

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

The Churchman

JANUARY—MARCH, 1943

Vol. LVII. No. 1. New Series

Contents :

	PAGE
" CHOSEN . . . IN THE FURNACE OF AFFLICTION "	
The Editor 	2
CHRISTIAN WORSHIP	
The Rev. S. Nowell-Rostron, M.A., B.D. 	3
THE SUPERNATURAL AND THE NATURAL	
The Rev. E. Steinly, M.A. 	14
THE DOCTRINE OF MAN	
The Rev. J. Russell Howden, B.D. 	21
THE WORD AND THE WISDOM OF GOD	
T. Miller Neatby, M.A., M.D. Cantab., M.A. Lond. 	28
CHURCH UNION IN SOUTH INDIA	
The Rev. P. J. Heaton, M.A.... 	34
ON NON-COMMUNICATING ATTENDANCE	
The Rev. E. Hirst, M.A., A.R.C.M. 	38
BOOK REVIEWS 	44

PRICE : ONE SHILLING

*" The Churchman," 1s. quarterly. Annual subscription, 4s. 6d. post free.
The Church Book Room, Dean Wace House, Wine Office Court, E.C.4*

“Chosen . . . in the Furnace of Affliction”

THOUGH the hope of many is that 1943 may be the year of victory, we are still in the furnace, and millions are suffering from the ravages of war, and the barbarous brutality of our enemies.

We are reminded that it was when the children of Israel were in the furnace of affliction that Moses heard the voice of God and received his call; it was during the early days of Christian persecution that the Apostle John, an exile in the Isle of Patmos, had his vision of the triumphant Lord and the glory of a new Jerusalem. Instances can be multiplied to prove that days of trial and sorrow can be the occasions when the servants of God may be inspired as pioneers of great spiritual movements, just as in 1804 when Europe was battered by the Napoleonic wars and England was threatened by invasion that a band of earnest men felt the Divine urge to found a Society for the circulation of the Scriptures.

It was during a national crisis that Isaiah saw the vision of the Lord enthroned amid the glory and power of His holiness which issued in an experience which transformed his whole ministry. In that crisis a spiritual leader was raised up, a man of God with the Divine fire burning in his heart.

Many are feeling that the spiritual front is definitely weak, it lacks the dynamic of spiritual leadership. The real danger is that in the splendid determination of the Church to give a Christian impetus in the establishment of a new social order two things should be forgotten—one that this time of trial, while millions are facing death through oppression, persecution and starvation, may be God's opportunity to raise up spiritual leaders—and secondly, that a Social Gospel will not entirely suffice to meet the desperate need of a war-stricken world.

It is being in the furnace of affliction which constitutes our supreme opportunity to proclaim with passionate conviction the message of the Incarnate Lord, who as Perfect God and Perfect Man, “carried our sorrows” and offered up Himself” as “a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world.”

We believe there is no other message and we hope that THE CHURCHMAN may in some small measure help Evangelicals to acquire a more scholarly understanding of its profound truths, a deeper spiritual appreciation of its sublime beauty, and above all a richer personal experience of its power.

To the contributors who help us so generously and the readers who send us their appreciation we offer our grateful thanks.

THE EDITOR.

Christian Worship.

BY THE REV. S. NOWELL-ROSTRON, M.A., B.D.

Vicar of Lansdown, Bath.

THE word "worship" is contracted from "worthship," which comes from the uniting of two Anglo-Saxon words, "weorth" (worth) and "scipe" (ship, a termination denoting office or dignity). So it was used frequently of the honour due and paid to men who were worthy, as well as to God. The chief citizen of the civic community is still accorded the title, as holding by the election of his fellow-citizens a position worthy of honour. It is still used by the bridegroom in his marriage vow, "with my body I thee worship." In the English Bible (A.V.) we find it in the parable of the Chief Seats (St. Luke xiv. 10), "then shalt thou have worship (doxa, glory, R.V.) in the presence of them that sit at meat with thee." A remarkable instance of this use is in Wycliffe's version of St. John xii. 26. "If any man serue me, My Fadir schal worschip hym."

When the word is applied to man's approach to God there is fundamentally the same idea of "worth," immeasurably deepened and expanded in meaning. It is the *motif* of the ascription in the adoring pæan of praise from the four and twenty elders, who "fall down before Him that sitteth on the throne, and worship Him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne saying, Worthy art Thou, our Lord and our God, to receive the glory and the honour and the power." It is the theme also of the triumphant song of the "ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands," "Worthy is the Lamb that hath been slain to receive the power and riches and wisdom and might and honour and glory and blessing." That infinite "worth" of God and of the Lamb, that Holiness without stain, that Power supreme, that Wisdom beyond all earthly wisdom, that "Love divine, all loves excelling," demand from us not merely a casual acknowledgment and salutation, or the honour and respect that man pays to man, they demand worship in its sublimest, profoundest sense; the worship, that is, which a creature offers to his Maker, a sinner to his Saviour, a disciple to his Lord, a Church to its divine Head, a redeemed humanity to its Creator and Redeemer.

II.

We can therefore arrive at a tentative definition of worship. Evelyn Underhill's illuminating and stimulating book on Worship opens with the words, "Worship, in all its grades and kinds, is the response of the creature to the Eternal." The net is cast very widely indeed in that statement, and she proceeds, "There is a sense in which we may think of the whole life of the Universe, seen and unseen, conscious and unconscious, as an act of worship, glorifying its Origin, Sustainer and End." Our use of the word narrows its meaning to mankind, and of mankind, to professing Christians. Of them we can say at once that worship is not a tentative feeling after, a groping search for,

God, it is a response, the response of the whole personality to that revelation of God which has been vouchsafed in Jesus Christ. It is a response that is also a self-surrender. So the Archbishop of Canterbury describes it in his *Readings in St. John's Gospel*. "Worship is the submission of our nature to God. It is the quickening of our conscience by His Holiness, the nourishment of the mind by His Truth, the purifying of the imagination by His Beauty, the opening of the heart to His Love, the surrender of the will to His Purpose; and all this is gathered up in Adoration, the most selfless emotion of which our nature is capable."

The Christian's worship is radiant with the light of knowledge, and pulses with the gladness of assurance. The Athenians, like the rest of the heathen world, made their altar "To an unknown God." To them St. Paul set forth, with the confidence of one who *knew*, the unveiled truth concerning Him in Whom "we live and move and have our being"; and that not as a matter for doubtful discussion, but as a proclamation of fact. In worship the heart of man is lifted up into the presence of God, Who loved us before we came to love Him. It is our answer to a love shewn in His patient dealing with us and with all mankind, and above all shewn "in the fulness of time," when "the Almighty Word of God," (to quote the daring words of the Sarum Breviary) "leapt down out of His royal throne," and, entering through the narrow gateway of a single human life, lived under human conditions, revealed the divine glory.

III.

If then we ask, what is the essential character of Christian worship? we turn inevitably to our Lord. Nor has He left us without guidance. More truly and clearly even than any of the prophets He saw how pitifully mistaken and inadequate was so much of the worship of those about Him. Some of it was a profane mockery, like that of those who honoured God with their lips, for a pretence making long prayers, though their heart was far from Him, or like those who even in the Temple Courts made merchandise of holy things, or like those who were meticulous about the observance of the Sabbath and the minute regulations of the Torah but callous about deeds of mercy, or like those who were careful not to defile themselves lest they should not be able to keep the Passover yet were even then hounding Him to His death. How saddening are the inconsistencies and hypocrisies that have been paraded as religion, and have degraded its name and those who have been guilty of them! How deeply concerned was our Lord that His disciples should be "true" (*alēthinoi*) worshippers, and that no fatal flaw should make their worship a travesty in God's eyes and a by-word amongst men! With the worship of the Gentile world outside Palestine our Lord would seem to have had little immediate touch. On one occasion, however, not to a Jew, but to a Samaritan, He revealed for all time, for Jew and Gentile alike, His own thoughts, and set a standard of worship for all who should be called by His Name.

The woman of Samaria was of those who knew not what they worshipped. Hers was a worship centred on, and associated with, Mount Gerizim, a holy place, as being the traditional mount of Abraham's

sacrifice of Isaac, and of his meeting with Melchizedek, and also as the Mount of Blessing (Deut. xxvii. 12), even as its rival Jerusalem was considered to be by the Jews the religious centre of their faith, and of the whole world. It was assumed by Jews and Samaritans alike that religious worship must have a local centre and habitation. To the woman, setting before Him these rival claims, Christ makes answer, "*The hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father.*" Already God was seeking those who should break through the trammels of materialistic conceptions. "*God is a Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship in spirit and in truth.*"

IV.

In these words Evangelical worship finds its charter, its guiding principle, its standard, and its touch-stone. Worship is both solitary and corporate. To this declaration of Christ all private and solitary devotions of the Christian, and all forms of worship, and the corporate use of these forms, must be brought. Christian worship must be "*in spirit and truth.*" This is the only kind of worship acceptable to God; these are conditions that every worshipper must fulfil. "*In spirit,*" for whatever accompaniments to worship there may be externally, they are only justified in so far as they exalt the spirit of man into "that highest region where the divine and human meet." (Westcott). "*In truth,*" (joined with "in spirit" as one phrase so that the two conditions are indissolubly united), for worship must be based upon, and express the truth about, God. There can be no escape from the Divine Imperative, "*must.*" The deep divisions of Christendom, the formalism, the puerilities, the superstitions and the abuses of much so-called Christian worship may be traced to neglect in the fulfilment of one or other of these two dominating characteristics of right worship. Sometimes spiritual worship has been obscured and even destroyed by concentration on externals. Sometimes it has been degraded by warped or false teaching and belief. The Incarnation and the Mediation of Christ, drawing together God and man, opening a new and living way to the Father, has made possible for all worship to be "*in spirit*"; that which Christ has revealed of God has enabled worship to be "*in truth.*" Westcott suggests that these two characteristics answer to the higher meaning of the second and third commandments. It is certain that this great declaration of our Lord, so fundamental and vital for the future worship of His Church, was no isolated saying, recorded without special purpose. It corresponds with the whole example and teaching of Christ. Its best commentary is found in the Sermon on the Mount, in all that we know of His own life of worship and prayer, and perhaps especially in the closing chapters of St. John's Gospel, with their record of the words and actions of One, Who is, in Brunner's striking phrase, "God's own Word about Himself."

V.

Worship, then, springs from *personal experience*. Though the initiative and cause of our worship comes from God Who seeks us, worship is not worship till that seeking of God is met by the spiritual movement of man Godwards. The individual response is essential in the worshipper. There is a corporate worship in which the individual

is called upon to share, that of the worshipping Church to which he belongs. But it is a fundamental mistake to differentiate, as some do, between the essential nature of the worship of the individual and that of the Christian community. "It is inevitable" says one writer, of corporate worship, "that the individual worshipper should sometimes feel that it does not exactly express his own emotions and desires. The Liturgy is not designed to express our personal feelings, but the aspirations of the Church." It is true that Christian worship cannot be content with solitary approach to God, and inevitably becomes also the worship of a fellowship. The worshipper is one of the Family, the Household of God, and whether he prays by himself or with others begins his prayer, "Our Father." He is of the Communion of the Saints, the living here and the living there. Therefore he joins with the Church on earth, "with angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven," in the Trisagion of adoration. But the value and efficacy of his worship is not that he is caught up in the whole adoring tribute of the mystical Body of Christ, and is swept mechanically into the unceasing current of its offering and self-offering before God, it is in the fact that he is himself one of the redeemed, and finds in the worship of the whole body that which represents his own joy, his own devotion, his own self-oblation, which he brings to swell the great Gloria in Excelsis. Only so can the Church, or the individuals of whom the Church is composed, worship "*in spirit and truth.*"

VI.

Consider then the two characteristics of true worship as Christ has given them to us, with some of their implications.

1. *Worship "in spirit."*

The heart of man, not any one spot deemed more sacred than another, is the trysting-place where God and he meet. There is in my house a reproduction of a well-known picture, called, I think, "The Presence." It is a constant reminder of this truth. In a great Church the High Altar is ablaze with light. Two figures alone shew through the gloom of the vast nave. One is a woman, dimly shewn, kneeling in the attitude of humble supplication at the very back of the Church, not daring to lift up so much as her eyes to heaven. The other is the radiant figure of the Master, standing beside her *there*, with hands outstretched to pardon, to comfort and to receive. There may be the most splendid ceremonial and the finest music that can be rendered, but if the soul be blind, the heart unmoved, the mind closed, there can be no realized Presence. For one who is truly Christ's, He is ever fulfilling His promise, "Lo, I am with you all the days." Everywhere, Church, home, street, workshop, all the path of daily duty, is holy ground, and a place therefore for worship and prayer.

Yet in insisting upon this as a cardinal truth, there must be a recognition of the facts of the nature of man. Man has body as well as soul, sense as well as spirit. Worship is of the whole man. Hence there have always been set apart special places for worship; and worship needs, and has always found, some embodiment, some outward and visible and audible expression, often some form or liturgy, that has tended to stereotype its formal presentment, and

has provided for its transmission to other generations. Christian worship of the first days in Jerusalem consisted of "the breaking of bread" and of "prayers." The latter obviously, and the former possibly, included opportunity for free and spontaneous devotions, but the liturgical traces in the New Testament, and those early liturgies of which we have examples, shew how inevitable was the movement towards recognised and canalized forms of worship, generally accepted by a particular group or community for corporate use. It is obvious then that Evangelical faith must clarify and understand its relationship to this fact. Evelyn Underhill analyses carefully the expression of worship, and finds in it four main elements: 1. Symbolism. 2. Ritual. 3. Sacraments. 4. Sacrifice. These demand close consideration. Here it is only possible to touch upon them. For the sake of brevity, and because the two strands are so intimately interwoven, we may take Symbolism and Sacraments together.

VII.

(a) SYMBOL AND SACRAMENT.

Symbols are used of necessity in the ordinary commerce of life for the interpretation and representation of invisible ideas, facts and realities. They speak a language that all can understand. Sometimes they are just tokens, as a simple gift of child to parent, or friend to friend is an indication of love, or the raising of the hat is a mark of esteem. But at other times they are more than tokens, they are "sure witnesses and effectual signs," and pass into the sacramental, fulfilling a mediating relationship between the sign and the thing signified, and becoming a means whereby this itself is received.

For instance, a flag to one person is an ordinary, it may be a dull and meaningless, piece of bunting, but to another person it will be a sacred and inspiring sign, thrilling him to deeds of utmost heroism, ministering strength and ardour to his patriotism. A cheque is an effective symbol. It is not money, though it is the earnest of money, and *if* it be presented and honoured, it can be converted into cash. A photograph is not the person, but the likeness of the person, representing the living form and face. In all these cases there is a potential and conditional ability to convey something, but the outward sign is not itself the thing conveyed. The appropriation and stimulus and enjoyment of the latter depend on the person who receives or interprets, and on the train of ideas set in motion, or the experience recalled and strengthened, or the faith that stirs into action. Without that personal movement the symbol is of no avail to him. Illustrations and analogies break down at some point or points, and none is perfect, but these may serve to elucidate in some measure the sacramental idea.

