



**THE  
DUKE  
DIVINITY SCHOOL  
REVIEW**

**Winter 1971**

## A Word About This Issue

This Winter issue of the *Review* is concerned primarily with the contemporary meaning and task of parish ministry, is contributed largely by working ministers convinced of the cruciality of their calling, and is offered in response to requests of many ministers who heard these addresses in the Divinity School Convocation and North Carolina Pastors' School in October and the Divinity School Seminars in South Carolina and Virginia in November, 1970.

Dr. Wallace M. Alston, Jr. of First Presbyterian Church, Durham, lectured in the Seminars on "Possibilities of Ministry in a Divided Church," and "The Minister as Theologian." His second address is printed here. Four addresses given in the Convocation and Pastors' School follow. Dr. Claude R. Collins (B.D. '39), Program Director of the West Virginia United Methodist Conference, gave the Eleventh Annual Alumni Lecture, on "Good Managers of God's Gifts." Dean Robert E. Cushman's address to the Alumni Association focussed especially on the partnership of the Divinity School and the Church in the education of ministers. As the Franklin Simpson Hickman Lecturer on Ministry, Dr. Richard W. Cain of First United Methodist Church, Phoenix, lectured twice in the Convocation on "The Misery and Majesty of Ministry," and continued such themes in Divinity School classes, services of worship, and informal meetings during the week following. Both lectures, with oral style retained so far as feasible, are recorded here. The book reviews also include three recent publications by teaching ministers who earned divinity and doctoral degrees at Duke University—Dr. Harmon L. Smith and Dr. Thor Hall of our faculty, and Dr. Louis W. Hodges of Washington and Lee University.

M.S.R.

**THE  
DUKE  
DIVINITY SCHOOL  
REVIEW**

**Volume 36**

**Winter 1971**

**Number 1**

# Contents

A Word about This Issue.....	Inside Front Cover
The Minister as Theologian.....	1
<i>by Wallace M. Alston, Jr.</i>	
Good Managers of God's Gifts.....	10
<i>by Claude R. Collins</i>	
Address to Duke Divinity School Alumni Association.....	20
<i>by Robert E. Cushman</i>	
One Perspective: The Misery and Majesty of Ministry.....	28
<i>by Richard W. Cain</i>	
Looks at Books.....	51

Editorial Committee: Frank Baker, Donn Michael Farris, Paul Field, Ray C. Petry, Charles K. Robinson, Robert L. Wilson, and McMurry S. Richey, Chairman

Published three times a year (Winter, Spring, Autumn)  
by The Divinity School of Duke University

---

Postage paid at Durham, North Carolina (27706)

# The Minister as Theologian

WALLACE M. ALSTON, JR.

Numerous attempts have been made in recent months to explain the lethargy, apathy, and outright apostasy of the Church in response to the great human issues which are before us as a society.<sup>1</sup> It is my contention that the locus of the crisis in the Church is not to be found in the committees, boards and agencies of the denomination, but in the faith of its membership. The real issue before the Christian Church in our time is the crisis of belief in the churches and, until that is recognized and dealt with effectively, there will be little cause for hope that the Church will institutionalize a ministry of integrity in the world. The Church does what it believes, just as the individual finally makes his definitive confession of faith in and through his manner of living in the world. The response made by the institutional Church to the issues of war, poverty, racism, and other forms of social injustice, is the direct expression of its apprehension, or lack of apprehension, of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ, for theology and ethics are one. To deal with the crisis in the Church as though it were of an organizational or institutional nature would be to miss the point. The Church never acts prophetically in the world unless there is in its life a prophetic faith that motivates it so to act. The real crisis of the Church, therefore, is the crisis of belief in the churches and the inevitable conclusion is that the ministry has failed in its function as teacher and theologian.

Something happened in the churches in the last decade. We were told after the second World War that there was a revival of religion in America. The ranks of the churches were swelled almost beyond capacity; the plates rang with offerings from the faithful; established churches divided and subdivided to keep up with their expanding population. Then something happened and the Church lost credibility for the man in the pew. In early 1963, the Student Christian Movement press in London published a book by the Bishop

---

Dr. Alston is Minister at First Presbyterian Church, Durham, N. C. This is the second of his two addresses in the Duke Divinity School Seminars in Columbia, South Carolina and Richmond, Virginia in November, 1970.

1. The best recent summary is Jeffrey K. Hadden, *The Gathering Storm in the Churches* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1969).

of Woolwich, John A. T. Robinson, entitled *Honest to God*,<sup>2</sup> and in a matter of weeks it became a best seller in Britain and in the United States. Bishop Robinson's message was not original. He simply said that our old images of God must go. He did not deny God. He repudiated the traditional images of God that had been taken for granted by large segments of the Christian world. The real significance of the book lies in the fact that Bishop Robinson dared to synthesize and to translate for the layman the works of three contemporary theologians previously unknown to the man in the pew. He opened the theological debate to an audience that was unaccustomed to reading theological statements that called the fundamentals of Christian faith into question.

The reaction to *Honest to God* was far more significant than the content of the book itself. In some quarters it was praised as courageous, imaginative, and edifying for the Church. Erik Routley, a Congregational minister and historian, wrote, "I cannot write objectively and dispassionately about this. I can only record that the reading of it gave me more comfort, more encouragement, and more sense that life is worth living, and the ministry worth exercising, than any book I have read for years and years."<sup>3</sup> In other quarters the book was viewed as evidence of the presence of heresy in the Church. A British journalist wrote, "What should happen to an Anglican bishop who does not believe in God? This, I hold, is the condition of the Bishop of Woolwich, as revealed in his paperback, *Honest to God*, and it raises, I maintain, a question of Church discipline which cannot be shirked without the greatest repercussions on the whole Anglican Communion. . . . It is one thing to restate the eternal truths of religion in contemporary language and quite another expressly to repudiate the fundamental doctrines which were believed by those who learn Christianity from the lips of Christ."<sup>4</sup> And in still other quarters there were those who failed to see anything at all significant, one way or another, in this book. The late C. S. Lewis, for example, wrote, "The Bishop of Woolwich will disturb most of us Christian laymen less than he anticipates."<sup>5</sup> History has certified, however, that C. S. Lewis was wrong. Most readers did not respond to Bishop Robinson with such casual indifference. Prior to the publication of

---

2. John A. T. Robinson, *Honest to God* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963).

3. Erik Routley, David L. Edwards (ed.), *The Honest to God Debate* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), p. 82.

4. T. E. Utely, in *ibid.*, pp. 95-97.

5. C. S. Lewis, in *ibid.*, p. 91.

this book, the theological enterprise was left to the highly trained theologians in the seminaries, while the average layman, and many clergymen, in parish churches continued to live easily with the concept of God "up there" or "out there." To some laymen the appearance of *Honest to God* was liberating and revelatory. To others it was simply a confirmation of what they had always expected, namely, that the leadership of the Church had abandoned the fundamental doctrines of Christian faith in the face of the new knowledge available to our world.

Even before the discussion over *Honest to God* had run its course, a Baptist theologian named Harvey Cox published a book entitled *The Secular City*,<sup>6</sup> which again rocked the life of the Church. It was only a short time before *The Secular City* was on the paperback best seller list, becoming one of the most talked about books of the year. Professor Cox's thesis pivots on four themes which he claims to be the consequences of urbanization and secularization: anonymity, mobility, pragmatism, and profanity. Urbanization and secularization, according to Cox, provide the shape not of man's sin, but of his liberation. Secular man is free from the traditional moral sanctions, from the old supernatural ideologists, and may now turn his attention to giving the world in which he lives a more human shape. Cox views the forces of secularization as largely rendering the traditional religions irrelevant. The forces of secularization have no serious interest in persecuting religion; secularization simply bypasses and undercuts religion, moving on to other things. The age of *The Secular City* is an age of no religion at all. It no longer looks to religious rituals and rules for its morality and meaning. It will do no good to cling to our religious and metaphysical versions of Christianity in the hope that one day they will come back. They have disappeared forever.

The point of these two books, and of my mentioning them to you, is simply to say that the response given to them by the man in the pew indicates the growing doubt and uncertainty about the traditional expressions of Christian belief, as well as the desire on the part of thousands and thousands of lay people to discover new images and new metaphors for faith. A young layman commented to me, "I have gotten to the place where I count the number of times my minister refers to God in spatial terms. I count the number of times my minister talks to me about God 'up there' or about God who has come 'down from heaven' or the number of times he looks up when he

---

6. Harvey G. Cox, *The Secular City* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965).

prays." This layman said to me, "No literate and honest man can speak like that of God anymore." How do we speak of God? It is this issue that lies at the heart of the crisis of faith in our time.

This growing doubt about orthodox theology is also reflected in the sociological studies of the beliefs of Christians in the San Francisco Bay area conducted by Charles Y. Glock and Rodney Stark.<sup>7</sup> They discovered that there was a larger diversity of belief within the denominations than there was between Protestants and Roman Catholics. In fact, there was no single doctrine raised by Glock and Stark on which Protestants even approached unanimity. They concluded that, "The new cleavages are not over such matters as how to worship God properly, but whether or not there is a God of the sort it makes any sense to worship; not over whether the bread and wine of communion become the actual blood and body of Christ through transubstantiation, or are only symbolic, but over whether or not Jesus was merely a man."<sup>8</sup>

My first point, then, is that there is a crisis of faith in the churches, not only in the minds and lives of theologians and clergymen, but in the viscera of the Protestant laity itself. The second point follows hard by the first and it is that there has been a popularization of the whole spectrum of theological debate that was once reserved to the theological seminaries. The crisis of faith and the ambiguity of belief are not confined to scholars anymore, but penetrate deep into the rank and file of clergy and laity alike. Glock and Stark reported that, among the Protestant laity, 29 per cent doubted the existence of God, 43 per cent seriously doubted the virgin birth, and 35 per cent doubted the reality of life after death. Among the clergy, 26 per cent seriously doubted the virgin birth, 18 per cent were in doubt over some type of judgment after death, and 62 per cent reported that they would expect any thinking layman to have doubts about the existence of God.

My first reaction to the Glock and Stark study was that this is simply a rejection of an old, worn-out fundamentalism, and not necessarily adequate evidence that there is a crisis of belief in the churches. In most decent contemporary theology, myth, legend, metaphor, and symbol have replaced the old literalism as bases for understanding and interpreting Christian faith. However this may be, one cannot

---

7. Charles Y. Glock and Rodney Stark, *Religion and Society in Tension* (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1965), Chapter V, "The New Denominationalism."

8. Glock and Stark, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-18.

write off the Glock and Stark study so easily. There is a consensus among fundamentalists that provides a measure of cement to any voluntary association. When myth and metaphor are introduced, consensus is shattered. What is metaphorical to one is literal to another. Who is to say who is correct? Wherein lies the authority to say which interpretation of Scripture is the right one and which the wrong one? The fact is that we have a pluralism of belief in the churches and that is in itself a part of the crisis. When one adds to this the influence of the social revolution, the deep existential anguish felt by sensitive people in our time in relation to others who suffer oppression and injustice, and the manner in which this has been interpreted as normative religious experience, you have at least a glimpse of that which we are calling the crisis of faith in the churches. It all adds up to the fact that the church people are simply not sure what Christian faith is anymore and they are basically unwilling, or unable, to have it defined for them in the same old ways.

Christian faith requires symbols and metaphors in order to be understood and believed. That which cannot be thought through critically and expressed with reasonable clarity cannot demand the allegiance of a man's whole being. Faith requires symbolization, a language, a means of conceptualization. Faith demands categories of thought and speech if it is to be believed and lived. The phenomenon of language, therefore, is of crucial importance to the Christian faith, to the life of the Christian man, and to the health of the Christian community. Needless to say, not any language will do. Man as an historical being needs a language that is also historical in order to interpret and to shape his historical existence. Man is an historical being, not in the sense that he is born into time and history as a finished product; but in the sense that he is always in the process of becoming. Man is not simply *a being in the world*; he is always *coming into being with the world*. Man and the world are receptive to each other. Time and history are in man as well as man in time and history. H. Richard Niebuhr called it the "historical relativism" which any theology of revelation must take into account.<sup>9</sup> Language, then, is the mirror of man as an historical being. Language is hammered out on the anvil of man's dialogue with the world of people, time, and events. It can never be static or remain the same, for people, time, and events are not static and never remain the same. To be

---

9. H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Meaning of Revelation* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941), Chapter 1.

historical, that is to say, to reflect accurately the ongoing dialogue of man with his history, language must remain open and flexible, always in the process of becoming. Historical language tells man's story, not through description but through interpretation, for it provides him the categories for understanding himself in his history and his history in himself.

The problem is that, through neglect or out of fear of the consequences, the Christian community has allowed its language of faith to die without benefit of resurrection. The language of faith is not particularly questioned in our time, as Professor Cox noted in his book, *The Secular City*. The crisis of faith is seen most clearly in our generation not in terms of radical doubt, but in terms of apathy. The language of faith is not so radically doubted as it is simply neglected as irrelevant in relation to the great human problems that face us as a people. The language of faith has ceased to be historical for those who once believed it. It has lost its power to assist contemporary men, women, and young people to reflect on themselves in *this* world and this world in themselves.

There are those who would have us believe that the deed is enough, that the Church exists simply in and for missions, and that the "being" of the Church has no relevance to the world in which we live. We are told that the Church has spoken long enough and desperately needs to put its words into action in the world. This is a half-truth at best. Ethics is of critical importance to the life of the Church, The Word must be fleshed-out in the world if there is to be any authenticity to the Christian experience at all. But I would protest any definition of language that understands it to be only the necessary shorthand for getting about one's life. Language is the spoken deed. It has about it both the potential and the power of being itself and should be treated with that kind of seriousness . . . "for by your words you will be justified, and by your words you will be condemned (Matthew 12: 37)." The problem faced by the Protestant Church in our time is not so much that it has too few ministers, but that it has too few *good* ministers. The real need in the life of the Church is for a competent ministry, for ministers who are willing to stay in a conflict-ridden local parish and to struggle for a vital language of faith that is both faithful to the tradition of the Church and historical for the contemporary moment. We need ministers, in other words, who are willing to shun the temptation to be amateur psychiatrists or amateur sociologists and dare to do what they were trained and ordained to do, namely, to be theologians in the con-

text of a local community of faith. For when the language of faith is neglected, the nerve of the Church is cut, the community of faith begins to disintegrate, and the prophetic witness of the Church in the world is pacified. Language, when it ceases to be historical, loses its power to assist man to reflect on himself in history and on history in himself, and thus begins to die.

I suggest to you that there is a case to be made for the minister as theologian and for the preaching function of the ministry as central to that task. What is the role of preaching in the Church's search for a new language that is both faithful and historical?

I would have to say, first of all, that the sermon and its preaching are the primary means by which the Christian community acquires, develops, tests, and reshapes the metaphors and symbols that form its theological vocabulary. The preaching function of the ministry should be one means at the minister's disposal to test, criticize, and reform new metaphors of faith with his people. The preaching function is often criticized for its monologic character, although good preaching is never monologue, but always dialogue with a congregation and its needs. There are numerous ways to set the sermon in the context of dialogue. A minister might select his text or theme in advance, gather a group of interested people of the congregation around that text or theme, and listen as they discuss it, entering into dialogue with the Church both before the sermon as well as in its preaching. Or again, reaction sessions may be held after the sermon in which dialogue over the issues at hand is encouraged. But even in the ostensibly monologic form of the minister in the pulpit preaching to the congregation, dialogue may be sensed by both pulpit and pew. If the minister has diligently been about the task of tending the community of faith in the week past; if the minister has done his political homework, opening himself for person-to-person engagement throughout the week; then preaching in the context of community worship can hardly be simple monologue, but will be an extension of the dialogue that stretches across the seven days.

Second, the sermon and its preaching provide a means of "traditioning" the Christian community. Now, of course, by "traditioning" I do not mean making people more traditional. Rather I mean the process of teaching the tradition of Christian faith and life in which we stand. It is a means of assisting people to identify themselves as active participants in "the communion of saints." To tradition a people, according to the use made of this phrase in the history of Christian thought, is to participate in that movement of

passing on the faith of the Church from century to century and from generation to generation. The sermon and its preaching ought to be a context in which the minister teaches the faith of the Church to a new generation of people.

No new symbolization can ever occur in a vacuum. We do not begin "de novo" in each generation to struggle for a meaningful theological vocabulary. We engage seriously in the process of finding a new language of faith only in relation to the similar struggles in the history of Christian thought. The most serious problem confronted by the minister of a parish church is the illiteracy of his parishioners. No longer can the preacher suppose a biblical frame of reference on the part of his listener. My parents were given a biblical frame of reference by their parents and by the ongoing dialogue of the family with the words of Scripture. Families simply do not do this any longer with their children and the minister must take this into account in his parish strategy. The minister who is not constantly at work educating his people in a literate faith is simply not doing his job. The minister who is not preaching for literacy may be wasting the time of his people. The minister who does not have a number of his laymen reading and studying serious theology is neglecting his task as teacher and theologian. The minister as theologian understands the sermon and its preaching to be the context in which the ongoing theological activity of the church is set, and uses it to establish the educational pace of parish life.

Third, the sermon and its preaching have a reflective function in the life of the Church. Preaching is the process by which the Church and its ministry interpret history in the light of faith. Gibson Winter called it "theological reflection."<sup>10</sup> It is the bringing to consciousness the meaning of contemporary events in the light of the Christian confession. The sermon as "theological reflection" is that act by which the Church scrutinizes the issues confronted by society in the light of those decisive events of the past, Exodus and Easter, in which the intent of God has been apprehended by man in faith. The sermon ought to be the one context in which the Church looks to the hints God has dropped in the past in order to make out what he is doing today. This is what Karl Barth meant by living in the world with the Bible in one hand and the daily newspaper in the other. The Church is that community of people that lives and dies in the faith that God is at work in the world doing that which in Exodus and

---

10. Gibson Winter, *The New Creation as Metropolis* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963), p. 71.

Easter he told us he was doing, namely, freeing the captives, making old things new, bringing light into darkness, making and keeping human life human. The preaching of the Church should seek to point to the presence of Jesus Christ in the world and call the Church to follow Him.

The sermon and its preaching form but one vehicle of the teaching ministry. The use of small group study is another. The election and training process for officers in the church is still another. The membership of a local congregation soon recognizes the presence of theological activity in the life and work of a minister. It is my conviction that Christian laymen want to think critically about the matters of life and death involved in Christian affirmations and, furthermore, that they have been long frustrated by the trite homilies that come on demand from the office of the minister. The integrity of the Church's witness in the world will depend on the integrity of the faith it claims. The minister, thus, neglects his theological task at the risk of integrity.

The minister as theologian seeks to enable a community of Christian people to shape a meaningful theological language in and through the dialogue of teaching and learning. The experience of the Christian community is the material with which the theologian works. Theology is reflection on the revelation of God in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ as apprehended by the Christian community. This means that the ongoing theological activity of the Church is the task of the parish minister as well as that of the teacher of theology. The local parish church is that event wherein men and women are led to view their lives in the light of Jesus Christ to the end that they might more faithfully do his will in the world. Only as the minister sets himself to this demanding task will the Church begin to move through crisis to promise.

# Good Managers of God's Gifts

CLAUDE R. COLLINS

This invitation was accepted with mixed feelings of appreciation and misgiving. Since I recall that speaking to my peers in student days was a disquieting experience, you will understand that the nature of this occasion hardly improves one's self-confidence. I think a fellow minister was correct in surmising that the word of the Lord, which was addressed to Jeremiah's lament, might also be pertinent to other situations: "If you have raced with men on foot, and they have wearied you, how will you compete with horses? And if in a safe land you fall down, how will you do in the jungle of the Jordan?" But ministry is not a matter of mutual charity, but of common service, to which each contributes his particular gift. Since my current position is administrative rather than pastoral in nature, there are many persons who keep me humble. Among these is Saint Paul who, in detailing the various gifts of ministry, places administration in seventh place in the list of eight. Being number seven, I understand, means that one must try even harder than number two. Therefore, with some personal hesitancy but with no apology, I respond to the opportunity to speak my own word on ministry.

I should like for you to remember that in the planning of programs, as in the creation of dramatic productions, serious errors in casting may occur. For thirty years I have been a preacher; for thirty seconds, or scarcely more, I have been a lecturer. I trust you will be tolerant if I should unconsciously forsake an unaccustomed role in favor of the more familiar. In fact, it is likely I shall need this indulgence. Apart from some exhortation I find it difficult to express my convictions about ministry in this day.

It has been suggested that my presentation should be partly retrospective and partly prospective, and I hope this instruction may be honored in the process, although the primary focus is on the present. Historians have reminded us that in those periods when the past flows as a continuous stream into the present, there is a sense of

---

Dr. Collins is Conference Program Director, West Virginia Conference, The United Methodist Church. This is the Eleventh Annual Alumni Lecture in the Divinity School Convocation and North Carolina Pastors' School, October 27, 1970.

security. But in an age of discontinuity the immediate past may be unusable as instruction for the present or clue to the future. Then one may reinterpret for his own purpose what has gone before, or turn to "the creative possibility of the moment."<sup>1</sup> We may be less than certain that the immediate past informs the present tasks and needs of ministry. Yet our reliance is not in some recent yesterday, but in the faith that God is the author of history, and at work in history. Man's ministry, "the creative possibility of the moment," is always a participation in God's ministry and activity in the world.

I want to speak of ministry not as the private preserve of the ordained clergy but as the work of the people of God. It is the calling of the whole church. I wish the word "reverend" as used of the clergy, as well as the word "laity" with its usual connotations, might be banished from the language. Either word conjures up distinctions between persons who belong to the same fellowship and whose differences are only functional, not intrinsic. All have received God's grace; all in turn are ministers of that grace. There are many forms of ministry, but no qualitative distinctions of persons as ministers, no differing degrees of obligation, no double standards of conduct. Ministry is entrusted to the whole body of believers, the people of God.

At some perilous moment in the life of the early church, the Christians scattered throughout Asia Minor received a letter of encouragement, known to us as the First Letter of Peter. It includes this counsel: "Each one, as a good manager of God's different gifts, must use for the good of others the special gift he has received from God."<sup>2</sup> The words were addressed to those being severely tested for their faith. They were exhorted to fulfill their ministry in the expectation that the end of all things was near. Centuries later the instruction is still timely, lest there be the end of vital faith and meaningful living. To be in ministry is to manage well God's gifts, or as alternately translated, to be "good stewards, dispensing the grace of God in its varied forms."<sup>3</sup>

In a day when we strive for language which is contemporary this word "grace" might not survive if there were some adequate

1. Martin E. Marty, *The Search for a Usable Future* (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), p. 12.

2. *Good News for Modern Man: the New Testament in Today's English Version* (American Bible Society, 1966).

3. *The New English Bible—New Testament* (Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, 1961). All quotations are from this translation except as otherwise noted.

substitute. It is unique and expressive of all that lies at the heart of the faith. It sums up the whole activity of God: the favor He shows to man though there is no way man may deserve it, the particular gifts He grants which man is to use, even the thankfulness which man shows in return. To be in ministry is to manage wisely the particular gift of grace which one has received. But grace is more than the sum of its gifts. God's grace and His love are one. Proficiency in the management of abilities does not guarantee competence in the ways of humane concern. Most needed today is the stewardship of the gift of God's love, received gratefully, managed faithfully (if one may so speak of it), shared fully. The most effective tools are not mere skills, but attitudes. More important even than what we are able to do is what we are willing to do and whether we care. What one does with a particular ability determines the effectiveness of his ministry; what one does with the gift of love determines whether there is ministry at all. I should like to state what I believe to be the most needful of His gifts and the most urgent requirements of ministry in our given time and place.

## I

He who would minister must have the grace to accept. He accepts as neighbor the one whom God has chosen to be his neighbor, on his doorstep or anywhere within the orbit of his living. He accepts as brother the one who by his acceptance of God's love has become a member of the fellowship of faith.

There should be no occasion to speak this word. Nothing is more explicit in Christian teaching than the unity of all who become new beings in Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female. James warned his brothers against partiality toward persons of wealth and status. The faith was saved from a sectarian fate when Simon Peter came to understand that God shows no discrimination, but accepts all who believe in Him, and therefore he may not refuse to accept. Many have not yet come to understand this. The apostle declared to the Gentiles that once there was a wall of enmity between Jew and Gentile, but now God through Christ has abolished it. It is a scandal that so diligently we rebuild what God so mercifully has broken down.

Nothing more seriously challenges the integrity of the church than racial division and distrust. That which is affirmed in gospel is denied in practice. The barriers of separation fall quite as reluctantly within the community of faith as in the whole of society. Justice

may be secured by law. No law can change the spirit which keeps men strangers. In the church, as in society, there is a festering, malignant racism. It is essential that we recognize this for what it is.

There is in human nature an inclination to reinterpret the commandments of faith in more palatable terms, to reduce them to a "manageable legalism,"<sup>4</sup> so that one may know the limits of his obligation. Thus the lawyer inquires: "Just who is my neighbor?" By way of parable, Jesus posed a substitute question: "When have you shown neighbor love?" Had he defined the neighbor in precise terms, some fertile mind in five minutes might propose a dozen exceptions to the rule. Through self-righteous eyes no man appears righteous. Judged by standards of our own devising, no man is our neighbor.

Perhaps this is the way we want it. Quite naively one may assume he has been generous in making some concession to equality. This is to mistake arrogance for generosity. How may one be generous with that which is not his to give? The test of equality is not permission, but freedom, to order one's own life. Wherever anyone may exercise his right to move within his society, to share its opportunities, participate in its institutional life, live where he elects, there is justice. But to be human all men need more than justice. They have a need to belong, a need of community which is something more than the fellowship of the excluded. Man needs acceptance.

Blasphemy consists not in simple acts of injustice, but in the profaning of what God has valued, in the defacing of what He has honored, in the thwarting of what He has purposed. There is something of infinite loss and loneliness in the desecration of "only" things: that the only life one has is hedged about with frustration, that the only hope one has is futile, that the only chance one has to be what he was made to be is forfeit, that the only dream which fires one's spirit is a thing of no consequence, that the only prospect of being fully human is a wild illusion. The ultimate obscenity is that of inflicted inhumanity. It attends every human encounter where there is the unwillingness to accept.

This is no simple social matter, but a theological one. Our inability to accept others may be only the reverse side of our inability to accept ourselves. Paul Tillich has made much of the idea of acceptance, central to the whole Protestant doctrine of justification by grace through faith. The better term for justification, he states, is ac-

---

4. J. Jackson Forstman, *Christian Faith and the Church* (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1965), p. 148.

ceptance.<sup>5</sup> By God's grace, and through faith which also is His gift, we are accepted even though by every standard of achievement and measurement we are unacceptable. We try so desperately to earn what is simply given. What we would prefer to buy is not for sale. There are no self-made men. Our pretended goodness is shabby; our deeds are useless; self-appraisal of our best efforts leaves us in despair. Our bonds are broken only by that voice which speaks through our futility: "You are accepted. Accept the fact that you are accepted."<sup>6</sup>

This is lethal to human pride. If somehow one may be self-made, he then may make demands upon others as condition of approval. But he who has been freely accepted, not because he qualifies but in spite of the fact that he does not, can never refuse to accept another person. Or, to put it more positively, when one is rescued from the necessity of justifying himself, he is free to love others. When he is liberated from self-righteousness, he has no need to despise the unrighteous. He who has been lifted out of his own self-contempt into a proper self-esteem knows also how to love the neighbor as himself.

Upon this issue of our fundamental humanity, what we feel and what we practice, rests the integrity of the ministry of the people of God. There is no credible witness of faith except as one takes seriously its central affirmations and requirements. There is yet no way to love God and reject the neighbor. Father Hesburgh reminded us again only a few days ago that in the granting of elemental justice in human rights, time is rapidly running out. A black caucus reminds us that time is running out too in terms of attitudes and relationships: "No, we're not polarized, not with you. The church just doesn't matter that much any more. But remember—that is the way you chose it to be." To be sure, in matters of attitude, it is always as we choose it. Things are what we want them to be. The usable present, within our grasp, may be one of those decisive, climactic moments of time, following which the whole order of our existence may be radically altered. It may be a time for a new creation, or for final rejection and despair. To minister is to manage well that which is given and entrusted. It is to accept our acceptance, and to accept others.

---

5. Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology* (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), Volume III, pp. 224-225.

6. Paul Tillich, *The Shaking of the Foundations* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948), pp. 153ff.

## II

Ministry requires the grace to listen.

A stranger walked unannounced into my living room, so quietly I did not hear him enter. Startled by his sudden presence, rankled by the ease with which the privacy of my home could be invaded, I hardly heard his request for assistance, but invited him out. Often I wished I might have back my words, for I remembered his so vividly: "All right, maybe I'm wrong, but if you really believe what you pretend, at least you ought to listen."

Jesus came preaching, said Mark. From the record, we may conclude he also came listening. His world did not differ greatly from ours, humanly speaking. It was a world of the poor and the rich, the "ins" and the "outs," a world torn by sharp polarities of thought and feeling. There was an establishment of religion which touched in no adequate way the real world where so many lived in wistfulness and desperation. But he listened to them, and this is the reason they listened, and "heard him gladly." To hear is not always to agree, but it is to know and understand. It is the capacity to listen which makes another vulnerable to love and hope.

Listening, as Bonhoeffer reminds us, is the heart of ministry. Persons search for an attentive ear, but Christians usually cannot listen since they are so busy talking. "But he who can no longer listen to his brother will soon be no longer listening to God either; he will be doing nothing but prattle in the presence of God too."<sup>7</sup> This he spoke of the Christian brotherhood, but it is true also of the Christian and his world. So much advice is given to unfortunate people. If half the time were spent in listening, we might conclude that the disenchanted have some reason and the rebellious some cause, that some whose morality we question have been more responsible stewards of their paltry chances than we. Listening might teach us that the poor are not just "them people." We might discover that those of different life-styles are sometimes persons of uncommon sensitivity and extraordinary need.

I do not pretend to understand much that is a part of the world of youth today. Some of its music still threatens me; much of its language escapes me. That is *my* problem. Even less can I understand the deadly fascination with drugs on the part of so many. "Why do you do it?" seems to me a reasonable question. The artless answer, "I like it," seems to me an inadequate response. Or, "there's not much

---

7. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Life Together*, translated by John W. Doberstein (New York: Harper and Row, 1954), pp. 97-98.

else to do," sounds scarcely more credible. I do not understand why so many flee responsibility, are indifferent to danger and disdainful of life. That is my problem too, and that of all of us. For in the making of that strange world we all in some unwitting way have played our part. In search of answers which heal, we had best listen.

We have reason to listen to the young for our own sake. Multitudes of them who have not surrendered their sense of responsibility, and who have not resorted to violence, are yet dissenters. Many are within our churches. We ought to listen. Even with a cautious ear, it is better to listen than to spurn. Our severest critics may prove to be our best hope. With candor they remind us we may be more committed to our own traditions than to the commandments of faith. We talk about freedom, but for some we must defer it. We speak of love, but draw circles around our compassion. We believe in brotherhood, but wage war in far off places and barricade ourselves against the neighbor at home. We favor equality, but not the *person* who is equal. Values which are verbal exercises, virtues which are divorced from life, are specious. There is a credibility gap. Loud and clear they say that faith which is not practiced is faith denied. When they are willing to practice it, as often is the case, there can be no argument. Perhaps they serve as agents of what Tillich has called "reverse prophethism," a criticism on the part of society of the "holy injustice" and the "saintly inhumanity" of the church.<sup>8</sup>

We need to listen to the world, for listening is a unique kind of proclamation. There is a sickness in our land which affirms that the way to disagree is to impugn, and the way to deal with dissent is to ridicule. Where divisive words only widen the fractures of our corporate life, the capacity to listen, to hear, might in some degree re-unite us. There is everything to lose by invective; there can be only gain in listening.

Whatever the climate of society, the business of the church is not to chide the world, but to love it; to listen to the world, not to scold it because it does not listen. Meeting the world on its own ground has never meant accepting the world on its own terms. There is a time to speak and a time to listen. The greatest encouragement is to be heard; the ultimate indignity is not to be taken seriously. Clarence Jordan has translated a passage familiar to us all: "God was in Christ, hugging the world to himself."<sup>9</sup> Proclamation is a matter

8. Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, Volume III, p. 214.

9. Clarence Jordan, *The Cotton Patch Version of Paul's Epistles* (New York: Association Press, 1968), p. 81.

not alone of words, but of attitude; not alone of declaring, but of caring. Whoever would minister in this day must have the gift of listening.

### III

Ministry requires the grace to serve. However obvious this sounds, it needs to be restated. Ministry is synonymous with service. It is hard for the church to be rid of the idea that it exists to be served. What is consciously disavowed is unconsciously demonstrated. Consider the usual laments: Why can't we get people interested in the church? What project can we use to enlist participation? How can we give everyone in the church a job to do? This inversion of faith and purpose is our sickness. The servant is not above his master, and the church is not above her lord. "The Son of man did not come to be served, but to serve."

When he washed the feet of his disciples, he performed not the act of a domestic servant, but of a total slave, with no reward, no privilege, no choice. It is even suggested that this act was normally reserved for non-Jewish slaves. By this voluntary service, he did for his disciples that which by custom they did not even owe to him. Thus he revealed the requisite spirit for servanthood. "Whoever wants to be great must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be the willing slave of all."

The church today must be able to distinguish between reality and its shadow, true servanthood and the patronizing gesture, humble attention to needs and pious words. To be a minister, Colin Morris has said, is to be "humanely useful."<sup>10</sup> The test of every effort is whether it nurtures the faith and hope of persons, and engages in any effective way the forces which demean their lives. The servant, to quote Roger Hazelton, "is one who has achieved a competence in caring. . . . He has learned to make others' good his own. His life, again and again, is bent into the shape of someone else's need."<sup>11</sup> As style is so integral that it cannot be put on and taken off as a garment, so the essential life-style of servanthood is not a pose, but the faithful expression of an interior commitment.

What does it mean to enact the role of "humane usefulness," of "competence in caring"? The setting of servanthood is the place of need: where the neighbor's freedom is abridged, his person slandered, his want ignored, wherever he is made more of a thing and less of

10. Colin Morris, *Include Me Out!* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968), p. 14.

11. Roger Hazelton, *Christ and Ourselves, a Clue to Christian Life Today* (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), pp. 99-100.

a man. Here the servant listens, lifts, encourages, gives, speaks, and contends. On occasion there may be no helpful role available but that of a courageous advocate. But he does not desert nor deny. The shape of his ministry is that of another's need.

One of the words which suggests this ministry is "power." This word alarms people, for it conjures up suggestions of violence and disorder. This is the reason it is controversial, that it does lie at the very center of the human scene. This is what life is about—the capacity to endure, the right to belong, the freedom to be. This is power, and in its possession or loss, its abuse or sharing, are bound together the destinies of people. The fact of power is a political reality; the distribution and humane use of power are religious matters. "If I had my way," said a professor and churchman, "I would have each church each day ask how they might empower each person to become what he was created to be."

In a time of unreasoned violence and anonymous intimidation, it may not seem politic to speak of power, particularly in terms of those who do not have it and who militantly seek some share of it. To defer and demur may seem a wiser course. But it is a responsible insight to know that it is precisely at this moment and in this climate that the decisive word and act of the servant are in order: where the issue of power is unresolved, where its use is questionable, where the powerlessness of persons is yet an unredressed wrong. In whatever climate, matters of justice, freedom, and opportunity are not academic to the humane mind nor marginal to the Christian faith. The temper of the times may obscure the issues, but they will not go away. Human hurts are healed neither by bitter invective nor pious pronouncement, but by the competent care of those who have been empowered to become children of God and commissioned to be servants of their neighbors.

Is true servanthood a possibility for the whole church? Can institutional forms be flexible enough to take shape around new purposes and needs? How are servants to take seriously their servanthood? How may a pastor shake free of housekeeping trivia to confront himself and his people with the world that is around them? How may the administrator assure that the system is the servant, not the master, of persons? Can the church itself, with its company of committed, but also its half-hearted, find its true identity and assume its true vocation? Some think not. I do not agree, but all that one may say with certainty is that the church is entrusted with ministry.

This means, I think, the local congregation. Some of the most vital

ministries are those which churches make possible and support, but in which they are not directly involved. Some of these demonstrate the kind of commitment which ought to be the norm of servanthood. But primarily it is in the local scene which the church inhabits that the ministry of Christ must be re-enacted and shared. Only where a people are united in common faith and worship, commitment to study and discovery, true community in Christ, will they come to see what they must do to be God's people in their given time and place. This is the intent at least of the restructuring process in which we are engaged, to free and enable the congregation to discover and pursue its calling. What degree of structure is essential to a responsible connectionalism, and what will be the shape of it, remains to be seen. But it also remains to be seen whether the church in its local setting will exercise its freedom to serve others, or its license to serve itself. To be free for mission is not necessarily to "do one's own thing." Jesus did not seek to do his own will, but that of His Father. To His own he said: "You did not choose me: I chose you." As in the search for our own identity we must accept our acceptance, so in servanthood, to use Hazelton's phrase, we "choose our chosenness."<sup>12</sup> It is that simple, and that risky.

#### IV

To write these words, and to deliver them, has been difficult, for in some measure they are critical words. They are voiced in the belief that our first duty to ourselves is to be neither critical nor uncritical, but truthful. I have stated what I believe to be the requirements of faithfulness in our time. For me, this has been something of a personal pilgrimage, a rethinking of my own commitment and need. I have no right to speak these things as one who has achieved, but as one who is convinced of the way we must go.

The prevailing winds of change and dissent threaten to rend the fabric of our fellowship. Because we all deplore division and want only to heal it, we may mistakenly refuse to admit to the forum of the church the ills and the issues which much of mankind cannot escape. Fellowship cannot be preserved at the price of integrity. We need to remember that Christian community is not our creation which we must preserve. It is God's creation in which we may participate. He who made it is able to keep it. If we strive not for safety but obedience, we may confidently leave the history of our ministry in our day in the hands of the God of history.

---

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 117-118.

# Address to Duke Divinity School Alumni Association

ROBERT E. CUSHMAN

## I

I wish to add my own word of warm welcome to that of our presiding President McKay Brabham. Year by year I have been heartened by our gathering together on this occasion, and also by many reunions with alumni in Annual Conference sessions far and wide. We are glad that you like to return here to the place where memory builds bridges and where we hope we may have something still to offer you for recapturing earlier vision and renewing commitment for ministry in the mid-course of a vocation that often finds us battle-weary. We hope that, in renewing fellowship of kindred minds, we all may experience refreshment of spirit and a sense of commonality with our fellows that will help to brace us for the tomorrows that are, as the saying is, so daily.

In this matter, I am reminded of the opening lines of Dante's *Divine Comedy*:

"In the midway of this our mortal life,  
I found me in a gloomy wood, astray  
Gone from the path direct. . . ."

The way, for Dante, was through hell to paradise, which also is a parable of our humanity; but, if we can recover "the path direct," it may be, in some part, by recurrent resort to the sources of our pristine aspiration. If so, it may be that our foregatherings as school and alumni will aid us somewhat to keep the pilgrim way. It may be that, for some such reasons, you return. It is my wish and prayer that we shall always be worthy to receive you.

This annual Convocation and Pastors' School unites in a single endeavor the Divinity School and the two North Carolina Conferences in what is now a long established and notable partnership in continuing education for ministry. It is an added boon that, in this same context, we also enjoy each year the reassembly of our alumni.

---

This address was given at the Annual Luncheon of the Alumni Association at the Divinity School Convocation and North Carolina Pastors' School, October 27, 1970.

The importance of this ingathering of alumni to the School can go unnoticed unless it is adequately realized that it is precisely in its alumni—as they fulfill their ministry, individually and collectively—that the School makes good its own reason for being and finds its own fulfillment. Let us be honest, without you and your ministry in Christ's name, we cannot, as a School of Divinity, attain our purpose.

While the School must be faithful in its stewardship of sacred learning—to use an archaic phrase—no learning is truly sacred that does not issue in the service of God. Unless St. Paul's judgment be in error, you are “ambassadors of Christ,” and it is ever the task of the School to assist successive generations of recruits for embassy to put their credentials in working order. In so far as you alumni discharge your embassies in the service of Christ and his Church, in so far forth and only so far, can the School find cause to rejoice in a true realization of its reason for being.

Emerson may have been right about the rhodora hidden in the woods, namely, that “beauty is its own excuse for being”; but this is not the case with the Christian message. Its justification is not just being but being recapitulated in life; and that is ministry. If I may state the matter negatively for clarification, the Divinity School does not fulfill its mandated purpose simply by being a center of learning or a collegium of scholars proficient in theological disciplines. On the contrary, it searches, propounds, and conserves Christian truth for the *doing* of it on pain of being a childless enterprise.

This doing the truth is mission; and mission begins here in the seminary. Indeed, the School is on mission. The School participates, by mandate and intention, in the same mission that its alumni go forth to discharge. The mission within the school, although distinctive in nature, is continuous with the mission that alumni advance in other contexts, “where cross the crowded ways of life.” By its very nature, therefore, a theological seminary—and this includes a University Divinity School—can never be discontinuous but always in-serverably united with the mission of Christ, of which—along with the rest of the Body of Christ—it is a servant.

## II

This principle of inherent continuity and mutuality between the seminary and the church has been fundamental to my own service to theological education at Duke over twenty-five years, first as teacher and then as dean. In twenty-eight years of professional involvement in seminary education, I have never heard a cogent refutation of

this viewpoint. I have, however, seen it ignored and obstructed from both sides, from the side of the Church and from that of the seminary.

I have seen it obstructed by anti-intellectualistic churchmen suspicious of the academy and depreciatory or indifferent toward informed and discriminating theological understanding. In the face of this kind of alienation, my first eight years in the deanship were often enlisted to the end of restoration of mutuality and understanding—not merely in the context of North Carolina Methodism, but, through the avenues of the Department of the Ministry and the Association of Methodist Theological Schools, across the Church.

On the other side of the line, there is sometimes manifested a tendency to myopic preoccupation of the theological academy with its own objectives—sometimes in supercilious unconcern or snide critique of the practicing church. It may succumb to the lure of introverted loyalties or grow complacent with “doing theology” on analogy with what John Ruskin rightly called the pathetic fallacy, “art for art’s sake.” Where these counter positions flourish, we are confronted, not with mutuality of mission between the church and the seminary, but a destructive climate of alienation which is, plainly, a scandalous obstacle to the Lordship of Christ within his own household.

For myself, I was long ago persuaded, by direct observation of theological seminaries and reflection upon their variety, that any theological school divorced from the living Church—whether the seminary be styled interdenominational, non-denominational, or just a university divinity school—tends to be a “cut flower” without rootage, answerable mainly to itself, and always prone to beam its cloistered wisdom at the practicing church, as it were, from the posture of abstracted, if not Olympian-like, detachment. If, from the perspective of the Church, such messages seem less than relevant for mission, it may be in part because such a school, or such schoolmen, shrink from the rigors of committed partnership with the practicing church in the inescapable and frustrating ambiguities of *being* the Church in the world.

While these tendencies may have regrettable exempla among theological faculties, yet it also remains true, as I have recurrently said in previous years and former contexts, that the distinctive vocation of the seminary is two-fold or bi-directional, not to say amphibious. In some real sense, therefore, the theological seminary, if it is faithful to its mandate—the mandate of Christ—must assert its mutuality with the Church, but with a measure of reserve. It must

reserve the role—which is really the role of all the servants of Christ—to subject, as Karl Barth rightly claimed, the life and preaching of the practicing church in a given era to the norms and standards of the Gospel. It is, indeed, the business of the seminary in every age to recover the essential Gospel from the overlay of cobwebs, dust, and accretion incident to the continual acculturation of the Church to the World.

### III

Theological education can be wholesomely productive of its aims only when this constellation of co-implicative factors attains some measure of equilibrium in the arrangement of priorities in any given school. To achieve this balance is as surely a constant imperative as it is also beset with endless risk. The equilibrium is always precarious. Barely attained for a time, it may shortly become unstable and threaten the measure of mutuality between seminary and church that may have briefly prevailed; for the equilibrium is inherently unstable and the threat to its imbalance is endemic and constant. This is especially true of the university divinity school.

In these observations I am, quite plainly, giving to you, the alumni, as much of an account of my stewardship as dean as is conveyed by a forthright exposure of the controlling rationale under which it has been my high privilege to exercise leadership of the School through these years. Moreover, I am pressing upon your consideration the simple but, I believe, all-important viewpoint that the Divinity School *is* continuous with the Church and that it is a particular form of the Church in the World, and a particular form of the total mission of the Church to the world.

Yet it remains true that, like the general Church in the world, it is faced with a perennial *challenge* and also a perennial and ineluctable *temptation*: a) The perennial challenge of the seminary, and especially of the university divinity school, is to equip itself and fulfill its distinctive task within the university world at a level of competence equal to the best of its sister disciplines within that world. b) The perennial temptation of the divinity school is, in principle, not unlike that of the Church in its world: This is, wittingly or unwittingly, to accommodate to the surrounding culture, to secularize its goals, feed upon itself, and, at length, to exchange Christian mission for a complacent self-maintenance or settle for the liturgy of sacred learning in the absence of sacred doing; it is to lose the sense of

mission and message and become largely domesticated in academic empire building.

Liability to this temptation is omnipresent for any seminary. This is why it is wholesome always for this school to reaffirm—upon such an occasion as this reunion—that the Divinity School is finally justified by what its alumni are achieving in message and mission. Moreover, it is much the same with the other professional schools—with the Medical School, with Law, or with Forestry. With them, also, learning is, at last, for doing. Yet the impelling mandate of the Divinity School is different; it is in fact unique within the university, for it shares its distinguishing mandate in partnership with the living Church, while it also fulfills its mandate in company with the University.

This is the amphibious life of the university divinity school. From it, there is no escape; there is only the peril of specious compromise in one or the other of two directions: in over-identification with the academy, on the one side, or in unreserved subservience to the ecclesiastical establishment on the other. Neither way is valid, and either will surely shipwreck theological education.

#### IV

To bring these remarks to conclusion, then, one of the sure consequences of this perspective is its inescapable corollary. It is this, that the Church and the University—in so far and for so long as the University means to support a Divinity School—are partners, necessarily, in the enterprise of ministerial education. This is inevitable but only so long as the University is aware of and acknowledges, therewith, its own Christian commitment. In so far as this commitment becomes obscured, dwindles, or becomes equivocal, forthwith the theological seminary must—if it survives at all—be altered into an academy for the sciences of religion. In this secularized era, this is always an over-arching possibility; and, while you and I sleep, this could happen at Duke and may now be in process. The historic precedents for this drift of things are visible on every side among university divinity schools of this country and have been for over a century. The forces of dissolution are not absent here, and only time will tell whether the staying of the tide in recent years was an interlude or a durable enhancement of continuing mutuality between the University and the Church.

In any case, one of the immensely gratifying aspects of my own experience as dean has been the renewed and heightened collabora-

tion between the University and the Church in these years despite, at times, the hesitancy of both and, especially of late, the intemperate and even subversive dissent of some students together with some faculty toward such collaboration.

How be it, if you as alumni have noted during recent years some modest advances of the school in caliber of instruction, in faculty contributions to scholarship, in special programs of research and publication, library enrichment and expansion, faculty salaries comparable to the best theological schools of the nation, enlarged resources for student financial aid, a more nationalized student clientele, and the near-completed capital development effort of the Divinity School, then you should understand the following: It is that, in large part, the cause *sine qua non* of these things and others has been an era of renewed collaboration between The United Methodist Church and the University through the avenue of the Divinity School.

Here, one must mention the Southeastern Jurisdictional Fund for Ministerial Education, inaugurated in 1960, as well as enlarged income deriving from World Service through the Department of the Ministry. The Jurisdictional Fund has been largely responsible for the capital expansion program of the Divinity School over this decade. It is, of course, the predecessor of Jurisdictional Funds elsewhere and supplied the essential pattern for the national Methodist Fund for Ministerial Education inaugurated only this past January. This latter program, adopted by the General Conference of 1968, places The United Methodist Church in the forefront of Protestant communions of this country in support of ministerial nurture, education, and continuing education. Along with its sister institutions, the Divinity School of Duke University has been and is crucially benefited by these resources from the Church.

