
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

THE LONDON QUARTERLY & HOLBORN REVIEW

JULY 1967

Vatican Council II

LONDON
EPWORTH PRESS

Five Shillings Net

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW

is published on 25th March, June, September and December. All contributions (typewritten, if possible) should be sent to the Editor, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope.

Contents

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

REGINALD KISSACK: Chairman of the Liverpool District of the Methodist Church, formerly Missionary Committee representative in Rome.

B. C. BUTLER: Titular Bishop of Nova Barbara, formerly Abbot of Downside.

LAURENCE BRIGHT: Dominican Father who works with the S.C.M.

HAROLD ROBERTS: Principal of Richmond College, Surrey, and Chairman of the Methodist representatives of the Anglican/Methodist Commission for Unity.

J. CYRIL T. DOWNES: Chairman of the York and Hull District of the Methodist Church.

TERENCE D. COPLEY: Theological student of Nottingham University.

ROBERT E. CUSHMAN: Dean of the Divinity School, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.

ALBERT C. OUTLER: Professor in the Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas, observer at all the sessions of the Vatican Council.

ROME, UNITY AND CULTURAL REVOLUTION

ANYONE who wishes for a full, judicious and lucid account of the Second Vatican Council cannot do better than read *Vatican Observed* by John Moorman, Bishop of Ripon (Darton, Longman and Todd 16/-). The viewpoint is Anglican: and non-evangelical, non-liberal, non-SCM Anglican at that. Dr. Moorman was much happier at Vatican II throughout four sessions during 1962–5 than at Nottingham for a week in 1964. He feels that the ecumenical movement without Rome is a travesty and his great delight is that now, as a result of the Council, we may glimpse that perfect unity in which *all* are one. But he was a very shrewd observer and his pages are as honest and as critical as they are interesting.

The question is, How far has the Council been really effective? What is the situation eighteen months after? There have been some signs of reaction and of a lessening of ecumenical spirit. The Pope has revealed still more of the ultra-caution manifested at times during the sessions. There is a joke at Rome: 'Why is His Holiness looking so tired? Because he is always going from right to left and from left to right.'

In England, there has been the resignation of Charles Davis and the sad affair of Herbert McCabe. Davis was one of the *periti* and a clever dialectician in defence of Roman orthodoxy. His Maurice lectures *God's Grace in History* (Collins 5/-) are wise and enlightened and full of implicit hope for Roman–Protestant dialogue; they criticize the notion of 'religionless Christianity' and do not portend that before they were off the presses their author would have found his Church intolerable and, presumably, no longer 'the manifest presence of the sacred in history' (p.88).

For a realistic appraisal of the Roman communion as it exists in England, Scotland and Wales, though one which would have been even more interesting had it appeared a little later, we may go to *The RCs* by George Scott (Hutchinson 35/-). This delivers us from an excess of post-conciliar optimism and reminds us of the ancient prejudices (on all sides) and of the confusion which is the state of the Church, whether Roman or not. Mr Scott is a journalist and occasionally a little careless as when he uses the title 'Father' for a Professor at Ushaw, where Cardinal Wiseman's injunction was ignored and 'Mr' retained, or seems to think that Nicolas Stacey works in the East End; but he may help to save us from considering the problem solely in terms of ecclesiological debate or Vatican decrees.

The issue now is more than the entry of Rome into the ecumenical movement. It is whether the philosophic and cultural revolution of our time is compatible with the idea of 'the coming great Church' as a world-wide, visible institution governed by devolution from an episcopate headed by a Pope or comparable Patriach.

If indeed our goal in the next half-century is to be a world-wide Church

with constitutional and doctrinal agreement, the Bishop of Ripon is right. Such a union must include Rome and it would be difficult to envisage without the Bishop of Rome in the chair, though, since Rome is a Western city, Jerusalem, if not Calcutta or Tokio, might be a truer centre.

But while we are trying to perfect our elaborate engines for breaking down the barriers, the gales of the Holy Spirit have already left most of them in ruins. Many of us will still behave as though they were intact and continue to blow our trumpets in procession around the walls of Jericho (if we are ecumenists) or prepare feverishly to defend them from the inside (if we are conservatives) without realizing that they have, in fact, tumbled down.

There is now a new mentality within the world and within the Churches to which confessional divisions are irrelevant and which is manifest as well among Catholics as among Protestants, though less among English than among continental or American Romans. Its characteristic is 'openness', to use a fashionable word, and it unites many whom traditions divide. A friend of mine at the BBC says that he no longer judges a man by his denominational allegiance but by whether he reveals this quality.

The January-February 1967 number of *The Ecumenist*, edited by Gregory Baum (Paulist Fathers Inc.), carries four reviews from different standpoints of a controversial book by Leslie Dewart, *The Future of Belief* (Herder and Herder). This has also been commended by Harvey Cox of *The Secular City*. Dewart is a Roman Catholic and Professor of Philosophy at St Michael's College, Toronto. He is no 'death of God' extremist, but he is anxious to free the Christian Gospel from the Hellenistic and scholastic chains of previous culture and to deliver us from a static conception of truth. 'Truth is "not the result of the mind's 'inner' reduplicative, intentional reflection of an object 'outside' it"; truth is rather "the result of the mind's coming into being through the self-differentiation of that which-is into self and world". Doctrine is not the homogeneous development of the once-for-all given, but the original Spirit-guided interpretation in a new cultural context of what God has done in Christ.

The book is certainly symptomatic of new ways of thought, though the debate about it may for a time increase confusion. It is because of the complete confusion in which we now are that I doubt whether we are destined for a majestic progress towards the 'coming great Church'. Perhaps indeed the great Church will come only with her Lord (which sounds rather Scriptural). But I think that *Honest to God* and the ferment of which it forms a part challenge some of the ecumenical assumptions which have sustained so many of us for so long. There will, there must be far more visible organic unity than in the past and such schemes as are now on paper ought to be consummated 'without tarrying for any'. A vote against *Towards Reconciliation* is a vote, however high-principled, for a past age of the world which is gone forever. But I cannot see that unity will henceforth be a piecing together of constitutions with an agreed doctrinal basis. It will be a wider tolerance and agreement to differ, while we engage with the 'world', sometimes in warfare against evil, sometimes in humanitarian partnership, always in search for the Truth

which is ever-to-be revealed to those who love Jesus. This will not mean the brash abandonment of Christian tradition but the conservation of its true riches and the rediscovery of its creative power. The biblical understanding of the living God, though not always in such crude, anthropomorphic terms, the Chalcedonian definition of the two natures, the 'subjective' and 'objective' conceptions of the Atonement, the eucharistic norm of worship, will all, I believe, be found in some form to be essential to the life of man (not merely to the life of the Church). But we shall not be imprisoned in the bloodless categories of metaphysical or ethical systems or bound by sectarianism whether papal or connexional.

As to relations with Roman Catholics, we may thank God that because of the Council and the winds of change, we may meet them more freely, the demons of suspicion banished with the memories of ancient wrong. We must be particularly sensitive to the dilemmas and uncertainties in which they find themselves, while charitably frank in our opposition to what puzzles, alarms or distresses us in their system and attitudes. Recent incidents *are* disturbing, not least because of the reaction they may provoke, and I doubt if Charles Davis has done much good to his own cause, though Methodism has not always been able to keep its *avant garde*.

To Dr Moorman's great satisfaction the Council decree on Ecumenism recognized that Anglicanism holds a 'special place' among the separated Catholic churches. But it is doubtful whether in practice this may not be a mixed blessing, because Anglicans are so self-conscious about it and have a more intense love-hate relationship to Rome than any of us. George Scott's book shows that insofar as the Anglican Church is still the Establishment at prayer, it may be the least congenial of the English communions to Roman Catholics. At any rate, Cardinal Heenan is sincerely determined on more contact with English dissent.

It was the last paragraphs of Scott's investigation which moved me, in which he showed that he too could not escape the lure of the real goodness and love which abides with so much else in the Roman Catholic Church.

> I say to the Catholics that if you wish to convert us, *show* us how to live. If you would teach us, give us your example, not your sermons or your condemnation. . . . Show us, if you will, 'the mystery of God, in its height and its depth'. Let us hear from Catholic writers and Catholic artists of the richness of living and the beauty of loving. Let there be creation, not destruction. Let there be life, not death.

Those are the accents of a twentieth-century John Wesley.

GORDON S. WAKEFIELD

VATICAN II: A SYNOPTIC VIEW

Albert C. Outler

THERE are many who have come to regard Vatican II as the most significant event thus far in the church history of the twentieth century. But there were very few who expected much of it when it was first announced. For Roman Catholics, the bare notion of a council was generally redundant. Moreover, it was plain from the beginning that the Roman immobilists were determined to safeguard the church from change. On the Protestant side, there was inevitable interest but also the quick recognition that the council as projected was an internal affair of the Roman Catholic Church. This prompted the easy invocation of the old dictum about Rome being unreformed and irreformable. The initial Orthodox response was one of massive indifference.

On the face of it, Rome was a huge citadel of traditionalism, alienated from the modern world and dominated by 'a fortress mentality'. The mottoes of her typical spokesmen (*Semper Idem*, Ottaviani; *Firmiter Stat*, Ruffini) were a mirror to a mind-set with a long history that had evolved into a closed system of doctrine and discipline which the immobilists regarded as the finality and fullness of truth. To friend and foe alike, the Roman Church appeared as 'an authoritarian system of private politics'.[1] In any estimate of what Vatican II attempted and achieved, it is necessary to understand how all this had come about.[2]

In 1773, Clement XIV was forced to suppress the Society of Jesus—by the Catholic monarchs of Portugal, Spain, France and Austria! This was an omen that the papacy would never again be a dominant force in European politics. When, subsequently, the French Revolution turned against the Church in a massive and savage persecution, it was inevitable that the survivors should thereafter be fearful of anything that smacked of revolution. When Napoleon I callously manhandled two popes in succession, it was enough to reinforce the papacy's attachment to its own 'temporal power'. When Pius IX was hounded from Rome by the 'liberals' and then returned to the Chair of Peter, propped up as it was by French bayonets, it was natural enough for him to turn against his avowed enemies and all they stood for. When finally the tangled tactics of France, Austria and Savoy reduced the pope to the pitiable status of 'the prisoner of the Vatican', it seemed to justify his belief that all such terms as 'secular', 'liberal', 'modern' had a common definition: 'anti-clerical'.

Meanwhile, the encounter of the Roman Catholic Church with the intellectual and ideological currents of European culture had forced her on to the defensive in thought and policy. While at least some Protestants were trying to come to terms with the Enlightenment, the Catholics, sorely

wounded in their encounters with 'free thought', were bracing themselves against the onslaught of 'the modern spirit'. Thus it was that the pioneering crusades of Lamennais, Lacordaire and Montalembert—on behalf of an ultramontane Catholicism that was also open to historical and literary criticism, to the doctrine of religious liberty, 'a free church in a free state'—stirred Rome to very nearly blind reaction. The successive papal condemnations of this new and different sort of Catholic liberalism—in *Mirari Vos*, 1832 and its sequel, *Singulari Nos*, 1834—set the basic tone for Catholic immobilism thereafter. One heard it still unmodulated in Vatican II whenever Ruffini or Carli rose to speak.

The struggle for *Risorgimento* drove the Italian 'patriots' toward secularism and the papists toward a yet stauncher intransigence. One of the prime motives for turning a pious belief in the Immaculate Conception into an absolute dogma (in 1854) was to defy the Enlightenment temper. A decade later, in logical sequence, came a reactionary encyclical *Quanta Cura*, with its appended *Syllabus Errorum*. In these, seventy of the most offensive slogans of secular liberalism were collated and anathematized.

Although widely approved by Catholics in Europe and America, this defence against 'the modern world' had been concentrated in Rome and managed mainly by the papacy. But, after the Marian dogma and the *Syllabus*, it began to seem important to have this defensive strategy confirmed by the whole church, and the pope's authority absolutized. This was the main purpose and effect of Vatican I. There is a conventional view abroad to the effect that, had it not been so rudely interrupted, Vatican I would have gone on to balance off its dogmas on the papacy with a collegial doctrine of the episcopacy, etc. Nothing is less probable. Given the temper of that Council and its tight papal control, *any* corollary to the papal dogma would have followed the absolutist logic of the *Pastor Aeternus*. It was, indeed, the Lord's mercy that the decisive struggle over collegiality was deferred for a century.

With Leo XIII, a partial change may be noted in this immobilist tradition: an impetus to intellectual enquiry (*Aeterni Patris*, 1879), albeit within the bounds of scholasticism; a good word for religious liberty (*Libertas Praestantissimum*, 1888) for the adherents of the true religion; a courageous restatement of the medieval doctrines of human rights and social justice (*Rerum Novarum*, 1891). But when, in the reign of St Pius X, a new ferment of critical and revisionist interpretations was stirred—by the writings of men like Alfred Loisy, George Tyrrell and Ernesto Buonaiuti—the immobilists struck back for an overkill. Anyone interested in calculating the current tensions and anomalies in contemporary Catholic theology has to read and re-read the condemnations of 'modernism' (*Lamentabili* and *Pascendi Gregis*, 1907), for they remain unrepealed and the anti-modernist oath *Sacrorum Antistitum*, 1910) must still be subscribed by new bishops and seminary professors. All this was reiterated by Pius XII's *Humani Generis* in 1950. In the same vein there was also the severe condemnation of the ecumenical movement in 1928 (*Mortalium Animos*) and again in 1948 (*Cum Compertum*). As a charter for *true* ecumenism, Pius XII issued his

great encyclical *Mystici Corporis* (1943). All this was a part of what Hales has spoken of as 'the long sequence of censure which was codified by Pius IX, given a philosophical basis by Leo XIII, supplied with teeth by St Pius X and sublimated by Pius XII'.[3]

The men who were manning the battlements of the Vatican when Pope John summoned the bishops to Council were conscientious guardians of this immobilist tradition. The prospect of a council was disconcerting to them but they were not alarmed. It would have been wholly out of character for them to have resisted a pope's expressed desire. Rather, they undertook to do as they always had: restrict what changes they couldn't prevent to an innocuous minimum.

What they had not reckoned with was a caretaker pope who neither understood nor accepted this 'steady state' theory of the Church in history. The man who wrote *The Journal of a Soul* was certainly no doctrinaire reformer. But he had had a mildly 'modernist' formation in seminary, he had spent the bulk of his career amongst non-Catholics (Sofia, Istanbul, post-war Paris), he had an invincible confidence in the power of goodness, he had a powerful concern that the Church should be recognized by her pastoral office instead of her judicial authority, he was stifled by the baroque style of the papal court. He thus was free to dream of reversing the old tradition of reproach, of throwing open the gates of the citadel, of turning the Roman Church outward toward the world in an irresistible gesture of love. He wanted an updating (*aggiornamento*) of the church in order that it might be more effective in its service to mankind. Above all, he wanted *peace*: peace between all Christians, peace in the world. And the only conceivable hope for any of this, he swiftly concluded, was to gather his brother bishops around him in Rome for a conscientious review of their collective mission in the modern world. It was this vision and his unfaltering confidence in it that opened the way for everything that followed.

One must conclude, however, that Pope John's vision and his practical policy were discrepant. With no evident misapprehension he turned the preparations for his Council over to the very men who felt duty-bound to thwart reform. In the interim between the call to Council and its convocation —in his allocutions to the *patres conciliares* and in his two great encyclicals (*Mater et Magistra*, 1961; *Pacem in Terris*, 1963)—the double emphasis was constant: no change in doctrine, discipline or devotion but a radical shift in spirit and approach to 20th-century man.

The first move was the establishment of a *commissio antepraeparatoria* (17 May 1959). Within a month, this commission had addressed a circular letter to all the eligible members of the Council, requesting suggestions as to the topics and issues that should form the agenda of the Council. The result was a flood—15 volumes running to 9,520 pages quarto! It took two years to classify and digest this mountain of memoranda and to produce from it a set of preliminary reports. Meanwhile, the pope had appointed ten *preparatory* commissions to draft the initial *schemata* for conciliar approval.

The work of these commissions was diligent and conscientious. Pope John repeatedly made the point that he wanted the preparations so thorough and

acceptable that the Council itself would be as brief as possible. He did not want the bishops absent from their dioceses any longer than necessary—nor did they expect to be. It was not until past mid-point in the first session that it became clear that it was going to be a long-drawn-out affair.

Over a full year—from 12 June 1961 to 20 June 1962—the commissions toiled away on their texts, which were then printed and forwarded to the bishops (and the observers)! The reports of these meetings (printed in *L'Osservatore Romano*) have been translated and edited[4] in a useful volume that shows how fully the immobilists were in control right up to the eve of the Council. Despite their repeated lip-service to the 'pastoral' purposes of the Council, doctrinal judgements are scattered freely—all of them conservative. 'Existentialism' is condemned, the monopoly of scholastic philosophy is reaffirmed, 'evolution', private revelations, 'spiritism', 'reincarnation' are some of the 'reprehensible errors' sternly condemned. Traditional versions of the doctrines of original sin and monogenism are re-stated in traditionalist terms, the papal primacy is firmly re-asserted, the liturgical revival is faintly praised (Latin being assumed as the *exclusive* liturgical language in the Western church), the post-Tridentine doctrine of two sources of revelation repeated as if it were self-evidently true.

There is scarcely a hint in these reports of the new developments in liturgy and doctrine that had been going forward for a century. One gets no whiff of the ferment in the seminaries or of the restlessness of the Catholic intellectuals. There is no notice of the vigorous advances in biblical studies or of the ecumenical movement. It was therefore quite clear that Roman traditionalism was on its way to yet another victory. Many of us who had hoped against hope for significant change were forced to conclude, on the basis of all available evidence, that anything like real *aggiornamento* would have to wait.

What none of us knew—who did?—was that the Catholic bishops in various parts of the world had somehow come unglued from their immobilist backgrounds, that they were choosing progressive *periti* and would listen to their counsel, that the Africans and Asians (the erstwhile *periferisti*) would assert their independence, that the Canadians and Americans would come impatient to get back home and would stay to become informed and effective, that the hopes and fears of the watching world would weigh so heavily against the immobilist monopoly. Nor could we foresee the impact on the Council of Cardinal Bea and his Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity —out of all proportion to size, status and authority. What loomed largest, beside the *schemata* themselves, were the editorials in *L'Osservatore Romano* which kept ringing the changes on *gli punti fermi* ('the fixed points') of *Romanità*: papal primacy, the immutability of the *magisterium*, curial omnicompetence, unquestioning docility to the hierarchy, progress without change, etc.

There are those who have come to believe that, because Vatican II achieved so much more than was expected, it might well have achieved even more than it did. They point to what the Council left unchanged or what may now revert. This can only mean that they have forgotten where and

how the Council began. What really needs explaining is how Vatican II achieved what it did. When the bishops came to Rome, the vast majority of them were either uncommitted, or out of touch, or disposed 'to go along'. How that majority proceeded to re-write the script for the Council, and its documents, and so transform a citadel-Church into an army on the march is the real-life drama of Vatican II.

When the Council convened (11 October 1962) its budget of *schemata* was ready for brief discussion and quick approval. So also was a slate of nominations for the *conciliar* commissions, viz., the veterans of the *preparatory* commissions. This is a hallowed way of rigging parliamentary bodies and is rarely protested.

But there was a small group of North European cardinals—Liénart, Frings, Bea, Suenens, Alfrink, Döpfner, König—who had already foreseen that here was an opportunity to alter the character of the Council at the outset. Their plan was to delay the vote on commission memberships until the bishops could caucus in their respective regional conferences, after which they could then elect the conciliar commissions by preferential ballot. They had checked this tactic with Pope John who raised no objection. On the first day, in the first general congregation, as the first item of scheduled business, the ballots for electing commission members were distributed. But before the Secretary General could call for the vote, Cardinal Liénart (primate of France) rose in his place at the Presidents' Table and proposed a postponement. 'He gave as his reason the need for prior consultation, especially among members of different ecclesiastical regions and the further need of time for the fathers to become more fully acquainted with the prospective candidates' (*Council Daybook*, p. 31). When he was seated, Cardinal Frings (senior prelate in the German hierarchy) arose to say that he supported Liénart's proposal and that he was joined in this by Cardinal Döpfner (president of the Bavarian Episcopal Conference) and Cardinal König (president of the Austrian Episcopal Conference). Applause—forbidden by the rules—began to ripple up from the far end of the *aula*, where the younger bishops were seated, and Liénart's motion was never put to a vote. Instead, the presiding cardinal (Tisserant) directed the Secretary General (Archbishop Felici) to announce that the balloting would take place on the following Tuesday. All this took less than 20 minutes, but it wrought a transformation.

Immediately, rumours began to buzz about the town, and early that afternoon, the Rome correspondent for *Time* (Robert Kaiser) cabled his New York office: 'So-called liberal minority aren't going to have anything crammed down their throats by Italian curia. Today demonstrated they have strength to avoid that possibility. This clearly going to be a real parliament of the church.' What is worth noting here is that phrase 'liberal *minority*', for that is precisely what it was—and also why Tisserant and Felici were willing to let their first bold venture pass unchallenged.

This caucusing and the balloting that followed did three things that changed the spirit of the Council. It upset the carefully constructed monopoly of the curial nominations. It galvanized the hopes of the liberal minority that they would have a fighting chance, not to win, but to register their

concerns. Finally, it made a deep impression on the missionary bishops because, as it turned out, they had swung the election. They were elated and felt a new sense of responsibility.

The first *schema* ready for debate was *On the Sacred Liturgy*. The obvious questions here were the vernacular and the authority of regional episcopal conferences in matters liturgical, but the deeper issue was the nature of the liturgical act and the essence of Christian worship. As the debate progressed, the progressives began to sense for the first time that they were visibly gaining strength.

Thus, when the Council turned to the crucial *schema On the Sources of Revelation* (14 November), it was clear that a showdown had come. Had the original text of this *schema* been accepted, the enterprise of biblical scholarship in the Roman Catholic Church would have been thrown back a generation and the ecumenical dialogue stopped dead. Here, then, was a crisis, with high stakes and no advance knowledge of the probable outcome. The *Ordo* specified that a two-thirds majority was required for acceptance or rejection of any given *schema*. But what if a proposal *to reject* failed of its requisite two-thirds? The debate would then have to go on—and on!

On 20 November, the conservatives decided to force the issue by proposing that the schema *be rejected*! This unexpected move created a mild confusion but the outcome was even more unexpected: present and voting, 2,209; *placet*, 1,368; *non placet*, 822; *nulla*, 19. The Secretary General then announced: 'Since the required majority of 1,473 votes has not been achieved, the *schema* is not rejected and we shall therefore proceed to a detailed consideration of its parts beginning with chapter I.' What this proved was that the progressive cause had gained a majority but the immobilists still had the power of veto. The prospect was that the debate would continue until each section had been reviewed and then the whole returned to the conservative Theological Commission—which was the immobilists' fail-safe strategy after their setback on the main motion. But the progressive vote had served notice that no *schema* revised by the conservatives would be accepted. It was an *impasse*, but also another turning-point in the history of the Council!

The following morning, Archbishop Felici's first announcement startled the whole assembly:

> ... the Holy Father has decided that the schema *De Fontibus Revelationis* should be withdrawn in accordance with the wishes of the majority, in spite of the fact that the vote on it yesterday had not reached the two-thirds majority required by the rules—and it will now be entrusted to a mixed Commission consisting of the members of the Theological Commission and the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, to be redrafted, shortened and have greater emphasis placed on the general principles of Catholic doctrine already treated by the Council of Trent and the First Vatican Council.[5]

Thus, out of the blue, the Secretariat was suddenly plunged into the thick of the conciliar process, with joint responsibility for a *dogmatic* constitution—the one that lay closest to its ecumenical concerns.

The rest of Session One was plainly anti-climactic. When it adjourned on

8 December, it had shaken the immobilist monopoly but had fallen far short of Pope John's vision. What was to have been the lighting of a torch to warm and guide mankind toward dignity and peace had turned into an ideological tug-of-war. To crown it all, the pope was dying, frustrated by the Council he had brought into being. It was therefore a sort of testamentary act when he set Mgr Pietro Pavan and others to work on an encyclical in which he could say for himself what he had meant his Council to have said. This was *Pacem in Terris*, addressed to the Roman hierarchy 'and to all men of good will'; more of an act of love than an essay in doctrine. This may be why it has had the widest impact on the world of any papal utterance on record.

Pope John died (3 June 1963) disappointed but undaunted. His Council had not followed his script, nor anyone else's. But it had acquired a character of its own, and this was what mattered most. The liberal minority had become a majority, if only a loosely organized coalition. The centre of gravity in the church had begun to shift—ever so slightly at first—from the Vatican to new frontiers in Europe and elsewhere round the world. The *immobilisti* had lost their grip.

If, as they tried, they could have elected Cardinal Antoniutti, the *status quo ante* might have been restored. But they had to throw in with the moderates and liberals in support of the Cardinal Archbishop of Milan, a veteran of the curial oligarchy. They did this with minimum misgivings because they knew that Cardinal Montini was a deep-dyed conservative in doctrine and discipline, that he was an ecclesiastical realist, that he was sensitive to the chronic instability of church–state relations in Italy.

What was not clear at first was how Pope Paul VI would proceed with regard to Pope John's council. It obviously had to go on, but its further development was now dependent on leads from the new pope. It quickly became apparent that although he took the papal primacy quite seriously, Paul VI did not regard the notions of collegiality, ecumenism and liberty as threats to the throne of Peter. In his first speech to the second session (29 September 1963 and his first major papal statement) he spoke of 'a new spring, a reawakening of the mighty spiritual and moral energies in the church which now lie dormant'.[6]

The second session quickly focused its energies on the *schema On the Church*, and the debate that ensued was an extraordinary exercise in self-examination and self-criticism in the context of a perceptible shift in ecclesiological perspective. The crucial theoretical question concerned the nature of the Church, as mystery and as People of God, and this posed the difficult point of the connection between 'the whole People of God' and the Roman Catholic Church. The most important single change in any of the conciliar texts came out of this debate—from *est* to *adest* in paragraph 8 of the *scheme On the Church*. The original text affirmed the old triumphalism—the People of God is (*est*) the Roman Catholic Church. The amended, and now official, text reads: 'This Church . . . subsists (*adest*) in the Roman Catholic Church."

A second great ecclesiological question had to do with 'the hierarchy'; the nature of the episcopacy and the relations of the bishops with each

other and the pope. Post-Tridentine tradition had taught that the bishops were mere surrogates of the pope. The progressives saw them as members by divine right of a *collegium episcoporum* of which the pope was head and president. This issue furnished Session Two with its most memorable confrontation and with a third great turning-point in the Council's history. Having abandoned their hopes for a short Council, the immobilists now switched tactics and began to drag their feet with a view to postponing decisions as long as possible. On 15 October, Cardinal Suenens, moderator for the day, announced a *suffragium indicativum* to test the mind of the bishops on the crucial issues concerning the nature of the episcopal office and the relationship between the episcopal college and the papacy. Immediately a backstairs fight broke out between the Secretary General, the moderators, the Council Presidents and the Coordinating Commission. A year earlier the reactionaries had wanted a division of the house. Now they feared one. It was not until 29 October that the actual ballot was announced, to be voted on the following morning. There were five questions as follows (with their tallies):

1. Whether episcopal consecration is the highest grade of the Sacrament of Holy Orders: *placet*, 2,123; *non placet*, 34.
2. Whether every bishop, who is in union with the other bishops and the pope, belong to the body or college of bishops: *placet*, 2,049; *non placet*, 104.
3. Whether the college of bishops succeeds the college of the Apostles and, together with the pope, has full and supreme power over the whole Church: *placet*, 1,808; *non placet*, 336.
4. Whether the college of bishops, in union with the pope, has this power *by divine right*: *placet*, 1,717; *non-placet*, 408.
5. Whether the diaconate should be restored as a distinct and permanent rank in the sacred ministry: *placet*, 1,588; *non placet*, 525.[8]

The progressives were careful to claim that these notions were not contrary to traditional teaching; the *immobilisti* argued that they were, and they had the better of the historical argument. The crucial revelation of this straw vote was that hitherto uncommitted bishops had finally taken a stand—a progressive one! In the interim between 15th and 30th October all eyes had been turned towards the Apostolic Palace. If Paul VI had given even a hint of apprehension, the test vote on the 30th would certainly have gone differently. But there was no such hint. Thus, the vote confirmed the fact that the progressives had come to dominate the Council. Thereafter, the *immobilisti* could delay and modify. They could not reverse the tide.