In one sense, everything is symbolic of spiritual and unseen realities. The Universe is as the garment of the invisible God. Nature points beyond itself to its Creator. All life in its fleeting outward show witnesses to the unseen and the eternal. The sacramental principle must be fully and frankly recognised. Every meal, every conversation, every task is sacramental. The Bible is the sacrament of God's word. "Christ," says Berulle, "is the major Sacrament." The Church of England recognises only two Sacraments because they

alone are "Sacraments of the Gospel," with the special authority of Dominical institution. So it deliberately puts aside from the same order those others that were commonly called Sacraments, and are so regarded in the Roman Church, some of which it affirms, have "grown of the corrupt following of the Apostles." But the sacramental idea, so defined and limited, must all the more be brought to the test of spiritual religion. As a distorted view of nature may produce idolatry on the one hand and pantheistic aberrations on the other, so in sacramental worship there are dangers of gross materialism on the one hand and of shallow emotionalism on the other. The Evangelical finds his safeguard against both in our Lord's declaration that all worship must be "*in spirit*." Therefore, though he regards the Sacraments as a veritable means of grace, he cannot accept an "*ex opere operato*" view of them. Between the effective representation of spiritual truth and its power to mediate spiritual strength to the soul of a believer, and the automatic conveyance of divine grace, there is a great gulf fixed. It is a vital divergence, dividing all Christendom in twain. Evangelical thought and practice cannot therefore follow the inferences of Evelyn Underhill's impressive presentation of the Sacramentalism for which she so ably argues. Writing of the Sacraments as a proclamation of the Divine Transcendence (as indeed in part they are), she describes them as "a bridge, an ordained path along which the Eternal Perfect may penetrate time and the things of time. Here," she adds, "man is pressed by God immanent to prepare the matrix: but it is God transcendent Who pours into it His quickening love to cleanse, feed, and transform. . . Here men can be sure of laying hold of spiritual reality, truly present in its own right. . ." In other words, it must be effective "*ex opere operato*" if it is to meet the creature's deepest need."

Is it not just this against which our Lord has warned us? The localizing of the Presence of the Deity is an essential prelude of idolatry, the deadly peril which St. John saw clearly to be that not of the pagan world only, but also of the Christian Church drawn out of it. Has not the story of the centuries, and of the cleavages within the Church, shown only too startlingly how much that warning has been needed, and how little it has been heeded? When symbol passes from Sacrament to an end in itself, and into identification with what it symbolizes, the danger line is crossed. That which should be but a "sure witness and effectual sign" of the utterly Sublime and the infinitely Holy, the seal and operative symbol of the unseen realities that transcend time and space and all the visible world, lifting the thoughts and prayers of the worshipper into the heavenlies till it is itself lost in his contemplation and adoration of God, becomes in itself the centre of the soul's reverence, and often the object of the soul's worship.

VIII.

(b) RITUAL.

The same test must be applied to those ritual observances that inevitably accompany worship. "Ritual" writes Evelyn Underhill "weaves speech, gesture, rhythm and agreed ceremonial into the worshipping action of man." Some Christian communities, like the Quakers, reduce ritual to its barest minimum. But in others, from

the general pattern of a Salvation Army meeting, or the free, but nevertheless typical, worship of bodies without a set liturgy, to the most highly developed and "stylized" liturgical services in Christendom, ritual has its place, always its importance, sometimes its grave peril. How should the Evangelical regard this universal phenomenon, and how so use it as to find in it no hindrance but a help?

That there is a right use of Ritual there can be no question. Whatever be the worship, in the Sanctuary, or in private, all things must be done "decently and in order." There is value in habitual worship, in reverence of gesture and posture and mien, in seemliness and cleanliness, in fitness of dress, in all the ordering of worship, in the quality of its music, the dignity of its conduct, in that which ministers to the sense of the awfulness of the majesty of Him Whom we approach. The ministry of holy things must be carried out with every care, and be the very best that can be given in the highest of all human occupations.

But the snare of formalism is a deadly one. How easy it is to mistake the service perfectly rendered for true worship, and to concentrate on the exact performance of the minutiae of the rite, regarding that as all that is necessary! Was it not this that made David feel, after his great sin, that no external sacrifice or ceremony could bring cleansing or peace?

"For Thou delightest not in sacrifice; else would I give it:

Thou hast no pleasure in burnt offerings.

The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit:

A broken and a contrite heart, O God, Thou wilt not despise."

Only then would the ritual sacrifice be of avail. Was not this "the vision that Isaiah, the son of Amos, saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem?"—the nation satisfying its religious conscience with sacrifices, "temple-treading," and ritual, but in heart and life rebellious, careless and wicked?

The prophetic and the priestly, as the days of Ezra and Ezekiel so vividly demonstrated, have always been in seeming opposition, the priest insisting on the performance of ritual and ceremony as the essential thing, the prophet ever recalling his people to the spiritual values that formalism so surely destroys, and to a life and character that must first be reached and influenced. In Christian worship the same two elements are found, and there is the same conflict. It is traceable in the development of the liturgical life of the early Church. It comes into violent clash in the Reformation. It is seen in any use of liturgical formulae or of ritual that leads the worshipper to find in them the full satisfaction of religious duty, and to put mechanical performance of services in the place of inward spiritual experience. Where, to use Dr. Heiler's words, "Ritual is a fixed formula which people recite without feeling or mood of devotion, untouched in heart and mind," it must meet the condemnation of Him Who has laid it down that all Christian worship must be "*in spirit*."

Yet though this is the clear Evangelical position, it does not mean, as has been already said, that all Ritual is to be condemned. The extravagances attached to the use of Ritual have given the word a sinister connotation. But some Ritual we must have. Let it then

be simple, not distracting, in keeping with the depth and sincerity of our faith, helping concentration, not dividing the attention. It is but the box of spikenard that must be broken if the fragrance is to fill the House of God. The symbols and the ritual alike are to be forgotten in that to which they lead. The worship of the Christian soul, and of the Christian community, can only be guarded from this inherent danger by never-ceasing insistence on its spiritual nature, on the truth that all barriers between man and God have been broken down, that there is no ritual *essential* to our communion with Him, that there is " *nothing between.*"

IX.

(c) SACRIFICE.

Sacrifice is a natural expression of penitence or of love ; sometimes it indicates sorrow, where fellowship has been broken ; sometimes devotion, for where there is love, there will be gratitude for love, and gratitude must ever overflow into gift. So sacrifice must be an accompaniment of worship. It springs from the commendable impulse to set all things right with God, and to give to Him of our best. So it has had many forms—the whole-burnt-offering, the peace-offering and the sin-offering of the Jewish law ; the rendering back to God of the best of the first fruits of the earth, or of wealth ; the building of the great Cathedral, on which all that human skill and devotion can provide is lavished ; the tiny offering, which was yet her all, of the widow in the Temple.

But like all else, if it is to be acceptable to God, sacrifice must be first and fundamentally spiritual. Whatever material offering be made, it is the sacrifice of oneself that it should represent. This, above all, God " seeks " in His worshippers. Not that our sacrifices earn or win us the free gift of God which is life eternal. Like all worship, our sacrifice is part of our response to that gift. It is " our bounden duty and service." But it is all we are and have. " Lebanon is not sufficient to burn, nor the beasts thereof sufficient for a burnt offering." When I bow beneath the Cross,

" Love so amazing, so divine,
Demands my soul, my life, my all."

So the real sacrifices we make are the offering of " ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable (logiké i.e. of the " logos," the reason, not mechanical), holy and living sacrifice " to God, and the sacrifice of our praise and thanksgiving for the benefits of Christ's passion. Whosoever has made and makes such sacrifice can say of all else, with Hudson Taylor, " I have never made a sacrifice," for even these sacrifices we confess we are not worthy to offer, and in the making of them there is a far more exceeding blessing. Christian worship must therefore include the self-offering of the worshipper, as the worshipping Church must express the self-offering of the whole Christian Body, to God.

This indeed is the sacrifice we offer in the Holy Communion. Nor does it seem possible to reconcile this, even in the broadest synthesis and within the wide boundaries of the conditions Christ has laid down, with a view widely stressed and attractive to many, that the Church is in the Eucharist ever sharing in " the ceaseless self-offering in

heavenly places of Christ," still less with that crude materialistic teaching which asserts that in the Mass the Body and Blood of Christ are offered as a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. Nor can a modified and mystical interpretation of the Eucharistic Sacrifice such as Evelyn Underhill quotes from Dr. James' book on *Christian Myth and Ritual* be left unchallenged. "In every Mass," he writes, "the redemptive process is reiterated, and Christ Himself is born anew after a heavenly and spiritual manner."

The Evangelical view has perhaps never been expressed (outside the Bible) more clearly and fully than in the familiar words of the Consecration Prayer. On the Cross, at a definite time and place in history, Jesus Christ "made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world." The phrase "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. xiii. 8), if indeed the latter words apply to the Lamb and not to the Book of Life, must be interpreted as well by other passages in the Book of Revelation as by the whole strong argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews (where there is repeated insistence on the fact of the sacrifice "once offered"—(a sacrifice that in its very nature could not be repeated) and also by the general teaching of the New Testament concerning the death of the Redeemer.

The Holy Communion is therefore primarily a continuance of the perpetual memory of the precious death of Christ, leading the soul that is spiritually prepared to a Communion with the living Lord, to a realisation of His Real Presence in the heart of a believer who comes in humble faith "with boldness" to the throne of grace. A process is at once open to doubt that has to find its justification outside Holy Scripture. To justify the transformation of the simple religious rite of "the Breaking of Bread" of the New Testament into the fully developed and gorgeous Liturgy of the Eucharistic Sacrifice of the Mass, which includes within itself the whole drama of creation and redemption, recourse must be had to a theory of development, to an appeal to "the worshipping instinct of generations" which regards the first services as "a grain of wheat flung into the field of the world." Upon this view the extreme divergence between the elemental simplicity of the Institution and the most ornate Liturgies, where the simple action is overlaid with a vast number of additions, is held to be natural and implicit in the memorial service ordained by Christ, and the localized Presence and the "miracle" of the Mass are not found inconsistent, as they would seem emphatically to be, with the clearly shewn purpose and the original institution of our Lord.

That there is a real and thrilling experience of the worship of the whole Church in heaven and earth no true Evangelical will deny; no will he neglect or despise so glorious a fact. But the sacrifice on which such worship is based is that once made and accepted by the Father, through which alone we are "accepted in the Beloved." To go beyond, or to claim to add to that, is to introduce teaching and practice for which we have no scriptural warrant. The imagery of the Apocalypse, with its golden altar, and its sacrificial implications, with its golden bowls of incense, which are "the prayers of the saints,"

can hardly be regarded as a picture of the earthly worship of Christian communities of the first century. To take the details literally is to strain impossibly our interpretation of the message of the book. But this at least we can do, we can join in the songs of the redeemed, and can claim the same great Sacrifice of which the golden altar in Heaven is the symbol and the eternal reminder.

X.

II. WORSHIP "IN TRUTH."

The second condition of Christian worship is that it must be "*in truth.*" Worship implies some conception of the object of worship. A false idea of God tends to produce both a warped and perverted character—for all worshippers grow like the God they worship—and a type of worship in itself decadent and debasing. Not only then must there be the sincerity that strikes at all formalism and superstition, but also, fundamentally, a right conception of God.

The story of Christianity is marked (and alas ! marred) with many deeds not due to the service of Christ. What excesses, what cruelties have been committed in the name of the King of love from this cause ! The bitter cry of Mme. de Staël concerning the French Revolution, "O Liberty, what crimes have been committed in thy name !" has its counterpart in the tragic side of the history of Christendom. The pitiful history of religious persecutions, of misguided zeal and unbridled fanaticism, culminating in the nameless tortures of the Inquisition, as well as the mediæval commercializing of the most sacred ordinances of our faith, as though the favour of God could be bought with money gifts and His grace automatically mediated to men of corrupt life and character by the performance of a rite, bear witness to the extent of this evil in the past. Nor is the story of the Reformed Churches free from stain. Much that passes for, and bears the name of, Christian, even to-day, is open to the same charge, for there must be a strangely perverted idea of God if His sanction be presumed for some of the things we tolerate, or even do, in our so called "Christian" civilization.

The Reformers saw truly that the basis of all Christian character and all Christian worship was the truth about God. Luther with his robust and downright sincerity, his intense desire and rugged stand for truth, Calvin with his insistence on the supremacy of God and His sovereign will, joined with the other leaders of the Reformation in revolt against the travesties that then passed for Christianity, and in their return to the great fundamental truths of the Scriptures they re-discovered the living Word of God, and gave to its ministry its proper place in a worshipping Church. From this they attacked and swept away abuses, and flung off the weight of accretions that had buried the truth for Christendom, and drew men back to a right and pure conception of God, of the contents of the Gospel message, and of those principles and values for which Christ lived and died.

A comprehensive summary of that truth it is not easy to give, but certain great aspects stand out clearly. It is the truth concerning God, His loving will, His holiness, His power, His surpassing glory. It is the truth concerning Jesus Christ Himself, His incarnation, His ministry, His redemptive sacrifice, His resurrection, His exaltation, His abiding presence, His return. It is the truth concerning the Holy Spirit,

as Life-Giver in the Universe and in the soul of man, as Sanctifier, Comforter, Guide, Illuminator. It is the truth concerning man, his helplessness to save himself, his sinfulness in God's eyes, his need of a Mediator, his salvation not by his own works but by justifying faith alone, the immediacy of his access to the Father, his chief purpose in life—to know and glorify God. It is the truth concerning the Church as the congregation of the faithful, as the Body of Christ, invisible, for it is spiritual, yet visible in, though not identical with, the organized Church, joined in closest union with its divine Head, and with those who have "crossed the flood," through which Christ sets forward His Kingdom on earth, and combats the "world rulers of this darkness."

Evangelical worship must express the truths by which it lives. At its centre is God's exceeding grace meeting man's exceeding need of personal salvation. If this means that such worship is subjective, it is only so in the right sense of that word, and does not imply an introspective pre-occupation with oneself or an unbalanced emotionalism. Such an experience involves the whole personality, the mind, will, heart, imagination, all that is the soul and spirit of man, as well as the body. These deep and massive truths, the pillars of his faith, guard the Evangelical from insincere and untruthful worship. They keep him humble, reverent, aware, confident and cheerful, and keep his worship pure and uplifting. For his worship, so far from being self-centred, is essentially Christo-centric. Therefore his soul is at peace with God, his heart is "at leisure from itself, to soothe and sympathise," and his energies are released and consecrated for the work of the Kingdom of his Lord.

XI.

THE ANGLICAN LITURGY.

Can we relate these principles to the Anglican formularies, and to the systematic and habitual worship of the Church of England? The Prayer Book with its stately diction, its prescribed offices, its regular and seasonal worship does not escape the possibility of criticism from the point of view of worship "*in spirit and truth.*" As regards "*worship in spirit,*" it might be said to have much in its liturgical services that must be insincere to the average worshipper. As regards "*worship in truth,*" it might be held that if the conception of God is lofty and inspiring, it is at times sub-Christian, and that the Prayer Book touches us spiritually in too limited a fashion, being concerned mainly with pardon, protection and comfort, and not too obviously with the life of self-dedication, the practical side of discipleship, and the missionary vocation of Christians and the vision of the world-wide Church.

Into the grounds for such criticism we cannot now enter. But we may affirm positively that the Prayer Book remains not only a superb monument of noble and dignified expression of a strong and wisely-regulated devotional life, but also an outstanding stimulus and guide to spiritual and truthful worship. No liturgy can avoid the reproach of formalism if there is not the active co-operation of the worshipper. Nor can any one liturgy express the entire fulness of spiritual truth. Forms of worship are aids, the moulds in which

it is cast, the words in which it is framed. The Prayer Book has no rival amongst the liturgies of Christendom as an expression of simple piety and scriptural faith.

In the matter of archaisms Prayer Book revision is overdue. But there is that about the structure of its main services, its insistence on sincerity and personal religious experience, its use of a tongue "understood of the people," its emphasis on the part that each worshipper is called upon to fulfil, and its fidelity to, and quotation of the Bible, that is a constant recall to the immediacy of our religion. Its stately and impressive language sets a standard rarely, if ever, reached since it was drawn up, though it does not forbid or quench, outside its liturgical offices, the spirit of freedom in prayer too little exercised to-day; whilst for use in the Prayer meeting there is no book of prayers to compare with it. The ministry of the Word to which it points, and on which it is based, preserves the prophetic note as an essential part of worship, and is joined with that of the Sacraments in its devotional scheme. The Prayer Book still speaks to the deepest needs, and opens up the highest flights of the soul. Penitence, forgiveness, adoration, praise, listening to God's voice, waiting on Him in prayer and, in the Holy Communion, the memorial of Christ's death "till He come," the reception of the "dear tokens of His passion," the self-oblation of the communicant, the sense of the living presence of Christ by His Spirit, and of our fellowship with the whole Family of God, cleanse, satisfy, strengthen and nourish the Christian life in all its aspects.