And so, I say to you quite soberly—and with a range of knowledge of University finance extending over many years—that, without these developments, the Divinity School could not possibly have advanced in the above mentioned ways to its present position of real, if modest, leadership in theological education in this country. It was plain in 1958 and in the succeeding decade that the University—in the light of competitive internal interests and counterclaimants upon its limited resources—simply could not alone underwrite the cost of up-grading theological education at Duke. In an era of unprecedented governmental and industrial grants and subsidies to the natural and social sciences, to medicine and its supporting pre-clinical disciplines, the Divinity School, by contrast, or any seminary,

could not hope to compete for institutional advancement in remoteness from its counter-part. The United Methodist Church, whose ministerial supply it greatly supported. Thus, where collaboration was, in principle, inherent theologically, it was also, in these times, indispensable practically.

The Church must necessarily be grateful to the University that for years—from 1926 to 1950—the latter absorbed virtually the whole cost of theological education with the help of the Duke Endowment. It was, furthermore, an unexampled generosity that, until 1964, no tuition charge was made to candidates for Divinity School degrees. But by 1958 the time had come when either the University would have to retrench or new funds would be required for maintenance of the existing program, quite apart from any considerations of its enrichment. And, while the Southeastern Jurisdictional Fund was being mounted and tuition instituted, it is true that the University continued to make the Divinity School recipient of proportionate increases available from enlarging income from endowment. Thus, while the record of the University toward the Divinity School has been one of fairness and generosity, its capability in terms of rising costs lagged behind the urgencies laid upon it.

Had it not, therefore, been a fact that, during the sixties, approximately two-fifths, or 40% of operational expenses annually derived from Church sources, the achievements of the past decade would, I believe, have been conspicuously narrowed. And, in the province of capital expansion, they would have gotten nowhere in simple dependency upon the Fifth Decade Development Program. Of the nearly three million dollars funded for capital development of the Divinity School since 1959, no more than \$275,000.00 has till now derived to the building program of the Divinity School from University sources. When, therefore, Foundation grants are deducted, approximately \$2,225,000.00 have, in fact, derived from the Church in varying forms and from the alumni. It is with these resources that present construction and final phase of the development program will be funded.

For this, very many persons and many individual churches are to be thanked; many colleagues, both far and near, in and out of professional theological education circles, are contributors. These include many laymen, college presidents, bishops—some active and some retired—former deans, such as our own Bishop Cannon, and our own wise and resourceful Assistant to the Dean for Development, Dr. Fletcher Nelson. And I cannot fail to mention with high

honor and respect two former Presidents of Duke University: Hollis Edens and Deryl Hart.

This address is far longer than I had intended at the start. My long enduring wife, Barbara, whom Herbert Herring used to call the "co-dean" has recurrently told me that I have lost my terminal facilities. It is almost true, I fear. I did wish, in the fashion of the day, to be accountable to you alumni on this occasion. I wanted you to know somewhat more about the rationale of my administration as dean—what I have at least tried to be about, and why.

As I have tried to indicate, it is not the *how* so much as the *why*. It is not the *what*, the magnitude of accomplishment—great or small—that counts but the underlying purpose, in the business of education, as in life generally. It is the aim and the vision that justifies or nothing does; for we are men, both mortal and finite; and, in this life, the only thing for which we really must accept final responsibility is our own motivation. At this juncture, I am still impenitent respecting the propriety of seeking an enlarging collaboration and mutuality between theological education at Duke and The United Methodist Church, for I understand no theological education, in this or any other seminary, which is not inherently and necessarily continuous with the message and mission of Jesus Christ, of which both the School and the Church are emissaries and natural allies. I thank you for your willingness to hear this report. I thank you for your past support of the school; I pray that it will be vital and unflagging in the future.

# One Perspective: The Misery and Majesty of Ministry

RICHARD W. CAIN

## I—NOW

Bishop Otto Dibelius, a man by training, action and stance qualified to speak to all who seek to be ministers of Jesus Christ in a changing and changeable era, was challenged on the style of his autobiography. His reply to his critics is, "What I have tried to describe is not a life but a ministry." Taking this as a cue, may I suggest that what I hope to do is to provide some hints about one church, the present conditions, hopes and future as one minister in one congregation sees them at this time. Long ago I learned that one must live by practical absolutes—at this time, experience, ideas, and faith indicate: this I do, but tomorrow it may change. Without this understanding it would be presumptuous for me even to be here, and most of all to spend your time speaking to you. But if in the mistakes and failures, insights and blindness of one you can see some possibilities for you, then this time can be worthwhile for us.

I see *a church in its ministry at times miserable but always hoping for the majesty*. It is with a sense of urgency that I speak—not an urgency of despair or of fatalistic complacency or of anticipated doom, but the urgency of beginnings not the desperation of endings. It is a time in which there is much destruction and consequent fears but also remarkable constructions and prospects. Paul R. Clifford, the President of the Selly Oak College, said it best: "It is evident to the most casual observer that the Christian Church everywhere is facing a major crisis in adapting itself to the rapidly changing world of today. My conviction is that it has not an indefinite period of time in which to do it, but that decisions of crucial importance must be taken now. The danger is that much too little will be done, much too slowly and much too late."<sup>1</sup> That is a good harbinger of the *now* for a congrega-

---

Dr. Richard W. Cain, Minister of the First United Methodist Church, Phoenix, Arizona, was the Frank S. Hickman Lecturer in the 1970 Divinity School Convocation and Pastors' School at Duke University. His two addresses are printed here.

1. *Now Is the Time* (London: Collins, 1970).

tion of the United Methodist Church that I know well and I think for the denomination that I do indeed love.

In that congregation and I think in many other congregations there is an immediate and always dominant antithesis that is manifest in however and whenever the congregation is. It is an antithesis that is easily catalogued and illustrated.

- a. There is awareness and unawareness of this one world and with it the multiplicity of worlds developing, encroaching and determining life for all else.
- b. Priorities on one hand declare that it must be determined by a God-World-Church order; other spokesmen for priorities in decision-making insist tenaciously that it must be a God-Church-World procedure. (And there are countless hours of debate in that change of order.)
- c. In every discussion and action there are those who appeal to the inner life and performance of the church and at the same time those who persistently insist that the church must be entirely outer in its functions and concerns.
- d. When an effort is made to determine just what is the church, a group vociferously demands that the church be open to and be seen in every act that speaks to or works for the good of man as understood through Jesus Christ. The opposition demands with equal fervor that the church be seen in a comparatively narrow and easily defined institutional scene.
- e. The pleas that we are to *serve* the world are balanced by those who say that the only function of the church is to be responsible *for* the world.
- f. At any moment you can mount an earnest, if not enlightening, but certainly violent dialogue on whether the old forms or the new are adequate, permitted or even desirable in the public and stated worship of the congregation.

Any effort at newness and freshness will be seen as an attack on the order, beauty and viability of the service of worship. If you act in the hope of deepening the tradition and the continuity of the acts of worship, you will hear a wail that "these throttling acts of history are crushing the surge of the human spirit." That's a quote from a parishioner.

- g. To the demands that we listen to dissident and even violent protests and protesting groups, comes the conclusive commitment that the church must be part of the agencies of society

that holds fast to absolute principles and time honored ways and above *all* must support all efforts to maintain law and order, reason and caution, and thus orderly protection of the established way.

- h. There is an impatient demand for structural freedom without restrictions so that the spirit may speak and newness may be sought and sampled. Equally important if not demanding is the urging that a structure be provided for systematic growth and seeking but always within "tried and true" means and institutions.
- i. The church for one group must be directly, actively and vigorously in every political discussion and decision in order to rightly serve the God who incarnated himself in the world he created. For another sizeable portion of the church, there is the affirmation that the church be aloof from the arena in which absolute decisions are not possible and in which compromise is the very art of achieving in politics. The Lutheran and Pauline doctrine of the two orders and shield are at war with the Bonhoefferian and Coxian "Men Come of Age" spawned ideas of the responsibility and mission of the church, with the congregation as the battlefield. And too often the real issues that can destroy man are totally unaffected by the church because of the exhaustion this warfare creates among Christians.
- j. For many the church (and or the faith) is a condition to which one must submit; for increasing numbers of others it is the experience that one has and then defines and perhaps joins.

Have I catalogued enough, so that what I find in one congregation, you can see indications of in your congregation? The condition we face is crucial if not desperate, as dangerous as it is demanding, and as frightening as it is hopeful.

The polarization that this has brought, is now established in the church and churches. If not new, at least it is now clearly the dominant part of the weakening and the cause of the indecision and inaction that can seize the church at one of the most auspicious moments of recent history. The resultant condition of the church can be so disastrous as to nullify any effort to be the church by anyone's standards, ecclesiology or common sense. Would you like an example as an indication? Like many of you, I consider the morning prayers as a "prime" in the liturgy of the morning service. It demands a great

deal of thought and not a small amount of preparation and sometimes agony to be reasonably honest when one dares to pray in the congregation. I have noticed in the congregation a repeatable condition: when prayers are offered in traditional or contemporary language for the President, Vice President, Governor and all in authority, there is a rustling indication of an obvious irritant factor for some, and at times an audible Amen in obvious support for the officers by others; when prayers are offered for peace even in the most general language, but particularly in the case of specific pleas for peace in denoted areas, there is a wave of antagonism and resultant comment from some, and a genuine overwhelming acceptance by others. Prayer and prayers have many resultants and effects, more than I know, but one that should not be present is the polarization of a congregation so that they are divided before the Maker of all and thus somewhat alienated from each other.

This polarization is the background of the struggles over budget, program ideas and even discussions concerning the life of the church. The tensions produce an aura of conflict and alienation that taxes even as it excites and, after sustained periods, produces a lethargy and inhibition that is severely limiting the church at the moment when it is in the midst of its most important struggle of a century. Persons of the church have gone from difference over basic questions and approaches to rigid commitments and prior judgments that, if not crystal clear, are crystallized. You want to know why the institution is suffering in about every category that you enumerate—attendance, finances, witness, mission, credibility, morality, future—it is here. For many it has been too rapid in its search and performance of ministry in this changing age and for almost as many it has been too slow in achieving what they see to be God's will in Christ for the now.

This state of the church is reflected in its moment of identification—the morning service and the sermon. Surely by this time there has been laid aside the idea that the primary function of the gathering of the faithful is to be as a service station stop for the week: that is, that the worship is expected solely to provide the refreshment and the nourishment for the particular group of Christians. The liturgy itself and the witness of the clergy and informed laity have been almost unanimous that the worship is for God first and then and then only for man. I would think that most of the regular attendants of the congregation in which I worship would agree intellectually that the service is a time of work, struggle, growth, but many do not *feel* that this is the case. They intellectually affirm that worship is to be the work

of God's people, at times hard and demanding, and always requiring the maximum of attention, participation and involvement as well as an openness of mind and heart to the profoundest of change. There is also alongside and at times dominant a hankering for the quiet, the so-called mystical, the comforting and the reactionary. None of these ought to be absent from the total worship life of the congregation, but none ought to be the prototype or the end product of the gathering of the congregation for its action before God on the Lord's Day. This confusion about worship results in those who would seek in liturgy to restore the aura of the past, compulsively sticking to the ways, music, words, feelings of the past. Then there are others who would insist that the worship should rally around and be built upon the general concepts of what is labeled as "celebration." The extreme examples focus attention upon man and his "coming of age" or supposition of this desired state; the service, replete with banner, color, excitement, noise, high emotion, uniqueness, with its preoccupation on and with and for man, projects a deist God if there is God at all. There is a danger of ignoring the whole transcendental element without which man soon becomes an exile with no direction to go and no real means of evaluation or judgment about what men of faith are in worship. Nothing enumerated in the celebration listing is wrong and all should be present as part of worship, but it must have a more broadly based conceptualization and setting or its glitter soon becomes mere setting for a performance. Obviously the elements that are dear and clear to each set of parishioners and worshippers are needed in the whole, but the polarization, the rigid commitments and the basic self-centeredness, and thus rejection of the others, prohibit all but the most cautious of experiments and operate to demand a rather low common denominator in the worship life of many congregations. The confusion and at times rejection seriously hamper and harm the "gathering of the faithful."

Every preacher that I know, has, as part of his alarm equipment, the warning of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, "Much of preaching is so dull because it does not really matter." The first qualification of a vital sermon, then, is a subject that matters. Every preacher strives to be certain that he is not dull by constantly seeking the matters that are before and defining the lives of those with whom he lives and works in the congregation. Even here we experience the polarization and the barriers that this brings. No preacher alive can be a preacher and not respond to the longings and even the pathetic cries that beat in from the younger generation in their music, their attachments

and their honesty. Even if we be of the generations that find their music at best questionable and their loyalties at times unfathomable, we must—if we would preach—hear and then speak. I recall the utter puzzlement that I felt when so many of the younger generation spoke of the musical “Hair” with appreciation if not exaltation. The universal acceptance and embracement of this production was a problem of no small portent for me. I reacted as most of you did and thus would not hear. It took careful presentation and not a little patience for me to tolerate much more listen to that folk rock celebration. I am still embarrassed and repulsed by a great deal in it and in the music. But I also see the spiritual dilemma and the plea that is being attested to by much that is there. After seeing the production and listening to the record it became clear to me that here was a subject that mattered and a setting that was not dull: more importantly, a condition that must not be ignored by any preacher. For *that* sermon that emerged from this conclusion, the lesson before the sermon was sung by an able and sweet young lady accompanied by her husband. She sang:

Where do I go	Follow the river
Where do I go	Follow the gulls
Where is the something	Where is the someone
That tells me why	I live and die
Where do I go	Follow the children
Where do I go	Follow their smiles
Is there an answer	In their sweet faces
That tells me why	I live and die
Follow the wind song	Follow the thunder
Follow the lightning	In young lovers' eyes
Down to the gutter	Up to the glitter
Into the city	Where the truth lies
Where do I go	Follow my heartbeat
Where do I go	Follow my hand
Where will they lead me	And will I ever
Discover why	I live and die
Why do I live	Why do I die
Tell me where do I go	Tell me why
Tell me where	Tell me why
Tell me where	Tell me why. <sup>2</sup>

---

2. From the RCA Victor recording (LS01150) of “Hair,” by Gerome Ragni and James Rado.

The most reserved of an evangelical Christian, trained or not in pastoral care, recognizes this as a plea for the way of the Christian Gospel. At the conclusion of the lesson sung so beautifully the congregation was in a state every preacher desires—ready for anything. Then I told them where it was to be found—in the musical “Hair”—and the temperature rose 15 degrees and tears became frowns and openness became judgment and three persons walked out. For others there was an expectancy and a refreshing listening, an eagerness to hear that caused my knees to buckle and my confidence to pale. The misery of the frail instrument before such an awesome task! My reactions, however, are not the focus; the division and the polarization of the congregation are. You can reverse the process and the persons with their reactions by speaking as you must to the ruthlessness and inhumanity present in many campuses and in many demonstrations. Call for coherence and reason in these scenes, remind them of the responsibility to the whole, and the polarization is off and running again.

The polarization makes the task of the preacher and the impact of the sermon even more important. The tremendous issues with which it must deal and the striking blow that the Gospel brings is a tribute to what the sermon and thus the preacher can be and do. This state of the congregation and its members delineates the necessity of the sermon and the essentiality of the message in a way that is too clear for comfort. Where once the sermon could be considered to be a good thing, now it is imperative. It is refreshing and frightening to know what effect words can have and to realize what conditions these words need to address.

In St. Paul's Cathedral on August 3, 1970, I heard an excellent sermon “Are We Our Brother's Keeper?” directed to the Biblical message of accountability for our fellow men. In the course of the sermon, the preacher suggested the innate sinfulness of the British government's continued supply of military arms to South Africa. It was clear that the preacher was indicting the government of South Africa for its racial policies and activities and was condemning his own government for its sinfulness in aiding and abetting that government of repression. The sermon was powerful and surprising. During the sermon, I was suddenly aware of a group of young people offering *Amens* as though they were in a Methodist preaching service rather than a Service of Morning Prayer. About the same time, a parishioner with the stride of a Sandhurst graduate strode out of the service with his heels ringing on the pavement in the best of British military tradition. I was informed that he was an officer of the South African

Army trained in Great Britain. In the same service, parishioners were responding in the commitments that they held, diametrically opposed to each other, but supposedly united in Jesus Christ. For the preacher comes the awareness that the Gospel can divide and he can be the instrument for the division. Can he also be the means of reconciliation?

I could go on for some time delineating the many, many instances of the polarization that afflicts and affects us. We can deplore it; we can plead that the church must be the place where all points of view can meet and all be subject to the judgment and the insights of the Gospel and the Church as it applies the Gospel. But still we are faced with the fact that for many and most the idea of the comprehensiveness of the church or the allegiance that this implies for all of us, simply is not the case. And the results plague us as institutionalists and bother us as men.

Where does this leave the minister of a congregation caught in a plethora of feelings, anxious to preserve his integrity and his relationships with those with whom he is privileged to serve? Right in the middle and hurting! I remember reading John Coburn's excellent description of the Christian ministry and thinking that he was a bit overly dramatic in his title, "Minister—Man in the Middle." I reacted somewhat negatively to Joseph Sittler's Earle Lectures (and later book) at Berkeley when he indicated that the minister was suffering the result of being cut into so many pieces by so many. But then I became a pastor again and discovered that both men were speaking to my condition. This polarization and polarizing does put us at the very point of the most stringent tension and most demanding of actions. We are looked to for strength and guidance, if not active support, by each identifiable group. At times we are torn between our own consciences and integrity and our desire to serve and be a servant. In this welter of conflicts and demands, feelings and actions, it is no small wonder that we sometimes falter and many of us want to escape. It frightens us that we must serve in a process of beginning, as we are a product of an ending. The minister is at the very pinpoint of tension and turmoil and escape it he cannot and be a minister in and of the congregation. We are tempted to let Alfred Delp, the German commentator speak for us:

The churches because they are products of their own historical development have also become their own enemies. I believe that wherever we show ourselves unwilling to cease being what we have become, history in the making will in its judgment strike us like lightning. That goes for each individual church-going Christian as well as for the institutions and cus-

toms of the churches. Despite our orthodoxy and regularity we have reached a dead end.<sup>3</sup>

But this is not the answer. Rather it is precisely at this point of utter loneliness and very near the breaking point that it seems to me we begin to find the reason for our being and to be able not only to exercise our office but also to fulfill our ministry. The minister is at the pinpoint of tension because he is irrevocably connected with each group and with each person in all the fields of polarization. He is the minister of each of the mutually exclusive groups opposing each other in the church. He is at the matrix of what causes the polarization and he may be the enabler of the benefits of that tension. He does have, as his working resources, relationships with the country club and the establishment, with the *barrios* and the developing world, with the almost alienated and the hurt. He stands in communication with the elders who have built the past and the youth that are bringing in the future. The miserable condition in which the church finds itself is the moment to begin to lead it out and the minister is the person who can begin.

Michael Novak, an able Roman Catholic commentator, expresses a song of hope and indicates the work of the pastoral office in the local congregation in these words:

A time to build: we have a civilization to build. Now is the time to build. The point of life is, that it is a time to build. Man is a creator and it is his responsibility to fill and possess the earth. He has accomplished that first responsibility; the earth is or soon will be filled. But to possess the earth—to possess it in freedom, truth, justice, and love—that further task has yet to be accomplished. We seem to stand on the threshold of a new era of civilization. We have come out from a dark tunnel—the light, as Camus saw, is up ahead:

We are at the extremity now. At the end of this tunnel of darkness, however, there is inevitably a light, which we already divine and for which we have only to fight to insure its coming. All of us, among the ruins, are preparing a renaissance beyond the limits of nihilism. But few of us know it.<sup>4</sup>

Just change “civilization” to “church” and a part of what is meant by “man” to “minister” and you have the majesty of what it means to be a Christian minister now. With all due respect and support for the ministry of the whole people of God, it is apparent to me that the

---

3. Quoted from H. J. Schultz, *Conversion to the World* (London: SCM Press), p. 101. See also *The Prison Meditations of Father Alfred Delp*, edited by Thomas Merton (New York: Herder and Herder, 1963), p. 116.

4. *A Time to Build* (New York: Macmillan, 1967), p. 4.

specific task and responsibility of the ordained ministry is in leading us out of the dead end into that which we can increasingly commit ourselves to do.

The ordained ministry must by its life and style, by its commitment and its courage as well as skill, be indication and example of what the new church (which is to say the church) is and is to be. In the performance and living of our ministry, the minister must suggest what the ministry of God's people is called to be and the means by which it is to be done: not to establish a new clericalism or a new monolithic institution, but to show what the ministry of Jesus Christ, in this world of change, polarity and debasement, truly is or can be. Our privilege becomes our responsibility, for the church has given us the means to demonstrate and, frankly, the protection to do it in a way that is denied to many of the people of God. There is another aspect and source of hope that needs consideration here.

The polarization and all the attendant evils and weaknesses for which it is the symbol seem to center in the lack of or incomplete understanding of what the church is. History, which is supposed to help us, becomes part of the building block in working out our history today. Alan Richardson in his *History, Sacred and Profane* wrote, "Each generation interprets what has been said and done in the past in the light of its own presuppositions concerning man and the world." As the minister teaches, preaches, indicates what the presuppositions of the Christian can and will be; as he enables a congregation to grapple with and discover just who and what they are, then the lesser loyalties that so easily divide us will give way to the discovery of the loyalty that we affirm but must now incarnate, even the Lordship of Jesus the Christ. And to do this for our day and in our way is our task.

Somewhere there must be done the strenuous work, intellectually and pragmatically, that will do for our day what St. Augustine did for his. We must have a new meaning of the Church, a new vision of what the Church is and how it is to be, and what this means in the whole economy of God. This must be done so that all the rest of us can understand and appreciate as we go about our ministry in our congregations, in one world. It seems to me it will be a furthering of the concepts of the Church by which we have arrived at this day—but considerably more open to how God and his Church are erupting in the world of man and his works. It will free us from the boundaries that have ruled us out (or some of us) from the happenings and the struggles of the world; it will provide the means by which communica-

tion can leap across the barriers that prohibit the news of God being proclaimed or seen; it will aid the continual renewing of men as we understand He intended in and did through Jesus Christ. The whole new theologizing about and in the church will bring us a new doctrine of the church that makes sense, incorporates history and lets the church be open to history *now*.

And I think it will be in a parish and by a parish man. With all respect to school men and with an abiding debt to their continual contribution to all of us—it must be hammered out in the immediate and recognizable gathering of a cross-section of believers that is a congregation. It may be a congregation far different than any now existing or it may come in the renaissance of one as set and staid as any you and I serve. But in a parish it will be. This is why I think you and I can continue to serve in the bewildering complexities and frustrations that are our job and ministry. This is why we can continue to do the maintenance and the housekeeping that are involved in the institutional life; it is the reason we can go about the mundane but ever pregnant tasks of teaching, preaching, listening, serving, pastoral care that make up the round of duties that is the life of the parish minister. It is in the parish that we see into our problems and it is there that we will get out of them. It is here that God has led us and it is there that he will find us to lead us out to wherever it is that we are to go. Far from seeing the church even in its most miserable condition or the ministry in its most straightened experience as the beginning of the end, I see it as the matrix point of all the beginnings. It is no accident that we were called to this office and responsibility: God called us here and He will lead us out.

Luther's words are a reminder to me every time I dare to publicly lead the congregation in worship. I've put them on the door so that each time I am slipping on my robe these words are the prayer I dare to utter.

#### LUTHER'S PRAYER:

O Lord God, dear Father in heaven, I am indeed unworthy of the office and ministry in which I am to make known Thy glory and nurture and to serve this congregation. But since Thou hast appointed me to be a pastor and teacher, and the people are in need of the teachings and the instructions, O be Thou my helper and let Thy holy angels attend me. Then if Thou art pleased to accomplish anything through me, to Thy glory and not to mine or to the praise of men, grant me, out of Thy pure grace and mercy, a right understanding of Thy Word and that I may, also, diligently perform it. O Lord Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, Thou Shepherd

and Bishop of our souls, send Thy Holy Spirit that He may work with me, yea, that He may work in me to will and to do through Thy divine strength according to Thy good pleasure. Amen.

They help me; perhaps they will help you in overcoming the misery and knowing the majesty that is the Christian ministry in these days.

## II—THE JUST AHEAD

It is going to be an ecumenical era. The ministry that is just ahead will not and cannot be ever again the denominational jungle in which we must now operate. This is so regardless of the concerns of involved people, the delaying tactics of some who are in authority and the outright opposition of some of the bishops of the church. No ministry that has an immediate heritage of the last fifty years stretching from Lausanne and its first skittish Faith and Order Conference to the issuance of a plan for the uniting of the Church of Christ Uniting can be anything other than ecumenical in formulation and action. It is a ministry that has to deal with the tasteless presentation of the trauma and agony of the Roman priesthood in October 1970 *Esquire* and see it not as an advantage to seize but an agony of brothers to share. The whole ethos of the contemporary ministry that is beginning to appear, is one of honest awareness of the ecumenical dimension of every facet, every decision and each performance of mission and ministry in this world. It is as ministers in Christ's Holy Church that we stand in congregations to which we are appointed and must administer for a denomination. It is ecumenical.

In the present environment, "ecumenical" is equated with organic union and it certainly doesn't skirt this issue. But surely we cannot be bogged down in the endless tracks of institutional dilemmas in seeking the meaning and use of the ecumenical. Church unions occupy the initial thought and touch us most directly—this no one can deny—but they may be far from being the most important item in a consideration of the ministry we have to perform and be in the immediate now. The fears and uncertainties of organic union must not inhibit us in the functioning as ministers in this ecumenical age. It may be that organic union has been bypassed in the surge of mission and ministry and can safely be left to be "mopped up" when the church has more time in which to do this sort of housekeeping. I recognize that this is heresy in the most entrenched of ecumenical circles, but those persons rarely invade the world of the parish ministry in the performance of its work. However, before developing

these leading thoughts more concretely, let us take a good look at the immediate union program as some see it and as the spectre that others perceive.

Opponents of the ecumenical era and particularly the denominational triumphalists in the United Methodist Church have wildly rejoiced in the setbacks that ecumenicity, as they define it, has suffered in recent union votes. The unseemly joy of those who interpreted the recent votes in the Convocations of York and Canterbury, with regard to the Anglican-Methodist reunion, as a clear victory for the denominations may have been shouted too quickly and too stridently. What a dreary and bleary picture these presented as they rejoiced. Closer observation shows a clear majority of both churches had voted to unite. What sort of strange and perverse sense of brotherhood and mission is presented when a small minority can block the clear wishes of a vast majority? What sort of witness does and did it make to see Christians refute what a majority clearly wished and will do? It is the sort of delay and reactionary stance that inevitably speeds that which it would stop. The recent actions of the anti-merger forces in Great Britain aided the inevitable union. The vote itself would not mean an inevitable victory; the unholy rejoicing and exuberance about it do. And I refer to actions and feelings on both sides of the Atlantic by Methodist-now-and-forever spokesmen. The irony of it all: each church's chief leader immediately announced the commitment to joint action and their growing togetherness regardless of the legal delay of union. You can't undo what the majority wants and has already undertaken. If those in opposition to this projected union had been wise they would have been discreet in the expression of their feelings; as it is, they insured that the next vote will bring the beginning of the new Church of England. And this has implications for your ministry and mine.

A United Methodist missionary, the Rev. Dr. Richard Taylor of India, wrote in his recent public letter in this vein.

"Last month the Central Conference of our Methodist Church in Southern Asia voted *not* to go into the Church of North India—at least not at this time. It is being inaugurated next month. This means that the new church will be only half the size it would have been. This was something of a shift for us Methodists because earlier all of the annual conferences had voted for the union—by a total of over two-thirds in favor. None of the reasons for not entering the union now are theological. There had been forty years of discussion preceding this union—mostly theological, mostly missionary led. Some of the Methodist arguments against union here sounded—alack!—like clear echoes of anti-union arguments spread

widely by a few bishops and other Methodist leaders in the States. Whatever the merit of these arguments there, here, we are convinced, they have none. Perhaps the only problem solved by church union is that of church unity. But in North India, where Christians are in a tiny minority, that is a major problem."

This without question is a polemical and prejudicial statement. It is filled with the frustration of one who has given (church union) a major portion of his life to achieve what seems to him an absolute necessity for the mission of the church in India. For this minister the union of the churches in North India was not an exercise in the ecumenical gamesmanship of the day but a matter of utmost importance for those who were entrusted with the proclamation and extension of the Gospel. I don't know whether it is or not. There is no secret where my own sympathies would lie, but I'm certain I don't know what ought to be done in India—I don't even know in Arizona or in one parish. But I do know for any of us to rejoice on the basis that this is the prevention of one more union or, even more despicably, that this insures retention of a favorite province of mother church, is the worst sort of ecclesiasticism. The very worst was the reaction of a number of a Finance Commission who announced, "Too bad, I thought it might lower apportionments for world service if we got rid of India." The delay of the entry of the United Methodist Church in India is important to the parish in which each of us woks. We need to know what this means with reference to the people who are there and the mission that they have to do.

Let's turn to a more immediate if not more exciting matter in the whole union-ecumenical panorama.

### To Begin Anew

#### We

The African Methodist Episcopal Church,  
 The African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church,  
 The Christian Church (Disciples of Christ),  
 The Christian Methodist Episcopal Church,  
 The Episcopal Church,  
 The Presbyterian Church in the U.S.,  
 The United Church of Christ,  
 The United Methodist Church,  
 The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

---

A company of the people of God celebrating the one God,  
 Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,  
 moving toward his coming Kingdom  
 and seeking in faithfulness to  
 unite under the Gospel for Christ's mission and service in the world,  
 open ourselves individually and corporately  
 to renewal from the Holy Spirit,  
 struggle against racism, poverty, environmental blight,  
 war, and other problems of the family of man,  
 minister to the deep yearning of the human spirit for fullness of life,  
 provide for the common use of the resources and gifts  
 of many traditions,  
 in a church  
 catholic, evangelical, and reformed,  
 do covenant together in this  
 Plan of Union  
 for  
 The Church of Christ Uniting  
 (C.C.U)<sup>1</sup>

This is an elegant expression of a miracle yet to be completed. The very fact of a published plan which has *some* agreement by *some* people in *some* of the churches is ephemeral but nevertheless miraculous. All of the shaggy humor about it and the deprecation that some show toward the plan will not stop the effect it will have in your parish and mine. Its ideas and above all its discussions will substantially affect, if not alter, much that makes up the everyday agenda of the ministry you and I are privileged to perform. The discussions, even if denied much money or ignored in the hopes that they will go away, will be held and the results will seep into every parish. The possibilities are too exciting and much of the COCU plan makes too much sense for the thoughtful portion of the church to ignore. A good number may wish that the whole thing might just be forgotten or shelved in some minor committee on the late afternoon agenda, but it will not be.

Before I go any further, let me make it clear that if the plan were ready for voting in the next Annual Conference or even the next General Conference and I were present, I would vote a rousing NO. There is much that is wrong from this pastor's standpoint. There is not

---

<sup>1</sup> *A Plan of Union for the Church of Christ Uniting* (Princeton: Consultation on Church Union, 1970), p. 9.

enough of the Methodist witness nor of our discoveries of faith in action in it. It is too cumbersome to be workable in structure. It is too idealistic in its statement of government and too naive in its assessment of the political situation in which the church must work. *BUT* it is a remarkable beginning document for those who are aware of what the church is struggling to become. It is the means by which we can discover what the church ought to be doing as an institution and as a means to get at the whole task for which the church exists. It is the means by which vast numbers will work together to bring into being the church that can be the Church. It is the means by which vast fissures in the body of Christ can be healed. It is the means by which in countless local situations, new structures will erupt that will get on with the task of being the church in that place regardless of what happens on the district or national level.

It is the means by which much that will change in our way of ministry will come about. Let me list a few of the ideas and thus the facts with which you and I must cope. COCU has intensified the need for defense of denominationalism on every level. Where once you and I had to defend any ecumenical loyalty and involvement, it is now the denomination that must be defended. At least this is what I'm discovering with respect to younger and I think more insightful Christians. The younger members of the parish I serve want to know why so much time is spent in the denominational labyrinth when there is so much to be done on the ecumenical level. COCU seems one way to get at a solution of the problem. Just mark it down: you are going to have to defend being in and being loyal to a denomination. The honest presentation of the whole people of God as the ministry and the assurance that this will be the case in every level and at every point in the life of the proposed Church of Christ Uniting will quickly force us rapidly to change our clericalized church government and concept of the ministry in the United Methodist Church.

COCU and its consequent discussions and discoveries will finally force the United Methodist Church to say what it means and what it does with respect to the episcopacy rather than what it enshrines on paper. COCU will draw us into an investigation and consideration of the ramifications of connectionalism long overdue and long needed. And, finally, we must have a doctrine of the Church that makes some sense in theological disputation as well as in the teaching of a confirmation class. COCU will drive us to search until we can present one that is worthy of Methodist Christians. Regardless of what happens with this Plan or any other that comes from the Consultation

and/or its successor, there will be profound changes as a result of our involvement for all the ministers currently in the ministry of our church. Let me sum it up: from COCU will come a union or unions that will affect the United Methodist Church. I think that we will be directly involved, but this is less clear. There is a Methodist bishop that I can throw into a frenzy by declaring, "You won't die as a Methodist bishop"—his reply, "Let me die first." That won't be necessary, but I'm certain that his obituary will show that he began as a Methodist bishop but ended as a bishop of a United Church.

As important as Union and unions are, these are not the most important items on the agenda of any ministry including ours. The task we have as ministers in the whole realm of the life, teachings and mission of the church is. Here in every place the cause of mission is sending us into combined work that simply will not wait for legitimatizing organization and structure. The *ad hoc* and admittedly less permanent and less efficient means of church government and mission are here. If one must choose between working for and in union and going ahead with tasks and mission, then by all means choose the mission. To plagiarize—union and organization will follow mission and action.

### *Roman Catholics and Our Ministry*

It still seems somewhat esoteric to say that the Roman Catholics have something determinative to do with our ministry. But they certainly do. For instance, I am convinced that in less than a decade we will be free to commune at their Holy Tables and probably they at ours. Does this seem outlandish? Only remember how it was ten years ago with our Roman Catholic brethren. It was an adventure to have a meal with anyone other than a former classmate in Holy Roman orders. You were tempting fate to go to a neighboring Jesuit institution and use the library. It was a topic of chilling excitement to discuss attendance at a service of the Mass. And if one of them came to one of our services, you didn't know whether to fumigate or call the bishop for absolution. Now, bishops and other prelates of each gather to discuss seriously the similarities and differences of our communions. I regularly am in conversation with the Roman Catholic bishop of my city. I spend much more time with him talking about the ministry of the church I serve than I do with my own bishop. There isn't a week without a call from a Roman couple that for some reason or other cannot be married or served in some way by their church because of some time lags in their rules and regulations. Their priest

has suggested that they should come to the local Methodist parish because we will serve them, and he indicates that thus *the Church* will be involved. Bishop McCarthy will be the preacher at the Thanksgiving Service at First Church. Some months ago he called asking if the 75th Anniversary service of the largest hospital (Roman) St. Joseph's could be held in First United Methodist Church. Increasingly, Methodists are confessing that they feel more comfortable in discussion and action with Roman Catholics than many ministers and members of more historically related bodies. There are all sorts of reasons for this friendliness and ability to unite in mission enterprises. Enough to say that it is so. With the renewed contacts and appreciation will inevitably come the deepening worship and sacramental observances. There are numerous trial balloons dealing with Protestant orders and sacraments, all pointing toward the inevitable acceptance and common use of the facilities of each by all. If it still seems strange, just recount what has happened since Vatican II. How much more we hoped would be in the scheme of the church. The pondering we gave to the meaning of ecclesiastical communities. The appeal to the separated brethren seemed vaguely patronizing. We read with intense concern the statement on the Jews and the regulations for worship and prayer. It seemed so little for the cause of unity. And yet in a very short time, the practices and actions had far outstretched the legal statements and orderly decisions of a Vatican Council.

In the "just ahead" we will be as certain to plan and proceed with our ministry in all phases after consultation with the local Roman Catholics as we now are with neighboring Methodists. Our resources and friendships in and with that church will eventually blot out 400 years of separation, alienation, hostility and loss. It will be a long time before we can contemplate union and it should be, but tasks we will do together. Let us rejoice that there are so many others with whom we join in order to get our job done.

### *Our Ministry in the Just Ahead*

It will be a day of specialization and much more intensive training than any we know today. This is indicated in a list of demands made by the Conference of Theological Students in Great Britain.

1. We should live among those whom we are being educated to serve.
2. Our education should be fully ecumenical.
3. Our education should be associated with the continuing education of ministers and lay training, and should take place in study, action and seminar teams.

4. Our education should take advantage of existing institutions of higher training.
5. Besides a permanent staff, there should be access to persons with specialist knowledge.
6. Theology should be built up in the study of cultures and society.
7. Our education should be in integrated practical courses.
8. Our education must be geared towards specialist ministries.
9. We must be made aware of new techniques.
10. We must develop forms of worship that are worthy of the people of God.
11. Our education must be under constant evaluation and revision.
12. Authority and responsibility must be in the hands of both students and staff.<sup>2</sup>

This is the sort of training that will enable our ministry to function as it must. The renaissance concept of the minister as complete unto himself is all but gone. Not one of us can keep abreast of all the information we need in education and be as well read and reasonably alert in the field of social action as it relates to our ministry. Certainly a man who would interpret from the pulpit in this highly technologized, mobile and articulate society must give almost full time to that task. One can only unsuccessfully attempt to utilize all the resources that are continually available to the pastoral counselor today. The standard of the one minister in the *one* congregation is tottering to its demise. The people do not want to be served exclusively by an all-around general practitioner. Their needs are too great in the performance of their ministry and the management of their lives. It is a hard blow to many of our egos, but it nevertheless is the case. We will of necessity be increasingly a specialist in the ministry of equipping and serving all the saints. It is going to take some fundamental changes in many of the personality make-ups of many of us, but we will work as teams of ministers rather than master of one.

It is one of the myths that the Protestant minister has been absolved of political responsibilities and stays clear of political involvement. We have kept our actions secret and played games insuring that we made our pitch and got our way as much of the time as possible. We have dealt in all sorts of veiled ways, but politically we have been involved! The topics that occupied us might have been limited until recently, but we were in there pitching for our side. The recent spate of political candidates who are in holy orders is but the beginning of the pace. School boards and local commissions are no longer the acceptable limits of the direct political involvements

---

2. Paul R. Clifford, *Now Is the Time* (London: Collins, 1970), p. 131.

of the clergy. We cannot run the risk of being called a shyster in our preaching on social and political issues by not being willing to be subjected to the direct political process. A warning needs to be sounded here: we need always to see our major role in the political field as aiding, helping, and supporting the rest of the ministry (i.e., the laity). However, we must not be negligent of our citizenship and responsibilities by automatically ruling ourselves out of the political arena because we are clergymen. To a large extent the questions of morals, ethics and personal involvement will be erupting and demanding witness and answers in the political fields. Here we will be increasingly active with all the promise and all the detrimental effects of such a stance and position. And I mean as parish men.

### *The Cathedral Concept*

One of the most interesting churches to visit and study in the British Isles is the new Coventry Cathedral. Here is a church and a clergy that literally understands its duty to be a supportive agency and auxiliary to other parishes and ministries in that city. It performs for other parishes in ways that individual parishes cannot do. An additional note—all cathedrals in England now are required to have clergy available for service to the whole, and not merely related to diocesan duties nor restricted to the religious acts and duties traditionally assigned to the cathedral. This renewing development has much to say for much of our ministry.

The team ministry will but reflect the new definition and structure of the congregation. With 90% of our population slated to be in urban and urbanized areas, it is no longer reasonable to assume that each parish will try to maintain the multifaceted program that is associated with being a church today. There is a need for many specialized and diverse ministries. Each worshipper and each Christian family must have a multitude of services each adequate to the demands. This mitigates against a congregation in each place trying to fulfill the total structure and programmatic responsibility. More and more churches must be banded together and in their mingling, assigned limited but highly specialized responsibilities to discharge. The cathedral concept and the special congregational functions will be the pattern of our ministries. The luxury of the individual parish served by the sole clergyman is a reflection of our agricultural era and hardly possible or desirable for the age that is already here. As nostalgic as we all can be and as desirous as some may make such a phenomenon—it just will not be in any generalized fashion.

*Preaching*

Every Monday I fervently hope that preaching will pass out of the minister's responsibility list—that the sermon is to be soon an outdated form of address and use. But I doubt if my pathetic hope of Monday will be so. The need for the eternal Word to have an immediate and continuing personality to speak to other persons will not be gone in the "just ahead." An old man wrote about as succinctly as anyone has on the meaning of the sermon and the challenge of the sermon.

I have always regarded the sermon as a vehicle for pastoral care. It should reach the members of the congregation in their daily duties and needs. That is why it has to be practical. For the parish pastor, the substance of his sermon is constantly supplied by his daily work of pastoral counseling. The pastor who has no parish has to search further for a subject. But no sermon should be without pastoral impact on daily life. During the sermon the listener should form resolutions. "He who does not have a God to thread his needle, does not have a God to give him salvation either," wrote Elise Averdieck in her old age. That is the spirit in which a sermon should be preached.

My principle regarding a sermon has always been quite simple and straightforward. When the wife comes home and her husband asks her (or the other way round, as the case may be): "What did he say?" she should be able to reply quite definitely: "He said this." Perhaps the text was so simple that she can repeat it. That is good. Perhaps the preacher gave an illustration or told a story which she can relate in her turn. That is also good. And it is also helpful if the pastor organizes his sermon under clear headings and recapitulates those headings toward the end. Then the listener can give an account of it, both to himself and to others. And what is remembered may bear fruit.<sup>3</sup>

Today the immediate task of the preacher is to find ways to get theological insight and commitment so that persons can commit themselves and serve in the whole realm of ecological thinking. Just these facts as a starter: in Arizona DDT residue in milk is above the level that is permitted in interstate shipments. The air of Phoenix—a desert area and hardly yet fully industrialized—is among the worst ten urban areas of the country. All 23 major interstate water systems in the USA are polluted. Noise pollution is near the limits that man can endure without permanent ear damage in many cities. Each person in the USA is using the equivalent of 100 times the caloric content necessary to sustain life, and it is increasing at a 15% rate each year. What a scant five years ago was the province of a few con-

---

<sup>3</sup> Otto Dibelius, *In the Service of the Lord* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 84.

ervation buffs is now a major theological if not survival question for the people that we serve. How to effectively translate so that a position of faith can aid in the solution of the programs of the moment is the task of the preacher *now*. How to preach the eternal Word that is present in the ecological facts? And this is but the beginning of the preacher's task in the technological age. How to prepare to preserve our humanity in this age that increasingly is putting us into cages, removing us from human contact, responsibility, stimulation and sensitivity? How to preserve man's relationship with his God, when that God declares that without the human relationship being righted, the human-divine encounter cannot take place? In this age when man can by remoteness destroy, maim and harm his fellow man and because of the remoteness be oblivious of what he does, how does one enable every man to be his brother's keeper? How to break through the mask of anonymity that bombing from the air gives some who have bombed and can talk about the beauty of the exploding bomb as it wreaks its havoc below, never thinking of the havoc and the hurt that is created below by the actions of man upon his fellow men? Where once it was the preacher's task to help in the person-to-person contact, it is now to preserve that person-to-person relationship even though they be miles away from other. How to insure that man knows that he is still his brother's keeper, even if the cord of connection may be the horror of the intercontinental ballistic missile? Yes we will have to preach in the "just ahead."

I have just begun to trace the excitement and predicament of the ministry and the Church of this ecumenical age. But we can do it and we can serve and rejoice in the Lord who came to save (help) in the past, the present and the "just ahead." And serve we will!

---

NEW POSSIBILITIES AND NEW QUESTIONS IN MEDICINE  
AND ETHICS

*Ethics and the New Medicine.* Harmon L. Smith. Abingdon. 1970. 174 pp.  
Paper. \$2.79.

*Ethics and the New Medicine* is a very instructive and thought-provoking book. It offers a handy summary of some of the most important facts and arguments concerning the medical, legal and religious aspects of a number of significant issues (e.g., abortion, artificial insemination, eugenic manipulation, organ transplants, and euthanasia). It presents a line of reasoning and some judgments on these issues which will be of great interest to anyone who cares about the art of Christian ethics in the contemporary world. The book has a special significance because it has emerged from several years of sustained interdisciplinary dialogue involving theologians, scientists, physicians, and lawyers. It therefore deserves a wide audience—and this reviewer knows of no better value, penny for page, in the exciting field of medical ethics. Churchmen of all theological persuasions should be grateful to Harmon Smith for bringing together such a wealth of material and organizing it so clearly, and anyone associated with Duke Divinity School can well be proud that the author of this book is a member of its faculty.

The reviewer who is not learned in the fields of medicine and law is in no position to comment on the adequacy of the treatment accorded to these subjects; he must assume the accuracy of these portions of each chapter and be thankful to the author for beginning his discussion of each issue by outlining the medical and legal facts of the matter. What is of particular interest to the readers of this journal is the approach to Christian ethics exemplified here and the answers obtained thereby. In focusing on the questions raised by the author's ethical style, we are being faithful to his main concern in writing the book, namely, to make Christians more reflective concerning the presuppositions and the methodology of moral choice, and more aware of the implications of alternative choices on the issues under discussion.

*Ethics and the New Medicine* is actually a collection of four separate essays, so there is no complete or concentrated development of the particular theological perspective which informs the argument on each topic. But a number of salient points are clear:

1. The treatment of each problem reminds us that responsible ethical analysis must begin with solid knowledge of the actualities and the technical possibilities of the subject at hand. That legal considerations are also included in the book's analysis of the "Is" reminds us, further, that ethical reflection is incomplete unless and until it has taken into account the laws which determine to such a large extent the feasibility of implementing whatever normative positions are reached. The fact that the book was written only after its author had engaged in long term conversation with the men who are most closely acquainted with the technical and legal aspects of the matter under examination serves as a valuable model for the proper exercise of Christian studies in our day.

2. The historical teachings of the church (or of some of its leading spokesmen) are taken very seriously. The theological section of each chapter in-

cludes an informative summary of the relevant ideas of Roman Catholic moral theology and of certain well known contemporary Protestant thinkers (notably Barth, Bonhoeffer, Thielicke, Ramsey and Fletcher). Smith's exposition of these pronouncements and his critique of them comprise one of the most interesting features of his book for the student of Christian ethics, although some of the historical arguments will strike many modern readers as too ridiculous to merit the attention required to refute them.

3. Smith's position seems to offer a middle path between the legalism of traditional Catholic thought and Protestant neo-scholasticism, on the one hand, and, on the other, what Smith regards as the excessively Promethean utilitarianism of radical situationists such as Joseph Fletcher. He rightly rejects the covert determinism of the view that "nature's way is God's way" and that anything perceived as "unnatural" is wrong, and he rightly denounces the hypocritical sophistry of the "double effect" argument often used by conservative moral theologians. Thus he dismisses the negative judgment on organ transplantation rendered by theologians who condemn "self-mutilation" regardless of its purpose. On the other hand, he is very appreciative of the traditionalist's fear of *hubris* and anarchy, and he wants very much to find rationally definable and defensible *rules* to guide the behavior of even the best-intentioned men.

