

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Anvil* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_anvil_01.php

PETER FORSTER

T. F. Torrance (1913-2007): An Appreciation

Following T.F. Torrance's death at the end of 2007, Peter Forster here provides us with a short biography and an accessible introduction to his thought with a particular emphasis on Torrance's interaction with the natural sciences, Karl Barth and natural theology, and the doctrine of the Trinity.

Introduction

Tom Torrance died on 2 December 2007, aged 94. He was often described as one of the leading theologians of the second half of the twentieth century, but during his lifetime the reception of his theology was somewhat mixed. His relationship with evangelicals in his native Scotland could be quite strained, but this can largely be explained by the relatively forthright way in which he tried to extricate evangelical theology from some of its habitual *cul-de-sacs*. His own early theological education was shaped by the writings of John Calvin and in the broader sense of the term he could clearly be described as an evangelical theologian. It is to be hoped that his death, following years of ill health after a stroke, will lead to a re-examination of his substantial corpus of writings.

In this article we will look at an outline of Torrance's life and career, and some major aspects of his theology. Although a full biography has yet to be written, we are indebted to Alister McGrath for *T F Torrance: An Intellectual Biography*.¹ A scattering of articles and doctoral theses have appeared over the years, and in an important essay written soon before his own death, Colin Gunton foresaw a renewed interest in Torrance's theology.²

Tom Torrance was born to Anglo-Scottish missionary parents, in inland China, and it was only as a teenager that he came to Scotland for his senior school and university education. He would often refer back to his early years in China, when he recalled having to read three chapters of the Bible each day, with five chapters on Sunday. He wrote of these formative years: 'Belief in God was so natural that I could no more doubt the existence of God than the existence of my parents or the world around me'.³

A devotional heart remained with Torrance throughout his life, although his rigorous emphasis upon the essentially scientific character of theology left him with little sympathy for a merely pietistic approach to theology or church life. There is

¹ McGrath 1999.

² Gunton 2003: 57.

³ Autobiographical memoir, cited in McGrath 1999: 13.

a certain parallel with Karl Barth here, in that both spent ten years in parish ministry before beginning their serious academic careers. Barth had wanted Torrance to succeed him in the Chair of Systematic Theology at Basle in 1961 but, mainly for family reasons, Torrance declined to be considered. The story is told that when, later in life, Barth made a first visit to the USA he was asked to identify the greatest theological discovery he had made, and he replied: 'Jesus loves me, this I know; for the Bible tells me so'. Throughout his life, Torrance could cite the same words in Chinese and he always emphasised, with Einstein, that one of the marks of a profound theory, be it theological or scientific, was simplicity.

Biographical sketch

Torrance's first degree at Edinburgh was in Philosophy, under A E Taylor and Norman Kemp Smith. Their influence, as representatives in their different ways of the Scottish realist, or commonsense, tradition of philosophy stayed with him throughout his life and Donald McKinnon, who also stood in that tradition, became one of Torrance's oldest and best friends. Kemp Smith also introduced him to European Kantian thought. Torrance then took a degree in Divinity and was especially influenced by H R Mackintosh who is little remembered today, but was a major influence on Scottish theology between the two world wars. Mackintosh particularly emphasised the oneness of Jesus Christ with God the Father and the unity of Jesus Christ as divine and human and the significance of these truths for the doctrines of revelation and salvation. These themes remained central to Torrance's theology.⁴

It was Mackintosh's death in 1936 which led Torrance to study under Karl Barth in the late 1930s. Barth proposed the doctrine of grace in the Apostolic Fathers as Torrance's doctoral research and this was eventually published under the same title.⁵ After war service and two parish ministries Torrance was appointed to a chair in Church History at New College, the Faculty of Theology of the University of Edinburgh and he soon moved to the chair in Christian Dogmatics which he occupied until retirement in 1979.

