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ABSTRACT OF THESIS

THE THEOLOGICAL CONTRIBUTION OF FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE TOWARD
THE SEARCH FOR A KERYGMATIC CHRISTOLOGY IN THE CONTEMPORARY
CULTURE

T. KERR SPIES.

The thesis maintains that a seminal contribution of F. D. Maurice to the
preaching of the Word is to be found in his Christology. Starting from the
assumption — which he has previously established through biblical exegesis and
Patristic examination — that it is more true to say that mankind is in Christ
than that mankind is in Adam — he develops the idea of a Christologised world.
The essence of this idea is that there is a Christological ontology rooted in
the reconciled and dominical relationship of mankind to God through Jesus
Christ. Flowing from this is the notion of a Kingdom established and
realised in Christ and expressed in the life of the Church. The Johannine
doctrine of the Logos is seen as part of the Christological light ... "that
lighteth everyman that cometh into the world" ... so that conscience and
natural law are regarded as a divine educative process in the hearts of men.
And it is this Logos-light in human nature that sets man in relation to the
claim of the Gospel in such a way that he can perceive its truth and make a
response.

Around this central Christological perception there are gathered many
other insights that Maurice develops. The world that is Christologised is
also sacramentalised and being is hallowed. From this Maurice develops his
idea about the potential unity of mankind to be expressed in a just social and
economic community. God's law is that of co-operation rather than that of
competition and the Trinitarian community of Father, Son and Holy Spirit is the
model for the human community. Alongside this is the Maurician insistence
on the nature of the life eternal and the insistence that it was not a post-
-mortem bonus for the righteous but rather a quality of life here and hereafter
which is open to all in Christ and to the awareness of which we come when we
recognise Christian truth and love.

This Maurician contribution is set in the context of a sketch of
Maurice's own theological quest with an opening biographical chapter which seeks
to trace this quest. Beginning from Unitarian origins he comes latterly to
Ordination in the Church of England after reading Classics and Divinity at
Cambridge and Oxford. His social awareness, which is an important part of
his theological formation, is broadened by a country curacy and an urbanc
chaplaincy. And the final tension that forged his thinking is found in his
theological reflection and an awareness through the group of Christian Socialists
whom he gathered around him of the empirical realities of urban life.

In the belief that the Maurician insights can only be incorporated
relevantly against an understanding of the problems of contemporary proclamation
a chapter is therefore devoted to an exposition of the theological, exegetical and
historical issues that bear upon the task of preaching. An attempt is
made to ask some bridging questions as between Maurice's theological culture
and that of our own day. The question at issue is whether, given the
contemporary theological challenge, the Maurician legacy provides a possible
useful model for Christological preaching and a final chapter tries to
sustain this thesis in terms of the idea of a Christologised world.
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1. A Biographical Sketch Showing the Theological Development

Maurice's home was a place of radicalism both in religion and in politics. According to the manner of the time his father, Michael Maurice united in himself the vocations of schoolmaster and minister of a Unitarian Chapel. His unitarianism provided the philosophical underpinning for liberal and humane views about society but was undogmatic to the point of being able to accommodate baptism into the name of the Trinity. He had married Priscilla Hurry, in 1796, the daughter of a Yarmouth merchant and they raised a family in which Frederick was the only son among seven daughters. The childhood years seemed to hold a very great happiness and harmony becoming such a nostalgic memory to Maurice that he regarded them as a paradigm of the unity which he longed to see projected on to the scale of the wider society of mankind.

This early domestic unity was however soon to be disrupted by religious fragmentation. One after the other the members of the family took their own spiritual pathway, all of them departing from the latitudarian unitarianism of Michael Maurice who felt that

"the aspirations of the time were far more political than religious."¹

After a period of aggressive, evangelistic unitarianism of a different genre from their father's the elder daughters took the paths of Calvinism and Dissent taking their mother Priscilla with them. F.D. Maurice reflects the shattering effect of all this on the home in an autobiographical letter about 50 years later.

"There came a great change over the spirit of our household. My cousin Anne Hurry had been particularly strong in Unitarian opinions; she had pursued them, I should suppose, more logically and consistently than my father, and had arrived at bolder conclusions. She became very intimate with a very superior woman, who was born a Quaker, and who was now a Moravian. By this lady she was aroused to feel the need of a personal
deliverer, such as her old system did not tell her of. The long illness
and death of her brother Edmund, which took place in our house deepened
all her impressions. She had broken off the engagement with Mr.
Hardcastle because they differed in their religious opinions. It was
renewed and they were married. My eldest sister went to visit her, and
afterwards a clergyman in Sussex, whose wife was a relation of ours.
She returned utterly dissatisfied with my father’s opinions. My third
sister Anne, a very earnest solitary thinker, who had been studying such
books as Law’s 'Serious Call', sympathised with her, though their habits
of mind were very unlike. My second sister ... arrived more slowly at
the same impatience of Unitarianism. At first they were strongly in¬
fluenced by Wesley’s teaching. Gradually they all, for a while, became
strong calvinists; the form of belief that was most offensive to my father.
It was still more grievous to him that they seemed to cut themselves off
entirely from their childhood by undergoing a second baptism, and being
connected with a Society of Baptist Dissenters. Very gradually my mother
entered into their views. When her youngest child was born, many years
after the others, she would not consent that there should be any baptism
till it should be of age to determine for itself."2

This paragraph, though deceptively domestic, is significant not only
because of its record of the causes of family heartache and disruption in an
educated, articulate early 19th century family, but, having regard to F.D.
Maurice himself, the experience seemed to give birth to one of the deep
theological themes of his life - the quest for unity which was the child of
the travail of the religious disintegration of his home.

"These events in my family influenced me powerfully; but not in the way
which either of my parents or my sisters would have desired, nor in a
way to which I can look back, so far as my then temper of mind was con¬
cerned, with the least complacency. These years were to me years of
moral confusion and contradiction ...."3

Frederick left the torn household, divided by faith rather than love, in
1822 in his 17th year to stay with his cousins in London, the Hardcastles, and
to study Law. One has the impression that he chose law as a religiously
neutral discipline that would allow him to escape from the tensions of his
home until he had gained time to discover afresh the place and function of
religion in life and its bearing on human relationships. The London period
was very brief and a year later he went up to Trinity College, Cambridge, still
a shy and diffident youth but wondering whether the university would begin to
clear the confusions that were clouding his mind. He spent three years at
Cambridge, two of which were at Trinity College and the third at Trinity Hall where he specialised in Law. At the end of the third year he took a first-class honours degree but did not graduate because he could not conscientiously subscribe to the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion. The period was a watershed in Maurice's life. It was during this time that he developed the habit of penetrating thought that would 'dig' beyond particulars to universals, beyond facts to principles; a period when he began creatively to sift for what was positive in moral and metaphysical ideas, attempting the correlation in them that would lead to unity and wholeness. Among his tutors Julius Hare, later to become related to him by marriage, was a prime mentor. From the distilled Platonism of Hare, Maurice perceived that

"there is a way out of party opinions which is not a compromise between them, but which is implied in both, and of which each is bearing witness .... Hare did not tell us this .... Plato himself does not say it; he makes us feel it." 4

The Cambridge days also brought him into contact with men who were to become well-known in several spheres of the national life and it was in the company of Maurice that they sharpened their intellects. Among the chief of these were Julius Sterling, Arthur Hallam, Richard Trench, Alfred Tennyson, Charles Kemble, Whitmore and others who formed themselves into 'the Apostles Club', a forum for political and philosophical discussion. In addition Sterling and Maurice embarked on their first literary sorties running and editing a journal called Metropolitan Quarterly, 'which achieved four numbers before Mr. Longman, the publisher, decided that it was too outspoken for so reputable a firm to produce.' 5

During the time when Maurice was at University the fortunes of the family continued to fluctuate though mainly they were adverse. This was a source of worry to him as he learned about the movement of the family first from Normanstone and then from Frenchay to Sidmouth, coupled with reports of the ill-health of his sisters Elizabeth and Anne. Principally involved in these unsettled days
was the poignant figure of Michael Maurice who, having relinquished a fortune in loyalty to his unitarian beliefs now found himself isolated from the rest of his family.

The three years following Cambridge were spent in London ostensibly in further pursuit of legal studies but in practice living a dilletante existence of the kind that seemed financially possible in that period. And though it was perhaps a rather diffuse part of Maurice's life it marked a further development of his experience in which he wrote and reviewed, edited and commented, met eminent men like John Stuart Mill who was a friend of Sterling and came under the influence of Coleridge though he was too shy ever to make pilgrimage to see him. The two journals, the Athenaeum and the London Literary Chronicle combined and, now in his early twenties, Maurice became the editor. But whereas Sterling, his close friend, thrived on life in London, Maurice had an underlying distaste for it.

"The superficial contacts, the clash of opinions, the sense of a huge melting pot in which the destiny of millions was moulded in the fires of circumstance, the whole drama, grim and gay, of conflicting desires and ambitions made his heart ache as he realised afresh man's desperate need of unity. Where could a bond be found, what Power could draw men together in willing obedience?"

Maurice seemed to be developing an even more pronounced philosophical seriousness and to this has to be added the increasing gravity of the family situation which was becoming a source of considerable depression to him. Much of what money his father had was lost in the commercial panic that seized the City 1825-26 and bonds that he held in the Spanish Constitutional party became valueless. The family rallied round in various ways and Frederick resolved to write a novel of social comment the proceeds of which would alleviate the family's hardship. It was eventually completed and published under the title Eustace Conway, though not without difficulty. All of these factors seemed to combine to bring about a reappraisal and when he came home for Christmas in 1828 his mother and sister, perhaps sensing his dissatisfaction,
urged him to give up his dilettante, journalistic existence and spoke to him about the possibility of returning to Cambridge to study divinity. This precipitated a correspondence with his father to whom it came as a further blow that Frederick had departed from the paternal interpretation of the faith and was contemplating ordination into the Church of England. But doubtless there would be further opportunity for the father and son to talk over these things further (though Frederick found it difficult to talk to his father about these matters) for in the spring of 1829 after the collapse of the Athenaeum Maurice came home for the summer. It was during this time that he decided to go to Oxford in face of the supplications of his Cambridge tutor Julius Hare who pressed him to return to his alma mater. His mind was now moving in the direction of ordination.

The years at Oxford were very mixed. He was often short of money and lived in poor lodgings. His work was interrupted by illness in his family and the sense of moral responsibility to rally to their financial support. He was forced to accept the support of friends, particularly Jacobson and Richards. During the winter of 1830 he toiled at the completion of Eustace Conway sending it home page by page to be pored over by the faithful and declining Emma. The letters from home told him not only of depressing family news but also of serious social unrest expressing itself in violence, strikes, militancy and riots. From time to time Maurice went up to London where the phenomena of Edward Irving's charismatic ministry were attracting wide attention. Maurice was prepared to keep an open mind on them and on account of this was scolded by his sister Priscilla who regarded Irving as an impostor.

During his second year at Oxford he was both baptised into the Church of England and also took his degree. The first of these occasions gave further pain to his father who had baptised his son in the Name of the Trinity even though he was a minister of the Unitarian Church. Returning to Oxford for
the Michaelmas term after the death of Emma he took a second class degree concealing any disappointment he might have felt at failing to take the 'first' that had been anticipated for him. Remaining for a time at Oxford to tutor pupils he continued his theological reflection and some of this is expressed in his correspondence with his father. It centred around the theme that was to become the theological concern of his days - the Incarnation. There was, he claimed, in man both an acknowledgement of the incomprehensibility of God linked to a desire to know Him. This, he describes as the great cry of the human heart in all ages. And in a significant letter, dated February 1832, he asserts that:

"There is a craving that will not be satisfied with anything less than the reconciliation of these two amazing contrarieties."

He then asks, "Can this longing be satisfied?" and goes on:

"If the Infinite, Incomprehensible Jehovah is manifested in the person of a Man, a Man conversing with us, living among us, entering into all our infirmities and temptations, and passing into all our conditions, it is satisfied; if not, it remains unsatisfied. Man is still dealing with an incomprehensible Being, without any mode of comprehending him."

Thus with a strong incarnational faith and now a member of the Church he responded to an invitation from a friend, Mr. Stephenson, a saintly figure from Maurice's description of him, to join him in his parish at Lympsham to test further his call to take holy orders. After meeting a vicar called Mr. Harding who offered him the curacy at Bubbenhall near Leamington, he moved to the village to acquaint himself with the situation and was eventually ordained on 26th January, 1834. This had been preceded not only by the formal ecclesiastical tests and examination but by a profound soul-searching on the part of Maurice who was deeply concerned about an awareness of personal unworthiness and a longing for greater love for his fellows. The year of his ordination coincided with the passing of the Reform Bill and Maurice's correspondence reveals a sensitivity not only to the significance of the times
for the church but for the country at large. He foresaw the need of change in both.

Bubbenhall was a rural parish made up in the main of humble people who made a living in labouring and agricultural work. It seemed on the face of it the kind of parish to which the brilliant young Maurice was unsuited by gifts and background. Moreover the notion of a resident curate was one to which the villagers were unaccustomed after a lengthy period when their church languished by the absence of their parson. Maurice did not find the task of communication easy and he was further hindered by his basic impracticality and shyness. However he worked away at it and came to the conclusion that pastoral concern must ultimately work itself through into political action. He was distressed at the living conditions of his people whose low wages and insanitary houses and cottages appalled him. He also became deeply aware of their need for a better level of education.

On the theological front he wrote an article entitled 'Subscription No Bondage' in which he defended the practice whereby entrance to the University of Oxford was conditional upon a willingness to subscribe to the 39 Articles of Religion - the theological basis of the Church of England. He argued that this procedure was less a form of intellectual bondage on the mind of any individual student than a statement of the framework within which the secular learning of the University was conducted. To us today it sounds like an intolerable limiting factor totally at odds with the open-ended direction of academic work but Maurice's belief was that without the broad framework of the Articles narrower theological considerations would begin to determine the form of education the university afforded. Curiously it was for reasons of freedom and harmony that Maurice defended the traditional practice. This episode ingratiated him to the Oxford Movement of Pussey, Froude and Newman because they too were opposed to any change in the regulations relating to
university entry but for different reasons. To them Christendom was preserved in the episcopate and the doctrine of the Church of England with the universities regarded as the intellectual arm of this entire Weltanschauung. The control of the universities by the Church was essential for the salvation of the nation from infidelity. The superficial alignment between Maurice and the Tractarians was very transient for between them there was a gulf of spirit and attitude - the Tractarians regarding themselves very selfconsciously as a 'party' within the church and Maurice being utterly resolute in his opposition to all parties, chiefly as it turned out, both to the Oxford Movement and the Evangelical Party.

After little more than a year at Bubbenhall Maurice was offered the chaplaincy to Guy's Hospital, London, mainly through the efforts of his friends Sterling, Rose and Hare. In a letter to R.C. Trench in October, 1835, he referred to his reasons for leaving Bubbenhall and the hopes he entertained for his new work:

"I was delighted with the establishment (the Hospital) and I think I should prefer it to a parish, because I am not skilful in suggesting improvements in the temporal condition of the poor, a serious deficiency in the country, but one that will not affect me there. If I could get any influence over the medical students, I should think myself honoured; and though some who have experience think such a hope quite a dream, I still venture to entertain it."

To an extent the hope was realised and medical students who drifted in to the chapel at Guy's were captivated by the things that Maurice said in prayer and sermon. But perhaps what was more important was the influence that the milieu of Guy's had upon Maurice himself over the next ten years of his life. The slums and poverty of nineteenth century Southwark made their mark on his sensitive spirit and stirred still further his theological thinking in a social and incarnational direction. He was also deeply engaged in a personal and pastoral ministry, striving to make the sense of the presence of God real to humble people in physical and social need. But he was also thinking further about theological sources of unity within the church and the world, trying to relate what was positive in Dissent
to what was Catholic in Anglicanism, the result being the eventual publication of the 'Kingdom of Christ', the first edition in 1837 and a full revision (the better known version) in 1842. The immediate stimulation to this work was provided by correspondence with a Quaker friend but typically Maurice enlarged the work to include an exposition of the relationship of other styles of dissent to what he regarded as the catholic Christianity of Anglicanism. It was also during this period that he was married to Annie Barton, the sister-in-law of his friend Sterling. She shared Maurice's concerns to the full both pastorally and theologically expressing herself on one occasion:

"If only you act on your conviction that Christ is in every one, what a much higher life you might live, how much better you might do!"9

This is so obviously an echo of the Johannine christology which was the fount of Maurice's thinking that one wonders how much Maurice was moved in this direction by Annie's ideas - or vice versa. It seemed, at any rate that his life was greatly enriched by his marriage and among other things Annie became his amanuensis for the 'Kingdom of Christ' and other books and articles which he dictated to her while pacing intensely up and down his study. However, there were other concerns which flowed from the realities of family life. In 1839 their first child was still-born and Maurice was moved to write both to Trench and Edward Strachey in a wistful way giving his reflections on the experience. This was followed in 1841 with the birth of his elder son to whom he gave the name Frederick.

Though in 1840 he had been appointed Professor of English Literature and Modern History at King's College, London, he continued to immerse himself in the humbler aspects of his chaplaincy at Guy's. Relating the faith to the poor, bringing education to the ignorant, deepening in men the awareness of the human and spiritual family with Christ as its Head - these were his daily concerns.
"My vocation, he wrote, is with the discontented, wearied, hopeless, with all that are in debt and disgrace, with outcasts and ragamuffins." Florence Higham expresses very well the feelings of Maurice's friends and perhaps his own inner thoughts about the period at Guy's:

"When he came to Guy's at the height of his powers, at the age of thirty-one, his many friends were sure that he would go far in the service of the church. They foresaw for him, with his integrity and depth of learning, high academic distinction or a position of eminence on the episcopal bench. The only thing they did not expect Maurice to do, was to stay long at Guy's or concentrate on work of which personal intercourse was the key-note... Yet by degrees, as God guided him, he was led deliberately to put aside the hope of advancement in academic or ecclesiastical circles, and to find in those very human relationships which in his shyness he had dreaded, with the sick poor, with the students, with young lawyers, with working men, an opportunity of witnessing to the meaning of Christian living."

In 1844 his former mentor and Cambridge philosophy tutor Julius Hare who had some years previously gone to a family living at Herstmonceaux became Maurice's brother-in-law through his marriage to Esther Maurice. But shortly after this the joy of this family extension which now included Hare as it had previously included Sterling was blighted by the death of Maurice's wife Annie who had been greatly taxed the year before in nursing Sterling through his last illness. She had herself developed a tubercular infection and passed away on Easter Tuesday, 1845. His wife's death provides us with occasion for reference to the almost obsessive sense of personal inadequacy which characterised him. He had an introverted sense of shortcoming with which he was always grappling even in the fiercest controversies of his life. But this sensitivity registered in his reflections about his brief marriage:

"I feel much more oppressed with the sense of sin than of sorrow. I cry to be forgiven for the eight years in which one of the truest and noblest of God's children was trusted to one who could not help or guide her aright, rather than to be comforted in the desolation which is appointed to me." 12

There is deep poignancy in the thought that Mrs. Maurice's death came as the dawn of wider recognition struck for her husband. Not only were his services now sought for special lectureships but in 1846 he was appointed to
the Chair of Theology in King's College, London. Furthermore, he was appointed Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn almost at the same time and while he had regrets about moving from Guy's there had been a melancholy hanging over him since the death of his wife and he needed the change to recover the full impetus of his life - and indeed for the sake of his children. And indeed now at the age of forty he was moving to the centre of his life's work. In a time of rising social agitation in the country he was the incumbent of a potentially influential pulpit. And he was at the formation of a new department of theology in King's College at a time when his own mind had matured and blossomed from the complex soil of personal experience, social encounter and academic reflection.

These appointments heralded the onset of what was probably the most memorable phase in Maurice's life. He published two books based on the Warburton and Boyle lectureships: 'The Epistle to the Hebrews' and 'The Religions of the World'. There was also the new department at King's to administer and form and in this Maurice was motivated by a deep concern for the theological formation of the many earnest young men who would study under his tutelage. The services at Lincoln Inn Chapel also took his attention and his arrival there coincided with a new attitude on the part of many students to the ministrations of the chapel. The story is of a gradual deepening in the meaningfulness of the worship and also a steady increase in the size of the congregations. Concerning the former Tom Hughes writes as follows:

"I believe that the daily congregations increased because when a man once got up and went to chapel in the morning and heard Mr. Maurice read the prayers, he felt there was somehow a reality about the service which was new to him." 13

In the same letter from R.T. Hughes to J.M. Ludlow written in 1853, there is interesting data relating to the steady increase in Maurice's influence and also some perceptive comment about him as a preacher and a man. Since it
it is the contemporary impression of someone who saw and knew Maurice at
first hand, I make the following extensive quotation from it.

"In 1846 I lived in Lincoln Inn Fields and was a regular attendant
at Lincoln's Inn Chapel. The services were the same as they now
are, that is, daily morning prayer at eight through the year ... 
and two full services on Sundays. Before Mr. Maurice's appoint-
ment to the chaplaincy the post was filled very efficiently, but
the congregation was very small indeed. In the winter the regular
attendants at daily morning prayer were certainly not more than eight
or ten, two of whom were ladies. In summer the number rose to twelve
or fourteen. The Sunday afternoon service which is, as you know,
performed entirely by the chaplain, was also very thinly attended. I
do not think that the barristers and the students' seats in those days
were ever more than a third full.

Very soon after Mr. Maurice was appointed the daily attendance
at chapel began to increase. The newcomers were almost all students,
or at any rate quite young men, and when I left the neighbourhood in
the spring of 1848 we seldom numbered less on the most unpromising
mornings than twenty-five. The difference in the attendance on Sunday
afternoons was even more remarkable: first the seats at the side set
apart for students and strangers began to fill, and then the barristers
benches; and although it was some years before the chapel filled as it
does now, yet in the year 1850, when the choir was brought down from
the gallery into the body of the chapel, the seats which they occupied
could not be well spared, and many persons, some of them regular
attendants, though not members of the Inn, had to sit in the passages.
Now, with the exception of the benchers seats, which are reserved
throughout the service ... five minutes after the service is begun
there is not a seat to be had, not even a stool in the passages, and
even the dark places under the organ loft always seem crowded.

The increase in the Sunday afternoon congregation is accounted
for, because when Mr. Maurice preaches, and the chapel is consequently
crammed with young men of all shades of belief, many of them to my
knowledge, not members of the church of England, and most of the rest
differing from him widely on many points. And come they will by
hundreds whenever he preaches, because they feel that he had got some-
thing to tell them which they want to know, and about which they must
be satisfied. Whatever turn his sermon takes, they are quite sure
that it will bring them back somehow to the year of grace 1853, and to
the needs and struggles of their own inner life, and will cast light on
those struggles and that life.

Moreover they will hear a man speaking to them as men, sympathe-
ing with and not silencing them; a far wiser and stronger man than
themselves no doubt, but one who is above all things at their side, and
fighting his own life-battle as one of them, which is what they want, and
not a saint or a doctor ever so much above them, with his cut and dried
methods and paths for them to war and walk in, which is just what they
don't want and won't have." 14

If Maurice established the rapport with his congregation indicated by
Hughes it was not because of any ebullient masculinity either of appearance or attitude - as was the case with Kingsley. Indeed it is an index of the complexity of his personality that one who was diffident, introverted slight and basically reticent should be able to combine in the communication of his preaching a feeling both of moral and theological leadership together with an existential identification with way-faring men so that they felt that he was at their side in the struggle.

Another cameo into Maurice's actual preaching style is given us by F.J. Hort who was among the first generation to be influenced by Maurice. Though Hort arrived at Cambridge at the very time at which Maurice left it for the last time in March 1872, he had heard him as a young man at Lincoln's Inn and indeed had had a correspondence with him on the subject of eternal life and death. Here is his impression of Maurice, the preacher:

"It was curious to watch his face looking out into the chapel, with the dark hollows of his deep-set eyes strongly contrasted with the rest of his face in the sort of twilight... Such a sermon in every respect I never heard; his quiet deep voice, piercing you so softly and firmly through and through and through, never pausing or relaxing in its strain of eloquence, every syllable, as it were, weighted with the energy and might of his whole soul (and what a soul!), kept me crouched in a kind of spell, such as I never could have conceived." 15

And so the pulpit at the Chapel was to be the sounding board for the exposition of theological ideas with social and human implications during the busiest and most creative period of his life. As Dr. Higham has put it:

"The next eight years were to witness his greatest work in the vindication of truth to the point of persecution and in the companionship in the working-day world of the brotherhood of man."16

This was expressed in the context of world-religions by his sympathetic treatment of Hinduism in his Boyle Lectures as it was also expressed within the political context in his deployment of christological arguments in favour of the admission of Jews to Parliament on the ground that the
unbelief of Jews or anybody else does not disturb the objectivity of the moral constitution of the nation as men under the Kingship of Christ. In 1846 he made an initial, though unpromising acquaintance with Ludlow who was to become one of the founding fathers of the Christian Socialist Movement which was about to come into being under the pressure of thought and circumstances. In 1847 he was able to visit Erskine of Linlathen, the Scottish lay theologian to whom Maurice had been attracted through the basic kinship of their thought on the meaning and implications of the doctrine of the Incarnation. And on his return he found a way of converting theology into action through the arrival of his sister Mary in London burdened with a concern to upgrade the status of governesses who often languished in workhouses during their years of retirement. Spurred by his sister Maurice elicited the help and expertise of colleagues at King's College together with other well-wishers, including the poet Tennyson, and inaugurated Queen's College to assist in the education of girls which he regarded as the key to the question of their better social standing.

The story of Maurice's life for the seven years from 1848 is interwoven with the Christian Socialist movement. M.B. Reckitt makes the apposite comment:

"It is a heroic story, still too little known, even by those who should know it best, and who can say what might not be the situation of the church today if the response had been such that the effort could have been sustained?" 17

It was certainly an extraordinary blending of theological application and social compassion which had at its roots a pragmatic radicalism though it was never politically doctrinaire. The Christian socialist attitude was worked out against the background of a remote church alienated from the people and subservient to the Establishment on the one hand and a rising tide of social agitation that was presently engulfing the nations of
Europe and was threatening the presuppositions of English society. The inspiration of the movement may be said to be Ludlow, the young lawyer whose social sensitivity had been stirred by what he had seen of the barricades on a visit to Paris. The propagandist of the group was the imaginative and dramatic Charles Kingsley, and the theologian and ultimately the guru of the movement was F.D. Maurice. So far as the ecclesiastical background was concerned C.E. Raven has sketched it adequately in his definitive work 'The Founders of Christian Socialism'. He refers to the Church of England's lack of inspiration and spirituality for nearly a century scathingly describing it as 'an ecclesiastical department of state'. Raven indicts both the Evangelical and Tractarian movements as making inadequate responses to the momentum of the times:

"While Evangelicals were applying St. Paul's more quietistic sayings to the circumstances of the industrial era, Pusey was labouring to reconstruct in 19th Century England the religion of St. Ambrose or St. Cyril of Alexandria." 18

The Christian socialists were the only church-orientated group that called in question ethical grounding of laissez faire economics believing in cooperation and 'the principle of association' as leading to a much more excellent way - both morally and economically.

In terms of social history there is no doubt that 1848 marks a considerable watershed. France, Germany and Italy were each convulsed in social conflict with a flare-up of violence and it seemed by no means certain that England would escape a similar fate. The unrest that had flickered from time to time during the past twenty years or so (when Maurice had been at Oxford he had received letters from his mother telling of riots and marches around Southampton) was coming to a head. Raven piquantly narrates the story of the blind unresponsiveness with which the church in general responded to the social situation and describes it as 'tragic and
amazing in view of the conditions of working people:

"That there should have been from the first this total lack of fairness or of endeavour to understand, this total blindness to the real conditions which had stirred the souls of the reformers, this total refusal either to support their efforts or to suggest alternative schemes is sufficiently tragic and amazing. It becomes almost incredible when we remember that the terrible condition of the poor both in manufacturing and in agricultural districts was not only widespread but well-known. General studies like those of Aikin and Gisborne in 1795 or pamphlets like those of Kay in 1832, Fielden in 1836 and Horner in 1840 revealed conditions as hideous as those denounced in Yeast and Alton Locke. For twenty years Cobbett had striven to arouse the authorities with his splendid gifts and splendid honesty. Luddites and Chartists had underlined his warnings. The protests of the workers, the constant debates in Parliament, the reports of three Committees and a Royal Commission, even the newspapers of the time testify to the devilries which were being perpetrated in Lancashire mills, or Stafford ironworks, or Durham coalfields, and repeated in the dens and hovels of every city and village. 19

The statistical reports of the period indicate that though London was the richest city in the world, one in nine of its citizens died in the numerous workhouses. Over the country as a whole and in the country in particular the combination of the effect of the Corn Laws together with a widespread potato famine brought many to the verge of desperation. Yet the astonishing feature of the situation is that whereas in other countries confidence in the democratic process (such as they had) had collapsed, in England the pressure was for an extension of that process in the form of votes for those to whom the Reform Bill had not given enfranchisement. This found its expression in the clamour of the Chartist movement which came to its head in April, 1848 when the Monster Charter was brought to the capital to be presented at Westminster. When we view with apprehension the social unrest of our day and hear apocalyptic utterances in respect of them we do well to see these against the perspective of the social history of the middle of the 19th century. As the army of the deprived and exploited assembled in London on the 10th April there were those who feared that the city would be ravaged by riot and arson. In fact the rain came on and the
mob dispersed short of Westminster Bridge and that was as near to the brink of revolution as England was to come for eighty years. As Florence Higham quaintly puts it:

"A good downpour of English rain had settled once and for all the hopes of revolution." 20

But this event which defused any potential Jacobinism triggered off the movement which was to acknowledge Maurice as its 'prophet'. And to his home in Queen's Square, Ludlow and Kingsley (up from the country to see history in the making) brought their report of the anti-climactic occasion. They discussed the outline of a Christian response to the events of the day and Kingsley sat up all night composing a slogan that might be carried out into the streets of London the next day. That they should have thought in these terms at all is an indication of their awareness of the momentous nature of the times for Maurice was not at all noted for rapid and decisive action. Yet the atmosphere of the day generated in Maurice an uncharacteristic ebullience. Of Maurice's mood Kingsley wrote as follows:

"Maurice is in great excitement. He has sent me to Ludlow, the barrister who wrote those letters from France, and we are getting out placards for the walls, to speak a word for God ......... Maurice is determined to make a decisive move. He says, If the Oxford Tracts did wonders, why should not we?" 21

At the heart of the poster which appeared next day was the message that 'The Almighty God, and Jesus Christ, the poor Man who died for poor men, will bring freedom for you, though all the Mammonites on earth were against you.' Raven comments:

"It is the first manifesto of the Church of England, her first public act of atonement for a half-century of apostasy, of class-prejudice and political sycophancy. And as such, quite irrespective of its contents, it may fairly be described by that much abused word epoch-making." 22

But after the drama and the sloganising there was developed a pattern of study and prayer with the groping attempts to channel their ideas into
practical ways, putting them to the test of human receptivity and frailty. Maurice was firmly convinced that the basic issues were theological and was inspired by the root idea that theological reformation would be the only true base for social change. And while it is not our function to recount the history of the early period of the Christian Socialist movement (already well documented in C.E. Raven's Christian Socialism, 1848-1854) we will sketch some part of Maurice's involvement over the period as the sociological expression of his leading theological ideas. Raven extrapolates these ideas as follows:

"; ... the Fatherhood of God, the oneness of humanity as seen in Christ, the presence of Christ in all men and his Revelation of Himself in every good thought and word and deed, and the consequent unity of human society as one body having many members, one body whose head and life was Christ ... ."23

Launching himself from this theological base he entered sometimes very uncertainly into the realms of social education, popular persuasion, novel cooperative experimentation, theological controversy, and a diversity of teaching in different centres of education. On Monday evenings he conducted bible study in his home for the inner core of the group and though those present were by no means united in theological opinion (Furnivall, for example being quite unorthodox in a way that must have pained Maurice), yet there is much evidence of the cementing effect that these sessions had upon the men who attended them. As time passed others were introduced. About the only thing they had in common was the conviction that the world was not as it should be. These included Cuthbert Ellison (probably Thackeray's model for Arthur Pendennis) an urbane young man with a rather grand manner; Archie Campbell who had novel ideas on phonetic spelling; Charles Mansfield, a vegetarian, interested in aeronautical theories and withal something of a saint; Daniel MacMillan, originally from Arran, making his way as a publisher
and keen to use print as an instrument for Maurice's brand of religion; Tom Hughes, barrister and Cambridge blue and finally a famous author of 'Tom Brown's Schooldays'; and Dr. Charles Robert Walsh 'who watched the symptoms of his own mortal disease so that the lessons might be used in later medical science. 24

They propagated their views in print on a two-prong basis with a newspaper called 'Politics for the People' which they attempted to get into the hands of working people and also a series of tracts by which they aimed to explain themselves to 'the religious people and clergy, pointing out to them the necessity of their meeting the questions of the day and trying to put them in the way of thinking earnestly and devoutly upon them.' (Maurice in a letter to Ludlow). This helped them to clarify their own thinking as well, as commend it to others. 'Politics for the People' was a mixed bag and though it did not last very long because of the difficulties of finance and public relationships (felt by the publishers) yet the genre of its contents is interesting. Maurice reveals something of this in a letter to Julius Hare in April, 1848:

"I hope we are going on promisingly with the paper. The first article will be one on "Fraternity" explaining our principles and purposes, by me. There will be one on "the People", on "France under Louis Phillipe", and on "the Suffrage" (the first of a series), all by Ludlow; a sanitary article by Dr. Gray; I hope some verses from Kingsley. Could you bring us anything of any kind, short or long, original or translated? The working people don't all cry for easy literature, but scorn it." 25

But by far the most radical and ambitious idea that the movement promoted was the establishment of Working Men's Associations which were manufacturing and retailing associations of craftsmen and tradesmen. Perhaps the most outstanding of these was the Tailor's Association of which the secretary was an ex-Chartist Walter Cooper one of the earliest of the working tradesmen to be integrated to the group. Maurice himself was slow to come to a positive
attitude on the subject of the Associations. This was partly because the main backing for this type of 'socialism' came from men who tended to be atheistic in religion and left wing in politics - Owen, Paine and Holyoake. In addition Maurice took time to make the philosophical connection between his basic Weltanschaung and what Ludlow and others were proposing by way of political action that was challenging the very structure of trade and commerce. However when he had engaged in the necessary reflection he wrote thus to Kingsley:

"I do not see further than this. Competition is put forth as the law of the universe. That is a lie. The time is come for us to declare that it is a lie by word and deed. I see no way but associating for work instead of for strikes. I do not say, or think we feel, that the relation of employer and employed is not a relation. But at present it is clear that that relation is destroyed, that the payment of wages is nothing but a deception. We may restore the whole state of things: we may bring in a new one. God will decide that. His voice has gone forth clearly bidding us come forward to fight against the present state of things; to call men to repentance first of all, but then also as it seems to me, to give them an opportunity of showing their repentance and bringing forth fruits worthy of it. This is my notion of a Tailor's Association."26

If there is a basic incoherence in Maurice's theology it is in the relationship of objectivity to subjectivity in it. He often states that there is a certain spiritual constitution to the universe in terms of the Fatherhood of God and the Kingdom of Christ which is the objective 'reality' despite a human unawareness of this or even a rejection of it. And one would have thought that a corollary of this notion of the Kingdom that is God's deed, rather than of man's subjective conferring, would have been the principle of association and cooperation as a part of the 'reality' rather than the fruits of subjective repentance. The idea of the Tailor's Association as part of the devotion of pious craftsmen rendering their reasonable worship is perhaps what drove Matthew Arnold to write Maurice off as 'a muddy mystic'.

