
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

W. F. LOFTHOUSE, 1871-1965

Memorial Address in Handsworth College Chapel, 17th September 1965

Donald R. Lee

Psalm 104[4] *He maketh his angels spirits: his ministers a flaming fire.*

THOSE words from the window might well be the text of any tribute to the memory of W. F. Lofthouse. The window and its words were a tribute he paid to his wife, but they may well serve to remind you, who regularly worship in this place, of the man himself. You may never have known him, hardly seen him, or only heard legends of him, but I beseech you to thank God sometimes for a man who, long before his translation to the hosts of heaven, was a 'ministering angel' in whom were the wind and fire of God.

Any attempt to characterize Lofthouse will, in the end, be a caricature. One can only hope that, in the exaggeration of it, or the deficiency of it, it is nonetheless clearly drawn, and drawn with obvious, unashamed affection and admiration. For he called forth both admiration and affection in very large measure.

The breadth and depth of the man's learning, the wide comprehension of his interests, were staggering. He taught Systematic Theology in my time (1931-5), and it was a teaching that made you wrestle hard with Biblical teaching about Holiness, Righteousness, Sin, Reconciliation, Priesthood and Sacrifice, and he had little patience with a man whose theologizing did not bear evidence of this painstaking work. But we knew that he had first come to fame and wide repute as an Old Testament student. And we knew, too, that before that he had held an Open Scholarship at Trinity, Oxford, with a First in 'Mods' and a First in 'Greats', a university Greek Verse Prize, a Greek New Testament Prize and a Hebrew Prize. His interests in Philosophy and the Classics were sustained to the end—and his last major published work was a philosophical study.

But this was also the man who had presented the Report on *The Relation of the Sexes* in the historic 1924 COPEC Conference, and every day, whether in Classroom or Chapel, made it clear that his passion for Righteousness was a passion for the right relationship of men with God, and ordinary man with ordinary man in a society which was meant to be a creative family life in the Father's House. Nothing ever happened in that world of unrest between the Wars, with the rise of Mussolini and Hitler, and the growing mood of disenchantment, that escaped his notice, his conversation and his intercession.

His teaching demanded of his students a discipline which he laid much more heavily upon himself. He was merciful, knowing our frame, and remembering that most of us were dust he hardly expected us to work his hours! For four years I lived on the North Corridor. Night by night, I carried

my oil-lamp upstairs to my bedroom (we had to provide our own illumination after 11 p.m.!). I would look through the window by the staircase. The study light at Endcliffe Cottage was always burning—for he was always working. I don't think he expected us to work his hours—but I think he always hoped that we would try to match his energy and enthusiasm. We were supposed to produce an essay, of fifteen hundred words *at least*, every week. Other tutors might relax this discipline, but not Lofthouse. And he was nowhere happier than in those Oxford-type tutorials when, donnishly, he would take our work to pieces, and then put it together again, and send us away thinking we were doing quite well.

Music and the arts were his joy too. His pictures and his books revealed his interest in the visual arts, and music was a part of his life. For four years, because of a peculiar dearth of musicians, I was College Organist. When there was a Communion Service, there would arrive, some hours in advance, the Hymns, an Order of Service, and something as terrifying as a Piano Score of *Parsifal* or *Gerontius*, with the earnest plea that this page or that page might be played as the music during the administration. In my fourth year, as the only student of my years deemed unfit for letting loose on the Circuits after his third year, he set to work to add to my musical education. One day after lectures he waylaid me with, 'Mr Lee, come over after lunch and see my new toy.' It was a gramophone, of a sort then unusual. It was an E.M.G. one of E. M. Ginn's individual creations, with its six-foot horn. Week after week I went to Endcliffe Cottage, sometimes with others, as he added prodigiously to his record collection, and he tried to teach us something of symphonic construction and discussed with us the orchestration of some major work.

But there was more than admiration for this man who had so much learning, and so much ability (good Oxford man as he was) to talk on every subject under and including the sun. After the awe of first-year acquaintance, and the amusement which was invariably evoked at first by his unique manner of speech, you began to love the great man. Olympian as he was, I believe he was looking for our friendship, and he certainly offered his friendship to us, with a large-heartedness that was never so apparent as when a man was in trouble, or sorrow, or distress of any kind. We were later to learn that all our ministry was to be borne up by this man's affectionate concern and intercession. Right until last year no connexional year has begun without dozens, perhaps more of use, receiving a note of good wishes for the New Year—full of pungent comment on the state of the Church, and showing an uncanny knowledge of any Circuit you happened to be in. And those of us who were Chaplains during the War know that he maintained a regular correspondence with our wives—most of whom he had never met—to cheer them during our long absences overseas. He wrote illegibly, he bashed typewriters to bits, and sometimes the typing needed as much interpreting as his writing! I believe his intercession for us continues, though now we receive those eagerly opened letters no more.

It was my privilege to know the great man during part of his retirement. For most of my five years in Oxford he was living at Woodstock, as near

as he could afford to be to the place to which he so truly belonged. He would often walk into Oxford, a haversack over his shoulder containing books to exchange at the Library, or work to be pursued at the Bodleian. The great teacher and thinker had become a Class Leader in a country society, and a preacher never more loved than in the places where he most loved to be—in the country-chapel pulpits of that largely rural Circuit. Among my proudest memories is that of the privilege of introducing the octogenarian Lofthouse to companies of undergraduates in the sitting-room of our house. They had grown accustomed to the odd mannerisms, and they sat round him in homely relaxation to draw from the rich treasure of the mind and memory of the greatest of Oxford's Methodist sons.

Memories abound of Lofthouse in Chapel—first in the Hall yonder, and then in this place, which was dedicated during my first year. Some of them are amusing memories, but how they commend him to our affection! He often made his own translations of scripture as he read the lessons, if there were a doubtful text or a difficult word. Some of you were perhaps students here on the day when he read Jonah 4, and instead of 'gourd' read 'castor-oil plant'. Howard used to tell the story of it, in *his* own inimitable way. The word occurs five times in as many verses, and the great Howard confessed that by the time it came to the fifth 'castor-oil plant' even the staff were only maintaining decorum by stuffing handkerchiefs in their mouths! But how many other 'off the cuff' translations remain in the memory for ever! Who of us can now read Isaiah 53 without wanting to say 'Despised and rejected of men, man of sorrows and *bosom-friend* of grief'?

The inferior hymn, or inferior music, would not be allowed to pass without comment. He had no time for 'Sagina', because it made you scream about the 'blood' a word, he always said, which the New Testament never uses except in hushed, awed whispers. But you could never be *quite* sure what would be praised, or what blamed. 'Mr Lee, do try to persuade the first-year preachers that some of the hymns they love are not of the best'—that was one of the charges laid upon the College Organist. One Wednesday night a brother insisted, *insisted* that we sang 'Let the lower lights be burning', and I awaited the great man's comments afterwards with something near to panic. I stuttered my apologies for my lack of adequate persuasive powers. He said, 'Oh, but how marvellous it was to sing it. I learned it at my mother's knee, and I have not sung it for years.' You never quite knew—and you loved him the more for it.

But nothing slovenly would do for the House of God. I once heard Nathaniel Micklem, addressing Free Church undergraduates in Mansfield College Chapel say: 'Our fathers used to kneel and pray. Our fathers used to stand and pray. How we came to crouch to pray remains one of the minor mysteries of Church history.' Lofthouse would have said the same. If he could not kneel, he stood, though everybody else might be crouching or sitting with reverently bowed head. Lofthouse stood—on the Conference Platform he stood, among his sitting fellow-ex-Presidents—for to sit before the presence of Almighty God, as you came to Him with your prayers, was slovenly.

This chapel bears his mark on it still. It was his artistic and liturgical sense that put that copy of the familiar Annunciation over the entrance to it. He would have said, 'That's where the Christian story began—with the wonder that the Love of God wrought with the village maid of Nazareth'. It was his inspiration that set the stained-glass window up yonder, to the memory of his loved one 'within the Veil'. Among the most treasured memories are those of the frequent announcing of Hymn 831—'Give me the wings of faith . . .'. The hymn moved him greatly, and if you were organist it worried you a little, for you never knew how much he would read of it . . . sometimes a mere line or two, before he had to stop, unable to say any more. His dear partner was very near to him then, and somehow he managed to make her known to those of us who had never met her.

His essentially simple faith and piety seemed to be nourished, specially, by two things—by an utter devotion to the Saviour (this was his most frequent name for Jesus) and by a delight in the Communion of the Saints. These two things belonged together. Christ's angels and ministers, the servants of the Saviour, were to be winds and flaming fire, and above all there was the longing he had to teach us that the minister must be the disciple who follows, the apostle who goes *Quo Monstrat Dominus*, whither the Lord points the way, and be ready for the fellowship of the host of Heaven.

It all became clear at college communions. 'Don't be disturbed,' he once said, 'by the man who tells you that the Communion is merely a memorial meal. Ask him, "How can a memorial of Jesus, of such a Saviour, be *merely* anything?" ' And as for the Real Presence, it was the Saviour who promised it. My Body; My Blood; Body that is My Presence; Blood that is My Life: My Presence, My Life, My Living Presence. And when he dismissed us from the Lord's Table, we were to depart *into* peace, the peace that passeth understanding, because—for Lofthouse—God's peace was not quiescence, inactivity, but the huge orderly *activity* of God in His world.

God be praised for W. F. Lofthouse, for all he meant to us, and still means to us: but above all for his service of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, to Whom —for all the Saints—be Praise and Glory evermore.

EDITORIAL

THOUGH Theology is no longer Queen of the Sciences, Spirituality remains the Queen of Theology, albeit at times on an inconspicuous throne. It is the numinous quality of their work which draws men to the great theologians, even craggy and difficult ones such as Tillich (R.I.P.), or Forsyth, or Von Hügel, while, as all the world knows, the secret of Newman was his spiritual power. One of the most penetrating comments on *Honest to God* was that of Christopher Evans, who placed it among the books of devotion on his shelves. *A New Reformation?* is, in comparison, a series of not very original lectures and, although it may be a better book technically, it seems lacking in the numinous dimension.

We are better equipped than ever to evaluate the spiritual theology of the past, and to apply the methods of former ages. There is still, however, no comprehensive study of British Spirituality, no parallel to Bremond's *Histoire Litteraire du Sentiment Religieux en France.* Archdeacon Strank's *Anglican Devotion* (S.C.M., 1961, 21*s.*) is most satisfying, but obviously limited by its subject, while the title of Martin Thornton's *English Spirituality* (S.P.C.K., 1963, 37*s.* 6*d.*) is downright misleading, since Thornton has little time for, or understanding of, the Puritan and Evangelical tradition. Indeed, in all his books there is a certain rigidity and lack of appreciation of the ecstatic or genuinely mystical. But if, as we read it, we try to remember that the book should really be called *A Study in the Making of the Higher Anglican Asceticism*, we shall find it fascinating and most valuable.

Perhaps a long-term by-product of the British Council of Churches' Working Party on Spirituality will be an adequate history. But the history of Spirituality is not the same as the practice of piety, and it is to Thornton's credit (though perhaps to the detriment of his scholarship?) that even in his evaluations of the past he never loses sight of the soul's needs of the local Church warden. His latest book, *The Rock and the River* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1965, 21*s.*), is much the most mature, eirenical and sympathetic of his works, in which he recognizes the pertinence of the questions the radical theologians ask, even if he feels that they can be answered only by refurbishing the traditional disciplines of the Catholic ages. But he writes with great humility, and has some wise counsels, even if he still neither knows, nor understands, classic evangelical Protestantism and, on the radical side, needs the correctives of Father Gibbard's article in this symposium.

Another important book is Father Louis Bouyer's *Introduction to Spirituality* (Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964, 21*s.*). This is as comprehensive a manual of Roman Catholic piety as is extant. It is written with most admirable lucidity, and much more attractively than the Anglican F. P. Harton's standard, *Elements of the Spiritual Life*, which Thornton has to admit is dull. Here the system is set forth in all its ripe wisdom and experience. No one can read Bouyer without saying 'Almost thou persuadest me . . .'. Yet it was this system which Luther found wanting, and which has

helped to cause the dissatisfaction and desire for reformation revealed in the Vatican Council. This textbook hallows those rigid differences between clerical and lay, celibate and married, which cannot be regarded as of the *esse* of the Church. A Protestant is bound to suspect that here, though there is so much to learn and to admire, may be the yoke of bondage from which Christ would set us free. Yet the system, and this account of it, are too important to be dismissed in a few sentences. A fine study such as this calls for that lengthy and profound theological argument to which a Professor Torrance would summon us.

One of the great questions of our time, which is most acutely posed in Christian Spirituality, is whether a genuine rapprochement between the Roman and other traditions is possible. The sheer majesty of the Roman discipline, even unreformed, let alone the new openness and clear longing for reconciliation and the real progress which the Vatican Council has achieved, are bound to make many non-Roman Christians ache for the bridging of the gulf. Yet it is not only Bouyer, but even more Rene Laurentin's *Mary's Place in the Church* (Burns & Oates, 1965, 12*s*. 6*d*.), which makes one wonder if the Roman system has not grown too far from the Gospel norm to be capable of complete restoration.

Laurentin's study of Marian devotion is splendidly full and objective in temper. The author, like so many Continental Romans, knows Protestant theology, and is anxious to meet difficulties with understanding, charity, and a reforming spirit. The proliferation of Marian piety, which he describes and criticizes, cannot but fill Protestants with alarm, while the Pope's proclamation at the end of the Third Session of the Vatican Council that Mary is the Mother of the Church was most disturbing. Yet, if all Catholic theologians were so balanced as Laurentin, there might be hope, for his own restatement of devotion and doctrine is moderate and largely scriptural. He deprecates turning Mary's privileges into a fleshly glory or exalting 'development at the expense of tradition, privileges at the expense of vocation, and glorifying speculations at the expense of dogmatic significance'. But it is doubtful whether a Protestant would feel altogether happy about Laurentin's succinct expression of the 'truths' of Marian dogma. It is the presuppositions of Marian devotion which worry us, the dogmatic basis which remains, even when Laurentin has removed its gilded and pagan superstructure. Does not this need to be submitted yet more rigorously to historical criticism?

Meanwhile, there are still many books on comparative spirituality, and some which desire a syncretistic amalgamation of religions. For instance, there is Bradford Smith's *Meditation The Inward Art* (Allen & Unwin, 1964, 21*s*.). The author is an American Quaker who pleads for a universal faith based on the practice of meditation, and has no difficulty in uniting Christianity, Yoga, Zen, and anything else, provided there is no dogmatism, just the common practice of mental prayer. Like so many who wish to combine the religions of the world into one universal faith and practice, Mr Bradford Smith is inclined to make everything too easy, to avoid the appalling intellectual difficulties of reconciling systems in essence so different, and the

spiritual struggles inseparable from all religious experience. Somewhere there is a cross in every religion, and in all prayer and Bradford Smith does not seem aware of it. Yet he, like Leslie Weatherhead, in the strange theological combinations of *The Christian Agnostic*, reminds us of the need for serious discussion among the spiritual theologians of all religions. To this end Pe Maung Tin's *Buddhist Devotion and Meditation* (S.P.C.K., 1964, 21*s.*), the work of a Christian, former professor at Rangoon University, is valuable. It should add to our respect for Buddhist spirituality, while making us feel that, at its best, this is but a preparation for the Gospel.

Perhaps a radicalism, which will expose the transcience of all these elaborate systems, is what is wanted most. Yet the outstanding book of recent years for practical use is from one who surely learnt his prayer in the rigid Roman school. It is unnecessary to sing the praises of Michel Quoist's *Prayers of Life* (Gill & Son, 1963, 12*s.* 6*d.*). This author, having been taught to meditate in the familiar categories, has attained that freedom which perhaps is only possible to those who have known the chafing disciplines of mental prayer. Here, once more, is 'the cult of the passing moment', classic meditation no longer enslaved by the fussy and overloaded methods of religiosity and yet which achieves the purposes of the masters, Catholic and Puritan alike. God is found in every encounter of secular life by 'penetration through the world' rather than by 'withdrawal from the world'. But, what transfigures these prayers, what indeed can transform even the rigid methods of the past, and without which the most radical and worldly holiness is all in vain, is the compassion of Christ.

GORDON S. WAKEFIELD

SOME BIBLICAL PRESUPPOSITIONS OF CHRISTIAN SPIRITUALITY

E. J. Tinsley

I. A SACRIFICIAL SPIRITUALITY

THERE is one great unifying theme running throughout both Testaments concerning the nature of spirituality. This is its necessary sacrificial character. Throughout the Old Testament there is the feeling that the essence of the religious life is self-giving, and sacrificial practice was for long regarded as the means whereby this essential homage to God may be done. But already before the close of the Old Testament period there is the realization that man is in no position to speak, with any sense of reality, of giving himself to God. The very best that he could give in sacrificial practice was still hopelessly impersonal, and inadequate as a true authentic giving of self. There is already in the Old Testament an intimation that only God can properly give the self, and that somehow some day he will himself adopt means to create man's only adequate substitute. This shows itself in the growing awareness of the possibility that God's own Israel may be being summoned to a martyr destiny which in the providence of God will turn out to have universal redemptive significance as, for example, in the servant-poems of Second-Isaiah.

In the New Testament this sacrificial spirituality is of course rooted in the self-giving involved in the Incarnation itself. When St Paul thinks of the motivation behind the Christian life of self-giving it is the whole process of incarnation that he appeals to (Philippians 2). This human imitation of the divine act of self-annihilation is the climax of the treatment in the Bible of the motif of the imitation of God. In the Old Testament the prime vocation of Israel is to be holy even as Yahweh the God of Israel is holy. This holiness in the Old Testament took the form of obedience to the Torah, aspects of which became more and more personified as Hebrew tradition developed. In the New Testament this imitation of God is centred in the imitation of Christ—who is himself the perfect imitator of the Father. But it needs to be said at once that there is in the New Testament a quite precise and characteristic interpretation of the nature of the Christian imitation of Christ. The phrase 'imitation of Christ' has become suspect in Christian tradition, especially since the time of Luther, because it seems to suggest an endeavour, a series of exercises whereby the believer can literally emulate Christ, and this is believed, quite rightly, to be an absurdity, if not a blasphemy, denying, as it seems to do, the necessity of grace and of the work of the Holy Spirit. The New Testament emphasis, however, is not on the Christian life as primarily a human endeavour but as a process of being lived through by the Holy Spirit in the action of grace; the work of the

Holy Spirit being to conform Christians to some recognizable likeness, to whatever extent is appropriate, to the model, the *eikon*, Christ himself. Luther's preference for the word *conformitas* rather than *imitatio* as a description of the Christian life has good New Testament warranty. The New Testament imitation of Christ is not some antiquarian attempt at literal mimicry of the historical Jesus, but is the description of a life which on the human side obviously involves commitment to Christ and the will to follow him but on God's side is a matter of creative moulding according to the pattern of the unique Christ.

II. THE BIBLE AND MYSTICISM

The discussion about the compatibility of mysticism with the Christian religion is focused in the question of the relation of mysticism to the biblical tradition. There are those Christians who feel strongly without further discussion that nothing could be more inimical to and incompatible with the biblical religion than mysticism. There are other Christians who feel on the contrary that mysticism has good biblical backing. Everything turns on the meaning which is attached to mysticism. Certainly mysticism as commonly understood is incompatible with the religion of the Bible because mysticism is generally taken to be a particular experience either resulting from or inevitably leading to a metaphysic in which the extinction of personal existence is believed to be the goal, the fruition, of the religious life. If this taken as a definition of mysticism then it is no difficult task to demonstrate its incompatibility with the biblical revelation. A good example of the way this works out is the typical protestant presentation of the relationship between Hebrew prophetism and mysticism. The majority voice in Old Testament scholarship believes strongly that nothing could be more foreign to prophetic experience than mysticism. But an examination of early Christian patristic usage suggests that mysticism in the early church was closely related to the New Testament experience of perceiving 'signs', of having eyes to see and ears to hear. This is the reason, perhaps, why some French scholars have designated Christian mysticism 'mystery-mindedness'. 'Mystery-minded' mysticism has two necessary components: the thing seen, the object out there, whether in nature or the human scene, and the experience of exaltation, 'ecstasy' as Paul Tillich calls it, wherein the object is taken to be not merely symbol, even coercive symbol, but has ontological significance as sharing in the transcendental reality which it symbolizes. 'Sign' and reality signified are two facets of the one experience. This mysticism of the 'sign' is undoubtedly a feature of Old Testament religion. Inevitably as time went on there was the temptation to separate the experience, the feeling of exaltation in perception, from the objective 'sign', and to dwell on the experience itself for its own sake and, indeed, to hope for and to work for its recurrence. In this way mysticism came to be identified more and more with a type of experience, or heightened awareness. This is mysticism as it is conceived in Neoplatonism, and in traditions which derive from it, and it is also the understanding of mysticism found in the Reformers and particularly in Martin Luther who, after an initial

attraction, came to see it as a dangerous aberration because for him it inevitably concealed a 'doctrine of works', an attempt by discipline to win the grace of this experience.

The chief characteristic of all kinds of mysticism is a profound overwhelming sense of unity, of being one with reality as a whole, in a way which transcends, for a moment, the sense and value of separation and of the individual separate personality. This sense of oneness is there in the Bible in both the Old and New Testaments; but the characteristic of the mysticism expressed in the Bible turns on the interpretation given to the nature of this union. Certainly in the prophetic consciousness there is a profound sense of union with the word of God, so much so that, to adapt some words of T. S. Eliot, one could say of the Hebrew prophet that he is the word of the Lord as long as his word lasts. There can be no final distinction or separation between the word of Yahweh and the word of the prophet, but this union is not of the prophet's seeking. In fact it is the mark of the false prophet to seek such a kind of union, at will. The essence of the New Testament experience seems to me to be well described as 'mystery-minded' mysticism. This could certainly be used as a description of what seems to have been the Christ's own kind of religious perception; his insistence on 'signs' which are at the same time 'scandals', on 'eyes to see' events and words as 'signs'. Jesus lays upon his disciples no dissimilar burden than he has faced himelf. The things that he found happening in and around him during his lifetime were taken by him as 'signs' from the Father. The 'signful' character of the mission of Christ lies behind the religious experience both of Paul and John.

III. THE BIBLE AND ASCETICISM

This is a key question because in traditional Christian schemes of spirituality it is assumed that asceticism forms a necessary part of the Christian life, and attempts are made to give it an indisputable biblical basis. The problem is that the biblical material is much more ambiguous on this subject than many traditional schemes of Christian asceticism allow. One has to reckon first with the strongly non-ascetical, even anti-ascetical, Hebrew tradition. Hebrew prophetic eschatology is non-dualistic in character. This world, pervaded by evil forces as it may be, remains nevertheless redeemable and capable of being the site of a restored paradise. Apocalyptic eschatology on the other hand did move towards dualism and this world was no longer regarded as a fit site for redemption. Such ascetical movements as do appear in the Old Testament, like that of the Rechabites and Nazirites, are not in the main stream of Old Testament tradition, and they were not ascetics in the traditional sense but rather those who are engaged in a kind of prophetic demonstration, pointing to the necessity of re-learning the lessons of the desert relation with Yaheveh. The Old Testament Hebrews were bound to move towards a certain materialism because of the lateness of the appearance of the belief in a real life after death. Justification had to take place in this life, in the form of more and more material possessions and so on (cf. the end of *Job*). In post-biblical Judaism the rabbis insisted that man was to enjoy the fruits of created existence and indeed that it was blasphemy not to.

Numbers 6^{11} (where the priest has to make atonement for the Nazirites because of contact with the dead) was interpreted by the rabbis to mean that the Nazirite had to make atonement by sacrifice for having sinned against his own soul in making himself miserable through leaving off wine. Such a man is called a sinner, and how much more is he a sinner who denies himself the enjoyment of everything![1] Another rabbinical saying of the same kind is: 'A man will have to give account on the judgement day of every good thing which he might have enjoyed and did not."[2] Not surprisingly, therefore, Judaism developed an intense antipathy to Christian monasticism and the ideal of celibacy. Again it is very difficult to conceive of poverty becoming a Jewish rabbinical ideal, poverty being regarded as a punishment for sin whereas wealth and riches were the reward of righteousness. There were of course certain ascetical practices, fasts, penitential disciplines, regulations concerning mourning customs and so on, but these were carefully controlled and only permitted in moderation.

The Jewish non-ascetical attitude is specially prominent in regard to sex and marriage. The Old Testament Hebrews, and the Jews later on, never came near to accepting a thorough-going gnostic or manichean attitude to the human body or to sexuality. Perhaps one might say that although Old Testament apocalyptic was dualistic in once sense (the contrast between 'this age' and 'that age') it was belief in the resurrection of the body which prevented finally any tendency towards metaphysical dualism.

It is interesting to notice at this point the different results of the motive of the imitation of God in the Jewish and Christian traditions. In rabbinical Judaism the motive of the imitation of God resulted in the prohibition of celibacy because the latter amounted to a denial of the image of God in man, since this was interpreted to mean male-female relationship and therefore not to marry was a blasphemy. This Jewish feeling was summed up by C. G. Montefiore: 'Judaism has consistently deprecated and depreciated celibacy. It has required its saints to show their sanctity *in* the world and amid the ties and obligations of family life. Asceticism has its justifications but on the whole when its practice involves a separation from the world and from the ordinary ties of man it is rather an evil than a good."[3]

The attitude of Jesus himself can perhaps be best expressed in the paradox that sexuality matters but does not matter ultimately. There can be no doubt that he assigned the highest place to marriage. His attitude seems to have been that marriage was part of the natural order of things willed by God, and that the *henosis* of man and woman in marriage must not be interfered with. Divorce, or sexual relations outside marriage, constituted such an interference and therefore promiscuity and adultery were incompatible with the relationship of marriage. There are some sayings like Matthew 5^{29-30} and 19^{11-12} which suggest that there ought to be a readiness to take sacrificial action in the interest of the demands of the kingdom and this sacrifice might well involve the surrender of family ties. But here it has to be said that this strain in the teaching of Jesus is associated particularly with the Matthaean Gospel. There is certainly an ascetic tone in the teaching of Jesus, but this does not spring from any metaphysically dualistic or gnostic

view of the material or the sexual ('There is nothing from without a man that going into him can defile him'). It is incumbent on man to be alert to recognize the 'signs' of the kingdom, and this readiness is, as often as not, conditional upon willingness to face painful renunciations of self. The asceticism of Jesus, therefore, was empirical and practical rather than metaphysical or dualistic, and orientated towards the eschatological character of the kingdom of God. In the Johannine writings the issue of asceticism is focused in the relation between Christians and the cosmos.

One reading of the gospel of John would certainly suggests that the world, the *cosmos*, is inherently evil. Consequently the ethical injunctions sound like a summons, not to remedial activity in the world, but to the conquest of it (cf. 1 John 2^{15f}). On the other hand, in no uncertain language, the author speaks of the world as the object of God's love (John $3^{16 \text{ and } 17}$; 12^{47}). There would seem to be a Johannine basis for the polarity of Christian attitudes towards ascetism suggested by A. R. Vidler in his *Essays in Liberality*. The Christian must first of all say 'Yes' to created existence because it is good and created by God. He must next say 'No' to created existence because it is perverted by evil and ranged against God; but thirdly he must again say a 'Yes' to creation because he believes that it has been redeemed by Christ.

In St Paul the question of asceticism revolves primarily round his attitude to sex and marriage. K. E. Kirk (*The Vision of God*) gives the impression that St Paul is entirely depreciatory of marriage. The only positive statement about marriage that he allows St Paul is the phrase in 1 Corinthians 9^{5} that he had the right, if he wishes, to 'lead about a wife'; but this is to neglect the very high doctrine of married love which is to be found in Ephesians 5^{25-33}. Further, Kirk does not bring out the significance of a passage like 1 Corinthians$^{12-20}$, which J. A. T. Robinson uses as the basis for his discussion of 'the true Christian doctrine of matter' (*On being the Church in the World*, p. 35) and Sherwin Bailey speaks of it as a passage which 'displays a psychological insight into human sexuality which is altogether exceptional by first-century standards' (*The Man/Woman Relation in Christian Thought*, p. 10).

