THE PRINCETON SEMINARY BULLETIN

VOLUME I, NUMBER 1 — NEW SERIES 1977

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

James I. McCord
President

John A. Mackay
President Emeritus

THE PRINCETON SEMINARY BULLETIN

With this issue THE BULLETIN begins a New Series. Volume 68, Number 3, concluded the old series which was begun in 1908. Hitherto THE BULLETIN comprised four issues annually, in which sequence the academic catalogue was one of its units. In the New Series there will be only three issues annually: one in the Winter, a Commencement number in the Summer, and another in the Autumn. The academic catalogue will be published as a separate journal.

THE BULLETIN is published by the Board of Trustees of Princeton Theological Seminary and is mailed free of charge to all alumni and on an exchange basis with various academic and/or religious institutions.

Regular features, including "Excerpta and Commentaria" will be resumed in the next issue.

All correspondence should be addressed to the Editor and accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped return envelope.

Second Class postage paid at Princeton, New Jersey 08540.

Edward J. Jurji
Book Review Editor 1947 - 1977

Since 1946 Professor Edward Jurji has served as Book Review Editor of *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*. Appointed by President Mackay, he has carried on faithfully the exacting task of ordering books from publishing houses for colleagues, selecting worthwhile titles from among the continuous in-flow from promotional agencies, and calling attention to monographs most useful for departmental consideration.

On August 31, 1977, Dr. Jurji, himself an author of international reputation, retires from his professorship in the History of Religions.

The administration, faculty, and alumni are deeply grateful for the services he has given and extend best wishes for a continuing career of scholarship and ministry.

James I. McCord
President

We Pause to Praise You, O Unbundled God of Sun and Summer

Die Voegelein schweigen im Walde.
Warte nur, bald ruhest du auch.

—Goethe

Lord, teach us to remember that we must die,
That we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.
Brewer's blackbirds in throb-winged throngs
Swaying into the settling sun;
Cut corn kneeling in stubble-stalked stillness
And the crisp crackle of varnished leaves
Galloped over by the acorn patrol.
A chain saw gnawing complaint
Into the fiber of the night.
Evening star in late autumn
Over the land of lakes and Swedes.
E're it ends and we edge out
Numb-faced against the drifted and howling dark,
We pause to praise you,
O unbundled God of sun and summer.

O ye Winter and Summer, bless ye the Lord:
Praise him, and magnify him for ever.
Benedicte, omnia opera Domini.

—Peter Fribley, 74D
United Ministries in Higher Education
St. Cloud State University

The Princeton Seminary Bulletin

VOL. I NEW SERIES 1977 NUMBER 1

CONTENTS

1977-1978

Annie Kinkaid Warfield Lectureship

The Reverend George S. Hendry, D.D.

Charles Hodge Professor of Systematic Theology, Emeritus

Ecumenism Today

by James I. McCord

Since 1959 James I. McCord has served as President and Professor of Theology at Princeton Theological Seminary. A native of Texas, Dr. McCord is an alumnus of Austin College, Union Theological Seminary (Virginia), Harvard University and the University of Geneva. He is the recipient of many honorary degrees, the author of numerous articles and reviews for professional journals, and North American Area Secretary of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches (Presbyterian and Congregational). This paper was given at Princeton during the Tenth Anniversary observance of the Decree on Ecumenism.

My assignment is to report on the ecumenical movement today. In the distribution of responsibility for this Seminar Cardinal Willebrands has reported on the past decade, including an analysis of the Decree on Ecumenism, and tonight Father Raymond E. Brown will assay the prophetic role and discuss the future. What I shall say will be from the vantage point of a Protestant Christian who prefers to be styled a Reformed Catholic and whose concern is for the whole of the Christian tradition.

There is a sentence in the Letter to the Hebrews that provides the theme for these introductory remarks. The letter begins, you recall, on a note of finality. Jesus Christ is God's last word to man. All things have now been put under his control. He has shared fully in man's every experience, standing under every threat that man stands under, and is now recognized a priest forever "after the order of Melchizedek." This is the great indicative of the Christian faith. But the problem to which Hebrews is addressed is a confused and hesistant church, one that has drifted away from its moorings and is tempted to let things go by default.

The author's antidote to this situation is not a summons to return to some ideal past or to go back to the faith of the fathers but, rather, to move forward to a new maturity and to possess the Christian faith in a new fullness. "Let us leave behind the elementary teaching about Christ," he urges, "and go forward to adult understanding. Let us not lay over and over again the foundation truths—repentance from the deeds which led to death, believing in God, baptism and laying-on of hands, belief in the life to come and the final Judgment. No, if God allows, let us go on."

It sounds as if the author had been involved in a long series of Faith and Order meetings and had reached the point of utter frustration, the experience many share today. For the ecumenical movement has entered into a critical phase. It is no longer the "great new fact of our time," nor does it represent the cutting-edge or frontier of theological inquiry or missionary effort. Its union schemes are being criticized for producing "power without glory," its theological position is being challenged for its inadequate orientation, and its record in launching a mission commensurate with today's needs is notoriously deficient.

This is a situation that is, in large measure, the product of success. Since the formal beginning of the ecumenical movement in 1910, churches and entire traditions have been drawn out of their isolation and into dialogue with each other. The pieces of the church's long and fragmented history are being gathered up and the church is being forced to confront afresh the meaning of unity. In fact, Bishop Lesslie Newbigin has contended in his book, *A Faith for this One World?*, that the movement toward unity in the twentieth century represents the confrontation of all nations by Jesus Christ. The decade of the 1960s witnessed an ecumenical miracle that can be accounted for only on the basis of a fresh blowing of the Spirit through the churches. While it did not produce dramatic unions, it did create a new climate among the churches and was evidence of powerful new responses to the ecumenical imperative. Among the events of this decade were the coming of major Eastern Othodox bodies into the World Council of Churches, the Second Vatican Council, a fresh resolve of classical Protestant bodies to attempt to restructure themselves in new union schemes, and the advent of Pentecostal groups for the first time into the mainstream of world Christianity.

I

Let us look at these developments for a moment and attempt to assess their impact on the ongoing ecumenical movement. Eastern Orthodoxy is least known and most exotic to us in the West because of time and distance. Schism separating East and West took place in the eleventh century, and subsequently the Fourth Crusade solidified the alienation between these two branches of Christendom. However, the Orthodox Church, often living in the midst of bitter circumstances, has continued into the twentieth century, conceives of itself as the undivided tradition, the Church which has within its boundary churches that were founded by the Apostles. That they have survived under Islamic domination and, later, under Communist regimes, is a powerful testimony to their sheer staying power.

Although the Greek Church was an early leader in the ecumenical movement, it was not until 1961 at the New Delhi Assembly that Orthodoxy came in strength into the World Council of Churches, led by the Russian Church. This produced a major change in the World Council's constituency, with Orthodoxy by the summer of 1962 constituting one-third of its membership. In the dozen years that have elapsed we are in a better position to assess the strength of this tradition. For one thing, there is a wealth of theological insight to be mined in the writings of the Eastern Fathers. A generation ago the theologians of Scandinavia in their "motif research" pointed out how the Eastern Fathers pre-dated the subject-object split that has vitiated so much of Western theology. One thinks of Gustaf Aulen's fresh treatment of the atonement from the standpoint of the patristics. A second lesson to be learned from the East is from its wealth of liturgical resources. Here is the clue to the persistence of a tradition under the cross, a powerful liturgical tradition that is able to sustain the faithful and to hold their allegiance to Jesus Christ and his Church. And a third boon has been the discovery of an added dimension of

depth in the entire theological enterprise. His Eminence discussed the dimension of mystery this morning, an added note in the doctrine of the Church emanating from Vatican II. One can also point to the dimension of the cosmic. In Eastern theology the cosmic Christ is the head of all creation. The influence of this doctrine in ecumenical theology has recently been traced by Conrad Simonson in a book entitled *The Christology of the Faith and Order Movement.* He sketches the broadening of the Christological discussion from the consideration of Christ in isolation to the inclusion not only of Christ and his Church but of the whole of concrete human experience. It is through this broadening of Christology that we are enabled to see "salvation today" in the widest possible context, a context that includes not only persons but also relations, structures, and the whole of creation. Indeed, patristic Christology has much in common with many of the emphases of liberation Christology today.

II

When we turn to the second tradition in our survey of developments since Vatican II, we must begin by remarking that Roman Catholicism was a part of the ecumenical movement long before Pope John convened the Council. It is common knowledge that a powerful renewal movement was going on among many of the great religious orders, and many outside as well as those within the Catholic communion were being enriched by a strong biblical and liturgical movement in Catholic centers. Moreover, the formal ecumenical movement was the subject of quiet but determined scholarly appraisals. Dr. Visser t'Hooft has often commented that many of the best studies of the ecumenical movement prior to Vatican II were produced by Roman Catholic scholars. Vatican II, therefore, does not stand alone, but its genesis must be understood in the light of these and numerous other renewal movements.

It has long been my conviction that the Reformation precipitated a premature definition and formulation of doctrines on the part of both Rome and Protestantism. Because of the polemical atmosphere that attended this period, these definitions tended much too often to be negative and one-sided, with each side defining itself over against the other. This was true of the Reformers and true of Trent, and in succeeding generations the pattern has persisted. Those in the ecumenical movement have known that its theological task will be limited and incomplete without full Roman Catholic participation, and there is a long theological agenda that awaits attention. The Decree on Ecumenism has made this task a possibility. As Samuel McCrea Cavert wrote, "Today the door is wide open."

While the relation of the Roman Catholic Church to other Churches and "ecclesial bodies" needs further clarification (Cardinal Willebrands' statement this morning was a brilliant exposition in this regard), certain elements of the Decree on Ecumenism stand out: the relation of the mystery of the Church to the mystery of the Holy Trinity; the pilgrim character and servant role of the Church in history; the continuing need for reformation; the encouragement to dialogue and to joint witness and action; the need of forgiveness and a change of heart for all; and the warning against any cheap and

pragmatic ecumenism at the expense of the truth. In short, the Decree has not only opened the door for a joint theological task, but also for joint service and witness and for a common quest for the unity that is in Jesus Christ.

During the past decade the churches have been eager to grasp the new possibilities inherent in this changed situation. A series of bilateral conversations has been instituted, engaging representatives of most ecclesiastical traditions. It is not possible here to tabulate the results of these bilaterals to date, nor am I competent to do this. Let me simply comment on one of these theological conversations, the one with which I am most familiar, between Catholic and Reformed. The last session was held in March, 1974, and its theme was the Eucharist, which has been a thorny issue for centuries. The participants today, however, could write at the end of their dialogue, "We believe we have reached a common understanding of the meaning and purpose and basic doctrine of the Eucharist, which is in agreement with the Word of God and the universal tradition of the Church." With such common understanding, the group now proposes to take up the doctrine of the ministry early in the following year. The Catholic-Lutheran dialogue has published already its results in five small volumes, and the last of these deals with papal primacy and the universal Church. The fifth volume is the most interesting in the series, not because the participants reached full agreement, but because a question which has divided the churches sharply and about which there has been great reluctance for any dialogue is now on the table and being discussed.

Enough has been said to indicate the promising results of these bilateral conversations. They have led to the elimination of many old misunderstandings, to the pruning away of polemical language, and to a remarkable convergence in doctrinal consensus and a new common understanding of many matters of faith. The Decree has also made possible joint programs of social action and has produced new depths of spirituality as the quest for unity has been fueled by common services of prayer and praise. A more biblical ecclesiology has been espoused, one that takes seriously the servant role of the Pilgrim People of God in their journey through this life toward their glorious consummation in God's heavenly Kingdom.

We give thanks today for the progress that has come during the past decade, but we also acknowledge that the work has just begun. We are still trying to cut away underbrush that has grown up over the past four hundred years, the preliminary work that must be done if the real task of theological reconstruction is to be done jointly. The premature definitions and formulations that came out of the sixteenth century do not bear the authority of such doctrines as the natures and person of Christ. We are busy now paring away polemical language and scraping away historical accretions in order that this and subsequent generations of Christians, Orthodox, Catholic, and Protestant together, will be able to read and hear the Word of God and further the work of common theological understanding.

III

We have looked at developments within two traditions, and now we should turn to two additional groups.

The first is classical Protestantism, as it is today and not in its sixteenth century form. Then it tended to be stabilized by agreements that were reached between political entities in Europe, but now classical Protestantism is experienced in a different form, as it was exported from European countries to the New World and, later on, exported from Western Europe and North America all over the globe in the great missionary years between 1815 and 1914. It was out of this missionary experience that the modern ecumenical movement grew, and the first ecumenical response was that of cooperation between the various missionary bodies. Competition seemed cruel when the need was so great and the resources so few, and cooperation enabled the churches to maximize limited funds and personnel. This became the conciliar response to the ecumenical imperative, which is the institutionalized form of cooperative Christianity.

Later on the churches took a deeper look and decided that cooperation was not enough. It was a too-easy response to Christ's prayer that his disciples "may be one," and a subsequent decision was made by the churches to seek to restructure themselves through organic union. Nearly fifty years ago the first such union was consummated when the United Church of Canada was formed. Congregational, Methodist, and Presbyterian components came together to form a national church. The primary impetus for this union was the challenge of the Canadian West and the inability of the denominations to meet this challenge singly. The attempt toward restructuring has continued to gain impetus, and organic unions have been formed in India, the United States, and in Australia. The most pretentious scheme currently on the boards is the Consultation on Church Union, composed of nine American denominations that are seeking to form a church that would be "truly catholic, truly evangelical, and truly reformed." Professor John Deshner of the Perkins School of Theology reported to the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches on the extensive work among churches throughout the world toward restructuring, a report that was a revelation to many. However, one problem persists, and it is the lack of an adequate model for a united church. Organic union is something other than a corporate merger. Many schemes of union continue to produce fear of bigness, fear of increased bureaucracy, and fear of becoming homogenized into a single church and thus losing the identity that comes with separate and distinctive ecclesiastical histories and traditions.

If I may add a personal note at this point, it is to suggest to classical Protestant bodies attempting to restructure themselves through corporate union that the membership of the participants be widened, in the period of dialogue and prior to the point of negotiating, so that there will be a more adequate representation of the full Christian tradition and a better opportunity for a balanced re-working of our theological heritage, which is the indispensable foundation of any adequate union. While such advice would delay schedules that some groups have projected, it might produce far more valuable results over the long pull.