Torrance was a co-founder in 1948 of the *Scottish Journal of Theology* which has evolved into a major international theological journal. It is edited today by his son, Iain, who is President of Princeton Theological Seminary. In addition to editing the *Scottish Journal of Theology* for many years, Torrance co-edited with Geoffrey Bromiley the translation of Karl Barth's *Church Dogmatics*. These major contributions to the theological world were supplemented by his own writing – Alister McGrath lists over six hundred publications during Torrance's career, including a dozen or so major books. Numerous awards came his way, including a Fellowship of the British Academy, and the Templeton Prize for Progress in Religion. His contribution to the wider life of the Church of Scotland led to his appointment as Moderator of the General Assembly in 1976-77. Torrance was also deeply engaged in ecumenical discussion in which he took a particular interest in the Orthodox tradition. This was recognised by appointment in 1973 as a Protospesbyter in the Patriarchate of Alexandria, an honour of which he was particularly proud.

4 Mackintosh's thought can be studied in Mackintosh 1912, 1927; Mackintosh and Torrance 2000.

5 Torrance 1948.

Given this outline of Torrance's life, why is he not more widely known today? It is partly because he fell somewhat between major theological confraternities: he could appear too conservative and orthodox for some, but insufficiently so to the conservative evangelical world. Although he had much sympathy with Orthodoxy, and especially with its early Patristic roots, he felt less at home in the contemporary Orthodox world. He shared the suspicion of Roman Catholicism which has been such a prominent feature of the Scottish Protestantism in which he was reared. Perhaps it is also the case that in certain important respects his theology was felt to be unconvincing, or incomplete, dominated too much by questions of theological method.⁶ Nevertheless, he was a major and rather unusual figure, whose writings look set to have an ongoing influence and a particular relevance to the wider interests of evangelical theology.⁷

A Scientific Theology

Method

Torrance took from Karl Barth the view that theology should be an organised body of knowledge. Such knowledge is developed in response to the reality of a God who has chosen to reveal himself and whose revelation is primarily attested in the witness of the Bible. Nevertheless, this knowledge is necessarily expressed in human language and conceptuality and for this reason needs constant revision and re-expression. Philosophers sometimes speak of this as 'critical realism', a belief that our knowledge is in contact with objective reality but that the formulations and theories in which our knowledge is expressed (whether that be knowledge of God or of the created world) is incomplete. Our knowledge therefore offers clues to the reality concerned rather than propositionally precise, cast-iron representations of the reality concerned. It is real, yet in need of a constant re-appraisal and reception.

For Barth this required that theology should be true to itself and should primarily be developed in independence from other branches of knowledge. On the one hand, this produced the *sang froid* with which Barth was content to continue writing the volumes of the *Church Dogmatics* during the Second World War, with hardly a mention of events in Europe. On the other hand, it laid Barth's theology open to the charge of being based upon a self-contained circle of faith, insulated from the challenges and criticism which other branches of knowledge might properly bring to it.

It was Torrance's insight fully to maintain, with Karl Barth, the view that theology had to be faithful to the God who had revealed himself uniquely and decisively in Jesus Christ, while recognising that this did not so much permit as require a dialogue between theology and other disciplines. In this Torrance placed a particular importance upon dialogue with natural science, but in principle it should apply, to one degree or another, to all branches of knowledge. Barth had acknowledged the potential importance of such dialogues but did not have the time or expertise to engage in them.⁸

6 See for example the comments of Dan Hardy (another recent sad loss to the theological world) in Ford and Muers 2005: 163-77.

7 In addition to McGrath 1999 another evangelical theologian engaging with Torrance is Elmer Colyer, see Colyer 1997 and 2001.

8 Barth 1958: x.

Modern physics and theology

Many books have been written over the past century or so on the relation between science and theology. It might be suggested that in most cases the author has been properly qualified either in science or theology, and has had to manage with a self-taught knowledge of the other discipline. There have been exceptions; among contemporary British writers one thinks of Alister McGrath and John Polkinghorne. Tom Torrance had little formal scientific education, but over time he acquired a remarkable working knowledge of the physical sciences, and especially of leading physical scientists' own reflections upon science and the scientific method. I can recall, when arriving in Edinburgh in 1974 from an Oxford science degree to study theology, raising a question about thermodynamics with Tom Torrance, and being surprised at his detailed grasp of the science concerned.

