

The World in the Church—

An Exercise in Natural Theology

by T. S. Gregory

I

In February 1963, the Cambridge faculty of divinity sponsored four lectures on Objections to Christian Belief. In the last of them, Canon Bezzant pointed out that we need a natural theology. He said that 'the only possible basis for a reasonably grounded natural theology is what we call scientific. The difficulty is that there is no such actuality as "science"; there are many and increasing sciences'. True, but there is such an actuality as a scientific discipline, a scientific attitude and habit of mind, a scientific conscience. To be detached, self-effacing, humble, industrious, co-operative, patient, observant, accurate, truthful, temperate is to be scientific. But why should you be any of these things? Why not be passionate, aggressive, arrogant, lazy, lonely, hasty, purblind, vague, false and lustful? Because the conventions of society chance to forbid these self-indulgences? They don't. Perhaps it is that without these high qualities and the discipline that lives upon them you cannot penetrate the mystery of the world we inhabit or discern a meaning in the life we have to live. Why is the world open to Aristotle, Newton, Planck, Einstein and their kind and closed to Tamerlane and Jenghiz Khan? Only through the discipline of science, a moral and even mystical discipline, can the existing universe be induced to yield up its secrets. Moreover the power thus liberated creates a human situation (e.g. the unity of the human race) in which the inferior human virtues such as courage and thrift are all inadequate and we cannot live without faith, hope and charity. This obvious inescapable bond between scientific discipline and scientific discovery may give us a faintly discernible outline of natural theology. 'Ye shall be holy' says the God of the Hebrews, 'for I the Lord your God am holy'. 'Ye shall be righteous' says Nature. 'for if you are not I will not speak to you'. The two words are not so far apart. To seek God in a description of the natural universe is to look in the wrong direction. But if we look into the *conditions* of scientific discovery and the qualities it demands perhaps we shall discern the covenant. It becomes clear at last as it was to Amos that the world is so constituted that in the long run only the righteous man can make sense of it. Before any dogma has been defined the instinct of enquiry demonstrates the need of the human community to seek salvation from its sins and fulfilment of all righteousness. Things speak to saints. Even the nominalist ethic of utilitarianism affirms this correspondence.

It will be clearly seen and promptly said that this is not a theology at all. But it *is* a preparation for theology. The mysterious and certain fact that the natural universe somehow corresponds with personal righteousness at least suggests, if it does no more than suggest, that the 'nature of things' makes personal judgments and is such a nature of things as to be capable of doing so. There is something more in nature than the 'ways things happen' and human evaluation of it; man is not only judge but judged. Something outside man rewards one kind of manhood with knowledge and leaves another kind of manhood in the dark.

We cannot base natural theology upon world descriptions, upon physics, or biology. Phenomena, though of an incalculably vast stellar universe, though of an immensely complex living evolution, know not the God they proclaim and indeed make no proclamation but 'in reason's ear'. The first chapter of Genesis came late into the consciousness of a people who had long since received the Torah, who had passed the exodus, the monarchy, the exile, the great age of prophets, who had practised an ethical religion for many centuries and had accepted the new covenant, 'I will put my law in their inward parts and in their heart will I write it'. On this base, not upon the cosmological speculation of the Ionian renaissance we raise a theology which is natural to man, not stars. The fact that the science of 1965 has completely 'shattered' the world of 65 makes no difference whatever to the theological appetite and ability of the human mind. Only nominalist confusion drives Rudolf Bultmann, the Bishop of Woolwich and apparently Canon Bezzant to suppose that a cosmological picture is necessary to natural theology. God is not a conclusion but a premiss.