St Paul does not seem to have shared his native Judaism's attitude towards sex and marriage, but he is not a thoroughgoing gnostic in his approach. A good summary of New Testament teaching is to be found in K. E. Kirk's *The Vision of God*, pp. 88ff. Kirk deals with the question by discussing the use of the terms 'flesh' and 'spirit' in St Paul. He shows how Paul uses 'flesh' in two main senses: (a) 'of those factors in a man's character, possessions or surroundings which, though they are good in themselves, it is possible for him to misuse or misapply', and (b) the tendency to misuse them which, apart from grace, is the normal and indeed inevitable tendency of life, and Kirk quotes here a good sentence from G. B. Stevens's *The Theory of the New Testament*: 'metaphysically considered the flesh is neutral, empirically considered it is sinful.'

One other New Testament passage ought to be mentioned because of its very great influence: Revelation 14[4] where reference is made to 'those who have not defiled themselves with women, for they are virgins'. The picture here is that before the throne there appear as well as the martyrs, most who

have led a single life. Here celibacy is presented as a martyrdom and in spite of its context the motivation suggested is not eschatological but dualistic, the sexual relation being regarded as itself defilement. And indeed it has to be said that apart from the very rich passage in Ephesians 5^{25ff} there is hardly anything in the New Testament that could be described as a high doctrine of marriage.

The New Testament teaching as a whole, then, may be summarized as follows. The 'flesh' is certainly something which can be defiled and, in view of man's 'fallenness', it is all too likely that this will be the case. Nevertheless, it will be a distortion to regard the flesh as itself evil. It is redeemable, and has been redeemed. While Paul may use terms which if pressed relentlessly are capable of a thorough-going dualistic interpretation, he does not himself press the words in that direction. But there are some passages in the New Testament which can be detached from their context and from the main emphasis of the New Testament as a whole, and used in a one-sided way. There is a tensison in the New Testament which is eschatologically conditioned and this in Christian history becomes frequently a dualism which is metaphysically conditioned. One of the urgent tasks in the reconstruction of Christian spirituality is to put positively into writing and practice the pre-eminence of the man-woman relationship in married love, and a Christian ascetic ought not to call in question in any way the unique richness of that deepest of all personal relationships. Even in the protestant tradition it was not until the day before yesterday, so to speak, that positive Christian writing[4] on the subject of marriage at all comparable say with that of a D. H. Lawrence became a feature of Christian teaching.

IV. THE BIBLE, PRAYER AND MEDITATION

It is easy from a superficial examination of the evidence to assume that in Old Testament thought prayer is conceived entirely in terms of petition. In fact Friedrich Heiler says that this is the distinguishing feature of prophetical piety with which he contrasts mystical piety wherein he assumes hardly any place to be given to petition and intercession as compared with meditation, adoration and contemplation. In fact, as Pedersen points out,[5] the theme of meditation is very deeply rooted in the Old Testament, but it would be a mistake to assume that underneath the English translation 'to meditate' there lie Hebrew words which relate at all to our common idea of meditation as something static and passive. On the contrary the characteristic Hebrew verb to meditate (*hāghar*), which is used in the psalms of meditating on the Torah day and night, means to make oneself so familiar with something that one is determined to live by it and act on it. So when the Israelites were told to meditate on the Torah it meant that they were to take it as the determining force in their lives, and to act on it. Similarly meditation on the acts of God in the nation's history took the form of appropriating actively the history of Israel in the life of the individual through festival and ethical motivation. This kind of activist meditation is characteristic of New Testament spirituality. The four gospels are deliberately composed as meditations on the life of Christ in the sense that they are about the task of the disciple

at the same time that they are about Jesus of Nazareth. It seems to me that in the New Testament there is in embryo something like what is formalized later as the contemplation of Christ 'in his mysteries' and it is this kind of contemplation of Christ which is advocated in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The biblical material is of special importance in our own day for the indications which it gives as to the structure of the life of prayer and worship. There is an antipathy in some contemporary theology to the idea of such a structure, and a good deal of this antipathy lies behind the writing of some advocates of 'religionless' Christianity. But simply to identify our ordinary life and work, even in its intensity, with worship or prayer is a form of gnosticism since it denies our finitude by equating life this side of the grave with eternal bliss. In life this side of the grave, which is attempting to do honest homage to the Incarnation, there is the need in prayer and worship for the particular act, time, words, gesture. And while these particularities will always be subject to the possibility of idolatry this is a fate which awaits the use of metaphor as such in human life. But this is no reason for the abolition of metaphor. To abolish metaphor would be to deny one's finitude. The Bible supplies the normative imagery for the two basic components of worship and prayer. There is the imagery of the 'way', the journey, which suggests human prayer and worship as 'approach' to God, as 'drawing near' to God, and this, incidentally, has a good deal to say about the necessary place of a linear axis in church architecture. But there is also in the biblical material a number of images which cluster round the theology of 'presence', the tabernacling presence of God, of being still in the presence of God. This is the idea which is expressed in the circular use of space in Christian architecture. There needs to be a blending then of the necessary nomadic quality of the Christian life as having to move on, and being ready to move on before one gets too deeply entrenched in one particular culture or environment. There is also the necessity for knowing when to peg down and sit out the storm. Both attitudes are necessary and wise.

[1] G. F. Moore, *Judaism, II*, p. 265.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 265.
[3] *Synoptic Gospels, II*. p. 265.
[4] I have in mind, among others, the work of Dr Sherwin Bailey.
[5] *Israel*, I-II, pp. 125ff.

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SPIRITUALITY

Trevor T. Rowe

SPIRITUALITY is a term much used in current theological debates. It tends to be regarded as a blanket expression that may be applied in the general field of what was called piety. If, because of its associations, we can use the word piety no more and must resort to spirituality, there must be some attempt to define the subject under discussion and the consequent limits of its study. On the one hand, as I have suggested, spirituality is used too loosely to refer to a vague area that includes prayer and most forms of Christian experience and, by adding the word 'corporate', worship too. On the other hand, it appears in the particular, albeit fascinating, study of mystical experience. Just as in this last mentioned field enormous confusion has been created by the misuse of terms such as mystic, mysticism and mystical experience, if spirituality is used without definition its study will be unrewarding and yield more disagreements than extensions of understanding.

In our day piety is a suspect term chiefly because of its association with *religion*, understood as Bonhoeffer uses it. The idea that there is a particular area in which the soul can be cultivated is rejected. Spirituality, though etymologically related to a body/soul, body/spirit dichotomy, is offered as a word that does not carry this association. Spirituality is taking wholeness as one's goal. It is the quest for wholeness and, as a theological discipline, spirituality is the study of the ways in which this quest has been undertaken. Understood in this way 'worldly holiness', prayer, worship and ethics can be regarded as aspects of Christian spirituality. Those who are familiar with part of the vast literature, particularly French Roman Catholic writers such as Gilson, Bouyer and Pourrat, will know how hard it is to integrate the study of Christian spirituality in the way I have suggested. The method of Professor E. J. Tinsley in selecting a motif and examining how far it comprehends all the material seems a useful one.[1] In this article I shall take the motif of 'death and resurrection' and allied images, and see how far they illuminate the quest for wholeness as seen in the New Testament and the writings of Augustine, Luther and Ignatius Loyola.

The relationship between the first chapters of Genesis and the four Gospels has not been systematically examined, as far as I know, but a great deal of evidence can be produced to show that the Evangelists use the symbols of the creation story to interpret the work of Jesus as a new creation.[2] One can mention briefly here the way in which the nativity stories and even the first words of Mark are coloured by Genesis;[3] the symbolism of the Baptism;[4] the correspondence between Adam and Jesus in the wilderness of the Temptation;[5] the use of 'water' in the first chapters of St John's Gospel. Paul is our best expositor of the gospel tradition. Ideas that are explicit in his writings we find latent in the Gospels. For Paul the Christian man is a new creature[6] and the Gospels present Jesus as the agent of God who is making man and

his world new. Christian spirituality from the New Testament point of view is the quest in which we allow Christ to do his work of re-creation in us and through us in our world. If we allow the symbolic overtones of the Baptism story to carry their full weight we see Jesus emerging from the waters of Jordan as the 'new Man', the one who is a creature possessing the wholeness that God intended for man. For Paul baptism was both the symbol and instrument of God's renewing work in man; it was both a re-enactment of Christ's baptism and his death and resurrection, and the means by which, through grace, a man is reborn.

While Paul describes sin in a number of ways we may best understand his thought in terms of rebellion. Man, instead of being a creature, God's dependant, had rebelled in seeking independence. This rebellion is seen as the obstacle to his wholeness, and healing as coming through faith which is the acceptance of dependance upon God as the proper posture for a man. In other words, a man must allow his rebellion to die and be given a new life by God's resurrecting act. In the Gospels the disciples work out their spirituality in terms of discipleship—they find wholeness in following the way of Christ. In the apostolic church men are guided and empowered by the Holy Spirit to find the way of love in every detail of life; their spirituality being fed by their treatment of their slaves, wives and children, by prayer and sacraments. It would be possible to give adequate documentation and fuller exposition of this suggestion that for the New Testament writers Christian spirituality is a quest for wholeness in which man's rebellion is destroyed by the action of the Holy Spirit and he learns to live as a creature conforming himself to the pattern of love incarnate in Jesus.

When we turn to St Augustine we move away from a number of creative exponents of a common tradition to a single, highly sophisticated, sensitive mind. It has been a common fault to conclude that Augustine regarded sensuality as the chief obstacle to man's wholeness. There is little doubt that he retained throughout his life a certain unease with regard to some aspects of life—his treatises on marriage read a little like a fundamentalist doing his best with the requirements of a University examining board. None of us can cut ourselves loose from our past and Augustine had been a Manichaen and a neo-Platonist. Nevertheless, the crucial fault in man from which all others come, in Augustine's view, was pride. His own spirituality, his quest for wholeness, is seen in his longing for humility. Ambition, not sensuality, was the obstacle to his conversion; and in the variety of forms that pride can take it remained with him to the end. Fundamentally he was a man with the Bible and his own experience, and he, as do we all, interpreted the Bible in terms of his experience. He is known to succeeding centuries for his doctrine of grace because what he read in the Bible and had known for himself combined to say that pride can be destroyed and humility resurrected in its place by the action of the Holy Spirit. This is well illustrated by the use Augustine makes of medical images.[7] For example: 'This Wisdom of God, setting out to cure men, applied Himself to cure them, being at once the Physician and the Medicine. Because man fell through pride, He applied humility as a cure.'[8]

The Pelagian controversy was a crisis of spirituality. Can a man find wholeness except by grace? Augustine's firm answer 'No' brought him into many arguments, some of which led on to unsatisfactory conclusions—predestination and the damnation of the unbaptized being two of them. Constantly he had to ask the Pelagians Paul's question: 'What have you that you have not received?' Apart from God, our pride corrupts us and only by his action do we have anything of ultimate worth. Love of self is the foundation of the Devil's City. Love of God, which is the root of humility, is that on which the City of God is built 'in the solid estate of eternity'. And we cannot love God except it is kindled by God's love for us in Christ. 'Christ's saying, *Without Me, ye can do nothing*, dominates every line that the mature Augustine wrote.'[9] To regard the Pelagian controversy as a debate in ideas is to misunderstand it. Augustine's writings against the Pelagians are like the unsubmerged part of the iceberg, supporting them is the life of a faithful bishop. Augustine's quest for wholeness could be expressed in a doctrinal debate but it belonged chiefly to his day-to-day bearing of what he called *episcopalis sarcina*—the bishop's load. Van der Meer's massive 'Augustine the Bishop' is a great description of a quest for wholeness which expressed in practice the theological ideas that were secondary to it. What became the subject of controversy was something that dominated his life from his conversion onwards. Two elements in his writings bear this out. First, the theme of the reformation of man to the image of God by the imitation of Christ who 'came of set purpose to give us new life in Himself, for we are made new by longing for Him and following after His passion'.[10] Second, the way in which he saw the Eucharist as the perfect symbol of the action of God within and through man. In a piece of typical Augustinian exegesis he notes that John prefaces the account of the institution of 'the sacramental supper' with the words 'When Jesus knew that His hour was come that He should depart from this world unto the Father' and concludes 'This passing over from this mortal life to the other, the immortal life, that is from death to life, is set forth in the Passion and Resurrection of the Lord' of which, we take it, the supper is a miniature.[11] Regin Prenter concludes that Augustine sees the Eucharist 'effecting in us a certain *transitas* from death to life. What once happened in Christ is repeated in Christian men through the sacrament.'[12]

The universal relevance of the Christian gospel finds no better illustration when we recognize the similarities in the spirituality of men as temperamentally different as Luther and Augustine. If, for Paul, the obstacle to man's wholeness was rebellion and for Augustine, pride, Luther sees it in self-centredness: man is *curvus in se*. All are talking essentially about the same thing.[13] Luther describes his own spirituality in which this obstacle to wholeness is overcome in his idea of *The two works of God*. The *strange work of God* (*opus alienum*) is to make a man aware of his disease and to break his confidence in himself. This is achieved primarily by the Law that confronts man with his failure and thus destroys his pride. Luther asks: Why are the commandments given? 'They are only fitted to show a man his own incapacity for goodness . . . thereby a man learns not to depend on himself, but to seek help elsewhere.'[14] The *proper work of God* (*opus proprium*) takes

place through the Gospel that turns a man from his self-centredness as he is given, through no merit of his own, the *righteousness of God*. 'In order that you may come out of yourself and flee from yourself . . . He sets you face to face with His beloved Son, Jesus Christ.'[15] Luther knew the damage that could be done by an imbalanced doctrine of the Holy Spirit and we find him seeing the Spirit acting in and through a man in ways that are recognizably authentic. The Holy Spirit's task is not to give visions but to be the agent of God's recreative work. So he says: 'Who will endeavour to amend his life? I answer, No man! No man can! . . . but the Elect will be amended by the Holy Spirit.'[16] 'A new creature is the work of the Holy Ghost, which cleanseth our heart by faith, and worketh the fear of God, love, chastity. . . .'[17]

As with the New Testament and Augustine, this basic pattern is given considerable theological expansion by Luther and, similarly too, it is related to the man's whole life. Luther had not the background of Augustine that formed a constant temptation to other-worldliness; practical issues pressed upon him with a speed unknown in the fourth century. He had broken himself from monastic spirituality and he had influenced others to make a similar break. He was thus compelled very quickly to show how a man could find wholeness in *secular* affairs. This he did through his teaching on *vocatio*. He claimed that the Sermon on the Mount can be applied in the world as in the monastery. The Christian man has a calling, a vocation, to fulfil the commands of God in the concrete things of his daily life. There he will live as a servant of God not in order to obtain his salvation, but in thankful obedience to the one who has justified him. Faith is 'a dimension of existence' in which a man's self-centredness is destroyed and life is reborn by the grace of God in Christ.

Ignatius Loyola has received too little attention from Protestant scholarship. This can be justified partly by the fact that he was not a highly creative theologian. Indeed, a considerable literature is available devoted to the examination of the sources of the 'Spiritual Exercises'.[18] A study of the literature reveals the dependence of Ignatius upon the *devotio moderna* in which Luther found many echoes of his own teaching. For Ignatius the obstacle to a man's wholeness is sin, understood as an attachment to things that oppose the fulfilment of the purpose of his creation. The Principle and Foundation of the *Exercises* he states as: 'Man was created to praise, reverence and serve God our Lord.' The aim of Ignatian spirituality is to restore this purpose and it proceeds by a method that falls clearly into a death and resurrection pattern. The *Exercises* are divided into four 'Weeks', in the first of which we are given a series of exercises that are intended to expose to man his sin of independence or uncreatureliness. Ignatius seeks to prevent this from being merely or morbidly introspective by making it clear that if the exercises are to be effective this exposure of a man to himself must be an act of God. Only as God reveals his purpose for a man and his failure in fulfilling it will the exercises be effective, and the *First Week* is full of prayers for this to happen. Christ is the one who fulfilled the purpose of creation, and man, in order himself to become a *creature*, must be re-created after the pattern of Christ. The Second, Third and Fourth Weeks of exercises are

devoted to the contemplation of Christ, that by the operation of God's grace working through meditation, a man may be re-formed after this pattern.

St Teresa, a fellow Spaniard whose spiritual crisis took place about the time of Ignatius' death, wrote 'To give our Lord a perfect hospitality, Mary and Martha must combine'. To understand Ignatian spirituality we must see the *Exercises* in their proper context. Their use was to be combined with severely Martha-like responsibilities on the part of the Society of Jesus for whom they were designed. The history of the Jesuits may not be a very happy or edifying one, but at its best their work has been an incarnation of the *Exercises*: an attempt to find wholeness in selfless obedience to Christ.

If my exposition of the New Testament and the thought of Augustine, Luther and Ignatius is correct, it is clear that these writers sought wholeness for themselves in allowing God to reproduce within them the pattern of Christ's death and resurrection. I would claim that death and resurrection is the basic myth of Christianity. Christian thinkers and artists have been obsessed by tragic and comic themes that reflect what we find in the Gospels. They have seen in Unamuno's phrase, 'the tragic sense of life'—life as a waste-land if it is confined to a totally man-centred system of reference. They have seen also comedy breaking into man's tragedy as God's action comes to take away the hopelessness of his lonely situation, just as the Gospel story is a classic drama of comedy breaking up tragedy. We must recognize that this death and resurrection theme is not solely possessed by Christianity and is related to many similar myths of renewal to be found in non-Christian literature and religions. But to find it in Freud is to have independent confirmation of the essential truth of the Christian understanding of the human situation.

This short comparative study has gone no further than Ignatius in the sixteenth century. Though space prevents an extended treatment of modern writers, some reference ought to be made to the fact that the death and resurrection theme is very clear in many writers who are generally regarded as characteristically twentieth century. Kierkegaard, though he lived in the nineteenth century, seems to us as a man born out of due time. A prayer in the *Journals* 'God in heaven, let me really feel my nothingness, not in order to despair over it, but in order to feel more properly the greatness of thy goodness'[19] is expounded throughout his writings. The themes of T. S. Eliot's *Four Quartets* are complex, but one idea stands out in the phrase 'Old stone to new building'. Man needs 'a place of disaffection' and 'a time for the wind to break the loosened pane'. He needs to recognize:

Our only health is the disease
If we obey the dying nurse
Whose constant care is not to please
But to remind of our, and Adam's curse,
And that, to be restored, our sickness must grow worse.

Then he must go on to know:

The one discharge from sin and error
The only hope, or else despair
Lies in the choice of pyre or pyre—

To be redeemed from fire by fire.
. . . We only live, only suspire
Consumed by either fire or fire.[20]

Bonhoeffer's epigram 'Death is the supreme festival on the road to freedom'[21] finds echoes in his other works. One quotation must suffice: 'Christ, incarnate, crucified and glorified is found in every Christian soul, for all are members of his Body, the Church. The Church bears the human form, the form of Christ in his death and resurrection. . . . When a man follows Jesus Christ and bears the image of the incarnate, crucified and risen Lord, when he has become the image of God, we may at last say that he has been called to be the "imitator of God".'[22] Sermons of Tillich in *The Shaking of the Foundations* and *The New Being* and those of H. A. Williams in *The True Wilderness* contain much that bears the impression of the death and resurrection theme as a pattern of Christian spirituality.

A study of the complexities of the Christological controversies of the fourth century for examination purposes could succeed in inoculating a person against interest in this subject for life. The study of the development of ecclesiastical institutions and Christian doctrines brings sufficient benefits to justify a place in the curriculum of theological education, but I am inclined to believe that the study of Christian spirituality related to the ferment of contemporary theological debate deserves more attention than it seems to receive. The one thing the Christian minister has to offer is the *wholeness* Christ offered to men. He has to show in many situations that 'from the depth of unhappiness springs new life, and only by draining the lees of spiritual sorrow can we at last taste the honey that lies at the bottom of the cup of life'.[23] He must make clear the idea well expressed by Teilhard de Chardin: 'God must, in some way or other, make room for Himself, hollowing us out and emptying us, if He is finally to penetrate into us. And in order to assimilate us in Him, He must break the molecules of our being so as to re-cast and re-model us.'[24] He will be greatly helped to do this by drawing from the experience of the Christian centuries, the story of which has had a renaissance in recent years, less publicised but no less real, than that of biblical theology, for these are the issues which the greatest in Christian history have explored most deeply.

'May God send the flood of his waters over our souls, destroy in us what he knows is in need of destruction and give life to what he considers should live.'[25]

[1] Cf. *The Imitation of God in Christ* (1960) and his projected *The Imitation of God in Christian Spirituality*.
[2] Cf. P. S. Minear, *Images of the Church in the New Testament*, p. 105f.
[3] Cf. A. Farrer, *St Matthew and St Mark*, p. 187; A. Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*, p. 174.
[4] Cf. G. Cope, *Symbolism in the Bible and the Church*, p. 15.
[5] Cf. V. Taylor, *The Names of Jesus*, p. 153; A. Farrer, *A Study in Mark*, p. 277.
[6] Cf. N. A. Dahl, 'Christ, Creation and the Church' (in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube).
[7] Cf. R. Arbesman, *Christ the Medicus humilis in St Augustine, Augustinus Magister*, II. p. 623f.
[8] De doct. Christ. I, 14.
[9] G. Bonner, *St Augustine. Life and Controversies*, p. 390.
[10] En. in Ps. 37, 27.

[11] Ep. 55, 2.
[12] 'Metaphysics and Eschatology in the Sacramental Teaching of St Augustine. *Studia Theologica*, I, 1-2 (1947), p. 5f.
[13] A. Nygren, A. S. Wood and E. G. Rupp subscribe to a distinction between Augustine and Luther on this point that I do not believe is valid.
[14] *The Freedom of the Christian Man*, 8f.; cf. T. M. McDonough, *The Law and the Gospel in Luther.*
[15] Ibid., 6.
[16] *De Servo Arb.*, 67.
[17] *Comm. on Gal.* (6^{15}).
[18] Cf. H. Rahner: *Saint Ignace de Loyola et la Genèse des Exercises*; J. F. Gilmont and P. Daman, *Bibliographie Ignatienne* (1894-1957).
[19] 14th May, 1839.
[20] East Coker 1; Burnt Norton 3; East Coker 1 and 4; Little Gidding 4.
[21] *Letters and Papers*, p. 163.
[22] *The Cost of Discipleship*, p. 274f.
[23] Don Miguel de Unamuno, *Tragic Sense of Life*, p. 71. (1962 ed.)
[24] *Le Milieu Divin*, p. 68.
[25] Origen, *Hom. 2 in Gen.*

CHRISTIAN SPIRITUALITY: THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE COMMUNITIES

Mark Gibbard, SSJE

WHEN I opened the letter from the editor of this review and found that he was asking me to try to write this article, I was surprised, delighted and perplexed. I was surprised that, when seeking for a Christian spirituality for tomorrow, he should turn to an Anglican religious community of Victorian foundation, which at least until very recently was regarded as Anglo-Catholic and conservative.[1] Then I was delighted because I, like my community, am not realizing that, without tearing up our roots, we must work towards a new spirituality for the future; and indeed that this cannot be a purely Anglican, but must be an ecumenical task. Yet I was perplexed, because we, like other Anglican communities, are uncertain of ourselves in the theological and religious ferment of the church of today. Like other Christians we have discussed *Soundings*, *Honest to God* and *The Secular Meaning of the Gospel.* These authors pose us inescapable questions, even though neither they nor we may yet have found answers; and we know that *we* cannot be the same again. Here are my personal reflections; I commit no one else to what I say.

Traditional religious communities

Communities, besides trying to train their own members in the life of prayer and in Christian character, have through the centuries influenced the spirituality of the people round about them. St Basil the Great and his monasteries must have had a great influence on the spiritual life of the Christians of Cappadocia; so must the Benedictine and Celtic monastic missionaries in the Europe of the Dark Ages. Indeed, so highly was their monastic *divine office* esteemed that it passed from the cloisters to the

secular clergy, who were gradually compelled to recite it in its entirety, unsuitable as it may have been for those who had onerous pastoral responsibilities. Although in the Middle Ages men technically fled from the world into the great monastic houses, yet those houses shed a spiritual *rayonnement* on the whole medieval church and its tradition of prayer. The Dominicans and Franciscans spread their own distinctive spirituality, not only through the thousands of members of their 'third orders' which they gathered around them, but even more widely by their preaching and teaching. The Jesuits must have moulded the spirituality of countless people by their retreats. And who can reckon up their influence in this field and that of more recent religious orders in their devoted apostolate?

The religious communities of the Tractarian movement

The Tractarian movement, which has done so much to revive or to give a 'catholic sense' in varying degrees to nearly all parts of the Anglican communion, soon produced its own religious communities. This movement is usually said to have been begun by a sermon of John Keble in the university church at Oxford in 1833. The *Tracts for the Times* followed at once. Eight years later the first Sister took the religious vows and soon afterwards entered a community and became its superior. The first sisterhoods were actually founded in 1845, 1847 and 1848. The first stable order for men, the Society of St John the Evangelist, began in Oxford in 1866.

The Tractarian movement was essentially a traditional movement. It tried to find a corrective to the erastianism and the liberalism of the Victorian age by a return to the past seen through rather rose-tinted spectacles. It looked first to the patristic age, and then to the middle ages. Some of these early Victorians were fascinated by a romantic medievalism. Keble, for example, wrote in 1838 that he felt that Sir Walter Scott in his novels was near to a catholic frame of mind.[1] Men were then building sham Gothic ruins and soon pseudo-Gothic churches. J. M. Neale, another Tractarian and the founder of a sisterhood in 1855, had become in 1839 one of the co-founders of the Cambridge Camden Society to promote interest in Gothic architecture. The second and third generation of the Tractarians looked rather more to the contemporary Roman Catholicism of the end and of the turn of the century.

The founders and advisers of these early communities had some difficulty in finding on what plan they should build and develop the spiritual lives of their members. They had no living tradition of 'religious life' of their own to guide them. Some may have wished to turn to the early centuries, to the desert fathers and to Cassian. But they needed some more detailed schemes for their life of prayer. Not unnaturally they turned to the English church of the middle ages, of which the leaders of the Tractarian movement stressed that they were the legitimate heirs. So the early communities were very soon using translations of the seven services of the English medieval breviary as supplementing the services of the Book of Common Prayer and sometimes as superseding them. A book so arranged, which is still widely used, was first published in 1858. The spiritual lives of these Victorian religious were

also much influenced by the medieval *Imitation of Christ* by Thomas à Kempis with its unbalanced stress on world-renunciation, and similar writings.[3] In meditation and mental prayer they turned frequently to the methods of *Spiritual Exercises* of St Ignatius Loyala. Significantly a retreat conducted by Fr Benson a little before he founded the Society of St John the Evangelist follows precisely the Ignatian scheme with the addition of a meditation on the work of the Holy Spirit.[4] Later we find the Tractarians' successors reproducing the identical grades of mental prayer as set out by the Roman Catholic authors since the Counter-Reformation.[5]

These methods of prayer were not only practised by members of the communities, but they themselves spread these methods widely through the Anglican communion. For example, through the influence of religious communities some theological colleges took over (however unsuitable for their own purpose) the lesser offices from the medieval breviary. The result has been that Anglican clergy heavily involved in pastoral work have sometimes over-burdened themselves with such additional offices and methods of meditation, which did not really help them towards a well-proportioned ministry.