This same movement was seen in the other major item in the second session: ecumenism. By now the Secretariat had revised its earlier *schema* and had also been assigned the general ecumenical questions originally handed to the Commission on the Eastern Churches. The result was a comprehensive *schema* in five chapters:

1. The Principles of Catholic Ecumenism
2. The Practical Aspects of Ecumenism
3. Christians separated from the Catholic Church
   Part I: The Oriental Churches

Part II: The Communities stemming from the Rupture of the 16th Century

4. The Jews
5. Religious Liberty

In this area, the tendencies sorted themselves out rather quickly. There was, on the one hand, the general question of ecumenism. The obvious obstacle here was the long-standing teaching that the fixed price of unity is abjuration and surrender. On the other hand, there were the specific issues of Catholic–Jewish relations and of religious liberty. Here the progressives were cutting close to the central nerve of the immobilist cause. These men were not anti-Semites nor advocates of religious persecution, but the traditional Catholic teaching that the Jews were responsible for the death of Christ was, in their eyes, sacrosanct. As for a doctrine of religious liberty for non-Catholics, they could see in this only a surrender to the old enemies: indifferentism, pluralism, relativism. Ecumenism was to be opposed with arguments; the chapters on the Jews and religious liberty had to be derailed. This was done first by separating Chapters 1–3 from 4–5 and then by postponing a vote on 4–5 before adjournment. This was a serious setback and many of the liberals found their old fears reviving that the diehards might spoil everything after all! What actually happened, however, was that the long struggles over these questions resulted in a substantial improvement in each successive version. These final texts were the most carefully drafted of all the documents of Vatican II!

One might mention here in passing that the observers were naturally more directly concerned with these problems and more fully involved in the work of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity than with any other agency in the Council. There was a weekly seminar in which the texts before the bishops were discussed by the observers in the presence of the Secretariat, and there was a position paper prepared by a committee of the American observers that turned up in substantial form in the final draft section (pars. 19–23) describing 'the churches and ecclesial communities in the West'—something rather different from the original phrase, 'communities stemming from the rupture of the 16th century'.

In the interim between the second and third sessions the most important event was the issue of the papal encyclical *Ecclesiam Suam*—rather obviously Pope Paul's personal contribution to the joint problems of ecclesiology and ecumenism. In it he described the Church in dialogue: within itself, as in the Council; with other Christian Churches; with other living religions; with non-believers in 'the modern world'.

In its first two sessions, the Council achieved its own identity and character. In the last two, it proceeded to express this character in concrete projects for church renewal. In the process, it provided both the Roman Catholic Church and the rest of Christendom with an agenda for at least a generation.

When the third session convened on 14 September 1964, the bishops had disposed of exactly two out of the sixteen items before them. But now they were ready to shuttle more securely between decision and debate—and voting began in earnest. There were, for example, 39 separate votes on as

many sections in a single chapter (3) of the *De Ecclesia*. What was striking here was that the 400–500 negative ballots of Session Two had now diminished to 200 and less, in one of the most sensitive areas in the whole immobilist–progressive controversy. As the session progressed, the progressive cause gained momentum steadily until, toward the end of October, the *immobilisti* were run over as regularly as the votes were taken. But then the progressives began to push beyond the limits of prudence and the papal referee had to blow the whistle on them. This was the nub of the now famous hubbub in the last week of Session Three.

What happened was this: the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, in its further revision of the degree on ecumenism and the declarations on religious liberty and Catholic–non-Christian religions, had put the progressive position in terms so unequivocal as to drive the diehards to desperation. Their cause in the Council was hopeless and their only recourse was an appeal to the pope. In the interest of conservative doctrine, Paul VI was persuaded to propose a series of amendments to the text of *De Ecumenismo*; of these, the only two considerable ones modified the flat statements that Protestants '*find* God' in Scripture and in their sacraments to the more cautious '*seek* God' in Scripture and sacrament. In the case of the declarations, the Secretariat had produced amended texts that were visibly different from its predecessor's. But there was an express stipulation in the *Ordo* (§30) that the Council could vote on no new text until after it had been debated in the general congregations. The progressives claimed that the changes had been made in the general sense of the evident will of the majority—and they were right. The diehards claimed that their minority rights were being overridden by the majority—and they were also right. Tisserant's decision to stand by the *Ordo* created the most dramatic confusion of all the four years of the Council—it was a wonderful row!—and the pope's decision to sustain Tisserant was bitterly criticized. It was, of course, as we can see now, both the right thing and also wise, for it meant yet another debate, further revisions and a sounder consensus in the end.

Session Four differed from its predecessors because the remaining topics for public debate were exhausted rather early on, long before the conciliar commissions had been able to complete their tasks of revision. Thus, for part of October and much of November the generality of the bishops—those not on the conciliar commissions—had very little to do. Moreover, there was not even much reliable gossip going about, since the commissions were working *in camera*. The declarations on the non-Christian religions (the nub of which concerned the Jews) and on religious liberty still had no formal standing in the Council's calendar and so the question of a decisive vote on these became the paramount issue. The crucial decision as to the declaration on the non-Christian religions came finally at the 150th general congregation on 15 October when the Council fathers approved the revised *schema* by a vote of 1,763 to 250. Three 'general congregations' later, on 26 October, they at last got round to the new *schema* on religious liberty and accepted that by a vote of 2,031 to 193. This finally erased the fear that they might be

quietly dropped; now the Council had to dispose of them publicly and officially.

The Secretariat, therefore, went back to work once more on a draft for the penultimate vote, that is to say, the last in Council before the public session in which they were to be promulgated.

For the last six weeks of the session the main focus of attention was fixed, finally, on the *schema* that had been Pope John's prime concern from the first: *The Church in the Modern World.* Its primary importance in the history of the Council was that, in it, the initial 'Message to the World' (20 October) had now been transformed into a full-scale 'pastoral constitution', the longest of all the Vatican II documents. Here was the Roman Catholic Church trying to formulate its mind-in-council not only on the principles of Christian social ethics but also on their practical application in the agonizing and insoluble problems of our time: the Christian family in a demoralized society, the social and economic problems of a hopelessly divided world, war and peace, nuclear disarmament, conscientious objection, etc., etc. On every point the tendencies divided in many directions across the whole spectrum of contemporary ideologies, no longer neatly defined by the dichotomy between immobilist and progressive. Many of the bishops I talked to were pessimistic about the chances of a *schema* that would satisfy the Church *and* the world, or that could prove acceptable to Catholics in the West, in the communist countries and in the so-called 'third world'.

It was therefore a heroic effort and an unprecedented one. Many men voted for it in the end because it was the best that could be done under the circumstances—and they understood that the Council would have proven derelict to Pope John's vision if it had adjourned without some concrete expression of love and responsibility for the world in its areas of anguish and need.

In its last ten days, after a period of let-down, the session picked up speed and interest. It was the only one of the four that closed in an atmosphere of general euphoria. The diehards fought every issue to its bitter end, but this served now only to maintain the dramatic tension. The progressives had learned their lesson and did not push past their limits any more. Compared to what could have been expected, Vatican II was a progressive achievement of historic proportions. Compared to what the liberals had come to hope for, it was only a *moderate* victory. Pope Paul had maintained the balance between conservatism in doctrine and discipline and a liberal outlook in polity and practice.

On 4 December, in the basilica of St Paul's-Outside-the-Walls, he participated in an unprecedented service of common worship with the observers, cardinals, patriarchs and bishops. On 7 December, he and the Patriarch Athenagoras mutually cancelled the mutual excommunications of 1054, and all that. On 8 December, the Council was adjourned after a splendid pageant in the bright sunshine on the steps of St Peter's.

Thus Vatican II had run its course—the largest and most complicated ecclesiastical gathering ever assembled and maintained over a quadrennium. It had ended one era of church history and had opened another. It had

achieved a special sort of reformation—'Reformation, *Roman style*'—characterized by changes set inside the *continuum* of stable tradition, with great tensions but no schism in the Roman Catholic soul. It had confounded its prophets, dismayed its diehards, let loose a ferment within the Catholic community and moved the ecumenical dialogue further forward than any event since Amsterdam (1948). It had deeply impressed the watching world, it had reoriented the Roman Catholic Church within the current scene and toward the ecumenical future.

There was a story going around Rome, after Cardinal Jullien had died in January 1964, that when he was received in purgatory (the customary routine for curial cardinals) he found Pope John there, sweating it out. 'Your Holiness,' exclaimed the cardinal, 'what are *you* doing *here*?' 'Well, you see,' said the old pope smiling, 'they have me here waiting to see how that council I started winds up—and then they will decide what next.' This crossed my mind as I left the Piazza San Pietro that last morning—and I was reassured that he had long since been welcomed by the heavenly choir as one of their rarest recruits, men who turn the hinges of history by the power of love.

[1] J. D. B. Miller, *The Nature of Politics* (1965), pp. 261-2.

[2] For two very useful surveys of this process, see E. E. Y. Hales, *Revolution and Papacy 1769–1846* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode 1960) and *The Catholic Church in the Modern World* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode 1958).

[3] E. E. Y. Hales, *Pope John and His Revolution* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode 1965), p. 37.

[4] Aram Berard, S.J., *Preparatory Reports: Second Vatican Council* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press 1966).

[5] Private Diary. Cf. Vincent Yzermans, *A New Pentecost* (New York 1966), pp. 147-9.

[6] 'The reform at which the Council aims is not, however, a turning upside down of the church's present way of life or a breaking with what is essential and worthy of veneration in her tradition. It is, rather, an honouring of that tradition by divesting it of what is unworthy or defective, so that it may be made more stable and fruitful.' (Cf. *Council Daybook* I, p. 147.)

[7] cf. par. 8, Abbott and Gallagher, *Documents of Vatican II*, p. 23. This was as tremendous a trifle for Vatican II as the HOMOOUSION had been at Nicaea I!

[8] *Council Daybook*, Vol. I, p. 235.

VATICAN II: IMMEDIATE PRE-HISTORY AND THE FIRST SESSION

Reginald Kissack

JOHN XXIII has left this personal testimony to the birth of the idea of the Council. He and Cardinal Tardini were taking grim stock of the gravely disturbed world. The Church, which ought to be giving it its guiding light—what ought it to be doing? Then the idea came to him in a flash so sudden and imperative that the word was out of his lips almost before he had grasped it: 'A Council!' In retailing the story the editor of *L'Avvenire d'Italia* commented: 'The idea of a Council was born not in a moment when the Pope was thinking about the Church, but in a moment when he was thinking about the World.'

To the Church of January 1959 the idea of a Council was daring to the point of absurdity. No one had any inkling that the Pope would use the occasion of his meeting with the clergy of the city (a body that naturally included the Cardinals), in St John Lateran on Sunday, 25 January, to give out the notice: 'I announce in your presence, my trembling indicating my emotion but also the humble firmness of my resolve, two events—a Diocesan Synod for the City, and an Ecumenical Council for the Church Universal.' The matter was such a shock that when he and the cardinals gathered later in the vestry, of all that empurpled throng usually so obsequious and voluble, not one came near him with a word. During the next days they were to slip in to him one by one to explain lamely that it was because their hearts were so full of joy for 'a gift as precious as unexpected'. There were many in Rome in those weeks whose attitude was one of embarrassment and incredulity. One Vatican functionary confided to a Protestant: 'This pope is too fond of the bottle, and gets strange ideas.'

But if the idea of a Council had come so suddenly to the conscious mind of Angelo Roncalli, was it so alien to his unconscious mind? Within an hour of his election in October 1958, dusty history books were being opened all over Italy to look for an answer to the question: Why has he chosen the title John XXIII? For another pope had borne the title; it is still visible on his tomb in the Florence Baptistery. True, two others had been disputing the papacy with him; true too, in the interests of peace and unity he was to renounce his title and die as if he had never been called pope. But he had done one thing. He had summoned that 15th-century Council of Florence, which did indeed bring the separated leaders of West and East round one table. They even produced a treaty, *Laetentur coeli*. But they were too far ahead of their followers and of their time, and the story of that council had no happier an ending than that of the first John XXIII. Roncalli had long had a passion for union with the Eastern Churches. He had spent his happiest

years among them. History too seemed to be repeating itself. Again there was the confrontation of a strong non-Christian power from the East pressing up to the very gates of Vienna, while Christendom was weak, divided and demoralized. We do not know if he aspired to be a John XXIII *redivivus*, and to go on from where the other had left off. But it could be.

But the weeks that succeeded his announcement must have brought him reward enough for his courage. Comment from all over the world was favourable. No one suggested insuperable difficulties. Particularly encouraging was the reaction of the Executive of the W.C.C. which met a bare three weeks later at Geneva. Their communiqué withheld 'formal comment' on the announcement, but it reported 'widespread interest' in 'the 13 members present on the part of 171 Orthodox, Anglican, Protestant and Old Catholic Churches belonging to the World Council in 53 countries'.

So then by May 'an antepreparatory council' was in being. This had a fourfold task: to contact bishops all over the world; to consult the registries of the departments of the Curia at Rome; to list the topics for discussion and collect memoranda on them from experts in theology and canon law; and to suggest the membership of the various committees of the Council.

By June 1960 the Central Commission had 10,000 pages of replies, which would keep it meeting six times during 1961 and 1962, in sessions of up to ten days each and with 500-page agendas, before announcing in June 1962 that its task was complete, so that the Council proper could assemble on 11 October 1962 with some seventy *schemata* ready for its consideration.

Two motive forces for the Council (a concern for the contemporary world, and union at least with the Eastern Churches) have already emerged. A third factor must also be reckoned.

At New Delhi in December 1961 the last of the Orthodox Churches was to join the W.C.C. The shadows cast by the coming of such an event must have meant much to John XXIII with his special predilection for that Church, and the consequences in terms of the final isolation of the Church of Rome cannot have been lost on him. If the siege-complex that had lasted since Trent was not to become rigid and absolute, it was imperative (in the phrase of Yves Congar) for Rome to 'enter a structure of dialogue'. To enter successfully, moreover, would mean to regain the initiative in Christendom, and to speak to the world with so much more authority.

John had defined his intentions for the Council in January 1959 as 'not only for the spiritual good and joy of Christian people, but also to invite the separated communities to seek again that unity for which so many souls are longing in these days throughout the world'.

It was natural that at first the theme of unity should receive exaggerated emphasis, and by reaction, a mood of suspicion should follow that little was really intended. The W.C.C. Central Committee meeting in August 1959 contented itself with saying that relations with the Roman Catholic Church would be greatly improved

> if opportunity were given for greater cooperation in social service and in working for just and durable peace, if there could be more discussion among theologians,

and if all the Churches would join in securing full religious liberty for all people in all lands . . .

They added:

We cannot be indifferent to an event which affects so large a number of Christians and which cannot avoid having a bearing on relations among the several Churches. We hope and pray that that bearing will be of a constructive nature, and that it will serve the cause of unity according to the will of Christ.

Uncertainty began to disappear when at Pentecost 1960 the Pope set up a Secretariat under Cardinal Bea to help 'the separated brethren to follow the the work of the Council'. Probably nothing from the Pope's lips after the announcement of the Council affected religious life in Italy as did his phrase 'separated brethren'. In the era of the Piuses Protestants had been accustomed to hearing themselves linked with Communists and Freemasons as the enemies of the Church. Typical of phrases which John used from the outset of his pontificate were the words of his encyclical *Ad Petri Cathedram* (29 June 1959): 'I address you as brothers even though you are separated from us', and he quoted Augustine: 'They will only cease to be brothers when they cease to say Our Father.' The Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity was a visible indication of the sincerity of the phrase. On 24 June, Mgr J. G. M. Willebrands was appointed Secretary. During September a staff was set up, and on 24 October an office suite was opened at Via dei Corridori, 64, just outside the Vatican.

The Secretariat had a two-fold purpose: its immediate one was 'to inform accurately non-catholic Christians on the work of the coming Council, to receive their wishes and suggestions relating to the Council, to weigh them and, if need be, pass them on to other Commissions. . . . The Secretariat is not a mere Information Centre. It aims to help guide the Council in those theological and pastoral matters which directly bear on the problem of Christian unity.'

Its 'larger and more general end' was 'to aid non-catholic Christians to find that unity for which Jesus Christ prayed so ardently to his Heavenly Father; e.g., to establish the precise situation and the problems regarding unity in different countries'. Both the staff of the Secretariat and its commission members were drawn from lands (Britain, America, Germany, France, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Israel and S. Africa) where Catholics were not preponderant. Only one Italian represented the opposite category.

The most spectacular response to these developments was the visit of Archbishop Fisher to the Pope in Advent 1960, but more tangible were the results of the dispatch of Canon Bernard Pawley early in 1961 to Rome as the unofficial representative of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, thus making a direct liaison between the Secretariat and the archbishops. Prof. Edmund Schlink performed a parallel function for the German Evangelical Churches. These were the only Churches to take advantage of this pre-conciliar liaison, and they were able to play a far more effective part in the Council as a result.

History will come to recognize increasingly the break-through made by

Archbishop Fisher's courageous initiative. He simply took his cue from a phrase in *Ad Petri Cathedram* where John expressed his hope that the Council would be

> a wonderful manifestation of truth, unity and charity; a manifestation indeed which we hope will be received by all who behold it but are separated from this apostolic see as a gentle invitation to seek and to find that unity for which Jesus Christ prayed so ardently to his Father.

This the archbishop construed as an invitation to non-Roman Churches to send observers. Would others follow suit? Dignity and protocol imposed on the Secretariat the delicate task of sounding out the World Confessional bodies to see how they would respond to an invitation if it should be extended. Much of 1961 and 1962 was passed in this way.

Methodists have long been familiar with that sort of situation, and it may be of interest to record for the first time in print the steps by which Methodism came to enter into dialogue with Rome.

The initiative came from the M.M.S., and from D. W. Thompson who, besides presiding over the society, was the Field Secretary for Italy. So the M.M.S. encouraged its representative in Italy to watch events closely. It played a quiet part in Archbishop Fisher's visit in ensuring that Protestant leaders in Rome met him as well as the Pope, so forestalling local reactions that have more recently appeared in Northern Ireland. It encouraged the Italian Methodist Church not to sidestep the difficult duty its ecumenical Methodist heritage laid on its conscience at that time and place, but to use its influence to evoke a positive ecumenical reaction in Rome itself.

The fortuitous presence in Rome of the President of the Conference for the centenary of Italian Methodism in May 1961 enabled the President to suggest that the M.M.S. representative meet Mgr Willebrands unofficially. At first it looked as if the fact that Methodism (unlike Anglicanism or German Evangelicalism) had active missions in Italy might preclude this, under the ugly word 'proselytism', but when it was indicated that, while Methodists were quite unwilling to discuss this, they were ready to respond to any sincere effort to help Christians to love each other better, with a hearty 'Give me your hand', the meeting took place in June 1961.

It was a very happy one. There were hopes that the World Methodist Council which was to meet in Oslo in August 1961 might have passed some resolution, however mild, expressing their good will towards the ecumenical intentions of the Vatican. (They would have been the first World Confessional body to have the chance to do this.) Mgr Willebrands would indeed have liked to have seen Roman Catholic observers at Oslo. But the attitude of Methodism in both the U.S.A. and Britain was cautious to the point of negation. Leaders of British Methodism were particularly sensible of the effects of pro-Roman declarations on the course of Anglican–Methodist conversations and were unwilling to put such a resolution on the agenda. Indeed the only reference at Oslo to the forthcoming Council was that made by the President of the Italian Church, Mario Sbaffi, who said in that context: 'In Rome just now there is only one Protestant Church capable

of sustaining a dialogue with Rome, and that is the Methodist.' When, in the final session at Oslo, Bishop Corson pronounced amid applause as he took over office as President of the World Methodist Council: 'We intend to show that roads to unity do not all lead to Rome or to its ecclesiastical suburbs', who was to have known that when the next W.M. Council met in Westminster five years later, Bishop Corson would call on a Roman Catholic Cardinal to rise and deliver the main address, or that a Papal Nuncio would enter unannounced into the middle of one of the Council sessions! But such is the measure of Bishop Corson's ecumenical statesmanship.

It was in fact not until the W.C.C. had pronounced at New Delhi in December 1961, requesting 'the Faith and Order Commission to make special provision for conversation with Roman Catholics' and asking 'member churches and local councils to take whatever initiative seems possible' that Methodism and the bulk of the non-Roman world really began to commit itself to the idea of sharing in the Council. In summer 1962 Mgr Willebrands met at Geneva the secretaries of the World Confessional bodies including the Methodists, and the details of observer representation was decided on. Five Methodists were to attend the first session at one time or another.

Two details may be recorded. The W.M.C. was the only World Confessional body to nominate to the first session of the Council officers of highest status, viz., the President and immediate past President, among its observers. Other communions sent personages whose presence might conceivably be discountenanced if need be. This fact was not lost on John XXIII, and he never ceased to appreciate it. Also, for the same reason, there were only some 35 observers at the first session. (There were over 100 at the fourth.) At the historic reception of these on 13 October 1962, there were five Methodists present, the most numerous group of any Church.

But this domestic Methodist chronicle does not mean that Methodism played any leading role in the session. Indeed in those days all eyes were on the Greek Orthodox. Would they or would they not come? Mgr Willebrands had to make a last-minute journey; and come they did, dramatically late.

Looking back it is hard to realize how little interest the Council had for the rank and file of the Protestant world outside Italy in the early days. Indeed, only when the Press censorship was diminished at the second session in 1963 did the Council begin to make an impact on the world. But in 1961–2 the idea of the Council was making a direct impact on Italian Protestants who were disconcerted by the lack of firm official assessments from responsible leaders of World Protestantism. So it was the tiny Italian Protestantism that had to make its own critique.

Latin Protestantism following Calvin assesses any situation from an analytical and theological point of view. The closest reading of the *avant-garde* Catholic thinkers like Küng, Congar and Daniélou, and of the official Vatican documents and speeches, failed to persuade Italian Protestants that the new move in Catholicism really reached down to the theological strata. They could detect no change in Catholic self-understanding (of which they

had so much first-hand experience). The Roman Church was still the *Totus Christus* of Augustine—the identification of the visible hierarchic Church with the person of Christ. As long as this attitude persists, the unity of Christians can only be conceived as some form of 'return' to Rome. Indeed, ask even of Cardinal Bea's *The Unity of Christians* the question: How is the ultimate unification of Christians regarded? and there is no other answer.

In the absence of any evidence of a new theological concept of the Church, Italian Protestantism could see little value in the change from old 'integrism' to new 'integrationism'. Küng might acclaim Justification by Faith as a Catholic doctrine, but all such novelties amounted to was to say: 'Forgive us, separated brethren, for implying (as we did so recently) that you must accept all our theological insights before you can come back home to us; we see now that you have valuable theological insights of your own; bring them into our house (your own old house) with you; our combined collection will enrich the catholicity of it.' The Catholic did not realize that if he still insisted on his *Totus Christus* concept of the Church, there could just be no room for the one insight the Reformed Christian would never let go—the sovereign transcendency of a God who could never be crammed without remainder into the structure of any institutional Church. Lacking confidence, then, in any theological basis, the Italian evangelical tended to write off Catholic ecumenism—in its 'intra-Christian' form, as a false hope that a *changed* catholicism could be the Coming Great Church; and in its 'extra-Christian' form of the 'Pro Deo' movement reaching out to other faiths, as a mere preaching of a political and cultural crusade against communism. This reaction might have been even more negative, had it not been for the remarkable phenomenon of Roman Catholic clergy all over Italy responding to the psychological thaw by going out of their way to show genuine friendship and interest in the Protestant clergy. But Italian Protestants remained sceptical even after the end of the first Council session.[1]

That first session of the Council seems so distant now. Yet it showed to all who shared in it, both to non-Romans and to Catholics, the diversity and unity of the Roman Catholic Church. The differences due to nationality, race, and culture emerged. The gradations on the ecumenical scale appeared, shading from the Franco-German outlook at the top to the Italo-Irish at the bottom: one noted how Spain might not be so low as had been thought, and the anomalous position of Britain. Personalities became alive; bishops and cardinals had minds of their own. One sensed a distrust of Curia bureaucracy, and a vivid concern for the World rather than the Church. The triumphalist-imperialist image of the Roman Church was waning; the son-of-the-carpenter/servant image began to take shape.

One of the memorable points of that session was the Press Conference of Oscar Cullmann on 23 November 1962. Then this veteran of Catholic–Protestant irenics voiced the first public reaction of observers to the Council. He pointed out with what expectancy other Christians waited to hear the Roman definition of Christian unity; and how enheartened they had been to find in the Council an almost complete agreement between Catholic and Protestant over the positive truths found in Scripture. The root differences

lay 'not in any positive element in our faith, but in that "extra" (that "too much" from the Protestant point of view) in Catholicism, and that "not-quite-enough" (that "too little" from the Catholic point of view) in Protestantism'. He asked the Catholic to see the 'too little' in Protestantism 'not as an arbitrary reduction on our part, but as a *concentration* made under the prompting of the Holy Ghost upon what we feel ought to form the single nucleus of our faith in Christ'.

It is in insights of this sort that the real value of the first session lay. To it we may add a similar distinction made by the Pope in his opening address, between the unchanging substance of the truth of God we find in scripture and tradition, and the wrappings of language in which it is expressed. Wrappings denote the differences of age from age, culture from culture. (Could it also denote the difference of Catholic from non-Catholic?)

Very little real business was done in the first session. Of those 70-odd *schemata* waiting for discussion, only one (*On the Liturgy*) was thoroughly dealt with, though *Mass Media of Communication* was considered fairly fully, and the questions of *Revelation* and the *Church* touched on with sufficient drama to indicate the revolutionary mind of the Council. Hans Küng told a Methodist observer as they walked down the steps from the final meeting of the session that it had surpassed all his hopes, but perhaps the words of Pope John sum up its spirit best: 'Whatever happens, we have looked into each other's eyes, and so none of us can ever be quite the same again."[2]

[1] The spokesman of Italian Protestantism was Prof. Vittorio Subilia, of the Facoltà Valdese, Rome. His book: *The Problem of Catholicism* (S.C.M. 1964) embodies the reaction of Italian Protestantism in general in the pre-Council period. See also V. Subilia: *La Nuova cattolicita' del Cattolicesimo*, Editrice Claudiana, 1967, p. 62. Vatican II, 1962–65 represents "merely the logical protraction of the line of dogma" on the Church which can be traced back via Vatican I, Trent, *Unam Sanctam* (1302) and Lateran IV (1205) to Augustine. Instead of expressing the relationship of the true Church to the Church of Rome in words like 'est', 'continetur', Vatican II speaks of 'subsist', 'fulness', or 'perfection'. He quotes the verdict of Fr C. Boyer, *Osservatore Romano*, 12 May '65: "The decree (*de Oecumenismo*) no longer *speaks* of 'return to the fold', but does it not *imply* it in its ecclesiology? If unity is conceived in terms of fulness of communion with the Catholic Church, and if those separated from this Church do not have the fulness of the gifts of Christ, if the Pope with his universal supremacy is necessary to the true Church of Christ, is there any way for non-catholics to realise the unity that Christ wills except by entering the Roman Church?" (p. 57f)

[2] For a detailed assessment of the 1962 session of the Council, see *L.Q.R.*, 1963, p. 204ff.