Two specific reasons led Torrance to concentrate in particular upon the relevance of modern physics to theology. In the first place, the development of field theory (from Michael Faraday and James Clerk-Maxwell to Einstein and others) provided a vocabulary and conceptuality which related well to theology. This development of natural science seemed to lead naturally to a dialogue with theology. Secondly, and more deeply, Torrance believed that the emergence of field theory, and relativity, had restored in natural science a proper relationship between the empirical and theoretical aspects of knowledge, the critical realism which the Scottish tradition had emphasised for him as a philosophy undergraduate.

Field theory, and especially general relativity, had established in our understanding of the natural world the interconnectedness of all things, within the very nature of finite reality. There was no longer the Newtonian need to posit an external framework of infinite and absolute time and space, by reference to which events could be measured and correlated. Rather, the correlations emerged as intrinsic properties of the world itself and had to be established by open experimental enquiry. The stripping away of externalised, infinite presuppositions about time and space from the scientific description of the world led in due course to modern cosmology with its mysterious 'big bang' at the temporal origin of the universe. In this way science throws up the limits to its enquiry in the mysterious invariant constants of nature, from the speed of light to the initial conditions attending the 'big bang' (which have subsequently allowed the universe to expand and evolve in a way which has been so congenial to the emergence of life on earth). It is not that natural science deals with 'how' questions and theology with 'why' questions, so much as the fact that the distinct realities of God and of the universe which he has created stimulate different but related combinations of 'how' and 'why' answers to the questions which knowledge of each naturally poses.

The book in which Torrance first examined the methodological relationship between science and theology is *Theological Science*.⁹ It was dedicated to his wife's cousin, Sir Bernard Lovell, one of the leading astro-physicists of his generation. In many ways it remains his *magnum opus* and it put him firmly on the international theological map. The ideas there are worked out in relation to specific doctrines in two smaller books: *Space, Time and Incarnation* and *Space, Time and Resurrection*.¹⁰ In relation to the theology of the incarnation, and to the resurrection and ascension

9 Torrance 1969b.

10 Torrance 1969a, 1976.

of Christ, these books helpfully demonstrate how trying to fit Christian doctrine into the now outdated views of space and time embraced by the worlds of classical philosophy and Newtonian science alike imported artificial distortions into the formulations of Christian doctrine. This, claimed Torrance, led to false controversies over such questions as the real presence of Christ in the Holy Communion and the relation of the divinity to the humanity of Christ. It also resulted in prosaic presentations of the resurrection and ascension, which in consequence have seemed rather mythological to the modern world. This in turn has fed both atheism and sceptical liberalism. Torrance argued that just as light is bent by matter in the space-time continuum and time slows down the faster an object moves, so, when the eternal light of God shone in our universe in a unique and special way in the person of Jesus Christ, our 'normal' perceptions of events have to be rethought in relation to God's actual revelation of himself, in the unique space-time track which the incarnation represents.

In *Theological Science* Torrance sought to set out an epistemology which saw evidence and theory as intrinsically linked by a common relationship with the underlying, eloquent reality of that which was known. He cited Einstein in particular who (in an important essay 'Geometry and Experience') had emphasised the interconnection of mathematics with the inner nature of the physical world. Einstein called mathematics 'the most ancient branch of physics'.¹¹ In this unitary vision of theory and experience there was no logical or deductive bridge between data and theories, but a deeply intuitive link with appropriate experimental and theoretical tools.

Implications for inspiration and atonement

For Torrance this meant that older views of the verbal inspiration of the Bible or propositional understandings of revelation were as outmoded as the purely mechanistic Newtonian view of the universe which had preceded modern physics. This did not imply that Torrance downplayed the importance of the Bible, because all theological knowledge had to be correlated at a deep level with the witness of the scriptures, but it ruled out any merely proof-text approach.