Many of these forms of devotion, which Anglican communities had borrowed from the Roman Catholic church and which they had commended to priests and people, are now being widely questioned in the Roman Catholic church. For example, a decree of the present Vatican Council has already begun to reduce the seven daily 'offices' of the breviary. Roman clergy outside the religious orders no longer say the office of 'prime', and they need only say one of the three lesser offices in the course of the day. This modification is probably only an interim measure before a more radical reform of the whole office is made. Professor Hans Küng, one of the more influential of the young radical theologians of the Roman church, has made a drastic, realistic suggestion:

> A priest should give at least three-quarters of an hour to prayer each day: a short morning and evening office, consisting of psalms and prayer, following the liturgical year: a quarter of an hour's consecutive reading of the Bible: and a quarter of an hour's meditation, which might take the form of unhurried, recollected reading of spiritual classics.[6]

A contemporary religious community—the Taizé community

The Taizé community, comprising chiefly pastors and laymen from the Reformed and Protestant churches on the Continent, whose first members took their vows (or *engagements*, as they prefer to call them) on Easter morning 1949, presents an interesting contrast to the Tractarian communities. Its rule was not formulated until 1953 and is very different from the rules of these earlier communities. They looked to the past in the sense of the phrase, 'Earnestly contend for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints': the Taizé rule looked to the present and the future—

> 'Be present to your day and age: adapt yourself to the conditions of the moment.'

The Tractarian rules stressed flight from the world, sometimes almost in a Jansenist manner: in contrast the Taizé rule demands, 'Open yourself to all that is human'. Even more strikingly the Taizé rule proclaims itself as provisional—this of course links up with the spirit of our present, rapidly changing world—

> If this rule were ever to be regarded as an end in itself and to dispense us from always seeking further to discover God's design, the love of Christ and the light of the Holy Spirit, we should be imposing on ourselves a useless burden. Then it would have been better never to have written it.

The Taizé rule speaks of the importance of the divine office and of its regular recitation. It says that there will be days when the office feels like a burden. The rule gives practical advice on how to deal with this difficulty and also on distracting thoughts during the office. But it does not go into any detail about the office. The office as it is practised, at Taizé, consists of prayers, mainly liturgical, but partly 'free', three times a day, morning, midday and evening. The rule also speaks of the importance of personal prayer and says that 'common prayer does not dispense us from private prayer'. But it never refers to the medieval and Counter-Reformation divisions and gradations of prayer. Indeed, it reminds us of the primitive simplicity of the Rule of St Benedict, 'If by chance another wishes to pray by himself let him go into the oratory with simplicity and pray'.[7] There is of course no allusion in the Taizé rule to any of the repercussions in the life of prayer of the ferment in the theology of today: it is rather more surprising that there is no hint of it in the more recent writings of the Taizé community.

Benedict Green's review of Max Thurian's *Visible Unity and Tradition* has this pertinent paragraph:

'The main criticism I have of the book is that it does not grasp the nettle of historical criticism, both of the Bible and of subsequent developments in the Church, e.g. the origins of the ministry, and that will lead many, especially on the Reformed side, to regard it as naïve, and many, especially on the Roman Catholic side, to see the problem of reintegration as simpler than it really is. As the authors of the *Catholicity* report of 1947 saw, the problem is a triangular one—catholic-protestant-liberal—and a final synthesis will have to do justice to all three.'[8]

Desire for modifications in Anglican communities today

There is now a growing desire in Anglican communities to get away from the rigidity and fussiness of some of their Victorian rules and from their rather blind following of the liturgical ways of the Roman Catholic church of the middle ages and Counter-Reformation. For example, until recently the Anglican communities, like other Anglo-Catholics, have supplemented the eucharist of the Prayer Book from medieval and modern Catholic missals. But a representative conference of 250 Anglican religious at Oxford last summer broke away from all this: they celebrated the CSI liturgy in the university church and also two very bold experimental liturgies, which are in use with episcopal permission in two contemplative communities.

There is also some desire to replace the traditional sevenfold office with a shorter office, perhaps combining 'free prayer' with liturgical prayer, at early morning, midday, evening and night. The times of these four offices would then correspond to the normal divisions of the day of modern man, and so could be clearly seen as attempts to consecrate his daily life and work to God and his service. This was the original intention of the old sevenfold office, but this aim is hardly realized in any of our communities today. For example, matins, lauds and prime, instead of being three times of prayer, are now commonly telescoped into one rather unduly long morning office: and again in at least one community the evening office is said immediately after tea and then it is oddly combined with compline, the going-to-bed office. From such customs it looks as if the sevenfold office is being said not with its original intention to sanctify the different parts of the day, but merely because it has been handed down by tradition in this sevenfold form. Similarly the traditional division of prayer into what appears to many modern people to be artificial types and stages is being criticized in the communities. One community, which has in its rule the standard Counter-Reformation analysis of meditation and mental prayer, has significantly appended to this chapter a note that slow, devotional reading of the Bible may be reckoned as a legitimate form of mental prayer.

The Anglican communities and consequently those whom they influence outside their own membership are now giving careful consideration to the observations of the radical theologians on the practice of prayer. And it may be that these communities out of their daily round of prayer and study may have something to say towards the finding of answers to the questions the radical theologians pose both to the church and to themselves. John Robinson himself recognizes the contribution which theologians from religious communities have made and are making today in this search.[9]

The radical theological ferment and the life of prayer

John Robinson has questioned a general presupposition of the communities' tradition of prayer; and from his question much good may eventually come. He makes his point very forcibly when he writes:

> I wonder whether Christian prayer, prayer in the light of the Incarnation, is not to be *defined* in terms of penetration through the world to God rather than withdrawal from the world to God.[10]

Already many theological students and young ministers in America are being influenced in their practice of prayer by the more radical Paul van Buren, who writes

> The reason why prayer is difficult for many men today is that its traditional language leads them to imagine something which contradicts their empirical attitudes. No wonder prayer seems to be a flight from reality.[11]

And yet he can affirm of the eucharist—

The celebration of the Lord's supper has and may again become a discernment situation, and that the believer's liberation there is as genuine as that of the disciples, being ultimately derived from Jesus himself by way of Easter.[13]

We may soon have a similar problem among students in the British Isles: Indeed during an old students' reunion an ordinand at Lincoln read a paper 'A Stage on the journey to Ordination', which was later printed in their quarterly, in which he said, 'This talk is nothing more than a short analysis of what is presumably very common among theological students. But I am told you might find it interesting to see what are the sort of thoughts and interpretations which prompt a man who wants to be ordained into the Church of God to reject the idea of a personal, transcendent God': he then went on to explain how some of the writings of the linguistic philosophers made the notion of a transcendent God quite impossible for him; and he then explained the repercussions of this on his life of prayer. 'Any idea of praying to someone, of talking to someone, of trying to bring one's will into line with God's will was nonsensical.... Intercession was very difficult, but I found meditation on the life of Jesus, on the effect that his life had on the church, and of thinking of others in the light of that meditation, empowered me to love them.... The one service which did make sense was the eucharist, in terms of the gathering of the local accepting community round the representation of the self-giving Christ. Gathered together in this context, the church is empowered to love and accept.... I am prepared to use religious images that I have rejected when others find them helpful, as in this way I may help the church to live out its life in the world as the loving and accepting community.'[13]

The Anglican communities would wish to try to meet this situation. Already Sister Edna Mary of the Anglican deaconness community of St Andrew has taken up John Robinson's point in the last chapter, entitled 'Towards a Secular Spirituality', in her recent book, *This World and Prayer*. Alec Graham, commenting on *Honest to God* in the monthly paper of the Society of St John the Evangelist, was prepared to say—

Worship so far from being the one thing needful can be an activity which prevents us from meeting and responding to the active, living God, who all the time stands over against us and seeks to elicit from us the response of self-giving trust.[14]

A correspondent to the quarterly of the Community of the Resurrection at Mirfield was told that better than any attempt to 'defend our church' against so-called radical attack would be to—

make a fresh surrender to the Holy Spirit, turn away from self, to see this or any controversy in perspective and without acrimony, not being fettered by the past, but going forward in faith to meet the future which God will open before us.[15]

This openness has been present in our Anglican communities, though often obscured by more conservative attitudes. But it was clear in Bishop Gore, the founder of the Community of the Resurrection, in *Lux Mundi*,

in his Bampton lectures and in all the earlier part of his life. It appears even at times in Fr Benson, devoted disciple though he was of Dr Pusey: in one instruction to his community he demanded that each member should be—

a man—not simply of the day, but a man of the moment, a man precisely up to the mark of the times

and so he continued—

This makes the religious—so far from being the traditional imitator of bygone days—most specially a man of the present moment and its life.... The religious therefore reviews calmly, dispassionately, dutifully all the phenomena of the age in which he lives. He does not review them as things to deplore, but as things to rejoice in, and as things to be acted upon.[16]

[1] In this article the term 'religious community' is used for groups of men or women, Catholic or Protestant, who attempt to live a life of dedication to God under the vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. Other communities, which include married members, may well play an important part in the life and service of the church now and in the future: but to include such communities in this article would have widened its scope too much.

[2] J. Keble, *Occasional Papers and Reviews*, 1877, p. 76.

[3] F. von Hügel, *Selected Letters*, p. 252: The *Imitation* 'embodies the world-fleeing element essential to all deep religion', but Thomas à Kempis is much less satisfactory as to the other, itself also essential element of all deep, or rather all complete, religion—the world-seeking, the world-penetrating element.

[4] R. M. Benson, SSJE, *Letters*, p. 226.

[5] Compare W. H. Longridge, SSJE, *The Normal Development of Mental Prayer* (SSJE publication, 1923), with V. Lehodey, OSB, *The Ways of Mental Prayer*.

[6] H. Küng, *The Living Church*, pp. 226-30.

[7] *Rule of St Benedict*, ch. 52.

[8] Benedict Green, *C.R. Quarterly*, Summer 1965, p. 32.

[9] J. A. T. Robinson, *A New Reformation?*, p. 75.

[10] J. A. T. Robinson, *Honest to God*, p. 97 (italics in original).

[11] P. M. van Buren, *The Secular Meaning of the Gospel*, p. 190.

[12] Op. cit., p. 188.

[13] *French Springs, No 3*. Lincoln Theological College letters, Summer 1965.

[14] Quoted in J. A. T. Robinson and D. L. Edwards, *Honest to God Debate*, p. 125.

[15] *CR Quarterly Review of the Community of the Resurrection*, Michaelmas 1965, p. 36.

[16] R. M. Benson, SSJE, *Instructions on the Religious Life*, III, p. 88.

PROBLEMS OF A PROTESTANT SPIRITUALITY

John Kent

SOREN KIERKEGAARD said that Christianity meant forsaking the world and that Protestantism had lost touch with this aspect of Christianity. With some such statement any serious discussion of spirituality must begin, because it is not spiritual techniques that are all-important—how often one should pray, what one should pray for, what is the value of confession, and so forth—but the end for which the technique is accepted. What is the proper model of the Christian life?—this is the question the answer to which determines in advance the choice of spiritual techniques, and it is the unsatisfactory nature of the model—so often accepted very much on trust—which stultifies so much Christian endeavour.

Kierkegaard defined the Christian category as the absolute relation to the absolute; he even granted a limited approval to the theoretically absolute renunciation of the world practised in the middle ages and in his closing years was inclined to defend the idea of celibacy. He explicitly rejected, however, a revival of monasticism as a solution to the spiritual problems of Protestantism, and here it seems to me that he was right. There is something more than slightly comic in the spectacle of young married ministers who have no intention of putting away their wives haunting the courts of Taizé as a way, one supposes, of sublimating their sense of guilt at not being more completely devoted to God. The sense of guilt is proper—it should be common to all of us—but the solution offered is a dead-end cult. It involved the very assumption that monasticism is spiritually superior to common Christian living against which Martin Luther protested, saying, 'however numerous, sacred and arduous these works may be, in God's sight they are in no way superior to a farmer labouring in his field or a woman working in her house' (cf. *Babylonian Captivity of the Church*).

Monasticism took too literally the idea of absolute mental concentration upon God. Experience showed that enclosure did not make it easier to concentrate absolutely upon God, and the most famous of all monastic reforms was that of Saint Benedict, who in effect partially converted his brethren into farmers and housewives in the hope of saving them from the devils who wait for the victims of accidia. Now if our major problem is how to work out a discipline for groups, a spirituality which will enable Christians more easily to live together and remain Christian—a spirituality of the housing estate rather than of the isolated country house of the member of the professional class who has fled to the country to avoid his social responsibilities—then monasticism once again is less help than the psychiatric workers and sociologists and others who are analysing the nature of small groups, the meaning of group therapy, and so on. The monastic community is too artificial, contains only one sex, has no children, does not relate to the industrial and social

patterns of our time. If one wants a significant model in the same basic tradition one should turn to the worker-priests, who have just received a very guarded Papal permission to resume some of their activities in France. I am well aware that the Bishop of Middleton has openly doubted the relevancy of this experiment to English conditions, though before accepting this judgement one should certainly have read both *The Church and Industrial Society*, by Gregor Siefer, and an Anglican manifesto by a group of Englishmen who are trying to apply the worker-priest approach to English industrial life, *Priests and Workers*, by John Rowe. The Anglican group, incidentally, is not vowed to celibacy and has thus avoided one of the pitfalls of the original French movement. The worker-priest is facing the problem—what difference does it make to be a Christian?—in the nakedly secular context of a factory, whereas the monk has constructed an artificial context which permits superficially attractive solutions. The worker-priest approach does attempt to combine the idea of forsaking the world with the deliberate embracing of it in its most typical form of industrial work.

The natural development of Protestantism, however, has transformed Luther's emphasis on the housewife and the farmer into a Christian activism from which the spirituality has often evaporated and to which the idea of forsaking the world seems alien. Spiritual discipline degenerates into little more than ethics, which may mean either private good behaviour, such as not stealing, not lying overmuch, and so on. Or it may mean support for more communal, if rather more vaguely defined, good works, such as Christian Stewardship—of which one might hazard the guess that Luther might have called it the Indulgence system of our century. In any event, the links between this activism and spiritual discipline are not thought out; instead, it is usually taken for granted that personal holiness—the aim of the classical discipline—will emerge as a kind of spiritual by-product. A whole case for trusting to one's spiritual luck seems to have grown up around the alleged truism that conscious holiness is impossible. Here is one of the great dead-ends of modern Protestantism, faithfully illustrated every year by many honest Scottish Calvinists and their churches in their attitude to the Edinburgh Festival. It is not what one does that makes one holy; the degree of holiness to which one has already attained largely determines instead how one acts. Christ could afford to trust to his spiritual impulses but his followers cannot. Trusting to luck means that both ministers and laity often live spiritual lives which are dominated by models which they have neither designed nor examined, and which may be completely self-defeating.

One's judgement here depends very much upon how far one feels that Kierkegaard was right in his contention that Christianity means forsaking the world. He was saying in effect that some form of the way of negation is necessary for a personal approach to God, even if poverty and the surrender of one's own will into the keeping of another are no longer very fruitful outworkings of the principle. I imagine that Kierkegaard derived his own interpretation of the way of negation from the Lutheran doctrine of justification, according to which there is at the root of any non-egocentric sort of piety a sense of having died. The dead man possesses nothing except memory,

certainly does not possess himself, and so is sharply aware that apparently an existence must derive immediately from the will of God. He should have known this when he was alive, but the fact of his spiritual death brings this knowledge to life and liberates him from the pains of possession, ambition and time. As long as he lives this borrowed, divinely-sustained existence he pays back what he owes in his love for his family (from which he is at the same time utterly detached, he has obeyed the dominical injunction to love Christ more than father and mother, wife and children), in the faultless discharge of his secular duties (from whose purposes he is again spiritually detached, seeing the irony of their human finiteness), and even having time for a walk in the Deer Park with the children (a human echo of the moment in the Old Testament when in the cool of the evening a God who is almost off duty and who loves his children comes to talk to them in the pleasure-garden). He needs no other set of spiritual techniques because his death and resurrection leave him no option but to fulfil, ghost-like but almost angelically, the will of God which is the underlying substance of his being. Monasticism and secularization have both become meaningless words as far as he is concerned, because they apply to stages which he has survived.

Kierkegaard, of course, was a reactionary, and I doubt whether he knew enough church history—a subject which theologians often rashly despise—to grasp in its entirety the historical context of his impulse to rehabilitate the classical asceticism in some new, nineteenth-century form. He was also a contemporary of the English Oxford Movement; both were expressing a rather similar horror at the apparent second-rateness and complacency of the so-called Christian living which surrounded them. They differed in that the English reformers went much further than did the Dane in reinstituting medieval piety. The Anglo-Catholics achieved much by personality, and more because they knew by instinct how to capitalize the discontent with classical Protestantism which was stirring among the Anglican clergy. But they were not original intellectually, they were content to borrow their spiritual techniques from French Catholic sources, a vice which seems to have become almost inherent in the Church of England. They restored the prestige of the old ideals of poverty, chastity and obedience, they tried hard to persuade the laity to accept aural confession and spiritual direction, and they set up new Anglican monastic orders which have survived into the present. Nevertheless, the Victorian world suspected that all this was a refusal to think out the nature of the spiritual life in the world which was being produced by the industrial and scientific revolutions, so that in the end the Catholic revival stopped far short of being a national religious movement.

Protestant spirituality lacked an authoritative note in its answer. If the revival of Catholic techniques was a dead end, little more could be said for the Protestant alternatives, in so far as they were alternatives and not half-hearted copies of what was suggested elsewhere. Protestant spirituality had been in difficulties, however, ever since the moment somewhere in the late sixteenth century when it became evident that the new Gospel (and Karl Barth still sometimes calls Romanism 'another Gospel') was not producing

an increase in Christian efficiency—that old monk was as good (or bad) as the new presbyter. Methodism, about which Kierkegaard probably knew next to nothing, had been the last major Protestant attempt to solve this problem, by bringing holiness (almost as absolutely defined as Kierkegaard would have liked) down to earth, but the London holiness crisis of 1760 convinced some, and the Methodist schisms of 1827-57 convinced those who still doubted, that no lasting solution had been found. The point about Methodism, as has become clearer with the passage of time, was that so far from being raised up to spread scriptural holiness throughout the land, it might be said with more truth to have been raised up in order to show that scriptural holiness could not be spread throughout the land. Wesleyanism was by no means a reaction towards Rome, as Maximin Piette argued in his well-known book, but a tremendous effort to make a case for Protestant spirituality, and it was the comparative failure of the experiment which led to the middle-class repudiation of Evangelicalism which in its turn caused the real reaction towards Rome which would have to be named after Newman, if any individual could be said to have been responsible for what was really the culmination of a process which had lasted at least two hundred years. After Newman's very logical withdrawal into the Church of Rome many Protestants either joined in the Anglo-Catholic redevelopment of sacramental piety, or seemed to lose confidence altogether in spiritual techniques and in the doctrine of justification by faith alone for which Kierkegaard was pleading so powerfully. From this disaster flowed the complacency of the days of the Nonconformist Conscience when sanctity consisted in making others toe a moral line (often a very wavy one), and now, in the aftermath of two global wars, we seem to be re-approaching the kind of spiritual crisis at the height of which Newman attacked the Church of England and Kierkegaard the Church of Denmark.

By this I mean that we are once against dissatisfied with the results of having become Christian, and with the religious experience which is available through the Christian Churches. We are also torn, not very fruitfully, between a knowledge that the scriptures talk about forsaking the world, and also talk about housewives and farmers. We do not know what model of the Christian life to choose. We flit from one to another. We are seduced easily by spiritual headlines. The dead ends emerge very clearly one by one.

There is Taizé, of which enough has already been said. There is sacramental devotion; but the adoration of the Reserved Sacrament and Benediction require an elaborate theological underpinning which most of us as Protestants cannot provide. And sacramental devotion without theological backing becomes self-indulgence, a sophisticated way of believing what one knows is not true. The same will be true of the cult of the Virgin Mary, renewed efforts to popularize which in Protestant circles are inevitable on ecumenical grounds. A dying man still draws a certain relief from swallowing medicine which he knows cannot cure him: for us as Methodists the dead end looms close at hand because we have never depersonalized the Gospel as completely as those who talk so much of the time about 'the Church', or who magnify Christ to the point at which he becomes invisible: if our piety

has been almost too Christocentric, at least this means that other sources of spiritual support always seem thinner, less necessary to us, than they may do to other people.

Perhaps the most pervasive new approach to spirituality is what might be called the belated Bloomsbury element—the tendency to believe that in the post-metaphysical age so cruelly devised by the philosophers, God (if the expression may be momentarily permitted) is to be found, if not very easily identified, in personal relationships, recognized suddenly in personal situations. This might, if it had been taken with the original Edwardian seriousness of high Bloomsbury itself, have caused orgies of self-examination, finely drawn moral analysis, fierce spiritual quarrelling. This would have brought us, oddly enough, close to the classical piety, with its instinct for perpetual self-examination, and to justification by faith, which turns always to God the face of a pardoned sinner. It didn't, however, because the man busy in Church and State, anxious about the recovery of membership and the reconstruction of morality, at work reuniting Methodism and Anglicanism and fighting simultaneously for peace in Viet-Nam becomes too sure that he himself is all right because he is sure that his targets are all right (his targets, of course, are often completely wrong). Or this Bloomsburyish piety ends in the feeling that everything is all right as long as one has personal relationships, and these are sincere, and as long as somewhere in the background lurks the fact that one still wears a clerical collar, still attends a Sunday service, still goes to the Bright Hour, so that in the moment of truth the fact will pop decisively out, that one is a Christian.

One imagines then a man, still haunted by some pietist negations, unhappy about gambling even if reconciled to the occasional glass of wine; a man who is simultaneously determined to make everything religious and to secularize the Gospel, to achieve holy worldliness without ever defining what is meant by 'holy' in the famous phrase. This depends partly upon the misleading exegesis of the New Testament idea of holiness which implies that it always means something which is 'set apart' for divine use, rather than something which is moving towards perfection. Paul's denunciations of the immoralities of his converts suggest that tradition was not far wrong in suggesting that 'saints' ought to be striving for a perfected relationship with God, not just with the problem of communicating the Gospel to industrial man. Christ himself said not only that our righteousness must exceed that of the scribes and pharisees but also that we must be perfect as our Heavenly Father is perfect. The dead end implicit in the Bloomsbury ideal of spirituality is that it becomes content with an ignorance of God for the sake of a knowledge of people, that it easily substitutes worldly wisdom for Christian insight, that it assumes that converting other people is more important than converting oneself.

This brings us back to the classical ideal, the striking thing about which is that it makes the relationship with God the all-important one, and insists that it must be perfected. In an allegedly post-metaphysical period such a relationship cannot even be described, becomes impossible by definition, or would at least be impossible to define. Hence suspicion falls on all the tradi-

tional methods—asceticism, justification-based piety, self-sacrifice, even holy-worldliness itself—because their God-relation has got lost or become obscured, and what remains visible is their human aspect, their slice of the human will to power, their human cruelty and temptation to exploit others, the human rejection even of humanity itself, in celibacy. And so the emphasis falls inevitably on to the relationship with men, and one has the substitution —love your brother, whom you can see, and perhaps you will be loving your invisible Father in Heaven. But this will be concealed from you as long as you remain in the body.

This post-metaphysical piety has relaxed too much in its aspiration towards both God and Holiness. And the real pressure, one suspects, is not so much scientific and philosophical, although this is the kind of expression which its rationalization takes, as social, the colossal pressure of western capitalist society, the strength of which is seen as soon as the build-up of West Indians in Smethwick has passed a certain point, or whenever Mr Smith's hold on Southern Rhodesia is seriously challenged. One cannot accept the social aspirations and assumptions of western society at the present time and simultaneously accept the classical goal of personal holiness. Forsaking the world does mean something in the twentieth century, but too much of our perfectly genuine piety is aimed at integrating people in a society in which they ought not, spiritually, to become integrated. If what you are praying for is fundamentally wrong it does not matter much whether you pray as a holy worldling, as a monk, as a Central Missioner or as a missionary in that East End of Africa which is the slums of Johannesburg. The problem is not just the choice of a method, a choice between Catholic asceticism and some Protestant variety of the same approach, but a choice between models of the 'saint', and the truth seems to be that for the moment we have rejected the classical image but have only Holy Worldliness to put in its place.

MYSTICISM AND ITS PURITAN TYPES

Gordon S. Wakefield

THERE is a constant tendency for writers to define Mysticism in accordance with their own prejudices; and, indeed, the subject is at once so vast, elusive and enthralling that we must not be too harsh on any attempts to reduce it to order. It is, however, a relief to turn to the simple and satisfying statements of a renowned historian, Dom David Knowles, who understands the words 'mystic' and 'mystical' 'in the sense that was standard among all the theologians and writers from the early middle ages to the sixteenth century, and which derived its currency from the title of the short treatise by the pseudo-Denis, which he entitled *Theologia Mystica*. Literally this means the secret knowledge of God, and it was translated by one of our English mystics as *Denis Hid Divinity*, which is accurate enough.' After distinguishing this mystical knowledge from that made available both by reason and revelation, Professor Knowles recognizes that it is 'never entirely separable from an equally immediate and experimental union with God by love'.[1]

Having borrowed an accurate and satisfactory definition, we must guard against another inveterate danger. Both the admirers and opponents of Mysticism are inclined to regard it as one universal phenomenon. Thus Aldous Huxley sees in Mysticism a *philosophia perennis* uniting Buddhists, Christians, and takers of mescalin. Evelyn Underhill quotes with approval Saint-Martin: 'All mystics speak the same language and come from the same country.'[2] Reinhold Niebuhr, on the other hand, in his critique seems to consider all Mysticism as the same deviation from Christian truth whether Western or Eastern, medieval or modern, Platonist or Bergsonian, Catholic or sectarian.[3] A truer sense of history would make us pause here. Not only must we accept Professor Zaehner's conclusion that there is 'an unbridgeable gulf' between monistic and theistic types of mysticism—'between all who see God as incomparably greater than oneself, though He is, at the same time the root and ground of one's being, and those who maintain that soul and God are one and the same and that all else is pure illusion'[4]; within the Christian tradition, which is our sole concern, there are varieties to be distinguished. Some of the best Catholic scholars are well aware of this. Dom Cuthbert Butler's *Western Mysticism* argues that the mystical theology of SS Augustine, Gregory and Bernard is pre-Dionysian and pre-scholastic—'untouched by the ideas and nomenclature of the religious philosophy made current by the diffusion of the Dionysiac writings in Latin in the twelfth century', and not reduced to scientific schemes.[5] He also claims that in these Fathers is a mysticism 'free from danger, intellectual or spiritual; free from bodily and psycho-physical phenomena, usually so dubious, so liable to illusion, and at best in most cases so little desirable; a mysticism that is simple and practical and downright in character, being no more than the exercise

of piety and prayer and love in a very earnest and wholehearted manner'.[6] It is also becoming fashionable to distinguish between the elaborate techniques of discursive prayer taught by the leaders of the Counter-Reformation, and the 'healthy, robust if a little easy-going spiritual writings' of those medieval English mystics, Rolle, Julian, Walter Hilton, of whom Dom David Knowles and Father Conrad Pepler have written.[7]

But all these Mystics may be classed as 'institutional' in that they are all honoured and deemed orthodox by the Roman Church, and themselves never repudiated its piety which nourished them. There is, in addition, a mystic underworld of Christian history, persecuted and derided for the most part, in grave danger of heretical excess, if not blasphemy, and yet bearing witness both to the failure of Christendom, and the evangelical beatitude of poverty. Until the Reformation set the Scriptures free, much of the spiritual rebellion against the evils of the Church was mystical in temper, most of the reforming movements sought to recall Christians to the inward religion of love, sometimes aided by the contemplation of God in the outward world of nature in reaction from His imprisonment in relic-filled shrines and hierarchical systems. Neither did the Reformation mean an end of such manifestation. For many the orthodoxies of Luther and Calvin were but old tyrannies in different guise. And the protest against Protestantism was largely mystical in its doctrine in that it desired an immediacy of experience which the creeds and confessions based on the historic gospel could not inevitably supply. (Where it was not mystical it was eschatological, a different expression of the same critique of organized Churchmanship.)