IV

The fourth group on which I shall report is the Pentecostals. It is significant

that in New Delhi in 1961 when Orthodoxy entered the World Council in its full strength, two small Pentecostal churches from Chile also joined the Council. More recently a large African church that is Pentecostal has also entered the WCC. As early as the 1950s Bishop Newbigin began writing about the Pentecostal phenomenon and suggested that it represented a third stream that had to be taken into account in any ecumenical dialogue. If the Roman Catholic tradition puts its primary stress on structure, and the Protestant its primary stress on message, then this third stream has placed its emphasis on the experience of the Holy Spirit in the life of the believer. Dr. Newbigin wrote then, "There is a third stream which has tended to be outside the ecumenical movement, whose central element is the conviction that the Christian life is a matter of the experienced power and presence of the Holy Spirit today; that neither orthodoxy of doctrine nor impeccability of succession can take the place of this; that the Church is often a mere shell, representing form but not life." I was told by the General Secretary of the WCC that when the African Pentecostal body entered the fellowship, he told that church's leader, "You will not be the same after taking this step." The leader agreed, "We will not be the same," but he added, "the World Council also will not be the same." The resurgence of Pentecostalism at this point is undoubtedly judgment on the established churches and will be a growing factor in future ecumenism.

V

Having reviewed progress made over the past decade, I would be less than candid if I did not turn immediately to new tensions that have arisen and that must be taken into account. There are some problems with which I shall not deal, such as vocations and theological training for the laity, a burning issue in many countries, or the question of women as ministers and priests, or the question of authority, which has become a crucial issue for the churches again in the 1970s. I can only express my shared hope with Cardinal Willebrands that these problems will be dealt with ecumenically. Surely we have reached the point when we move beyond dialogue and in an ecumenical context deal with pressing issues confronting the churches.

(i)

The first tension to which I shall point has been produced by the massive presence of member churches from the Third World in the WCC. When the First Assembly was held in Amsterdam in 1948, its membership was almost exclusively western. When a year from now the next Assembly is held in Africa, there will be delegates from churches on every continent, and many of these churches will bring with them what is being called liberation theology. This point of view is, they feel, congruent with their desire to throw off the yoke of ecclesiastical colonialism and to find a theology expressive of their own needs and hopes. Undoubtedly the best book in this general area is Gustavo Gutierrez' *A Theology of Liberation*. The Nairobi Council theme was "Jesus Christ Frees and Unites," a liberation declaration. Liberation theology attempts to define salvation as operative in many dimensions. It speaks of salvation from economic exploitation, from

political oppression, from communal alienation, as well as from sin or separation from God. As the American theologian, Fred Herzog, has written, "Our theology seems turned in on itself because it is saddled with an anthropological model and begins with man's self-understanding. Thus we are forced to choose between the bourgeois self and the longing of the wretched of the earth." This criticism helps illuminate the background of the Bangkok Conference on "Salvation Today," in which the old forms of evangelism and mission were challenged and an attempt was made to express the meaning of salvation in terms and dimensions far broader than customarily conceived of in the West. Let me repeat: I have been impressed with the possibility within Orthodox theology with its doctrine of the cosmic Christ to engage many of the issues raised by liberation theologians far more adequately than much of Western theology with its individualistic and sociological orientation.

(ii)

The second tension is reflected in the continuing absence of conservative evangelicals from ecumenical participation and the threat of the formation of another and opposing structure of ecumenism on a world-wide basis. It is common knowledge that the ecumenical movement in the nineteenth century had an evangelical genesis, but we are less familiar with the quiet drop out of the evangelicals in the late 1920s. Now they are reappearing, in international conferences on evangelism in Berlin and Lausanne, more conscious that a horizontal and social dimension too often has been absent from their concerns, and raising questions about the theological integrity of the meaning of salvation as it is developed by many exponents of liberation theology today.

(iii)

The third tension has been produced by the failure of the churches to deal adequately with the relation of the Christian faith to other world religions, which also have a vision of world community and human brotherhood. Historically it is a fact that the great period of missionary success coincided with the heyday of western colonial expansion. As late as the Tambaram Conference, held in India in 1938, Hendrik Kraemer in his great book, *The Christian Message in A Non-Christian World*, could speak of the radical displacement of the other religions of the world by the Christian faith. Kraemer lived long enough to revise his strategy. By the time he gave the Stone Lectures in Princeton two decades after Tambaram, he was lamenting the absence of dialogue in depth between the major religions of the world. It was his view that this had not taken place in the modern period, and that to find it one had to go back to the Iberian Peninsula in the late Middle Ages when Christians and Muslims were in dialogue.

It was not until the meeting of the Central Committee of the WCC in Addis Ababa two years ago that the subject of world religions became an item for the agenda. In this respect there is much we Protestants can learn from the dialogue already begun by the new Secretariat set up for such dialogue. We make a claim that the Christian faith is for the whole of mankind, but we have steadfastly postponed our obligation to deal adequately with what this means.

(iv)

The final tension to which I shall point has arisen through the appearance of the charismatic movement in the churches. In an earlier period this movement tended to be separatist and sectarian, but since about 1960 the charismatic movement has taken on a new form. It has begun to infiltrate established churches. Ideally it should represent renewal within the churches, but too often it has tended to produce a new form of ecclesial life that exhibits characteristics that historically have led to schism. This movement, with its great emphasis on immediacy, tends to call into question the whole sacramental life of the church. To be ecumenically responsible we should begin now a study of pneumatology, and especially of the relation of the Spirit to the Church, with leaders of the charismatic movement.

In 1968, when the WCC met in Uppsala, there developed great expectations that we had reached the point in ecumenical maturity where an ecumenical council of all the churches could be convened and when we could together develop a common statement of the hope that is in us as Christians. Both are needed if the Christian faith is to be addressed to the needs and hopes of our world. Up to this time, however, we have not been able to take these steps. Ecumenically we are now able to talk among ourselves, but we have not yet reached the point where we can together talk to the world. It is this maturity that we seek in our life together.

What I have said has grown out of the conviction that the Church is one, that she belongs to Jesus Christ, and that unity is his gift. It is in this confidence that all of us, lay persons and clergy, are challenged to return to the ecumenical task with renewed vigor, in the knowledge that the coming great Church is not an illusion but a gift that will be received through the grace of our Lord, Jesus Christ.

Leibniz's Relevance for Today's Christianity

by Diogenes Allen

A native of Lexington, Kentucky, Diogenes Allen is an alumnus of the University of Kentucky (A.B.), Oxford University (M.A.), and Yale (B.D. and Ph.D.). Since 1969 he has been Professor of Philosophy at Princeton Theological Seminary where he came from York University in Toronto, Canada. Dr. Allen is the author of three books, including Finding Our Father *(John Knox, 1974).*

Inaugural Lecture, October 6, 1976

I am primarily a philosopher who spends most of his time thinking about the Christian faith. I have come to believe that for the Christian faith to be thoroughly justified in Western society at the present time three things must be done: (1) the *possibility* of God must be shown in a scientific universe; (2) the human *need* for God must be articulated; and (3) a person must be touched to some degree by God's holy and gracious presence.

Nowadays the subject known as philosophy of religion concentrates almost exclusively on only one of the three: the possibility of God. It deals with such topics as: Is the word "God" meaningful? If it is meaningless, then it is not possible for there to be a God. It considers the possibility of proving God's existence; the possibility of metaphysics, of revelation, of miracles, of religious experience. But the entire discussion is a theoretical one concerning *possibility*. And what is considered to be possible is deeply influenced by the acceptance of a scientific universe.

It is generally thought to be very difficult at best to show the possibility of God. Some writers are more optimistic than others, and the tide of opinion is always rising and falling. But what I want to point out here is some of the consequences of this exclusive concentration on possibility. It means that philosophers of religion, the majority of whom reside outside of seminaries, dismiss as irrelevant both people's need for God and people's experience of God. They do not deny that people may need God, but this is, they think, irrelevant to the issue of his possibility. After all, people may need something and it simply may not be there. Likewise people may think they experience God, but there may be a perfectly natural psychological explanation for their experiences. People's need for God and people's alleged experience of God both presuppose the possibility of God. Until the issue of his possibility is settled, need and experience cannot be considered. So both need and experience are set aside as though they had no contribution whatsoever to make to the question of God's possibility. Philosophers of religion by their exclusive concentration on the possibility of God can happily spend the rest of their lives feeling rather superior to the common herd, whose needs open them up to the reality of God. Without realizing it, they have become victims of Kant's dictum: "Concepts without experience are empty." What you can do with mere concepts is not decisive.

On the other hand, it is not only philosophers of religion who are guilty

of narrowness of focus. The Christian churches of America have a sizeable number of believers who have plenty to say about their experience of God's reality. But they are unaware of how difficult a thing it is to find room for God in the universe uncovered and created by modern science, or why that matters. They are often also poorly informed over the depth and complexity of human needs and aspirations. As individuals they may or may not be genuine Christian souls, but in any case they are often inarticulate about the range of human longing and the wretchedness of human frustration in a modern industrial society. They often have no healing word to offer, even if they be very verbose about what Jesus does for them, because they know so little about people. Kant's dictum applies here too: experience without concepts is blind. Neither possibility, nor need, nor experience treated in isolation from one another is fully adequate.

I

The reason I have chosen to talk about Leibniz is because he did deal with all three. He treated them in ways that are still of value today. We cannot of course simply repeat what he said, but we can find in him ideas that we can use in our own reflection. I want to share enough of him and enough of my own reflection on him with you today to encourage you in your own thought.

Leibniz had a very human trait: he wanted to understand how things hang together. That is not the route to academic success; for this is an age of specialization. Specialization may be inevitable for people of ordinary gifts; we simply haven't got the brains to master very many things. But Leibniz wasn't ordinary. He was intimately aware of every intellectual pursuit of his day. We have over 15,000 of his letters to every imaginable scholar and investigator of his day. It is difficult to find a field to which he did not make an original contribution. It was Leibniz's thirst to understand how all things are connected which led him to consider not only the possibility of God in a scientific universe, but also our need for God and our experience of his reality. Let us now see how he did this.

Leibniz was born in 1646 and died in 1716. During that time the scientific revolution occurred. Herbert Butterfield says of that revolution:

> It outshines everything since the rise of Christianity and reduces the Renaissance and Reformation to the rank of mere episodes, mere internal displacements, within the system of medieval Christendom. It changed the character of men's habitual mental operations, even in the conduct of the non-material sciences; it transformed the diagram of the physical universe and the very texture of human life.

Now Leibniz cared very much about that revolution and contributed significantly to it, mostly by his discoveries in mathematics, but also by such things as the discovery of kinetic energy. At the same time as being a promoter and creator of the emerging scientific outlook, he was a devoted Christian. He saw with great clarity the challenges the new science was making and would be making in the future to Christianity. It would fundamentally challege the vision of the universe as God's creation, and of human beings as destined for the kingdom of God. So he resisted the sci-

entific materials of his day. On the other hand, he wrote clearly and powerfully against the many attempts to *splice* together a Newtonian world with a seriously altered Christianity. He considered these compromises to be both scientific and theological monstrosities. Many of Leibniz's own theological views were daring and novel; so he was not a static traditionalist. Instead he had that rare combination of a mind which was able to appreciate many points of view, to select from the past and present what he thought was sound, and then to *fuse* it all into a novel and creative whole.

II

Now I cannot today describe that fusion of modern science and Christianity effected by Leibniz. Instead I will mention only one feature of that synthesis. Let me first set the stage. The biggest single effect of the new science on Christianity is to have made God superfluous to every field of investigation in modern times, save theology. The physics and cosmology of the Middle Ages which included God in its accounts was being replaced by Newtonism. Now Newton himself could and did include God in his scientific accounts. For example, God was used to explain how energy was conserved at a constant level in the universe, even though energy is apparently lost in every collision between particular bodies. But, after Newton's time, in area after area of the natural sciences, God was replaced as an explanatory factor. The same replacement has occurred in field after field. Of course Christian believers can be found in every field of enquiry; but when it comes to their actual investigations, God does not enter into any of their explanations. People engage in their work as though the universe were self-contained. Whether you are studying the motion of a particle, the development of an embryo, the social behavior of a groups, the psyche of an individual, the main stream of academic study does not look to the reality of God in its attempts to account for the phenomena in its field.

This fact is enshrined in LaPlace's famous remark to Napoleon. Napoleon wanted to know if he could see God with a newly developed telescope. LaPlace replied, "Sire, I have no need of that hypothesis." LaPlace had the approval of his colleagues. But Leibniz, who a hundred years earlier anticipated and advocated the removal of God from the sciences, did not have the approval of many of his colleagues. Many of them were like Newton; they were still trying to include God within their scientific accounts. Leibniz in opposition to them argued that they were trying to *splice* together two different kinds of reality —a creature and a creator. The two could not be put into one type of explanation. He claimed that Newton, for all his brilliance, reduced God to the level of a creaturely reality. So Leibniz became a champion of the independence of scientific explanations. At no point was one to introduce God *within* a scientific account. The physical world operated as a machine. He argued hard and long against the Newtonians, and others, who kept inserting God into a scientific account, whenever they had a problem they couldn't solve. Leibniz was convinced that each presently unsolved problem was open to scientific explanation, and whenever a solution for a problem was forthcoming, the continual replacement of God would

eventually discredit religious belief. He anticipated what in fact has happened in Western society.*

Leibniz resisted the Newtonians, partly for theological reasons. Leibniz was convinced that you could never explain anything by referring only to God's will, but you must also refer to the reason why he wills something; for God always acts for a reason and indeed for a good reason. Leibniz was convinced that the world was a reflection of God's wisdom and goodness, and not just his power. Only a universe which operated well was a universe morally worthy of his creative hand. One criterion of a well-ordered universe was the existence of immense variety organized by a relatively few systematic principles. We would not admire a person who solved a problem in mathematics by including a half-dozen unnecessary steps, or a person who built a house and had more joists than were needed. So too with God's universe. God considered every possible type of universe to make—each with different physical laws, each with different kinds of inhabitants, each with different sequences of events. From all these theoretically possible universes, he selected to make the one he in fact made because on the whole it was the best. It is because God made the best of all possible worlds that we can discover such excellent scientific laws and gain such elegant scientific explanations. God's wisdom is the ontological foundation of our science.

If we were to rank possible worlds according to their relative merit in a series from top to bottom, we would find that the better the possible world, the better we would be able to explain its workings by reference not to God but to other things in that world. The better a possible world, the more orderly, and hence the less need to refer to God *within* a scientific account. He made our actual world so well that its mechanism does not need any mechanical interference. Things gear into each other so well that there are no gaps, no place where God's finger would be needed to make up for the absence of something else that could and should have been there to do the job.

So we have the ironic situation that precisely in a universe made by a perfectly wise and good God, we have no occasion to refer to him when we are explaining its workings. Every entity has been selected so as to mesh perfectly with every other entity, so that accounts of why or how something happens are always given by referring to particular items of the universe. We of course do not have complete scientific explanations of everything. But we see that in the best of all possible worlds, we have a built-in ground to continue to seek to perfect our scientific accounts of its successive states without any reference to God within our accounts.