It is difficult to estimate whether the creativity and excitement of
the next few years outweighed the difficulty and disappointment or vice versa. For both the literary efforts and the practical schemes of the group came one by one to an abortive end. We have spoken about the fate of the weekly paper 'Politics for the People' which though moderate enough in view of the social background against which it was being written was too hot for Parker the publisher to continue to handle. It was superceded by a Journal called 'The Christian Socialist' which was to explain and boost the idea of associating together in trades and crafts with Ludlow as the editor. Beyond this it carried a great deal of copy of an economic and social nature, Bible articles by Kingsley and eventually spread itself to contain material by Robert Owen. After more than a year's useful life the economics of the task overwhelmed them and 'The Christian Socialist' ceased publication in June 28th, 1852. A more personal effort was Kingsley's novel 'Alton Locke' depicting the life of a cockney tailor. This was written, according to Kingsley, 'to explain Maurice'. So far as the Associations were concerned almost all of them - the cobbiers, the needleworkers, the builders, and to a lesser extent the tailors - folded up before very long often wrecked by squabbling about policy and finance. They may however have paved the way for the passage through Parliament of the Industrial and Provident Societies Act in 1852 which gave legal status to co-operative societies.

At this point Maurice rather turned away from committees, administration and such total practical involvement to teaching, though of course it should be remembered that during all the zestful days of the Christian Socialist Movement he had continued to occupy not only the Chair of Theology but also the Chair of English Literature and Modern History at King's in addition to teaching at Queen's College which he had been instrumental in setting up. But his concentration on teaching had been complicated by a new and disturbing issue that had arisen in 1851. Obviously there had been those
both within King's College and beyond who had noted with disapproval the close link that Professor Maurice had with the Christian Socialist Movement. Despite Maurice's and Ludlow's conviction that they must socialise Christianity otherwise socialism would become increasingly naturalistic it was clear that there were those who either from malice or a lack of perception saw the movement as a seedbed of subversive ideas. One such was the contributor to the London Journal 'Quarterly', J.W. Croker, who named Kingsley and Maurice as the authors of books and articles of 'a heterodox character' pointing out that one of them was the holder of the Chair of Divinity in the Anglican stronghold, King's College. This triggered off discussion in the Council of the College on Maurice's theological probity and a committee of enquiry was set up to investigate the situation. Speculating on the possible conclusions of the committee Maurice expressed the hope that (1) he would be cleared so far as his college teaching was concerned, (2) they should speak honourably of the Christian Socialist Movement, and (3) they would recommend his resignation. In the event however he was exonerated insofar as his teaching was concerned though concern was expressed as to the misconstruction that might be placed on the name 'Christian Socialism'.

It was however only a stay of execution. Believing that it was his role to probe to the roots of theological issues - 'a digger' as he put it - rather than to construct systems, he determined in the Spring of 1852 to assemble a number of essays on the fundamental themes of faith. As always he was concerned to expound the meaning of the catholic faith both to unbelievers and to those of other styles of Christianity. And because of his own background he seemed to have a special concern with men and women of a Unitarian persuasion. To them he addressed his book. The most sensitive chapter in terms of the theology of the time was one on the subject of eternal life in which he expounded the conception in Johannine terms as
against a rather crude temporal interpretation that prevailed at that time. He argued that the creeds of the church and the words of the Bible pointed the direction by which the soul could arrive at a true knowledge of and fellowship with God. This was eternal life, a quality of being and experience which defined Christian existence here and hereafter. To lose or reject this possibility was to be alienated from God and this was eternal death. He comes to the climax of his argument toward the end of the Essay:

"A man may be living without God in the world, He may be trembling at his Name, sometimes wishing that He did not exist; and yet if you told him that he was going where there would be no God, no one to watch over him, no one to care for him, the news would be almost intolerable. We do shrink from this; all men, whatever they fancy are more appalled at the thoughts of being friendless, homeless, fatherless, than at any outward terrors you can threaten them with ... . And surely this, this is the bottomless pit which men see before them, and to which they feel they are hurrying, when they have led selfish lives, and are growing harder, and colder, and darker, every hour ... . Will not that show them more clearly what life is, the risen life, the eternal life, that which was with the Father and has been manifested to us? Will it not enable us to say, This life is that for which God has created man, for which he has redeemed man in his son, which He is sending his Spirit to work out in man? Will it not enable us to say, This eternal death is that from which God sent his Son to deliver men, from which he has delivered them? If they fall into it it is because they choose it, because they embrace it, because they resist a power that is always at work to save them from it. By delivering such a message as this to men, should we not be doing more to make them aware how the revelation of God's righteousness for the redemption of sinners is at the same time the revelation of the wrath of God against all unrighteousness and ungodliness? Would not such a message show that a Gospel of eternal love must bring out more clearly than any mere law can, that state which is the resistance to it and the contradiction of it? But would not such a message at the same time present itself to the conscience of men not as an outrage on their experience, but as the faithful interpreter of it, not as disproving everything they have dreamed of the willingness of God to save them, but as proving that He is willing and able to save them to the uttermost." 27

There is a subtlety about Maurice's thinking that was inhospitable to his time. One feels that he might have been happy to have translated his thinking into the categories of authentic and inauthentic existence. That inauthentic existence is basically an alienation from Being which expresses itself not so much in the notion of being punished but of finding oneself
cut off from relationship and community and condemned to the experience of the lonely self which is ultimately the death of selfhood. Christ stands at the gateway to this eternal death not as a law-giver but as a giver of sight by which the soul can see reality 'as it really is'.

This however was not the view taken by the Council of King's College and after a lengthy theological correspondence between the Principal Dr. Jelf and Maurice, the Council met on October 14th, 1853, to decide the issue of Maurice's continued fitness to hold his Chair. There was some division of opinion and no less a figure than W.E. Gladstone moved an amendment to the simple dismissal proposal to the effect that -

"the Lord Bishop of London be requested to appoint competent theologians to institute an examination into the question how far the writings of Professor Maurice, or any propositions contained in them, which have been brought under the notice of the council, are conformable to or at variance with the three creeds and the formularies of the Church of England, and to make a report thereupon, and that the Lord Bishop be requested to communicate the results of this examination to the council." 28

The amendment failed and the original proposal carried that the opinions set forth in the Essays were:

"of dangerous tendency and calculated to unsettle the minds of the theological students of King's College." 29

Now approaching fifty years Maurice found himself consoled and supported by friends great and humble but faced with the prospect of adjusting to a new way of life as well as absorbing the hurt that had been done to his spirit. Many shared the view that an injustice had been done and many unschooled in the theology of the day registered their moral intuition to this effect. The decision of the Council received wide publicity and comment in an age when theological controversy of this kind was regarded as news. Maurice resigned from Queen's College where he had been a Professor for six years and offered his resignation at Lincoln's Inn. It was not accepted although there were those who shared a disapproving attitude to his theological views.
On hearing this Maurice wrote a long letter which, though it might be regarded as an overreaction is one of the best of his 'theological letters'. He speaks in it of the necessity to face the issues that are unsettling the mind of young people because to do otherwise is 'to foster infidelity' or to tempt 'the cowardly and self-indulgent to a feigned acquiescence, which involves ... the most deadly Atheism.'

Before the end of the year the prospect of a new task began to open up. It originated from a dual source. For some time Maurice himself had been entertaining the idea of an extension of the education for working men that had been begun under the auspices of the Christian Socialist movement. And this idea was given a great impetus when on 27th December, 1853, a congregation of men met at the Hall of Association to present him with a testimonial and in the course of doing so invited him to become the 'Principal of a Working Man's College'. Maurice responded to this with unusual alacrity and early in the year he had plans fairly well advanced for the inauguration of such a College. He worked out a curriculum, consulted with his 'disciples' of the past six years and enlisted the support of eminent men of the stamp of John Ruskin, Lowes Dickinson and Rossetti. The College opened at Red Lion Square which the Maurices put at the college's disposal.

"As for curriculum (it) would begin with history, with everyday problems in politics and economics, with elementary psychology, through which the men might be taught to understand themselves ... . In ethics as in politics they must start from their own concerns and interests and, however devious and confused their thinking might be, Maurice for one was certain that they would never be able to prove "that wrong means right and truth falsehood". So he ended with theology ... ." 31

Through many vicissitudes, some caused in part by the magnanimity of Maurice in refusing to apply the tests of orthodoxy to those who were his colleagues, the College was sustained and expanded, eventually moving into larger premises in Great Ormonde Street. Maurice remained as Principal for twelve years until the time of his departure for Cambridge.
The next three years till 1857 were years of light and shade. Alongside the creative task of getting the Working Men's College on its feet there were personal losses that temporarily crushed his soul. Both his mother and his sister Priscilla died and since from time to time the latter had lived with him - both in his bachelor days and in the period between his marriages - he had a specially close bond with her as revealed in his letters from time to time. Another sad blow of another kind was the death in 1855 of his brother-in-law and former Cambridge tutor Julius Hare who had latterly been the vicar at Herstmonceaux in Sussex. In a letter to Daniel MacMillan he writes:

"My whole life for the last eighteen years had been closely bound up with his, and nearly every joy or sorrow I have had has been connected with his home and with him." 32

By contrast his home became the headquarters for the Sterling children after the death of their parents and this was to be their home for the next six years. In addition Maurice was kept busy receiving a stream of visitors who wanted to consult him and discuss theology with him and he made a habit of inviting them to have breakfast with him. For a time he was also involved in a scheme to start a college for working women but this never achieved the success of the Working Men's College. During this period also he was asked back again to Queen's College and in 1856 he became the Professor of Moral Philosophy and English Literature. All the time he was carrying on a heavy correspondence not only on the subject for which he had become notorious but on other matters of church and state as they arose. He also held Bible Classes for working men and sustained the work of his chaplaincy at Lincoln's Inn. The group which had composed Maurice's bible study meetings in the heyday of the Christian Socialist Movement continued to meet but it is noticed that Maurice seemed to be less and less involved with the promotional aspect of this work. And it has been suggested that Maurice succumbed to the negative
pressures of his second wife Georgina who seemed to have little enthusiasm for the Christian Socialist ideals. This indeed led to some strain between Maurice and Ludlow and in his autobiography Ludlow observes:

"Observing her total want of interest in Co-operation as such I have suspected that her influence had largely worked on Mr. Maurice to dissever him from active connection with the movement."

There is evidence from various sources including Daniel MacMillan and Augustus Hare (Julius's son) that there was a neurotic streak to Georgina's make-up as indeed there is evidence of a compulsion in Maurice to allow his life to be over-burdened in the service of 'bed-ridden women'.

"Apart from his shyness, exaggerated humility, his restlessness and lack of confidence, Maurice apparently had a compulsive need to care for unquestionably neurotic sick women ... . His biographer noted how often he referred "back in thought to the sick-beds of Guy's of his sister Emma, or of others whom he had known, and to speak of the 'bed-ridden woman' to whom truth revealed itself because of her need and not because of her intellect." Save for the early, and all too few, years of his first marriage, he was involved in essentially self-imposed attendance upon chronic invalids."

I would feel that though this may not be an exaggeration of the facts it is far from proved that this was because of some psychological drive in Maurice's personality. When you are the only surviving son of a large family of daughters, then become a chaplain to a large urban hospital, and your first marriage comes to an untimely end and your second wife is either psychologically or physically frail or both, it is not easy to avoid involvement with 'bed-ridden women' and it seems to me doubtful whether Maurice's time and attendance to these people should be described as a 'compulsion' in that direction. It seems to me much more reasonable to account for it in terms of the - for the most part - given framework of his life.

In 1858 Maurice published one of his best works 'The Epistles of John' delivered first as lectures to his classes in the Working Men's College.
But it was what another author published rather than his own work that proved to be the starting point of what was the fiercest controversy of his life. The Bampton Lectures for 1858 were published under the title 'The Limits of Religious Thought' by Henry Mansel in which he dealt with the question of the nature of religious knowledge. The actual theological issues involved and Maurice's participation in the debate are dealt with elsewhere in this work and it is sufficient to note in this context that Mansel's intention was to develop an apologetical epistemology against the inroads of scientific agnosticism on the grounds—widely accepted today—that the Christian theory of knowledge rested much more on revelation than on reason and that what was revealed was the revelatory act of God from which we could deduce 'regulative' knowledge which however fell short of the experience of existential fellowshipping with the divine. Word first came to Maurice of the dissemination of these ideas through the Preacher of Lincoln's Inn, Dr. Thomson (later Archbishop of York) who had heard the delivery of the lectures in Oxford.

Maurice launched into this controversy with more vigour than exactitude. He himself was to admit as much in hindsight but at the time he could only see Mansel's views as a blow aimed at what was for him the heart of religion: the accessibility of the knowledge of the Living God to wayfaring men. And even Frederick Maurice, whose biography, without being hagiographical, is not shrewdly incisive, has to admit:

"I do not think that any of my father's friends have ever read the discussion (that is the correspondence and the published riposte, What Is Revelation?) with entire satisfaction. He does not limit the points of his difference with Mr. Mansel; does not enter upon a methodic argument, does not, in a way that would attract the attention of a careless reader, acknowledge the points that are not in dispute and define those that are. What he does is to prophesy against the book, to declare what its inevitable tendency must be, how the weapon forged in behalf of orthodoxy will become a deadly one in quite other hands."
Mansel for his part was provoked into a bitter, personal reply and on this tone the controversy proceeded until Maurice, realising how aggressive his tone had been, wrote another book entitled 'A Sequel to What is Revelation' in which he states the issues in a much more balanced fashion. But in these days there is little doubt that Maurice had a sense of all men's hands being against him and he writes to his friend Alexander MacMillan in this vein:

"I have had a bundle of reviews (of What is Revelation?) forwarded to me, all except the Inquirer exceedingly unfavourable. My flesh of course revolts; but in my heart of hearts I welcome this treatment. If the religious world had not declared almost en masse in favour of Mansel I would not have written against him. I spoke because he was its spokesman. So it has happened exactly as I ought to have expected .... ." 36

Surprisingly then in the light of his alienation and isolation he was offered the influential incumbency of St. Peter's, Vere Street in 1860 by Lord Palmerston who was thought to be a champion of the ecclesiastical journal of comment called 'The Record' which was an implacable foe of Maurice and all his works. Following this in 1861 there came the publication of the magnum opus 'Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy' which he had been working on for about thirty years. Its theme was an examination of the ways in which the Christian faith could learn from the universal intellectual experience of mankind. But the effect of this publication was soon superceded by the appearance of 'Essays and Reviews' and this was followed a year later by the provocative treatment of the historicity and authorship of the 'Pentateuch' by Bishop Colenso of Natal in a book of that name. As a counter to 'Essays' Maurice assembled his old christian socialist colleagues for the purpose of publishing a series of 'Tracts for Priests and People' to counter constructively the 'modernist' tendencies of the 'Essays'. The Colenso episode affected him more personally in that he had maintained a friendship with the Bishop over some years and Colenso had previously dedicated a book of sermons to Maurice. The latter however could not give a welcome to the
'Pentateuch' which had been sent to him in proof form, partly because of the radical conclusions about the early Old Testament which Colenso was advocating but also because it seemed to Maurice that Colenso had overlooked the 'theological' element in the record in his obsession with historical questions. In a personal conversation between the two men Maurice suggested to the Bishop that his views were inconsistent with his episcopal office and that he ought to contemplate resignation. Whereupon Colenso reminded Maurice that there obviously were very many in the Church who disapproved of his theological stance and that if this were the criterion than he himself could not escape the consequence of resignation. Maurice took the suggestion seriously - too seriously - and earnestly reconsidered his own position. This was compounded by the fact that a judgement had been passed in ecclesiastical courts against certain clergymen who held views similar to his on eternal life and punishment. However, the solicitations of his friends and the intervention of the Bishop of London who indicated an unwillingness to accept his resignation if offered, prevailed on him to remain at Vere Street.

In 1863 the judicial committee of the Privy Council quashed a conviction against two clergymen on the subjects of the verbal inspiration of scripture and the endless punishment of the impenitent, ruling that it was not obligatory upon English clergymen to subscribe to these views. This called forth an immediate reaction both from the Evangelical and Tractarian wings of the Church and a statement of required theology on these and other matters was drawn up in Oxford under the auspices of the Bishop of Oxford and Dr. Pusey and circulated to every clergyman in the land. Maurice protested at this, writing to 'The Times' complaining that:

"an irresponsible, self-elected committee has no right to frame a new test for the Church of England." 37
The document met its death knell and Maurice was again vindicated when it received only meagre support in the Upper House of Convocation.

By this time Maurice's life was drawing toward its eventide and upon his receiving an invitation from the University of Cambridge to become the Knightsbridge Professor of Casuistry, Moral Theology and Moral Philosophy he resigned his Principalship of the Working-Men's College to return to the quieter academic setting where his quest had begun about forty years previously. Moving to Cambridge in 1866 he continued for four years to travel to London to sustain his duties as the incumbent at Vere Street, but when in 1870 his health began to fail more seriously he relinquished this charge, accepting in its place the chaplaincy of St. Edward's Church in Cambridge.

"On November 7th 1869 he preached his farewell sermon. People had come from all parts of the country to hear him. The church was crammed throughout. Numbers remained standing all through the service ... He startled his hearers by choosing the text, Plead thou my cause, O Lord, with them that strive with me, and fight thou against them that fight against me. To many who were present the words as he read them conveyed the sense of an appeal against those who throughout his life had misunderstood or opposed him." 38

We are assured however by his biographer that this thought had never occurred to him and indeed the sermon is a characteristic statement of his faith in the fatherly benevolence of God, the parity of all before Him and the catholicity of the Church of the Living God.

The next three years yielded a more peaceful postscript to his rather tempestuous life. In addition to the curacy at St. Edward's he fulfilled a number of other preaching engagements over the period - always against the increasing difficulty of failing health. But the decline became more marked in the early months of 1872. He resigned from St. Edward's, became seriously ill as Easter approached and appropriately - since so much of the joy and sorrow of his life coincided with it - he passed away on Easter Monday 1872 at the age of sixty-six years.
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2. The Christology of F.D. Maurice against its Cultural Milieu

The paradox of Maurice's theological relationship to his age is set forth in the sermon preached by Dean Stanley on the Sunday after Maurice's death in which he "spoke of the way in which every incident of the history of Europe and the world, and every wave of thought which passed over them, produced their impression and left their mark upon Maurice's mind and spirit."\(^1\) Yet his son Frederick Maurice also notes how "some have said that his great characteristic was that he was entirely uninfluenced by other men."\(^2\) Both statements are exaggerations which nonetheless have within them a stratum of validity. He was not flexible to the point of viewing sympathetically the movement towards a more democratic form of franchise and government by which people could "cashier and depose their rulers" at will; rather he saw both king and aristocracy as instruments through which society might be better ordered so that "the whole manhood of the country may have a choice" and "that every member of Christ's body may be indeed a free man."\(^3\) His socialism therefore had nothing in it that was akin to the Jacobinism that was agitating France nor indeed was it of the genre that was to give birth to Trade Unions (though as we have seen Maurice was instrumental in founding the first Cooperative Societies).

His impetus towards reformation was theological rather than ideological and it was his constant insistence that the teaching of the Church rooted in Bible and Creed and embodied in Eucharist and Baptism had within it the seeds of social reformation. This is well explained in his reply to the Members of Lincoln's Inn after they had presented him with an Address on the occasion of his dismissal from his Chair at King's College. He represents himself to them as having been most anxious that "you should receive God's Word as the witness of his Love, and what it has effected for us and all
mankind, God's Church as the living and continuous witness that that Love is the same yesterday, today, and for ever, and that it will put down evil and establish righteousness throughout the universe." 4

This view of the ultimacy of the triumph of the divine love is rooted in what he believed about the theological and christological realities of the here and now. For while he did not minimise the nature of evil, he saw mankind as standing not in Adam but in Christ and he resisted the revision of the Liturgy for example, lest Evangelicals should so amend it as to rob it of its witness to what Maurice believed to be a theological fact that "a nation consists of redeemed men." This is to say that he took an entirely 'objective' view of christology and soteriology expressed repeatedly in assertions that "Christ is the Head and Lord of every man", a view which had far reaching ecclesiological implications affecting in turn his doctrines of the Sacraments, which he saw as dramatic signs of existing divine human relationships rather than as means effective in transforming them in a saving way. It also provides the key to what appear to be Maurice's social and humanitarian interests. His 'socialism' was not only 'Christian' in its ethical tone but Christological in that it was this aspect of Maurice's doctrine that gave Christian Socialism its theological basis. He sets it forth thus. "The Gospel is, 'Christ is with you, and in you, and He is in me.' I cannot live except it were so, nor can you ...... . I feel more and more the importance of the history, of the history in its simplest, most direct form. But I believe we cannot read the Gospels simply and directly, except we consider them the revelation of Him upon earth who is the light that lighteneth us and all men, whether they walk in his sight or dwell in darkness. Jesus is not the Christ, not the Son of God, if He is not this. And yet our preachers do not seem to perceive this. They hold our inward relation to Christ as a sort of high refined notion, but it is not one that they will take to beggars and
reprobates, who want it as much as any, and perhaps will take it in as readily.\(^5\)

Living as Maurice was in an age of rising political agitation and aspiration which made people bemoan "the state of the country" there is little evidence that he shaped his christology to the spirit of the age, making Christ into the image of brotherhood and the embodiment of the principle of unity though A.M. Ramsay says that this principle haunted Maurice all his days.\(^6\) Rather he believed that a true christology (true in the sense of being rightly interpretative of Bible and creeds) would so govern the doctrines of church, baptism, eucharist, ministry and race that it would work itself out in challenging the political, social and cultural presuppositions of the age.

Christology and the Church

Maurice had a deep respect and love for the Church of England which he joined after rejecting the Unitarianism of his boyhood and youth and after resolving his difficulties over the Articles of Religion to which inability to subscribe had cost him his Cambridge Degree. Thereafter he became a staunch supporter of the Thirty Nine Articles and his first published work was entitled 'Subscription No Bondage', though in later years he altered his opinion towards the use of the Thirty Nine Articles as a religious criterion of entry to the university. But his support of them as the theological basis of the Church of England never wavered and he was incensed when in 1844 a certain Mr. Ward then a resident at Balliol published a book suggesting the acceptance of the Articles in a 'non-natural' sense; to which Maurice replied saying that he believed "the Articles to be drawn up by honest men for an honest purpose. Perhaps one of the contradictions of Maurice's churchmanship is to be seen in that together with this rather rigid adherence to the Articles there went a catholicity of attitude which amounted almost to an obsession against sects and parties within the Church. He quarreled with
the Tractarians and the Evangelicals because in different ways each according to Maurice had a much too exclusive ecclesiology deriving from a doctrine of Man which started from the premise of his unrelatedness to God through sin rather than his relatedness to God in Christ Who is the Redeemer of every man. His notion of the inter-relationship of Christ to His Church on the one hand and that between both and Mankind on the other is set forth in his reply to a group who had presented him with an Address out of sympathy for him on his dismissal from his Chair at King's College.

He indicates how he took refuge in the Church of England, "in which I had not been educated because, as I thought, it offered me an altogether different bond of fraternity from that of similarity of opinions. A society merely united in opinion had, it seemed to me, no real cohesion; it must exalt that which a multitude troweth, above the truth, or must suppose them to be identical. It will be very positive, yet it will have no permanent resting place. It will be always changing; never growing. It will be alternately persecuting and Latitudarian; it will be equally far from steady belief and genuine tolerance. The Church of England confesses a Father, who has revealed Himself in a Son; a Son Who took our nature and became Man, and has redeemed men to be His children, a Spirit who raises men to be spirits. She invites all to stand on that ground. She tells all - so I read her formularies - that they have no less right to claim their places in her as members of Christ than they have to claim their places in the nation as subjects of the Queen, and in their families as children of an earthly father and mother. This was a rock on which I felt I could rest. It was a foundation for a universal human society .... Such a society must be ready to embrace all persons. It could never seek to comprehend any sect. It must be the great instrument for healing the strife of classes within a nation. It must proclaim Christ as the Deliverer and Head of all nations."
He seemed to start from the basic theological premise of much eastern thought that the body of mankind was co-terminous with the Body of Christ. The Church was founded in the reality of this universal Headship and deliverance and indeed she was the earnest of its empirical manifestation, so that to be joined to the Church was to claim a right in Christ and to come to an awareness of the theological reality of relatedness to one's spiritual Lord and Head. The Church was the society not of the saved over against the unsaved but those made aware over against those still blind. He is unrelenting in his christology of a Head and Deliverer of Man conceived in the most objective way so that faith becomes a way of perception rather than a way of salvation. This made him unsympathetic toward 'evangelical' preaching exemplified by a comment he made on such a preacher he listened to during a vocation. "The tone is uniform. In a certain sense all men being created by God are his children; in a somewhat enlarged sense the name is restricted to the baptised; in the only true and important sense it is restricted to the true believers; to those who are conscious of having Christ as their personal Saviour. In this way the Gospel of God is emptied of its power; faith, not God, is made the source of every good and perfect gift."

Or again on the question of the revision of the Prayer Book in a possibly more evangelical direction: "Do not let us surrender the one great witness which we possess, that a nation consists of redeemed men, sons of God, that mankind stands not in Adam but Christ. Give up the Prayer Book to an evangelical or semi-evangelical commission and this witness will be eliminated from it by a thousand little alterations, which will be counted insignificant, but which in fact will render the English Church another Church altogether." Both the outward reach of this christology taking seriously the 'panta' of Col. 1.20 and the downward reach of it to 'all classes' within the nation have to be seen against the prevailing Calvinism and also
the social insensitivity that dominated the churches. And the implications have to be seen in relation to other doctrines.

**Christology and Baptism**

There is an ambivalence in the baptismal theology of Maurice which he tacitly concedes when he acknowledges that 'the baptismal forms of the church' to which he holds include the diverse elements of both High Church doctrine and also that of the Evangelical party. He was able to incorporate the Tractarian notion that the Church was the Ark of Christ and that baptism was the deliverance from the evil of a fallen world. But he is here forced into a departure from his basic theological perspective of a world viewed not in Adam but Christ. He does however part company with the High Churchmen (e.g. Dr. Pusey) in his refusal to construe Baptism as 'an event' constituting 'a change of nature' but rather, clinging to the analogy of regeneration, views it as a further stage in an existing relationship as is the moment of birth in the physical sphere. He is also able to incorporate the Evangelical emphasis that the baptised is holy not by any individual status of holiness in relation to God but because he is clothed in the robes of Christ's righteousness.

Given Maurice's Christology it is inevitable that there should be tensions in reconciling it with a baptismal theology which did not move out of the sphere of ideas that controlled the orthodox baptismal theology of his Church, whereas his christology was much more radical. The two remain in very uneasy union for logically such a universalistic christology could only rightly bear a quite non-sacramentarian view of baptism, but from this he shrinks. Rather he speaks of baptism as 'a mark' and this is the best figure by which to develop further his thinking.

Baptism is the mark of distinction. "By an outward act, such as baptism,
I obtain the distinction I want between the family and the race to which the family is to be a witness ...."10 Closely related to this is baptism viewed as the mark of adoption. God's covenant with the child is interpreted not so much as an individual relationship but rather as a member adopted to be a member of Christ. It is also the mark of illumination. He regarded baptism as the point at which the child is brought forth into the beam of that light that had always been shining for it and for all the world. It was also the mark of union. This is really a more comprehensive way of setting forth what he has already interpreted the meaning of baptism to be. Perhaps the bitterest controversy of Maurice's life was over the subject of revelation when he inveighed against Dr. Mansel's notion that we could not know God in Himself but only have a 'regulative' knowledge of him. This undercut what to Maurice was the heart of the Faith - namely that God had revealed Himself in Christ and that divine/human communion was the ground of religious reality. It was on to this ground that the child stepped in the sacrament of Baptism.

Maurice's earliest work of theological importance was 'The Kingdom of Christ' in which he sets out to answer the question: is there a Catholic Church? He starts from the Incarnation and the Atonement which is the earnest and reality of the Kingdom and which effects a 'constitutional' difference in the relationship between God and Man in that Christ has asserted and claimed a place in it for every man. It is on the warrant of this new constitutional status of the race in Christ that "we receive every member of our species by baptism."11

Christology and the Eucharist

Maurice believed that the Sacrament was a more sensitive instrument than dogma for setting forth the essential meaning of Christianity. For this
reason he was not sorry that the English Reformation was much more focussed in sacrament than dogma. "My great wish is to show you that the Anglican Church was led, not by reason of any peculiar excellence or glory in the members or teachers of it, but by a course of providential discipline, to put worship and sacraments before views, to make these acts which directly connect man with God the prominent part of their system and those verbal distinctions which are necessary to keep the understanding of men from error and confusion, as its accessory and subordinate part." He thinks that the continental reformers with their over-emphasis on guilt and sin did less than justice to the Eucharist inasmuch as they interpreted it too exclusively in terms of its ministry to the consciences of men, neglecting to view this end as a consequence of a higher end - namely the communion of the soul with God. "Communion with God, in the largest and fullest sense of that word, is not an instrument of attaining some higher end, but it is itself the end to which he is leading his creatures .... There is something in this idea far surpassing that mere aim after a satisfaction of the conscience which seemed to me almost the limit of the expression and notions of the continental reformers. They looked upon communion with God, and upon every other blessing, rather as a condition for attaining this privilege."13

Thus the primary stress falls on Communion but this doctrine is christological in its expression. The continuing Presence of Him, by the Spirit, Who was God and Man is the means of the communion held forth in the Eucharist. And Word, Bread, and Wine were each stepping stones to this Presence without substantive virtue in themselves. It is Christ, in his Mediatorial office, in whom "the Father can alone behold his creatures" and in whom "the creatures can behold their Father". And if it is in Christ that men can behold the Father it is equally in the membership of Christ that men are led to fellowship with each other. This seems to be the sacramental
root of Maurice's sociology which falls to be considered later. "Set before a man the Head of the Family offering up a sacrifice once for all to reconcile him to God and inviting him and all men to be partakers of his death and resurrection, and the casting away of selfishness is but the removal of a filthy garment, which is inconsistent with his new and glorious position." He saw the Sacrament as the charter of a universal fellowship in which the Lord is bound to all men and men are bound to one another. Christ cannot break his pledge but every failure of service and love on the part of men in society is a violation of the charter sealed in Christ's blood and expressed in the Eucharist. The Sacrament becomes the ground of communion in a manner that is at one and the same time both mystical and social. And to those who were asking theoretical questions about the extent, necessity and meaning of Christ's Sacrifice his advice was to seek the answer in the fellowship that the Sacrifice established between men and God and man with man.

Whereas in The Kingdom of Christ' Maurice seems to limit the Eucharist to the baptised he comes near in other places to allowing his unconditional christology to work through to the logical conclusion of barring none from the Table. In a letter on the matter he writes: "If I did not believe that you and I and all people whatsoever have actually been redeemed by the sacrifice of the eternal Son of God, and that in his flesh and blood there is a new and living way consecrated for us into the presence of God, I would not urge you to frequent the Communion Table. Because I do believe this and am sure that such a redemption goes beneath all thoughts, dreams, apprehensions, and that we only approach God because He has drawn us to Him, therefore I say, "No thought about our feelings or qualifications, the amount of our faith, the consistency of our lives, the sincerity of our repentance, ought to keep us back." This seems the corollary of the constant stress on the objectivity and universality of the salvation wrought by Christ.
Christology and the Ministry

Though Maurice uses the O.T. models of kingship, priesthood and prophecy as paradigmatic for his doctrine of the ministry the controlling factors are the dwelling of God in the temple of Christ's Incarnation and the Coming of the Spirit, by whose inspiration the Church comes into being and is constantly sustained. Defending the historical episcopate against Quaker and Dissenting attacks he writes: "He held that every bishop, being rightly ordained, holds his office directly and immediately under Christ, as the first Apostles did. This is implied in the succession, this is an essential part of the idea. The permanence of the office is the perpetual witness of Christ's presence in the church." The nature of Christ's presence as mediated through the Ministry he works out by reference to an interesting interpretation of the nature of Apostolic Ministry. He claims that this ministry was a composite which only gradually came to be seen in its fullness through the experience of the events of the Incarnation, the Resurrection and the Descent of the Spirit. In the experience of companionship with Him Who described his purpose in terms of diakonia the apostles entered the office of 'deacon' or 'minister'. Then comes the filling out of the office which derives from the implications of the Resurrection. Through his Resurrection Christ becomes "the elder and representative of the race, entered before us and for us into the Holiest of the Holies." The Apostolic Ministry takes further shape in the light of this, namely, the showing forth to men of their privileges and glory in their champion and head. To this aspect of ministry he gives the designation - presbyter. But Pentecost deepens the Apostolic Ministry yet again. Ministry has about it now the dimension of 'episcope' and the Apostles are called on to "exhibit Christ in his character of Overseer." Maurice regards these conceptions of deacon, presbyter, and episcopacy as following the O.T. outline of prophet, priest and king, - "the office of the king, expounding the
relationship in which the invisible being stands to us as members of society; the office of priest, bringing him before us in his transactions with the conscience of every particular man; the office of the prophet, exhibiting him (Christ) as the mover and inspirer of human thoughts, energies and actions ... ." 18

It will be noted that Maurice sought to root his key thoughts about the ministry in scripture, interpreting New Testament ministry with the aid of Old Testament antecedents. He was to adopt this method when he was formulating his doctrine of the church. In this connection A.M. Ramsay writes: "It was not at the time common to expound the church as the Israel of God, and to seek its meaning within scripture as a whole." 19 This methodology led him to the conviction that the Apostolic Ministry guaranteed and universalised by the historic episcopate belonged as essentially to the constitution of the Church as did the priesthood to Israel. Yet though he uses the word 'sacramental' as a description of one function of apostolic ministry he nowhere comes near to a High Church view. He certainly criticised those who assert that the priesthood of Christ renders all other priesthood redundant, as he does the notion that the supreme episcopacy of Christ excludes all other episcopacy. Rather does he speak of human priesthood as the witness to Christ's priesthood both in the Eucharist and by the insistent proclamation of the Atonement as historic event and existential reality.