VATICAN II AND THE WORLD

B. C. Butler

ECUMENICAL councils, at least as remembered by the ordinary man, have usually been inward-looking affairs of the Church's own theology. Nicaea I, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon were preoccupied with trinitarian theology and Christology. At the other end of history, Trent defined the Catholic position over against the tenets of the Reformers, and Vatican I ended a long debate in the Church about the relations between ecumenical councils and the papacy.

The great central achievement of Vatican II was the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (*Lumen Gentium*). At first sight, nothing could be more inward-looking than a Council concerned to elaborate the Church's convictions about herself. And in fact this Constitution does–among many other things–return to the issues raised in Vatican I and 'situate' the episcopate in general *vis-à-vis* the papacy: a task left over through the premature adjournment of Vatican I.

But from the day of the inauguration of his Council, John XXIII had emphasized that it was to be a 'pastoral' council, concerned with the work that the Church finds herself called upon by God to do. It was therefore natural, though not inevitable, that the Council Fathers, having dealt with *Lumen Gentium*, found their thoughts turning outwards to the world in which the Church's mission is set and to which its efforts are directed. The result, only brought to completion in the closing days of the final session, was the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the World of Today (*Gaudium et Spes*).

Unlike most of the documents of Vatican II, this Constitution is an original creation of the Council in session; no draft of such a constitution was offered by the preparatory commissions. One of the basic questions which those responsible for compiling it had to face was: what meaning was to be attached to the term 'the world'? On the face of it, it was a biblical term; and the Bible offered several different meanings for it. Was it the whole of the visible (and invisible?) creation? Was it the human race as a whole? Or was it the collectivity of 'those hostile to God who hate Christ and his disciples' (*Jerusalem Bible*, note to Jn. 1:10), the world in which Christ's disciples exist, though they do not belong to it (Jn. 17:11, 14f.), the world which as a whole 'lies in the power of the Evil One (1 Jn. 5:19)?

The meaning adopted by the Council does not exactly coincide with any of these, but approximates closely to the second, which takes 'the world' as equivalent to the whole human race:

> The Council focuses its attention on the world of men, the whole human family along with the sum of those realities in the midst of which that family lives. It

gazes upon that world which is the theatre of man's history, and carries the marks of his energies, his tragedies and his triumphs (*Gaudium et Spes*, n. 2).

The world, then, for the Council, is the human race on earth along with its material environment, and especially that environment as progressively transformed by human effort. Thus understood, the world is not in sharp contradiction with the kingdom of Christ. It is indeed 'fallen into the bondage of sin'; but it is also 'emancipated now by Christ' (*ibid.*).

The choice of this meaning enabled the Council to frame the Constitution as an address not merely to Catholics or Christians but to 'the whole of humanity'. Here, then, the non-Christian is not merely overhearing words spoken between explicit believers; he is invited to listen to the opening gambit in what would fain be a dialogue between the Church and mankind as a whole. John XXIII addressed his famous encyclical, *Pacem in Terris*, to all 'men of good will'. The Council goes one stage further; though of course it is not likely that men who lack good will could gain from the reading of this Constitution more than a fraction of the light it seeks to convey.

The notion of dialogue is familiar to those who concern themselves with the ecumenical movement, where it is applied to discussions between adherents of differing Christian traditions. The present Pope, in his first encyclical, *Ecclesiam suam*, had widened the word's application to cover analogous discussions between Christians and non-Christians, in quest of a greater human unity. One of the prerequisites for dialogue is the discovery of a field of preliminary agreement. Until this has been found there is room for controversy but scarcely for constructive discussion. Dialogue involves a readiness to postpone one's own peculiar convictions until they arise naturally as a consequence of the joint exploration of an agreed field.

Can all men of good will find such a field, such a starting-point? Good will by itself is not enough. In itself it is a subjective attitude, not an affirmation of objective truth. The Constitution, however, before approaching this crucial question, offers some reflections upon the nature of our common contemporary predicament:

Today, the human race is passing through a new stage of its history. Profound and rapid changes are spreading by degrees around the whole world. Triggered by the intelligence and creative energies of man, these changes recoil upon him, upon his decisions and desires, both individual and collective, and upon his manner of thinking and acting with respect to things and people. Hence we can already speak of a true social and cultural transformation, one which has repercussions on man's religious life as well (n. 4).

In this 'crisis of growth' (*ibid.*)

History itself speeds along on so rapid a course than an individual person can scarcely keep abreast of it. The destiny of the human community has become all of a piece, where once the various groups of men had a kind of private history of their own. Thus the human race has passed from a rather static concept of reality to a more dynamic, evolutionary one (n. 5).

This bold view of man in his dynamic development is in marked contrast

with the more traditional Western theology which has emphasized the unchanging fixity of human nature. We could almost say that the Constitution expresses a shift from essential to existential anthropology. The shift was made easier by the previous adoption, in *Lumen Gentium*, of a dynamic, existential view of the Church herself. While the Church, as presented by the Council, has permanent structures that are basically sacramental, she is seen as the pilgrim Church ever moving through history towards a post-historic goal of realization in the glorified Christ:

> The pilgrim Church in her sacraments and institutions, which pertain to this present time, take on the appearance of this passing world. She herself dwells among creatures who groan and travail in pain until now and await the revelation of the sons of God (*Lumen Gentium*, n. 48).

Where, then, in this changing world and changing humanity can be found a fixed point of reference? Where can be found a basis for dialogue between the evolving Church and an evolving world?

> The Church maintains that beneath all changes there are many realities that do not change and which have their ultimate foundation in Christ, who is the same yesterday, today and for ever (*Gaudium et Spes*, n. 10).

But 'Christ' is precisely the presupposition which cannot be made a platform for dialogue with non-Christian men of good will. Instead, in the first chapter of the Constitution, attention is directed to 'the dignity of the human person'. Respect for the human person may indeed be regarded as a ground of agreement between all men of good will, Christian and non-Christian (though the ultimate reasons for such respect may differ):

> Man judges rightly that by his intellect he surpasses the material universe. . . . By relentlessly employing his talents . . . in our own times he has won superlative victories, especially in his probing of the material world, and in subjecting it to himself. . . . The intellectual nature of the human person is perfected by wisdom and needs to be. For wisdom gently attracts the mind of man to a quest and a love of what is true and good. . . . In the depths of his conscience, man detects a law which he did not impose on himself, but which holds him to obedience. . . . Conscience is the most secret core and sanctuary of a man. . . . In a wonderful manner conscience reveals that law which is fulfilled by love of God and neighbour. In fidelity to conscience, Christians are joined with the rest of men in the search for truth, and for the genuine solution of the numerous problems which arise in the life of individuals and from social relationships (n. 16).

Here we have the first and most fundamental truth which, it is suggested, can be presupposed and exploited in a dialogue between the Church and all men of good will. Nearly every sensible man acknowledges the dignity of the human person, of the human intellect, and of the human conscience. A man of good will, even if, as a philosopher, he may seem to throw doubt on the validity of conscience, will be found to recognize that validity in his practical decisions.

It is true that men's conscientious judgements vary. But, first, you can argue a moral issue with a man of good will and there is some chance that either he will convince you or you will convince him; whereas you have no

basis of argument, on a moral issue, with a man who denies the reality of moral responsibility. Secondly, the judgements of men of good will tend to converge on certain basic issues: scientific integrity, loyalty to contracts freely entered into, care for the needy, respect for human life, subordination of selfish to unselfish aims. . . . The Christian may want to underpin these values with a supernatural motivation, but he accepts the values themselves as whole-heartedly as does the humanist.

Here we may point out that John XXIII, in *Pacem in Terris*, builds up a total moral system of social relations on this basis of respect for the human person. He argues that the dignity of the person confers rights; and rights must be respected. Thus society is a network of inter-related rights and duties mutually acknowledged, and the social bond is, *de jure*, as universal as the human race itself.

The Constitution on the Church in the World of Today itself passes on from considering the dignity of the human person to the theme of man in society. It has much to say about modern technological progress, but it is not satisfied with the need that this engenders for co-operation; it seeks the bases of human society at the same depth as did Pope John:

> One of the salient features of the modern world is the growing interdependence of men one on the other, a development largely promoted by modern technological advances. Nevertheless, brotherly dialogue among men does not reach its perfection on the level of technical progress, but on the deeper level of interpersonal relationships. These demand a mutual respect for the full spiritual dignity of the person. Christian revelation . . . leads to a deeper understanding of the laws of social life which the Creater *has written into man's spiritual and moral nature* (n. 23).

Thus briefly the Council endorses John's moral sociology, in which personal and social values interact at the level of interpersonal relationships:

> The progress of the human person and the advance of society itself hinge on each other. From the beginning, the subject and the goal of all social institutions is and must be the human person, which for its part and by its very nature stands completely in need of social life. This social life is not something added on to man. Hence, through his dealings with others, through reciprocal duties, and through fraternal dialogue he develops all his gifts and is able to rise to his destiny (n. 25).

We are far, here, from the notion that social bonds are a restriction on the liberty of the individual. The individual person is indebted to society for his own full personal development, just as society is only fully healthy when it results from the free co-operation of all its members. And when it is borne in mind that 'social order requires constant improvement' (n. 26), we begin to see the dynamic change of human affairs today as something falling well within the providential order and as capable of being sanctified.

The Constitution does not restrict itself to the common ground on which all men of good will may unite. It was right that it should not do so. Not only must some indication be offered to the Christian of the way in which these 'natural' values harmonize with, and are raised to a higher level in, the light of the gospel. But the desire for a dialogue between the Church and

the world presupposes that the Church has something of her own to offer to the world. Hence a regular feature of the Constitution is the way in which it takes up the elements of its 'agreed human position' and, in paragraphs usually clearly distinguished from the dialogue itself, views them in the light of the biblical revelation. Thus, we are told, man is not only an intelligent being with a conscience; he is a creature fashioned in the image of God, and the model of all humanity is Jesus Christ, 'the final Adam', 'who fully reveals man to himself and makes his supreme calling clear' (n. 22). So also, man's social life has its higher analogue in the People of God, the 'new brotherly community composed of all those who receive Him in faith and in love', i.e. the Church (n. 32).

Non-Christians may well be suspicious of such teaching; they may fear that 'a closer bond between human activity and religion will work against the interdependence of men, of societies, or of the sciences'. The Council therefore renders full acknowledgement to the rightful autonomy of human affairs. It shows no desire to revert to a medieval synthesis in which the other sciences might be enslaved to theocratic control. 'We cannot but deplore certain habits of mind, sometimes found too among Christians, which do not sufficiently attend to the rightful independence of science.' In fact, the voice of the Creator himself is heard in the 'discourse of creatures' (n. 36). The great debate about religion and secularity which has been waxing so strong during the last year is thus adumbrated by the Constitution, which at the same time rejects the secularist (as distinct from the secular) position of the problem. The last chapter of the first part of the Constitution is concerned with 'the role of the Church in the modern world', the help given to the world by the Church, and the help which the world can afford to the Church.

The Constitution, then, offers us an anthropology and a sociology which, though far from elaborated in scientific formulation, are of immense potential value. Some might, however, hold that so far all that has been said is too general and abstract to be of service as mankind faces its present problems. The second half of the Constitution does direct its attention to certain specific fields of interest: Marriage and the Family, the Development of Culture, Socio-economic Life, the Life of the Political Community, and the Fostering of Peace and the Promotion of a Community of Nations. Space does not permit a close examination of all these chapters, but we may consider shortly the first and the last.

Not surprisingly, public attention has been fixed on the fact that the Council did not revoke current Catholic teaching on contraceptive methods —though it quite clearly inculcates 'responsible parenthood'. The appraisal of methods of birth control was left, by papal instructions, out of the purview of the Constitution. Nevertheless there is a positive progress in the doctrine of marriage as presented by the Council. Western theology has tended to concentrate its gaze upon the biological pattern of the marriage act and upon marriage as involving human 'nature'. The Constitution, by contrast, stresses the interpersonal quality of the marriage relationship. Marriage and the family create a 'community of love' (n. 47). Conjugal love, giving rise

to an intimate partnership which is 'rooted in the conjugal covenant of irrevocable personal consent' (n. 48) is 'directed from one person to another through an affection of the will. It involves the good of the whole person. Therefore it can enrich the expressions of mind and body with a unique dignity, ennobling these expressions as special ingredients and signs of the friendship distinctive of marriage' (n. 49). The marriage act, expressed in a manner which is truly human, is 'noble and worthy'; it signifies and promotes 'that mutual self-giving by which spouses enrich each other with a joyful and thankful will' (*ibid.*).

There has in the past been much emphasis on the 'ends' (or purposes) of marriage, and it has often been taught that its primary end is the procreation of children. It should be borne in mind that this teaching referred not to the conscious motive which might lead a man and woman to enter into marriage and to perform the marriage act, but to the intrinsic or natural teleology of the state and the act considered in themselves. This teleological view of nature and natural processes came more easily to the medieval mind than to that of modern man, educated to think of nature as the object of 'natural science', which tries—not always with full success—to exclude the idea of purpose from its hypotheses. It is, however, also important to remember that St Thomas Aquinas himself viewed marriage as directed to the end of the procreation-*and-education* of children; he pointed out that procreation alone would not require the stability of marriage, but the care of the offspring does. The Council avoided the attempt to arrange the purposes of marriage in a hierarchical order. It does indeed teach that 'the true practice of conjugal love, and the whole meaning of the family life which results from it, have this aim: that the couple be ready with stout hearts to co-operate with the love of the Creator and the Saviour, who through them will enlarge and enrich His own family day by day'. But it explicitly affirms that this statement does not involve 'making the other purposes of marriage of less account'—or perhaps we could translate this clause more cautiously as: 'depreciating the other purposes of marriage' (n. 50).

The Constitution gives no sanction to the view that a large family is necessarily better than a smaller one. It speaks rather of the parents determining the size of their family with thoughtful reference to 'both their own welfare and that of their children, both those already born and those which may be foreseen. . . . They will reckon with both the material and spiritual condition of the times as well as of their state of life. Finally, they will consult the interests of the family group, of temporal society and of the Church herself. The parents themselves should ultimately make this judgement, in the sight of God', being governed by a conscience docile to divine law and submissive to the Church's teaching in their choice of methods of family limitation (n. 50; note that, in the last resort, it is the parents, not an outside authority, which have the responsibility for such decisions. This point is reiterated later in the Constitution, in connexion with the population explosion).

The chapter of the Constitution dealing with Peace deals also, of necessity, with war. A real effort is here made to get beyond the 'classical' theories of

a 'just war', in the light of the appalling evils experienced in wars in our times, and of the dangers of total war. The Council urges the need of an international organization which would make possible the total banishment of war. In the meantime, three points may be selected from the extensive material of this chapter. First, the Council speaks approvingly of 'non-violence' as a method of defence—provided that its employment does not injure 'the rights and duties of others or of the community itself' (n. 78). Secondly, since conscientious objection is still illicit in some countries, it suggests that humane provision should be made by law for dealing with conscientious objectors. Thirdly, in the context of its discussion of the threat of total war, it declares that indiscriminate warfare ('aimed at the destruction of entire cities or of extensive areas along with their populations') 'merits unequivocal and unhesitating condemnation' (n. 80). Needless to say, it also issues an emphatic call to progressive bilateral or multilateral disarmament. It expresses neither approval nor disapproval of 'unilateralism'.

I have spoken of a 'dialogue' between the Church and the world. But who, in the last resort, are the parties to this proposed dialogue? They appear to overlap each other. Christians are human beings; they form part of 'the world of men, the whole human family' which, with its material environment, is what the Constitution means by 'the world' (n. 2). And on the other hand, the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church bears witness to the fact that the Church transcends her visible limits, existing as if by overflow wherever man responds to the grace of God by a fully conscientious behaviour and self-commitment. The dialogue is therefore not between two distinct sets of human beings. It is a dialogue within the breast of each of us and within the heart of humanity as a whole. It may be said to be a dialogue between man as and in so far as he is conscious of and responsive to the gospel and the same man as he is, independently of the gospel, conscious of and responsive to what used to be called the 'natural' values. It is perhaps a measure of the progress of Christian insight that, while St Augustine saw the history of man as a warfare between the City of God and the City of Babylon, between the love of God and the love of self, Vatican II sees that same history as a dialogue between 'nature' and the gospel. But it must be remembered, and the Constitution makes the point, that man is not always responsive to grace and his conscience. Man, and every man, is faced with a basic option; and since he is free, there is no room for either optimism or pessimism at the human level. History is not only a dialogue but a drama, ever threatening to turn into a tragedy. The Christian hope is not ultimately in man but in the overarching providence of God, who, as St Augustine reminds us, would not permit evil if he were not wise and powerful enough to elicit good from it.

VATICAN II: THE INTERNAL AGGIORNAMENTO

Laurence Bright O.P.

ONE of the parables tells the story of the man with two sons who sent them out to work; the one who refused did in fact go, the other said he would but didn't. The Roman Catholic Church is rather like the first of these. She is capable of fairly rapid change, more so perhaps than some of the Churches who talk more about it, but very reluctant to admit the fact. I suppose one of the ways to get new ideas accepted is to persuade people that they have always held them, but as a method it is a little disconcerting to the outside observer. If anyone should still doubt that very considerable changes were introduced by the Council it is enough to point out that every one of the drafts prepared by the officials at Rome before the council opened, and representing the norms by which Catholic theologians were being criticized and judged five years ago, was thrown out and radically redrafted by the assembled bishops.

In this article I am concerned only with those documents that deal with the internal renewal of the Church; taken by itself that would present an unbalanced picture. It cannot be too much emphasized that the ultimate aim of every Church, of every Christian, indeed of every human being, must be the transformation of the world from its present state of injustice, shown in the poverty and violence which a minority of nations in the West inflict on the majority, to a situation of greater equality and peace. We cannot wait until the Church has been reformed before we try to change the world; it is in fact probably true that by resolutely looking outwards we shall most effectively bring about the necessary internal changes. Nevertheless these have to be thought about and planned for, and however inadequate some of the conciliar documents may prove to be in detail (for this is only the beginning of a long process of development) there is no doubt that, taken as a whole, they have introduced a new and living spirit into the whole Roman Church.

The crucially important document in this respect, which in many ways is the key to understanding what has gone on, is the *Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation*.[1] The reason for this is that over a long period of time scripture and tradition had become separated in people's minds. It is not true that the Roman Church neglected scripture; the tendency was rather to subordinate it, 'make use' of it, and so distort it. Even though, long before the Council, a series of encyclicals strongly recommended biblical study, and gave exegetes the necessary freedom from extra-biblical constraints to pursue their studies usefully, it was still felt that theology could be pursued in more or less independence of this work. The real belief of the Church was felt to be contained in a limited number of verbal statements for which

scripture was merely the support. The opening chapter of the *Constitution on Revelation* now says instead:

> The plan of revelation is realized by deeds and words having an inner unity: the deeds wrought by God in the history of salvation manifest and confirm the teaching and realities and clarify the mystery contained in them. (§2)

This insight is followed by a clear statement that the tradition, the life of God's revelation in the contemporary Church, cannot be restricted to the handing on of theological propositions:

> Now what was handed on by the apostles includes everything which contributes to the holiness of life, and the increase of faith of the People of God; and so the Church, in her teaching, life and worship, perpetuates and hands on to all generations all that she herself is, all that she believes. (§8)

Since it is 'teaching, life and worship' that constitutes the tradition rather than teaching alone, it is now easier to recognize the fact of development, and it should be noticed that it takes place first of all in the faithful as a whole (the reference to Mary, in Luke's gospel, taken in conjunction with her identification with the whole Church in ch. 8 of the *Constitution on the Church* underlines this):

> The tradition which comes from the apostles develops in the Church with the help of the Holy Spirit. For there is a growth in the understanding of the realities and the words which have been handed down. This happens through the contemplation and study made by believers, who treasure these things in their hearts (cf. Lk 2: 19, 51) through the intimate understanding of spiritual things they experience, and through the preaching of those who have received through episcopal succession the sure gift of truth. (§8)

Far from being divided 'sources', then, scripture and tradition form a single whole:

> Hence there exists a close connection and communication between sacred tradition and sacred scripture. For both of them, flowing from the same divine wellspring, merge into a unity and tend towards the same end. (§9)

The importance of these ideas, I think, goes far beyond our simply 'coming into line' with the Protestant Churches, or even our now sharing a common language, that of biblical theology. For even the Protestant Churches have to some extent placed tradition before scripture: they have quite unconsciously read their ideas into a text, the Hebrew Bible, in which they have no place, because essentially they are western rather than *Christian*. If together we can radically question these ideas we may do much to renew not merely Christian life but the world's. I must briefly try to indicate what I mean.

Western Europe has been dominated by dualistic thought from at least the early middle ages. We oppose, for instance, the spiritual to the material: we imagine that what 'goes on in the head' is not related in any necessary way to the behaviour (word or gesture) by which it can be communicated. We oppose, too, individual and community: we imagine an individual as a self-sufficient atom who for convenience gets together with others to consti-

tute a society. Both these divisions would be attacked by modern philosophers, but philosophical ideas take a long time to develop into 'common sense': more to the point is that both ideas are foreign to the thought of the biblical writers. We read them in, and our theology becomes distorted. If we see Christ as a man who is necessarily, because of our general view of man, isolated from others, then it matters little whether or not we add the fact that he is also divine; unless we see him as able to represent all mankind in all its history, in the way that any man can represent particular societies making particular history, his death and resurrection can have little significance for our present lives. We are left with a doctrine of atonement which sees him as individual substitute for mankind as object of God's wrath, and with a reduction of his human significance to that of a wise teacher in the line of the prophets, no doubt with something to say to our situation today if we can only make the effort of translation. It is this reduction which the *Constitution on Revelation* implicitly denies.

These developments are also relevant to the other reforms I wish to discuss, since this sort of thinking affected western Christendom for so many centuries that it has led to much distortion. The typical preconciliar liturgy, for instance, resulted from a combination of ideas which we now reject. If the continuing activity of Christ as our representative is lost sight of, then we are left before the divine presence in fear and trembling: the liturgy is handed over to be 'performed' by a professional class of men, specially protected, and the rest become mere spectators. If at the same time the sense is lost that no man is complete in himself, but is only brought to full maturity through openness to the community he helps to make, then emphasis is laid on the individual's relationship to God as direct, not through others, and the assembly becomes simply an occasion for individual adoration of God. All this is reinforced by the idea that the spiritual life doesn't need institutional form anyway (as certain kinds of Protestantism maintain). Catholics never abandoned liturgy, but they allowed it to be done in a way that was not fully authentic.

Hence the reforms suggested in the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*. Its central theme is the public and communal nature of all liturgy. Liturgy is an event celebrated together by all those present, whether lay or ordained, though these have different functions within the whole:

> Liturgical functions are not private functions, but are celebrations of the Church, which is the 'sacrament of unity', namely, a holy people united and organized under their bishops. Therefore liturgical services pertain to the whole body of the Church; they manifest it and have effects upon it; but they concern individual members of the Church in different ways, according to the diversity of holy orders, functions, and degrees of participation. (§26)

This is the purpose of the particular changes designed to bring such a renewal about; the use of vernacular, simplification of the rites, concelebration at mass, increased use of scripture, new attitudes (mass facing the people), increased use of communion in both kinds, and so on: these are means to ensure that 'Christian people, as far as possible, should be able to understand

(the rites) with ease and to take part in them fully, actively, and as befits a community'. (§21)

It is this whole complex activity together which constitutes the presence of Christ to his people; there is no division between spirit and matter. Nor is the manner in which Christ is present limited to a single expression: in a passage which is theologically very compressed the council says:

> Christ is always present in his Church, especially in her liturgical celebrations. He is present in the sacrifice of the mass, not only in the person of his minister, 'the same one now offering, through the ministry of priests, who formerly offered himself on the cross', but especially under the eucharistic species. By his power he is present in the sacraments, so that when a man baptizes it is really Christ himself who baptizes. He is present in his word, since it is he himself who speaks when the holy scriptures are read in the church. He is present, finally, when the church prays and sings, for he promised 'where two or three are gathered together for my sake, there am I in the midst of them' (Mt. 18:20). (§7)

In the light of passages such as this it is possible to see how the reformed liturgy will itself help to renew the Church's theology, bringing back to the centre of things the paschal mystery of Christ risen as the human life of the community to which he is present through the power of the Holy Spirit. Moreover, because in the end the things they do act more powerfully upon men than mere ideas, the liturgy will become the means of healing the division between the laity and the clergy which has so affected all the Churches.

The central importance of community, lay and cleric within a single body, is clearly expressed in the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*. After an exploration of some of the great biblical images (not merely ideas) that set out the mystery of the Church, the constitution in its second chapter looks at the Church as 'the people of God'. In other words the Church must be seen as a whole before any differentiation between clergy and laity is made. The image of a people has a far more dynamic quality than the image of a body, which until the Council was taken as the primary description of the Church. It at once links the Church of today with its whole developing history, the history of salvation through the Old and New Testaments. The structure of chapter two (like that of the fourth chapter, on the laity) is determined by the three-fold character of the risen Christ as priest, prophet and king, who shares these characteristics with the whole community of the baptized. This is a renewed emphasis on a theological concept which, if never lost in the Catholic Church, was certainly obscured by the religious controversies after the Reformation.

> The baptized, by regeneration and the anointing of the Holy Spirit, are consecrated into a spiritual house and a holy priesthood. Thus through all those works befitting Christian men they can offer spiritual sacrifices and proclaim the power of him who has called them out of darkness into his marvellous light (cf. 1 Pet 2: 4-10). (§10)

It is by exercise of this priestly power of mediation between God and men, in Christ, that the Christian Church becomes 'a kind of sacrament or sign of

intimate union with God, and of the unity of all mankind. She is also an instrument for the achievement of such union and unity'. (§1) Had it been included in my brief, this would be the natural place for me to talk about the mission of the Church to the world, which demands that close collaboration of laity and clergy (the *conspiratio* of which Newman spoke) within the unity of the priestly people of God.

The same rejection of the older clericalism, for which 'church' and 'hierarchy' were almost synonymous terms, appears under the description of the Church as sharing in Christ's phophetic office:

> The body of the faithful as a whole, anointed as they are by the Holy One (cf. 1 Jn 2: 20, 27) cannot err in matters of belief. Thanks to a supernatural sense of the faith which characterizes the people as a whole, it manifests this unerring quality when 'from the bishops down to the last member of the laity' it shows universal agreement in matters of faith and morals. (§12)

This passage, with its deeply scriptural and pastoral overtones, should help to elucidate the idea of infallibility, so often taken, even within the Roman Church, in a quasi-magical way, and set at rest some of the fears Protestants have felt—though it should be remembered that the first Vatican Council had already carefully set papal infallibility within the context of the Church as a whole (Denziger 1839 [3074]).