The progressive removal of God from all fields of investigation, which is used

* As mentioned earlier, Leibniz's own *positive* position cannot be given here. But it should be mentioned that Leibniz rejected the view of nature current in the 17th century. Matter for him was not an ultimate reality; the fundamental reality in nature was force. Force was for him in the first instance a metaphysical reality ("primitive force") but it manifests itself in nature as "derivative force," some of whose effects were scientifically measurable. So for Leibniz, nature did not consist of inert matter, but of living or active centers of energy which are *perceptually* available to us as matter in motion. The concept of force enabled Leibniz to link together God and scientific explanations in a positive way.

by opponents of Christianity to discredit it, actually has its basis in the nature of God. It is because he made such an orderly and integrated universe that it is so easy to ignore his reality when pursuing the various university disciplines.

Although the world is like a machine, Leibniz did believe in miracles. He believed that God could divide the Red Sea when he led Israel out of bondage in Egypt and he could raise his Son from the dead. But miracles occur only for the purpose of our salvation and to mediate God's presence into our person. The scientific order is over-ridden by a higher order, that of grace. The physical disorder that is introduced by a miracle is resolved into a greater harmony at a higher level. But God is never to be introduced within scientific accounts to explain the workings of nature. Scientific accounts deal with the natural, not the gracious, order of the universe.

III

Although Leibniz was a champion of the independence of scientific explanations, he believed that they were incomplete. The world is *fully* explicable only by reference to God. How did he reconcile the independence of scientific explanations and at the same time their incompleteness? Scientific explanations were complete on one level only. God is never to be introduced on the level of a mechanical explanation, as though he were a bit of matter or a wave of energy. On the other hand, mechanical explanations could not explain why we have a world. If we are to account for its existence, we have to rise to a higher and different level of explanation and use different explanatory principles. Besides this, our scientific laws have no logical necessity. That is, there is no logical contradiction in imagining a world with a very different set of physical laws. You cannot therefore explain why we have this world with its set of physical laws by an examination of those physical laws themselves. To find a basis for scientific laws, we cannot appeal to science itself. We thus have two questions which drive us to refer to God: Why does anything exist at all? And, why do we have these particular physical laws? We need a being who is powerful and intelligent if we are ever to explain the existence of the universe and its particular order.

This part of Leibniz's thought has not been shown to be invalid, and it still elicits some interest among philosophers. But the arguments he gives are not conclusive. He thought they were, but he makes some assumptions. These assumptions, though plausible, are not compulsory and are in fact alien to the spirit of our day. Without those assumptions, his arguments lose their conclusiveness. But they do not lose all their value. They force us to face the questions of the existence of the universe and the basis of its order. We cannot answer those questions conclusively; yet the questions are still there. They are genuine, and not, pseudo-questions.

Unfortunately these questions are easily ignored. Each discipline nowadays asks only those questions which are within its specialized framework. In some respects, this is commendable and Leibniz himself helped create the situation by his insistence that the sciences are on one level independent. People can stay on one level and never be driven by any problem on that level to rise above it. Success on a mundane level has encouraged people to ignore Leib-

niz's questions which, though not in their field or any other recognized discipline, are nonetheless real questions. They don't belong to any discipline, not even to philosophy which occasionally dabbles with them, because they are human questions about the foundation and purpose of all things. To consider them can drive a person to recognize the *possibility* of God.

IV

Let us take just the first question, the existence of the world. If that question is raised and pursued with persistence, we eventually run into a blank wall. We cannot tell by our science or philosophy whether the universe is or is not the sort of thing that has a reason for its existence. Maybe it has; maybe it hasn't. The universe may be dependent on another kind of reality. It is possible that there is a God. We just don't know and we have no recognized discipline for finding out. We encounter a mystery: the mystery of existence. Each university discipline operates, however, with no awareness of this mystery. It is assumed that the universe is self-contained and is not dependent. This can be done because we can conduct our investigations with great success on a mundane level, as Leibniz has shown us. That success blinds us to questions that point toward a higher level. But even though each field of enquiry can operate this way with impunity, this does not mean that people as people should ignore the mystery of existence, and the possibility of God.

It is here that the question of the possibility of God—which is opened up by the mystery of existence—merges into the question of the human need. We run into a blank wall when we encounter the mystery of existence; we may have no university discipline or method that can answer the question of its existence, but there is another route we can follow. That route allows us to come to a decision concerning the mystery of existence.

That route has to do with the search for happiness. It is evident that people want to be happy. But this is rarely examined by the university disciplines of today. One great exception is the non-university man, Jean-Paul Sartre. I believe that he unintentionally stands as a great witness to Christian truth. No one in our time has as prominently and graphically portrayed the human hunger and thirst for fullness of life. At the same time he has courageously described the impossibility of finding it. For him there is no God, and so for us there is no fullness; there is only restless craving and the honesty to recognize it. But even though he is an atheist, he is a witness to a Christian truth—viz. there is nothing in this world that can give us fullness. We have a capacity and a craving that is so large and so distinctive that the world cannot satisfy it.

Sartre himself has remained hungry. It may be God's purpose for him to remain hungry, and in his hunger to bear witness by his shouting out that he is hungry, that we live in an age that has forgotten God. We live in an age that is condemned by its godlessness to run vainly after every cause and solution that is highly publicized. We have forgotten what it is to hunger for God. We have not learned that all that we eat, drink, wear, lust for, fight for and live for cannot fill an emptiness that is at the center of our person.

Leibniz knows of this striving for

fullness. It is a major principle of his philosophy. He called it *conatus*; he attributes this relentless striving to every entity of the universe. All creation is actively striving, in most cases blindly, for the achievement of as much fullness as it is capable of achieving.

Now I want to point out only one feature of this striving that Leibniz develops. Human striving, which is the very center of our person, finds fullness only in the reality of God. Our spirit is known by his Spirit, and finds fullness by a never ceasing and constantly increasing knowledge of him. Our infinite hunger gives us an infinite capacity to enjoy his reality forever. (His reality is known directly and also indirectly. Indirectly we know him by a study of this world. We perceive more and more fully his glory, and enjoy him more and more fully.)

V

We have spoken of God's possibility and human need, now we can introduce experience and show how the three are linked. The mystery of existence leaves us with agnosticism. But if we encounter that mystery, we know that God is at least a possibility and has not been excluded by our modern scientific knowledge. But as far as this goes, God is *merely* a possibility. We have no way of getting beyond that as long as we keep on looking at the universe itself—as long as we consider only the *objects* of knowledge. We must turn to the subject—to ourselves. There we can recognize a hungry creature. And then, should that hunger find nourishment, we can come to faith. Because we now eat, we become convinced that our need can be satisfied. We live then neither with the mere possibility of God nor in a Sartrean universe in which we hunger but in which there is no food. Our minds show us the possibility of God; our hearts reveal to us our hunger; God's Spirit shows us his reality by coming to a mind and a heart that are open to his presence.

We now need only one more point to complete the picture. To find our fullness, we must receive God's grace. This makes the Christian life sound completely passive: for to receive grace is to be passive. It is to be acted on by another. But there is also an active side to the achievement of fullness of life. We as creatures are made in God's image. The world only passively reflects God; we exhibit him by our actions. God is active as a creator and redeemer, and we reflect his nature by being active ourselves. We are to be little gods. We are to bring order and good into being. We are to be fellow creators of the best of all possible worlds. So you find in Leibniz a combination of passiveness and action. Our action is inspired by the presence of God's Spirit and guided by the goal of imitating his goodness.

This combination of passiveness and activity does not exist merely on paper in Leibniz's writings; it was incarnated in his own life. He rejected an academic appointment so he could work as a high level government official all his life. His entire career was devoted to projects designed to improve human health and industry. His concern over religious and political strife which had led to the devastation of the *Thirty Years War* led him to conduct, on behalf of his ruler, negotiations for the reunion of Lutheran and Catholic Christianity. He founded Academies, with the novel idea that enquiry would

be conducted cooperatively for the sake of human good, rather than for the glory of each individual. All of this work was guided by the great goal of achieving a social order in Europe that had a moral and religious foundation. In this way society could control the vast new physical energy which he believed the new science would unleash. Without the vision of a universe under God and the incorporation of that vision into a moral society, he foresaw disaster for the human race because of the vast forces the new science would release.

Ever since Voltaire's entertaining but unfair caricature in *Candide*, Leibniz has been considered a facile optimist by the intellectual community at large. So I think it is fitting that we end with this somber note—of a society with far more power than moral wisdom, far more appetite than discipline, far more greed than nobility of aim. Leibniz feared its arrival and all his efforts were directed toward preventing it. But his confidence in God's providence was not diminished by the fearful prospect which his greatness allowed him to foresee. His confidence was not a facile optimism. Its ultimate basis was his awareness of the possibility of God, of our need for God, and his own experience of God's grace.

Pastoral Theology: Its Nature, Methods, and Uses

by James N. Lapsley, Jr.

A native of Tennessee, the Rev. James N. Lapsley, Jr. is a minister of the Presbyterian Church, U. S., an alumnus of Southwestern at Memphis (A.B.), Union Theological Seminary, Va. (B.D., cum laude), *and the University of Chicago (Ph.D.). A recipient of a Rockefeller Doctoral Fellowship and a Danforth Fellowship, Dr. Lapsley joined the faculty at Princeton in 1961. He is the author of two volumes*: The Concept of Willing *(ed.) and* Salvation and Health *(Westminster).*

Inaugural Lecture, February 16, 1977

I

One of the constants during the more than fifteen years of my association with Princeton Theological Seminary has been that the seminary catalogue has always stated that I was teaching pastoral theology. It would, therefore, seem to be a fair inference that I should be able to say what pastoral theology is, if I ever will. Indeed, I shall be saying what I think it is, what its methods are, and what it is supposed to do—but I cannot say that I shall be very definitive about these matters. For the discipline which I profess is not one that commands a high degree of unanimity about its nature, and pronouncements about that nature do not have much immediate effect upon the confusion, which is rooted in the diversity of theological and ecclesiastical traditions which surround us. More than most other theological disciplines, pastoral theology, even on the question of what it is supposed to be studying, is rather directly responsive to central values of the traditions. Hence it is not surprising that the work on pastoral theology done by that national institution, my senior colleague, Seward Hiltner, has not succeeded in basically changing this picture, even though it did open up new avenues and possibilities, and provided the foundations upon which the model of pastoral theology contained in this lecture is erected.

Although Hiltner stands virtually alone as architect of modern pastoral theology as such, there are many others to whom I am indebted for inspiration and illumination in several dimensions of thought related to the concerns of this lecture. Such lectures are not usually dedicated, but nevertheless I wish to thank a host of teachers, students, and colleagues from whom I have learned much, only a few of whom will be mentioned by name in the course of these remarks, and probably none of whom would wish to endorse fully their content.

In addition to presenting some remarks about method, I shall take up two concerns that I hope the methodological discussion will illumine. The first of these is the current state of the modern pastoral care movement, which faces a serious crisis of professional identity, the outcome of which appears to be momentous not only for the movement, but to me, at least, for the church as a whole. I know that it is not news that the pastoral care people have been employing secular thought forms and

procedures, but some recent developments have led to the pressing of many of them into decisions about their basic identity and commitment as ministers. The danger is not only that practice of pastoral care will become impossible to distinguish from other forms of personal helping, but that the churches will lose altogether some of the "best and the brightest" in the pastoral care movement.

One of the reasons for the crisis, though not the only one, is that many of the pastoral care people cannot find handles in the theological situation of today by which to hold on to their identity as ministers. Although efforts have been made in this direction in recent years, including some by myself, it still remains true that for the most part theology seems remote from the concerns of the pastoral counseling specialist. Some of this remoteness is no doubt the fault of the pastoral care movement, but not all. Some of it lies with modern theology itself and the largely academic battles in which it has been engaged. Pastoral theologians, above all others, have an obligation to speak to this gap between what must be core professional theory for ministers and their practice of pastoral care.

Beyond this concern, pastoral theology must make its own contribution to the thinking of the church, both because what it can contribute is sorely needed, and because, as a theological discipline, its job is to do so. It cannot solve all the problems of modern theology, but it can shed significant light on some, and I shall attempt to do that with one cluster of theological issues which have tended to be gathered under the rubric of the problem of theodicy, and in the Reformed tradition in particular have been considered as a part of the doctrine of providence. These issues are about God's love and power, their nature and relationships. The questions about God's justice have, of course, traditionally been a part of this complex, but I believe that the issues can be considered from the perspective of pastoral theology in a provisional way without explicitly considering those, although of course they do have to be considered in a more systematic approach, even in pastoral theology. I have chosen to deal with this problem because I believe it to be of great practical significance in the churches today, and because of its special significance in the Reformed tradition within which I stand. I believe that tradition to be a valuable resource for pastoral theology, because of its great experience in wrestling with the issues involved, and its insistence upon their importance in the lives of Christians—an importance to which the modern pastoral care movement can amply testify. So important are they in our time of cultural crisis that I believe that the survival of the church itself may well depend upon our finding better approaches to them.

In discussing such controversial issues as those stated, it is inescapable that I shall be against some positions and ideas held by living persons, some of whom may be present. For this polemical note I make no apology, noting that the first professor in the seminary, Archibald Alexander, became in 1840, late in his career, Professor of Pastoral and Polemic Theology. Ancient precedent increases weight but also responsbility for him who claims it. Bearing in mind these comments about continuity, and especially the last one about responsibility, I turn now to a consideration of

the nature of pastoral theology and its methods.

II

I shall not here rehearse all the meanings that pastoral theology has had during the era since the Reformation. The great divide in these meanings has been whether pastoral theology has to do with all or almost all acts of ministry, or whether it has to do only with one kind of acts—those usually called pastoral care. This division continues to the present day, and is one of the main reasons why definitive statements that are likely to command a consensus are not viable efforts. Hiltner, acknowledging that there was some value in both sets of meanings, attempted to bridge them with his perspectival model, in which he held that the basic attitude of tender, solicitous concern is present in all authentic acts of ministry, but that it is only dominant in some, those he called pastoral care. Pastoral theology, then, was ". . . that branch or field of theological knowledge or inquiry that brings the shepherding perspective to bear upon all the operations and functions of the church and the minister, and then draws conclusions of a theological order from reflection on these observations."[1] I shall not here attempt to parse this definition, but I do note that the attitudinal factor was the key to bridging the gap we are discussing. Shepherding is an attitude which becomes a perspective, and when theological inquiry is focused through it, it becomes pastoral theology.