Some would maintain that Orthodox Protestantism and Mysticism are incompatible. For the Protestant there is *no* secret knowledge of God other than that revealed in the Gospel, and no union beyond that which our condescending Lord begins when he receives poor sinners who turn to Him with nothing but faith. This is the Christian Mystery as S. Paul understood it. Luther 'exhorts us to detest as a veritable plague that Mystical Theology of Dionysius and similar books'. The mystical ascent is a false way to God, for God

> will not have thee thus ascend, but He comes to thee, and has made a ladder, a way and a bridge to thee.... He comes first to us and we do not first mount up to heaven to Him, but He sends His Son down into the flesh.... He speaks: This way, brother, 'The Father is in Me, and I in the Father; keep thine eyes fixed on Me, through My humanity is the way to the Father'.[8]

Reinhold Niebuhr shows how, in S. John of the Cross, Mystic doctrine virtually rejects the second great commandment of Christ, and sees full perfection in the first alone: 'As long as the soul has not attained unto the state of union of which I speak, it is good that it should exercise itself in love, in the active as well as in the contemplative life. But once it is established there it is no longer suitable that it should occupy itself with other works or with exterior exercises which might raise the slightest possible obstacle to its life of love with God, and I do not even except those works most relevant to God's service."[9]

It is significant, however, that Niebuhr admits that Christianity and Mysticism, at their best, have a common understanding 'that the human spirit in its depth and height reaches into eternity and that this vertical dimension is more important for the understanding of man than merely his rational capacity for forming general concepts'.[10] And although we must admit that by evangelical standards it is the Mystic rather than the anti-mystic, who—*pace* Burnaby[11]—should feel embarrassed, the question of the legitimacy of a Christian Mysticism is not so easily disposed of as Luther in the mood above, or our modern dialectical theologians would have us infer. We may agree with Luther's rejection of the doctrine of the *Synteresis*, the divine spark in man, and the belief that it is this essence of the soul which is capable of entering into union with God,[12] but we cannot deny Niebuhr's 'vertical dimension', nor the possibility of experience which transcends the categories of rational thought or scientific investigation. A most notable instance is that recorded in Pascal's *Amulet*, and it is extremely interesting that it should be quoted as an example of mystical experience by Dom Cuthbert Butler,[13] and as 'nothing less than a wonderful expression of faith as *fiducia*: total commitment' in a book from the Protestant standpoint by J. S. Whale.[14] The whole is often cited, but here is an extract:

The year of grace 1654
Monday, 23rd November, day of St. Clement, Pope and Martyr, and others in martyrology.
Eve of St. Chrysogon, martyr and others.
From about half-past ten in the evening until about half-past twelve.

FIRE
God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; not of the philosophers and scientists.
Certainty, certainty. Feeling. Joy. Peace.
God of Jesus Christ
Deum meum et Deum vestrum
Thy God shall be my God
Forgetfulness of the world and of all, except God.
He is to be found only in the ways taught in the Gospel.

Here is the record of an ecstatic experience, which Pascal, 'the intellectual, the philosopher, the master of language and style',[15] finds beyond power of articulate description, and yet which is altogether Biblical and evangelical. The ecstasy is paralleled in the experience of the prophets and of Our Lord; the God is the living God of the Bible; 'He is to be found only in the ways taught in the Gospel'; the soul is sinful, and has fled from God; the moment of unspeakable assurance and communion does not swallow up the 'infinite qualitative difference' between God and man, or annihilate the individual in the Infinite; the 'forgetfulness of the world and of all except God' is not a permanent state of perfect union as with S. John of the Cross. But here is an immediacy and intensity of knowledge which no philosophy could attain, or science discover. It may well be a description of faith in the Lutheran sense; it is impossible not to regard it as 'mystical'.

It may seem ironic that John Wesley who condemns Mysticism as unscriptural[16] should have considered Luther to be 'deeply tinctured' with it.[17] Wesley may have misunderstood Luther's not uncritical enthusiasm for Tauler and *Theologia Germanica*. But Rudolf Otto maintains that Faith in Luther is a mystical way of response, and declares that 'the really typical moments of mysticism'—creature-feeling and union—are not *less* but *more* possible upon the basis of Luther's fides (faith as 'fiducia' and 'adhaesio') than upon the basis of the 'amor mysticus'.[18] And, in spite of John Wesley's strictures, Charles Wesley's Hymns contain much Mystical language, though it is always 'sola fide' Mysticism in that he never forgets that the saving work of God in Christ is the only basis of relationship. He is not afraid to sing of man being 'lost in God', though in Hymns on the Incarnation and the Holy Spirit. He paraphrases Canticles I verse 7: 'Tell me, O thou whom my soul loveth, Where thou feedest thy flock where thou makest it to rest at noon.' This indeed is what some of us would regard as the greatest of all his Hymns, 'Thou Shepherd of Israel and Mine'.[19] Here is Mystical exegesis in the sense of Origen and the Alexandrians.[20] Here, too, is rapture, and ardour beyond all 'bloodless categories'. But 'Charles Wesley in this lyric never goes beyond New Testament spirituality'.[21] In Deissmann's famous distinction it is communion rather than union which he celebrates; the bliss which he describes is shared with the other 'lambs of the flock'; and the object of devotion is eternally Christ Crucified.

It is not then impossible to conceive, on Protestant principles, of a Mystical dimension of experience and expression. With the Catholics, we must agree that not all believers seem called to this, or capable of appreciating it, and this in no way prejudices their salvation. Yet the serious, sensitive and ardent soul is never far from it; and if he is not often 'caught up into the third heaven' of rapture transcending ordinary consciousness, his language naturally soars as he contemplates the mystery of redemption, and he is 'lost in wonder, love and praise'.[22]

II

There are those who would feel instinctively that to be a Puritan and a mystic is a contradiction in terms. A spirituality fashioned amid bitter controversies over the doctrine of Grace, a desire to teach plain truth to plain people, a conception of study, pulpit and home as the minister's milieux rather than altar, choir and cell, a strict discipline of the fancy, and a certain suspicion of nature do not provide obvious encouragement for the ecstatic. Enthusiasm was deplored, sectarianism discouraged. One great American scholar even claims that 'the symbolism of the Nativity and Passion came to mean little to the Puritan saints';[23] they were dominated by their faith in an Almighty, Sovereign God, and the Christian life for them was a Holy War with Prayer as a weapon to shake the gates of hell, not a ladder to ascend to heaven.

There is evidence for all this, as a reading of such a fine study as the first volume of Professor Perry Miller's *The New England Mind* will show. But to generalize about Puritans is as impossible as to generalize about mystics. We

must reckon with the richness and variety of religious movements in seventeenth-century England, and with the fact that hard-and-fast distinctions are impossible to draw in an age of flux and creative experiment. Parties multiplied, individuals 'progressed' in their views, but there is no reason to dispute Nuttall's verdict that 'Some of the Episcopalians within the Established Church, all the Presbyterians and Independents in it before 1662, most of the Separatist and sectarian leaders outside it, and the founders of Nonconformity after 1662, are thus all spiritually nearer to one another than is any of them to the Roman Catholic Church or to the Laudian party within the Church of England'.[24]

That we must not rule out the possibility of a type of mysticism even in the 'scholastic' Puritan theologians of Cambridge is suggested by a curious passage in the work of a twentieth-century Dutch scholar, A. Eekhof, *De Theologische Fakulteit te Leiden in de 17de Eeuw*. He writes:

> The cultivation of a soft life of feeling, letting oneself be rocked on the waves of religious emotion, in the way we perceive it in the *English mystics such as Perkins* and others, may have found an echo in some circles in the imitation of independents or separatists, but in the golden age of Reformed Protestantism in the Netherlands it was regarded as a plant from foreign soil. . . . It is striking to observe that in the year 1659, when men were feeding in the Netherlands on mystical literature and the question of the Sabbath was being revived, Professors Heidanus and Cocceius at Leyden complained that the books of Bucer and Calvin were scarcely to be found any longer in the libraries of the majority of the preachers, but 'in their place a lot of English teachers and new doctors' would be met with.[25]

Clearly Eekhof uses the words 'mystics' and 'mystical' very loosely. Puritans like Baxter would have been more precise and written of their Cambridge Fathers as 'affectionate'. But the comment is revealing in that it underlines something of the intensity and warmth of Puritan theology, and also seems to imply a genuine succession from the Cambridge Puritans to the Commonwealth Independents.[26]

If in the first place, we are to confine ourselves to this central Puritan tradition, we shall find a type of Mysticism akin to that which we earlier demonstrated as not incompatible with Orthodox Protestantism. These Puritans had little time for the devotional techniques of the Counter-Reformation. I am inclined to modify a suggestion I once made that Bayly's *Practice of Piety* owes something to the Ignatian *Ignatian Spiritual Exercises* —'Bayly opens hell's mouth for us as though he were making aloud and for our sakes, a Jesuit meditation'.[27] True, Edmund Bunny in 1582 adapted *A Book of Christian Exercises pertaining to Resolution* from the Jesuit, Parsons: but there is no need to posit direct Counter-Reformation influence on Puritan guides to meditation. A continuing tradition from the Middle Ages, powerful among such companies as the Brethren of the Common life, is sufficient explanation.[28] And the Puritans were opposed to the elaborate methods of discursive prayer. John Owen attacks Mental Prayer as described and advocated in the Church History of the Benedictine, Dom Serenus de Cressy—'pure spiritual prayer'—he quotes—'or a quiet repose of contem-

plation; that which excludes all images of the fancy, and in time all perceptible actuations of the understanding, and is exercised in signal elevations of the will, without any force at all, yet with admirable efficacy'. Preparation for such prayer necessitates 'an entire calmness and even death of the passions, a perfect purity in the spiritual affections of the will, and an entire abstraction from all creatures'.[29] Owen acknowledges that he is disposed to welcome anything in Rome alternative to 'magical incantations', but he cannot believe that Mental Prayer is scriptural, since he claims it is exemplified neither in the prayers of Jesus, nor of the prophets. It denies the mediatorial office of Christ and aims at 'such an immediate enjoyment of God in His essence' 'as is regardless of Christ and leaves him quite behind'.[30] What is more, Mental Prayer 'is in the will and its affections without any actings of the mind or understanding' so that prayer is no longer our 'reasonable service'. It derives from Plotinus and his disastrous neo-Platonism, whose Enneads Owen quotes to expose the origins of this method of supposed ecstatic union with God.[31] 'A kind of purgatory it is in devotion—somewhat out of this world and not in another, above the earth and beneath heaven, where we may leave it in clouds and darkness.'[32]

Yet Owen has one qualification:

> The *spiritual intense fixation of the mind*, by contemplation of God in Christ, until the soul be as it were swallowed up in admiration and delight, and being brought unto an utter loss, through the infiniteness of those excellencies which it doth admire and adore, it returns again into its own abasements, out of a sense of its infinite distance from what it would absolutely and eternally embrace, and withal, the inexpressible rest and satisfaction which the will and affections receive in their approaches unto the eternal fountain of goodness, are things to be aimed at in prayer, and which, through the riches of divine condescension are frequently enjoyed. The soul is hereby raised and ravished, not into ecstasies or unaccountable raptures, not acted into motions above the power of its own understanding and will; but in all the faculties and affections of it, through the effectual workings of the Spirit of grace and the lively impressions of divine love, with intimations of the relations and kindness of God is filled with rest 'in joy unspeakable and full of glory'. And these spiritual acts of communion with God, whereof I may say with Bernard, *Rara hora, brevis mora*, may be enjoyed in mental or vocal prayer indifferently.[33]

The reference to S. Bernard is to no. lxxxv 13 of the Sermons on Canticles: 'It is a good work to save many souls; but to be transported and to be with the Word, that is far more delightful. But when does that happen to us, or how long does it endure? Sweet is that intercourse; but how seldom does it occur, and for how brief a time does it last!' Bernard is speaking of the Spiritual Marriage; its offspring may be souls brought forth by preaching, or growth in spiritual understanding. But it is the act of love itself which is supremely delightful, even as the embraces of a husband give to a bride a more rapturous and transporting joy than even her later motherhood. Yet in this life such enjoyments are rare and limited. Dom Cuthbert Butler would agree with Owen that the communion of which Bernard preaches is not accompanied by abnormal, trance-like states.[34] Therefore, although Owen is

not a mystic either in style or temper, he is not unaware of experiences in harmony with the 'Western Mysticism' of the twelfth-century Father, whom he and his fellow Puritans honoured as one of the 'mystical divines' who kept alive true spiritual religion in the dark ages of Papal supremacy.

It will not therefore surprise us to find in other Puritan authors some of the fruits of 'the spiritual intense fixation of the mind by contemplation of God in Christ'. One of the most fascinating is John Preston (1587-1628), Master of Emmanuel, Preacher and Politician. At a time when William Laud was a syncophantic, largely absentee, Welsh Bishop with a disturbing infatuation for the Duke of Buckingham, Preston was actually ministering consolation to King Charles and the Duke as they drove home from Theobalds after James I's death.[35] But it is the strain of Mysticism in his influential published writings which is significant for our purpose, and indeed for the religious history of England, for Preston is a link between the Puritans and the Cambridge Platonists. He was a philosophic divine, with the engaging habit of reading Aquinas at the barber's.[36] Perry Miller has regarded him as an exemplar of 'the hidden rationalism' of the Puritans, in whose sermons 'conversion is not prostration on the road to Damascus, but reason elevated'.[37] Benjamin Whichcote entered Emmanuel in 1626 when Preston was still Master, and he may well have imbibed not only Preston's philosophical approach to theology, but also the Mysticism which could compose *this Soliloquy of a Devout Soul to Christ, Panting after the love of the Lord Jesus.*

I have hid myself from thee as Adam, yet thou hast pierced through the dark cloud and loved me ... Thou has often showed me thy riches and I have loved them; but oh show me thyself that I may love thee ... Show me where thou liest at this my noon ...

If I look to Mount Tabor, I see thee in glory and I cannot but love thee for that. If I look to the garden, I see thee lying on the cold ground, sweating drops of blood for me, and I cannot but love thee for that. If I look to Golgotha, I see thee nailed to the Cross, and thy heart broached that I may drink thy blood and live, and I cannot but love thee for that. If I look to Mount Olivet, I see thee ascending far above all heavens, and I cannot but love thee for that also. Indeed in Tabor thou hadst visible glory but it soon vanished: in the Garden and in Golgotha thou hadst visible beauty that I should desire thee; and in Olivet thou wast quite carried out of my sight. If then thou hast for me nowhere else what hope have I to love thee, O thou to be beloved of all. Art thou not in the tents of the shepherds? Dost thou not walk in the midst of the golden candlesticks? Dost thou not dwell in the hearts of men by faith? Oh let me see here below in the Church and in myselfe?

Why hast thou kept thyself at such a distance? why hast thou not been formed in me? why hast thou not dwelt in me that I might see thee in thy glories and vertues of thy life, death, resurrection and ascension and to be sick of love?

Sin—my sin— says Preston is the reason. Free from this 'I may contemplate thy glory and be grounded in thy love'; then 'I find the filth of domineering sin in some measure washed from my soul that the beames of thy glory may pierce it and draw my love after thee'.[38]

Here is a passionate desire for immediacy, and for a knowledge different from historical or doctrinal. The language of Canticles is the refrain of the Soliloquy. Yet there is a strong ethical content; it is not temporality from which the petitioner must be delivered but sin. And it is the contemplation of the Christ of the Gospels which is the height of blessedness.

Many Puritans treated of Canticles. For instance, in John Evelyn's Diary for October 12th, 1656, we read: 'our Preacher is againe in the Canticles (as these halfe Independents & Presbyters delighted to be) 5 Cap. v. 1 shewing the Spiritual presence of Christ with the Saints in the ordinances, the same on 26.' But there is a difference between the exposition of, say, Richard Sibbes, a devotional writer and preacher, who influenced all schools, but was himself in the central, Cambridge succession, and Francis Rous (1579-1659), a Cornish layman, who in the course of his long career was Provost of Eton and Speaker of the Commons, and, ecclesiastically, passed from the Presbyterians to the Independents. Sibbes sees the Bride as the Church, though 'since all Christian favours belong to all Christians alike . . . every Christian soule is the Spouse of Christ as well as the whole Church'.[39] The kisses of the divine Lover's mouth are Christ's presence in the ordinances; the Sacraments are his love-tokens; and though the soul longs for Christ most ardently and every taste whets her appetite the more, she receives Him in His appointed ways and not, as a rule, through special and private raptures. The desire for Christ is manifested outwardly and ethically. It implies a love of doing His will in good works.[40]

Rous's *Mysticall Marriage* is more concerned with the individual in his relationship to Christ, though he does not depart from an evangelical foundation. The 'pure counterpart' to sinful human nature is not *syntheresis* but Christ. He is One with God by personal union; the human soul can be made one with God by 'mystical union' through Christ. Mystical union is thus a kind of intermediate state between sinful historical existence and the life of the Godhead. Rous leans heavily upon pseudo-Dionysius, Bernard and Gerson.[41]

It is indeed the more radical Puritans who are the more Mystical, and who have nothing of Protestant suspicion of Dionysius, whose treatise they were not ashamed to re-publish. The fascination of medieval mysticism lies for them in its concern for personal religion transcending books and institutions alike. And the opinions of some very recent scholars would support their instinctive judgement that this mysticism is in no sense a deviation from the Gospel. Louis Bouyer claims that 'In spite of his evident borrowings from the contemporary phraseology of neo-Platonism we cannot forget that the framework in which Denis deliberately sets all his religious thought is that of the liturgical celebration. This mystical theology is but the hearth, which itself transcends all vision, around the glowing central flame which he discerns there, which may be likened to this *enosis*, this union with God, which merely transposes into the language of his own era the universal reconciliation and restoration in Christ which St Paul had preached as "the mystery".'[42]

We must mention, without assessing his precise relationship to Puritanism,

a remarkable mystical theologian of the seventeenth century named John Everard. He had a long career, being imprisoned by James I who dubbed him 'Dr Never-out', and still active after the regicide. His most famous book, *The Gospel Treasury Opened or the Holiest of all unvailing*, consists of Kensington Sermons with, as appendix, a translation of Dionysius and some collections from Tauler, Franck and others. In an Introduction, Rapha Harford claims that Everard preaches experimental religion of which both 'the practical part and the contemplative are clean contrary to flesh and blood', but steers a middle course between the 'meer Rationalist' and Formalist and the Familist 'who saith he lives above ordinances and so hath quite left all Religion and by degrees hath turned licentious ranter'. There is an anti-historicism in Everard. In the Scriptures as records of actual events he is little interested. We need 'a dayly doing all the Scriptures over again'. All the events of Christ's life on earth must have their counterpart within us from the miraculous conception to the Cross. Apocalyptic describes spiritual re-birth.

It is easy to see a connection between this and John Preston's Soliloquy. Indeed Haller points out that Everard and his school were condemned for following Preston's doctrine of the immanence of Christ in the breasts of believers to its logical conclusion.[43] It is certainly true that, in the seventeenth century, any teacher who attempted to take seriously the Bible metaphors of union with Christ was in danger of lapsing into the extremes of underworld sectarianism. This is what may well have happened to the most gracious of the early Quakers, James Nayler. He seems to have been influenced by the Familists and their literal Mysticism not far removed from Everard. 'That Christ was "a Type and but a Type"; and that it was possible for a man "totally to be inhabited by Christ", "out of the creature", "having dependence upon none", in "perfect unsinning obedience"; such was the Familist teaching which diverted Nayler from Apostolic Christianity and which, with a simplicity divine, if also naïve, he sought to put into practice.'[44] The story of his tragic 'fall' and its barbarous punishment is well known. What is less often realized is the completeness of his recovery. If he fell into the worst perils of Mysticism, his later writings reveal a growth in grace very rare among either heretics or orthodox, a Pauline understanding of the sinfulness of sin and a re-affirmation of a true *theologia pectoris*. His sad error did not lead him to abandon the *true* 'acting the part of Christ in the spirit of I Corinthians xiii',[45] and he interprets his failure as a dark night of the soul: 'Though at some times the Clouds may be so thick and the powers of darkness so strong in your eye that you see him not, yet love him and believe and you have him present.'[46]

Lurking in the shadows of the prolific religious life of mid-seventeenth-century England were the followers of Jacob Boehme or Behmen. All his works were translated into English between 1644 and 1662. But these the Puritans repudiated and the Quakers too, though this is not to say that they were not debtors even in disagreement. It is perhaps worth mentioning that Everard translated the *Poimandres* of Hermes Trismegistus in 1650 and other volumes of the Hermetic Corpus were also published in English

versions. These works with their conviction that everything in Nature has its place in a Divine order influenced the poet Henry Vaughan and also George Fox, as the following well-known anecdote from Fox's Journal shows.

& there came Jo: Storey to mee & lighted his pipe of Tobacco; and saide he will you take a pipe of tobacco sayinge come all is ours: & I lookt upon him to bee a forward bold lad & tobacco I did not take butt it came into my minde yt ye Lad might thinke I had not unity with the creation; for I saw hee had a flashy empty notion of religion; soe I took his pipe & putt it to my mouth & gave it to him againe to stoppe him least his rude tongue should say I had not unit with ye creation.

There is a similar nature mysticism from an unexpected source, in Baxter.

You can open your Bible, and read there of God and of glory, oh learn to open the creatures and to open the several passages of Providence and to read of God and glory there. Certainly by such a skilful industrious improvement, we might have a fuller taste of Christ and heaven in every bit of bread we eat and in every draught of beer that we drink than most men have in the use of the Sacrament.

And it is this same Baxter who, after many turgid paragraphs of *The Reasons of the Christian Religion*, suddenly bursts forth: 'Thy presence makes a crowd a church; thy converse maketh a closet or solitary wood or field to be kin to the angelical choir.' Richard Sibbes said: 'The whole world is a theatre of the glory of God.' Roger Sharrock has declared that for Bunyan in *Pilgrim's Progress* the mystical flame of medieval piety becomes a farmyard bonfire. May not this too be a kind of Nature Mysticism? We are all familiar with Bunyan's experience of unity with Nature in the crises of his conversion.

In conclusion, we may notice two Puritans who illustrate different types of Mysticism, while both maintain a true and Scriptural balance. Walter Cradock was a Congregationalist of a more enthusiastic temper than John Owen. Dr Nuttall claims that he 'perhaps refers more frequently than any other Puritan writer to "something in nature": for the creatures are God's characters.'[47] He seems to have enjoyed Mystical experience:

I remember, in such a Countrey, in such a Chamber, in such a place, where God she'd himself to me, & I was satisfied; I saw everything, and I desired nothing but that...[48]

In another book, he writes:

when a man's ways please God, the stones of the streets shall be at peace with him... that is, he shall be at peace with every thing. Why so? because there is an infinite unspeakable quiet in his own soul...
a Saint... can say, I cannot tell what shall become of England or Scotland, or Ireland, but I am sure I know a back door that leads me into a kingdom that cannot be shaken, to go into the middle Region where no storms of the Air shall trouble me; and there I can rest my spirit.[49]

Walter Marshall, deprived in 1662, is much more in the central tradition of Preston and Thomas Goodwin, but his posthumous *The Gospel Mystery of Sanctification* (1692) is concerned with what he calls the 'Mystical Union' where the adjective is derived directly from the Pauline *mysterion*. The book is an orthodox, evangelical exposition. The Mystic Union is consequent upon Justification by Faith alone. We may say indeed that for Marshall the 'three ways' are Justification, Sanctification, Glorification' rather than 'Purgation, Illumination, Union', but the whole treatise is an intense appeal to take Scripture language seriously. Though as another writer, Thomas Gouge, put it, Christians must 'prove their mystical union with Christ by their moral union',[50] life with Christ is more than the sober following of rational precepts. It is a glorious mystery, and the Sacraments are not bare outward signs, but the seals and conveyances and resemblances of the most intimate relationship between God and men, parallel to the union of Father and Son in the Holy Spirit, and the two natures in the One Person of Christ. In spite of the hasty impressions of some, there is a close connection between Mysticism and Sacramentalism, and where the value of ordinances is questioned in the interests of 'inward religion' Sacramental language is not infrequently used.[51]

We have given a brief review of a large subject. All we have achieved is to make clear that the Mysticism of the English Puritans is in need of extended research. But such investigation will not be prejudiced at the start if it looks for certain types of Mysticism in the rich variety of Puritan Christianity. Much of it will be 'Protestant' and 'sola-fide' and related to the *ordinances*; some will be in dangerous liaison with movements beyond the pale of Apostolic Christianity; the tradition of pseudo-Dionysius will not be universally condemned as by Luther, while nature and reason will in some authors be veritable ways to the God and Father of Jesus Christ. But wherever there is conjoined with serious Christianity a certain tenderness of heart and a hunger and thirst for God, and the metaphors of Scripture are believed to enshrine definite promise of intimate communion with Him, we are not wrong to speak of Mysticism.

[1] David Knowles. *The English Mystical Tradition* (London, 1960), p. 2.
[2] Evelyn Underhill. *Mysticism* (London, 1912), p. ix.
[3] See R. Niebuhr. *The Nature and Destiny of Man I and II* (London, 1943), passim.
[4] R. C. Zaehner, *Mysticism Sacred and Profane*, London, 1957, p. 204.
[5] Cuthbert Butler. *Western Mysticism*, London, 1926, p. 125.
[6] Ibid, p. 131.
[7] See Knowles, op. cit., and Conrad Pepler, *The English Religious Heritage* (1958).
[8] P. S. Watson, *Let God be God!* (London, 1947), p. 95, quoting from Luther, *Werke*. Kritische Gesamtausgabe (Weimar, 1883ff.), XXXIX, 1; 389ff., XV, 1144, 16ff.
[9] R. Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man II* (London, 1943), p. 97, quoting S. John of the Cross, *Canticles* 2d redaction, str. 28.
[10] Ibid., I, p. 168.
[11] See John Burnaby, *Amor Dei* (London, 1938, 1947, Ch. I).
[12] Cf. Dom Cuthbert Butler, *Western Mysticism* (London, 1926), p. 140.
[13] Ibid., p. 12.
[14] J. S. Whale, *The Protestant Tradition* (London, 1955), p. 19.
[15] Butler, op. cit., p. 13.
[16] Wesley has a thoroughgoing critique of Mysticism, e.g. *Works*, XIV, 232ff., though he is clearly influenced by what he came to detect as the weakness of William Law, and the errors of Quietism.
[17] Wesley, Works, I, 315.