Along similar lines is the statement of collegial government of the Church by the bishops as a whole under the papal primacy. As is well known, this was one of the most highly controverted themes at the Council, and despite a long 'explanatory note' added by the theological commission, it is still not entirely clear. That the bishops among themselves constitute a college in union with the pope is clear enough; but is the pope head of the Church in a sense distinct from that in which he is head of the college of bishops? Undoubtedly there is room for development here before an answer is given by some future council. That doesn't matter; what matters is that the future government of the Church will be far more balanced, with representation from the whole world, rather than just from Italy and Rome, as a by-product of this declaration of collegiality. In the same way local Churches have been given greater freedom of manœuvre, and within them too the government will be broader based.

The points made in this document are spelled out more fully in a cluster of minor decrees such as those on the *Bishops' Pastoral Office in the Church*, on the *Ministry and Life of Priests*, and on the *Apostolate of the Laity*. Unfortunately, these could not be argued out in council with the care given to the major writings, and they do not necessarily add very much. Perhaps the most important points relate to the practical setting up of such institutions as the synod of bishops to discuss major problems with the pope at regular intervals, the national conferences of bishops as officially part of the Church's structure, and pastoral advisory councils, made up of clergy and laity, to be set up by each bishop. If these institutions can be encouraged to work properly, they could eventually lead to exciting developments. For what they amount to is the reintroduction of democratic principles into the

Church's official structures. This is a matter of practice rather than theology. There has never been anything in theory against, for instance, the election of bishops by their people: it was done in the early centuries and could be done again. But before it could in any sense be meaningful a longish period of democratization has to take place in which lay people will come to *feel* (not merely to be informed of) their maturity as part of the people of God. A lot will depend on the spirit in which these particular council decrees are put into practice in the dioceses of the world.

It is, no doubt, the strength of this Council rather than a weakness that no clear-cut summary even of the decrees relating to the internal renewal of the Church can be made. The style of the Council was not concise and dogmatic, but explanatory and complex with the complexity of all human life. But if one had to choose a word to characterize its spirit, it would surely be 'freedom'. The Council aimed to open up a new era within the Church, one which is exploratory rather than closed, one in which the old narrow certainties will give way to a new and more open richness and depth. Whether or not it will succeed remains to be seen. But despite the many difficulties to which it has already led, the Council represents a challenge not merely to Roman Catholics but to all Christians, indeed to the whole world.

[1] All quotations are from *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. W. M. Abbott, S.J., London-Dublin 1966. Of the many commentaries on the various documents, the most useful is E. Schillebeeckx, *Vatican II: The Real Achievement*, London 1967, which in short space says better things that many lengthier studies.

VATICAN II: ECUMENICAL RELATIONS

Harold Roberts

WE shall consider in this paper the attitude of Rome to non-Roman communions and to the ecumenical movement, as focused in the World Council of Churches, in the light of Vatican II. Special attention will be directed to the Constitution on the Church and the Decree on Ecumenism which are intimately related to each other since the teaching about ecumenism is based upon the doctrine of the Church. Other documents of importance in this connexion are the Decrees on Eastern Catholic Churches and the Church's missionary activity.

I

If we are to begin to understand the attitude of the Roman Church to Church relations, it is imperative to recognize that for Rome the primary question is: What is the Church? In conversations between Protestant Churches, there is a tendency to begin by affirming with a great sense of relief, but with an assurance that is not always well grounded, that in regard to the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith there is no significant difference between us. The assumption that lies behind this confident assertion of doctrinal unity rests on the belief that somehow the Gospel is one thing and the Church another, and that what matters is that we should be at one about the Gospel. What sometimes becomes painfully obvious in our ecumenical discussions is that the Gospel involves the Church and the Church involves the Gospel and that we are not likely to make progress in mutual understanding until we have a larger measure of agreement about the nature of the Church. While conversations may begin about closer relations at any point, the ecclesiological foundations must be well and truly laid before serious negotiations can begin.

It is therefore important that we should enquire what the second Vatican Council has to say about the Church.

First, it is significant that the Constitution on the Church, which is one of the most impressive religious documents of our time, does not begin by speaking of the Church as an institution, nor does it give priority to the place of the priesthood and the hierarchy in the understanding of the Church. The first chapter of the Constitution is entitled 'The Mystery of the Church'. In a footnote to *The Documents of Vatican II* (edited by Walter M. Abbott, S. J.), from which extracts are taken in this paper, we read that the mystery of the Church indicates that the Church as a divine reality cannot be captured by human thought or language and Paul VI is quoted as saying that it is imbued with the hidden presence of God (p. 14). The Church is in essence a spiritual entity. It is the place where the presence of God is to be discerned. It is seen to be a sacrament or sign of union with God and of the unity of mankind. The

external order of the Church is by no means regarded as unimportant but it is no longer possible, without going clean contrary to what is affirmed in this Constitution, to obscure the nature of the spiritual character of the Church by seeming to imply that the primary element is institutional.

Secondly, the Church finds its essential expression in the Eucharist. In this sacred rite, which is not simply one element in Christian worship, the Church renews its own life and mission. The Church and the Eucharist are fundamentally one.

Thirdly, Christ the one Mediator sustains his Church on earth as a visible structure. Through her, he fulfils his ministry by communicating his grace to all. The visible structure has hierarchical agencies but these agencies are not to be set over against the Mystical Body of the Church as though they were two realities. On the contrary, they form 'one interlocked reality which is comprised of a divine and human element' (*Documents*, p. 22).

Fourthly, while the common priesthood of the faithful differs from the ministerial and hierarchical priesthood in essence and not only in degree, the two priesthoods are inter-related. Each is in its way a sharing in the priesthood of Christ. The ministerial priesthood rules the priestly people in virtue of the power committed to it. It brings about the eucharistic sacrifice, but the offering is made to God in the name of all the people and by virtue of their royal priesthood the faithful join in the offering. What is more, they exercise their priesthood not only in the common liturgy but by the witness of a holy life and by manifesting their union with Christ in their self-sacrifice and active charity.

Fifthly, the Church is the people of God, to whom all men are called to belong. There is but one people of God throughout the world and they are all in communion with each other through the Holy Spirit. Each individual part of the Church contributes through its own special gifts to the whole Church. Further, in its inner structure it is composed of differing ranks either because of their duties or the way of life, as in the case of those who enter the religious state, to which they are called. But all are part of the catholic unity of the Church of God.

Sixthly, those 'are fully incorporated into the society of the Church, who, possessing the Spirit of Christ, accept her entire system and all the means of salvation given to her, and through union with her visible structure are joined to Christ, who rules her through the Supreme Pontiff and the bishops' (*Documents*, p. 33).

The Roman Church recognizes that she is linked with many who, though baptized, do not profess the faith in its fulness or are not in communion with the Papacy. They acknowledge God as Father and Christ as Son of God and Saviour. They are united with Christ through baptism and receive other sacraments. Some of them have the episcopate, celebrate the Eucharist and venerate the Virgin Mary. 'We can say that in some real way they are joined with us in the Holy Spirit, for to them also He gives His gifts and graces, and is thereby operative among them with His sanctifying power' (*Documents*, p. 34).

Again, there is a sense in which all men of good will belong to the Church of Christ. Those who through no fault of their own do not know the Gospel, yet sincerely seek God, can attain to everlasting salvation while Divine Providence does not 'deny the help necessary for salvation to those who, without blame on their part, have not yet arrived at an explicit knowledge of God, but who strive to live a good life, thanks to His Grace' (*Documents*, p. 35).

Hence the Church prays and labours that the whole world may become the people of God. The Church is the Kingdom as present, for it is the Body of the Christ with whom the Kingdom came. But it looks to the fulfilment of the divine purpose in the bringing of all men within the fellowship of the redeemed—the Body of Christ which lives and discharges its mission by inward renewal and obedience in the sharing of the ministry of her Lord.

The Constitution deals with other issues that do not directly concern our theme. It may be said, however, that the Scriptural approach to the nature of the Church, the exposition of the Scriptural images of the Church, the primary emphasis on the Church as a spiritual presence or a general sacrament, the reiteration of the fact that the Church is the whole priesthood of God's people even though the ministerial priesthood differs in essence from the laity, and the glowing desire to reach out to separated brethren everywhere—these are elements which make this document one of the more valuable treasures of religious literature.

I

The Decree on Ecumenism recognizes that in early days there arose in the one Church certain rifts which are censured by Paul as damnable. In later centuries disagreements of a more fundamental character arose and they led to the organization of communions which became separated from the Catholic Church. There was blame on both sides, we are told, for these developments, but 'we are not to impute the sin of separation to those who at present are born into these communities and are instilled therein with Christ's faith. The Catholic Church accepts them with respect and affection as brothers' (*Documents*, p. 345). Here lies the key to the understanding of the attitude of the Vatican Council to members of non-Roman communions. The separated brethren were regarded throughout the Council's deliberations with affection and respect. Let us note first what is said more specifically about relations with other communions in the Decree, bearing in mind that the basis of everything that is said is the doctrine of the Church which has been briefly summarized in the previous section.

First, 'those who believe in Christ and have been properly baptized [and by 'properly' is meant that the conditions of a valid baptism have been observed] are brought into a certain, though imperfect, communion with the Catholic Church' (*Documents*, p. 345). The editor's note on this passage (p. 345) reminds us that the Decree stops short of saying outright that they are members of the Church probably because of Pope Pius XII's encyclical *Mystici Corporis* (1943) which declares that only those are included as real members who have been baptized and profess the true faith 'and have not been so unfortunate as to separate themselves from the unity of

the Body or been excluded from it by legitimate authority for serious faults'.

Secondly, the Decree affirms that many elements or endowments which go to the building up of the life of the Church can exist outside the visible boundaries of the Catholic Church: the Bible, the life of grace, faith, hope, and charity. 'All of these which come from Christ and lead back to Him belong by right to the one Church of Christ' (*Documents*, pp. 345–6). It should be noted that the words 'by right' in the quotation were added by Pope Paul and must be interpreted in the light of an earlier phrase in this Decree which affirms that those who are justified by faith through baptism have a right to be honoured by the title of Christian. That is, it is not a concession grudgingly or otherwise made but a right to be claimed.

The separated Churches perform many of the sacred actions of the Christian Religion which promote the life of grace and 'can be rightly described as capable of providing access to the community of salvation. . . . These separated Churches and communities have by no means been deprived of significance and importance in the mystery of salvation. For the Spirit of Christ has not refrained from using them as means of salvation which derive their efficacy from the very fulness of grace and truth entrusted to the Catholic Church' (*Documents*, p. 346). It is of interest to observe that the editorial note in our book of documents tells us that 'Catholic' was inserted by Pope Paul (p. 346).

Thirdly, it is submitted with complete candour that the separated brethren, whether considered as individuals or as communities and Churches, lack the unity which Scripture and tradition proclaim. It is firmly stated that it is through Christ's Catholic Church alone that the fulness of the means of salvation can be obtained. It was to the apostolic college alone of which Peter is the head that the blessings of the New Covenant were entrusted which made possible the establishment of the one Body of Christ.

Fourthly, the Catholic Church must seek renewal by faithfulness to its calling in setting forth the Gospel in its fulness and power. Continual reformation must be the watchword of the Catholic Church if it is to prepare the way to unity. Its members need to appreciate afresh the endowments from the common heritage to be found among the separated brethren and to avail themselves of the opportunities of encounter and co-operation which authority provides. It is allowable and indeed desirable that 'in certain special services for unity and during ecumenical gatherings Catholics should join in prayer with their separated brethren. As for common worship, *communicatio in sacris*, care must be taken to observe two principles; such worship should express the unity of the Church and a sharing in the means of grace. The first condition, as the Decree indicates, seems to rule out common worship, while the gaining of an immediate grace by sharing seems to commend it. The Decree leaves common worship to the 'prudent decision of the local episcopal authority' (*Documents*, pp. 352–3).

Fifthly, members of the Roman Church are exhorted to study the outlook of their separated brethren, their distinctive doctrines, the history of their communions, their spiritual and liturgical life and their cultural background.

Furthermore, Catholic belief needs to be expounded with greater clarity, and Catholics and non-Catholics should work together in bearing a more effective social witness, determined and illumined by the Christian Faith. Such co-operation helps to make smooth the road to unity.

When the Council turned to the question of closer relations with Churches separated from the Roman Apostolic See, little of a concrete character was contributed apart from the special position of the Eastern Churches. It was probably felt that no useful purpose would be served by dealing in detail with the relations to Churches and ecclesial communities in the West until there had been the initiation of dialogues between them and Rome. We may turn for a moment to the attitude of the Council to the Eastern Churches. In the Decree on Ecumenism and Eastern Orthodox Churches, there is plainly a warm desire that the work of restoring full communion between the Eastern Churches and the Catholic Church should proceed without undue delay. It is recommended that special attention should be directed to the history of the origin and growth of the Eastern Churches as well as to the relations between them and Rome before the separation. It is recognized that the Eastern Churches possess true sacraments, the priesthood and the Eucharist. For this reason some degree of common worship is not only possible but desirable. In the Decree on the Eastern Churches (Art. 26–29) special attention is given to this question. Catholics are urged to avail themselves of the riches of the spiritual traditions that find expression in monasticism and in other ways. To avoid any misunderstanding, the Eastern Churches are reminded that the Eastern Churches have the power to govern themselves according to their own disciplines while having due regard to the unity of the whole Church. The variety of discipline should also apply to differences in theological interpretation, and the seemingly diverse theological formulations should be regarded as complementary rather than conflicting. To restore communion and unity between the Papacy and the Eastern Churches a plea is made that no burden should be imposed beyond what is indispensable (*Documents*, p. 360 ff.).

The approach of Rome to the Orthodox Churches is certainly marked by optimism. It is doubtful whether the prospect of full communion is as bright as would appear. While the spirit of the two Decrees is appreciated by the Orthodox, it is fully recognized that the problem of Uniat Churches—that is the Churches of Eastern Christendom in communion with Rome, while retaining their own rites and discipline—has by no means been solved and in any dialogue the difficulties that arise in relation to them will need to be carefully examined. Further, it is hardly likely that the attitude taken towards theological differences between the Orthodox and Rome in the Decrees will meet with widespread approval among the Orthodox. There is an insistence in many Orthodox circles that rites and discipline cannot be considered apart from doctrine and herein lies for them the major issue. Again, as Rome knows well, to secure the agreement of all the Orthodox Churches on issues bearing on unity with Rome is a goal much to be desired but surrounded by difficulties that are perhaps wisely evaded in the decrees (*Documents*, comment by Alexander Schmemann, pp. 387–8).

In regard to closer relations between Rome and the Churches of the West, the Decree on Ecumenism draws attention to the fact that between these Communions and the Catholic Church there are not only historical, sociological and cultural differences, but differences in the interpretation of revealed truth. Some considerations are submitted that may serve as a basis for ecumenical dialogue.

While there are Christians who openly confess Christ as sole mediator between God and man, and acclaim him Saviour and Lord, the Decree is aware of differences even here that should be seriously examined particularly in relation to the person of Christ, divine redemption, and the role of Mary. There are differences of interpretation again about the relation of Scripture and tradition, and the Sacraments. Because, it is believed, of the lack of the sacrament of orders, the total reality of the Eucharist has not been preserved. In any dialogue, there must be detailed study of the Sacraments and the Church's worship and ministry. Moral questions of great importance must be raised in any encounter between Roman Catholics and other Christians. Although both desire to share and proclaim the mind of Christ about the more pressing problems of modern society, there are divergences of view that must be investigated if closer relations are to be secured.

Nevertheless, it is clear that there was revealed in the Council an astonishing change of disposition towards the Protestant Churches which augurs well for the dialogues that have been already arranged between Rome and her separated brethren. It is clear that the use of the term 'ecclesial communities' signifies a modification of the traditional Catholic attitude. It implies the recognition that Protestantism, in spite of the fact that it is not in communion with the Papacy, is in some sense within the Catholic Church. On the other hand, the Decree has some hesitation in describing the Protestant Churches as Churches. Perhaps we may recall that some time ago the Free Churches in England were deliberately described in some quarters as 'bodies' in a sense that did not even imply an ecclesial community.

Although the differences between Rome and Protestantism, as disclosed directly and indirectly in the documents of the second Vatican Council, are substantial and must not be obscured by an increasing concern for Christian unity, there is sufficient evidence to justify dialogue and it is important that dialogue should take place at every level. Among the issues calling for common study and enquiry are the doctrine of the Church, its mission and authority, the Bible and tradition, Baptism, the Eucharist, the Ministry, the place of the laity, the role of Mary, social witness and mixed marriages.

III

That the Roman Church is in sympathy with the ecumenical movement as focused in the World Council of Churches is implied by the attitude revealed in the Introduction and in the chapter on 'Catholic Principles of Ecumenism' in the Decree on Ecumenism. We are told in the Introduction that Christians are experiencing remorse over their divisions and a longing for unity. To this end reference is made, without using the name, to the World Council of Churches—'a movement fostered by the Holy Spirit for the restoration of

unity among all Christians. Taking part in this movement which is called ecumenical are those who invoke the Triune God and confess Jesus as Lord and Saviour' (*Documents*, p. 342). The spirit and content of the Introduction and brief exposition of the Catholic principles of Ecumenism leave little doubt that the possibility of taking part in the ecumenical movement through co-operation with the World Council of Churches is being seriously considered. The implied reference to the World Council as being fostered by the Holy Spirit and to the basis of the World Council suggests that the movement points the way to that closer fellowship between Churches and communities which looms large in the Documents of the second Vatican Council. It should be noted, for reasons that can be easily understood, that the Vatican Council did not wish to make more explicit at this stage its views about possible membership of the World Council.

It should be recognized that although the Decree on Ecumenism seems to be committed to the idea of co-operation in a fellowship of Churches, there are difficulties in the way that should not be underestimated. While the documents we have considered call attention to the fact that the Roman Church has discovered in other Communions elements that belong to the Catholic Church, this admission implies that the standard of reference is the Roman Church itself. It is true that the Vatican Council urged the need to learn from other Churches but this does not disturb Rome's conviction that other Communions can only illuminate aspects of the truth with which Rome as the Catholic Church has been entrusted. Hence in a fellowship of Churches, it is hard to see how Rome could easily become a partner and how its relations with other Communions could become reciprocal.

The starting-point of thought for Rome in any consideration of its own relation to the ecumenical movement is the belief that it is the one Church. Its failure to make clear its unity and to engage with sufficient obedience in its mission is confessed with unquestionable sincerity. But it is on the basis of the unity of the Church as embodied in its own heritage rather than on the basis of a common witness or a fellowship in study, worship and action that its thinking about the ecumenical movement must rest.

Another difficulty, frequently noted in ecumenical circles, arises from the fact that Rome could only enter the World Council of Churches as one World body and not as a national or territorial community with affiliations to a World Confession or Federation. But these and other complications need not prove insuperable, if Rome and other Churches find the way of renewal and respond to the divine summons to unity in order that the Church may be the Church and fulfil its mission as the servant of the One Christ in a divided world.

VATICAN II: A PROTESTANT VIEW IN RETROSPECT

Robert E. Cushman

VATICAN COUNCIL II is now an event of the past. As I stood with perhaps eighty other observers before the massive façade of St Peter's Basilica on the last great day of splendid ceremonial, 8 December 1965, I was deeply conscious of high privilege. So were my colleagues beside me. We had been witnesses and participants in one of the epoch-making events of modern church history. The Council had begun under the inspired leadership of the aged and beloved Pope, John XXIII. It was my own good fortune to begin observership in the second session of 1963 and to return to the third, and to the fourth, or final, session of 1965. Close, even intimate, were the associations and friendships that had been formed, not only with fellow observers but with our hosts, the Roman Catholic brethren. The unfailing courtesies and consideration shown to the observers by the staff of the Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity, under the presidency of Augustine Cardinal Bea and the executive direction of Bishop J. Willebrands, will remain a lifetime of pleasant heart-warmng memory.

How shall we forget the many vivid hours spent in travels, conversation and dining together? Together we shared the hospitality of monasteries and their monastic brotherhoods. Ancient precedents were set aside, and our wives accompanied us. They dined at tables in refectories where women had never set foot. It was so at the Franciscan monastery of Assisi, at Subiaco, at Monte Cassino, at Florence, and most memorable of all, at Casa Mari, a Cistercian abbey to the south of Rome, where we were feasted and serenaded by a most engaging band of young monks, for all the world reminiscent of my own seminary students.

But space fails me. It is only to be said that, as the observers returned session after session, the friendships and interchange with their Catholic hosts became warm, vital and ever more fruitful. In the final discussions of the fourth session, we were marvellously engaged, with emancipation of mind and spirit, in candid discussion in which Catholics often held variant views among themselves, Methodists sided with Orthodox against Calvinists, and Lutherans were quite as likely to gainsay an Anglican as they were a Roman. In the closing session of the Council we were really 'mixing it up' with candour and unembarrassed good will that was the fruit of mutual trust and personal understanding nurtured by prolonged association.

So, at the Council's closing on 8 December 1965, it seemed to us observers, and I believe to most Council Fathers, that John XXIII's courageous risk in inviting non-Catholic observers had paid off. Quite apart from the indirect

influence on Council debate, quite apart from formal and informal conversations with committees of Catholic bishops interested in observer judgement and opinion, quite apart also from actual, if indirect, contribution to the shape and emphasis of some conciliar documents of first importance, the presence of the observers had created a new ecumenical reality. It was the reality of living personal exchange, abiding friendships and the heartening experience of Christian fellowship that had grown to ripeness over and above acknowledged doctrinal differences. It was a fellowship that asserted its reality, vouched for itself and for its own possibility despite ancient misunderstandings and predisposing suspicions and hostilities. These things, bred of a long past, were somehow transcended. They were transcended in being together, in worship at St Peter's, in debate, in informal gatherings, in the sheer momentum of a common concern for the truth of Christ and the advancement of his Kingdom in a secular world, and perhaps above all, in common prayer. In Vatican Council II, Catholics and non-Catholics learned that they could pray together; indeed, that they could hardly avoid praying together because it had become almost embarrassingly plain that they owned a common Lord.

So the self-conscious approach of the first session of the Council, the earlier rather circumspect attention to protocol and nicety, gave way in the later sessions to the *openness* which had come to be the new spirit of the Council itself. Whereas the observers were known at first as the 'separated brethren', it is quite important to note that Pope Paul VI, in his last and farewell audience with the observers, addressed them as 'Brothers, brothers and friends in Christ'.

So it came about, in those prolonged and sustained inter-relationships of Christian with Christian, of man with man, in the Council days, that the question before us was and remains how to grasp our divinely-given unity in Christ so as to overcome our actual historical disunity. Too long it has been a disunity in which Christians have been not only content but stubbornly resolved to live. For many years, very many I suppose, we shall be occupied with 'the nature of the unity we seek'.

Christians will be probing this question. But there are one or two things in particular to note: First, Vatican Council II actually marks a radical change of course in world Catholicism. Present-day Catholicism not only now seeks, but has come to acknowledge at least in foretaste, not simply the possibility but the actuality of Christian community above and beyond ancient ecclesiastical divisions and long-entrenched divisive suspicion and hostility.

Secondly, with the historic service of common prayer held in the sanctuary of St Paul's Without the Walls on 4 December 1965, the highest possible official authorization was given to the practice of common worship short of sacramental communion. Thus was implemented by papal action and precedent the permissive legislation of the Council's decree *On Ecumenism*. Over obstacles and obstruction, opposition and manœuvre, this decree eventually passed. In peril and often in doubt as to its outcome, it was finally adopted to the profound relief of the observers and the deep satisfaction of Cardinal Bea and his staff in the third session of the Council in 1964. With the service of

common prayer at St Paul's on 4 December 1965 (at which I was privileged to be present), the 'word' of *De Oecumenismo* 'was made flesh' by the Pope himself.

So John XXIII's revolution of openness has in this respect prevailed. It has prevailed in others, such as religious liberty, the 'collegiality' of the bishops, the reconstruction of the sacred liturgy, the Constitution on the Church, the enlarged place and responsibility of the laity, and many others. But my concern here is to mark the revolution of openness which now replaces the withdrawal and introversion that, on the whole, characterized post-Tridentine Catholicism in theory, spirit and practice until these recent days.

A few weeks past a friend sent a clipping from Holyoke, Massachusetts. The headline read: 'Over 2,000 attend historic joint religious service here as Christian Unity Week begins.' The article states: 'Over 2,000 people filled Second Congregational Church Tuesday night for the first of two joint ecumenical services.... Several hundred residents were turned away when all available room in the church building had been filled. Walls were lined three-deep with people, and doorways, platforms, and the pastor's study were crowded with the overflow crowd.... Msgr. James J. Fitzgibbons, Pastor of the Sacred Heart Church, welcomed the large congregation... and invited the faithful to come to a similar service at Sacred Heart on January 25.

'The Rev. F. B. Carr of Grace Congregational Church delivered the homily. Rev. James J. Anilosky of the First Presbyterian Church offered prayers; confession of faith [probably the Apostles' Creed] was led by Rev. Donald H. Gustafson of the First Methodist Church. The Old Testament lesson was read by Fr. John Kelly of Holy Family Parish; the New Testament lesson was read by Fr. John Vaughn of Sacred Heart Parish.' And it goes on: the Litany by an Episcopalian rector; intercession, Lord's Prayer and blessing by the Baptist minister.

A friend who attended the service was all but stunned by the experience. He is an old-time Protestant in a rather Catholic city. Nothing like this had been heard of! He called it a 'miracle'. Well, this miracle has been happening. It is happening elsewhere. I well remember my amazement when, with the late Bishop Ferdinand Sigg of Zurich, of noble memory, I attended such a service at the University of Montreal when the justly celebrated Émile Cardinal Léger was host to the Faith and Order Conference of 1963. As this truly ecumenical service of common praise and prayer proceeded, our astonishment deepened. Since then, I have seen Cardinal Léger's informed and consecrated leadership in the Council at Rome. But while what happened at Montreal is truly historic, it is now to be remembered as but a prophecy of what was to come. Yet without Vatican Council II it could not have come, certainly it could not have survived.

The Catholics, one might say, have joined the common Christian World. They will give it leadership. One can expect the pace of this leadership to accelerate. We may even see shortly a revitalization of the old-line Protestant Churches in America. They will need a renewal of their witness and their life. If they have a distinctive message, it will behove them to possess it, to know it

and to publish it. The well-worn ruts and the time-honoured routines will hardly suffice in the days ahead, for former times have passed away.

And, therefore, if you ask me what is the consequence and outcome of Vatican Council II, I would point first of all to the Holyoke service of Christian unity. It symbolizes and prophesies, I believe, a new day in world Christianity. It signifies, at least in its beginnings, the passing away of the post-Reformation and counter-Reformation eras. The most palpable effect of Vatican Council II is a new readiness and openness for Christian community and common Christian effort, on the part of world Catholicism. Just as Methodists or Lutherans do not expect forthwith to become Anglicans by having fellowship or common worship, so neither a Methodist nor a Roman Catholic shall cease to be such by mutually acknowledging the common Christian commitment of the other and sharing with him in the measure that doctrine and conscience allow.

Accordingly, in this domain we are, I think, about to live in a different Christian world. It will not be one of complete unity in the foreseeable future, but it will be increasingly a world of enlarged understanding, enhanced good will, fellowship and common effort and purpose. Its effect on Protestantism will, I believe, be, among other things, renewed theological awakening and renewed vitality of doctrinal discussion and enquiry. This will have its effect both upon the conception of ecclesiastical and institutional structures and upon worship or liturgical practice. It will also have an effect upon the social concern and action of the Churches in the world, and a deepening of their consciousness of responsibility for the world.

