Holland.

One in Christ: A Catholic Ecumenical Review, Vol. 11, 1966, No. 2.
Let us listen to our Brothers, by Ilse Friedberg.
The Bible and Tradition, by J. Coventry, S.J.
The Eastern Patriarchates and their relationship to the Power of the Pope (Part 11), by W. de Vries, S.J.
The Vatican Council: Personal Impressions of an Anglican Observer, by J. Lawrence.
Mount Athos: Views of Christian Unity, by Elefterius Fortina.
Unity at the Fireside: Ecumenical House-groups, by J. Hammersley.
The Common Declaration of Pope Paul VI and Patriarch Athenagoras I, 7, December, 1965.
The First Report of the Joint-Working Group between the Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches.

The Church Quarterly Review, April-June 1966.
New Testament Studies in the Service of the Teaching Ministry, by E. R. Lewis.
Froude's *Remains*, by H. Clegg.
A Dutch Catholic on the Reformation: Some Catholic Reflections, by J. Pinnington.
Infallibility, by K. C. Scott.
The Matter and Form of Confirmation, by C. E. Pocknee.

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.