

Enthusiasts naturally wish to share their experience with other people. If the time were thought to be ripe for an attempt to commend more widely the principle of congregational singing of liturgical texts, several factors would require to be weighed. The Leighton settings have proved their singability, though the "Gloria in excelsis" is tough, and they are readily available in the hymnary. But their text is that of the English prayer-book. Settings of the now current ICET texts have been written by several Anglican and Roman musicians and some of these could prove acceptable in the Church of Scotland. But such music will not take root by just circulating copies. On paper it may look very alien. It will only be sung if organists, choirs and congregations (in turn) catch the enthusiasm from others. And missionaries of Stuard Campbell's ability and persuasiveness are not easily found.

RECJ

REVIEWS

ANGLICAN-ORTHODOX DIALOGUE: The Dublin Agreed Statement 1984. S.P.C.K. 1984.
Price £2.50

In most ecumenical dialogue, church government, ecclesiastical structure and forms of ministry are too often the priority. I find it the more refreshing that in dialogue in the Orthodoxy, spiritually, worship and doctrine precede those controversial church differences, while the participants speak from within that "wonderful and sacred mystery", the Church, One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic, the Body of Christ. This is the immediate value for other communions in this 1984 Anglican and Orthodox Agreed Statement, which has resulted from eight years of inter-church conversation, launched when the Third Pan-Orthodox Conference (Rhodes 1964) decided to resume dialogue with the Anglican Communion, believing that "faith and worship are inseparable". "Anglicans and Orthodox hold that the liturgy and all worship are essentially for the expression, maintenance and communication of the true faith." (p. 33)

This Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue is a most valuable "grow-more" to feed into Church of Scotland ecumenical thinking, especially when the church of our fathers is somewhat negative in its response to the current Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry document, as requested by the W.C.C.; when she has hardly begun to study God's Reign and our Unity, the Report of the Anglican-Reformed International Commission 1981-1984; and when she is in danger of succumbing to another avid discussion of bishops-in-presbytery, which is exactly where some of us "came in" in 1957, when there was the ill-tempered response to the miscalled "Bishop's Report", Relations between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches.

The subject of Section I of this Dublin Agreed Statement is The Mystery of the Church. This is an almost forgotten theme within the Reformed Churches at present, although it was once so vital, particularly in the confessional statements at the Reformation: "we most earnestly believe that from the beginning there has been, now is, and to the end of the world shall be a Church which Kirk is Catholic out of the which Kirk there is neither life, nor eternal felicity." (Scots Confession, 1560).

Theological insight and liturgical renewal could be fostered in our own Presbyterian ranks through a devotional study of the Anglican-Orthodox document's Section II on Faith in the Trinity, Prayer and Holiness. A fresh pondering of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and new thinking about the concept of Holiness, seem to me most relevant for revival in our church life. Are we Presbyterians of one heart and mind with our Orthodox and Anglican brethren in affirming: "we agree in affirming that prayer and sanctification are founded upon the grace of the Holy Trinity" (p. 43)?

This short report offers stimulus and direction to the world-wide ecumenical movement, while it also provides theological background for the concerns of the Church Service Society.

R Stuart Loudon

CREATION AND EVOLUTION - THE FACTS AND FALLACIES ALAN HAYWARD

Triangle (SPCK), 232 pp £2.75 pb

It is impossible for preachers to grapple effectively with the early chapters of Genesis without at some stage touching upon the supposed conflict between science and the Bible. This is a notoriously difficult area for any author, not just because it involves profound ideological questions, but because on the purely scientific level it demands an inter-disciplinary expertise in an age where the polymath, unless he is elevated by the popular media to the status of a 'cult' figure, is normally taken much less seriously than the specialist. Dr Alan Hayward, a physicist and retired principal scientific officer at a Government research laboratory, has with great courage and very considerable competence, tackled this complex and controversial subject.