A second nominalist confusion besets Canon Bezzant's Christology. 'The theory', he says, 'that Christ is the universal of humanity and not a particular man, that is surely a form of words to which no intelligible meaning can be attached. A particular man cannot be a universal . . . If it be held that Jesus was not a particular man but a person in whom a universal or generic humanity was united with Divinity, such a theory if it meant anything would be inconsistent with the real humanity of Jesus in any intelligible sense.' No one indeed (except a few gnostic speculators a long time ago) has ever denied that Christ was a particular man. The sole difficulty lies in applying the title of Christ in its Christian sense to a man born two thousand years ago. For Christ is the Lord's Anointed, the divine Vicegerent who establishes the reign of God. There is no logical difficulty, nothing unintelligible in such a concept. The difficulty is factual, since the history of the world does not obviously or immediately disclose the presence of a divine kingdom, but exhibits rather a perpetuity of wars and rumours of war – as Christ foretold. And the end is not yet. That Christ should be both a particular man *and* the universal of humanity would be easier to believe, if like the Jews,

we could expect Him ten thousand years hence when the human race may be imagined to have learned how to live and the virtues of the scientist have become the norm of humanity. Nor need we accuse His first disciples of absurdity if in their simplicity they were prepared to accept their Master as the Christ in their time and to credit Him with the title and function of the Lord's Anointed. But this is not Canon Bezzant's difficulty. He is wrestling in a fog of words with 'universal' and 'particular', and fancies in the style of Ockham that 'universal' can mean nothing but a logical abstraction from all the 'particulars'. Universal for him is abstract; and of course it is absurd to suggest that Jesus is *abstract* humanity or that, if He were, He could carry such a thing as 'guilt' or could be united with Divinity. There is no abstract Jesus but there is a generic humanity and logically there can be, and Christians believe that there is, a universal Christ. Protestant Christology has often groped and stumbled in this nominalistic fog, for instance in the long distraction described by Schweitzer from Reimarus to Wrede, and nowadays in the nominalist cul-de-sac of Heidegger.

Factually, the Christ seems indeed to be coming. The history of the human race during the last six thousand years has been the history of a generic humanity discovering its unity and simultaneity and unlocking the mysteries of human existence with a strangely persistent success, making human possibilities actual and unfolding new reaches of human responsibility, so that at length man appears to be singly and sovereignly human in spite of walls of partition, deserts and oceans of division and a babel of languages which seemed insuperable but a few thousand years ago. The generic humanity is here, God help us! and nothing can postpone the crisis of universal co-operation or universal destruction. We certainly confront the Christ. The question is, what manner of Christ? Does He come to condemn or to redeem? Is He like Jesus? Or like that which crucified Jesus? Or perhaps both together in some consummate moment of forgiveness? A natural theologian need go no further but he can go so far. The questions are not abstract, and they are worth asking.

The two thousand intelligent and responsible men who have been meeting in Rome this last three years would agree that when He comes, the Christ will judge and accomplish the purpose – whatever it may be – for which the human race has come into existence. They believe much more than this, all of it logically and factually intelligible, none of it subject to the 'objections' which Canon Bezzant and others find so serious. They believe, for instance, that this consummation began nineteen hundred years ago with a community conceiving itself as a divine organism and founded by a man who was also God. It is not, however, quite accurate to say with Professor Mascall that 'Christianity . . . stands or falls by certain events which are alleged to have taken place during a particular period of forty-eight hours in Palestine nearly two thousand years ago' – not quite accurate

because during these two thousand years that same identical event has taken place upon innumerable altars every day. That event was not closed and done with in that forty-eight hours two thousand years ago, since I witnessed it this morning.

In other words, Christianity is an historical religion, not only because it rests upon an event at a time and place assignable in the historic past, but also because this event is contemporary with all times and present to all places, so that time and space are perpetually bound to this event. That is to say that Christianity is an historical religion because it enfolds and validates all history and without it, history has no determinate pattern, time no meaning. Anyone who would make sense of these human millenniums or indeed any sense of the cosmos at all must come to terms with that eventual union of historic Man with living God, which is the Blessed Sacrament. The present world is in the Church, not the Church in the world.