But no liturgy can do more than bring us to the fountain of living waters. That the Anglican Liturgy has done for countless Christian people, and is doing to-day.

The Supernatural and the Natural.

(WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE MODERN WORLD).

BY THE REV. E. STEINLY, M.A.

THE Supernatural may be defined as "the world which has values which stir the sense of the holy and demand to be esteemed as sacred." It stands in contrast with the world perceived by the senses, the values of which are merely comparative. The division of environment into Supernatural and Natural is thus the work of religion.

To affirm the existence both of the Supernatural and of the Natural is to affirm that man stands both within, and yet apart from, the flux of his sense-experience. His life floats upon the ever moving stream of time, and yet he is conscious that this is so. Moreover, the possibility of breasting that stream is present to his consciousness because a reality outside the power of its flow bids him in its own right to be more than a mere float.

There are not a few, of course, who maintain that man transcends

his natural environment and yet deny the reality of the Supernatural. They will agree, at the very least, that man is an animal who uses tools and who, in consequence, never passively accepts "the arrangements life (has) made for him."² Some, though not all, will strongly assert that man is a rational animal, even more than he is a tool-user, and that his ability to use tools is merely the outcome of reasoning about the means of livelihood. Whether tool-using is the outcome of reasoning or reasoning the outcome of tool-using, however, it is obvious that man is in part the master as well as the slave of his environment. He transcends, even as a man, the world around him. Yet a definition of man merely as a tool-using or a rational animal does not do justice to man's capacity for transcending himself as well as his environment, nor does it explain his "victory over immediate association, and immediate advantage and immediate impression."³ There is an essential homelessness of the human spirit, no matter how much it tries to master the world of nature, whether by tool-using or by reasoning. In the last resort, only one thing "challenges in its own right man's submission to his environment and that is the sacred"⁴ or Supernatural.

Any doctrine which implies the denial of the Supernatural is rightly called naturalist. Those who make the denial may with the ancients believe that man is essentially a rational animal, or with many moderns that tool-using is the essential mark of man, and that his reason is but an analysing instrument "unsuited for understanding any reality of a creative nature."⁵ Again, those who deny the Supernatural may merely put man on a level with the higher animals, or, again, they may deny that anything other than mechanical necessity is to be found in nature. Whether they be rationalists, intuitionists, vitalists or materialists, however, if they deny the reality of the Supernatural, they all are no more than naturalist in outlook.

Although it is the religious interest in man which causes him to assert the reality of the Supernatural, it by no means follows that those who deny the Supernatural are necessarily non-religious. The fact is that man, just because of the homelessness of his spirit in the natural world, is incurably religious, whether he affirms the Supernatural or not. He must needs seek for a city which has foundations whose builder and maker is *as if* it were God, even while denying that God exists. Naturalism, therefore, can be a religion no less than a philosophy. Stoicism, the greatest naturalist movement in the ancient world, "may be called either a philosophy or a religion."⁶ In Marxism, despite its atheistic outlook, "we are in contact with a religious idea."⁷ In every species of naturalism, however, religion is no longer a means for apprehending a real Supernatural, but is purely an imaginative device for introducing an element of absolute value into a sphere where the values are all comparative. In other words, naturalism, as St. Paul declares, exchanges the truth of God for a lie, and worships and serves the creature rather than the Creator. At the same time, the very inability of naturalism to dispense with religion is itself an indirect testimony to the reality of that Supernatural to which even false religion bears witness. Perhaps it might be truly asserted that the religious element in all semi-authoritative naturalism is a kind of shadow cast by the really authoritative Supernatural on

interpretations of the world made by those whose faces are turned away from the light.

II.

In the ancient world man was understood "primarily from the standpoint of the uniqueness of his rational faculties."⁸ The Greeks were nothing if not rationalist. "With them the dominating tendency from the beginning to the end of their creative period was the assertion of the power of thought to find unassailable truth and to organize individual and social life in accordance with their findings."⁹ "Whatever was unintelligible was no part of nature."⁹ Into this category there seemed to fall both pure "matter" and pure "change." Greek thinkers sought therefore for a *permanent* determinant of both "matter" and "change" and thereby they developed a doctrine of cause which reached its final formulation in the philosophy of Aristotle.¹⁰ Matter is the vehicle of a conceptual determinant or Form. But since, in every growing thing the Form is originally but latent or potential, and becomes actual only after a process of growth, it is necessary to speak of two causes of that motion whereby what is potential becomes actual, namely, an agent of motion or Efficient Cause, and a goal of movement or Final Cause. The Formal, Efficient and Final Causes are identical ideally, but actually they never coalesce, save in the region of the heavenly bodies, owing to the resistance of Matter to Form. In that region things did not change, and beyond it was that highest region of pure Being, from which matter and motion were excluded also.

In the great movement known as Stoicism, rationalism enclosed itself in naturalism. The identity of Being and reason remained, but Being, termed Phusis or Nature, by which was meant a "Process of Growth,"¹¹ became indelibly marked with what Sir Arthur Eddington has called "Time's Arrow." This stress on process rather than on actuality, an "eternal effort towards perfection"¹² as a modern writer describes it, suggests that Stoicism was really a system of rationalized vitality rather than of reason, for Phusis was in all creation, in beetles no less than in man. At the same time, the "completely negative attitude"¹² of Stoicism "toward the passions and the whole impulsive life of man"¹² enabled Stoics to have before their eyes the ideal Wise Man, "who acts without desire,"¹³ but only at the cost of making each man's life a mere *role* in an unknown drama, and so unreal. Even so, Stoicism ended by assuming "that there is a beneficent purpose in the world,"¹³ that is, by groping after the Supernatural it professed to deny.

III.

In the modern world, man is no longer understood primarily from the standpoint of the uniqueness of his rational faculties, nor is there any sustained attempt to find a permanent determinant for "matter" and change. On the contrary, man is regarded as rationalizing, rather than reasoning about, his activities, and both "matter" and change are declared to be the very stuff of reality.

(I)

By the modern world is meant the world since the period of the Renaissance. It was in that period that the reaction against reason

began. There was, as Professor Whitehead observes, "a recoil from the inflexible rationality of mediaeval thought," and "a return to the contemplation of brute fact."¹⁴ How was it possible to contemplate, however, "brute fact," that is, data which were not primarily that of thought, and which could not be resolved into concepts? It was at least possible to contemplate the *behaviour* of "brute fact." The more such behaviour was contemplated, the more it seemed to be akin to the automatic behaviour of the parts of a machine. In due course, it was possible to construct imaginatively such devices as would enable the observer to anticipate the behaviour of brute fact, and even carry it "beyond the limits which unreflective experience can reach."¹⁵ So there arose and developed the work of the scientist in contrast to that of the philosopher.

Once the investigation of the behaviour of "brute fact," and the construction of devices to anticipate, and so control, that behaviour, had got well under way, it was inevitable that there would be a profound revolution in the notion of cause, as that notion had been formulated by the rationalist Greeks. Hobbes began the revolution by affirming that what "is not Body is no part of the universe,"¹⁶ thereby repudiating the idea of Form or Essence. Descartes next declared that "the species of cause called Final finds no useful employment in physical or natural things."¹⁷ The Efficient Cause remained, only to be stripped of its former glory by being detached from Form, with the result that motion became an ultimate fact in the universe. As for matter, it was enthroned as king in place of Form, and instead of being a non-existent that "neither is nor is not," but is just "not yet,"¹⁷ it became "something hard, solid and tangible," possessing, to use Professor Whitehead's phrase, "simple location in time." The universe thus became reduced to two ultimates, "matter" and "motion," neither of which was the vehicle of any conceptual determinant. All that thought can do in regard to them is to assist in constructing imaginative devices for anticipating, and so controlling their observable behaviour.

Science took complete charge of both matter and motion. There still remained the cogitating mind, however, which somehow had unearthed these two ultimates. Having performed this miracle of knowledge, must it henceforth remain "confined to its own private world of cogitation?" Yes, said the empiricist Locke, in effect, since all that we can know of matter are the sensations and ideas which the unknowable "substance" that we call matter induces in our minds. Bishop Berkeley, the arch-empiricist, however, pointed out that, since we never have experience of this "substance," we have no cause to think that it exists. Thereupon, he proceeded to argue that the existence of anything consisted in its being perceived, not by our finite minds, however, but by infinite universal Mind. In this way, Berkeley brought back the Supernatural as the ground of all existence, and swept from his view any world of matter at all. Kant attacked, not the conclusions, as did Berkeley, but the assumptions of empiricism, by pointing out that what we call perception is really a kind of reasoning, howbeit unconscious, since in any act of perception, it is we who provide from our minds both the "forms of intuition" (space and time) and the "principles of understanding" (causality, quantity,

etc). To a world so known, Berkeley's conclusions apply, but, argued Kant, there are *noumena*, as well as *phenomena*, to be known, not however either sensuously or intellectually, but only by the free exercise of the will. In that free exercise, Kant argued, we are in touch with a demand that is not just hypothetical but categorical, that is to say, unconditional or absolute. Kant also thus asserted the reality of the Supernatural, but to him, the Supernatural was one, not of mind but of Law. With Hegel, the rationalist attack upon empiricism reached its highest pitch of intensity. For him, the empirical world, being the world as it presents to us plurality, is but one of *phenomena*. By contrast, the real world is "a single unified whole, comprehending within itself all distinctions." This single, unified whole is the Absolute. Thus, in the end, "there is no true *noumenon* or *phenomenon*, there is nothing that is unknowable."¹⁸

(II)

Meanwhile, Science continued successfully to investigate the behaviour of "matter" by using, as the basis of investigation, the hypothesis that the world is like a machine, and mechanical causation is the key to the working of all its parts. From investigating the behaviour of "matter," scientists turned to investigate that of organisms, and ultimately of man himself, without changing either their principles or their methods. The Behaviourist in psychology, for example, treats the living organism as functioning like an automatic machine. "It will, that is to say, only 'behave' in so far as it is caused to do so by a specific stimulus."¹⁹ It is, of course, "pertinent to point out that, if all thought is accurately and exhaustively described as a set of responses to stimuli . . . then this applies also to the thought which constitutes the Behaviourist view of psychology."¹⁹

The present-day psychologist conducts his investigations on the supposition that "the human personality is like an iceberg; only a small part appears above the level of consciousness, the remainder is below."²⁰ This remainder," known . . . as "the unconscious" is not only the larger but also the more important part" and "may be said to determine the contents of the conscious." Hence, "the components of human behaviour to which (the psychologist) penetrates by analysis are unconscious . . . He is driven by his scientific purpose to describe how this unconscious energy, in accordance with the operation of determinate natural laws, gives rise to consciousness . . . All our conscious intentions will then appear as "rationalizations" of primary unconscious tendencies."²¹

Freud interprets these primary unconscious tendencies "in individualistic and sexual terms."²² Their abode is described by him as "a chaos, a cauldron of seething excitement." It has "no organization and no unified will, only an impulsion to obtain satisfaction for the instinctive needs according to the pleasure principle."²² In that case, mankind "is or may be, a volcano as well as an iceberg."²³

Marx regards these primary unconscious tendencies "as basically collective and economic."²⁴ They are expressed in the productive relations of society which, according to Marxist doctrine, are the basis upon which "the superstructure of culture and philosophy, of religion and morals, is reared."²⁴ To a Marxist, man is a tool-using

rather than a reasoning animal. Consciousness merely reflects the productive relations of men, which in turn are the outcome of that technique of production which has evolved from man's capacity to use tools. Hence, concerning Hegel's doctrine, Marx wrote, "In my view . . . the idea is nothing other than the material when it has been transposed and translated inside the human head."²⁴

Both the Freudian psycho-analyst and the Marxist sociologist, though materialist in theory, are really humanist in faith and practice. The former attempts to bring the repressed elements of life in the unconscious into the conscious, in the belief that they can be there re-educated. The latter looks forward to an age of reason, replacing this age of rationalization. Each postulates the need for a new kind of consciousness, Freud to replace the "superego" and Marx to replace the present "super-class." Marx goes further. He proclaims the speedy advent of the rule of that new or classless consciousness. It is really his divinity, in whose name he denies the Supernatural.²⁵ So Marxian man is the image and likeness, not of God, but of society.

(III)

In the modern world, the protest against rationalism has taken a romantic as well as a materialistic form. In Romanticism as distinct from materialism, the concept of organism has displaced that of matter. The concrete is thereby opposed to the abstract, since, in science, matter has become an abstract entity. Wordsworth is a romanticist in that he "opposes to scientific abstractions his full concreteness."²⁶ In sociology, Romanticism "asserts the vitalities of nature against the peril of enervation through rational discipline."²⁷

On the one hand, the romantic protest achieved nihilistic proportions by defying "every principle of form and order"²⁷ in the name of vitality regarded as self-justifying. The prophet of this nihilistic romanticism was Nietzsche. On the other hand, romanticism asserted the primitive and organic forms of unity against the universalities of rationalism. Fascism is "the cause of the nation, the national organism—racially conceived in Germany as a body of pure blood." In Fascism, however, there is often more than a dash of nihilistic romanticism also. For example, the hidden lie of society is overcome by "the robust and 'honest' lie,"²⁷ the value of truth being thereby utterly disavowed.

There remains Bergson who, though rejecting alike romantic nihilism and romantic primitivism, does so on grounds not of reason but of intuition. By intuition, Bergson apparently means immersion in the stream of a life-force, termed Vital Impulse, which exists not *through* but *in* change, and which gives rise, not to the Uniformity of Nature, as Intelligence asserts, but the Variety of Nature.²⁸ This principle of "novelty growing out of novelty," however, "remains wholly negative . . . until some such notion as growth or development is brought in."²⁸ Concerning Bergson's positive treatment of it, a modern writer asserts that "it is difficult to exclude the suspicion that . . . Bergson is really introducing . . . the . . . causes which Aristotle used."²⁸

(IV)

The change from the mediaeval to the modern era marked, as we

saw, a protest against the pretensions of rational man. In his place moderns have, in the main, installed *homo faber*, reduced to abstract and mechanical proportions in materialism, interpreted concretely and organically in Romanticism, and related, not to the Supernatural but to some super-individual form of human life. Modern man does not, in other words, possess any transcendent individuality, because he is not interpreted in terms of a God who, as will and personality, reveals himself to man from beyond himself.

We are prone to reduce "mind" to "instincts," as we have reduced "matter" to "atoms." But there are extremely few examples of instinctive behaviour in human life. . . . Nearly all human activities require to be learned."²⁹ In other words, human nature has a history, and "is not nearly so natural as it looks."³⁰ What is the ultimate truth about that history? It is that "as regards anything we are *in ourselves* naturalism is true," and "a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast," but as regards the full stature of our *human* nature,³⁰ that is "constituted by the self-disclosure to this poor dust of the Spirit of the living God."³⁰

"Thou hast fashioned me behind and before, and laid Thine hand upon me." These words of the psalmist express that faith in the transcendent Creator and Judge of man upon which is built the Biblical witness to the revelation of God in history, as of One Who is "what each individual heart has already dimly perceived in its sense of being judged: as the structure, the law, the essential character of reality, as the source and centre of the created world against which the pride of man destroys itself in vain rebellion."³¹ History, as St. Paul indicates, is the revelation of the wrath of God on the sinful pride of man. The final question concerning man, therefore, is "whether there is a resource in the heart of the Divine which can overcome the tragic character of history and can cure as well as punish the sinful pride in which man inevitably involves himself."³¹ Because of its witness that God in Christ takes man's sin upon Himself and into Himself, "the Christian faith regards the revelation (of God) in Christ as final."³¹

"The most important of all verities is the verity that cannot be argued."³² The Supernatural is this kind of verity. For "the spiritual life of man is, in every part and mode of it, a derived and dependent life . . . man is a being whose centre lies not in himself but in God. 'O Lord,' exclaimed Jeremiah, 'I know that the way of man is not in himself.'"³³ The prophet's words are not argument but witness. Apart from that witness, humanism debouches into sub-human naturalism and even nihilism. In the power of that witness, however, it rises to that freedom and "measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" of which the super-class or superman of modern forms of naturalism is but an idolatrous and tyrannous counterpart.

