

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

Freedom and Tradition in Religious Thought.

BY PRINCIPAL W. ROBINSON, M.A., B.Sc., D.D., OVERDALE COLLEGE, SELLY OAK, BIRMINGHAM.

CHRISTIANITY did not begin as a system of speculative thought or as a reasoned theology. It began as a way of life based upon a faith. And faith was not assent to certain intellectual propositions enshrining a metaphysic about a reality or a cosmological phantasia. Faith, for the early Church, was trust in and loyalty to the Person of Christ; and dogma was not a given set of intellectual propositions to be believed on pain of death, but a set of given facts *which had happened in history*. These facts were regarded by early Christians as having a certain meaning and value for life and destiny. To put it simply, they were regarded as being, in an absolute sense, acts of God on the plane of history. The earliest compilation of these facts of which we have any record is that given by St. Paul, writing to the Corinthian Church about A.D. 53. He there assures the Corinthians that he delivered unto them, first of all, that which he received, evidently referring to the instruction which had been given him by the messenger of the Damascus Church before his baptism, nearly twenty years earlier. There is good ground for believing, with Ed. Meyer, that St. Paul is here quoting the baptismal creed of the Damascus Church.¹ These facts enumerated are:

1. Christ Jesus died for our sins, according to the Scriptures.
2. He was buried.
3. He rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures.
4. He was seen of Cephas.

Here, then, we have four given happenings in history; and faith, for the early Christians, meant reliance on these happenings *as the acts of God*—just as God had once created, so now He had come to redeem. From this followed the exaltation of Jesus as Lord and Christ and the beginning of Christian worship centring in two redemption rites, which were dramatic acts setting forth the Holy Action of God within the sphere of history. When we first meet the Christian Church, faith is a simple matter of trust in and loyalty to the manifestation of the character and action of God as set forth in

¹ I Co 15³⁻⁵. For justification of this idea, see *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, Bk. III. p. 209 ff.

the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. This character of God can best be declared as *righteous love*—and both words are important.² The greatness of God had been shown to be, not power, but love. To the Jews it was a stumbling-block, to the Greeks foolishness, but to the Christians it was a sublime faith which had been guaranteed by an act which had about it the character of once-for-allness—the resurrection of Jesus Christ. And, in spite of every contradiction in life and thought, Christians were prepared to risk all and to venture on life and shape its course as if this were true. For them this faith was sealed by such simple affirmations as, 'I believe Jesus is Lord (*Maran*),' and 'I believe Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God,' which were oaths of allegiance, rather than dogmatic utterances in the sense in which we to-day generally understand dogma. In their worship, which was *action* rather than words, they constantly saw the Holy Action of God re-presented in symbolic forms. In Baptism they saw set forth the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus, and the personal action of God was again made intimate for them in the remission of sins. In the Breaking of the Bread they again saw Christ visibly depicted crucified, and His holy action was made meaningful and powerful in the Fellowship which shared His life and was willing to be identified with Him in making up the afflictions which were lacking—treading the path of love and not of power.

This is all very different from later forms of Christianity seen in the structure of classical Catholicism or of classical Protestantism, where dogma has become a set of given propositions, which are mainly *explanations* of given facts, set forth in closely reasoned terms, rather than the facts themselves; and where *faith* is conceived of subjectively as assent to the given propositions, and objectively

² This is what St. Paul asserts in the classic passages in Ro 3²⁶ and 5⁸. Surely the sense of *προθετο* as used here by St. Paul is that of a *visible* manifestation, as is the sense of *προεγράφη* as used in Gal 3¹, a passage which I believe refers to the Christian Eucharist. If this is so, the sense of Ro 3²⁶ may be taken to be that in the life of Jesus, and more especially in the spectacle of the Cross, there was *placarded* once for all on the plane of history the fact that God is righteous, in spite of all the seeming contradictions of history. There the fact had been *stood lit*.

as the sum-total of the propositions themselves. In both Catholicism and Protestantism of the classical types, theological definition is of more importance than the facts to be defined, and rational assent to propositions has taken the place of personal allegiance.¹

The contrast which I have drawn between the conceptions of faith and dogma in the early Church and in later classical Catholicism and Protestantism, makes it clear that in the one case there was, within the sphere of loyalty, much room for freedom of thought and liberty of interpretation; whereas in the other case such liberty has almost entirely disappeared. Instead we have developed the idea of salvation by orthodoxy. How did this change come about? It came about, in the first place, because Christianity, like any other way of life, is bound to explain itself in the thought-forms of the world in which it finds itself. And, in the second place, it came about because Christianity had to defend itself against systems of life and thought which inevitably would have perverted its central truth. Let us examine the process more closely.