The thirteenth schema in Vatican II was entitled the Church in the Present World. Dante and Aquinas would have thought rather of the Present World in the Church. And so would St Paul: 'the Kingdom of the Son of his love; in whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins, who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of all creation; for in him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers: all things have been created through him and unto him: and he is before all things, and in him all things consist. And he is the head of the body the church'.

Christ is not a cause to be propagated or institution careful of its own expansion or repair. He is the first and final creation of the living God – all that God means by all that God does. He is before all things and in Him all things cohere. There is nothing unintelligible in this concept, and it would follow that by tracing all things to their creation or discovering the principle of their coherence we approach Him in whom God has realized His creative Agape. As we have said and as is obvious this exploration demands the highest qualities of self-sacrifice, self-discipline, humility and truth, qualities summed up in worship. Tracing the creation and discovering the coherence of *all things* evokes *all* the human being, both as individual and as society. And such is liturgy. In the liturgy, says the Pope, we enjoy 'a foretaste of the heavenly liturgy which is celebrated above in that heavenly Jerusalem whither this earthly pilgrimage shall finally lead us, where Christ is, seated on the right hand of His Father as giver of holiness and priest of the true tabernacle; in the liturgy we join with the whole court of heaven in praising the Lord in hymns of glory; we honour the memory of saints and hope for a share with them in the company of the blessed; we look forward to the coming of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ Who will in Heaven indeed be our Life, with Whom we shall reign in glory'. Again, nothing un-

intelligible – only the linguistic convention of the Bible, the best available, which expresses with all the analogical resource of human imagination that which *ex hypothesi* must remain for ever beyond the resource of human speech, but is nonetheless real for all that. It is the sacramental language of worship.

II

Nominalism attained its scientific maturity through the criticism of Aristotle.

‘The most radical attacks made in the fourteenth century on Aristotle’s whole system of physics’, says Dr A. C. Crombie, ‘concerned his doctrines about matter and space and about motion. Aristotle had denied the possibility of atoms, void, infinity and plural worlds, but when his strict determinism had been condemned by the theologians in 1277 this opened the way to speculation on these subjects. With the assertion of God’s omnipotence, philosophers argued that God could create a body moving in empty space or an infinite universe and proceeded to work out what the consequences would be if He did. This seems a strange way to approach science, but there is no doubt that it was science they were approaching.’

Not so strange after all. Theologians appealed to the first article of their creed – God the Father Almighty Maker of heaven and earth and of all things visible and invisible – from a cosmology which was conceptually complete *a priori* and thence rationally determined and in fact dead. Their faith in God transferred their allegiance to events. Henceforth it was at once their freedom and their duty, not to devise a cosmic pattern, which was God’s affair, but to observe events which were God’s actions. These they were to explain by the most economical hypotheses and to test the hypotheses by events. Such was the simple and universal method of empirical science. It sprang from the first article of the Creed. Event is observed; hypothesis explains event; a second event verifies (or falsifies) hypothesis. The human reason does not ascend to heaven but subdues itself to earth. To do so the reason had to stand upon three suppositions which being made were soon forgotten, as a man does easily forget the ground under his feet. Forgotten, concealed, but always implied, always invisibly present. These framers of empirical science believed in one God Almighty Maker, in a universe wherein truth was one, so that two separate events were mutually relevant and the relevance rationally perceived, and in one humanity such that all knowledge was ‘public’, mathematical reasoning and strict observation universal. The early scientists had one God, one Man, one Cosmos. ‘All things have been created through him and unto him and in him all things cohere. And he is the head of the body the Church.’ For as you fasten your eyes upon these three primal suppositions of modern science simultaneously you realise that it is the Church you are staring at.