1 J. Oman, *The Natural and Supernatural* (1931), 71.

2 *Ibid.*, 85.

3 *Ibid.*, 82.

4 *Ibid.*, 85.

5 *Ibid.*, 83.

6 G. Murray, *The Stoic Philosophy* (1915), 14.

- 7 N. Berdyaev, *The Russian Revolution* (1932), 68.
 8 R. Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man* (1941), 6.
 9 J. L. Stocks, *Time, Cause and Eternity* (1938), 5-6.
 10 See A. E. Taylor, *Aristotle*, 42.
 11 *The Stoic Philosophy*, 32, 34.
 12 *N. & D. of Man*, 8.
 13 *The Stoic Philosophy*, 53, 51.
 14 A. N. Whitehead, *Science & the Modern World* (1938), 19.
 15 J. Macmurray, *The Boundaries of Science* (1939), 236.
 16 *Time, Cause and Eternity*, 34.
 17 *Ibid.*, 34.
 18 H. Cunyngame, *Short Talks on Philosophy* (1932), 184.
 19 C. E. M. Joad, *Guide to Modern Thought* (1942), 53, 59.
 20 *Ibid.*, 182.
 21 *The Boundaries of Science*, 204.
 22 *The N. & D. of Man*, 36, 44.
 23 E. Barker, *The Citizen's Choice* (1937), 15.
 24 Quoted by R. Osborn, *Freud and Marx* (1937), 242.
 25 See *The Russian Revolution*, 81-82.
 26 *Science & the Modern World*, 100.
 27 *N. & D. of Man*, 35, 35, 38.
 28 *Time, Cause and Eternity*, 86, 90.
 29 *The Boundaries of Science*, 183.
 30 J. Baillie, *Our Knowledge of God* (1939), 40-42.
 31 *N. & D. of Man*, 151-3.
 32 *Our Knowledge of God*, 16.
 33 *Ibid.*, 258.

The Doctrine of Man.

BY THE REV. J. RUSSELL HOWDEN, B.D.

THERE are two principal divisions in all Christian teaching and preaching. One is the doctrine of God, and the other is the doctrine of man. It is this latter which we are to consider in the present paper.

Our teaching about man will necessarily include the consideration of man's origin, and our ideas as to the nature of man will naturally be coloured by our ideas about this. There are two principal views on this. One is the doctrine of Evolution and the other the doctrine of Creation.

Creation implies the direct act of God, and, therefore, is essentially miraculous.

Evolution, in the common use of the word, pre-supposes the activity of nothing more than natural causation. Of course, even in saying this one has to beware of an ambiguity into which it is so easy to slip. And the ambiguity is this, that until we are quite clear as to what we include within the sphere of the natural, it is confusing to begin to talk about the supernatural. However, leaving this on one side, it is generally thought that the idea of evolution precludes any direct Divine activity. Indeed, in its extremist form the doctrine is usually so expressed as to eliminate the idea of God altogether.

On the other hand, it is to be remembered that a good many Christians believe in some form of evolution as a method of the Divine

working. A notable instance of this is found in Dr. J. Y. Simpson, in such a book as *The Spiritual Interpretation of Nature*.

We may agree, therefore, that evolution is in itself a term of doubtful meaning. The real crux of the question is whether God is recognised at all. In other words, the two main accounts of man's origin may be summed up as theistic or atheistic.

The latter class of theories supposes that originally man was only a somewhat improved ape, and it was thought that a highly-trained chimpanzee might be nearly as intelligent as the lowest races of mankind, such as the pygmy of Central Africa or the native of Australia. Such theorists further hold that there are indications which have been discovered of intermediate forms between man and some sub-human creature, simian or otherwise in its general characteristics.

As to the relationship between the highest form of ape and the lowest form of man, it is most misleading to talk as though an intelligent ape had anything approaching the intelligence of even the lowest races of mankind. It is possible to teach apes, like other animals, to do certain tricks, and their tricks are made the more impressive by the general anthropoid appearance of the performers. But between even the cleverest and most highly trained animals and the lowest form of human being there is an obvious and great gulf fixed. Dr. Rendle Short, in a recent booklet *The Christian and the Scientific Outlook*, says:—"You must not judge of human intelligence by degenerate specimens in middle life who have never had a fair chance. The only way of judging human intelligence is by what can be done with the well-trained child." Professor Short points out that an Australian aborigine became a noted mathematician, and others have been selected to play cricket against an English Test Team.

Then with regard to the supposed missing links, we may venture to affirm that the missing links required by the theory of evolution do not, as a matter of fact, occur. Particular instances that have at different times been set forward as examples have themselves been sharply criticised by anatomists and biologists upon various grounds. But as instances of missing links are still sometimes brought forward, it is well to notice the possibilities of error which may arise in connection with them.

First, there is a possibility of error in estimating the date of the geological strata in which the remains are found.

Secondly, there is a possibility of error in referring remains to their proper origin. The explorer comes upon very scanty remains of a skeleton, and he has to decide whether these bones belong to a human being or an animal. The most likely mistake will be in confusion between simian and human, but other and more unlikely confusions have occurred. Remains have been discovered in various parts of the world, particularly in China, California, and the South of France, and with regard to every example there has been considerable difference of opinion as to whether the bones belonged to a human being or to an anthropoid ape.

In the third place it is necessary to enter a caution as to the explanation of finds which may accompany such remains. For instance, chipped flints are frequently discovered in conjunction with fossil remains. It is often assumed that these are incontrovertible evidence

of human or sub-human activity. We need to remember that there are at least two other ways in which such flints may have received their peculiar shape—the first, and the most likely, being the action of natural forces, such as the wearing of water, or the splitting caused by frost ; the second, which is little more than a possibility, would be through the activities of flint-chipping apes—though this last is purely a supposition.

The fourth and most serious likelihood of error lies in the reconstruction of remains, and particularly of skulls. It is obvious that when a very small portion of a skull has been found it is a matter of considerable delicacy to determine the radius of the arch of the skull. In fact, such reconstructions have been contested from time to time by anatomists themselves. When these reconstructions have been essayed, and when highly imaginative drawings based upon them have been published, the plain man will do well to ask two questions : First, how much exactly of the skeleton has actually been found. Secondly, how far were the bones, especially those of the skull, broken or otherwise when found. These are simply commonsense precautions which the ordinary reasonable man will do well to observe if he wishes to arrive at the truth. It has been popular for some illustrated papers on both sides of the Atlantic to put forth from time to time highly imaginative pictures of hairy, low-browed creatures which purport to be missing links. "Evidence for the existence of these creatures has never been discovered except in the imagination of the artists." (Dr. Rendle Short).

Dr. Rendle Short sums it up thus. The more recent anthropologists emphasize not the narrowness but the width of the gap between man and the apes. "Although they mostly state that man was derived from a primitive primate, no one seriously suggests now that man was derived from any of the existing anthropoid apes, or from any creature at all like them."

The foregoing will suffice for all that there is opportunity to say now by way of criticism of what I may call the vulgar forms of evolutionary theory.

Leaving this on one side, we may now turn to consider the Creationist's view of the matter. He bases his ideas upon the Bible. In Genesis i. 26 we read : "God said, Let us make man in our image after our likeness." In ii. 7 : "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life." These two verses assert, on the one hand concerning the physical nature of man, that he is formed of matter, which he shares with all other created beings ; and, on the other hand, that he is akin to God Himself. In Luke iii. 38, Adam is called "the son of God."

The Bible, therefore, clearly sets forth man's nature as being a duality—physical and spiritual.

More than this, I Thessalonians v. 23 indicates that the non-material part of man is itself dual, comprising both spirit and soul. Various meanings have been assigned to the word soul, and it is perhaps unfortunate that there is no general agreement amongst Bible students as to the connotation to be assigned to this word. If we confine ourselves to Scriptural language, we may distinguish three meanings

of the word : (1) It is used as equivalent to spirit, as in the Magnificat, where, according to the rules of Hebrew parallelism, it seems to be implied that spirit and soul are identical. (2) It is used of the emotions, as in Luke ii. 35. And (3) in the Thessalonian passage already referred to it appears to be sharply distinguished from spirit.

There is no difficulty about the first two meanings to be assigned. The difficulty is as to what we are to understand when the terms soul and spirit are thus distinguished. To begin with, it is to be observed that soul is predicated, not only of man, but of the lower creation also. Even the swarming marine life of the primaeval sea is spoken of as having soul (Genesis i. 20). We seem, therefore, forced to the conclusion that in this sense the soul is something which man shares with other creatures. And I would suggest that this something is the unifying centre of consciousness. Modern surgery has referred the action of each of the physical senses to its appropriate brain centre, so that if that centre be injured, the sense apparatus corresponding to it is rendered useless. The impressions conveyed by the senses, however, are presented in consciousness as a unity. No physical centre of the unifying process has been discovered. It appears, therefore, as if such a centre must be supra-material, however little we may be able to assign such a meaning to such a term. The non-material part of man is that which is described as his spirit. I use the term spirit as equivalent to mind. I do this with some diffidence because so many people use the term mind as equivalent to soul. But, personally, I find it difficult to assign any meaning to spirit which does not include the operation of man's mind. The Greek word for soul is, of course, *psukhē*, but the science of mind is termed psychology. In my view of the matter it would be better if this could be labelled pneumatology, if such a word might be coined, but, of course, it is now too late to alter the common nomenclature. Psychology teaches us that the mind, or the spirit, is threefold as to its functions—thought, feeling, and will. These three functions of the human spirit correspond to the three ultimate categories of the true, the beautiful, and the good. It seems, too, that in the Bible itself we have an endorsement of this common classification of the human mind. In Luke x. 27 we read : “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind.” Here the heart appears to stand for the whole spiritual being of man, and is distinguished from the other three particulars by the use of a different pronoun. If this be correct, the soul will correspond to the emotions, the strength to the will, and the mind to the reason.

Such then is the spiritual nature of man in respect of which he is like God. But the declaration in Genesis i. 26 appears to refer to the whole man, and not merely to his spiritual nature. It may be difficult to regard man's physical nature as being in any way like God, when we remember that God is a Spirit. But the difficulty seems to disappear when we remember that man's physical nature was an adequate vehicle for the incarnation of the Lord Jesus Christ ; and, further, when we remember that man's material nature is fitted for eternity. There is a natural (or soulish) body, and there is a spiritual body. Whatever the unknown conditions of Resurrection

life may be, at least they are something for which man's physical nature is fitted.

The soul or the spirit then exhibits the three functions of thought, feeling and will. It is to be observed, however, that though we may separate these three functions in our own thought, they are not separable in life. For we know ourselves to be doing any or all of these three things at the same time. They are simply the ways in which our self acts. But these are the constituent elements of personality. They are distinguishable functions, but they are united by being functions of one and the self-same subject. (Illingworth). This is what we mean when we speak of the personality of a man. This is what makes him a person.

But the Bible assures us that man is made in the image of God. Therefore we may venture to say that God Himself is a Person. Some people find a difficulty in thinking of God as a Person, because a person is essentially separated from all other persons, and is accordingly limited by the existence of other persons. Therefore limitation seems to be of the essence of personality, and that is unthinkable in the case of God. Lotze, however, points out: "Among the things which a personal being recognises as in this opposition to itself are its own inner states of consciousness and its own thoughts. Therefore the thought of God's personality does not require us to assume a reality outside Him and limiting Him, but only the production in Him of a world of ideas to which He finds Himself in contrast as to His own states."

Further, Illingworth points out that the development of the doctrine of God's personality has always proceeded side by side with the recognition of the personality of man. To know God as a Person is the very essence of true religion, and, as a matter of fact, it is something which is peculiar to Christianity. Our Lord Jesus Christ revealed the Father as in essential personal relationship with man, and He also supremely crowned the individual man with glory and honour which is given to him by no one else. The fear of the Lord in the Old Testament corresponds to faith in the New, and they both mean fundamentally the recognition of the personality of God. Eternal life as predicated of a human being is nothing less than this entering into personal relationship with the Infinite and Eternal God. "This is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, Whom Thou hast sent." (John xvii. 3).

Assuming then that man has a spiritual as well as a physical nature, the further question arises as to how this spiritual nature is to be regarded. Three main views may be distinguished.

(1) Transmigration. This involves the idea that every human birth means the cutting off, so to speak, of a certain amount of spiritual existence from the great reservoir of it which is supposed to be supra-mundane. Wordsworth, in his familiar *Ode to Immortality*, sets forth this view. But we must not allow the beauty of the poet's language to obscure the difficulties which underlie the idea.

(2) Then there is the view known as Conditional Immortality. There are various aspects of this theory. Some hold that the soul or spirit is created, to be destroyed by physical death. In connection with this it is commonly held that immortality is to be regained at the

Resurrection. Other people regard the soul as unconscious between death and resurrection. From the point of view of Bible doctrine, one special difficulty which meets this view is that it is necessary to suppose, in the case of the wicked, that they are first destroyed by physical death, then they are re-created for judgment, and thereafter destroyed a second time. This view, therefore, seems to raise more difficulties than it solves.

(3) There is the view which I may perhaps venture to call the ordinary Christian idea. That is, that each separate person is a separate creation from birth, or, better, from the moment of conception. This separate creation carries with it the gift of immortality.

It should be carefully borne in mind that man is always presented in the Bible as consisting essentially of two natures, spiritual and physical, and that neither is complete without the other. There are beings, whether angels or demons, who are merely spirit. There are also animals, which have body and soul but apparently no spirit. But man is a denizen of two worlds, and his final complete state is not a mere ghostly immortality, but the resurrection union of spirit and body. The body is as really a part of man's personality as the spirit. Philosophy, particularly heathen philosophy, is apt to look upon the body as a mere vesture, or, still worse, a prison house, and to regard salvation to consist essentially in getting rid of it.

Professor Orr wrote: "The soul was made and meant to inhabit the body, and was never intended to subsist apart from it. Hence death . . . is not something natural to man, but can only be regarded as something violent, unnatural, the rupture or separation of parts of man's being which were never meant to be disjoined. The soul, in virtue of its spiritual personal nature, survives the body, but in separation from the body itself, as for example the doctrine of Sheol shows, exists in a mutilated, imperfect condition."

Modern psychology increasingly lays stress upon the close relationship between soul and body—in the theory of psycho-physical parallelism. And the Bible doctrine of man harmonises with this idea, and gives honour to the body as well as to the spirit of man. "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost?" (I Cor. vi. 19).

In accordance with the foregoing, redemption is represented in the Bible as including body as well as spirit. St. Paul told the Roman Christians that they were "waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body." (Romans viii. 23). A redemption which already has been secured by the death of Christ, and which is to be fully realised at His Second Advent.

Another feature to be observed with regard to man is the sense of frustration which attaches to his life. He is out of harmony with his environment, and in this respect appears to differ from the brute creation. Luthardt, in his *Fundamental Truths*, enumerates four sets of contradictions which continually beset man. (1) There is the sense of his helplessness with regard to nature and, at the same time, the greatness of his power over nature; (2) There is man's insatiable curiosity concerning his surroundings and the ignorance of which each new advance in knowledge makes him more aware; (3) There is the incessant conflict between desire and disappointment; and (4)

most significant of all there is the power of choice and will combined with frequent and strange weaknesses in carrying out that will.

The Bible explanation of these anomalies is that man is a fallen creature. His frustrations and unhappinesses are due to this one terrible infection of his nature which is sin. The root trouble is that man is alienated from God. To paraphrase Pascal's words: Man is made for God, and yet is contrary to God.

Man's sinning has caused his will to be emasculated, so that even when to some degree he apprehends the good, he nevertheless fails so often to do it.

Moreover, sin has not only affected man's spirit, but his body also. In the day that he fell his body became mortal. "Sin entered into the world, and death by sin." (Romans v. 12). St. Paul does not say that there was no death in the universe before man's sin. He does not appear to be concerned there with the universe as a whole. He is talking about man, and it is death as affecting man that he has in mind—the death with the sting in it. And Scripture throughout quite uncompromisingly connects this with man's disobedience.