In the history of Christianity there have been certain great periods when theological activity has been at a maximum, and other periods when there has been little or no such activity. These periods of theological activity may be set out as five in number :

1. The Creative Period, which begins with St. Paul and ends with St. Augustine.
2. The Scholastic Period, which may be said to have its beginning with the Revival of Learning in the tenth century and ends with St. Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth.
3. The Reformation Period, beginning in the early sixteenth century and going on into the seventeenth.
4. The Critical Period, beginning with Schleiermacher at the close of the eighteenth century and ending with Harnack in the early twentieth.
5. The Period of Confessionalism, which some people prefer to call The Period of Reaction,

¹ This can hardly be asserted of the creeds which played their part in defining dogma in the Conciliar period of Church history, such as The Apostles' Creed (in its various forms), the original Nicene Creed, The Creed of Constantinople, The Creed of Eusebius, The Creed of Chalcedon. Here, in the main, dogma is still concerned with facts rather than the explanation of facts, though perhaps the personal aspect of faith has been largely lost sight of.

with prophets like P. T. Forsyth, Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, Otto Piper, Paul Tillich, Karl Heim, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Nicolas Berdyaev.

Let us look at each of these movements in turn.

I.

From the first of these great movements Christianity emerged with :

1. A definite hierarchical system centring in a single organ of authority—the General Council—through which the Great Church could speak dogmatically on points of doctrine, order, worship, and discipline. So far as the Eastern Church is concerned, however, the dogmatic utterance of a Council was never completely regarded as the voice of the Holy Spirit until it had received the *Consensus fidelium*. This is practically the position of the Eastern Orthodox Church to-day, though it is not generally understood by some of the auto-cephalous Churches, nor by many within all the Churches.²
2. A sacred Canon of Holy Scripture, identical—at least in the West—with our present Canon, which Canon was accepted as a norm by which to test all development in doctrine and practice.
3. Certain doctrines clearly defined, and safeguarded in most cases by a Creed which had œcumenical authority (the present form of the Nicene Creed). These doctrines included :
 - (a) The doctrine of the Person of Christ which was set forth as two natures in one Person.
 - (b) The doctrine of God, which was set forth as one of trine-unity—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, One God.
 - (c) The doctrine of Grace, which declared the inability of man to save himself, and was set forth in terms of pre-destination.
 - (d) The doctrine of the Church, which declared its visible unity as the organ of Christ's will and the sole sphere of salvation.

² See a recent memorandum submitted by Father Sergius Boulgakoff to the Metropolitan Eulogias in refutation of a heresy charge. In this Memorandum he sets forth the Orthodox doctrine of the *Consensus fidelium*.

as the sum-total of the propositions themselves. In both Catholicism and Protestantism of the classical types, theological definition is of more importance than the facts to be defined, and rational assent to propositions has taken the place of personal allegiance.¹

The contrast which I have drawn between the conceptions of faith and dogma in the early Church and in later classical Catholicism and Protestantism, makes it clear that in the one case there was, within the sphere of loyalty, much room for freedom of thought and liberty of interpretation; whereas in the other case such liberty has almost entirely disappeared. Instead we have developed the idea of salvation by orthodoxy. How did this change come about? It came about, in the first place, because Christianity, like any other way of life, is bound to explain itself in the thought-forms of the world in which it finds itself. And, in the second place, it came about because Christianity had to defend itself against systems of life and thought which inevitably would have perverted its central truth. Let us examine the process more closely.