In Hiltner's *Festschrift* published in 1969, I attempted to simplify this definition somewhat, realizing that I was actually coming down on the side of the tradition that held that pastoral care is the focus of inquiry, even though other aspects of ministry might embody a "pastoral" concern. Pastoral theology, I wrote, is ". . . the study of all aspects of the care of persons in the church in a context of theological inquiry, including implications for other branches of theology."[2]

While this definition is not exclusively focused upon certain kinds of acts of ministry, it does represent a shift from emphasis upon attitude to emphasis upon intentions, and a focus upon the personal dimension. Pastoral theology has within its preview all aspects of ministry in which the *personal* dimension of the human spirit is in the field of focus, but its main concern is with those acts of ministry in which that dimension is dominant—pastoral care. The human spirit, which at least provisionally, I shall call the intensity and direction of human life, is the focus of all branches of practical theology, and partly in focus in all branches of theology. But concern for the personal dimension, the interaction of the unique with more generally human factors, is the special focus of pastoral care, whether it be brief or prolonged, as in pastoral counseling, whether individual, marital, family, or group.

Beyond the operational focus, the first hurdle in the way toward an understanding of pastoral theology, there lie others even more formidable. A recent survey conducted by the Program in Pastoral Theology at Notre Dame

[1] Seward Hiltner, *Preface to Pastoral Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1958), p. 20.

[2] "Pastoral Theology Past and Present," in *The New Shape of Pastoral Theology*, William B. Oglesby, ed. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1969), p. 43.

under the direction of Tjaard Hommes shows that there is still no common understanding of the nature of the discipline. Some modern representatives tend to emphasize operational aspects only, viewing pastoral theology as the theory of pastoral care and counseling, or as theology applied to all aspects of ministry. Others are more theologically oriented, emphasizing reflection on practice (that has a familiar sound here among those involved in the D. Min. program). Still others view pastoral theology as some kind of intermediate discipline relating theoretical and practical concerns, whatever these might be.

All these views contain some merit, except for the factor in some which stress all, rather than some particular aspects of ministry. When the two emphases which I have already mentioned are added, namely the professional aspect and the constructive theological aspect, the picture becomes even more muddled and complex. I believe that there is really no escape from the complexity, but I shall now suggest a way of considering pastoral theology which I hope reduces the muddle.

There are three elements which, taken together, exhaust the concerns of pastoral theology, and all of which, at least by clear implication, should be represented in any study in this field. The first of these is that aspect of the ministry which focuses at least to some degree on concern for the personal dimension of the human spirit. Modern pastoral care as well as ancient was nurtured in the trenches of the battlefields of the individual human spirit and its relationships with other spirits both human and divine, as the life and work of Anton T. Boisen, more than any other man the founder of the modern movement, amply testifies. It was because Boisen refused to divorce the spiritual from the personal in his own life—no matter how twisted the personal element seemed to him and to others, that we have a legacy and a tradition with this field in which, whatever my quarrels with it, I can stand. Pastoral Theology has a fundamental commitment to better understanding of this aspect of ministry, and to its continued improvement. In the seminary that means also commitment to better ways of teaching pastoral care and counseling, even though that does not entail the endorsements of fads in a field perhaps even more fad prone than most. It does mean a continual review of developments in the field and in the secular helping professions.

The second element in pastoral theology is the interdisciplinary element. This has, of course, been a distinguishing mark of the modern pastoral care movement, and I do not foresee any time in the future when we can do without it, even though, as I shall try to indicate, the discipline of pastoral theology is, itself, beginning to have some content which makes the interdisciplinary element, as such, somewhat less of a pervasive presence. But even then, the effects of interdisciplinary work in the past are very much in evidence. In the time that I first came into this field during the 1950's the interdisciplinary character of pastoral theology was considered to be the most problematic thing about it. At that time, except for the relative few who were willing to try almost anything in theology—a view which made a genuine contribution at Chicago and a few other schools, the churches were under the sway of Neo-orthodoxy in its Barthian mode and

more or less impervious confessionalisms. These together meant that, while pastoral care was necessary, thinking about it could be tolerated only as long as it was understood that such thinking was not a part of the theological enterprise, or if it was, it should reflect rather directly firmly held positions about forgiveness as the expression of the Word of God as that was understood. It should be said here that Emil Brunner, whose influence was so great in this seminary, never held such a position, although he did have caveats about the limits of interdisciplinary work.

Today, the situation is sufficiently different, even though some uneasiness remains, that I shall not defend at length this element. Thanks to the pressures of the previous era, I and others of my colleagues in pastoral theology and allied disciplines have had to explore in considerable detail the questions about interdisciplinary method, and that is a resource we carry into the future. I shall not present these details, but I shall attempt to show how the interdisciplinary element functions in the discipline as a whole, while noting that interdisciplinary effort appears to be sanctioned in the Confession of 1967 of the United Presbyterian Church, under Part II, Section 3, in which the renewal of the church is said to come in part from non-Christian sources. It may be argued also that theology in general always has a trans-confessional, as well as a confessional task, and that pastoral theology shares in this task.

The third element in pastoral theology is theological output. This output may come in the form of answers to a theological question that has been put at the outset of the inquiry, as Hiltner has advocated. It may come in the form of questions which arise in the course of the inquiry. Or it may be a commentary upon certain themes or issues. A logical corollary to theological output is output or contribution to the other discipline or disciplines which have been involved in the study. In pastoral theology these have usually been psychology or psychiatry, although others, particularly sociology and anthropology may be involved. Strictly speaking, the constructive output into those disciplines is not a part of pastoral theology, but in practice pastoral theologians have been engaged in it, partly because to be so engaged appears necessary in some kinds of studies to do their own work. Thus for examples, Rodney J. Hunter has made a contribution to the study of psychoanalytic ego psychology in work on commitment, Hiltner has worked on the problem of anxiety, and I have from time to time worked on the concept of health. Nevertheless, such efforts are somewhat ancillary to pastoral theology as a theological discipline.

The question of method in pastoral theology is essentially that of how these elements are to be related, and that in turn depends upon the initial kind of question being asked. If the question is about the practice of pastoral care or other aspects of ministry in which the personal dimension is in focus, the interdisciplinary connections are best made in advance of the inquiry into practice, for otherwise there is a strong tendency for one or the other to function in an imperial fashion. In practice this kind of imperialism has frequently meant that psychology gets there first, leaving the inquirer in something of a dilemma regarding what kind of theological reflection is to be engaged in, and what kind of issues are at stake theologically.

It is possible to take a two pronged approach directly to practice, but this kind of approach requires a great deal of dialectical skill and has the further disadvantage of rarely producing relatively univocal results. While some kinds and levels of theory not only tolerate dialectical thinking but actually require it, if they are to be true to the state of knowledge involved, those elements most closely related to practice must somehow come to terms with the need for relatively clear cut indications for action.

If one begins with a theological question, however, the best approach is often to take the question directly to the data of pastoral practice. While such data have in most cases been preconditioned by various factors, including psychological models of helping, nevertheless new light may be shed on the question and a possible answer, or answers, derived. My own essay entitled "Reconciliation, Forgiveness, Lost Contracts," is an example of this kind of approach.[3] In that essay I attempted to show both the necessity of forgiveness in a theological climate that was tending to ignore it, and something of its intrapersonal dynamics. This approach is especially useful when the investigation represents a relatively early stage in efforts at theological understanding of the particular problem involved.

There are several other possibilities in pastoral theology. One may begin with a primary interest in what Hiltner has called "theology and personality." Because he wanted to emphasize the legitimacy of this approach when he came to Princeton Seminary in 1961, he chose to be called Professor of Theology and Personality. Indeed, it is possible to work strictly at the theoretical level of interdisciplinary endeavor, which Hiltner has sometimes done, as have others. In such efforts, however, implications for both theological reconstruction and for practice have often been drawn, even when these were not necessarily in view when the study was begun. In some studies this approach has been taken in an effort to develop comprehensive models of practical theology. That is, the intent was to move toward a theologically informed theory of ministry, of which pastoral theology was only one component. My study entitled *Salvation and Health* was one such effort of this type. We do not have at the present time book length studies of this sort which are directed primarily toward a detailed understanding of pastoral care, although I hope these will be forthcoming.

There are differences among scholars about the right kind of starting place in studies that begin with theology on the one hand and psychology on the other. Some prefer to work with themes and issues, while others believe that more far-reaching results are achieved by beginning with identifiable positions within one or both disciplines. I have followed the latter approach out of the belief that the differences among schools, positions, and sometimes individual writers in both the theological and psychological disciplines are so significant that coherence of results is difficult to achieve without choosing among positions at the outset. Undoubtedly, I have been influenced by my teacher, Perry D. LeFevre, in this respect.

Other starting points are possible, as suggested earlier. Problems arising from

[3] James N. Lapsley, "Reconciliation, Forgiveness, Lost Contracts," *Theology Today*, XXIII, 1 (April 1966).

gaps in the psychological disciplines may stimulate theological investigation, the practice of pastoral care sometimes uncovers acute theological problems in the persons whom one is attempting to help, and suggests avenues of approach to long-standing problems in theology itself. This is the kind of approach that I shall try to present further on in this lecture, when I shall speak about pastoral care and the providence of God. In short, there are many ways of getting into the pastoral theology intellectual matrix, but they must treat fairly and responsibly all three of the elements: practice, the interdisciplinary connection, and theological output. To do all this is demanding and time consuming, and studies which fall within parts of the total matrix of pastoral theology may be responsibly done, even if they do not explicitly touch all points. I believe that more is gained if we call them by some other name, but at the same time, if we understand that they are studies within the total field of pastoral theology, their potential for contribution to that field is enhanced.

In 1969 I wrote that the constructive results of Hiltner's proposal set forth in his *Preface* were relatively meager. Although not all facets of the whole matrix of pastoral theology is represented, we do now have some book length monographs, notably by Hiltner himself, by Don Browning, by Peter Homans, and by Ian S. McIntosh. The last named is now translated into the minister of the Old High Kirk of Inverness, thus providing the field with strategic location to re-enact the traditional invasions of the Scottish highlands. There has also been a corporate address to various questions about forgiveness, in which Emerson, McNeill and I have participated, and in which we now look forward to a contribution by Sandra R. Brown. Although this endeavor has not been an orchestrated one, it is showing how the field can build upon itself, and I believe that it is a most promising development, and indeed a necessary one if pastoral theology is to become established as an intrinsic discipline, and not merely as a hyphenated one.

III

I turn now to the situation in the pastoral care movement, and especially to the current crisis among those specializing in pastoral counseling ministries. Although the modern movement in pastoral care has, I believe, been of very great value in the churches, and specialized ministries have also made a legitimate contribution, both in the institutional chaplaincies and in various forms of pastoral counseling, it faces a crisis of public recognition which is far more than an internal debate about identity, although that question underlies the more public one. The twin questions of state licensure, and that of being certified to receive third party insurance payments, are putting a kind of pincer pressure on the movement. The latter issue is especially ominous because of the now real possibility of a National Health Insurance Act in the near future. To be excluded from the group of health professionals who may receive such payments would apparently spell economic disaster for many pastoral counselors who rely primarily upon payments made by their clients, either directly or indirectly, for their livelihoods. The issues involved in these matters are complex and for the most part beyond the scope of this lecture. The point is that these developments in the pub-

lic sphere have forced the specialists in the pastoral counseling field to face the question of their own professional identity in a way that no amount of questioning from within the movement has ever done, and there has always been a considerable amount of that.

The leaders among the specialists have been sensitive to this problem for some time. Although the response has been varied, there have been in the main two strategies employed. One is to make claim to the titles, functions, and legal status of the secular helping professions. For instance, in testimony before a committee of the New York State Assembly, then considering a bill to license psychologists, one pastoral counselor, fearful of exclusion, stated: "Let me say that it is very much in order for the State to establish standards and licensure for ordained clergymen who desire to present themselves to the public as persons who are competent to offer *psychological* (italics mine) counseling as a specialty and function." Some persons in the movement have begun to call themselves pastoral psychotherapists. Perhaps the most outspoken of these has been Charles Jaekle, who has urged it repeatedly in the journal, *Pilgrimage: Journal of Pastoral Psychotherapy*, which he started in 1972. Although Jaekle did not stress the legal angle, he did emphasize the point that some pastoral counselors were just as competent as other professionals who called themselves psychotherapists, and hence entitled to public recognition as such. Jaekle wishes to hold onto ordination, and maintain some connection to the Christian tradition. But ideologically, he has put his stress on the kind of concerned humanism which undergirds modern "third force" psychology—a label coined by Abraham Maslow to refer to a somewhat amorphous group emphasizing human liberation and self-actualization, and rejecting behaviorism and traditional dynamic psychology alike.[4]

Other leaders have realized that, whatever the claims of competence on the part of pastoral counselors to use psychology and to do psychotherapy, they may be insufficient to meet the kind of professional test required in a legal and public sense. Morris Taggert, commenting on his significant research on the American Association of Pastoral Counselors in 1972, put it this way:

> Does there exist within the profession a "body of knowledge," a point of view, a way of understanding human events in the area of health and dis-ease, which, although found among members of other professions, is somehow represented "institutionally" within this particular profession? Further, does this way of understanding human experience in the health area enjoy a measure of plausibility in the culture within which its practitioners serve?[5]

While not explicitly trying to answer Taggert's pointed question about the institutional character of a way of understanding human nature, several other leaders have addressed themselves to the question of the kind of unique, or at least focal, knowledge and attitude that the pastoral counselor possesses, among them Wayne Oates and John Patton,

[4] Charles E. Jaekle, "Editorials," *Pilgrimage: Journal of Pastoral Psychotherapy*, I, 1, 1-3; I, 2, 1-3.

[5] Morris Taggert, "The AAPC Membership Information Project," *Journal of Pastoral Care*, XXVI, 4 (December 1972), p. 220.

both of whom have stressed the religious expertise and concern of the counselor. Patton recently spelled out his own view of the uniqueness in an editorial in the *Journal of Pastoral Care*. There he stated that pastoral counseling is a "religious process" characterized by "related humanness." He indicated that these factors are to be understood "in the light of Christian theology" and that the pastoral counselors, "like biblical man, have a sense of history." He made it clear that pastoral counseling is a form of Christian ministry interested primarily in promoting "change and growth" as opposed to "problem solving," and is broader than psychotherapy, since it is also concerned with "guidance, structuring, and other procedures focused upon the counselee's immediate situation."[6] Patton comes very close to saying what appears to be unsayable by pastoral counseling specialists—that pastoral theology is the "institutional" discipline which they must own if they are going to be able to begin to cope with the various identity issues which they face. He did say that viewing the expertise in human relationships which is focal in the light of Christian theology is important, but that is all he said about theology, so it is not clear what light it might shed on the matters that concern him.