The narrative of the Fall is criticised on the ground that the occasion appears to be too trivial to have carried with it such far-reaching consequences. But our assumptions as to what is trivial and what is important may be sadly at fault. The important point to note in the narrative is that sin entered because man, unfallen man, made his own choice the law of his life. That is the essence of all sin. "Sin is lawlessness" (I John iii. 4). It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that a decision of this nature on man's part should involve very far-reaching results, and the Bible is emphatic that this is just what has happened. A little reflection will show us that Adam's transgression is paralleled daily in our own experience apart from the keeping grace of the Lord Jesus Christ. And remembering the necessary and intimate connection between man's spirit and his body there is nothing at which to be surprised in the fact that the transgression had results which affected both parts of man's nature.

But just as man's dual nature has been spoiled by his sin, so that nature has been redeemed in its entirety by Christ. Our Lord's death secures the justification of every sinner who will accept "the gift by grace." (Romans v. 15). The believer has been now justified by Christ's blood (Romans v. 9). That is to say, he is put back spiritually into the right relationship with God from which Adam fell by his transgression, and in which alone man can find his true satisfaction.

Spiritually this becomes true as soon as ever a man by faith accepts the reconciliation, as multitudes can testify from their own happy experience. They know that the cloud between them and God has gone, that they have been brought back again into that right and happy relationship with Him, and that life henceforth for them is a new thing.

But they are still face to face with the consequences of sin in the body. Even if Christ be in them, and they in Christ, their "body is dead because of sin" (Romans viii. 10). But the redemption which our Lord secured through His passion and death is something which includes man's whole nature, body as well as spirit. Man, therefore,

is still "waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body" (Romans viii. 23).

This redemption of the body is to be realised at our Lord's Second Coming. "We shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump." (I Corinthians xv. 51-2). What this change will involve is, of course, something which is entirely outside our own experience, and about which we know nothing. But it seems clear that the resurrection body somehow partakes of the characteristics of the present mortal body. (I Corinthians xv. 42 f). And this is consistent with the fact that man is declared to have been made in the image of God. We saw at the outset that this included the capacity for sharing the resurrection, whatever else it might mean.

The foregoing is an attempt to set forth briefly the Bible teaching concerning ourselves. It is teaching which is at many points being sharply criticised to-day, as indeed it has often been. And it is, therefore, teaching which is all the more necessary for the Christian unflinchingly to urge upon the attention of his fellowmen.

The Word and the Wisdom of God.

BY T. MILLER NEATBY, M.A., M.D., CANTAB., M.A., LOND.

ONLY by the Evangelist John is the title "Word" (in the Greek, 'Logos') applied to the Second Person of the Holy Trinity.

For Matthew, Christ is "Great David's Greater Son," heir of his throne and Israel's promised Messiah. For Mark, He is the Divine Servant. For Luke, He is the Perfect Man. For John, He is the Word, the Son of God, Himself God blessed for ever.

The abrupt introduction, without preliminary or explanation, of this title in the first verse of St. John's Gospel shows that the Logos, a conception hovering uncertainly upon the confines of theology and of philosophy, was familiar—superficially, at least,—to those for whom the Apostle was writing. What, then, is the meaning of this title "The Word," applied by St. John to our Lord?

From a very early date philosophic Greeks had perceived at the heart of the visible ordered world or 'cosmos' a rational principle which they called the 'logos' or "reason." They argued, reasonably enough, that a world that displayed such order revealed also an ordering intelligence. Many of them—the Stoics, for example—rejecting, as do the fashionable scientific pantheists of to-day, the idea of a personal and transcendental intelligence, located the 'Logos' in the 'cosmos' itself.

Others, more intelligently, regarded the supreme intellectual principle—or principles, for some of them held that there were several—as independent of, and above, the material world, and as an emanation or creation of the Supreme Being.

Philo, the Jewish philosopher, born shortly before the Christian era and living his whole life in Alexandria, wrote as a Jew, zealous indeed for monotheism but deeply attracted by Greek speculative

philosophy. (It is highly likely that he knew little or nothing about Christ or Christianity.) Philo developed on monotheistic lines the doctrine of the Logos. For him the Logos was the self-revelation of the One God ; but he oscillated uneasily between a Logos that was an independent and even personal Being and a Logos that was merely an aspect of the Divine activity.

These varieties of the Logos doctrine represent the gropings of Gentile and Jewish minds (for the Jews of the dispersion were considerably infected with Greek intellectualism) after some being who should reveal or interpret God and act as an intermediary between man and the Higher Intelligence—gropings, in fact, after the doctrines of the Incarnation, the Trinity, and the Mediatorship of Christ. Some of them fail to recognise their Logos even as a conscious personal existence distinct from God, and all fail to recognise his eternal Godhead. To the rescue of these blind gropings comes St. John with the true doctrine of the Logos.

But before considering this New Testament revelation on the subject, we may well put ourselves into the place of the pious Jew who lived before Christ. Had he any knowledge of such a Being as the Logos? He knew the God of his race, who was also the Lord of the whole earth—the one true God. But did his scriptures, the holy oracles which were the precious and distinguishing heritage of his race, reveal to him any existence at all comparable to the Logos of Greek philosophy? Any being that might be regarded as the pure and uncorrupted counterpart or analogue of the ordering and creative "Reason" of heathen speculation?

That counterpart, it may with some confidence be maintained, is the "Wisdom" of the book of Proverbs.

There is much in the early chapters of the Book of Proverbs on the subject of wisdom. It is an attribute of God—an attribute highly to be coveted by man—a precious possession willingly bestowed by God upon all who seek it. "A wise and understanding heart" had been bestowed upon Solomon himself at his own request. But there is more than a hint that wisdom is something more than an excellent quality in God or man. When it is said that "Wisdom crieth without : she uttereth her voice in the streets" (Prov. i. 20), we may say that by a literary figure wisdom is here personified. But when she goes on (v. 24) to say : "Because I have called and ye refused, I have stretched out my hand and no man regarded . . . I also will laugh at your calamity : I will mock when your fear cometh . . . then shall they call upon me, but I will not answer," we begin to have serious doubts whether this "wisdom" may not be something other than a literary personification.

Again, when in chap. 3 Solomon breaks out (vv. 13-18) into a riot of ecstatic praise of wisdom—of all that she is and all that she brings, we may reflect that Solomon, vessel of inspiration as he was, was yet an Oriental writing with Oriental luxuriousness of imagery and was possibly recalling the vast prosperity that had accompanied his own acquisition of wisdom. But suddenly (v. 19) he says "The Lord by wisdom hath founded the earth ; by understanding hath He established the heavens" ; and we are at once reminded that John, when introducing the true Logos to his readers (and be it remembered that the

Greek word Logos signifies both "Reason" and "Word") declares with clear allusion to the first verse of Genesis ("In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth"), that "in the beginning" all things were made by this Creative Intelligence.

Wisdom is, then, much more than a mere attribute or quality. The most remarkable proof of this is to be found in the eighth chapter. There again, as in chapter one, wisdom is represented as "crying aloud" in all the places of public concourse—crying her priceless wares through a score of verses. And then suddenly, in vv. 22 to 31, occurs one of the most remarkable passages in the Old Testament—a passage in which "Wisdom" is set forth (as the Logos is set forth in the first chapter of John) as existing "from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was," when neither sea nor dry land was; and then (again, like the Logos of St. John) as taking part in the creation of the heaven and the earth "as a master craftsman" (v. 30, R.V.); as being *with God* in all this (as John says, "the Word was *with God*"); as being One between whom and God there was a mutual complacent delight (v. 30); and as finding, even in the eternity of the past, His delights—surely re-creative and redemptive—in the sons of men.

The Wisdom, then, of Proverbs is an analogue of the Logos-Reason of Greek and Judæo-Hellenistic philosophy, and, as we believe, a title of Christ as Creator. That His delights are with the sons of men suggests Wisdom as the Re-creator or Redeemer. But that the Wisdom of God is redemptive as well as creative is made most clear by a passage of the New Testament. To the Greeks at Corinth, versed in their native speculations on the Logos or Reason that informed the visible cosmos and seeking always (as the Apostle remarked) after "Wisdom," Paul preached the true Wisdom. The Wisdom that they were ignorantly groping after was Christ—He who was made unto them Wisdom from God—even righteousness and sanctification and redemption; not the Wisdom that was the creative energy of the Cosmos, but the Wisdom that was re-creative and redemptive. Sin had come in, and the message of the Creative Wisdom was useless to the sinner. What the intellectual Greek really needed, though it seemed to him "foolishness," was Redemptive Wisdom.

But if he rejected Wisdom on the Mercy Seat, there was left only Wisdom on the Judgment Seat. For Wisdom is not only Creator and Redeemer. He is Judge. This also is proved from the New Testament. Towards the conclusion of the most terrible of all His denunciations of the Pharisees our Lord made use of these remarkable words, recorded in Luke xi. 49—"Therefore also said the Wisdom of God, I will send them prophets and apostles and some of them they shall slay and persecute." In the corresponding passage in Matthew (23, 34) Christ is reported as saying "Wherefore behold I send unto you prophets and wise men. . ." Now as there can be no discrepancy between Matthew and Luke, it is clear that our Lord assumes to Himself the title of the Wisdom of God. It is also clear from the context that He holds that title as a Judge: "that the blood of all the prophets which was shed from the foundation of the world may be required of this generation."

The Wisdom of God is thus *creative, redemptive, and judicial.*

Let us now pass on to the Johannine version of the Logos. "In the beginning" says John, "was the Logos." The Greek word, as we have noted, signifies both "reason" and "word." The two ideas go together; in fact, the first may be said to involve the second. Divine Reason—creative, purposive intelligence or wisdom—is plainly also a "word," that is, the means by which God expresses Himself. Just as we express ourselves not merely by articulate speech but by our acts, so God speaks in His creative acts.

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." That was a self-expressing manifestation of Divine Creative Reason. The simple sublimity of this verse has often been commented upon. But John in the not less sublime exordium of his gospel lets in the light of inspiration upon its inner content. "In the beginning"—as far back, that is, as the mind can go—the Word of God was "with God":—not "in" God, but, as a distinct Person, "with" God; and the Word *was* God. John reiterates the distinctness of this personality—"the same was in the beginning *with God.*" There was to be no mistake about it. One of the chief errors of the ancients concerning the Logos must be nailed to the counter.

Again the Logos, while creative (the ancients were right in that), was creative in a far deeper and more embracing sense than the ancients had imagined. The Logos was God and was creative in the sense in which God is creative—"All things were made by Him," and (that there might be no possible shadow of a mistake) "without Him was not anything made that was made." He was

"Of the full Deity possess'd;
Eternally Divine."

This witness is confirmed by St. Paul—"By Him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth . . . all things were created by Him and for Him" (Col. i. 16); by St. Peter—"By the Word of God the heavens were of old" (II Peter iii. 5); by the writer to the Hebrews—"By Him also God made the worlds," and again, "the worlds were framed by the Word of God" (Heb. i. 2, xi. 3).

We learn, then, that in that "beginning" of which Genesis speaks the creative activity of the Word, the Second Person of the Trinity, was present. The "Word" was the means by which God expressed Himself. The suitability of the title is apparent. There is creative Reason indeed, but the Reason is God's "Word" of self-expression. Just as we express ourselves by our words, so God expresses Himself by His Son.

"Thou art the Everlasting Word,
The Father's Only Son."

Long before there were men to speak to—long before Adam communed with God in the garden of innocence—God expressed Himself in His great creative acts. So we, if we were living like Alexander Selkirk upon a desert island, should still be expressing ourselves.

God's creative activity is vested in His Son. "My Father worketh hitherto and I work" (John v. 17). By Him God speaks. He is God's Word—God's Word in *creation.*

But He is also—and this is the main burden of St. John's message—God's Word in *re-creation*; the "new creation"; redemption. The analogy of this, it is instructive to notice, is to be found in that same first chapter of Genesis. When God originally "created the heaven and the earth," He created them good and fair—radiant with light unmixed with darkness. For "God is light and in Him is no darkness at all" (I. John I. 5). But mysterious chaos overtakes the Divine order of God's fair creation, and darkness is on the face of the deep. What happens then?

Where darkness is, the Word expresses Himself as light. For God said, Let there be light. And the light scattered the darkness. Even so we are told by John in his inspired exposition of the Logos that "in Him was life, and the life was the *light* of men, and the light shineth in darkness." For

"Discord on the music fell,
And darkness on the glory."

Man, created upright, had fallen. Sin had covered him with a darkness that could be felt. Again, the Word, expressing Himself as light, shines amid the uncomprehending darkness of man's sin and ruin.

The Word is manifested now not as creative but as redemptive energy. "God hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son" (Heb. i. 2). "In the beginning" He spoke by His Son in creation; "in these last days" He speaks by that same Son in redemption. Christ is God's Word to lost man. Man has now not to be born, but to be born again, "not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (John i. 13).

And how is this effected? John tells us. The Word in the beginning created the cosmos by His sovereign fiat. But this new creation? Ah, that is a different matter. Sin has created a staggering problem. The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us" (John i. 14), that He might be what the Baptist, seeing Him for the first time, proclaimed Him—"the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world" (John i. 29). Bethlehem existed for Calvary. "He Himself took part of flesh and blood that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death" (Heb. ii. 14). "Once in the end of the age hath He been manifested" in an earthly life "to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself" (Heb. ix. 26).

When John proclaimed the Word who in the beginning was with God and was God, he was not voicing any speculations of human philosophy. He had not by searching found out the Word. No, he had himself heard and seen with his eyes and looked upon and his hands had handled, of the Word who is life (I John i. 1). He had seen the moral glory that shone in the ways and walk of "that eternal life which was with the Father and was manifested unto us" (I John i. 2). He had seen, too, upon the holy mount another glory—the unearthly glory "as of the only-begotten of the Father" (John i. 14).

In the opening verses of the first book of the Bible we have seen the Word in His glory as Creator of the heaven and the earth. In yet greater glory we have seen that Word made flesh that He might redeem and new-create the fallen race of man. Yet once more—in

the last book of the Bible—is presented to us the Word of God, not now as Creator or Redeemer, but as Judge.

We know from other scriptures that judgment is vested in the Son. Paul on Mars' Hill announced that God had appointed a day in the which He would judge the world in righteousness "by that man" whom He had ordained (Acts xvii. 31). Our Lord Himself solemnly declared that "the Father judgeth no man but hath committed all judgment unto the Son" (John v. 22).

So John in Revelation xix. 11-16 portrays "the Faithful and True"—in the day of His vengeance when He treads down the workers of iniquity in His righteous anger, and tramples them in His holy fury—riding forth to war and judgment, "clothed with a vesture dipped in blood"—not now His own blood, but the blood of His enemies; for "He treadeth the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God"; "and His name is called *The Word of God.*"

"God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that"—that and nothing else, that precisely and exactly—"shall he also reap" (Gal. vi. 7). The easy sentimentality that thinks of God as the good-natured master who won't be too hard on his man has no warrant in Scripture.

Men are mocking God every day; but it is God who will have the last word. After the hardness and impenitence of their hearts men are treasuring up unto themselves "wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God." But the word of the Lord is that "God will render to every man according to his deeds" (Rom. ii. 5, 6).

Everywhere throughout the civilised world the demand is growing in volume and intensity for strict and exact retribution upon men whose unexampled crimes of cruelty, perfidy and mendacity have shamed the darkest records of heathenism.

"Strict and exact," forsooth! Justice aims, the saying is, at "fitting the punishment to the offence." But there are some offences—long and complicated catalogues of offences—for which there is no fit, precise or adequate punishment. No penalty that any civilised people could ever exact from the loathed Nazis would be anything but a "token" payment. (That is not to say that a tribunal of the civilised nations should not to the full extent of its powers offer its solemn satisfaction to the claims of justice).

But what man cannot do, God can do and will do. Through that Word to whom He has committed all judgment He will render to all men everywhere according to their deeds; and men will cry, and cry in vain, to the rocks to fall upon them and hide them "from the wrath of the Lamb" (Rev. vi. 16).