But despite his deeply spiritual view of the Ministry or perhaps because of it he lamented the inadequacy of the clergy of his day. His challenge was in effect: 'Become what you are'. "The God we have preached", he says, "has not been the God who was manifested in his Son Jesus Christ but another altogether different being ... . When I am describing what we have made of the Gospel of God's Redemption of the world, I cannot soften my expression." 20 The nub of this criticism seems to be that the preaching was too much about
religion (which Maurice described as a non-biblical, pagan notion long before Barth) and too little about theology which he defined in his 'Essays' as "the setting forth of God's acts and purposes to us." That is union with and redemption by the Saviour of the race.

Christology and the Race

One of the unresolved tensions in Maurice's theology is that though he wrote and preached a good deal about the meaning of the Cross his thinking is dominated by notions that flow from his understanding of the Incarnation. Though chronologically it is posterior to the Adamic event yet theologically it is prior to it. Using the conceptions of incorporation and 'recapitulatio' he sees the race in Christ. "No man has a right to say, My race is a sinful race, even when he most confesses the greatness of his own sin and fall because he is bound to contemplate his race in the Son of God, and to claim by faith in him, his share in its redemption and glory." He approves of the order in which the Articles of Religion refer first of all to Christ and then to Adam. "We hear nothing of the first Adam till we are told of the Second Adam, the Lord from heaven." He speaks about "the contemplation of the race in the Son of God" and insists that "Christ was before all things and by him all things consist. In him God created men and his incarnation, though it came later than the fall, was really in God's purpose before it." He accepted the practical challenge of this and indeed this was the theological basis of Christian socialism. He quotes with approval a comment made to him: "If you only act on your conviction that Christ is in everyone, what a much higher life you might live, how much better work you might do." This principle with its corollary that it was more true to say that all men were in Christ than that they were lost or fallen or in Adam was to Maurice the true ground of universal fellowship. It was the business of the Church to
bear witness to this and indeed the Gospel consisted in the proclamation that men were united to God in Christ, and this was the basis of their corporate humanity. The Church "ought to make men understand and feel how possible it is for men as men to fraternise in Christ; how impossible it is to fraternise, except in him. Now the denial of a universal head is practically the denial of all communion in society .... I meet men as men because I feel I have a ground on which I can meet them, and that this is the deepest and safest ground of all."27 The application of this is to be found in his political, social and educational concerns.

A.M. Ramsay cites the concept of unity as one that haunted Maurice all his life. Church and world seemed broken into the fragmentation of parties, systems and classes. There was a given unity in Christ realisable within communions, within nations, within the comity of nations. And whether men consciously acknowledged the Kingship of Christ or not, wherever they sought to enrich life and break down barriers they were moved by the Spirit and moving the human process toward 'the omega point' of what Maurice called Christus Cosummatur.

There is something metaphysical in Maurice's conception of mankind in Christ which preserves for him the validity of the conception against the evidence of a diabolical bondage within which man is shackled. He speaks about the Kingdom as an existing, practical reality of the here and now while manifestly recognising that this is not to be equated with a utopian condition of things upon earth (an error which his disciple Kingsley fell into). The Kingdom is that which he believes corresponds to the true 'constitution' (a favourite word) of things rather than human fallenness. "Men are in the divine image, men are members of a redeemed race, men have God as their Father. Sin is to act as if these things were not true, to slip into a false view of what things mean. To know how things really are - is to be delivered from
Dr. Ramsay sums up the two dimensional anthropology of Maurice which saw Man in Christ and yet confessed perhaps over-sensitively "the greatness of his own sin and fall."

The implications for preaching were clear. "It seemed to me that if I could not address all kinds of people as members of Christ and children of God, I could not address them at all." It was not faith that brought men to God but The Incarnation and faith was acceptance, recognition, and illumination.

The Church and the Age

We turn now to consider some of the social and theological influences that were elements of the total cultural milieu of F.D. Maurice's day. For while it would be an over-simplification to think of Maurice's insights as the mental children of this culture it is part of our research to try to assess to what extent the form and content of Christian preaching and the theology underlying it and producing is conditioned by the prevailing milieu. There seems to be some truth in the words of A.C. Hatch "The religion of a given race at a given time is relative to the whole mental attitude of that time. It is impossible to separate the religious phenomena from the other phenomena (of the age)." And again: "No permanent change takes place in the religious beliefs or usages of a race which is not rooted in the existing beliefs and usages of that race." This matter of theological and social interrelationships, especially in the formulation of radical or pioneer Christian thinking, is one to which we must return in greater detail (particularly the consideration of christology against the background of its cultural setting) but perhaps this paragraph may stand meantime as the justifying link between a consideration of Maurice's theology and a consideration
of the age to which it was addressed and within which it came to life.

Describing the condition of England at the beginning of the 19th Century Trevelyan writes: "It was a hard world of sharply-divided interests with small sense of national brotherhood." Poverty, which had always been an economic axiom of life for the agricultural workers, became much more striking in its ghastly effect when it was seen in the much more densely collective context of the urban societies created by the Industrial Revolution. "The factory poor were wholly uncared for by Church or State; no Lady Bountiful visited them with blankets and advice; no one but the Nonconformist Minister was their friend; they had no luxury but drink ...." There were attempts to fix minimum wages under the Speenhamland system in Berkshire which sought to relate wages to the minimum price of bread which was high because of the effects of the Corn Laws. These attempts failed and the proposed 'minimum' system was replaced by an embryonic 'assistance' system by which "every poor and industrious person should receive from the parish a certain sum per week in addition to his wages, so much for himself and so much for other members of his family, when the loaf cost a shilling. As the loaf rose, the dole was to rise with it." This gave rise to further anomalies because the prosperous farmer was not required to pay his labourer a living wage while at the same time his employees were being subsidised by the parishioners without however escaping the status of pauperism even while in full employment. Where there was competition from the expanding manufacturing industries, as in the North of England, the wages of the agricultural labourers were forced up and despite the effects of the Napoleonic War, Trevelyan concludes that by the beginning of the 19th Century "the average standard of life was almost certainly higher than in the previous century, if all regions and all classes are taken into account." The century was however destined to see the gradual increase of political
agitation and aspiration which would arise from the new social situation created by industrialisation. The prevailing political and economic theories were calculated to suppress these aspirations. And these were buttressed by the Utilitarianism of John Stuart Mill and Bentham. The market play of the law of supply and demand would fix wages and prices and the consequence would be the greatest possible happiness of the greatest number. Malthus published in 1798 his economic 'Essay on the Principle of Population' embodying the thesis that man multiplies at a greater rate than the productive capacity of the earth and that the balance is only held by the ravaging effects of disease, vice and starvation. It was therefore dangerous to tamper with this delicate economic balance by increasing wages and prosperity for this would have the effect of increasing human fecundity and the population explosion would be insupportable. A large pool of people were needed as the economic instruments of an industrial society but though they must be virile enough to maintain their class and strong enough to work yet they must be kept within those margins of poverty which expose them to the balancing effects of vice, starvation and disease. As C.E. Raven says: "Over-population became in fact the favourite bogey of the laissez-faire school, and for nearly a century was employed to scare away every champion of reform."  

Against such social conditions, interpreted in terms of this economic theory, there arose a continuing protest. Carlyle was one of the first to voice a humanitarian protest and indeed he was not without significance as an antecedent of the later Christian Socialist Movement. "Laissez-faire, Supply and demand - one begins to weary of all that. Leave all to egoism, to ravenous greed of money, of pleasure, of applause - it is the Gospel of Despair." Carlyle was of course the British historian of the French Revolution and was influential when he spoke of social causes and effects. Yet Carlyle stood almost alone at the beginning of the century as a man of
letters whose sympathies were with reforming trends. At the level of practical politics Cobbet inveighed against the Corn Laws, which, by banning imports of corn were cutting the supply, heightening the demand, forcing up the price and thereby pricing the poor out of the market while at the same time 'featherbedding' the farmers. At the level of social experiment there was the outstanding attempt of Robert Owen at New Lanark to create a model industrial and social pattern in which the process of industrialisation would be an instrument not of profit but of broad-based human enrichment. His sociological doctrine was based on the notion that human personality was exclusively the product of environmental factors and therefore with the aim of evolving a model society he worked at the improvement of living standards, housing, sanitation, wages and education. The evidence of his material achievement remains at New Lanark but his campaign to get the State to follow his example failed because "unfortunately, in the earlier years of the century, State control in the interests of the working classes was not an idea congenial to the rulers of Britain."38

There is also the ambivalent effect of Evangelical religion on the social scene to be considered. Though this falls to be considered more specifically in the context of the church's response to the age, yet we may note here the positive though limited contribution of the evangelicals to the life of man in society. Evangelicalism of this period has its origins in the Wesleyan movement which of course for a period was a school of thought within the Anglican Church. The earnestness of personal religion which it encouraged led to the duty and practice of holiness in living and the imitation of Christ and this in turn expressed itself in practical philanthropy, a pity for the poor, a conception of salvation which included the reclamation of the whole person. These outworkings of evangelical faith continued within the Church of England party of that name. It is associated with the names of men like
John Newton and Charles Simeon and as Morley (Life of Gladstone) says, "they helped to form a conscience, if not a heart, in the callous bosom of English politics." The total social and political impact of Evangelicals on 19th Century life is in process of re-appraisal at the moment (see Kathleen Beasman's work) and therefore a final verdict cannot be given, yet considerable new evidence would have to be forthcoming to overthrow the prevailing view that while Morley's conclusion is true it has to be balanced against Raven's who speaks about "evangelicals applying St. Paul's more quietistic sayings to the circumstances of the industrial era," and Halevy who says that "it was the influence of the Evangelicals which invested the British aristocracy with an almost stoic dignity, restrained the plutocrats who had newly risen from the masses from vulgar ostentation and debauchery, and placed over the proletariat a select body of workmen enamoured of virtue and capable of self-restraint. Evangelicalism was thus the conservative force which restored in England the balance momentarily destroyed by the explosion of the revolutionary forces." (Halevy, History of English People). Evangelicalism tried to fill moral cement into the structure of a society which was, so it believed, God-ordained. It was individualistic but not revolutionary in any but the most spiritual connotation of the term.

Evangelicals apart, the social alienation of the Church of England was very marked. The 18th Century had been marked by Latitudinarianism characterised by a lack of dogmatic or ecclesiastical commitment and by social acquiescence and approval. As Raven says: "The Church of England had for nearly a century been singularly lacking in spirituality or inspiration. Her position under the Hanoverian kings was that of a respectable though little respected department of State. Her traditions decried enthusiasm as dangerous or even vicious, relegated piety to fixed days and places and persons, inculcated a slavish adherence to the Crown and nobility and a loyal support
to privilege and the status quo. Her bishops were deliberately chosen either for reasons of birth and political service or because they were known to be sound and sleepy. Her clergy were the well-groomed, well-meaning sons of the well-to-do, men in whose eyes all was well in this best of worlds - or if not there was always the hereafter."42 This utter acquiescence is embodied in the person of William Paley (1743-1803), Archdeacon of Carlisle, who wrote a pamphlet entitled, 'Reasons for Contentment addressed to the Labouring Part of the British Public' and defended episcopacy principally on the grounds that it was a God-ordained role for those from the nobility whose vocation lay within the Church.

In the 19th Century this torpor was aroused by three quite separate movements in English Churchmanship: the Evangelical party, the Oxford Movement and the Christian Socialists. The dominant interests of the Evangelicals can be seen from the societies that came into being through their influence: the Society for the Reformation of Manners, the Religious Tract Society, the Church Missionary Society and the Bible Society. The christianising of Britain (and beyond) was the end result of the evangelisation of individual men and women. The Oxford Movement was partly the result of religious nostalgia ('Pusey was labouring to reconstruct in 19th Century England the religion of St. Anselm or St. Cyril of Alexandria')43 and partly the result of genuine ecclesiastical and theological concern. The individualism of the Evangelical was usurping the consciousness of the corporreality of the Catholic Church throughout all Christian history, while the Erastianism of the latitudinarians had robbed the church of its commission to lead men into sacramental union with Christ through His Church. In the Oxford Movement there was also an element of escape from the effects of a liberalism that was eroding traditions and leading to scepticism. "It was a response to the panic of the times" in which Catholic authority seemed the best alternative to "liberalism of thought
that was undermining the remnants of authority." In this they tended to be unselective failing to identify the best elements in liberal and reformist movements (e.g. Questioning subscription to the 39 Articles as the basis for entry to Oxford), tending rather to flee from all change into the unchanging, mediaval Ark of the Church. This made them backward looking and so exacerbated their alienation from an age of rising aspiration; it made them introverted and rendered them blind to injustice, poverty and the whole secular and industrial framework of life.

The identification with the politically and socially influenced culture of the age which the Tractarians rejected, was attempted by the third significant party (though Maurice abhorred the word 'party') within the church—the Christian Socialists. The founders were J.M. Ludlow, Charles Kingsley and F.D. Maurice.

Christology and Culture

The culture of the mid eighteen hundreds was given its character by the ongoing process of industrialisation. If we may take as a working definition of culture the body of moral, social, political, religious and aesthetic notions that influence the life of a society we may say that there was a direct interplay between these and the new developing economic bases of the nation in mass manufacture and the full scale exploitation of natural resources. This process gave rise to new types of men: capitalists and labour; new types of societies; factory towns and mining towns; new types of social problems: the problems of large connurbations of people living in close proximity; New types of theological problems particularly in the communication of the meaning of Christianity. Paul Tillich in 'Theology of Culture' referring to our contemporary culture speaks about it as having "the spirit of industrial society as it was shaped in the 18th and 19th centuries" and he characterises
the theological effect of that culture as having removed God from "the power field of man's activities". In the Industrial Revolution the 'power field' had been moved from the Church where it had been located in medieval Europe and Britain, and from the aristocracy and landed classes where it had been located during the feudal period, to the new class of manufacturer, industrialist and pioneer technologist. This was the beginning of the period in which there arose a widespread sense of the autonomy of the 'saeculum'. Machines could serve the interests of man, the earth could be exploited for human wellbeing and wealth and with the application of human inventiveness the whole pattern of life could be changed. While for the masses the passage through this life might remain 'a vale of tears' it was not thought of as a 'a vale of soul-making', the religious question having been put aside. Maurice both saw the need of the application of the Gospel to this new social and cultural situation but also believed that there was an essential social orientation to the Gospel. This centred on his social and 'secular' interpretation of the Christ Event. To what extent was this christology conditioned by the spirit of the age and what contribution did it subsequently make as one element in the culture of British society?

1. The Roots

We must consider it in its literary, political and theological context, tracing first of all its antecedents in these spheres.

The question of the influence of Thomas Carlyle on Maurice needs further examination. It used to be thought that though Carlyle was antagonistic to the church he had nonetheless stimulated Maurice's interest in working class interests and education by his exhortations along that line. Certainly the social edge of his criticism of the evil of all human relationships being under the domination of the economics of laissez-faire and the law of supply and demand was prophetic. And while Maurice says that there are lessons for
churchmen strewn all over Carlyle's 'French Revolution' it could not be said that he was in any sense a disciple. Indeed Maurice felt that Carlyle lived in a world 'without a centre' because he had missed the meaning of the Incarnation but also praises his "real abhorrence of what is base and false".

A much more certain literary and philosophical influence of Maurice was Coleridge (1772-1834). A.R. Vidler says of Coleridge that "he stands at the starting-point of various lines of thought that were followed, and more carefully marked out, by a number of Christian thinkers whose minds he set in motion." Maurice was one of these. On two subjects in particular the direct influence is seen: the doctrines of Revelation and the Church. Coleridge posited two avenues of knowledge which he referred to as understanding and reason. By understanding he meant comprehension of things and by reason he meant apprehension of people or of God. It was with the reason that one responded to revelation to give a 'personal' knowledge of God. This was Maurice's view and it is against the background of this theology that we must understand the violence of his reaction to Dr. Mansel in whose Bampton Lectures the thesis was that there could be no "fellowship knowledge" of God but that we could only comprehend certain rules that God had given for the regulation of life and conduct. The other Coleridgean doctrine reflected in Maurice is the idea that the Anglican Church is to be thought of in a twofold way: as a National Church to which every Englishman has the right of membership, not identical with but not unrelated to the State, but simultaneously and primarily a portion of the Church Catholic and Apostolic. There are other echoes: the limited value of 'evidences' of the truth of Christianity; the mediation of God's revelation through all truth and through the feelings of the heart as well as the formulations of the mind; that Christ is the consummation of all reality. The influence of Coleridge also preserved Maurice from panic-stricken reaction to the historical biblical criticism
that was developing in that Coleridge held that the authentication of the Biblical record lay at a deeper level. We may say that Maurice worked within the complex of ideas provided by Coleridge but set the Incarnation much more firmly at their heart than did Coleridge.

Another kind of underlying influence on Maurice's thought is in the area of social upheaval and the political effects of these. From childhood days he had been aware of poverty and injustice and the obligation to view these with a practical pity. His father, who was a Unitarian Minister introduced the young Frederick to practical schemes in which he was involved: Sunday School, soup kitchens, anti-slavery agitation, clothing clubs etc. "A boy living among a family, all the members of which were so intensely interested in the questions of the day, could hardly fail to be strongly affected by the excited condition of the public mind in England during the years of his childhood." This gave to him an early introduction to liberal and reformist politics. After leaving Cambridge where he claims to have been saved from Benthamism by his reading of Coleridge, he became the editor of a review called 'Athenaeum'. Carlyle suggested in his 'Life of Sterling' that Maurice wrote in a very radical vein in this journal but he seems to have attributed to Maurice copy that came from other pens. There is no distinctive political commitment evident. But more and more he expresses his political commitment through his theological commitment. The year he was ordained was 1834, the year of the passing of the Reform Bill when quite new political issues were coming before the nation. That same year Maurice expresses his loyalty to "that church which alone stands forth and upholds universal brotherhood, on the only basis on which brotherhood is possible." There is little doubt that what he had in mind when he speaks about the 'only basis' is his Christological doctrines which he expounds in social terms repeatedly. And turning away from Radical, Whig or Tory doctrines of society he expressed his own in terms
of Christian Socialism.

The great theological influences that underlay Maurice's thought were taken from the Greek Fathers where the Loges concept in Irenaeus and Origen is thought of as the divine educative principle at work in the world though this sometimes laid him open to the charge of vagueness and obscurity. There is also a Platonist strain in his thinking when he speaks about the reality which lies behind the form of the Creeds.

2. The interplay of Influence and Creativity

We have to raise the issue as to the relationship between what Maurice received and the creative application of his mind to what he received, in the process enlarging what he had received and regenerating it as the relevant christological word for his own day.

There is the relationship of his use of scripture to the social and cultural issues. The use of scripture is never 'in vacuo' but is always conditioned by the complex aspects of the human situation. The light of the existential situation shines on the word just as the light of the Word shines on the situation. This comes out clearly in his reply to the Address presented to him by the Members of Lincoln's Inn on the occasion of his leaving. He writes: 'I have the best reason to know that the minds of numbers in all classes of society ... are unsettled, not on some trifling or secondary questions, but on those which affect their inmost faith ... . I have maintained therefore long before I ministered among you - and in every sermon I have preached to you - that there is no safety but in looking fairly in the face of all the difficulties which beset ourselves. So far as I have been enabled steadily to pursue this method with myself, with you, with all who have been brought under my teaching; so far I have found that the Scriptures ... have unfolded their meaning to me, have shown me a way out of my perplexities; have offered me a deeper theology and a wider humanity than I had ever
imagined for myself, or than the age .... has ever dreamed of." He regarded the Bible as an 'instrument' of the Kingdom of God; a means of attaining the knowledge of God made possible in Christ for every man and which expressed itself socially in righteousness and peace. He spoke of "God's Word as a witness to the Divine Love which shall put down evil and establish righteousness throughout the world." Always the Bible is seen as a means subserving Divine purposes and this view brought Maurice to call for less 'idolatry' and more 'reverence' of it. But even at that he never thought the Word of God in scripture as something to be heard in a quietness where the noise of the world was hushed and sealed off. He believed that Bible Study was reduced almost to uselessness if men brought to it the presuppositions of wicked or selfish political or social stances. "I came more and more to the feeling that sound political teaching is what we want to restore sense and might to our Bible studies," by which he seems to mean a restoration of the teaching of the Bible about the relationship of God to men in their sociality. He illustrates this by comparing the Book of Isaiah with Lord Mahon's 'Life of Pitt'. He describes Isaiah as luminous and the 'Life of Pitt' as 'muddy beyond expression'. And yet strangely enough Isaiah seems unintelligible by comparison with Pitt. This, claims Maurice, is not because of the time gap for Isaiah might have been written for the time of Louis Napoleon and "Pitt's age seems separated from ours by an infinite chasm". And then comes the observation which clarifies his plea for 'sound political teaching'. He writes (quoting from Isaiah): "Take the words, 'I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me'. 'Nonsense,' say all the preachers, 'these English people are not God's children in any sense. How can they know their owner or their master's crib? They have no owner and no crib till we have been and converted them.' And so Wolff (a Jewish theologian) says rightly enough, 'You give up Isaiah and the
prophets to us - your doctrine is different from theirs, and all attempts to accommodate them to your doctrine must prove futile."50 The biblical theme in which Maurice found God's Word for a society characterised by its fragmentation was God's undifferentiated relationship with all his people, rich and poor, capital and labour, converted and unconverted.

Early personal and family experience in which he saw religious divisiveness in his home first stimulated his longing for some central and unifying principle for life. This was further developed in his study of the classics at Cambridge under Julius Hare. Referring to the study of the Antigone of Sophocles he writes: "one rose to the apprehension that the poem had a unity about it, and that the poet was pursuing an ideal, and that the unity was not created by him but perceived by him ... . I cannot the least tell you how Hare imparted this conviction to me; I only know that I acquired it, and could trace it very directly to his method of teaching." And of this period of experience of the classics he writes: "We were, just as much as the students of natural philosophy, feeling our way from particulars to universals, from facts to principles."51 These influences, together with later involvements which highlighted for him both churchly and worldly distinctions brought him to think creatively about the meaning of unity and universality. This is where the interplay of political, social and cultural influences with scripture finds its focus. For it is perhaps no surprise that it is the Johannine writings that he finds the controlling motifs of his thought. This point is the point at which scripture and culture meet creatively. It is drawn out again and again in his 'Commentary upon the Gospel of St. John'. "Christ was not a King whom a faction set up. He was the original Lord of men, ruling not as a stranger, but as One who had from the beginning been the light of men."52 The implications of the 'logos' teaching of John's prologue gave Maurice the secret of unity and universality
which his individual and social experience cried out for. The 'logos' presence in every man is part of the meaning of Creation. And Christ, the Incarnation of the Logos, is now present in every man. For Maurice this is the Gospel, the basis of his social anthropology, the principle by which he measured the falseness of every kind of divisiveness. Dr. Headlam who was perhaps the first to combine in his churchmanship the elements of high sacramentarianism with radical socialism says that "the most important part of Maurice's teaching" was "the Fatherhood of God, with, as its corollary, the eternal Sonship of Christ and consequently the brotherhood of Man."
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3. A Survey of the Christological Problem from the Kerygmatic Point of View in the Light of Contemporary Theological Issues

a. Some Bridging Questions

Having examined Maurice's main concerns in the light of his christology we now extrapolate some questions rising from the considerations of the previous chapter. The introduction of these questions has a twofold relevance. One is that they are examples of issues that practitioners of homiletical and practical christology have to wrestle with in every generation. And secondly, they are questions that provide both a preamble and a bridge to a wider survey of the issues in contemporary theological contention of which the preacher has to be aware and about which he has to make either value-judgements or firm theological commitments. It is this wider survey with which this chapter will in the main be concerned as a prolegomenon for a subsequent exposition of Maurician themes in terms of their usefulness to preaching the Gospel in our day.

But first the reflections to which the material of the previous chapter give rise.

1. Is the form of Maurice's christology (the christological myth) expressed typically as universal Kingship and Headship contingent upon the cultural milieu or is it a result of a genuine submission to the word of scripture?

According to Dillistone the meaning of the Incarnation of the Logos has to be interpreted in the terms of the myth conceived as truth embodied in thought-forms shapen and conditioned by cultures that rise and pass away. He does not himself feel that the thoughtforms of the N.T. world are definitive for the expression of the meaning of the Christ Event, though the relationship of the history of Jesus of Nazareth to the myth of Christ the Son of God is the relationship of one root to a many-coloured plant which changes 'colour'
in different cultural climates though it is never severed from its historical rootage. Christology perhaps always involves part borrowing from scripture and part borrowing from the prevailing culture even if it is only by reaction against that culture. But the question has to be asked what is contingent and what is definitive or essential in the Biblical christology which has to be carried over into any transplantation of that christology into another culture. And while Maurice's time predated the era in which this question has become acute yet his use of Kingship as his leading christological motif is significant. National kingship is interpreted as the means of preserving and indeed understanding the constitutional and organic esse of the nation. Each member belonged to the King; the King belonged to each member; each member belonged to the others. In a culture searching for a unifying principle Maurice brought to bear upon it the Kingship of Christ. This was the myth for the age as he saw it. The world he knew was a Western world and though he related Christ to 'everyman' in reality this was perhaps to every Western man, for whom kingship was a meaningful conception.

2. Is Christology always the key to renewal within the church and communication with the world because it is the ground both of hope and judgement? This comes out in a passage like the following: 'I cannot believe that the devil is in any sense King of the Universe. I believe that Christ is its King in all senses'. His issue with Evangelicals was that in subordinating this note to the notion that the world lay in the grip of evil was that they muted this pre-eminent truth about Christ. And it was the restoration of the objective primacy of Christ's sovereignty over all that he was calling for when he spoke about the need of a theological reformation that would be the prelude to political change. He speaks about Christ's universal atonement and sacrifice as the keynote of social harmony. And his hopeful adventures
into co-operative experiments and education may have been based partly on
an optimistic view of human nature (though not of his own nature) but it
was much more rooted in the idea that the Kingdom was real and would be
found by those who sought it and that in the most genuine sense Christ was
King of all.

Authentic christology must always have dimension of hope to it and its
effect is mission. The Church's message to itself is about Christ and the
Church's message to the world is about Christ. Is the source of a theological
reformation not always in christology?

3. What are the conditions that bring to life a pioneering christology?
What Maurice was saying was new. He described himself as a theological
'digger' and one wonders what are the conditions that call for theological
digging. In Maurice's time there was rapid social change which changed the
pattern of life and altered the form of human relations and need. There was
also an awareness of the threats to existence brought about by the change in
which stabilities of an agrarian society were being replaced by another
society whose form was uncertain. Does rapid external change always draw
theology into its vortex so that the pressing problem for the church becomes
one of explanation and communication with the message about Christ at the
centre of this adaptation?

4. Is there always a 'logos equivalent' in every culture? Maurice drew
a distinction between the Church and the world although sometimes it became
blurred and it was at most a distinction that centred on the idea of per-
ception rather than salvation. But certainly he regarded the whole world
of men as the theatre of God's glory with the divine presence at work in
men in such a way that all that was good was the outworking of Christ's
presence in men. Not only so but in his educational work Maurice welcomed
all beliefs and none provided they were seeking for that unity and brotherhood
which he sought. And he interpreted this unity and brotherhood in 'logos' terms as that which God had set in human hearts and to which Christ could be related and vice versa. It was the 19th Century equivalent of the 'logos' notion that the writer of the Fourth Gospel found to hand in Hellenistic culture.

5. Is Maurice's christology a christology of protest and therefore simply a mental child of its age? It was a protest against Tractarianism and Evangelicalism within the Church. It was a protest against economic and political theory outside the church. Vidler says: 'Maurice attacked the whole laissez faire, competitive, commercialist outlook in the name of theology. Men, are not in their true nature as created by God and redeemed by Christ, mere self-contained individuals who are bound to compete with one another, each in pursuit of his own interests'. It was against a theology that alienated men from Christ and a sociology that saw man as a commercialist, competitive being that Maurice saw men in their Christian relatedness. It really does seem that in this there was a certain mystical view of human nature which together with a deep sensitivity to the human predicament did cause him to obscure all that the Bible says about man in his alienation, lostness, and sin.

b. The Polarities of the Problem

Taking seriously these bridging questions arising out of the consideration of Maurice's christology against the historical background we may feel that many of the issues are homologated into the haunting question posed by Bonhoeffer thus: 'Who is Christ for us today?' This lays the stress on the need for a cogent exposition of the meaning of the Christ Event in terms that have a contemporary intelligibility. But the tension inherent in the attempt to accomplish this end lies in the awareness that behind the last
wave of christological re-interpretation there is the ocean of the tradition formulated in creeds and councils and beyond that is the fontal spring of the New Testament witness. Reinterpretation may be required. Indeed the need is widely recognised for both psychological and theological reasons but the fact is that there is a framework of 'Giveness' which cannot be ignored and this is one expression of the wider insight that re-interpretation must take the form of 'reformation at the bar of the Word of God.'

This poses the tension of contemporary re-interpretation and establishes the polarities within which homiletical christology moves. The problem may be expressed in the question: is it possible to come to the meaning of Christ for us today through the contemporary culture defined as that body of moral, social, intellectual and aesthetic ideas and values which either comprise the prevailing world-view or a number of inter-related world-views or in a pluralistic civilisation a number of incompatible world-views? Or must the preacher interpret the contemporary culture always against the background and in the light of a definitive christology that does not permit of much departure from the psychological and philosophical categories of the New Testament? The danger of the latter is that christology is expressed in biblical and Hebraic categories that are far removed from the intellectual climate of the day while the weakness of the former is that what seems to be the meaningful form of the 'Myth' does not sufficiently correspond with the Apostolic witness. The relativity of every kind of religious expression, including christological expression, is underlined by A.C. Hatch as follows:

"The religion of a given race at a given time is relative to the whole mental attitude of that time. It is impossible to separate the religious phenomena from the other phenomena ...." 5

That is a point which we shall have occasion to elaborate for though scholarly research displays the truth in it in the various strata of biblical material
and their relationship to history and tradition, yet the practical theology of the church expressed in its preaching and teaching at the more popular level, is often either unaware of the imposing influence of the contemporary culture or unwilling to admit the influence. And also where there is this awareness it sometimes takes the form of a total intoxication with the idea or re-pristinisation thinking in terms of wiping clean the slate of the tradition and ending up with a Jesusology more attributable to the Enlightenment period, than the classical christology of the church. It will be our endeavour to show that though men have found that the question, who is Christ for us today? has always been inseparable from the momentum of the contemporary mores (given expression in its culture), yet the original biblical 'giveness' cannot be renounced. This in fact means always the attempt to proclaim Christ in the reality of a humanity which hallows all humanity, in the activity of a saviourhood which offers fundamental spiritual regeneration and as the paradigm of a life-embracing existence of a kind that validates what John Baillie called 'the proper claims of earth.' This will probably always require from the church a form of pragmatic and provisional intellectual commerce between the world of the New Testament and each succeeding day and age. F.W. Dillistone hints at this in an important passage. After making the point that there must be continuing research into the word-structures and language-forms that provided the original kerygmatic 'myth' he goes on to refer to the possibility of the modification both of the form and expression of this 'myth' in the light of greater knowledge. But then he makes this crucial point:

"Not that it is likely to be entirely outmoded by subsequent discovery though the coming of the modern scientific age has necessitated greater revolutions in the world's mythology than ever before. Still, however, man is seeking to obtain a total picture of his universe, still he is seeking to formulate its rhythms and regularities, still he is seeking to find a way from the disordered and transient to the harmonious and abiding. And still the essential message of the Christian Gospel is
that through the incarnation of the Son of God the answer has been given to all these questions though never precisely in their own terms. For the life-pattern of the Son of God cannot be expressed as a law or a principle or a formula or an equation. It is a life pattern of personal involvement and personal redemption, of incarnation and transfiguration, of death and life, of kenosis and glorification. This pattern of humiliation and glorification through death and resurrection constituting the central meaning of every mythology - here is (the other) part of the essential message of the Christian gospel."