In the history of Christianity there have been certain great periods when theological activity has been at a maximum, and other periods when there has been little or no such activity. These periods of theological activity may be set out as five in number :

1. The Creative Period, which begins with St. Paul and ends with St. Augustine.
2. The Scholastic Period, which may be said to have its beginning with the Revival of Learning in the tenth century and ends with St. Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth.
3. The Reformation Period, beginning in the early sixteenth century and going on into the seventeenth.
4. The Critical Period, beginning with Schleiermacher at the close of the eighteenth century and ending with Harnack in the early twentieth.
5. The Period of Confessionalism, which some people prefer to call The Period of Reaction,

¹ This can hardly be asserted of the creeds which played their part in defining dogma in the Conciliar period of Church history, such as The Apostles' Creed (in its various forms), the original Nicene Creed, The Creed of Constantinople, The Creed of Eusebius, The Creed of Chalcedon. Here, in the main, dogma is still concerned with facts rather than the explanation of facts, though perhaps the personal aspect of faith has been largely lost sight of.

with prophets like P. T. Forsyth, Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, Otto Piper, Paul Tillich, Karl Heim, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Nicolas Berdyaev.

Let us look at each of these movements in turn.

I.

From the first of these great movements Christianity emerged with :

1. A definite hierarchical system centring in a single organ of authority—the General Council—through which the Great Church could speak dogmatically on points of doctrine, order, worship, and discipline. So far as the Eastern Church is concerned, however, the dogmatic utterance of a Council was never completely regarded as the voice of the Holy Spirit until it had received the *Consensus fidelium*. This is practically the position of the Eastern Orthodox Church to-day, though it is not generally understood by some of the auto-cephalous Churches, nor by many within all the Churches.²
2. A sacred Canon of Holy Scripture, identical—at least in the West—with our present Canon, which Canon was accepted as a norm by which to test all development in doctrine and practice.
3. Certain doctrines clearly defined, and safeguarded in most cases by a Creed which had œcumenical authority (the present form of the Nicene Creed). These doctrines included :
 - (a) The doctrine of the Person of Christ which was set forth as two natures in one Person.
 - (b) The doctrine of God, which was set forth as one of trine-unity—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, One God.
 - (c) The doctrine of Grace, which declared the inability of man to save himself, and was set forth in terms of pre-destination.
 - (d) The doctrine of the Church, which declared its visible unity as the organ of Christ's will and the sole sphere of salvation.

² See a recent memorandum submitted by Father Sergius Boulgakoff to the Metropolitan Eulogias in refutation of a heresy charge. In this Memorandum he sets forth the Orthodox doctrine of the *Consensus fidelium*.

- (e) The doctrine of Revelation, which declared the given-ness of God's will in the sacred Scriptures. By this time the doctrine of Revelation had hardened into that of Verbal Inspiration—an inheritance which the early Christian Church had received from Jewish Scholastic Theology.
4. The two great sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, as dramatic vehicles for representing the central facts of the Christian Faith and as channels of grace.

As yet there had been no attempt to define what later became a great centre of controversy—the doctrine of the Atonement.

Throughout the whole of this period there had been much freedom of thought, much controversy (which naturally goes along with freedom of thought), and much variety of emphasis, especially in the East where intellectual activity had precedence over the desire for order and uniformity of a legal and disciplined type, which was the passion of Rome and of the West generally. Though dogma was not yet set forth in completely legal and authoritarian terms, nevertheless the passion of Rome for disciplined order had so far triumphed, and from now until the Revival of Learning there was little theological activity of any consequence. What followed was a great period of missionary activity and dogmatic evangelism with undisciplined growth of devotional practices.

II.

The Scholastic Theology¹ had its occasion in the Revival of Learning and the consequent necessity of expressing the Christian message in the new thought-forms of Aristotelian philosophy. The Church of the West was still one, but within this Church there were the two great rival schools of Dominicans and Franciscans. It should always be remembered that the Western Catholic Church was nothing like so intransigent as the modern Roman Church. Theological opinions varied as between

¹ The great movements in the field of speculative theology, except the first, have reference to Western Christianity only. Orthodoxy was scarcely influenced at all by Scholastic Theology; it was only slightly influenced by Reformed Theology; and it is only now coming in contact with the theology of the Critical Period and making its own peculiar response, while at the same time it is producing, especially in the exiled Russian Church, its own Theology of Crisis.

one school and another, and the great Doctors of the Church were in their own day 'modernists,' as they always are in days of theological controversy—that is, they were attempting to express their Christian faith in the thought-forms of the modern world in which they lived, and refusing to adhere to out-worn shibboleths of a bygone age. They all, each in their turn, claimed liberty of expression against the traditional thought-forms of dogmatic decrees which they saw to be no longer serviceable. This was especially true of the greatest of them all—St. Thomas Aquinas, who set forth his teaching in the great *Summa*, which has ever since remained definitive for the Roman Church.