[18] R. Otto, *The Idea of the Holy* (London, 1923), p. 211. See the whole of Appendix VI, p. 208ff., and pp. 107ff.
[19] *Methodist Hymn Book* (1933), 457.
[20] The customary use of the word mystical by Alexandrian Christians derives precisely from the notion 'fundamentally evangelical and Pauline' that Christ is the meaning of the whole Bible. See L. Bouyer, *Mystery and Mysticism*, a symposium (London, 1956), p. 125.
[21] Cf. R. N. Flew, *The Hymns of Charles Wesley* (1953), p. 95.
[22] A phrase found both in Joseph Addison, and Charles Wesley.
[23] William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism* (New York, 1938), p. 151.
[24] G. F. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience* (Oxford, 1947), p. 9.
[25] Ibid., Introd. pp. 27-8. Italics mine. I owe the reference and translation to Dr G. F. Nuttall.
[26] First-hand confirmation of this is found, e.g., in Hugh Peters' *A Dying Father's Last Legacy to an Only Child* (1660) where 'a little English library' is recommended, largely of 'classic' Puritans—though Peter's was more radical than many.
[27] G. S. Wakefield, *Puritan Devotion* (London, 1957), p. 87.
[28] Cf. E. F. Jacob, *Essays in the Conciliar Epoch* (Manchester, 2nd edn., 1953), Ch. VII, especially p. 126.
[29] J. Owen, Works (ed. Goold, London, 1851), IV, p. 328.
[30] Ibid, p. 337.
[31] Ibid., p. 329.
[32] Ibid., p. 338.
[33] Ibid., p. 329-30.
[34] *Western Mysticism*, p. 117.
[35] Cf. I. Morgan, *Prince Charles's Puritan Chaplain* (London, 1957).
[36] 'If hair fell on the page he blew it off and read on.'
[37] Perry Miller, *The New England Mind; the Seventeenth Century* (Harvard, 2nd ed., 1954), p. 200.
[38] *A Heavenly Treatise of Divine Love* (London, 1640 edn.), p. 89ff.
[39] *The Spouse* (London, 1638), pp. 13-14.
[40] Ibid., p. 22, 29-30, 51-2, 53-4.
[41] There is a summary of Rous's treatise without any attempt at source-criticism in the author's *Puritan Devotion*, pp. 103-6.
[42] L. Bouyer, *Mystery and Mysticism*, p. 135.
[43] W. Haller, *Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution* (New York, 1955), pp. 167-8.
[44] G. F. Nuttall, *James Nayler: A Fresh Approach* (London, 1954), to which I am indebted for the whole section.
[45] Nuttall, op. cit., p. 19.
[46] Nayler, *Milk for Babes*, p. 3, cited Nuttall, op. cit., p. 20.
[47] Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit*, etc., p. 12.
[48] W. Cradock, *Gospel Holinesse*, pp. 36ff., quoted Nuttall, op. cit., p. 147.
[49] W. Cradock, *Divine Drops Distilled*, pp. 147, 19, quoted Nuttall, ibid.
[50] T. Gouge, *Principles of the Christian Religion*, pp. 50, 110.
[51] Cf. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit*, p. 101.

A REVISED COVENANT SERVICE

David Tripp

WE ARE frequently told that the Covenant Service is the only liturgical practice peculiar to Methodism. This is misleading, for the service is not without its counterparts in other traditions; but it is sufficiently characteristic of Methodism to enjoy, in our liturgical structure, a unique prominence. It is reasonable to maintain that it will be, together with a particular appreciation of hymnody, extemporary prayer and preaching, our essential contribution to the worshipping life of any tradition in which, in the future, we may have a place. However, if our contribution is to be worthy of its own possibilities, we must be ready to ask ourselves seriously what the service is about, and what form it should take. There is nothing sacred about any particular stage in the mercurial development of liturgy; there is everything sacred in the meaning of worship, and in the devotional and critical depth at which we approach it.

I. WHAT IS THE SERVICE ABOUT?

The Old Testament is built around the conviction that God has made himself known in a unique way in the life of a single nation, a chosen people; that he has brought this people into a vital relationship with himself by rescuing them from the ignorant worship of false gods and from servile subjection: that he has offered them a bond with himself, binding him to be for ever in their midst to guide and protect, binding them to obey him: and that, by means of a Covenant Sacrifice, they have accepted this bond with its mutual obligations.

The New Testament takes up this idea, but sees in Jesus the great saving event that creates the *New* Covenant. In the preaching of the Church, which proclaims that God the Son has come into our world with a new and final completeness, to die for our sins and to rise again for our justification, a New Covenant is offered, not only to Israel, but to all mankind.

Under the Old Covenant, the people were challenged by their leaders to decide whether or not they were willing, after hearing of God's mighty acts, to be his obedient people (see, for instance, Joshua 24^{1-28}); they then avowed their willingness to obey Yahweh as their God, and the bond was solemnly ratified by sacrifice. Under the New Covenant, those who hear the challenge of God in the Gospel respond by entering the Church, the holy people created by the redeeming work of the Son, and by remaining in it. The entry we know as Baptism—together with the complementary service of Confirmation, or its equivalent under another name, where such further service is appropriate. The continuing adherence to the Covenant is a faithful and consistent Christian life: and at the centre of such a life is the Holy Communion, which (however much more we may believe about it) is the divinely

instituted pledge of the continuing presence of Christ in his Spirit, 'almighty to save', among his people.

Any 'Renewal of the Covenant' must be clearly related to the Covenant and to the Covenant Ordinances, or we shall appear to be acting as if Christ had done nothing for us, or as if our Christian commitment were of our own invention, begun and continued in our own strength.[1] The Service for Renewing our Covenant with God should speak emphatically of God's saving initiative—and how better to do this than by being closely linked with Baptism?—and also of his faithful saving presence—and how better to do this than by being closely linked with the Communion? Only under such conditions should we renew our vows of consecration that are involved in our entering and remaining within the Church.

II. IS THE PRESENT FORM SATISFACTORY?

Wesley's original *Directions for Renewing our Covenant with God* of 1780, borrowed *in toto* from Puritan sources, consisted simply of a very long exhortation and a very long prayer. Throughout the nineteenth century, in Wesleyan practice, this monolithic text was associated with the Communion, the custom being, so far as can be judged, to commence the latter at the Offertory Sentences.

Contrary to popular belief, our present form is by no means Wesley's original, but almost entirely the work of George B. Robson, whose experimental order of 1922, after two stages of revision, provided the whole of our present service as far as the end of the Preface. The only parts derived from Wesley's *Directions* are 'This taking of His yoke . . . never to go back' and 'I am no longer my own . . . to thy pleasure and disposal' (adapted from the original Exhortation), and 'And now, O glorious and blessed God . . . ratified in heaven. *Amen*' (adapted from the original Covenant Prayer). The first Exhortation is derived from additions made to the *Directions* in 1897, and the Devotions—Adoration, Thanksgiving and Confession—were based by Robson on the style and design of John Hunter's *Devotional Services for Public Worship*.

These facts do not affect the suitability of our present form: but certain other considerations suggest that it leaves much to be desired.

The Devotions suffer from three faults. First, their detailed and didactic style, quite apart from its uncomfortable incongruity with the rest of the text, is more at home in a sermon than in prayers. Secondly, their great length—John Hunter's forms of Confession, and so forth, were intended each to be a major part of a single service—overloads and obscures the logical development of the whole rite. Thirdly, they are not fitted to their own purposes: adoration should be the tone of, not a section in, every service; a prayer of confession is more suitable if it is concise and general than if it is verbose, introspective and analytical; and a Communion Service has a proper place for a Thanksgiving, not in the preparatory devotions but in the Great Eucharistic Prayer.

The other great fault of our present form is the lack of a firm connection between the Renewal of the Covenant and the Communion, which Robson

intended to be a feature of his service. We begin with the Collect for Purity and the Lord's Prayer, as at the beginning of the Communion Service: and Robson also introduces a Proper Gospel, which (at least in the Wesleyan tradition) had generally been missing. Unfortunately, this 'Service of the Word' suffers from the absence of material from the Old Testament and the Epistles, and from the Exhortation being broken sharply in two by the insertion of the three long Acts of Devotion.

The Ante-Communion has thus lost its traditional pattern: a still worse fate awaits the Service of the Lord's Table. Robson's proposals offered Methodism a single service in which the Renewal of the Covenant and the Communion were united, the Communion being in a drastically revised version. His attempt to revise the Eucharistic liturgy was dropped before 1932, and his attempt to unite Covenant and Sacrament was finally defeated, probably unintentionally, in 1936. The Sursum Corda and the Preface are printed as if they were part of the Covenant Prayer, and are separated from the Prayer of Consecration—to which they belong—both by a hymn and the Collection, and also by the final rubric, which reads as if it implied that the service has so far had nothing to do with the Communion. One result of this is that, when the Covenant Service is held without the Communion—and this does occur, despite the liturgical and theological traditions of Methodism, the Standing Orders and the Rubric—the Sursum Corda and the Preface, whose significance is clear only when they have their proper places as integral parts of the Great Thanksgiving, are left hanging disconsolately in the air.

III. CAN THE TRADITION BE PRESERVED?

The tradition of the Covenant Service is richer than is often supposed, and its resources are not exhausted by Robson's failure to achieve his laudable aims. In the 1880s, three attempts were made to produce a united Covenant and Sacramental Service, by J. A. Macdonald (Wesleyan), the Wesleyan congregation in Eccles, and T. Scowby (New Connexion): and similar, though less thoroughgoing, efforts appear in the Bible Christian, United Free Methodist and United Methodist Churches. The first and second of these experiments were more successful than Robson's in every respect but the vital one of continuing influence. Their virtue was that the Communion was taken as a basis, and the Covenant Service made to fit into it. My suggestion is that any revision of the Covenant Service would be theologically and liturgically better if pursued on similar lines.

IV. WHAT MIGHT SUCH A REVISED SERVICE LOOK LIKE?

By way of concrete suggestion, here is an outline of a possible Covenant Service according to the specifications set out above.

A. *The Preparation.*

1. The Service would begin with a Call to Worship, and,
2. A hymn of thankful adoration, such as 'Father, in whom we live',

3. Then would follow a prayer for sincerity in worship, preferably one used regularly in such a position in the Communion—say the Prayer for Purity—and,
4. A proper Collect for a right intention in covenanting, perhaps something like this:
'O God, who hast, by the precious gift of thine only Son, brought us into the Covenant of thy grace, grant that we, being faithful to the vows which we make before thee, may at the last behold thy glory, and worship thee in the great company of thy saints: through the same . . .'

B. *The Service of the Word.*

1. This would consist of three readings—one from the Old Testament, preferably Jeremiah's prediction of the New Covenant (Jer. 31^{31-4}),
2. One from the Epistles, which might well be a Pauline description of the life of the baptized (e.g. Rom. 6^{3-14}),
3. One from the Gospels, perhaps the present reading, which describes the union of believers with Christ (John 15^{1-8})—
4. And then an Exhortation, consisting of an exposition of the nature of the Covenant and its mutual obligations, of God's faithfulness and our unfaithfulness, and of our need to seek and receive forgiveness, and in faith to renew our vows of consecration. (This Exhortation could either be printed in full, or only in outline, for the Minister to develop in a way suited to the needs of his congregation).
5. The Church would respond to the Word by singing the Covenant Hymn ('Come, let us use the grace divine'), and also
6. In an expression of repentance and faith, Confession and Absolution and the Creed, introduced with special biddings:
'Since we have been unfaithful to the Covenant into which we have been admitted, let us make confession to God our Father, and seek his forgiveness: . . .
Let us proclaim our faith in our Covenant God: . . .'
7. Then would come the Renewal of the Vows associated with entry into membership of the Church, ending with a special Covenant Prayer, perhaps something like this:

'(*Minister*)—O God of all power and love,
who hast given thy Son to die upon the cross and
to rise again in victory,
and who, by the indwelling of thy Spirit, dost awaken
our faith in Christ,
that, as he died, so we may die to sin,
and that, as he is risen again, so we may live in him:
we offer ourselves anew to thee, as those whom thou
hast redeemed,
for we are not our own, but thine:
(*People*)—We are not our own, but thine;
take us to thyself, Lord, and use us as thou wilt;
give us such faith that we may know thy presence

and obey thy will in all things:
grant that we may so use the means of thy grace
that we may be wholly sanctified in love.
Amen.'

C. *The Service of the Lord's Table*

1. The Collection would then be received, during the singing of a suitable hymn, 'Give me the faith which can remove', 'Being of beings, God of love', or the like,
2. At the presentation of the Offerings, the Offertory Prayers might well include a special Collect for the occasion, of this sort: 'Accept, O God, in the name of thy beloved Son, this offering of our persons and possessions, and in the ordering of thy providence employ them to thy glory. Amen.'
3. Then come the Thanksgiving,
4. The Communion,
5. A prayer for faithfulness in the universal Church, and,
6. The Benediction.

V. WHAT IS THE BEST OCCASION FOR THE COVENANT SERVICE?

Wesley generally held his Covenant Services at the chief centres of Methodism at the times of his regular visits, and it was, apparently, pure chance that led to his being in London at the New Year—with the very Society that served as a model for the whole Connexion—although he certainly saw some appropriateness in linking new dedication with the New Year.

It was not unknown for him to hold a Covenant Service around Easter: and that season has much to commend it as the regular occasion of the Service, for the themes of the Easter festival concern the essentials of the Gospel, the saving work of Christ as the divine initiative in creating the Covenant, and our sharing in Christ's death and resurrection as the human acceptance of the Covenant. Both the beginning of the Connexional Year and Aldersgate Sunday have been suggested as possible alternatives to the first Sunday in January; but Easter has the great advantage of being a feast whose meaning, like that of the Covenant, is the inheritance of all Christians, and not the eccentric preoccupation of a few, nor the exclusive property of one denomination. This principle holds good for the whole scope of liturgical revision, and indeed for Churchmanship in general—the only way to be loyal to the Catholic Church is through loyalty to the differing traditions that brought us the Gospel and nourish us with the means of grace appointed by Christ; but the best we can do for our denominations is to look beyond them to the well-being of the Church Universal.

[1] This objection, in various forms, has been framed against the Covenant Service by Anglicans and (latterly) Presbyterians for more than a hundred years.

SPRINKLING AS A BAPTISMAL USAGE

A. Elliott Peaston

JOHN WESLEY allowed sprinkling, but he was not an innovator. This usage is to be found in *The Directory for the Public Worship of God.* The Directory was adopted by the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and was ratified by Parliament for use in the three Kingdoms in 1645. The Directory declares: 'That baptizing, or sprinkling and washing with water, signifieth the cleansing from sin by the blood and for the merit of Christ', etc. The Westminster Confession of Faith states: 'Dipping of the person into the water is not necessary; but baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person' (Chapter XXVIII). The Westminster Divines had before them the great authority of Calvin. In the *Institutes of the Christian Religion,* it runs: 'Whether the person baptized is to be wholly immersed, and that whether once or thrice, or whether he is only to be sprinkled with water, is not of the least consequence: churches should be at liberty to adopt either according to the diversity of climates, although it is evident that the term *baptize* means to immerse, and that this was the form used by the primitive Church' (iv. 15.19, Beveridge's translation). The French version had: *'Au reste, c'est une chose de nulle importance, si on baptise en plongeant du tout dans l'eau celui qui est baptisé, ou en repandant seulement de l'eau sur lui.'* The Latin is even more interesting, because it seems to speak only of two ways, immersion and sprinkling (with affusion hidden only in a word): *'Caeterum mergaturne totus qui tingitur, idque ter an semel, an infusa tantum aqua aspergatur, minimum refert.'*

It is possible that Wesley may have arrived at a similar conclusion by his own independent study of the Scriptures. In his *Thoughts upon Infant Baptism,* he says: 'With regard to the mode of baptizing, I would only add, Christ nowhere, as far as I can find, requires dipping, but only baptizing; which word, many most eminent for learning and piety, have declared, signifies to "pour on", or "sprinkle", as well as to "dip". As our Lord has graciously given us a word of such extensive meaning, doubtless the parent, or the person to be baptized, if he be adult, ought to choose which way he best approves. What God has left indifferent, it becomes not man to make necessary' (1837 edition, pp. 21-2).

Wesley was quite capable of forming his own opinion on any subject! But it should not be forgotten that the Confession of Faith was known to him (Works, X, pp. 206, 229, 459). He was well acquainted with the thought of the Westminster Divines among whom were two of his own great grandfathers. It would be not a little singular if such a man had failed to observe their judgement.

ECCE HOMO: The Historical Jesus in 1865

H. Gordon Powell

ECCE HOMO, J. R. Seeley's life of Jesus, appeared exactly one hundred years ago. The book when read nowadays may excite little sense of discovery but in the years immediately following its anonymous publication it aroused very strong feelings; the Evangelical Lord Shaftesbury declared it to have been 'vomited from the jaws of Hell'. It became indeed an *Honest to God* of its period, achieving notoriety out of proportion to its weight because it gave expression to liberal notions, and confirmed the sense of insecurity of the 'establishment', in a transitional decade.

Ecce Homo is a classic portrait from the liberal Jesus of history school. With the confidence in historical method characteristic of the period, Seeley took it for granted that he essayed a legitimate exercise. The reactions of eschatologists, form critics and demythologizers against the anti-dogmatic quest for the historical Jesus were unforeseen in England in 1865. Taking *Ecce Homo* as representative, it may be useful to show how far the book's innocence of mid-twentieth-century theological attitudes limits our ability to share its thesis. At the same time it may serve to illuminate some current debates in 1965.

Criticism of liberal attempts to portray the historical Jesus is now directed less against the end results than against an assumption which guided their authors.[1] This was the assumption that the nearer one came to accuracy in describing Jesus of Nazareth the more fully the impact of his personality and message would be felt. It was believed that the personal Jesus of history could speak for himself if only one could 'get through' to him.

Three principles, themselves inter-related, have come to be regarded as undermining the basis of this type of research and therefore as rendering the very quest fruitless from the start. These may be characterized as (1) Critical, (2) Existential, (3) Christological.

I. The most obvious source of uneasiness about the liberal approach is the critical limitation of the amount of 'original' material available for such 'lives of Jesus', and the consequent reversion to a (larger or smaller) *kerygma* as the field for quest and the locus of the life-giving Word. The implications of this for a Synoptic-orientated work such as *Ecce Homo* are evident. Seeley certainly did not differentiate in detail between the authenticity of sayings or narratives in building up his portrait. The Gospels were biographies, on the whole reliable, and if they were proved untrustworthy, 'then of course this, but also every other, account of him falls to the ground'.[2]

Liberals of one hundred years ago however were far from being bound to biblical texts for their authority. 'We have not rested upon single passages, nor drawn upon the fourth Gospel' is Seeley's revealing note on his method.[3] He does not hesitate to employ a criterion of probability when

discussing the miracle narratives,' and acknowledges that a man who would live the Christian life in its fullness must be 'free from the fetters of tradition and Scripture'.[5] 'We are not to enquire whether the New Testament commands us' to philanthropy' but whether the spirit of humanity commands it."[6]

Seeley shared in a sceptical tendency which was not uncommon in the literature of the period (seen for example in the contemporary novels of George Eliot and the contribution of Baden Powell on Scriptural interpretation in *Essays and Reviews* (1860)). In *Ecce Homo* the result of Seeley's diffused and gentle scepticisms was to allow that selectivity and idiosyncrasy which was one of the failings of the liberal lives of Jesus. This may well be seen today as a bigger handicap to the quest than his lack of the apparatus of New Testament criticism now available.

II. A more damaging charge against the liberal assumption has come through the existential approach to historical study as a theological medium. This questions the belief that 'objective' historical research can be an appropriate instrument for the disclosure of what is theologically significant in past events, by setting beside this the existential concept of the historian's self-involvement in the lives and decisions of his subjects.[7] It may or may not be possible for us to be acquainted in detail with the actual life history and verbatim words of the man Jesus; but only by grasping the existential significance of what has come down to us shall we be confronted with the life or death decisions which are the meaning of Christ for us. Although this criticism of the 'purely' historical originates in Existentialist philosophies of history as an historiographical difference of method, the fundamental issue is often not historiographical at all. The pressure upon historical study is to produce interpretations which lend support to a particular philosophy, and thus upon New Testament study to come up with Christian existentialism.[8]

Here then, liberal historicism, as represented by *Ecce Homo*, would seem to be called to answer such questions as these (anachronistic in the asking, but illuminating in the answering): How far does the Jesus whom *Ecce Homo* portrayed offer a possible understanding of a man's own existence? Does it present a challenge to personal commitment or merely set up a pious interest in the mechanics of a past dynamism?

No doubt Seeley, the secular historian venturing into biblical study, was guided by mid-nineteenth-century historiographical principles. In discussing the comparative difficulty of obstacles to belief in the first and in his own century he significantly gives priority to the sheer distance in time between the events and their recapitulation. 'Only a well-trained historical imagination, active and yet calm, is competent . . . to draw from them, at a distance of eighteen hundred years, a meaning tolerably like that which they conveyed to those who heard them.'[9]

One result of what may be called this historical absolutism is that we are not always sure in *Ecce Homo* at what level the relationship of men to Christ is being discussed. Seeley moves from the past to the present tense, from historical to contemporary planes, without acknowledging the differences in meaning between allegiance to Jesus of Nazareth and faith in the living

and exalted Christ.[10] The point of his exercise is indeed that there is no significant difference. But he transcends the limitations of this over-simplified understanding of Christian time in one of his key themes, which curiously realizes the existentialist requirement of radical self-understanding leading to decision, in the interpretation of the New Testament.

This theme, which was certainly Seeley's most original, was his view of Christian faith as an initiative prior to entry into the experience of Christian living. He makes use of this idea throughout *Ecce Homo*, but the fullest account of it occurs where he is describing Christ's selection of membership for his Kingdom. Christ repudiated the conventional criterion of virtue in Judaism, says Seeley, and began to select followers, 'recruits for the great work', by allowing them to select themselves. 'All those who found Christ's call attractive were such as were worthy to receive it.'[11] Those who came out of the ordeal of self-criticism proved that they possessed a certain quality of character or spirit; and Seeley surprises us by going on to say that to this quality the first Christians gave the name 'faith', 'the virtue required of one who wishes to become a Christian'. 'The New (Theocracy) gathered out of mankind, by a summons which though absolutely comprehensive was yet not likely to be obeyed but by a certain class, all such as possessed any natural loyalty to goodness, enthusiasm enough to join a great cause, and devotion enough to sacrifice something to it.'[12]

Seeley's description of faith as a potential enthusiasm is peculiar and seems at first sight to be at odds with traditional Protestant exposition of the word. One immediately questions the implication that a certain type of temperament was required to gain access to the friendship and sympathy of Christ. It may be that Seeley did fail to distinguish two ideas here. It does seem to be true that our Lord 'warmed' to those of straightforward and 'extroverted' personality, as for example in the stories of Zacchaeus and the centurion at Capernaum. The Synoptic record also affirms that he was best able to help those who, whether pleasing or unpleasing in personality, were willing to trust him absolutely. Logically Seeley comes near confusing these two observations and saying that the halting or devious were in Galilee, and are now *ipso facto* precluded from the benefits of the Kingdom.

The broad compassion of *Ecce Homo* allays any suspicion of such determinism, however. Seeley was here attempting to express, we may now feel inadequately, an important aspect of the individual's response to the offer of saving love in Christ, which is now being more carefully defined by the post-Freudian theology of self-awareness. This is the idea that faith is not so much achieved as given, i.e. is not primarily an intellectual conviction which later leads to the response of the whole man, but is rather the intuitive acceptance by a man of his true and full self-hood in the light of the revelation in Christ.[13] John Henry Newman five years later in his *Essay in aid of a grammar of assent* (1870) was to explore the same idea.

Faith understood as involving crucial self-analysis and self-acceptance is thus allowed (as in the teaching of Christ, Seeley points out) to be influential at the level of complex motive and what Seeley calls 'anarchic desire'. This adds depth to those post-Reformation interpretations of *sola fide* which tend

to harden into a personal but formal requirement, a mental acquiescence, by which the believer is admitted to a higher level of spiritual benefit.

III. The Christological objection to the liberal biographical approach is probably the most damaging, for this asserts that, however self-consciously uncommitted the quest, the result is the illegitimate extraction of some ideal of the essential Jesus. Bonhoeffer thus deplored these portraits as Docetic in tendency because by being primarily interested in the idea they 'undermine the fundamental proposition of all theology that God by free grace has become a real man'.[14]

The criticism here goes beyond the Existentialist's plea for more personally relevant (or more existential) interpretation of the New Testament *kerygma*. A demythologized *kerygma* may be no better than a 'Jesus of history' in providing an answer to the question 'What is Christ for us today?' Indeed, by weakening the ties with historical time and place it may produce an even less meaningful answer. Bultmann's words about liberal idealism also apply to the more radical demythologizing. 'The *kerygma* is here reduced to specific religious and ethical principles and to a religiously motivated idealistic ethic. But therewith the truth of the *kerygma* as *kerygma* is eliminated, that is as the message of the decisive operation of God in Christ. The great religious and ethical ideas are eternal, timeless truths. . . .'[15]

Few would doubt now that nineteenth-century liberal idealism led up a blind alley, and in so far as *Ecce Homo* attempted to turn the Gospel into moral principles it will be regarded now as deficient. On the whole, Seeley's professional sense of the historical saves him from abstractions. Moreover, as its title suggests, his book is thoroughly Christo-centric in its treatment of such temptingly theoretical subjects as law and morality. For instance, in the chapter on 'The Enthusiasm of Humanity' Seeley puts the crucial question: 'Has the verb "to love" really an imperative mood?'; his answer as in the discussion of faith is in terms of inward renewal in response to Christ. 'Christ believed it possible to bind men to their kind, but on one condition—that they were first bound fast to himself. He stood forth as the representative of men, identified himself with the cause and interests of all human beings. . . .'[16] 'As the lover of his country is free from the temptation to treason, so is he who loves Christ secure from the temptation to injure any human being, whether it be himself or another . . . he is eager to benefit and bless to the utmost of his power all that bear his Master's nature. . . .'[17]

In this chapter Seeley comes perhaps as near as the nineteenth-century liberals could to confronting men with 'the Christ who stands at the centre of history'. What is lacking? The Christological answer today might be that Seeley failed to realize the full potentiality of that confrontation. For his Jesus derives authority from the 'two-dimensional' psychological and physical attributes discovered in the historical man rather than from his continuing presence as risen Lord in the community of the Church. 'For the dogma of the Church . . . the foundation dare not be the history of Jesus Christ as past, but the presence of Jesus Christ as history. . . . The miracle of his real presence in the Church substantiates what historical research can neither negate absolutely nor affirm absolutely.'[18]

It is in Seeley's failure to make this connection that the difference between the Christology of 1865 and 1965 becomes apparent. For all the emphasis of *Ecce Homo* upon corporate aspects of Christianity—'the Christian Commonwealth', 'the New Theocracy'—the influence of Christ is essentially singular and static; he is the Founder of an empire to whose blue-print the community still refers. But his influence is moreover subject to dilution in history, for the Faith is 'only one of many revelations', and must increasingly be supplemented by 'the blessed light of science'.[19]

One may say, without ingratitude for *Ecce Homo*, that Seeley, like other Victorian courteous rebels, was near and yet so far. Theological agonizing since he wrote is bringing us to understand the meaning of Christ's manhood; but (at last) without making his contemporaneity depend upon a theological sleight of hand in the name of 'faith', or upon an assimilation of Christ's history to a localized interest.

[1] Cf. A. M. Hunter, *Expos. Times*, Oct. 1964, 16.
[2] *Ecce Homo*. 33.
[3] *Ibid.*, 33.
[4] *Ibid.*, 35.
[5] *Ibid.*, 180.
[6] *Ibid.*, 161.
[7] Cf. M. Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*, 395. 'The theme of history is neither the purely unique occurrence nor some generality floating above it, but rather the possibility which was factually existent. . . . Only factual authentic historicity, as determined fate, is able so to open up the history that has been, that in the repetition the "power" of the possible strikes into one's factual existence, i.e. comes to it as its futurity' (quoted James Robinson, *A New Quest for the Historical Jesus*, S.C.M., 1959, 46).
[8] Cf. P. Tillich, *Journal of Rel.*, XXVII, no. I, Jan. 1947. 'It is the beginning of a process of disintegration in theology if the objective side is isolated as a quasi-scientific assertion and the subjective side as an emotional 'will to believe' in spite of a lack of evidence. The problem of truth in theology cannot be solved in terms of objective evidence. It can be solved only in terms of existential criteria.' See also O. Evans's useful article, 'Demythologising', in *L.Q. & H.R.*, April 1958.
[9] *E.H.*61; and cf. Jowett's contribution to *Essays and Reviews* (519) where he concludes that 'you cannot give a people who have no history of their own a sense of the importance of Christianity, as an historical fact'. The missionary should therefore 'be able to separate the accidents from the essence of religion; he should be conscious that the power of the Gospel resides not in the particulars of theology, but in the Christian life'.
[10] The difficulties of this become especially clear towards the end of *E.H.* where Seeley is describing 'the Christian Commonwealth', which he is reluctant to make co-terminous with the Church as institution.
[11] *E.H.* 50.
[12] *Ibid.*, 54.
[13] Cf. H. A. Williams' chapter in *Soundings*, and writings on 'acceptance' by Tillich (and his successor at Union Seminary, Daniel Williams), especially *The Courage to Be.*
[14] Bonhoeffer, *Christologie* (quoted Marty, *Place of Bonhoeffer*, 1963, 158).
[15] *Kerygma und Mythos*, 26. Cf. discussion of Bultmann's positions re liberal essentialism in *God who Acts*, G. E. Wright, 119-20, and *Christology and Myth in the NT*, G. V. Jones, 24ff., 42ff.
[16] *E.H.* 133.
[17] *Ibid.*, 134.
[18] Bonhoeffer, quoted op. cit., 156.
[19] *E.H.* 262.