The "Word" like the "Wisdom" of God is *creative, redemptive, and judicial.*

Church Union in South India.

By THE REV. P. J. HEATON, M.A.

WITH the publication of the seventh edition of the Proposed Scheme of Church Union in South India the final stage in a great spiritual enterprise has been reached. The period of negotiation, of drafting, amending, and perfecting has closed and the Scheme in its definitive form is now before the negotiating Churches for a final decision to unite on the basis therein defined.

The South India Provincial Synod of the Methodist Church has already resolved (with the approval of the Methodist Conference in England) that it "unreservedly approves of the Basis of Union contained in the Scheme, and is prepared immediately to unite on this foundation with the other negotiating churches."

Six out of the eight constituent Councils of the United Church of South India (itself a Union of Congregationalists and Presbyterians) have voted in favour of the scheme, which now comes before the General Assembly of that Church for a final vote.

The Episcopal Synod of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon has warmly commended the scheme to the diocesan councils for their consideration. If two-thirds of the thirteen diocesan councils give a favourable vote the scheme will then come before the General Council of the Province, which meets at the beginning of 1944. In the General Council simple majorities will be required in each House and a three-quarters majority of the whole Council. The consequence of the Scheme obtaining approval at each of these stages would be the separation from the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon of the four dioceses in South India, those of Dornakal, Madras, Travancore, and Tinnevely, and their inclusion in the new "Church of South India," as the united body will be called.

The decision is primarily one to be taken by the Anglican Church in India, which since 1929 has been an independent Province of the Anglican Communion. There can be no dictatorship of Lambeth in these matters, but inasmuch as the Church in South India is still largely dependent for leadership and support upon the Church at home, it is important that the attitude of the Home Church be clearly defined.

Let us here remind ourselves first that this Union is the first to be conceived and come to the point of final consummation based upon the main principles of the famous Lambeth Quadrilateral—the Supremacy of Scripture, acknowledgement of the Creeds, acceptance of the two Sacraments of the Gospel, and the Historic Episcopate. Secondly, the Scheme has twice been before the full Lambeth Conference—in 1920 and 1930—and has received its cordial general approval. Thirdly, the Consultative Committee of the Lambeth Conference has thoroughly examined the alterations and additions to the Scheme that have been made since 1930, and has given its considered opinion that these have not affected the Scheme in such a way as to detract from the general approval given in 1930.

The way would thus seem to be clear and the stage set for a definite and unequivocal acceptance of the Scheme in its final definitive form by the Home Church. Yet it is just now that the latent Anglo-Catholic opposition to any union involving the recognition of non-episcopal orders and the inclusion of non-episcopally ordained ministers without a "re-ordination" or "mutual commissioning" (as it is now more euphemistically expressed) is beginning to make itself felt. Voices are to be heard urging that no final step be taken until the Lambeth Conference can meet again. And the appalling state of ignorance in the Home Church about the nature of this proposed union, in itself a sad reflection of the general indifference to missionary work throughout the parishes of our Church, bids fair to play into their hands. The plea of "no changes in wartime" is a potent one to conservative minds in Church as well as in State.

It is not that this agitation could *hold up* the Scheme and prevent it going through if the Anglican Church in India vote in favour of it, but should any considerable proportion of Diocesan Missionary Councils or Diocesan Conferences at Home reject the Scheme, it might influence the decisions yet to be made by the Church of India Burma and Ceylon.

It is important, therefore, that Evangelical Churchmen, to whom the cause of Foreign Missions has always been an intimate concern and who have always looked forward to Reunion with the Evangelical Free Churches, should closely study the Scheme and combine to educate the Home Church about it, so that when in the Providence of God the new Church of South India is formally inaugurated it may enjoy the support and goodwill of the Church of England.

The proposed Union is no sudden hurried move dictated by political pressure, as have been the recent "unions" of Christian bodies in Japan and Japanese occupied territories; but it is the fruit of long and patient labour, and prayerful consultations which have lasted twenty-three years, by a Joint Committee whose personnel has continually changed as old leaders have retired and new ones come to take their place, who have had to be initiated into its large generosity of spirit and educated in its intricate discussions. The urge towards union arose in the first place among Indian Christian leaders of various denominations, who though realising their spiritual unity in Christ found themselves divided by ecclesiastical barriers that held no meaning for them as Indians. Their faith and zeal have sustained them and others through the disappointing delays and postponements that have occurred during these protracted negotiations. The unhurried nature of the deliberations and the absence of any external constraint encourage us to accept the claim of those concerned in the negotiations that they have been guided and controlled throughout by the grace of the Holy Spirit.

The Scheme before us, then, merits sympathetic study in grateful humility. The Christians of South India have pioneered a way for themselves out of divisions of Western origin, and their way to Union may well prove ours as well. They have hammered out a Constitution which they believe will preserve the essential elements of the four different types of Church Order imported from the West—Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, Congregationalism and Methodism—within one

living organism, and without compromise of vital principles. Within the framework of this Constitution and in reliance on unity of fundamental belief they have reserved "wide freedom of opinion" and "wide freedom of action" in non-essentials. The Constitution is not thought of as final or static; on the contrary its authors expressly declare their hope that the United Church "will always be ready to correct and amend (its provisions) as God's will becomes more clearly known through the growing together of the several parts of the now divided Church into a common mind and spirit under the guidance of the Holy Spirit."

The points in which the proposed united Church will differ from that of the Churches of the Anglican Communion in the "practice of Episcopacy" have been admirably summarised by Bishop Western (formerly of Tinnevely) in an article in the *East and West Review* for October 1942. He does not, however, offer any opinion as to their acceptability, but leaves that to the reader's judgment. He enumerates three points, which we may examine from the Evangelical standpoint.

The first is that in the consecration of bishops three presbyters may join with the three consecrating bishops in the laying on of hands. It is laid down that the three presbyters must belong to the diocese for which a new bishop is being made, thus symbolising the acceptance of the new bishop by the diocese concerned, and associating the diocese itself in the central act of the service. Any diocesan council wishing to dispense with this provision is at liberty to do so. No reasonable man could take exception to such a practice and research might well discover a precedent, or an analogy in "Catholic practice."

The second is that Confirmation, while being recognised and practised within the Church, will not be a compulsory rule. Alternative forms of reception into full membership will be allowed, not involving the laying on of hands; but such must include prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit. Bearing in mind the considerable variations within the "Catholic" branches of the Church with regard to Confirmation no Evangelical could condemn the freedom of practice here allowed. The criterion whereby we should judge this is surely to be found in Article xxxiv *Of the Traditions of the Church*. "It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one or utterly alike . . . so that nothing be ordained against God's Word." It was on the "authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority" claimed in this Article that the Church of England herself at the Reformation radically altered the corrupt Roman practice of Confirmation. We may well believe, however, that the manifest benefits of episcopal confirmation will commend it to the Church of South India and result in a more general use of it.

The third point is at first sight more serious. The Constitution admits the possibility of the clergy and laity in the Synod—the supreme governing body—over-ruling the bishops even in matters of doctrine. Such an elaborate procedure has been laid down, however, before such a startling event could happen, that the likelihood of its ever occurring is remote indeed. Nevertheless, a Church which has solemnly declared (Article XXI) that General Councils (whose voting member-

ship was always exclusively episcopal) " may err and sometimes have erred even in things pertaining to God " can hardly quarrel with a Church that has foreseen the possibility of its own bishops erring in matters of doctrine !

But it is possible that the main weight of opposition to the Scheme will not be directed against any such details as the above. It is quite likely to be directed against (i) the lack of any " mutual commissioning " of ministries at the inauguration of the Union, and (ii) against the safeguards in the thirty years' *interim* period of mixed ministries.

The first is only the demand for " re-ordination " in a more attractive guise. The offer of the Anglican Bishops of the uniting dioceses, made in all humility and sincerity, to receive a fresh commission at the hands of the leaders of the other uniting Churches at the inauguration of the Union, was rightly rejected (though with equally sincere expression of sympathy and admiration) by those leaders. For such an act would be open to the subsequent—if not contemporary—misconstruction of being a bait to secure the conferring of unimpeachable episcopal orders upon the whole ministry from the very start, and involving in consequence the admission of the inferiority, or invalidity of their own orders by the non-episcopal ministries. While admitting that such a deduction is not logically necessary, the fact that the demand for mutual commission is almost exclusively Anglican is bound to raise suspicion as to motives. Indeed there is no need for any such act if the fundamental Basis of the Union is accepted honestly and unreservedly. The Union is based upon a frank acknowledgment by the uniting Churches of " each other's ministries to be real ministries of the Word and Sacraments, and thankfully recognise the spiritual efficacy of sacraments and other ministrations which God has so clearly blessed," and they declare that " all the ministers of the uniting Churches will from the inauguration of the union be recognised as equally ministers of the united Church without distinction or difference." This is to be achieved by the act of faith and love displayed in the act of Union itself without the adventitious aid of a ceremony which could be interpreted in a sense inconsistent with the basis of mutual acceptance, for which indeed Scriptural authority might well be claimed, Romans xv. 7. Moreover, the Basis of Union has twice received the general approval of Lambeth, and so may claim an impressive weight of Anglican authority.

The second object of attack—the mixed ministries of the interim period of thirty years and the general provisions for their exercise—boils down to a lack of trust in those with whom Anglicans will be uniting. The " mutual pledge " which lies in the heart of the Basis of Union should surely dispel the unworthy fear and suspicion behind such assertions as " It would be possible for a Congregational minister to hold a service of bread-breaking in Madras Cathedral." Here is the pledge: (the uniting Churches) " pledge themselves and fully trust each other that the united Church will at all times be careful not to allow any over-riding of conscience either by Church authorities or by majorities, and that it will not in any of its administrative acts knowingly transgress the long established traditions of any of the Churches from whom it has been formed. Neither forms of worship

or ritual, nor a ministry, to which they have not been accustomed or to which they conscientiously object, will be imposed upon any congregation; and no arrangements with regard to these matters will knowingly be made . . . which would either offend the conscientious convictions of persons directly concerned, or which would hinder the development of complete unity within the united Church or imperil its progress towards union with other Churches."

When a pledge in such terms has been given and received, any distrust is a sad reflection on the honour of the one who entertains it and on the sincerity of the pledge he himself has given! The pledge has received the approval of Lambeth. If its operation will need "watching," that need will be far more on the part of the non-Anglican sections, for Anglicans will constitute fully one half of the total membership of the united Church.

Ultimately the whole Union rests, as it should, on the spiritual qualities of faith, hope, and love. As Evangelicals we could ask for nothing else.

If at bottom the opposition to the Scheme is due to the fear that its provisions may form a basis for further attempts to achieve Reunion at Home then we may well declare our joyful acceptance of any such desirable development. Only the spiritual unpreparedness of the Home Churches would make it premature. May we catch the spiritual fervour of South Indian Christians and humbly accept from their hands the key to the door of Christian Reunion!

On Non-Communicating Attendance.

BY THE REV. E. HIRST, M.A., A.R.C.M.

"HOW things have changed!" was the remark made by one who had returned to his home town after an absence of forty years.

Many landmarks had disappeared. New areas had been built. Modern buildings had replaced the old. However, the man remarked that the old Church remained the same, with its usual worship and witness.

This is not the case in every Church of the land. The services to which our parents and grandparents were accustomed have been greatly changed. Some of the changes have been made for the sake of brevity whilst not altering the character of the services. Others have been so drastic as to render the services unintelligible to those accustomed to the use of the Book of Common Prayer. The customary service of Morning Prayer, often attended by whole families, or at least by a large part of the family, and which is specially suited to the needs of family worship, has disappeared for what is termed a "Sung Eucharist," or a "High Mass." These services are in line with neither New Testament examples, Early Church tradition, nor the teaching of the Church of England. They are not suited to the English character, which is another consideration. Such services have often been thrust upon unwilling congregations by self-willed

incumbents who have neither studied the generality of their people, nor their wishes in the matter. That congregations resent these changes is clear from the arguments put forward by these clergy in support of the alterations. Most of these arguments will not bear investigation in the light of the New Testament, Early Church History, and the teaching of the Church of England in her Articles and Book of Common Prayer, for these standards do not accept a service in which worshippers will not be communicants, as the Sung Eucharist or the High Mass clearly presume.

“ WHAT SAITH THE SCRIPTURE ? ”

It is clear that all who were present at the Institution of the Lord's Supper received the bread and wine at the Lord's hands. “ Take, eat ; this is My body ” ; “ Drink ye all of it.” The order of the Greek is remarkable, which Dr. Moffatt emphasises in his translation. “ Take and eat this, it means My body ” ; “ Drink of it, all of you : this means My blood.” Reception of the elements was distinctly Christ's intention for His followers. It His worth noting how St. Mark stresses this, for of the Cup he adds, “ and they all drank of it.” Moreover, if we are to understand Christ's words recorded in St. John vi. as anticipatory of the Holy Communion, reception is absolutely essential to the rite : “ Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have not life in yourselves.” St. Paul, one of our primary witnesses to the Institution of the Lord's Supper, whose authority cannot be questioned, for he claims that his knowledge was due to a direct communication from the Lord (I Cor. xi. 23). adds to Christ's command to eat and drink : “ This do in remembrance of Me ” ; “ This do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me.” The Apostle stresses the essential connection between the commemoration and the Communion, a connection broken by non-communication at a Sung Eucharist or a High Mass. “ As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till He come.” Whilst the last quotation is apparently a commentary on the Institution, it is possible that it forms part of Christ's own words at the Institution. That Christ clearly intended reception of the Elements is further emphasised by St. Paul. “ The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a *communion* of the blood of Christ ? The bread which we break, is it not a *communion* of the body of Christ ? Seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body ; *for we all partake of the one bread.*” The necessity of reception is stressed by St. Paul's comparison between the Lord's Table and the heathen altar : “ Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils : ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils.” The Apostle is even more emphatic when he condemns the abuses of the Lord's Supper prevalent in Corinth. He contrasts what was actually happening in their assemblies with what ought to happen. Their conduct was such as compelled him to say : “ This makes it impossible for you to eat the Lord's Supper when you hold your gatherings ” (Moffatt). As Professor Lias has said : “ It is not merely that the conduct of the Corinthian Christian was inconsistent with taking part in the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, but that it was in no sense a supper of Christ's institution of which they partook.” The plain

words of Scripture are definitely against non-communicating attendance at the Holy Communion. To join in the commemoration—to proclaim the Lord's Death—involves reception of the elements with faith. To be present without communicating is plainly beside the purpose of the Sacrament ; it fulfils no duty ; it has no promise of a blessing.

THE PRACTICE OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

It appears that the Early Church was careful to safeguard the Holy Communion from the eyes of the outside world. Caution made this essential during days of persecution. Yet, even so, the custom of meeting for solemn, regular, and stated administrations of the Holy Communion was a feature of the Church's life. In this, the taking of one loaf, breaking it, and distributing it remained the true catholic ritual. Ignatius emphasises this participation by all : " Ye all individually come together in common, in one faith and in one Jesus Christ, breaking one bread which is the medium of immortality, one antidote that we should not die but live for ever in Jesus Christ " (ad Ephes.). The Didache has a passage of much the same import : " As this bread that is broken was scattered upon the mountains, and gathered together, and became one, so let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy Kingdom : for Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever. And let none eat nor drink of your eucharist, but they that are baptised into the name of the Lord ; for as touching this the Lord hath said : Give not that which is holy to dogs " (chap. ix). Similar testimony comes from Justin Martyr : " When we have concluded our prayer, bread is brought and wine and water ; and the president in like manner offers up prayers and thanksgiving with all his strength ; and the people give their assent by saying Amen, and there is a distribution, and a partaking by every one, of the Eucharistic elements ; and to those who are not present they are sent by the hands of the deacons." The Clementine Liturgy is equally clear in its rubric : " Let the bishop communicate, then the presbyters, and the deacons, and subdeacons, and the readers, and the singers, and the ascetics, and of the women and deaconesses, and the virgins, and the widows, afterwards the children, and then all the people in order, with reverence and piety, without disturbance." It is clear that those of the Early Church came to the Eucharist as participants by receiving the elements.