The passion of Aristotelian thought is for logical precision, and, broadly speaking, we may say that during this period doctrine became more logically formulated on the basis of the underlying idea that the relationship between God and the universe, including the kingdom of men, is one of a *legal* character. Theology became completely transactional, and this transactional character of doctrine has remained very permanent in Western Theology, both Catholic and Protestant. The wholly *personal* relationship of God to men was almost entirely lost sight of. Dogma (in the modern sense of the term) thus became of major importance, and its character was that of *supernaturally given truth*. The natural and the supernatural became sharply divided. Man by his natural reason (and the whole emphasis was on reason) was able to arrive at belief in God and in immortality, but could not have arrived at the dogmas of the Trinity and the Incarnation. These were rational concepts which had to be supernaturally delivered, and could only be rejected on pain of death. No *natural* truth could be allowed to contradict what had been supernaturally delivered. By this time, too, the doctrine of Grace, in accordance with legal modes of thought, had assumed the form of a credit and debit balance system, and a whole Moral Theology with its system of casuistry was added to doctrinal theology proper. The sacrament of Penance was thoroughly elaborated and became the major sacrament of the Church. It was at this point, and almost at this point alone, that Protestantism in its classical form of Lutheranism broke with the Roman Church.

In any judgment we pass on Mediæval Christianity it must always be remembered that the Mediæval Church was entirely unlike the Primitive Church in one important respect. The Primitive Church came into a world which was highly civilized and cultured. It had nothing to contribute to the ancient world in the realm of culture—art, music,

politics, and so on. It existed as one of many societies within the State, often displaying the puritan attitude of complete separation from the State. The Mediæval Church, on the other hand, was the sole guardian of the relics of the culture of the ancient world. It was a missionary Church, and its missionaries came to the barbaric cultures of northern Europe with a tradition which was ripe in wisdom and powerful in discipline. The Church was the arbiter of the State's destiny, and the whole of life and culture were within her domain. The instrument of excommunication was the most powerful social and political force which the world has ever known. The world was adolescent and the Church was the nursing-mother¹ and more often the stern father. The intransigence of the Mediæval Church becomes most pronounced and evident in the field of authoritarian disciplinary action after the time of Aquinas, and heresy-hunting and martyrdom began to be common in the fourteenth century. The notion of salvation by orthodoxy had become supreme.

III.

The Reformation theologies were occasioned, in the first place, by the new world which was produced by the revolutionary thought of the astronomers, explorers, and scientists. In the second place, it was occasioned by the corrupt state of the Roman Church which became plainly evident to a world no longer adolescent. In the third place, it was occasioned by the growth of nationalism, which was not a result of the Reformation but one of its causes.

The classical Reformation Theologies of Luther and Calvin differed little from the Mediæval Scholastic Theology, and this is even more true of the second generation of Lutherans and Calvinists. That of Zwingli differed in a more fundamental way. But one thing the Reformers had to do, and that was to break with the authority of the Church and so to give a new emphasis to the doctrine of private judgment. But once their systems were set up, private judgment was another matter. How far they were prepared to go with it is seen in Luther's treatment of the Anabaptists and Calvin's burning of Servetus, as well as in the Anglican persecutions of Roman Catholic and

¹ Perhaps, as in the case of many nursing-mothers, the Church became the possessive-mother and refused to allow her children to grow up, with the inevitable result that some failed to grow up and remained the children of authority, whilst others rebelled and sought freedom and manhood away from her bosom.