Torrance was also critical of some formulations of penal substitutionary approaches to the atonement. This was on the ground that they projected human logic into God's dealings with us rather than seeking to understand God's action in Jesus Christ out of its own divine logic, which would always be a mystery to be probed rather than a problem to be solved. Central to this mystery is the incarnation itself. Any doctrine of the atonement which was centred upon a legally interpreted intra-trinitarian divine event seemed to Torrance to be an example of the abstract theorising which modern science had rejected. He expressed reservations about any 'theories of the atonement' as such.

It was therefore hardly a surprise that Scottish conservative evangelicals were rather wary of Torrance, and he of them. In English terms he might be described as an open evangelical with a strong commitment to doctrinal orthodoxy, but the freshness and originality of his discussion of theological method eludes any easy comparative description.

11 Einstein and Seelig 1954: 235.

Karl Barth and natural theology

Torrance's strong connections with Karl Barth, and his role in editing the volumes of the monumental *Church Dogmatics*, kept him at the forefront of the interpretation of Barth's theology. His scientific interests drew him into the controversy over the possibility and place of a natural theology in relation to a theology based upon the revelation witnessed in the Bible. His original study of Calvin gave a somewhat clearer place to a natural knowledge of God than the early Barth was willing to acknowledge.¹² Torrance accepted Barth's basic motivation to avoid a subtle anthropocentric basis to theology and a false human autonomy over against God. Barth had been led to this by the demise of nineteenth-century liberal theology in its support for German aims in the First World War and it was confirmed in the tendency of wide stretches of the German Protestant world to support Nazism. He nevertheless argued that natural theology could find a place within the broad sweep of revealed theology as an attempt to reveal the grammar or workings of revealed truth. In this way the revelation of God attested in the Bible both validates and defines the scope of natural theology, which is thereby shaped by God's own grace and self-revelation.

This presentation of natural theology correlates closely with Einstein's account of the relationship of mathematics to physics: mathematics is not seen as an axiomatic, deductive science so much as a form of natural science which laid bare the inner structure of physical reality, the grammar of physics and chemistry so to speak. As an illustrative analogy the comparison works well, although some have cautioned that it should not be pushed too far.¹³

Although he sought to offer a modification of Barth's *Nein!* to Brunner and natural theology, Torrance held Barth in the highest esteem. On his death in 1968 he referred to him as 'the one genuine Doctor of the universal Church the modern era has known... Only Athanasius, Augustine, Aquinas and Calvin have performed comparable service in the past, in the search for a unified and comprehensive basis for all theology in the grace of God'.¹⁴ He saw Barth as recalling theology from the various cultural captivities which it had fallen into in the modern age, and across the centuries, and back to a renewed trust in the faithfulness of God's revelation of himself. He sought the possibility of a living, dynamic, unfolding theology which refused to abstract from God's revelation any self-contained theory or set of propositions that were then projected back into God's own being, with subtle anthropomorphic results. Our formulations of the truth can never be identified with truth itself: justification by grace has an epistemological dimension too.

Torrance gleaned a great deal of support in this from the philosopher and scientist, Michael Polanyi. Polanyi's exposition of a personalised critical realism as a framework for all human knowledge extended Torrance's earlier arguments from the physical sciences into the biological and social sciences.¹⁵ Polanyi offered Torrance both support for the epistemology set out in *Theological Science*, and a way of developing a corresponding ontology of stratified levels of reality. This ontology linked things seen and unseen in the diverse yet unitary way which Torrance sought. Polanyi's work has been influential across quite a broad spectrum

¹² Torrance 1988a.

¹³ Norris 1984.

¹⁴ Torrance in Barth 1969: vi.

¹⁵ Polanyi's most famous work, *Personal Knowledge*, appeared fifty years ago (Polanyi 1958).

of scholars, including other theologians such as Lesslie Newbigin, in his widely read *The Other Side of 1984*.¹⁶ Polanyi, who died in 1976, trusted Torrance's interpretation of his work and made him his literary executor. Torrance's extensive use of Michael Polanyi's ground-breaking work in the philosophy of science can be seen as an outworking of his desire to find a proper place for natural theology within a theology firmly based upon grace and revelation.