One of the fascinating aspects of this volume, then, is the illustrative material it offers for a comparison of three different styles of Christian ethics. In making these comparisons, it would certainly be unfair to maintain that Smith's "personalistic rule-agapism" is consciously hard-hearted in its assumptions and its conclusions. The author's approach is based on the conviction that the hard-headedness (i.e., clear-mindedness and objectivity) of traditional moral theology protects the Christian ethicist from errors of reasoning which turn out to be destructive of human well being. But that is precisely the query raised in the situation ethics debate: Can God's will for man (understood as life-affirming and joy-promoting in a this-worldly sense) best be discerned and secured by a fairly scholastic rule-agapism, or by the more flexible summary rule-agapism of situation ethics?<sup>1</sup>

The main issue at stake in one's choice of an ethical style is this: how can human life be protected, supported and fulfilled, and how can the *agape* which seeks this goal be nurtured and expressed? Scholasticism, still under the sway of a theological view which pictures God as a rather jealous patriarch who wills a certain amount of bewilderment and pain for the spiritual edification of his rebellious subjects, prescribes a host of rather inflexible rules designed to uphold the majesty of God and promote the true creaturely well being of sinful man. If this sometimes results in severe limitations of the freedom and this-worldly fulfillment of countless men and women, well, that's just the way the cosmic cookie crumbles.

The personalistic rule-agapism of Harmon Smith is quite an improvement on the old morality, for it does make *consequences to persons* a decisively important variable in ethical choice. But his definition of what is really good for man (and what persons ought to desire or be content with) still seems to be colored by a misplaced and disproportionate reverence for scholastic tradition—its substance, its methodology and even, at times, its pretentiously convoluted syntax—which causes him to hold back from the full implications of his person-centeredness. The fact that the relatively "hard" and impersonal disciplines of medicine and law are given due consideration in his thought, whereas the

---

<sup>1</sup> In his comments on his critics in *The Situation Ethics Debate*, Joseph Fletcher declares that his version of situationism is the same as summary rule-agapism (pp. 253-54).

“softer” and more personal disciplines of psychology and sociology are virtually ignored, confirms this impression.

Now, it may well be that the bold attempt of situation ethics to focus sharply on the welfare and fulfillment of the persons whose needs and desires will be affected in a particular network of situations is a mistake. Perhaps *rules* (not merely *summary* rules, which situation ethics interprets as guidelines or admonitions to careful thought with a historical dimension) are more necessary to and helpful for agapism than situationists allow. If so, the kind of middle path practiced by the author of *Ethics and the New Medicine* may be the wave of the future in Christian ethics.

But if the only function of moral principles and rules is to serve the good of persons, then a more direct focus on their expressed wishes and felt needs in concrete situations is the best way to discern and implement the will of a genuinely loving God. Christians will worry less about offending his dignity or breaking what earlier generations of Christians (actually, a handful of monkish scribblers) thought were his immutable laws than they will about furthering the humanly perceived fulfillment and—yes, let us dare to use the word so often avoided and maligned by theologians—the *happiness* of flesh-and-blood men and women.

Of course, situation ethics could be theologically and morally right on many issues, yet still be wrong pragmatically. In medical ethics, for example. Smith’s comparatively cautious conclusions on euthanasia and eugenic manipulation might turn out to be more realistic as a guide to policy because of *political* dangers scarcely alluded to in this book. Nevertheless, it is important not to confuse a course of action recommended for reasons of psychological or political prudence with a normative position arrived at because of spooky fears about generalized *hubris* or an irrational failure of nerve regarding the choice of a merciful death where it is the least of the evils available.

One final observation. The reader should not forget for a moment that the most pressing and humanly significant question concerning ethics and medicine is not addressed in this volume. That question, of course, is the one of economic justice. For every person who suffers because of not being able to obtain an abortion without an exhausting medical or legal hassle, or because of legal or moral hang-ups about voluntary euthanasia, or because of difficulties related to AID or an organ transplant, there are a dozen poor persons who suffer because of the scandalously high cost and limited supply of a medical care system that is run primarily for the profit and prestige of its practitioners rather than for the benefit of mankind.

To take note of this omission is not to rebuke the author (nor would it be a rebuke to him—although it might be to the publisher!—to note that this book on “the new medicine” omits discussion of what many analysts would call the most exciting and frightening possibility arising from medical research in recent years, viz., mind and mood manipulation through chemical, electric and surgical stimulation of the brain). Every writer must carve out a manageable task in the division of scholarly labor and do that task well when he is ready without waiting until he can cover everything in a single work. On this score, and in terms of the usual criteria of professional excellence, Harmon Smith deserves nothing but praise.

But noting the omissions and commenting on the special nature of the virtues of this book are important as a reminder to the reader that the intellectual—especially, perhaps, the religious intellectual—is constantly in danger of neglecting the weightier matters of the law of love because of distorted definitions of professional respectability and the attendant distortion of the psychological and pecuniary reward system in academic life. The problems of human freedom and

fulfillment that emerge as a result of new technologies are more fascinating than the old problems of justice, and historical scholarship is much easier to carry out than institutional or social reform. But the present distribution of energy in the profession of Christian ethics is out of balance—and unless more energy is devoted to the development of knowledge and skill in effective social change, freedom and fulfillment for the few will continue to be bought at the expense of injustice for the overwhelming majority of mankind. Thus a review which commends the excellence of a book that may tend to perpetuate the existing misallocation of professional priorities would be unfaithful to the ultimate values of the vocation of Christian ethics if it failed to call attention to this peril.

—HENRY B. CLARK, II

*The Christian and His Decisions: An Introduction to Christian Ethics.*  
Harmon L. Smith and Louis W. Hodges. Abingdon. 1969. 328 pp. \$7.95.

A great variety of materials went into the making of this book. It will accordingly be useful to a great variety of people.

Smith and Hodges are fundamentally concerned to display the major contemporary "ways Christians go about deciding" (p. 16), and some two-thirds of the book is devoted to excerpts from the writings of leading Protestant theologians of America and Europe who, over the past twenty years, have given to the phrase "Christian ethics" the ring of a discernible theological discipline. Most of the recent greats are here—Barth, Brunner, the Niebuhrs, Paul Ramsey, and a dozen others. They are here in relatively short selection, but it is a very good selection, potentially valuable to a broad readership.

The seminary student will find here several key articles in recent theology and ethics—Tillich on revelation, H. Richard Niebuhr on "The Center of Value," and Paul Ramsey on "Christian Love in Search of a Social Policy." The college student in undergraduate religion courses will probably find the first and last sections of the book more to his liking than the anthology in between. Here Smith and Hodges give an introductory overview of the general characteris-

tics of the Christian ethic, and at the end they write five chapters on specific decision-issues such as abortion, political dissent, and racism. It occurs to me that the Introduction, coupled with the reading of the selection from Alexander Miller ("The Ethics of Justification") would make an excellent beginning to any classroom discussion of what a non-Christian *should* object to if he means to object to ways Christians go about deciding. "To study Christian ethics is to ask what are the consequences for human behavior of the fact of God's love for man." I know some philosophy classes wherein that succinct summary of the genuine Christian article in ethics would serve as a correct target against which to fling other presuppositions about what can pass as "fact" in our world!

Both the undergraduate and many an adult church member, however, will probably find some of the latter five chapters of the book the most intriguing. The first title of the five—"Human Sexuality"—will guarantee that; but more important, these chapters give us examples of the ways in which the two author-editors go about their own deciding.

A predictable problem of such a book is the problem of its disunity. One example of themes that do bind the several sections together is the line that leads from Niebuhr's article, "The Center of Value," to Harmon Smith's interpretation of the human person in relational terms in his con-

cluding chapter on abortion. No variety of permissiveness or legalism is as helpful in discussing the abortion question as is Smith's principle that

"To be a human person is not a matter of *statically* being a certain kind of substance, but rather a matter of *becoming* personal through temporal duration." (p. 248)

Once this principle has freed us to see normative "humanity" in the total web of relationships into which an infant will or will not be born, the question of abortion has some "yes" and "no" answers that would seem to be both conformable to the varieties of human circumstances and the steady requirements of Christian love for the person. This essay, I believe, is a good example of the sort of ethical analysis that should be welcome to people who approach their thinking about ethics from the opposite direction presupposed by the ordering of materials in this book: that is, from the direction of a decision to be made. The abortion essay ably demonstrates that theories of human nature, even theories about God and ultimate reality, *do* make a difference in the practical business of deciding. Smith's approach here does what competent ethical analysis should do for two classes of readers: it deepens the ethical problem in the eyes of those who want to solve it too easily, and it narrows the difficulties for those who see only too many. For both it will keep open the options for deciding differently in different circumstances without surrendering the decision-maker to the grip of relativism. That is quite an achievement.

A book that seeks to combine so many sorts of material between two covers is bound to suffer from the defects of its virtues. One wonders how Bonhoeffer and Paul Lehmann were not permitted to speak for themselves in the mid-part of the volume. And

in these ecumenical times, one wishes that a Roman Catholic and a non-Western Christian writer had also made the grade. Further, for an introduction to Christian ethics, perhaps some way could have been found to have incorporated some varieties of literary expression not usually found among the "heavies" of recent Protestant theology. Alan Paton and Martin Luther King "did ethics" during the fifties and sixties; they were, for many, more accessible interpreters of the Christian way than were Tillich and Barth. Are the most authentic interpreters of Christian ethics those most adept at linear reasoning? To raise this question is to suggest what is for me the growing, formidable challenge facing Christian ethicists in the 1970's. Theological equipment will be utterly necessary for those Christians who cross the deserts of the growing secularity, pluralism, and disorder that affect the intellectual condition of our time; but the equipment will have to be spare, unpretentious, and (perhaps) embodied as much in images as in concepts. In this, a new generation of theologians may have to learn to "do ethics" in ways that combine occasional, systematic, and artistic modes of expression more deftly than many of the recent greats have been able to do. But this very ambition, let it be hastily added, we partly derive from reading their writings.

The really definitive test of excellence in any ethical writing will always be the fruit it bears in the ethical doing of those who read. Many who read this book will confirm its excellence, I suspect, precisely so. As a final note of personal indebtedness to authors Smith and Hodges, however, I must note that my reading of their book coincided with the writing of one of my own. Mine should be better for theirs. If not, it will be my own fault.

—Donald W. Shriver  
Associate Professor of Religion  
North Carolina State University

*A Theology of Christian Devotion: Its Role in the Modern Religion Setting.* Thor Hall. The Upper Room. 1969. 93 pp. \$1.25.

The key word in this little book, so filled with thoughts for further thinking, is "devotion." It is the last word in the title, and the first word in the headings of the three parts into which the book is divided. So a review had better start with the author's explanation of that word. Negatively, it is not "devotionalism," that contemporary child of religious traditionalism and personal pietism (vi). Devotion is "the mood and spirit of the Christian faith and life itself" (v). It is "the total framework of one's existence as a Christian: one's point of view, one's perspective, one's center and circumference, one's spirit and one's work" (ix). Moreover, devotion is "the root and the end of theology" (49). And that juxtaposition of words gives Thor Hall the title of his book.

Hall is not happy about the present status of devotion, especially when he measures it against the writings of Thomas à Kempis, Blaise Pascal, and John Bunyan. Yet he is encouraged by authors like C. S. Lewis, Elton Trueblood, and D. T. Niles. All is not slush, nor saccharin, nor sentimentality. He comes at the matter as a Christian Scholar: academically grounded, theologically oriented, and ecclesiastically concerned.

Part I: "Devotion—The Biblical Perspective" is a plea for a back-to-the-Bible movement (1-5), provided certain things are kept in mind: the two Biblical perspectives, as a phenomenon of history and as an instrument of revelation, resulting in the necessary wedding of Biblical criticism and "faithful" study (6-11). This union of scholarship and devotion hopefully results in exegesis, exposition, and application—which should remind Duke alumni, since 1945, of the Textual Expository method in sermon construction (12-19). The resultant Word of God is: Be, Be so, Beloved,

Become (20-27). This is Christian devotion, Biblically grounded.

Part II: "Devotion—The Framework of Theology" is harder for me to grasp, since my theological upbringing was Biblical rather than systematic. But, here goes. Theology is defined (28-36); but I cannot quite grasp Hall's distinction between "strong" and "soft" theologies. If these are supposed to be antonyms, Webster would disagree: strong and weak; hard and soft. Even so, Hall wants to link faith-reflection with faith-investigation (28-36). There follows a chapter on the language of theology, which, understandably, is the language of devotion (39). Theology is "the faithful man's reflection on the meaning of life" (43). So the next chapter is headed "Doctrine and Life" (44-49)—the author has a tidy mind. There are two major groups in the church. One is "commonsensical about life and experience," Jesus-centered, and pragmatic. The other is emotional, irrational, subjective. Hall asks both to recognize that theology involves experience *and* thought, feeling *and* knowledge. If theology is a faithful reflection on the meaning of life, then it holds in a devotional union the historical Christian faith and contemporary secular life (47). "To do theology is . . . to talk about things religiously" (48). The last chapter (50-56) in Part II offers, as an alternative to "devotional life," the two words "theological existence," which almost seems like offering a stone for a bowl of mush. "Holy living" or "Holy, and wholly, living" isn't quite as frigid as "theological existence." But, it is a good chapter. Such an attitude to life is marked by activity, courage, and social responsibility, as the Christian lives "responsibility—as under God—in all things, secular and sacred" (55).

Part III: "Devotion—The Life Principle of the Church" is the ecclesiological, inevitable outcome of reflections on the Bible and theology. The first matter dealt with is "The

Church's Foundations" (57-66), the old question of the kirk as a divine and/or human institution. It is analyzed, almost in sermonic form, the text being:

The Church's one foundation  
Is Jesus Christ her Lord.

How shall it be interpreted: literally, liturgically, theologically devotionally? Then follows an interpretation of the three words: Jesus, Christ, Lord. I hae my doots about the interpretation of "Christ." I also hae ma doots that Jesus is Lord of the world, as well as of the church, unless there is an eschatological loading of the word.

Now we come to today. There are wise words on the minister as the one who interprets for God, and who serves the servants of God, followed by three interesting views of the ministry of the church as life-centered, soul-centered, church-centered, all being true if focussed on, and stemming from, a theology of devotion (67-75). What shall we do with the dichotomy between the Church visible and the Church invisible? Do what Paul did: keep trying to bring the visible into line with the invisible. Thus panic and apathy are avoided, for the visible and invisible Church are understood as two dimensions of the same reality (76-84).

The last chapter, somewhat inevitably, deals with "The Renewal of the Church" (85-92). It hopes and it promises that, if we take seriously the previous eleven chapters, then churchmanship (a bad word) will yield to discipleship (always a good word), and that will lead to mission, covering "the full spectrum of secular existence" (89). So the Christian *becomes* a Christian in a church which is concerned about the meaning of membership; nurturing Christian understanding; united in spirit, maybe even in mind; relevant to the contemporary situation; courageous in relation to its cultural setting.

That is a summary of what, I think, the book is all about. Do I agree

with it all? I don't understand it all! I am surprised at the omission of any reference to the resurrection when the central facts of the faith are alluded to (18, 32, 85). I do not believe that "Christianity was born out of death" (32). If it had been, it might have survived as the Nazarene sect of Judaism, but no more. Was St. Paul the author of "Ephesians" (24)? I am unhappy about the separation of philosophy and theology (38-39). Tillich commented: "As a theologian I have tried to remain a philosopher, and vice versa. It would have been easier . . . to choose one or the other." I wonder if a Gentile can, dare, say: "Jesus is the Christ." He can say: "Jesus is the Lord" (61-64).

But these are minor matters—to prove I read the book: three times! If I had a group of middle-aged, curious and serious church-members, still alive above the neck, I would use this volume as a source-book for growth in meditation. It would be a useful norm or yardstick or thermometer. It is a compact, tight, meaty little volume. He that runs won't read it. It is a book about devotion, which can lead to personal and corporate devotion.

If you don't know who Thor Hall is, buy it and read p. 93.

—James T. Cleland

*The Coming Faith.* Carlyle Marney.  
Abingdon. 1970. 176 pp. \$4.00.

Carlyle Marney's new book stands as another milestone on a man's route from static traditionalism to a dynamic faith. He has been at it a long time now, yet the intensity of the quest does not show signs of dissipation. If anything, the direction is becoming clearer and the thrust stronger. His style—always compact, always direct—shows the impact of an increased pressure; it is, if possible, even more compressed and undiluted than before. His subject matter—always wide-ranging—reveals a sensitive and comprehensive man. He talks about the situation of religion, the search for identity, tra-

dition, Christian essence, Pauline theology, universalistic humanism, resurrection symbolism, secular religion, radical theology, ecclesiology, church renewal, lay ministry, Christian life style. Add to it all the fact that Marney writes from both critical and constructive perspectives—even polemical, at times—and the outcome is necessarily and understandably complex. His book is not easy to read, nor to understand. But it is intriguing.

Not everyone who talks of something as a *coming* thing is equally anxious to have the new anchored in the past. Marney, arguing the case for a new humanism, or a new secularity, or a new Judeo-Christian universalism, desires this anchoring. Before he ventures to project his expectations he is eager to secure his memory. Only, his memory is a twofold thing; it contains both something that hurts and something remedial. The first aspect has become increasingly bothersome to Marney; he talks of several kinds of "crimes," "wounds," or "illusions." At times he gives the impression that the church is stuck with those things, while the new breed moves on. The new breed does not leave the tradition alone, however; the second—"longer"—aspect of Marney's memory becomes at once his rescue and his spur. It is the study of Pauline thought which once again emerges as the base of a new neo-orthodoxy. But it is a new kind of Paulinism.

Marney's book attempts to show that Paul's interpretation of things has been given a monumental misreading until now. The new discovery is that Paul was a Jew who talked of a new human race in a way that makes "all localisms, regionalisms, and nationalisms subject to constant revision." The essence of Paul's point of view, according to Marney, is that in Christ we see God deciding *for* us in terms of humanity—a special man-ness. This means, to Marney, that Jesus Christ is the secret truth about our own

nature; what is Christian is secretly, fundamentally, universally human.

It is against this background that Marney lashes out against any and all Christian "special-ness" or separate-ness. The Christian is one who has been liberated to be genuinely human. At bottom of this Biblical universalism is an ontology of love, world-wide love ("implicit in us all; explicit of all humanity"), which is Christ's kind of love; in short, "proper manhood."

Is there no Christian uniqueness, then? To Marney, unlike many humanists, there is: Manhood must be informed by what he calls "an indispensable center," a faith that is capable of carrying us "beyond biology." Cryptically, impressionistically, Marney argues that this "center" is not to be found in Christianity as a system; nor is found in the optimistic certainties of an earlier science. It lies, he says, in the mystery of the resurrection (which to him is the Pauline "we shall be changed" interpreted dynamically, not apocalyptically). Consequently, the new shape of things in the world is not formed by simple notions of ethics (although Marney does point with appreciation to the tremendous permeation of Christian concerns in today's society), not by mere social reconstruction (although Marney urges us strongly to begin reconstruction by going against the myths we are living with), not by theocratic Christianity as it is commonly understood ("no simple Jesus-cult, or warmed-over biblicism will do"); the new breed's man is first a theologian, then comes his efforts to make humanity human, then his sociology.

All of which—lo and behold—calls for a communal base, a nurturing context of faith and thought, a church, within which the new humanity emerges and from which it can disperse itself throughout the old order. Marney has not given up on the idea of a church, then; he only calls for a radical change in the church as we

know it, a redefinition of everything, ministry, education, mission, evangelism, proclamation, worship, stewardship—the whole gamut. The end of all must be that the laity becomes “the ministry of the church in the world.” The church itself, says Marney, using his own favorite symbolism, is simply The Interpreter’s House.

The coming thing? We have a long way to go, of course, but visionaries like Marney make it at least possible to continue the quest.

—Thor Hall

*A Dictionary of Comparative Religion.*  
General Editor, S. G. F. Brandon.  
Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1970. 704  
pp. \$17.50.

Increasingly the area of History of Religions is intruding into the lives of pastors and laymen. Today ecumenism is beginning to include not only different sectors of Christianity, but also the religious traditions of Asia and Africa. Partly to meet new needs and times this volume has been edited by S. G. F. Brandon.

Billed on the dust jacket as “The first comprehensive one-volume Guide to the Religions of the World” it is a fairly impressive offering. Brandon is Professor of Comparative Religion at the University of Manchester and served as General Editor. He also was responsible for the “general” category as well as “Prehistoric Religion,” the “Ancient Near East,” “Classical Religions,” and “Christianity.” Four other Britishers served as sectional editors: Trevor Ling for Buddhism; Ninian Smart for Hinduism; James Robson, Islam; and D. Howard Smith for “China and the Far East.” Twenty-three other scholars aided in the venture.

The Dictionary itself consists of short articles alphabetically arranged and printed in double columns. The articles range from a few lines to some of five or six pages, with about 1,000 words per page. The text is replete with abbreviations such as m.

for million, or doc. standing for either doctrine or doctrinal, etc. The editing is expert and cross references are prolific. In addition to a general bibliography most of the articles list further references. There is a “synoptic index” by religious traditions, as well as a general index to supplement the alphabetized articles. Overall it is a valuable reference tool to add to one’s personal or church library.

The volume has several biases which are worth noting. The stress is definitely Protestant, and even topical, both in selectivity and point of view. Thus to mention some illustrations from the Western tradition, the Eastern (Orthodox) Church merits one-half column while the Reformation receives four and one-half; “Papacy” one-half column, Zwingli over twice as much, etc. Reinhold Niebuhr is in, as is Bonhoeffer; but Pascal, Spinoza, Max Mueller, R. Otto, Freud and Jung are out. The Dead Sea Scrolls get almost four pages, and so it goes. Similar bias could be noted in the coverage of Asian religions, much of it probably due to space limitations. In spite of such slanting of selectivity and coverage which could easily be charged against any publication as ambitious as is this one the result is a distinct advance over the only other one-volume dictionary I know to compare with it. This is *The Encyclopaedia of Religion and Religions* by E. Royston Pike. This is still a paperback bargain although its longtime price of \$1.95 has recently been more than doubled in line with current inflation. Brandon’s *Dictionary*, however, should prove invaluable to anyone who needs a handy reference to all the world’s religions from pre-historic times to the present.

—David G. Bradley

*Religion in Communist China.* Richard C. Bush, Jr. Abingdon, 1970. 432 pp. \$9.50.

“What is happening to religion, of all kinds, in Communist China today?”

The question is often asked in connection with last year's mission study of the Church on the Chinese mainland. Indeed, some answers have been available from Francis Jones' *The Church in Communist China* (Friendship Press, 1962) and William H. Clark's *The Church in China* (National Council of Churches, 1970), as well as from much periodical literature.

But Richard Bush gives far more detailed, inclusive material. As former director of the Christian Study Centre on Chinese Religion and Culture in Hong Kong, as current professor of religion and philosophy at Tunghai University in Taiwan, he has had the peripheral vantage point and the scholarly and linguistic competence to gather most of the data that is available "outside": from Chinese newspapers and some European sources as well as the many Protestant and Roman Catholic "China-watchers."

Although 60 percent of this volume deals with the experience of Christians, Chinese and foreign, in remarkably thorough fashion, the more original coverage treats developments of Communist policy toward Islam, Buddhism, Confucianism, and Taoism. Unavoidably, the accessible material differs widely, from government-sponsored "Hajjes" to Mecca to ideological debates over the original and contemporary interpretations of the Great Sage. The story is far from complete—may never be—but the documentation of how the Great Cultural Revolution has suppressed China's indigenous religions almost as completely as it has eliminated all visible, institutional Christianity provides an extremely valuable summary.

It is unfortunate that such a comprehensive and useful book suffers in two respects—mentioned by this reviewer with particular reluctance. First, it contains a number of minor errors, in matters that I happen to know. For example, the eight lines concerning my father, last American

Methodist bishop in China, manage to encompass at least six factual misstatements or misinterpretations—including his name. A few of the too-frequent typographical errors involve personal names which could lead to "confused identity." This is not to imply that the ratio of mistakes is that high throughout the book—far from it—or that such insignificant flaws mar the tremendous scope and detail of the total picture. It is to suggest, to all writers and readers, the perils of relying on printed, sometimes translated and editorialized, documents or fallible oral reporting.

The second weakness which I cannot avoid mentioning is a somewhat disconcerting style, at two points. Amid scholarly footnotes and careful organization, phrases like "nervy" and apologies "for the whole business" ring too colloquial. More important, the voluminous, documented quotations and events are interrupted by generalizations and observations not developed in the text. The appraisal of an external observer, especially as objective and qualified a scholar as Dr. Bush, may well be more accurate than an emotional "eye-witness" account. I respect and value and welcome the author's opinions, but preferably in a separate chapter—or in another volume which he promises on the exciting subject of "Chinese communism as a religion."

—Creighton Lacy

*The Birth of Methodism in England.*  
Élie Halévy. Translated and with  
an Introduction by Bernard Semmel.  
University of Chicago Press, 1971.  
81 pp. \$6.00.

Two warnings must first be issued. This is a book on historiography rather than history, and the monograph which it introduces to English-speaking readers is over sixty years old. Nevertheless this should prove a very welcome volume, both to Methodist historians and the growing company

of Methodist sociologists, as well as to the historiographers.

Élie Halévy was born in 1870, was raised in Catholic France as a Protestant, but "confessed himself an unbeliever who regarded Buddhism as coming closest to truth." (p. 4). He is best known by his massive history of England in the 19th century—an acknowledged classic—in which he advanced the hypothesis that England was spared a revolution similar to that which had ravaged his own country mainly because of the influence of Methodism. Halévy's *magnum opus*, published in French in 1913, has several times appeared in English, and is available in the Penguin series. Almost unknown, however, is a prior work in which he had advanced the same thesis for the England of 1739, claiming that Wesley and Whitefield were chiefly responsible for saving their country from revolution half a century before the French Revolution. Halévy published this brilliant monograph in two installments in August 1906 in the *Revue de Paris*, under the title "La Naissance du méthodisme en Angleterre." This essay is here presented for the first time in English, with a lengthy and very valuable introduction by the translator, who is Professor of History at the State University of New York, Stony Brook.

Dr. Semmel outlines Halévy's studies, those long periods in the British Museum reading a rich variety of Methodist works and background material in order to lay bare the secret of the different courses taken by British and French history. He also shows how the author was influenced in this by earlier writers, especially by his mentor Hippolyte Taine, like him finding the true origin of the modern nation in the realm of ideas rather than in political or economic institutions. The main source, he believed, was the puritanical character of the English, which in the seventeenth century had led to revolution against the Stuarts, but in the eighteenth was channeled into religious enthusiasm,

thus effectively bypassing revolution for the following centuries. In the Methodist revival Halévy discerned a combination of enthusiasm and churchmanship which infiltrated all other religious groups, and so affected the pace-setting bourgeoisie that the revolutionary tendencies of the proletariat were deflected.

Several scholars have pointed out that Halévy did not understand Methodism fully, and Dr. Semmel joins their company. He describes how after Wesley's death the Methodists continued to be challenged with having revolutionary tendencies, and defended themselves by vehemently protesting their loyalty, a controversy which came to a head in 1811 with Lord Sidmouth's bill, designed to undermine Methodism by eradicating the itinerant system. Sidmouth's withdrawal under pressure, and the repealing of the Conventicle Act in 1812, was naturally construed by the Methodists as a vindication of their loyalty to the Crown. Dr. Semmel points out that Halévy gives undue weight to Methodist protestations of loyalty, claiming them as proof that Methodism saved England from a revolution, and overlooking the fact that they were in large measure a party cry induced by reaction to special political pressures. Nevertheless, he claims, Halévy's general thesis should not be thrown overboard as worthless: "imaginatively qualified and extended," it "remains a highly stimulating one, worth further exploration." (p. 25) With this judgment I find myself in agreement. The tendencies of Methodism through two and a half centuries have been both revolutionary and anti-revolutionary, so that Methodist influence upon history has been complex, and no simplistic answer is possible to the question, "Did Methodism act as an obstacle to revolution?"

Halévy's major work studied this question from the point of view of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. This earlier essay shows how the thesis was first sketched

out in relation to the beginnings of Methodism in the early eighteenth century. Although the modern reader must be on guard against minor errors of fact and perspective, the essay is stimulating and provocative to those many pious Methodists who are inclined to be unduly parochial in their approach to their own beginnings.

The translation on the whole reads well, though Dr. Semmel must be faulted on not checking Charles Wesley's *Journal* when translating back from Halévy's French translations from that document, so that Wesley would never have recognized Semmel's English as his own. Thus Charles Wesley's host John Bray is described (in a supposed quotation from his *Journal*) as "a mystic 'who has no science but Christ, but who knows and discerns all things by this science.'" (p. 56) In fact Wesley wrote: "who knows nothing but Christ; yet knowing him knows and discerns all things." Even less understandable is the transformation of "The Holy Club" into "the Club of Saints"! (p. 36). The book is attractively printed and bound, and an index is provided, covering both introduction and essay.

—Frank Baker

*The Revelation of St. John.* Leon Morris. Eerdmans. 1969. 263 pp. \$4.50.

This book is a volume in the Tynedale New Testament Commentary series and as such reflects the general tone and purpose of that series. The basic idea is to have a commentary

which will ". . . avoid the extremes of being unduly technical or unhelpfully brief." (p. 5) This particular work on the book of Revelation does just that. It is well written, well researched, is not dogmatic, and attempts to interpret the work for exactly what it is—a highly symbolic apocalyptic writing.

The author points out immediately that the work is highly symbolic and not to be used as a scheme or timetable for the end of the world. He is concerned most of all to point out the "eternal realities" contained in this writing.

The "Introduction" briefly outlines four basic approaches to the interpretation of the book, and the author emphasizes the importance of the reader's understanding of the symbolism of this kind of writing. "It is important to realize that John is an artist in words. We are to look for the meaning conveyed by each symbol in that symbol itself. It is a matter of indifference whether the symbols can be visualized or reconciled. That is not their purpose. Their purpose is to carry ideas." (pp. 21-22)

It would be impossible to outline here the contents of the book for it is a verse by verse commentary. Suffice it to say that the commentary is sound, clearly written, and understandable. The author attempts, without being too technical, to give various possibilities of interpretation where there is variation in scholarly opinion. For those who have never studied the book of Revelation, student, minister, or layman, this is an excellent work with which to begin.

—James M. Efrid









**THE  
DUKE  
DIVINITY SCHOOL  
REVIEW**

**Spring 1971**

DEDICATION  
to  
ROBERT EARL CUSHMAN  
Dean of The Divinity School  
Duke University  
1958-1971

On May 24, 1971, Divinity School alumni, faculty and wives, student leaders, and distinguished guests gathered at Duke University to honor Dean Robert E. Cushman through a testimonial dinner sponsored by The Divinity School Alumni Association. The program, reprinted in our inside back cover, is represented in this REVIEW by the text of Dr. Norman L. Trott's address, and also by the following statement which was read at the dinner to forecast this Spring issue of the REVIEW:

By action of the Faculty of the Divinity School, the forthcoming Spring issue of THE DUKE DIVINITY SCHOOL REVIEW is especially dedicated to Dean Robert Earl Cushman. This is not a *Festschrift* for a retiring teacher, since we are keenly anticipating the best years yet of his theological teaching and scholarship, but an appreciative recognition of a few representative developments during the "Cushman era."

Waldo Beach takes an overview of the Divinity School through these thirteen years and interprets its present outlook and promise;  
Arthur Kale testifies to the Dean's leadership in relating seminary and church;  
Vincent Arthur Yzermans adds a personal and Catholic word about Dean Cushman's ecumenical service;  
Frank Baker reports on the development of the Wesley Works project;  
Kelly Ingram and Robert Colver give a preview of their voluminous studies of our ministerial students and their subsequent ministries;  
Richard Goodling tells of developments in Pastoral Psychology programs and Clinical Pastoral Education;  
Robert Wilson interprets the new J. M. Ormond Center for Research, Planning, and Development;  
and the Chairmen of the Biblical, Historical, Theological, and Ministerial Studies Divisions bring readers up to date on our Faculty and its teaching ministry.

In these ways we express our gratitude for Bob Cushman's vision and leadership, and for his indefatigable labors and devotion to task, as theological dean, ecclesiastical statesman, ecumenical theologian, institution builder, and brother in Christ.

THE DUKE DIVINITY SCHOOL REVIEW Committee  
McMurry S. Richey, Chairman

May 24, 1971

**THE  
DUKE  
DIVINITY SCHOOL  
REVIEW**

Volume 36

Spring 1971

Number 2

# Contents

Dedication to Dean Robert Earl Cushman . . . . .	Inside Front Cover
Theological Education at Duke Today: An Overview . . . . .	63
<i>by Waldo Beach</i>	
Bridging Troubled Waters . . . . .	69
<i>by William Arthur Kale</i>	
Two Strangers Become Brothers . . . . .	79
<i>by Vincent Arthur Yzermans</i>	
The Oxford Edition of Wesley's Works . . . . .	87
<i>by Frank Baker</i>	
Notes on the Graduating Classes of 1958-1967 of Duke Divinity School and Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary . . . . .	100
<i>by O. Kelly Ingram and Robert M. Colver, in collaboration with Robert M. Poerschke</i>	
Reflections on Outcomes . . . . .	112
<i>by Richard A. Goodling</i>	
The J. M. Ormond Center for Research, Planning and Development . . . . .	118
<i>by Robert L. Wilson</i>	
The Divinity School Faculty and Our Ministry of Teaching . . . . .	121
<i>by Franklin W. Young, Stuart C. Henry, Creighton Lacy, and William Arthur Kale</i>	
A Dialogue with James Buchanan Duke . . . . .	134
<i>by Norman L. Trott</i>	
The Dean's Discourse . . . . .	139
<i>by Robert E. Cushman</i>	
Looks at Books . . . . .	142
Reviews by <i>McMurry S. Richey, Ray C. Petry, Harriet V. Leonard, Kimsey King, and Martha M. Wilson</i>	
Program for the Testimonial Dinner . . . . .	Inside Back Cover
Editorial Committee: Frank Baker, Donn Michael Farris, Paul Field, Ray C. Petry, Charles K. Robinson, Robert L. Wilson, and Mc- Murry S. Richey, Chairman	

Published three times a year (Winter, Spring, Autumn)  
by The Divinity School of Duke University

Postage paid at Durham, North Carolina (27706)

# Theological Education at Duke Today: An Overview

WALDO BEACH\*

The retirement of Professor Robert Cushman from deaning is a suitable moment for a review and assessment of the Divinity School's development in the interval of some thirteen years of his tenure as dean. Though a relatively brief period in the history of even as young a university as Duke, it has been one of swift and marked change. What has happened to the school, outside and inside, from 1958 to 1971, is a fairly reliable index of the drastic change in theological education in the nation, which in turn is a reflection of the rapid shift in the working conception of the nature of the church (underneath the "official" conception) and its role in American society.

To take first a look at our exterior history, a comparison of the 1957-58 and the 1970 catalogs is revealing. Measured in quantitative terms, the graph line of the Divinity School GNP moves upward. Growth and gain are seen in an expanded faculty, in the number of courses offered, in student enrollment (from 250 to 300, in round numbers), making Duke currently the third largest among United Methodist seminaries, and in the spread of denominations and geographical area represented. All sorts of diversification appear in the student body: a sizeable contingent of black students, of women (the President of the Student Association for the current year is a woman), and an ecumenical spectrum ranging from Roman Catholic to Nazarene. (Five students are listed as of "no denomination," some sort of sign of the times.)

The renovation of Gray and Divinity buildings, especially the spacious library facilities, with the new wing under construction, whose Commons Room is made possible by the magnificent support of the alumni, will release us from our current claustrophobia and provide both handsome and adequate facilities for the work of the school in the decades ahead.

More significant than statistics and graphs, of course, is the

---

\*Dr. Waldo Beach is Professor of Christian Ethics, Supervisor of the Master of Theology Program, and former Director of Graduate Studies in Religion.

“inner” history of the school, its changes in life style and temper, its shifts of focus and concern. Evaluational reporting on these matters is a matter of subjective impression, to be sure. But an alumnus visiting the school after a gap of a dozen years away would be simultaneously jarred, amused, impressed, troubled by the new atmosphere. Whether for the better or worse, he would certainly agree that things have changed. Beneath the new styles of dress and hair-do, which John the Baptist in the wilderness might emulate, is a new way of thinking, a restless, searching, baffled spirit. The seminarian often brings to the Divinity School from his undergraduate background a latent idealism, frustrated by the tragic events of the times, and a settled mood of suspicion of, if not downright rebellion against, the “establishment.” Many, perhaps most students are not clear or sure in their reasons for coming to Divinity School; certainly very few feel “called” in the traditional evangelical sense. The majority are here groping for some faith of their own, rather more than to acquire the professional skills to impart the gospel already grasped. Given such vocational uncertainty, it is surprising that the attrition rate of voluntary withdrawal (13 of the current entering class of 83 dropped out by the end of the first semester) is as low as it is.

In contrast to a day not long past when the church enjoyed a high prestige and authority in American culture, the decline of the influence of the church, with the rapid secularization of life, is marked, in the South almost as much as in America at large. Christianity is dying of its own respectability, smothered in the churchianity of its suburban captivity. Or so it appears to this generation of seminarians, who are agreed on one thing: they are not eager (to put it mildly) for a professional career in the conventional parish ministry. They are interested in exploring new and unconventional forms of ministry, in quest of new models of church life. There is no “typical” theological student these days, but for the majority of them, in their academic choices the criterion of worth is “relevance” (that weary and porous term), the posture of mind is a quizzical diffidence toward history and tradition, and the style of etiquette is hardly that of a modest and humble deference to their elders.

In such a context, the framing of a course of study, the selection of faculty, the determination of administrative policy have been difficult indeed, as difficult as it would be for a medical school to frame a curriculum for a generation of students who were not intending to become doctors, or a law school for law students quite uncertain about

practising law. To such a strenuous assignment, the dean has brought a far-sighted, imaginative, sober and wise leadership. Under his administration, the school has kept a steady course toward responsible education for ministerial leadership, has twice revised and up-dated the curriculum with extended faculty deliberation, and, most recently, has changed the patterns of governance to include student in-put at crucial policy-making levels.

The presiding purpose remains education for ministry. As phrased in the current Bulletin, "the Divinity School aspires to prepare adequately qualified students for mature espousal of their vocation, with disciplined intelligence informed by sound learning and equipped for worthy professional service." This is a norm standing beyond either that of a trade school, or preacher factory, on the one hand, long on evangelical zeal and slick gadgetry in soul-winning but short on critical scholarship, or, on the other hand, that of a graduate institute of religious studies, long on the fine points of critical and historical scholarship, short on evangelical zeal or the service of men in their religious needs. The next-to-impossible task has been to maintain a productive rather than paralyzing tension between the academic demands set in the accountability of the school to the university, and the professional demands set in its accountability to the church.

It is the impression of this faculty participant in the enterprise here, based on some gleanings of the trends in other theological schools, that Duke has done comparatively well in approximating this purpose.

In particular, one might cite the policy of ecumenical range in faculty appointments. Next year a Roman Catholic scholar assumes the major post in Old Testament studies. This continues a Duke tradition going back to our patristic period in the deanship of Elbert Russell, a member of the Society of Friends. Ecumenism is symbolized in our iconography as well as in our class room exchange. It is a nice bit of irony that a statue of John Wesley presides over the porch entrance of the University Chapel, while over the porch of the Divinity School is the World Council of Churches symbol of the cross in the boat. The value for the United Methodist Church of keeping an ecumenical faculty can hardly be gainsaid.

For a second particular, it has been the dean's insistent principle, shared by the faculty, that education for the professional ministry of whatever sort requires exacting, careful, rigorous, critical scholarship. The glad hand is no substitute for the schooled mind. To be sure,

technical knowledge about the authorship of the Pentateuch is of doubtful use to a young pastor trying to help a heroin addict in his congregation or to save a disintegrating marriage. But for the equipment of persevering saints, to cope with the range of tasks confronting one seeking to be an instrument of God's grace for the redemption of man's life through the church, there is no substitute for disciplined, critical scholarship. The two or three curriculum revisions have loosened some of the older requirements, but still retain, wisely, the standard basic requirements in biblical studies, church history, systematic theology, and ethics. This is the "conservative" quality of the curriculum. The historical approach, wherein the student is asked to read intelligently and reflect critically on the perennial issues of the Christian faith in the company of great thinkers of past and present, finds its "functional" validity in that it protects the leadership of the churches from foibles and transient fads, from the instant remedies of the spiritual dope-pushers, or the devices and programs offered by denominational headquarters. Something of the seasoned calm of the historical outlook can be brought to bear on the puzzles of the turbulent present, as well as the faithful courage to grapple with their urgency.

But the curriculum has not stayed fixed. There have been major shifts of interest and revisions, made despite the drag of inertia and the weight of vested interests, and the impression one gets, in the midst of faculty deliberations, that changing a curriculum is not unlike moving a cemetery.

One clear trend has been the increased interest in pastoral care and counseling. Additional course offerings in this department, supplemented by the resources of the Duke Medical Center, have filled the spiritual vacuum created by the fading of the evangelical concern for saving souls and by the preoccupation of church leadership with issues of social and political policy. In some quarters, that vacuum is being filled by various spiritualist movements, and a kind of neo-evangelicalism. (Zen Buddhism is more popular among college students than even the Campus Crusade for Christ; and *The Prophet* is scripture for many more than is the Bible.) Among suburbanites, faith-healing and spiritualist cults are increasing in popularity. Whatever may be the urgency of the need here, it is important that professional leadership in the ministry be equipped in the disciplines and skill of pastoral counseling, to fulfill the priestly role of the

"care of souls," in such a way as to "test the spirits" and distinguish authentic therapy from quackery.

Another curricular change has been the increased number of courses addressing themselves to the function and role of the church in the middle of middle America, and to discern its role as critic and conscience of the culture in which it is immersed as well as healer of its wounds and woes. The Junior Seminars and Junior Colloquia have been experiments to introduce entering students to the rationale for theological education by reading and reflection on the nature of the church and the ministry. Another feature of the new curriculum, increasingly popular, has been the internships. Beyond the seasoning experience in the field provided for most students in summer work with the Duke Endowment, the internship semester or year is available for a selected few, between middler and senior year, in industry, science and technology, and government and politics. On the face of it, it may seem an odd mode of a preacher's education to arrange his employment for a year as administrative assistant in a Senator's office in Washington, performing many "secular" chores, or working in an office of the Research Triangle Institute. But it is the intention of the internship program to alert the pastors of tomorrow to the moral ambiguities of the decisions that Christian laymen are perforce making, to acquaint them with the moral distance between the world and the church, and thus hopefully to redeem their counsel and homilies from vain and vacuous rhetoric, floating right over the hard choices uncomfortable people in the comfortable pews must make. The internship experience is a small step in the direction of reforming the churches from being clubs where a nice man in the name of Christ encourages nice people to try to be even nicer, into becoming, under the sign of the cross, the point of forum in the community where in the spirit of reverence and searching, Christians may be led into costly authentic discipleship.

Though our experiments in this line are new and characterized by more grope than grasp, they represent serious tries to take the measure of the interaction of church and world, the old Christ-culture problem. If theological education can somehow give its students an awareness of the world in the church, converting the church to worldliness, it may stay its young ministers against the drop into despair so many experience as they go out to convert the world to Christianity. We should do much more than we now do to interpret

“secular” experience, whether it be field work or an internship, in Christian theological terms. But worldly “political” education is every bit as necessary for the maturing of the theological student as his formal instruction in Bible or church history or homiletics.

It would be unlikely that the dean could muster a unanimous faculty vote on any single statement as to what we are about in theological education, given the proclivity of the faculty animal, caged in a meeting, to hedge, qualify, and raise prior questions *ad infinitum*. Yet there may be a tacit consensus in a shared allegiance to one presiding ideal of theological education: that it trains persons for leadership in the church as the servant of society. Dean Cushman has put it succinctly: “Ministry is service of the church to the world and not primarily to itself. Ministry is not simply the maintenance and growth of the congregation, but the enlargement of the range of grace in the determinative structures of national and international society.” (“Theological Education,” *Duke Divinity School Review*, Winter, 1968.)

The prevailing ideal of the ministry under this norm would be that of the pastor, within or outside the parish conventionally defined, who is biblically literate, theologically informed, ethically sensitive, enlivened by an evangelical conviction, tempered with the cool of an historical perspective, inspired to speak and to do the word of God, both in prophetic rebuke of his culture and a pastoral healing of its victims, all in the spirit of Jesus Christ his Lord.

The matters reviewed have been at stake in the faculty deliberations over what seem often trivial housekeeping matters. The dean has presided over these deliberations with careful discrimination and a sure grasp of the many facets of a major policy decision. He has sacrificed the satisfactions of teaching to give his total energy to serve the school as administrator. He has been no less exacting of himself than he has been of his faculty. He leaves the deanship of the school in a condition of strength on which his successor, in collegialship with the faculty, will gratefully build.

# Bridging Troubled Waters

WILLIAM ARTHUR KALE

Above the arch of the Kilgo Entrance Porch, which is the chief doorway into the Divinity School building at Duke University, is a stone carving of a ship's hull sailing on restless waves, the familiar symbol of the World Council of Churches. The ship's mast, maintaining balance and proportion in the design, is the Cross. For students, faculty and others who walk into the building the symbol is a reminder of the affinity which has been established between the Divinity School and the Christian Church at both local and world levels. The symbol also suggests the motif of the daily life of the Divinity community, particularly during the period of the deanship of Robert E. Cushman.

The Entrance Porch, named in honor of the late John Carlisle Kilgo, President of Trinity College (now Duke University) 1894-1910, and Bishop of the former Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was dedicated at noon on May 12, 1965. It is worth noting that the date of the dedicatory exercises was only a short while after the midway point (in the seventh year) of Dean Cushman's term as the administrative head of the Divinity School, and it is not difficult, six years later, to believe that the carving on the Kilgo porch has been symbolic of one of his central concerns, namely the preservation, strengthening and refinement of sound church-seminary relationships.

## *The Troubled Waters of Mistrust*

That church and seminary are yoked in a relationship of mutual trust and obligation is affirmed generation by generation, but in recent years attitudes of suspicion, one toward the other, have appeared. Serious differences regarding curricular priorities have been expressed. Questions regarding the purposes of theological education have been raised. What changes in the concepts of ministry are necessary in a time of political and sociological flux? What forms of ministry are required in an industrialized society? On what should seminaries concentrate their major effort—on instruction in Biblical, historical and theological documents? . . . on ecclesiastical structures and strategies? . . . on processes for ecclesiastical change? . . . on

social issues? Whom should seminaries aspire to influence—the intellectually elite? . . . the ecclesiastical policy-makers? . . . the present and future generations of clergy? Often the answers to these questions as given by churchmen are derided by seminarians, and, contrariwise, the proposals offered by theologians are regarded with suspicion and even alarm by churchmen. The differences in viewpoint and attitude make it inevitable that church-seminary relationships involve risk and undergo continuous change.

Under Dean Cushman's leadership and influenced by his example the Divinity School has regularly been engaged in a variety of bridge-building enterprises. The analogical implications are important to note. Institutional divergencies have not been ocean-wide in their dimension and hurricane-like in their manifestation. They have been more like the rapids of a river, difficult and dangerous for crossing except by means of some kind of bridge. In some instances what is needed is quick and temporary action, something comparable to placing a foot-log across a stream. At other times a more substantial bridge, one to be used for an extended period, must be designed and built. Admittedly the waters of institutional relationships have not been placid in recent times but it can be reported that in a variety of ways they have been spanned.

### *"Serving One Another in Love"*

It is appropriate that institutions as interrelated as are the Christian church and the Christian school of theology should seek ways of applying to themselves the admonition St. Paul expressed to Galatian Christians, "Brethren . . . serve one another in love" (Galatians 5:13). The importance of the love-service relationship was highlighted by Dean Cushman in his address to the Alumni Association on October 27, 1970 (published in *The Divinity Review*, Winter, 1971), when he spoke words of warning regarding the obstruction of the "principle of mutuality," a threatening possibility that is encouraged whenever anti-intellectualism and theological obscurantism are tolerated by the Church and whenever disdainful attitudes toward the Church are maintained and expressed by seminarians. Let it not be forgotten that in their interdependence the church and the theological school are obligated to deal responsibly with one another.