There is at the heart of this passage the sticking point which distinguishes Dillistone from other theologians like William Hamilton and Thomas Altizer who are similarly concerned with the tensions between Christ and modern culture. For while Dillistone speaks of the need for continuing research into the form of the original 'myth' (muthos) and the possibility of modification he in fact states the original form of the myth in terms of 'the incarnation of the Son of God' as the essence of the Christian message, which whatever the semantic and cultural adaptations to which it is subject, will remain as the theological basis and starting point. This seems to be one of the most clearly distinguishable divisions in modern theological dialogue within the examination of Christianity and culture: the division between those for whom Christology must ultimately be construed in terms of incarnate word and those for whom there are no such presuppositions. Among the former are men of such diverse theologies as Ronald Gregor Smith, F.W. Dillistone, Francis Schaeffer, H.A. Williams, Norman Pittenger who nonetheless share this basic christological sticking point. In their different ways they make this the ground of their judgement of the christology of the historic church. In 'The New Man', for example, Gregor Smith, after describing the vain attempts of the church to protect God against 'the advancing battalions of intelligence, reason and scepticism' goes on to say: 'In this attempting to safeguard God, the Church has only been safeguarding its idea of God. It has been honouring not the Incarnate Word in the bleeding helplessness of utter service, but an emasculated Jesus, the Jesus of the ersatz
gold halo and the tawdry piety of decadent Jesusology. Here indirectly we are introduced to Smith's basic plea for the recovery of the existential response to the message of the Kerygma as the ground of faith while at the same time stripping the Christian message from the metaphysical forms which it has assumed in its passage from the initial Judaic environment through the subsequent centuries. At first glance this seems like a plea for a recovery of the elusive "first century Christianity" and at one level it may be so interpreted. But the subtlety and ambivalence of Smith's christological thinking stems from his attitude to the historicity of the New Testament material which is in turn influenced by the stance of an existentialist thinker towards the category of history, the overall effect being that the whole concept of 'kerygma' seems to have been radically re-interpreted. But the observation of this element in Smith's thinking may serve as a way of exposing the various facets in the problem of the relationship of christology to culture.

c. The Place of the Historical Christ

There is the place of the historical Christ within the whole frame of reference, whether what is being thought of is the supposed importance for christology of personality or historical particularity, or both. To follow Dillistone's thesis at this point, he asserts that the implication of the Christian message is that the "universe is to be interpreted in terms of personal values" and "the model for its integration is to be found in a personal career. The meaning of the universe became incarnate and we beheld His Glory - the outshining of grace and truth, the revelation of perfect sonship, the final unveiling of perfect sacrifice. The model of the universe was disclosed as a personal movement of self-fulfilment through
self-identification, of the enrichment of spirit through involvement in matter, of the increase of energy through patient submission to forms of organisation." Here Dillistone draws out the universal significance of Christianity from the personal and historical particularity of Christ. Meaning is not to be separated from personal experience and the paradigm of personal experience is to be found in the specific experience of the Person of Jesus Christ. This implies the historicality of the Person of Christ for though as it has been developed in Christian theology historicality is only one dimension of the Person of Christ, it has been traditionally thought of as an indispensable aspect. This is emphasised by Dillistone as follows: "Something happened in history and the story of it must be told: Hence the appeal to the word and to the ear. The story must constantly be reinterpreted and re-applied to other histories and in this way its significance will expand and grow. But the essential events of the Gospel story stand firm in history and no message can ultimately call itself the Christian message which is not constantly returning to and wrestling with and being judged by and being renewed by the story of the saving acts of Jesus the Christ." 

d. Ontology and Myth

A second facet of christological interpretation is in the probing of the meaning of Christ in such fashion that from the inner ontological meaning of the event there is yielded or mediated the myth that provides the word of basic theological interpretation within the relativities of any day or age or culture. Dillistone makes the point that the Christ Event must not only be thought of as having been the actual centre and fulfilment of the mythological world-picture of the New Testament era but also "the symbolical centre of the world-picture of any era."
In the broader theological field it is the work of the Theologian 'to make the mystery present' in the images and thought-forms that are both faithful to the givenness of the Word of Revelation and intelligible to men within the relativity of their own universe of discourse. And in the specific field of homiletical christology it is no exaggeration to say that the well-being of the Church as the mother of a living faith for men depends on the measure in which her preachers and teachers can find the living image and contemporary thought-form in which to make present the mystery of the Kerygmatic reality. And quite apart from the depth of theological perception that brings to life the word of the Gospel about Christ the concern being introduced at this point is the requirement of a linguistic, imaginative word in the mould of the intelligible 'myth'. This myth asks for no eternity of validity. It has a purely relative and pragmatic function: namely that it is the vessel that holds the water of life for a 'day'. Dillistone writes: "In the later writings of the New Testament there is the clear affirmation that the categories that were being used in the mythology of that time - eternal life, the Logos, Heaven and Earth, the High-Priest of Creation - had gained their centre of illumination and concentration of meaning in and through Jesus, the Son of God. Again, the stress is not laid at first upon the moral qualities and aesthetic excellencies revealed in the daily life of the incarnate son. Instead the concentration of interest is upon the way in which Jesus supplies in His own person the confirmation of the speculations and the answer to the deepest questionings of His own particular age." Speculation and questionings are always to be taken by the church and made the paving stones towards the christological centre, as according to Dillistone they were in the first century. There is therefore the requirement to be sensitive to the speculations and to listen to the questioning
arising out of life and literature so that we are not engaging in saying things that used to be right but are so no longer because the inner life of linguistic rapport has died out of a given conception. This was surely the awareness that generated the creative logos christology of the fourth gospel which translated the Palestinian form of the gospel into a Hellenistic mould. But since it is still this logos form that is among the foremost forms preached by the Church throughout the world in the 20th Century, some questions are inevitably raised. Was this the one definitive and sufficient transmutation? Has the Church been culpably lazy in the task of theological transmutation while she has been busy on the task of linguistic translation? Or is the catholicity of human experience such that it can be subsumed under the great creative conceptions adumbrated in the New Testament or modifications of them? Are the main conceptions mentioned by Dillistone perennially cogent: eternal life, the logos, heaven and earth, the High Priest of Creation? Is there a framework of existential constants which take the form of standard intellectual mysteries and speculations, and moral experiences, which together comprise the human predicament to which the Christian response is the Gospel interpreted within the framework of the biblical paradigms? Though as Gregor Smith has said, "theology is not the repetition of thoughts and words of the bible, yet do these thoughts and words not enshrine the collective moral and intellectual experience in an indispensible way? The status of biblical word and image is a crucial matter, and from it there stems the question as to what extent religious truth of a christian kind can be stated in non-religious language.

3. Christological Norms and Contemporary Influences

Now if the church is not required to adhere to definitive and a priori
christological norms of the kind referred to above, to what extent may her formulations be influenced by the total human milieu in which the faith is being communicated at any given time? And christological thinking has run the entire range of its ambit as in one age it has been pressurised one way and in another age been pushed the other. In the fourth century, for example, when the Arian controversy was coming to its height, the pressure that was felt in order to preserve the Christian faith focussed in an acceptable assertion of the divinity of Christ. Hence the famous homoousion formula associated with Athanasius. This is to be contrasted with the pressures of our own day generated from within the church as it views a world-affirming style of life and thought spring up around it. The christological quest as expressed in a multitude of books during the past decade has been to find in Christ the pleroma of human maturity, responsibility and freedom. An example of this kind of thinking which owes much to the contemporary cultural pressure is in this statement by Charles West:

"Man exists, then, as Christian faith sees it, in a field of personal relationships at the centre of which is Jesus Christ. He is constituted in his very being by his actions and responses in that field. From him we derive our power to be human and our ever-changing understanding, in specific relations, of what it means. Through his work, God negates the power of our inhumanity, releases us from fear of ourselves and frees us to shoulder responsibility and take action which serves our neighbour, even when we incur guilt thereby. Because Christ is there, man is not an individual, nor part of the masses, nor the creature of a race or culture, nor the citizen of a nation, but a person in these various contexts. Free for the responsibilities they carry because he is free from defining himself in terms of them." 15

This statement with its acceptance of a network of anthropological relationships at the centre of which is Jesus Christ comes near to being an expression of secular soteriology taking seriously the kerygmatic affirmation of Christ as the ultimate deliverer and saviour of men but trying to work this out in the context of the struggle for the establishment of a true humanness that is constituted by a release from the ideologies of race, nationalism, colour, and affluence that tend to be the 'principalities and
powers' of our day. As such it is a christological statement that is born out of contemporary cultural pressure, and indeed would not make much sense if it were detached from these pressures.

The influence of the relativity of culture and placing on christology can be illustrated from the contemporary scene. Consider for example the question of a christology for the third world. Under the pressure of suffering and poverty images of imperialism and authority are remote and it is the New Testament notes of servant-hood that relate the meaning of Christ to which many are attracted. It is set forth with unacademic bluntness by Colin Morris:

"The Church of the Well-Fed that offers a well-nourished Jesus to congregations of good trencher-men is dying because it speaks to a constituency that is visibly shrinking. In the next 25 years the population of the world will double and for every bonny, healthy child born on our side of the barricade, ninety nine skinny ones will pop up on the other side, far beyond the range of our evangelism... It may be claimed that the church is on both sides of the barricades, so that there is no 'wrong side'. The wrong side of the barricade is the one where Christians, of all men, find themselves protecting what they have from those who have nothing. The wrong side is where those gather to whose advantage it is to resist revolution. Jesus is on the other side of that barricade. Of that, there cannot be a shadow of doubt, He is a Revolutionary. And I am not using the term as a preacher's cliche for a man who did and said daring things, but in its technical sense. He is a Revolutionary because He stood for the radical discontinuity between the past and the future. He offered men no hope that they could build carefully and slowly upon what had gone before... His way was the Way of political and social chaos, and society is entitled to protect itself against those who bring chaos in their wake. Those hungry hordes too, will bring chaos in their wake. And we will be forced, in the interests of good order and stability and decency to resist them. By so doing we shall be resisting Jesus the Chaos-Bringer." 16

This christology seems to be forged from a selective interpretation of some aspects of the life and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth read through eyes and a mind that look on and ponder over the inequalities of modern society seen on a world scale. But it stands exposed to the criticism of casting Christ much too simplistically into the Guevara image. If there is a givenness and even a theological definitiveness in the apostolic witness to Christ then
the main drift of Morris's christology is unacceptable. It is undeniable of course that Jesus saw Himself as having a special relationship with the poor and construed his life in terms of diakonia toward them. The simplest form of the Beatitude about 'the poor' is from the Sermon on the Plain in which he says, Blessed are ye poor for yours is the kingdom of heaven.  

And the parable of Dives and Lazarus is basically a warning about the consequences of inhumanity and the hope of redress in the Kingdom. Furthermore both in his parables of Judgement and in his own inner assumption of the form of the suffering servant he identifies himself with the poor both in word and deed. The status of his own life is something he construed in terms of service. For all that the basic witness is against a Christ who would stand at the barricades and who believed that the way of the barricade was the way of redemption. The Cross was the alternative way in which the servanthood that suffers and absorbs, thus assuaging the violence of others is set forth as the paradigm of redemption, rather than a form of suffering that results from a mutuality of violence at the barricades. And the sphere in which alone Jesus can be said to be a revolutionary is in the sphere of moral ideas. This is the revolutionary nature of the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount where repeatedly the insights of Old Testament are 'revolutionised' by this 'new Moses'. But armed insurrection was something which he totally rejected to be identified with. The fire he came to kindle was a spiritual faith in human hearts and the Kingdom he came to establish was not of the order of temporality or else his servants would be soldiers. Indeed, if the witness of the New Testament has any historicality to it, Jesus was extraordinarily loyal in many respects to the status quo of society and the Judaistic heritage in which he was reared. He worshipped in the synagogue, he paid the temple-tax, he celebrated and respected the religious festivals of his people and he regarded his own
teaching much more as fulfilment of the great prophets. It is indeed difficult to find in him the prototype of the social chaos-bringer. At most he is what Stephen Neil has called 'the courteous rebel' and the flaw in the revolutionary christology of Morris is in the failure to recognise that though the contemporary 'form' of the Christ can have a cultural and social relativity about it, it must have an essential form which is not incompatible with the original christological witness. When this happens the admittedly delicate balance between contemporaneity and apostolicity is upset. The full extent to which Morris has allowed this to happen may be seen by comparing his Christ, the revolutionary man identified with the hordes at the barricades with the meticulous exposition of the career of Jesus given by C.H. Dodd in 'The Founder of Christianity'.

The crucial point of the exposition is the insight that in a potentially revolutionary situation in Palestine Jesus specifically rejects the role of the leader of it. After describing the Galilean 'recruiting campaign' to the new Israel for which John had made preparation, Dodd makes the following apposite points:

"At the same time there was another movement bidding for support - the national liberation movement of the Zealots. Its back had been broken militarily, some years before, and it had gone underground. For the time being it remained, so far as we know, without organisation or leadership, but sporadic outbreaks proved that its force was far from spent. A favourable public for its propaganda was found in Galilee and particularly among the humbler orders of the populace there. This was just the public to which Jesus at this time was appealing.

Up to a point they seemed to speak the same language. The Zealots, as Josephus tells us, refused to recognise the Roman government because 'they held God to be the only Governor and Master', and rather than acknowledge any man as master they endured indescribable sufferings." 22

He goes on to describe certain surface similarities between the requirements of Jesus' kingdom of God and this liberation movement and indeed of the passage of at least one Zealot from the one movement to the other.
This culminated in the increasing pressure on Jesus towards a political messiah-ship and the attempt to bring this about is seen by Dodd in the record of the sequel to the story of the feeding of the multitude recorded significantly in all four gospels. Speaking of the reaction of the multitude to the miracle Dodd says:

"Jesus became aware 'that they meant to come and seize him to proclaim him king.' In that brief phrase John passes over what must have been a gravely critical situation. It was no less than an attempted rising against the government with Jesus as leader. If he had been a 'Messiah' of the common sort it was a golden opportunity; but that sort of messiah he had long ago rejected as a temptation of the devil. It remained to put an end to a situation which threatened to compromise his whole mission." 23

If this is a right assessment of the response of Jesus - as we would hold it is - it seems unjustifiable so to select some gospel material which when it is passed through the alembic of a particular human perspective becomes the basic data for a homiletical christology which however suffers from the fatal flaw that it lays stress on the specific interpretation of mission and destiny rejected by the New Testament Christ.

f. Biblical Christology?

But if the corrective of Dodd is applicable to the selective and eisegetical approach of Morris, some aspects of Dodd's interpretation do not altogether answer questions and challenges posed both before and since in the various quests for the historical Jesus. And since ultimately what we preach about Christ is not unaffected by this 'quest' (unless with Bellarmine we believe that 'the dogma overcomes the history') we have to be aware of the main positions adopted and in the end - for the practical purposes of the proclamation - make a value-judgement on it which will take into account all relevant factors which will include not only the word of the historian, but also the witness of faith together with "the evidence
of religious experience."

As an example of the point at which the new testament historian poses the sharpest challenge to the preacher of a kerygmatic faith we may think of H.J. Cadbury's view of Jesus. In the book 'Christ For Us Today' (a symposium of papers given at the conference of Modern Churchmen, 1967, edited by Norman Pittenger) Denis Nineham draws attention to the challenge of Cadbury's thinking as enshrined in two books 'Jesus, What Manner of Man?' and 'The Peril of Modernizing Jesus'. They pose an astringent scholarly reproach to the free-ranging, socially motivated christology of Morris. Nineham says:

"Dr. Cadbury warns us that in virtue of the questions we put to the Gospels we are in continual, and perhaps inescapable danger of illegitimately modernizing the picture of Jesus and unnecessarily limiting its dimensions. So many of our questions are based on purely modern assumptions." 24

That would be a comment that would be widely accepted the underlying concern of which is something to which much preaching would be sensitive. But what in Cadbury would seem to call for deeper reappraisal in its bearing on christological preaching is the extent to which he calls in question the biblical theology of such as Dodd on which much modern kerygmatic proclamation has been based for its theological foundations. Nineham comments:

"We ask the undoubtedly important, and apparently innocent, question whether Jesus conceived his ministry as messianic, and how he saw it as related to the coming of the Kingdom. Yet in posing the question we assume a number of things: that Jesus conceived of himself as having a ministry, that is to say that he set himself a well-defined goal to his activities and had worked out a programme for realizing it; that he had a clear-cut conception of the messianic and that we can discover what it was; likewise that he had worked out a clear-cut conception of the Kingdom of the relation of his life's work to modern New Testament scholarship, and the parables are habitually interpreted in the light of it." 25

It may indeed hardly be contested that these assumptions are the indispensable bases of Christian preaching and the preaching of the past thirty
or forty years has been nourished on such an understanding of Christ and the Kingdom as has been expounded by such leading British New Testament scholars as Dodd, William Manson, T.W. Manson, A.M. Hunter, and William Barclay and from the continent Jeremias. It is therefore important to note that all this is challengeable. It may be thought to be important for preaching that the challenge is capable of being met and refuted. Sufficient for the moment to note the challenge. Referring to the above assumptions, Nineham says that H.J. Cadbury calls each into question and then offers the following quotation from 'The Peril of Modernising Jesus':

"I am doubtful whether we do not read into Jesus' life more of a campaign than existed .... The sense of purpose, objective etc. as necessary for every good life is more modern than we commonly imagine. Some men in antiquity lived under it, (but) .... my impression is that Jesus was largely casual. He reacted to situations as they arose but probably he had hardly a programme at all. His martyrdom is not in conflict with such a view .... 'Jesus' ...... is likely to have lived much by custom and by uncoordinated impulse and to have made conscious decisions only of a rather isolated and varied character ....... Jesus was in this respect a child of his age." 26

And again:

"Almost everything that Jesus said can be associated with the Kingdom. But I must express my feeling that a term like that was so conventional and so inclusive that it would be a mistake to find the key to Jesus' interests by our own attempt to narrow the term down to some special implication of the term ........

Whatever be its most probable or persistent meaning, it provides in the parables no centralizing subject, but rather a convenient way of doing what we do when we say,

"Life is like this. Truth or duty may be illustrated by this. Here is the way it seems to me." 27

g. Biblical and Homiletical Christology

And while the insights of existentialism for example have taught us that reality lies as much - if not more - in a relationship based on faith and commitment as in the ascertaining of the 'certitude' of facts yet the roots of effective
preaching about Christ have lain in the historical rectitude of the message about him contained in the preaching. In its very simplest form, preaching is rightly regarded as the story about Jesus and this concept is obviously eroded if there can be no certainty about the nature of that story, or if that story is really so different from the kerygmatic interpretation that it makes the preaching of the story a rather useless and ineffectual exercise. That is why the biblical theology of the kind associated with Dodd or Jeremias has inspired useful and effective preaching while the reflections of Cadbury on the nature of the life of Jesus has contributed to the moribundity of preaching - and this without prejudice to the actual validity of these reflections. And it is submitted that the preacher has to expose himself to the possibility of the truth of the Cadbury point of view even at the expense of being confronted with an unpreachable religion for clearly if he has reason to reject some forms of modern homiletical christology because of its cultural and social overtones he cannot take it for granted that this is not an error that has infiltrated itself into the proclamation right from the beginning. He has to explore the origins. This has sometimes been objected to by those in the kerygmatic tradition as being an impossible and indeed unscientific enterprise. For example J.S. Whale has written:

"Two and only two critical attitudes are possible towards the documents of the New Testament.
1. A man may refuse to have anything to do with them. He may repudiate them completely, such scepticism being irrefutable. 
2. He may sit down in front of these documents and reckon with their testimony, using all the resources of scholarship to discover what that testimony is. What he may not do, if his investigation is to have any scientific value, is to go behind the documents and rewrite them. That is unquestionably illegitimate. Evacuate the earliest Gospel of the faith which is its living content - namely that Jesus is the Son of God, giving his life as a ransom for many - and no historian with a reputation to lose will look at what is left."28

I think that Whale concludes with the only value-judgement of the evidence that ultimately makes preaching possible, namely, the validity
of the Gospel of the faith that Jesus is the Son of God, giving His life a ransom for many. One might even say - that if this is not so then no preacher with a reputation to lose will look at what is left. He states, however, the alternatives much too simplistically and in a way that polarises preacher and New Testament scholar to a quite unnecessary degree. Dr. Cadbury's conclusions may be uncomfortable for the kerygmatic tradition but in his own terms they are neither illegitimate or unjustifiable. And there is a thin line between

"bringing all the resources of scholarship to discover what that (i.e. the documents) testimony is" and "going behind the documents to rewrite them."

The latter is what in effect both 'Form Criticism' and the 'Quest for the Historical Jesus' are about. And although preaching cannot be totally unrelated inasmuch as the power of preaching ultimately derives from its integrity and part of the totality of the integrity rests on the judgement, rationally arrived at on the basis of the examination of the evidence, that the Christ of the kerygmatic witness is not simply an artificial theological construction but a historical figure which bears the theological interpretation of the original witnesses. This will always be of the nature of a theological judgement in the face of others who do not share the view but only so long as that judgement can be maintained within the integrity of the preacher's mind can he remain a preacher of a christology of incarnation, soteriology and, for that matter, theological secularity.

h. Preaching and Historicity

But though the historicity of Jesus of Nazareth is important to homiletical christology, the validity of the preaching of the Christ Event is not to be thought of as something that is dependent on the hypothetical clarification of the life of Jesus as proposed by the quest for the
historical Jesus which absorbs the interest of New Testament scholars from time to time. The underlying purpose of preaching is the creation and nourishment of faith and this is neither dependent on nor is it guaranteed by what appears to be the historical rectitude of the Jesus figure or even the witness of the N.T. about the Jesus figure. The validity of preaching rests much more on the biblical insight that faith comes by hearing and hearing by the Word of God. There is therefore at the heart of christological preaching a perception which recognises that historicity though important has to give ultimate place to the existential experience to be expressed in terms of the believer's life in Christ rather than Christ's life in Palestine. The perception may be expressed thus: that the form of the Logos which the disciples perceived in Jesus of Nazareth is not altogether concomitant with the form of the Logos known to a modern Christian in the Christ of faith.

This is hinted at in the words of Schweitzer written in 1906:

"The historical Jesus will be to our time a stranger and an enigma. The study of the life of Jesus has had a curious history. It set out in quest of the historical Jesus believing that when it found him it could bring him straight into our time as a Teacher and a Saviour. It loosed the bands by which he had been riveted for centuries to the stony rocks of ecclesiastical doctrine, and rejoiced to see life and movement coming into the figure once more, and the historical Jesus advancing, as it seemed, to meet it. But He does not stay; He passes by our time and returns to His own." 29

It is because there can never be a simplistic conflation of the Jesus of history, the Christ of apostolic witness and the Christ of existential experience that the subject - the Quest for the kerygmatic Christ is justified. R.H. Lightfoot points to the same necessity when he says:

"Only when we see Him hereafter in His fullness shall we know Him also as He was on earth. And perhaps the more we ponder the matter, the more clearly we shall understand the reason for it, and therefore shall not wish it otherwise. For probably we are as little prepared for the one as for the other." 30

There remains only the Christ who is the focus of meaning for the 20th. Century man finding existential significance as he probes and re-interprets
the conceptions of incarnation, soteriology and secularity in Christ. It is not of course to be denied that there is a subtle and inextricable interweaving of subject and object in faith's image of this totus Christus which one is viewing from a contemporary perspective, yet it does not seem necessary to deny that those dimensions of the whole which come more clearly to view in one culture as over against another are part of the entire Word, seen by faith, and sustained in faith. This is the argument of Professor John Knox in his book 'Criticism and Faith' in his discussion on the effect of the conclusion that the early church read back to the lips of Jesus some of their own early theology. He defends the theological authenticity of 'sayings' of Christ, for example, that are factually and chronologically speaking, interpretations of the mind of Christ by the apostolic church. And when he discusses the implications of this for preaching he makes the distinction between the kind of meaning that a historian can attribute to the event of Christ and the kind of meaning that the event bears as it is felt, interpreted and experienced within the life of the church.

"The scholar is often occupied in trying to distinguish between the outer or bare facts of Jesus' career and the beginnings of the church on the one hand and the meanings these facts had for the early Christians on the other; between what happened in the public eye and what happened in the community's experience. This occupation ........ is not a mere academic exercise but has importance for the Christian theological enterprise. But any scholar thus occupied who supposes that the distinction he is making is between the event on the one hand and what does not belong to the event on the other is mistaken, as is any preacher who makes the same assumption. The event is by definition something that happened, not primarily on the stage of Jewish or Roman history (as a matter of fact little happened there, as the virtual silence of Jewish and Roman historians bear witness), but within the life of the Christian community. And that 'something that happened' must be taken as a whole - fact and meaning, two equally important elements in this as in every other event, inseparable and only partly distinguishable inextricably involved with each other in a concrete organic whole." 31

Knox's argument fortifies our own that when the early church in its subjectivity recorded the mind of Christ - as distinct from the ipsissima verba of Jesus it was proclaiming part of the entire word deriving from the
incarnation of the Word made flesh. Knox speaks of the understanding of the church that "entered creatively into the development of the event" so that its message was an extension of the reality that was in Jesus of Nazareth.

It seems that this principle has a bearing on the question of the meaning of Christ for us today. We have already discussed the need to avoid the temptation to create Christ in the image of the Guevara or any other modern hero and we have also seen with Schweitzer that the Jesus of history (granting that he was ever found) might not be easily seen to be a palatable Teacher and Saviour to modern man, so that homiletical christology is left to steer a path between the charibdis and scylla of these rocks. The line would therefore appear to be that suggested by Knox though his application was to the teaching and experience of the early church. That is to say that modern, cogent christology shapen by Bible and tradition brings its creative understanding of the Christ event to bear upon the contemporary world, holding up each to the other and in this process finding the mind of Christ and the kerygmatic Word and in doing so arriving provisionally at the answer to the question about the meaning of Christ for us today.

It is our thesis that the Maurician insights help to give shape to this meaning; that in his incarnational theology he has left us an important christological legacy which we have to discern and then turn into a coinage of style, idea and communication as a part of the Word for our day. To this legacy we now turn our attention.
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4. Legacy and Coinage

a. The Maurician Legacy

Turning now to consider more directly the theology of Maurice in relation to contemporary issues we note that it was voluminously poured forth in numerous articles, tracts, books and sermons. He never ever wrote a systematic theology, responding rather to theological issues as they arose and indeed much more given to the unveiling of 'hints' (a favourite word) than to systematic exposition. This is not to say that there is either a dilettante, or a superficial flavour about Maurice's work. For example, one of his main theological concerns was about the nature and instrumentality of revelation and this issue is approached in his 'What is Revelation?' (published 1859) not only with some passion - because of his feelings about the current controversy sparked off by Dean Mansel's Bampton Lectures - but by a formidably historical and interpretative treatment.

The form of the book referred to above also illustrates a further point about the method and manner of Maurice's writings. Like Paul's they are in response to pastoral or theological questions. Or else they are the transcripts of discourses first delivered in the living situation of man-to-man encounters. Some were courses of sermons delivered in Lincoln's Inn Chapel or lectures at Queen's College or the Working Men's College at Hackney, e.g. 'Lincoln's Inn Sermons', 'Studies in St. John's Gospel', 'Patriarchs and Lawgivers', 'Studies in the Lord's Prayer'. Examples of books that are cast in the form of answering questions set for him or sent to him are 'What is Revelation?' and the more famous 'The Kingdom of Christ' (published 1838 but revised and re-written in 1842).
Many of the letters preserved for us by his son in his 'Life' (1) and (2) have extended theological content to them and it is in the perusal of these as much as the formal publications that the great ideas of his theology are expounded in a personal and pastoral setting.

There is no doubt either that Maurice's complex personality contributed to the temper of his theology. He was a shy but extraordinarily intense man and this is reflected in the writing. In 'What is Revelation?' Dean Mansel raised some fundamental issues about the immediacy and personalness of revelation which find echoes in modern theological exploration but which Maurice took issue with in what he regarded as the most important controversy of his life. His writing (in the form of letters to a theological student) has about it an almost shouting quality of acute intensity:

"My Dear Sir,
I do not wonder that you are spending a portion of the time that remains to you before your examination in the study of Mr. Mansel's Bampton Lectures. You have heard, on good authority, that they expose triumphantly different forms of unbelief or half-belief which exist in Germany or in England. This exposure is not, you are told, like many that have preceded it, made by a man who has only a secondhand acquaintance with the writers whom he condemns, or who condemns them with the zeal and passion of a Theologian. He is a scholar, and has mastered the books against which he warns us; he is a philosopher, and places his warnings on a philosophical ground. His maxim you are assured, will be as effectual for future Rationalists and semi-Rationalists as for those who flourish in our day. It will be effectual for crushing the questionings that have arisen or may arise in your own mind. It informs you of the Hercules' Pillars beyond which you cannot, by the very conditions of your intellect, sail in quest of truth. How desirable, who must find himself often amidst the quicksands of written controversies! What a help to a preacher of the Gospel who must encounter the doubts, old and new, of his lettered or unlettered hearers!"

The intensity here expresses itself in irony and sarcasm enclosed in exclamation marks. It is some indication of Maurice's feeling that the bed-rock which he had believed uncovered in his self-appointed role as a theological 'digger' was in danger of being eroded and this roused him to a level of vehemence which afterwards he was to regret deeply. The
point is that he was a theologian of feeling and apart perhaps from his later years at Cambridge, he lived out his life close to the frontiers of the church's work and thought. And this in itself gives him a special interest for someone interested in theology and committed to the practical work of the preaching of the church. It was a theology woven around living issues often hammered out in the throes of controversy which were as varied as an examination of the logical consequences of Bishop Colenso's critical work on 'The Pentateuch' and the entry of Jews to Parliament. This often gives a polemical edge to the way Maurice states his point of view, though we may regard this as excusable when we consider how biblical and prophetic some of these contentions were and how alien they were to the prevailing thinking of the time. Examples of these insights might be cited as follows: the biblical paradigm for the church in the covenant people of Israel (common enough now but rare then); the analogy between the Christian Ministry and the priestly and prophetic offices of the bible; the application of Christian social insights; the nature of eternal life.

One further paradox to be perceived for an understanding of Maurice is the tension between sensitivity and firmness in his theological expression. 'The Kingdom of Christ', published while he was still in his thirties sets forth his theology in a form that held good right to the end of his life. On the subjects of Church, Ministry, Sacraments, Scripture, Creed and Humanity it blazes the trail that Maurice was to follow consistently and with rigorous application, and towards the end he summed up the basic consistency with the quaintly stated perception:

"I have laid a great many addled eggs in my time, but I think I see the connection through it all which I have only lately begun to realise. The desire for unity and the search for unity, both in the nation and in the Church, has haunted me all my days."2
And yet there was a deep sensitivity. The effect of Maurice's preaching in Lincoln's Inn Chapel on many of the hearers was such they found in him not a haughty, remote divine but one 'who stood beside them in the battle of life'. This rapport with men is further exemplified in the role which he played in the Monday evening Bible Classes held in his home at Queen's Square during the Christian Socialist 'period' when he listened with patience to every point of view, probing it to see what lay behind the contribution and what was positive in it, trying to relate it to the truth as he saw it. The point is well documented by Charles Mansfield's description of these occasions. The sensitivity of Maurice is evident:

"Whatever the facility of speech which each might possess, and whatever value each might attach to the suggestion of his neighbour, one feeling was common to all the circle, that whatever Mr. Maurice might say, was more worth listening to than anything else that could be said at the table. There was only one person who was evidently not impressed by this belief - that was Maurice himself. Not a few of those who had the privilege to attend these meetings were surprised by the much less inclination shown by their leader to speak himself, than to draw out of each other speaker some truth that might seem to be lurking in some corner of his mind, or struggling at the surface for utterance. Nothing indeed could be more striking than the tact and readiness with which Mr. Maurice seemed to seize the truth for which each was seeking to put it into words which the student himself could not find ....... Thus he would be teaching those around him to think, while with the simplest humility he daily said that he was learning from them, and that they were showing to him new sides of truth at which his own mind had not arrived." 3

Referring to J.M. Ludlow's articulate promulgation of unusual or radical viewpoints, Frederick Maurice comments:

"The importance of these classes as affecting the form of all my father's later writings was very great. If others were afraid to speak out difficulties and objections, Mr. Ludlow at all events was not. He always purposely played the part of the Devil's advocate, knowing well what other men were thinking and often too shy to acknowledge. This drew out the thought of others, and in this way my father acquired a knowledge of the actual difficulties, doubts and objections of the more thoughtful laymen of his time such as few clergymen either have or attempt to have. Indirectly these classes had two other effects. When books appeared in which he met the
objections which men of earnest thought were putting forward in all lay societies, those of the clergy and those dissenting ministers with whom it had become a habit to imagine that they could stifle inquiry by snubbing thought, were aghast at the frank statement of objections, to which he did full justice before he answered them .... In this way, therefore, he acquired an acquaintance yet more extended with the thought of his age." 4

The tension between firmness and sensitivity need not be altogether a puzzle. Indeed it is this blend that is, arguably, the psychological prerequisite for genius and insight in any sphere of life. It makes for complexity and anguish but also for the sort of seminal creativity that we are claiming for F.D. Maurice. And if there are psychological determinants underlying the style of a man's thought and the communication of it, this is an important feature of Maurice and a last comment on it may be left to his son and biographer:

"Dean Stanley, in the eloquent sermon preached on the Sunday after my father's death, spoke of the way in which every incident in the history of Europe and the world, and every wave of thought that passed over them, produced their impression and left their mark upon my father's mind and spirit. Yet some have said that his great characteristic was that he was entirely uninfluenced by other men. There is a sense in which both these statements are true, though I think that those who follow his life closely will see that the Dean's is very much the more true of the two." 5

Except for the failure to grasp some of the questions relating to revelation in the Mansel controversy, the failure to accept more positively the principle of biblical criticism exemplified in the Colenso controversy, the inability to see the democratic movement in any other way than the capacity 'to depose and cashier our rulers at will' and the intransigent way in which his 'system phobia' expressed itself at times, we should agree with the verdict of Frederick Maurice. And this was the complex psychological base from which there were evolved the patterns of thought that made him the kind of thinker and preacher whose themes, so we shall attempt to prove, are relevant to the contemporary task.
what are these themes? It is not within our remit to produce an exhaustive 'theology of F.D. Maurice' but rather to extrapolate those aspects of his thinking that are consistent with the aims of this work. That is to say, to establish his right to be the progenitor of a strain of British preaching, by locating in his thinking the creative source of one kind of theological communication. It is in the perspective of Incarnational exposition and his communication of such a key theme for his time and ours that we view his thinking.

He was beyond all else an Incarnational theologian in an age when incarnationalism was received as a norm of orthodoxy but not really put to work as the revolutionary dimension of the Christian religion in the way that it is nowadays. He disliked the word religion in much the same way and for the same reasons as Barth: that it pointed men to a starting place in the human soul rather than the purposes of God. These purposes are revealed in the act of the humanity of Jesus Christ, in which there is redemption, identification and consummation. The relationship, therefore, between God and mankind is tenacious and cosmic, determined by that reality of fellowship effected through man's creation and redemption by God, whose very being is revealed by Jesus Christ and the universe.

"Christ was before all things and by him all things consist. In him God created men and his incarnation, though it came later than the fall, was really in God's purpose before it." 6

"God must be declared as he is in himself. We must be shown what we are as he has constituted us in his son before we learn what we are when we revolt from his constitution. (This is) a much more difficult method to follow than the other just as it is more difficult to think that the earth travels round the sun than to think that the earth is the centre, and that the sun goes round it. But if all confusion in practical life follows from the former method, and if this shows us how we may act faithfully, we must adhere to it whatever trouble it costs us." 7

It is in the relation of adopted sons that men have always stood to God and this is so because God sees men ontologically in Christ and the
Gospel commands us 'to contemplate our race in the Son of God'.

"This relation is fixed, established, certain. It existed in Christ before all worlds, it was manifested when He came in the flesh. He is ascended on high that we may claim it." 8

This redemptive association of the humanity of Christ with all humanity which is Maurice's theological lodestar was an interpretation of the Incarnation that had a thrust to it that was absent in any of the other currents of thought. Broad Churchmen tended to be latitudinarian both in thought and practice and avoided any precision in theology. The evangelicals of Shaftesbury's Clapham Set tended to relate the redemption of Christ to a restricted number of people who had undergone an experience of personal conversion in the prescribed manner. Dissenters were, like Scots Presbyterians, deeply influenced by Calvinist theology and believed in a limited atonement. The Unitarian stream of thought in England was expressed either tolerantly (by Michael Maurice) or dogmatically (as by Elizabeth Maurice, his daughter) but in whichever genre it tended towards a slightly remote doctrine of God in which doubtless there was a tacit universalism arrived at by bye-passing the question of redemption, a word that does not appear in Unitarian preaching of the period. By comparison with all this Maurice spoke about Christ as 'the Head and King of our Race' and this by virtue of an identification and redemption wrought in the Incarnate humanity of Christ. Maurice's understanding of the meaning of this causes him to sweep the theological horizons between the poles of Christ's historical particularity and a deeply metaphysical conception of cosmic recapitulation which incorporates all in the redemption of Christ.