Separatist disturbers of the national peace. Another thing which all the Reformers did was to break with the Roman system of moral theology which had become dreadfully corrupt. In its place they erected the doctrines of *sola fides* and *sola gratia*, which were equally capable of moral corruption. Another result of the Reformation was a fresh emphasis on Holy Scripture as the organ of authority, and the translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular gave a fresh impetus to their study, which at first resulted in a certain measure of free treatment but which later actually gave rise to a new literalism. And a final thing which the Reformation did was to make Rome more intransigent. Definition of doctrine was increased and liberty of interpretation reduced. Christianity was henceforth divided into camps set over against each other. Each camp had to build up its walls of defence and to build them as high as possible. These walls were the great Confessions of Faith which were produced in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, such as The Tridentine Decrees (Rome), The Helvetic and Westminster Confessions (Reformed), The Augsburg Confession and the Smalcald Articles (Lutheran), The Thirty-Nine Articles (Anglican), and The Racovian Catechism (Socinian).

These all became standards of orthodoxy, and they differ entirely from the creeds of the Primitive Church in that dogma is no longer a set of given facts, but a set of given *opinions*, closely defined and logically coherent. In the main this system of doctrine remained authoritative until the close of the eighteenth century. Meantime, the new scientific age was producing its results, and in the realms of astronomy and physics changing the whole current of men's thought. The Churches were becoming more and more isolated from the main currents of life, and theology more and more remote from the ways of men's thought.

IV.

The eighteenth century saw a great religious revival with emphasis on feeling and experience as over against reason and rational theology. Nevertheless the old dogmatic truths were the basis of the new experience as they remained the basis of nineteenth-century evangelicalism. But this new emphasis on experience gave rise to a new experiential theology in the work of Schleiermacher, and opened the way for a new critical inquiry. The scientific spirit had once more entered the field of theology and Biblical interpretation. The chief result of this new movement was to subject the

Bible to an exhaustive critical inquiry, and to subject religion to both historical and psychological inquiry. The actual results may be summed up as follows :

1. The Bible came to be understood as a record of *progressive revelation* or *progressive discovery* in the field of religion. Eventually, in the extreme schools, discovery and revelation were regarded as one and the same thing.
2. The old literalism was broken down, and *historical* interpretation of the Bible was substituted for *textual* interpretation.
3. The Jesus of history assumed a new importance, and was rediscovered in a somewhat preferential and arbitrary treatment of the Synoptic Gospels which resulted in two sharply contrasted pictures, the Ethical Jesus and the Apocalyptic Jesus.
4. Jesus was sharply divided from St. Paul, who came to be regarded as the first perverter of the original Ethical Gospel of the Kingdom of God which was conceived of purely as a Kingdom of Social Righteousness. Paul had mistakenly deified Jesus, who had been the last and greatest of the ethical prophets whom Judaism had produced.
5. Religion came to be equated with the History of Religion and interpreted through the Psychology of Religion, and theology came to be regarded as a by-product of social forces.¹
6. A new emphasis on *life* as over against *creed* became widespread, and moralism was substituted for religious dependence.
7. The Church and the Sacraments tended to become quite secondary and in the end almost irrelevant for Christian theology.
8. Finally the emphasis in religion became almost wholly subjective, with the result that toleration developed into 'anythingarianism.'

The above are broad generalisations, and there are many things which here must remain unsaid. But, whatever the results, theology had to pass through this stage and to be released from some of its old dogmatic manacles, in order that it might not only understand itself in the light of the new knowledge of the world which the scientific age had produced, but also in order that it might arrive

¹ Many exponents of this school failed to see that their own theology was equally condemned as a by-product of their own social environment. Others frankly recognized it and abandoned theology for religious humanism.

at a deeper understanding of the Faith in Christ which it sought to interpret. One thing this new movement did which was of permanent value—it put out of court for ever the old Biblical literalism and the *legal* interpretation of Christian doctrine.²

V.

The last of the great movements in Theology (and we must speak with great caution about it, for it is a movement which is now in process) may be described as a movement away from liberalism towards orthodoxy, but orthodoxy at a deeper level ; and away from easy-going tolerance towards confessionism, but confessionism in the form of *essential witness* and *fundamental principles*. It is an attempt to lead away from all subjectivisms to what is objective. The transcendence of God is once again being emphasized over against immanence, and the Psychology of Religion and the History of Religion are no longer the arbiters of the Christian Faith. Philosophy and science have their place, but they are no longer the creators of the *credo*. And so far as philosophy and science are concerned we have to note that within their field there has been a most significant move away from materialism and mechanism towards a spiritual interpretation of the universe, so that the conflict between religion and science, in the sense in which it was understood in the nineteenth century, is almost a meaningless concept.