ONE OF MANY

Bishop Jeune of Peterborough, Anglo-French Oxford Reformer

C. J. Wright

A RECENT visit to Jersey in the Channel Islands has recalled an eminent Victorian Bishop of *Ecclesia Anglicana*, François Jeune, whose name and work call aloud for recollection in this age of dogmatic confusion, and inchoate search for, and striving towards, a richer, deeper, and more radical unity among Churches and Religions than any previous age has known. I hope it is not out of place if I now recall that my wife's father used to tell me of the close relationship of the two Jersey families—the 'de Sainte Croix' family from which, on his mother's side, he had sprung (the 'head of the family', as he not unproudly said, 'according to Jersey Norman-French law'), and the 'Jeune' family from which, on his father's side, François Jeune came.

Three outstanding expressions, in time and place, of Jeune's mind, heart and will became as a goad to drive me to write about him.

But before I turn to them I will recall the facts of his lineage. In the Birth Certificate which I saw in Jersey, I found that he was registered and baptized not as 'Francis', by which Christian name he has always been called in England, but as 'François'. Here is a reminder of how our own island and its people have so often sought to smother or doctor history. I was reminded, in this context, by one of François Jeune's grandsons only recently that even some of those closest to the Victorian bishop wanted to delete the 'e' from his name, making the ardent youthful 'Jeune' (who belonged to the school of prophetic men who ever *renewed their youth like the eagle*, in the Psalmist's vivid language) into the mild and sunny 'June' familiar to our English scene and climate. A declension indeed! Happily, though the 'François' was forgotten, the 'Jeune' remained.

François Jeune, then, was the son of *'François Jeune et Elizabeth le capelain sa femme: né 22 Mai, 1806'*—as I saw in the records. He was baptized privately on May 28, *'et presenté à la chapelle de St. Aubin le 11 Juin, 1806'*. (I was interested to note that this French 'chapel' in St Aubins was writen by the then 'Recteur, G. Bertam' in an old Norman-French spelling as *'chappelain'*). He was born near to St Aubins at St Brelade. These two names tell those who can see and hear that the history of what we call 'Christianity' in Jersey goes back to the age of early pre-medieval 'saints'. But I must not write of the intermingling of legend and historical fact in the lives of 'Aubin' and 'Brelade'.

This Jersey boy was sent by his parents, for a fuller education than Jersey could then give to an outstanding learner, to St Servan's College, Rennes, in Brittany. Another 'saint' and this time with the name of 'St Servan', who, it should be remembered, was 'the apostle of the Orkney islands'. France,

Scotland and Norway were thus conjoined in name, heritage and nature, as transmitted to the boy.

In 1836 François Jeune went to Canada as secretary to Sir John Colburn, the governor-general. His Anglo-French family and education was the directing rod that prodded him to the great country where the descendents of Britain and of France were living in an uneasy peace: Wolfe and Montcalm being alive in spirit in both Upper and Lower Canada, with Jacques Cartier of St Malo contending with the later seamen from England among the two peoples.

On his return from Canada, Jeune became Headmaster of King Edward's School, Birmingham, an educational establishment which, in large measure and ideal, he remodelled. Leaving this famous school, he was called in 1838 to become Dean of Jersey and Rector of St Helier's—the boy's college that was rivalled by the later some-time Anglican-Methodist College for girls called 'The Jersey Ladies College' (now a School of Jersey State).

In 1843 he was recalled to Pembroke College, Oxford, where he had been a student during the turbulent years when 'the tractarian movement' was heaving in its Oxonian womb. Twins were fighting in that womb, and after the days of Newman, Pusey, Hurrell Froude, and Keble, the strife of the contenders who had emerged was great, bitter, and (I would add) chaotic, disordered, and full of sound and fury. 'Catholicism—Roman and Anglican' —was in the lists with 'Evangelicalism—Low, and with less heat and display —Broad'. It was the contest between what has been mordantly called 'Attitudinarianism', 'Platitudinarianism', and 'Latitudinarianism'. I would rather, for my own reading of history, describe this vehement age of strife in the Oxford that Jeune knew so well, in the words of a Wordsworth whom neither Newman nor Pusey understood, nor, indeed, their 'evangelical' opponents:

The intellectual power through words and things
Went sounding on a dim and perilous way.

Master of Pembroke College, Oxford, from 1843 until he moved to Lincoln as Dean in 1863, he became also Residentiary Canon of Gloucester Cathedral, and was Vice-Chancellor of Oxford University from 1858 to 1862. Throughout this period of intense dogmatic upheaval he kept the flag of liberal thought and practical endeavour flying through the storms. How great was the consternation in the Hebdomadal Council when he took his appointed seat in Oxford! What gnashing of teeth! What plans and counter-plans!

Jeune left Oxford for Lincoln in 1863, and after but a year or so, was consecrated Bishop of Peterborough in 1864 where he remained until his death in 1868. In this lovely and noble Cathedral of St Peter is his 'Memorial', and by its walls his bones lie. Few today who pass through and by the present building, on a site where a Christian Cathedral stood as early as 656—founded by Penda, king of the Mercians, and destroyed by the Danes in 870—stay to recall its history. Even a recent bishop of Peterborough, a scholarly teacher of boys in public schools, had, he told me, little or no knowledge of who François Jeune was and what he had done.

Three facts, then, about François Jeune stand out for remembrance today. First, his mainspring work for Oxford reform. Second, his zeal for British-European, and especially Anglo-French, understanding. Third, his combination of practical acumen for administrative reform with liberal-evangelical conviction for the cause of truth and unity in *Ecclesia Anglicana*, and among the Churches that were the heirs of the sixteenth-century Reformation. Inevitably his Huguenot ancestry, from the 1560s, when his forebears first fled to Jersey from France, moved deeply in all that he said and did.

First, Oxford will never forget, or never ought to forget, his practical zeal for her reform. As Master of Pembroke he sought, in his own way and with his own talents, to awake Oxford from her dogmatic slumbers, and to make impossible for the future such a description as that of Matthew Arnold's famous one in his *Essays in Criticism*: 'Worshipping from her towers the last enchantments of the Middle Age.... Home of lost causes, and foresaken beliefs, and unpopular names, and impossible loyalties.'

Jeune, before 1850, had strongly urged upon Oxford a Commission of Inquiry to revise the aged statutes. Among a distinguished company of members of the Commission, set up in 1850, were Tait, later Archbishop of Canterbury; Liddell, joint author, with Scott, of the famous Greek Lexicon; Baden-Powell, famous for his confrontation of 'miracle' and of scientific issues in *Essays and Reviews*. Jeune was the mainspring of the whole action for reform. I here cite the testimony of Goldwin Smith, himself, as a young Oxford don, present at the meetings and taking notes. (I have his *Reminiscences*—published in Canada—before me now, with other books of his and about him.) 'The Paul Louis Courier of our times and tongue'—as York Powell called Goldwin Smith—wrote: 'The most active spirit of the Commission was Dr Jeune, the Master of Pembroke. The Head of a House, to sit on a Commission of Inquiry to which Oxford generally and his own Order in particular were bitterly opposed, required courage. Jeune had it. He was a man of superabundant energy, remarkable acuteness, and lively wit.... He was excellent company and said good things. A lady at his table asked him the delicate question on what principle they chose the Heads of Colleges. "They always take the handsomest man among the Fellows," was his reply. "I should not have thought," said the lady, "that the Provost of Worcester had been chosen on that principle." "Ah! but you have not seen the Fellows of Worcester." '

The report, when produced in 1852, was unanswerable, but the Commission, being Royal, not parliamentary, had no compulsory powers. An Act of Parliament was required. The Act, after much skirmishing, delaying tactics, and amusing contortions among politicians and ecclesiastical zealots, was eventually passed in 1854 (followed, of course, by the Act of 1877). As Goldwin Smith wrote: 'It swept away the mediaeval statues, opened the Fellowships and Scholarships to merit, and practically transferred the University from clerical to academic hands.... The result, amplified as it has been since, proved the soundness of the maxim that the half of a loaf is better than no bread.'

I must also add—and *this* fact reveals the true prophetic strain in the mind of Jeune, in an age that was, in church circles, largely indifferent, blind, or hostile to 'Science'—that to Jeune and his Commission were chiefly due the Schools of Natural Science, of Law and of Modern History in Oxford.

When Jeune was Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, Edward, Prince of Wales, afterwards Edward VII, came to Christ Church. The story is told and confirmed for me by Jeune's grandson that the question arose as to which of the two should first raise his hat to the other when they met in the street. They agreed that both should raise their hats at the same time!

Second, there is the sermon in French preached by Jeune in Westminster Abbey on June 11, 1862, at a service in connection with the International Exhibition in London.[1]

Everyone knows that 'The Great Exhibition' of 1851 sprang out of a suggestion made by Prince Albert before the Society of Arts, and that this most cultured and liberal Prince Consort (the title given him in June, 1857) carried through his project against the opposition of dreamers and dogmatists, and, further that he was thus able, through the realized surplus of £150,000, to establish and endow the South Kensington Museum (afterwards called the Victoria and Albert—the famous 'V. and A.'). But not everyone knows that this same Prince Albert was a moving spirit in the International Exhibition of 1862.

Alas, in the autumn of 1861, on his return from one of the meetings to arrange the Exhibition, he was seized with what was thought to be influenza and found to be typhoid fever. He died on December 14 that year from congestion of the lungs.

I am confident that Prince Albert knew well and appreciated justly the liberal mind of François Jeune, then at Oxford. I am also confident that he would have been wholly sympathetic with the service in French in Westminster Abbey on June 11, 1862. Both these men sought to further understanding among the nations, to promote honest scientific thought, and to urge the island nation to awake to the beckoning tasks in industry, commerce, arts, and religion.[2] I imagine that this service was unique in that it was a statutory service in the nave of Westminster Abbey, and almost wholly in French. I believe that not since the Reformation had so much French been spoken in the Abbey.

In *The Times* report we are told that 'the spacious nave was well filled, the majority of persons present being French, although there was a considerable sprinkling of Germans, Dutch and Italians'. The lessons were read in French by the Rev. R. Burgess, Prebendary of St Paul's and Rector of Upper Chelsea. Dr Jeune, then Master of Pembroke College, Vice-Chancellor of Oxford University and Canon Residentiary of Gloucester Cathedral, took as the text for his sermon verses 16 to 19 of St Luke IV: 'And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day and stood up for to read. And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias, and when he had opened the book he found the place where it was written, The spirit

of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind; to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord.'

This text is, to me, the most meaningful part of the whole French Service in Westminster Abbey on June 11, 1862—and coupled with the text, its context in place and time.

I need not here write of what happened in Nazareth on that day, early in the teaching ministry of Jesus, when many of his hearers 'were filled with wrath in the synagogue' as 'this Joseph's son', in Luke 4[22], used the familiar words of the prophet (Isaiah 61) they were accustomed to drone with drugged minds to weary synagogue-frequenters. 'Is not this,' some asked in muddled amazement, 'the carpenter, the son of Mary and the brother of Jacob and Joseph and Judas and Simon, and are not his sisters here with us?' (as in Mark's account). Nor need I now go back in history to the place hard by Nazareth—to the hill from which 'they might throw him down headlong'. . . . Nor need I here write how the Johannine evangelist many years later than Jesus, recalled the place, time, and message—'For Jesus himself testified that a prophet hath no honour in his own country' (John 4[44]).

It is fascinating to remember that Charles Kingsley had preached on this very text during the Great Exhibition. But there was this difference between the reception given to Jeune's Sermon in Westminster Abbey in 1862 and to Kingsley's in a west-end London church in 1851. In the decorous and historic Westminster Abbey *no one protested.* In the west-end church, the parson in charge himself arose when Kingsley had finished, strode to the 'altar' or 'communion table', and declared, as the 'priest' responsible for what was said and done in *his* church before *his* congregation, that *the great part of the 'doctrine' or 'dogma' of the Sermon just preached was untrue.*

So the fierce resentment that Jeune faced in his reforming zeal in the Oxford of 1850-2 was matched by the same type of unbending hostility that Kingsley faced in 1851, in a different place, before different people, but with the same essential spirit—the spirit that sought, in that age and in every age, to overcome 'the Spirit of the Lord'.

As far as I know, we have no complete published record of Jeune's sermon, for Jeune did not write books, though he published a number of single sermons, as well as his first Charge as Bishop of Peterborough in 1864. The text itself, however, reveals the man: a strong liberal mind, alive to the liberal outlook of the prophets and, supremely, to the mission and message of Jesus. I can imagine *what* he said, and *how* he said it. His French must have been flawless, if a bit rusty through disuse. But French learnt as a child, and, later at St Servan's College, Rennes, is never forgotten; and Jeune, an eminent figure in ecclesiastical England, did not even wholly forget the Jersey Norman-French which he spoke as a child.

'The sermon,' we are told in *The Times* of June 12, 1862, 'was in every respect worthy of Dr Jeune's accomplished scholarship. Much care had evidently been taken in its composition, although there was nothing ambitious in his matter or pedantic in his mode of expression. His manner was

effective, and though by no means exaggerated it was admirably adapted to the delivery of a French sermon. The whole service was a conspicuous success, and has placed the Church and Churchmen under obligation to the Dean of Westminster, with whom it is understood the idea of the service originated and under whose auspices it has been so well carried out.'

Jeune was not a speculative philosopher. Unlike Mercury, he did not stand on tiptoe gazing at the heavens. With his feet planted firmly on the ground, he looked around at the turbulent and evolving scene to help the forces of truth and toleration. Like his Huguenot forebears, it could be said of him, as is inscribed on the fine memorial to Admiral Coligny in front of *L'Oratoire*, opposite the Louvre in Paris (from Hebrews 11[27]): *'Il demeura ferme, comme voyant celui qui est invisible'* ('He endured as seeing him who is invisible').

Third, this reference to the great Coligny, the first to be struck down on St Bartholomew's Day, 1572, in the Rue de Rivoli, Paris, is surely appropriate in closing this account of a doughty liberal evangelical bishop in mid-Victorian England. Jeune never forgot his Huguenot forebears, never ceased to ponder on the political and ecclesiastical strife in his beloved France—a strife that had brought his own forebears to Jersey in 1565 just after the tragic events in Amboise and before the 1572 massacre in Paris and throughout France.

Nor could he forget how in this very chapel, *L'Oratoire*, Richelieu used to worship and how Napoleon had given it to the Protestants in lieu of what he had taken from them; nor could he forget the death-bell at midnight on August 23, 1572, from *St Germain l'Auxerrois*, adjoining.

Nor could he forget the pockets of French-speaking Huguenots throughout England—in Southampton, Canterbury and many other towns. In Canterbury Cathedral to this day the descendants of French Huguenots worship every Sunday afternoon in the crypt, where, by Royal Charter in 1547, *'L'Église Wallone et Huguenote Évangelique Française'* was *'Fondée en 1547 dans la crypte de la Cathedrale'*.[3]

There is a story told by Jeune's descendants, and, I believe, historically true, of how Palmerston wanted to appoint Jeune to be Archbishop of Canterbury when Sumner died in 1862. Queen Victoria, however, said that he was then not sufficiently versed in ecclesiastical affairs, or too young, though she, like Albert, appreciated Jeune's qualities, and approved his appointments to Lincoln and Peterborough.

But though he did not sit on Augustine's throne, Jeune would not forget that bare, bricked-up tomb in Canterbury Cathedral, where the bones of Cardinal Odet de Coligny still rest—east of the tomb in the cathedral where Archbishop Courteney, great grandson of Edward I, was buried on August 4, 1396. Courtenay's bones lie at the feet of the Black Prince, in whose Will he had been appointed as one of the executors. Odet de Coligny was a brother of Admiral Coligny; he had died in 1571, a year before the St Bartholomew Massacre, having fled to England because of his Huguenot sympathies. I have often stood by these two tombs in Canterbury Cathedral. The Archbishop, as Bishop of London, bitterly opposed Wyclif and his

teaching, and presided in 1382 over the 'Earthquake Council' that condemned the Articles, twenty-four in number, which were being spread throughout England by itinerant preachers.[4] Thus the opponent of Wyclif lies just to the West of the friend of the Huguenots! Courtenay and Odet de Coligny, these two—the first seeking to encloud 'the morning star of the Reformation in England', the other seeking, in England, to escape the mounting fury of France's Wars of Religion.

From the death of such tensions, loudly shouting to those who can, or will to, hear, grows slowly—how slowly!—fuller truth and deeper unity. Two corns of wheat fall into the ground, side by side, and die before the eventual fruit ripens. The lover of freedom and the lover of authority both have to die before the liberty that is instinct with *justice for all* is reached. Thomas Jefferson, the third American President, put the truth this way: 'The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants. It is its natural manure.'

Let me, however, conclude not with Jeune and Kingsley and Jefferson, and the whole prophetic company of those who lived and died for the reforms demanded in their different times—but with Jesus, 'The King of Martyrs' as he is described in the stained-glass window of an old village church in Shropshire. Here, once again, are the words of the evangelist who had deepest insight into His mind:

'I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.'

'I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine. And other sheep I have; which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one *flock*, and one shepherd.'

'The servant is not greater than his Lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also.'

[1] I am indebted to the Editor of *The Times*, Sir William Haley, for a micro-film of the account of the service. The Westminster Abbey authorities were unable to give me the facts I desired.

[2] Musicians may remember that one of Auber's last compositions was a March for the opening of this exhibition.

Prince Albert was deeply concerned for a true and just unity in Europe and was especially alive to the need of a frank understanding with France. See his letter to the Earl of Clarendon on May 21, 1857, welcoming, though with statesmanlike caution, the proposed visit of Napoleon III. He was also concerned with allaying the excitement in Britain and the U.S.A. over a Federal ship's seizure of the British mail steamer *Trent* on November 8, 1861, and thought the Exhibition might help. See *Letters of Queen Victoria 1837-61*, Vol. 3, p .421.

[3] I have recently seen, in Jersey, a copy of the record of this founding from an 1835 memorial 'from Martyrs' Field Canterbury'. And I possess the history of this 'French Refugee Church of Canterbury' written by a Pasteur (1881).

[4] It was during this Archbishop's rule that the Norman nave and cloisters were being reconstructed in the perpendicular style.

SHORTER SURVEY

John T. Wilkinson

THE Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman (Vol. XVI), ed. C. S. Dessain and V. F. Blehl, S.J. (Thomas Nelson & Sons, £5). This sixth volume in the monumental series of the Newman Letters to be published covers the correspondence for the period January 1854 to September 1855, and although the period is a brief one it runs to more than six hundred pages. It is concerned with the inauguration of the new Catholic University in Dublin of which Newman was its founder and first Rector. These letters reveal his immense task, often pursued under great discouragement, involving for him the purchase and reconstruction of buildings, the collection of academic staff, the erection of the university Church, finding the money for it himself in part from the surplus of the Achilli trial fund; the securing of distinguished patrons to lend their support and, in addition, the preparation of syllabuses of study and examination papers, together with much domestic oversight. All this had to be carried forward under restriction because he had to secure permission from the Irish bishops, and in particular from Dr Cullen, Archbishop of Dublin. Associated with this project was the attempt by Cardinal Wiseman to procure a bishopric for Newman, and, the proposal being made public, he received congratulatory messages and even presents of the necessary insignia from friends, but under secret correspondence with Rome by letters from Dr. Cullen the whole project was withdrawn, and Newman was never told the reason, yet he accepted the slight with quiet resignation. The problems of the University formed only part of Newman's responsibility at this time. Though under great strain, he still remained Superior of the Birmingham Oratory, and these letters reveal something of the internal difficulties with which he had to grapple. This volume holds the mirror to Newman's indefatigable labours and each letter shows a glimpse of the man himself. Once again the editorial work is superb.

In *The Christian Agnostic* (Hodder & Stoughton, 30*s*.) Dr Leslie D. Weatherhead provides what may be regarded as his *confessio fidei*, expressed in his lucid writing and marked by his characteristic wealth of illustration. It is the fearless and candid writing of a man of humble mind in search for Christian truth. Dr. Weatherhead's standpoint is that of an earlier Christian liberalism which was prepared to challenge many of the positions of Christian orthodoxy. Written for the thoughtful layman who often feels that 'the churches are far more concerned to defend a hoary tradition than to follow the moving light of new insights and understanding; far more concerned to defend historic language than to discover truth', Dr Weatherhead believes that we can only 'recommend Christianity to the thoughtful men of today by a restatement which admits a large degree of agnosticism, eliminates magic, dispenses with imposed authority, and abolishes from our

conception of God horror and cruelty'. For him 'Christianity is a way of life, not a system of theological doctrines which must be believed. . . . The essence of Christianity, past, present and future, is loving Christ and one another'. The soundest parts of the book are in his chapters on Divine Providence, Prayer and Faith, Evil and Sin, Death and Survival, Judgment, Hell and Heaven. His deep understanding of psychological processes and of psychical research compels the reader to think deeply as does his chapter on Reincarnation, 'a matter worth our enquiry'. It is the more theological chapters of the book which lay themselves open to criticism, and, indeed, somewhat easily to a misunderstanding of his position. Dr Weatherhead's thought about God seems to resolve itself into a virtually binitarian view, despite the fact that it is not impossible along experimental and historical lines to approach some understanding (even on the part of 'the thoughtful layman') of a trinitarian theology. Moreover, though undeniably convinced of the glory of Christ, his Christology, probably without any such realization on his part, verges upon a vague gnosticism which obscures the real quality of his own actual experience of the Divine grandeur that is Jesus. Further, his keenness to examine every possibility of interpretation, however speculative, leads him to consider, for example, the possibility of an explanation of the Virgin Birth in terms of 'sacred marriage', and so to fail to note that the simple and natural explanation of the fact that Mary went to the home of Zacahrias is that Elizabeth was her cousin! Yet he is right in asserting that an explicit belief in the Virgin Birth is not to be regarded as essential to the Christian faith, and that it is one of those elements in the Christian tradition 'to be held *sub judice* awaiting further light'. A full appreciation of this courageous book will only come if it is viewed *as a whole*. Some things in these pages will not command assent but it will be seen as the precipitate of the thought of one who is essentially close to Christ as the Lord of all good life.

In similar vein but in smaller compass, Dr Nathaniel Micklem deals with the same issues in *A Religion for Agnostics* (S.C.M. paper-backs, 7*s.* 6*d.*), 'having in mind those many who wish they could be sure but have no confidence, no constant vision, whose spiritual life is a series of "mere glimmerings and decays" '. He believes that 'the traditional Christian doctrines are not final: they need to be radically revised if the truth to which they point is to be made intelligible today'. This is a book about essential things.

In *Christian Discourse: Some Logical Explorations* (Oxford University Press, 12*s.* 6*d.*) Professor Ian T. Ramsey pursues a line similar to that of his *Models and Mystery* (1964) in an attempt 'to clarify habitual ways of speaking about theological topics'. The first lecture deals with the language of the Bible, which is ultimately concerned with 'cosmic disclosures'. To behold a flower we may have 'the eye for botanical detail' but those who see with the eye of faith talk as did Tennyson of the 'flower in the crannied wall'—a potential revelation of 'what God and man is'. Professor Ramsey shows how the parables of Jesus and Hebrew poetry are instruments of such disclosures. The second lecture is concerned with the various doctrines of the Atonement, in which he shows that the language used is essentially to be regarded as metaphorical—'the multiplicity of models which have for the

most part prompted perilous articulations'. He asks: 'Is there a model which gives rise to the minimum number of bogus interferences?' and concludes that such a model is love. The third lecture is concerned with discourse about God, and deals with the issue raised in *Honest to God*, with its 'riotous mixture of models', revealing the confusion of thought which he thinks lies beneath its main argument. Professor Ramsey has given us a rewarding book.

Athens or Jerusalem?: A Study in Christian Comprehension, by Dr L. A. Garrard (Allen & Unwin, 21s.), is a series of lectures by the Principal of Manchester College, Oxford, and former editor of the *Hibbert Journal*, in which he endeavours to show the balance in the development of Christian thought through the centuries. He believes that the old antithesis: 'Thy sons, O Zion against thy sons, O Greece' is a false one, and that there is evidence that the reaction against the synthesis of Hebrew and Greek elements has gone too far. 'Today the danger in Christian circles lies in the direction of a too exclusive devotion to Jerusalem.' He declares that 'unless we retain some of the Greek analytical spirit we are in danger of simply talking dogmatic nonsense'. Dr Garrard takes a wide survey of Christian history in which he reveals the range of his knowledge. His view of the task of theology is expressed in a quotation from Ambrosiaster: 'Every truth, by whomsoever it is spoken, is of the Holy Spirit'. It is an erudite and stimulating book, and, whilst it represents the development of liberal Christianity from the standpoint of Unitarian approach, it indicates the elements of a new liberalism as a valuable corrective for much of the theological emphasis now current. *Contemporary Theological Liberalism* (A. & C. Black, 5*s*.) is the title of the Inaugural Lecture at King's College, London by Professor G. F. Woods, in which he asserts that 'to reject responsible liberalism in Christian theology is to reduce and impoverish the meaning of the Christian faith'.

Under the title *The Abolition of Religion* (Inter-varsity Press, 4*s*. 6*d*.), Dr Leon Morris presents a carefully prepared argument against the 'religionless Christianity' which is so strongly emphasized by Dietrich Bonhoeffer, in the pages of *Honest to God* and in other recent theological writings. His conclusion is summed up in the following sentence: 'The fact must be faced that in the new movement, despite the vigorous protestations of some of its protagonists, we are being asked to accept not a re-stated version of Christianity, a Christianity translated into the idiom of the twentieth century, but a new heresy, an apostasy'. This book should be read.

In *The Conditionalist Faith of our Fathers* (Vol. II) (Review & Herald, Washington, 92*s*.) Professor L. E. Froom, of Andrews University, U.S.A., presents the views of human destiny held by the Seventh-Day Adventists, and in a survey of more than thirteen centuries seeks to show that multitudes of scholars have held the belief in 'conditional immortality' which declares that man's immortality is a Divine bestowal to be received only by the righteous at the Second Coming of Christ, when the wicked will be destroyed, and which will be conditional on faith and obedience. This formidable volume of thirteen hundred pages represents an amazingly impressive achievement of compliation which will doubtless encourage those of Pro-

fessor Froom's own persuasion, but for many others will seem a strange collection of evidence. Plato, the Papacy and modern Spiritualism, as opposing the belief, fall under severe castigation.

In 1942 the Princeton University Press published *A Short Life of Kierkegaard* which, in the opinion of a reviewer in *The Times Literary Supplement*, was 'as good an introduction to Kierkegaard as any that is ever likely to be written'. From the same press that is now available in a second paper-back edition ($2·95) and is indeed a most useful account of the life and work of the Danish philosopher.