The Triune God

From his early doctoral work on the Apostolic Fathers under Karl Barth and an appreciation of Calvin's patristic scholarship, Torrance developed a particular interest in the fourth-century debates over the divinity of Christ and the doctrine of the Trinity.¹⁷ He regarded Athanasius' struggles to defeat Arianism (and establish the belief that the Son of God was of one substance, *homoousios*, with the Father) as on a par with Einstein's replacement of Newtonian physics with the integrated space-time continuum recognised by modern physics. The *homoousios* was portrayed as an invariant principle upon which all theology reposed, rather as the invariant speed of light functions in modern physics. This was a point to which he would frequently return, in his lectures and writings.

For Torrance, Athanasius confronted the question of the degree to which Christian theology could be expressed in the language and conceptuality of ancient Greek and Roman thought. At this point, Torrance believed, patristic theology had needed to make a complete break with Graeco-Roman modes of thought. The first generation of patristic writers had clearly held that Jesus Christ was in some sense divine, even if also in some sense subordinate to the Father. Origen, with his profound grasp of ancient philosophy, had insisted that if Jesus Christ was divine, this must be seen as an eternal reality, because God was essentially unchangeable. Difficulties developed in Origen's theology because within a Graeco-Roman pattern of thought this tended to harden the sense of the subordination of the Son to the Father as an *eternal* subordination. Thus, for Origen the Son of God was seen as divine but eternally subordinate to the Father – located at a slightly lower level in the great chain of Being with which Graeco-Roman thought tried to understand the world. Arius, out of a combination of primitive Judaeo-Christian monotheism and an acceptance of the Graeco-Roman philosophical scheme, drew the conclusion that while the Son of God occupied a place of great honour in the universe – as the firstborn of all creation – he was nevertheless to be seen as created by God. In the Arian slogan, 'there was a time when he was not'.

Athanasius' *Nein!* was paralleled, for Torrance, by Barth's *Nein!* to the twentieth-century Germany corruption of Christianity by a captivity to an autonomous and secularised modern culture. This explains the frequent comparisons which Torrance drew between Athanasius and Barth. For him, both had to battle *contra mundum* for the heart of the Christian faith in its insistence that in Jesus Christ God had really become man and that in Jesus Christ there was and is a complete union between God and the world.

The revelation of God in Jesus Christ reveals God *as he is in himself*, a phrase which Torrance, following Barth, would often repeat. At the same time, the flesh

16 Newbigin 1983.

17 His major works on Trinitarian theology are Torrance 1988b, 1994, 1996.

which was united to God in Jesus Christ was truly human. It was inherently the flesh of sinful humankind because unless this was the case there could be no real hope of salvation for our sinful humanity. This latter insistence, which Torrance (rightly or wrongly) asserted was Calvin's view, accorded with the presentation of a substitutionary view of the atonement as set forth by the early nineteenth-century evangelicals Edward Irving and John McLeod Campbell, through to Karl Barth himself. Torrance believed this insight was essential, in order that the corresponding theology of the incarnation was that of God come *as* man, rather than God merely dwelling *in* man. For Torrance the latter approach, which led to an unbalanced focus upon an intra-trinitarian action only, rested upon an underlying dualistic conception of God's relationship with the world. He regarded the consequent propitiatory theory of penal substitution as an example of abstract theorising. It located the action of atonement mythologically in the Godhead rather than in the incarnational reality of Jesus Christ. It was this underlying dualistic conception of God's relationship to the world in its Graeco-Roman form which Athanasius had sought to confront in his day. For Barth, it was the rationalist dualism through which Newtonian physics and Enlightenment philosophy had encouraged a modern anthropocentrism in theology.

Torrance was far from being a monist, or pantheist, and he was reluctant to embrace any form of panentheism, for example in process theology. He felt they all underestimated the radically evil character of sin, suffering and death. For Torrance there could be no fusion between the divine and the human. The indivisible oneness of God and man in Jesus Christ was a unique oneness in the person of the Son of God, purposed by grace in order that the world might be redeemed. It was no general principle outside the personal dynamics of God's grace in revelation and salvation. The Nicene *homoousion* secured this essential and evangelical heart of the Gospel, that in Jesus Christ we have to do with God the Father, and the whole triune God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Torrance would often quote John 14:9,10: 'He who has seen me has seen the Father...Do you not believe that I am in the Father, and the Father in me?'. He argued that the bottom would fall out of the Gospel itself unless these statements were taken with absolute seriousness and not treated as hyperbole.