This last movement in the field of theology is the most complex of all, and there are many varying elements within it, so that it is difficult to describe. But we may say some things :

1. The new critical interpretation of the Bible is its basis and remains regulative. This position is accepted by all to-day except Roman Catholics (I mean officially) and extreme Evangelicals (Fundamentalists) who inhabit all the Protestant Churches and wholly embrace some of the smaller bodies.
2. The Word of God, which has received a new

² There was a parallel movement in America to that inaugurated in Europe by Schleiermacher and Ritschl. It had for its prophets men like Moses Stuart of Andover and, later, Alexander Campbell of Bethany, Va. Campbell, who was a Lockian in philosophy, reacted violently against literalism and legalism ; see his *Sermon on the Law*, delivered in 1816. Campbell had a large following, but unfortunately the second generation of his followers understood little of his aims and purposes.

emphasis, is not so much a *spoken* word as an *acted* word. What is important for theology is the Holy Action of God revealing to us His character and purpose.

3. This, of course, means that Revelation is never infallible in the sense in which it has been conceived to be in traditional Catholic and Protestant theologies, though it is infallible in a deeper sense. Man's search for an infallibility of the rigid, verbal, and legal type is a vain one. An infallible declaration of this kind would need an infallible mind to understand and interpret it. But an infallible mind is just the kind of mind which would have no need for such a declaration. The whole thing is a delusion and ought to worry us no longer. Both Judaism and Christianity are agreed that *in the absolute* God's ways are past finding out, but they both rely fully on the guidance of God in history, that is on Revelation. Theories of 'infallibility without limits' belong to those systems which are of the order of 'flights away from reality,' and both Judaism and Christianity are far too closely wedded to history—to what is actual—to find room for such theories. It is true that both Jewish and Christian Scholastic systems have propounded theories of 'infallibility without limits,' but such theories are really alien to the temper of both religions; and, paradoxically enough, they have been found to carry with them nothing but 'limits'—they have been the means of binding and not of loosing. When we realize that Revelation is divinely contrived but humanly conditioned, that we need training which will make us sensitive to values, that our limits set a limit on God in the sense of the measure in which He may be fulfilled in us, we do not rob ourselves of the idea of infallibility, but we arrive at a notion of infallibility as existential and concrete. This, if we like to call it so, may be described as 'infallibility with limits,' and it is just this kind of infallibility, which, paradoxically enough, carries with it no limits. And just for this reason it can never be completely conveyed in *verbal* form. At its highest it has for its vehicle the Divine Act. The words of the younger Isaac Penington are to the point here: 'All truth is a shadow except the last. But every truth is substance in its own place, though it be but a shadow

in another place. And the shadow is a true shadow, as the substance is a true substance.'¹

4. There is a return to the primitive emphasis on dogmas as *given facts in history*, and on faith as *fiducia* and not *assensus*—a venturing out on life on the ground of certain deathless and uncontradictable actions of God within the sphere and meaning of history. This is coupled with the revival of the idea of the 'fulfilled time' or the 'ripe time' in history. The 'eternal now' of God is given in the 'crises' of history.
5. There is a new emphasis on the Church as an ontological reality, and as having meaning for history. The Church is closely identified with 'the true Israel,' 'the Remnant,' or 'the Little Flock,' which in history represents the level at which the heavenly and earthly planes intersect and at which 'over history' is shot down into history. With this emphasis on the Church goes a revived emphasis on the Sacraments and a new interest in worship which is concerned rather with its objective quality than with its subjective apparatus.
6. In many of the schools² within the movement there is a welcome emphasis on the *personal* action of God as over against *legal* and *mechanical* action. This is perhaps the deepest thing of all, and it means that God's Holy Action in creation and redemption is nothing other than God's bid for *fellowship*; so that the whole problem of freedom and authority takes on a new complexion as it is seen to be related to loyalty within

¹ Early in the third century Origen, through his study of the Fourth Gospel, had become aware of the need for a similar philosophy of Revelation in history. He declares that it was the purpose of the Evangelists 'to give truth where possible, both spiritually and corporeally, but when this was not possible, to prefer the spiritual to the corporeal, the true spiritual meaning being often preserved, so to speak, in the corporeal falsehood' (*Commentary on St. John's Gospel*, x. 4).