Authority and the Church (S.P.C.K. Theological Collections No. 5, 15*s.*) edited by Dr R. R. Williams, Bishop of Leicester, is a series of papers and discussions between theologians of the Church of England and the German Evangelical Church. It falls into three parts. 'The Authority of Scripture and Tradition', by Professor G. H. Lampe, of Cambridge. 'Scripture explicated by, sometimes reinterpreted by but always ultimately controlling and judging the subsequent tradition, evokes faith. . . . It is authoritative . . . in so far as the Spirit makes it a channel of God's Word. The subsequent tradition is secondary, being interpretative and explanatory rather than creative' (p. 19). Second, 'The Authority of Christ in His Church', by Professor Ernst Kinder of Münster: 'Ecclesiastical authority may never cut itself loose from the functional obligation of being the authority of Jesus Christ; it may not concentrate upon itself so as to claim a religious autonomy of its own' (pp. 43-4). Third: 'The Authority of the Church Today, by Canon I. T. Ramsey, of Oxford. 'The Church will never gain her authority in contemporary society until she has seen better that her authority is the compelling authority of a vision of God's love which she herself in her life must express, and until, in humility, she has struggled to relate her theology with the problems of thought and action which she has learned by listening to what secular men have had to say' (p. 80). This is a searching book.

The Beckly Social Service Lecture for 1965 was delivered by Sir Ronald Gould, the General Secretary of the National Union of Teachers, under the title *The Changing Pattern of Education* (Epworth Press, 11*s.* 6*d.*). Following a rapid review of tendencies at work in a changing world, attention is directed to the confusion over the purpose of education, largely caused by a confusion of values. The author indicates three aims in education: to secure a living; to be good citizens; to live satisfactory lives as individuals, and further suggests that whilst the Churches have been pioneers in providing elementary education they have had a limited view of the issues really involved, being rather concerned with schools as sources for potential Church members. Then follows a clear statement of the Christian position and a discussion on the 'agreed syllabus', recognizing its merits but also its weaknesses—'a composite document not completely satisfactory to anybody'. The final chapters deal with the present position regarding religious instruction in a growingly secular society and the nature of attacks from without. The book is a wise and far-sighted study of the problem.

Jewish Prayers and Worship: An Introduction for Christians, by W. W. Simpson (S.C.M., 9*s.* 6*d.*), is a book about prayers used by Jews in the

privacy of their own homes and in public synagogue worship; about prayers hallowed by the use of centuries, some of them even before the time of Jesus—and about prayers which could bring enrichment to the life of the Christian, as they have done for the life of the Jew through many generations. The first part of the book gives a brief outline of the liturgical framework; the second is a collection of Jewish prayers and the third contains some Jewish hymns valued alike in home and synagogue. Mr Simpson, a Methodist minister who since 1942 has been General Secretary of the Council of Christians and Jews, is to be warmly commended for opening up a field of rich devotion hitherto unknown to most Christians.

Free Churchmen Unrepentant and Repentant (Carey Kingsgate Press, 25*s*.) is a collection of ten papers from the pen of Dr Ernest A. Payne, the eminent Baptist historian. Collected by the author in order to set them in the context of the contemporary ecumenical situation, they are all particularly pertinent to our time. Marked by that sound historical scholarship and that clarity in historical writing which is characteristic of the author, almost every paper sheds new light upon the subject with which it deals. In particular the following papers may be noted. 'The First Free Church Hymnal'—a sixteenth-century Anabaptist Hymn Book now used by the Old Amish Mennonites of Pennsylvania and familiarly known as the *Ausbund*: 'Contacts between Mennonites and Baptists'—a historical study with the hope of encouraging a closer fellowship between these members of the same ecclesiastical family belonging to the left-wing of the Reformation; 'Baptists and the Laying-on of Hands'—of which Dr Paynes writes: 'There would be general surprise were it claimed that during the greater part of Baptist history the laying-on of hands not only at the ordination of pastors but also of deacons has been explicitly enjoined in formal pronouncements and general practice, and that in addition not a few Baptists for more than a hundred and fifty years practised the laying-on of hands on baptized believers as a rite closely akin to the confirmation ceremony of other Christian traditions. Yet such is the case.' Clearly this is an illuminating volume demanding the most careful study and appraisal.

Where in the World? and *What in the World?* (Epworth Press, 6*s*. 6*d*. each), first published in America by Dr Colin Williams, Chairman of the Department of Studies in Evangelism of the World Council of Churches, are intended to be study-manuals for discussion groups on ecumenical issues, and for which questions are provided at the end of each chapter. The first deals with the issues confronting the Church, and seeking to answer the question as to whether the present structure of the Church is a major hindrance to the work of evangelism, emphasizes the changing forms of the Church's witness. In the second volume many examples of experiment are given, illustrating how the Church should be focused upon the world's need. Challenging throughout, nevertheless some impression is left that the existing local Christian community is so circumscribed and static that it can hardly function effectively in mission. It still remains true, however, that the residential Christian community can be a focus of spiritual ministry, not

least in regard to the issues connected with family life. and it need not be self-contained, but of great value in its outworkings, as is true of many Christian congregations in their witness.

In *Whereof we are Witnesses* (Epworth Press, 7*s.* 6*d.*) Dr Daniel T. Niles. the Secretary of the East Asia Christian Conference, presents the results of his experiences gained in his widespread travels in America and elsewhere in this series of brief meditations centring around the text: 'This Jesus . . . whereof we are all witnesses' (Acts 2^{32}), the spirit of which is summed up in the following sentence: 'We who speak about Jesus must learn to keep quiet about ourselves.'

Dr Philip S. Watson now Professor at Garrett Theological Seminary, Evanston, has done excellent service in providing an anthology of the writings of John and Charles Wesley under the title *The Message of the Wesleys* (Epworth Press, 18*s.*). A valuable introduction gives an interpretation of the emergence of the Wesleys as leaders of the Revival and reveals what they regarded as 'essential Christianity'. In the rest of the book the Wesleys are allowed to speak for themselves. Part I expresses the basic doctrinal elements which formed the foundation of their evangelistic enterprise. Part II shows the outworkings of their doctrine in practical application. The ultimate purpose of the book is to provide 'A Reader of Instruction and Devotion' for the modern reader, and forms a corrective to the idea widely held that Protestantism has failed to produce a literature of Christian devotion.

The Bible Christian denomination began a hundred and fifty years ago and was merged in the United Methodist Church in 1907. The story has been fascinatingly set forth by the Rev. Thomas Shaw in the Wesley Historical Society Lecture for 1965—*The Bible Christians: 1815-1907* (Epworth Press, 15*s.*). This study gathers up the essential elements in the history of the Bible Christians written by F. W. Bourne (1905) and brings the story up to the time of the Union of 1907. It is a scholarly piece of writing, based upon original sources, and Mr Shaw is to be warmly congratulated upon his work, a subject in which he must be counted as an authority. The book contains excellent illustrations.

In the realm of Christian devotion three works are to be noted. *Divine Intimacy*, by Fr. Gabriel of St Mary Magdalen, O.C.D. (The Mercier Press, Cork, 90*s.*), is a volume of Roman Catholic meditations on the interior life planned for every day of the year. It is a translation from the Italian edition. The author believes that the special mission of the Carmelite order is that of leading souls to a life of intimate union with God by means of the practice of mental prayer, and his book sets forth the whole doctrine of the spiritual life in the form of simple, solid meditations. These are so arranged that 'in the course of one year the most important problems of the spiritual life and all the supernatural realities met with in the interior life will have been reviewed'. In the words of St Theresa, upon whose method of devotion this collection of meditations is based, it seeks to cultivate 'frequent solitary

converse with Him who we know loves us'. It is a profoundly enriching book for Roman Catholic and Protestant alike.

Prayer and Personal Religion, by Dr John R. Coburn (Carey Kingsate Press (Layman's Theological Library, 6*s*.), deals with a topic that is vital to Christianity and the emphasis is rather upon the experience than on the theory of prayer. The reader is conducted by easy stages into the practice of prayer, and for those who have never begun seriously to pray this forms an excellent introduction, and for those who have already made some advance along the way this will prove a means of further progress.

The Mystery of the Transfiguration, by Gordon S. Wakefield (Epworth Press, 2*s*.), is a series of five meditations on this theme, in richness far beyond the modest compass of the work. First conducted in the service of Morning Prayer at the Methodist School of Fellowship at Swanwick, they reveal a profound insight into the experience of Jesus. As the author indicates: 'Each exposition is concentrated and each sentence should be weighed and thought over carefully.' It is a rare piece of devotional writing from the pen of one who is expert in this field.

A number of sermon studies are to hand. In *Mind and Heart* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 18*s*. 6*d*.), Dr R. A. Ward, formerly Professor of New Testament at Wycliffe College, Toronto, and now Rector of a country parish in the Norwich Diocese, presents a series of 'Studies in Christian Truth and Experience', representative of the author's preaching and teaching. He reviews the main doctrines of the Christian faith and the book evinces sound scholarship and careful exposition enriched by homely illustration. It is the fruit of the author's thirty years of ministry. *Mastery in the Storm*, by George B. Duncan, minister of St George's Tron Church, Glasgow (Lutterworth Press, 8*s*. 6*d*.), is a collection of addresses delivered at the Keswick Convention, the object of which is 'to discover the faults and flaws in our Christian living and experience in the light of the standards revealed in God's Word, and then to seek the remedy for our failure in the light of the promise made for the Christian by virtue of his living union with the living and risen Christ'. The addresses are heart-searching discourses, and the book contains delightful illustrations of the English Lake District. From the pen of Ian Macpherson comes yet a further collection of fourteen choice sermons under the title of *God's Middleman* (Epworth Press, 16*s*.) Marked by excellence of style and with telling illustration, they are modern preaching at its best; they contain the pure word of the gospel of Christ. *The Way of the World and the Way of the Lord* (Epworth Press, 5*s*.) by Dr Neil Alexander, Lecturer in New Testament in the University of Glasgow, contains five meditations for Holy Week, each followed by a prayer. The opening meditation on 'The Way of the World' summarizes those elements which culminated in the Crucifixion, and the rest reveal 'The Way of the Lord' as Son of God, as High Priest, as Servant-Messiah and as Conqueror the World'.

In the hope of providing material for teachers of Scripture, The Principal of Westminster College, Oxford, the Rev. H. Trevor Hughes has produced a most useful series of studies under the title *Life worth Living* (Epworth

Press, 16*s*.) which should form a basis for the discussion of fundamental questions from a new angle. Beginning by looking at the individual. Mr Hughes examines the relation of the individual with others, and finally looks at his relations with God. At the end of each chapter there is a series of useful questions. It represents a new approach to an understanding of the meaning of life as faced by modern youth.

What kind of Classics? (Oxford University Press, 4*s*.) is the title of the 1964 Inaugural Lecture given in the University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland by Professor Guite, formerly of the University of Manchester. It is an eloquent plea for a recognition of the value of the Latin and Greek classics in a reasonable education, but in no exclusive way. Let there be a combination of classical studies and other disciplines for those able to learn the languages, and also a wide insertion of classics-in-translation for those without the linguistic ability to grapple with the original. 'Of all arguments for studying the classics the one that wears best is the argument that in studying the classics we are studying ourselves.'

All beginners who are studying Hebrew will welcome another of the series by Dr Norman H. Snaith especially designed for those students who are compelled to study by themselves without the guidance of regular tuition. The latest in the series is *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Genesis xxii-xxv and xxvii*, published by the Epworth Press (10*s*. 6*d*.).

Finally we note two new Reviews now to hand. *One in Christ*, a Catholic Ecumenical Review continuing the *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, seeks to contribute to a fuller mutual knowledge and deeper understanding of the traditions and life of all Christians, Catholics, Orthodox, Anglicans, and Protestants by contributing to the dialogue between Christians and encouraging mutual love and prayer for Christian unity. The annual subscription is £1. From abroad comes *The New Zealand Theological Review* published twice yearly by the Faculty of the College of St John, Auckland, the annual subscription also being £1. Both hold great promise.

RECENT LITERATURE

Edited by John T. Wilkinson

Leviticus, by M. Noth. (S.C.M. Old Testament Library, 35*s*.)

It will be generally agreed that for the great majority of readers Leviticus is very far from being the most absorbing book in the Old Testament. Its almost complete concern with matters of a cult and ritual which ceased to operate nearly 2000 years ago (and without which Judaism has lived and flourished as a great religion to this day) does not commend it to those who turn to the Hebrew Scriptures to seek what is eternal in them. There is so much in Leviticus which is temporal; so much which fits neatly into the background of ancient Near Eastern cultic practice in general and can give the impression that Israelite worship was scarcely indistinguishable from that of the multitude of the contemporary peoples. It is true that in chapter 19 the book touches on some subjects which we recognize as being of the essence of religion; but as most of them are dealt with in other less tedious parts of the Pentateuch one can at least understand the man who, when confronted with Leviticus, wonders, like Dickens's charity-boy, if it is worth while to go through so much to learn so little. Nevertheless this is the code which governed the worship of Judah, centred in Jerusalem, for about five centuries until well into the early Christian period. As such, and as the embodiment of many cultic and social laws far older than the post-Exilic period, it must be taken into account by any who would understand the religious history of Israel, even if it be seen only as the ground from which sprang the fine flower of more significant faith. It certainly needs to be explained; and this is admirably done in the volume under review, by Professor Martin Noth of Bonn. This is a translation by J. E. Anderson of Noth's Germany commentary which was published in 1962. In a brief introduction the questions of structure, literary criticism and textual history are dealt with, the author making clear that the whole book is to be regarded as proceeding from the P source, though only chapter 9 belongs to the earliest P narrative. The non-narrative sections of Leviticus are recognized as having had a separate existence, in oral or written form, for a considerable time before the composition of the P narrative. In many cases there are signs that they represent the actual practice of the Jerusalem sanctuary in the late pre-Exilic period; this is particularly true of the Code of Holiness, chapters 17-26. In the commentary itself the matters mentioned are dealt with in detail, and the exposition of the various sections of the text is for the most part very clear. There are a few passages which are somewhat obscure; one may suspect that translation of a commentary so concerned with cultic technicalities has sometimes been far from easy. The whole is a reliable guide to a complicated piece of religious literature which will be most useful to all who wish to study the worship of later Israel.

J. Y. MUCKLE

Daniel, by Norman Porteous (S.C.M. Press, Old Testament Library Series) 30*s*. The mark of the worth of this commentary on the Book of Daniel by Dr Norman Porteous, Principal of New College, Edinburgh, is seen in the fact that a German version of it was published in 1962 in a series of commentaries, *Das Alte Testament Deutsch*. Not written in the conventional commentary form, it has a continuous flow that impels the reader to gain an understanding of the entire Book of Daniel with its many problems. In a biblical book which is neither prophecy nor apocalypse, but in which eschatology and history are entwined, to gain the right perspective for its interpretation is of first importance. This, Dr Porteous maintains, is the historic perspective, and it is no mean task to unravel the background of the Book of Daniel, made more difficult by its historic and prophetic inaccuracies, but this is done with an element of real fascination. Dr Porteous accepts the Book of Daniel as a composite whole and rejects the view of a double version for chapter seven. The identity of the fourth kingdom as Greece, a view from which there can be but few dissentients, the baffling figure of Darius the Mede who 'owes his existence to a historical blunder', the mysterious figure of the one like unto a son of man, which Dr Porteous with Heaton and others accepts as a corporate personality, and all the other topics of the Book of Daniel are viewed theologically and the appropriate truths emphasized. He clearly brings out the over-riding note, found so clearly in chapter seven—the heart of the Book of Daniel, that God is about to do something on the stage of history. With its theological slant it is an ideal commentary for the ministerial and lay preacher. In it there is profound scholarship.

GWYLFA H. MORGAN

Jesus Christ in the Old Testament, by A. T. Hanson. (S.P.C.K., 30*s*.)
Professor Hanson has written an extremely interesting and fascinating book, in which he argues that, according to St Paul, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Fourth Gospel, Stephen's Speech in the Acts of the Apostles and the Catholic Epistles, Jesus Christ was actually and really present in Old Testament events. He presents a very strong case for this theory of interpretation. This most valuable book throws considerable light on the theology of the Early Church, and also clears up many difficulties and problems that are to be found in the New Testament writings. The first six chapters deal with the main theme—Typology—which, as we understand the term, has according to the author very little place, if any, in these New Testament writers' interpretation of the Old Testament. For them there are no types of Christ at all; it is the pre-existent Christ Himself who is really present and active throughout. Extracts from commentaries by the early Fathers—in which the author is well-versed—are freely quoted to support this view. In chapter seven—'Prophetic Prayer and Dialogue in Paul'—Professor Hanson develops his theme and endeavours to show that according to Paul the pre-existent Christ converses with the Father and others through the mouth of psalmist and prophet. This is of special interest, because, if correct, no little light is thrown upon Paul's estimate of Christ and His work, i.e. upon Paul's Christology. In the final chapter—'Jesus in the Old Testament'—the author discusses the question as to how far do the writers of the New Testament identify Jesus with the Adonai or Yahweh of the Old Testament—again throwing light upon Christian doctrine in the primitive Church. The conclusion reached seems to be that the New Testament writers as a whole regarded the Son as being one with the Father

in His essential nature, but there is no confusion of Persons. Speaking of Paul, the author states: 'He held at least a binitarian theology, and I would add, a trinitiarian theology in the making'. The whole subject is treated in a masterly fashion, and the book contains a wealth of scholarship. In reading it some knowledge of Hebrew and Greek is helpful, but not essential; obscure biblical passages are beautifully paraphrased and difficult words in Hebrew and Greek are carefully explained. There are copious notes, a valuable bibliography, and index of biblical and patristic references and a list of authors. The book is excellent value for money and should be in the possession of all serious biblical students.

KENNETH V. EVANS

A New Testament History, by Floyd V. Filson (The New Testament Library, S.C.M. Press, 42*s*.)

Anyone who wishes to understand the origin and emergence of the Christian Church must study the New Testament against the wider background of the history of the Roman Empire and of the Jewish nation during the three centuries from the Maccabean Revolt (167 B.C.) to about the middle of the second century A.D. There has long been a need for a comprehensive and authoritative treatment of the history of these crucial centuries, taking into account all the fruits of modern research into the many and complex problems of Christian origins. It would be difficult to find a writer better qualified for such a task that the distinguished Dean of McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, and Dr Filson is to be warmly thanked for an admirable piece of work. The book will serve as a most valuable text-book for theological students beginning the serious study of the New Testament; and ministers and teachers who wish to refresh and bring up to date their knowledge of the New Testament could not find a more reliable guide. The documentation is full and helpful, so that any who wish to pursue further the study of any particular subject will know where to turn for further guidance. The work consists of five clearly defined parts. Part One sets out clearly and concisely the Historical Background and the Religious Setting. The three central sections deal respectively with the life and ministry of Jesus, the Jerusalem Church, and the life and mission of St Paul. Part Five carries the story on from the point reached at the end of *Acts* through the obscure decades into the first half of the second century, dealing with the various doctrinal, liturgical and organisational trends in the developing Church, and finally showing how the composition of the canonical Gospels served to anchor the life of the Church in history, and how the gradual growth of a canon of authoritative Church writings provided an anchor in Scripture. There is inevitably a certain amount of repetition of material in the different parts of the book, but this has the advantage of enabling the student to use the parts separately as well as constituents of the larger whole.

OWEN E. EVANS

Paul and James, by Walther Schmithals. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. (S.C.M. Press, 18*s*.)

The finest tribute to the work of Prof. R. Bultmann is to be found in the number of younger men who, under his inspiration, but not necessarily accepting his ideas, have been stimulated to pursue and make their own contributions to New Testament studies. Dr Schmithals is one of this band. His special study, as revealed by several volumes published on the subject, is the place and influence of the various parties in the early Christian Church. A correct appraisal is vital for the understanding of the Acts and the Pauline letters. The present book,

which is a translation of its German counterpart, published in 1963, has great value both in the questions it raises and the contribution it makes to their answers. This does not mean that one readily accepts the position taken by the writer. His explanation of certain difficulties seems too easy and the emphasis on the influence of Gnosticism is almost an obsession. It is more than a hundred years since F. C. Baur put forward his famous theory that the early development of the Christian Church was influenced decisively by an antagonism between Pauline teaching and that of the earlier apostles, represented by Peter and James. Schmithals, however, argues that there was never any real conflict between Paul and James, and that there was no Judaising faction or disunity. The discussions we associate with the references in Galatians chapter II, and the Council of Acts XV. took place 'within' the fellowship. He thinks it is 'precarious to construct out of isolated sections of Paul's letters the most diverse heresies of which we hear nothing either before or afterward'. Paul and James both accepted that the law should be binding on Jewish Christians but not on Gentile Christians. The opponents of whom the apostle speaks were Jewish or Jewish-Christian Gnostics. While many sound arguments support his thesis some have little to uphold them. Thus the writer maintains that Luke altered the historical picture in the Acts by making the death of Stephen precede the conversion of Paul. But, despite these reservations, it must be recognized that the book is a fine contribution to an important study for the understanding of the New Testament. We are grateful to the translator for a rendering which is easy to read and yet—as the author himself attests in a brief preface—is faithful to the original thought.

HERBERT G. MARSH

The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament, by B. Gärtner. (Cambridge University Press, 25*s*.)

This is a scholarly work which calls attention to the use of Temple symbolism in the Qumran literature and in the New Testament, apparently with the intention of establishing an essential connection between the two, although this is nowhere very clearly stated. A large number of passages from the Dead Sea texts are used to demonstrate that the Qumran community regarded itself as the true congregation of Israel, charged with the task of making atonement for the nation, called to manifest that holiness which should belong to the sanctuary at Jerusalem. Strongly critical of the Temple of their day, the Qumranites claimed that their community constituted the new Temple in which the glory of God dwelt, whose officers and members by their life of holiness fulfilled in a spiritual manner what should have been achieved by the Jerusalem sanctuary. In these circumstances it was natural, indeed inevitable, that cult regulations and features of the Temple building and of its worship should be employed as symbols of the duties and activities of the Qumran community. For example, the rules regarding freedom from blemishes for those who served in the Temple were made conditions of membership of the community; and the priests at Qumran are thought of as the 'foundations' and the members as the 'stones' of the new 'spiritual building'. This may be regarded as abundantly proved by the large number of Dead Sea texts cited. Dr Gärtner then proceeds to deal with Temple symbolism in the New Testament—first, in important passages in the Epistles such as 2 Cor 6^{14}-7^{1}, 1 Cor $3^{16,17}$, 1 Pet 2^{3-6}, and then in the teaching of Jesus recorded in the Gospels. His argument that the Epistle writers concerned must always have had the Jerusalem Temple in mind when speaking of the Church as a holy building, even when Gentiles were being addressed, is rather unlikely to convince everyone. On the Gospels, Dr Gärtner

is careful to distinguish the 'Temple symbolism' of Jesus from that of the early Church: Jesus thought of the Temple as being replaced by himself, whereas the Church believed that it was the Christian community which was the new Temple of Israel. But the texts quoted are occasionally surprising—even the so-called 'cursing of the fig-tree' comes in for treatment here—and one is left with an uneasy feeling that an attempt is being made to establish that the teaching of Jesus was dominated by the thought of the Temple as the centre of Israel's holiness. Some of us will not be able to accept this, or the final contention that Jesus, aware of the principal Qumran tenet that the community had replaced the desecrated Temple, was greatly influenced by it in his own teaching. That Jesus and the early Church knew a good deal about Qumran is indeed likely; but that they were debtors to it to any great extent is a much more debatable proposition, and so remains in spite of this interesting treatment of the subject. The book is certainly stimulating, but it needs to be used with caution.

J. Y. MUCKLE

The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology, by G. S. Hendry. (S.C.M. Press, The Preacher's Library, 21*s*.) *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, by H. Berkhof. (Epworth Press, 12*s* 6*d*.)

Dr Hendry modestly denies that his book provides the great book about the Holy Spirit which is so often desired, but his contribution has already proved its worth and is aptly reprinted in *The Preacher's Library*. Dr Hendry has added two short but valuable new chapters. Theological disagreement at the time of the Protestant Reformation centred in the third article of the Creed. Hendry seeks to show that divisions within Christendom tended to divide three fruits of the Spirit which need to be related closely to each other. These are the work of the Spirit as the author of solidarity, authority and vitality. His sketch of Roman Catholicism, Protestant orthodoxy and movements such as those of Anabaptists, Spirituals and (perhaps) Moravians is suggestive. (It raises again the question, where to place Methodism; though like most theological books this makes no reference to Methodism.) Dr Hendry argues that the true relation of the three works of the Spirit must be brought together again if the unity of the Church is to be actualised. He also reminds us that unity in doctrine is not the prelude to the unity of the Church but a result of it, and that the Church's dependence on the Holy Spirit 'finds its true expression, not in reflection, but in prayer'. Professor Berkhof of Leiden also writes with ecumenical concern. His book is within the field of biblical theology and provides a useful account of both biblical descriptions of the Holy Spirit and historical and denominational variations. In line with much current thinking, he discusses the Spirit in relation to Mission before going on to enquire about the Spirit and the Church, the individual, the world, the End and the Triunity of God. In all these chapters he has some fresh things to say. He wrestles with the Pentecostal doctrine of a third work of the Spirit (in addition to justification and sanctification) and offers suggestions that deserve scrutiny. Rightly recognising that the doctrine of the Trinity is about the Being of God, not only about His revelation, he makes tentative comments about a way of thinking which will totally avoid tritheism, which results from thinking of 'persons' in our modern sense, without ending in pure modalism. Whether he is on the right lines in this and whether he is correct in thinking that we must turn away from a Logos-centred doctrine to a Spirit-centred one, the reader must judge. Certainly this little book should not be overlooked.

FREDERIC GREEVES

The Dynamics of Forgiveness, by James G. Emerson. (Allen & Unwin, 21*s*.)
This is an unusual book. Dr Emerson is pastor of a Presbyterian Church in New Jersey and visiting lecturer at Princeton. He writes out of pastoral experience and with the firm conviction that pastoral theology is not a mere appendix to more significant theological enquiry but, rather, the prelude to all theology. His book begins with a detailed record of an enquiry among his Church-members and students. Out of this parish-experience, conducted by means of test-cards patiently filled in by his helpers, he seeks to learn what the experience of forgiveness means and by what means and in what contexts forgiveness is realised. He arrives at a number of tentative conclusions. He then proceeds to test these conclusions by an examination of the teaching about forgiveness in the Bible and by consideration of a number of periods of Christian history. Out of this total enquiry emerge a number of convictions which Dr Emerson expresses forcefully and clearly, offering them, however, as material for further examination by specialists in different fields of study. He affirms, for example, that the Pauline understanding of 'the freedom to be a new creature and a new creator' lies at the heart of the meaning of 'realized forgiveness', and he shows that this experience is often described in words which do not include the actual word 'forgiveness'. Whilst owing much to the teaching of earlier theologians as well as of contemporary writers, Dr Emerson believes that the distinctive and the all-important significance of the realization of forgiveness has often been missed, even by some who have written much about it. Theological systems must themselves be deeply influenced by this experience. The Church—in its local community—is meant to be the context within which forgiveness is realized, and so God made known. Sympathetically but strongly the author invites 'angry young ministers' and others to think again about their tendency to decry the place of the parish (i.e. local) Church. Incidental to the main argument are several interesting criticisms of Luther, Calvin, Bultmann, Tillich and others. But it is as a contribution and a stimulus to pastoral theology that this book must be commended. The author is modestly aware that not all his conclusions will prove to be valid; he has no doubt about the importance of his theme and few Christian readers will fail to agree with him about that. It is unfortunate that his literary style is lacking in felicity.