II

If, with this background, we ask more narrowly what is the import of Vatican Council II for Protestant Christianity, for the several Protestant communions, my first answer would be this: Protestant Christians of all denominations should mark well the new and unprecedented openness of Catholicism toward other Christian communions. It is of utmost importance to recognize that the Roman Catholic Church has officially decided to enter into dialogue with the world: first of all, with non-Catholic Christians; secondly, with non-Christian religions and, thirdly, with the whole of the modern world in its agonies, defeats and triumphs. This seems to me to be a revolution when compared with the Catholicism of the First Vatican Council or even with the Pontificate of Pius XII. It is a reversal of the standpoint of censure, defensiveness and withdrawal that marked the prevailing tone and temper of the 19th-century official Catholic teaching and ecclesiastical policy.

The recent journeys of Paul VI to India in 1964, and to New York in the fall of 1965, his address to the United Nations, his urgent and deliberate effort to mount a peace offensive in the face of the Vietnam crisis and, most recently, his encyclical letter on peace and supportive of the United Nations (19 September 1966) are indications of the new dialogue with the world. Also the Declaration on the Relations of the Church to non-Christian Religions (Council Document, 9: 28 October 1965) contains not only the long-controverted Declaration on the Jews but also statements of appreciation for the

values of non-Christian religions through which men (no longer depreciated as unbelievers) seek to discover and to relate themselves to the Supreme Being. 'The Catholic Church', it declares, 'rejects nothing that is true and holy in these religions. She regards with sincere reverence those ways of action and of life, those precepts and teachings, which, though differing in many aspects from the ones she holds and sets forth, nonetheless often reflect a ray of the Truth which enlightens all men.'

But, above all, the dialogue is commended with respect to non-Catholic Christians. It is plain that Roman Catholicism finds its closest affinity, on doctrinal and ecclesiological grounds, with Eastern Orthodoxy. A central aim of Paul VI's trip to the Holy Land in January 1964 was to find the proper place of meeting with the spiritual leaders of Orthodoxy. The mutual and simultaneous lifting of the ban of excommunication by Paul VI and Athenagoras of Istanbul on 7 December 1965 was at once a fruit of the Palestinian journey and a further important step toward reconciliation of Eastern and Latin Christianity. The ban had been mutually imposed above 900 years ago in A.D. 1054. It was lifted by a mutual exchange of letters on the final day of official business of the Vatican Council in St Peter's Basilica. As I walked to the closing ceremonies on the next day, 8 December, with Bishop Aimilianos, representative of the Patriarch to the Council, I was assured that this was a most important beginning of a process which could, in the providence of God, lead to eventual re-establishment of communion between Eastern and Latin Christianity. The way may be long, but the two ancient churches are presently on the march in the direction of one another.

But what of dialogue with Protestant Christians? Well, it has begun already in the four years of Vatican II. It will be attended by increasing occasions of common prayer or worship, short of sacramental inter-communion. The signs of this are numerous. Since the close of the Council, reaction on the part of conservative Catholics has been in the press. But the Father DePauws cannot subvert the spirit and the declaration of Vatican Council II. Catholic ecumenism is here to stay, at least until it is rescinded by another Council. Uncritical and excessive Catholic enthusiasm for the recent ecumenical emancipation may embarrass constituted authorities in the Church responsible for the conservation of authentic tradition. There is bound to be internal stress, but the new ecumenical outreach has conciliar authorization and its deliberate advancement may be expected.

III

What, then, are some achievements of Vatican Council II that both make dialogue possible with Protestant Christians and also constitute some of its important presuppositions? What, in other words, are some of the things affirmed or sanctioned by the Council which Protestants ought to bear in mind as they contemplate both dialogue and closer association with their Roman Catholic brethren? What are the things they must regard as altered and changing within the mind of Roman Catholic Christianity that, as it seems to me, markedly distinguishes it from the 400-year-old defensive posture of the counter-Reformation era? What are Protestants to understand if they are not

erroneously to hold, and be guided by, clichés and consequent animosities and suspicions of the past?

Here are a few such changes and such emergent positions, officially adopted by the Council, that require our notice if we are not, like Don Quixote, to fight windmills or confound ancient hostilities with real and important issues and differences:

(1) In the first place, we must bear in mind that Vatican Council II was conceived and aimed and now has succeeded in turning the searchlight of *self-criticism* upon the ancient Roman Church. I do not think we can escape the fact that Vatican Council II represents the most thorough, searching and sustained self-examination to which any branch of Christianity has subjected itself since the 16th-century Reformation and counter-Reformation. The 18th-century Wesleyan self-examination was long and sustained, but it was neither heeded nor shared by the Anglican establishment and by confluence of historical circumstances became a schism. This Roman self-scrutiny and self-criticism is also marked by a monumental and theologically informed intellectual output probably unequalled in modern ecclesiastical history. Protestants, in undertaking dialogue with Catholics today and tomorrow, must understand not merely that some Catholics have really done their homework, but also that it has been honestly and remarkably self-critical.

(2) Secondly, Protestants should realize that Vatican Council II, again and again, has adopted the principle that the Church is perpetually in need of self-renewal and reformation, that the unfaithfulness of men clouds and obstructs the redemptive mission of Christ through his Church. Cognate to this was and is the rejection of what Bishop De Smedt of Bruges, Belgium, in the first session of the Council denominated 'triumphalism' in the Church. Triumphalism is not simply the disposition to pomp and vainglory. It is not simply pride of mind and ecclesiastical snobbery or complacency. Basically, 'triumphalism' was deprecated as a tendency to identify the Church on earth, the Church militant or the embattled Church, with the Kingdom of God itself. In its place a new sobriety is accepted about the Church. It is the 'pilgrim people of God'. It is the people of mission. It is the servant Church, not one asserting its claims or affirming its prerogatives but one accepting anew its responsibility for service in Christ's name to the world. This is a central acknowledgement of the Constitution on the Church. Vatican Council II rejects 'triumphalism'. It is a fair question, I think, whether American Protestantism has yet fully recognized its own need to do so.

(3) In the third place, Protestants must recognize that a new understanding of the nature and role of the Church has been strenuously debated and defined by the Council. The Church is viewed more nearly in biblical, Pauline and Augustinian terms. It is, first of all, 'The People of God'. It is the body of Christ. It is no longer the hierarchy. It includes *all* believers, among whom the laity have an integral and indispensable 'apostolate'. Correspondingly, 'clericalism' has been officially checked and disapproved. The distinctive role of the ordained clergy is reaffirmed but always in company with the laity, who are also servants of Christ in mission, word and deed. The sacramental

ministry as a distinctive service of bishops and priests is affirmed, but with the understanding that even in sacramental worship the congregation and the laity have an integral and active part.

(4) Fourth, the doctrine of the Church has been altered by greater clarification of the function of the episcopate. The absolute sovereignty of the See of Rome, affirmed in the decrees of the First Vatican Council, has in my judgement been modified in practice and precedent, and perhaps in constitution. First, in the 'collegiality' of all bishops as (1) holding the highest order of ordination and as (2) conjointly *with* the Pope exercising the supreme governing and teaching role in the Roman Church. The limited autonomy of national and regional conferences of bishops has received formal authorization. Provision for a Synod of Bishops, world-wide in composition, has been made by Paul VI for ordinary and extraordinary convocation and business. Thus, the absolute or almost absolute power of the Roman See and, more particularly, its administrative and adjunctive arm, the Curia, has been, both in principle and in fact, limited and modified. A far more pluralistic world Catholicism is to be looked for in the future, even though it will not be attained without struggle. The monolithic absolutism of Vatican Council I has, as I see it, been breached. Finally, while the doctrine of Papal 'infallibility' (adopted over weighty protest from within its own membership by that Council) remains, I will hazard the opinion that it has been modified by the Vatican Council II *in fact* rather than *in theory*. This seems indicated on two scores: first it has been *broadened to include* conciliar declarations and, secondly, it, accordingly, has been explicitly shared with ecumenical councils such as Vatican Council II.

(5) A fifth reality which Protestants must come to understand is a newly established centrality of the Bible and of biblical authority as normative for the determination of faith and practice, doctrine and worship. The mainspring and source of the liturgical reform and renewal represented by the Council's Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy adopted in 1963 is undoubtedly a renewal of biblical study, exegesis, and theology among Roman Catholic theologians over the past half-century. Catholic biblical scholarship is rapidly catching up with and overtaking this prominent achievement of Protestant scholarship. But our interest centres in the fact that the new definitions of church, ministry, worship, revelation and Catholic ecumenism (represented by several important Council documents) are the result of the somewhat recent vital thrust of biblical research and understanding among the generality of Catholic scholars, theologians and clergy. It is of extreme significance that in Schema XIII, The Church and the Modern World, it is said that the Church in its life and faith is always subject to the judgement of the Gospel. This is to acknowledge the stone of stumbling which made Luther's break with Rome inevitable in the unequal balance of forces of the 16th century. The centrality of the Scripture is both a cause and the fruit of the Second Vatican Council.

(6) Cognate to this, and in the sixth place, Protestants must study carefully the long-controverted and finely chiselled Schema, On Divine Revelation, adopted almost at the end of the Council after four years of constant debate,

amendment and review. So nicely juxtaposed are the complementary authorities of Tradition and Scripture that the knowledgeable modern Protestant will find very much to commend in the balance of Scripture with tradition that is attained. The relation is one of dialectical tension, so that the crude superiority of tradition over Scripture, characteristic of counter-Reformation Catholicism, is greatly modified. The positon attained is, I think, not far removed from that of many contemporary New Testament scholars of Protestant origin.

Quite apart from what this suggests by way of reconciliation of long-standing Protestant-Catholic differences and even hostilities, it must now be recognized that the Second Vatican Council has quite definitely adopted a biblical basis as fundamental in restructuring its life and doctrine as a Church. This is official; it is no longer the aspiration of liberalizing Catholic scholars or theologians. It is, with Vatican II, the acknowledged position of the Roman Catholic Church. In September 1966, addressing a group of eminent Catholic theologians, Paul VI stressed the Scriptural foundation of Christian doctrine, reminding the assembled group of 'the great importance the Council always attached to Sacred Scripture in doctrinal explanation. . . .'

(7) In the seventh place, it is now official policy and doctrine of the Catholic Church that it participate in the ecumenical movement of modern times. Whatever uncertainties attach to regional implementation, and there are many, Catholic ecumenism is policy. It is more fully and thoroughly defined and avowed than presently exists among many of the Churches of the Reformation. I mean to say that now the aim and effort toward Christian unity is a mandate upon all Catholics, not just clergy but the whole of the laity and as a real part of 'the lay apostolate'. The division and disunity of Christendom is declared contrary to the will of Christ for his Church, and while it is affirmed that the Roman Catholic is the authentic Church of Christ, it is by no means supposed or declared that the reunion of Christendom is to be understood simply as return to Rome. I would venture to say that in his words to the observers in the fall of 1964, the Pope plainly intended something else. The words he used were 'recomposition in unity' to suggest, I believe, a new conception of the nature and way to the unity we seek.

And, finally, in this connexion it is of importance for non-Catholic Christians to notice carefully a phrase which appears in the Council documents. It is the proposition that 'the one true religion *subsists* in the Catholic and Apostolic Church'. We should mark it well that: (a) the true Christian religion is not exhaustively identified with the Roman Catholic Church but *subsists* in it, and (b) that 'The Catholic and Apostolic Church' is *not* exhaustively identified with the Roman Catholic Church. From these seemingly small distinctions an unforeseeable harvest of ecumenism may grow, for what is evidently allowed for is the possibility that true Christian faith or religion may 'subsist' in some measure also in other churches of Christendom. And just this, in fact, is what is allowed and affirmed in the decree On Ecumenism.

These distinctions may seem insignificant. The phrase of Paul VI, 'recomposition in unity', may give small satisfaction to those impatient for im-

mediate and unambiguous solutions to long-controverted issues. This is understandable, yet it should be realized that in the solemn context in which the words were uttered, as a direct address to the observers and by the supreme reigning authority of the Roman Church, such words are not to be taken as casual but as deliberate and finely chiselled vehicles, not merely of ideas agonizing to be born, but as usable instruments for the 'easement' of eventual policy and action. If I may refer to my own experience, there are three things with which, in the context of discussion and deliberation, I became quite conscious: first, the profound sense of inescapable responsibility entertained by Catholic officialdom, and pre-eminently by the Pope, to be faithful to the venerable *consensus* of Catholic doctrine; secondly, the long, long look ahead and readiness to discover vehicles for the future emerging in the conjunction of ancient truth with present urgencies. And, in the third place, consonant with Newman's theory of the development of doctrine, but added to it, was a remarkable disposition to open small 'growing edges' into the future with confidence in the leading of the Holy Spirit to find pathways into larger truth, aspired after, but now not yet visible. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the decree On Ecumenism; but it is worthy of notice that this perspective, fostered and nurtured by Cardinal Bea and the staff of the Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity, was not only a presiding rationale in the formation of the document but gradually created, I believe, a pervasive spirit of acceptance among the Fathers of the Council that made its adoption possible.

There is one other and last matter to be mentioned, in the seventh place, which Protestant Christians should have in mind as dialogue and fellowship between Catholics and Protestants develop. Protestants should understand that, however belatedly in their view it has come to pass, it is now true that after a most interesting and vigorous contest very full of suspense, the Second Vatican Council did adopt—against the lag and drag of centuries of contrary theory and precedent—the principle of religious freedom for both individuals and communities. The dignity of man, according to natural and revealed law, supports the right of conscientious worship. Men can be constrained neither by ecclesiastical nor political power to assent or dissent in matters religious. The inviolability of conscience and man's vocation before God is affirmed against all coercion whatsoever.

The importance of this reaffirmation of historic Reformation and, one may say, Puritan principles is great in this period of the twentieth century. In and with it is contained a most wholesome corrective against forces in our time that have mocked and traduced the essential dignity of man. Man's dignity is once again grounded upon his responsibility and calling under God.

But over and beyond this laudable emphasis is the implied acceptance of the disestablishment of religion as a protectorate of the state. The medieval doctrine of the 'two swords' which made the state the servant of the Church is silently relinquished. But it is also relinquished, in principle, in the explicit affirmation that religion, and Christian faith in particular, are matters transcending the power of man or institutions to establish or dissolve. Religious

liberty is a corollary of the basic Christian tenet that religious faith is a transaction between God and the individual person, that it cannot be enforced or coerced, and that the truth of the Christian religion must convict and persuade by the transparency of its own light. Accordingly, the primary work of the Church and its ministry and laity is witness, mission, proclamation in word and deed. One can reasonably say that, with this standpoint, Roman Catholicism and Evangelical Christianity are again standing more nearly upon the same New Testament and Apostolic ground.

These, then, are some of the things that are results of the Second Vatican Council. They have obvious implication for all Protestant or non-Roman Catholic Christians. Collectively, they compose an astonishingly different and unprecedented standpoint from which quite unexpected but promising conversations and *koinonia* between Catholics and non-Catholics may unfold in the years ahead. If so, *Deo gratias*: God be thanked!

THE RELIGION OF JOHN GALSWORTHY

J. Cyril Downes

TO anyone familiar with the writings of John Galsworthy this title will no doubt seem strange. For again and again, in letters and essays, and through the characters of his novels and plays, he expresses his disbelief quite forcibly—disbelief in orthodox Christianity, in a personal God, in a divine purpose and destiny for man, in a future life beyond death. At times he seems to write about Christians with malice and cynicism. Yet, as I shall seek to show, there were about him certain characteristics essentially religious: his nobility of character, his compassion for the weak and the fallen, his burning concern for social justice, his passionate love of beauty, his ceaseless quest for truth all mark him out as one who was 'not far from the Kingdom'.

John Galsworthy was born just a hundred years ago—on August 14, 1867. He was the son of a prominent London lawyer, and was born into the upper middle class. He was educated at Harrow and New College, Oxford, where he read for the law. But he never practised; he travelled widely, ostensibly on business for his father. In 1893 he met Ada, who was unhappily married to his cousin, and they fell in love. But, although they became lovers, it was some years before they were free to marry. He had already thought it might be good to be a writer, but it was a chance remark of Ada's—'Why don't you write? You're just the person'—which started him on his career. His first attempts, published under a pseudonym, were not very successful. It was not until 1904, with the publication of *The Island Pharisees,* that he began to attract attention. In 1906 his novel, *The Man of Property* (the first volume of *The Forsyte Saga*) brought him immediate fame, and when, in the same year, he wrote and had performed the first of twenty-seven plays, *The Silver Box*, it was clear that a star of the first magnitude had arisen. During the next twenty-six years his output was prodigious—novels, plays, poems, essays, longer and shorter stories appeared with incredible rapidity. He was honoured throughout the world, his works translated into many languages. But in 1932 he became seriously ill, and after many months it was diagnosed as a tumour on the brain. In his last days he became a pathetic figure, unable to move, unable to communicate with his wife and friends, and on February 1, 1933 he died.

Such, briefly, are the details of his life. We turn now to his religion. Both in his novels and in his plays Galsworthy was a great crusader against injustice, cruelty, man's inhumanity to man. He attacked society's rigid system of conventional morality. With an irony that was bitter without being cynical, that was softened by humour and marked by penetrating insight, he began ruthlessly to expose the insensitivity, the hardness and the hypocrisy of the class to which he himself belonged. Indeed, in a letter to Edward Garnett in 1910 he wrote: 'This book [*The Patricians*], like *The Man of Property, The Country House* and *Fraternity*, is simply the criticism of one half of myself by the

other, the halves being differently divided according to its subjects. . . . It's a bit of spiritual examination.'[1]

In *The Man of Property* and the succeeding volumes of *The Forsyte Saga*, Galsworthy exposed the Victorian sense of property, which extended even to wives and families. Here he was writing out of his own—or rather Ada's—bitter experience. Irene, like Ada, was married to a man who regarded her as his chattel, and with whom she was sexually incompatible. Soames even asserted his marital rights by force. Galsworthy portrays the subsequent depths of suffering, and bitterly condemns the marriage law which refuses to acknowledge the fact that a marriage can be broken beyond hope of repair. He attacked certain aspects of the law ('one law for the rich and one for the poor' in *The Silver Box*), of the prison system (*Justice*), and society's unfeeling attitude to the weak, the poor and the failure. He advocated, in letters to the press, the reform of the House of Lords, votes for women, censorship reform, help for prostitutes, and better treatment for performing animals and pit ponies. He repudiated the title of propagandist, saying that in his plays and novels he was concerned, not directly with social reform, but with lighting up the emotional features of a dramatic situation. But it is a fact—in which Galsworthy took great satisfaction—that because of one powerful scene in the play *Justice* depicting the horrors of solitary confinement, the then Home Secretary, Winston Churchill, brought a Bill in to the House of Commons which resulted in substantial modifications in the law. Galsworthy exposed, with ruthless irony and amazing impartiality, the conflicts within society—the clash of unyielding prejudices and obstinacy, the violence of the mob, the conflicts of loyalties. He described, with a new realism, society's hypocrisy, its materialism, its indifference to human misery and poverty. Here indeed was a prophet of social righteousness, championing the under-dog, making men face up to the truth about themselves and their society, condemning man's callousness and inhumanity.

Closely allied to this is Galsworthy's compassion. Critics have sometimes spoken slightingly of his 'pity', but that word implies condescension, and although at times this is not entirely absent from his work, his is a tender and sincere love for all who suffer. He had first come face to face with poverty when he had gone collecting rents for his father. He explored many of the slums of London, and as one who had been born with a silver spoon in his mouth, who had hitherto shared the sheltered and affluent life of his class, he was deeply shocked. His latest biographer speaks of 'his horror at the hypocrisy with which his own class, his own family—indeed, to some extent, he himself—buttressed their comfortable lives upon the mass wretchedness of the poor'.[2] He felt deeply the suffering of men and women, especially the outsider, the outcast, the victim of an unsympathetic law or society or church. He believed in the purgative and cleansing power of suffering; Soames, for all his faults—his possessiveness, his ruthlessness, his insensitiveness—gradually mellows and eventually wins our sympathy through his suffering. As he moves slowly, obviously confused, into the modern world he begins to claim our compassion, and his sacrificial death to save his daughter Fleur finally redeems him. His tragedy was, as Galsworthy says, that 'he

might wish and wish and never get it—the beauty and loving of the world'.

Galsworthy was himself high-principled, generous, tolerant, with wide sympathies. One who knew him well once wrote: 'I have never heard him utter a harsh or intolerant word about anyone, not even about those who have attacked him unjustly or spitefully.'[3] He once said of himself, 'When I see a mangy cat or a dog that's lost or a fellow-creature down on his luck, I always try to put myself in his place. It's a weakness I've got.' The Prisoner (in the short story of that title) is surely expressing Galsworthy's own feelings when he says, 'I can't bear things in cages—animals, birds or men. I hate to see or think of them.' He had a deep affection and understanding of animals—his novels (like his own home) are full of dogs and horses, vividly and sympathetically drawn. One of his finest pieces of imaginative writing is the account of the old dog Balthasar in *The Forsyte Saga*, who dies from over-excitement on the return of his master.

Courage was, for Galsworthy, the primary virtue, and had priority even over faith. Writing to a correspondent in 1894, he says, 'After all, it seems to me that Faith is a very little thing compared to Courage. What is it? Only a means to that end; and unless one conscientiously believes, it is childish to try and make oneself do so. The great thing, I take it, is to cultivate a stiff upper lip, both for the world's buffetings, and for what, if anything, we are going into afterwards.'[4] This 'stiff upper lip' is the kind of courage he admires. To keep on, without complaining, without bitterness, without regrets—to the very end. It is exemplified in the story 'The Stoic', where an old man, deserted by his friends and exposed by his enemies, refuses to give in. He is alone, and dying. But he will go out well, without surrender. He has a magnificent dinner. He is already weak on his feet, his legs unable to support him. He has a stroke while reaching for a bottle. He struggles to put it back—refuses to acknowledge defeat—just does it, and dies—gallant, fighting, courageous to the end.

In a letter in 1912 he wrote, 'If I have a philosophy or religious motto it is contained in Adam Lindsay Gordon's words—

> Life is mostly froth and bubble,
> Two things stand like stone;
> Kindness in another's trouble,
> Courage in your own.'[5]

(He had already quoted this in his novel, (*The Country House.*) This defiant courage is expressed in the poem, 'The Prayer'—

> If on a Spring night I went by
> And God were standing there,
> What is the prayer that I would cry
> To Him? This is the prayer:
> O God of Courage grave,
> O Master of this night of Spring!
> Make firm in me a heart too brave
> To ask Thee anything!

Revealed in all his work is a passion for beauty. Hermon Ould says: 'Gals-

worthy thirsted after beauty as the saint after righteousness."[6] He had the soul and sensitivity of a poet. In his essay, 'The Faith of a Novelist', he writes: "The beauty of the world is the novelist's real despair; the heartache that he feels in the presence of Nature in flower. Maybe that ache is part of the sex instinct—a longing for fusion or union with beauty beheld; or, more rudely, might be called greed—the desire for the perpetual and intimate possession of loveliness. The effort to paint or render that loveliness in words is, then, a natural resort, an attempt to slake longing, which achieves, alas! but the mere shadow of fulfilment."[7] His novels are interspersed with descriptions of Nature in its varying moods, a Nature which Galsworthy always spells with a capital N, and with which he feels a sense of kinship, almost of identification. These are not 'purple passages', sentimental and over-written, but poetry that can stir the heart and fill the eyes with tears of longing. One of his poems is entitled 'To Beauty':

> Beauty on your wings—flying the far blue,
> Flower of man's heart whom no God made;
> Star, leaf-breath, and gliding shadow,
> Fly with me, too, awhile!
>
> Bring me knowledge:
> How the pansies are made, and the cuckoos' song!
> And the little owls, grey in the evening, three on a gate;
> The gold-cups a-field, the flight of the swallow;
> The eyes of the cow who has calved:
> The wind passing from ash-tree to ash-tree!
>
> For thee shall I never cease aching?
> Do the gnats ache that dance in the sun?
> Do the flowers ache, or the bees rifling their gold?
> Is it I only who ache?
> Beauty! Fulfil me! Cool the heart of my desire!

In his latter years, every evening before going to bed, Galsworthy would go outside the door of his home, and spend some time quietly looking up at the sky. This became a ritual, almost an act of worship. So he sought to satisfy his longing in contemplation.

But by beauty Galsworthy made it quite clear that he meant more than the beauty of Nature. In a letter to Robert Blatchford (1920) he says—'I don't use Beauty in the mere narrow aesthetic sense. I include in it all that, of course; but I mean by it an increased conception of the dignity of human life."[8] How the man exemplified it in all that he wrote and was!

Finally, we come to his rejection of orthodox Christianity. He will have nothing to do with authoritarianism or dogmatism. He sees through the hypocrisy of the Church—sees how it is always on the side of the wealthy, the powerful, the Establishment. He seems almost to hate the Church. No doubt his own ostracism from respectable society during the years when he was Ada's lover ate into his soul, and there was a bitterness he would never forget, a bitterness partly transferred to the Church, the guardian of conventional morality.

For Galsworthy Christianity was impractical, unattainable, unreal. He believed it was particularly unsuited to the English character—and Galsworthy was the Englishman *par excellence*! Writing to Edward Garnett about *The Man of Property*, he says: 'At the back of my mind, in the writing of this book there has always been the feeling of the utter disharmony of the Christian religion with the English character.'[9] He even contemplated giving to the first book of *The Forsyte Saga* the ironic subtitle, 'Natural Ethics I' or 'Christian Ethics I' or even 'Tales of a Christian People I'.[10] Shelton, a character in *The Island Pharisees*, is standing outside a prison—'And it was suddenly borne in on him that all the ideas and maxims which his Christian countrymen believed themselves to be fulfilling daily were stultified in every cellule of the social honeycomb. Such teaching as "He that is without sin amongst you" had been pronounced impractical by peers and judges, bishops, statesmen, merchants, husbands—in fact, by every truly Christian person in the country.'

Scattered throughout his novels and plays are a number of clergymen, portrayed not too sympathetically. There is Barter in *The Country House*, drawn almost maliciously—a typical representative of the Establishment—hard-drinking, hard-riding, intolerant, obstinate, insensitive—a zealot, yet with a certain dogged courage which compels admiration. There is Strangway, in the play, *A Bit o'Love*—'a gentle creature, burnt within', a tender idealist, who cannot hurt or condemn anyone, even the wife who has deserted him. Too sensitive for this world, beyond the understanding of his parishioners, his last prayer is—"God of the moon and the sun, of joy and beauty, of loneliness and sorrow—give me strength to go on, till I love every living thing.' One feels that life will just sweep him to one side. Pierson (in *Saint's Progress*) is also an artist, unworldly and sensitive, yet in his beliefs absolutely orthodox. To him anything other than conventional morality is unthinkable. His faith is, for the most part, simple and unreasoned. His daughters drift from him—the elder has married a free-thinking doctor who disturbs Pierson with his arguments, and has herself serious doubts about the faith; the younger becomes pregnant by a young officer who is killed in action in France. Pierson blames himself for failing his motherless daughters—even his attempts to pray for them are met with hard resistance. He is caught between his orthodoxy and his love—and suffers agony and loneliness. The most attractive of Galsworthy's clergymen is Uncle Hilary in his last trilogy, *End of the Chapter*; but he is so utterly unorthodox, so completely unconventional and unselfish as to stretch credibility to the limits. It seems that for Galsworthy there are only two kinds of clergyman: the hard, inhuman, orthodox authoritarian, and the idealistic, unworldly sentimentalist.