² It is a pity that this new movement in theology has come to be known almost solely in the form of Barthianism. Many people do not know that even in Germany Barth is only *one* amongst a number of leaders, such as Heim, Piper, and Tillich, and still less do they understand that the movement has its prophets elsewhere, such as Berdyaev in Orthodoxy, and the new Realistic theologians in America, and that von Hügel and P. T. Forsyth are just as significant as Karl Barth and much less hysterical and pathological.

a fellowship of love, and not to logic within a system of law.

So far as freedom and tradition in Christian thought are concerned, perhaps the one most important lesson we may learn from all this is that we shall never learn to set ourselves right within this whole business of freedom and tradition until, on the one hand, we set aside the whole paraphernalia

of *legal* ideas which have worked such havoc in Christian theology, and until, on the other hand, we learn the meaning of *loyalty* based on a love relationship. Then we shall discover that only within loyalty is freedom, that he is most free who is most loyal, for loyalty is freedom, and freedom means loyalty. We must learn to grow up and to be true sons and not slaves, nor even sons-in-law, in our Father's house.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Bridge-makers.

BY THE REVEREND RALPH F. CALDER, B.A., B.D.,
GLASGOW.

HAVE you ever thought how really important bridges are? Perhaps you live in a city which is built on both sides of a river—then you will realize how long a time we should take if we had to wade or swim or take a boat or go along the bank until we could jump over the narrow stream near its source. And how dangerous it would be if every time a road and a railway line met, it could only be at a level crossing, and how tiresome having to wait for the gates to open! Bridges are most valuable things. They make for speed and comfort and safety, but most important they make for friendship, for they bring us closer together and so help us to know and understand each other.

Most of the bridges you will have seen will have been made of stone or steel or concrete or wood. But I want to tell you the strangest story of a bridge which was built on eggs.

Very nearly five hundred years ago there came to the throne of Bohemia, in the middle of Europe, a king called Charles the Fourth. He had a fine castle built on one bank of the river Vltava, separated from his capital city Prague by the strong flowing waters. If any one wished to go from the town to the palace, or the palace to the town, he had to use the ferry boat, and in winter-time the river ran so swiftly that the boat was sometimes swept away. So King Charles gave orders for a bridge to be built. Great stones were gathered together, and at last the work was finished. But the bridge stood up for a few months only, for the first flood waters from the hills swept it away. A second bridge was ordered and built, but it suffered the same fate, as did a third.

The King was much distressed and wondered what

to do. Then he had a bright idea. He issued a proclamation, commanding each of his subjects to bring to the riverside a basketful of eggs. This was done, and great piles of eggs were stacked up by the wondering men and women of Bohemia. Then the workmen were told to break up the eggs and mix into the sticky mess sand and gravel. If you have ever broken an egg in your hand you will have some idea of what a gluey mixture this would be. The result was embedded in the river and became the foundation of another bridge. The floods came that year, and have done ever since, but the bridge still stands after nearly five hundred years, one of the most beautiful, yet solidly built bridges in Europe.

A bridge built upon eggs! Little, frail common things, yet together linking two sides of a river that the people might cross over and understand and love each other.

Would you think me rude if I said that the story makes me think of you children? You are only small things in the great world of people. Yet you have built many mighty bridges together, and could build more. Are not the Boy Scouts and the Girl Guides and the Boys' Brigade like great bridges built between countries making for friendship and love between peoples?—and these are made up of tiny little contributions, like some of you here to-day. So are the world's Sunday schools, when the children think and pray about one another in different lands.

You would notice that I have no text—that is because the word bridge does not occur in the Bible, for there were no bridges in Palestine. But I think that if Jesus had heard our story He would have thought of you, and of how you could help towards the peace of the world by forming a bridge for understanding and love. We are to sing the hymn, 'Oh what can little hands do to please the King of