The meaning of the Pauline admonition as applied to Duke's association with the United Methodist Church is that the Divinity

School considers itself the servant-ally of the church. As stated in the catalogue, "the curriculum continues to prepare students for the historic offices of church and congregation. Whatever form or context 'the local church' of tomorrow may assume, Divinity School education remains predicated upon the historically grounded probability that these offices will remain." (Quoted from *Divinity School Bulletin*, 1970, page 2.) Essentially this is "education for ministry," and the responsibility for its design and execution is shared by church and seminary. This is also "continuing education," an extension and refinement of early training in family and local church. The task of the seminary is familial and pastoral as well as academic and vocational.

### *Cooperative Ventures*

The fulfillment of their desire for responsible love-service relationships requires regular consultation and frequent cooperative undertakings by seminarians and churchmen. This is accomplished in a variety of ways, one of which is the participation of the Divinity faculty in the work of the church, locally and beyond. From its beginning in 1926 the life of the Divinity School has been interwoven with that of the Methodist Conferences in North Carolina. In recent years the borders of this kind of relationship have been extended to include other sections of the United States as well as several distant countries and several communions other than Methodist. The majority of the faculty have been and are ordained clergymen with previous experience as pastors, and both ordained and nonordained persons are eager to continue their ministry of preaching, teaching, and counseling in churches of the region and elsewhere. Also from the beginning the Divinity faculty has been represented on the delegations to Methodist Jurisdictional, General, and World Conferences. In every year one or more have served on national and international boards and agencies and have accepted assignments to special task forces. The non-Methodists have been equally prominent in the legislative and supervisory bodies of their communions. Through the preparation of a variety of brochures and guidebooks as well as the publication of books and articles many faculty persons have joined with other churchmen in the interpretation of contemporary conditions and trends. It is agreed that such experience is rewarding, both personally and professionally, to the

individuals involved and also enhances dialogue between the associated institutions.

Six examples of cooperative endeavors, each one designed to enhance the love-service relationship of churchmen and educators, are worthy of brief description. They are: the Regional Seminars, the Summer Clinics, the Symposium of Christian Missions, the Alumni Visitor's Week, the Convocation and Pastors' School, and the Course of Study School.

1. The Regional Seminars, inaugurated several years ago under the leadership of Dr. Kenneth W. Clark, and continued today in cooperation with Boards of Ministry and Commissions on Continuing Education in United Methodist Conferences, operate as workshops for pastors and other leaders. Leadership for the seminars is provided by faculty representatives from Duke and other institutions and by selected churchmen from the region. Divinity alumni and other ministers, including lay workers, are invited to participate. In the autumn of 1970 two seminars were held—in Columbia, South Carolina, and in Richmond, Virginia, the subject being, "The Role of the Minister Today." Plans are developing for conducting seminars in these same cities in mid-November, 1971. The subject to be presented in Columbia will be: "Stewardship As a Style of Life," and the one to be used in Richmond will be "The Church and Extremism."

2. Summer clinics for ministers, wives, and church leaders of all denominations are held annually on the Duke campus. They operate for two weeks, usually in August. They are planned to supplement seminary education through intensive training in a selected area. Subjects for the summer of 1971 are: "Pastoral Care," "Preaching," "Interpreting the Contemporary Scene," "Minister—His Marriage and Family," and "Parish Development and Leadership."

3. The Christian Missions Symposium is a well established annual event which was instituted soon after the school was founded. In collaboration with the Board of Missions of the United Methodist Church the Divinity School brings to the campus a team of leaders, including a Duke alumnus living and working overseas, who represent the world mission of the Christian church. The general aims are "to inform students and faculty of the philosophy and work of missions . . . , to educate present and future ministers . . . , and to evaluate the missionary enterprise as a significant force in the revolutionary world." An impressive service of worship, presided over by the Dean, with individual prayers for Duke alumni missionaries, each

person's name spoken aloud, is held at the concluding session of the symposium.

4. The Alumni Visitor's Week was established in 1966 and is held during the spring semester each year. Planned and directed by the Committee on Worship and Spiritual Life, the period is a time for reflecting on the nature of ministry in today's world as reported by the visiting alumnus. Informal conferences between the "visitor" and students are held in dormitories, faculty homes, and classrooms. Other features include services of worship, led by the "visitor," and attendance by him of selected class sessions followed by evaluation periods with students and the instructors. Alumni who have been chosen as visitors are: 1966—Eben Taylor, of the class of 1953, South Carolina Conference; 1967—Clark S. Reed, of the class of 1958, Florida Conference; 1968—Russell T. Montfort, of the class of 1953, Western North Carolina Conference; 1969—Albert F. Fisher, of the class of 1954, North Carolina Conference; 1970—Forrest G. Nees, of the class of 1953, Ohio Conference; 1971—John W. Reskovac, of the class of 1966, Oklahoma Conference.

5. The Convocation and Pastors' School continues a tradition that is older than the Divinity School and even the University. Just after the ending of World War I in 1918 the two Methodist Conferences in North Carolina set apart funds to establish at Trinity College a short-term school for pastors, to be held for two weeks immediately following the commencement exercises in June. This school was conducted annually each summer until the late 40's, its length being reduced to one week some time in the late 30's. After the Methodist conferences began to meet in June the date of the Pastors' School was changed to the autumn period and the program was combined with the James A. Gray lectureship, established in 1947. The program of the Convocation and Pastors' School, as designed in recent years, consists of the Gray Lectures, a distinguished series; the Hickman Lectures, established in 1966 by Mrs. Veva Castell Hickman in honor of her late husband, Dr. Franklin S. Hickman, long-time Professor of Psychology of Religion and Homiletics and Preacher to the University; the Alumni Lecture, given by a selected graduate of the Divinity School; the Bishops' Hour, a seminar conducted by the Methodist bishops of the Charlotte and Raleigh Areas; the Convocation Preaching Hours, three in number, with sermons by a clergyman of distinction usually from outside the region; and special lectures on current theological issues by faculty representatives

from Duke and sister institutions in the region. The high quality of the program has gained for this event a wide reputation and a response from churchmen of many denominations and citizens of all races from many parts of the country.

6. The Course of Study School began in 1948, and is conducted for four weeks each summer in cooperation with the Department of Ministry and the Southeastern Jurisdictional Conference of The United Methodist Church. It offers the Methodist Course of Study for non-seminary clergymen, a course that requires five summers to complete. Approximately 225 persons attend each summer, representing seven Methodist conferences and six states.

These six enterprises exemplify the purpose of the Divinity School to reduce the distance and bridge the troubled waters between the seminary classroom and the church pulpit, between the seminary curriculum and the parish problem, between seminary instruction and humanity's hurt, between educational philosophy and humanitarian action.

### *Turbulent Financial Waters*

Among the problems of the theological administrator none is more acute and baffling than the perennial task of budget preparation and fiscal planning. In the decade of the 1960's unprecedented and unanticipated advances in operational costs, together with the pressing need to maintain an adequate staff and faculty and provide for institutional development in competition with other divisions of Duke University and with other seminaries, caused multiplied headaches for Dean Cushman and his advisers. Truly the financial waters were troubled in those years.

The condition has not improved in the early period of the 1970's. Dr. Gerald O. McCulloh, head of the Department of the Ministry of the United Methodist Church, has estimated that the cost of theological education in the nation has been increasing at the rate of ten per cent each year for several years. This estimate may be conservative in view of the uncertainty of the dollar in the markets of the world. Duke, in company with her sister institutions, has been forced to adjust to a policy of restriction in fiscal planning and in capital expansion.

One specific incident from the history of the 1960's illustrates something of the complexity of the financial situation. It contains emotional human overtones because of its association with students

and their families and because it marked a break with precedent. For the first thirty-eight years of its operation the University did not require Divinity students to pay a tuition fee, but in 1964 it was found that no longer could the institution carry the burden of enrolling 250 to 300 persons for three years of graduate-professional study without such a charge. When the initial announcement was made that a charge of one-half the amount required in other segments of the University would be applied to Divinity students a crisis situation developed. Reduction in enrollment was threatened, and financial aid problems, already difficult, became crucial. Fortunately for both students and the administrative personnel involved the severity of the crisis has been reduced by generous and well-timed assistance from a few private endowments but primarily from church funds. In reporting to the Board of Visitors a short time ago Dean Cushman gratefully stated, "It (the Divinity School) receives from The United Methodist Church approximately two-fifths of its annual operating revenue. Likewise, especially during the past decade, it has received large revenues for capital expansion and renovation. Virtually the whole of its scholarship and grant-in-aid program depend upon church funds save for modest funds from private endowments."

One of history's most significant actions in support of theological education came to a climax in 1968 when The United Methodist Church, by action of its General Conference, officially approved the Ministerial Education Fund. Dean Cushman was a prominent leader in the conceptualization of the fund and in guiding the strategy for its adoption by the General Conference. Building on the experience in the Southeastern Jurisdiction over a period of eight years, during which a plan worked out by Duke and Emory (Deans Cushman and Cannon being the designers) had been in operation, the General Conference instituted a nationwide, ongoing, year-to-year program by which each local church and annual conference shares in the responsibility for the recruitment and education of ministerial candidates. This is done according to plan, by including the Ministerial Education Fund in the budgets of all churches and all annual conferences. The total amount raised by this fund is separated into two parts: one going to the Boards of Ministry in the annual conferences for use in recruitment, continuing education, and as loans and scholarships, and the other distributed by the Department of the Ministry to the fourteen United Methodist theological schools.

Dr. Gerald McCulloh, mentioned earlier, head of the Department

of Ministry, reported in the May, 1971, issue of *The Interpreter* that receipts for 1970, the first year of the operation of the fund, exceeded \$4,750,000. When full implementation by all annual conferences is achieved it is expected that the yearly receipts from the fund will reach a total of \$8,250,000. Dr. McCulloh comments, "The MEF will not, of course, provide all the funds needed to operate the fourteen seminaries, but it will enable the church as a whole to share in meeting the mounting costs of ministerial education."

### *An Unusual Appointment*

In the summer of 1964, Dr. Fletcher Nelson, long an effective minister in the Western North Carolina Conference, with special dedication and skill in the area of institutional financial development, was named Assistant to the Dean for Development. His labors across the past seven years have not only produced more substantial financial foundations for the school but have resulted in stronger ties with the church.

Dr. Nelson gave vigorous leadership to the campaign among alumni for raising \$100,000 to finance the "Commons Room" in the new wing now being added to the Divinity Building, a campaign that not only achieved its goal but made possible a variety of fresh associations between different generations of students and between alumni administrators and faculty.

The work Dr. Nelson has done must be evaluated chiefly in terms of its long range significance. He has introduced Duke University, and the Divinity School in particular, to a variety of industrial corporations and foundations, to a lengthy list of families prominent in political and civic life, and to church bodies at all levels—local, regional and national.

### *Bridges Between Classroom and Life*

No institution worthy of its ecclesiastical sponsorship can fail to take account of the total environment in which it operates. Like its ally the church, the seminary is affected by multiple influences and associations—technological shiftings as well as ideological ferment, instantaneous communication as well as the triumphs of the computer, the problem of vocational clarification as well as the problem of information overload. The processes of secularization are relentlessly at work on campus and in classroom as well as in church pulpit and pew.

Today's theological students are both contributors to and the products of current mis-trust, travesty, and attenuation of hope. They have had more "experience" than their counterparts a generation ago. They have traveled more widely, read more widely, and confronted issues more directly. Literally they have been involved in jails, politics, rock music, sports, encounter psychology, civil rights, and war resistance—to list some of their better known enterprises and ventures. They are regularly skeptical of authority and anti-institutional in attitude and mind-set. They are struggling to find new modes of conduct and new models for ministry.

One of the clear rediscoveries of the past five years is that any liaison between church and seminary must involve students. Unless the voice of the student is heard and his message understood any significant future for the two institutions will become hopelessly out of reach. Only with the students' participation can the distance between the classroom and life be reduced, and the chasm between Sunday-at-eleven and the rest of the week be crossed.

Two important innovations have been launched in recent years, both of them designed to stimulate and guide institutional and generational intercommunications: (1) the Board of Visitors and (2) Student Representation on Standing Committees.

The Board of Visitors was inaugurated in 1963 by authorization of the University Trustees. Its function is to evaluate the work of the school and to acquaint the school with the "facts of life" in the world outside. It meets annually to receive reports from the Dean, faculty and student representatives. Its officers consult regularly with individual administrators, teachers, students, alumni, and observers of the school regarding the import of conditions, trends and/or problems as these are reported and explicated. Representative leaders from business, politics, industry, and civic life, as well as prominent educators and churchmen, make up the membership of this Board.

In the eight years since the inauguration of this agency the exchange of information between "visitors" and seminarians has been mutually enlightening and has covered a wide range of subject matter related both to the inner life of the Divinity School and to its relationships with university, church and the world at large. If a rupture of the love-service relationship between church and seminary is to be avoided in the future and if communication across conflicting ideologies and loyalties is to become increasingly honest the Board of Visitors,

or some agency like it, must continue to function, and indeed must be given opportunity for more prominent participation in the evaluative and policy-making processes of the school.

What kind of report should be made on the new structure of standing committees? It might be regarded as premature to attempt an assessment of the decision to include student participation in the work of these important bodies. It can and should be said, however, that this venture, launched initially during the academic year, 1969-70, in response to student request, and which currently is in process of refinement, is regarded by faculty and administrators as desirable and wise. Experience to date has been positive. While differences regarding the type and extent of their participation have not been resolved it is recognized that contributions by student committee members have been substantial. Moreover, feelings of mutual confidence and trust within the committees have grown. Additional experience in the years immediately ahead will reveal the meaning and depth of this experiment. Meanwhile, the import of it should not be exaggerated. There are limitations to what can be done by and within committees.

#### *Moulding Culture Through Distinctive Education*

The Kilgo Entrance Porch, mentioned at the beginning of this paper, leads into a corridor and reception area of the Divinity building. Hanging on a wall just inside the heavy double doors is a bronze plate containing an inscription paying tribute to Bishop Kilgo's vision of Christian higher education as "moulding rather than conforming to culture." When Dean Cushman, the author of the inscription, used these words was he not also dedicating his period as the administrative head of the Divinity School to the same high purpose? Was he not proclaiming to present and future generations that while church and seminary are disjoined at many points they stand together in their purpose to mould rather than to conform?

# Two Strangers Become Brothers

VINCENT ARTHUR YZERMANS\*

When Dean Robert E. Cushman wrote me last Christmas that he had tendered his resignation as Dean of Duke Divinity School, I secretly rejoiced. In Roman circles we have always felt it was a pity to make an administrator out of a person who obviously excelled in one or the other academic or theological discipline. I rejoiced that the Dean had resigned, for I entertain the hope that he will return to scholarly theological pursuits where his more than ordinary talents are so badly needed in an age of theological confusion. And so I wrote the Dean and his charming wife, Barbara.

It would, of course, be exceedingly rash on my part if I were to let stand a personal and obviously prejudiced judgment about Dr. Cushman's theological stature. However, I do not rely merely upon my own estimation. I recall a high ranking theological member of the Vatican Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity saying to me, in the waning days of the Council, words such as these: "I am sure this comes as no surprise to you, but it is gradually becoming the conviction of more and more members of the Secretariat that he is not the flashiest and most flamboyant among the English-speaking Protestant observers. He is, however, recognized as one of the deepest and most profound theologians in their ranks."

It was no surprise to me. Two years earlier, the late, beloved Gustave Weigel, S.J., the English-speaking interpreter for the observer-delegates, remarked, "Dr. Cushman is one of the finest theological thinkers I have met. When he speaks at our sessions we listen most attentively. Would to God only that he would speak more often!" Finally, I have read most of the articles and speeches that the Dean has written over the past eight years. His evaluations and observations, though never extreme, were most judicious, and the course of ecumenical developments over those years has proved that

---

\* Vincent Arthur Yzermans, a priest of the Diocese of St. Cloud, Minnesota, was both a journalist and *peritus* (expert) of the Second Vatican Council. An expert in the area of theological communications, he is the author of numerous articles as well as his most recent study, *American Participation in the Second Vatican Council*. He has been a visiting lecturer at Duke Divinity School in 1966 and 1971.

he has always been on the side of the angels. By way of contrast and with all due respect, our mutual friend, Dr. Albert C. Outler, was a most optimistic commentator on ecumenical issues while Dr. Cushman was always a bit more reserved and cautious in his judgments. I do not think any documentation is needed at this stage of development to show that although Dr. Outler was more "popular" (especially among Roman Catholic audiences), Dr. Cushman more accurately assessed the real situation.

These observations have been made to support my deep conviction that the Dean's "more than ordinary talents" will be given the opportunity to be put to use in following "scholarly theological pursuits." It was, after all, the Dean himself who observed more than five years ago, that it is the professors who have "an explicit mandate to think, and they in enlarging numbers are substituting travel and conference for thinking." As a close personal friend of the Dean's I pray that his departure from the deanship will enable him to return to a life of theological scholarship where, I firmly believe, his charisma will be enriched by the Holy Spirit in the service of the Church which desperately needs, at this moment in its history, the development of a sane and sound theological position.

\* \* \* \* \*

This article was never intended to begin in such a way. But so it has begun and my only *apologia* is the scriptural text, "*Quod scripsi, scripsi.*" Sometimes certain things need to be stated and at such times even the writer is incapable of explaining why he wrote what he did. Perhaps, though, the reader may find greater benefit in words that were not intended than in words that were pondered upon for many days and weeks. Most readers, I presume, know Robert E. Cushman as a professor, a leader in his church, and dean of Duke Divinity School. Professionally, I know he is all three. Personally, I know him as a ecumenist, a pioneer and above all, a close personal friend. This is the Bob Cushman I would like to write about in these few pages.

\* \* \* \* \*

I returned to my modest hotel in Rome one afternoon in late October, 1963 to be greeted by a somewhat confused proprietor who fidgeted several moments before breaking the awesome and awful news to me. He blurted out, "We have a Protestant clergyman and

his wife with us. What do we do?" I roared with laughter (for even an American Catholic priest who went about a year ago in sport shirts and a turtle-neck sweater was already a shocking innovation to stolid and staid Romans). "Treat him as a guest," I said, "and Dominico, they don't bite, you know." Thus I was introduced to Dr. and Mrs. Robert E. Cushman.

That evening I dined with my own religious superior, Bishop Peter W. Bartholome. Thinking I might shock the venerable prelate, I said, "We have the son of a bishop staying at our hotel." He was not shocked. "Who?" said he. "Dr. Robert Cushman of Duke Divinity School. He's a Methodist observer-delegate." It was my turn to be surprised. "I knew his father well; he used to be the Methodist bishop of Minnesota." You just can't beat age and experience. I lost that round and knew it.

During the ensuing years Bob Cushman and I were frequent companions. We went to receptions together. We dined together. We compared notes on the progress of the Second Vatican Council. We drove together to the early morning sessions of the Council. We jostled together on a simply impossible Roman bus returning from a conference, a lecture, a press panel. At times his charming wife, Barbara, served as a loving referee and blew the whistle on conversations that lasted much too long into the night when we both knew the morrow would be a busy day. At times, too, Barbara served as a gracious hostess for dinner parties that I was obliged to host for one group or another. During three marvellous years, I was constantly enriched, intellectually, socially and above all religiously by my associations with Bob and Barbara. Through them I came to know many other American and English observer delegates. I discovered another dimension to the theological discussions of Vatican II, enriched by a tradition that grew from the evangelical perspective of American Methodism. I gained an insight into the invaluable assistance of a clergyman's wife, thus giving me a totally new concept of celibacy and the married clergy.

From Dean Cushman I learned that ecumenism is not merely something you sit in your room and write about, or kneel in the chapel and pray for. On the contrary, ecumenism was a reality, clothed with flesh and throbbing with blood. The Roman Catholic-Methodist dialogue was concretized. It consisted of an evening with Dr. and Mrs. Cushman, Dr. and Mrs. Outler, Bishop Leo Dworschak of Fargo, Bishop Lambert Hock of Sioux Falls, Father Godfrey

Diekmann, O.S.B., Father Colman Barry, O.S.B., Father Hans Küng and myself sitting around the table at a supper (so reminiscent of that Last Supper) and seriously discussing the Church that is and the Church that is becoming. On both figurative sides of that table we came to learn, as Dr. Cushman later wrote, "it is possible . . . that we are on the threshold of real reformation, which I would call the de-domestication of God."

These, I know, are no more than fond personal reminiscences. They do, however, reveal what ecumenism is all about. The relationship continued. After the Council the Dean and I would snatch a few hours from his busy schedule as he came to Washington, D.C., to compare notes. Our correspondence grew longer and longer. Through his graciousness, I was invited to lecture at Duke Divinity School. We would meet again, and again and again (three times!) on the lecture circuit at Methodist Pastors' Conferences. We were no longer ecumenists; we were friends, deep, loyal and faithful. Several times I reflected upon what Father Colman Barry, O.S.B., president of St. John's University in Collegeville, Minnesota, and one of America's leading Catholic historians said about Bob Cushman. "He's a real sleeper," he observed after our first evening with the Dean. "He gives the impression of being a quiet, shy southern Methodist preacher—but after a while you come to realize that he is, in fact, a leading American theologian of our times."

Dean Cushman is both theologian and ecumenist in the finest sense of the words. An ecumenical principle, enunciated at least a decade ago by no less a leader than Dr. Jaroslav Pelikan, underscores the fact that the purpose of the ecumenical movement is not conversion but commitment. True ecumenist that he is, Dr. Cushman has been faithful to that principle. Personally, he has made me (force is too strong a word to use when speaking of so gentle a man!) be a better Roman Catholic. We both realize the apparent insurmountable hurdles we face in preparing the way for that Church that is Uniting. Nonetheless, we both understand the absolute necessity of cleaning our own doorsteps before we can invite each other to enter as a native son into the House of the Lord. Our example, among many, of Dr. Cushman's profound grasp of the ecumenical vision, appeared in an article he wrote in *The Drew Gateway* in 1965 entitled, "The Ecumenical Challenge to Methodism." His words deserve not only repetition but also meditation:

... the ecumenical challenge to the churches is sixfold: (1) It is ripening faith in the eschatological reality of the undivided Church of Christ. (2) It is acceptance of obligation to pray and labor for the visible manifestation of the one Body of Christ. (3) It is a spirit of openness and reconciliation, replacing alienation and self-defensiveness. (4) It is service to the Kingdom of God that no longer complacently confounds "my church" with God's Kingdom. (5) It views tradition and traditions not primarily as evidences and tokens of God's past mercies and man's response that are inalterable and fixed but more nearly as manifestations of what God has done, is doing, and will yet do among us. It is open to what God will do and does not presume to commit him inalterably to what he has done. (6) The ecumenical challenge is the negation of every form of the human and idolatrous tendency to localize and domesticate God's working in rites, persons, places, orders, and institutions. It is a rebuke to every tendency to enshrine and therefore possess deity.

I also mentioned that Dean Cushman is a pioneer. Nothing recalls that fact more clearly than an incident that happened to this writer at a meeting of Methodist pastors in central Minnesota. I was invited (through the suggestion of Dean Cushman) to address this group of about 125 pastors during the course of the Second Vatican Council. After my morning lecture we were going through the line in the cafeteria. While talking to the pastor behind me, I accidentally stepped on the foot of the pastor in front of me. "Pardon me," I said. "That's all right," he replied. "You've been stepping on my toes all morning." (Crunch!) In a subtle, quiet manner (which is the Dean's usual procedure), he opened avenues—not just doors—for extended and broadened dialogue between Roman Catholics and Methodists. Through a word here, a letter there, a suggestion there, he enriched both Methodist and Roman Catholic clerics to come to know and understand each other better. This would not—in fact, could not—have been accomplished a decade ago. The Dean used his office, his knowledge, and his experience to broaden the base of dialogue—and in such a sense he has been an ecumenical pioneer. Dr. Cushman has long practiced what he said—a truth we all need to be reminded of from time to time—when he wrote that "those who have acquired some ecumenical empathy are conscious of the unity which all Christians presently have in Christ as a rebuke to and negation of a historical state of things which is the dis-unity of the churches."

A pioneer, too, must be honest. For the past decade I have been addressing Roman Catholic audiences on the absolute necessity of honesty as a condition *sine qua non* for ecumenical dialogue. During these years it has been a source of constant support to know that

Dean Cushman not only preached, but especially practiced this degree of honesty. I wish to cite as one example, not only as an example but also as a reminder, the forthrightness and directness which he practiced. In his November, 1965 "Letter from Rome" to the faculty and students of Duke Divinity School, he summarized the Second Vatican Council and handed down an admonition worthy of our consideration today :

The Council is very near its close. Its meaning will take years to digest and, certainly, to unfold. But one great impression stays with me. Here, for four years, the most thoroughgoing intellectual effort has been made on the part of all sorts and conditions of Catholic leaders, bishops, theologians, and laymen, to renovate an ancient fabric in the face of intransigent conservative minorities. The sheer intellectual and spiritual output, and "in-take," is overpoweringly impressive. It is my opinion that extraordinary achievements in self-reformation have been made. To apply the new principles to the actual shape and life of practicing world Catholicism will require the earnest dedication of many generations. And I would add this: Catholic ecumenism is really born and, even if it has to grow up, we may as well be prepared to reckon with it.

I have previously alluded to the sagacious judgments that Dean Cushman has made concerning the present status of the Roman Church, especially in the light of the Council. For this reason those of us in the Roman Church who know him and have read his observations respect his judgments as often more important than those made by members of our own church. In the course of the 1964 Gray lectures he did not hesitate to make the bold (at the time) and definite statement that "for those who have eyes to see, you are witnessing a radical renovation of modern Catholicism." Then it was bold and definite, and subsequent event (the birth control controversy, the celibacy issue, the closing of Catholic schools, the defection of priests and religious) have shown how observant he was. In that same address he commented on the issue of religious liberty during the second session of the Council and then acutely observed, "The sorry episode places in bold relief the momentous and pressing question whether world Catholicism can be de-Romanized." Present tensions within the Roman Catholic Church (the election of bishops, the formation of pastoral councils, the life-style of the clergy) all prove how absolutely correct he was in making this observation at a time when even most Roman Catholics were not even thinking of such issues. These are but two of many examples to show the pioneering nature of his thought.

He is also my friend, as I have tried to delineate above. But he is also the friend of the Roman Catholic church. He paid my church a great compliment, one that I have seldom seen voiced by my own religious colleagues, when he wrote as follows:

. . . I think I would be an unfaithful Protestant reporter on Vatican II if I did not voice the considered judgment that the Holy Spirit is at large today in the Catholic Church, and that the Spirit is one of renewal and almost of revolution. In Pauline language, I think I see it as a struggle between the "letter that kills" and the "Spirit that makes alive." Also I believe I see signs that the Spirit is in process of transforming the "letter" and may yet profoundly reshape the "earthen vessel."

Revolution is no comfortable word, and a word, I know, that is repugnant to the Dean. Nonetheless, he did use it when he penned those words and, I believe as an observer of Catholic life and thought, that "revolution" rather than "renewal" best describes the contemporary scene in the Roman Church. Again, his judgment anticipated the facts!

The reader will, I pray, excuse me for leaning so heavily upon the experiences and the aftermath of Vatican II in recalling my affection and esteem for Dean Cushman. I must do so as a reporter, however, for these were the idyllic years of our mutual coming together in Christ. The image, however, would be out of focus if I did not cite one example of his brilliant theological insight. I chose, as an example, his address to the entering class of Duke Divinity School in the autumn of 1966. The address is entitled, "The Eclipse of God and the Vocation of Godliness" and remains even at this late date as one of the noteworthy Christian responses to the death-of-god theology. The Dean's concluding remarks are:

For today, the vocation of godliness is, above all, openness to transcendence. That includes prayer. It is also participation with Christ in his sufferings for the world. The way of *openness* and *participation* is the secret of the godly life. It is to this life that this Divinity School is irrevocably committed. Today openness and participation are the pressing meanings of obedience, and it is upon this obedience to God that depends a clearer apprehension of God—by us in our day and by all men in any day. . . . I offer you a seasoned conviction: the vocation of godliness today is still open to all of us. It is openness to transcendence. It is also, since Christ, participation with him in his absolute affirmation of the world—not the world in its flight from God, but the world in the intent and purpose of God for it.

\* \* \* \* \*

No words of any man can possibly express the sentiments of any man for a friend. Pascal said it better: "The heart has reasons which reason knoweth not." This is but a pitiful attempt. When the Dean returned from the Vatican Council the faculty and students of Duke Divinity School honored him with a reception. One of the songs sung on that occasion contained this verse:

The Dean, he leads a jolly life  
Away from all internal strife.  
He doesn't have to rule, pontificate,  
Or even excommunicate.

I accepted writing these observations for this issue as a deep and signal honor. With the same sentiments, I pray that the Dean, my friend, your friend, our friend, will lead in the years ahead "a jolly life" which will be a life of service and love UNTIL HE COMES.

# The Oxford Edition of Wesley's Works

FRANK BAKER\*

For the past decade Duke Divinity School, especially through the vision and enthusiasm of Dean Robert E. Cushman, has been intimately associated with what in its beginnings was entitled "The Wesley Works Editorial Project"—one of the major literary ventures of this century, and one far more complex and arduous than any of its sponsors or editorial workers could be expected to realise, especially during the early stages of surveying the situation, defining the limits of the project, clearing the ground, assembling materials and workers, and laying the foundations. It now becomes clear that at least another decade will be needed to prepare and publish the thirty-three volumes envisaged—some five million words of Wesley text supported by a million words of editorial apparatus—and that the cost of the editorial preparations alone will be in the neighbourhood of \$250,000. A formidable undertaking indeed!

This undertaking more than anything else brought the present writer to Duke, and it has been suggested that at this turning-point in the history of the project he should put the Divinity School community more "in the picture" about what has been happening, and to do it by means of a series of personal impressions rather than by an official report.

## *The Need*

The need for a definitive edition of Wesley's works has long been apparent. So far as I know it was first given wide publicity by a Belgian Roman Catholic scholar, Father Maximin Piette, in his monumental *John Wesley: Sa Réaction dans L'Évolution du Protestantisme* (1925). He expressed the pious hope: "Soon we may expect from the painstaking and highly qualified Wesley Historical Society a truly critical edition of all the works of their founder. Such

---

\* Dr. Frank Baker is Professor of English Church History and bibliographer, textual editor, and editor-in-chief of The Oxford Edition of Wesley's Works.

a service . . . cannot long be refused the friends of Methodist research."<sup>1</sup>

Almost twenty years later a similar plea was independently voiced in a commemorative issue of the *Proceedings* of the Wesley Historical Society, which was celebrating its first fifty years. The present writer, in undertaking to indicate what might be accomplished during the next fifty years, pointed out that one of the major tasks was "to prepare a critical, fully annotated standard edition" of Wesley's prose writings, and suggested its preparation in "units" comprising different categories of writings. The article continued:

It is a formidable undertaking, and one not likely to attract a publisher, as the work would be arduous, and the volumes not likely to sell extensively or speedily. Yet it would supply an undoubted need. For there are, and we believe will be in the future, a number of students who wish to consult an authoritative text of Wesley's own words, and who also desire to know about such things as the sources of his quotations, how his thought developed, and how his conclusions compare with modern thought and knowledge. . . . At present anyone attempting to read Wesley's works with such questions in mind has to do a tremendous amount of spade-work before arriving at the thing he really wants. For we are still compelled to use the basic 1829 edition of most of Wesley's writings—undoubtedly valuable as an authoritative collection, but woefully meagre in annotations.<sup>2</sup>

The 1829-31 edition of Wesley's *Works* in 14 volumes prepared by Thomas Jackson is nothing like as poor, however, as some older editions of important writers. In any case it was a mammoth task for one man, even though he was the connexional editor and separated in part for such work. Jackson's edition has been reissued many times, occasionally with minor revisions, most recently by the Zondervan Press (1958-9). Jackson made one error, however, which turns out to be fundamental for those who seek a definitive text of Wesley's writings: he used the latest editions (sometimes with Wesley's manuscript corrections), not realising that these demonstrably suffer from careless printing and hasty proofreading over the years, resulting in a progressive deterioration of the text. Wesley was so engrossed in the ever-increasing demands of his primary mission that his normal method of preparing a new edition of any work was to enter revisions in any copy that was readily available, which usually proved to be that most recently printed, and therefore the one with the greatest

---

1. M. Piette, *John Wesley in the Evolution of Protestantism* (English translation by J. B. Howard), London, Sheed & Ward, 1937, p. 203.

2. *Proceedings* of the Wesley Historical Society, XXIV.36-7 (June, 1943).

accumulation of compounded errors, most of them slight, but some quite important. Any missing phrase or sentence (if discovered), any obviously incorrect word, was patched up then and there with something that at least made sense, though these makeshift corrections usually lacked the clarity or the forcefulness of the original text. This is why even Wesley's own manuscript corrections in a late edition are frequently not as trustworthy as an earlier edition.

The general contents of Jackson's volumes also leave something to be desired. Some works were included as Wesley's original writings which we now know to have been his extracts from the writings of others—though this certainly does not mean that they lack importance as an index to his own thought. A few minor Wesley publications not known to Jackson have also been discovered during recent years, as well as hundreds of letters. Much more serious, Jackson's edition furnishes no historical or critical introductions to the different items, no footnotes identifying quotations or elucidating obscure points about people and places and events—simply the uncollated Wesley text roughly gathered together into mostly undefined categories, the only apparatus being a reasonably good index.

### *The Beginnings*

The plea for a new edition had been voiced on the continent of Europe and in Wesley's England, but it was left to the New World really to get something done. The moving spirit behind the project was Professor Albert C. Outler, of Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, who had persuaded the editorial board of the Library of Protestant Thought to include a volume on the thought of John Wesley, as a "folk theologian" (his happy phrase) whose positive doctrinal contributions have been too little recognized—a volume which seems to have proved the most successful in the series. In 1958 or 1959 Dr. Outler, after enquiries by correspondence, visited the writer at his Methodist manse in Hull, and spent some hours discussing the possible contents of the proposed volume, as well as some of the literary problems involved. These preparations convinced him of the urgent need for "a complete and scholarly edition" which might reduce the "conventional and misleading stereotypes about Wesley and his thought."<sup>3</sup>

---

3. A. C. Outler (ed.), *John Wesley*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1964, p. ix and book-jacket.

Another important influence urging the need for such a publication was a general renaissance of Wesley studies in America, in which still another scholar played a major part—Professor Franz Hildebrandt of Drew University, a German Lutheran who had transferred to the British Methodist ministry and had been loaned to Drew by the British Conference. One sign of his widespread influence was the springing up of branches of the Wesley Society in several seminaries. In this favourable climate he and Outler secured the support of a number of influential friends, including Outler's dean, Merrimon Cuninggim, Hildebrandt's dean, Bernhard W. Anderson, and the dean of Duke Divinity School, Robert E. Cushman. The writer's first inkling of what was in the wind came in March 1960 with letters from Duke University inviting him to teach in the Department of Religion and in the Divinity School, and also in all probability to participate in an infant undertaking to publish a definitive edition of Wesley's works. The wheels were already turning.

On behalf of the group of enthusiastic pioneers Dean Cushman convened the administrative heads of five Methodist universities and the deans of their related theological schools to a meeting in connection with the General Conference of the Methodist Church held at Denver in May 1960. This gathering warmly endorsed the project, pledged the backing of the institutions represented, and appointed the seminary deans as a Board of Directors. Thus added to Cushman and Anderson were Joseph D. Quillian, Junior, who had succeeded Cuninggim as Dean of Perkins, and William R. Cannon, Dean of the Candler School of Theology, Emory University. Walter G. Muelder, Dean of Boston University School of Theology, personally endorsed the project, but did not serve as a director until recent years because his parent institution felt unable to furnish the necessary financial support. The task of the board was to secure an adequate financial backing, to make any necessary appointments, and generally to supervise the project.

The Board of Directors continues its general oversight, though the personnel has been subject to the changes wrought by time. Dean Anderson of Drew was replaced first by Charles W. Ranson, and more recently by James M. Ault; when Dean Cannon became Bishop of the Raleigh area of the Methodist Church he was replaced by his successor at Candler, James T. Laney. With the resignation of Dean Cushman from the helm of Duke Divinity School his place will be taken by the new dean. From the beginning of the project

Dean Cushman has served as Chairman of the board, but this position will now be filled by Dean Quillian of Perkins.

The structure of the Board of Directors, as well as its personnel, has changed over the years. At an early stage the Department of the Ministry of the General Board of Education of the Methodist Church promised regular financial support, and the Department's Director, Dr. Gerald O. McCulloh, was co-opted as a director. Similarly the Executive Secretary of The Commission on Archives and History of The United Methodist Church, Dr. John H. Ness, Jr., was co-opted to the board. Three General Editors had early been appointed "to approve editorial policies, to facilitate their implementation, and to conduct negotiations with the publishers," and it was decided to co-opt these also as directors. These are Bishop Cannon, Dean Cushman, and Dr. Eric W. Baker, Secretary of the British Methodist Conference, who upon his retirement from that office this year will be replaced as a General Editor by the Rev. Rupert E. Davies, President of the British Methodist Conference 1970-71; both will serve as directors.

### *Editorial Preparations*

The original Board of Directors speedily appointed an editorial committee to study the dimensions of the project and to formulate specific plans for its fulfilment. They were charged by the directors to follow "the highest standards of scholarly research and editorial practice, to the end of producing a definitive edition of the whole work of John Wesley." This task has proved enormously complex and difficult, and I believe that it is true to say that no member of the editorial committee has come through the individual researches, the extensive correspondence, the annual series of meetings from 1961 to 1970, each spreading over at least two or three days, with his preconceptions and prejudices and predilections intact. The committee consisted of the General Editors together with Dr. Outler as Executive Editor and Chairman, Dr. Hildebrandt, and the writer, to whom were subsequently added Professors Philip S. Watson of Garrett Theological Seminary, John Lawson of Candler School of Theology, Emory University, and Charles A. Rogers, then at Duke Divinity School.

The original resolution of the directors called for a definitive edition of "the whole work of John Wesley." The editorial committee faced several problems here. It is sometimes difficult to dis-

entangle the work of John from that of his brother Charles, especially in the verse publications. Together they published some five hundred items, ranging from broadsheets to the fifty-volume *Christian Library*. Some of these were completely original—or as nearly so as it is possible for any literary work to be truly original. Others were little more than extracts from or editions of the writings of other authors. Nor is it always quite certain which is which, for John Wesley published a large proportion of his undoubtedly original works anonymously, as well as including in the thirty-two volumes of his own collected *Works* much of which only an occasional “and” or “but” actually came from his own pen!

With an author-publisher of this character a descriptive bibliography is an essential foundation, and the committee agreed quite early that a definitive bibliography must be regarded as an integral component of the edition. They also agreed that this should deal with the publications of both brothers, whether published jointly or individually, whether in prose or in verse, whether original or edited. This decision made, it became the easier to agree that the remaining volumes should concentrate upon the original prose writings of John Wesley. Nevertheless it seemed desirable to include a handful of the more important edited items, with one volume devoted specifically to John Wesley’s work as editor, and another to the most famous and influential of his hymn publications—*A Collection of Hymns for the Use of the People called Methodists*.

Settling upon the basis for a definitive text also raised difficulties. The committee studied and debated the respective merits of: (a) the first edition; (b) those appearing in Wesley’s own collected edition—available only for items published by 1774; (c) the last editions published during his lifetime. The *Works* text was eventually set aside because it proved not only to be full of printing errors, but to have been heavily abridged by Wesley. The emphasis of the committee as a whole swung to the last edition which could be shown to have been revised by Wesley. Extended textual research, however, demonstrated that in his later days Wesley became a compulsive wielder of the editorial blue pencil, frequently altering the order of words from the form which had been traditional through several earlier revisions. though for no obviously good reason.<sup>4</sup> More damaging

---

4. Thus in the 1772 *Works* edition of the *Earnest Appeal* “have not ye” became “have ye not,” and “vehemently have” became “have vehemently,” though the original forms were retained in the 1786 edition—also revised by Wesley.

still was the mounting proof that when faced with an obvious error in the latest text before him Wesley did not go back to early editions to discover the original intent and wording, but made the best he could of it with an ad hoc alteration, which in many cases proved to be quite inferior to what he had originally written. It seemed—and still seems—that in most cases the first edition will furnish the soundest reference text, though there will be exceptions. A new formula was devised to cover the options which thus presented themselves: we would print as our basic reference text the edition which “represents the most fully deliberate expression of Wesley’s thought.” We would also furnish the reader, however, with all the significant variants from this text which were printed during Wesley’s lifetime.

In order to secure such a definitive text it was first necessary to identify as many contemporary editions as possible, and then to collate these with each other in order to discover what variant readings in fact existed. Only then would it be possible to make an informed decision about the best reference text to reproduce. This has entailed an enormous expenditure of time and energy. During the process some two thousand editions published during Wesley’s lifetime have been identified, many in unique copies. Some ephemeral works which we know him to have published, however, seem completely to have disappeared. A few of the less important editions of known works have also eluded us, in spite of close personal investigations in most of the major libraries of the Western hemisphere, as well as hundreds of smaller collections. The first stage of this search for editions of Wesley’s writings was embodied in a *Union Catalogue of the Publications of John and Charles Wesley*, published by Duke Divinity School in 1966, but now out of print. Several of the gaps there noted have been filled by subsequent research, and a number of new editions discovered, as well as many more copies of editions therein listed.

With the consistent cooperation of Professor Donn Michael Farris the Perkins Library of Duke continues to secure at our request microfilms and xeroxes of Wesley items of which we do not possess originals, so that we now have easily the most complete accumulation in the world of originals and reproductions. Even of eighteenth century Wesley originals Duke’s holdings (including those still held personally by the writer) total over 1300, second only to those of the Methodist Archives, London, which has almost 1400. Ours is by far the strongest collection in the Western hemisphere, the next

largest collections in the U.S.A. being at Drew University (741) and Garrett Theological Seminary (602).<sup>5</sup>

The collation of all the editions which Wesley revised or might have revised usually discloses variant readings, the more editions usually implying more variants. Such things as obvious printers' errors, punctuation variants, and spelling changes, are being disregarded in the reproduction of the text, though they often prove of great value in determining the textual history of a work. Every substantive change, however, is being recorded, the more important in footnotes, and all of them in an appendix to each volume, together with a *stemma* showing the genealogical descent of the text of each work. Thus from the apparatus furnished it will be possible for the scholar to reconstruct the text of any edition published during Wesley's lifetime.

Because of the exacting nature of this highly technical work, in 1963 the directors asked the present writer to serve not only as bibliographer but also as textual editor for the whole Wesley corpus. The term first used was "copy text editor," because this was a two-pronged office, and he was expected not only to secure a definitive text but to present it to the modern reader styled in the manner approved for the project. Wesley's life spans a period of rapid transition in English literature, when it is easily possible to distinguish the change from the ancient to the modern, in spelling, in grammar, in punctuation, in the use of italics, in typography. Wesley's early publications seem to be of another world; his later ones belong to ours. The general intention of this edition is to reproduce his original text, both of earlier and later works, styled according to modern literary usage, yet without obscuring the fact that he was indeed an eighteenth century Englishman writing for eighteenth century Englishmen. This means in effect the application of the styling principles of his later works to his earlier works also. The styling will be made as uniform as possible even where the originals themselves are inconsistent, e.g. in using different spellings (even in the same paragraph!), different methods of citation, or the numbering of sections and sub-sections. The editorial aim is to provide the reader with an easily read text on a well-designed page, rather than to preserve all the antique

---

5. *Gnomon: Essays for the Dedication of the William R. Perkins Library*, ed. John L. Sharpe, III, and Esther Evans, Duke University Library, 1970, pp. 52-62, especially pp. 56-7.

minutiae of the reference text as if it were a museum piece, to be inspected with awe but never handled and read.

Another major problem facing the editorial committee was that of classifying Wesley's writings. Some works fall readily into simple categories such as journals, sermons, personal letters. Others touch on several subjects: a description of the organisation of the Methodist societies may be succeeded by a defence of lay preaching or an exposition of the doctrine of Christian perfection. Eventually a series of twelve major categories was devised, two of the categories being subdivided. These categories were termed "units," and to each unit was assigned an editor or editors. Each of Wesley's prose publications was then allocated to one of these units, the allocation of some items remaining the subject of debate over several years because they might fittingly have been included in either of two units—occasionally the possibilities were even greater. Consensus has now been reached, and the overlapping of the subject matter will be recognized by frequent cross-references between the units. The order of arrangement of these units is roughly that which Wesley himself adopted in preparing his own collected *Works*, 1771-74.

The unit editors have all been appointed, and their units are in various stages of preparation. All editors are familiarising themselves with the background literature of their category, and the problems of the text which may require annotation. Each will furnish a general introduction to the class or classes of writings included in his unit, individual introductions to special groups or individual items, and footnotes throughout, elucidating Wesley's references to people and places, to themes and events. They will also attempt to identify his many quotations. The aim throughout will be a maximum exhibition of Wesley himself, and a minimum intrusion upon the reader by the editor. An index will be supplied for each unit, and a general index for the whole series. This task is in the hands of a member of the Society of Indexers, Mr. John Vickers, B.A., B.D., Senior Lecturer in Religious Studies at the College of Education, Bognor Regis, Sussex, England, author of a valuable recent biography of Dr. Thomas Coke.

#### *Units, Editors, Consultants*

The editorial work is being shared by teachers and preachers, those domiciled on both sides of the Atlantic, by Methodists and non-Methodists. The twelve units and their editors are as follows:

I. *Sermons on Several Occasions* (Vols. 1-4), Dr. Albert C. Outler, Professor of Theology, Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.

II. *Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament* (Vols. 5-6), Rev. John Lawson, Associate Professor of Church History, Candler School of Theology, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia.

III. *The Hymnbook: A Collection of Hymns for the Use of the People called Methodists* (Vol. 7), Dr. Franz Hildebrandt, of Edinburgh, formerly of Drew University, Madison, New Jersey, and the Rev. Dr. Oliver A. Beckerlegge, British Methodist minister, of Sheffield, England; Assistant Editor, Dr. James Dale, Associate Professor of English, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.

IV. *Prayers Private and Public* (Vol. 8), Rev. A. Raymond George, M.A., B.D., Principal of Richmond College, Surrey, England, and the Rev. Gordon S. Wakefield, M.A., B.Litt., Editor of The Epworth Press, London, England.

V. *The Methodist Societies: (A). History, Nature, and Design* (Vol. 9), Dr. J. Hamby Barton, Dean of the College and Professor of History, Southwestern College, Winfield, Kansas, and the Rev. Rupert E. Davies, M.A., B.D., Principal of Wesley College, Bristol, England, and President of the Methodist Conference.

*The Methodist Societies: (B). The Conference* (Vol. 10), the Rev. Dr. John C. Bowmer, Archivist of The Methodist Church, Archives and Research Centre, London, England, and the Rev. Normal P. Goldhawk, M.A., Shrubsall Tutor in Church History and History of Doctrine, Richmond College, Surrey, England.

VI. *Doctrinal Writings: (A). Appeals* (Vol. 11), Dr. Gerald R. Cragg, Professor of Church History, Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Center, Massachusetts.

*Doctrinal Writings: (B). Theological Treatises* (Vol. 12), Dr. John Deschner, Professor of Theology, Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.

*Doctrinal Writings: (C). The Defence of Christianity* (Vol. 13), Dr. William R. Cannon, Bishop of the Raleigh Area of The United Methodist Church, Raleigh, North Carolina.

VII. *Pastor and Teacher* (Vols. 14, 15), Dr. A. Lamar Cooper, Professor of Social Ethics, Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.