Yet it seemed that a prevailing nominalism, forgetful of its premiss and origin, must dissolve the supernatural community. It was part of this natural empiricism to take men out of heaven and set them fairly and simply on earth, so that their religion was no longer the established norm of living but an isolated, heroic, individual perception of the inhuman, the absolutely Other. God had no human voice. The Church was a purely eschatological institution, humanity too natural to be holy, divine holiness too holy to be human. 'To pluck up and to break down,' says Luther, 'and to destroy and to overthrow, namely, everything that is in us (i.e. all that of ourselves and in ourselves pleases us) and to build and to plant namely everything that is outside us and in Christ . . . for God wills to save us not by domestic but by extraneous righteousness and wisdom, not that which comes and springs from us, but that which comes from elsewhere into us, not that which originates in our earth, but that which comes down from heaven. Therefore it behoves us to be instructed in a righteousness altogether external and alien. Wherefore it is first necessary that our own and domestic righteousness should be rooted out.' And Dr Anders Nygren quotes this with approval in 1938; indeed it is the theme of his great work on Agape and Eros. Outside, extraneous, from elsewhere, altogether external and alien – a strangely ineffective incarnation which failed to overcome that extraneity and even in the act of grace itself maintained that alienation! So also Professor Torrance explains Luther: 'In so far as the Christian is one person with Christ, he is hid with Christ in God, and his union with Christ is *in medio tenebrarum*, but in so far as he still lives *in mundo*, he presents to the eyes of the world a person that is to all appearances sinful.' And lest the Catholic should lay any flattering unction to his soul, it is well to remember that even as they lived in the Church herself, Catholics met the world with inquisitions and anathemas and armaments, tortured heretics and oppressed the poor and turned the Church into a clerical monopoly, a beleaguered fortress at war with its humanity.

For the Reformers, the dominant human fact was the human fall. The whole substance of revelation enforced the separation of man from God. The only place where God could be found was in the Book which, as it issued perfect and infallible from the mouth of God could never succumb to the nominalist revolution. But when the nominalist method attacked the Book, it became a natural literature subject to naturalistic scrutiny and scholarship, describing not the kingdom or grace of God, but an evolving idea of God on a par with other human ideas. Fundamentalist on one side and naturalist on the other turned revelation into a controversy which absorbed professors and neglected people. Protestant religions, for there were many, hovered between these two extremes – and still do. The Word was either a sovereign mystery delivered to a prostrate humanity without reason (for reason is natural) or else a word of human

religion conceived, invented, uttered by unaided human minds. There could be no tradition for man was incapable of it. Catholic or Protestant, the layman was a perpetual minor. The affairs of this world had only a diminishing part in Christ. While Catholic states were all political failures, the Protestant states expanded into materialist powers. But meanwhile science grew from more to more.

It has been a habit of Catholic apologists looking into the century of the Reformation to denounce the nominalism which perverted Reformation theology. The perversion lay not in nominalism but in its misapplication. It is not and cannot be a theological method. It affirms the divine right of things, of events in this world, of human nature and natural human experience. As such it is a stage in the technique of Incarnation which would make natural experience a sacramental function and require the human intellect to bestow itself upon 'the flesh'. It counts natural science to be no less than theology a contemplative discipline proper to God's creatures living in God's creation. How soon 'the flesh' forgets its Creator, and then faith piously turns against the flesh! In doing so, faith takes the flesh at its own valuation and exaggerates its fall. But the true medicine for the perversion is to restore nominalism to its proper end, not in the holy discipline of theology, but in the no less holy discipline of natural science exploring all things that cohere in Christ. If Catholics would heal the schism and pardon the heresies of the Reformation or, in other words, find means of uniting 'our separated brethren' to the Catholic Church, their first move should be to restore the sacrament of human experience, embracing the mystical and moral discipline of natural science, their second, to understand the structure and movement of human society not as it ought to be but as it is. In short, the Catholic must recapture and restore nominalism to its true function of unveiling God's natural creation in its natural feature. The Church must bear, not merely diagnose, the sin of the world, must not merely think about the Incarnation of God but *be* it.