This considerable emphasis upon the *homoousios* in the Nicene and Nicene-Constantinople creeds may have imported a latent tension into Torrance's theology. This was derived from a tendency so to emphasise the oneness of the three persons of the Trinity, as *homoousios* with each other, that he under-estimated the distinct personal character of Father, Son and Holy Spirit within the one Person of God. It has been suggested that, against his intentions, he gives a certain precedence to the *being* of God over the *person* of God. As a result, Torrance offered a solution to the old controversy about the *filioque* clause which was added to the Western version of the Nicene creed. For him, because one should approach the Trinity through the confession that all three persons are of one substance with each other, and equal in Godhead, the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit should be seen as from the being of the Father. This could only be conceived in relation to the shared being with the Son and Spirit, rather than from the person of the Father and

rendered the need to choose between the disputed formula 'from the Father', or 'from the Father and the Son' as unnecessary.¹⁸

Such an approach offers the welcome possibility of a major ecumenical *rapprochement* between East and West and in his lifetime Torrance believed that a new ecumenical consensus on the doctrine of the Trinity was possible. To a large degree, this has now been achieved. The difficulty, for some, has been a judgement that Torrance was still approaching the issue from a fundamentally Western perspective which gives priority to the one being of God over the triune persons. For Torrance the divine *monarchia* is essentially that of the whole Trinity rather than of the Father. Opposition to Torrance's view has been led in recent years by another giant of the theological scene, Metropolitan John Zizioulas, who is perhaps the leading contemporary Orthodox theologian. Ironically, he was once appointed by Torrance to a lectureship in his department in Edinburgh. There is much that they would still hold in common, but in one of the most important theological books of recent years, *Communion and Otherness*, Zizioulas presents a strong case for the Cappadocian view that it is the Father who is to be regarded as the 'source' or 'cause' of the existence of the Son and Spirit, within the one, inter-personal being of God. For Zizioulas this is necessary if the full personhood of God is to be maintained, against the endemic Western tendency towards an abstract, philosophical understanding of God. Zizioulas summarises his underlying concerns as follows:

We must free ourselves from legalistic and monistic ideas in ecclesiology, and understand the Church not simply as an occasional 'happening', where the Word of God is preached and listened to and the sacraments are performed, but as the reality of *sonship in the Spirit*, that is as a constant movement of filial grace from the Father, giving his Son to us in the Spirit, and as a return of this by us 'giving grace' to him by offering back to him his Son in his incarnate, sacrificial and risen state as the head of a body comprising of us and all that exists.¹⁹

In many ways, Torrance could have written that sentence himself, but in the longer-term assessment of his interpretation of the Fathers, especially in relation to the doctrine of the Trinity, much will depend upon whether Zizioulas' criticism stands. Do we need still to break out from a subtle prioritising of a rather impersonally conceived substantialist view of God into a truly personal appreciation of 'the God and Father of all'? Or is Zizioulas, as Torrance charged, reading a modern existentialist concept of personhood into God?²⁰

Further reflection on these issues at the heart of trinitarian theology may come to cast fresh light upon the major impasse which exists within Western Christianity, and between East and West, over the place of women in the ministry of the Church. Against Zizioulas' presentation of the biblical and patristic emphasis upon the Fatherhood of God as a fundamental given of Christian theology, we need to set the widespread liberal Protestant tendency to abandon it altogether. Where does the truth lie? Zizioulas points out that the original use of the term Father in the

18 The problem of a one-sided emphasis upon the 'one being' of the persons of the Trinity in Torrance's theology are well discussed by Colin Gunton in Gunton 2003, chapter 3.