In time, however, certain people did remain without communicating ; yet this was not because of unwillingness, but of inability to communicate. These were the penitents under discipline. Of these, there were four orders, and each order had a different place assigned to it in the Church. The furthest advanced of the penitents were the *Consistentes* (those who stood together), and alone of the penitents, this order was allowed to remain after the rest had been dismissed prior to the Communion proper ; but they were not permitted to partake of the elements with the congregation. Non-communicating members of the Church were in the class of penitents ; so non-communicating attendance was evidently not counted as a privilege, but as a penance, which Cardinal Bona characterised as " a stigma of shame and ban of ex-communication." St. Chrysostom reflects the

same view : " Thou hearest the herald (i.e. the deacon) standing and saying, ' As many as are in penitence, all depart.' As many as do not partake are in penitence. If thou art one of those that are in penitence, thou oughtest not to partake ; for he that partakes not is one of those who are in penitence. Why then does he say, ' Depart ye that are not qualified to pray,' whilst thou hast the effrontery to stand still? But no! Thou art not of that number. Thou art of the number of those who are qualified to partake and yet art indifferent about it, and regardest the matter as nothing" (quoted from "The Communion of the Laity," Scudamore, pp. 45-6).

The rule of the Early Church which demanded participation in the Holy Communion by reception of the elements, a rule which clearly gave no place to non-communicating attendance, is perhaps best expressed by the ninth canon of the Ante-Nicene Code : " All the faithful who come in and hear the Scriptures, but do not remain at the prayer, and the holy reception, must be suspended, as bringing disorder to the Church." So far from being considered as a privilege, a virtue, or worthy of commendation, non-communicating was regarded as worthy of exclusion from the fellowship of the Church—Ex-communication.

THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Prior to the Reformation, the Western Church had accepted the principle of non-communicating attendance, known as "Hearing Mass." The outstanding work of our English Reformers was the abolition of the Mass and the restoration of the Communion. In this, they reverted to the New Testament standard. Non-communicating attendance at the Holy Communion was not to be permitted, but it is not surprising that without the threat of penalties, the change could not be effected at once. A rubric of the first Prayer Book of 1549 A.D. says : " So many as shall be partakers of the Holy Communion shall tarry still in the quire, or in some convenient place nigh the quire, the men on the one side and the women on the other. All other (that mind not to receive the said Holy Communion) shall depart out of the quire, except the ministers and clerks." This injunction to non-communicants, telling them to leave, is in keeping with early Liturgies which dismissed catechumens and penitents prior to the Communion proper, for they were not able to receive the elements. Mgr. Duchesne informs us that " The Constantinopolitan ritual . . . has preserved to our own day the ceremony of the dismissal of the catechumens." The obvious break in our service after the prayer for " the whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth," would seem to correspond with the dismissal of non-communicants in other Liturgies. This division between the Ante-Communion and the actual Communion is no haphazard thing, for the collects at the close of the service are to be used to round off the Ante-Communion " when there is no Communion." From these directions, non-communicants may evidently be present at the Ante-Communion, but are expected to have departed from the Church before the actual Communion. This conclusion is supported by the rubrics before the third Exhortation and the Invitation. The first of these speaks of " the Communicants being conveniently placed for the receiving of the holy

Sacrament;" and the second speaks of "them that come to receive the holy Communion." It is clear that this part of the Service has no message for non-communicants, and cannot imply, as is sometimes argued, that there may be some persons present who do not propose to receive. Moreover, it should be noted that the prayer of thanksgiving in the 1549, the 1552, and our present Prayer Books presume that all present shall have received the elements. "Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank Thee that Thou hast vouchsafed to feed us in these holy Mysteries . . . and hast assured us (duly receiving the same) of thy favour and goodness towards us." "Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank Thee, for that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, which have duly received these holy mysteries." "Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank Thee, for that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries." Furthermore, all of these Prayer Books we have mentioned, specify that there shall be no communion except there be communicants to partake with the Priest.

It is well known that the Prayer Book of 1549 was wilfully misrepresented by some of the clergy; and in such measure as it did not effect the intended changes, it was a failure. To make sure that only participants were present at the Holy Communion, the 1552 book had these most significant passages in the first Exhortation: "We be come together at this time, dearly beloved brethren, to feed at the Lord's Supper, unto the which in God's behalf I bid you all that are here present, and beseech you for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, that ye will not refuse to come thereto, being so lovingly called and bidden of God Himself"; "And whereas ye offend God so sore in refusing this holy Banquet, I admonish, exhort, and beseech you, that unto this unkindness ye will not add any more. Which thing ye shall do, if ye stand by as gazers and lookers on them that do communicate, and be not partakers of the same yourselves." "It is said unto all: Take ye and eat. Take and drink ye all of this: do this in remembrance of Me. With what face then, or with what countenance shall ye hear these words? What will this be else but a neglecting, a despising, and mocking of the Testament of Christ? Wherefore, rather than you should so do, depart you hence and give place to them that be godly disposed." The non-communicants having departed, the service proceeded with the Invitation addressed "to them that come to receive the Holy Communion." The strong terms of this exhortation were necessary in 1552, because the habit of non-communicating attendance had not been entirely overcome; but by the time of the publication of our present book, the warning was not necessary. One of the results of the suppression of the Prayer Book under Cromwell was that by the time of the Restoration it was imagined by some that absence from the Lord's Table was an alternative which people were free to choose." It was natural that the stern words of 1552 should be omitted in 1662, because they were no longer necessary. That the Communion, and the Post-Communion, of our present service is for communicants only is clear from the actual prayers and the rubrics. They all bear the sense of the rubric before the third Exhortation: "At the time of the celebration of the Communion, the Communicants being conveniently placed for the receiving of the holy Sacrament, the

Priest shall say this exhortation." Our contention is supported by The Second Book of Homilies, declared as authoritative in Article xxxv, for the Homily "Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ" asserts: "Every one of us must be guests and not gazers, eaters and not lookers. . . Of necessity, we must be ourselves partakers of this table, and not beholders of others." With these facts before us we cannot reasonably understand the meaning of the rubrics and prayers of the Communion office as contemplating the presence of any other than Communicants for the Communion and the Post-Communion.

It is sometimes argued that non-communicants are tolerated at the Coronation Service and at Ordinations, and so non-communicants may be present at other administrations of the Lord's Supper. The only reply that so specious an argument can deserve is that those whom these services concern are definitely communicants at the service, namely the Sovereign and his Consort, and the Ordinands.

A more subtle argument for non-communicating attendance is that, because the Communion Service is the only place in the Prayer Book which orders a sermon (excepting the Marriage Service), the direction to Godparents in the Baptismal office that they must call upon the children "to hear Sermons" must involve the presence of children at the Eucharist as non-communicants. To show how groundless is such a plea, the facts must be stated. Strictly, the Prayer Book seems to intend that the Holy Communion should come after Morning Prayer; for the Church of England has no prescribed rule of time for the celebration of that Sacrament. The order which still obtains in many parts is Morning Prayer, Litany, Holy Communion. This order finds corroboration in the prescribed teaching of the Church in Passion Week, when the story of the Passion is given from the four Evangelists, in the Second Morning Lessons and the Gospels. The Gospel portions follow on that chosen for the Lesson, not vice versa. This shows that the Church's teaching throughout the year is not confined to the Epistle and Gospel, but to the whole of the Scriptures to be read—Lessons, Epistle, and Gospel. "The Sermon or Homily" follows the prayer for the Church militant. One or these Homilies might well be that "Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ," which, as we have seen, roundly condemns non-communicating attendance. Moreover, the natural break in our Communion Service follows that part in which the sermon or homily is ordered. The Ante-Communion is quite separate from the rest of the service; a fact recognised by those who use the Ante-Communion only, instead of the whole service, on Good Friday, and acknowledged by the rubrics which give directions for procedure "if there be no Communion," as well as what is to be done "when there is a Communion," and "the time of the celebration." When the direction to Godparents was inserted in the Prayer Book there was also a clause in the Exhortation to the Negligent condemning non-communicating attendance, and also a demand for the withdrawal of those who did not intend to communicate. We have seen that when the clause regarding non-communicants was omitted, the abuse no longer existed; so children could hear the sermon and withdraw from the Church together with non-communicants at the close of the

Ante-Communion, as they were then expected, and still are expected to do.

That the Church of England values and safeguards her Communion Office, none can question ; but she has fenced the Lord's Table from abuse and from the prying eyes of the curious and the negligent. The encouragement of, or the insistence upon the presence of non-communicants at a Sung Eucharist or a High Mass, breaks down the safeguards which the Church of England has placed around her ministrations of the Sacrament of our Redemption, and ignores what is her expressed opinion upon non-communicating attendance. That she expects participating recipients, not spectators, at her Communion, is clear from the terms of the Exhortation to be read when people are negligent to come, and from the Exhortation "to them that come to receive the Holy Communion."

Book Reviews

A PREFACE TO PARADISE LOST.

By C. S. Lewis. Pp. viii. and 139. Humphrey Milford. Oxford University Press. 7/6.

A new book on Milton's masterpiece by such a well-known writer will be welcomed by a large circle of readers. No doubt the circle would have been far larger a generation or so ago when the great poem was probably far more widely read than it is to-day. But in some ways this is not altogether surprising. To read Milton, or for that matter Chaucer, Shakespeare or any of our greatest authors, requires time, not to mention patience and concentration. And with so many novel attractions, literary or otherwise, many to-day are not prepared to make the necessary effort. Yet in spite of this there will be a ready welcome for the volume if only because of the name of the author. Mr. C. S. Lewis by his religious writings alone—which we greatly hope will increase as time goes on—has won a name for himself and attracts the attention of numbers of people who do not normally read religious or theological literature. So we predict a great demand for C. S. Lewis on Milton!

There are several standpoints from which it is possible to study a book like this according to the predilections of the particular reader. We are not concerned here primarily with what Mr. Lewis has to say on point of literary form, though this is not in any way to belittle his achievement in this direction. Much of the book naturally is taken up with a study of Milton's great work from the point of view of epic poetry and to a discussion of the poem as a supreme example of what epic poetry is intended to be.

But in the present case we feel that most of the readers of this Magazine will be far more interested in that part of the book which treats of the contents or subject matter of the poem. And here Mr. Lewis writes emphatically as a Christian and has no hesitation in saying so. Commenting on the statement of a certain professor that it is necessary to clear away certain "theological rubbish" before one can appreciate the "lasting originality in Milton's thought" Mr. Lewis writes: "In order to take no unfair advantage I should warn the reader that I myself am a Christian and that some (by no means all) of the things which the Atheist reader must 'try to feel as if he believed' I actually, in cold prose, do believe. But for the student of Milton my Christianity is an advantage. What would you not give to have a real live Epicurian at your elbow while reading Lucretius?" Here at least the Author is perfectly frank.

We can indeed see the advantage of this standpoint as we follow the writer's treatment of such themes as "Milton and St. Augustine," "The theology of Paradise Lost," "Satan's Followers" and "Adam and Eve"—to quote some of the chapter headings of the last half of the volume. It is very tempting to examine the contents of some of these chapters in some detail but it would take too long. The book is full of good things which we can only indicate by

making in conclusion one or two quotations. In speaking of the Fall, Mr. Lewis writes: "Since the Fall consisted in man's Disobedience to his superior, it was punished by man's loss of authority over his inferiors . . . Man has called for anarchy: God lets him have it." . . . The Fall is simply and solely Disobedience—doing what you have been told not to do: and it results from Pride—from being too big for your boots, forgetting your place, thinking that you are God." On the very next page Mr. Lewis has much more to say on the manner in which some writers have missed "the main thing that Milton was writing about" on the grounds that it is (to quote our author) a "rather vague explanation" On which Mr. Lewis rightly comments: "How are we to account for the fact that the great modern scholars have missed what is so dazzlingly simple?" I think we must suppose that the real nature of the Fall and the real moral of the poem invokes an idea so uninteresting or so intensely disagreeable to them that they have been under a sort of psychological necessity of passing it over and hushing it up." And so we could go on quoting. But there is one passage which must be retold. In so far as the poem "is Augustinian and Hierarchical it is also Catholic in the sense of basing its poetry on conceptions that have been held 'always and everywhere and by all.' This Catholic quality is so predominant that it is the first impression any unbiased reader would receive. Heretical elements exist in it, but are only discoverable by search: any criticism which forces them into the foreground is mistaken, and ignores the fact that this poem was accepted as orthodox by many generations of acute readers well grounded in theology."

This is a vindication with which many will agree. And it is a good example of the manner in which the Author deals with the Poem as well as many of its modern critics. Many admirers of the Poet will be exceedingly grateful for this book and it deserves the widest circulation.

THE HIGH CHURCH TRADITION. A STUDY IN THE LITURGICAL THOUGHT OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

By G. W. O. Addleshaw, M.A., B.D., *Faber and Faber.* 7/6.

"The public prayer of the people of God," to use Hooker's phrase, is of such crucial importance to all Evangelicals at this creative period in Church history that we hope this admirable 7/6 introduction to 17th century liturgical thought will find its way into the libraries of those to whom the title might not at first appeal. For our own part we have found this "exposition of the liturgical ideals and principles of High Churchmanship between the age of Andrewes and the Oxford Movement" absorbingly interesting as an historical study even if we cannot share the author's all too complacent belief that the liturgical thought of the traditional High Churchmanship points the way to that new integration of Christian worship and everyday life for which this tempestuous age cries aloud.

After a detailed discussion of "The Liturgy of the Seventeenth Century," the author proceeds to an elucidation of the principles of "Edification" and "Order" and of "Uniformity, and Changes in the Liturgy." Final chapters on the meaning given by the 17th century liturgists to the "Church" ("Liturgy and Community") and an all too brief and inconclusive chapter on "Integration" conclude the book. We have already been prepared for the main contention, "Worship demands a point of integration, where Calvary is brought back as an ever-present reality, so that man can plead it in reparation for his own sins and the sins of mankind. . . . This point of integration, the High Churchmen said, was to be found in the Eucharistic sacrifice; it is the centre to which the whole liturgy converges, integrating dogma and life in one whole and giving life its true meaning."

It is already evident that, though we commend this book, we cannot accept the author's main contention. It is also difficult to know what to make of such statements as "It comes as a great shock to the modern Christian brought up in the Protestant tradition, to find that what he does in church is vitally related to his working life." and "In the words of Consecration Calvary is brought back, but it is a Calvary whose glory is attested by the Resurrection and Ascension: these are brought back too in the words of consecration" (Italics ours). Is the Protestantism of a Calvin or a Dale so productive of ecclesiastical "yes-men"? Is it not an accepted and agreed principle of Eucharistic theology that the consecration is effected by the whole Eucharistic prayer and not by "the words

of consecration"? Might there not be a true consecration without the use of these particular words?

If the modern Evangelical can learn from a study of the 17th century liturgists that theology is not the pathetic irrelevance we sometimes suppose, that the Parish is pre-eminently the school for creative theology, that we must make such an approach to the "liturgy" that it continues to relate the simplicity of Redeeming Love to the baffling complexities, not of the 17th century but of the 20th and 21st centuries, then a careful and critical perusal of this fine book will set him on his way. The paramount need of Evangelicalism to-day is to recover the *depth* of her heritage, and from the creative contact that comes from parochial contact with the "sordid particulars" of every day life so to re-interpret the liturgy that with a new depth of meaning and with a heightened sense of their relevance we can re-echo the words of Charles Simeon "The finest sight short of heaven would be a whole congregation using the prayers of the liturgy in the true spirit of them." A.B.L.

THE MYSTERY OF FAITH. BOOK I. THE SACRIFICE OF OUR LORD.

By Maurice De La Taille, S. J. Sheed and Ward, 1941. 10/6.