There are two kinds of belief, to be held together in one Body, one of necessity, the other of faith. The nominalist believes of necessity. Natural science yields a world that commends itself ultimately to sense, and sense acts by necessity. I not only believe that these walls exist; I could not doubt it. To prove their existence I should need only to collide with them. The metaphysics of substance and accident would be irrelevant and so would any other metaphysic. The principle of scientific experiment which works by falsification aims at this kind of compulsion. An hypothesis is accepted because it cannot be doubted. The realist on the other hand believes of faith. Whereas I could not possibly doubt the existence of this wall, I am not in any sense compelled to believe that England or the truth or my child is worth living and dying for. In this second kind of belief necessity has retreated and value has taken its place, but the value is a fact, is embedded in reality as real as the wall. And it is even more com-

elling, it engages a greater area of consciousness. The wall I accept as inevitable, then I can use or ignore it. It remains it. But in order to pass beyond the world of 'it', I do not need, in the manner of a Lutheran theologian, to leap into the world of 'Thou'. Cover the wall with beauty, and I shall not merely accept it, I shall react to it and become a different man in contemplating it. By such transfiguration I shall be called beyond the world of mere things into a world of universal essence, angels and ministers of grace.

This second kind of belief which engages not only sense but also will, and judgment, which not merely satisfies reason but evokes it, which makes me *want* to think and judge and decide and act as a man, is realist. It is not imposed but inspired. The captives in Plato's cave who lived in their world of shadows were never forced to ascend into the daylight. The form of the good, though it gives reality to all that is, though it be greater than existence, is not contemplated of necessity. God, heaven, holiness, the Church, grace, sacrament do not invade our consciousness like the pavement; they are not an atmosphere in which we respire automatically, biologically secure and insignificant. They demand our soul and life. To apprehend them we have to live with our entire humanity; we will to believe. We do not *prove* the being of God as a logical necessity. We lay hold upon Him with all our heart and mind and soul and strength. This reason emancipated from things and living in acts, as it demands our humanity, gives us a human environment, the kind of environment that answers to the whole act of man, his rational appetite as well as his sensuous passivity, his reverence no less than his knowledge. As he descends from faith to knowledge, so he can ascend from knowledge to faith, not by compulsion of experience but by the will to worship. He undergoes the discipline of science, not as a consequence of the phenomena which he examines, but as the man he is. Science gives him the phenomena, but he gives science its command, and he does so not as forced but as free. He *will* tell the truth. He *will* abandon his preferences in order to see and record what is really there. He *will* reject hypotheses that fail to compel him. He *will* unveil the natural world. Behind the scientist is the man, the world in the Church. The nominal discipline is one real function within the real Creation, and the real Creation coheres in Christ.

III

To elicit the mystery of divinely constituted nature we need something more than human aspiration: we need humility and detachment. Courage is not enough, nor missionary zeal, nor poetry, nor piety, nor love of mankind, nor belief in God. We need also the natural capacity of natural men to do justice to natural events. We need the Mother as well as the Apostle. As we have seen this naturalism was itself discovered and affirmed against the ideal cosmology of Aristotle by the theologians' faith in God. It was not a materialist

revolt but on the contrary an act of faith inherent in the mystery of the Incarnation, and it reached articulate maturity simultaneously with devotion to the Mother of God. For the Christian, 'the flesh' is a holy thing and the contemplative discipline which directs human intellect upon the natural world is essential to the Church. Otherwise, why bread and wine rather than odes and arguments? So in this Council, Archbishop Hurley of Durban said that 'the central problem of the schema (xiii) was that of the true value of the natural order and its relation to man's final and supernatural end; it was a question of the continuing creative presence of God in the world and St Paul's cosmic Christocentrism'. And it is an essential element in the contemplative discipline of science to lay aside the vesture of sacred doctrine, to come down from the altar and into the natural world. To do so is far indeed from the sceptical technology of the 'science user' who treats the world as a store of utilities and examines nature merely to exploit it. Nevertheless natural science is an end in itself, a real devotion to be practised in singleness of mind without metaphysical or theological distraction. Much of the scientific 'atheism' during the last two centuries has been no more than a fence drawn about the scientific vocation against invasion of prejudice and alien interest. If I study the galaxies or the behaviour of animals as words of God I must use the concentration, skill and self-denial that a word of God demands; I must not spend half my thoughts on pious ascriptions and theological interruptions. I must not be half apologist when I ought to be all astronomer. I must be allowed to forget the question how the language of astro-physics or zoology fits in with the catechism or the Bible or the Summa Theologica or the Council of Trent. So Bishop Spülbeck of Meissen, a physicist by training, pointed out that from a scientist's point of view