VIII. *Editor* (Vol. 16). Dr. T. Walter Herbert, Professor of English, The University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

IX. *Journal and Diaries* (Vols. 17-23), Dr. W. Reginald Ward, Professor of Modern History, The University of Durham, Durham, England, with Assistant Editor having special responsibility for the diaries, Rev. Richard P. Heitzenrater, Instructor in History and Religion, Center College of Kentucky, Danville, Kentucky.

X. *Letters* (Vols. 24-30), Dr. Frank Baker.

XI. *Bibliography* (Vols. 31, 32), Dr. Frank Baker.

XII. *Miscellanea and General Index* (Vol. 33), Mr. John Vickers.

A panel of *Consultants* has also been enlisted, who are available to offer advice and information to editors in the field of their own special competence, including the possible identification of stubborn quotations. They may also occasionally be invited to serve as readers of manuscripts. These include the following: Professor Nelson F. Adams, Dean of Brevard College, North Carolina (Wesleyan musicology); Sir. Herbert Butterfield, Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge, England (eighteenth century British history); Rev. George Lawton, M.A., B.D., Rector of Checkley, Staffordshire, England (Wesley's use of specific words and phrases); Dr. Geoffrey F. Nuttall, New College, London, England (the English Puritans); Dr. Jean Orcibal, The Sorbonne, Paris, France (the Roman Catholic mystics); Dr. E. Gordon Rupp, Principal of Wesley House, Cambridge, England (the Protestant Reformation); Dr. John Walsh, Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford, England (eighteenth century Evangelical clergy); Professor Basil Willey, King Edward VII Professor of English Literature, the University of Cambridge, England (eighteenth century English culture); Dr. George W. Williams, Professor of English, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina (literary bibliography, textual problems in English literature, Shakespeare).

### *Publication*

A huge investment in time and money has been made over the last decade in formulating editorial policy, in bibliographical and textual research, and in the attempt to draw up detailed guidelines for the styling of Wesley's text throughout the corpus. There is no doubt that the eventual volumes will be much nearer perfection as a result of these patient labours. It had been hoped to publish the bibliography very early as the reference unit for the whole series, and one-third of this unit is now written. Work on it was halted in 1969, however, when the directors asked the writer to oversee the whole project as editor-in-chief, especially with a view to securing the publication of a few volumes of Wesley text as soon as was practicable. This present year, 1971, they appointed a new supporting committee to replace the former editorial committee, to provide oversight in such tasks as discussing priorities in publication, appointing readers for

manuscripts, and resolving any problems not readily decided by consultations between the unit editor and the editor-in-chief.

The actual publishers were decided upon several years ago, after lengthy negotiations by the Directors and Dr. Outler, then Executive Editor. Although both the Abingdon Press in the U.S.A. and the Epworth Press in England assured us of their fullest cooperation, and were prepared to undertake the whole task of publication, the directors and editorial committee were most happy that the whole project could be elevated above the denominational to an incontrovertibly scholarly level by the readiness of the Clarendon Press of Oxford, England, to undertake the venture—the largest which they have ever taken in hand for the writings of one man. In recognition of the birthplace of Methodism as well as in tribute to our publishers the series is therefore to be entitled “The Oxford Edition of Wesley’s Works.” The Press does not expect to publish more than two or three volumes a year, and the order of publication will not correspond to the numbering of the units or volumes. The first volume projected for publication is the *Appeals* (Vol. 11), of which the manuscript should be ready this year, after which it is hoped to publish the *Sermons* (Vols. 1-4)—or at least a part of that unit. Others in a fairly advanced state of preparation are the *Hymnbook* (Vol. 7), and the *Bibliography* (Vols. 31-2). The Clarendon Press would like to see early publication of the *Journal* and the *Letters*, but logistic problems may render this impracticable.

The continuing cost of the extensive editorial preparations is being borne mainly by the sponsoring universities, in cooperation with the Board of Education and the Commission on Archives and History (both at denominational and conference level). Dr. Fletcher Nelson of our own administrative staff has been active in securing donations from foundations and individuals, and arrangements have been made to dedicate specific volumes to generous donors. Much more money still needs to be raised. The actual publishing costs are to be met by the publishers. The price of the volumes will vary with their size, but will be kept as low as possible while securing the publishers from an overall financial loss. It is clear that volumes will vary in their appeal to the scholar, to the minister in pastoral work, and to the general reader, though surely no major library will feel able to neglect any of them.

It is a privilege, as well as a heavy responsibility, to be associated

with this venture, which will enable us both to see John Wesley as he was, in the frailness of even his humanity, and at the same time to realise more fully than has previously been possible all that under God he was able to do for world Christianity in the realms both of action and of thought.

# Notes on the Graduating Classes of 1958-1967 of Duke Divinity School and Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary

O. KELLY INGRAM AND ROBERT M. COLVER  
(In collaboration with ROBERT M. POERSCHKE)\*

Graduates of Duke Divinity School and Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary have told us much about themselves in a study now reaching conclusion. They were almost unanimous in reporting that seminary education has proved to be essential for the work they are now doing. They were least inclined to say they needed more emphasis on historical studies in seminary, and, whereas Duke graduates were most inclined to say too little emphasis was placed on the practical aspects of parish administration, Southeastern graduates were most likely to say that too little emphasis was placed on pastoral care.

Much of the information we received was disturbing. For instance, there is a clear "generation gap" among our graduates with the older tending to be more identified with and the younger tending to be more alienated from parish ministry. There is a marked tendency among the younger to become ministerial drop-outs or to gravitate toward non-parish forms of the ministry, and increasing numbers of them are finding their ways into parish staff associateships rather than the pastorate. Fewer graduates are entering pastorates with unambiguous commitments.

Another disturbing fact is that there are mounting numbers who are going into *parish ministries* and are *expressing dissatisfaction with their roles*. They are the "alienated" within the ranks. Their

---

\* The Reverend O. Kelly Ingram is Professor of Parish Ministry and Director of Field Education. Dr. Robert M. Colver is Director of Regional Programs, Duke University, specializing in Psychometrics and Statistics. Formerly he was Assistant Director of the Duke Counseling Center. Dr. Robert M. Poerschke, Professor of Religious Education at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, provided the basic data from SEBTS on which this article is based.

negativity toward parish ministry is seconded by the drop-outs from ministry and those in non-parish ministries, three-fourths of whom say they do not expect to return to the parish. Duke, in contrast to Southeastern, demonstrates a ten-year trend toward increasing alienation from parish ministry, but, strangely enough, the "generation gap" is more evident at Southeastern than at Duke. At Southeastern, "dropping out" is characteristic of an age group, while at Duke it correlates with both age and year of graduation.

It is interesting to note that there is no discernible trend at either school toward *non-parish forms of ministry* when analyzed according to the date of graduation. The percentage of those entering such ministries permanently remains essentially the same across the years, but those who are co-opted temporarily for non-parish types of ministries tend to come from the classes of 1962 and 1963; otherwise their percentages remain at the same level.

#### *Vocational Categories Into Which Graduates Distributed Themselves*

This study of seminary education and subsequent vocational choice is based on responses to questionnaires received from 515 graduates of Duke Divinity School and 1,307 graduates of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary of the classes of 1958-1967, making a total of 1,822 questionnaires received. Subsequent analysis was confined to graduates who received the BD degree or its equivalent, so that the total number was reduced to 1,624.

*Eight categories of graduates* were established, ranging on a spectrum from the totally identified pastor to the totally alienated drop-out. Beginning with the latter group the categories are the following: (1) graduates holding the BD degree or equivalent engaged in nonreligious work and not expecting to return to the ministry, referred to henceforth as "*alienated drop-outs*"; (2) those engaged in secular pursuits who *do* expect to return to the parish, referred to henceforth as "*identified drop-outs*"; (3) graduates engaged in "religious" or church related work outside the parish who do not expect to return to the parish, referred to henceforth as "*non-parish ministers*"; (4) those engaged in "religious" or church related service outside the parish who do expect to return to the parish ministry, referred to henceforth as "*pastors-in-exile*"; (5) those engaged in parish ministry other than the pastorate who do not wish to remain in the parish, referred to henceforth as "*alienated associates*"; (6)

those engaged in parish ministries other than the pastorate who do wish to remain in the parish, referred to henceforth as "*identified associates*"; (7) those who are now in the pastoral ministry who do not wish to remain therein, referred to henceforth as "*alienated pastors*"; (8) those who are in the pastorate and wish to remain in it, referred to henceforth as "*identified pastors.*"

*Analysis of Alienation-Identification  
According to Age Groupings*

An analysis was made of the alienation-identification groups listed above according to their age group distribution. At *Duke*, a total of 59 students were classified as "*alienated drop-outs.*" Of this total, 59% were between the ages of twenty-six and thirty; 34% were in the age group thirty-one–thirty-five; 5% in the age group thirty-six–forty; 2% in the age group forty-one–forty-five; and none were older. It should be noted that 93% of the Duke "*alienated drop-outs*" were between the ages of twenty-six and thirty-five, while only 76% of the Duke graduates were in that age range. The most significant fact is that there is a marked difference between the age groups twenty-six–thirty and the age group thirty-one–thirty-five in the number who are "*alienated drop-outs.*" While the total numbers in those two age groups are approximately the same, 177 being in the age group twenty-six–thirty, and 179 being in the age group thirty-one–thirty-five, 19% of the younger age group were "*alienated drop-outs*" and only 11% of the older of the two groups were in that category, even though those in the older group should have had more time to find their way into alternative vocations.

In the case of *Southeastern*, the difference is even more marked, for 29% of those in the age group twenty-six–thirty are "*alienated drop-outs,*" and only 15% of those between thirty-one and thirty-five are "*alienated drop-outs.*" Another significant difference between *Southeastern* and *Duke* is that while only 5% of *Duke* graduates between the ages thirty-six and forty are "*alienated drop-outs,*" 13% of the *Southeastern* graduates in that age group are "*alienated drop-outs.*" For the two seminaries, out of a total of 335 in the age group twenty-six–thirty, 24% are "*alienated drop-outs,*" and, of the 587 in the age group thirty-one–thirty-five, 13.9% are "*alienated drop-outs.*" In other words, there was almost twice the likelihood that a graduate thirty and under would become alienated from the ministry as a graduate thirty-one to thirty-five years of age. This is what we

mean by the "generation gap" as it applies to alienation-identification.

One dismaying fact that this study has revealed is that so *few who are outside the realm of religious service expect to return*. Of the sixty-two graduates of Duke outside the ministry altogether, only three (4.8%) expect to return to the parish ministry. At Southeastern, of the 189 outside the realm of religious service only twenty-eight (14.7%) expect to return. There are 251 graduates of the two seminaries who indicate that they are not in religious service, 12% indicating that they expect to return. For both seminaries, there is a total of sixty between the ages of thirty-six and forty who are completely outside religious ministries, but 25% of these indicate their intention to return to parish ministry. The indication is, therefore, that the older a man is, the less likely he is to be emotionally alienated even though he has dropped out and the younger he is, the more likely he is to be emotionally alienated.

For the two seminaries, 254 are *in religious service outside the parish*, seventy-eight graduates of Duke and 176 graduates of Southeastern. 56% of the Duke graduates in religious work outside the parish are in the age group thirty-one–thirty-five, and 48% of the Southeastern graduates. In the case of both seminaries graduates are approximately thirty-one years old before they get into non-parish ministries. Since these men often require specialized training, one can expect them to enter late into their areas of specialization. The two seminaries are alike in that approximately 74% of those in religious work outside the parish do not expect to return to the parish.

505 (31%) of the 1,624 respondents are either engaged in *non-religious vocations* or *are in religious vocations outside the parish*. It is important to note that 88% of these indicate that they do not expect to return to the parish. The tendency to be engaged in non-parish ministries is most marked among those between the ages of twenty-six and forty, indicating that the proliferation of non-parish ministries is a phenomenon characteristic of the last fifteen years, but, as we shall observe later, our data do not demonstrate a trend that is on the increase. It is true that the preponderance of non-parish ministers is between the ages of twenty-six and thirty-five, but they tend to cluster in the age group thirty-one–thirty-five while those going into non-religious work tend to cluster in the age group twenty-six–thirty.

The tendency to *drop out of ministerial service altogether* seems to be correlated inversely with the age of the graduates. Of those

forty-one and older who are graduates of Duke, only 2.4% were out of religious vocation altogether and did not expect to return; 5% of those thirty-six–forty were out of religious vocation, not expecting to return; 11% of those thirty-one–thirty-five; and 18.5% of those thirty and under.

The trend is even more discernible in the case of Southeastern. 4% of those forty-one and older were permanent ministerial drop-outs; 5% of those thirty-six–forty; 15% of those thirty-one–thirty-five; and 30% of those thirty and under. For both schools, 4% of those over forty were permanent ministerial drop-outs; 12% of those thirty-six–forty; 14% of those thirty-one–forty; and 24% of those thirty and under. In terms of age, therefore, there is a definite trend toward exiting from all religious vocation.

There may be a trend toward *non-parish forms of the ministry*, but only an extension of the present study will reveal whether there is or not. In the case of Duke, 12% of those forty-one and older were in non-parish forms of the ministry; 7% of those thirty-six–forty; 20% of those thirty-one–thirty-five; and 7% of those thirty and under. In the case of Southeastern, 8% of those over forty were in non-parish forms of the ministry; 11% of those thirty-six–forty; 13% of those thirty-one–thirty-five; 13% of those thirty and under.

The noticeable increase of Duke graduates in non-parish forms of the ministry between the ages of thirty-one and thirty-five encourages one to speculate that the relatively large number clustered in that age grouping compared with less than half that number in the younger age group may be attributable to the fact that most non-parish forms of the ministry, e.g., teaching, chaplaincies, etc., require specialized training, so that, by the time a student has completed the required training, he is close to the age of thirty-one.

In the case of the Duke graduates who are in non-parish ministries and indicate that they expect to return to the parish ("*pastors-in-exile*"), there is a kind of reverse trend, on which it is interesting to theorize. Instead of their numbers increasing as we move toward the younger age group, they tend to diminish, so that they demonstrate a trend opposite that of the drop-outs. While 10% of the graduates between the ages thirty-six–forty are in this category, the percentage drops with increasing youthfulness so that only 5% of those thirty-one–thirty-five are in this category, and only 3% of those under the age of thirty-one. Since these are men who expect to return to the parish, one might be safe in assuming that they have been in the

parish and intend to return to the parish, but have been co-opted for some specialized form of ministry for a temporary period. This would seem to be most likely to happen in the case of someone in the age group thirty-six–forty. Graduates of Southeastern do not manifest this tendency. What we have been describing is a characteristic of graduates of Duke Divinity School.

In the case of Duke graduates, there is a growing number who are associates in *some form of parish ministry but do not wish to remain therein*. No graduates over the age of forty are included in that category, and only two over the age of thirty-one. On the other hand, there were eight under the age of thirty who say they are associates in the parish and want out. Of course, the older a man is the less free he is to consider vocational alternatives. Southeastern graduates who want out do not cluster in this same young age bracket.

There may be a trend in the case of both schools toward *specializations within the parish ministry*, although the data are subject to other interpretations. The number of graduates engaged in parish ministries other than pastorates has increased numerically and percentage-wise. The movement is most discernible at Duke where 7% of those over the age of forty were in non-pastoral forms of parish ministry; 3% of those thirty-six–forty; 4% of those thirty-one–thirty-five; and 15% of those thirty and under. There is the same general trend at Southeastern; 3% of those over the age of forty; 3% of those thirty-six–forty; 7% of those thirty-one–thirty-five and 12% of those thirty and under. This may represent a trend toward increasing specializations within parish ministry, or it may simply represent the tendency of graduates to engage in associateships as apprenticeships prior to undertaking full parish responsibilities.

Apparently the younger the pastor is the more likely he is to want to get out of the parish. In cases of graduates of both seminaries, there is a remarkably high degree of morale in the age group thirty-six–forty, in which only slightly more than 2% are *pastors who wish to make their exits*. For Southeastern graduates in the age bracket thirty-one–thirty-five, the percentage doubled to 5%, but for Duke pastors the percentage jumped to 15%. Among those pastors from both seminaries thirty years of age and under the dissatisfaction is even more widespread: Duke, 16% and Southeastern, 17%. In other words, younger pastors are far less likely to enter and persist in the parish ministry, and, if they do enter, they are far more prone to say they want to get out.

An unexplained anomaly crops up in the form of the *difference between Duke graduates and Southeastern graduates who are over the age of forty-one*. (There were 318 of them.) How does one explain the relatively widespread dissatisfaction among Duke graduates of that vintage and the relatively little dissatisfaction among the Southeastern graduates of the same age group? Apparently, Methodists over the age of forty are more likely to be unhappy with the pastorate than Baptists. Pastors over the age of forty from Southeastern are for the most part satisfied with their lot, only 3% saying that they do not wish to continue, but a much larger percentage, 12%, of the Duke pastors in that age group manifest disenchantment. If this were a characteristic of both seminaries, one might speculate that the desire to exit at that age is related to the developmental crisis characteristic of the "forties." But the fact that Southeastern pastors do not manifest that tendency probably indicates that this is a denominational rather than a psychological problem. It is possible that Methodist itinerancy guaranteeing an appointment to all pastors in full connection, as it does, retains within its ranks men who do not enjoy advancement based on "merit" and who would be dropped from the ministry altogether by a polity that places pastors by the "call" system.

For both seminaries, *the younger the man, the less likely he is to be in the pastorate*. 78% of Duke graduates over the age of forty are in the pastorate; 81% of the Southeastern graduates. The percentages decrease as one moves from age toward youth: Duke, 71% of those thirty-six-forty—Southeastern, 63%; Duke, 59% of those thirty-one-thirty-five—Southeastern, 58%; Duke, 52% of those thirty and under—Southeastern, 38%.

There are signs of increasing alienation from parish ministry. One of the most disturbing facts revealed by this study is the number of graduates and percentage who are either not in any ministerial vocation and do not expect to return or are serving in some form of parish ministry and want to get out of the parish. The ministry seems to be a troubled profession for a large percentage of those thirty-five and under. Those over the age of thirty-five manifest much less dissatisfaction. The percentages saying that they are either in the parish and want to get out or are out and do not expect to return increase again as we move toward the younger groups: Duke, 22% of those over forty—Southeastern, 15%; Duke, 15% of those thirty-six-forty—Southeastern, 28%; Duke, 40% of those thirty-one-thirty-five—

Southeastern, 31% ; Duke, 38% of those thirty and younger—South-eastern, 50%.

To be sure, these figures represent the tendency of pastors with longer tenure to develop increasing professional commitments, on the one hand, and the difficulty younger ministers have in becoming identified with the ministry. This is to suggest that many of the dissatisfied younger ministers may become increasingly accepting of their roles as they mature. On the other hand, there is much to be said in favor of accepting the data at face value and assuming that the parish ministry is in trouble, for the number actually leaving is on the increase.

### *Analysis of Alienation-Identification According to Date of Graduation*

In order to establish a trend toward alienation from or identification with the parish ministry over the ten year period studied, it would be necessary to demonstrate that the number of one or the other increases appreciably between 1958 and 1967. The attempt to correlate alienation from and identification with parish ministry with the date of graduation presents us with something of an anomaly. While we can demonstrate in the case of both institutions that there is a discernibly higher degree of alienation among those in the age group thirty and under, we cannot demonstrate in the case of Southeastern that there is an increasing trend toward alienation from the pastorate by citing percentages according to years of graduation. Duke, however, is different, for there we have a line that travels along a high plateau and drops precipitately to a low plateau after 1963.

We received thirty-seven responses from Duke graduates of the class of 1958 of whom 65% were in pastorates, wishing to remain. Of the forty-four Duke respondents of the class of 1959, twenty-eight (64%) were in the pastorate, wishing to remain. But there was an 18% drop between 1958 and 1967, for only twenty-four of the fifty-two respondents graduating in 1967 (46%) were in the pastorate, wishing to remain. Percentages committed to the pastorate for the years 1964-1967 do not vary appreciably. There has been a significant decrease in the percentage of graduates committed to the pastorate from Duke Divinity School, from 65% in 1958 to 46% from among the class of 1967. The puzzling character of the trend is demonstrated by the sharp decline from 64% from the class of 1959 to 49% from the class of 1960, a 15% difference from one year to the

next. The following year, 1961, however, the pastorate recovered, claiming 62% of alumni of that year. But, then it made its most dramatic drop of all in 1962, falling to a ten year low of 37%. There was, again, a recovery in 1963, 57% of which class reported that they were serving in pastorates, wishing to remain. It was then that the percentages plunged to the low plateau that remained relatively stable between 1964 and 1967 at approximately 46%.

The statistics seem to prove a trend away from "*non-parish ministries*," but it probably only appears so because the study has not been extended sufficiently. The picture we have shows that the number of "*non-parish ministers*" tended to decline between 1958 and 1967, so that there were more of them from the earlier years of graduation than from the latter years. The Southeastern data indicate the same trend with 19% of the 1958 graduates having gone into "*non-parish ministry*" and only 6% of the 1967 graduates. Such a picture, however, probably illustrates the danger of attempting to establish a trend on the basis of data taken from a defined time period, for it is doubtful that there has, in fact, been a trend away from non-parish forms of ministry. What we have demonstrated in all probability is that it takes time for graduates to work themselves into extra-parish specializations.

The "*alienated drop-outs*" began with a low profile and built to a peak which we predict will maintain itself. The "*non-parish ministers*" began in 1958 at a peak which maintained itself fairly well until 1962 and then began to drop to a low profile. The "*pastors-in-exile*," those in non-parish ministries who expect to return to the parish, reflected an entirely different profile, one that is elliptical. It began low, reached a peak in 1962 in both institutions and dropped to an even lower profile in 1967 than that with which it began in the cases of both institutions. Perhaps we could speculate that these are men who are basically parish ministers released temporarily for some form of denominational service such as camp director, denominational executives, or associational secretaries who see themselves as potential returnees to parish ministry, and they demonstrate, in many ways, the highest degree of identification with the parish ministry, sometimes higher than that of the pastors themselves.

"*Alienated associates*," those serving in parish vocations other than pastorates and wishing out, represent an almost negligible percentage of the graduates of the ten year period, 2.1% of the Duke graduates and .85% of the Southeastern graduates. In fact, the num-

bers involved are so negligible that they are hardly statistically significant.

Probably the most marked trend demonstrated by this study is that toward *specializations within parish ministry*. Both institutions are sending ever increasing numbers of their graduates into associate-ships or staff ministries. The trend is less noticeable at Southeastern than at Duke where the percentage increased from 2.7% of the 1958 graduates to 21.2% of the 1967 graduates. 3.4% of the 1958 graduates at Southeastern reported that they were contented in staff associationships compared with 9% of the 1967 graduates.

### *Attitudes of Graduates Toward Their Seminary Education*

Alumni of the classes of 1958–1967 were invited to respond to two questions that would indicate their attitudes toward their seminary education. *First*, they were asked to indicate whether, for the demands of their present jobs, their *seminary training* was “essential,” “helpful,” “irrelevant” or “unhelpful.” Both seminaries can be encouraged by the fact that the overwhelming majority of respondents (96.1%) indicated that they found the training either “essential” or “helpful.” The two seminaries had the same percentage, 3.9%, responding either “irrelevant” or “unhelpful.” By far the most negatively inclined group were “alienated drop-outs,” those not serving in any form of ministry and not expecting to return. 19.7% of these at Duke and 18.1% at Southeastern reported seminary education “irrelevant” or “unhelpful.” In the case of Duke only 5 (2.1%) of the “identified pastors,” who expect to remain in the parish, reported that they tend to look back negatively upon their seminary experience.

64.5% of Duke graduates and 52.4% of Southeastern graduates tell us that seminary education is “essential” for the jobs they are doing. In both seminaries, “pastors-in-exile,” those in non-parish forms of ministry but expecting to return, are most disposed to affirm the *essentiality* of seminary education, 75% at Duke 69.6% at Southeastern. “Identified pastors,” “non-parish ministers” and “identified staff associates” follow close behind in their affirmations. In the case of both seminaries, those least disposed to affirm seminary experience as essential are the “alienated drop-outs,” the “alienated associates,” the “identified drop-outs,” and the “alienated pastors” in precisely that order.

*The second question designed to elicit an expression of attitude*

toward seminary education asked whether *too little emphasis* was placed on biblical studies, church history, theology and ethics, pastoral care, or practical aspects of parish administration. (The fifth option in the case of Southeastern was listed as "studies in ministries, *i.e.*, Christian education, church administration, etc., other than pastoral care.") The purpose of this inquiry was to give graduates an opportunity to tell us what, in the light of their professional experience, they considered to be the deficiencies in their seminary education. One can interpret the responses any way he sees fit.

However one chooses to interpret the responses, only 1.7% of Duke graduates and 2.2% of Southeastern graduates did, in fact, assert that "too little emphasis" was placed on *historical studies*. 14% of the Duke graduates felt that *pastoral care* had been scanted, but 46% of the Southeastern graduates thought this part of their preparation had been neglected (the most frequent complaint of graduates of that seminary). 21% of the Duke men thought more attention should have given theological studies; 10% of those from Southeastern. 27% of those from Duke and 23% of those from Southeastern were of the opinion that too little emphasis had been placed on *biblical studies*. Southeastern graduates tended to be better satisfied with their *studies in ministries*. Only 19.3% of them said that too little emphasis had been placed on that division of the curriculum. On the Duke questionnaire that section was worded differently to read "*practical aspects of parish administration*." 36.4%, by far the largest percentage received by any of the fields, indicated that they had too little training for this aspect of their ministries. One wonders whether these alumni were saying that the curriculum was structured in such a way that they were not directed into a sufficient amount of study in that field, or they did not recognize the need for preparation for parish administration at the time they were in seminary, or the training that was given them while they were in seminary was not really relevant to the jobs they were called upon to perform. But, by contrast, only 19.3% of the Southeastern graduates said that they received too little training in studies in ministries, which may indicate that their curriculum was so structured that students were required to get that training, or it may indicate that the quality of training that they received was more appropriate to what they experienced in the parish.

By the same token one can ask what the 45.5% of Southeastern graduates saying that they received too little *training in pastoral care*

means. This contrasts with only 14% of the Duke graduates making that complaint. The pastoral care department at Duke has been popular and well-subscribed, and students have been free to take as many courses in that field as they desired. It is possible that training in pastoral care has not been equally accessible at Southeastern. At any rate, the two seminaries should take note of the fact that most of their graduates are trying to tell them something. The Duke graduates are saying they have not been adequately prepared for the *practical aspects of parish administration* and the Southeastern graduates are saying they feel the need for a greater emphasis on *pastoral care*.

# Reflections on Outcomes

RICHARD A. GOODLING\*

As the decade of the sixties opened the writer, in his first year on the faculty of the Divinity School, "bright-eyed and bushy tailed," wrote on "'Plans and Happenings' in the Pastoral Ministry" (*The Duke Divinity School Bulletin*, February 1960). That decade, which seemed at the time to stretch out into the future, is now past and a new decade lies before. What better time to reflect again upon 'plans and happenings'?

The term "Pastoral Theology" was used to identify a field at the start of the decade; "Pastoral Psychology" was the term "on the door" as the decade closed. We too have had an identity problem—a problem which Erikson reminds us is characteristic of adolescence! In many ways the sixties was the decade of our adolescence. Certainly it was a period of continuing growth and a struggle with identity. In 1960 we were not ready for pastoral theology—that was a promise, a promise that pastoral care would reflect an interest which ". . . goes beyond personality development to Christian nurture, beyond personality disintegration to alienation, beyond personality reorganization to redemption, beyond catharsis to confession, beyond acceptance to judgmental love and divine grace" (*ibid.*, p. 12). This promise as lived out was, during most of the sixties, little more than a preface to pastoral theology. In 1960 the writer quoted from Seward Hiltner's *Preface to Pastoral Theology* to define, negatively, the characteristics of pastoral theology: ". . . not merely the *practice* of anything . . . not merely applied theology . . . not just pastoral psychology or pastoral sociology under a new name . . . not the theory of all pastoral operations save preaching . . . not the link between the organized fields of theological study and the acts and functions of ministry and church" (pp. 20ff.). Pastoral theology, it was asserted, raises theological questions and concludes with theological answers as it examines the expressions of the minister's affectionate concern for his people as he meets them, especially in crucial and critical life situations. With the appointment in 1970 to our faculty of one of

---

\* Dr. Richard A. Goodling is Professor of Pastoral Psychology and Director of Programs in Pastoral Psychology.

Hiltner's students, Paul Mickey, in Pastoral Theology, the promise has moved toward realization. The dialogue, within Pastoral Care and across disciplines, primarily with psychology, is reflected in one of his new courses, *Psychotherapy and Sanctification*: "An analysis of structuring and growth processes in psychotherapy in the light of a Christian understanding of sanctification." It is, I believe, of significance to note that in the early third of the decade, courses such as one exploring "The meaning of the self and the resources of the church in doctrine and worship in self-fulfillment" and another providing "An analysis of the fundamental categories of the Christian message and psychoanalysis" were taught by a psychiatrist with some seminary education. As the decade of the seventies gets under way such courses are provided by a pastoral theologian with an in-depth understanding of personality and some counseling and psychotherapeutic experience.

But we are ahead of our story. The promise of a pastoral theology was not fully realized during the decade; there was, rather, a return, for several years, to the earlier title, "Pastoral Care" as being more indicative of the pastoral and professional emphases of the programs. During this period, professional training was enhanced by our affiliation with the Institute of Pastoral Care, Inc., one of the merging organizations which later formed the Association for Clinical Pastoral Education. Chaplains P. Wesley Aitken, John Detwiler, and William Spong are now certified Supervisors with ACPE. All three, together with the writer, have served on Mid-Atlantic Regional ACPE Committees and, in particular, on its Certification and Accreditation Committee. Chaplain Aitken has served on the National C. & A. Committee and he, along with the writer, who is currently National Secretary, have been delegates from the Region to the National ACPE's House of Delegates, the Association's governing body. Our clinical training programs, accredited through ACPE, draw both summer quarter and intern year trainees and advanced trainees for both degree and non-degree credit. Duke was one of the first centers to provide a CPE unit over the period of a semester for students regularly enrolled in seminary for one or two additional courses thus enabling students to take CPE without having to give up a summer Endowment appointment with its financial aid through the Field Education program.

With the arrival of Donald S. Williamson in 1966 now at the Institute of Religion as Dean of the Faculty) the theoretical and

conceptual base for the discipline within the behavioral sciences was consciously strengthened and enlarged. So we became "Pastoral Psychology" for the rest of the decade. The body of knowledge about human behavior is being applied not only to one-to-one or small caring-group relationships through the ministry of pastoral care but also to the structure and organizational life of the local church and to social action settings.

Hopefully, title changes over the decade have reflected the incorporation of important facets of identity rather than the rejection of such. Certainly, these changes have occurred along with the growing awareness of the richness and complexity of the field and the developing professional competency of the staff. Still, there does remain the problem of identifying, with one all-inclusive term, this field. Do not be surprised if another re-labeling occurs during the seventies!

Preparation for ministry in general remains as the major thrust of our programs although at the same time provision is made for the development of professional competency in specialized ministries in pastoral care. A popular misconception held is that an educational program in pastoral care in a particular institution is thereby preparation for a specialized ministry. Rather, such programs should be viewed as raising issues in the midst of critical life situations which touch upon the broad range of ministry: individual life styles which facilitate or inhibit ministry; the nature of health and illness, sin and salvation; technical, personal, interpersonal, and faith resources; the nature of life processes, especially at the point of crises; and so on. Course relationships now exist with the Murdoch Center, a school for the mentally retarded in Butner where Harley Cecil is Chaplain, and the Department of Corrections in Raleigh with Chaplains John Crow and Kenneth Cannaday, as well as with hospitals and clinics in the Duke Medical Center. Between sixty and sixty-five Master of Divinity students enroll each year in one of the institutional courses.

A major program development occurred with the establishment of an advanced training program in Pastoral Care and Counseling, now under the direction of John Detwiler. This program places trainees in the Medical Center (with out-patients and in-patients from among several services including psychiatry, geriatrics, and physical rehabilitation), in local churches, in the Durham Community Mental Health Center, and in the Family Service Association. Such professional training has enabled recent graduates not only to become

part of the professional staff of a local church but also to participate on health care teams in counseling centers, mental health centers, rehabilitation programs, and other treatment centers. In 1960 the writer expressed the hope that those trained here could join “. . . with other professional groups in a vital, comprehensive, meaningful healing ministry.” It is with a measure of satisfaction that this is being realized. The professional organization to which the program in Pastoral Care and Counseling is related is the American Association of Pastoral Counselors; the writer is certified as a Diplomate and Chaplains Detwiler and Spong as Fellows in this organization.

Stipend assistance for men in the advanced training programs remains a critical problem even though some \$25,000 is available for such aid over and above what tuition assistance may be provided by the Divinity School for degree candidates. Averaging out to about \$3,000 per trainee, these stipends are approximately half the amount available to trainees in comparable training programs nearby and across the country. Adequate physical facilities is another pressing need. After several years of doubling up, each senior staff member now has his own office in the Divinity School or in the Medical Center. With the exception of two small seminar rooms in the Medical Center, one of which doubles as a student lounge, there are no rooms set aside for individual, group, and family counseling, for a receptionist-waiting room, for seminars, demonstration labs, etc. There are times when we feel like the poor country cousin who moved in with his less than enthusiastic city cousin in his already crowded apartment. The dearth of space to house our activities is accentuated by the number and variety of programs and the numbers of students, averaging two hundred a semester, related to one or more of these programs. Unfortunately, no immediate relief is in sight in terms of more physical facilities for these programs in Pastoral Psychology. One other pressing need is for an additional senior staff person on the Divinity School faculty to provide additional theoretical and research strength, particularly for the advanced programs and, hopefully, for a doctoral program still only in the “think” stage.

The decade of the sixties also saw members of the staff conducting one of the nation's earliest clinical parish training programs (see *The Duke Divinity School Review*, Winter, 1967, “Clinical Pastoral Education in the Parish,” pp. 20-38). Members of the staff participate in the supervision of M. Div. students in summer and winter field work assignments. One sign of continued and increased interest in

preparing the parish minister is in a recently developed course on *Power and Restraint in the Parish*, "A case-study approach to the practical dimensions of the parish: counseling, adolescence, marriage, funerals, theologizing. . . ."

Approaches to professional training continue to emphasize the total person through various didactic approaches: lectures, the use of case materials, ministering under supervision in clinical settings, and interpersonal growth groups. Several process-type courses are provided to maximize the personal growth of ministerial students and to provide for the integration of personal and professional skills. Such experiences are provided not only within the context of Pastoral Psychology courses but more generally in personal identity and in marriage enrichment groups offered on a voluntary non-credit basis for students and married couples each year. Within the curriculum attention for such growth experiences centers on the entering students who are provided with supportive groups to work with those concerns stirred up by preparation for ministry, whether personal, family, educational, ideological, or vocational. The purpose of these groups includes the identification, support and affirmation of existing and potential strengths and competences of group members, engagement in the process of getting in touch with and affirming the humanness of oneself and others, the enrichment of personal growth through the exploration of personal identity, increased awareness of interpersonal styles of relating, and sensitivity to the typical responses which each draws from others.

Approaches to professional training include not only students in the Master of Divinity and Master of Theology degree programs but also those ministers who wish to enhance their professional competency through continuing education. Basic and advanced units of Clinical Pastoral Education are, of course, available. The summer two-week clinic in Pastoral Care in which some 150 ministers have participated over the past decade continues to be offered. A five-day workshop on the local church's ministry to the homebound aged was held in April, 1965; copies of the 138-page resource report on this workshop are available through the Division of the Local Church of the General Board of Education of The United Methodist Church. Another publication of which the staff is proud is the Winter, 1967 issue of *The Duke Divinity School Review* which was written by members of the Pastoral Psychology staff and students. Most recently yearly or twice yearly two-day pastoral care workshops on crucial

care issues have been inaugurated. The first of these, held May 24-25 for ten ministers in the North Carolina Conference, was on abortion. Members of the staff, particularly the chaplains, continue to serve as resource persons to local clergy groups interested in establishing visitation programs for local community hospitals.

On the basis of the foregoing reflections, our continuing efforts to establish our identity and find a label reflect, I believe, vitality and growth. Reflections about experience never end since such reflections invite us to plan for and shape new experiences. Basically, our identity is being formed and our competency achieved in the efforts to be responsibly responsive to the persons who are caught in conflicted and ambiguous life situations which threaten and hold in bondage the human spirit. We are bound together in ministry by our concern for and identification with such human spirits, by our efforts to get in touch with life's sustaining and renewing resources, and by our efforts to find meaning and direction for these endeavors as Christ's ministers.

# The J. M. Ormond Center for Research, Planning and Development

ROBERT L. WILSON\*

The J. M. Ormond Center for Research, Planning and Development was established in 1970. It is a cooperative venture of the Divinity School, The Duke Endowment and the North Carolina and Western North Carolina Conferences of the United Methodist Church.\*\*

The larger society is the context in which the Christian Church lives and ministers. The church both is influenced by and attempts to influence the society of which it is a part. Social changes may have a profound influence on the church's ministry and structure. In a time of rapid social change institutions are subject to intense pressures. In such a period a church research and planning unit in a Divinity School has three major purposes.

The *first* is to assist the church by providing data which will be useful to congregations and denominational organizations in decision making. Research and planning services are provided to church leaders as they attempt to guide the church in carrying out its task in a rapidly changing society.

The rapid rate of social change has vastly increased the complexity of institutional administration. More decisions must be made in increasingly shorter periods of time. Practical problems demand attention and solutions. Decisions must be made concerning such issues as the possible location of a church. Should a building be erected, and if

---

\* Dr. Robert L. Wilson is Research Professor of Church and Society and Director of the J. M. Ormond Center. Before coming to Duke last fall he was head of the Department of Research and Survey for the National Division of the Board of Missions of The United Methodist Church.

\*\* The J. M. Ormond Fund, one of the sources of support for the work of the Center, was established in the North Carolina Conference during the Methodist College Advance, 1949-51, to be used in The Divinity School for the purpose of research and the training of ministers. During the same period the James A. Gray Fund was established in the Western North Carolina Conference.

so, when? Who are the people to whom the church should minister? What population changes can be anticipated? What kind of ministries are needed now and what may be needed three or five years from now?

Resources are limited and never adequate for the needs which the church feels an obligation to meet. Church leaders are anxious to use the available resources most effectively. Research and planning can help achieve this goal.

Research can provide evaluation of the church's ministries. It can help determine if what was attempted, was, in fact, accomplished. Thus the probability of making the same mistake twice can be reduced and more effective ministry achieved.

The *second* function of a research and planning unit in a school of theology is educational. The research and planning function should provide the basis for the educational task.

Potential church leaders need to be able to understand the social context in which they will be carrying out their ministry. They need to be aware of the dynamics of social change and how these may influence the church. They should be able to interpret relevant data and see their implications for the church. They should be able to analyze their community and their congregation to determine needs and directions for ministry.

The planning studies provide the method for accomplishing these goals. They give students an opportunity to gain experience in the techniques of data gathering analysis. By participating in planning studies dealing with current problems the students can gain insight on how the church operates. The techniques learned in this process will hopefully prove useful throughout their ministry.

A *third* purpose is to contribute to the understanding of the church in society. Thus the research center should from time to time contribute to the general fund of knowledge about the subject under study. The specific planning studies should form a basis for the development of theory and generalization.

The studies carried on through the center will utilize the methodologies of the social sciences in the study of the church and its community. Research will include both scientific data and Christian discourse, depending on the problem under consideration. The approach whenever appropriate, will be interdisciplinary.

A major focus of the center is on the study of the parish and its function in the community. This may include the issues confronting

the church and the development of models by which congregations may effectively and efficiently minister.

While the primary service of the center will be directed toward the United Methodist denomination, it will seek to be ecumenical in its outreach within the limits of its capacity. Where possible, community studies will include congregations of more than one denomination.

The research and planning studies of the center represent a converging of interests. Church leaders in both the denomination and the local church need data to assist in decision making. Students need experience in data gathering and analysis. Both are interested in research which will increase the understanding of the church. The center is the result of a joint venture of the church and the university to work toward these objectives.

# The Divinity School Faculty and Our Ministry of Teaching

Among those unspecified and mysterious "rights and privileges" to which our graduates are entitled (if we may borrow time-honored words of graduation-time conferral of degrees), surely one not to be underestimated is freedom from further necessity of puzzling over catalogue listings of requirements, courses, instructors. Yet our alumni and other readers of this *Review*, not receiving successive catalogues, often inquire about our current faculty and program of teaching. At this juncture it would seem especially appropriate, in view of Robert E. Cushman's retirement as Dean, and in further recognition of his administrative leadership, to bring our readers up to date with a report on who we are and what are doing as a faculty. Accordingly we have borrowed the faculty roster from the new 1971-72 Divinity School catalogue, and have asked the Chairmen of the four Divisions of our faculty and curriculum—Biblical, Historical, Theological, and Ministerial Studies—to introduce their colleagues and their ministry of teaching.

## *The Faculty*

Lloyd Richard Bailey (1971), B.D., Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Old Testament*

Frank Baker (1960), B.D., Ph.D., *Professor of English Church History*

Waldo Beach (1946), B.D., Ph.D., *Professor of Christian Ethics*

\*Robert Earl Cushman (1945), B.D., Ph.D., L.H.D., *Professor of Systematic Theology*

William David Davies (1966), M.A., D.D., F.B.A., *George Washington Ivey Professor of Advanced Studies and Research in Christian Origins*

James Michael Efrd (1962), B.D., Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Biblical Languages and Interpretation*

Donn Michael Farris (1950), B.D., M.S. in L.S., *Professor of Theological Bibliography*

- Richard E. Gillespie (1971), B.D., *Instructor in Historical Theology*
- Richard A. Goodling (1959), B.D., Ph.D., *Professor of Pastoral Psychology*
- Thor Hall (1962), B.D., M.R.E., Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Preaching and Theology*
- Stuart C. Henry (1959), B.D., Ph.D., *Professor of American Christianity*
- \*Frederick Herzog (1960), Th.D., *Professor of Systematic Theology*
- \*Osmond Kelly Ingram (1959), B.D., *Professor of Parish Ministry*
- William Arthur Kale (1952), B.D., D.D., *Professor of Christian Education*
- Creighton Lacy (1953), B.D., Ph.D., *Professor of World Christianity*
- Paul A. Mickey (1970), B.D., Th.D., *Assistant Professor of Pastoral Theology*
- Roland E. Murphy (1971), M.A., S.T.D., S.S.L., *Professor of Old Testament*
- Ray C. Petry (1937), Ph.D., LL.D., *James B. Duke Professor of Church History*
- McMurry S. Richey (1954), B.D., Ph.D., *Professor of Theology and Christian Nurture*
- Charles K. Robinson (1961), B.D., Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Philosophical Theology*
- John Jesse Rudin, II (1945), B.D., A.M., Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Christian Communications*
- Dwight Moody Smith, Jr. (1965), B.D., M.A., Ph.D., *Professor of New Testament Interpretation*
- Harmon L. Smith (1962), B.D., Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Moral Theology*
- David Curtis Steinmetz (1971), B.D., Th.D., *Associate Professor of Church History and Doctrine*
- \*\*William Franklin Stinespring (1936), M.A., Ph.D., *Professor of Old Testament and Semitics*
- Robert L. Wilson (1970), B.D., M.A., Ph.D., *Research Professor of Church and Society*
- Franklin Woodrow Young (1968), B.D., Ph.D., *Amos Ragan Kearns Professor of New Testament and Patristic Studies*
- Visiting Faculty*
- Christopher Ludwig Morse (1971), B.D., S.T.M., *Visiting Instructor in Systematic Theology*

*Associates in Instruction*

- P. Wesley Aitken (1963), B.D., Th.M., *Chaplain Supervisor, Duke Medical Center, and Part-time Assistant Professor of Clinical Pastoral Education of the Divinity School*
- John William Carlton (1969), B.D., Ph.D., *Adjunct Professor of Preaching*
- James H. Charlesworth (1969), B.D., Ph.D., *Lecturer in Old Testament and Assistant Professor of Religion, Duke University*
- Philip R. Cousin (1969), S.T.B., *Lecturer in Church and Society*
- John C. Detwiler (1966), B.D., Th.M., *Chaplain Supervisor, Duke Medical Center, and Instructor in Clinical Pastoral Education*
- John Kennedy Hanks (1954), M.A., *Lecturer in Sacred Music, Director of the Divinity School Choir, and Professor of Music, Duke University*
- M. Wilson Nesbitt (1958), B.D., D.D., *Adjunct Professor of the Work of the Rural Church*
- Harry B. Partin (1964), B.D., Ph.D., *Lecturer in History of Religions and Associate Professor of Religion, Duke University*
- William Hardman Poteat (1960), B.D., Ph.D., *Lecturer in Christianity and Culture and Professor of Religion, Duke University*
- William C. Spong (1965), B.D., Th.M., *Chaplain Supervisor, Duke Medical Center, and Instructor in Clinical Pastoral Education*
- Orval Wintermute (1959), B.D., Ph.D., *Lecturer in Old Testament and Associate Professor of Religion, Duke University*

*Emeritii*

- Kenneth Willis Clark (1931), B.D., Ph.D., D.D., *Professor Emeritus of New Testament and Co-Director of the International Greek New Testament Project*
- James T. Cleland (1945), M.A., S.T.M., Th.D., D.D., *James B. Duke Professor Emeritus of Preaching*
- Hiram Earl Myers (1926), S.T.M., D.D., *Professor Emeritus of Biblical Literature*
- H. Shelton Smith (1931), Ph.D., D.D., Litt.D., *James B. Duke Professor Emeritus of American Religious Thought*
- Hersey Everett Spence (1918), A.M., B.D., D.D., Litt.D., *Professor Emeritus of Religious Education*
- Arley John Walton (1948), B.S.L., D.D., *Professor Emeritus of Church Administration and Director of Field Work*

---

\* Absent on sabbatical leave 1971-72.

\*\* Retires August 31, 1971.

I. *The Division of Biblical Studies*

FRANKLIN W. YOUNG

*The Scope of Study.* The Division of Biblical Studies is responsible for the instruction in the various disciplines pertinent to the interpretation of the Old and New Testaments. The curriculum consists of several categories of courses designed to provide both broad coverage and more specialized study and research: (1) introductory courses in both Old and New Testament interpretation; (2) introductory and advanced study of Biblical languages, Hebrew, Greek, Aramaic, and cognate languages, Ugaritic, Akkadian, Coptic and Syriac; (3) exegetical courses on the individual books of the Bible based on Hebrew, Greek or English texts; (4) topical courses dealing with some of the most important areas and/or problems in the field of Biblical studies. The faculty of the Division carries on its work with a keen sense of its ultimate responsibility to come to grips with the problem of the relevant interpretation of the Biblical message in our day.

*Personnel.* *Lloyd Bailey*, a specialist in Old Testament, will join the faculty in September 1971, having most recently served on the faculty of Union Theological Seminary in New York. Professor Bailey will have a major responsibility for Hebrew instruction and the introductory course in the Old Testament. He will enrich our offerings with courses in his major field of interest and research, the early period of Hebrew history (second millenium), and he will inaugurate regular offerings in Ugaritic and Akkadian.

*W. D. Davies* continues his research and teaching in the general area of Christian origins. Pursuing this interest he offers work in Judaism and Jewish background of the New Testament. In relation to this general area Professor Davies offers specific courses in Pauline studies, the Gospel of Matthew and the Epistle to the Hebrews. He enriches the language program with work in Rabbinic Hebrew.

*James Efrid* continues to supervise and teach in the introductory course in New Testament Greek, as well as participate in the advanced reading courses in the field. He has shared with Professor Smith the responsibility for the introductory course in New Testament, and with his double interest in the Old and New Testaments has offered topical courses in both fields. Professor Efrid is also responsible for supervision of the honors program in the Biblical field.