Given this thorough-going incarnationalism what is its theological base and what are the gospel proclamation and practical imperatives that flow from it? It is possible to locate in Maurice the roots and the off-shoots that gave Maurician christianity its character. The discovery of the open
secret of the Incarnation, rejected of course by many of his contemporaries like Carlyle, John Stuart Mill, Matthew Arnold, was to be understood in terms of a response to revelation. Though he did not despise reason he saw it as the receptive instrument for the knowledge of God rather than an initiating instrument for the acquisition of that knowledge.

Maurice's view was that this Revelation was of such a nature that the way was open not simply to a regulative knowledge of God but one that partook of the nature of a personal fellowship. This fellowship however rested on the basis of ontological reality that was the corollary of the doctrine of the Incarnation. Maurice was fond of converting this relationship into the image of the family. It was the bond that held a father to his children, a brother to the elder brother.

"Men are in the divine image, men are members of a redeemed race, men have God as their Father. Sin is to act as if these things are not true, to slip into a false view of what things mean. To know how things really are - is to be delivered from sin." 9

But if this is how 'things really are' in the vertical relationship there is a Kingdom on earth in which the 'reality' is seen and known - even if only as an earnest and token. This is in the life of the church, whose life is nourished and taught by scripture and creed and ordered by the Ministry whose institution goes back to Gospels and Apostles. This was the theme with which he was concerned in 'The Kingdom of Christ' in which he expounds his vision of a Holy Catholic Church of men and nations - a nation defined by its church - of which the English Church was a national expression. But the national church is the proleptic sign of the cosmic Kingdom into which all men have the right of entry. When he left Lincoln's Inn he said to its members that

"they should receive ... . God's Church as the living and continuous witness that that Love is the same, yesterday, to-day, and for ever, and that it will put down evil and establish righteousness throughout the universe." 10
This vision finds its inspiration and regulation in Scripture. And there is no nineteenth century British theologian who spent more time in the exposition of scripture and its application to the social and theological shape of religion than did Maurice. Most of his books are sermons and most of his sermons are expositions either of passages of the Bible or clauses from the creeds or formularies of the Church. But again there is a christological centre to his use of scripture and his claim is that the revelation as a whole is coherent with the revelation at its christological apex in St. John, St. Paul and the Apocalypse:

"If Theology is regarded not as a collection of our theories about God but as a declaration of His will and His acts toward us, will it not conform more and more to what we find in the Bible - will it not meet all the experiences of individuals, all the experiences of the race?" 11

What is the message to emerge out of this understanding of the Incarnation borne witness to by revelation in scripture and perpetuated in the church as the sign of the Kingdom? What is the gospel according to Maurice? Negatively it has to do with the rejection of the idea that there is a great gulf of sin fixed between God and his creation which can be bridged only by an effectual human response. In his treatment of the theme of justification by faith Maurice notes how the idea had been misconstrued so that instead of its expressing the notion of deliverance by the action in Christ realised through faith it had become a rather pelagian doctrine by which the act of faith bridged the gulf of alienation. Positively the Gospel was about recognition, acceptance and realisation.

"The Gospel is the full discovery of him who is the living centre of the Universe, the assertion of every wall of partition between Man and Man; the admission of all who desire it into Fellowship with the Father of the whole family in Heaven and earth." 12

With Maurice as with the evangelical tradition the Gospel was proclamation and response but they proceeded from different theological
presuppositions. To the evangelical response was the instrument looked upon in the grace of God as the mode of entering into the blessings of salvation. To Maurice response was the dawn of human awareness to a reality fixed in the eternal purposes of God and demonstrated in Jesus Christ: the reality of Fatherhood and kingship over mankind. And though the existential pattern of human life in terms of sin, injustice and disunity might seem to deny the appearance of all this yet the meaning of the reality of objective Lordship overcomes the appearance and its visible assurance is mediated in the life and sacraments of the Church. And as it was the objectivity and catholicity in Maurice's thinking that marked the watershed between himself and both evangelical and high churchmanship, so it was this that caused them to see in radically different ways the task of the mission of the church. The task as Maurice conceived it might be summed up as the realisation of that state in which nation, church and kingdom may be said to be co-terminous. He disdained the idea of mission as the plucking of individuals out of the historic process into some aeon of being thought of as the state of salvation. The activity of the Spirit was to be seen in goodness and truth from whatever source it came and it was the function of the church to co-operate with the work of the Spirit. The goal of the Spirit's operations was the creation of a unity of mankind in Christ and the mode of this was in the principle of cooperation in which mankind learns again that reality to which Maurice returns unceasingly - that race is organic in Christ and not to be thought of as atomised either religiously or socially. Though he saw this as essentially the mission of the whole church he related it in particular to the Church of England and saw it and stated it clearly:

"The Church of England confesses a Father, who has revealed himself
in a Son; a Son who took our nature and became Man, and has redeemed men to be his children, a Spirit who raises men to be spirits. She invites all men to stand on that ground. She tells all - so I read her formularies - that they have no less right to claim their places in the nation as members of Christ than they have to claim their places in the nation as subjects of the Queen, and in their families as children of an earthly father and mother. This was a rock on which I could rest. It was a foundation for a universal human society .... Such a society must be ready to embrace all persons ... It must be the great instrument for healing the strife of classes within a nation. It must proclaim Christ as the Deliverer and Head of all nations." 13

The note of social reconciliation which is so explicit in this understanding of mission was both creative and startling in a class-ridden society and a church which not only accepted it but benefitted materially from it. Mission, according to Maurice, must have a prophetic dimension to it or else it is not truly evangelical. It had to do not only with the salvation of persons into a state of 'fellowship knowledge' with God but with creation of a community out of a religiously and socially fragmented people. This vision, he believed to be entirely biblical and he expounded in the context of God's relationship with the community of Israel in the Old Testament, the idea of the Body of Christ in Corinthians and Ephesians, and also in his studies of the Book of Revelation with its description of the city of God. He maintained that biblical teaching and political awareness should go hand in hand and affirmed that theological understanding was essential to any extension of the mission of the church into the social sphere.

For all his social concern he was never seduced from his understanding of things in a primarily theological way. The Kingdom was something given by God. The law of association which underlay his Christian socialism was a Spirit-given law. And above all the life of the Kingdom was not the result of social amelioration (as Kingsley came near to affirming quite often) but was the gift of God. And greatly attracted as he was to Johannine categories of thought he spoke of this ultimate gift as 'eternal
The following quotation is an indication of the theological background against which he was speaking and by implication a sign of the way his own thought had moved from it - a departure that was to cost him dearly:

"The Athanasian Creed has led me to ask myself, What does the Bible mean, what does the Creed mean, what have all earnest Christians meant, when they have spoken of eternal life, and of that life as being connected with the knowledge of God, as being the knowledge of God? Have they meant life that lasts a very, very, very long time? Is that the natural sense of the word eternal when it is opposed to temporal? Is it the orthodox sense? Is it the Scriptural sense? Can I speak of this word as belonging emphatically to God, who 'is and was and is to come', and then say, It means an interminable series of future ages? Am I not departing from the signification I at first felt to be the true one? Am I not unfairly slipping into another? What signify the logical limitations as to 'a parte', etc.? Do you find them in the Bible; in your own conscience; or reason? Can you thus limit eternity by time notions?"

In microcosm this is a summary of the theological legacy that Maurice has left practical theologians and preachers to wrestle with. We submit that even a kaleidoscopic review of them is sufficient to suggest that, albeit in different form and language, the issues represent the source of a theological stream which flows about us in the task of Christian communication today. They have to do with the church's christological understanding and its ecclesiological understanding and both issues are at the heart of contemporary theological exploration and ecumenical dialogue. They have also to do with the penetration of that basic, definitive humanness which is the existential stratum of unity and community. They have to do with resurgent questions of the Logos, scripture, sacraments and church as the instruments of revelation. They have to do with the concept of incarnational mission and not least 'eternal life' - the concept of christian ultimacy. It is our purpose now to extrapolate these issues, examine the Maurician teaching in greater depth and detail and see how and where
they are taken up in the kind of contemporary theology which serves the preaching of the church.
b. Incarnation and Revelation

In this section we shall analyse Maurice's basic understanding of what revelation is, the principle of revelation as it were, as distinct from the specific content of it in terms of revealed religion which properly belongs to subsequent sections of the work. Maurice took very seriously the distinction he employed between 'religion' and a faith that rested on the divine reality and initiative mediated to mankind in and beyond church, sacraments and scripture. The nature of this revelation was rigorously personal and moral rather than regulative and intellectual so that the friendship and fatherhood of God was open to wayfaring men and women. The ground of this revelation is in a God who acts in such fashion that what is ultimately revealed in the incarnation of Christ is the reality of the Kingdom.

"Therefore let people call me merely a philosopher, or merely anything else, or what they will, or what they will not; my business, because I am a theologian, and have no vocation except for theology, is not to build, but to dig, to show that economy and politics ... must have a ground beneath themselves, that society is not to be made anew by arrangements of ours, but is to be regenerated by finding the law and ground of its order and harmony, the only secret of its existence, in God .... The Kingdom of Heaven is to me the great existing practical reality which is to renew the earth and make it a habitation for blessed spirits instead of for demons." 15

Maurice had much to say about the constitution of the Kingdom and believed that though conceptuality was a corollary of revelation, the thing itself did not amount to a catalogue of notions. This was the point at which he divided on the one hand from the more 'dogmatic' expressions of the Reformed tradition and on the other hand from a philosophical tradition stemming from Sir William Hamilton and given popular expression in the Bampton Lectures of Dean Mansel. There was in Maurice's view a visual, existential, moral and indeed secular element in revelation which could not be contained in verbal instrumentality but which were the disclosures and hints of the great possibility open to all out of personal knowledge of God in the sense of a living fellowship of spirits. The fullness of this disclosure, fulfilling a historic process in
which in Israel the Word summoning men to this fellowship and knowledge had been heard, was in the Incarnation. And to Maurice the challenge of the Christ event was the nature and the extent to which its revelatory reality embraced the humanity of men.

"Is it or is it not true that in the revelation of God in Christ, the righteousness, truth, love, which cannot be measured by time, which do not belong to time, are brought within the faith and apprehension of the meek and the lowly?" 16

Born out of his experience among lowly people both at Bubbenhall in his first curacy and then among the urban poor he met at Guy's Hospital Maurice developed an awareness that the link between established religion and 'the plain folk of the world' was perilously frail. So much so that in one of his more polemical utterances he expressed the view that the Christian faith had been projected in such a fashion that it seemed as if God had less concern for the outcasts of humanity than the great humanitarians of the age.

"I must bear what testimony I can do for the right of English divines to preach the Gospel of God's love to mankind and to maintain that Lord Shaftesbury and the Bishop of London do not care more for the outcasts of the human race than God does, if Theology and Humanity are not to be forever torn apart and the regeneration of the working classes is not to be given up by Christians to infidels." 17

Writing these words to his friend J.M. Ludlow while he was awaiting the verdict of the 'heresy trial' at King's College there is a quality of passion in them which nonetheless ought not to obscure his ongoing concern that if theology is not orientated as a practical and interpretative instrument for the lives of ordinary people, then the entire principle of incarnational religion is eroded and there remains no 'practical' theology. And to Maurice the function of theology was to be the transcript of revelation - to bear witness to the acts of God in history and experience. This of course raises the question of the theology of revelation which was thrown up by Mansel's lectures and which has become a continuing subject in the field since then - and is thrown up in a new form in our own day both by the
questions of biblical criticism and the bearing of the nature of religious language on the theological realities of which it is the transcript and myth.

Mansel stood in the Kantian tradition mediated through the Scottish philosopher Sir William Hamilton in his insistence that the Infinite could not be known through the processes of the reason. Faith was a decision about reality taken beyond the sphere of reason. It was a response to the coming of God in revelation and miracle. There were two questions that arose from this view of revelation. One was the function of philosophical theology vis a vis this revelation. And the other was the nature of the revelation itself. And Mansel's conclusions on both of these matters which were designed to be weapons in the apologetic armoury of orthodoxy reveal a shrewd prescience and it is weakness in Maurice that his reaction to them was so antagonistic that he was unable to appreciate the theological perception in them. Some of the issues raised directly or indirectly are as follows: what is the function of words and thoughts in the communication of religious reality? Is religious language mythological and 'regulative' rather than meaningfully exhaustive? If so is our field of revelation limited to God-in-action rather than God in his essential being? And what is the function of our reason in the appropriation of the knowledge of theological reality? Since the knowledge of God is something that transcends finite experience can any kind of divine illumination be imported into man's reason? But if not does this not shut off theological truth from other ways of investigating truth in such a way that it casts doubt on the entire enterprise because it has to resort to an epistemology that is unique to itself?

The nub of Mansel's position is enshrined in one sentence from his lectures:

"We cannot transcend our own personality, as we cannot transcend our own relation to time; and to speak of an Absolute and Infinite Person, is simply to use language to which, however true it may be in a
superhuman sense, no mode of human thought can possibly attach itself." 18

In replying to this kind of thinking Maurice seemed to make a confusing identification between the nature of the discourse of philosophical theology and the validity of religious experience claiming that such propositions as Mansel was advancing not only 'annihilated' the theological thinking of the great Fathers (e.g. Augustine) but 'annihilated' their very experience of God.

We are now in a position to perceive what Maurice apparently failed to see in the vehemence of the controversy that the nature of theological language is something that needs continual examination by scholars and their perceptions explained and expounded at the practical level of the church's work. But also that there is always an existential gap between religious language and religious experience and that the language is often outstripped by the experience in such fashion that we may not think of the language as giving exact definition to the experience without a residuum of spirituality which is verbally impenetrable. There are other levels in which Maurice does seem to agree that conceptualisation has an intrinsic inadequacy and for this reason elevates liturgy, creed and sacrament as the 'org. anon' of revelation because they speak to the soul of faith in ways that words cannot do.

Beyond the question of the function of reason and the use of words there lurked however the more fundamental matter of the nature of the revelation itself. The reason was the instrument of the revelation in the sense that Maurice believed with Coleridge (and indeed with Aquinas) that it was with the reason that one responded to revelation so that through this response one entered into a personal knowledge of God.

"Revelation is .... the unveiling of a Person - and that Person the ground and Archetype of men, the source of all life and goodness in men - not to the eye, but to the very man himself, to the Conscience, Heart, Will, Reason, which God has created to know him and be like him." 19

Mansel's contention as against the personalness of Maurice's view seemed to be that there was more hiddenness than revelation in God's relationship with men.
The incarnation was less the humanity of God in the reality of his fellowship with men than the mode chosen by God to lay down the moral and theological signs which would give to men the required guidance for a life lived in accordance with the divine rules and assured of the divine approval. There is a sense in which Mansel was entering in the terms of his own time the kind of christological caveat registered in our time by those who have construed the godward revelation in more opaque terms and have sought to develop an understanding of the Christ event more horizontally as a paradigm of freedom, values, humanness or a new and limited form of transcendence. Seen like this Jesus was the man who blazed the trail of showing, how life was, his life and words and death throwing off the sparks of 'regulative' knowledge as the free man, the responsible man, the man for others, or the man who discovers that 'God is not a meeter of needs or a solver of problems' (Hamilton). The christology of Mansel was certainly, like these contemporary christologies, a move away from a metaphysical to an existential Christ. The element of transcendence had certainly not been reinterpreted away from its traditional form and the traditional image of God is not in question, but the 'function' of Jesus is much more limited in that he does not 'show us the Father' as in the understanding of Maurice. And though Mansel earned the vehement protest of the leading incarnational theologian of his time, yet paradoxically there has been a sort of Mansel strain in the British pulpit among men who would have thought of themselves as preachers whose chief concern was to bring religion down to earth. In doing this they have removed religion from any large metaphysical context, saying little about heaven or hell or the eternal purposes of God and concentrating on the values and morality inherent in the words and deeds of Jesus as the basis of human fulfilment and dignity. It is an issue to which we shall return when we write about the contemporary possibility of preaching the meaning of the incarnation. But we note at the moment that Maurice rested
his case on the necessity for an authentic personal revelation and he found the theological basis for this in scripture, particularly in the Johanneine writings which he expounded with great skill. The reality and particularity of God's manifestation in Christ is the centre and core. In his book of sermons 'The Gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven' he quotes the passage from the first epistle of John which says: "That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon and our hands have handled of the Word of life ......" - and then the typical comment:

"There is the theology, there is the morality of an apostle; a theology and a morality, as I think, fresh and young for our times, striking at the root of our self-denials and our self-deceptions, showing us why we can't believe in ourselves, or our notions and theories; showing us in whom we may believe, who is able to deliver us from all our darkness and enmities, who is able to bring us into his perfect light and love." 20

The incarnate presence revealed in Christ was not simply or exclusively the kenosis of God in the form of humble service but the manifesting of a true revealer and moral deliverer able to do for men 'exceeding abundantly above all that they ask or think'. In Maurice's description of the work of Christ in incarnation there is a lyrical element which has been represented in the Scottish pulpit by men like Denney, Gossip and J.S. Stewart.

As Maurice rejected the strict demarcation that isolated reason from revelation in the thinking of Mansel so in fact he extended his understanding of revelation to incorporate the results of all true and right reasoning. He accepted what he called 'natural revelation' and what today many would refer to as 'general revelation'. This might be seen as being of a piece with Maurice's objectivity and catholicity of thinking of an existing Kingdom, a universal atonement, a logos-like activity of the Spirit ranging through the entire universe. It is not alien to the style of this thinking that on the specific range of revelation he should write:

"The revelation of Christ must be the revelation, however gradually, of all these hidden principles and secret powers, and directing laws, which
men in all directions have been seeking after; must be the revelation of all the relations in which they stand to each other and to God's universe." 21

It is this feeling for totality and unity that accounts in part for the relevance and attractiveness of his thinking to many today. There was a deep confidence in his thinking that truth was one and indivisible, that it was all part of the ultimately unitary purpose of God. It was the meaning of Christus Consummator. And it was this understanding of the breadth of the divine revelation that for example saved him from a negative or obsessional response to the new techniques of biblical criticism that were making their presence felt. (In this connection it should be noted that the controversy in which he was involved over the publication of Bishop Colenso's work on the Pentateuch should not be taken to mean that he was against biblical criticism in principle). It was the counterpoint to the personalness of revelation: a cosmic, all-pervasive principle of teaching, illumination, moral consciousness which was the operation of the logos in all life. For example, in a sermon in his expository series on the Gospel According to St. Luke he traces the inner dealing of the logos in the heart of the Roman soldier who came to Jesus to appeal for the healing of his servant (Luke 7). After quoting the words: "He is a man under authority. He has soldiers under him. He says to one, Go, and he goeth; to another, Come and he cometh to his servant, Do this and he doeth it", he draws the lesson about the logos:

"Very obvious facts these; what could they be worth? ..... These simple lessons about obedience and authority - about the might of words spoken by a weak man in governing a number of strong men - had been of quite unspeakable worth to this Roman. They had been in the strictest sense, a Divine education to him ..... They had led him practically, insensibly, through no arguments of religion or philosophy, to confess a Divine Word from whom a governing, restoring power might go forth." 22

Or from a sermon on the Parable of the Sower:

"The Word who gives us power to hear, to think, to speak, is never far from any one of us ..... the source is ever the same living Word of God ..... It is therefore the might of the Divine Word as a living
and life-giving power which is the subject of the parable." 23

And what is seen and heard in many places, through nature and humanity, in Greece and Rome, in science and poetry, in society and politics, finds its fulfilment in its incorporation in the Christus Consummator:

"We often say that Revelation is progressive, and the writer of this Epistle (Hebrews) abundantly justifies the language. But by progress, some seem to mean a continual journeying away from the inmost centre; a movement toward the circumference. Here we seem to be taught that each step of it is bringing us nearer to the ground of things - nearer to the throne of God. The revelation of God in this sense is truly the unveiling of himself. First, he speaks in that which is most distant from him, the mere things he has formed; then in men whom he created to rule over these things; lastly, in him who by the eternal law is the inheritor of all things, in whom and for whom they were created. The order of the world, the succession of ages, spoke of the permanence of God. Here he speaks in him by whom he framed the order of the world, the succession of times .... Things in themselves cold and inanimate, are found to have a personal centre; the course of time, in itself dead and abstract, to have a living Mover. It is the Son of God, 'the brightness of his Father's glory, the express image of his substance'. Glimpses of his glory we have seen in his creation, brighter glimpses in the love and tenderness of human creatures. Here is he from whom they have both proceeded; here is the mystery which the prophets perceived in different portions, and expressed in diverse manners; here is the whole WORD, of which they uttered different syllables .... In him creation has subsisted, in spite of all the elements of confusion and discord within it." 24

There is a recognisable kinship of thought in all this with the emphasis in our own day of Teilhard de Chardin: the same cosmic interpenetration by the divine logos, expressed mystically both by Maurice, as above and by Teilhard, as follows:

"This is what I have learnt from my contact with the earth - the diaphany of the divine at the heart of a glowing universe, the divine radiating from the depths of matter aflame."25

Or again from Teilhard:

"May God preserve in me this deep relish, this lucid intoxication, as it were, which elates me with the joy of being, drunk as from an ever-flowing fountain. At times when I am quite absorbed in rocks and fossils, I experience an ineffable happiness at the thought that I possess in the form of a single, all-embracing, incorruptible and loving element the supreme Principle wherein everything subsists and is alive." 26

Maurice seldom arises to the 'ineffable happiness' but the difference is more
temperamental than theological. The same 'logos' Weltanschaung - ultimately incarnational when the 'logos is made flesh' - is the fundamental motif of the thinking working itself out in a world - affirming understanding of the purposes of God. The following paragraph is taken from a monograph by Michael Walker entitled 'The Significance of Teilhard' contributed to 'The Fraternal' (The Journal of the Baptist Ministers Fellowship). I quote it because it is not only a masterly summary of de Chardin's incarnational theology but because, with hardly the alteration of a single word it might stand as a summary of Maurice's incarnational theology:

"We have to decide whether Christ is representative man, related to all other men and to the created order in the same way as the first Adam. The natural meaning of the Pauline passages would seem to be that he is. His obedience has restored grace to mankind, it has reconciled man to God and to his fellow, it has accomplished a redeeming act whereby the whole of creation is affected. Nature is inseparable from the first Adam, it is also inseparable from the second. That would seem to be the way Teilhard's thought ran. The concept of energy driving the world on to its destiny was identifiable with the transcendent Christ Who was incarnate in nature.

The notion of a representative death upon the cross cannot be separated from the notion of the representative man. The death is effective on our behalf simply because of the One who is dying. It is because Christ is the representative man that His death which He chooses to die with us is effective as a death that is for us. Thus the whole incarnation is a redemptive act spelt out in the sequences of birth, life, death and resurrection. The idea may be foreign to Western minds steeped in legal theories of atonement, but its antecedents to through the Eastern church and the Greek Fathers to John and the Paul of Ephesians and Colossians." 27

There is here a marked kinship of thought between these two men separated by time and churchmanship, yet so obviously drinking from the same theological springs. It is arguable that Teilhard - at any rate in his way of relating the incarnation as the focus and centre of the all-pervasive logos - is the greatest Maurician of all. And though the exploration of this kinship can only be a marginal interest of this work it is surely so remarkable as to point to further research on the interweaving of their christologies.

To sum up this section on revelation and incarnation we make the
following attempt at precis. Revelation to Maurice was as wide as every hint of truth but it was as narrow an individual's genuine relationship to God. It was cosmic and catholic so that individual perception of it might be seen as a part of the destiny of the race in Christ. It was ecclesiological inasmuch as the church in its custodianship of creed, scripture and liturgy is the instrument yet the Spirit which animates the church works also in the world's creativity and brokenness, so that the operation of the revelatory logos is known there. The Incarnation is the event in which all this is gathered up. It has a historical particularity about it that allows its meaning and pattern to be explored by a rigorous exposition of the reports of the life of Jesus of Nazareth contained in scripture but it also has a metaphysical dimension which makes it both the clue to and consummation of the quest for life construed in terms of the deep ground of unity and fulfilment.

Maurice would have approved of a paragraph about the Incarnation written in the famous collection of essays 'Lux Mundi' by men influenced by his own thinking:

"The claims of the church to knowledge through the Incarnation can only be rationally met, and only really answered, when the claim itself, and its evidence, are seriously examined." 28

Having examined seriously the claim of the Incarnation and having come to accept it he then regarded it as the centre of a revelatory solar system with every other kind of truth and reality drawn within its gravitational field.
c. Incarnation and Reality

Christian preaching is the communication of a reality. The reality has to do with the nature of man's relationship to God and the presupposition of the Christian world-view is that it is by reference to this relationship that the meaning of real humanness is known and preserved. This is why the story of the Creation as told in Genesis finds an abiding place within a variety of theological frameworks so that where it is not interpreted in historical terms it is nonetheless accorded profound theological significance. This is because it is the myth that enshrines the biblical understanding of humanness as man-in-relationship-with-God. But what is the nature of the reality of this relationship which Christian preaching has to expound? It is to this question we now turn for it was quite central to Maurice's thinking and indeed without question this was the theological issue - as distinct from, though related to, his social involvements - that isolated him from other schools of thought.

We may illustrate this by locating the difference on this matter between Maurice and the Evangelical Movement both within his own church and also the dissenting bodies. Referring to an Evangelical critic he speaks about:

"the real issue upon which the dispute between his school and me turns. It is the question whether the Fall or the Redemption is the ground on which humanity rests." 29

True to his understanding of theology as a way of probing to the foundation of being and relationship he often used words like ground, basis, constitution and reality. And this rigorous probing using the instruments of scripture, creed, 39 Articles and the tradition of the Alexandrian Fathers and the Johanneine theology brought him to what he believed to be the determining insight that it was saying something much more profoundly true about the human condition to say that mankind was in Christ than to say that mankind was in Adam. Now of course Maurice shared in the contemporary understanding
that the Genesis Story was a literal and historical description of the fallenness of man but for all that his insight was that the christological reality took precedence over the historical chronology. That though the fall in Adam was historically prior to the redemption in Christ that theologically - in terms of the constitution of mankind as it really is - it is posterior to it - or indeed superceded by it. Though all around him the starting point of evangelical preaching lay in the assertion of the depraved status of the natural man, Maurice preached that the practical moral depravity to be witnessed in human life was a departure from what is most real about the human condition rather than an expression of it. He complained of Calvinistic bodies who had -

"the habit of contemplating the fall of Adam as the starting point of divinity, or if not the starting point, as only subsequent to a divine arrangement which provided a means for curing the effect of it." 30

As Alec Yidler has said:

"The truth from which he (Maurice) started was that God had created and redeemed mankind in Christ." 31

That is a concise precis of what without doubt Maurice believed and asserted but it is important first of all to see how Maurice was wont to set out this belief and to get a glimpse of the theological perspective from which he saw things as he did. And there is perhaps no better statement of all this in all his writings than that to be found in an autobiographical letter written against the background of the issues raised by the preaching and theology of Edward Irving. Irving had spoken about the Incarnation in brave terms as carrying with it the corollary that evil in all its ghastliness had presented itself to Christ as it does to every man and that whereas Christ rejected it all other men participate in it and that this is the intrinsic characteristic of man, the very definition of the ontology of humanity - that he is a member of a sinful race. Indeed this was clearly written into
'the Scotch confession of faith' which gave Irving his theological presuppositions. Starting from this point Maurice expounds his understanding thus:

"According to that confession the race stood in Adam, and had fallen in Adam; then a scheme of salvation of which the Incarnation formed a step was necessary to rescue certain persons from the consequences of the fall. Mr. Irving had begun to regard the Incarnation, not merely as a means to a certain end in which some men were interested, but, as the very manifestation of God to men, as the link between the creature and the Creator. But what could the incarnation, on his previous hypothesis, be but the descent into a radically evil nature? Some of Mr. Irving's Scotch opponents perceived the difficulty, and resorted to the hypothesis of our Lord taking the unfallen nature of Adam. He regarded the suggestion as a miserable subterfuge, which made the relation between Christ and actual men an utterly unreal one. It led me to ask myself, 'What does that unfallen nature of Adam mean? Did not Adam stand by God's grace, by trust in Him? Did he not fall by trying to be something in himself? Could he have had a nature which was good independent of God more than we? Is not such a notion a subversion of Christian belief? But did the race ever stand in him? Old theology taught quite a different doctrine'.

Our own articles set forth Christ very God and very man - as now and always the Head of the race. They teach us of an infection of nature which exists in every son of Adam. They call that a departure from original righteousness. This original righteousness stands and has always stood, in Christ the Son of God, and in Him only. Here, it seems to me, was the true practical solution of the difficulty. I could believe that the Head of man had entered fully into the condition of every man, had suffered the temptations of every man, had wrestled with the enemy of every man; and that he had brought our humanity untainted and perfect through that struggle. And this because He had never lost his trust in His Father, His obedience to His Father - had never asserted independence as Adam did, as each one of us is continually doing. His temptations then become real in the most tremendous sense, They were more fierce than any mere individual can ever undergo. He did, in truth, feel the sins - bear the sins - of the whole world. And every man may turn to Him as knowing his own special danger, his easily besetting sins, as having felt the power of them. And no man has a right to say, 'My race is a fallen race' even when he most confesses the greatness of his own sin and fall; because he is bound to claim to contemplate his race in the Son of God, and to claim by faith in Him his share of its redemption and its glory." 32

Maurice's thought seems to operate at two levels. There is the personal and empirical level at which he observes the radical nature of human evil without in the least veiling it. No Calvinist of his age described the frailties and falsities of human nature more rigorously than did Maurice. He was often overcome by a sense of his own wickedness and traced the failures of the
Christian socialist experiments to the moral and personal weaknesses of men. In his expositions of scripture he took seriously the witness of scripture to human sinfulness and urged that theology could only be related realistically to life if it wrestled with this element in scriptural teaching. But the empirical human experience should not, he asserts, so be interpreted as to obscure what is the 'reality', the proper constitution of mankind in his relationship to God. For that relationship is not 'constituted' by human sin but by the divine redemption in Christ incorporating men not in virtue of their response or their faith but as a result of the act of God in creation and incarnation. And at this point his thought moves away from existential empiricism into the level of theological ontology which provides him with his master idea. And in the constant tension which runs through scripture and theology between the objectivity of the divine action and the subjectivity of human responsiveness Maurice believes that serious damage is done to the theological witness if priority is not given to the former. And so though he can say,

"We are very evil, each part so .." 33

yet because the condition of mankind is to be viewed in its incorporation into the 'original righteousness' of Christ, our sin and falsehood are absorbed into the incarnation in which Christ bore the strain of them in the exposure of temptation yet redeemed them in the constancy of his obedient humanity. Therefore in this ontological way of speaking Maurice claims that no one has a right to say, My race is a fallen race. Rather it is a redeemed creation and to fall into the moral sin of pride or the intellectual sin of unbelief in a secondary departure from that which is the assertion of the primary reality about the human status. And in this he believed that he was echoing faithfully the biblical witness:

"If ... we appear to assume that a communion between God and man is not merely the rare privilege of a few, but is the foundation on which
the very existence of our race stands; that without it there would have been no thought, memory, hope, no feeling of kinship, no possibility of friendship or affection — we are only reaffirming the doctrine of the Bible ...." 34

This understanding had two effects. It set man's own personal existence in a context of hope. And it seems as if Maurice was glad to find in the Bible the witness that 'God had reconciled all things unto himself' (Col. 1:20) as the locus of a hope which transcended 'his own empirical sense of sin and unworthiness. And also it provided him with a Gospel which penetrated beyond human sociology and indeed theological opinion to what he believed to be the objective ground of reality. If in what has been called 'the hierarchy of truths' the highest of the truths that he was called upon to communicate to men is that they are the depraved members of a sinful race then that would have been no Gospel but since on the contrary the climax of the Christian communication lay in the reality of man's redeemed relationship to God, this was the very heart of the message. This insight set him apart from the Calvinism which was caught in the straight-jacket of predestination and gave him a deep affinity with Macleod Campbell and Erskine of Linlathen. It is worthy of comment that though a good deal of opposition to Maurice came from Scotland in the form, for example, of Principal Rainy who lectured in London against Maurice, subsequently writing a monograph on the subject of his opposition, yet undoubtedly in the person of Erskine and to a lesser extent Campbell, he found the sources of his inspiration. And this especially in the way in which the meaning of incarnation and redemption are interpreted in the most catholic and cosmic fashion. Thus summing up Maurice's view of the reality that is constituted by the incarnation and the communication that flows from it we note the two following quotations:

"Men are in the divine image, men are members of a redeemed race, men have God as their father. Sin is to act as if these things were not true, to slip into a false view of what things mean. To know how things really are — is to be delivered from sin." 35
"It seemed to me that if I could not address all kinds of people as members of Christ and children of God, I could not address them at all." 36

But Maurice with his theological perception knew that the assertion of the reality could not be separated from the question of redemption and regeneration. And there are not many signs in Maurice's thinking that would link him with the liberal modernism that was to emerge in the early years of the twentieth century which made the Maurician assertion of the Fatherhood of God over every man but founded this on a version of Christianity which accepted Jesus of Nazareth as a teacher of such a way of faith and life. With Maurice the adoption of the human family into the divine family was always the result of redemption. But if this is not to be linked either with individual conversion or baptism how are we to think of it? The answer has to do both with metaphysics and with biblical interpretation. For Maurice's feeling for Alexandrian theology is evident in the way in which he thinks of the Trinity as an eternal community whose united will plans and fore-ordains the redemption of man. In the patristic tradition he thinks of the inter-relationships of the trinity in terms of the will of the Father and the obedience of the Son and the effectual outworking of this by the Spirit. And his answer to the question of regeneration seems to be that if the historic expression of the regeneration of the race is in the Incarnation the reality of it lies in the eternal purpose of the Trinity. As Maurice put it:

"This relation is fixed, established, certain. It existed in Christ before all worlds, it was manifested when he came in the flesh. He is ascended on high that we may claim it." 37

But this rather metaphysical view is translated into the terms of homiletical theology in his preaching. He finds confirmation of it in his exposition of scripture as for example in a significant passage from a sermon entitled 'The Lamb Before The Foundation of the World'. It is an exposition of 1 Peter 1. 18/20 in which he comes to wrestle with the thought of Christ
as one who was 'verily fore-known before the foundation of the world'.