'We use an, as it were, archaic language, antiquarian in character, unsuited and alien to their world, if not to say false from the point of view of these scientists solving their problems. These lay researchers today are worried by recent problems in e.g. cosmogeny, since they have adopted new explanations and descriptions for fundamental concepts that do not correspond to our philosophy. The concepts of matter, cause, substance, finality and life have already been in fact so modified in the scientific world that it is high time for us to examine with an open mind from a theological point of view these new advances and concepts that have been so honestly and seriously elaborated by laymen.'

This conflict is nothing new. Already in the fourteenth century Nicholas Oresmes found serious difficulties in the metaphysics of transubstantiation which relies upon an Aristotelian definition of substance. But the mystery is not the metaphysics and Aristotle is not the word of God. In modern English the word transubstantiation conveys a difficulty, for in English the word substance lost its metaphysical significance four centuries ago and nowadays connotes only

chemistry, cookery and bank-balance. Substance in Aristotle and Aquinas comes nearer to the modern English word activity, for a substance in Aristotle is defined by its 'end'. Bread is bread because it feeds. When St Thomas quotes St Augustine that the difference between ordinary bread and the bread of the Sacrament is that one is turned into man, the other turns man into Itself, the whole reference is to a living universe – a 'transaction' rather than a 'trans-substance' in any modern sense. But even 'transaction' has been taken over by our commercial genius, and would be even worse misleading.

'In Him were all things created', 'in Him all things consist' – this is not Aristotelian physics nor modern physics, but a language available in the realist universe to men at prayer in the age of Aquinas or of Einstein, who consummate their discoveries and their discipline in the divine-human unity. God-and-Man at one contains all worlds. For men thus contained, the 'substance' of the universe is the act of God in the Christ in whom they have their redemption and it is so for them, because prayer is at once their apprehension of Reality and Reality's apprehension of themselves. But prayer in this sense embraces all the scientific discipline which makes them 'holy'. For in True-God-and-true-man who makes all things holy, all things are created and cohere. To explain prayer in terms of science and science in terms of prayer is the business not of the natural scientist but of the theologian but it is the vocation of both scientist and theologian to cohabit as organs of the divine organism. The Church is not in the world, but the world is in the Church. As the smoke, largely verbal, of theological controversy vanishes in the advent of the Christ and man is seen to be man, the art and industry of verbal definition will be given to the artist whose vocation is to define, but the divine command upon the uniting human race is that it cohere in the divine-human community.

When the Creed proclaims the mystery of the Incarnation, *homo factus est*, it means by *homo* not any selected class, race, religion or order but the being who lives a human life, the genus homo. The Church baptized barbarians without waiting upon their theology – that was a sacred science for the centuries to come – and in the Sacrifice she does not offer a denominational confession. God so loved the world, not Catholics. The question confronting the assembled bishops is not primarily of the organization which they can bestow upon four hundred million professing Catholics now living on this planet, nor is the ecclesia nor the liturgy defined by what professing Catholics profess to do. The liturgy is the realization of humanity in Godhead; it is ascension to heaven, and that which ascends is Man. It is not remarkable that bishops should think about bishops, priests about liturgy, Catholics of Catholicism. What is unique and tremendous is the community which transcends the 'ismatic' mind and possesses and is possessed by the Spiritus of the Incarnate God. 'And He breathed on them and said, Receive ye