Father *Roland Murphy*, the distinguished Roman Catholic Old

Testament scholar, joins the Biblical faculty in September, 1971, having recently come from the faculty of Catholic University. He will share in the teaching of the introductory course in Old Testament and will assume responsibility for the study of Aramaic. Professor Murphy, among other things, will offer courses in the Psalms and Wisdom Literature, major fields of his interest and research. He will also share in the teaching of both the Hebrew and English exegesis courses.

*Moody Smith* shares with Professor Efrid the responsibility for the introductory courses in New Testament. He also participates in the teaching of both English and Greek exegetical courses. Professor Smith continues his interest and research in Gospel studies, especially the Gospel of John, and offers work in this field. He has a major interest in the theology of the New Testament, and several of the topical courses center on various aspects of this subject.

*Franklin Young* shares in the teaching of the advanced New Testament Greek, and both the English and Greek exegesis courses. He offers work in Luke-Acts and the later writings of the New Testament. Professor Young divides his teaching duties between the Biblical and Historical Divisions, offering in the latter Division work in Patristic Greek and various aspects of Greek Patristic thought and life.

In addition to the Biblical faculty in the Divinity School, the Biblical Division is most fortunate for the enrichment which comes to its program from time to time from various members of the Biblical faculty of the Department of Religion. *James Charlesworth* offers courses in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, the Dead Sea Scrolls and Syriac. *Eric Meyers* provides opportunities for study in Rabbinic Hebrew, Palestinian archaeology, and Judaism. *James Price* participates in the offering of the exegetical courses in Greek and gives courses in the Johannine literature. *Orval Wintermute* regularly offers work in advanced Hebrew, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and Coptic.

With the six Divinity School faculty, and supplementation from the four members of the Department of Religion, Divinity Students have access to offerings from ten scholars in the Biblical field.

*Retirement.* After July 1, 1971 the Biblical Division will suffer the loss of its distinguished Old Testament scholar, *William Stinespring*. Generations of divinity students need no reminder of the unusual contribution made by Professor Stinespring over many years to the work and the reputation of the Biblical Division. His unusual

competence in the study and teaching of the semitic languages, history and interpretation of the Old Testament, as well as his warm comradeship enjoyed by both students and faculty, will be sorely missed. The Division is delighted to know that Professor Stinespring will continue his residence in Durham, and his scholarly relations with the faculty. We are sure that his continued presence will be an inspiration and a help to both faculty and students.

## II. *The Division of Historical Studies*

STUART C. HENRY

The Historical Division embraces studies in Church History, Historical Theology, American Christianity, and the History of Religions. Dr. *Ray C. Petry*, James B. Duke Professor of Church History, senior member of the historical faculty, continues his distinguished work in medieval studies, although his interest in the critical temper in relation to the Christian tradition relates his primary focus to other periods than the Middle Ages. Professor *Frank Baker*, who offers courses in English Church History and Methodism, continues to employ the major part of his time and effort in the Wesley Works Project, which, when completed will have published a definitive edition of the writings of John Wesley. Professor *Stuart C. Henry* teaches in the area of American Christianity, a discipline which endeavors to relate the institutional and theological developments of the Christian tradition in this country to the whole social milieu, including the political, cultural, and social environment. Mr. *Donn Michael Farris*, Professor of Theological Bibliography, continues his significant support to all branches of the Historical Division.

Two men with major responsibility in the Division of Historical Studies assume their duties at the Divinity School in the Fall of 1971: Dr. *David C. Steinmetz* has accepted appointment to the Divinity School faculty as Associate Professor of Reformation Church History and Doctrine effective September 1, 1971. He graduated summa cum laude from Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois, with the A.B. degree in 1958, Drew University Theological School, B.D. summa cum laude 1961, and Harvard Divinity School with the Th.D. degree in 1967. He is presently an Associate Professor of Church History, Lancaster Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, where he has been teaching for a period of four years.

The Reverend Mr. *Richard E. Gillespie* has accepted appointment as Instructor in the History of Early and Medieval Christian

Doctrine, effective September, 1971, with responsibilities in the area of his title and including instruction in the first segment of the basic course in History of Christianity. Mr. Gillespie comes immediately from Munich, Germany, where he has been pursuing the completion of his doctoral studies in late medieval figures. Graduate of Whitworth College, B.A., 1959, and B.D. from San Francisco Theological Seminary, 1965, he has pursued his doctoral studies under the Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, California, and was Research Scholar at Ludwig-Maximilians-Universitat, Munich, Germany.

Professor Steinmetz and Gillespie will teach in the areas formerly under the direction at the Divinity School of Dr. *Hans Hillerbrand*, now of City University of New York, and Dr. *Egil Grislis*, now of the Hartford Seminary Foundation.

In addition to those whose work is exclusively within the sphere of Historical Studies of the Divinity School curriculum, three other professors contribute to our offerings: Dr. *Franklin W. Young*, Amos Ragan Kearns Professor of New Testament and Patristic Studies, teaches courses which deal in historical emphasis with the patristic period; Professor *McMurry S. Richey* offers work in Wesley's thought, under the rubric of Historical Theology; and Professor *Harry Partin* offers courses in the History of Religions.

### III. *The Division of Theological Studies*

#### CREIGHTON LACY

The Division of Theological Studies covers the primary disciplines of Theology and Ethics, with Christianity and Culture, and World Christianity and Ecumenics as related fields. The Division has had no additions to its faculty since 1962, but its members continue to explore new theological perspectives and new ethical applications of the Christian faith.

*Waldo Beach* (Christian Ethics), from both historical and contemporary perspectives, continues his long-standing interest in the inter-relation of Christian theology and ethics. His curricular emphases in areas of applied ethics include church-state relations and problems of authority, power, and violence. In addition to recent publications dealing with concepts of community, Professor Beach is devoting attention to such emerging fields as ethics and technology, and

ethics and ecology. He also serves as supervisor of the Master of Theology program.

Administrative responsibilities as Dean have severely curtailed the teaching time of *Robert Cushman* (Systematic Theology) since pre-1958 generations of students "cut their theological eye teeth" on his epistemology and philosophy. Having shared the "core course" in systematic theology with Professor Herzog for some years, the Dean assumed full responsibility for it in 1970-71 and offered the study of Christology in the preceding term. The theological curriculum of the Divinity School will be greatly strengthened when Professor Cushman resumes and hopefully expands his course offerings as a full-time teacher after his current sabbatical leave.

*Thor Hall* (Preaching and Theology), in a double relationship to the Divisions of Theological and Ministerial Studies, continues a basic interest in theological presuppositions and a distinct concern for the dynamics of authentic communication. He has recently published books in each of these fields. Teaching courses in Christology and ecclesiology, in addition to his responsibilities in homiletics, he also continues his research in Scandinavian religious thought, contributing to the widening interest and growing bibliography in that field.

For *Frederick Herzog* (Systematic Theology) teaching in this field has meant coming to grips with the Christian dilemma in contemporary America, especially in relation to three issues: racism, individualism, and fundamentalism. The remoteness of black and white Christians from each other, the stress on private economic and political gain, and the false view of the Word of God as "a strait-jacket of propositional truths," all must be approached as heresies, he believes. His major concern, therefore, is to make the student see that the task of Christian doctrine is to engage the Christian in the battle between faith and unfaith in the church, or—in other words, "the Christianization of the church after its total secularization," the formulation of "liberation theology, a theology radically centered in the liberation accomplished by God in Christ."

The background training and experience of *Creighton Lacy* (World Christianity) in both ethics and missions converge in his central focus on the role of religion (Christian and non-Christian) in social change, in the moral and political interaction of different cultures. He has pursued this broad theme not only in China, but during two sabbatical leaves in India, and most recently through a summer

in Africa. Guiding (with Professors Beach and Smith) one section of the introductory class in Christian Ethics keeps him involved in the theological foundations of Christian ethics, as well as their application to contemporary American social problems.

*McMurry S. Richey* (Theology and Christian Nurture), teaching in both Theological Studies and Ministerial Studies Divisions, has focused on Christian understandings of man and his salvation, as these understandings have been worked out in relation to successive Western cultural expressions—as exemplified in the course of Western philosophy, in more recent “sciences of man,” especially depth psychologies, in current cultural (and counter cultural) “images of man” and of what “makes human life human,” and in the educational philosophies and practices of the teaching, nurturing church, including theological education.

*Charles K. Robinson* (Philosophical Theology) teaches survey courses dealing with “religious philosophy” or “philosophy of religion” and seminars in the thought of individual theologians of philosophical interest: e.g. Kierkegaard and Tillich. Operating from a loosely “philosophical” perspective, he is interested in the classical “apologetic” task of relating theology to contemporary cultural perspectives, including modern science, especially physics. He has recently focused much of his attention on the Christian understanding of the perennial human experiences of tragedy. Throughout, Professor Robinson sustains his concern for Biblical interpretation, which comes to bear chiefly in a course in the area of eschatology.

Since publishing (with a fellow-alumnus, Louis Hodges) *The Christian and His Decisions*, *Harmon Smith* (Moral Theology) has pursued his interests in theological ethics and ethical methodology. He has also concentrated extensive speaking and writing on problems of medical ethics; such as, abortion, organ transplants, the right to live and the right to die. In these areas he hopes to develop interdisciplinary explorations with the Schools of Law and Medicine. Professor Smith relates Christian ethics to other areas of contemporary culture through his teaching and through supervising Interseminary Internships in Church and Society.

During the simultaneous sabbatical leaves of Professors Cushman and Herzog, the basic course in systematic theology will be taught by a visiting interim instructor, *Christopher Morse*. Mr. Morse, who has served pastorates in the Virginia Conference and is currently completing his doctoral dissertation at Union Theological Seminary

in New York, will also teach courses in contemporary theology and in his own field of research, "Promise as a Theological Concept."

#### IV. *The Division of Ministerial Studies*

WILLIAM ARTHUR KALE

Courses in this Division are grouped into five areas of specialized study: Care of the Parish, Christian Education, Pastoral Psychology, The Church at Worship, and Field Education—Clinical Training—Internships. Together these courses offer a broad coverage of professional concern and practice. The several units are correlated within the Division and have complementary relationships with basic courses in the other Divisions of the school.

*Care of the Parish.* Studies in this area are primarily oriented toward the local church with specific emphasis on the several ministries of the church in the contemporary world. Professors *Kelly Ingram* and *Wilson Nesbitt*, who offer basic courses in church administration, church building and church polity and program, have had extensive experience as pastors and maintain official relationships with ecclesiastical leaders in the region. Professor *Robert Wilson*, who came to Duke a year ago after serving as Executive Secretary of the Research and Survey Department of the Board of Missions, is concerned with the sociological frame within which the church conceptualizes and practices its several ministries. He has recently said, "The local church as an institution within the larger community both influences and is influenced by what is happening in society. . . . To minister effectively, the pastor should have some understanding of the forces at work in society. He must have an understanding of community structure and be able to discern trends of importance to the church and perceive the dynamics of social change."

The Reverend Dr. *Philip R. Cousin*, pastor of St. Joseph's A.M.E. Church in Durham, is part-time Lecturer in Church and Society and annually directs a section of the seminar in Church and Ministry.

*Christian Education.* Students enrolled for either the Master of Divinity or the Master of Religious Education programs find courses in Christian Education correlated with studies in Bible, Church History and Theology as well as other units of work in the Ministerial Division. Seminars, laboratories and special workshops in educational theory and practice are conducted in parish settings, and involve leaders of churches in the region. Professors *McMurry Richey*

and *Arthur Kale* offer the main courses in this area, but consultants and resource persons from outside the school are regularly invited to assist in instruction.

The new Divinity building, now under construction, will contain facilities for a Christian Education Laboratory, and several innovations in curricular offerings are being developed, anticipating the availability of the new facilities in the spring of 1972.

Professor Richey is concerned with theological and educational foundations, curricular content, and emerging issues for the teaching ministry of the church. His recent sabbatical leave inquiry in England and Holland was focused on relationships of the teaching church (including theological education) to social change, religious and moral education in secular society, and implications of cultural and theological change for Christian teaching. He has given special attention to "lay training." Dr. Richey is also involved in the Theological Studies Division.

Professor Kale, in addition to offering instruction in the nature, scope, and processes of the teaching ministries of the church, serves as the Director of the Master of Religious Education program.

*Pastoral Psychology.* The Divinity School offers one of the country's most comprehensive programs in pastoral care for the basic theological degree candidate. Five full-time staff persons—Professors *Goodling* and *Mickey*, and Chaplains *Aitken*, *Detwiler* and *Spong*—have their advanced degrees in pastoral theology, pastoral psychology and clinical psychology. The three chaplains are certified Clinical Pastoral Education Supervisors. Certification with the American Association of Pastoral Counselors is also held by three of the staff.

Professor Paul Mickey, the most recent addition to the staff, came to the Divinity School in the summer of 1970, upon completion of his doctoral studies at Princeton Theological Seminary and after serving as pastor of Hope United Methodist Church, Cleveland, Ohio, and St. Paul's United Methodist Church, Bay Head, New Jersey. Regarding his role at Duke Dr. Mickey has said, "My responsibility and thrust is to take theoretical principles from the field and models of psychology and to raise critical and integrative questions from a theological and parish perspective, so as to facilitate the students' integrative processes from pastoral psychology to pastoral theology."

Basic and advanced training in pastoral care and counseling through CPE is provided in several settings, including the Medical Center, a community mental health agency, and the local church, in

either degree or non-degree programs. Several programs in continuing education are provided in addition to Basic and Advanced CPE, such as the two-week clinic in pastoral care each summer and occasional two-day workshops on special pastoral care problems.

*Worship and Preaching.* A varied and extensive list of courses in church music, liturgies, and preaching, as well as workshops in communication, are grouped under the single category of worship. These are closely related and designed to complement one another, yet two sub-divisions of this category indicate a logical distinction of subject-matter as well as appropriate variation in approach and emphasis.

*Preaching.* Instruction in preaching today continues the tradition from Professor *James T. Cleland*, under whose direction the so-called bi-focal theory of preaching was developed. This Duke theory has been further refined and developed under Professor *Thor Hall* and mainly in interaction with recent developments in theological methodology, linguistic analysis, hermeneutics, ecclesiology, and the study of communications media. As a discipline homiletics is not narrowly concerned with theologizing about preaching nor is it designed to develop a peculiar homiletical rhetoric. It is related to all other disciplines studying the contemporary mindset, religion and secularity, religious meaning, tradition, history of theology, Scriptures, liturgy, language, community and personality, communication and interaction, etc.

Some examples of developments and refinements in the area of instruction in preaching include:

1. the joint appointment of Professor *John W. Carlton* at Southeastern Baptist Seminary, Wake Forest, and Duke.
2. the introduction of a course designed to analyze preaching done in the context of Black religious experience, taught by Dr. *Cousin*.
3. the reorganization of preaching sections to include sermon planning seminars as well as sermon presentation sessions.
4. the use of video-tape equipment in sermon evaluation.
5. plans for a Preaching Center in the new Divinity building.

*Worship and Church Music.* Professors Hanks and Rudin are the chief instructors and resource persons in this sub-division. Professor *John Hanks* has a joint appointment with the Divinity School and the Department of Music of the University. His Divinity

course in church music includes a survey of "great monuments of church music" and a consideration of the principles of conducting and principles for selecting and using hymns and other music. He also serves as the Director of the Divinity Choir.

Dr. *John Rudin* joined the Divinity School faculty and staff in 1945, coming from graduate clinical education and teaching in two metropolitan universities and a teacher's college. Through all the years since he has taught the skills of corporate worship and preaching and has served as a resource person in planning and leading the corporate worship of the school. He has also been a consultant to Conference and Jurisdictional Commissions on Worship. Dr. Rudin's present title, "Christian Communications," provides a functional umbrella for his varied duties as teacher of the skills of leadership, focusing in worship and preaching and employing electronic media as teaching aids. His clinical, curricular and group-life skills have made him a member of the Field Education supervisory group.

*Field Education and Internships.* Field experience as an integral part of the academic program is regarded as fundamental to the total work of the Divinity School. Faculty personnel as well as selected churchmen and civic leaders in the region are enlisted as leaders and resource persons in the operation of the field education program, under the general direction of a Field Education Director and staff.

An interseminary internship program is conducted jointly by Duke Divinity School, Union Theological School in Richmond, and Virginia Theological Seminary in Alexandria. Concentration of study may be done in one of three areas: industry, government and politics, and science-technology. Professor *Harmon Smith* is the chief Duke representative on the interseminary staff of leaders and supervisors.

# A Dialogue With James Buchanan Duke

NORMAN L. TROTT\*

While visiting the Duke University campus last Fall, I went into the Chapel to pray and to engage in a little window watching. Coming out of the sanctuary into the dusk of a warm and hazy late November day, I mingled with the students as they drifted across the quadrangle after the evening meal. The sounds and the sights of a university campus did strange things to the senses of this staid, old man of the cloth; the overclothed and the mini-clad girls and the bearded, blue-jeaned boys belie to the eye of the untrained beholder the hidden beauty and the mystic, esoteric dimensions of a modern student body.

One must learn to expect anything and to be shocked at nothing on a university campus, particularly in the misty twilight of an Autumn day. Nevertheless, it was unexpected, and startling, as I passed the Duke statue, to see shining out against the bronze, in the encroaching darkness, the button-sized glow of the end of a lighted cigar—and to see a ring of smoke caught and held like a little halo above the figure's head in a moment's upsweep of a breeze—and then to hear a deep throated, metallic voice in the glooming mutter, as a couple of long haired seminarians strolled by—"holy smoke!"

As I look back on it, it could have been a figment of my imagination, for the garnet glow of stained glass was still in my eyes and the hushed whispers of Chapel visitors were still in my ears; but at that time it seemed real enough, so I stopped beside the figure and heard it (or him) say again: "Holy smoke!! When I took an interest in educating Methodist preachers I never thought they would be walking through a world like this."

"Say, what are you doing here?" he queried. "There's the smell of the Potomac about you. I've been suspicious of you boys from Washington, ever since Teddy Roosevelt broke up my tobacco trust."

"Mr. Duke," I responded, eager for dialogue with my brassy

---

\*Dr. Norman L. Trott is President Emeritus of Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C.

conversationalist, "I'm just walking around, thinking by way through the shock of Dean Cushman's upcoming resignation."

The figure spoke again. "Yes, I know about that. I'll miss him, he has done much for Duke. I don't understand everything he says—some of those words he uses really outstyle old Henry L. Mencken—but what I hear coming through the walls makes sense to me. That Chapel address, *Thoughts on the University*, given in the midst of last year's campus disturbances, was profound.

"Say, how well do you know Dr. Cushman?"

"Buck," I said, discarding formality and employing the nickname the Duke family used, "my association with Bob Cushman goes back to 1958, when we began working together for the adequate funding of ministerial education. The currently increasing flow of funds from the Methodist Church stems from a decade of strategy on the part of a small group of men in which Cushman's leadership was pivotal. Dean Cushman, Bishop Cannon, Dr. McCulloh and I were to the fund for Theological Education what the Hell's Angels are to motor cycling."

Mr. Duke broke in—"Faculties and students are generally unaware of the agonizing struggle that is necessary to produce that life-giving money on which creative growth depends. Some of us who make it don't know how to use it and some of us who use it don't know what it takes to get it."

"If I may continue," I said, "Bob Cushman has also played a key role in making Methodism aware of the ecumenical dimensions of our age. Just one example: As the result of a paper which the Dean read to the Methodist Council of Bishops, at their invitation, an Advisory Committee on Ecumenical Consultation was created, to be followed by the establishment of the Commission on Ecumenical Affairs in 1964. This agency has done much to relate Methodism to the great search for unity within Christendom, one of the dominant concerns of our century."

---

Night had arrived and with it a stillness disturbed only by the flutter of falling leaves as the light evening breeze gently shook the branches of the nearby oaks. I lingered, enjoying the darkness, and the figure spoke again:

"I appreciate Dean Cushman's labor. It is hard to get Methodists to vote funds for education. But they have responded, and given

more than any denomination I know about. My father got so danged mad at the Conference that he swore he would never give another red cent to Trinity College. But, fortunately, President John Kilgo made him change his mind. That was good, because it was the influence of my father and my brother Ben that kept me interested in Methodist churches and Methodist education and Methodist preachers. I wanted to see preachers and teachers, lawyers and doctors trained—and making the funds available for the establishment of Duke University, to accomplish this purpose, was the greatest achievement of my life. As I watch the years go by, the only regret is that I did not do more. President Few of Trinity College told me it should take a hundred million dollars to do all that I wanted to do. I really laughed in his face at his audacity, but he was right. In the end, I gave about half that amount, counting all the extra gifts, like that seven million dollars to start the Duke hospital. I woke up Dr. Few in the early morning hours to tell him I had made up my mind to do it during the night.

“It is hard work—out on the front line of education in these turbulent days—and every ten years or so a man needs to shift the direction of his life. That is the way he regains perspective and keeps possession of his wits and his soul. And it is good for an institution to have a change of leadership. I learned this is business. Building on Bob’s achievements, good leadership will advance the school. Then too, after a man leaves the scene of tension and others regain perspective, a more objective evaluation of his work and worth ultimately takes place, and what is good endures, and we are grateful for it.

“The force of an individual’s life can only be seen in perspective. I remember Dr. Crowell, who was president of Trinity College from 1885 to 1893. It was because of him that my father and my brother began putting money into Methodist education. He was a Yale Ph.D. and probably the first Northerner to head an educational institution in the South after the War between the States. He became discouraged because of turmoil in the college and lack of support from the Church, but it was his creative leadership that brought the little Trinity College to Durham and laid the foundation for Duke University.”

---

Suddenly, shaken from my reverie by the realization that my meeting had begun, I abruptly turned and hurried across the grass to

the Divinity School door, not looking back at the stolid, immobile statue until the door swung open to let me in.

Winter passed and Spring arrived, the figure placidly weathering the passing seasons. It was not until May 24th that I returned to the Divinity School. Walking across the Quad in a pensive mood, for it was Aldersgate Day, the day of John Wesley's eventful religious experience, I paused once again by the bronze statue of James Buchanan Duke.

A gardener was mowing the grass nearby. I heard a loud "whyffp" and a stream of tobacco juice came from somewhere, accompanied by an enormous wad of the weed, landing near my feet. Mixed with the metallic whir of the mower there seemed to be another sound, like a hollow voice grinding out the words—"that danged gardener pulled a fast one on me. That was a plug of *Brown's Mule* he left here, the kind young Dick Reynolds used to make. Not as good as my licorice flavored *Battle Axe* or *Newsboy*; those plugs really went over big in the West! Phfuy!"

The figure continued without waiting for comment. "I presume you're back on campus for the dinner honoring Dean Cushman. They're really rolling out the top brass tonight. It might create a disturbance if I showed up. Besides, I'm busy, what with my spiritual residence upstairs, my body resting in the Chapel (monitoring some sermons and sleeping through others) and my bronze out here watching Academia in action.

"Will you tell Dean Cushman that I know this is a difficult time, full of mixed emotions. Something that illustrates the point happened to me as I passed by the Pearly Gates the other day. Stopping to rest by a Tree of Life, who should be sitting nearby, swinging his feet in the water that flows by the tree, but John Milton. I didn't know that he was blind on earth, and that he wrote poetry, and that it was so good that a few people still read it. Sure enough, the very next day a pair of English majors, sitting at the base of my statue, were talking about two of John Milton's poems: 'L'Allegro' and 'Il Penseroso'—'Mirth' and 'Melancholy.'

"Mirth and melancholy, these are the emotions Bob Cushman must feel. He cannot help but be introspective—pensive—as he views the struggles of these later years and wonders if the candle was worth the burning. In that Chapel address of last year I recall him saying that 'administrators alternate, in these perilous days, between hope and despair.' The universities of our time bear the burdens of youth's dis-

enchantment and revolt, but the divinity schools bear the double burden of reaction against both the School and the Church. It is natural to feel depressed, and when melancholy is magnified by battle fatigue a man can hardly bear it.

"But Milton proposes that Mirth is Melancholy's Companion. Blessed

'Sport that wrinkled care derides  
And laughter, holding both his sides . . .'

"So tell my friend the Dean to rejoice in his achievements and now, as he begins his travels, his studies and his rest, may the joy of God go with him, and in the Good Lord's good time may he come back to Duke and to teaching, for the future waits for men like him.

---

"And please tell Barbara to come over and say 'hello' to me some-day. A man is fortunate to have a mate like that. She has the charm and beauty of my first wife and, fortunately for Bob, the grace, the constancy and brains of my second wife as well."

## *The Dean's Discourse*

---

Professor William Franklin Stinespring will terminate his services to the Divinity School of Duke University on August 31, 1971, after thirty-five years of near matchless contribution to Old Testament interpretation and studies in Semitic languages. I quote my own words from the program of the Closing Convocation signaling his professional career in the Divinity School: "As he is beloved by generations of students, so he is revered by his colleagues of the faculty for selfless and indefatigable service to the School, for impeccable learning devoid of arrogance, for rigor slated with charity, for acumen enriched by wisdom, for righteousness toward man, which is soundly rooted in faith, hope, and love to God.

"Dr. Stinespring came to Duke from Smith College in 1936 as Assistant Professor of Old Testament. A graduate of the University of Virginia, B.A. 1924, he studied for two years at Peabody Conservatory of Music, Baltimore, Maryland. Resuming studies in classical languages, he earned the M.A. degree in 1929 from Virginia. In 1932 he received the Ph.D. in Semitics and Biblical Languages from Yale University. Thereafter, in the years 1932-35, he was Fellow and Assistant Director of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem. In 1946 he was Research Assistant to the Anglo-American Committee in Palestine in relation with the State Department.

"During the thirty-five years of Dr. Stinespring's service to Duke University and the Divinity School, he has served on numerous and important committees involving curricular policy and administration, with always discriminating judgment characterized by incisiveness. His virtual creation of, and unsurpassed instruction in, the program of Semitic languages helped to qualify the Divinity School, by 1950, at both the professional and graduate levels, as a leader in this field. His recent election (October 1970) as Honorary President of the Society of Biblical Literature is a testimonial to his estimable standing in the scholarly world. 'Behold, an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile.'"

I am gratified to be able to announce that in the forthcoming fall four new faculty will take up instructional service to the Divinity School. Internationally distinguished Old Testament scholar, the Reverend Dr. Roland E. Murphy, will join the faculty as Professor of Old

Testament in the succession of Dr. Stinespirng. Dr. Murphy has been on the faculty of Catholic University for many years and has served as a Visiting Professor at Yale, Chicago, Princeton, and Duke. He is a member of the Order of Carmelites and will be the first ordained Roman Catholic member of this faculty. Dr. Lloyd R. Bailey comes to us from Union Theological Seminary, New York, as Associate Professor of Old Testament. He pursued his doctoral studies at Hebrew University, Jerusalem, and has been for four years on the faculty of Union Theological Seminary. He received his B.D. degree from Duke Divinity School. Dr. David C. Steinmetz comes to us as Associate Professor of Reformation and Post-Reformation Church History and Doctrine. He comes from Lancaster Theological Seminary, where he has taught for some years. A graduate of Drew Theological Seminary, he completed the Th.D. in church history at Harvard Divinity School. In the field of historical theology of the ancient and medieval period, we look forward to the services of Mr. Richard E. Gillespie, who joins the faculty as Instructor in Historical Theology, with extensive research in Munich and Bonn, Germany. During the forthcoming year the Reverend Mr. Christopher Morse will serve as Visiting Instructor in Systematic Theology. Mr. Morse is completing his Th.D. at Union, New York, and is a minister of some years' experience in the Virginia Annual Conference. We have coming to us in this company three Methodists, one Presbyterian, and one Roman Catholic.

Professor Frederick Herzog and Professor O. Kelly Ingram will be on sabbatical leave during the forthcoming academic year, both of them pursuing studies in Europe and in America.

It is a matter of gratification to be able to announce to the alumni that by a series of actions, beginning with the Faculty Executive Council of the Divinity School and the Divinity School faculty, and by favorable action of the office of the Provost, the Academic Council, the General Faculty, and the Board of Trustees, retroactive conferral of the Master of Divinity degree is an option open to Divinity School graduates who desire to replace the Bachelor of Divinity with the more recent nomenclature. Formal notice will be communicated to all alumni of the Divinity School, informing them of the option and the procedures whereby a certificate will be both conferred and acquired. At the moment of writing the exact procedures have not been fully determined upon.

I am glad to be able to announce that the third phase of the

Divinity School capital expansion program is well under way in construction. The so called educational wing, which will embrace many important and greatly needed features in support of our educational program, should be completed and occupied by January, 1972. This will be six months in arrears of the projected completion date. Due to a combination of circumstances affecting general University finance, the central administration has ruled that further projection of construction entailing a Divinity School chapel and conference auditorium must be retired. I interpret this as a moratorium on a long projected plan formulated in terms of established needs. In lieu of this facility it has proved necessary to repossess York Chapel and readapt it for corporate worship of the Divinity School community. This cannot be considered more than a temporary and temporizing expedient in view of the needs of the school.

I have been deeply moved and heartened in recent weeks by expressions of alumni regard and esteem, especially as represented by a memorable testimonial dinner in honor of Mrs. Cushman and myself. I lay down my responsibilities with a sense of satisfaction in the fulfillment of many objectives that I had set myself and which had been set for me by previous administrations. I wish for the school enduring fulfillment of its calling as a seminary dedicated to the preparation, first of all, of a well trained Methodist ministry and then of an ecumenical ministry as it may be worthy and able to serve.

Robert E. Cushman, Dean

---

*John Wesley and the Church of England.* Frank Baker. Abingdon. 1970. 422 pp. \$14.50.

In the Preface to his *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (Scribner's, 1910), the late James Moffatt acknowledged that "if the first commandment of research is, 'Thou shalt work at the sources,' the second is, 'Thou shalt acquaint thyself with work done before thee and beside thee.'" Dr. Frank Baker faithfully keeps those commandments! Surely no contemporary scholar knows so well the vast range of sources and interpretations of Wesleyana. As Professor of English Church History in Duke Divinity School, he has been at work on this volume for years but has thrice put it aside for more "urgent research and writing tasks" as editor and bibliographer of the *Oxford Edition of Wesley's Works* (see his article in this issue). Now at last this massive sample of his prodigious Wesley scholarship is available to enhance Anglican-Methodist understanding in Britain and the Consultation on Church Union and other ecumenical discussions in this country. Alumni will especially appreciate this embodiment of a decade of teaching as well as their teacher's characteristic and affectionate dedication: "To those students at the Duke Divinity School who have shared and will share with me the adventure of studying 'The Rise of Methodism and Its Anglican Background.'"

This book becomes the major study of the development of Wesley's relations with the Church of England, as the Methodist renewal movement he fostered within it eventually emerged to become a separate church. Though many have taken in hand to write of these matters, Dr. Baker's modest but discriminatingly masterful treatment of the materials and their meanings goes beyond the usual "sweeping generalizations . . . based on a few well-worn facts" to set those facts in context and introduce others "either forgotten or never considered" (vii). Deftly combining chronological, biographical, and topical methods, to take full account of the personal and situational dynamics of Wesley's "fluctuating and frustrated affections for the Church of England" (viii), he presents a study of a constantly developing rather

than static churchmanship—"a study in human reaction to changing circumstances—a study of great importance when that human being is probably the most significant religious figure in his century, and when those circumstances included the burgeoning of a growing industrial nation into an empire and the beginnings of a great world church" (1-2).

However familiar one may be with early Methodist history and biography, the Wesley story takes on new meaning as the author insightfully illuminates details of place, event, the pull-and-tug of persons; as he clarifies Wesleyan practice or thought left obscure in *Journal* accounts or traditional biographies; as he corrects Wesley's own chronology and interpretations of facts, and thereby corrects Wesley's less critical interpreters; as he refuses to iron out or explain away inconsistencies, conflicts, uncertainties, rather exploring their meaning; as he looks beneath Wesley's pragmatic resolutions of crises and subsequent rationales to discover revealing intra- and inter-personal dynamics of a developing leadership and movement. Well-tutored critical observations abound, as for example this note on Wesley at Oxford: "Although Wesley was never a dictatorial autocrat in the harshest sense, he was a born organizer, and the responsibility of setting rules, maintaining discipline, settling disputes, presiding over discussions, even the chore of keeping statistical records, seemed to satisfy some deep emotional need quite irrespective of the service which he thus believed himself performing for others" (23). The author's careful study of the divergence between the two brothers is aptly crystallized in this quotation from Charles Wesley, in 1772: "'All the difference betwixt my brother and me . . . was that my brother's first object was the Methodists, and then the church; mine was first the church, and then the Methodists. That our different judgment of persons was owing to our different temper: his all hope, and mine all fear'" (207). Again, as Dr. Baker refers to the culminating events of 1784: "The separatist tendencies of Methodism had long been obvious to all but the most blind or the most prejudiced. Among the latter we must rank John Wesley, who did indeed recognize the tendencies, but was convinced that God would find a way out of the impasse. In 1784 he secured the legal incorporation of Methodism as a distinct denomination, he prepared and published a drastic revision of the *Book of Common Prayer* and the Thirty-Nine Articles, and he finally embraced presbyterial ordination in practice as well as theory—yet he characteristically refused to admit that he had com-

mitted any irrevocable breach with the Church of England!" (218)

The crucial separatist developments of 1784, as well as counter-vailing devotion to the Church of England, may be traced in part even back to latent tension between strong churchmanship and sectarian reformism bred into John Wesley in the theology and practice of his Epworth home; through the profoundly significant Oxford period with its influential studies, teachers, Methodist society, and both traditional and innovative disciplines; through the testing of such ideas and practices in mission to America, with high church tendencies nearer Rome than Geneva but also separatist portents such as hymn singing, a published hymnbook, extempore praying and preaching, itinerant and open air preaching, employment of laymen in parish work, and organization of religious societies; on into the decisive early 1740's, with societies formed around England, lay preachers enlisted, the *Journal* and other publications maintaining Anglican faithfulness yet implicitly divergent, and ambiguous relations with bishops and archbishops. The connexional system developed—conferences, doctrinal and disciplinary minutes, doctrinal standards in published sermons, model trust deeds to secure property, and expanding organization of societies, lay preachers, itinerants, and circuits—all "in the name of infusing new spiritual life into the (Anglican) Establishment, but in effect . . . creating a Methodist establishment" (114). With the maturing of Methodism as a national movement, despite recurrent Anglican opposition, Wesley increasingly (but not without failures) sought common cause with other minority church groups of evangelical spirit, notably Calvinistic Methodists, Presbyterians, and Moravians.

Surveying the changes in Wesley's churchmanship up to 1755, Dr. Baker reviews the developing conflicts between two differing convictions as to the nature of the church held tenuously together in Wesley's theology and practice. He was son of the church as historical institution, episcopal, sacramental, traditional; he was coming to see the church also as mission of the faithful, in reform and nurture; and his views of church government, ministry, and orders underwent change from authoritarian to charismatic, from institutional to functional. Thus "his view of the ideal church as a sacramental institution with an evangelical mission was slowly transformed into that of a missionary society performing sacramental functions, with the Church of England performing one task and the Methodist societies the other" (159).

This eventually meant separation, as witness the decisive actions

for American Methodism in 1784, but throughout the preceding three decades John, goaded vigorously by Charles, contended long and hard against separatist preachers, congregations, and conference efforts. His little known but eloquent plea of 1755, "Ought We to Separate from the Church of England?" (Appendix, 326-340), was one more vain effort to guard against the inevitable outcome, as was his unsuccessful effort of the next decade to unite evangelical Church of England clergy with Methodist lay preachers to sustain the movement within the church. Continuation of the Methodist movement after Wesley's death therefore rested with the lay preachers and a separate church to come, and Wesley reluctantly but resolutely laid the legal and organizational foundations. Provisions in 1784 for an independent Methodist Church for a newly free United States of America thus represented both fulfillment of tendencies already powerful in English Methodism and precedent for their realization in Wesley's own homeland. American Methodists, accustomed to focusing attention this side of the Atlantic after the ordinations of 1784, will be especially instructed by Dr. Baker's closing chapters on subsequent developments in England, and by his moving Epilogue! But they will find John Wesley both a Methodist and still an Anglican till death, and the Methodists in England not fully a church till after that.

---

For this reader whose interest in John Wesley is primarily theological, this is a salutary and informative volume. It would be presumptuous to evaluate otherwise this major contribution of such a knowledgeable and meticulously competent historian-interpreter as he relives the eighteenth century, identifies with protagonists in the long drama, sifts the enormous store of original documents and interpretations, evaluates contending arguments, revises traditional judgments, and withal presents the matter with clarity, faithfulness, and felicity of style worthy of Wesley's own discriminating approval. The author is to be thanked for the copious notes (66 pages!) and the research represented in the extensive select bibliography of works cited (besides countless others studied but not listed). The index could be even more helpful if it included authors' names, but the number might then be prohibitive.

In critical vein the reader might wonder why Professor Baker did not make more of the conflicts, persecutions, and exclusions Wesley and his followers suffered in the early years of Methodism, as possible

factors in Wesley's changing view of the church and of needed reforms. One might wish, too, that space and the author's inclination allowed more correlation of the story with contemporary English history, with thought and practice in the Church of England, with fuller Wesley biography, and indeed with the development of Methodism itself. But the volume is already too long for the author to include some documents he wanted, and these other matters may be left for reader initiative.

The book was handsomely printed in England with attractive format and worthy binding. Only a few typographical errors (five or six) showed up in this large volume. If prospective buyers hesitate before the high price, let them consider the extra values in such a full and definitive treatment! Dr. Baker has done his work superbly!

McMurry S. Richey

*The Church in a Changing World: Events and Trends from 250 to 600.* Mariananka Fousek. Concordia Publishing House, 1971. 176 pp.

I heartily recommend this compact unpadding, deeply committed little book. It has a good historical sense of topical issues in relation to chronology and geography. The related themes of tradition and social criticism, organization and dynamic piety, specialized leadership and homiletic zeal are well balanced. By rigorous delineation of areas covered and by usually defensible simplifications of historical problems, without unduly simplistic naivete, much has been achieved. Worship, art, traditional practices, crucial controversies, biography and contemplative literature get a wholesome hearing together. Of course, the restricted compass of the book lends inevitably, at times, to sketchiness and even an unjustifiable clarity about what never existed aside from a multitude of complexities and inconsistencies here impossible to report, let alone focus, accurately.

Yet, the impression that scholarly books, big and little, often manage to leave is missing. I refer to the sophisticated slur that is all too prevalent among professionals, whether teachers or pastors; namely, that scholars cannot be expected to bother with committed faith, and that church leaders couldn't care less about what scholarship thinks.

Professor Fousek's personal piety and scholarly integrity come through in reassuring focus together with a lively concern over the

church's historic and contemporary witness to the world. Prestigious authorities and recent Ph.D. graduates "looking for an angle" could well afford to ponder all this. So, also, could case-hardened parish and conference/convention/assembly technicians tempted to think that they have been long enough out of seminary not to be exercised about "research fantasies."

Miss Fousek has had a distinguished career as teacher and book editor, as well as scholar-missionary and children's writer in ecumenical context. Her experience shows. The book is well organized. The divisions are central for faith and work, society and personal piety, parish feasibility and inspirational reading. The writing is clear and unaffected. There is really little excuse for a busy pastor's not reading and profiting by this book. Young people can get a much needed catechetical start in the working knowledge of a church that gets more worldly wise and less edifying by the day for anyone needing spiritual guidance and indispensable indoctrination in the faith.

The literature cited is sometimes arbitrarily selected and by no means equally pertinent. But the narrative, though sometimes choppy, is pretty well balanced by reference to sources. Furthermore, there is a well selected appendix of primary readings in translation. There is a good set of running sub-heads throughout the chapters. They will not satisfy people looking for something different no matter what, but they do have the freshness of concern for historical vicariousness as the most contemporary of all present needs. Fortunately, and not accidentally, the book is neat, well proportioned and attractively published. The index is minimal but useful.

—Ray C. Petry

*God in the Dock: Essays on Theology and Ethics.* Clive Staples Lewis.  
 Edited by Walter Hooper. Eerdmans, 1970. 346 pp. \$6.95.

It is encouraging to see a renewed interest in the writings of C. S. Lewis, for he produced fine, imaginative stories for both children and adults, perceptive criticism, and not least a body of popular theological literature including *The Screwtape Letters* and *Mere Christianity*. One hopes that this enthusiasm will continue long after the usual burst of interest that occurs at the time of the death of well-known author.

*God in the Dock* is a compilation of brief papers, speeches, letters, and responses to letters, written over a period of twenty-four years.

The largest section deals with theology, primarily the miracles recounted in the New Testament. The other parts contain essays of general theological and ethical significance, and a short collection of letters which reveal his involvement in religious controversies in the Church of England. There is a good index. The book takes its title from an essay in which Mr. Lewis comments on the theology of modern man, especially his lack of a sense of sin. "The ancient man approached God (or even the gods) as the accused person approaches his judge. For the modern man the roles are reversed. He is the judge: God is in the dock."

This book, put together after Lewis's death in 1963, seems at times to be a melange of cold left-overs, but enough of the original warmth and flavor come through to be recognizable C. S. Lewis. Which means that from time to time one smiles with the recognition of truth, scribbles down a usable quotation, or pauses to argue with this sometimes irascible adversary.

The main problem with this collection is that the essays are too brief to allow for necessary development of themes, so that in several papers on the same subject one gets a repetition of Lewis's major comments but not ever a full discussion of the implications of his argument. An obvious example is the section on miracles; if one wants the logical development, one should read Lewis's book on the subject.

On the other hand, just as one is about to fling the book down there comes a piece of writing, even one sentence, that one wouldn't want to miss for the sheer joy of it. In "The Sermon and the Lunch," for instance, Mr. Lewis is reflecting upon a Vicar's sermon in praise of home and family life as the source of strength and purity, and the contrast of what home life is often really like (even the Vicar's)! This sermon made the congregation uneasy; obviously the laymen realized the true state of things more clearly than their preacher, that "since the Fall, no organization or way of life whatever has a natural tendency to go right." Murphy's Law from an Anglican!

Lewis is generally conservative in ethical approach, but whether agreeing with him or not the reader is often delighted by the way in which he expresses his sentiments. In several essays Lewis reflects alarm that criminal acts are not treated with sufficient moral seriousness. Citing the way in which this misleads the criminal as to his likely fate, Lewis says that "planting new primroses on the primrose path is no long-term benevolence." In other essays Lewis comes out

against “priestesses in the church,” and he expresses his dislike of congregational singing. His arguments can be both maddening and hilarious, but there is something admirable about such stubborn individuality.

Through all, Lewis is the literate, literary 20th century man converted to a thorough-going New Testament Christianity, somewhat to his own surprise. In the midst of sceptics he maintains belief in miracles and in other manifestations of God in the world, both natural and supernatural. He takes seriously both scripture and history and treats all with a winning combination of intelligence and humility. He gives shrewd advice to ministers as well: “One of the great difficulties is to keep before the audience’s mind the question of Truth. They always think you are recommending Christianity not because it is *true* but because it is *good*. And in the discussion they will at every moment try to escape from the issue “True-or-False” into stuff about a good society, or morals, or the incomes of Bishops . . . .”

One of his primary concerns, and it should be ours as well, is the necessity of “translating” the Gospel into language that our contemporaries use and understand. He suggests that before ordination the preacher should be required to write out some theological passage in the vernacular, for such an attempt will tell how much the minister understands theology. “Our failure to translate may sometimes be due to our ignorance of the vernacular; much more often it exposes the fact that we do not exactly know what we mean.” Lewis usually knows exactly what he means! If you have time to read essays rather than books, this will be a good source of instruction and pleasure for you.

Harriet V. Leonard  
Reference Librarian  
Divinity School Library

*The Shape of The Gospel*. Merrill R. Abbey. Abingdon, 1970. 352 pp. \$9.50.

This is a homiletical aid worthy of mention. Dr. Abbey has provided us with an up-to-date, relevant, road-map into the lectionary. While his treatise does not pretend to be a comprehensive commentary for all 228 Biblical passages contained within the lectionary of the Christian year, this work is new, imaginative, and compelling to the user. The book never falls into the trap of being condescending to its audience, as are so many “mini-commentaries.”

The working minister-preacher will find new joy in the use of the lectionary when he discovers Dr. Abbey has done his homework well and has provided him with a tool for study that will lead him to other sources and thoughtful reverie. There is no warmed-over material here! There is a combination of exegetical excellence and a dramatic, up to date, prophetic expository insight, which does not fail to relate the scripture from the lectionary to the turn of the Christian year.

A "special day" section at the end of the book adds to its value. Other distinctive features of the volume include a concise discourse on the Christian definition of each season of the year, an excellence in writing which is free of unnecessarily obscure phrases, and a willingness to use modern language and non-Biblical materials for illustrative purposes in the expository sections. Finally, if one doubts that this is an extremely valuable addition to the minister's working library, he need only compare it with one of the many church school lesson annuals to see the greater depth of scholarship, the wide ranging bibliography, and the long term value.

Dr. Abbey will not do your thinking for you, but he will engage you in a tremendous challenge to use the lectionary and preach the Christian year and so vary one's homiletical approach to cover the entire Bible. Cerebration is required, but the end product is a renewal of homiletical celebration!

—Kimsey King  
B.D. '58

*Beyond Feminism: The Woman of Faith in Action.* Marilyn Brown Oden. Abingdon, 1971. 112 pp. \$3.50.

Must we move beyond feminism so soon? Marilyn Oden urges us to do so, to actualize ourselves to take responsible places in our communities. She has failed to admit that few women see themselves as persons in their own right and fewer are able to assume positions of leadership. Perhaps women must leave behind questions concerning their identities in order to participate in the structures of which they have always been a part. But this is to leave the structures unquestioned, intact, and ready to bind another generation of women in their traditional roles. Such a solution also leaves our society in need of the feminine dimension in business, politics, industry, the military, and the church.

Although Oden skips over the issues of woman-consciousness and

the rights of women to pursue the varieties of tasks usually reserved for men, she does make many challenging suggestions for action. She compares, for example, the woman of the pre-twenty-first century with the cave man, Ur, in James Michener's novel *The Source*. Like Ur, women must separate themselves from the cave-like, sheltered life of the suburbs and apply their talents in the larger world (p. 88). Women, she asserts, have special traits which have been developed in the care of the family that are urgently needed in society. "At the same time that scientific development has made endless housekeeping chores obsolete, it has magnified the need in the world for feminine care—as a symbol of love, reconciliation, and sensitivity" (pp. 94-95). Oden would send women to meet the social ills of our cities and their peoples. She suggests political involvement. Each woman should assess her skills and try her best. She climaxes her plan for moving beyond feminism with a description of the Christian feminist, who "is not dependent upon her husband and children for her identity. She hears the summons to today's woman and dares to say "I." . . . The Christian feminist strives to learn how to pronounce "I" as God does. She sees love as involved care. And it is this love in action which moves her beyond feminism. For the Christian feminist dares to place her 'I' in the 'we' of her community, her nation, her world. She celebrates the past as it was, freely confronts the present as it is, and assumes responsibility for the future. In the spirit of Christ, she needs the challenge of these crucial times and hurls into history, struggling to bend it in the direction of hope" (p. 110).

Many women, particularly those who have dedicated themselves to womanly church-work, may find *Beyond Feminism* a good beginning point for considering their potentialities as women. If, from Oden's queries, we can move to examine those things within and without ourselves that hinder our growth as contributing persons, this little book will be a useful addition to the increasing numbers of books concerning women and religion. But if we stop with her surface reflections, we fail to assess the implications of a male-centered theology and a male-dominated church for an already imbalanced world.

Martha M. Wilson  
M. Div. '70



## PROGRAM

Testimonial Dinner for Dean Robert E. Cushman  
Sponsored by The Divinity School Alumni Association

6:30 P.M.