There are two further ingredients in Galsworthy's philosophy which militate against Christian belief. He believes in fate, in determinism. Men and women are really the sport of the gods—they are swept along by impersonal forces outside their control. A pitiless power governs the destinies of men. If there is a Supreme Being, then He is obviously quite indifferent to men's struggles. There is a passage in *Maid in Waiting*; Dinny sits at the open window, smoking a cigarette. 'The night was neither more nor less "amazing"

than it had been, but her own mood was deeper. Perpetual motion in perpetual quiet? If that, indeed, were God. He was not of much immediate use to mortals but why should He be? When Saxenden tailored the hare and it had cried, had God heard and quivered? When her hand was pressed, had He seen and smiled? When Hubert in the Bolivian wilds had lain fever-stricken, listening to the cry of the lion, had He sent an angel with quinine? When that star up there went out billions of years hence and hung cold and lightless, would He note it on His shirt-cuff?'

The other factor is a kind of Nature-mysticism, where Galsworthy seems to identify himself with Nature, and where his own yearning for Beauty seems to find at least partial fulfilment. He is at one with the stars, the trees, the very pulse of Nature. So young Mark in *The Dark Flower*: 'He stole out presently, and got down to the river unobserved. Comforting—that crisp, gentle sound of water; ever so comforting to sit on a stone, very still, and wait for things to happen round you. You lost yourself this way, just became branches and stones and water and birds and sky.'

He concludes 'The Faith of a Novelist' with this fine passage: 'Truth and beauty are a hard quest, but what else is there worth seeking? Absorption in that quest brings the novelist his reward—unconsciousness of self, and the feeling that he plays his part as best he may. At the back of all work, even a novelist's, lies some sort of philosophy. And if the novelist now writing may for a moment let fall the veil from the face of his own, he will confess: That human realization of a First Cause is to him inconceivable. He is left to acceptance of what is. Out of Mystery we came, into Mystery we return. Life and death, ebb and flow, day and night, world without beginning and without end is all that he can grasp. But in such little certainty he sees no cause for gloom. Life for those who still have vital instinct in them is good enough in itself, even if it leads to nothing further; and we humans have only ourselves to blame if we alone, among the animals, so live that we lose the love of life for itself. And as for the parts we play, courage and kindness seem the elemental virtues, for they include all that is real in any of the others, alone make human life worth while, and bring an inner happiness.'[11]

It is sad that apparently John Galsworthy never encountered a Christian who was orthodox and yet compassionate, practical and yet with one foot in eternity, uncompromising in his goodness and yet deeply sympathetic and understanding of doubt and failure. Sad that he never realized that God is himself a God who suffers just because he cares. Sad that he never knew the Christ of compassion and seeking, redeeming love—the Christ of the Cross. Yet this man's integrity and courage, his compassion and concern, his quest for the unutterable beauty must surely rejoice the heart of God, the God he but dimly saw and imperfectly comprehended.

[1] H. V. Marrot, *The Life and Letters of John Galsworthy*, p. 303.
[2] Dudley R. Barker, *The Man of Principle*, p. 45.
[3] Leon Schalit, *John Galsworthy: a Survey*, p. 26.
[4] *Life and Letters*, p. 96.
[5] *Life and Letters*, p. 709.
[6] Hermon Ould, *John Galsworthy*, p. 237.
[7] 'The Faith of a Novelist' (*Candelabra*, p. 221).
[8] *Life and Letters*, p. 492.
[9] *Life and Letters*, p. 174.
[10] *ibid.*
[11] 'The Faith of a Novelist' (*Candelabra*, p. 222).

TYPES OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITIES

Terence D. Copley

THIS article embodies the results of a survey undertaken for Nottingham University, a survey into the courses and problems of staff and students in Departments of Theology in English universities. How relevant are these courses to the problems of the Church in modern society? To what extent do they undermine the faith of those who learn? Would a degree in Sociology be more useful to the clergyman of today? In an attempt to examine these and related questions, questionnaires were sent to 12 Departments to ask about courses, and Heads of Departments concerned supplied me with much useful information and comment.*

The first question I asked was the number of part-time and full-time staff. Generally there was an even distribution here, though Birmingham has a staff of 8 full-time and 14 part-time—including two Roman Catholics—and Bristol has 4 full- and 20 part-time. The number of part-time staff was directly related to the proximity or otherwise of Theological Colleges. Of the total number of staff just over two-thirds are ordained. The number of students obviously varied so as to defy the calculation of a representative average; in all cases (except Hull) the first year was the largest. Theology may be combined with the following subjects for a Joint Degree: Philosophy, History, Classics, Hebrew, Sociology, English and Music.

The next and main section of the enquiry concerned the actual subjects taught. New Testament and Old Testament Introduction, Theology and History were largely similar and there were no variants worthy of comment. Greek is usually compulsory in the first two years and optional in the third (at Bristol it is not taught in the first year). Hebrew, in comparison, is usually compulsory in the first year and optional after. It is entirely optional at Exeter and Bristol. At Nottingham students are spared the Hebrew lions in the first year unless they are previously skilled in Greek. Hebrew was always regarded as a rather embarrassing black sheep of the theological family, something which one ought to do but which was thought to be a chore. This has been fostered by the fact that there is no general agreement as to how it should be taught, and research into this might lead to more effective teaching and thus encourage interest. I am not in favour of entirely optional Hebrew since this, of all languages, cannot be rejected as an examination option unless at least some attempt has been made to learn it.

There was much variance with regard to Philosophical Theology, Philosophy of Religion etc. At Bristol and on the London B.D.Hons. it is compulsory for 3 years, yet it is absent from Hull. At Leeds and Exeter it is optional. At Nottingham it is optional for examination purposes but attendance at a 2-year lecture course is compulsory. That there should be no

compulsory (if non-examination) course is distressing, since it seems dangerous to produce theologians unaware of the dialogue of philosophy and theology, and the workings of philosophy. Some knowledge of philosophy is essential, though we should not see philosophy as a master of theology, rather it is a great guard-dog that performs a useful and necessary function but must be kept in its kennel.

Similarly there is a disturbing lack of Modern Theology: there is none at London and Exeter, it is optional (Year 3) at Leeds and Hull (Years 2 and 3), compulsory at Birmingham, Bristol and Nottingham. Intellectual Christians and non-Christians tend to be better informed on this than on any other aspect of theology and if people can leave university with an Honours Degree in Theology and know nothing about this, they must lamely answer 'I never studied that' when asked, perhaps, about some aspect of Bultmann's thought.

Church History is generally compulsory for two years (Exeter for three). Ethics is usually optional, though compulsory at Hull. Comparative Religion is compulsory at Leeds and London, not taught at all at Hull and Exeter, and optional at most others. We might note the great problem here: lack of time for the really detailed study required. To what extent can students grasp, say, Islam, in a fraction of the time devoted to Christianity? This need not, however, prevent the effort, and we may conclude that it is a valuable, if limited, option.

Other subjects taught include doctrine (usually compulsory), liturgy (optional at about half the courses surveyed), textual criticism (optional, Birmingham), Reformation (compulsory, Exeter, Hull, Bristol), Church ministry and sacraments (optional, Hull), Medieval period (optional, Bristol), Prayer (compulsory, London), the Oxford Movement (optional, Exeter), Methodism (optional, Bristol), Comparative Sociology of Religion (optional, Exeter) and the study of a particular theologian e.g. Augustine, Bultmann, Tillich (optional, Nottingham).

The number of tutorials per term vary from 20 (average) at Birmingham to 5 at Newcastle, the total average being 11. The number of students present ranges from 1 to 8, the average number present is 2.

In answer to the question 'Are students able to read a subsidiary subject out of their department?' 5 universities said they may, 4 said they may not, Newcastle said they must, and one university said nothing! I would defend the right to read a non-theological subsidiary in Part I. University *is* the place for intense specialization, nevertheless some people may have a subsidiary interest they wish to develop to Part I level. It is as wrong to prevent this as it is to compel students to read a non-theological subsidiary under the fashionable educational delusion that it is wrong to specialize.

Eight universities surveyed have a Theological Society (two have two). Bristol is for graduates only. Hull also integrates into the Hull and District Theological Society. These societies can be very valuable for the integration of the department into the university as a whole, for presentation of original thought and as a forum for discussion.

We now turn to the staff. In the case of ordained staff, and we have seen

that they constitute more than two-thirds of the total staff, many might experience a tension between their role as teacher and as clergyman. Clearly they cannot be regarded as just teachers, for they continue to conduct services and celebrate communion, etc. In one sense their task is that of the Church but their responsibility that of the State. Barth says: 'When properly understood an examination is a conversation of older students of theology with younger ones concerning certain themes in which they share a common interest' (*Evangelical Theology*, English trans. p. 160). Despite this, however, an examination is an affair of the State, involving the participant in a State-recognized qualification at a State-recognized standard.

For teachers of theology there is often a vexed question of staff-student relationships. Is there not, as it were, an ontological difference between them? For a teacher of theology this question is aggravated: not only may he have had students into his home, he may mix with them in Denominational societies, help with their personal poblems, but the students to whom he gives the Sacrament on Sunday may well be his lecture-audience on Monday morning.

As students of theology themselves, they too are involved in questions of personal belief, and yet must attempt to be as impartial as possible in lectures, even though they are involved in personal decision about the nature and value of the material of their lectures. The impartial approach in lectures can, however, prove negative and unhelpful, although it avoids prejudicing the audience. On many occasions I feel students would like to hear an opinion, when admitted to be such, not to believe it without thinking, but to illuminate and relieve what can be a most arid assessment. To avoid the extremities of the 'devil' of aridity and the deep, blue sea of opinion and speculation is no easy task.

In consideration of the students it is important to remember a vital, though little-heeded teaching of Barth on this point:

'No one', he says, 'should study merely in order to pass an examination, to become a pastor or to gain an academic degree.' He places the student of theology in a type of academic apostolic succession. Our teachers were students of teachers regressing right back to those whose only chance and desire was to be pupils of the immediate witnesses to the history of Jesus Christ. Theological study involves participation in that community. Similarly stressing the important task committed to theology, Newman fought those who were in favour of remanding religious knowledge to 'the parish priest, the catechism and the parlour'.

But the major problem is the relevance of theology, or rather theological courses. Are not many of the present courses useless, both for cleric and layman alike? As Hazlitt says,

> The Hebrew, Chaldee and the Syriac
> Do, like their letters, set men's reason back.

Expressed more prosaically, would it not be better for ordinands to read a degree in Sociology? With reference to this type of argument four vital points must be made. First there is no such thing as an objectively relevant course. It

is relevant for X or Y or the needs of Z. Too many people who dismiss theology courses as 'irrelevant' merely mean that they think it is irrelevant *for them*. It must also be remembered that if the principle of utility were applied to all university disciplines the only branches left would be vocational training: parts of Applied Science, Cert. Ed. etc. and pastoral theology. Clearly university courses are not designed to be utilitarian in that sense. Similarly the view that sociology is more apt entails a rosy-spectacled view of sociology that, for example, we should learn 'How to abolish delinquency' (6 lectures), 'What is wrong with society and how to right it' (6 lectures and a Teach Yourself book)—sociology is a discipline as academic as our own. Fourthly, could any minister or teacher have a better basis than the grounding in the literature, language and history of his faith, learned in a non-denominational atmosphere and supplemented by an insight into philosophy and the special problems that it raises?

Then there is the problem I mentioned in connexion with the staff, that of belief. To believe one thing on Sundays and another on Monday morning, or to suspend faith to do theology or to suspend the intellect at times of devotion, is a dangerous process which can lead only to psychological and spiritual disaster. Of course we are influenced by books read and schools of thought studied. This may at the worst lead to atheism (though in such cases is there not basically a drawing out of pre-university latent doubts, etc?) or at least a not inconsiderable change of view. University provides—in the context of the course—an opportunity to learn, to re-think and to re-assess, and this is surely no bad thing.

At this point, however, we must note an inconsistency between the position of the student inside and outside the department in which he works. The demands of the Denominational Societies and those of non-specialist Christians and non-specialist un-Christians are such that the theologian is regarded as a source of information and in some sense an authority, and a help. Thus he may be in the deepest regions of doubt and yet consulted by someone who has a pressing personal problem and regards him *qua* theologian as an authority.

There is also the very thorny problem of the extent to which a theologian might reasonably be expected to participate in 'university religion', i.e. university services, the work of Denominational Societies, etc. These societies naturally use or call on theologians to offer large contributions and there are certain dangers inherent in this. The first is that a parochialism far more concealed yet far more deadly than that of non-university communities might arise. There is also a tendency for students of theology to make this their only university activity. When Christianity is to be the 'career' and life of most graduates in Departments of Theology they might be encouraged, while at university, to enjoy some non-religious activity as well. There is also in university Denominational Societies a tendency to emphasize the academic at the expense of the devotional. This tendency can be corrected in two ways: where there is a theological society let all academic emphasis be handed to that body, and where it is not already practised, communities which worship

in the university should be encouraged to take part at times in city services where the academic element is not usually so prominent.

Another criticism of theology is that it is too much a subject of opinion and speculation. This view arises partly, I think, owing to ignorance and partly owing to the lack of authoritative voice in interpretation and criticism in recent years. This could stifle theological thought among students in that they might be tempted to discuss and write about what X thought Y thought, or why Z thought X thought Y thought what he did, whether Y ever thought that, or whether there was a deutero-Y! This type of argument has its place, but ought not to preclude the risking, here and there, of original thought, if based on a knowledge of the problem in hand, even at an undergraduate level.

This brief sketch has aimed to show an outline of theology as it is now taught to undergraduates, seen by an undergraduate, with an outline of some of the problems confronting staff and students, and comment on some of the criticisms current. When undertaken rightly, i.e., seen as part of a greater whole, theology can be the most rewarding of all disciplines since its reward is not academic alone.

SHORTER SURVEY

John T. Wilkinson

THE Cato Lecture for 1966 is the work of Professor Gordon Rupp, and bears the title *The Old Reformation and the New* (Epworth Press 8*s.* 6*d.*). Small in compass but written by a master-hand, it is rich in profound historical insight and understanding, and withal salted by that pungent wit so characteristic of its author. Regarding the period 1650–1750 as 'the real breakthrough of the modern world', Dr Rupp suggests that it is worth while 'to take a long look' at the Old Reformation of the 16th century, in which he discerns a threefold crisis: a crisis of the Word, a crisis of communication and a crisis of compassion. He sees a Church built upon Divine truth, aflame to bring it home to men, and with a profound concern for human need. He then turns to consider the present ferment and urges that the basic essentials of the old order must be communicated to what is loosely called 'The New Reformation', but which would be better styled 'The New Enlightenment'. Dr Rupp has incisive things to say about what is called 'the New Theology' and 'Radical Christianity'. 'The real parallel between the exponents of radical theology is not with the Reformers at all but with the humanistic groups who preceded the Reformation.' He has wise words for those who are in the ministry, both young and older alike, in the midst of their uncertainties. He gathers up his thoughts in an apt quotation from Dante's *Paradiso* (Canto V): 'Ye Christians, be more steady, not like a feather in the wind.... You have the Old Testament and the New Testament and the Shepherd of the Church to guide you; let this suffice you to salvation.... Be not as a lamb who leaves his mother's milk.' There is the mark of inspiration on these pages, which go still further to indicate that the writer is a prophet in our time.

The name 'Puritan' has a particular historical association, but 'it is not doing violence to the word to apply it more generally to that spirit in religion which has driven men at all times to seek a purer way of life, one that was simple and good as opposed to the insincere conventionalities and corruptions in the world around them'. Such have a passionate desire for righteousness which demands improvement and reform—and this as an essential part of Christianity. This truth is the golden thread which runs throughout a collection of essays and addresses from the pen of the distinguished historian, Dr Geoffrey F. Nuttall, recently published under the title, *The Puritan Spirit* (Epworth Press, 42*s.*). Marked by that exact scholarship and lucid writing which we have come to expect from him, the range of these essays, which represent some thirty years of historical writing, is remarkable. There are fascinating studies in personalities: Bernard of Clairvaux, Erasmus, Baxter, Cromwell, George Fox, Walter Cradock, Philip Doddridge and Virginia Woolf; illuminating studies on the influence of Arminianism in England and

on the relation between Quakers and Puritans (including an essay on Early Quakerism and the Primitive Methodists); penetrating studies on the life and work of the Church and the implications of the Christian Gospel; a moving address on the devotional life of the Christian ministry (in some sense perhaps the most incisive of all in these pages), for which Dr Nuttall asserts three indispensable requirements: 'the large outlook, the ordered life, and the tender spirit'. In his essay on Dante's *Paradiso*, he speaks of 'the correlation of truth and light' and this phrase may well describe the richness of his own volume in which lucidity of writing and charity of spirit are combined with distinguished scholarship. This book should stand as a valuable corrective for the many false notions of Puritanism current in our time.

In *Congregationalists and Creeds* (W. M. Llewelyn Lecture, 1966) (Epworth Press, 2*s.* 6*d.*) Dr Nuttall, himself a Congregational minister possessing a far-reaching similar ancestral background, deals skilfully with the reasons for the hesitant attitude of Congregationalists to creeds, yet affirming that they have always been 'eager witnesses to the Christian faith', and suggesting that 'few Christian communions can offer so much confessional material of a communal character as Congregationalists can'.

During recent years a great deal of attention has been directed to the various sources underlying the life and thought of John Wesley. His studies in the Early Fathera, Anglican and Roman Catholic writers, the German Pietists and the Moravians are significant, yet the most important spiritual heritage underlying Wesley's thought was that of English Puritanism, the measure of which has hitherto not been fully assessed. Some indication of this influence was recently stressed in Dr J. A. Newton's lecture on *Methodism and the Puritans* (1964), but a more comprehensive and indeed definitive study is now available in Dr Robert E. Monk's *John Wesley: His Puritan Heritage* (Epworth Press, 42*s.*). In the first part of his book Dr Monk examines Wesley's use of Puritan literature, not only in *The Christian Library* but also in his general writings, and gives a careful analysis of Wesley's methods of abridgement in the light of theological considerations. He then proceeds to a detailed examination of the theological foundations of the Christian life and its expression in the spheres of the individual, the family, the Church and the world, indicating 'areas of close affinity, and at least the possibility of real dependence'. Dr Monk's thesis shows skilful discernment and his conclusion is undeniable. 'Behind the obvious similarities is substantial evidence of significant interconnection of the two traditions.' In two useful appendices on Wesley's *Christian Library*, Dr Monk shows how closely Wesley followed book-lists which emphasized Puritan writings—and in particular Baxter's bibliography contained in his *Christian Directory* (1673). A full bibliography completes Dr Monk's book, which is the first systematic gathering of material and an assessment of the subject.

In his foreword to the new and revised edition of *A History of the Baptists*, by R. G. Torbet (Carey Kingsgate Press, 50*s.*) first published in 1950, Dr K. S. Latourette writes: 'Nowhere else is there to be found in so nearly and inclusively up-to-date fashion a summary of the people who bear the name of

Baptist.' This is a significant estimate of this important book. The first part deals with Baptist origins; the second with British and European Baptists; the third and largest part with the American Baptists. It is both detailed and comprehensive and is likely to remain the standard book for many years. The book should be particularly valuable for English students, who, though familiar with the British development—e.g. through the *History of the English Baptists* by Dr A. C. Underwood (1957) and the earlier works of Dr W. T. Whitley—are not always aware of the widespread Baptist expansion, which is a world-movement numbering some twenty-four million members. Appendices give statistical tables, a chronological table of the movement, and a list of Baptist schools and colleges in the United States. There is an extensive bibliography. Throughout their history Baptists have preserved 'a warm evangel of personalized religion' which has produced 'a heritage of spiritual freedom and quality' to which this volume bears undoubted witness. The author is Professor of Church History at the Central Baptist Seminary, Kansas City.

Dr Nels Ferré, one of the most outstanding American theologians and a prolific writer, has produced an unusual and challenging book under the title, *The Living God of Nowhere and Nothing* (Epworth Press, 35*s*.), a portion of which was delivered at the Wolverhampton Conference, 1966, as the A. S. Peake Memorial Lecture. It is a profound study, not always easy to read, but considerably helped by recapitulation of the argument as it proceeds. The first chapter, 'God without Theism', is basic for an understanding of the book and opens up the meaning of the unusual title, bringing the subject at once into the area of contemporary debate. Dr Ferré rejects theism as 'an unchristian term' on two grounds: first, because of its association with substance philosophy. 'On this basis God would be the supreme instance of substance, the Supreme Being' (p.8). The Living God cannot be defined 'except in terms of himself'. 'God is the Living God, the all pervading, all relating Spirit': therefore 'the steeple of substance philosophy can crumble and fall, and yet the bells of the Spirit can live on. . . God is no thing. . . and he is no where': therefore God cannot be the Supreme Being. 'Space and time are adjectival to God's work.' The second ground of Dr Ferré's rejection of theism is that the philosophy of process—as expressed in A. N. Whitehead and Teilhard de Chardin—cannot be a satisfactory vehicle for Christian theology, for it regards God as the ultimate in the long chain of the evolution of Being. In an intensive, and to the more orthodox perhaps alarming, chapter on 'The Myth or the Gospel', Dr Ferré distinguishes between the statements 'Jesus is God' and 'Jesus is the Son of God'. He seeks to bring out the full implications of the Trinitarian faith, and essentially to safeguard the full humanity of Jesus—a chapter which reveals the soundness of his christological thought. In the succeeding chapter he faces the problems of biblical interpretation and suggests that 'the Book of God is still being written'. In his section on 'Moralism or Morality' Dr Ferré declares that 'our approach to ethics must avoid alike an arid objectivism and an irresponsible subjectivism'. 'Conscience in itself is far from being the voice of God.' There is the need of an

interpretation 'which can give meaningful motivation without being either externally imposed or internally undependable'. The final chapter deals with the nature of the true Christian community in relation to the concrete problem of the world which now confronts us. Dr Ferré's book needs to be read carefully because of the depth of its argument, and it should be read more than once. It is the product of a sincere and devout mind.

From Cambridge University Press come three further volumes in the 'Cambridge Bible Commentary' on the text of the New English Bible (C.U.P., each 17*s.* 6*d.*; paper ed., 9*s.* 6*d.*; schools ed., 10*s.* 6*d.*). The *Letter to the Romans*, done by Dr E. Best of St Andrews, is a useful and reliable piece of work, clear in its exposition of the text. The *Letter to the Galatians* is by Dr William Neil of Nottingham University, who stands by the South Galatian theory and asserts that the letter was written between Paul's first double visit to Galatia and the Council of Jerusalem, and can therefore be dated A.D. 48 or 49. The *Letters of Peter and Jude* are done by Dr A. R. C. Leaney, also of Nottingham University, who faces squarely the complex problems of authorship, arguing for an early 2nd-century date for both letters of Peter, and that 2 Peter is 'certainly pseudonymous and that 1 Peter may be also, although the early church represented it as authentic'. He further suggests that 1 Pet. 1:3–4:11 may be a paschal discourse set within the 'letter framework' of the rest of the letter. He finds that Jude was written first and that 2 Peter expanded it. A final essay deals with the subject of the Christian Hope.

In *The Gospel Parables* (Hodder & Stoughton, 15*s.*) Edward A. Armstrong, of St Mark's, Cambridge, presents an approach to the subject which is a distinct reaction from the positions held by C. H. Dodd and J. Jeremias as to the nature of parabolic teaching. He questions the idea that Jesus used the parables as a polemic against the Pharisees or that the key to their interpretation lies in the original setting of the ministry of Jesus, in its eschatological aspect. 'There are cogent reasons . . . for a more generous attitude. . . . The *raison d'être* of a parable is to alert the mind and to stimulate or tease it into associative activity.' Fully aware of the findings of modern critical scholarship, Mr Armstrong attempts to set forth the teaching of the parables in terms helpful to those using them devotionally or as teachers and preachers, and so to bridge the gap between academic study and devotional use.

In *Myth and Truth* (Carey Kingsgate Press, 12*s.* 6*d.*) Dr John Knox, of Union Seminary, New York, deals with a difficult problem in a most lucid way. He seeks to assess the value and place of myth in religion and history, being convinced that myth is indispensable for the expression of religious faith—indeed the sub-title of his book is 'An Essay in the Language of Faith'. It is a common presupposition that a myth is, by definition, untrue, suggesting the fanciful and fictitious. Not so, however, for Dr Knox, who defines it as 'an account of the action of God', and is prepared to agree with Bultmann's statement that the word signifies 'the use of imagery to express the otherworldly in terms of this world and the divine in terms of human life'. Yet, as Dr Knox sees it, the myth is more than 'a figure of speech'. 'The myth claims a kind of relation to objective factual truth which other forms of allusive

discourse do not claim.' A further peculiarity of the myth is its claim 'not only to express and describe the felt reality, or quality of an object, but also to account for it, to explain its origin'. In the light of this understanding of the term a new language of religion can emerge which can stand alongside the language of science. These will be different languages and neither can be translated into the other, but they can communicate truth, which in its nature is indivisible.

New Directions in Anglican Theology by R. J. Page (Mowbrays, 21*s.*) is a useful account of the emerging pattern of theological thought during the period 1939–1964—'a survey from Temple to Robinson'. Through the development of earlier events the Church has been 'thrust towards a critical point' (a phrase taken from the Paul *Report*), and is now awaking to the fact. Speaking wisely not in terms of finality but of 'direction', Dr Page proceeds to indicate certain continuing characteristics of Anglican theological writings: a sense of the heritage of the past; 'a marked restraint and moderation, and even distaste, for systematic or dogmatic theology'; a large measure of diversity of opinion and diffusion of doctrinal authority. He then turns to emphasize, first the influence of new developments in biblical theology in the creative work of A. G. Hebert, Archbishop Ramsey and Alan Richardson. A second strand of development is the liturgical renewal, as a unifying factor within Anglicanism in terms of a deeper understanding of the foundations of corporate worship, Dom Gregory Dix in *The Shape of the Liturgy* (1945) being the one most responsible for the revival of liturgical interest in Anglican circles. A third element in theological direction is associated with participation in the quest for unity. Ecumenical discussion has focused itself in the important writings of this period: *The Apostolic Ministry* (1946); *The Historic Episcopate* (1954) and *Old Priest and New Presbyter* (1956). A further feature which has emerged in this period is the challenge to theology, in a way not previously known, to clarify the meaning of its own language. In regard to current ferment of theological thought, Dr Page thinks it unlikely that this signifies the birth of a new theological movement, not least because there is a lack of unifying principles. Such theologies express a Christian Radicalism, and it should be remembered that radicalism is a spirit, or quality of mind, rather than a precise and easily definable theological position. But Dr Page's conclusion is quite definite: 'Because of their tradition of sound and godly learning with its insistence on seeking the truth . . . Anglican theologians are particularly well-suited to make their contribution in an age of profound and increasing religious unsettlement.'

Published as an S.C.M. Paperback (7*s.* 6*d.*) *A Reader in Contemporary Theology* (edited by J. Bowden and James Richmond) is an attempt to map out parts of the vast field of theological writing in the hope that it may prove a useful introduction for sixth-formers, students in college and university as well as for private readers. Issues which lie at the centre of contemporary theology have been chosen, and the excerpts selected should open new doors. Each section contains historical and biographical introductions together with editorial comment. The great Protestant thinkers are represented by Barth,

Bultmann, Tillich and Bonhoeffer; the new developments in Roman Catholic theology by Rahner and Teilhard de Chardin; pioneering discussions of the significance of the Christian faith, of science and of analytical philosophy are included, and finally three British theologians comment upon the contemporary situation. Helped by suggestions of books for further study this *Reader* should prove a valuable introduction.