19 Zizioulas 2006: 149.

20 Torrance 1996: 178.

ministry of the Church was in relation to the bishop as president of the eucharistic assembly.²¹ He argues that this ordering of the life of the Church reflects a properly 'hierarchical' understanding of the Trinity, amid an equality of nature and dignity. For Zizioulas it cannot be a matter of projecting gendered human relationships into God, but the reverse, as we allow God's way of being to reveal to us true personhood. Torrance would agree with this in principle, but in practice drew different conclusions (including over the question of the ordination of women) because – arguably – of his starting point in a shared ontological being of God, rather than, with Zizioulas, in the person of the Father.²²

Conclusion

By any estimate, Tom Torrance made a major contribution to modern theology: as midwife to the translation of the *Church Dogmatics* and the main founder of the *Scottish Journal of Theology*, as a key contributor to the debates over the relation of theology to modern science, and as a participant in the development of a renewed doctrine of the Trinity. He was also a churchman who saw little divide between the pulpit and the seminar, where a growing separation so emasculates both the Church and the theological academy today. How likely is it now that a leading international theologian would have spent ten years in parish ministry, as was the case with Torrance? It is to be hoped that following his recent death a period of mature reflection will develop upon the substantial and significant body of writings which he was able to bequeath to the Church. Plans are well advanced for the publication of his central course in Christian Dogmatics at the University of Edinburgh, and it is particularly to be hoped that this exposition of Christian doctrine will complement the sophisticated account of theological method for which he is currently best known.²³

Peter Forster is Bishop of Chester.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barth, Karl. (1958). *Church Dogmatics: The Doctrine of Creation (III/1)*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- . (1969). *Church Dogmatics: The Doctrine of Reconciliation (IV/4)*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Colyer, Elmer M. (1997). *How to Read T. F. Torrance : Understanding His Trinitarian & Scientific Theology*. London: Triangle.
- . (2001). *The Promise of Trinitarian Theology: Theologians in Dialogue with T.F. Torrance*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Einstein, Albert, and Carl Seelig. (1954). *Ideas and Opinions*. London: Alvin Redman.
- Ford, David, and Rachel Muers. (2005). *The Modern Theologians : An Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Gunton, Colin E. (2003). *Father, Son and Holy Spirit : Essays toward a Fully Trinitarian Theology*. London: T & T Clark.

²¹ Zizioulas 2006: 148.

²² Torrance 1993 is Torrance's important discussion of ordination and he explores women's ordination in Torrance 1992.

²³ The TF Torrance Theological Fellowship is online at <http://www.tftorrance.org/index.htm>. Its new President, Paul Molnar, has a major study of Torrance due out later this year – Molnar 2008.

- Mackintosh, H. R. (1912). *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- . (1927). *The Christian Experience of Forgiveness*. London: Nisbet.
- Mackintosh, H. R., and Thomas F. Torrance. (2000). *The Person of Jesus Christ*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- McGrath, Alistair E. (1999). *Thomas F. Torrance : An Intellectual Biography*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Molnar, Paul. (2008). *Thomas F. Torrance: Theologian of the Trinity*: Ashgate.
- Newbiggin, Lesslie. (1983). *The Other Side of 1984 : Questions for the Churches*. Geneva: World Council of Churches.
- Norris, F W. (1984). Mathematics, Physics and Religion. *Scottish Journal of Theology* 37:457-70.
- Polanyi, Michael. (1958). *Personal Knowledge : Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Torrance, Thomas F. (1948). *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd.
- . (1969a). *Space, Time and Incarnation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . (1969b). *Theological Science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . (1976). *Space, Time and Resurrection*. Edinburgh: Handsel.
- . (1988a). *The Hermeneutics of John Calvin*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
- . (1988b). *The Trinitarian Faith: The Evangelical Theology of the Ancient Catholic Church*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- . (1992). *The Ministry of Women*. Edinburgh: Handsel.
- . (1993). *Royal Priesthood: A Theology of Ordained Ministry*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- . (1994). *Trinitarian Perspectives: Toward Doctrinal Agreement*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- . (1996). *The Christian Doctrine of God: One Being, Three Persons*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Zizioulas, John. (2006). *Communion and Otherness: Further Studies in Personhood and the Church*. London: T & T Clark.