Ballroom, West Campus Union

May 24, 1971

Duke University

Presiding—The Reverend Orion N. Hutchinson, Jr.  
President, The Divinity School Alumni Association

Invocation and Grace

Miss Katherine Ann Belton, President Divinity School Student Body

Greetings from a Former Administrative Colleague

Dr. R. Taylor Cole, James B. Duke Research Professor of Political  
Science and Former Provost of Duke University

Greetings from a Faculty Colleague

Dr. Waldo Beach, Professor of Christian Ethics

Greetings from the United Methodist Church

Bishop William R. Cannon, Raleigh and Richmond Areas

Greetings from the Duke University Board of Trustees and The Divinity  
School Board of Visitors

Dr. Wilson O. Weldon, Editor of "The Upper Room," member of  
the Duke University Board of Trustees; and Chairman, Divinity  
School Board of Visitors

Greetings from the American Association of Theological Schools and  
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary

Dr. Olin T. Binkley, President Southeastern Baptist Theological  
Seminary

Greetings from the Association of United Methodist Theological  
Schools and Introduction of Speaker

Dr. Gerald McCulloh, Executive Director, Association of United  
Methodist Theological Schools

Address

Dr. Norman L. Trott, former President, Wesley Theological Sem-  
inary, Washington, D. C.

In Appreciation

President Terry Sanford

Presentation to the Cushmans

The Reverend William K. Quick, Dinner Chairman

Closing Prayer and Benediction

Bishop Earl G. Hunt, Charlotte Area





**THE  
DUKE  
DIVINITY SCHOOL  
REVIEW**

**Fall 1971**

## The Deanship of The Divinity School

Thomas A. Langford became Dean of the Divinity School and Professor of Systematic Theology on July 1, 1971. He had formerly been Professor of Religion and Chairman of the Department of Religion. Dean Langford holds both the B.D. and the Ph.D. degrees from Duke University and has taught here continuously since 1956. In 1965 he was named Outstanding Teacher of Undergraduates at Duke, and the same year was awarded the E. Harris Harbison Award for Distinguished Teaching by the Danforth Foundation. During the academic year 1965-66, he was an American Council of Learned Societies Study Fellow in Cambridge, England. In 1969 he was elected a Post-Doctoral Fellow of the Society for Religion in Higher Education. He is the author or editor of a half-dozen volumes, including *In Search of Foundations: English Theology 1900-1920* (1969). Dean Langford is a minister of The United Methodist Church and a member of the Western North Carolina Conference. Born in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, he was reared and attended public schools in Charlotte. He holds the A.B. degree from Davidson College.

Robert E. Cushman, who resigned the deanship last year after thirteen years of distinguished service in that post, returns to his teaching and writing as Research Professor of Systematic Theology. He is presently in Jerusalem as a Senior Fellow of the Ecumenical Institute for Advanced Theological Studies.

**THE  
DUKE  
DIVINITY SCHOOL  
REVIEW**

**Volume 36**

**Fall 1971**

**Number 3**

# Contents

The Deanship of the Divinity School.....	Inside Front Cover
Christian Ministerial Education .....	155
<i>by Thomas A. Langford</i>	
Political Responsibility Amid Violence and Revolution:	
A Challenge to Biblical Authority .....	163
<i>by D. Moody Smith</i>	
Swan Song .....	183
<i>by W. F. Stinespring</i>	
“That We May Ever Hereafter Serve and Please Thee” .....	191
<i>by Harmon L. Smith</i>	
Book Reviews .....	197

Editorial Committee: D. Moody Smith, Chairman; James R. Bailes, Donn Michael Farris, William M. Finnin, Richard E. Gillespie, Roland E. Murphy, Ray C. Petry, and Harmon L. Smith

Published three times a year (Winter, Spring, Autumn)  
by The Divinity School of Duke University

---

Postage paid at Durham, North Carolina (27706)

Opening Convocation, Duke Divinity School  
September 9, 1971

# Christian Ministerial Education

by THOMAS A. LANGFORD

We inaugurate a new school year, and for all of us, in various ways, a new time begins. I welcome those of you who are among us for the first time this fall. I greet those of you who are returning to the Divinity School for a second or third year. I extend appreciative regards to colleagues on the faculty who have contributed to the life and spirit of this school and who continue their leadership and to our new faculty members who are now with us. We are pleased to have members of the staff present with us, for they are also a significant part of our community. We especially welcome the wives and families of our students. And I come among you as one who shares your effort to serve Christian ministerial education.

I want to speak about this type of education. I do so in a rather simple, straightforward manner, for I am only beginning to understand this responsibility and I have much to learn. I covet sharing together our wisdom, perplexities, hopes, uncertainties—and above all, a common concern for the meaning of Christian ministry.

What I have to say tonight is not intended as an unusually ambitious statement. Rather, I put before you some of my initial reflections and I hope that these reflections will be a stimulus to our discussing, planning, and establishing a truly common endeavor. In order to initiate this process, I want to comment upon the three words in the title: Christian Ministerial Education.

## *Christian*

We are in this particular place, doing these specific things because of the Christian tradition. For us—as a community and as an educational enterprise—the lordship of Jesus Christ is and must be the center.

I have stated this boldly, but not simply to fly my colors for public

---

Thomas A. Langford became Dean of Duke Divinity School on July 1, 1971.

notice. I put the matter this way because we do come out of a specific religious tradition and work within a concretely defined context; and for this tradition and for this context, Jesus Christ is the center.

Yet, you must understand that I am not proposing that there be theological agreement, consent as to life-style, or a closed community because of this affirmation. I acknowledge that there is diversity of theological interpretation as to what such a declaration means. I know that there are many for whom the very issue of the significance and place of Jesus Christ is a serious question. I am aware that we cannot and should not seek conformity of thought or action even if we work out of this common ground. But there is no justification for our existence and no hope for our training if we do not set firmly before us the fact that the churches, this school, and our educational processes depend upon the vital sovereignty of the lordship of Jesus Christ.

Our primary task is to explore what this centrality has meant, now means, and might portend. In this task we have a responsibility to affirm our convictions, to raise our questions, to possess the integrity of our basic affections, and to allow others the integrity of their personhood. The gospel of Jesus Christ frees men. No other base can provide for the openness to others as can this one. For whatever else the acknowledgement of the lordship of Jesus means, it propels one into an agapeistic mode of life—and this is as true of thought as it is of action. So whoever you are, from whatever special background you come, with whatever questions and theological interpretations you possess, you are among us . . . and we are with you. We are together in acknowledging and investigating the importance of Jesus as Lord; and in seeking to understand and mutually support, correct, inform, and challenge one another. In short, if Jesus as Lord is central, our common responsibility is to come to an appreciation of what this means.

Further, the lordship of Jesus is always concretely expressed in the experience of an historical community. The life of the community of the church is the life of worship and ministry. The fact that you are in Divinity School, exploring or preparing for ministry, does not set you apart from the church, it sets you squarely within the life of the church. We must explore the meaning of, even as we train for, Christian ministry. No other task is so important. No other responsibility is more humbling. No other vocation is more demand-

ing or so all encompassing as is this one. And no other preparation should be entered more cautiously, more thoughtfully, more prayerfully than this one. If you think you already know what this lordship means in a final way, you have no place among us. If you are willing to be nurtured along with us in such understanding, we welcome your participation. If you come with a lack of seriousness about the search, or with an indifferent attitude toward the importance of such a vocational role, then you have no place among us. But if you come to explore intensely, to give yourself in full, to engage in challenging dialogue, to laugh and celebrate, to anguish and strive with us, then we welcome you in the most congenial way; we want you among us and want to learn with and from you.

The lordship of Jesus Christ, as expressed in concrete communities, must find a significant—even if partial—realization in the life of the Divinity School. Here we do come together to embody our central reality. Consequently, this lordship has something to do with our common worship, our study and our exploration of missional tasks. I hope that we can find a center to our community in worship. I invite and, indeed, implore all of you to participate in this venture. Not just because we need it as a community though, in fact, we do. But perhaps this is to put the entire matter in a reverse way. The reason for our worship is not the expedient that it fosters the utilitarian interest of creating and maintaining community. The real reason we must worship together is that it is an appropriate response to the claim of lordship which Jesus has laid upon us. We shall be worshipping at the heart of the morning; it should constitute the center of our life as a community. I do not pretend that worship is easy or that we will always realize great significance. But I do know that worship is essential to Christian existence, and that all of us have an obligation to explore its meaning. If we do not worship, our life will be poverty and our service will be insignificant.

But, let me add quickly, that to speak of common life does not mean that we are seeking conformity. A better way of putting this might be to speak of complementary life, for the rich variety which is represented among us is to be acknowledged and preserved; and it is to be preserved in interchange with one another; it is to be authenticated by our mutual involvements which sanction differences while also referring us back to our primal source.

Again, to move to another dimension, I am concerned that the Divinity School be vitally related to our university context and to

the life of the churches. We cannot live in isolated, insulated fashion. The pressure and claims of the time demand that we draw from the resources of our immediate intellectual environment. The riches of this reservoir must be tapped and we must be full dialogical partners with our external colleagues and with the disciplines of this university. At the same time, we must also be creatively related to the church. We cannot afford to be isolated from the cutting-edge where full engagement with life is to be found. In a unique sense, we must stand at the intersection where the best of the academic tradition and the challenge of the practical life meet—and if we stand at this juncture, then they will meet, sometimes with thunder and lightning and, perhaps occasionally, in stillness which intersperses a storm. Our place is exciting, it is demanding, and it can be renewing. The lordship of Jesus makes a comprehensive claim and we must discover that comprehensiveness in our order of life and education.

Now let me speak of my position. Administratively, the lordship of Jesus is precisely the issue which must be clearly recognized and served. Decisions about the life, purposes, and character of this Divinity School are to be set under this aegis. I do not mean this simply in a pietistic sense—although I also mean it in the pietistic sense that our decisions are to be made within the context of prayer and agapeistic concern—I also mean this in the most vital, strong, aggressive sense of having the courage of our convictions, of being open to one another, and of being willing to stand upon principle even in the face of opposition from whatever quarter.

Let me, then, repeat: we are in this particular place, doing these specific things because of the lordship of Jesus Christ. And for us as a community, and as an educational enterprise, Jesus Christ is and must be the center.

### *Ministerial*

Already, I have stated that the life of the church is expressed in worship and ministry. I want now to concentrate upon its ministry. Wherever Christian community is found, it is alive and possesses authenticity only in so far as it is involved in serving under the lordship of Jesus Christ.

The ministry of the church possesses many dimensions. It must succor and nurture the young and the weak; it must develop maturity, and demand of maturity its full responsibility; it must challenge alien cultural values; it must be where there is hurt, and hunger; it must

be involved in the political order; it must—in terms of the gospel—be revolutionary; it must be a liberating force in society; it must be self-critical and self-correcting; it must always be serving the concrete needs of men in response to the incarnate action of God in Christ.

Ministry is found in the working out of these dimensions and responsibilities. To be in ministry is to be in the world—sharing its joy and sorrow, alleviating its pain, and embracing its good, fighting demonic forces, and serving graciously the cause of grace. Ministry is not one thing, it is many things, and these are always changing. But it is our task to discover for ourselves and for our time what our ministry is.

Although ministry is many things, it always comes from a basic root and possesses a primitive and final commitment. For ministry, in whatever form, is ministry under the lordship of Jesus. This is our source and norm. And it is by incorporation into his life that we find ourselves incorporated into ministering service to the world. From this center we must learn to be innovative, and our innovation must return to this center.

To point to the multiplicity of styles and responsibilities in ministry is also to point to the difficulty of ministerial training at the present time. For the Divinity School must attempt to train for service in numerous and diverse functions. We are obliged to perpetuate the tradition, that long—and often ambiguous—history through which men are encountered with the claim of lordship and responsible discipleship. We are obliged to attempt to embody among ourselves the reality of community which comes through common worship and mutual support for different tasks. We are obliged to explore the possibilities for new and innovative forms of ministry, and to discover new ways of making our service effective.

Such problems are further heightened by the fact that not all of you will have the same responsibilities or combine these various modes of ministerial action in the same proportions. That is, we shall be training you for different tasks under the one commanding task. And we as a faculty cannot do this alone. To do this we need to hear from you who are students; we need to know about your talents, your developing expertise, your concerns, your vocational plans and hopes. Relevant ministry is a challenge we can meet only by working together.

The ministry is not a task that can be neatly described. Our central value in the Lordship of Jesus remains. But the viable and

vital expressions of how this Lordship is exhibited, proclaimed, extended, and made effective are what we are here—and here together—to learn. And, once again, to do this requires that scholars, young and old, must work together. What I commit myself to at the beginning of my tenure as Dean is a willingness to participate as colleague with all of you—students, faculty, staff—in this search.

Now, let me once more repeat, we are in this particular place undertaking our particular tasks because of the Lordship of Jesus Christ. Acknowledgment of the richness and importance of proclaiming, embodying, and nurturing in this commitment leads us to the necessity of finding what must be maintained from the past, what can adequately serve the present, and what is most promising for the future.

### *Education*

I believe in education. So let me be direct. I believe in disciplined, intense development of the mind. I believe in rigorous, intense development of the spirit. And I hope that all of us share this sense. But more needs to be said: Education involves the development of the whole man. We must be concerned with the maturation of all of our potentialities—of mind and spirit and strength—if we are to be full persons and if we are to serve a complex world.

Education is the development of the whole man for a whole life. The educational processes which are continued or initiated at this point in your maturation do not represent a final accomplishment. It is, rather, an invigoration and new propulsion for continuing education. As a point of initiation or new resourcefulness your present experience is significant. But ultimately it is important only if it inculcates an educational process which will continue with you throughout your life.

Education is the development of the whole man for a whole life and for a total job. Not only is your personal maturation important, it is equally important that you continually re-assess your vocational commitments, and constantly study the situation in which you are ministering. A significant education should make you critically and appreciatively aware of the context in which you live; it should open you to new cultural development; and it should make it possible for you to learn from, as well as contribute to, this context.

In the Divinity School we are engaged in theological education; and the mention of this fact returns us to our center and the initial

point of my comments. Theological education can mean many things, but in terms of the training we hope to provide, it carries several denotations for me. Initially, it must mean that you are well trained in terms of the historical theological disciplines: Biblical, historical, constructive. My attention was recently called to a comment by President Kingman Brewster, Jr. of Yale University, and it is a comment with which I agree. "Hopefully, the church will not try to be an amateur in everything but will develop a professional competence with one discipline, theology, the organizing principle of its thought." Such an educational focus is tremendously important. As ministers you will be called upon to do many things—and in most of them you will be amateurs. Hopefully, we can train you to know your strengths and limitations in various areas and can give some instruction in ways to utilize the expertise of others in your communities. But, primarily, I hope that we can train you theologically; that is, that we can help you find a point of reference from which you can operate, in terms of which you can make your theoretical and practical decisions, and on the basis of which you can make your primary contribution. To know some few things well, will, in the final analysis, enrich all of the other things you do.

But there are matters of more practical wisdom. Recently a friend told me about being in the hospital and listening to some physicians discussing how one can discern a really good practitioner. Finally, one of the men said, "The way you can identify a good doctor is by the care with which he does those things he doesn't enjoy doing."

It is more fun to celebrate than to conjugate the Greek verb *lúo*; it is easier to be busy about trivia than to think in a sustained manner (perhaps I should simply say, to think); it is easier to be lazy than to pray; (and I add, half facetiously, it is easier to drink coffee than worship). But a good minister is, in a fundamental fashion, determined by his doing well, doing carefully, those important things he doesn't especially enjoy doing. (If this sounds like the Protestant Work Ethic . . . so be it.)

Further, I am convinced that not all education takes place in the classroom or in the traditional processes or forms. One can and must learn from life and in life. Ministry is learned in engagement with the love and pain and hope and hurt of life; and we must be at the places where this occurs. One must learn from engagement with the society of which we are a part. Here I affirm that a range of experi-

ences are valuable to us. Moreover, I am sure that the tasks of ministry are not learned apart from the practical involvement in various modes of Christian mission. What we must learn how to do more adequately is to interrelate our academic and our practical education so as to build a holistic program for those who are initiating their professional training. In this training, the intellectual must find its justification in the practical and the practical must have its evaluation from the intellectual.

The challenge that we freshly discover viable forms of Christian ministry is full of ambiguity and can be the cause of uncertainty. But it also represents a grand opportunity. We are challenged to be inventive and fresh as we explore this strange culture of which we are a part. And we must be disciplined if we are to possess the strength for the continuous challenge of relevant ministry. Most important, such an educational experience is necessary if we are to mold the attitudes and abilities necessary for living creatively in a world where creativity is too seldom found.

Education which combines the best of the past and the freshness of the present is difficult to achieve. But to undertake this task is the most important thing we can do. And here we cannot predicate our hope upon things the faculty can give to the students; nor for that matter things the students can give to the faculty. I see hope only if we can begin to share together our frustrations and our visions; our scholarship and our sensitivities; our disappointments and our hopes. Such education is gained from shared life and from transforming experience. Perhaps if we can be clear as to our center, if we can explore the meaning of our common and complementary ministries, and if we can be disciplined about our education, we can find together the qualities of life which should define our existence.

### *An End, a Beginning, and a Prayer*

Well, I have put before you some of my basic concerns. The statement of them is quite simple. The achievement of them would be profound in effect. If you can share these points of reference with me, then perhaps we have a basis upon which to begin our life together in the Divinity School. In any case, I welcome all of you into this venture and I take my place among you as a colleague in this vocational endeavor.

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, Amen.

Lecture, Cambridge University Divinity School  
February 24, 1971

# Political Responsibility Amid Violence and Revolution: A Challenge to Biblical Authority

by D. MOODY SMITH

A subject like "Political Responsibility Amid Violence and Revolution," even when qualified by the question of Biblical authority, is a rather ambitious undertaking for a lecture scheduled to last somewhat less than an hour. Justification for the choice of such a topic may be sought in one of two directions. Either the lecturer is an authority on the subject of such impressiveness or originality as to demand a hearing, or the subject is of such interest and importance as to require our urgent attention. Certainly in this case the second justification may be invoked, if not the first. And I do hereby invoke the second justification and not the first! Yet I believe I am not quite reduced to the level of hoping for your attention because the title evokes considerations which most of us deem important, and because they "turn me on." Such scholarly and theological competence as I have lies in the field of Biblical studies, particularly New Testament, and it seems to me to be important for Biblical scholars who are concerned with the theological and practical implications of their work to participate in the discussion of the issues cast up for Christianity and the churches by the modern world. Yet to my knowledge we have contributed rather little to the elucidation of such

---

D. Moody Smith is Professor of New Testament Interpretation. He spent the academic year 1970-71 on sabbatical leave in Cambridge, England. This lecture is in part based upon the report of a study group working under the auspices of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches. Participants in this group were the Reverend Philip Cousin, Pastor of St. Joseph's A.M.E. Church, Durham, N.C., and Lecturer in Practical Theology at Duke Divinity School; Prof. Veselin Kesich of St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary, N.Y.; Father Roland Murphy of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.; Prof. Derek Shows of Duke University; and Professors Frederick Herzog and Franklin Young of Duke Divinity School, as well as the author.

matters as are suggested by the announced title of this lecture. If there is to be any useful contribution to the discussion, however, it must be entered into seriously. Not a great deal is likely to be accomplished by occasional or off-hand references or exhortations, after which we may return to those historical, philological, or even theological questions, which in our heart of hearts we feel are our serious business. Speaking at the Pittsburgh Festival of the Gospels last spring, Paul Minear suggested that the average person in our day, if he developed an interest in the Gospels at all, probably would not think of consulting a New Testament scholar or theologian to help him understand them. He is, of course, entirely right, and I do not think the blame can be laid wholly at the door of American anti-intellectualism. It is, however, very difficult for one whose breadth of competence scarcely matches his interests to know how the issues which concern and agitate people nowadays can be grasped and addressed in a responsible and helpful way. After all, one does not want to make matters worse than they already are by writing another unnecessary lecture, article or book.

Recently, however, the Faith and Order commission of the World Council of Churches has taken the initiative in involving a number of Biblical scholars, as well as others, in an effort to re-open the question of Biblical authority and to ascertain its dimensions in the world in which we presently live. One hesitates to equate an initiative from the Secretariat for Faith and Order with the prompting of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, I have been gratified to be able to participate in some of the discussions pertaining to this study, and this participation is the principal basis for what I shall have to say. There is no need to describe the procedure of this study in detail. It is only necessary to know that for over a year there have been study groups in several parts of the world looking into various aspects of the problem of Biblical authority. The procedure has been either to take a specific theme or doctrine with Biblical roots in order to examine and elucidate it in view of our present knowledge of the Bible, or, as in our case, to take a pressing contemporary problem and to ask how the Bible speaks to it and how the question of Biblical authority looks in relation to it. The group of which I was a member was looking into the ramifications of the theme of political responsibility amid violence and revolution for the problem of Biblical authority. The purpose of our group, as well as the others, was not to offer definitive formulations or solutions, but to indicate directions

and to identify problems and issues. Each group was also asked to address itself to a number of specific questions about Biblical authority in the light of the discussion of the substance of the theme with which it was dealing.

Perhaps the most useful thing I can do here is first to open out to you the main lines of our group's thinking on the theme proposed and then to indicate some of its implications for the kinds of questions that are generally thought important for the problem of Biblical authority.

### I. Preliminary Considerations

At the outset, we were instructed not to spend a great deal of time discussing in the abstract what is or ought to be meant by authority, but rather to let such insights as we might have evolve in the course of our discussion of the theme. A separate group is, in fact, working on the problem of authority *per se* and another on the problem of the canon. On the question of Biblical authority our group, and probably most others, eschewed a purely formal or verbal definition on the one hand, but on the other agreed that the very existence and shape of the Bible and the history of its use among Christians constituted a claim to authoritativeness which could not be ignored. A purely formal or verbal understanding of Biblical authority simply defines out of existence any problem of Biblical authority or translates it into the problem of unbelief. At the other extreme, the problem of Biblical authority also disappears when the claim of the Bible is not recognised as something to be dealt with seriously. As a teacher on an American theological faculty, I encounter the latter perspective very regularly and, I think, increasingly.

In our own group we did not begin by attempting to agree upon definitions of the principal terms used in the setting forth of our theme. Presumably at the outset "political responsibility" could not have been defined except in a tautological way or in such a way as to concede that a really non-Biblical concept of political responsibility was determining our deliberations. Possibly a tentative formulation could have been adopted as a working hypothesis, but in any event the group did not choose to proceed in that way. Neither did we attempt to define at the outset "violence" and "revolution." In this case it quickly became obvious that our own American cultural and political situation is tending toward a broader use of one term and a narrower use of the other. "Violence" is often taken to refer to any

oppressive situation or system which does harm to people and might ultimately be backed up with physical force. On these terms to take up arms in the situation or against the system is not to initiate violence but only to defend one's self against violence. "Revolution" increasingly means "violent revolution" unless otherwise qualified. There was some strong feeling that the legitimate use of the term to refer to radical but not violent change ought to be preserved. In fact, most members of our groups saw some dangers inherent in both tendencies of current usage.

As our discussion developed, it centered more and more upon the problem of interpretation, that is, the question of the necessary and appropriate presuppositions for understanding the Bible and the question of the horizon or the range of human concerns to which the message of the Bible may be relevant. That we should have gone from the problem of authority to the problem of hermeneutics was, in fact, a curious turn of affairs, at least in the history of Faith and Order discussions. For in its origin the study of Biblical authority grew out of the somewhat inconclusive study of hermeneutics which had preceded it. This seeming reversal of directions doubtless means only that the questions of authority and hermeneutics are in our time rather closely intertwined. We decided not to attempt to abstract ourselves from our involvement and conditioning in the American social and religious situation, but rather consciously and explicitly to make that situation the background of our own efforts. In so doing we were in effect deciding not to engage directly in the hermeneutical discussion as it has been going on in Germany or derivatively in the United States and not to limit the focus narrowly so as to include only the theological scene. It is probably true of any predominantly Christian country, but certainly most of all true of America, that the place and use of the Bible in theology does not determine its place and use in the church generally.

Despite a slump from the peak reached in the late nineteen fifties, American churches still count more than half the population among their supporters and the vast majority among their constituency. Despite the recently reported death of God, a continuing interest in religion, and particularly the ethical values of the Christian scriptures and tradition accompanies growing disaffection with the institutional church, particularly among the present student generation. Within the church, or the broader constituency of the churches, there is a continuing willingness to regard the Bible as in some way au-

thoritative, even where orthodox belief has been somewhat eroded. In any event, the pressing question in the contemporary church scene—as distinguished from the theological scene—is not so much the right or legitimacy of Biblical authority, as the scope of that authority and the way it may impinge upon the Christian and the church. While there is doubtless a great variety of views on the subject, one can perhaps identify two predominant tendencies. On the one hand, there is a widespread recognition of an important ethical dimension of the Bible that is taken to have social and political implications. On the other hand, there is the visceral inclination to regard the Bible as a religious book dealing with and exercising authority over the inward and individual aspects of man's existence, and only through them over the social dimensions. In addressing the question of the authority of the Bible over against the range of issues indicated by the theme "Political Responsibility Amid Violence and Revolution," we were well aware that we were facing more than the comparatively simple and relatively innocuous task of taking a Biblical truth that everyone more or less agreed upon and applying it to a similarly agreed upon human problem or need. Rather, willingly or not, we were entering the lists of a conflict in which the issues of the nature and scope of Biblical authority have important consequences for the church's understanding of its faith.

One way of entering the lists might have been to assume the garb and role of referee in order to point out what seems obvious enough, namely that there are both individual and social or political aspects of the Bible, and therefore of Biblical authority. But the nature of the theme and its urgency, the rather rigidly individualistic understanding of the Bible among so many church people on the one side and the growing disaffection of students, black people, the poor, and others vitally interested in human welfare on the other, seemed to demand another course.

It was, of course, scarcely imaginable that the deliberations and results of one small study group should have any immediate and important effect upon the scope, range, and impact of Biblical authority in American Christianity. Yet it is not inconceivable that such discussions can make a helpful assessment of the present state of affairs and suggest some possibilities or even urgent tasks. Thus we set about formulating a position paper which does not purport to be a statement of the Biblical view of political responsibility amid violence and revolution, but rather a specific proposal about how the Bible

may be understood as authoritative in a society and world in which political issues in the broader sense excite violence and revolution and otherwise seem the important human issues among an increasing multitude of people. This proposal takes the following form.

## II. Freedom as Key Hermeneutical Concept<sup>1</sup>

The relevance and urgency of the question of political responsibility amid violence and revolution arises out of the struggle of oppressed peoples for freedom and self-expression. This struggle goes on in the United States. One thinks not only of black people, but of other minority groups such as Mexican-Americans (Chicanos), the poor whites of Appalachia, and, indeed, women, who can scarcely be thought of as a minority group, but who in many instances actually are caught up in very restrictive or oppressive social structures. Significantly, the proponents of women's liberation argue that these structures oppress men as well as women, even as Martin Luther King rightly pointed out that the structures of segregation were oppressive to white southerners as well as black. These American struggles are only a part of a world-wide phenomenon that has been with us all since World War II. The uncritical assumption that all such struggles have Christian motivations or goals would, of course, be unwarranted. Those of us who grew up under the pervasive influences of the Niebuhr brothers in America would also want to warn of the moral ambiguity that is involved in all such struggles, necessary or inevitable as they may be.

When all the necessary cautions are issued, however, one is nevertheless faced with the significant fact that God in the Bible is, viewed functionally, one who liberates. Liberation or deliverance from captivity is a dominant Biblical category of salvation. Quite naturally the proponents of the civil rights movement in America spoke the language of the Exodus tradition. For understandable reasons Moses has always been an important figure in black Christianity. More recently Jesus' definition of his own ministry in terms of release to the captives (Luke 4:18) has attracted the attention of black theologians. This passage in Luke is of course drawn from second (or third) Isaiah (cf. 61:1ff.) and probably referred originally to the return from exile and the liberation from the conditions of oppression and captivity which that period imposed. Naturally, it is possible to

---

1. For this fundamental insight and perspective our group was indebted to Frederick Herzog.

exaggerate the importance of liberation or freedom in the Old Testament, but its significance is confirmed by the emergence of the same theme in the New Testament. The title of the English translation of Prof. Kaesemann's recent polemical tract, *Jesus Means Freedom*,<sup>2</sup> is when all is said and done not an inaccurate statement, either historically or theologically, of what the New Testament is about—if one wants to say it in three words, and sometimes one must say it briefly if he does not wish to be misunderstood. As surely as Jesus was a Jew, he was also a Jew who broke rather decisively from certain oppressive aspects of his religious tradition. Here Kaesemann is, I think, right, as much as one regrets his tendency to portray Judaism monolithically as a piety oppressive to the human spirit against whose background Jesus attitude appears as utterly unaccountable. Moreover, the theme of freedom appears also in important ways in Paul and John, as we all know. That freedom or liberation is a central motif in the Bible, indeed, in very important parts of the Bible, is obvious.

Yet the recognition of several facts or problems prevents any simple assertion that freedom or liberation is the central motif of the Biblical message. First, it is clear that there are other significant ways in which the Biblical message of salvation comes to expression. Quite understandably, in other periods churchmen may have seen the central Biblical message to be resurrection or eternal life. Secondly, the concept of freedom in the Bible, while it may have various connotations, is nowhere synonymous with anarchy or chaos, but stands alongside concepts of community, law, and even order, and is apparently not thought to be incompatible with them. Thirdly, the kinds or spheres of freedom which are suggested in scripture are not entirely congruous with the freedom sought by oppressed peoples today. Fourthly, Biblical scholars today would be quick to reject the suggestion that there is a single Biblical conception of freedom. Nor can one speak of Old Testament or New Testament concepts of freedom as if these were unitary patterns. Finally, in scripture God appears as the author and bestower of freedom, and man is not encouraged to believe that freedom is contingent upon his efforts alone. Even when the liberation in question is entirely this-worldly, as in the Exodus, it is God who accomplishes it.

Taking up the last problem first, a frank recognition that the Bible portrays the situation so that it is God who always sets man

---

2. London: SCM, 1969.

free, does not necessarily imply that no real support or encouragement is offered to those who would support human efforts to relieve oppression or otherwise set men free. There is, of course, the not insignificant fact that in the Bible such oppression is frequently condemned. Moreover, and perhaps more important, although one may scarcely move directly from the theme of freedom as it appears in various parts of the Bible to the elaboration of social, economic or political programs, the theme of God as liberator embodies a basic understanding of man as one created for freedom. Such a view of man is emasculated when the scope of this freedom is confined to the "spiritual realm" and a serious distortion results. It is one thing when such inward freedom is seen as the chief human problem, as it was by Paul and Luther, but it is quite another when in the face of a human situation in which social and political oppression are felt to be deeply harmful to human beings and their aspirations the scope of what the Bible may mean by freedom is arbitrarily confined. Such restriction of the meaning or relevancy of the Bible tends to make of the Bible, and therefore of Biblical authority, an irrelevancy or anachronism at best and a weapon in the hands of the most reactionary elements of society at worst.

That there is no single or unitary concept of freedom in the Bible then turns out to be no real problem or objection at all, but an indication that in various times and situations, God's deliverance takes different shapes and forms. If anything, this would seem to warrant the continuing reinterpretation of freedom in the present and future. That the kinds or spheres of freedom spoken about in the Bible are not entirely congruent with those sought by men today is again just what one might expect. Furthermore, the radically different position of Christians and the church in the western world today, as compared with New Testament times, suggests that the restriction of the sphere or scope of the concept to those areas of life denoted in the Bible, or even in the New Testament, may well result in the abnegation rather than the preservation of authentic Christian witness in the present. Moreover, while it is certainly true that freedom in the Biblical tradition, whatever else it may mean, does not mean anarchy, it is equally true that the same may be said of almost any responsible concept of freedom. Most obviously, limitations on freedom of action are at once implied by the existence of other individuals, who are or ought to be free also. Finally, while the message of salvation is not always cast in the language or conception of freedom in the Bible, its most

significant elements can be and often are, e.g. freedom from the law, freedom from sin, freedom from death. It may be objected that since almost anything can be defined in terms of freedom from or freedom for, the concept itself is not very helpful. To this objection two things may be said. First, over against the background of the history and phenomenology of religion, in which the ordering of the world in hierarchies of people and things seems to have been very important, the recurring Biblical theme of salvation as deliverance or freedom is quite significant and characteristic. In the second place, we are not attempting to give a precise formulation of a Biblical concept, much less *the* Biblical doctrine of salvation. To do that would at best result in considerable distortion of the materials which lie at our disposal. Our objective is more modest, but perhaps also more important, because it is more likely to lie within our grasp. We are attempting to get hold of the problem of Biblical authority from the standpoint of a human situation that is indigenous to, and characteristic of, our time; and we are proposing that at the point of the recurring Biblical motif of freedom as the goal and substance of salvation there is to be found a potentiality for understanding the Bible's relevance to this situation and therefore for affirming its authority and giving it some specificity.

In practice Biblical authority has generally moved from a basic sensibility for what the Bible is about though a sensitivity for the perceived human situation to a hermeneutical center from which the burden of the message is grasped and interpreted in its relevance for that situation. The assertion of Biblical authority has often implied a breaking through barriers and restrictions in recognition of a superior authorisation or demand, which appears in correlative relationship with a human situation.

In the Judaeo-Christian tradition the authority of the word, whether written or spoken, or of the scriptural text comes to expression furthermore and is understood and applied in a community, in Israel or the church. Historically viewed, the preservation and authority of traditions or documents tend to arise from acknowledgement by the community of their import and meaning. (While they may speak to those outside the community, they have their primary field of authority within the community). The character of the authority of the spoken or written word is not static or fixed *a priori*, and the scope of such authority may actually grow within the community. For example, some prophetic oracles were doubtless rejected

by Israel as a whole and were preserved at first only by circles of the prophet's disciples. As the unfolding of events subsequently vindicated these oracles and gained for them a wider hearing, they were incorporated into literary complexes or books and ultimately became authoritative or canonical for the whole community. The completed document might be understood in ways quite remote or at least different from, the original tendency of many of the individual oracles. In fact, in the growth of the tradition the direction and emphasis of the prophet's message were subject to alteration. What one says in connection with an Isaiah or a Jeremiah will also have to be said of Jesus and the tradition stemming from him. As a recent authoritative Roman Catholic document on the study of the Gospels has recognised, there are at least three levels of meaning or interpretation of Jesus in the Gospels, namely, the most primitive material of Jesus himself, the traditional framing and *Umdeutung* of that material by the Apostolic witnesses, and the final rearrangement and incorporation of it in our present Gospels.<sup>3</sup> Thus the authority of the tradition, which is always respected, is not to be separated from the reinterpretation of the tradition in changing circumstances.

Now, if we speak of a hermeneutical center, from which the Bible is interpreted, we have to admit that in the course of Christian history this center also has changed with changing circumstances, and that this is not only inevitable, but as it should be. Unless there is such flexibility, Biblical authority may become a dead letter. At the same time such change may not be merely arbitrary or capricious. Christian faith as such has a prior commitment of finding in Jesus Christ its permanent hermeneutical center. In him God is present for man in a decisive way. This much at least is not debatable, if Christian faith is not to be deprived of its very essence. But the mode or manner of his presence as a continuing reality is open for reinterpretation. This goes on in the Christian community as the churches seek to understand the treasure they have in earthen vessels and the necessary shape of the gospel message in the face of the fluctuations inherent in man's existence in history. Obviously, such reinterpretation has limits. The New Testament documents and the process of canonization witness to this limitation. Jesus means freedom, but he does not mean escape from the responsibilities and realities of this world. If he frees

---

3. See "Instruction concerning the historical truth of the Gospels," VI-X, in A. Cardinal Bea, *The Study of the Synoptic Gospels*, ed. J.A. Fitzmeyer (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), pp. 82ff.

man from the law, it is only so that he may be free to better fulfill the plain intention of the law, which is love of God and neighbor. The limits to the reinterpretation of Jesus were extended and refined in Christological controversies of third and fourth centuries, and particularly in the struggle over Gnostic reinterpretation in the second century. The understanding of the meaning and therefore the nature and scope of the authority of Jesus has been a matter of debate and struggle within Christianity from the earliest times, as Paul's letters to the Corinthian and Galatian churches particularly demonstrate. The insight that there are legitimate and illegitimate interpretations of Jesus and that the reason for this inheres in the historical person himself is present from the beginning and a fundamental factor in the growth of the Gospels and the preservation of the tradition. For us, the canon places limits on the churches' interpretation of Jesus and suggests his meaning, as do the creeds, but it does not lay down or exhaust the possibilities for understanding his importance for all generations or for any or every eventuality.

Our fixing upon the Biblical motif of freedom and our understanding of God through Christ as liberator stand within the range of hermeneutical possibilities offered us by scripture and tradition. Indeed, the centrality and relevance of this theme, as well as its many nuances, invite us to adopt it as our hermeneutical center. Having done this, however, we must give some indication of how this hermeneutical center actually relates to the Bible and how it may be helpful in eliciting some useful response from the scriptures to the question of political responsibility amid violence and revolution.

How then does the proposed hermeneutical center relate to the Bible? We have already given some indication of the way in which the theme of freedom appears in the scriptures. But let us now take a closer, if *per force* rather briefer, look at one of the New Testament passages where the concept of freedom appears. We pass over the more frequently cited Pauline and Johannine passages and turn rather to Luke 4:16-30, Jesus' preaching in the synagogue at Nazareth, Luke's account of the first public appearance and pronouncement of Jesus. We have a right to expect it to be an important programmatic statement, and this in itself is of some importance, if for no other reason than that the Lucan corpus is the longest block of material stemming from a single author in the entire New Testament. The Lucan episode seems to be based upon Mark 6:1-6a, although Luke has incorporated little enough of the Marcan pericope apart from the synagogue setting

in Nazareth (which Luke only names, although that is clearly intended by Mark). Nevertheless, the fact that Luke has the incidents preceding and following Mark 6:1-6a (i.e. Jairus' daughter and the woman with an issue of blood, Mark 5:21-43; the sending forth of the twelve, Mark 6:6b-13) in the same order and position but without any parallel to Mark 6:1-6a between them probably indicates that Luke has already made this passage the basis for his account of the beginning of Jesus' public ministry. Whether the distinctively Lucan material is based upon tradition is for the moment not an important question. It may well be based only on the Old Testament prophecy and Luke's reflection, but at the very least it is an important statement about the nature of Jesus' ministry and of the Gospel message:

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor.  
He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and the recovering of sight to the blind,  
To set at liberty those who are oppressed, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord."

Jesus' text is Isaiah 61:1f. probably influenced by Isaiah 58:6. Clearly for Luke Jesus is the fulfillment of this prophecy (cf. v.21). That the fundamental "programmatic" statement comes from Isaiah comports well both with Luke's view of prophecy and fulfillment and with his understanding of the church and its mission as defining a period of history analogous with the time of Israel. This fulfillment is in no way contradicted by Jesus' rejection by his townspeople. Just such a rejection allows a major Lucan motif to surface, the acceptance of the gospel by gentiles and its rejection by Jesus' own people. Alongside the element of fulfillment of prophecy is the important role assigned to Jesus' miracles in the dialogue between Jesus and his fellow countrymen. Moreover, Luke probably wishes to make Jesus' endowment with the Spirit a matter of public record. But none of these factors, real as they may be, detracts from the fact that the Old Testament text which Jesus has read describes his mission, in effect the salvation he works, in strikingly this-worldly language. After all, even the miracles are transformations which take place here and now. The rather worldly description of salvation as the fulfillment of common human needs and yearnings is not uncharacteristic of Luke, as the canticles of chapters one and two and his version of the beatitudes tend to confirm.

That Luke understood either the Christian message or the preach-

ing of Jesus as the outline of a program of political or social reform, in which the freeing of captives and the oppressed would play a major role, is scarcely to be imagined. Yet the language which Luke uses in chapters 1, 2, and 4, where he is describing in an anticipatory way the salvation which Jesus brings, makes significant contact with the earthiness of the human situation. But the worldliness of Luke's language and its Old Testament origin correspond with his perspective on history and Christianity's place in it. For he appears to foresee the continuation of the church as an institution in a world whose history God has not yet brought to a close. Thus he is already on the way toward restating the message in a language relevant to that world. That his horizon and problems differ from Paul's is clear enough. While his distance from the originating event is perhaps the same as John's, he manifests a somewhat different stance toward the world. The Johannine emphasis on the inwardness of belief and on the separation of the community from the world—albeit with the world's salvation still in view—is scarcely found in Luke. Yet the Lucan definition of Jesus' work in the passages we have been considering is perhaps not fundamentally alien to the perspectives of Paul and John, any more than it is alien to the Old Testament, or, as far as can be told, to Jesus himself. The motif of release of captives or release from oppression is, of course, paralleled by the understanding of salvation as freedom in Paul and John. While the freedom of which Paul speaks is principally a freedom from sin or from the dominant world-system, it is not irrelevant to the present-day world and its problems. But Luke's setting forth of Jesus' announcement of freedom and release in a literary context where the world mission of the church is in view has a special significance. I do not think it too much to say he implies that the message and meaning of Jesus as the object of the church's witness includes the freeing of captives and the oppressed as well as the announcement of good news to the poor, and Luke's language scarcely allows us to be satisfied with a spiritualising interpretation.

Of course, there are elements or traditions in scripture which seem conservative enough with respect to the status quo or seem to imply that the Christian and the church have no role to play in the ordering of society, but are only to accept it (cf. Rom. 13:1-7; I Peter 2:13ff.). It would seem, however, that just such instances reflect customary mores or common sense necessities. They do not belong to the distinctive perspectives of the Bible or to its dynamic salvific

themes. Precisely the existence of such passages, however, points to the necessity of a proper hermeneutical center, one determined jointly by the balance of scriptural emphases and the total situation of the church, which is after all the arena where Biblical interpretation is primarily practised.

While the relevance of the Bible to all humanity is not to be denied, the importance of the question put to us lies first of all in its implications for Christians and therefore in some sense for the church. The primary scope of the authority of the Biblical material, even before the formation of the canon, has been the community. We have just attempted to show how our hermeneutical center has significant basis in the New Testament at a point where a major New Testament theologian is describing the inauguration of Jesus' ministry in language drawn from the Old Testament. We may now ask what is actually thereby warranted or implied for the church's understanding of itself and its mission vis-à-vis its authoritative scriptures.

The hermeneutical task consists not only of the location of an appropriate hermeneutical center, but in understanding how one moves from that center to a grasp of what the Christian or Christian community should be saying or doing. In what and to what realms of life should the church speak and act as it endeavors to understand and respond to its authoritative scripture? At just this point there seems to be a great deal of uncertainty and disagreement, a least in America and American Christianity. And at this point an important battle is to be fought. For there is a pervasive and deep-seated conviction that the Bible is a strictly religious authority in which God's liberating work could only be understood as applying to the individual, particularly affecting his spiritual life and his hopes for life after death. Such a privatistic view of Biblical authority is inadequate and in the long run, debilitating, and urgently in need of overhaul if not displacement. It allows the Bible to speak reassuringly to men caught up in other authority structures, whether militaristic, economic, racist or even ecclesiastical, without calling those structures into question. Since the Bible and the Christian gospel, which finds authoritative statement in the Bible, set forth a total claim upon man's life, such a view is scarcely satisfactory. Moreover, key passages such as Luke 4:16-30 not only permit but invite and require interpretation that will manifest the inclusive, societal or political scope of Biblical authority. The objection that the Christian gospel was addressed only to individuals in New Testament times is true, of course, but it should

not be made the basis for limiting the church's evangelical witness in our own day to the conversion of individuals. In the earliest period this was a practical necessity given further impetus by widespread belief in the imminent end of the age. At the same time, confessing Christian faith was often politically dangerous, an act of civil courage. We need scarcely be reminded that in the West at least it is no longer so today. At most one runs the risk of being gently chided on British television or crudely revolted on the American stage or screen. Sermons in which the perils of Christian confession today are likened to the trials of early Christians scarcely ring true. Furthermore, when the churches act as though the established social and political orders of this world are beyond serious questioning and the Christian proclamation must simply take them for granted, the conversion of individuals, which is not to be disparaged, is greatly impeded. The young Afro-American who makes the discovery that throughout much of their history American churches and churchmen, black and white, have allowed the Christian religion to play a role in the pacification of an oppressed people may understandably prefer the new self-identity afforded him by the Black Muslims or the Black Panthers. But this is a matter that concerns not only deprived or oppressed peoples. A new generation is upon us which understands human existence largely in social, political and economic terms. Whereas during much of the history of the church these factors were taken for granted as more or less fixed, this is no longer the case. A Christian faith founded upon an interpretation of the Bible that leaves out of account the importance of these dimensions of life and does not speak to or about the potentiality for their alteration already finds it increasingly difficult to persuade individuals of its indispensability. The case for a more comprehensive understanding of Biblical authority does not have to be made mainly on prudential grounds, however, for the impetus toward such interpretation is to be found in the Scriptures themselves and the justification in the recognition that scriptural authority entails a genuine confrontation of the word of God with the human situation.

To return to a specific scriptural instance, when Paul said that for freedom Christ has set us free (Gal. 5:1), he was not only expressing a "spiritual truth," but was giving utterance to a fundamental element of the Biblical tradition, a view of man and the goal of mankind whose significance is not without relevance in a world where

it is still not obvious that oppression is being gradually eliminated by enlightenment. The oppression of mankind, whether in its more obvious and virulent forms—war, racism, economic exploitation and deprivation—or in its more subtle self-inflicted forms—“the American way of life” understood as dedication to material affluence—cries out in various ways for a liberating spiritual word that will speak helpfully to men’s captivity to material want, ideological bigotry, or subjugation to materialistic yearnings. The affluent may also be among the oppressed. But for a church of affluent people in a wealthy land to speak of freedom in spiritual terms to people who are economically or politically oppressed would be the height of hypocrisy. Only those who suffer oppression can bear authentic witness to their own spiritual liberation. For the rich to urge the poor, the oppressed, or the captives (Luke 4:18) to be satisfied with spiritual freedom in the name of Christ would be a display of cynicism bordering on blasphemy (James 2:14-17).

### III. Some Observations on the Problem of Biblical Authority

A number of aspects of Biblical authority are illumined when considered in view of our particular question. Rather briefly, I should like now to point to several of the more important of these.

First of all, the Bible often asserts its authority outside the auspices and without the refinements of theology and professional theologians. Some aspects of the Bible seem to answer to a particular human need or aspiration. Thus Lutheran assertion of the authority of scripture was followed soon after by certain extreme “left-wing” uprisings. Presently black Christians want to understand Jesus’ announcement of freedom to captives in a very down-to-earth way. For reasons that are not difficult to understand, the church has as often as not been embarrassed by such things. Nevertheless, they underscore the point that the authority of the Bible is likely to become a reality in ways that cannot be programmed theologically. This point may be obvious enough, but it at least needs to be recognized.

All along, we have tried to keep the question of Biblical authority tied down to specific problems and issues, for this seems more profitable than discussing Biblical authority in the abstract. On the other side, of course, it ought to be made clear that Biblical authority is itself derivative from the authority of the God whose revelation is made known in scripture, as inseparable as the scripture and the revelation may be for us. The authority of the Christian Bible is the authority

of God who makes himself known in Jesus Christ. Yet this cannot obscure the fact that this authority is mediated by events, traditions and scriptures which took shape over a period of a thousand years. It is always a fair question whether the authority of the Bible is dependent upon the accuracy of the report of the events. This is clearly too big a question to undertake here. From the standpoint of our investigation, however, the historical accuracy of the reports as a modern man might understand accuracy did not seem crucial. For example, one can take seriously Luke's portrayal of Jesus' inaugural statement in the synagogue at Nazareth without being able to assure himself that the words attributed to Jesus are the *ipsissima verba* arising out of a record made on a particular occasion. Yet to deny any historical substance to the Gospel reports about Jesus would make of the Christian revelation something quite different from what it has always seemed to most readers to be, and might particularly endanger the claim that Christianity is a religion with historical roots and relevance. Furthermore, the findings of historical research, if they can be shown to be probable, are found to have an effect on how we understand the authority of the Bible. If, for example, Prof. S. G. F. Brandon's theory about the relation of Jesus to the Zealot movement<sup>4</sup> were to prove tenable—and I believe it is not—some rethinking of Christian doctrine as well as practise would be in order. As reviewers have not failed to note, Brandon has produced the Jesus desired by a revolutionary age.