The biographical note at the start of the book describes him as a "Bible-believing Christian" , a fact which might unintentionally deter potential readers who are well aware of the eccentricities of so-called 'creation science' . A substantial body of literature, supposedly of rigorous scientific quality, exists to promote the case for the universe being no more than about ten thousand years in age. This almost invariably necessitates the philosophical, and empirically unverifiable, speculation that God created the universe with the mere appearance of great antiquity, the light from distant galaxies being instantaneously created en route to the earth, and the rocks being formed by Divine fiat complete with fossil-bearing strata whose main function would seem, by implication, to be to delude the 'ungodly' amongst the scientific fraternity. Alternately it is argued on 'scientific' premises that the geological and fossiliferous constitution of the earth's crust is due wholly or mainly to Noah's Flood. In the second section of his book, Hayward convincingly explodes the fallacies inherent in these approaches, and gives a timely reminder that until the post-World War II era it was almost universally accepted, even within 'fundamentalist' circles, that the cosmos is of extreme antiquity, and that a true exegesis of Genesis does not demand a theory of recent creation.

In the third section he examines the Bible teaching on creation, and explores a number of alternative suggestions as to the meaning of the term 'day' in Genesis 1 . He is unhappy with the very common 'liberal' theory of 'theistic evolution' , and argues that the positing of successive divine interventions (most notably in the creation of the human race) is not merely Biblical, but also, in the light of his earlier arguments, compatible with contemporary science. Some of his detailed arguments (e.g. with respect to the creation of Eve in Genesis 2) seem to involve an unnecessary preparedness to take literally Biblical matter which even many who would hold to a very high view of verbal inspiration would be fully prepared to treat as symbolic in nature. Nevertheless, he makes out a most impressive and timely case for the Divine createdness of the cosmos and, without indulging in a vulnerable 'God-of-the-gaps' chain of reasoning, which progressively squeezes God out as each gap is scientifically plugged, invites us to consider afresh the question of whether, in the absence of a continuously controlling Providence, the world could have become what we know it today to be.

Undoubtedly the most valuable and successful part of Hayward's book is the first section, in which, drawing exclusively upon reputable and non-creationist scientific research and literature, he exposes the weaknesses of the Darwinian theory of evolution (which is not, as many laymen suppose, the sole evolutionary

theory), envisaging as it does the gradual transformation of one species into another over long ages. This theory has acquired a quasi-religious sanctity across a broad spectrum of the scientific fraternity. For many atheists, humanists and agnostics Darwin simply has to be right, because his theory offers, on the face of things, a plausible mechanistic explanation of the world as we know it today, and an apparent escape from the necessity either of interventionistic theism or from the positing of massive, abrupt, and so-far inexplicable transformations among living organisms. The Darwinian model of evolution has seduced even many committed Christians among scientists, but Hayward carefully, and with scrupulous fairness, enlists the support of many eminent authorities, some of whom are not even theists, to show that the traditional theory of gradual change over aeons is wholly incompatible with the scientific evidence, not least the disastrously embarrassing, but often glossed-over, widespread absence of intermediate fossils. Many eminent scientists, especially in the non-English-speaking world, are convinced that the evidence points to sudden transformations of species, and are prepared humbly to admit that they have scarcely begun to explore the possible mechanisms which could effect such drastic events. Surely to have no theory is better than to cling to one which is patently faulty. Many scientists now reject Darwin's particular theory, while holding to evolution as a basic principle. Especially when such profess themselves not merely non-creationist, but non-theistic in outlook, their weighty arguments deserve a much more serious treatment than they have hitherto received in the English-speaking world, where it has sometimes seemed that to question Darwin is to invite others to question one's sanity, let alone one's scientific integrity!

Hayward emerges as a well-informed, fair-minded critic of what has, until very recently, been an almost monolithic adherence in scientific circles in this country, to Darwin's theory. Creation can be preached! A belief in creation is not incompatible with intellectual honesty. Hayward may not convince unbelief, for that is primarily the task of the Holy Spirit, but this book should be widely read as a timely corrective to much of the 'creationist' literature available today, which he exposes as less than truly scientific, and thus unworthy of the Christian Church as it seeks to speak to the world with credibility about its Maker.

WILLIAM G NEILL