Obviously, I believe that Patton is moving in the right direction as opposed to Jaekle and his followers. Indeed, a split in the pastoral counseling movement may be in the making along the lines represented by these two leaders. Yet I do not really favor such a split, and it is far from clear that even pastoral counselors who think more like Patton will be able to cross over the great divide in cognitive identity and avow themselves to be theologians in the professional sense, rather than representatives of some vague melange of disciplines. If a way to surmount the resistance to this barrier can be found, I believe that the whole movement might well cross it.

I am aware of the roots of their resistance—disenchantment with the institutional churches (that's one of the sensitive connotations of the word "institutional"), presumed irrelevance, and sometimes actual irrelevance of theology, and certain clinical versus academic matters—to name a few. I believe that many of them are dated, although some are not—mainly the failure to date of the churches, with few exceptions, to take the specialized pastoral counselors seriously as ministers. However this may be, I believe that pastoral theology as a discipline is now ready to bear the weight of the demands of the specialized pastoral counselors for both relevancy and connectedness, and I invite them to try it. Such a move would not solve all their problems, but it would give them much firmer ground to stand on while they, and we in the teaching and parish ministries, try to solve them. Moreover, the churches need the specialized pastoral counselors, even if they are not as aware of this need as they might be.

I do not endorse the specialized ministries in all their forms, in particular private practice. In a monograph which I hope will be published in the near future, I have addressed the problems facing the pastoral counseling movement in some detail, proposed some lines of thinking about them, and also

[6] John H. Patton, "Editorial," *Journal of Pastoral Care*, XXX, 4 (December 1976), pp. 217-221.

tried to develop an approach within the field of pastoral theology which is designed to put some flesh on the bones of method. All this is in the interests of working toward a genuine professional base for those who have touched the heart of man so closely on the boundary of church and world, and also for those whose pastoral care ministries are less specialized. But for now I turn to the matter of theological output.

IV

It seems probable that the issues involved in what in the Reformed tradition is called the doctrine of providence have always been a particular concern of Christians at all levels of sophistication and involvement, and of greatest concern in times of cultural crisis and uncertainty. There is now rather massive concurrence on the part of commentators viewing our cultural situation from many different perspectives to the effect that ours is such a time. Even our regional daily newspapers, not given to speculative essays of interest to intellectuals only, run regular columns about various aspects of the crisis, though, of course, they do not agree about what its true nature is, what its causes may be, or how deep it runs. But people are perceiving their situation as full of uncertainty, with the grounds of hope in this world elusive, in spite of a mild upturn in Carter-inspired confidence. *Newsweek* magazine recently estimated that about ten percent of us in this nation have placed their hopes on the apocalypse which should arrive sometime between now and the year 2000, believing that they, or at least some of them, will be preserved in the holocaust.[7] This has a familiar ring to us; we have heard it all before, which may blind us to the fact that the ten percent or so who are committed apocalyptists are only the tip of an iceberg of those wondering and groping, often desperately.

Pastoral care has always found that some of those whom it sought to help have felt that they are either abandoned by God or the object of his wrath. For instance, in 1962 Coval MacDonald, formerly my colleague on this faculty, found that many of the people he visited as chaplain in the University of Chicago Hospital either blamed God or themselves for whatever illness they suffered. Those who blamed primarily themselves often felt that they were being punished for wrongdoing. In MacDonald's doctoral dissertation entitled "The Judgment of God," he studied by tests and interviews the experience of judgment in thirty-seven pre-surgical patients in the same hospital, and concluded that the perception of judgment in a context of grace was positively related to middle and upper social class status, language ability, and personal maturity, and that the tendency to blame God, doctors, or self, with the lack of these characteristics. Although his study was more complex than this brief report suggests, it did not in any way attempt to study what effects, if any, pastoral care might have on these perceptions of judgment.

Indeed even minimal empirical studies of this point are lacking, so what I shall say about the situation as I see it today is admittedly tentative and impressionistic, although it is based upon my reading of many hundreds of reports of instances of pastoral care and counseling done by students and ministers, and on my own experience in pas-

[7] *Newsweek*, January 10, 1977, p. 49 f.

toral care and counseling, especially during the past six years.

In using such a broad, and admittedly relatively undisclosed pastoral data base, I am in no way abandoning case studies reported in concrete forms and yes, the "sacred" *verbatim* form, nor am I despairing of rigorous empirical studies in pastoral theology. However, for the purpose of question-raising about this particular concern, I believe that the data base is adequate, as I hope will be made clear in the course of the discussion.

First of all, explicit concern with the questions about the relationship between God's power and love seem to be increasing as an initial conscious problem. People do appear to be increasingly aware of the presence of evil in the world in many forms, and to identify themselves as participating victims. They do wonder why God does not do something about this situation. Although we find that there is often a strong sense of guilt over whatever plight besets one, even then there is often the sense of having been led into the difficulty by forces beyond one's control—parents, institutions, professionals, governments, and employers, all find their places in the lists of victimizers, and God himself is sometimes seen as victimizer-in-chief. This last point has sometimes made me wonder whether the root meaning of victim—someone or some animal consecrated for sacrifice to the gods, still has reverberations in the modern psyche. There are, too, of course, those who do not believe that God, if there is one, has any power, as we should expect in a presumably secular age. But even these often feel cheated by the order, or disorder of things, and express in different ways the sentiment that the world should be run better, even if from their angle, there are faint grounds for believing that it is being run at all.

The effect of pastoral care on this kind of initial cosmological and theological questioning, if it is reasonably well done, is to reduce its intensity, and often to result in its disappearance completely from the person's agenda. Other concerns, usually those about personal relationships and one's own attitudes toward them begin to dominate, even if they were not dominant at the outset. If the pastoral care contacts continue long enough, however, the issues involved in one's own sense of power to direct and influence the course of personally significant events tend to come to the fore. Instead of seeing themselves as victims in a global way, persons who have had extended pastoral care or pastoral counseling begin to focus on the question of *how* they have been victimized in the past, whether by others or by self, and how they may be able to avoid such victimizations in the future. In this process they begin to see that power is not nearly as concentrated in a few persons or institutions as they thought, but is rather diffused, and that they themselves have some power to influence the distribution of it. Hopefully, they also become less vulnerable to power that has contributed to their difficulties in the past, and better able to anticipate situations in the future in which they might again be victimized.

This kind of process does not mean that there is no actual victimization, and I do not decry the heightening of consciousness about victimization which we find all around us—as symbolized last year by the appearance of *The Journal of Victimology*. Rather it means that by a process of clarification of re-

sponse patterns and intrapersonal processes a kind of *victimization ratio* can be found which has more correspondence with reality than the perception of reality dominated by victors and victims with which the person began.

While this is happening, the person's vision of what it means for people to love changes as well, and it changes generally in positive relationship to the growing perception of personal power. Indeed, loving requires power, and so does, perhaps in a lesser degree, the ability to receive it. Power itself does not, of course, entail the ability to love, and when concentrated it does tend to corrupt, as Acton and his legions of quoters are always reminding us. But if the distortions and confusions of love and power are untangled more or less simultaneously and to a significant extent, as in good pastoral counseling, their constructive potential in the life of the individual is found linked together. And it is discovered that just as there are different kinds and centers of power affecting the life of the person, so there are differing capacities and kinds of love which are made possible by those kinds of power. There are many ways that the human spirit reaches out affirmatively toward another, and these ways of loving are related to differing power nexus. Parenting provides a kind of power, for instance, as does friendship. They differ in the kinds of love they make possible, and the limits their power limits entail. Even institutions, in this view, have a capacity to love inherent in their power, but they are neither parents nor friends.

I say these things not in the belief that they are brand new ideas as such. Most pastoral counselors and many persons in the secular helping professions are familiar with them, although not perhaps with this kind of language about them. On the theological side, Paul Tillich treated them dynamically more than twenty years ago, along with justice, in his *Love, Power and Justice*. Nor is the developing interlocking motif of love and power characteristic of all pastoral care. Much pastoral care is for one reason or another a kind of first aid only, valuable in its own right, but dealing only or mostly with the anxieties and distresses of some immediate crisis. Even in pastoral counseling on a designedly sustained basis, these issues do not always get directly into focus, although inevitably they are touched, whatever the direct focus of the counseling and however limited its goals. Whenever major decisions are involved and their longer term implications, the spirit, its direction, and its potential for love and power are always present as issues.

In some cases the theological focus on love and power, which may or may not have been present at the outset, emerges or re-emerges explicitly. This happens usually with persons with a strong attachment to the church, though not always. Even though the general dynamics of love and power are seen in a new light, the problem of evil in the world is recognized as not having disappeared; its pervasiveness is felt as still touching them, and often with ominous portent for destruction in the future looming as a shadow. They know that death and grief are still there, hardships of other sorts probable, and tragedy in some form a distinct possibility. In my experience as a pastoral counselor no one has ever worked all this out into a completely tidy theodicy, but more than one has found intellectual and emo-

tional ground on which to stand, at least for a time, on their own new experience of the relationship of power and love. Providence, for them, is the sense that God has enough power to love them in some kind of appropriate way, even though all power in the world is not concentrated anywhere.

From this last point, made explicit in a few cases, but I believe implicit in many, comes a question for those theologians whose primary business it is to work toward an understanding of providence which is viable in the contemporary world. *What are the implications for the doctrine of providence in the processes of pastoral care and counseling which lead to an increase in the perception of power as diffuse and differentiated in the world, and to a perception of these differential power centers as enabling different kinds of love?* Various responses to this question may be made, of course. It may be dismissed as irrelevant by those who maintain God's complete independence of the world and its processes. Or it may be said to be too subjective, based as it is upon individual human experience, which is culture bound to boot, even though that experience at least seems to be one in which the human spirit receives new vision, direction, and power. Or it may be taken seriously as an instance of modern perceptions of the world and God which might present a challenge to older perceptions.

As a pastoral theologian, following the approach outlined in this lecture in which the theological question originates in the pastoral situation, I must stop at this point. I shall not here propose an answer to the question, for to do so would take me beyond the bounds of the intent of this lecture, and well beyond your patience on a winter afternoon. Pastoral examination of the issues involved in the doctrine of providence provided a way of trying to show at least one way of doing pastoral theology, and to raise what I think is a valid question.

However, if I had made and presented an extensive examination of the doctrine of providence in advance, and also of the related problem of theodicy in philosophical theology, and asked a question from that point of view about the implications of pastoral processes, either employing an interdisciplinary matrix if I sought a more general answer, or moving directly to the data, if I sought a more suggestive one, I should also have been engaged in pastoral theology as I understand it.

Many of you know that, as a theologian working out of the field of pastoral theology, I have in fact engaged for a long time, if not on a completely sustained basis, in the study of questions related to the issues I have been discussing, seeking questions and answers in many places. Some of my thoughts about these issues have been published, and I expect that more will be in the future. Many of you also know that in some of my work I have been rather clearly working from a particular kind of modern theological base—process theology, and I expect to continue. But I hope I have shown that no particular kind of theological outlook is necessary to do pastoral theology in which I have presented today, provided that certain kinds of methodological assumptions are made.

I shall not attempt to summarize all that I have been saying, but shall close with the hope that the relationships between the parts of the lecture are rela-

tively clear. The nature and methods of pastoral theology as I understand them are broad, but demanding precision at many points. I have tried to show their implications for a pressing problem in the professional dimension of the pastoral care movement, and for theological inquiry. I believe they are adequate for both, and must be. I commit myself to continued responsible use and development of the discipline of pastoral theology, to its teaching within this seminary, and to perpetuation and constructive expansion of the tradition within which both it and I today stand. May we all be led by the power and vision of God.

Frontiers in Theology and the Arts

by S T Kimbrough, Jr.

Formerly a member of the Princeton faculty in the Department of Biblical Studies, Dr. Kimbrough is also a widely recognized professional musician and is serving now as European Executive Secretary for Christian Arts, Inc., with headquarters in Bonn, Germany.

A native of Birmingham, Alabama, Dr. Kimbrough is a graduate of Duke University Divinity School and received the Ph.D. degree from Princeton in 1966.

"I thought of James Joyce's idea that the important question about any work of art was from how deep a life did it spring." (Kildare Dobbs, "Muggeridge Rediscovered," *Macleans*, Nov., 1974, p. 81)

"Christianity it would seem, no longer has the power to release the life-giving waters—at least for its artists." Such is William Barrett's claim in his newest work, *Time of Need*. No Christian theologian hears that statement with a spirit of welcome or encouragement, especially if he feels he himself has any "cultural sensitivity." After all, one hears that well worn phrase—the arts and the church have always been intimately bound together, and the past twenty years have seen a rejuvenation in the church of interest in multiple art forms and their use in theory and practice, especially in Christian education and related areas. But Barrett's claim forces the raising of other questions—Just how long can this interest survive based on the debonnaire, dilettante selective powers of the so-called leaders? What eventually happens to Christianity and the arts when the former no longer releases the life-giving waters for its artists? Before one can speculate about that, a brief look at the situation which has prompted Barrett's statement is vital.

Here is neither time nor space to discuss how art arose to a form of high importance during the first twelve centuries A.D., but our purpose here can be served adequately by beginning with the Middle Ages. Exemplary of attitudes which developed in many forms of art are those which surround painting which we shall use as an example.

During the Middle Ages it was of utmost importance that the painter "represent" the sacred. The truth of the gospel is made visible. Hence a portrait of Christ was not intended to be a reproduction of his likeness, but was to represent the truth about him. The truth of the gospel took on a visible form. Therefore, it is not surprising that many such paintings were regarded with a sense of awe, even to the point of the invocation of the miraculous.

The doctrine of the church found its exposition in much of this art and the entire church year played a central role in the prescription of subjects treated.

With the inclusion of mythological subjects along with Christian ones during the Renaissance, painting was still concerned with the representation of truth, but more "a" truth than just "the" truth. The pantheon of Greek gods emerged in the art of this period but in

relation to humanist truths. Yet, here was not the mere prescription of repertory, rather artists were already becoming avenues of expressing the thought of their time—man's ideas about beauty, love, reality and humanity. Whether this power of reflection was related to the truth of the Christian faith or not, this element remained integral to the art of painting as a whole.

With the Enlightenment there was a shift at the center—man as a creature in relation to God and other creatures in submission to power from beyond himself is replaced by rational man at the center of the universe.