"What could such words seem to denote, but that there was one whom the Father of all knew, and who, in the fullest and most intimate sense, knew Him, before the 'earth or the lowest part of the dust of the earth was formed?" 38

Here in the eternal Word is the source of the light that lighteth every man and the regeneration that is for every man. But how are mortal men to perceive the eternal reality of their regeneration?

"It must be all important that men should know Him, from whom their light comes, in whom their life dwells. But how could they know Him? How could they look into the eternal secret? What apprehension could they have of that life which He had with the Father, that life which does not belong to time and its accidents, that life which can only be spoken of as eternal? St. Peter assumes that we could know nothing of it ........ if this life had not been manifested. But the veil, he says, has been withdrawn which hid his divine nature, His relation to the eternal Father, from us. And how has it been withdrawn? He has appeared in our world, in our nature; He has sacrificed Himself. In that sacrifice we see what He is - what He has always been. His acts here, plain and palpable, done among men, done for men, have shown forth that perfect filial obedience to the Creator of all things, that entire filial union with the Eternal Father, which is the ground of the universe and the ground of our humanity.

I think if we had no other words to guide us than those in the text, we should be forced to put this construction upon them. And then this 'fore-knowledge' of which he speaks, instead of being a provision that is contingent upon human events and human will ...... becomes the communion of will and purpose in the persons of the Godhead." 39

After expounding his belief that the crucial decision about the redemption of the race was taken in eternity stemming from the divine fore-knowledge, manifesting itself historically in the incarnation he presses home his characteristic conclusions about the relationship of these insights to the way in which we should hear and understand the Gospel:

"That this obedience (the obedience of the incarnate Christ) should be the means of rectifying the disorders of the universe, of bringing back the state of things which self-will has broken and disturbed, of re-establishing the kingdom and righteousness of God .... this is what we should with wonder and trembling expect .... This is the very Gospel which has brought light into the midst of our darkness, life into the midst of our death. But we must not change and invert God's order, to make it square with our condition; if we do, it will not meet the necessities of that condition. We must not start from the assumption of discord and derangement, however natural to creatures that are conscious of discord and derangement such a course may be; we must begin with harmony and peace, and so understand why they have been broken, how
they have prevailed and shall prevail." 40

The sphere in which the constitution of mankind in Christ is manifest is in the Church which Maurice sees as the prolepsis of the Kingdom and the sign of the constitution is in the sacrament of baptism. Maurice strives to relate the meaning of baptism to the redeemed status of mankind but for all that there is an intrinsic obscurity and ambivalence in his teaching. The nub of his difficulty is the attempt to relate a cosmic ecclesiology with a sacramentarian understanding. If mankind is redeemed in Christ from all eternity in what sense is a child regenerated by baptism? If there is this heavy emphasis on the objective primacy of God in redemption what place is left for subjective appropriation and individual participation? Maurice once wrote that:

"Christ has preached at the fonts when we have been darkening counsel in the pulpits." 41

But it is difficult not to countenance the view that his own baptismal thinking is shrouded in obscurity and torn by an unresolved tension. It is of course by no means unique to Maurice. Rather it is shared by every preacher who affirms on the one hand that God has redeemed the world and then proceeds to draw some kind of distinction between the Church and the world. But it is less of an anomaly with those who for all practical purposes accept the empirical unregeneracy of the world and see their task as extending the boundaries of the redeemed. This happens, so they believe at the point of confession or conversion or baptism - or at the climactic point at which all converge to create 'the new man in Christ'. But Maurice's basic perspective was so different. To take an obsessive cognisance of the existential unregeneracy or unbelief of men was, he claimed, an inversion of the divine order leading to the kind of invidious distinctions indulged in by Evangelicals who preached that though all men were in some sense children of
the Heavenly Father it was a sonship of different kinds and degrees. And it is impossible to read Maurice without feeling his deep disdain for this kind of theological categorising of the human race. If he could not speak to all men as the redeemed children of God, he could not speak to any!

But if so, what is the point of baptism? And whatever point it may have as 'the sacrament of constant union' with what meaning can it be invested as the sacrament of regeneration? It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that though Maurice supported the creeds and formularies of his church as the conservatory of 'the old theology' yet the basic cast of his thinking in an Alexandrian form with its cosmic christology engendered a certain unresolved tension between these and the drift of his own thinking. He dissented from the Tractarian view that baptism was an 'event' that changed the nature of the baptised.

"A man does not ... by baptism, by faith, or by any other process, acquire a new nature, if by nature you mean, as most men do, certain inherent qualities or properties." 42

That is as may be but it does not prevent Maurice's from asserting tortuously,

"Baptism asserts for each man that he is taken into union with a divine Person, and by virtue of that union is emancipated from his evil Nature. But this assertion rests upon another, that there is a society for mankind which is constituted and held together in that Person, and that he who enters this society is emancipated from the world - the society which is bound together in the acknowledgement of and subjection to, the evil selfish tendencies of each man's nature." 43

It is surely in the explication of his baptismal doctrine that the brute moral facts of human experience and empirical alienation from God obscuring his fundamental premisses. Here he comes as near Evangelicals and Tractarians as he ever does. Baptism is the point where the disunion between God and Man is bridged. Not only so but that disunion expresses itself with ineluctable logic into a distinction between the church and the world which is
blurred elsewhere in Maurice though of course it is arguable that the Johanine
Maurice is bound to observe the Johanine connotation of 'world' as human
society organised to serve the interests of human pride and selfishness.
Not I think that Maurice was unaware of the tension in his thinking, although
the platonist in him may have predisposed him to think of the relation of
baptism to reality in terms of the temporal or historic form or shadow behind
which there is the eternal idea of the reality of the redemption in Christ
from all ages. And in furtherance of this idea he employs the metaphors of
birth and coronation to disengage himself from the commitment to baptism as
an 'effectual' sacrament. As birth is the further stage in a process already
begun so too in the life of the soul is baptism. And just as a King can only
assume sovereignty at his coronation if he was already a 'king' by birth and
promise so too it is in baptism. In baptism a man 'becomes' what he already
'is'. And A.R. Vidler has made the significant point that Maurice habitually
avoided the use in connection with the practice of baptism of the phrase 'made
a child of God in baptism'. And so we are left with the final impression that
though he used the rubric of his church on baptism his interpretation of it
rather strained the natural meaning of the words. For in baptism nothing
was added to the spiritual status of the baptised which had not been already
assured for him in the fore-ordaining love of God.

The setting of Maurice's thinking was that of a church-orientated society
and in the course of his writings he makes claims for the visible church
that sound ostentatious. He had a view of the church which came near to
identifying it with the Kingdom and he made much of the importance of the
Incarnation towards the implementation of the divine purpose of the life that
was nourished within the church and that which nourished this life. In a
world of decaying institutions and discredited clericalism we are hard put
to share Maurice's ecclesiology. And indeed there are those who would regard
the debunking of the church as the precondition for the liberation of his world-affirming view of the life in Christ. It is not the function of this work to challenge this view overtly but rather to let the light of Maurice shine across the contemporary forms in which his basic thinking is being re-expressed on the ontological and redemptive relationship of man with God. For every communication of the Gospel from the pulpit is grounded on the presupposition of one form or another of this relationship. And in several different ways the modern minister who is versed in contemporary biblical and theological thinking is challenged towards a view of religious reality of which the prescient embryo is to be found in Maurice's understanding of the incarnation.

If we turn to New Testament scholarship there is the careful exegesis of the conception of the Kingdom as interpreted by C.H. Dodd.

"The common idea .... underlying all uses of the term, 'The Kingdom of God is that of the manifest and effective assertion of the divine sovereignty against all the evil of the world." 44

We have quoted sections from Maurice's thinking that closely resemble not only Dodd's thought but also his words. But just as Maurice's theology personifies the Kingdom in the incarnation so too does Dodd in the particularity of the event of Christ.

"In what sense then did Jesus declare that the Kingdom of God was present? .... In the ministry of Jesus Himself the divine power is released in effective conflict with evil .... For eternal life is the ultimate issue of the coming of the Kingdom of God, and this coming is manifested in the series of historical events which unfolds itself in the ministry of Jesus.

Here then is the fixed point from which our interpretation of the teaching regarding the Kingdom of God must start. It represents the ministry of Jesus as 'realized eschatology', that is to say, as the impact upon this world of 'the powers of the world to come' in a series of events, unprecedented and unrepeatable, now in actual process." 45

The tendency towards the interpretation of the life of Christ as an eschatological event is in line with Maurice who once wrote:
"to preach the Gospel of that Kingdom, the fact that it is among us, and is not to be set up at all, is my calling and business." 46

And from among the theologians we may call Bonhoeffer to witness the contemporaneity of Maurice's view of religious reality and its relation to incarnation. In many ways christology is as much the key to Bonhoeffer as to Maurice. J.D. Godsey says of Bonhoeffer what one might as truly say about Maurice.

"It is the ever-increasing apprehension of the implications involved in the Name, the growing awareness of the total meaning of Jesus Christ .... that accounts for the different emphases and development in Bonhoeffer's theology." 47

Bonhoeffer's doctrine of Incarnation is one of identification and incorporation. Christ is the man for humanity and the whole of humanity is incorporated in Christ. Christology is set in the cosmic context as it is ultimately with Maurice who like Bonhoeffer speaks of Christ not only as Lord of the Church but as Lord of the world. And in the urgent question that the contemporary preacher is required to grapple with, What is God doing for and with the world and what is the relationship of the life of Jesus of Nazareth to this process? we submit that we are required at least to listen to the basically united worldly incarnationalism that is sounded in differing languages and from separated cultures by Maurice and Bonhoeffer. The emphasis is made by Bonhoeffer,

"(The Old Testament Jews) offered sacrifices and performed works which they fondly imagined God would accept in place of themselves, but with these they purchased their independence from him. Then the supreme miracle occurs. The Son of God becomes man. The word is made flesh. He who had existed from all eternity in the glory of the father, he who in the beginning was the agent of creation, he who was very God accepts humanity by taking upon himself our human nature. God takes humanity to itself, not merely as heretofore through the spoken word, but in the body of Jesus. Of his mercy God sends his son in the flesh, that therein he may bare the whole human race and bring it to himself." 48

"The reality of God discloses itself only be setting me entirely in the reality of the world and when I accept the reality of the world it is already sustained, accepted and reconciled in the reality of
God. This is the inner meaning of the revelation of God in the man Jesus." 49

"The incarnation means that God has taken upon himself bodily all human being that henceforth divine being cannot be found otherwise than in human form." 50

When we come to think of these insights as having their place in the total quarry of theological preaching we must test them against the criteria we set up earlier in this work, seeing whether they adequately relate to 'the primacy of the given' in the biblical witness and to the modes of apprehension to which an intelligible presentation of the Gospel has to conform in the contemporary culture.
d. Incarnation and Community

Frank Mauldin McClain has described the 'Christian socialist' years of 1848/54 as the 'watershed' of Maurice's life and suggests that afterwards some of his intellectual power went into decline. They were years that may paradoxically be described both as a period of failure and fulfilment. One feels that the intense activism of the period was basically alien to the nature of Maurice the 'digger'. The involvement with the world that the experiment inevitably entailed was not really his metier - though it was the logic of his theology! And indeed the fulfilment lies in the opportunity these years gave for the full flowering of his social theology. McClain, in a useful but rather diffuse book published to mark the centenary of the death of Maurice has observed that it was his political involvement with radical elements in society rather than his theological opinions that led to his removal from King's College.

".... the crisis at King's College, London, was not really the result of Maurice's heretical ideas about eternity .... . Rather the crisis ... was the result of a profound suspicion of Maurice's political opinions by the conservative members of the college council." 51

This may be indeed how the 'conservative members' of the college council saw it but it is a deep misunderstanding of the theological sensitivities of the times to suggest that Maurice's religious views did not have a bearing on the matter. It is even less perceptive to draw such a sharp distinction between his political and theological views. Maurice himself would not have done this and I suggest he would have been hard put to it to say whether his dismissal was the consequence of his politics or his theology. As he says:

"The highest theology is most closely connected with the commonest practical life." 52

The truth in McClain's point may be that he was dismissed for his theology but not necessarily for the ostensible cause of offence - his interpretation
of the meaning of eternal life. But rather for the central theological motivation that lay behind his 'political' involvement. For he was convinced

"that theology will be a mere hortus siccus for schoolmen to entertain themselves with, till it becomes associated once more with the life of men and nations; their politics will be a mere ground on which despots and democrats, and the fools of both, play with the morality and happiness of their fellow-beings, till we seek again for the ground of them in the nature and purposes of the Eternal God." 53

And the theological grounding of Maurice's politics lay in a complex of ideas that included an understanding of the Trinity as a community of divine persons rather than a metaphysical principle; a belief that the moral constitution of the universe expressed itself in 'the law of cooperation' and 'the ethos of consanguinity' rather than 'the law of competition' and that as always there was a christological basis and revelation of the meaning of this principle in

"... the truths of an actual living community under Christ in which no man has a right to call anything that he has his own but in which there is a practical cooperation and spiritual fellowship." 54

And so everything is social in the theology of Maurice: the church seen as the kingdom of the free members of Christ; the race itself which is always the church in its potential; the universe as the habitat of men dwelling in membership with one another; and the divine ordinances of law, nation, state, family as the products and paradigms of human community. The conception of man in membership with other men is the great derivative springing from a tripartite theological base: the 'constitution' of the universe in terms of the law of cooperation, the church as the sphere in which that law is translated into the reality of human communion, and Christ as the centre of the human fellowship.

We may note the radicality of the first of these by contrasting the thrust of this socio-theological approach with the more common view as described by M.B. Reckitt in his study of the Anglican incarnational tradition, 'From
"We shall never understand the violence of the antipathy with which the ideas of a Maurice and the projects of a Shaftesbury were met until we realise that accumulation was the unquestioned and almost exclusive purpose, for at least two full decades from 1851, of every class in England below the landed gentry who had no need of it, and above the miserable hordes of slum dwellers who had no hope of it." 55

As against this Maurice found the law of cooperation either explicit or implicit in the entire range of scripture. The covenants given to the patriarchs and lawgivers were for the regulation of life into an acceptable social entity. The all-pervasive logos which was liberated in increasing education would bring men to the recognition of their mutuality. And the Christian socialist principle as expressed by Maurice was

"... the view that desired to reconstitute society on the basis of cooperation as a great Christian and true social principle and to banish out of society everything which opposed itself to these principles." 56

This was his Christian sociology and as he interpreted the ethos of contemporary society he felt that this dimension of the Christian faith answered to the social condition of the times:

"Men are evidently more alive now to their social than to their individual wants; they are therefore more awake to the evils that affect society than to those that affect their own souls. To him who merely or mainly preaches about the soul, this is a most discouraging circumstance - to him whose purpose is to awaken men to a knowledge of God and a knowledge of sin, it need not be discouraging at all." 57

The point was that as Florence Higham has put it, 'The keynote of Maurice's religion was fellowship.' 58 The denial and abrogation of this as expressed across the entire range of human disintegration from partisan quarrelling to laissez faire greed was the contradiction of the very constitution of things in the design of God of creation and the Father of Jesus Christ. There is a remarkable passage in the 'Theological Essays' which may be regarded as a commentary on the text quoted above:

"If God presents himself to us as the Father of a Family it is not necessary for the knowledge of Him, that we should force ourselves to forget our relations with each other, and to think of ourselves as
alone in the world. And though as I have admitted and asserted,
the sense of sin is essentially the sense of solitude, isolation,
distinct individual responsibility, I do not know whether that sense,
in all its painfulness and agony, ever comes to a man more fully than
when he recollects how he has broken the silken cords which bind him
to his fellows; how he has made himself alone, by not confessing that
he was a brother, a son, a citizen. I believe the conviction of that
sin may be brought home more mightily to our generation than it has been
to any former one; and that a time will come, when every family and
every man will mourn apart, under the sense of the strife and divisions
of the body politic, which he has contributed to create and perpetuate.
The preaching, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand, has always
been the great instrument of levelling hills and exalting valleys. It
will be so again. The priest and the prophet will confess that they
have been greater rebels against the law of love than the publican and
the harlot, because they were sent into the world to testify of a love
for all, and a Kingdom for all, and they have been witnesses for
separation, for exclusion, for themselves." 59

In this passage he bats all round the wicket. He reveals his abhorrence
of the theological partisanship which is the pious way in which human unity is
subject to destruction. He marks out the essential characteristic of sin as
the alienation that is inimical to brotherhood and a sense of sonship. He
hints at his favourite theme of the Kingdom as the healer of the alienation,
the leveller of the spiritual and social hills and valleys that separate man
from man and put the idea of community out of sight and out of mind. And
there is little doubt that underlying his words about the kingdom there is the
thought of the rule of the Kingship of Christ seen empirically within the
eschatological community of the church which for all its imperfect 'prophets
and priests' is the locale of the Kingdom on earth. By comparison it is
what Maurice calls 'the world' that is the anti-community: the locale of
proud and loveless fragmentation. Whereas he saw the function of the
Christian persuader as being that of bringing men to the recognition that they
were all of one 'kind' because Christ too was one of their 'kind', this was
constantly in conflict with the world in a Johanine sense of 'the power of
evil organised against the kingdom of Christ.' It was not so much that
this power was to be thought of as an ontological reality existing side by
side with Christ's kingdom and reign. It was a tendency that had its roots
and locus in the aeon of the Kingdom in the manner of the New Testament parables of the wheat and tares, sheep and goats. This aspect of Maurice's thought is interesting in that it shows how he thinks of evil in a 'redeemed' world in which redemption - however else it is to be construed - has a dimension of social harmony to it. This comes out in his lectures on the Apocalypse when he is able to expound the fulfilment of the kingdom in terms of the eternal community and the city that standeth foursquare. But obviously - and at few times in history was this more obvious than in the mid-nineteenth century - the life of man is not like this and there is surely substance, capable of biblical support, for the contention that both the essence and the empirical results of sin lie in the loss of fellowship and the relapse into an alienated loneliness of spirit and being. This was something that Maurice did not miss in his expositions of scripture: fellowship was a quality given to Adam and sin was the rejection of it. And the purpose of God is noted as being the creation of community in terms of the Old Testament covenant and nation and in terms of the New Testament covenant and kingdom, the whole finding its consummation in the New Jerusalem. This fellowship was to be expressed in the providential units of the family and the nation and indeed there was a curiously holy patriotism in Maurice which should be remembered in the evaluation of a man popularly associated with the 'christian socialist' label. (He could speak for example of the qualities of heart of the 'true-born Englishman' and about 'the true principle of English society, that has been asserting itself from age to age in our history'). These units were the 'hints' of God's unifying design and while there was a strong personalistic and moralistic connotation to sin, Maurice believes that man 'sees' what sin is when he recollects 'how he has broken the silver cords which bind him to his fellows.' And there is a bitterness as well as an arrogance about this experience of worldliness. Its essence is the breakdown of communion both vertically and
horizontally. And says Maurice, carrying in his soul the tensions between an 'objective' view of redemption and an empirical observation of the social realities,

"The principles of the world exist in the heart of every family and of every nation .... they are precisely the natural tendencies and inclinations of men .... they are always threatening to become predominant .... When they become predominant there ceases to be any recognition of men as related to a Being above them, any recognition of them as possessing a common humanity." 60

And though this dissipation could only be countered by the basic Christian perception, there is a theological diffuseness in Maurice's interpretation of the explanation of this. Or looked at from another point of view the diffuseness might be thought to be richness of expression by which he relates a variety of theological conceptions to the main problem. But always implicitly or overtly there is the christological definition making community both a reality and a hope. But within that controlling idea Maurice sometimes turns to his favourite 'logos' conception as the social and spiritual principle of unification: In 'The Kingdom of Christ' (which was published in the form of letters to a Quaker friend) he elaborates on what he regarded as the defect in George Fox's system as follows:

"By substituting his principle (that of a universal light) for Christianity, and for the church in which Christianity is embodied, he (George Fox) had inevitably fallen into the mistake of not regarding the living Word as the bond of humanity, from whom men separate themselves when they choose to be individuals, and of making the truth of his presence with us an excuse for exalting the apprehensions and intimations of each particular man." 61

Sometimes 'the living Word' is transmuted into 'the universal atonement' as the spiritual cement of the universal harmony of all things. Interpreted in the narrower terms of Calvinistic dissent it was the atonement that was elevated as the very core of theological discrimination between a man and his brother but in a creative way Maurice turns it into the ground of the universal kinship.

"The more strongly and passionately I believe in a universal atonement and sacrifice, the more do I desire to extricate them (the Dissenters) from some of the confusions into which the narrow and dark representations of that master-principle and key-note of social harmony have driven them." 62
The ideas of Christ as the Lord of mankind in a sense that is more cosmic than that which thinks of his Lordship conditioned by human response; of the act of God in Christ as holding within it the potential and token of universal reconciliation; of the logos of God as the power that forces men towards social harmony through the lessons of travail and sufferings; of the kingdom interpreted rather less ecclesiologically than Maurice allowed; of the sacraments as signs of immersion into humanity and interdependence upon humanity - these are all parts of the strata of contemporary thinking and proclamation.
e. Incarnation and Scripture

As the incarnation is the sun around which the whole of Maurice's theology revolves so his view of the relationship between scripture and incarnation is an expression of this. Scripture is the record of a divine penetration of the human scene, especially in the history of Israel, that was leading almost inexorably toward the event of the Word made flesh. The end was always in the beginning and he who came forth from the bosom of the Father was 'the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world'. The King whom only some recognised in the form of Jesus of Nazareth had been recognised by the Father from all eternity and his 'kingdom was an everlasting kingdom'. And never being greatly deflected from the massive objectivity of his christological thinking Maurice presses home the point in a sermon based on the prologue to John's Gospel. Referring to Jewish speculations about the coming of the Messiah and the kind of speculation that characterised these expectations he asks:

"What was there faulty in such speculations? What was there to complain of in the test which was applied to ascertain their worth?" 63

Typically Maurice traces the epiphany of the incarnate Christ in history recorded in scripture to the logos from all eternity who had been the light and life of mankind:

"St. John suggests this answer to us. They were expecting one who should come after all prophets, not one that had been before all. They were looking for a son of David, a prophet, an angel; they were not looking for one who had been with God and was God. They were looking for one whom they should recognise with their eyes; they were not looking for one whose light had always been shining in their hearts; they were looking for a King who should reign over men, they did not think that that King must be one who had from the beginning been the Light of men. They thought of one who should be born into the world; they did not think that He who was to be born into the world was One who was in the world, and by whom the world was made, though the world knew him not." 64

It is this kind of insight of which scripture is the basis and record that brought him to concentrate on the theological significance of scripture.
Questions of a critical nature were not in principle to be rejected and bibliolatry was an attitude to be deplored because of the confusion it reveals between faith in the Living Father and spiritual assent to a book. And though Maurice dissented from the critical conclusions of Bishop Colenso of Natal who had taken a radical view both of the authorship and historicity of the Pentateuch, he neither based his criticism on the principle of the inviolability of orthodoxy nor did he approve of the witchhunt that gathered around Colenso. Rather did he try to set the issues in a theological perspective. He drew a distinction between the dubiety about the accuracy of the chronicling of events, their dates and the identity of their reporters as against the denial of a definite historical process in which the word, will and presence of God are revealed. And while Maurice himself took a conservative view of the historical accuracy and indeed literalness of scripture and did not have either the interest or the equipment to be a 'critical' scholar, yet he accepted the validity of this kind of investigation, assuming at the same time that the 'history' could not be eroded by such an approach and that this 'history' was to be interpreted theologically - in its relation to God's spiritual purposes - as the history of the Kingdom of God. And indeed he developed the idea, now widely accepted as the clue to biblical theology, that in the Old Testament the narrative is slanted by theological presuppositions and that though this determines the interpretation of the 'meaning' of events it does not deny the historical raw material over which the historiographer has worked. And Maurice suggests that the existence of the Pentateuch at all suggests a background that has more to do with history than with 'religious ideas' and that this data has been theologised in the Pentateuch in such a way as to confront us with the challenge that the meaning of history is a theological question beyond the point at which it is an investigatory or 'critical' question. As A.M. Ramsay has put it:
"It is valid evidence for a great event, that a nation's literature and religious experience took a certain shape, and that an event must be postulated such as created this shape." 65

And if the Old Testament bore witness to the history of the Kingdom in the obedience of the patriarchs, prophets and the givers and interpreters of the law so there was a theological continuity between that and the New Testament. The Old Testament was the frame of reference within which the New Testament would be understood and there is no suggestion in Maurice that the basic biblical categories need be re-interpreted for the sake of contemporary intelligibility. Rather that they be discovered and proclaimed. And so, for example, he used the Old Testament ideas of the covenant and the people of God to interpret the church's being and sacraments at a time when this was very uncommon. The function of the New Testament, he argued

"... was to show the link between Old Testament and New Testament. The New Testament is the explanation of how these events (Incarnation, Cross and Resurrection) were connected with the declarations of God under the Old Covenant - to show how the Christian kingdom was the expansion and development of the Jewish seed ... how the awful name of the Father, the Son and the Spirit was the only perfect unveiling of him who had spoken to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." 66

The continuity of experience between Old and New Testaments and the unity of the revelatory reality that dominates both is such that Maurice spoke of the Old Testament as 'the dictionary' of the New Testament. But it should be noted that though he used the Bible with a deep theological rigour yet he objected to its being designated as the Word of God. He regarded this as a mere slogan which the Bible itself never claimed and he felt that so to describe the Bible does less than justice to the divine 'dabar' and 'logos' and moves in the direction of bibliolatry: it is to mistake the 'end' for the 'means'. Referring to the Evangelical Party in the Church of England he writes:

"To magnify the Bible to the utmost - not to magnify that great living object with which the Bible seeks to make us acquainted - this is the great vocation of one party." 67
What prevented him from adopting this view, despite the fact that he believed there was a correlation of thoughts and words capable of being described as 'verbal' inspiration, lies in two factors. One was his unwillingness to ascribe 'inspiration' to scripture only. The afflatus of God expressed itself in literature, experience and the Holy Spirit, which Maurice regarded as the key to the regeneration of the church, was not bound by scripture. He agrees with George Fox that the Living Word, dwelling with each man is superior to Scripture. And in this way Maurice departs from the scholastic legacy of the Reformation in which the letter of scripture has been elevated to the ipssisima verba of God and his revelation confined to the pages of scripture. This would be a form of religious idolatry to be avoided as rigorously as true reverence for the scriptures is to be encouraged. The basis of this reverence lay not in the attribution of its contents to the direct inspiration of God - "The Book is most recognised to be divine when it is seen to be human" - but in its historic revelatory depths and in its theological continuity for the Book is wrapped up not in celestial but in christological covers. Having said that - and having removed Maurice on his own testimony from those who held a narrow understanding of scripture - we also have to note his belief that scripture was the principal source of the Living Word and that it had about it 'the mysterious power of steam' to energise.

The other factor was that to Maurice the supreme, mediating Word between God and humanity was not written but incarnate in Christ. He was the Word of God and since the function of God's Word to man is revelatory and since the nature of that revelation is personal rather than propositional then it is in the manhood of the Word made flesh that the revelation is fully known. It is in its way an anticipation of the distinction drawn in modern theology between religious reality described in propositional terms as against religious reality known in an existential relationship. The words he used rather
pejoratively were words like 'system', 'opinion' and 'notions'. There was
the Evangelical system resting on ecclesiastical fundamentalism. These
theological systems he contrasted with the objective personal reality of
Christ revealed as the Head and Lord of every man. Scripture leads us to
a Person regarding itself as the stepping stones leading to him. David
M. Murphy sums up well the view of Maurice in an unpublished doctoral thesis
thus:

"Men attach themselves to notions and opinions, to a system to a
religion, and all this they put in the place of truth, which is not
a proposition or a formula but a living person. In this, men have
forgotten the authentic teaching of the New Testament.

We are never taught there to adopt a certain scheme which can
be labelled and ticketed Christian, and set up as a rival of every
other. They speak of a Person – a Son of God and a Son of Man." 68

"This, to Maurice, is truth, the living God; attachment to Him is the
only way to be saved from man's falseness and idolatry.

When I give glory to the Father, and to the Son and to the Holy
Ghost I am escaping from opinions. I believe I am at the centre of
God's revelations of Himself; I believe that He has led us out of our
crude and miserable opinions about Him, to that Name which expresses
what He is in himself, what He is in relation to me, and to all the
universe." 69

The distinction between subjectivity and objectivity, between reality
and opinion is over-simplified by Maurice. His view of personal attachment
to the divine realities may be said in itself to be a notion, resting on an
opinion he came to about the meaning of the christological event. For all
that the point he is making has to be underlined for the fault to which he
was pointing recurs in differing forms in the church so that the code is
given primacy over the commitment and ecclesiastical or biblicist forms of
fundamentalism take precedence over personal faith, hope and love. This
even works itself out to the extent of an anti-intellectualism which is rather
quaint in a man who regarded the function of theology so highly. But I think
this distrust of the way in which much professional religion and theology
manifested themselves sprang from the almost obsessive view that religious reality was much more personal and existential than the exclusiveness that was built into most theological systems would allow. Creed and Prayer Book were exempt from this, as indeed were the 39 Articles because they provided the ground of unity rather than the tests of acceptability. But it is significant that Maurice never ever produced a 'systematic theology' for all his voluminous writings and the reason may be found in his conviction that the world of his day was heavy with religious systems but knew little of God at first hand. His method then becomes the expository method of interpreting the divine experience of the men of scripture and holding forth the same possibility to wayfaring men as was known by patriarchs and prophets, evangelists and apostles. It is the possibility of the revelation of the Living God - a Son of God and a Son of Man.

"Maurice's criterion of a sound doctrine is defined as one that helps him to realise fellowship with God of the kind that characterised the experience of the patriarchs and outstanding figures of the Bible." 70

It is therefore both the history and the faith of the Bible that are important. There is an attempt to treat the Bible as a spiritual manual (what Forsyth called 'the manual of eternal life') but the spirituality was not severed from the ongoing processes of history narrated in scripture. Nor was it severed from the secularity that characterises great tracts of scripture in its descriptions of the clash of individuals, peoples and armies. Both spirituality and secularity are related to the history as different aspects of the development of the Kingdom of God. And as they are expressed in the Old Testament both contain the clue and provide the congruous hinterland of what is finally revealed in the Incarnation. God's involvement in Christ is comprehensive. It is involvement with all being and all relationships. Without the logos was not anything made that was made. And if this means that the work of the world is part of the life in God then the way is
prepared for such secular Christianity by the witness of the Old Testament to God's concern about all life.

"Here (in the Bible) the circumstances and relations of ordinary life are exhibited as the ladder through which God is guiding man to a knowledge of himself." 71

"What is the subject matter with which the Bible is conversant? You would say perhaps that it is the supernatural, the transcendent. But see! There is no book that speaks so much of shepherds and their flocks, of the most ordinary doings of families, of nations and laws and wars; of all that we are wont to call vulgar and secular things ....... Must we not then say that the Revelation or unveiling of the divine or supernatural, if it is made at all, is made through the relations of ordinary daily life? Is this not the great characteristic of the Book, the one which, if we take it to be the record of a continuous Revelation, prepares us for the full manifestation in the Son of Man?" 72

There is at least a hint in this kind of language of the modern way of seeing the event of Jesus as the supreme sign of God's commitment to the common life of man. And that far from being a 'change of gear' on God's part from the divine to the human, the conceptual to the personal, the religious to the secular, the great principle of the Incarnation is writ into the biblical record in the story of the common life of the people of the Old Testament. For in his way of talking about the common life he too is a de-sacraliser seeing transcendence in the depths of secular things.

"Only by the most violent and tortuous processes can you separate what may be called the transcendent or supernatural part of the narrative from these affairs of common life." 73

This does not mean that the history is not divinised in the sense that it is inter-penetrated by the divine purpose. For in many places Maurice's thinking is not far removed from that of Cullman and Richardson in their conceptions of 'salvation history'. His chosen term was of course 'the kingdom of God' and he related the biblical history to his understanding of the Kingdom. Maurice's understanding of the Kingdom is somewhat elusive and perhaps sufficiently obscure as to attract Arnold's description of him as 'a muddy mystic'. It is an order, a sphere of being corresponding with the 'constitution' of the created universe and it finds its expression in the catholic
church. He saw the revelation of the kingdom in the Old Testament to the patriarchs and the nation. But this 'dispensation' was but the platform for the revelation in Jesus Christ and through him to all men:

"Finally all these dispensations were but the platform for another and more august revelation, when the Son of David and Abraham, the expected king and champion of the nation, that unseen head, who had been presumed in all its acts and the secret ruler of all its powers - when the Son of God, who was to bring a message of peace to his people, the light to lighten the gentiles, and the glory of Israel - when lastly that Divine Word, in whom all the glories of the godhead dwelt, should be manifested to the eyes of men, that they might see him and handle him." 74

It is a dramatic unfolding and there is in Maurice the sense of the grand denoument which becomes in turn the ground of faith for it contains the good news of the gospel: the Divine Word in whom all the glories dwelt, is at last manifested to the eyes of men, that they might see him and handle him. To Maurice this is the brand mark of the divine revelation: the incarnate manifestation, the seeing by the eyes, the very touching and handling. If, as he said, the incomprehensible, incognizable Jehovah is manifested in a Man in such fashion, the cry of the human heart in all ages is met. And it is the combination of a theological sense with a sense of the dramatic unfolding of God in the biblical history that gives power to his way of handling scripture. There is no doubt that this was one of the great natural gifts that he possessed and it is early evident not in relation to scripture but in his way of looking at and interpreting the meaning of classical texts. The hint is in the early days at Cambridge in the classes of his classical tutor Julius Hare. For beyond the discipline - indeed through the discipline - of Greek nouns, verbs, participles he saw the beauty and drama. It is interesting to note Maurice's own description of how he saw beyond the mechanics of the language to themes of drama and unity for this discipline may be regarded as a schoolmaster leading him to understand scripture in the same way:

"How could we discover the divine intuitions of the poet while we were
tormenting ourselves about his tenses? I cannot tell but it seems
to me that I never learnt so much .... about Greek dramatic poetry,
about all poetry, as in that term .... by some means or other, one
rose to the apprehension that the poem had a unity in it, and that the
poet was pursuing an ideal and that the unity was not created by him,
but perceived by him, and that the ideal was not a phantom, but some¬
thing that must have had a most real effect upon himself, his age,
and his country. I cannot the least tell you how Hare imparted this con¬
viction to me, I only know that I acquired it, and could trace it very
directly to his method of teaching." 75

In some analogous way he construed the unity of scripture to be a unity
of truth being unfolded in revelation. His basic argument with Colenso
and the emergent biblical critics was that though it was right enough to grapple
with the 'tenses' there was in reality no point in resting the matter there.
One had to perceive beyond these the 'unity', the 'drama', the 'ideal' and
that all this was part of the givenness of the scriptural revelation. And
at the heart of this givenness was Christ sometimes spoken of as the Eternal
Logos or as the Son in the eternal community of the Trinity, sometimes
interpreted in terms of the divine epiphanies of the Old Testament, and
sometimes in terms of a doctrine of refined typology:

"Because I regard Abraham, Joseph and Jacob as actual men, men made
in the image of God, I must regard them as showing forth some aspect
of his character and life whom I recognise as the express image of
God's person." 76

And because the scriptures unfolded the story of that Kingdom and
finally that incarnation which linked the life of God with the life of man,
therefore scripture could never be properly allowed to speak its message if
it ceased to be incarnational, to do with life, and held up to the dilemmas
of existence. This was the only way in which the book of the Incarnation
can be used. The use of scripture is never in vacuo but always conditioned
by the complex aspects of the human situation. The light of the existential
situation shines on the Word just as the Word shines on the situation. And
so in one of the deepest crises of his life he wrote:

"I have the best reason to know that the minds of numbers of people
in all classes of society ... are unsettled, not on some trifling or
secondary question, but on those that affect their inmost faith. I have maintained therefore ..... that there is no safety but in looking fairly in the face of all difficulties which beset ourselves. So far as I have been enabled steadily to pursue this method with myself, with you, with all who have been brought under my teaching; so I have found that the Scriptures .... have unfolded their meaning to me, have shown me a way out of my perplexities; have offered me a deeper theology and a wider humanity than I had ever imagined for myself, or then the age has ever dreamed of." 77

He believed that Bible Study was reduced almost to uselessness if men brought to it the presuppositions of wicked or selfish political or social stances.