Paul Tillich's third volume of Sermons, *The Eternal Now*, first produced in 1963, is now available as an S.C.M. Paperback (9*s*. 6*d*.). In this work Tillich 'talks profoundly but not obscurely about such things as loneliness, solitude, forgetting, being forgotten, thankfulness and being afraid' (*Theology*).

The significance of Cardinal Newman was summarized in a remark made by Abbot Butler towards the close of Vatican Council II: 'The themes which Newman was working on and working for at the intellectual level a hundred years ago are now coming to the surface.' Newman's views on the importance of faith, on revealed religion, on free discussion, on the study of the scriptures, on the early church and on the status of the laity have emerged with a new emphasis. 'He wanted Catholics to take their place in the world, to adapt themselves, to enlarge their minds in the confidence that truth could never contradict truth, and to be guided like responsible men by their duly enlightened consciences.' This sentence is from *John Henry Newman* (Nelson, 30*s*.), by Fr Charles S. Dessain, of the Birmingham Oratory, than whom none was better qualified to undertake a new biography in the 'Leaders of Religion' series, for he is the editor of the *Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman* now being published. This biography is therefore an authoritative account of Newman as a religious thinker for whom the fundamental interest was the cause of revealed religion, his devotion to which gave his life its inner unity. In this book, by his deep insight and by frequent excerpts from Newman's own writings and sermons, Fr Dessain lets us into much of the secret of Newman's greatness.

Another book, *Newman on Tradition* (Burns & Oates, 30*s*.), by Dr Günter Biemer, is an important monograph on one strand of Newman's teaching, and of which so far there has been no adequate treatment. In the first part the writer traces the notion of tradition in Anglican theology and then, by an examination of the historical development of Newman's view, proceeds to the construction of a doctrinal synthesis, despite the fact that, as Mgr H. F. Davis, the leading Newman scholar has declared, Newman was 'a notoriously untechnical writer'. This is an excellent study.

One of the most important outcomes of Vatican Council II was the Declaration on Religious Freedom, the text of which is printed in *Religious Liberty: An End and a Beginning* (Macmillan, N.Y., $4.95), edited by J. Courtney Murray, S.J., who was the chief architect of the document itself. In this volume various opinions and interpretations of the Declaration by a group of outstanding scholars of several faiths are recorded, being papers read on the subject at a recent Conference in Illinois. In one of the essays the writer, Fr J. L. McKenzie, S.J., recalls the time 'when a declaration of religious

liberty seemed as unlikely from the Roman Catholic Church as the canonization of Martin Luther'. Of the changes involved the same writer declares: 'The Church can survive the disorder of development better than she can stand the living death of organized immobility. . . . The Church has disclosed her true identity and it will be impossible to conceal it in the future.' This is a collection of valuable papers on this ecumenical issue.

Towards Reconciliation (S.P.C.K. and Epworth Press, 6*s*.) is the Interim Statement of the Anglican–Methodist Unity Commission, which is composed of representatives appointed respectively by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York; by the Episcopal Church in Scotland and by the Church in Wales; and by the Conference of the Methodist Church in 1965, to prepare, on the basis of the 1963 Report, a detailed scheme for union, and to clarify points referred to it by the two Churches, together with a request to revise the Service of Reconciliation and to prepare an Ordinal for use from the beginning of Stage One. It should be borne in mind that nothing in this statement 'necessarily represents the final thoughts of the Commission'—it is *an interim report* and has the value of moving discussion on from the 1965 Report and the debate that followed. One thing stands out clearly—that although differences are bound to exist, *liberty of interpretation is completely safeguarded throughout*. The sincerity of the Commission is seen in its 'deep concern' for those Anglican priests and Methodist ministers who might feel unable for reasons of conscience to take part in the Service of Reconciliation, but this new document ought to go far to remove many doubts previously held.

Letters and Papers from Prison, by Dietrich Bonhoeffer, first appeared in German in 1951, and in an English translation in 1953. The book has had a far-reaching and unanticipated influence, bringing both encouragement and perplexity. It is now issued in a new and revised edition (S.C.M. Press, 22*s*. 6*d*.), in which every word of the English translation has been compared afresh with the German text, resulting in many small changes. Some new material has also been added. Dr Eberhard Bethge, to whom many of the letters were addressed, has written a new Foreword in which he surveys the last fifteen years of discussion of Bonhoeffer. There are also pictorial illustrations showing the setting from which these writings emerged. It is a book that will continue to be read..

The Message and its Messengers, by Daniel T. Niles (Carey Kingsgate Press, 10*s*. 6*d*.) is concerned with 'missions today and tomorrow'. It consists of lectures delivered to Methodist leaders from thirty countries who met at Gatlinburg, Tennessee, in 1964. Beginning with a meditation upon the Divine Faithfulness, Dr Niles declares that the ecumenical task possesses four dimensions:

> There is the dimension of *length*. The task is toward the end and until the end. There is the dimension of *breadth*. The task is set by the churches all around the world in their togetherness and their separation. There is the dimension of *height*. There is always a vertical reference to him who is Lord of all and who is constantly at work. And lastly, there is the dimension of *depth*. The Christian responsibility to penetrate into the life of the world in all its varied forms has to be faced.

Other meditations follow, and the impression made upon the mind is a

sense of the urgency of the work and Dr Niles's commitment to it. Rich in illustrations from the author's experience, it is a call to service.

Today's Ministry and Tomorrow's Church (Mowbrays 8*s.* 6*d.*), the work of Fr Theodore Simpson, C.R., a member of the Community of the Resurrection, Mirfield, presents a study of the biblical theology of the ministry and its significance for the Church of today which is largely divided on this very issue. It is written with the *Conversations* (1963) report largely in mind. For the most part theologians seem to have agreed to differ regarding the ministry, and seek to devise some formula which will enable separated Christians to come together without either affirming or denying any specific view of the ministry, and in particular of the ministry of bishops. Fr Simpson believes that 'the fruitfulness of the work of the ministry within a reunited church would be enormously increased by a greater measure of agreement about the ministry', and with this end in view he offers this brief, detailed and lucid study of the subject and writes throughout in a spirit of Christian charity and understanding.

The Needle, the Pill and the Saviour (Oliphants, 5*s.*) is the result of investigations, in smoke-laden cellars, derelict houses, shady backstreets, in the haunts of 'junkies' in London and other cities, where its author, Keith Bill, a young journalist, came into contact with human wreckage, but also discovered the fine endeavours of a growing company of redemptive workers in this field. This book should be read widely—by ministers, social workers among youth, and especially by the parents of teenage children in this age of growing drug addiction.

The Church of England in South Africa: A Study of its History, Principles and Status, by Anthony Ive (Church of England Information Office, Cape Town, 3*s.*) is a brief but fully illustrated monograph dealing with the developments and achievements, as well as the tensions, of the Anglican Communion in this region, from its entry up to the present time.

A Case for Humane Learning, by Sir Maurice Bowra (Clarendon Press, 3*s.* 6*d.*) is the Romanes Lectures 1966 delivered in the Sheldonian Theatre, Oxford. Defining humane learning as 'the study of man and his works', the author argues for the inalienable rights of pure scholarship. 'The scholarly spirit is of inestimable worth in the social scene. . . . It insists that nothing can be truly understood unless it is examined with the utmost care and precision. . . . No matter how esoteric some humane learning may be, it extends the domain of the understood and encourages a man to believe that he is in a strange way master of things because he can grasp them with his intellect and to this degree make them his own.'

Thomas Gray and The Bard is the subject of an Inaugural Lecture at the University College of Aberystwyth, by Dr Arthur Johnston, Rendel Professor of English Language and Literature (University of Wales Press, 3*s.* 6*d.*). Dr Johnston takes Gray's poem, 'The Bard', the theme of which is connected with the massacre of Welsh poets by Edward I—'Ruin seize thee, ruthless King'—and proceeds to analyse its structure as a Pindaric Ode and presents his own appreciation of the work.

John Clare (privately published, n.p.), Dr C. Xenophontos has arranged to the humbleness of his lot, and, despite his periods of mental aberration, his poems reveal qualities of sympathetic observation. In *The Life and Works of John Clare* (privately published, n.p.), Dr C. Xenophontos has arranged Clare's poetry into three groups: Nature, Love and Philosophical poems, and has added an introductory essay.

RECENT LITERATURE

Edited by John T. Wilkinson

Deuteronomy, by Gerhard von Rad. (S.C.M. Press, Old Testament Library, 35*s*.) Those who have used von Rad's commentary on Genesis or who have read his *Studies in Deuteronomy* will welcome this further translation of his exegesis. The approach is based upon form criticism and on this score alone it is valuable to have a book in which this method is worked out in detail, unpeeling as it were the different layers of tradition. The exegetical comments are normally made upon sections of the text rather than individual verses, and sometimes the reader feels that he would have liked more detail. For example, the notes on the decalogue can only be regarded as sketchy. In the introduction von Rad sets out his theory that the writers of Deuteronomy were Levitical preachers and that the relationship of the book to Josiah's reform is not as close as has often been claimed.

In common with several of the earlier translations of this series of German commentaries, the O.T. Library edition prints the full RSV text. This appears unnecessary and only adds to the cost of the book. This criticism would not apply to the original, of course, where the fresh translation of the Hebrew provides part of the interpretation.

CYRIL S. RODD

The Puzzle of 1 John, by J. C. O'Neill. (S.P.C.K., 17*s*. 6*d*.)
Dr O'Neill entitles this study 'The Puzzle of 1 John'; according to his interpretation the epistle is indeed rather like a jig-saw puzzle to which a great many extra pieces have been added. The task which he has attempted here is to detect and remove these additional pieces.

1 John is normally interpreted as an epistle written in order to combat a docetic heresy. Dr O'Neill, however, sees it as a collection of twelve 'poems', emanating from a Jewish sect, which have been worked over by a Christian author and used to demonstrate the error of those Jews who have failed to accept Jesus as the Messiah. There is certainly much to be said, both for the belief that the background of the epistle is thoroughly Jewish, and for the view that the author's opponents are most naturally understood as Jews. But can it be established that the letter, as we have it, consists of a set of Jewish admonitions plus Christian additions? In order to demonstrate this thesis, Dr O'Neill suggests that we need to reveal a clear poetic pattern in the underlying source; that the source must be large

enough and continuous enough to be demonstrable *as* a source; and that 'there must be an obvious and clearly discernible difference between the theology of the source and the theology of the editor' (p. 3). How far has he succeeded according to his own tests?

It is always difficult to uncover 'poetic structure' in the New Testament: the text can be arranged in many ways. Certainly Dr O'Neill has no difficulty in writing out his basic text in poetic form. But often what he excludes is itself in poetic form, or can be included in the whole structure if a slightly different (and equally convincing) pattern is followed. As far as theological differences are concerned, the contradictions may be more apparent than real; certainly the final editor (if such he is) does not seem to have been aware of any serious inconsistencies. Perhaps the most convincing point in regard to Dr O'Neill's three tests is the fact that the material which remains, when he has removed all the 'Christian comments' and a great deal of material which is not necessarily Christian, is considerable. Over half the epistle can be read without any Christian reference whatever.

In the nature of the case, the kind of thesis which O'Neill presents here is ultimately unprovable. One can only ask 'Is it a reasonable explanation of the evidence?' It is certainly a *possible* explanation, though many will have doubts as to whether it is the most likely explanation. The evidence which he examines can perhaps be equally well explained in terms of a Jewish Christian who uses the ideas and terminology which have long been familiar to him, and which he now reinterprets in terms of his Christian experience. Whether or not one accepts Dr O'Neill's main thesis, however, his book is a fascinating study, which will certainly stimulate further study. A special word of thanks for the inclusion of the Greek text, which makes the argument so much easier to follow.

MORNA D. HOOKER

The Phenomenon of the New Testament, by C. F. D. Moule. (S.C.M. Press, 12*s.* 6*d.*)

The Historical Jesus in the Gospel of St John, by Franz Mussner. (Burns & Oates, 12*s.* 6*d.*)

Jesus and the Zealots, by S. G. F. Brandon. (Manchester University Press, 55*s.*)

'To handle the New Testament means running against the thorny question of *the measuring of history*.' The quotation is from Professor Moule's book but all three are concerned with various aspects of the problem. His enquiry into the implications of certain features of the New Testament is the first volume in the second series of the distinguished 'Studies in Biblical Theology'. He writes both for those who reject Christianity as based on insufficient evidence and for those Christians not satisfied with the claims made for authenticity. The method is to start from certain incontestable facts and to ask how we are to account for them. There is the fact of a new sect having as sole function to bear witness to the conviction that Jesus had been raised from among the dead. There is the fact of the extraordinary conception of the Lord Jesus Christ as a corporate personality. There is the fact of witness to the identity of the Jesus of the earthly ministry with the Lord who was worshipped. These phenomena, selected as demanding explanation, lead to certain conclusions worthy of being called an apologetic, however distasteful the word may be to some. Over against many tendencies in current criticism, Professor Moule, in line with Cullmann, bravely claims that 'the decision to accept Jesus as Lord cannot be made without historical evidence.... We need to know what manner of man Jesus was'. As always, the argument moves coolly, even inexorably, to the conclusion and never presumes on more than the evidence can bear.

We think that in making his case, Professor Moule has cut clean through much of the turgid and involved thinking of the post-Bultmann era and by bringing us back to some of the forgotten simplicities has advanced our cause and case.

Franz Mussner's monograph, in the series *Quaestiones Disputatae*, is a further attempt to grapple with the 'discrepancy' between the Synoptic and the Johannine account of Jesus. He sees the problem to be one of mainly hermeneutics. How does the evangelist *see* Jesus? What is the Johannine 'mode of vision', 'perspective'? In answering these questions Dr Mussner makes use of the hermeneutical work of Hans-Georg Godamer, in the tradition of Heidegger and Dilthey, to analyse St John's 'gnoseological' terminology: see; hear; come to know; know; testify; remember. This leads to the conclusion that the gospel is 'interpretative anamnesis'of the life of the historical Jesus, whereby the actualization of what Jesus said and did takes place for the Church, in this gospel, in an unsurpassable way. Dr Mussner boldly concedes that the Johannine Christ speaks John's language and does not avoid the consequent problem as to the Jesus of history. The manner in which the essential identity is demonstrated in terms of a view of scriptural inspiration is a real *tour de force*. The arguments and phraseology do not always win ready rèsponse from the non-Roman mind but they are well worth perseverance and, to some extent, they help to the understanding of what C. H. Dodd has been saying at greater length. The reader who finds himself at sea is advised to turn to p. 92 where the argument is summarized.

The last book is the largest and, in the long run, the most important. Sub-titled 'A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity', it continues the argument of the author's *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*, and discusses whether, and how far, Jesus was involved in the Jewish resistance movement against Rome. Can 'crucified under Pontius Pilate' be something more than an historical reference? Professor Brandon writes with immense erudition and with a full sense of responsibility in challenging a long tradition of the understanding of Jesus and many precious implications. Whether or not he has given the right answers remains to be seen, but it is certain that the discoveries at Qumran and Masada compel the asking of the questions. These, incidentally, have already been adumbrated in Bo Reicke's assessment of the social ethics implied in the Catholic Epistles. Professor Brandon, commendably, has maintained the historian's discipline throughout. The conclusions of the many-sided investigation (including an important study of *St Mark*) raise fundamental problems of the origins of Christianity. Had the execution of Jesus its original cause in the reaction provoked by his attack on the sacerdotal aristocracy on which Roman rule relied? Did he, in the interests of his spiritual mission, advocate hostile action against those who treated the Holy Land as their possession? And how does all this relate to the traditional picture of 'the mild pacific Prince' detached from current political movements? These are hard and uneasy questions. At the very least, Professor Brandon's massive argument demands that they be taken seriously and before the matter is settled theology must play its part as well as history.

MARCUS WARD

Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus, by Norman Perrin. (S.C.M. Press, New Testament Library, 40*s*.).

A Reading of St Luke's Gospel, by D. W. Cleverley Ford. (Hodder and Stoughton, 21*s*.)

We can agree with Dr W. D. Davies that 'all serious students of the New Testament today are to some extent Form Critics'; but that some are more so than

others stands out very clearly as we consider these two books together. Dr Perrin first came into general view with *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus*, an admirable survey of movements and tendencies hinging on Schweitzer and concluding with an attempt to delineate the lines of development. It is from following up his own suggestions that he has written this book. It concerns the fundamental question as to how far we have any certain knowledge of teaching that goes back to Jesus himself. Dr Perrin was a pupil of T. W. Manson and there is nothing inherently wrong in launching radical criticism against the views of one to whom he, like so many, owes much. It would be generally agreed that conclusions reached mainly within the source-critical age need to be reconsidered, and that Manson's optimism in respect of the authentic elements in the gospel tradition can hardly be justified today. For these reasons we can welcome the opening discussion of a methodology appropriate to the form-critical era. It is the application of the principles and precautions here set out to the reconstruction and interpretation of the material which gives cause for some disquiet. Dr Perrin has gone forward boldly and consistently on the slogan: 'When in doubt, discard'. We cannot be charged with obscurantism if we suggest that this is as unreasonable and unscholarly as the bias of the other extreme which would take every word, preferably as printed in the A.V., *au pied de la lettre*. Such whole-hearted scepticism is not to be justified by the statement that 'the purpose of the book came to be to establish what may be known with reasonable certainty of the teaching of Jesus'. The rigid application of a preconception which we had hoped went out with Schmiedel vitiates much of the otherwise admirable treatment of the teaching gathered under the main headings of Kingdom, Recognition and Response, the Future. In the fifth and final chapter, Dr Perrin returns to the field where he is most at home and has most to give—the concise presentation and evaluation of current discussion, in this case concerning the significance of knowledge of the historical Jesus and his teaching. Herein a most useful discrimination between *historical-*, *historic-*, and *faith*-knowledge is well argued and brilliantly illustrated. Finally, the value of this book has been enhanced by an excellent annotated bibliography. This we may hope the reader may use in order to correct the radical scepticism of the central part of the book. In turning to the other and contrasting treatment, it is not suggested that Dr Cleverley Ford is less concerned with the discipline of scholarship, indeed he has obviously come under the influence of the Conzelmann tradition. In his stress on exposition rather than exegesis, Dr Ford is consistent with what he has written in his well-known *Preacher's Notebooks*. The pattern of the book is controlled by the concept of the Mission of Jesus, rightly accepted as one of the basic themes determining Luke's use of his material. For Dr Ford Luke is to be regarded not so much as historian, or even theologian, but as preacher. Within this pattern the material has been divided and articulated, and all so naturally as to support the original premiss. The exposition, in which good scholarship is used but never obtruded, is not concerned to draw too firmly the lines between the original authentic word of Jesus, the first proclamation by the apostolic Church, and the second-generation use by Luke. The general impression given by the whole is such as to suggest that some blurring of the edges may not be, after all, so bad a thing. Certainly, preachers and teachers, perhaps thrown off balance by the Perrin outburst, will be grateful to realize that there are other ways of viewing and using the material. We must not fail to mention Canon M. A. C. Warren's Foreword which says a great deal, in small compass, about the ministry of preaching today.

MARCUS WARD

Paul, the Man and the Myth, by A. Q. Morton and James McLeman. (Hodder & Stoughton, 35*s.*)

Several years ago, A. Q. Morton published a popular account in a Sunday newspaper of the researches he had made into the authorship of the Pauline epistles with the aid of a computer. Now at last New Testament scholars have the chance to study in more detail the methods of mathematical analysis which he has employed with such striking results.

The book opens with a statement of the problems involved in establishing the authorship of the epistles, and an incisive criticism of the traditional methods. The next (and the main) section of the text gives an account of the methods which the authors claim are objective, and which they have employed on a variety of Greek prose authors in preparation for their tests on the Pauline epistles, and this is followed by a consideration of the differences which the results of these tests might make to our understanding of Paul. Finally, we have 80 pages of tables, setting out the results of the rests.

Any criticism on the part of a reviewer will probably be dismissed by the authors as another example of prejudice, for they seem convinced that almost all New Testament scholars are either knaves or fools who do not want to know about their methods. But many *do* want to know, and will for this reason be disappointed by this book, for it fails in three respects to give the information which we need.

Firstly, it fails to explain how the methods work. The authors complain that New Testament scholars have ignored statistical methods, but their attempt to explain them will win few converts. They quickly forget that their readers are not trained in this particular discipline, and introduce methods and statements with little or no explanation. It needs no little mathematical ability to be able to follow the complexity of their account of the tests they applied, and the normal reader will be left completely baffled by the equations, wondering what the 'chi squared test' is (though if he reads far enough he will discover how, if not why, it is carried out), and what significance 'degrees of freedom' have for the results. Terms which are plain to the statistician will leave the uninitiated in a state of mystification (especially when an example contains a numerical misprint, as on p. 71).

Secondly, the book fails because it does not give us sufficient information about the tests on the Pauline literature. Only 8 out of the 57 pages which explain the method, and 10 out of the 80 pages of tables, refer to the Pauline epistles. Just at that point in the book where its title leads us to expect greater detail, we are given only generalizations: the descriptions of the tests are tantalizingly brief, the tables incomplete and less detailed than some of the earlier ones which deal with other Greek writers. In the text, for instance, the authors tell us about 'chi squared' for the occurrence of *kai* in Romans, I and II Corinthians; what about the other epistles? Neither the text nor the tables explain. The authors cannot blame us if we are left wondering just how significant their conclusions are.

Thirdly, the book fails because the authors do not consider any reason for the differences between the four 'main' epistles and the others, except that Paul did not write the latter. They dismiss any alternative explanation as the product of a reactionary attitude which is afraid of the truth. This is scarcely fair; many of us, indeed, probably feel that it would be no loss for the Church if it were shown that the authors of this book are right, for we should gain confirmation of the existence of other men in the early Church who shared Paul's theological insights. But this does not dispose of our doubts about some of the authors' conclusions. They find, for example, that in some respects the early chapters of both Romans and II Corinthians are inconsistent with the group Romans-Corinthians-Galatians as a

whole. No explanation of this is offered, except that 'these epistles have been shown, by literary analysis, to have anomalies where the statistical evidence indicates them to be' (p. 93). This is an extraordinary statement, for the authors have already rejected 'methods of literary analysis' with scathing comments. In other respects, the *third* of the sections into which they divide Romans and II Corinthians are found to differ from the 'norm'; the anomalies in Romans are explained by the large number of Old Testament quotations in Rom. 9–13, while of II Corinthians the authors write: 'one must have reservations about examining any habit with a periodic element in a composite text' (p. 93). Again, these explanations are surprising; if anomalies in *part* of an epistle can be explained in this way, may not the same or similar explanations be relevant in the case of a whole short epistle? Other epistles may also be composite, or contain non-Pauline quotations. But of what relevance is the possibility that II Corinthians may be composite, and chapters 10–13 a separate letter—since the authors' whole case rests on the premiss that a writer's style does not change from one letter to another? And if the figures for one section of Romans have been affected by the large number of Old Testament quotations, does this not mean that figures for *other* sections will also have been affected to some degree (since Old Testament quotations are not confined to the third quarter of Romans), and does this not mean that the standards by which other epistles are judged may be slightly inaccurate? Once one admits the influence of factors like this, one must consider the implications in every case, and not simply in those which seem to disturb the authors' theories about which epistles are genuine: for one feels that they are as concerned to disprove the authenticity of some of the epistles as the scholars whom they condemn have been to maintain their authenticity. It is impossible to deduce from the information which we are given how close the other epistles are to the 'authentic' group, and to what extent an exceptional circumstance would affect the figures. What difference, for instance, would it make to the pattern of sentence-length in Philippians if the two very long sentences in what is possibly a pre-Pauline quotation in 2:5–11 were omitted?

There is only one thing to be said to the authors of this tantalizing book. Will they please write another, in which they give us much more information and more detailed explanations.

MORNA D. HOOKER

The Church is Healing, by Michael Wilson. (S.C.M. Press, 9*s.* 6*d.*)
Where No Fear Is, by Maurice Nesbitt. (Epworth Press, 13*s.* 6*d.*)

It is remarkable how, in the last thirty years, within the Church the wheel has almost come full circle in the matter of Spiritual Healing and Psychology. When in 1937 the Methodist Conference appointed a Committee on Spiritual Healing, those who led it were regarded not only as eccentrics but also as theological undesirables. The medical profession, as well as the Church, looked askance at the attempt to recover the ancient Christian gift of healing in a scientific age. Now we have the Institute of Religion and Medicine; and the B.M.A. has gone far to recognize the spiritual problems posed by psychosomatic medicine. The climate of opinion has changed.

Between them these two small books reflect that change. Their value is out of all proportion of their size. Dr Wilson has been intimately connected with the Guild of Health. He is a Doctor of Medicine who has practised in Africa and is now a lecturer at St Martin's in the Fields. No one is more qualified than he to treat spiritually and scientifically this fascinating subject of the healing ministry of the

Church. His book is a refreshing contrast to much of the literature associated with it. He stresses the place of the church community in all healing work, whether of the body or the soul. There is an excellent section on prayer which takes it out of that sphere of magic in which it seems to be placed by many 'healers'. He agrees with the Methodist Conference on public healing services. Laying on of hands should be done privately, as it implies the care of the local Christian community. The task of the Church here is to show that God is at work in every new discovery about human personality.

The fact that he himself has been a doctor in West Africa slants his book away from anything approaching quackery. He believes that the mission hospital more truly embodies spiritual healing than much of what goes under that name in Britain today. He enters an intensive plea for some training in human relations to be given to the ordinary Church member, pointing out what is often forgotten, that the Church has a unique function in after-care, especially in the case of mental patients.

He says some hard and not altogether justified things about the lack of psychological training in theological colleges. The present reviewer can testify from his own experience that this is not true of our Methodist colleges. Pastoral psychology is receiving now a better and more expert treatment in them than it has ever done. But this is certainly a book to be read, the best small book on the subject. It is original, arresting and entirely down to earth.

Maurice Nesbitt illustrates from his own experience the truth of what Dr Wilson has been saying. An Anglican parson, he has himself known the horrors of a shattering neurotic illness. In *Where No Fear Was* he strikingly reveals how he found deliverance and health through a new and vivid understanding of the truths of the Gospel. There are many new insights in his book, and here and there statements which seem psychologically dubious. But taken as a piece of living spiritual experience, what he says brings home the fact that modern psychology can indeed be a servant of the Gospel.

The two books should be read together, the first laying down some general principles, the second shewing how they work out in actual life. Together they present an informed apologia for the Church's ministry of healing which cannot well be refuted.

JOHN CROWLESMITH

The Church in the next Decade, by Eugene Carson Blake. (Macmillan, $4.95.)

This book is a collection of essays, articles and sermons on subjects which the author regards as important for the Church in the next decade. The author is a minister, and has for some years been a leading official, of the American Presbyterian Church. He is widely travelled, and is in close touch with movements of thought and practice throughout the modern world. Since he is the newly appointed General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, interest will centre in what this book reveals of his personality, character, outlook and ability.

As might be expected, Dr Blake devotes several chapters to the world-wide movement for Church Union, which he heartily supports. He is thoroughly convinced that complete visible organic union is Christ's will for his Church, and that such a union would greatly advance the cause of Christ in the world. He does not hesitate to speak of our present organic disunity as 'a scandal and a sin', and to declare that the Ecumenical Movement must include the Roman Catholic Church. The coming United Church, he says, must be 'evangelical, catholic and reformed'. People will differ, no doubt, in their evaluation of many of his statements and

arguments on this issue, but all will appreciate the depth and sincerity of Dr Blake's convictions, and the charity and ability with which he sets them forth. His general attitude will best be gathered from the following quotation from his preface: 'I feel that the Ecumenical Movement is best served when it is regarded, not as a quest for the lowest common denominator upon which Christians can co-operate, but rather as the interaction of loyal representatives of distinct traditions under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.' He believes that we all have 'much to contribute and much to learn from other Christians'.