the Holy Ghost'. As Cardinal Döpfer said to an audience in Munich: 'If we must recognize a manifold working of the Spirit outside the bounds of the Catholic Church, many very concrete consequences follow. There is an inner link and co-ordination between our separated brothers and us. What God has done amongst them is important for us too. There is a common basis on which to start honest, brotherly, patient discussion to clarify what still divides us. Here we see the first step of the road on which God can at last bring us together'.

But 'separated brothers' has a much wider connotation than those churches and sects innumerable which profess allegiance to the name of Christ, and it must follow that a denominational method of 'converting atheists' falls far short of the mission of the Church. For what is an atheist but a man whose breeding and experience have given him first a misconception of God and then a hatred of the misconception? A man at any rate – and it is the function of the Church to take manhood up to God, and indeed to unveil the true being of all that is. It is her glory to find and sanctify the depth and height and breadth and length of human nature as God knows it – its politics, economy and science, art, sex, food, philosophy and theology, mind and language, and whatsoever else is human. Part of this humanity, no doubt is 'the little platoon we belong to', the local, partial, sectarian loyalty which has taught us all that we know thus far of loving God and loving our neighbour. The Church would not dissolve this smaller allegiance until we had grown out of it or ask us to become Catholic by playing the traitor. But she can direct our eyes upon what is truly sacred in this limited sanctity and discriminate it from what is false and proud and inert. This she does with both Catholics and Protestants. She can tell us how right we are and therefore, and only therefore, how wrong we are, how much we have and therefore what we lack. She can understand the divine worth of our *litterae humaniores* when we fancy that they have made us agnostic. She knows in her long history and profound experience that empirical science though it seems to breed materialism for a season is an affirmation of one God, one world and one humanity. The Church is not limited to propositions; she has never required each Tom, Dick and Harry to be his own theologian; she lives by priests not professors. Herein she differs from those Protestant communities which have spent four centuries in defining and re-defining, scrutinizing, criticizing, anatomizing, disputing, rearranging, doubting, denouncing, reaffirming the foundations of the faith given her two thousand years ago. Yet with all their argument all the Protestant churches could stand up whole within the Church and lose nothing that really contributes to their spiritual life and health. And for their mistakes, she has carried all the mistakes men ever made. From the first she made it her practice to find that which was lost.

Now that the bishops are a college, the college of the Apostles,

perhaps they may consider creating an Academy, a Catholic Academy which should include priests and laity who have attained intellectual distinction enough to give them representative authority. The function of such an Academy would be to realize the world in the Church. It is sufficiently clear that the world of the future, if it is governed at all, will be governed by its intellect and important therefore that this intellect should be sacramental. It should sanctify its science and express the holy Church through its science. It would be well not to limit the membership of such a Catholic Academy to professed and practising Catholics and while the Church would govern it, the co-opted physicists and chemists would need only to sympathise with the aims of the Academy without necessarily embracing its faith. The note of such an Academy would be its intellectual integrity and its double effect would be to bring the world within the Church and the charity of the Church to the world. No one would be tempted to mistake the proceedings of the Catholic Academy for the pronouncements of the Church, and everyone would see that herein the Church with complete integrity does justice and is hospitable to the mind of the world. It would break down the linguistic partitions, bring daylight into the linguistic confusions which perpetuate suspicion, and it would give the intelligent agnostic clear insight into his agnosis, the separated brother into the genius of separation. It would transcend the denominational and defensive hatreds of the past and bring us perceptibly nearer to the conviction that what the world needs is not Christianity but Christ.

ANY book of interest to CATHOLICS can be obtained from the
MAIL ORDER Dept.
BURNS OATES RETAIL LTD, 129 Victoria Street, S.W.1