"I came more and more to the feeling that sound political teaching is what we want to restore sense and might to our bible studies." 78

And though many of his own political views were conservative in the extreme - there being an entrenched anti-democratism - yet the point he is making above is that the Bible re-directs men to the recovery of the understanding of the relationship of God to men in their sociality. He illustrates this by comparing the Book of Isaiah with Lord Mahon's 'Life of Pitt'. He describes Isaiah as luminous and the 'Life of Pitt' as 'muddy beyond expression'. And yet strangely enough Isaiah seems unintelligible by comparison with Pitt. This, claims Maurice, is not because of the time-gap because Isaiah might have been written for the time of Louis Napoleon and Pitt's age separated from ours by an infinite chasm. And then comes the observation that clarifies his plea for 'sound political teaching'.

"Take the words, I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me. Nonsense, say all the preachers, these English people are not God's children in any sense. How can they know their owner or their master's crib? They have no owner and no crib till we have been and converted them. And so Wolff (a Jewish theologian) says rightly enough, You give up Isaiah and the prophets to us - your doctrine is different from theirs, and all attempts to accommodate them to your doctrine must prove futile." 79

Where there was not the 'sound political teaching' that taught the nation to see themselves as one people of God bound together by the bonds of their creation and redemption to the Kingdom, there could be no understanding of a book which was a commentary based on these social and theological foundations. As he
says elsewhere about the Minor prophets as a whole:

"Why we find (them) so obscure is because we cannot enter into the strong national life of which they speak." 80

Maurice's exegesis may be faulted but the perception that sees the theological follow-through into the meaning of social, secular life as a corollary of the Incarnation interpreted objectively and comprehensively as affecting and hallowing all life gave rise to a new understanding of the relationship between Christianity and society.
f. Incarnation and Mission

In a work ultimately to do with the data of contemporary preaching it is fair to ask, What was Maurice's understanding of the christian message and mission? And while Maurice himself is not above giving a one-sentence-answer to that question ('The Gospel is that Christ is in you') a survey of his writing and thinking brings us to the conclusion that though there is basic thematic unity in his understanding it is expressed in several different ways. With Maurice, as with all sensitive communicators of the gospel, the message was coloured by the changing perspective and the varying notes of the gospel are struck as his life moves through its various phases and his thinking measures his faith against the changing scene. Perhaps Maurice, no less than Hosea, found his message - and the terms of it - rearing up out of his immediate life situation. It is the thesis of Frank Maudlin McClain that 'Maurice's inward tensions heightened his moral sensitivity and caused him to move toward an ethical statement important for the secular social ethics of today.'

This, I believe, may be broadened out to provide some kind of understanding of the reasons why the themes of unity and justice and deliverance are interwoven into the Maurician proclamations. The reason is that they were part of the warp and woof of his own existence and no gospel could have been personal for him that did not hold out answers in these terms to the conditions of his own life. This is not to say that his message was a simple philosophical projection from the plane of Maurice's needs and aspirations. But he did believe that the great universals had their roots in the human experience - not least his own.

As we have already seen Maurice saw the Kingdom of God as the comprehensive motif of the christian faith and this idea must be regarded as the groundwork of the proclamation.

"The Gospel of Jesus Christ - the Gospel, as he called it of the
Kingdom of heaven, does profess to show why the life of man is not vanity. The life of man, so the gospel declares, is not vanity for it is derived from the life of the Son of God. He is the Lord of everyman. In Him is life and his life is the light of man. The life of a man becomes a vain show, just because he does not confess his relation to the Fountain of Life .... just because he seeks that life where it is not to be found - in the things which he is to rule, not the Lord who rules him." 82

Here we have a mosaic of Maurician ideas that find their place in his explication of the message: the gospel - the gospel of the kingdom - the life of man that is derived from the life of the Son of God - Christ as the Lord of everyman - in him the life that is the light of man - the relation to the Fountain of life - the Lord who rules. These may be said to be telegraphic captions of the Maurician gospel. They recur in his writings to the point of monotony but if they seem like that to us and side by side with that we remember how novel they were to the ears of congregations at Lincoln's Inn, Vere Street, King's College and Cambridge we have a curious kind of witness to the measure in which Maurice has been a seminal figure in British preaching and theology.

What was certainly pre-eminent in the message was that in God is the only ground of human unity. And there was a comprehensiveness about his notion of unity that is well expressed by David M. Murphy:

"This concern for unity extended to all aspects of his life: the personal stance and style which he developed in his dialectical contact with other men and their ideas, his choice of theological topics, his social theories, and the consequent practical concerns of his life and mission. His life was dominated by what we would now call 'ecumenical' concern ......... Both salvation and revelation are universal in nature; even pagans are given both." 85

There was a remarkable universalism about the span of this desire for unity which was surely unusual either among men of the church or the world in England of the mid-nineteenth century. And we, whose minds are fed by the universal images of the mass media do not without an effort appreciate the creativity of Maurice's thinking in this respect. For there were strong national and social deterrents mitigating against the mental breakthrough
that viewed God's concern as being for all mankind. And yet this is the
strain again and again in his thinking: the mission is to awaken in mankind
an awareness of its unity as men in Christ and therefore spiritual brothers
one of another. And there are passages in the Boyle lectures which bring
out this feeling that God's plan is for nothing less than the creation of a
new humanity expressing itself empirically in the universal integration of man.
Not that he was a starry eyed idealist unaware of how far the dream was from
realisation. Nor was he deaf to the voices that said it could not be so.
The voices dinned in his ears:

"To look out in the world and see a valley covered with the dry
bones of different systems, to hear them clashing together as if
they might be joined to each other, and then to be told, 'It is
all in vain; there is no voice that can bid the breath enter into
these bones .... such an announcement as this, however softened by
thoughts of the past or the future, must be a very mournful one." 84

With a generosity quite untypical of the Christianity of the day with
its rather exclusive missionary impulse he makes the point that perhaps
Buddhism can be instrumental in showing Christianity the way to universal
inclusiveness based on the working of the creative Spirit. And after having
spoken of the resignation with which Christian men and most others looked out
on this valley of dry systems struggling to be joined together but being
persuaded by the voices that said it was impossible, he speaks thus of
Buddhism:

"... this great religion of the world comes to turn the current of
these thoughts, to check this despondency. We are but ill-provided
with a theory, say the Buddhists; we have tried many and little fruit
has come of them. But this we are assured of: you Christians may not
have heard it, but there is a quickening, life-giving Spirit, which is
meant for humanity; which all may possess together; which alone may
bring a universe out of chaos, unity out of division." 85

This view of mankind as an organic unity grounded in the purposes of God
was a vision which he would not allow the 'party men' of the church or the
world to cloud under any circumstances. He disapproved of parties within
the church and pleaded for cooperation at every level. This in practice
he made difficult for himself by being so critical of those whose preaching and teaching seemed to him to violate that unity that God had given all men in Christ. Maurice held up the Evangelicals as an example of those who taught that men were to be found in various grades and categories, a few men truly sons of God by redemption but the majority forfeiting this sonship by their lack of faith. There was about Maurice a temperamental incapacity for seeing some men as 'being dead in tresspasses and sins' and 'others as alive unto God' through the act of their own faith, the basis of the sense of cosmic unity resting rather on the redeeming act of God, whether it be accepted, rejected or unknown.

But another part of the message integrally related to the above was the gospel of the unity of the church. Again we must remember that he was writing more than 50 years before the Edinburgh Conference of 1910 and yet the theology of ecumenicity is accurately anticipated in his way of thinking about the unity of the church.

"The broken limbs of the world may yet be united, if the broken limbs of the church be united first." 86

The unity of the church has an evangelical purpose - it is for the world. And the nature of the unity of the church is that of a living entity rather than the amalgam of separate ecclesiastical institutions. And in this he anticipates the manner in which the discussion of the unity of the church takes its reference from the biblical category of the Body of Christ. Speaking of 'the broken limbs' he says:

"Are these the limbs of a great system, or of a living body? Holding the first opinion of herself, the church has been either held artificially together, the children within her groaning under the bondage to which she has subjected them .... or else, these artificial joints and fastenings being removed, she has split into fragments ...... But if the scripture language is true, if the church is a body constituted in a Head, the Bhuddist proclamation carries with it the reproof and consolation we require. There is a Power which can bring us not into some imaginary condition of excellence but precisely into our true condition:
of excellence but precisely into our true condition: which can remove the individual interests, selfish feelings, national antipathies, narrow apprehensions that all our efforts to produce unity have only evoked and strengthened." 87

The 'scripture language' yielded to Maurice the conceptions of the Body, the covenant, the people of God, and the new humanity which form the key terms by which biblical scholars have interpreted the meaning of and obligation toward Christian unity. There is also the understanding that the church's life should have a christological pattern to it - it is a body constituted in a Head. And the Head is Christ.

But the challenge of thinking organically about the unity of the church as an 'earnest' of the unity of mankind finally brought Maurice to relate the life of his land to these overriding theological insights. The mission must be related to the task of the social unification of the people. And the expression of this is in the Christian socialist movement about which Maurice constantly made the assertion that its basis was in a theology of unity and corporeality. This theology moved in two directions - into the church's life and thence beyond to the life of society. It consisted in an appreciation of what God had done and thereby of the destiny to which every man was called. Church and world were two ways of looking at that reality which seen in the perspective of eternity was a unity. And this kind of theology he did not regard as some kind of 'modernist' speculation at odds with classical theology. He has a habit of speaking about 'the old theology' by which he means the patristic tradition of Alexandria which he sees expressed in the creeds and articles of the church. And his claim is that it is this theological tradition which lets the church see the nature of its message and mission in his day. It puts him on the side of those whose view of the church is that of ecclesia semper reformanda no matter how painful this may prove to be:

"I foresee a terrible breaking down of notions, opinions, even of most precious beliefs, an overthrow of what we call our religion -
a convulsion far greater than that of the 16th century - in our way to reformation and unity." 88

It would be easy to speak of this as an uncanny prophecy of what has been happening both in the realm of theological thinking and practical outworking in the life of the contemporary church. But there is not much in Maurice's teaching to substantiate either his anticipation of, much less approval of, some of the suggested modes of reformation: though he was against 'religion' he would not have seen 'religiousness christianity' as sui generis with the Gospel. And though his thinking was rigorously christological he would not have recognised the more extreme forms of the 'secular Christ' as having any connection with the transcendental meaning of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth. He would however have recognised a servant church whose function was to proclaim the rule of God in the visible, secular, social relationships of men in their horizontal existence.

"I am most thankful to be able to connect church reformation with social reformation - to have all one's thoughts tested by their application to actual work and by their power of meeting the wants of suffering, discontented, resolute men." 89

The England of the mid-nineteenth century was a drastic test-bed for the mission inherent in Maurice's social theology. 'It was a hard world of sharply-divided interests with small sense of national brotherhood.' Poverty, which had always been an economic axiom for the agricultural workers became much more striking in its ghastly effect when it was seen in the much more densely collective contexts of the urban societies created by the Industrial Revolution. Maurice had seen the poverty of the country at Bubbenhall and the poverty of the city around Guy's Hospital.

"The factory poor were wholly uncared for by church or state; no Lady Bountiful visited them with blankets and advice; no one but the Non-conformist minister was their friend; they had no luxury but drink ....." 90

There had been attempts to fix minimum wages under the Speenhamland
system in Berkshire which sought to relate wages to the minimum price of bread which was excessive because of the effects of the Corn Laws. These attempts had failed and were replaced by an embryonic 'assistance' system by which 'every poor and industrious person should receive from the parish a certain sum per week in addition to his wages, so much for himself and so much for other members of the family, when the loaf cost a shilling. As the loaf rose, the dole was to rise with it.'

The century was however destined to see the gradual increase in political agitation arising from the social impetus of industrialisation. But there was also strong resistance and apathy to much in the way of improvement for the masses. And the economics of the period buttressed the forces of repression which held sway both in the civil and ecclesiastical Establishment. At the beginning of the century the Archdeacon of Carlisle had written a pamphlet entitled 'Reasons for Contentment addressed to the Labouring Part of the British Public' which defended episcopacy principally on the grounds that it was a God-ordained role for those from the nobility whose vocation lay within the church. This was not untypical of the conceit and complacency that characterised the Church of England and as we have previously noted the Christian Socialist manifesto of 1848 has been described by C.E. Raven as 'an act of atonement' for a century's social complacency. Sanction was given to all this by the economics of Malthus who had proposed the thesis that man multiplies at a greater rate than the productive capacity of the earth and that the balance can only be held by the ravaging effects of disease, vice and starvation.

There were of course those who challenged the social morality of the national situation. Carlyle, the historian of the French Revolution, was listened to when he spoke about social causes and effects. Yet he was almost alone among British men of letters in the earlier part of the century whose
sympathies were with reforming trends.

"Laissez faire, supply and demand, one begins to weary of all that. Leave all to egoism, to ravenous greed of money, of pleasure, of applause - it is the Gospel of Despair." 91

The Utilitarian philosophers Bentham and John Stuart Mill linked up with Malthusian economics to forge the socio-economic theory that it would be the market play of the law of supply and demand that would fix wages and prices determining the levels of comparative happiness and misery that would result. But at the level of social experiment there had been the outstanding attempt of Robert Owen at New Lanark based on the social philosophy of environmental influence. In the religious sphere there was the palliative effect of the compassion of evangelical religion. This came from two sources. There was the Evangelical Party within the Church of England associated with the names of Newton, Simeon, Wilberforce and Shaftesbury about whom Morley says in his 'Life of Gladstone':

"They helped to form a conscience, if not a heart, in the callous bosom of English politics," 92

But though the total impact of Evangelicals on 19th Century life is in process of re-appraisal at the moment by a historian like Kathleen Heasnam and therefore a final verdict may not be given, yet considerable new evidence would have to be forthcoming to overthrow the accepted view that while Morley's reference is true it has to be balanced against Raven's who speaks about 'evangelicals applying Paul's more quietistic sayings to the circumstances of the industrial era'. The other brand of evangelicalism was enshrined in the Wesleyan movement. The earnestness of personal religion which it encouraged led to the duty and practice of holiness in living in imitation of Christ and this in turn expressed itself in practical philanthropy, a pity for the poor and a conception of salvation which though individualistic involved the reclamation of the whole person. But basically what evangelicalism attempted
to do was to fill moral cement into the structure of a society which was, so it believed, God-ordained. It was revolutionary only in the most spiritualistic sense of the term.

Maurice's response to the social predicament was different. It was theological to the point of being complex. It is not to be identified with the simpler forms of the 'social gospel' which consisted in the belief in the social application of the sermon on the mount for the creation of the Kingdom of God 'in England's green and pleasant land'. Maurice indeed started from the more biblical standpoint that the Kingdom had been established. It was the gift of God made known finally in Christ. Allied to this was his soteriology of objective redemption of all men so that Christ is in truth the Head and Lord of all men. And as he saw all men in Christ so he saw English society in its true constitution as being an entity of members (not individuals). Underpinning this there was a sociology that owed much to the way in which Maurice read the Old Testament. There the divine ordinances of family, law and nation are set forth as the paradigms of the Divine Order of life and these, Maurice believed, were no less a part of the contemporary Divine Order. He believed further in the monarchy as a divine institution and with it a hierarchical social order and disliked democracy because of its tendency to subordinate truth to numbers. He believed also in the nation as a divinely ordained unit of the universal society and believed that it was as appropriate to describe England as 'a holy nation' as it was for the ancient Jews to be called by this designation. Over all this order was the Fatherhood of God and the Headship of Christ:

"An unseen Being is presiding over it, claiming it as his Order, as the constitution He has made for man." 93

Much of Maurice's mission was educational in a very total sense. There was the function of the church to provide a religious education for her people
who required to have knowledge of the scriptures and the creed. And his own preaching was so steeped in the text of the Bible and so didactic in style that he could be said to be a pioneer advocate of 'a teaching ministry'. But ultimately he saw revelation and truth as being incapable of being slotted into religious and secular categories and consequently he could regard the total educational enterprise with which he was associated as part of the educational mission. The schemes of adult education which are part of the enrichment both of our secular and religious life today were ideas in the mind of Maurice and he would have approved of the widespread recognition in the church today that christian renewal is indispensibly linked with christian education.

But perhaps the most impressively creative contribution to the understanding of the christian mission lies in the sphere of the social experimentation on the basis of a christian sociology. The christian socialist 'community' committed to the transference of gospel truth into christian social action is the precursor of experiments like the Iona Community, the East Harlem Parish, Taize, the industrial mission concept and many others. All the seeds are in the understanding of Maurice: identification with urban man, the insistence that he can only retain his significance through the gospel, the tie between social and personal salvation, the understanding that the world in its secularity belongs to God and that his Word can be heard and known in it, the sense of man as members one of another rather than an aggregate of individuals.

These were the notes of the Maurician idea of mission and they are held together in a Gospel of a Son of Man whose life hallows all our humanity.

But beyond the identification of the Son of Man - and indeed as the supreme expression of it - lies the initiative of the Living God. And Maurice has taught us what is conceivably an insight to be developed against the contemporary background: namely that God is the author of mission and that his mission proceeds constantly in the depths of the world's social and
political life; and that the christian function is to think God's thoughts after him, to listen to the divine voice in the thunder and stillness of human affairs - and to be co-workers with him in the outworking of his purposes. As Dr. S.C. Carpenter has put it:

"The increasing willingness of modern christians to recognise that it is not what we do but what God is doing that matters, I trace, in large measure to the influence of Maurice."
5. **Incarnation and Eternal Life**

We come finally in this chapter to an examination of the heart of Maurice's religion: the meaning of the life eternal. It follows on quite logically from the previous chapter and might equally have been included in it for it deals with the spiritual status of the individual as a consequence of God's mission in the world. And it is important to notice in Maurice that though indeed there is a strong nexus linking the personal and the corporeal aspects of the divine/human relationship there is also a strong sense of the individual communion with God springing from the soteriological meaning of the Incarnation. It was from the sacrifice of Christ that the way of life was opened up for men - as well as for mankind - and it was Maurice's own inner sense of the need of a deliverer that caused him to part from the faith of his father. His challenge to the Unitarian tradition was constantly that it produced no answer to correspond with the sense of alienation of the human heart. And as A. Vidler has commented:

"It was because personal evil was very real to him (Maurice) it was of crucial importance to know whether the Devil or Christ was the actual Lord of the universe." 95

This is the bridge between individual experience and theology. And there can be little doubt that there is a pronounced element of life-orientation in Maurice's theology at this point. If he spoke about Christ as the Deliverer it was because he had known the experience of the deliverance within his own soul and if he made much also of the sacrifice for sin it was because his own conscience found peace only on that ground. Certainly, it is a superficial reading of Maurice that removes him from the concerns that have made evangelical religion attractive to the human soul because inasmuch as it focusses on the moral and spiritual experience of guilt and alienation, it reflects Maurice's existential trauma. He certainly departed from the evangelical 'system' and has been supposed to stand an extreme theological remove from it. And while
I would not want to contest the proposition that in the terms in which often he formally stated the element of the objectivity of God's relationship with mankind he appears to be at total odds with the element of subjectivity emphasised by the evangelicals, I wonder if exaggeration and distortion have not crept in. Maurice comes close to caricaturing the evangelical point of view in the 'Essay on Eternal Life' by putting words of objection into the mouth of a Unitarian objector:

"Your church, they say, maintains the notion of everlasting punishment after death.... Consider what is involved in this notion .... An immense - and incalculable - majority of all that have been born into it, must, if their statements mean anything, if they are not merely frivolous rhetoric, be hopelessly doomed. Their object is to point out how a few, a very few, may be saved from the sentence .... Let them speak of Atonement, Justification, Regeneration; these are only different names to denote the methods by which certain men may have the comfort of feeling that they are not shares in the condition to which God has consigned our race." 96

Maurice uses the literary device of putting these words in the mouth of a hypothetical Unitarian but they really represent his way of describing the evangelical point of view. Elsewhere he says he stands for the position that the eternal father does not love the outcasts of humanity less than Wilberforce and the Bishop of London - as evangelical religion would seem to indicate! But in all this Maurice is surely ignoring the less rigorously Calvinistic expressions of evangelicalism. There was a strong Arminian strain in the evangelical preaching of the Nonconformist denominations which certainly would not have assented to a theology of a God who exempted only a few from the determinate fate of perdition to which the many had been 'consigned'. It is puzzling to discover that Maurice seems to have restricted his investigations of evangelicalism to those of that designation within the Church of England who in their theology - as distinct from their practical outreach - were certainly influenced in their interpretation of the Gospel by the Calvinism of such as George Whitfield. But even within that tradition - and certainly
within the wider evangelical manifestations of the Methodist and Baptist movements of the nineteenth century in England - the conclusion would not have been adduced that by the divine will salvation was available only to the minority of men. And anyone who has any personal knowledge of the British evangelical tradition and has experienced its warmth in his own religious development finds it difficult to conceive that in its nineteenth century expression it was as negative as Maurice describes it. Its characteristic caption has always been the Johanine insight that God so loved the world that he gave his Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life. And it was an exception to the general theological empathy that Maurice displayed towards theological opponents (and indeed to other religions) that he was unable to enter into a maturer understanding of the evangelical point of view. One feels that this was because he believed that there was a total and unbridgeable dichotomy between his theology of cosmic redemption and the essential spiritual parity of man as over against the evangelical starting point of sin and the Fall. Maurice saw men against the potential of eternal life, the evangelicals against the threat of eternal punishment.

Some of the difference may be explained as that of perspective and the question has forced itself upon me in looking through the material: was the difference as great as all that? Theologically Maurice spoke of a universal redemption but existentially he confessed to an inner sense of the bondage of sin. Theologically the evangelicals spoke of a world in the grip of the Devil but existentially rejoiced in the liberty of the children of God. The problem set for the evangelical was the reconciliation of the twin biblical insights that God has reconciled all things unto himself with the notion that we are born in sin and shapen in iniquity. Maurice had the task of reconciling his insistence on the Kingdom of God as an existing and present reality
in human affairs with an empirical reality which seemed in its sin and fragmentation to be the denial of this. And if as 'The Dictionary of the Christian Church' says the Evangelical Party in the nineteenth century was characterised by such convictions as

"... rejection of the doctrines of baptismal regeneration and the Eucharistic sacrifice; and, in general, a strong suspicion of the Roman Catholic Church and hostility to Tractarian and High Church doctrines." 97

then there was a considerable - if negative - kinship between them and Maurice who certainly shared these antipathies.

But having advanced these mediating points it still remains the case that whereas for Maurice the ground of the life eternal was as broad as mankind for many evangelicals and sacramentalists it was as narrow as the elect and/or the baptised. And that behind this there was his understanding of redemption as objective spiritual reality as we have expounded it in an earlier chapter. And the charge he lays is that the right conclusions have not been drawn about the relationship of the incarnation to the promise of the life in God.

"The God we have preached has not been the God who was manifested in his Son Jesus Christ but another altogether different being .... . When I am describing what we have made of the Gospel of God's redemption of the world, I cannot soften my expression." 98

We cannot see his point unless we accept the premise that 'the God who was manifested in his son Jesus Christ' is the Father who in the Incarnation of his son has subordinated the effects of Adam to the work of the Second Adam - the Representative Man. Because of this mankind stands not on the abyss of death but on the ground of life. 'The dwelling place of God is with men and he shall dwell with them'. 'In Him was life'. And the ontological effect is in terms of a cosmic redemptive status. As Murphy says:

"Since all things are rooted and grounded in God, Father and Creator of the universe, and in his Son, head and center of all creation, Maurice had a vision, tinged with romantic idealism, of a harmony and unity of all things. This vision led him to many diverse, yet related, applications. He taught an
inter-relationship of all things, a unity of all truths on every level, a corporate and societal union of all men as men, a revelation of God which comes through all reality and is never divorced from any part of it, a divine redemption which includes all creatures, even those of lower orders. In brief, Maurice refused to tolerate the idea of disunity anywhere; all things are woven by the divine shuttle into the web of life." 99

This then was the effect of creation and recreation by the Word - ultimately made flesh. It was the Word of life to all. To all? Yes, Maurice says resolutely in many places. Is there then no human response required? Does the light of the eternal life shine on every cradle to become the torch of every human life? Are pagan and saint equally the possessors of the life eternal? Maurice would take the evangelical and the Tractarian to task for categorising men but it is interesting to note that the exercise of proclamation forces him to do the same. It may be that metaphysically and eschatologically all stand on the ground of the life eternal but Maurice calls for men to take the step of their own volition:

"The only true God knows the creature in all his wanderings and ignorance and falsehood, knows Him in that Son in whom He has created him. when he turns to that God of truth, when he confesses Him and the Son, who is his image and the light of Man, then comes the true life, the eternal life, which Christ, who has power over all flesh, alone confers upon it." 100

Much here seems to be dependent on response on the human side rather than the unconditioned divine initiative. The entire passage reads rather like an evangelistic appeal. what was the condition of Maurice's hearer before he 'turns' or if he fails to do so? And if by the response of faith he comes to 'the true life, the eternal life' on what ground was he previously standing?

It would seem that even in a theology like Maurice's which fastens on the Incarnation as God's great redeeming act there is a duality that has to give due place to the human response - because the nature of the God of the Gospel requires it just as much and as surely as it requires that the initiative is with Him.
And so we begin to see that the greater divergence between Maurice and his fellow theologians lay not so much in the relationship of mankind to the life eternal in Christ but rather in discerning the true nature of the life eternal. It was this that brought him his theological notoriety and was the ostensible cause of his removal from King's College. His views are scattered in correspondence and published sermons but perhaps the clearest and most systematic accounts are in a letter he sent in reply to a query from the young F.J.S. Hort and the last essay in his book 'Theological Essays'.

His thesis is that eternal life is the reality of the knowledge and fellowship of God which is opened to all in Christ and to the awareness of which we come when we recognise Christian truth and love. It is the soul finding the true heritage of its being in God and is not to be thought of as endlessness of life starting at the point of death and projected infinitely on to the plane of eternity. As the Kingdom was a contemporary reality so too was the life eternal. The Greek word he argues does not mean 'without beginning and without end'. Making much of the philology of the matter he writes:

"How then can we affix that meaning to Eternal, when we are speaking of man's bliss or misery? Is that without beginning as well as without end? 'Oh no! You must leave out the beginning. That of course has nothing to do with this case.' Who told you so? How dare you play thus fast and loose with God's word? How dare you fix the standard by which the signification of a word is to be judged, and reject that very standard a moment later?" 102

Obviously if the bliss and the misery start at the point of the acceptance or rejection of God there should be an end to the simplistic equation of eternal with everlasting. But Maurice taught that the biblical understanding of was predominantly moral and not temporal. It was eternal life to know the divine truth, to live by the divine justice, righteousness and love. It was by prayer and not by death that one entered into 'life'. The people of God in the Old Testament were educated into this understanding as they came
to see that the Lord required of them that they 'do justly, love mercy and walk humbly' with their God. This was a preparatio evangelica for the christian understanding which is that

".....the eternal life is the righteousness, and truth, and love of God which are manifested in Christ Jesus; manifested to men that they may be partakers of them, that they may have fellowship with the Father and with the Son. This is held out as the eternal blessedness of those who seek and love Him." 103

Correspondingly the notion of everlasting punishment is given a qualitative and moral connotation. Giving an exegesis of the parable of the Last Judgement 104 he speaks about the nature of the punishment as the spiritual anguish of a loss of the presence of God and the separation from love:

"Are we affixing a new meaning to these words, or the very meaning which the context demands, the only meaning that is consistent with the force that is given to the adjective by our Lord and His apostles elsewhere, if we say that the eternal punishment is the punishment of being without the knowledge of God, who is love, and of Jesus Christ who has manifested it; even as eternal life is declared to be the having the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ? If it is right, if it is a duty, to say that Eternity in relation to God has nothing to do with time or duration, are we not bound to say that also in reference to life or to punishment, it has nothing to do with time or duration." 105

And he is prepared to be agnostic about the ultimate fate of those thus punished. There is no easy universalism in Maurice as is sometimes supposed and indeed as he was charged with in his life. He leaves us pondering the great philosophical question about the possibility of the triumph of the divine love while there are rebel wills in the universe of His Creation.

"I dare not fix any limits to the power of His love. I cannot tell what are the limits to the power of a rebel will." 106

Maurice contended that in this interpretation of the meaning of ζωή he was sustaining the best and truest extension of the biblical teaching to be found in the history of the Church. Though there was no uniformity there had been a consistent strain in the patristic teaching that eternal life was the experience of the divine/human communion and eternal death the corresponding loss of this. If this strain had been lost it had been because of the coercive
demands of the mediaeval church's worldliness requiring the incentives of endless rewards and the deterrents of endless torments. The teaching of the Reformation had tended to apply a corrective to this and recover the biblical perspective:

"I have come to the conclusion, that the deepest and most essential part of the theology previous to the Reformation, bore witness to the fact that eternal life is the knowledge of God who is love, and eternal death the loss of that knowledge; that it was the superficial theology - that which belonged to the Papal system as such - which interfered with this belief; that it was the great effort of the Reformation to sweep away that superficial theology, in order that Righteousness and Evil, Love and Hatred, might stand out as the eternal opposites; the one as the eternal life which God presents to men, the other as the eternal death which they choose for themselves ...." 107

Though Maurice has confessed that he was aware that in writing these sentences he was writing his own sentence of dismissal from King's College, the extent to which his general thesis is widely accepted in the range of the church's thinking - both at the academic and popular level - is surely not unrelated to the creativity of his contribution. There is a general level of acceptance that defines the quality of the life that God confers on those who love and trust Him. As William Barclay describes it it is an adjective that qualifies the divine attitude in such fashion that for every occurrence of the word 'eternal' we might substitute without distortion the word 'divine'. The life is divine life and the punishment is divine punishment.

What is even more remarkable is the shift of emphasis that has penetrated the preaching of the more evangelical sects and communions in this respect. Apart from a recrudescence of a Calvinistic neo-fundamentalism which is often located in the Free Churches and the Church of Scotland, there is a life-affirming understanding of as the life of the Kingdom of God; the life of the world to come in the soul of the believer in his existence on earth. There may be some churches and missions where you might still hear a thunderous hell-fire sermon with heavy emphasis on the endlessness of the torture. But beyond question the emphasis is where Maurice laid it:

"This is life eternal to know thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou has sent." 108
Appendix

At the end of this part of the work in which we have been dealing with F.D. Maurice's theological legacy and looking provisionally at the contemporary relevance, we conclude with a summary from his own writings. We feel it sums up in caption form much of what we have considered earlier illustrating in particular the setting of his incarnational thinking in the love of God made flesh in Jesus Christ which is the supreme deed constituting our true humanity, individually and in membership with one another.

The passage comes from a letter written to the members of Lincoln's Inn after F.D. Maurice had learned of his dismissal from his posts at King's College:

"I do not repent of any words in which I have spoken to you of this Love as mightier than all which is opposed to it, or of the triumphs which it is yet to achieve. I believe that, if I had spoken more broadly, strongly, freely on this subject, I should have done more to make you righteous and true. My fear is not of expanding, but of contracting, the Gospel which we are sent to preach; not of seeing too strong a testimony in the Bible to the will of him in whom is light and no darkness at all, but of limiting its testimonies to meet my narrow conceptions; not of exaggerating the duty of the church to be a witness against all hard and cruel conceptions of our Father in heaven, which lead to a confusion between Him and the Spirit of Evil, but of not perceiving how manifold are the ways in which that duty should be fulfilled. I am sure that if the Gospel is not regarded as a message to all mankind of the redemption which God has effected in His Son; if the Bible is thought to be speaking only of a world to come, and not of a Kingdom of Righteousness and Peace and Truth with which we may be in conformity or in enmity now; if the Church is not felt to be the hallower of all professions and occupations, the bond of all classes, the instrument of reforming abuses, the admonisher of the rich, the friend of the poor, the asserter of that humanity which Christ bears — we are to blame, and God will call us to account as unfaithful stewards of His treasures."

His thinking constantly grapples with the relationship between Bible and Gospel, Church and World, the Kingdom of heaven and the kingdoms of this world, the humanity of the Son of Man and the humanity of all men and in this passage they are all brought together. We shall now explore the bearing of these themes on the preaching of the meaning of Incarnation against the world of our own day.
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5. The Idea of a Christologised World

a. The Quest for a Kerygmatic Theology

From the Maurician spring a wide and deepening river of incarnational theology has flowed out. It has found a course through various traditions and communions and achieved popular outlets in the homiletical christology of the church. Our task now is to look at it 'from this end'. Given the assumption that each new generation develops within its own culture such new theological perspectives as pose for faith the challenge of preaching the Word pro nobis, what material is there in this tradition that has a prehending effect for us? Changing the metaphor if Maurice is in some way regarded as the exploding sun of this tradition what are the fragments of theological insight, scattered - as seen from some points of view - yet nonetheless homogeneous because they are all arguably expellents from the same source and remain within the same gravitational field of the original sun.