> "Before the Enlightenment philosophy was primarily ontology—dealing with being—, after that it became epistemology—how can we as human beings have any knowledge of any reality outside of ourselves, and how can we get at universal principles? The old principles and ideas were gone, and man was left with that which he could see, feel, touch, weigh, measure. Man had to start from his perception. . . . Art, as a result, became a kind of philosophy, a kind of epistemology, an intellectual activity." (H. R. Rookmaaker, *Art and the Public Today*. Huemoz-sur-Ollon: L'Abri, 1969, 2nd edition, 7)

In both of his books, *Art and the Public Today* and *Modern Art and the Death of Culture*, H. R. Rookmaaker has plotted the continuing currents of development in art down to the present age. He points out how Goya, "the first modern painter," indicated the new direction ushered in by the Enlightenment. His well known two-fold portrayal of the robed and unrobed "Maya" sounded the alarm that Giorgione's "Venus" was *passé*; it was meaningless—its representation of love and beauty. Manet followed with his then scandalous "Olympia." Were all non-Venus nudes mere representations of whores? As aesthetic romanticism died, stark reality grew.

The Impressionists such as Monet arose in the late nineteenth century. Even reality's days were numbered, leaving primarily the spectrum of color to play on man's sight and awaken his subjective sense. Van Gogh, Seurat, Gaugin and Cézanne sought to save the day by renewing the subject matter of art. They sought to rebuild the bridge to reality and hence lead again to an expression of truth in art. Even these efforts did not last, because positivism had a stranglehold on the late nineteenth century. But the stage had been set for the entrance of modern art, because more was expected of a painting than the representation of beauty or nature.

The new art tended to depict man as having no contact with reality. Seen through the pen and brush of Picasso man is the epitome of absurdity. And while Picasso became lost in absurdity, Kandinsky became lost in abstraction. These artists and those who followed them had a message and there was no doubt about their commitment to it. While a few artists tried to pull back on the reins, Duchamp pushed the results of Picasso's painting to their extremity and Dadism and Surrealism were not far behind.

Here we are in the twentieth century and we have seen further developments like Pop Art and Disposable Art and experienced John Cage's musical composition by chance. We stand here as inheritors of these traditions which cul-

minate in the attitude of Sartre's *No Exit* and as inheritors of a biblical tradition and faith which are permeated with the message of "Exit"! Where have things gone so wrong that Barrett can make his claim with such agonizing validity that Christianity can no logner supply life-giving waters to its artists?

I

What are some of the factors behind Barrett's statement which indeed give it validity?

(1). Firstly, there is *the church's bourgeois resistance to modern art.* This is extremely interesting, since "Modern art is based on the principle that the artist is pledged to formulate a deep human reality and to represent this in his work." (Rookmaaker, *Art and the Public Today*, p. 8). Of course, when art itself becomes so overestimated that it becomes the epitome of revelation, it is easy to understand some objections. But too often there has been a desire still to prescribe the repertory, at least in the sense that the claim is made that the spiritual processes in the mind of the artist are the primary element in the creation of a work of art, even at the expense of the result.

The idea that art must always convey beauty, lovely ideas and the order of creation in order to be art is a dangerous view. It leads in fact to distinguishing the cultivated man from the barbarian and, as Barrett says, "Art is then regarded as a product for consumption by a refined sensibility; no longer, as in Greek tragedy, an open ritual celebrating the god and shared in by the whole people." (*Time of Need.* Harper & Row, 1973, p. 165).

Paul Tillich has tersely summarized the response of the church during the time that modern artists have been taking an honest look at the world.

> "The churches followed in most cases the petty bourgeosie resistance against modern art and against existentialism generally. The churches believed they had all the answers. But in believing that they had all the answers they deprived the answers of their meaning. These answers were no longer understood, because the questions were no longer understood, and this was the church's fault. They did not do what the existentialist artist did. They did not ask the questions over again as they should have out of the experience of despair in industrial society. The churches did not ask the questions, and therefore their answers, all became empty because the questions were not vivid any more as they were in the periods in which the answers were given." ("Existential Aspects of Modern Art," in *Christianity and the Existentialists*, ed. by Carl Michalson. Scribner, 1956, p. 146).

(2). Secondly, "one of the greatest tragedies in America today is the *lack of interest on the part of the church in the work of artists in communicating the Christian faith.* We put faith in words, slippery as they are, and in mortar and bricks, but not in the creations of artists," says Roger Ortmayer. ("The Graphic Arts: Painting," in *Adult Teacher*, 13, 1960, No. 4, 22). But it is an American societal sickness that we almost always can fund gigantic buildings—be they civic cultural centers with theaters, museums and excellent facilities for the cultivation of artistic ability and sensitivity, and yet rarely, very rarely, can cultural programs be properly funded, such as theater repertory en-

sembles, exhibitions, performances, artists in residence, etc. As a result these buildings, when used, often become attraction-oriented with the hope of filling the empty space with some Madison Avenue or Broadway "feature." The church, a would-be center of cultural life in the community, falls prey to this mentality as well. Instead of developing long term programs which will nurture creative imagination, attraction type events are used as a device to draw out the people to fill the empty space.

(3). Thirdly, Tom Driver pinpoints a malady in the church when he writes, "*Protestantism has been more effective at voicing critical judgments* (which does not necessarily mean acting upon them) *than at expressing the body of faith in works of the imagination.*" ("Playwrights Still in Hiding," in *Christian and The Contemporary Arts*, ed. by F. Eversole. Abingdon, 1958, p. 142). Hence the question arises: If Christianity is to be the foundation of a lasting culture, how can that transpire? It will not be merely on the basis of voicing critical judgments. Is it false to assume that the Christian dialectic can be creatively affirmed in works of the imagination? Yet, our theological libraries are filled with more voices of critical judgments than with expressions of the body of faith in works of imagination. Can we place our hope only in the T. S. Eliots, Christopher Frys, Graham Greenes, Charles Williams, Dorothy Sayers, Henri Gheons, Gabriel Marcels? Do we have a responsibility here?

(4). Fourthly, *there is a prevalent attitude among Christians that artists are basically on an ego trip.* The performer longs for the applause of the audience, the sculptor and painter await the admiration of the observer, the visual journalist craves an award for his film, and so it goes. Hence, this criticism has a theological basis, which is in conflict with man's praise of man and his creativity. Its vision of humanity is one in which man is denuded of his God-given creative abilities through a concept of false pride, guilt, sin, and the flesh which has little to do with these ideas in the Bible. It has little to do as well with God's view of creation in Genesis, "And God saw that it was good."

The ego trip attitude toward art and the artist fails to see that "the task of the artist is not to make pretty a blank wall. It is to celebrate God's love. If the vocation of the artist is this celebration, then the church not only must help him to see the true revelation of God's son, but also must ask him in turn to help show what this means to the church and to the world." (Ortmayer, *op. cit.*).

(5). Fifthly, there are some factors which are behind why Christianity no longer has power to release the life-giving waters for its artists which stem largely from forces outside the church, but they play a significant role in this grave situation. (a). Francis Bacon suggests that art has become a game by which man distracts himself. Life is useless so amuse yourself. (Rookmaaker, *Modern Art and the Death of Culture*, p. 174). (b). Paul Goodman in *Growing Up Absurd* claims that our abundant society corrupts the fine arts and that society not men dehumanize men. (c). "Automatism" exists to find the "one best way" and as Os Ginnis says in *The Dust of Death*, then "at once human, moral and aesthetic values are either ousted or relegated to a lower

position." (*The Dust of Death*. Inter-Varsity, 1973, p. 127.) ". . . The modern mind . . . has yielded to the inferior magic of facts, numbers, statistics and to that sort of empiricism which, in its passion for concreteness, paradoxically reduces experience to a purely abstract notion of measurable data, having cast aside the 'immeasurable wealth' of authentic experiences of the spirit of imagination." (Eric Heller, *The Disinherited Mind*, 1953, quoted in the pamphlet of International Artists Associates, Inc., 235 East 49th St., New York). (d). Much contemporary art like much rock music since 1960 reflects the agony of man's despair and the alienation from a future with purpose. (e). In *Future Shock* Alvin Toffler has suggested that with the "psychologization" of environments and entertainments, for which he cites Disneylands and World Fairs as examples, we are on the threshold of new "mood engineering." Hence, arts and aesthetics may change dramatically.

With these forces closing in on aesthetics as a whole, if Christianity discovers anew how it can release life-giving waters for its artists, its task is made extremely complex and difficult by this inundation of developments in the world of art itself in a technological age. Nevertheless, the situation is not hopeless, especially when one takes a cue from McLuhan, who when discussing the question of whether the effects of media can be controlled, states that "in the person of the artist society, has an 'early warning system' against 'media fallout'." (See Ginnis, *op. cit.*, p. 127). This is because as Barrett says, "The aim of the artist is to pierce through the fluidity with its crooked and distorting perspectives to uncover the luminous stasis of being." (*Op. cit.*, p. 320). "The artist in this century . . . has been engaged in the struggle to recognize his ties to the earth. Before a world grown so imposingly complex, in its technical and social organization as well as in the mountainous mass of its systematical information, the artist may seem a feeble creature but he dares to exist by reasserting the primal and elemental things that mankind may be on the way to forgetting." (*Ibid.*, 344).

II

What are then the frontiers for theology and the arts in the future?

(1). The first is *the frontier of symbolization*. "It is the artist's task to make symbols." And Christianity needs "a powerful symbolization that reveals its faith. The church must seek out the artist who has the talent to create imaginatively in its service. Perhaps this is the most important frontier in church life today." (Ortmayer, *op. cit.*). It must certainly become a part of the theological educational enterprise. This frontier pervades almost every aspect of theology and not merely the area of worship to which it is often assigned.

Tillich suggests at a level somewhat different from that which Ortmayer has in mind the importance of enlisting the existing creations of artistic imagination for the understanding of theology and symbols.

> "I myself used pictures in my lectures in order to show in other realms of life, especially philosophy, the relationship of form and substance, the possibility of breaking the surface form of reality in order to dig into its depths; and I must confess that I have not learned from any theological book as much as I have learned from

these pictures of the great modern artists who broke through into the realm out of which symbols are born. And you cannot understand theology without understanding symbols. . . . I believe that existentialist art has a tremendous religious function, in visual art as well as in all other realms of art, namely, to rediscover the basic questions to which the Christian symbols are the answers in a way which is understandable to our time." (*Op. cit.*, pp. 144-145).

Here is a frontier that has had few theological and artistic homesteaders.

(2). The second is *the frontier of the unexpected.* Too often the church has sought to chain the imagination and has succeeded. Those of us who study theology are extremely susceptible, because "the people who talk most about exalted things are the very ones, for the most part, who have no attributes to raise them to high levels." (C. Stanislavsky, *An Actor Prepares*, trans. by E. R. Hapgood. G. Bles, 1967, p. 159). But the artist speaks in simple terms. His is an "experiment of initiating, clarifying, transforming simple everyday human realities into crystals of artistic truth." (*Ibid.*, p. 160).

Theology suffers from the danger of the expected—the desire to know in advance, have things familiar and clear and to establish an external form through which activity may be channeled. The church functions as an institution largely in this way.

Stanislavsky told the following story to his first ensemble when establishing the famed Moscow theater.

"Two travellers were marooned on some rocks by high tide. After their rescue they narrated their impressions. One remembered every little thing he *did*; how, why and where he went; where he climbed up and where he climbed down; where he jumped up or where he jumped down. The other man had no recollection of the place at all. He remembered only the *emotions* he felt. In succession came delight, apprehension, fear, hope, doubt and finally panic." (*Ibid.*, p. 166).

There is a tendency to leave out the emotional side of creativeness. Recapturing an emotion that once sped by like a rocket will always be a problem. And theologians know all too well how to spend their time chasing after the inspiration of the past. That is often as recoverable as childhood joys and first love elation. With abandon we must "bend our efforts to creating new and fresh inspiration for today." (*Ibid.*, p. 174).

Theology and the arts can be the arena of real life and living moods—the arena of the exchange of our thoughts and feelings, that which we have experienced. If we have experienced little, we will have little to share creatively. The frontier of the unexpected may bring the awareness that we find it much easier to represent ourselves as being in communion with God than actually communing with him. Art may provide a new, not always visible antennae, by way of which our emotions can be tuned in and allowed to break through in creative honesty. Once on such a wave length we may be enabled to "generate energy and excite a compelling devotion to the fulfillment of human potential." (International Artists Associates, Inc., pamphlet, *op. cit.*). That is what artistic experiences can do! That is why Dag Hammarskjold's

words of caution should be given careful scrutiny.

> "All first-hand experience is valuable, and he who has given up looking for it will one day find—that he lacks what he needs: a closed mind is a weakness, and he who approaches persons or painting or poetry without the youthful ambition to learn a new language and so gain access to someone else's perspective on life, let him beware." (*Markings*, trans. by Leif Sjöberg and W. H. Auden. Knopf, 1964, p. 114).

(3). The third is *the frontier of critical acumen*. Here we are not concerned with becoming *avant garde* or "arty." When the church popularizes art for those reasons or related ones, it is certainly wrong. Rather a study of the foundations of art is imperative for the theologian and the life of the church, because art and artistic values are relevant to everyday experiences, decisions and the pursuits of men throughout the world. Where life's character is often illusive, art is often precise and hence aids in the grasp and creation of the inner life of a human spirit. "The languages of art are of sufficient depth to assist profoundly in the access that groups and nations have to each other and to heighten the sense of commonality and caring" which may help stabilize our future. (International Artists Associates, Inc., pamphlet, *op. cit.*). Hence, a study of the foundations of art is part of the beginning work of every student theologian so that he may know the boundaries of art and theology and be equipped to make in depth judgments about the validity of art for theology and *vice versa*.

There are, however, some common stumbling blocks to the development of critical acumen as regards art and its relation to theology. They include (a) inviolability and (b) non-commitment.

(a). There is a common view of art prevalent in our time that it is inviolable, a holy of holies, which no one may trespass; "it cannot be questioned, because it belongs to the uniqueness of our time and it is the way that twentieth century man sees the world. This historistic fatalism is a trap—as if we were caught in some cultural pattern and could view life in no other way." (Rookmaaker, *Art and the Public Today*, p. 10).

Art has always had an important function in society but with the development of the attitude of inviolability it has reached the status of religion in our age. And artists themselves become engaged with the inviolability of themselves as artists and their art. Art supposedly possesses the mystique to reveal the most ultimate reality in an incomprehensible way.

(b). This attitude toward art leads to the second stumbling block—non-commitment. How does the theologian approach art? Is he committed to make a judgment about its content and its quality? Generally, no. While modern art is busy engaging itself with man's contemporary problems, most theologians generally demonstrate a reluctance to get involved. Perhaps since aesthetics generally deals with the theory of beauty and art, many art laymen feel inadequate and do not wish to make a judgment based on a storehouse of ignorance. If so, then our theological education is partially at fault here. Certainly to know something about the grammar, the structure and framework through which artistic expression takes

place is imperative for rectifying non-commitment, but even more, a willingness to criticize the content of art is necessary. Here is a taboo *par excellence*. It is very easy to neutralize everything in art into one huge universal culture by making quality the only criterion of art. (*Ibid.*, p. 80). "We have become accustomed to the idea . . . that everything in a gallery with a lamp above it and a name beneath it is art." (E. Kendall, "Pop Art," *Ranstaad*, 11-12 [1966], pp. 279-280).