FREDERIC GREEVES

Reality and Man, by S. L. Frank. (Faber & Faber, 42*s*.)
It will be with a sense of shock or of pleasure, according to his view-point, that a reader will discover that this book begins with the traditional metaphysical question: What is really real? The further discovery that it lies within the neo-platonic tradition and draws widely upon mystical theology, as well as upon the profoundly religious experience of the author, may tempt some readers who are steeped in contemporary theological and philosophical discussion to turn away from this beautifully written (and translated) volume. It would be a pity if that were so. As the book continues, current discussion about 'the God out there' and about existential theology are brought to attention, not so much by direct reference as by re-examination of some of the great thinkers of the past—Plato and Augustine, Aquinas and Pascal, 'Genesis' and Paul—to name only a few. The superficiality of much of our present debate becomes clearer, and even those who are not persuaded by Frank's main thesis can hardly fail to profit by passages of great insight which are also marked by a deep humility before mystery. The underlying conviction of the author is that 'reality' is other than the world-of-fact,

yet not separated from it. For him God is other than 'reality', yet not isolated from it. One of the tests of all theology is the degree to which the transcendence and the immanence of God are held together. Frank's attempt to avoid both the submerging of God in the world (or in man) and the separation of God into remote beyondness helps to make this an impressive book. Most of all, it is as an attempt to interpret the meaning of man as made in the image of God that this study is both fascinating and original. The fact of sin, which Frank rightly sees to be of primary significance, emerges as soon as we take seriously the *imago dei*. The fact of so-called physical evil comes to the fore as soon as we seek to interpret the meaning of Creation. It is the chapters which deal with these themes which contain many comments that are worthy of close attention by those who reject Frank's main metaphysic. A. M. Allchin, in an admirable preface, regrets that Frank did not pay more attention to the implications of Chalcedon for his views on the relation of God and man. There are other points at which one would have liked to see more attention paid to Christ. But Mr Allchin's closing words have found an echo in at least one reader's mind. 'Whatever the limitations of Frank's work, it at least represents a notable attempt to recapture and restate for our age the vision . . . summed up by Irenaeus in the word . . the glory of God is a living man; the life of man is the vision of God'.

FREDERIC GREEVES

Truth in Words, by A. Snell. (The Faith Press, 27*s*. 6*d*.)

The author, who is a member of the Society of Sacred Mission, describes his task as an attempt 'to estimate the place of authoritative verbal matter in a Christian's faith'. By 'verbal matter' he means the words of Scripture and the Creeds, though brief reference is made to other confessional statements and the work of individual theologians. No reference is made to preaching. An interesting discussion of the difference between *imperium* and *auctoritas* raises hopes which are hardly fulfilled in the chapter about authority. The author assumes (as he has the habit of doing) that 'anybody likely to read this book' will agree that for the Christian 'authority' really means, or 'is primarily another name for the obligation arising from God's having made us Christians . . . to assimilate ourselves to every part and aspect of the Church's life, work and belief'. Towards the end of the book he affirms that the individual's chief responsibility is to decide which is the right Church to be in and he warns of the danger in conversion to another denomination. In between he devotes a great deal of space to refuting literalistic interpretations of the Bible and in exposing the search for infallibility (in persons) and inerrancy in matters. He suggests that this latter is idolatry, though he is much too kindly to accuse any living persons of this sin. Unfortunately the writer himself seems progressively to realise that those who are 'literalists' will not heed his exposure and that other readers will, as he several times says, find what he writes to be tedious. There is a chapter on the logical status of words about God (though that way of putting it is not his); here, if it is not discourteous to say so, the author appears to be out of his depth. There are many interesting paragraphs and a few somewhat fresh ways of putting fairly familiar facts. The sincerity of the author cannot be doubted and if his book could help some to get rid of illogical and inconsistent views about Scripture it would serve a useful purpose. It is difficult to believe that it will very greatly help those other Christians to whom the writer repeatedly addresses himself.

FREDERIC GREEVES

By What Authority? Studies in the Relations of Scripture, Church, and Ministry. By G. D. Yarnold. (A. R. Mowbray & Co., 21*s.*)

This is a stimulating and useful treatment of a subject of prime importance in the present ecumenical situation. The last chapter on Authority and Reunion indicates the aim of the book. It is concerned with problems bearing on Christian unity. 'Nowhere', says Dr Yarnold, 'is there a stronger case for the re-examination of unconscious presuppositions than in the concept of authority. Through the intellectual honesty, which only the Spirit can give, we must seek a common mind on the question which underlies all our differences. And this requires not more historical research but *new thinking*.' It is impossible in a short review to do justice to the scope of this book. It raises within short compass (158 pages) so many points that call for comment. Yet the treatment is careful, clear and scholarly, never superficial. Dr Yarnold deals with the ultimate basis of all authority in God, and with Scripture as the supreme objective standard of revelation, and its relation to the inward authority of experience. He gives due weight to tradition in the life of the Church, for it is not to be supposed that the Holy Spirit ceased to speak with the closure of the canon. But the heart of the book is in the chapter on Ministry and Authority. A careful study of the New Testament meaning of *exousia* and *diakonia* points to the fundamental conclusion that '*True authority declares itself by ministry. Self-giving ministry is the hallmark of authority.*' All ecclesiastical authority must submit to that test. Dr Yarnold's view of the original relationship of *episcopos* and *presbuteros* has an important bearing on the function of episcopacy in a re-united Church. Authority in the Church is 'corporate'. The Holy Spirit works through the fellowship, even though the principle of leadership within the fellowship is recognized. But does this not point to a democratic 'episcopate in presbytery' rather than prelatic authority? There is much ground in this book for agreement on basic principles, though one is tempted to question the relative importance attached to particular ecclesiastical expressions of them, and to wonder why mutual recognition of each other's ministries and inter-communion is not possible as a first step, precedent to the joint consideration of church order and the value and place of the episcopate in a united Church. At any rate the book could be useful material for discussion groups of clergy and ministers between now and 1968.

ARTHUR N. ROSE

The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr, by Willis A. Shotwell. (S.P.C.K., 19*s.* 6*d.*)

This paperback of 136 pages is based upon a doctoral dissertation presented to Chicago University, and the author is Professor of New Testament studies at Berkeley Baptist Divinity School. After discussing Justin's concepts of Scripture, the writer passes to the methods of exegesis he employed. The most familiar of these are (a) the claim that the life of Jesus gives the literal fulfilment of prophecy, and (b) the allegorical method. But to these there must be added the observance of the context of a passage, the argument concerning 'the general and the particular', the argument from the lesser to the greater, and the use of analogy. Perhaps the most interesting chapter is the longest, ch. 4, which is devoted to Jewish principles of exegesis and to Justin's evident knowledge of these. It is shown that again and again the Christian Apologist is employing methods used by Palestinian Judaism, and that he has far more in common with Rabbis and Qumranites

than with Philo. The author is, of course, aware that Philo himself was influenced by rabbinic interpretations; but he maintains that Justin kept much closer to the rabbinic traditions, Philo being more philosophical in his interests. The discussion of the Logos doctrine in the two writers is particularly valuable. In spite of the fact that seven titles attributed to the Logos are common to Philo and Justin, Dr Shotwell is not convinced that there was any direct borrowing on Justin's part. He admits the bare possibility of this but contends that both may independently have taken some of their ideas from the Stoics. Furthermore, 'Justin may have been indirectly influenced by Philo through his use of John's Gospel' (p. 62). The book also includes a discussion of 'Justin and his Christian predecessors' and it is shown that Justin was a 'direct descendant' of Paul as far as matters of Old Testament exegesis are concerned. Both writers employed thoroughly rabbinic methods, but to both it was the Christocentric interest that was all-controlling. The word 'pascal' on p. 85 should be 'paschal'.

T. FRANCIS GLASSON

The Liturgical Movement and the Local Church, by Alfred Shands. (Revised and Enlarged Edition.) (S.C.M. Press, 8*s.* 6*d.*)

This is an enlarged edition of a well-known book on the Liturgical Movement by an American Episcopalian priest, first published in 1959. It is an excited and exciting book, and in his documentation of this Movement, which is renewing the Church across the old divisions, he has much to be excited about. The usually cautious Pope Paul said recently about the drastic changes in worship in the Roman Church: 'One must not believe that after a little while one will return to the quiet, devout, but lazy ways. No, the new order must be different, and should shake up the apathy of the faithful at Holy Mass. Before, it was enough to be present; now one must participate.' The Liturgical Movement aims to change the emphasis from 'going to Church' as a spectator, to 'being the Church' as a participant in its worship, government and mission. It is characteristic of the new patterns of church life which the Movement is creating that the author's American parish has no church building at all; it meets week by week to celebrate the Eucharist on a table in a restaurant using the table cloth and bread and wine usually served to customers. Bonhoeffer wrote that 'The Church is Christ existing as community' and this book (lacking in self-criticism though it sometimes is) is an exhilarating demonstration of what the Body of Christ can be as a priestly community serving the world and the neighbourhood for which it exists. It contains also a valuable ten-page Bibliography. It would be invaluable for an ecumenical study group.

ALAN WILKINSON

The Just War in Aquinas and Grotius, by Joan D. Tooke. (S.P.C.K., 63*s.*)
Conventional Warfare in the Nuclear Age, by Otto Heilbrunn. (Allen & Unwin, 21*s.*)

As the potentially instantaneous destruction of war increases, Christian concern properly grows, but there is as yet no clear Christian judgement. On one side there is an earnest re-examination of the doctrines of pacifism and non-violence, on the other an equally earnest reappraisal of the 'just war'. Dr Tooke, profoundly

sympathetic to the first concern, here analyses with careful scholarship a part of the second. Her book begins before Aquinas, and continues after Grotius, but she concentrates on these two. Aquinas did not originate the doctrine of the just war, but he formalized it and gave to it the weight of his immense authority. Yet what did he in fact say? What did he mean? And was he right? To these questions Dr Tooke gives penetrating and detailed answers, but her impartial learning does not hide an uncomplimentary judgement. A brief summary does no justice to her patient exposition, but the conclusion is that Aquinas was self-contradictory, curiously inclined to ascribe superior wisdom to the State, and tending to equate 'natural law' with O.T. morality rather than with the Christian revelation. Grotius wins warmer approval as the propagandist for international law as the authority which might control and eventually overcome the wild forces which lead to war. His weakness is that he relies too heavily on justice, and not enough on mercy and love. 'If we consider human nature in its wholeness it may indeed be sane to believe that it needs tremendous restraints. The extreme Christian position may seem remote from these realities, but if we consider the international situation it does not seem extravagant to believe that finally an absolute love may alone be able to conquer the conflict.' This is a stimulating and valuable book. The gap, all too familiar, is the lack of a chart from things as they are to things as they should be. The seriousness of the gap may be measured by Dr Heilbrunn's calmly dispassionate acceptance of war. His theme is the ability of NATO to fight a war in Europe against the Soviet Union. Troops must be widely dispersed, operations must be purely mobile, forces must be deployed in the enemy's rear. The study has the cool, logical sobriety of a chess analysis. There is no hint of the blood and the blunders and the agony of actual war.

EDWARD ROGERS

Maladjusted Boys, by Otto L. Shaw. (Allen & Unwin, 28*s*.)

Redhill School in Kent was started in 1934. It was shaped by a belief that the problems of abnormal behaviour were to be solved, not by admonition and punishment, but by understanding. It is now recognized as a residential grammar school for the education and psychological treatment of maladjusted boys of high intelligence. In this exciting book the headmaster describes how this understanding is achieved and what are its effects on the behaviour and academic prowess of the pupils. The symptoms of maladjustment are enuresis, nervous eczema, asthma, phobic and anxiety states, obsessions, truancy, sexual difficulties, dishonesty and lying. About a third of the pupils are on probation or have passed through the juvenile courts: the remainder have been diagnosed through the school medical service or the child guidance clinic. The strategy is to recognize deviant behaviour as an indication of inner malaise, to avoid condemnation and punishment and to love the children as they are and not as you would prefer them to be. In the place of external authority exercised by adults there is self-government on democratic lines, with various committees and a disciplinary court for the maintenance of law and order. In this permissive atmosphere delinquent tendencies are carefully studied in order to uncover their unconscious motivation. For instance, once a boy has grasped the reason for his stealing he is in a better position to resist the temptation. Various case histories are provided as illustrations. One type of problem dealt with is school phobia. When a boy refuses to go to school, his mother is faced with a real dilemma. She has to choose between

giving in to him and dragging him there by force. In such cases Mr Shaw looks for the basic reason for this hysteria. It is usually due to fear of separation from the mother. This is caused in turn by the mother's emotional dependence on her son and her unwillingness to allow him an independent existence. In his analysis of parental attitudes and their effect on the conduct of their offspring this unusual headmaster shows remarkable insight. His tact in dealing with the neighbours is equally impressive, and so is his ingenuity in harnessing religion and psychoanalysis in a redemptive mission. This book will help the general reader to understand what is meant by the Grace of God.

J. ARTHUR HOYLES

Christian Themes in Contemporary Poets, by Kathleen Morgan. (S.C.M. Press, 21*s*.)

Fifty years ago preachers commonly quoted poetry in their sermons, and gave series of addresses with titles like 'The Religious Teaching of Robert Browning'. Today the role of poetry is a very much reduced one, and large numbers of people find metaphoric or symbolic thinking strange or even nonsensical. It is symptomatic that much of the New Theology is so insistently prosaic, and that the Bishop of Woolwich seems to lack what Eliot once called 'the vision of the horror and the glory'. Jung and Freud, let alone Yeats, Eliot and Lawrence, might never have written. Miss Morgan in her exposition of the way in which Christian themes find expression in such modern poets as Nicholson, R. S. Thomas, Gascoyne, Muir, Charles Williams, Auden and Anne Ridler, may do something to encourage Christians to read more poetry. It is a study rather in the *Christian Discrimination* tradition, the book by Brother George Every so severely castigated by *Scrutiny*. Miss Morgan is a better expositress than a critic—she is not sufficiently external to her subject to be able to make a searching theological or literary critique of it. But if she encourages her (I imagine) mainly Christian readers to roam as widely as she has done among modern poetry, then she will have performed a useful service.

ALAN WILKINSON

Priest and Worker, the Autobiography of Henri Perrin, translated and introduced by Bernard Wall. (Macmillan, 25*s*.)

No Church in Western Europe has faced the missionary situation in Western Europe with as much insight, heroism and frankness as the Church in France, of which Henri Perrin was a priest. Born in 1914, ordained in 1938, he entered the Jesuit novitiate. He was sent during the war as a clandestine worker-chaplain to those conscripted to work in the German factories. Here in depth he experienced the degree to which the French working class had become pagan. Discovered to be a priest, he was imprisoned. In prison he wrote: 'I have no bread to offer, but a day in prison is a precious offering in my hands. . . . Besides how could I have any nostalgia for the services we knew only too well in France. . . . The liturgy, which should be the living experience of the prayer of God's people is almost dead in most of our churches. . . . Perhaps one day we'll be able to live another liturgy, speaking spontaneously from the heart of a priestly people gathered round their high priest in a moving dialogue and communal act.' From 1947 to 1950 he was one of the priest workers in Paris, whose vocation received deep understanding from some of the French hierarchy, but much hostility from other groups inside and outside the Church. Fr Perrin's experiences led him to seek greater freedom

outside the Jesuit order. In 1951 he became a priest-worker on the construction of a dam and tunnel. There he lived with the other workers in their crowded hutments, and became increasingly involved in the protests and strikes against the intolerable working conditions. So much did he gain the respect and affection of the men that when he was dismissed for his trade union activities, the workers went on strike in sympathy, and a Communist journal described him as 'the best man among us—the man whom all the workers loved and respected'. Good Friday 1952 found him working an eleven-and-a-half-hour day. In 1953 the Vatican, despite protests from some of the French heirarchy, ended the worker-priest experiment, though some fifty worker-priests stayed at their jobs rather than betray the world they sought to serve. In October 1954 Fr Perrin was killed in an accident. By that time he was considering resigning from his priesthood. The final question at the end of this moving and searching book should agitate readers of all confessions. How was it that a priest who had received so much from the Church which he loved so much, should be led by his very priesthood to consider renouncing what had been the very heart of his life for so many years, in order 'to bring together his brothers and God—that is, two worlds unknown to each other, the Church and the working class? The real drama is that such a question should have to be asked at all.' It is valuable to compare this book with *Priests and Workers* by John Rowe, a reply on behalf of a group of Anglican worker-priests to the assertion that the English situation does not require anything parallel to the French experiments.

ALAN WILKINSON

BOOKS RECEIVED

ALLEN & UNWIN: Otto L. Shaw, *Maladjusted Boys*, pp. 168, 28*s*. L. A. Garrard, *Athens or Jerusalem: A Study in Christian Comprehension*, pp. 183, 21*s*. Luce Pietromarchi, *The Soviet World*, pp. 462, 42*s*. Marjorie J. Smith, *Professional Education for Social Work in Britain*, pp. 114, 42*s*.

AUGSBURG PUBLISHING HOUSE, MINNEAPOLIS: *Christian Marriage Today: A Comparison of Roman Catholic and Protestant Views* (revised ed.), pp. 204, $1.95.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: J. W. Wenham, *The Elements of New Testament Greek*, pp. xi + 268, 18*s*. 6*d*. Do. *Key to Elements of New Testament Greek*, pp. 49, 6*s*.

CAREY KINGSGATE PRESS: E. A. Payne, *Free Churchmen Unrepentant and Repentant*, pp. 145, 25*s*.

CHURCH INFORMATION OFFICE: E. C. E. Bourne, *Church Planning and Arrangement* (I), pp. 26, 3*s*.

DARTON, LONGMAN & TODD: E. L. Mascall, *The Secularisation of Christianity*, pp. xiii + 286, 32*s*.

EPWORTH PRESS: Ronald Gould, *The Changing Pattern of Education* (Beckly Lecture, 1965), pp. 87, 11*s*. 6*d*. D. N. Francis (ed.), *The Preacher's Handbook* (No. 9), pp. 188, 12*s*. 6*d*. G. G. Yates, *A Guide to the Old Testament*, pp. 266 + maps, 25*s*. A. W. Wainwright, *A Guide to the New Testament*, pp. 288 + maps, 25*s*. G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Preaching the Gospel from the Gospel*, pp. 127, 12*s*. 6*d*. T. Shaw, *The Bible Christians, 1815-1907* (Wesley Historical Society Lecture, 1965), pp. 120, 15*s*. P. S. Watson (ed.), *The Message of the Wesleys*, pp. 264, 18*s*. J. S. Glen, *Pastoral Problems in First Corinthians*, pp. 224, 18*s*. 6*d*. H. G. Hardin, J. D. Quillian and J. F. White, *The Celebration of the Gospel: A Study in Christian Worship*, pp. 191, 15*s*. H. Trevor Hughes, *Life Worth Living*, pp. 108, 16*s*. W. Hordern, *Speaking of God: The Nature and Purpose of Theological Language*, pp. 209, 21*s*.

FABER & FABER: G. Parrinder, *Jesus in the Qu'ran*, pp. 187, 32*s*. 6*d*.

HODDER & STOUGHTON: A. W. Argyle, *God in the New Testament*, pp. 220, 15*s*. A. W. Argyle, *An Introductory Grammar of the New Testament Greek*, pp. xi + 156, 21*s*. D. W. C. Ford, *A Pastoral Preacher's Notebook*, pp. 159, 15*s*. Leslie D. Weatherhead, *The Christian Agnostic*, pp. xxi + 264, 30*s*. W. C. H. Frend, *The Early Church*, pp. 288, 16*s*.

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: D. J. Broomhall, *Time for Action: Christian Responsibility in a Non-Christian World*, pp. 152, 5*s*.

INDEPENDENT PRESS: J. H. Rodgers, *The Theology of P. T. Forsyth*, pp. 324, 36*s*.

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: R. H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Theology*, pp. 268, 50*s*.

MACMILLAN & CO., N.Y.: M. E. Marty and D. G. Pieman (ed.), *New Theology, No. 2*, pp. 316, $1.95.

MARSHALL, MORGAN & SCOTT: Ronald A. Ward, *Mind and Heart: Studies in Christian Truth and Experience*, pp. 144, 18*s*. 6*d*.

MERCIER PRESS: Fr. Gabriel of St Mary Magdalen, O.C.D., *Divine Intimacy* (Trans. from 7th Italian ed.), pp. 1,228, 90*s*. Joseph Höffner, *Fundamentals of Christian Sociology*, pp. 196, 21*s*.

METHUEN: Kathleen Kenyon, *Archaeology in the Holy Land*, pp. 328 + plates, 25*s*. Max Weber, *The Sociology of Religion*, pp. 308, 30*s*. J. Hartnack, *Wittgenstein and Modern Philosophy*, pp. x + 124, 21*s*.

NELSON, THOMAS & SONS: C. Dessain and T. Blehl (ed.), *Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, Vol. XVI, pp. 628, 105*s*.

OLIVER & BOYD: P. Ramsey, *Deeds and Rules in Christian Ethics* (Scottish Journal of Theology; Occasional Papers, No. II), pp. 110, 10*s*. 6*d*. F. G. Healey, *Religion and Reality: The Theology of John Oman*, pp. ix + 175, 30*s*.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Ian T. Ramsey, *Christian Discourse: Some Logical Explanations* (Riddel Memorial Lecture, 1963), pp. 92, 12*s*. 6*d*. Walter Lowrie, *A Short Life of Kierkegaard* (Princeton University Paper Backs), pp. xii + 271, $2.95, 22*s*. 6*d*. *Carols of Today: Seventeen Original Settings*, pp. 110, 15*s*.

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY, N.Y.: Dagobert D. Runes, *The Jew and the Cross*, pp. 94, $2.75.

S.P.C.K.: A. T. Hanson, *Jesus Christ in the Old Testament*, pp. 211, 30*s*. E. G. Jay, *Son of Man, Son of God*, pp. 116, 7*s*. 6*d*. E. M. Good, *Irony in the Old Testament*, pp. 256, 30*s*. D. E. Nineham and others: *History and Chronology in the New Testament* (Theological Collections No. 6), pp. 160, 17*s*. 6*d*.

S.C.M.: W. W. Simpson, *Jewish Prayer and Worship: An Introduction for Christians*, pp. 128, 9*s*. 6*d*. Walter Schmithals, *Paul and James* (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 46). pp. 125, 18*s*. Ferdinand Hahn, *Mission in the New Testament* (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 47), pp. 184, 21*s*. H. E. Todt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* (New Testament Library), pp. 366, 63*s*. J. Macquarrie, *An Existential Theology* (cheap ed.), pp. 252, 18*s*. T. W. Manson, *Ethics and the Christian Gospel* (cheap ed.), pp. 109, 9*s*. 6*d*. N. Micklem, *A Religion for Agnostics* (paper-back), pp. 158, 7*s*. 6*d*.

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

The Expository Times, July 1965.
Theologians of our Time: XIX. Rudolf Bultmann, by Prof. E. D. Nineham.
Moses and the Burning Bush, by John Baker.
The Expository Times, August 1965.
Life after Death: VII. The New Testament, by C. Leslie Mitton.
A New Look at the Christian Hymn in Phil. 2^{6-11}, by John Harvey.
Ventures in Liturgy: V. The Renewal Group: An Order of Holy Communion.
The Expository Times, September 1965.
Life after Death: VIII. Eschatological Ideas in Indian and Iranian Religions, by G. Widengren.
Computer Criticism, by H. K. McArthur.
Theologians of our Time: XX. Ernst Käsemann and Günther Bornkamm, by S. A. Barbour.
Harvard Theological Review, July 1965.
Language and Theology: Some Critical Notes, by Paul Holmer.
The Meaning of the Temple in Lukan Writings, by Klaus Baltzer.
The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity, by Helmut Koester.
Some Vow and Oath Formulas in the New Testament, by G. W. Buchanan.
International Review of Missions, July 1965.
The Purpose and Motive of Mission, by Anas Iasios Yannoulatos.
Mission and Unity from the Theological Point of View, by Elias Voulgarakis.
Macaire Glovukharev: A Prophet of Orthodox Mission, by Nikita Struve.
Some Contrasts in Missionary Patterns, by W. H. Scott.
Mission and Radical Obedience, by W. H. Crane.
Christianity and Ibo Traditional Religion, by Edmund Ilogu.
Christian Evangelical Strategy in West Africa, by W. Sawyern.
Christian Apologetic to Muslims, by Daud Rahbar.
Interpretation, July 1965.
Mission and Ethic: An Interpretation of John 17, by C. D. Morrison.
'Speaking in Tongues': Early Evidence Outside the New Testament Bearing on 'Glossais Lalein', by S. D. Currie.
Orthodoxy and Heresy in Primitive Christianity, by Hans D. Betz.
Interpretation in Contemporary Theology: VII. Reconciliation in New Testament and Confessional Differences (Part II), by Amos A. Wilder.
Journal of Politics, May 1965.
Plato and his Critics, by J. Hallowell.
The Political Attitude of Sir Henry Maine: Conscience of a Nineteenth-century Conservative, by G. P. Feaver.
Cosmopolitan Attitudes and International Relations, by J. D. Singer.
Politico-Military Organisation in the United Kingdom: Some Recent Developments, by E. A. Johnstone.
Neutralists and Neutralism, by S. N. Anabtowi.
The New Zealand Theological Review (Vol. 1, No. 2), Autumn 1965.
The Problem of Discrimination in Typology, by J. A. Ziesler.
The Singular Independence of John Henry Newman, by C. G. Brown.
Christian Faith and Secular Society, by Bp. F. R. Barry.
Contemporary Theological Issues, by H. G. Nicholas.
Theology and Catechism: Their Ecumenical Relationship, by J. Mackey.
The Church and Alcoholism, by W. A. Pyatt.
One in Christ (Vol 1, No. 3, 1965).
The Eucharist: Current Work in Faith and Order, by P. Rodger.
Moral Problems involved in Responsible Parenthood, by L. Janssens.
An Anglican at the Bombay Eucharistic Congress, by C. Murray Rogers.
U.S. Russians and Autocephality, by Alexander Kelliher, S.A.
Beniford: A Venture in Christian Prayer and Unity, by F. N. James.
Anglican-Methodist Relations: An Open Letter, by A. M. Allchin.
Scottish Journal of Theology, September 1965.
The Historical Problem in Paul Tillich's Christology, by B. R. J. Cameron.
The Christian Doctrine of the Origin of the Soul, by A. W. Argyle.
The Place of Tradition in Reformed Theology, by I. F. Peter.
The Missionary Message of Second Isaiah, by A. Gelson.
Witness in the Fourth Gospel, by J. Clifford Hindley.
The Message of James, by C. E. B. Cranfield.
Studies in Philology, April 1965.
Prayer and Confession in Michaelangelo's Poetry, by R. J. Clement.
The 'Estates' Morality Play, by A. C. Dessen.
Doubling in Bale's *King Johan*, by B. B. Adams.
Hieronimo's Dilemma, by David Laird.
The Meaning of 'Philosophie' in the *Essais* of Montaigne, by L. C. Stevens.

Shakespeare's Henry V and the Second Tetralogy.
'Decorum' and the Style of Milton's Antiprelatical Tracts, by Thomas Kranidas.
'O Foul Descent': Satan and the Serpent Form, by Mother Mary Christopher Pecheux, O.S.U.
Adam's Tragic Vision in *Paradise Lost*, by Robert A. Bryant.
Studies in Philology, May 1965.
Literature of the Renaissance in 1965: A Bibliography.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

MARK GIBBARD: Priest of the Society of St John the Evangelist, Oxford.

JOHN KENT: Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History and Doctrine, University of Bristol.

DONALD LEE: Superintendent Minister of the Birmingham (Sutton Park) Methodist Circuit.

A. ELLIOTT PEASTON: Author of *The Prayer Book Tradition in the Free Churches.*

H. GORDON POWELL: Methodist Minister in Ramsey, Isle of Man.

TREVOR T. ROWE: Minister of the Moseley Road Methodist Church, Birmingham.

E. J. TINSLEY: Professor of Theology at Leeds University, and Author of *The Imitation of God in Christ.*

DAVID TRIPP: a Methodist Probationer Minister, who has recently gained an M.A. for a thesis on the Covenant Service, and is at present studying in Germany.

C. J. WRIGHT: Tutor in Systematic Theology and the Philosophy of Religion at Didsbury College, Manchester, from 1930 to 1942; clergyman in the Church of England since 1945.

Printed in Great Britain by The Sidney Press Ltd., Bedford, and published by
The Epworth Press (Frank H. Cumbers), 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1.
Price 5*s.* net per copy (postage 6*d.*) or 22*s.* 6*d.* per annum, post free.