There is no room for any doubt that the Evangelical school have not begun to make that vital contribution to Eucharistic theology which we have every reason to hope and expect. This persistent and long sustained going by default of Evangelical theological witness is a menace to the boasted "via media" of the Church of England and cannot be lightly regarded. Few have ever stopped to ask why these things should be so and many complacent answers can be given. Is it an over-simplification to say that its root is that for the Evangelical devotion waits upon doctrine, while for the opposite school of thought doctrine waits upon devotion? The *cultus* invariably has the last word in doctrine. To see what this means in practice we cannot do better than read this first instalment of the English translation of the great work of the late Père de la Taille "Mysterium Fidei." Published twenty years ago this work has had in diverse ways a great influence upon English Eucharistic theology and its teaching has percolated to some of our Parish Churches. The volume before us is the first volume of the English translation and we look forward to receive the two other volumes to be published in due course—"The Sacrifice of the Mass" and "The Eucharist as Sacrament."

It is impossible to peruse a book of this quality without unstinted admiration not only of the author's erudition but of the zeal and energy he brought to his task in a busy life. We wish we could think of a similar work by an Evangelical theologian—if the race has not died out!—which in any way approaches its close knit and informed theological competence. In a specialist theological work of this kind, technicalities are the rule, but the clarity of the presentation makes it not impossible for the average attentive reader to follow and the effort is rewarding. Père de la Taille's special contribution to Eucharistic doctrine is based upon his major premise that in all true sacrifice there is a distinction between "immolation and "oblation." Our Lord suffered "immolation" at the hands of sinful men, yet He Himself pleads eternally His sacrifice. "In the Supper Christ offered His own death: that is, while He appeared to hold the bread and wine in His Hands, He really sacrificed the Body of His torment and the Blood of His Passion." In the Mass there can be no mere repetition of the immolation," though the offering of the Death and Resurrection are continued. "The Sacrifice of Christ was made glorious by the Resurrection, heavenly by the Ascension,; by the immortality of His eternal life it was made perpetual." While the consecration represents the immolation of Calvary, the sacrifice of the Mass is in the oblation which the Church makes of Christ at the altar. The definition of the Council of Trent prepares the way in which this sacrifice is not only accepted by God but participated in by the faithful. "We are now justified in arguing from the Mass back to the Supper. For if Christ is offered in the Mass as already immolated on the Cross, He must have been offered in the Supper as to be immolated on the Cross. If we offer the Death of Christ as having happened, He must have offered His death as impending (our contention). We cannot teach the one in the Mass without concluding to the other in the Supper. Hence unless you follow this teaching on the Supper, you can scarcely be in accord with Trent on the Mass."

This necessarily sketchy account of a great argument does scant justice to the

theological brilliance of the author and the wealth of authorities quoted. None the less the firm impression left upon the critical reader is of the *sophistic* character of the whole reasoning. For ourselves we cannot accept the distinction between "oblation" and "immolation" in the way contended nor can we agree that the argument from the Old Testament will bear the weight placed upon it. As to the other basic assertion that the sacrifice of the Lord needed the ritual oblation of the Last Supper, the witness of St. John's Gospel and the Epistle to the Hebrews seems to us quite final.

The great service of a writer like the late Père de la Taille is that he gives some intellectual precision to the theory of the Eucharistic sacrifice. In this respect Roman Catholic theologians are almost invariably more helpful than the nebulosity of some "advanced" Anglicans. The undefined teaching of some "advanced" Anglicans in the Church of England too often has the strange practical outcome of leading to virtual positions no competent Roman Catholic theologian would care to defend! Père de la Taille has been firmly criticised in his own Church, though this will be news to some Anglicans who follow his teaching *au pied de la lettre*. The perusal of this instalment of a fine work leaves us with the unanswered question with which we began. When are Evangelicals in the Church of England going to give up their ease in Zion and attempt to state their own positive Eucharistic theology with some of the verve and theological erudition and competence of which the late Père de la Taille has set such a fine example?

A.B.L.

PSYCHOLOGY AND RELIGIOUS TRUTH.

By Thomas Hywel Hughes, D.Litt., D.D. (George Allen and Unwin 7/6).

The New Psychology is not looked upon very favourably by a number of Christian people for the simple reason that the adverse statements of non-Christian psychologists with regard to its bearing upon the Christian faith have been too readily accepted. Whether Christians like it or not, the findings of this important science must be accepted where true, and their application to the faith must be explored. It may be that old beliefs will require some modification, but this will not matter over-much if greater light and understanding result. On the whole, however, psychology tends to confirm the substantial truth of the main doctrines of our religion. Some investigators are not equipped to deal satisfactorily with the psychology of religion, neither are their methods free from objection. The American school, for example, has made much use of questionnaires. People have been asked a series of questions with reference, say, to their conversion experiences. The different answers have been tabulated and deductions drawn. This method is liable to serious error. Furthermore, the investigators themselves have not had any religious experience. Hence, it is very necessary that Christian students, well equipped with a knowledge of recent psychology should turn their attention to theological problems. These are the only men who can speak with real authority, and it is to be noted that when they speak, the statements are characterised by humility and reverence.

But someone may ask why psychology should concern itself with religion at all. A partial reply is because psychology deals with experience and religious experience must come within its survey. A more detailed answer and justification is contained in a book entitled, "Psychology and Religious Truth," written by Dr. T. Hywel Hughes. He reminds us that "psychology has joined forces with philosophy in probing into the deep places of personality and seeking to understand the processes and laws of spiritual life. This is, in reality, one of the most interesting and important movements of the realm of modern thought, for the fuller understanding of the energies and of the meaning of personality must have repercussions on every other aspect of human nature and thought, as well as on our conception of God and His operations in the world. This is the point at which psychology begins to influence theology—by compelling us "to view these problems from the standpoint of personality and personal relationships." p.9f. This is precisely what the author proceeds to do with reference to certain fundamental Christian doctrines, e.g., he shows us what light psychology has to throw upon the nature and being of God, religious life and truth, the Trinity, Jesus Christ and the doctrines of sin, atonement and the future life.

Many non-Christian psychologists have asserted that religion originates in one or other of the instincts, e.g., the self-preservation, sex or herd. Dr. Hughes

shows that psychology itself proves otherwise. Similarly, he brings to light the shortcomings of such philosophers as Kant who assert that religion takes its rise in the will, or in the moral consciousness. The religious impulse is an impulse of life itself. It is in our very make-up. It derives from the whole nature of man and not from its lower aspects in the subconscious, nor yet alone from its higher side in the will and moral sentiments. It flows from his whole personality. For this reason it is authoritative over our entire nature having claims which can only be set aside at our soul's peril. The author's argument is cogent and concise, and he concludes that "it ought not to be difficult for us as Christian believers to accept the view that there is a spiritual need and impulse wrapped up within the will to live . . . especially when this has reached the self-conscious level; for if we believe life to be a gift of God and that God is the source of all life, as coming from Him who is Spirit, there must inevitably be some spiritual element or intuition, call it what we will, in the very fact of life itself. We can well believe that the merely biological concept of life is inadequate, at any rate on the self-conscious level. In its very constitution it means more than bare existence; it points on, or reaches out to more life and fuller-life that is more abundant." p. 28.

Equally valuable is Dr. Hughes' discussion of the doctrine of sin and atonement treated from the psychological side. He draws parallels between the "pleasure principle" and the "death principle" of Freudian psychology and the New Testament teaching on sin, *e.g.*, "When lust (the pleasure principle) hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin when it is finished bringeth forth death." James 1. 15. Modern psychology has taught us to differentiate between sin and moral disease. Sin is always of the will, but moral disease brings about evil acts which are done despite the will. It has also provided a scientific basis for the doctrine of the fall. "The Biblical doctrine of the fall has been assailed from many sides in recent days. One of the most effective criticisms has come from the evolutionary view of sin. This view maintains that what is spoken of as a 'fall' is in reality a rise—a step upward in the growth of moral life and the dawning of moral sense in the soul. There is great truth in this idea, but it is not all the truth. If, as we have suggested, it is possible to sin without being conscious of it as sin, then something has preceded and always does precede the step upward when the moral sense is stirred to wakefulness. Evils that may fetter the soul as habits may have begun their baneful influence, before the sense of their evil nature is born. Now sin is always a fall, evil is always a step downward whether it is known as evil or not. When it is recognised as evil, that is assuredly a step upward, but this has been preceded by a 'fall'. So the fall in Genesis is the disobedience of the divine command, the knowledge of good and evil comes afterwards and may be regarded as in a sense a rise. But the effect of the disobedience remains as is clear from the fact that, from henceforth, the tree of life is guarded and prohibited." pp. 126f.

The psychological theories of the subconscious, conscious and superconscious levels of the personality are used to support the doctrine of the future life. Thus psychology suggests that the mind never really loses anything. Every experience is stored up within the personal content and many of these can be recovered under suitable circumstances. Again, many men by hard application have developed talents which are most useful. Saints have built up noble characters. It does not make sense that these valuable abilities and traits should be lost at death. Since, then, all experience is stored up in the personality, it is more than probable that this store is there for future use after death. Psychology gives a basis for believing it, whilst the Christian revelation asserts it to be so in fact.

Enough has been said to prove that Dr. Hughes has made another valuable contribution to the psychology of religion and his book should be widely read and digested. All will agree with an aside of his to preachers. "One word of warning to students of theology. Don't preach psychology. Preach the gospel. Let psychology be the handmaid of the gospel and not the gospel the slave of psychology, for psychology has no saving power. Such power is in the grace of God, but psychology may help you to understand how His grace saves." p. 142.

G. S. DAWSON

THE CONFESSION OF AN OCTOGENARIAN

By L. P. JACKS. *George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.* 265pp. 15/-).

The Octogenarian Confessor whose life story is unfolded in these stimulating pages is no ordinary man. His independence of thought and character shew

BOOK REVIEWS

him to be one who would fit into no mould nor pass muster as a hundred per cent. member of any group.

An acute and original mind, an adventurous spirit, wide interests, and absolute sincerity of purpose mark this fine career at every stage.

It would do everybody good to read this book. If only there were space to quote, a notice three times the length of this could be filled with good things apart from any comment, for here we have character sketches, condensed impressions, shrewd judgments, enlivening anecdotes and abundant humour.

Some readers will be attracted by the descriptions of the straitened years of early life, others will find special interest in the author's ministerial work in important Unitarian Churches in Liverpool and Birmingham. Many will like to read of the years at Oxford when at Manchester College this pioneer tried out some of his theories with, as he candidly admits, only partial success. The Unitarian powers that be expressed complete confidence in him, and at Manchester College and in the Editorial chair of the Hibbert Journal he found a free field.

The story is adorned by descriptions of life in the country where a lively interest in farming seems to have filled up whatever available time this industrious man could find on his hands. Various tours in America and contacts with many distinguished people round off these reminiscences. The story of the controversy in Liverpool over the admission of Unitarians to the pulpit of the Cathedral is told with dignified understanding. The references to the author's mother, and to his wife (a daughter of Stafford Brooke) are a fine tribute to their influence. Their portraits appear in the book, as does that of Prof. Jacks himself, the latter revealing a truly noble countenance, strong, shrewd, open, with humour lurking close under the surface. In conclusion, a brief comment offered with great respect. We are more than sorry that Prof. Jacks should seek to complete the work of the Reformation by finding the Messiah in the Common Man. This side-tracks the Reformation and buries it in the sand. We see nothing to justify this optimism, and it is our conviction that anything which denies to the Lord Jesus Christ His Supremacy and Sovereign rights is bound to lead to disappointment and disaster.

SCIENCE AND ETHICS

By C. H. Waddington, Sc.D.: George Allen and Unwin, 7/6.

This book is in the form of a discussion between Dr. Waddington who is Lecturer in Zoology in Cambridge University and eighteen eminent scientists and divines. Dr. Waddington writes a closely reasoned essay which was first printed in *Nature*. A number of authorities were then invited to comment upon it. Others joined in and the discussion became too voluminous for the paper. Hence this volume. Dr. Waddington discusses the relations between Science and Ethics. The science of human conduct. What is the intellectual basis for ethics? Dr. Waddington believes that there are four trains of thought which help to answer the question. They are (1) the psycho-analytical; (2) the anthropological; (3) the Marxist and (4) the teaching of the Logical Positionists. These systems have seemed to combine to rob ethical statements of any claims to intellectual validity. But the author thinks that this seeming opposition which appears to leave no basis for our ethical beliefs for reasons which he gives, can be understood differently. These four trains of thought make it possible to envisage man's morality as one of the ways in which he becomes adapted to his environment, and is thus able to take part in evolutionary progress. Dr. Barnes, Bishop of Birmingham, the only Bishop who can write F.R.S. after his name, finds himself in fundamental agreement with Dr. Waddington but does not think he is quite fair in his strictures of T. H. Huxley. The Dean of St. Paul's confesses that he is "not quite clear about the main theme" and adds: "No doubt science can throw light on the way in which minds come to apprehend values but, as it seems to me, it cannot determine whether they are truly values or only appear to be such, nor can it determine the scale of values, if any." He considers the idea of the super-ego (about which, Dr. Waddington, following Melanie Klein, is so enthusiastic) as "a piece of useful mythology" while further on Professor C. E. M. Joad enters "a disclaimer against his uncritical taking over lock, stock and barrel of the pretentious jargon with which psycho-analysts disguise the commonplaceness of their observations upon the obvious." Well done, the Brains Trust! Professor Ritchie fails to see the alleged connexion between science and ethics. Professor Dingle considers that Dr. Waddington's scientific ethical principle provides one more example of the widespread abandonment of

science in the name of science. Dr. Needham argues ably that the ethical principles formulated by Christ and the great ethical teachers are those which have in the past few thousand years tended towards the future evolution of mankind, and that they will continue to do so in the foreseeable future. With this Dr. Waddington agrees and adds that "the Christian ethic, by for the first time combining a deep respect for the individual with a low regard for relations of dominance and submission, released an enormous store of initiative for the arts of peace." From this review it will be seen that this is a book which demands from its readers not only a knowledge of ethics and also of, at least, some branch of science but close application and study. It is a gain to find that the opinion is growing amongst scientists that the course of this world is "good." It seems clear also that the old dictum "Nature is red in tooth and claw" must go.

A. W. PARSONS.

ALFRED BUXTON.

(Lutterworth Press 5/-)

Many Christians in all parts of the world will be grateful to Mr. Norman Grubb for this delightful pen-picture of one whose winsomeness and Caleb-like qualities endeared him to all who had the pleasure of knowing him. It is grand to have this permanent record of the life of our beloved brother to refresh our memories of him from time to time and in so doing draw fresh inspiration from his Christlike personality. It may be also that this simple account of one who wholly followed the Lord will inspire others who had not the privilege of knowing him to an equal surrender. In this book the author has given us a faithful picture of Alfred Buxton, based as it is upon many years of close and intimate friendship.

It was the reviewer's privilege to have almost daily fellowship with Alfred for the last 18 months of his life and he can therefore endorse the author's verdict as to the qualities which the book reveals.

Sincerity, forthrightness, courage, loyalty and affection were the outstanding characteristics of this Christian gentleman—and all these in turn are brought out in the book—perhaps the greatest courage of all was shown in the way he faced his thorn in the flesh—he was a living proof of the truth of 2 Cor. 12. 9.

The photographs on the jacket and inside the book enrich the value of the book as a speaking likeness of our pioneer brother.

T.A.

"THE POOR HAVE THE GOSPEL PREACHED TO THEM." Matt. 11. 3.

SALMON LANE MISSION

(Conder Street), Limehouse, London, E.14.

now in its 52nd YEAR'S "Christlike," Voluntary and Accredited Work in "Darkest East London" IS

A "REAL LIVE" GOSPEL MISSION

ministering for the Salvation and Material Blessing of all Creeds and to the many and constant needs of the "Bombed" and distressed in the "devastated" East End, and

A HAVEN OF HOPE, SUCCOUR AND UPLIFT
to a host of very poor and needy souls.

Will YOU very kindly assist this Evangelical and Beneficent Work for the extension of GOD'S KINGDOM in this benighted area, and also earn OUR LORD'S glorious Commendation and Benediction.

"FREELY YE HAVE RECEIVED, FREELY GIVE."

No Salaries or Administration Expenses!

E. PERCY DENNIS (Hon. Supt. Minister),
57, Ethelbert Gardens, Ilford, Essex.