Dr Blake is a strong churchman. He believes that 'organized Christianity' is vital to Christianity. While he accepts 'The Right of Private Judgment', he is opposed to 'that rampant individualism which lightly breaks the corporate fellowship of the Church'. The Holy Spirit operates, at least usually, he believes, through the Church, though he rejects the doctrine, 'no salvation outside the Church'. The book also deals with several other ecclesiastical issues such as 'The Crisis in the Ministry' and 'The State and Religion in the Schools', and also pressing social problems like 'The Colour Problem', 'Unamerican Activities', and 'Poverty—National and Individual'. In all these, he reveals a clear grasp of the issues involved, and courage and sanity in dealing with them.

Dr Blake's book is intrinsically well worth buying; but additionally so, because it sheds much light upon the type of leadership and guidance the World Council of Churches is to be given in the future. This, surely, is important.

HENRY T. WIGLEY

Sex in Christianity and Psychoanalysis, by William G. Cole. (Oxford University Press, 12*s.* 6*d.*)

Professor Cole combines real scholarship with an attractive and readable style. It is this combination which makes his book as enjoyable as it is useful. It was first published in 1955, but it remains one of the best historical surveys of the varying Christian approaches to an interpretation of sex. It also deals very competently with the views of Sigmund Freud and of several other well-known psychoanalysts. There is, therefore, every reason to welcome the cheaper Galaxy Edition of the book now made available by the Oxford University Press.

The First Part of the book presents a critical survey of the Christian tradition with its roots in the Old Testament, developing through Jesus and St Paul, the Church Fathers and the Protestant Reformers. It is a somewhat depressing record and what makes it so is the influence of a negative dualism and an androcentric emphasis which survives even in an age when at long last the concept of sex equality is emancipating both women and men. The works of various modern writers are reviewed. The pioneering work of Leslie Weatherhead is recognized in eight whole pages. It is a pity, however, that this new edition of Professor Cole's work could not have referred to the important recent contributions of Dr Sherwin Bailey in this field.

In the Second Part of the book, there is a full recognition of the need to expose traditional views to the findings of modern psychology. But the final section is rather disappointing. In this, Dr Cole attempts a critical reconstruction. It is good as far as it goes. Ten years ago it excited the hope that the author would develop this section further, but unhappily it appears unchanged in the new edition.

KENNETH G. GREET

Faith and Philosophy, by James Richmond. (Hodder and Stoughton, 16*s.*)

Students (no age-limit implied) need to read the great thinkers for themselves, but

it is the rare student who can readily assert that he has so grasped the essential contribution of some philosopher as to make a balanced judgement at a first reading. There is always need for books about books. James Richmond's *Faith and Philosophy* is an excellent introduction to contemporary philosophical theology. The first chapter brings out the strength of the position adopted by Hume and Kant, who each in his own way disposed of *knowledge* to make room for *belief*. A second chapter, dominated by Schleiermacher, shows how the 19th-century thinkers developed this concept of a religion based on faith rather than reason. The third chapter analyses the attempts made to ground religion in morality, while the remaining chapters examine the implications for religion of the thought of Barth and Bultmann and of contemporary linguistic philosophers. This outline introduction to the contemporary discussion is concise without being scrappy, and provides, within the self-limitation imposed by the author, who deals with a few thinkers at length while only mentioning others in passing, a good book that can be recommended to ministers and laymen. It is one of a series under the general title 'Knowing Christianity', and as prices go these days good value for money.

BERNARD E. JONES

A Christian Natural Theology, by John B. Cobb, Jr. (Lutterworth Press, 35*s*.)
'What is a Christian natural theology?' asked Alice as she tumbled down the theological treacle well. 'If it's Christian it can't be natural, and if it's natural it can't be theology.' But things have changed. Theology is more and more infected or transformed (according to one's viewpoint) by natural theology. Whitehead's philosophy was not specifically Christian. He set out in his Gifford lectures, *Process and Reality*, 'to frame a coherent, logical, necessary system of general ideas in terms of which every element in our experience can be interpreted'. John B. Cobb has taken this system, altered it here and there, and attempted to show that it is compatible with Christian thought. He admits that a Buddhist could take the same philosophy and turn it into a Buddhist natural theology. This is not the point. The Bible does not provide a metaphysic satisfactory to the modern mind and so the believer must provide one from other sources. It is in this sense that John R. Cobb has adapted Whitehead's philosophy as the basis of a Christian natural theology. When the theologian is appealing to the general experience of mankind he is engaged in Christian natural theology; when he is directing his thought to that revelation of truth given to his particular community he is in the realm of Christian theology proper. Cobb acknowledges that natural theology of itself cannot provide theological conclusions which will meet with general acceptance, nor would it do for a religious faith like Christianity to be tied to a particular metaphysic which might well change in a decade. (Christianity has suffered too much from this in the past.) Natural theology provides a way of thinking about the world in the light of Christian insights, and Cobb's claim is that Whitehead's philosophy serves this purpose best in the second half of the 20th century. Obviously the reader who knows his Whitehead will get more out of this book, but even those who are not so familiar with Whitehead will learn much of his philosophy, for the author is always careful to distinguish between the text and his own commentary. This is a stimulating work.

BERNARD E. JONES

The Mormons, by Robert Mullen. (W. H. Allen, 30*s*.)
I could have tolerated the pedestrian style of this book, had the contents not been

pedestrian as well. It is, in fact, a book of missed opportunities. In part this is due to the fact that, though the author disclaims being a Mormon, his tone is uniformly eulogistic; even appreciation lacks point unless there is the power of perceptive criticism. What to most people would seem incredible in the appearance of God the Father and God the Son to Joseph Smith, followed by the visitation of Moroni, who showed him where to find the book inscribed on golden plates, is just stated baldly as Joseph himself told the story. In the same incredible fashion the author speaks of a Jerusalem family in 600 B.C. who built a ship and sailed westward, landing on the American Continent. From this family sprang two nations, the Nephites and the Lamanites. The Lamanites turn out to have been the American Indians, but the Nephites had a prophet called Mormon who was able to keep his people in the right way. It is from these people, therefore, that the Mormons have come. Pushing the points of credibility still further, the author states their doctrine without comment, even the weird process of baptism for the dead so that they also may be saved and the families kept united. Incidentally, how astonishing it is that in their temples vast vaults of genealogical tables should be preserved in this attempt to sustain the identity of a family down the generations! This emphasis on the continuing family may be illustrated by two verses from the favourite hymn of the Mormons:

In the heavens are parents single?
No; the thought makes reason stare.
Truth is reason; truth eternal
Tells me I've a mother there.

When I leave this frail existence—
When I lay this mortal by,
Father, mother, may I meet you
In your royal court on high?

Let no one suppose, however, that the author has given a complete digest of Mormon belief for there is the barest reference to the conception of the Kingdom of God being established in Utah itself and the thirteen articles of Joseph Smith set down here have been so expanded that the author outlines rather than amplifies the tenets by which they live. Chiefly the book is historical, tracing from the first beginnings the remarkable expansion of the Mormons throughout the world. Here the author is on firmer ground. This strange cult is spreading even in our own country and in America, especially on the west coast and in the islands of the Pacific, and now on the mainland of Asia the progress is sustained. One could wish that in his own interests Robert Mullen had come more closely to grips with the reason for this prosperity. First, it must be admitted that most people are not theologically minded, and therefore stumbling blocks to the few present no special difficulties. What they eagerly seize upon in their Creed is the idea of the family not separated even by death. It is a western form of ancestor worship and family loyalty. Secondly there is the cosy feeling that what Jesus was, in his day, Joseph Smith was for a later age, and therefore to belong to his people is to belong to the people of God on whom the Kingdom will come in all its fulness. Thirdly there is the note of joy and fellowship which runs through the worship and the activities of the Church. In Mormon churches that I have visited the architecture reveals this 'togetherness' in worship, linking elders and people; and the side rooms, with their ample provision for social and recreational activities, all emphasize the idea of fun in religion.

The book, therefore, is entirely relevant, because it discusses one of the modern sects with the greatest ratio of increase, but it must be sadly confessed that the author has missed his way. The faithful may be pleased but the uninitiated will be as puzzled as ever, and their questions will remain unanswered.

MALDWYN EDWARDS

Events and their Afterlife: the Dialectics of Christian Typology in the Bible and Dante, by A. C. Charity. (Cambridge: University Press, 60*s*.)

The culture in which Israel grew up was 'saturated with myth'; it was marked by 'a terror of history' and by ritual 'evolving a technique of evasion'. Israel, on the other hand, demanded faith in Yahweh as 'the Lord of history'; and faith in Yahweh as one who combined newness in creation with steadfast love made it possible both to interpret the present and to predict the future in terms of God's mighty acts, unknowable yet promised. Every present is at once the fulfilment of past promise (or at least its 'subfulfilment', the first stage of its fulfilment) and the promise of future fulfilment; and this future fulfilment in turn casts its light back on to the present. At every point man is confronted with the action of God calling him to responsible decision in free surrender to God's purpose: the imperative is embedded in the indicative.

For Christians the one 'absolute norm of divine action and human existence' is in 'Christ's history', where we see 'Christus Recapitulator'. As Son of Man and as Servant, Jesus uniquely fulfils what God demanded of Israel and Israel had yielded but imperfectly; in his own present Jesus alone 'perfectly responds'; he is also 'in some sense living the life of the future' Kingdom. At every point man is confronted in Christ with what is both gospel and challenge, 'eschatological news and existential vocation', the call to conversion, repentance and newness of life.

In some such fashion we may summarize the first two parts of this book. The third part is devoted to the *Divine Comedy*, and it was 'the conception of the *Comedy*' underlying this which 'prompted the whole investigation'. For professionally Dr Charity is neither a biblical scholar nor a theologian but a literary critic, a Lecturer in English at the University of York. 'Admittedly and centrally (as distinct from canonically) Christian', 'in nothing', Dr Charity contends, is the *Comedy* 'as close to the Bible' as in its typology, both its typological structure and its application of typology to the confrontation of the reader with the purpose of God. 'Its own methods and uses are those of the Bible': 'the light of eschatology is cast back on historical life: the future is made to involve the present, the past is fulfilled in the future.' Dante's 'journey is a "subfulfilment" of the Christ-event'; it is also, for the reader as well as for Dante, 'a means of righting the will, of bringing about a change of life'. For Dr Charity, the 'existential' aspect of typology is fundamental.

This is a distinguished book. Its manner is academic-conversational, its bibliography multilingual. Its special interest lies in the juxtaposition of Scripture and Dante. For one student of both, typology, as Dr Charity expounds it, has for once become not only intelligible but exciting.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL

Shakespeare in the Light of Sacred Art, by Martin Lings. (Allen and Unwin, 25*s*.)

When I saw the title in Gothic lettering on the dust-jacket I feared the worst. It is never clear what Mr Lings means by 'Sacred Art'. A few references to Dante and some generalizations about 'mysticism' hardly amount to 'Sacred Art'. Statements

like the following are characteristic: 'The essential feature of man's primordial state was the union of his soul with the Spirit.' 'Desdemona symbolizes the Spirit.' 'Isabella's marriage . . . means no less than the perfected soul's union with the Spirit.' 'Lear's throwing away "the pearl" represents the Fall. He is not banished from Paradise, which in this play is symbolized by the presence of Cordelia.' Some light is thrown upon the ten plays which are discussed, but the book completely fails to justify its pretentious title.

ALAN WILKINSON

'Starre of Poets': Discussions of Shakespeare, by Hayes and others. (Carnegie Series in English, No. 10, Pittsburgh.)

This collection of lectures on broad aspects of Shakespeare's work is exemplary teaching material for training college and liberal arts tutors; the scope is too wide for sixth-formers, too cursory for undergraduates, but exactly right for the modest scholarship attainable by teachers and learners in the cinderellas of higher education. The essays exemplify the art of summary with the minimum of distortion, and they are written with a graceful clarity that is characteristically American.

There are weaknesses, also distinguishably American. The peroration to an admirably untheoretical, practical exposition of the Sonnets is embarrassing; the account of the Histories is superficial and sentimental—figuring 'this blessed plot, this earth' and old Jack Falstaff and the writer's own barely disguised evening of life; and the essay on the Dark Comedies opens with unfortunate references to the 'unmatched tragedies', 'the sunny world' of the romances, and '. . . this realm, this England'. But four of the five contributions are substantially very good. The analysis of the pattern of *Troilus and Cressida* and the review of the changing role of the Fool in the comedies provide the student with just the preliminary direction he needs for his own investigations; and the essay on the Tragedies selects the Aristotelian-Plutarchan ideal of *sophrosyne* and traces its unhappy absence from the various natures of Shakespeare's protagonists.

A. C. CAPEY

The Art of Prayer, An Orthodox Anthology, compiled by Igumen Chariton, ed. Timothy Ware. (Faber, 50*s*.)

The 'death of God' is partly the result of the spiritual hollowness of the confidently dissective tradition of western theology, divorcing theology from prayer, confusing information with knowledge. Orthodox teaching about prayer can be of great help here, for mental pictures (which have played such a large part in western teaching about prayer) have only a very restricted place in eastern prayer. 'Whoever sees nothing in his prayer, sees God. 'The compiler of this anthology, first published in 1936, was a Russian monk. It is mainly concerned with the Jesus prayer, 'Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy upon me'. Around these few words many Orthodox have built their whole spiritual lives. To appreciate this anthology one has to begin by agreeing with St Irenaeus that 'the vision of God is the life of man'. Timothy Ware provides us with a most instructive thirty-page introduction, and there is a select bibliography.

ALAN WILKINSON

The Chronicle of the Worker-Priests, ed. Stanley Windass. (Merlin Press, 25*s*.)

This book, translated from the French, is a calendar of events, containing a fair balance of opinions on all sides of the question. A hope was born, then cruelly stifled. As long ago as 1929, Surhard wrote that Christ was unknown in the great

factories of his diocese. During the war, twenty-five priests were secretly sent to be worker-chaplains to the 800,000 Frenchmen deported to Germany. All but one were arrested, two died in concentration camps. They discovered for themselves the virtually complete de-Christianization of the working classes, and the abyss which separated them from the thought-world of the Church. After the liberation, the worker-priest movement grew out of this experience. From the beginning many priests found that identification with the workers led to alienation from the Church, 'to feel as foreign as a real proletarian when you go into a presbytery, or into a church'. It also naturally led to participation in working-class politics, and many of the priests grew to regard Communism in a much more favourable light. But in 1949 the Holy Office excommunicated all those who knowingly defended the doctrines of Communism. During the demonstration against the visit of the American General Ridgeway in 1952, two priests were arrested and beaten up; the Nuncio telephoned directly to Rome; 'the cause of the worker-priests was finally lost on that day.' In January 1954 the worker-priest experiment was suspended on orders from Rome. For fifteen years the Right had tried every means to discredit it. Fr Perrin wrote of 'the distress of millions of souls, whether Catholics or not, who through us had begun to catch a glimpse of Christ in the Church'. Rome simply would not believe that the working classes were de-Christianized, though at the port of Rouen only one out of 700 workers was a practising Catholic, and in another section of industry half were unbaptized. With the tragic events at Sheffield still fresh, we are in no position to believe that we are any more willing to face the immense changes in attitude that would be required if we took such facts seriously. (On page 16 an incident from the English situation is misleadingly presented as though it represented the total English response.)

ALAN WILKINSON

Colonialism and Christian Missions, by Bishop Stephen Neill. (Lutterworth Press, 42*s*.)

This important book by the Professor of Missions in the University of Hamburg and former Associate General Secretary of the World Council of Churches is the first general survey to be published on this subject. It brings together material from various areas of the world and over a considerable period of history. Bishop Neill is concerned only with the relationships between the forces involved in the processes of western expansion and control and the forces underlying the missionary expansion of the Christian Church. The first chapter on 'The Colonial Idea' traces the background of western colonialism in three types of colonial enterprise: (i) the Greeks and their colonies which arose from the natural overflow of citizens; (ii) the Romans, whose colonists were set to guard the frontiers of empire, and who were an aristocracy determined to keep under control an inferior and potentially dangerous population; (iii) the Trading Settlement without thought of political dominion. These types are cited as providing the patterns which recur in all the subsequent history of colonialism. The chapter also gives an extensive treatment of the Crusades and the intellectual ferment they produced among the thinkers of the Middle Ages, a ferment in which the principles of 'legality' played a decisive part. The book gives a masterly objective survey of its subject on a world scale, with a particularly important chapter on 'Africa and the Western Powers' in which the activities of the colonizing nations are treated in critical detail. The work ends with a summary of conclusions drawn from the survey analysing the state of affairs existing fifty years ago and in 1965. The comparison of these two states illuminates the extraordinary rapidity of change in the last half-century in activity

and thought. Bishop Neill concludes that Mission will continue to the end of time and that the tension between total engagement with men in their needs and total detachment from them in their desires is the permanent situation of the Church seeking to accomplish that Mission. An extensive bibliography and index add to the value of this book which will set the standard in this field for many years to come.

DOUGLAS H. PRESCOTT

The Christian Response to the Asian Revolution, by M. M. Thomas. (S.C.M. Press, 7*s.* 6*d.*)

In these Duff Missionary Lectures for 1965 Mr M. M. Thomas, an Indian layman, who is the Director of the Institute for the Study of Religion and Society at Bangalore, South India, gives us a far-sighted appraisal of the Asian situation. He lays bare the contribution to and the responsibility for the Asian revolution which comes from Western humanism, Western technology and Western Christianity. He sets out the four major patterns upon and through which Asian States are seeking to find and to build their nationhood and, at the same time, to do justice to both the secular and religious requirements of their peoples. In the fourth lecture he seeks to show the way in which Christianity can best contribute to this search for nationhood in the East. The task of Christianity is to inspire other religions and secular faiths to define their own bases in personal terms, to set up and to maintain the integrity of personal values. The emergence of a just personal humanism in Asia is dependent upon the Christian Church taking up its true prophetic ministry, but, Mr Thomas warns, 'only a Church which has developed its prophetic *being* can exercise a prophetic ministry'. Through Western secularism and Christianity, Asia has been awakened to the personal dimension of human existence; the Mission now is to present the message of Jesus Christ, and Christ himself, in terms which are intelligible to the peoples of Asia as they seek their own true nationhood. Not all of Mr Thomas's observations and opinions will be accepted without argument, but any who seek either to understand what is happening in Asia and Africa today, or to serve Christ in those continents will ignore them at their peril. This is a book which all missionaries in training for service in both Africa and Asia should study carefully long before they embark. For those who doubt the necessity for modern missionary involvement this book will open out new depths of service which the Church must fulfil. The footnotes offer useful guidance for further reading. It is a pity that the text suffers from eight or nine misprints.

HARRY PARKIN

BOOKS RECEIVED

ALLEN, W. H.: R. Mullen, *The Mormons*, pp. 314, 30*s.*

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: A. C. Charity, *Events and their Afterlife: The Dialectics of Christian Typology in the Bible and Dante*, pp. 288, 60*s.* *Cambridge Commentary on the New English Bible:* A. R. C. Leaney, *Letters of Peter and Jude*, pp. 144, 17*s.* 6*d.* (Schools ed. 10*s.* 6*d.* Paper 9*s.* 6*d.*). W. Neil, *Letters to the Galatians*, pp. 96, 17*s.* 6*d.* (Schools ed. 10*s.* 6*d.*, Paper 9*s.* 6*d.*). E. Best, *Letter to the Romans*, pp. 184, 17*s.* 6*d.* (Schools ed. 10*s.* 6*d.*, Paper 9*s.* 6*d.*)

BURNS & OATES: Yohanan Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible: A Historical Geography*, pp. 410+maps, 63*s.*

CAREY KINGSGATE PRESS: D. T. Niles, *The Message and its Messengers: Mission Today and Tomorrow*, pp. 128, 10*s.* 6*d.*

CLARENDON PRESS: M. Bowra, *A Case for Humane Learning* (Romanes Lecture 1960), pp. 29, 3*s.* 6*d.*

DARTON, LONGMAN & TODD: T. C. Akeley, *Christian Initiation in Spain, c. 300–1100*, pp. 220+plates, 35*s.*

EPWORTH PRESS: *Congregationalists and Creeds* (W. M. Llewelyn Lecture, 1966), pp. 19, 2*s.* 6*d.* G. Rupp, *The Old Reformation and the New* (Cato Lecture, 1966), pp. 65,

8*s.* 6*d.* J. Haroutunian, *God with us: A Theology of Transpersonal Life*, pp. 318, 35*s.* J. D. Smart, *History and Theology in the Second Isaiah, 35, 40–66*, pp. 304, 35*s.*

GLEEUP (Lund): E. J. Sharpe, *Not to Destroy but to Fulfil: The Contribution of J. N. Farquhar to Protestant Missionary Thought in India before 1914*, pp. 387, 35 Sw.Kr.

HERDER/BURNS & OATES: G. Biemer, *Newman on Tradition*, pp. 209, 30*s.* F. Mussner, *The Historical Jesus in the Gospel of St. John*, pp. 174, 12*s.* 6*d.*

HODDER & STOUGHTON: D. W. Cleverley Ford, *A Reading of St Luke's Gospel*, pp. 256, 21*s.* E. A. Armstrong, *The Gospel Parables*, pp. 219, 15*s.* J. Hillman, *Insearch: Psychology and Religion*, pp. 117, 21*s.*

HOLT, REINHART & WILSON: W. H. Maehl, Jr., *The Reform Bill of 1832*, pp. 122 n.p.

INTERNATIONAL PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION: C. Xenophontes (ed.). *Life and Works of John Clare*, pp. 233, n.p.

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: H. A. Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation*, pp. 334, 35*s.*

MACMILLAN (N.Y.): E. C. Blake, *The Church in the Next Decade*, pp. 182, $4.95.

MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS: S. G. F. Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots*, pp. 414 + plates, 55*s.*

MOWBRAY: C. E. Pocknee, *Infant Baptism, Yesterday and Today: The Case for Baptismal Reform in the Church of England*, pp. 31, 6*s.* R. J. Page, *New Directions in Anglican Theology: A Survey from Temple to Robinson*, pp. 208, 21*s.*

OLIPHANTS: K. Bill, *The Needle, the Pill and the Saviour*, pp. 94, 5*s.*

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: P. McNair, *Peter Martyr in Italy*, pp. 325 + plates, 55*s.*

S.C.M. PRESS: G. Ainger, *Jesus our Contemporary*, pp. 112, 6*s.* 6*d.* J. Macquarrie, *Principles of Christian Theology* (Library of Philosophy and Theology), pp. 470, 50*s.* Neville Clarke, *Interpreting the Resurrection*, pp. 125, 9*s.* 6*d.* C. F. D. Moule, *The Phenomenon of the New Testament* (Studies in Biblical Theology, 2nd series), pp. 120, 12*s.* 6*d.* J. J. Stamm and M. E. Andrew, *The Ten Commandments in Recent Research* (Studies in Biblical Theology, 2nd series), pp. 119, 15*s.* E. Bethge, *Dietrich Bonhoeffer: Letters and Papers from Prison* (revised edn.), pp. 236, 22*s.* 6*d.* Alan Booth, *Not only Peace*, pp. 142, 21*s.* D. E. Jenkins, *The Glory of Man* (Bampton Lectures, 1966), pp. 118, 18*s.* P. Tillich, *The Eternal Now* (cheap edn.), pp. 160, 9*s.* 6*d.* J. Bowden and James Richmond, *A Reader in Contemporary Theology*, pp. 191 (paper-back), 7*s.* 6*d.* L. Hodgson, *Sex and Christian Freedom: An Enquiry*, pp. 128, 9*s.* 6*d.* Max Warren, *Social History and Christian Missions*, pp. 190, 27*s.* 6*d.* J. C. Hockendyk, *The Church Inside Out*, pp. 206, 15*s.* A. H. Van den Heuvel, *The Humiliation of the Church*, pp. 192, 15s. Norman Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (N.T. Library), pp. 272, 40*s.*

UNIVERSITY OF WALES: A. Johnston, *Thomas Grey and The Bard: An Inaugural Lecture*, pp. 23, 3*s.* 6*d.*

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

Expository Times, January 1967

Recent Books on Philosophy of Religion (1951–66) by Bernard E. Jones.

Sex and Morality, by J. R. Gray.

First Aid in Counselling: XII. The Sixth-Form Agnostic, by H. G. Dickinson.

Reunion—A Scottish Precedent, by J. S. MacArthur.

Expository Times, February 1967

First Aid in Counselling: XIII. The Mother whose children are grown up and no longer need her as once they did, by W. L. Carrington.

The Relevance of the Logos Christology, by D. Hill.

The Society for Old Testament study, 1917–1967, by F. F. Bruce.

Dialogue Preaching, by Brian A. Greet.

Harvard Theological Review, July 1966

Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in later Persian and Hellenistic Times, by F. M. Cross, Jr.

God, Faith and the Theological Object—an Historical Dialectic, by C. Welch.

Two Concepts of God, by J. Lachs.

The Changing State of Moral Authority, by D. R. Burill.

Notes on the Text and Transmission of Apocryphal Psalms 151, 154, by J. Strugnell.

The Death of Adam—an Armenian Adam Book, by M. Stone.

An Instance of Early Greek and Jewish Synthesis, by B. W. Dombrowski.

Harvard Theological Review, October 1966

Doing Theology Metaphysically: Austin Farrer, by J. Glasse.

Patristic Arguments against the Eternity of the World, by H. A. Wolfson.

Jewish-Christian Disputation in the Setting of Humanism and Reformation in the German Empire, by H. H. Ben-Sasson.

In Question of the Historical Rabban Yohanan Ben Zakkai, by J. Neusner.

Max Weber Revisited: The 'Protestant Ethic' and the Puritan Experience of Order, by D. Little.

The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Pauline Letter Collection, by C. P. Anderson.

International Review of Missions, January 1967
World Survey of the Year, 1965–6.
Roman Catholic Missions, 1965–6, by J. Beckmann.
Joint Action for Missions in relation to Confession, by Hans-Werner Gensichen.
The Post-Colonial Crisis of Mission, by Kai Baago.
Interpretation, January 1967
The Kerygma of the Book of Jonah, by G. M. Landes.
The Biblical Idea of History, by D. N. Freedman.
Apocalyptic Eschatology, in 1 Cor. 15, by H. W. Boers.
The Divine Sonship of Jesus, by I. H. Marshall.
One in Christ, Vol. III, 1967, No. 1
Recovery of Unity, by the Archbishop of Canterbury.
Ecumenism in the Decree on the Missionary Activity of the Church, by A. G. de Pelichy, O.S.B.
Mission in the Spirit of Ecumenism, by M-J. de Guillou, O.P.
The Church's Missionary Obligation, by V. E. W. Hayward.
The History of the Malines Conversations, by R. Aubert.
The Malines Conversations and Anglicanism Today, by J. C. Dickenson.
Little Brothers and Sisters of Unity in Christ, by Brother Bernard, S.S.F.
Religion in Life, Winter 1966
Paul Tillich—Retrospect and Future. Five Articles.
A Report on the Anglican–Methodist Conversations, by Eric W. Baker.
The Psychological Method of Personalistic Theology, by J. E. Will.
The Trend towards Dynamic Impersonalism, by P. E. Johnson.
The Christian Community and the Homosexual, by C. Marney.
Nathan Söderblom, Prophet and Pioneer of Ecumenism, by C. A. Nelson.

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 7*d.*) or 22*s.* 6*d.* per annum, post free.