The theologian must be committed to questioning the truth, the content of art, or else he himself avoids the spiritual struggle—he runs away from encounter with things as they actually are in Western culture.

Development of critical acumen must not be conceived as a mere intellectual exercise or else we will create only a new language for "arty" theological tabletalk. It has to do with the development of an artistic sense, which dismisses Abraham Maslow's earlier opinion with him, "Unconsciously I had assumed that creativeness was solely the prerogative of certain professionals." (*Toward a Psychology of Being*. Van Nostrand, 1962, p. 128).

What Alvin H. Reiss in *Culture and Company* says about the business-arts relationship also applies to the theology-arts relationship. The ripening of the "relationship and the more important matter of shaping individual quality depend, to a large degree on how well" theological institutions "prepare their students to achieve the very virtues which are inherent to the art process: the ability to render judgments, to make decisions, to recognize excellence, and to lead the way into the future." (*Culture and Company*. Twayne, 1972, p. 53).

(4). The fourth is *the frontier of affirmation and negation*. Theology and the arts should always stand in relation to one another in the context of creative tension. Christianity needs the kind of expression in art, for example, that will affirm biblical prophetic tradition while rejecting traditions which buttress injustice in the world, as well as its false prophets. It needs an expression in art which affirms man, his hopes and his institutions, while standing radically over against these. It needs an art which scrutinizes all terrestrial or celestial figures, forms and symbols, contemporary or biblical.

One of the finest examples of this type of artistic expression is Günter Rutenborn's play, *The Sign of Jonah*, one of the few contemporary Christian plays which successfully finds a viable dramatic form for Christian dialectic. "It produces an ambiguity as to whether we are in Nineveh or Babylon or Berlin or Chicago or at the Last Judgment, . . . whether we are the accusing or the accused." (Driver, *op. cit.*, pp. 143-144).

America has produced one of the world's finest dialectical playwrights, Tennessee Williams. While he does not take this form as far as did Berthold Brecht in his pentrating analyses of society in his plays, Williams certainly has juxtaposed the forces and problems in American society through irony, sarcasm and contrast with more success and consistency than most of his contemporary American colleagues.

On the frontier of affirmation and negation the Christian faith needs artistic expression which creatively calls into question beliefs, institutions, presup-

positions, while affirming God at the center of human existence taking on the form of man in Jesus Christ. And the church must be willing to stand the test of this creative tension of affirmation and negation which alone may perhaps adequately raise anew for man today the questions for which the church and its various theologies have always had the answers. Too often Christianity has sought to resolve all the tensions, when in fact faith alone has life amid tension.

For all that has been said about the contemporary scene of theology and art and its frontiers, Christianity's artists of the future and its progenitors of a new artistic sense must be done with mediocrity and the discipline of composition must have a firm foundation. Richard Stankiewicz suggested almost ten years ago something which needs to be reiterated today, especially in the context of the church, "Benefits from happenstance, either in life or art, are too infrequent to rely upon. Method, manner, message, material—all these become quickly dated. One thing that holds up a lot better is sound aesthetic construction." (R. Stankiewicz, "An Open Situation," from *Arts Yearbook 8*, published by *The Art Digest* of New York, 1965, reprinted in *The Arts in Communication of Faith*. Graded Press, 1969, p. 59). Where there is little interest in this foundation of art in the church, it will suffer from a cultural lag that will hamper its communication of the Christian faith.

III

In conclusion the question must be raised about centers of theological education: Are they places where the frontiers in theology and the arts can be explored? Indeed they are! They are in the business of developing the leaders of the church, whose character will be shaped largely by the motivation and competence of these young people. Hence, motivation is equally as important as information and what is learned in the classroom and seminar must be related to future living.

> "Part of this need can be met by incorporating into the educational process meaningful associations with professional persons who can stimulate creative energy, excite a spirit of excellence for its own sake, and actively demonstrate the power and joy of the disciplined skills demanded for performance in any vocation by any human being. The artist comes to the campus these days not as fringe benefit but as core curriculum, not to teach, not to preach, but to share. He comes to demonstrate his art, of course, but, more importantly, he comes as an articulate, deeply experienced representative of a highly competitive profession. He has much to say about the excitement and validity of challenge, struggle, discipline, persistence, conviction, achievement and victory." (International Artists Associates, Inc., pamphlet, *op. cit.*).

And the theological seminary is an important place to say it! Herein lies no doubt part of what is behind Nathan Scott's view of the artist as one of the theologian's most natural companions, "for it is the whole office of the artist to liberate the imagination and to train and educate us in the ways of feeling and sensibility." (Nathan Scott, "Art and The Renewal of Human Sensibil-

ity in Mass Society," in *Christian Faith and The Contemporary Arts, op. cit.*, p. 27).

It is not surprising that in the Spring, 1968, issue of *Theological Education*, in which there was a discussion of the proposed "cluster" system of theological training centers, there was a preliminary outline of a "Center in Theology and The Arts." If one examines the catalogues of the seminaries of America in almost every denomination, and non-denominational ones as well, he will find the fields of study outlined grossly neglected, with the exception of some creative work being done in religion and literature, as well as visual journalism. The article in *Theological Education* suggested more substantive lines of discussion and development than mere pragmatic means of communication, such as new films and plays. It raised some penetrating questions in a number of basic areas of instruction.

"The purpose of such a center is: (a) to stimulate the prophetic and humanizing function of the arts; and (b) to interpret the witness of the artistic community to the church.

Areas of Instruction

a. "*Language and Logic of the Arts.* Focus: How do persons involved professionally in the arts understand what they are doing? Course offerings in this area would be under the direction of a philosopher of art or art critic, or some person trained to reflect upon and analyze the world of art. Dialogue with practicing artists (supervisors) as well as student involvement at some point in the artistic enterprise would keep courses in this area from being merely theoretical aesthetics.

b. "*The Psychology and Sociology of Art.* Focus: What is the actual function of art within the total economy of the psyche and the polis? What is the psychological and political significance of art? What relationship exists between business, mass media, government, and the artistic community?

"Course offerings in this area would be under the direction of a sociologist especially trained to deal with the artistic community.

c. "*Diagnosis and Therapy.* Focus: What are the unique problems facing the artistic community? In what direction ought change to be encouraged? By what techniques may change be instigated?

"Courses in this area would be under the direction of an ethicist who would also be competent to deal with problems of power and techniques of change.

d. "*Theology and the Arts.* Focus: What does the language of theology have to contribute to diagnosis and therapy of the artistic community, and vice versa? What is the relationship between the moral, the aesthetic, and the holy?

"Course offerings in this area would be under the direction of a theologian, trained in theology *and* the arts. A biblical theologian would also be needed on a part-time basis.

e. "*The Christian Presence in the Artistic Community.* Exploration of this area would take place largely in small group discussions involving students, supervisors, and faculty." (Jesse H. Ziegler, editor *et al*, "Theological Curriculum for the 1970's," *Theological Education* IV [1968], pp. 707-708).

Any concerned theological community should be addressing itself to some of these questions. Their importance has been underscored by Nathan Scott in his article already cited.

> "The problem of life-style, of imaginative style, may well be one of the central issues facing the apologetic theologian in the years just ahead, and this is an issue to the settlement of which I am convinced he will not himself make any very helpful contribution unless he clearly perceives how closely he must cooperate with the most vigorous movement in the art of our time. . . . But now what we must recognize in the theological community is that it is not within the competence of the theologian as theologian to deal directly with the order of sensibility. This is, rather, the order in which the artist takes the steadiest, the most permanent, and the deepest interest." (*Op. cit.*, pp. 24, 25).

Doesn't the preparation and motivation for imaginative life-style belong to the life and educational process of our seminaries through which every year gifted men and women are passing—poets, writers, musicians, painters—young artists whose talents are vital to the life of the Christian church? But they usually remain untapped resources. They receive little or no encouragement from most theological curricula and communities. If they are inspired to contribute creatively to the church's ministry through the arts, it is usually almost completely out of personal motivation. It is as though the church were saying to them, "Go on and develop your talent and when you become proficient in it you can make a unique contribution to the life of the Christian community. And if you should become renowned, especially in the secular art world, you may even get written up as an 'unusual churchman or Christian' in a leading religious periodical." In other words, develop your creative consciousness in the world but not in the church! But where is the church's integrity? Must it force every artist into secular art to build a reputation, before it can accept him? It is tragic if the church thinks it is *avant garde* when it has surrounded itself with leading contemporary artists (and art), whom it avers have so much to contribute to the church. They may indeed, but theology also has its integrity and has something to say to the world of the artist. One hardly need plead for an "arty" church, which is the worst kind of hypocrisy for both artist and theologian. Suffice it to say, no seminary can be a school of fine arts and one should not hope for a colony of Christian artists "untainted" by secular art; but will the theological community become the open plain of frontiers in theology and the arts? Without human creativity, and I do mean artistic, we shall not be able to show the real validity of an art and life founded on Jesus Christ as Lord.

> "I said, ah! What shall I write?
> I inquired up and down
> (he's tricked before
> with his manifold lurking-laces).
> I looked for his symbol at the door.
> I have looked for a long while
> at the textures and contours
> I have run a hand over the trivial
> intersections.
> I have journeyed among the dead
> forms causation projects from
> pillar to pylon. I have tried the

eyes of the mind regarding the
colours and lights.
I felt for his wounds
in nozzles and containers.
I have wondered for the automatic
devices . . . I have tested the
inane patterns without prejudice.
I have been on my guard to not
condemn the unfamiliar . . . for it
is easy to miss him at the turn of
a civilization."

(David Jones, "Art and Sacrament," in *Catholic Approaches*, ed. by Lady Pakenham. Farrar, Strauss, Cudahy, 1955, p. 223).

CHAPEL TALKS

Freedom

by Lefferts A. Loetscher

The son of a leading churchman, author, and historian, the Rev. Lefferts A. Loetscher has been associated with Princeton Theological Seminary for thirty-five years. A graduate of Princeton University (A.B., 1925), Princeton Seminary (B.D. & Th.M., 1929), and the University of Pennsylvania (Ph.D., 1943), Dr. Loetscher served as professor of American Church History at Princeton from 1941 to 1974. An authority on the history of Presbyterianism, its theology and polity, he is the author of a number of books, including The Broadening Church *(University of Pennsylvania, 1954).*

"*If the Son makes you free, you will be free indeed*" (John 8:36 RSV).

It seemed peculiarly appropriate during our national Bicentennial Year that much consideration be given to the subject of freedom; indeed the more so because freedom is central to our Christian faith and also to our American political ideals. But there is a catch here, because freedom does not mean exactly the same thing in our Christian faith that it means in our American democracy; and yet there is a real parallel between Christian freedom and American political freedom.

Have you ever thought of the parallel that exists between the religious community and the political community? The church is a community which has over it a ruler, God. Similarly, a nation is a community which in earlier days had over it a king, today, in most nations, elected officials. The Bible itself implies this parallelism. The Bible speaks of God as King. There is executive power. The Bible refers to God as Lawgiver, which implies legislative authority. Elsewhere the Bible describes God as Judge, judicial power. What are these but the three branches of government as we know them in the Anglo-Saxon world, and more particularly in the United States of America. Or, to change the figure, every professing Christian wears two hats. One hat is his or her membership in the church; the other hat is citizenship in the state. But these two "hats" are worn on the same head, and inevitably ideas pass back and forth from the one area to the other—from religious thinking to political theory and *vice versa*. The relation between religious and political thought is like the "reversible reaction" of the chemist, with chemical action proceeding in both directions at once, symbolized by parallel arrows pointing in opposite directions. There is continual reciprocal influence between Christian theological thinking and political thinking, but they never become identical. The gospel in any era is not the mere product of any human culture, nor does any human culture become thoroughly "christianized." Nonetheless, important parallels between theology and political thinking continually emerge.

I

Jesus said, "Every one who commits sin is a slave to sin." We all know from sad experience what that means. How

often have we had grand, idealistic dreams only to find them fade in the noonday of life or become compromised in the marketplace. An old popular song put it this way: "I'm forever blowing bubbles, pretty bubbles in the air. They fly so high they nearly reach the sky; then, like my dreams, they fade and die." The Apostle Paul gave the sad truth poignant expression when he said, "I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do. . . . Wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death?" Some have argued that Paul was here speaking only of his pre-Christian life; others interpret it as a comment on his continuing experience. In either case, it is a classic statement of the human predicament.

Thank God for the great "buts" of the gospel! God has erupted into the river of human life to change its course. He has built a switch in the track to re-route the train. "Every one who commits sin is a slave to sin," said Jesus, *but*, he added, "if the Son makes you free, you will be free indeed." Freedom faces in two directions: freedom is *from* something, and freedom is *for* something. Jesus Christ frees from the guilt of sin, and he frees for full life. Toplady's hymn, "Rock of Ages," states it clearly: "Be of sin the double cure, cleanse me from its guilt and power." Guilt is not a popular word, but it is a stark reality to the psychiatrist who knows how terribly feelings of guilt damage the human psyche. It was quite in vain that guilt-ridden Lady Macbeth washed her hands and cried, "Out, damned spot! . . . All the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand." Her physician frankly confessed, "This disease is beyond my practice." Guilt cannot be talked away; it is too deeply rooted in the moral nature of reality. But Jesus Christ frees from the guilt of sin, and God has cast it behind his back. Christ also gives freedom *for* something. Freedom is an empty box, waiting to be filled. Christ gives freedom, to the extent of the believer's faith, to grow toward "the image of God," for which we were created. One can say reverently that this freedom—but only to the extent of our faith—is the kind of freedom which God Himself possesses. God cannot sin. This is the mark of his complete freedom. He has unhindered freedom to express his righteousness and holiness and grace and benevolence.

I was driving in the Adirondacks, speeding over a concrete road, when suddenly a doe and two fawns appeared ahead. I stopped the car suddenly. Then, realizing the danger of parking on a lane of fast moving traffic, I turned off onto the shoulder of the road, still keeping the deer in view. They stood frozen, like statues in a park, watching us. Then they turned and bounded off, disappearing into the nearby woods. I started the engine, but the car did not move. The wheels were churning in the mud of the road shoulder. We were marooned until a Good Samaritan came along with a chain and towed us back onto the highway. As long as the car kept to the road for which it was made it was free—free to move with speed and ease. But when it chose the mire of the road shoulder it lost its freedom.