With the mention of zealotry and revolution in that sense, we are brought round to the question of revolutionary violence. Our particular study group spent a fair amount of time on this question, but did not come to any very substantial agreement. On the one hand it is quite obvious that while there are sanctions for violence in parts of the Old Testament, these run contrary to the utterances of the New Testament and very quickly proved to be an embarrassment to Christian thinkers. Thus Archbishop Ramsey has scripture and tradition on his side in his opposition to church support of certain revolutionary groups in South Africa. My own inclination is to agree with the Archbishop for theological and practical reasons. But that is perhaps too easy a solution. The situation can be read not only as a choice between violence and non-violence, but also as a choice between the church's tacit acceptance of violent oppression and its

---

4. See *Jesus and the Zealots* (New York: Scribner's, 1967) for Brandon's complete presentation of his thesis.

refusal to accept it. If the church accepts it, it is reasonable to suppose that a great many people in Africa will write it off as just another instrument of colonialism. Certainly the Christian cannot contemplate the use of violence until all other means are exhausted. Moreover, violence begets violence and has incalculable consequences, as we Americans have been so slowly learning in Vietnam. Nevertheless, it remains easy, even if it may also be wise, to counsel non-violence when one is not the object of violent or potentially violent repression. The call to non-violence on the part of one exposed to violence, however, carries an authentically Christian ring. If the Christian's abhorrence of violence prevents him from supporting or participating in violence, he will certainly not be surprised if it erupts around him as the almost inevitable result of political and other forms of oppression. With respect to this problem and many others the Bible's authority points clearly in a certain direction, but does not give specific guidance for any and every eventuality.

We have, of course, been concerned to maintain that the authority of the Bible embraces questions of political responsibility in times of revolution and violence. While it became clear at least to us that the Bible is not irrelevant to such matters, it became equally clear that the present situation presents a range of considerations and issues for which Biblical perspectives are at best less than adequate. Modern insights about man and society will necessarily be integral to any realistic confrontation by the church or by Christians of the question of political responsibility amid violence and revolution. Such insights or theories will inevitably carry with them an important, if not final, authority. They are subject to rejection or alteration in view of the community's understanding of God's will, which devolves from the Bible through what we have called the hermeneutical center. That center nevertheless does not provide the only necessary conceptuality for understanding social, economic and political problems any more than it provides specific programs or prescriptions for resolving them. One must in all candor say that on no view of its authority does the Bible really provide adequate specific guidance for all the varied and complex realities of modern life. Moreover, certain Biblical statements (e.g. Romans 13:1-7) may be viewed by Christians as wrong when taken as general directions for action valid in all specific situations. But such statements are actually often found to have been written with very specific concrete situations of the community in mind, so that the

interpreter should not feel obligated to make them apply to vastly different modern problems. It is at least a fair guess that Christian extremisms of the right or of the left often go hand in hand with such attempts to move directly from scripture to the contemporary social situation, for it is certainly no secret that scripture can be quoted on all sides of the political spectrum.

The difficulties of trying to understand the Bible's authority in the face of the contemporary scene at least make understandable the widespread limitation of the scope of the Biblical message to man's personal existence, whether this limitation appears in pietistic or existentialist garb. There is as much truth in this perspective as there is danger of a Christian amateurism or diletantism in psychology, sociology, or political science. Although the danger of this is real, the dangers entailed by simply pulling in our horns seem to me to be greater.

A couple of months ago I found myself watching Bernard Levin's interview with Herman Kahn on ITV. Perhaps you saw the interview or read the account of it in *The Times* of London. Kahn, as you may know, is the author of an important book about nuclear warfare and the director and apparently the chief brain of a gigantic think-tank operation in New York State. With the support of government and foundation money these people are projecting or predicting the future course of history with the aid of the best information, cybernetic technology, and certainly some of the ablest brains around. As Levin put questions to Kahn about the likelihood of nuclear war, the American political scene, the third world, etc., I found myself awaiting Kahn's answers with what seemed to me on reflection to be an unseemly eagerness and an implicit faith in the trustworthiness of his answers. After all, Mr. Kahn is reputed to have the highest I.Q. in the world, and I suppose the next ten highest all work for him. And I thought to myself, I am really the child of the scientific and technological age. If these questions about the future of the world were being put to Billy Graham, the Pope, or even to Bishop Robinson I would probably have turned off the television and gone upstairs to bed. Yet there I sat hoping that the word of the great priest would be yea instead of nay. What chance does Biblical authority have in a world where theologians behave in such a way? At the end of the program Levin asked Herman Kahn what he most hope for in the next twenty-five or thirty years. Do you know what Kahn answered? A resolution of the problem of meaning and pur-

pose in life! Maybe we have a chance at a piece of the action after all. Not by being amateur psychologists or sociologists or whatever. But also not without being aware of, and able to speak with some understanding and authority to, the human issues with which our fellow travellers on this planet must wrestle.

Closing Convocation, Duke Divinity School  
May 19, 1971

## Swan Song

W. F. STINESPRING

Webster's *Third International Dictionary* explains the expression "swan song" thus: "A song of great sweetness formerly thought to be uttered by the swan just before death." I fear that my song today will not be altogether sweet, nor do I feel that I am just about to die. The great composers, Saint-Saens and Sibelius, have adequately presented beautiful swan songs in music. Today, I wish to use the expression simply to designate a sort of final statement before retirement from active service in the Divinity School community, where I have been laboring for the past thirty-five years. In other words, this statement is somewhat similar to the so-called "last lectures," popular on this campus several years ago; except that those were only hypothetically last lectures, whereas this one is really last, so far as a public appearance is concerned, though I still have to meet two class sessions.

I did not ask that Psalm 90 be read because it may contain a hint that I could live to be eighty years of age. Really, it was the prayer in the last two verses of the Psalm that seemed to be apposite to what I wanted to say:

Let thy work be manifest to thy servants, and thy glorious power to their children.

Let the favor of the Lord our God be upon us, and establish thou the work of our hands upon us, yea, the work of our hands establish thou it.

This is my prayer for the world, for our country, for Duke University, and for the Divinity School. I speak thus because I feel that this is (1) an age of idolatry and (2) an age of great danger. Moreover, I hope that the Duke Divinity School will continue its splendid past by providing even more leadership in the future to make this world a better place to live in, that mankind may not perish from the earth. Thus I desire today not so much to review the past, as you might have expected, but to call you and your successors to

---

W. F. Stinespring retired as Professor of Old Testament and Semitics at the end of the academic year, 1970-71.

participate and lead in the struggle for a better future. The past is gone. Some of it was good, and for that we thank God. Some of it was bad, and the mistakes cannot be revoked, but we can learn from them not to repeat them, and for that we can also thank God.

Modern so-called civilized men often scoff at the idea that today they would bow down in worship before images of wood and stone. But, as a matter of fact, modern man, especially American man, is more prone to worship material things than were his spiritual ancestors of Bible times. Fine houses, fine cars, fine clothing, fine jewelry, big bank accounts, industrial expansion, high-speed travel, and other things of this nature are the idols which men worship today.

There have been many aspersions cast at ancient peoples, such as the Canaanites, who offered human sacrifices to their false gods. Milton put it like this in *Paradise Lost* (Book I, lines 393-397) :

Moloch, horrid king, besmeared with blood  
Of human sacrifice, and parents' tears;  
Though, for the noise of drums and timbrels loud,  
Their children's cries unheard that passed through fire  
To his grim idol.

Let me say in defense of these ancient peoples that the number of victims offered in this odious practice was very small, percentage-wise, and that the occasion was sometimes one of the most critical danger, such as that when the king of Moab sacrificed his eldest son and heir apparent in a successful attempt to save himself and his country from destruction (II Kings 3:27). You may note my comment on this in the Oxford Annotated Bible.

By contrast, or perhaps not by contrast, note our worship of the almighty motor car and our human sacrifice to it. It has demanded more victims than all the wars in our history and the end is not in sight. Not only is it slaughtering its victims on the highway, but we are now beginning to realize that it is polluting the air so that there will be more and more victims by asphyxiation.

Ancient idolatry has often been criticized, no doubt rightly, for furthering immoral activities, especially of a sexual nature. Here again, the motor car has been a factor, with its elimination of chaperonage, in growing divorce, juvenile delinquency, increasing illegitimate births, and the epidemic proportions of venereal disease among our young people, especially gonorrhoea among young women. It was candidly reported in a front-page article in the *Durham Morning Herald* only a few days ago that Durham ranks fourth in the nation

in incidence of gonorrhoea. What a claim to fame! One is reminded of what St. Paul said about Corinth. The Chamber of Commerce will not advertise this distinction.

I do not mean to blame the motor car for all of our troubles. When the historians of the future, a hundred or a thousand years from now, tally up the pros and cons of this now popular device's contributions to man's development, there may be something on the plus side, especially if the internal-combustion engine can be eliminated. All I am claiming now is that this idol of glass and tin is not adequate to be either a national god or a household god in a really civilized society. And the same would be true of a number of other material idols now so ardently worshipped.

The point I wish to make is that these material idols must be dethroned from our Christian community and that the Duke Divinity School, alumni, faculty, and students of now and of the future should be among the leaders in such dethronement and restoring the true God to his rightful place in our lives. This is a tremendous task, but yet an inspiring challenge to the really committed Christian.

It will be hard to tell people that man cannot live by bread alone, that not everybody can be rich, that material resources on this earth are dwindling, that our 6% of the world's population cannot hang on to 50% of its wealth much longer, that space on this earth is limited, that affluent Americans must reduce their material standard of living and increase their spiritual standard of living, that over-population is a real threat, hence the human race will have to curb its reproductive instinct, that abortion is only a tragic last resort, that pure air and pure water are already in short supply, that the spacious skies of which we sing are now overcrowded with polluting aircraft, that if paving of highways and parking lots continues at the present rate there will soon be no land left to receive the rain and produce grass, trees, and food, that the future legal allotment may be one small car to a family instead of three or four big ones, and finally that the Great Lakes are already hardly more than open sewers and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans are not far behind in their state of pollution.

So far has our idolatry taken us. Of course, I am not a pessimist, but believe that it is not yet too late to do something about these things. That is why I am challenging the Duke Divinity School to increased leadership in confronting the real problems that confront our world.

Perhaps I have said enough about our age of materialistic idolatry. Let us pass on to consider the great dangers of our age. They are two, and you have already heard of them: (1) the population explosion, to use the popular term; and (2) the possibility of nuclear warfare. The two are not unrelated, for when the planet becomes grossly overcrowded, as it will in a comparatively few years at the present rate, men and nations will become like wild beasts, fighting for the little food that is left. Defeat will mean extinction, hence somewhere along the line the deadly bombs will be released, with the very possible result that the entire human race will suffer extinction. At first sight the population explosion seems to indicate an increase in people and the bomb a reduction in people. But in the end both lead to the same end—extinction. Thus it should be fairly obvious what the really greatest problems are, and here again I am challenging the Duke Divinity School to have a very special share in solving them. Very few graduates of the other schools of the University have a captive audience at least once in every week of the year. That fact entails a very great responsibility. In other words, I take preaching seriously.

The population explosion is the best illustration I know, of the methodological dictum that Biblical literalism is a very dangerous thing. "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth," Genesis 9:1, was penned at a time when there was real danger that the human race might not be able to survive, owing to lack of reproductive power. Now that power has become a terrible threat. We must correct Genesis 9:1 by John 10:10—"I came that they may have life, and have it abundantly."

Only Sunday before last, on May 9th, the Durham Morning Herald had a realistic full-page, front-page spread on this subject. The headline in big red letters said: "Twelve Babies Were Just Born While You Read This Headline." And the first several lines of the story ran as follows:

It took all mankind until the middle of the 19th century [at least a hundred thousand years] to produce a population of one billion. But it took only 75 years to double that figure and less than 40 years to add the third billion.

Most experts insist, if nothing is done to snuff the fuse of a phenomenon most [people], call "the population bomb," that the world's population will burgeon to some 7 billion by the turn of the next century—and, long before 2100 A.D., about 20 billion persons will be standing shoulder to shoulder.

This is not mere newspaper sensationalism, but the considered conclusion of the Carolina Population Center in Chapel Hill, a research agency of the University of North Carolina.

It is exceedingly strange, indeed incomprehensible, that this is the very time when, as happens every now and then, the advocates of so-called free love, now euphemistically dubbed cohabitation, have once again raised their voices in great clamor. This old, old idea may have had some value five thousand years ago, about the time Noah landed his ark. But today we are having too many legitimate births, and increasing illegitimate births are even harder for society to bear—and they *are* increasing in spite of the pill and other devices. It would have been much better for our fellow men if these brash youngsters had gone to the other extreme and embraced another old idea, namely celibacy, instead of embracing each other. Most would prefer a plan somewhere in between these two extremes, as the long history of mankind has clearly shown. Let me repeat my feeling that abortion is only a tragic resort and not an easy way out. There is no easy way out of really serious problems. Solution of such problems demands foresight, character, sacrifice.

Can the Duke Divinity School of the future afford not to have a share in helping to solve this very great problem, the population problem?

We come now to the question of war and peace. Perhaps this is the ultimate social problem, or *one* of the ultimate social problems. The ancient prophets dreamed of beating swords into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks, but their dream was not realized. The League of Nations failed largely from lack of support by the U.S.A. We retreated into isolationism and began to worship our tinny idols more avidly than ever. That brought us into World War II, which in turn led to the formation of the United Nations. And again we are lending less than wholehearted support to this potentially valuable organization by frustrating its efforts to restore the exiled Palestinians to their own lands and homes, and by carrying on a war in Southeast Asia against the almost unanimous will of the rest of the world, and in general by failing to support the proposition that land and property taken by military conquest is stolen property and must be returned to its rightful owners.

The prophet Jeremiah in ancient times was imprisoned for crying out against a useless war which his people could not win. Jerusalem was captured, the temple destroyed, and the whole city laid in ruins.

Many citizens were deported into a Babylonian exile and Jeremiah was dragged off to Egypt against his will. The prophet has sometimes been called a pacifist. This is not correct, if by pacifist is meant a person who opposes war in any form and for any reason. Jeremiah simply could not support a war that served no purpose except the personal gratification or vanity of the ruling classes, and in any case could not be won, as the prophet was wise enough to see. The verdict of history is with the prophet. Who today would think for a moment of justifying King Zedekiah, his nobles, and his political advisers? The prophet has stood vindicated for more than 2500 years.

The situation of our own country is not entirely analogous, though there are similarities. Instead of being a small nation trying to find a right policy toward larger nations, we are one of the larger nations trying to find a right policy toward smaller nations. We pick certain favorite nations or political groups within nations and help these nations or groups with money, arms, or even direct military assistance, in spite of the warning by George Washington in his Farewell Address that playing favorites among foreign nations or groups is a dangerous game. This game is dangerous today because other great powers such as Soviet Russia or Communist China tend to pick other favorites to fight against our favorites. And here at home we are having the bitter and ominous political conflict between the so-called hawks and doves.

So what do I think should be done for world peace? Of course the U.S. should get out of Southeast Asia as quickly as possible by setting a date for complete withdrawal, contingent on release of all prisoners of war by both sides. And by all means let us continue the Strategic Armament Limitations Talks, the so-called SALT talks. Let us give up our opposition to U.N. membership for the People's Republic of China. Let us strive to strengthen the United Nations with a view to making it a sort of World Legislature for Peacekeeping, with an executive branch that has a genuine World Police Force. And let us make the International Court of Justice a real World Supreme Court with real powers of enforcement. One of its first decisions should be on who owns Palestine and how should it be governed. These last two questions were almost settled by a commission in 1946, but the implementation was frustrated by the U.S. Government with the collusion of Soviet Russia, whereby twenty years of agony have ensued.

Actually a program of this general nature would be less difficult

to achieve than one might think, since a beginning and a framework already exist in the United Nations and the International Court. And if something of the sort is not done, the prospects are bleak. So again I challenge Duke Divinity School to stand in the front line of service.

Perhaps I have not said as much today as some of you would have liked about the underprivileged of our nation and of the world. But I have not forgotten them. One of the best arguments for getting out of Indo-China is that we need the money for social improvement at home. If the barbs which I have thrown at the affluent middle class and at the U.S. Government reach their mark, the affluent middle class will be greatly improved spiritually and the underprivileged will be greatly improved materially and spiritually, I hope. One of the most heartening things I have heard recently is the statement to me by one of this year's graduating class that he has asked his conference to assign him to one of its poorest churches. Of such is the kingdom of heaven.

I have said quite a bit about social and political evils and the hoped-for impact of prophetic religion on them. And now, finally, I must say a word about personal religion and personal integrity. The finest social programs and political plans will come to nought if there are not honest, efficient, and consecrated persons to guide and support them. That is where Duke Divinity School comes in again. You are a part of a really permanent institution. The church of God and Jesus Christ has stood for two thousand years and its roots go back four or five thousand years, truly a rock of the ages, while other organizations merely come and go. This great nation, the U.S.A., for example, will pass away in its time, like the Roman empire, but the church will go on in one form or another. So we of the church must provide the element of permanence and stability in our society and at the same time offer a method of character building, a school of the prophets, so to speak, to send forth men and women who can be depended upon to undergird the new social and political institutions that must lead the way to a better future.

Another thing that worries me these days is that Christians are too much conformed to this world, too much like just anybody. But our Lord said, "For I tell you, unless your righteousness exceeds that of the Scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven." Or in the words of the New Testament lesson this morning, "If you love those who love you, what reward have you? Do not

even the tax collectors do the same? And if you salute only your brethren, what more are you doing than others? Do not even the Gentiles do the same? You, therefore, must be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect." Or, to paraphrase the words of the late John F. Kennedy in his Inauguration Address, "Do not ask what the world can do for you, ask what you can do for the world."

That is a real challenge for you, O Duke Divinity School of the future.

AMEN

Divinity School Baccalaureate  
June 6, 1971

# “That We May Ever Hereafter Serve and Please Thee”

Lam. 3:17-26

II Cor. 4:1-2, 7-12, 16-18

by HARMON L. SMITH

This time last year my esteemed and now lamentably departed colleague, Gene Tucker, stood in this place and rejected the temptation—since both he and the class of '70 were shortly leaving this place—to give a last will and testament. But the *Sitz im Leben* tonight does not precisely parallel that situation—at least I plan, *Deo volente*, to stay while you plan, *Deo gratias*, to go! And it may therefore be a little less inappropriate if I presume to say some things that seem to be in the *genre* of a last word. Indeed, since none of us knows what in God's Providence tomorrow may bring, tonight could be both *chronos* and *kairos* for us; and in view of that possibility, however apparently remote, a saying from Janis Joplin might very well have served as the sub-title of this sermon: “You'd better not compromise yourself; it's all you've got.”

I suspect that when we are alert to it, we know that every day brings its own bizarre combination of elation and depression, joy and sadness, hope and futility. And tonight is not exceptional, inasmuch as we are faced by precisely that kind of paradox without being able to elect whether we will acknowledge it—it is simply upon us in the double awareness that this day has been set aside for the glory of God and our final convocation as a school, and that it is also a day bracketed by the death of Reinhold Niebuhr and the anniversary of Robert Kennedy's assassination. In the face of such apparently hostile and contradictory events, how we can conscientiously choose to celebrate either life or death may finally be an article of faith; but the paradox is squarely upon us, and probably most force-

---

Harmon L. Smith, Associate Professor of Moral Theology, was chosen by the Senior Class to deliver the Baccalaureate Sermon.

fully when, on a day like this, the juxtapositions are not at all subtle but uncommonly clear. To suppose that a choice between life or death, hope or futility, can be neat and uncomplicated is, however, finally deceitful; at least I think it nearer the truth, and certainly more paradigmatic of our real situation, that life as we know it is precisely such a confused and perplexing welter of good and bad, trust and estrangement, compassion and indignation, success and failure, life and death.

What I want to stay tonight, then, will doubtless reflect the ways in which all of us together are victims of times like these; but beyond that, I want to speak directly to you Seniors who leave here to take up your ministerial responsibilities, as well as to the others of us who by our presence here tacitly confirm your vocation. And if I speak in images as well as syllogisms, I hope that you will nevertheless know what it is in my heart and mind to say.

Both the Old and New Testament lessons which were read earlier reflect the very kinds of tension and dialectic I have in mind—of pain and comfort, of despair and hope, of disappointment and reassurance, of alienation and reconciliation. Jeremiah's soul was bereft of peace, he had forgotten what happiness is, he continually thought of his bitterness, and was weighted down by frustration and disappointment. Similarly, St. Paul was afflicted in every way, crushed, perplexed, persecuted, struck down. But both men also knew a hope that saves from despair, a steadfast love that sustains, and mercies that are new every morning.

I doubt that many, if any, of us would grant that these experiences are unique to Jeremiah and Paul. Each of us has confronted similar circumstances at some time or other. In my own experience, I've discovered that those moments filled with greatest meaning and offering greatest fulfillment are very often also those times of greatest fear and anxiety and uncertainty. My wife knows (because my father, who performed the service, told her!) that ten minutes before our wedding I was quite seriously doubting whether I should go through with it. She may have had some of the same doubts, or at least second-thoughts—she has never admitted them in any case. And during my own ordination service, I still vividly remember wondering about two gnawing doubts—one was whether this was not a vocation too awesome for me to undertake; and the other was whether, in view of the kind of world we live in, this profession was one that any longer held much real promise of serving and pleasing God and

ministering to the needs of men. I'm still haunted, after 20 years, by those same questions; but my private anxiety is partly comforted, and partly confirmed, by remembering the difficulty Luther had celebrating his first mass and observing that many of you are troubled by a similar recognition of your creatureliness.

Unless I miss my guess, serious Christians in every age have entertained similar thoughts—if only because we know that our professions of faith frequently contradict our practice, that our belief systems and behavioral patterns are often discontinuous. And this brings me to the first point I want to make—but since I don't think of myself as an old and sagacious pastor who can, as it were, pass on the wisdom and experience of many years; nor, on the other hand (as colleagues and students sometimes remind me), am I permitted to think of myself as one who has achieved entire sanctification—let me speak these things confessionally.

One of the common criticisms leveled at the church and its ministry is that it meddles too much in the affairs of the world and ought to pay more attention to its proper business—which, when translated, usually means that church and minister ought to be a group of congenial people whose unruffled native affection should somehow qualify it to be called *agape* because it deals only with “spiritual” matters. We all know the converse of this criticism as well—and that is that whatever else it means to be a Christian in our time, membership in the Church (to say nothing of trying to be a serious theologian) is so far removed from where the action really is as to be functionally sterile and irrelevant. In both criticisms there is the implicit notion that Christians, and particularly theologians, ought to stay—if not be kept—in their place! But we are jealous for our vocation, and we rightly reject these criticisms for the gross and simplistic garbage that they are.

On the other hand, we ought also to know that we help to perpetuate these notions every time we divorce faith from life, every time we defend questionable practices for reasons of expediency, every time we shrink from moral conflict, every time we allow institutional protocols to run roughshod over persons, every time we have treated our common endeavor in theological education as an end in itself and not as a means by which we serve and please God. In consequence many of us have lived out these past three or four years in this Divinity School as moral schizophrenics—doubting, and sometimes even denying, that what we do and say on Sunday or at

morning chapel has anything to do with what goes on in the daily round of lectures or seminars or examinations. It is not so strange, when one pauses to consider it, that our lives are so compartmentalized and insulated, that we are so perpetually engaged in what Peter Berger calls "alternation"—tailoring our lives to the expectations of others—that the Dr. Jekyll in us often gives way to Mr. Hyde.

We need desperately, I think, to reunite love and service; and to remember that our bounden duty is an intellectual and visceral love of God which embodies itself serviceably in ordinary human affairs. Otherwise what we suppose to be our devotion to God remains barren, a wasteland, because we have failed to engage compassionately the world's affairs in obedience to God's will and intention. Of course it is no less the responsibility of Christian congregations than it is of professional ministers and theologians to engender and support that kind of awareness; for whatever assists us ever hereafter to serve and please God is our corporate duty.

If we can be liberated from an inordinate preoccupation and fascination with structures, organizations, institutions, and roles, we may then be free enough to reaffirm a passion for persons—and this is the second confessional admonition I want to make. It is terribly easy, I know, for ministers and congregations alike to stereotype each other, and in that process to demoralize and depersonalize every potential human relationship. There is also that tendency for schools toward students, so some of you tell me. It is certainly rampant in our culture at large. Perhaps these things help to explain why there is no greater temptation in the modern church than for everybody to play what he supposes to be his proper role, however incongruous this may be with one's own self-understanding. But that is to play fast and loose with integrity and honor. Mere role-playing is not our calling—and every style of Christian service, however unconventional or eccentric, calls out for our encouragement and support. We must, in other words, become more accountable to each other if we claim to be accountable to God. So pastors must become more accountable to their congregations, and congregations more accountable to their pastors; and theological education must become more accountable to students and churches and congregations, as these must correspondingly assume increasing accountability for excellence in preparation for the church's ministry. If sometimes the effort to accomplish this has been mistaken as subversive dissent, we would do well to remember that we have this treasure in *earthen* vessels

—and that means, at least in part, that institutions cannot sacrifice mutuality and the conditions for full personal development to a highly disciplined but closed organizational system. We cannot forfeit the shared shaping of our common destiny to the power of prejudice.

In my boyhood days in Mississippi, we sometimes went “hand-fishing” in the bayous and rivers near our home. Now “hand-fishing” is an exact description of an exacting sport—we would wade, barefoot, along the shallow banks, and probe with our feet the washed-out niches under the bank. The great catfish of those bayous and rivers nested in these places, and the object was to find a fish and then reach down and pull it out barehanded. It was dangerous sport; and occasionally one lost a finger or suffered a lacerated forearm—sometimes hand-fishermen were even drowned, and that was believable since some of the larger fish weighed 90 pounds or more. On one such hand-fishing expedition, a red-necked raw-boned farmer who was with us felt around for the fish, proudly announced that he had it, and proceeded to come out of the water holding a 6-foot-long cottonmouth moccasin just behind its head. All of us were frightened, but the man with the snake was literally paralyzed by fear. Even after the snake was killed, we had to pry the farmer’s fingers loose. When I got home and related this experience to my father, he responded with a very wise question: “Who would you say had control of that situation, the man or the snake?”

Our tendency to judge too quickly, to be too self-assured and certain, to act too precipitately, often functions in something of the same way—we are held in the grip of our own paralyzing fears and we are not free, even after what we feared is dead, to celebrate our life together. There is a richness about us in the lives of our fellows that often simply waits for our acknowledgement and engendering affection. In a time marred by strife and discord and suspicion and mistrust, and in a nation whose sickness feeds on intolerance and hatred and murder, we urgently and desperately want for men and women who celebrate a pervasive passion for persons.

Finally, I want to suggest to you who will shortly be alumni that respect for conventions and institutions does not abrogate your freedom and responsibility to transform them. It is no longer astonishing or novel to acknowledge that Protestantism in America is beset by a religious sickness, the symptoms of which are a fascination with institutional machinery and structure and an imprisonment within certain archaic and sterile forms. For Christian people this surely

constitutes a most peculiar paradox: that a community committed to saving its life through a willingness to lose it has become so surrounded by the affluent signs of its institutional life that it is either unable or unwilling to participate in its own denial, and is thus prevented from finding its own authentic being. A willingness to lose certain self-appointed values—whether in scholarship, educational philosophy, or style of ministry—for the sake of gaining a fuller and more inclusive life is certainly one of the marks of genuine Christian community; but it is precisely the tendency to hold inviolable certain goals or a certain way of doing things that corresponds to the way we think they've always been done that is at the root of much of our current difficulty. That both church and ministry are, as St. Paul says, earthen vessels and that the transcendent power belongs to God and not to us ought always to be a sober reminder that no empirical feature of either church or ministry can be confused with that great treasure which is committed to us in and through these vessels.

That just may be, in fact, the institutional and professional bearing of the doctrine of justification by grace alone—we are perennially challenged to “sit loose” to the time-honored values and goals of another time and place; to walk the dialectical razor's edge between uncritical affirmation and unqualified negation of the church's life; to be willing, with Abraham, to pack our tents and go into the land that the Lord will show us.

Our bounden duty is a love of God which incarnates itself in the ordinary affairs of human life, which honors persons, and which transforms institutional structures into instruments of God's will and purpose. To that end, all our work and play and thought and action may be an offering to God; and our lives disciplined by his will that we may ever hereafter serve and please him.

Have mercy upon us, have mercy upon us, most merciful Father; for thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ's sake, forgive us all that is past; and grant that we may ever hereafter serve and please thee in newness of life; to the honor and glory of thy name; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

## Book Reviews

*Theology of the Liberating Word.* Edited and introduced by Frederick Herzog. Abingdon, 1971. 123 pp. \$2.75. paper.

This volume reproduces in English translation four essays by four German theologians, which originally appeared in *Evangelische Theologie*.

More accurately, I might say we have here five essays. For Dr. Herzog's Introduction, while ostensibly undertaking to survey and interpret the theological (especially American) scene so as to provide a backdrop for the four essays following, constitutes in fact a self-contained essay assessing present theological issues as Herzog sees them shaping up. The subtitle of his Introduction is: "A New Church Conflict?" The interpretive focus of conflict, as Herzog sees it, revolves around the issues of the acculturation of Christianity versus sensitivity to the (biblically grounded) Word of God as both authoritative (over against all thoroughgoing relativisms and reductionisms of thought and practice) and liberating (in contrast to all forms of oppression and bondage, of which racism is now the chief, but not only, empirical focus).

The analysis is sensitive and sensible. And those who know Frederick Herzog will not be surprised to find well-aimed critical barbs landing on such attractive targets as James Cone, Michael Novak and Langdon Gilkey.

The relation of the title of the book and also of Herzog's Introduction to the four essays is something of an *ad hoc* sort. (The essay by Bastian might be more aptly designated as "liberation *from* a theology of the World!" And, while the other three essays—especially that by Conzelmann—open up horizons which *could* be explored for implications respecting "liberation," none of the essays, as they stand, do this.) But no matter. All well merit the wider audience this economical paperback format will give them.

The central thesis of Herzog's Introduction in respect to the topics of the essays is perhaps this: "It is exactly this hearing of the Word which cannot be presupposed and which makes theology necessary. What must be presupposed is the presence of the Word—otherwise there would be no church left" (p. 19).

Not being a biblical scholar, I am in no position to offer critical comment on the last two essays, by Hans-Joachim Kraus and Hans Conzelmann. The Kraus essay offers a study of the meaning of "the living God" in Biblical (especially OT) thought, which in my in-expert opinion would alone be worth the price of the book. The Conzelmann essay argues for an anthropological interpretation of Paul's doctrine of justification and "the righteousness of God."

In the first of the four essays, "God—as a Word in Our Language," Eberhard Jüngel interprets the significance of the culturally pervasive fact of the problematic status, inside as well as outside the church, of the word "God": the growing tendencies toward *silence vis-à-vis* God, or the obverse-side of silence—a nervous verbosity about "God" which in its irrelevance and powerlessness shows that it too is grounded in silence, in a not hearing (and therefore a not-being-able-to-speak) the living Word of God.

I find myself in agreement with most of Jüngel's basic theses. But, again and again, precisely where I find myself agreeing most I am left with the feeling that the basic question (namely as to the interpretation of the cultural phenomenon of silence *vis-à-vis* God in our time) is still being begged. "Who God is is not revealed by the word 'God.' Only God himself declares who God is. . . . Where the word 'God' is not necessary it is superfluous. . . . God discloses who he is when he necessitates our speech about him . . ." (p. 29). Just so! But that is precisely the question: namely, *when*, indeed (and where and under what conditions) is he "necessating" our speech about him? *Is* he ("still") doing this? The cultural starting-point for Jüngel's essay is his acknowledgement that in a comparative cultural sense we are confronted with a pervasive silence.

In criticism of any proposal (such as Van Buren's) in the name of Christianity to do away with "God-talk," Jüngel writes: "Does not the foregoing of talk about God mean, as a matter of fact, the identification of God and the idols? Who would God be that we should be allowed to be silent about him?" (p. 33) Right! But this latter question, if it is to be taken seriously in the context of Jüngel's own acknowledgement of theological silence in our time, drives intrinsically toward another question which may be immediately formulated by substituting the indicative mood in the latter question: *who*, indeed, *is* God that we (in a culturally extensive of "we") *are*—in fact apparently—allowed to be so silent about him? Does our

cultural situation offer some clues as to *who* the God is who—though he may obligate us otherwise—does “allow” this?

Jüngel argues, in agreement with Reformation theology, “that God is not *brought* to speech, but rather *comes* to speech” (p. 34). Maranatha! But Jüngel does not really get at the problem of relating this theology to the present cultural reality: “*where* is the promise of his coming?”

In a section (VIII, pp. 41-43) on theological verification—which, though brief, is one of the most insightful treatments I have read—Jüngel does apparently intend to suggest an answer to the kind of questions I have been pressing. He speaks of the essentiality of faith in any appropriate hearing of the Word of God and seems to imply that the cultural phenomenon of theological silence in our time can be adequately understood from the fact that, to reapply the words of Jesus: “This is a faithless and perverse generation.”

I can scarcely regard this interpretive suggestion as irrelevant. But neither can I regard it as sufficient. Needed also, from the cultural way that Jüngel poses the problem, is an analysis and interpretation of modern *cultural factors* which may at least condition and partially tend to predispose us away from sensitivity to the Word of God. (The presupposition of Jesus’ words above was surely his conviction that his generation—far from a situation of relative silence vis-à-vis the Word of God—was being decisively confronted with a far more direct and authoritative revelation of the Word of God than any prior generation. Who will argue that this is “also” our situation?) Such a cultural analysis and interpretation might also suggest some relevant possible alterations of “Christian practice.” The “theologian of the Word”—however sound in many respects his theology—who disdains this task, or who does not at least indicate a conviction for the relevance of it—leaves the door of action open to any who may enter (including Hans-Dieter Bastian in the second essay in this volume)!

Finally, I would think that that mode of attempting to interpret theological silence which surely ought on principle to be of the most primary importance for a “theologian of the Word of God” would be the effort to “sound out” the silence as regards its possible *theological significance* for our *understanding of God* and *God’s relation to us*. The theologian of the Word—and Jüngel will suffice as example—typically wants to insist on the incommensurable priority of God’s agency vis-à-vis any and all human agency in the matter of

revelation. All right! But having done that, the theologian of the word cannot then be allowed to “get off the hook” on the issue of interpreting the apparent *de facto* silence of God merely by appealing to an interpretation of our own human agency: namely, that we are “faithless.” There is no interpretation of Christian theism which I personally regard as equalling in distortion the doctrine of double predestination. But at least the predestinarians had the theological courage (albeit, as I think, misguided) to face the issue of relating divine sovereignty to human sovereignty in the issues of hearing versus silence and faith versus unfaith.

Doubtless we have in our time, among other things, “absence of the experience of God.” Do we also have “the experience of the absence of God”? That is, is God one who not only “presents” himself, but may also “absent” himself? Doubtless we have in our time a silence vis-à-vis the Word of God because we are culturally “tuned-out” and/or perversely faithless and unwilling to have ears to hear. Do we also have a “hearing of the silence of God”? That is, is God one who not only “speaks” his Word, but may also “silence” his own Word? These at least are *theological*, and not *merely* anthropological, questions. And the language in which I have cast them is intended as a reminder that such ways of thinking—however strange they may seem to “modern man” (including the “modern theologian of the Word”!)—are anything but foreign to *Biblical* man’s ways of “understanding God”!

In my estimate, the most potentially fruitful sentence in Jüngel’s essay is this: “‘God’ is a word of invocation (‘My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me’)” (p. 40). The quoted example of invocation in the parentheses was selected by Jüngel. But he does not follow out its implications: which are surely not irrelevant for a Christian theological interpretation of the silence of the Word of God.

The most stimulating and provocative of the essays—which is not to prejudice relative intrinsic merit—for most readers will likely be the second: “From the Word to the Words: Karl Barth and the Tasks of Practical Theology,” by Hans-Dieter Bastian. One could well guess that Dr. Herzog found it “the most stimulating and provocative,” and that he indeed included it partly on the grounds of letting “the other side” have “its say”!

The implicit logic behind Bastian’s essay can perhaps be briefly formulated in a series of questions: If preaching (and other aspects

of contemporary church life) is *not* in actual practice the glorious thing which under Barthian (or, in a different way, Bultmannian and Neo-Bultmannian) theological theory of the Word of God we might anticipate its being or becoming (in the possibility of God's grace), can we be theologically responsible in merely ignoring the sorry state of affairs in the church? Are we not obliged to ask whose *fault* is this? God's, perhaps in inscrutably and mysteriously withholding his Word from us in our time? Or ours, for not taking with sufficient seriousness and imaginative sensitivity the possibilities, as well as the limits, of contemporary human cultural, cybernetic and linguistic phenomena in their implications for responsible language usage and other modes of action in the churches?

For Bastian these questions are so simple and their answers so unambiguously clear as to make the questions rhetorical. If the actual efforts of men in words and deeds to become transparent vehicles of the Word of God are meeting by and large with dismal failure and leaving the church socially and culturally irresponsible—which to Bastian's eye is self-evident—we must blame ourselves (pre-eminently theologies of the Word which have, he feels, fostered a dualistic disjunction between God's responsibility for his own Word and all human efforts at speaking and acting) and we must immediately begin to take upon ourselves a far greater burden of culturally-sensitized responsibility for Christian practice in all areas of life. The way to become appropriately responsible will not lie along the path of attempting to reconstruct and improve Neo-Barthian or "new hermeneutic" modes of doing theology of the Word of God: "the Word-of-God hermeneutics is at the end of its rope" (p. 73).

We can no longer afford to delay while professional academic theologians and exegetes ponder new theological subtleties. Rather what is demanded is that "practical theology" launch out courageously as an autonomous discipline in its own right. And Bastian is exuberantly confident that the guidelines for such an enterprise are ready-to-hand in that arena of modern culture which is already decisively dominant both as the authoritative methodology for knowledge and theory-construction and as the effective controlling power for the responsible shaping of human life and practice: Science.

In the course of sketching outlines for his faith in practical theology as an autonomous discipline, Bastian exhibits an unusually sensitive and balanced understanding of complementary aspects of scientific theory and practice. (Indeed many an American social

scientist might gain a more balanced recognition of what science is about, by reading this essay.) Whether, however, Bastian's gospel of a cybernetic science of practical theology is an adequately comprehensive and balanced, and appropriately grounded, view of what the Word of God demands of us in our time ("We are not leaving behind Karl Barth's axiomatic Word because we despise it, but because we wish to regain it," p. 75), is less than self-evident, as the other essays in this volume and the Introduction by Dr. Herzog will attest—and a matter which the reader will be challenged to judge for himself.

—Charles K. Robinson

*Hope and Planning.* Jürgen Moltmann. Translated by Margaret Clarkson. Harper and Row, 1971. 228 pp. \$6.50.

The essays collected here, coming as they do four years on either side of the publication of *The Theology of Hope* (1964) offer us more of Moltmann, but little new. They are, however, by and large clear and brilliantly suggestive variations on his well known themes and serve as a comprehensive introduction to his theology.

In the first essay, "The Revelation of God and the Question of Truth," he would show that cosmological and anthropological proofs succeed at the expense of the particularity of the Christian claim. The ontological proof (truth reveals itself) protects the particular at the expense of universal meaning or truth. As we might suspect Moltmann then argues that the only satisfactory proof is the eschatological—the coming of the promised particular one to the world to bring it to wholeness and meaning. The essay, "God and Resurrection" continues the discussion to demonstrate that the proofs are in fact superficial, theoretical expressions of the basic experience of suffering—the suffering of cosmic chaos and moral evil. At stake in the proof of God is his vindication in the overcoming of evil. Again, it is not the Wholly Other (*Ganze Andere*) of the traditional proofs who answers to the theodicy problem, but the God of resurrection, the Wholly Altering (*Ganze Ändernde*) of Biblical faith.

Concluding the first section of the book on "Theological Perspectives" is the essay "Exegesis and Eschatology of History." Here Moltmann draws out implications of his eschatology for the understanding of history and sets forth principles that guide his discussion in the final section, "Perspectives of Christianity in Modern Society." The principle developed in this article is the historical principle, and

is to be contrasted with the positivistic and existential, both of which have the effect of ending history—the former by reducing reality to a causal nexus of “experienceable phenomena” and the latter by reducing it to the inner history of the individual. History appears only when reality is seen in terms of the future that promises it meaning, the kind of future testified to be the resurrection.

Moltmann turns then to the question of the “Understanding of History in Christian Social Ethics,” and seeks to deliver sociology from its positivistic hang-ups by offering it a historical method underwritten by the Biblical promise of society’s future. Similarly he would free the tradition of Protestant ethics from its static conception of the orders of creation. In the essay, “The ‘Rose in the Cross of the Present’” he addresses the misunderstanding of the Church in modern society according to which its assigned role is that of adjusting to a positivistic society by confining itself to existential concerns for a personal piety, interpersonal relationships, and abiding meanings signified by its institutional stability. He proposes instead that the Church, through a renewed understanding of its own resurrection hope, become the source and promise of meaning that can call society into a history of movement toward its own future. He must therefore reject, in the essay, “The End of History,” 19th-century metaphysical and 20th-century positivistic views of history which, by their failure to speak of the end or goal of history have the effect of ending or denying history. Biblical eschatology promises to draw society out of its positivistic fix by giving to social planning, which reflects on the possibilities given in the present, the hope that both justifies and directs it in terms of the presently impossible. Such is the argument of the article, “Hope and Planning.” However, not only sociology and the social sciences, but also the natural sciences are generally limited by the positivistic prejudice. In his discussion of “Theology in the World of Science” Moltmann points out that modern physics has created a crisis for the more prevalent conception of the world as a fixed and given causal system, in its recognition that the perception of science is not that of the objective, natural world but of the relationship between the scientist and that world. This means of course that the scientist as well as his world is a part of society, its technology and planning, and as such is the proper concern for theology in its witness to a hope for planning.

In a summary word, Christian hope means the radical historicizing of human existence—social, scientific and ecclesiastical. Secular pos-

itivism and sacred existentialism both signify the end of history, whereas faith's vision of the end of history means its beginning. Quite beautifully, clearly, heuristically Moltmann develops the implications of this view, showing us the promise of a theology of hope. There are of course questions—especially as to whether Christian faith can be understood so undialectically as futuristic. Nevertheless, regardless of the fact that these essays do not advance perceptibly beyond *The Theology of Hope*, they are stimulating expansions and restatements of the themes. Heartily recommended!

—Robert T. Osborn

*Moral and Ethical Implications of Human Organ Transplants.*  
George W. Miller. Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1971. 135 pp.  
\$9.25.

A little learning is a dangerous thing;  
Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring:  
There shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,  
And drinking largely sobers us again.

I remembered these heroic couplets from Alexander Pope's *Essay on Criticism* while reading this book; and they come back to me now as an apt, if yet enigmatic, commentary on this work. George Miller has addressed a subject of considerable importance, and one which deserves searching and sensitive investigation; but this discussion, at the end of the day, will confuse more than it will clarify the moral and ethical aspects of human organ transplantation. This is particularly regrettable in view of both the critical significance of the issues themselves and the increasing recognition by physicians and theologians (and others) that they urgently need to talk together about these and cognate matters of mutual professional concern.

Perhaps that is why reviewing a book like this one is something like going to a dentist—you know it's necessary and hope some good will come of it, but you would like it to be as quick and painless as possible. A publisher who supplies a \$9.25 book deserves to have it reviewed; sympathetically if possible, but honestly at all costs. The good one hopes for is two-fold: that the general public will not be misled by scholarly and professional pretensions which are unsupported by competence and perceptive judgment; and that theologians who would comment about moral issues created by another discipline's innovative expertise will avoid the errors of fact and in-

terpretation which are endemic to well-intentioned but ill-informed opinion giving. It is simply erroneous, for example, to say that Roman Catholicism does not object to *inter vivos* donations (p. 46). And citing Genesis 2:21-22 as evidence that God initiated anesthetics and performed the first organ transplant, that Adam was the first human donor and Eve the first recipient, and that the coincidental use of "closing" indicates medicine's dependence on the Bible (pp. 44-5)—all this does little to advance serious conversation between medicine and theology, but it does indicate the level of hermeneutical sophistication which Miller employs in what can only be described as contrived exegesis.

The technical data supplied by this book is similarly crude and unhelpful. Miller states, for example, that "more than two thousand kidney transplants" have been performed since the first procedure (p. 6). The fact is that more than 6,000 are known to have been done. Even that kind of misinformation, however, pales in comparison with chapter three where it is alleged that there is no moral distinction between sperm and organ donors!

So let it be said as quickly and as painlessly as possible: one who professes skill or knowledge in a matter about which he knows little or nothing is called a "quack." Medicine has its share of these pretenders; and this book demonstrates that theology does not enjoy immunity from that affliction.

—Harmon L. Smith

*John Wesley in Wales, 1739-1790*, Edited, with an Introduction, by A. H. Williams. University of Wales Press, 1971. 134 pp. £3 (\$7.20).

During John Wesley's ministry he made thirty-five visits to Wales, and passed through the country on at least eighteen other occasions. These journeys lasted anywhere from a day to three weeks each. Between 1739 and 1790 he visited the country during every year except fourteen, making up for this lack by two visits in many years, and three visits in two—1777 and 1781. In a valuable 24-page introduction Mr. Williams describes the background of these visits—Wesley's desire to further the evangelical awakening in Wales, largely begun by Howell Harris, at whose invitation he first came, and to build up the Welsh religious societies, whether they were Arminian or Calvinist in doctrine, whether they threw in their lot with him or not. Because

of doctrinal differences, however, from 1747 onwards Wesley's visits were reduced, when an amicable agreement was reached that neither he nor his preachers should attempt any proselytizing in Wales. The disruption of Welsh Calvinistic Methodism by internal disputes in 1750 led to the retirement of Harris at Trefeca, further reducing Wesley's contacts with the Welsh societies, which for over a decade remained minimal. Harris's emergence from retirement encouraged Wesley to venture into Wales a little more frequently—perhaps too frequently for Harris's less friendly Calvinistic colleagues. Quietly a handful of Wesley's preachers extended themselves widely from the handful of long-established Wesleyan societies, but even at his death in 1791 Wesley's followers were represented in Wales by only three circuits, seven preachers, and about six hundred members. Not until after his death did rapid expansion of Welsh Wesleyan Methodism take place, largely through the efforts of Dr. Thomas Coke, himself a Welshman. Mr. Williams, the editor of this work, won acclaim for himself thirty-five years ago by his definitive *Welsh Wesleyan Methodism, 1800-1858*, and the introduction to this volume whets the reader's appetite for his forthcoming history of Wesley's Methodism in eighteenth-century Wales.

This handsomely produced volume gathers together all the entries relating to Wesley's journeys in Wales from his *Journal*, as reproduced in the eight-volume edition of that work prepared by Nehemiah Curnock. Mr. Williams also inserts Curnock's transcriptions from Wesley's manuscript diary. The place names have usually been reproduced in their English forms where these are well known, but otherwise in their modern Welsh form. The volume is enriched by a summary and an analysis of Wesley's journeys, illustrated by three maps and three plates, and contains also a bibliography and index. Most valuable are Mr. Williams' footnotes, where he concentrates far more knowledge of Methodist origins in Wales than was available to Mr. Curnock and his colleagues.

—Frank Baker