We have extrapolated from the subject of the study - and its development - a number of issues which are all, we claim, incarnation-related in that they have to do with an interpretation of the Christian way that has as its central 'confession' the faith that God was enfleshed in the revelatory manhood of Jesus as the Christ. But it is our purpose to deal with these issues not in the terms of academic christology per se but rather in the terms of homiletical christology against an admittedly academic background. That is to say to take the Maurician themes, expose them to the comments of the theologian, and having passed them through this alembic to talk about them in terms of their communicability as an aspect of the incarnational kerygma.

For the relationship between the work of the academic theologian and the parish or congregational preacher is not to be thought of as a watershed
but rather as a confluence. At the point of meeting there should be some turmoil and turbulence. The meeting point is in the mind and soul of the theological preacher for he feels 'the burthen and the mystery' of faith transmitted in the wavelength of his practical work and he also reads the thinking of creative theology. The relationship of the one to the other may be remote or ambivalent and it certainly may not always be easy or possible to transmit one on to the wavelength of the other. And indeed where this is possible a further tentative division may be found helpful in that there are some types of theology that are transmittable in a kerygmatic way and others that are transmittable in an expository way while others are transmittable simply as the mental framework of arcane religion.

To take the last mentioned first there was a period in the theological pilgrimage of Bonhoeffer when he was so sensitive to the collapse of the traditional metaphysical props of Christian theology and the absence of any to replace them that he advocated a moratorium on the words about 'God' and an era of theological silence until the creative word would come forth again out of the void of the process of secularisation. Those who would pray, would pray. Those who could find the hints of transcendence would worship. But basically the form of faith would be arcane and the form of the word would always be penultimate for the ultimate form of the word could not be seen or known.

"Christian thinking, speaking and organisation must be reborn out of this praying and this action ....... It is not for us to prophesy the day, but the day will come when men will be called again to utter the word of God with such power as will change and renew the world. It will be a new language, which will horrify men, yet overwhelm them by its power. It will be the language of a new righteousness and truth, a language which proclaims the peace of God with men and the advent of his kingdom ....... Until then the Christian cause will be a silent and hidden affair, but there will be those who pray and do right and wait for God's own time." 1
Ironically the silence which Bonhoeffer advocated became the voice box for much theological noise and the quietus of 'religious christianity' and 'arcane religion' became the prolific source of radical theology, secular theology, and death-of-God theology. It is of course misleading to homologate all these as if they were uniform either in content or expression. They comprise a congeries of ideas that propose to take seriously the scientific, psychological and existential life-setting of modern man and against that background reinterpret the meaning of faith and religion in a variety of ways. The point to note at this stage is that it is very debatable indeed whether any of these proposed reinterpretations in the forms in which they have so far appeared - with the exception of R. Gregor Smith who has a christological 'sticking point' - have within them the catalyst of christian kerygma. That is to say: though they are obviously capable of exposition - and have been in fairly lengthy monographs - they have so departed from the broad evangelical 'giveness' of the Christian faith that it is difficult to the point of impossibility to convert them into a form of 'enaggelion'. They are perfectly capable of exposition as a possible modern form of world-view evolved out of the christian tradition but because the christological sticking point has been seriously transgressed they are not communicable as 'gospel'. And it is interesting to note that they show no sign of being fruitful sources of any new creative tradition of preaching. For preaching is either in the setting of faith in the biblical sense - 'from faith to faith' - or else its aim is to persuade towards that faith. But as Heinz Zahrnt has said:

"If theism comes to be regarded as out of date, more is lost than merely a certain conception of God; all biblical faith in God vanishes with it. For an essential element of belief in God in the Bible is that God is another person whom man encounters and to whom he speaks face to face, who stands in a direct personal relation, who speaks to him through his word and to whom he can reply in
prayer. Thus 'a-theism', in the sense of the mere end of theism, has a powerful tendency, whether voluntary or not, to become 'atheism' in the sense of the total denial of God, or at least of biblical faith in God." 2

The third form of theology is that which is communicable in the sense that it can be converted into the mental muscle of Christian preaching but more than that - it is the substratum of communication in that it provides the preacher with a theological universe of thought that is related to the existential vibrations that are part of his human sensitivity. And if there is a Gospel to be communicated and if that Gospel is not set in static categories to be rehearsed from age to age, then one of the key figures in the church's task is the man who stands at the confluence of academic theology and kerygmatic communication. His role is interpretative in a two-way direction: not only 'down' from the theological classroom to the pew but 'up' from the inchoate intuitions of the perceptive layman, through the mediation of his own provisional theological reflections to the academic theologian. But his role is not only interpretative. For theology always has to be created de novo at the point of communication and obviously it is not the function of the academic theologian to do this. And the point that is being argued here is that if the Word is to be heard then what is required is not simply a populariser of what is abstruse or a simplifier of what is complicated or a judicious selector of what is diffuse but someone who, by the Spirit, is creating something new - the contemporary and ultimately disposable logos - out of the cement of creative theology and the bricks of the secular and mystical dimensions of existence.

Whether this kind of theology is possible is a corollary of the question about the nature and validity of the Christian faith. And the exploration of this question seems more and more to be finding its focus in relation to the connexion between the life and experience of Jesus of Nazareth (or raising
it to a more theological frame of reference - the Christ Event) as the revelation of the meaning of existence and all the separate islands of meaning which authenticate themselves to modern man through his personal, relational and social experience in those moments which were called by Ian Ramsay 'the disclosures of reality'. What would seem to validate the faith for many would be a christology of illumination in which the meaningless would not sink in the absurd, the secular would not be equated with the materialistic and the Christ Event would not only be an archetype and pattern but would have a truly prehending effect on the meaning of life through response to the kerygma. As William Temple put it rather prophetically in 1944:

"Previously theologians could undertake the task of showing that Christianity enables us to 'make sense' of the world with the meaning 'show that it is sense' .... . I was still talking like that when 'Hitler became Chancellor of the German Reich'. All that seems remote today. We must still claim that Christianity enables us to make sense of the world, not meaning that we can show that it is sense, but with a more literal and radical meaning of making into sense what, till it is transformed, is largely nonsense." 3

Is there then a christological base for a christianity that sheds a modicum of meaning on an enigmatic existence?

From that explanatory excursus and against that perspective we return now to Maurice and the Incarnational tradition to explore what issues there are in it that seem germane to the contemporary task.

b. The Proclamation of a Christologised World

Historically a communicable theology has needed a model which is at one and the same time the expression of the reality - the way in which 'the mystery is made present' - and the challenge to the 'unbeliever': what is enshrined in the invitation to respond. It is possible to see both biblical and historical theology as a succession of changing models which in their time were the ways in which both the transcendence and the activity of God were
located. Writers like Harvey Cox for example have argued that the Old Testament understanding of the relationship between God and the world amounted to the de-divinising of creation, and while this is arguably the case in as much as the Bible does set the dimension of transcendence between the Creator and the creature, there is nonetheless a deep sense of the divinising of the world in the early books of the Old Testament expressed in sacred streams and trees, objects containing the quality of 'mana', and the power of the divine unpredictability in nature and weather. The first 'evangelical' model is that of a divinised world (both in biblical and extra-biblical religion) in which mystery is omni-present and the divine power, which in the Christian tradition comes eventually to be seen to be narrowed down to the service of love, is promiscuous, impersonal, subservient to no moral values. This was the earliest model: the Gospel of the sacrifice of Isaac at the divine call and the provision of the animal by the divine power. And the response is in terms of the fearful, faithful, but unbewildered patriarch making his way up Mount Moriah. This primal model is replaced in the passage of biblical history by the Redeeming God, the Lord of Righteousness, the Suffering God (as in the servant songs of Isaiah). And in their day a succession of biblical prophets proclaimed that the meaning of the corporate blessings and adversities of life was to be interpreted against the divine 'image' that prevailed in the contemporary Word. And while this process has been widely written up in many works of Old Testament scholarship as a deepening human receptivity allied to the revelation of the Lord 'who was moving forward the fulfilment of his divine purpose', we may also relate it to our overall theme by viewing these as examples of supervening models and images which gave Old Testament preachers the words, ideas and images of their gospel.

By 'model' we mean that image that links coherently what is experienced
in the empirical realities of life with what is understood to be the heart of the divine nature and activity and the process can be seen in the proclamation and witness of the New Testament. It is arguable that the approach to the New Testament data implied in 'Form Criticism' is uncovering not only the manner in which the early church went about its teaching and preaching task but in the process shows us the homiletical models used to open up the meaning of the Gospel in different situations. The Gospel is thus heard and received - and indeed transmitted - in a variety of forms: ethical, didactic, soteriological, eschatological. And He who is its centre is preached as Son of Man, the Man from heaven, the Second Adam, the Logos, the Lord, etc. etc. From the primitive model of the Petrine preaching in Acts where Jesus is spoken of as 'that man whom God has appointed to be the judge of all things' (Acts 17.3) there is the remarkable theological mobility that takes us to the cosmic christology of the later Pauline and Johanine letters.

All these biblical models (and it is not our function to give an exhaustive exegetical treatment of them) seemed to be part of a sequence of movement from the more to the less partial: always moving in the direction in which larger and larger tracts of the spiritual experience were subsumed within the given model until in fact before we come to the end of the New Testament we reach the ultimate christological monism of 'the Alpha and the Omega' (Rev. 1.8). What we propose to discuss now is the argument that the contemporary preacher may be faced with the reverse of this process. The monistic model has been persistently chipped away and the movement is from the monistic to the partial, from the absolute to the relative.

J.A.T. Robinson makes the point thus:

"We live in what Paul van Buren has called 'the dissolution of the absolute'. (Theological Explorations, pp. 29ff). The monistic model has lost its power over our thinking, whether about space or time. Ours is a relativistic, pluralistic world in which we are
compelled to be more modest about our claims.

Supremely is this a question for Christology, which is where the crunch really comes. To go on saying the same thing in the old terms is to be in danger of rendering Christ invulnerable but meaningless - unquestionably the answer because he corresponds to no questions. Above all, any kind of exclusive uniqueness or finality in relation to other truth or other religions strikes men as incredible. Christ may be a centre or even the centre for me, but to say that he is the centre absolutely seems as naive today as thinking of Delphi as the navel of the earth." 5

We would agree with Robinson that the challenge of theological relativity is at its sharpest in the sphere of Christology. The Faith as it is enshrined and expressed in institutional Christianity has adjusted itself to revolutions in cosmological thinking in the fifteenth century and to the implications for ecclesiological absoluteness contained in the sifting and probing of biblical theology and church history. It has also absorbed the unwelcome knowledge of the relativity of its source book, as this has been revealed by biblical criticism and the examination of the history of other religions. But now the point at which the notion of relativity is being pressed is at the person of Christ and the challenge of this consists partly in the fact that as previously the secondary props of the faith have been relativised so the focus has been turned towards what has been regarded as the absolute centre - Jesus Christ confessed for example in the basis of the World Council of Churches as 'God and Saviour according to the scriptures'. And Robinson himself who effectively launched the famous discussion on the meaning of 'God-talk' by the publication of 'Honest to God' ten years ago ventures the view that the frontiers of creative discussion have now been pushed into the field of christology.

Central to this discussion so far as preaching is concerned is the question of the alleged inevitability of the retreat from christological monism. According to Robinson it has been caught in the domino collapse of other sorts of monism; a casualty of modern man's deep suspicion of the
one definitive code, religion or philosophy claiming a total monopoly of reality. It cannot however be maintained that pluralism is a new phenomenon for it would be difficult to point to a century either from the era of Christendom or the period of the Christian west from the time of the Reformation when the dogmatic monism of the Christian faith was not under attack and when men might not have interpreted their age in the terms in which Dr. Robinson characterises ours. R. Gregor Smith traces the roots of secularisation — and therefore of relativism and pluralism — to the Renaissance.

Ancient pluralism finds its spokesman in the words of the Roman pagan, Q. Aurelius Symmachus, who wrote that 'the heart of so great a mystery cannot be reached by one road only'. I believe that this is an intuition that deeply accords with the modern mood and registers in hearts attuned both to Christianity and to the deep wonder and complexity of existence. It induces a certain strategic relativism in the Christian encounter with other worldviews, religions and ideologies in which a certain existential openness is a pre-condition of usefulness though this may not be incompatible with an ultimate christological monism. For always it is the pre-requisite of the effective evangelist and apologist and preacher to have the empathy to stand outside his own tradition and be open to the world of those to whom his faith is meaningless or relatively so. That this is required today is undoubted and the truth of Dr. Robinson's assertion lies in the heightened awareness of the ideological pluralism of our day through the influence of rapid and blanket communications. But the difference between our age and previous centuries in this respect is much more one of degree than of kind.

David L. Edwards casts the net of pluralism very widely indeed:

"There are no clean breaks in history. Just as religion has not in fact disappeared from our largely secular civilisation so also the secular emphasis was in fact prominent in past ages which we regard as heavily religious. According to the evidence of history, there have been no ages of faith, if we have in mind a whole society's
acceptance of a religious faith, and if we define religious faith as the deliberate subjection by a freely acting individual of his whole personality, thought and conduct to the dominance of 'belief in God or a future state'. In every age both the clever and the rich have often been critical of religion, and again and again as in the poetry of Lucretius, who died half a century before the birth of Jesus, or amid the 'Enlightenment' of eighteenth century Europe and America, the death certificate of the God of popular religion has been signed by the elite with a flourish...... Most history, including religious history, was secular." 6

A further aspect of Robinson's prolegomenon to any relevant christology refers to the 'danger of rendering Christ invulnerable but meaningless'. And this is a criticism that is both well expressed and has to be taken seriously. An example of the invulnerable but meaningless 'model' is arguably the christology of chalcedonian definition of 'the two natures in one person' of Christ that has been superceded by modern psychological categories. We cannot understand the idea of the metaphysical replacement of the human spirit by the divine logos in the manner of patristic thinking and nowadays we must think of the divinity of Christ in ways that do not attenuate or 'phantomise' the nostrums of his real Humanness. The chalcedonian definition may be said to render him invulnerable but meaningless. It is in that sense a broken model.

Edwards argues much the same when he criticises that we might call the Barthian model. And the point being made is that though the chalcedonian definition and the Barthian system are separated in time being about fourteen centuries yet their intellectual alienation from contemporary thought categories is about equal. This is a judgement which to many will seem wrong to the point of being totally ill-conceived but it is widely held so shortly after the death of Karl Barth that it has to be taken seriously against the context of our theme because it was a system of christological monism on an unparalleled scale. To quote Edwards:

"Let us be candid: the trouble about this whole proclamation of
Jesus Christ by Karl Barth is that it means little or nothing to modern men whose minds do not move in response to talk about religious meta-physics and religious sacrifices. Not even the genius and attractiveness of Barth can permanently remedy this basic defect. The language of Barth can be deeply meaningful to minds formed by the orthodox tradition of Christianity, and such believers may compare Barth's theology to its advantage with the theology of Calvin, etc. But to those who begin at another place, Barth offers no concessions and no connections. He frankly speaks of faith as a miracle, and his sole concern is that the faith should not be betrayed in the attempt to make it palatable."

We feel the validity of Edward's criticism inasmuch as there was a rigidity about the epistemology of Barthianism that removed it into a rather enclosed religious world with norms of its own living side by side with other universes of discourse yet strangely never coming into any contact with them. Did the system require this? Was this the inevitable conflict between the thinking of revelation and grace as against the apotheosis of reason and nature? Certainly there has been a tendency on the part of some Barthians not only to attribute humanist but other non-Barthian christian contentions to the carnal effect of the 'enlightenment' or other non-biblical presuppositions. But having said that we would now argue for a christological model to be at the heart of christian faith and preaching which is monistic in the sense that it makes the Christ-Event central as the decisive Word of God to man both personally and cosmically in the Barthian mould but is upheld by less positivistic pillars. For F.D. Maurice, as much as Barth, expounded the notion of what we would like to call 'a christologised world' though he neither excised from that world the exercise of human reason as a potential contributor to further understanding nor did he restrict the ambit of revelation to scripture or the Judeo-Christian witness in the manner of Barth.

But is this not a monistic model of the kind that Robinson and van Buren say have been eclipsed by 'the dissolution of the absolute'?
if it is not surrounded by a moat of biblicist epistemology does it not disqualify itself from consideration by virtue of the transcendent, metaphysical, monistic posture inherent in incarnationalism itself? As Robinson says, "Doesn't any kind of exclusive uniqueness or finality in relation to other truth or other religions strike men as incredible?" But on the other hand, would any portrayal of Jesus Christ which muted the note of transcendent claim and imperative be recognisable as distinguishably christian in the sense that it was either faithful to 'the primacy of the given' in the New Testament message or congruous with the christian tradition? May the credibility gap not lie on the other side? And mustn't we take seriously the task of christological congruity with its documentary origins as much as christological credibility with respect to its contemporary milieu? As D.L. Edwards says:

"What our time needs ..... in the reconstruction of distinctively christian faith is the centrality of a credible Christ as the enfleshed Word of God." 8

But the element of credibility is always enmeshed with the element of particularity. It is always possible to translate the Christ image into the ethos of a given culture, making it credible in the sense of being palatable. In this way he becomes a man recognised as the ideal embodiment of whatever are the ideals of the age: the reflection at the bottom of the well. But we do this by composing an aesthetic and spiritual identikit picture out of the raw material of the New Testament Christ. And it is only done by eliminating what Brunner called 'the scandal of particularity'. And while it is possible so to overlay the historical and theological particularity with such a metaphysical framework as to remove the Christ from the grasp of modern credibility, that particularity - in the sense of the biblical once for allness - is the very 'skandalon' of the Gospel, authenticating itself as such because it draws to itself both our credibility and our increditibility, constituting in itself the very incentive to a response that would have
about it the character of faith.

And if the perception of faith about the authenticity of the particularity is right, the christological line leads from history to eschatology, from the personal to the universal, from the world of the self to the ground of all being. 'Christ died for our sins and not for our sins only but for the sins of the world'. Thus after an exposition of the theology of Bultmann with emphasis on the need to translate the reality of religion out of the soil of history into the ground of one's own existence, David Edwards says:

"A personal faith is seen to be vital. Each man for himself has to decide how his experience is to be interpreted. He must choose one past event which will enable him to escape from the burden of the remainder of the past. He must place his faith on a bit of history which will lead him beyond ordinary, tragic history into authentic existence."

And this is essentially what Maurice meant when he spoke about the incarnation as the clue to eternal life, the Kingdom of heaven, the knowledge of Christ as the head and Lord of everyman. It was the authentic existence yielded by the monistic reality of a christologised world. And we would submit that a model for the contemporary preacher who sees his task in terms of the exposition of incarnation would be that of a christologised world based on the Maurician insights in this direction. It is interesting that this was the model of the Oxford Movement. The evangelical model was that of a lost world under the rule of the Devil. And what we mean by the phrase 'a christologised world' is that a major clue to meaning lies in that frame of reference that stems from the acceptance of and witness to Jesus as the Christ enfleshed in the particularity of a human life sharing a human experience but redeeming it in the mystery of the cross and resurrection (held together as the revelatory and redeeming divine action) in such a way that it is this event that comprises the ontological reality of our existence.

To Maurice reality was what it was because Christ was what God had made
him to be, Head and Lord. The reality was rooted in the revelation of the incarnation when what had been established before all worlds was manifested in his flesh. The Kingship of Christ is not something conferred and established by individual believers or even by the aggregate of believers - it is the dominant aspect of the constitution of things. So what we have called a christologised world is the confession of the faith that the event of Jesus Christ has a past, present and a future in the life of man.

Hans Kung develops this idea interestingly from his interpretation of the parables of Jesus:

"What then is the mystery of the Kingdom of God which is announced in the parables? .......... This much is certain: Jesus had no thought of an organic development of the Kingdom of God, still less of identifying it with the church. The kingdom comes by an act of God. But - despite the contrast between the small beginning and the magnificent end - there is the promise of the mighty tree in the grain of mustard seed, of bread for many in the little leaven in the meal, of the great harvest in the inconspicuous seed: of the glorious end in the slight beginning. And where is the beginning to be made if not with Jesus himself? Who is in fact the sower who scattered a little seed on good soil and produced a hundredfold? In Jesus' unassuming talk and action - in his word calling to the poor, hungry, weeping, downtrodden; in his deeds giving aid to the sick, suffering, possessed, those burdened with sin, the hopeless - there is already the promise of the kingdom where sin, pain, suffering, and death will have an end: the kingdom of absolute righteousness, freedom, love, reconciliation, and eternal peace, God's absolute future. In Jesus God's name is already sanctified, God's will is already done on earth, all sin is forgiven and all evil overcome; in him here and now the time of fulfilment, of salvation, of redemption, has come, the kingdom of God has itself dawned - 'in your midst'. In him therefore is 'founded the mystery of the kingdom of God' announced in the parables. He is himself the end. With him the consummation of the world, God's absolute future, has already dawned - even now. With him God is present." 10

This is a vigorous contemporary proclamation of the idea of a christologised world in our definition. And F.D. Maurice's feeling for this understanding of the Christ Event determined the thrust of his christology. Standing as he did at the dawn of the modern age he developed the implications of eschatological incarnationalism in secular and social ways that hold out hints for the life of the churches today. At the level of their practical life the churches have had a built-in reluctance to follow these hints. As Howard Williams
"It is easy to be blindly critical of the past. But we must attempt to criticise wisely if we are to understand the possibilities of our time. In the past the church failed in universal commitment because the passion was felt for "souls" and their destiny in the regions beyond. Both Catholic and evangelical held a poor view of this present life. For long enough it was believed that nothing of abiding value could be found here and all hope was centred in the next world. Occasionally there were people who were splendidly untrue to this belief and much has been written about the "Gesta Christi" in the early centuries of the church. But the hearts home was not to be experienced in this world. It would be folly to dismiss this view too rashly for it helped to preserve eternal dimensions when the city of man was collapsing in ruins." 11

And interestingly enough, in that same article, in which he is appealing to Christians to 'look to the reality of faith on the earth' he concludes thus:

"In theological terms we are pleading for a fuller understanding of the incarnation. Men like Thomas Braske, F.D. Maurice and Scott Holland were feeling after it. Their achievements are still inspiring but they were but on the threshold of the modern world. The call comes to those who in this modern age have been given the means to accept the responsibility which God gives in handing the earth over to men. For modern christians the knowledge of the divine must mean the vision of a new heaven and a new earth - a new humanity. It is possible of course, to deal with this insight through the decent obscurity of ritual and worship. The 'sanctuary', indeed, can help to keep the vision alive. Yet it should not be hidden there, for the only true arena for this faith is the whole life of man in the community of mankind." 12

Obviously the spirit of Maurice animates this approach, the essence of which is that in the depths of the incarnation there is the assertion of a positively life-affirming God. It is an approach that has to be differentiated from some expressions of secular christianity where the incarnationalism of God-active-in-Christ-in-human-experience is replaced with the idea that such transcendence as there is in life is to be found in the mystery of the depths of inter-personal relationships. By comparison the Maurician influence is allied to a recovery of the political and social teaching of the Old Testament prophets together with a new seriousness given to the doctrine of creation, all this finding its focus in the redeeming and representative manhood of Christ.
It is this theology that is sometimes explicit and often implicit in the incidence of recent Christian involvement in political and social affairs. There is both a cosmic and a personal dimension to it. On the widest possible scale the coming of Christ is seen as the final sign of God's pledge to make the earth 'the theatre of his glory' (Calvin): the place of the divine community which was part of the Old Testament hope: the sphere of the realisation of the Kingdom. And the prayer in such a christologised world is that of our Lord: "Thy Kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." The theological confidence of such a christologised world is expressed by J.S. Stewart as follows:

"It is upon God's mighty acts at the Cross and the Resurrection that Christ's Kingship stands for ever. When Pilate wrote upon the Cross 'This is the King', he had unconsciously expressed the divine determinate decree, 'He reigns from the tree'. This is the Gospel. It is not that we are sent out into the world to 'make Christ King'. How could it be that when God has made Him King already and given Him the name which is above every name? It is not that our missionary task is to co-operate with Jesus in seeking to establish the Kingdom, as though we were to prepare the way for its coming or work for its inauguration at some future day. How could it be that, when from every page of the Gospels the words and works of Jesus cry aloud that in Him the Kingdom has broken through and is now in the midst? It may indeed be a hidden kingdom with a King incognito, a mystery veiled from the eyes of sinful men and therefore unacknowledged ........... Nevertheless he has taken hold on history and He is history's Lord.

Whenever we speak of an historical incarnation and of an objective atonement, we are asserting that God's mighty act in Christ has changed the human scene decisively and for ever even for those who do not believe on Him and who refuse to recognise His claim. The very earth which God has given to the sons of men has been different since the days when it was trodden by the feet of the one true Son of Man; and every human life, whether Christian or not, is affected by the cosmic battle fought to a finish at Calvary between Jesus and the powers of darkness. In this sense He is King, not only of the Church, but of the universe itself." 13

All this might have been written, word for word, by Maurice himself.

The very style of the language is reminiscent of him. And though there is a kind of linguistic triumphalism in Stewart's words that do not accord with the more modest and chastened life-style of our faith in the 1970s yet the reality is that of an act of God in Christ whose past historicity is the
effective guarantee of its future and eternal validation. But more pressing-ly and practically - of its present outworking. The corollary of a christologised world is to believe in what Jurgen Moltmann has called 'the rectifying future of God'.

c. The New Community in a Christologised World

The effect of seeing a world christologised thus is that it becomes the subject of human concern. Because it is christologised it becomes sacramentalised. And this works itself out in terms of humanity and community. The God who in Christ upon the earth has taken all being into the divine being awaits the effective instrumentality of his people to be the demonstration of real community which is his will for mankind. The preaching of the requirement of such a response has been the constant theme of George F. MacLeod. The life-affirmingness of the transcendent God incarnated in Christ is the basis of a similar life-affirmingness in the message of the Church. In the structure of the modern world this means the re-assertion of the biblical theme of the termination of alienation and injustice with peace and community in the terms of 'real politik'. MacLeod devoted much of his book 'One Way Left' to the exposition of this theme.

Sometimes it is the recreation of the church as the incarnational life-affirming community: so he writes characteristically and idiosyncratically:

"As God, in his vast design, rolled up tribal community till John Baptist stood alone, so He has rolled up our tribal, instinctive Christian communities. It is God who has also rolled up even the appearance of satisfaction in individualistic Christianity. It is God who has rolled up Christendom. Christendom has had a great fall and not all the vatican horses or ecumenical men will ever put Christendom together again, (This was Maurice's view of the Tractarian Movement) in any authoritarian way.

God has rolled up instinctive christendom because He wants it built of really free persons at last, and for the first time, voluntarily choosing him and his way, but choosing him as the new Community. He has rolled up even the possibility of individual
religion by itself alone, till we learn that we cannot become persons except in Community. Not until we pay as much attention to Christian Community as to personal conversion, to God's pattern for our world - if you like to God's 'politic' - can we know the meaning of persons again or dare to talk of personal conversion, though its spurious counterfeit may continue to deceive." 14

It was Maurice who spoke thus in the middle of nineteenth century England. The echo reverberates in MacLeod's social incarnationalism from the middle of the twentieth century. But since the ecclesia is the arrabon of the community of mankind and the gospel concern is for that world of which Christ is the Lord it is the creation of this latter 'worldly' community that becomes the focus of concern. Since it has been christologised by God it must become what it is. It is this that gives the prophetic dimension to the message and MacLeod utters it with great political particularity:

"It is because we put the vast problem of 'God's community' second - and a long way second - that increasingly folk are asking, Will nobody tell me who I am? And when we answer in merely theoretic terms, it does not mean a thing. It is no good saying with a passionate gleam in the eye, 'There is one solution for Africa - One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism, and then moving at a snails pace about Church Unity there, where there are 269 registered christian denominations. There is a problem of God's community. It is no good saying of Kenya, 'What is wanted there is a christian conviction such as only the West can give': and then going at a snail's pace about the fact that the average European income there is £600 a year and the average income of such Africans as are industrial workers is less than £50 a year. There is a problem of God's community second that increasingly folk will continue to be restless. Restless till they rest in Him. And to rest in God is not to ascend to some high spiritual mysticism. To rest in God is not to be lost in Community that we may be found in Him. A fullness of the time has come when obedience to Christ as the new community is the only way to be comforted of Him as the New Man." 15

Maurice related the vision of the divine community to the farm labourers of Bubbenhall and the wretchedly poor of London where one in nine persons died in the poorhouse in the midst of the richest city in the world. Because in the intervening century communications have moved on to a larger scale MacLeod relates the vision of community to the poor blacks of Africa living side by side with rich white men. But the language is extraordinarily similar.
And the fount of the passion and the vision is certainly identical as MacLeod puts it: 'The apex of the divine majesty resides in His most glorious humanity'. Or as Maurice said: 'The revelation of Christ must be the revelation of all the relations in which men stand to each other and to God's universe'.

But besides the community that correlates to this reality there is also the new creation in its personalness. The christologised world can be understood as such only if there is within man the logos capable of making response to the 'christologos'. Ultimately the response of the individual cannot be separated from that of the entire christian community and the relationship of the christologised church to the christologised world is that of the 'arrabon' to the full admittance. For the instrument of individual response to God through the service of mankind is in the Church. And Professor Denis Nineham has put it well when answering the question about what God was seeking to do in Christ:

"God was seeking to do through Jesus what in fact he has done, bring into existence a community under the lordship of the risen one, in which reconciliation with God himself and the power of a holy life should become, at least potentially, a reality ....." 16

This is both biblical and true to the experience of faith throughout the centuries. The Church has been the mother of faith and perhaps there is a sense in which St. Cyprian is right when he says that there is no salvation outside the church. Certainly Paul sums up the thrust of biblical thinking when he says that it is within the total community of faith that we perceive the fullness of the christological glory.

"With deep roots and firm foundations, you may be strong to grasp, with all God's people, what is the breadth and length and height and depth of the love of Christ, and to know it, though it is beyond knowledge." 17
d. The New Man in a Christologised World

Yet man in community is not in biblical parlance a way of giving collective priority over personalness and individuality. And the evangelistic challenge is always personal.

"If on your lips is the confession 'Jesus is Lord' and in your heart the faith that God raised him from the dead, then you will find salvation." 18

The question that arises then is about the nature of the man to whom the word about the christologised world is addressed. Maurice had a sense of the divine educative process in all men. It is the opposite to the neo-orthodox emphasis on the total severance of the human capacity for knowledge of God apart from the miracle of grace. There is a logos-like potential in man, Maurice believed, that was part of the total coherence of a world into which God had come in the form of the incarnation. One of his favourite ideas was expressed in the Johannine verse in which the logos is interpreted as the all-pervasive illumination of the human soul.

"That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." 19

This means that the potential responsiveness of individuals in the christologised world lies in the fact that there is not a total ontological discontinuity between Jesus Christ and the rest of human kind. There are the obvious areas of kinship at the level of human experience and this has been probed along new and creative lines recently in such books as 'Christology Reconsidered' by Norman Pittenger, 'The Humanity and Divinity of Jesus Christ' by John Knox and 'The Human Face of God' by J.A.T. Robinson. They remind us that the incarnation not only has a historical setting but that if its historical setting is real then there must not only be a genealogical background to it (which of course is what the New Testament sets out meticulously if variously) but also a genetic background. It is not within
our remit to expound or criticise this approach except to note that it marks
a new dimension of rigour and realism in the exploration of the meaning of
the manhood of Jesus which the preacher will note as a further expression of
the reality of the kinship between Jesus of Nazareth and all other men. But
the even deeper and more significant kinship is that between 'the light that
lighteth every man' and 'the Light of the world' - surely one of the most
seminal christological motifs of the Fourth Gospel. And it is this kinship
that keeps men within sight of the christologised world. I think the theme
is developed helpfully in the terms of 'process theology' by Norman Pittenger
in a passage in 'Christology Reconsidered':

"In Jesus Christ that which is a possibility - and thereby the ground
of our human existence; that which in each of us is to some extent
partially realised and effectual and thereby the secret of our growth
in true manhood; that is made real and factual ....... In each of us,
to be sure, this is realised in concrete actuality only to some slight
extent and becomes effectual in the same lesser degree; yet all the
while it is the secret of our growth in true manhood whenever and however
growth occurs. What God purposes and accomplishes in Jesus Christ is
the fully adequate expression - in the term which I have often used, the
classic instance - of that intention. This is achieved through God's
setting before the historical existent Jesus his initial aim, through
his providing him with his vocational lure, and through the mutual prehension
which is found when God and man are in open-ness and inter-
penetration one with the other in love - in the filial obedience of the
man to the divine imperative, in the freely chosen decisions which the
man made, in the response 'Yes' to the Love that is God. If this is
said to be only a moral union and condemned on that ground, then one
can only reply that in this respect the moral is the meta-physical -
once we have come to see that love is not simply a matter of desirable
human behaviour but is the very basis of the universe and the grounding
reality in all creative advance. I myself should say that this is a
christianisation of ontology." 20

According to Pittenger man is a potentially responsive being set in a
universe whose foundation is love. This itself is a deduction from the kind
of weltanschaung with which this chapter has been concerned. It is the other
end, as it were, of the confession that God has sought the fellowship of man
in the interpenetration of man's whole life through the incarnation of Christ.
And so that the possibility of what he calls 'the mutual prehension' can be
real possibility then we must pierce through all existential deterrents in the belief that the same lure that prompted Jesus towards the fulfilment of his vocation as man open to God is not absent in different degree from the life of man in the world. This is what he interprets in personal terms as 'that which in each of us is to some extent realised and effectual and thereby the secret of our growth in true manhood'. It is also what he interprets in philosophical terms as a 'Christianisation of ontology'. It is also an essential part - indeed the subjective, responsive dimension - of the christologised world in that the only practical confidence - and authority - on which a contemporary can repose his ministry is the faith that if the clue to meaningful existence is a world illumined, vitalised and validated by that total reality of Jesus Christ of which the historic incarnation is the epicentre then the human heart and the wayfaring man are not blind to this reality when the communication of it is in 'the power and demonstration of the Spirit'.

The christologised logos is the preacher's communication of the meaning of the christologised world and it is effective when it makes moral, spiritual and intellectual contact with the logos-light that is in man.
7. *Ibid.,* p.351
9. *Ibid.,* p.177
12. *Ibid.,*
15. *Ibid.,* pp.53-54
17. Ephesians 3.18
18. Romans 10.9
19. John 1.9
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