Martin Luther as a devout medieval monk agonized in his cell in the effort to find a gracious God. But the more he struggled the more he became conscious of his sinfulness. A fellow monk reminded him of the clause in the

Apostles' Creed, "I believe in the forgiveness of sins." This helped a little, but it was not until he discovered that "the just shall live by faith" that he attained full Christian freedom. He now realized not only that he could not earn God's favor, but that he did not need to earn it—God gave him forgiveness and grace as a free gift. Three years after the start of the Reformation Luther wrote his famous treatise on Christian freedom, which contains the suggestive paradox that the Christian is the lord of all and subject to none, by faith; but is the servant of all and subject to every one, by love. On another occasion Luther stated the truth even more boldly: "Love God and do as you please." Luther's words were sometimes grossly misconstrued as endorsing licentiousness, but properly interpreted they are a commentary on Jesus' words, "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit." The good action of true faith is spontaneous and free.

II

American political freedom finds classical expression in the Declaration of Independence, where we read that "all men are created equal." That is not a statement of actualized fact, but a projection of a grand dream which beckons and commands us all, but which is still far from being realized. The Declaration goes on to say that all men "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." This phrase "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness" is reminiscent of the English philosopher John Locke, who said that government should be confined to the protection of life, liberty, and property. By substituting "the pursuit of Happiness" for "property," Jefferson and his colleagues greatly enriched the meaning. We certainly are not to understand by the phrase "the pursuit of happiness" that the republic was being founded to give its citizens an unending round of sensuous delights. Rather, these words hold out the promise that all should have the opportunity for the largest possible fulfillment of their humanity. This concept of freedom is not identical with Christian freedom. Christian freedom is far more profound and has a cosmic setting in divine redemption. The concept of American political freedom, on the other hand, is more universal and unconditional. But there is a notable parallel between these two ideas of freedom, because both seek—according to their quite different presuppositions—the highest fulfillment of human beings. The parallel is sufficiently close that Americans who are also Christians stand doubly committed to the American ideal of the fullest possible human life for all.

Three years ago we built a house on the edge of town. Last summer a young man working on a nearby lawn found an Indian relic and hurried over to show it to me. Other Indian relics have been discovered in the vicinity. This caused me to muse. Perhaps there once was an Indian wigwam on the very ground where our house now stands; or even an Indian village in the vicinity; or maybe there was here an Indian trail from the Delaware to the Hudson River paralleling the present line of New Jersey's largest cities. But there are no more Indians in the vicinity. They are all gone—pushed off the best lands in New Jersey as in most of our other states onto the bad lands and the waste

lands of the continent, their game gone, their culture almost destroyed. It is a long, sad story of broken treaties, white treachery and exploitation. Next to our enslavement of black Africans our treatment of the Indians is the darkest stain on American history. True, you and I individually had no part in this action. It was all very neatly completed before any of us were born. But the crucial point is that you and I continue to this day to benefit from this outrageous exploitation. The land we occupy, the minerals we mine, the agriculture and industry by which we prosper today have all in part been made possible by the exploitive action of those who preceded us. We cannot undo the past, even if we would. History is a one-way river. But we can, if we will, see to it that a greater measure of justice is belatedly given to the Indians, to the blacks, and to the millions of underprivileged white Americans who today have had little reason to join with us in the Bicentennial celebration of American freedom. We must face the fact that to bring about this belated justice will be extremely costly to us. It will mean nothing less than sharing our power and influence and a portion of our great wealth in order that all of our citizens may have the opportunity for the fullest development of their humanity.

I have sometimes been asking myself in recent months: What does it really mean to be a disciple of Jesus? The inquiry is a painful one, as I realize how far my scale of values differs from his. But let us hear the words of one who perhaps came as close as anyone in history to approximating Jesus' scale of values, the Apostle Paul. "Let this mind be in you," said the great apostle, "which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth." Jesus was completely free.

The Ministry of Administration

by Hugh B. Evans

A native of Ohio and son of a distinguished churchman, the Reverend Hugh B. Evans is an alumnus of Princeton University (A.B., 1938) and Princeton Theological Seminary (B.D., 1941). After several pastorates, including the Seventh Church, Cincinnati, O., Dr. Evans is presently the Executive Presbyter for the Presbytery of Scioto Valley. He gave this Chapel Talk, October 12, 1976, in Miller Chapel on the Seminary campus.

I Corinthians 12:4-7, 14-31

In inviting me to conduct this service, Dr. Macleod suggested I tell you "how a Presbytery Executive manages (!) to fill his day." If I knew how I would fill any average day, or if there ever were an average day, I would be delighted to do so. But after three years as an Executive Presbyter I have yet to have an "average day!" However, since Dr. Macleod has given me this suggestion regarding the scope of my talk this morning, I will try to reflect about the role of a Presbytery Executive or other judicatory persons within the life of the church.

I suspect that no minister, having accepted a call to a judicatory position after years in the pastorate, escapes some concerned well-wisher who asks, "Why have you left the ministry?" I must admit that I have done a good deal of thinking about the ministry of administration. Just putting it this way reveals that the word administration has a root meaning in "ministering to." In the passage just read, Paul notes that administration is among the gifts of the Spirit and lists administrators near the end, but still among those called and appointed by God. I suspect that Paul would probably look on administrators or church bureaucrats as "unpresentable" but "indispensable" parts of the body of Christ to be treated with "greater modesty" which apostles and prophets and teachers, being the "more presentable parts" do not require.

Essentially, the administrative role, whether in a local church or Presbytery, or in one of the more inclusive judicatories, is that of the pastoral role made effective by getting others to work together. When I was in seminary I did not pay much attention to the required course in church administration. It did not have the glamor or excitement of preaching or liturgics or counseling or teaching or the study of the Bible, theology or church history. But when I began my pastoral ministry, I soon found how much administrative skills were needed. How to raise the budget? How to work with the Women's Association? How to meet with the Session, Trustees and Deacons? And at times, how to cut a stencil and mimeograph a letter or bulletin, and even how to fire a balky furnace and take out the ashes! The ministry of administration is nothing less than the practical way of doing the Gospel in and through the structures of the church.

In my work as Executive Presbyter I see how many ministers falter and fail because they do not know good work habits, how to get things done

themselves and how to get others to fulfill their own unique ministries in and through the church. I find my work a calling of God, a pastoral role helping to make other pastors and churches effective. For instance, the neglect of competent administration in the area of ministerial relations results in the neglect of human beings who minister to the church and of churches where ministry is being carried out. And to those who demean the role of administration, I can only hope they will exegete the passage just read, for what they are saying is "I have no need of you!"

As part of the body of Christ, we begin to realize the reality of a connectional church. We know that our structure and place in the body may not be visible as muscles and skeleton are not visible, but that we enable the body to reach out, as our Lord commanded all of us, to the uttermost parts of the earth. We minister in this way so that Christ's will will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

Paul may be right in putting administrators relatively low on his totem pole of those called by God to serve. Administrators are and must be the servants of servants! Before one can be an administrator he or she must first know the full ministry of the parish, the preaching, pastoring, teaching, prophetic, apostolic role. But do not forget that the work of an administrator in the church must encompass all these others, and for some of us at least, and for some of you in the future, it is God's way of using our ministry within His Church.

As we pray together, I thought we might use one of the collects in the *Worshipbook*. But when I looked at the prayers there, the nearest I could find for administrators was "For those we may forget in prayer." We administrators do covet your prayers!

Let us pray:

How many are the ways we serve within your church, O God. Some are called by you as prophets, teachers, workers of miracles, healers, helpers, administrators, speakers in various kinds of tongues. Watch over all who serve you in the church, who promote the gospel of your Son our Savior. Do not let any think themselves lesser or greater than others, but show them that their gifts are needed in the one ministry of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is head of the Church.

Unite us in love and service. Remember those who serve in distant and difficult places in your name. Uphold them in their ministries. Be with those who serve you beyond the institutions of the church in business and labor, in helping professions, in homes and families, or farms and in the busy cities and towns, in remote places and nearby. May they see in all they do the honoring of your name, the fulfilling of your will, the ministering to human needs, and the exhibition of the kingdom of heaven to the world, in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Paradox of Holy Week

by W. D. Davies

A native of Carmarthenshire, England, the Reverend W. D. Davies is an alumnus of Cambridge University and since 1966 has been the George University Ivey Professor of Christian Origins at Duke University Divinity School. Dr. Davies taught at Princeton University 1955-1959 and at Union Theological Seminary (New York) 1959-1966. He is a member of a number of learned societies and the author of ten books as well as many articles and reviews.

Isaiah 49:1-9a; I Cor. 1:18-31; John 12:37-50

The suffering of Christ in his passion is beyond our full comprehension. It is, therefore, justifiable to call the week preceding that passion Holy Week; but it is holy only as it refers to Jesus. Historically it was a most unholy week when political and religious authorities combined to put Jesus out of the way. In another sense it has very often been unholy. Millions of Jews throughout the centuries have dreaded its occurrence and endured with terror the countless pogroms which Holy Week has provoked. To some the passion narratives in the Gospels are among the tap roots of antisemitism. Holy Week presents us with a paradox: it has been an unholy holy week.

I begin with this paradox because it points to a struggle in which we all have to engage, that of trying to understand the suffering of God's emissaries.

It is this struggle that finally occupies the three passages from scripture read to us. Separated as they are in time and space, all three share certain fundamental assumptions. In all three, mankind is regarded as somehow having lost the way. In Is. 49 the nations need to be enlightened; in I Cor. 1 the existing order needs to be overthrown; in John the darkness of this world is assumed, darkness being a primordial symbol of evil. But equally certain all three passages imply that our human existence is not simply subject to a blind succession of events which have no meaning. However dark the shadows, behind our life stands One who keeps watch over it. The peoples are under his control; He holds the whole world in his hands. That One is no absentee landlord or deistic foreigner to his own universe. He has a purpose and He intervenes in History. All these convictions lie behind our three passages. All three also have one characteristic in common: they all present a paradox. Each paradox is differently expressed and yet is profoundly related to the others.

I

The Paradox of the Elect Reject

The first passage, Is. 49:1 and following, presents the paradox of what I shall call "The Elect Reject" or "The Chosen Reject." Here a figure called the Servant is addressed. He is mysterious, because it is impossible certainly to identify him. Is he the people of Israel as a whole? Do we here encounter the mission of the Jewish people in human history?

Or is the Servant an ideal Israel or a true Israel, a Remnant, set apart from and over against Israel as a whole? Or is the Servant an individual, a prophet or some historical figure, known or unknown? Recently he has even been seen as representing the city of Jerusalem itself. There is no clear answer as to who the Servant is. But it is through this figure that God fulfills His purpose. God has prepared the Servant for his appointed task, called him from his mother's womb, that is, predestined him. God has endowed him with a sharp tongue so that he is like a polished arrow, a figure of effective purpose. God has concealed him in a hidden way, so as to train him secretly for his task. That task is, first, to untie the broken life of his own people and to gather those of them that were in exile. But, secondly, the Servant's destiny has wider horizons: its scope is not simply national. The Servant carries on the purpose of God, not in a corner, but in the sight of the coasts and islands of the earth, and of peoples far away. He is to be the light of the nations, God's agent to bring salvation to the earth's farthest bounds.

Is all this the dream of a megalomaniac, the fantasy of the sick arrogance of a people suffering from a superiority complex born of its "chosenness"? By implication, some have so understood Deutero-Isaiah: it is a document of an insatiable Jewish nationalism or a holy jingoism. There is one aspect of the Servant's existence which makes it difficult to accept such a view. Jingoists are seldom uncertain of themselves; they are usually cockily arrogant. But, despite his world-wide mission under the purpose of God, this Servant knows disillusion.

> I have laboured in vain.
> I have spent my strength for nothing, [to no purpose].

Not only has the Servant come to think little of himself: he has become an object of contempt among the nations.

Here lies the paradox of the first passage. Predestined for a glorious mission *to* the world, the Servant cuts a pitiable, inglorious figure *in* that world. He is a chosen reject.

But in Deutero-Isaiah the paradox is resolved. Though now an object of contempt, there will come a day when the tables will be turned. To put it crudely, the Servant will get his own back.

> Thus says the Holy One, who ransoms Israel, the one who thinks little of himself, whom every nation abhors, the slave of tyrants: When they see you, kings shall rise, Princes shall rise and bow down.

The suffering of the Servant is temporary. The power of God will manifest itself through him to inaugurate a period of triumph. The purpose of God, though for a time involving suffering for the Servant, leads to his earthly vindication. The paradox is resolved in a future dénouement; as it is also, more subtly, in Is. 53.

II

The Paradox of the Foolish Wisdom

When we turn to the second passage, that from Paul in I Cor. 1:18-31, we encounter another paradox: the folly of the cross is wisdom. In this passage there can be no question that the central figure is an individual person, Jesus of Nazareth, who had been nailed to a cross. As with the Servant in Is. 49, Jesus did not suffer in a corner. Al-

though he died like a common criminal, his cross was placarded before the world. The folly of his dying and of the tremendous claims made for its significance was apparent to Jews and Greeks. Paul asserts that this foolish dying figure on the cross revealed the wisdom of God; indeed is the very wisdom of God. The Apostle claims that the power and wisdom of God encounter us here, at this very point where Christ stooped most. This is the way that God acts: he comes to us in the weakness and brokenness of Christ. The hackneyed phrase that the Gospel is the transvaluation of all values is true. Paul subordinates all things—miracles, supernatural gnosis, wisdom, power, the pride of pedigree, high-birth, the established order—to a man nailed to a cross, whose folly is wisdom.

Like the Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, the Jesus of Paul was depised and rejected of men. But Deutero-Isaiah, as we saw, looked forward to a future reversal of the Servant's plight, when the despised would become the honoured, the suffering would be annulled. Does Paul regard the cross of Jesus in the same way, that is, as a temporary phase whose tension would be resolved at a future dénouement in which the cross would be undone and the Christ cease to suffer? In I Cor. 1:18-31 there is no suggestion of a public reversal in history of the situation of the crucified. True, Christ's cross is to overthrow the existing order. But this was not to be by any outward revolution which would slay his foes and lift him high. The revolution of the cross was of a different order. The benefits of Christ's passion are a new life here and now "in Christ." Those who formerly were low, contemptible, mere nothings, have now "in Christ" been given righteousness, consecration, freedom. A new dimension of life has opened up to them which has a dynamic to overthrow the things that are: through the folly and weakness of the cross, they have spiritual power. In I Cor. 1:18-31 there is nothing to suggest that the cross is simply a past phenomenon: Christ is still nailed to the cross. The Greek in I Cor. 1:17 points to our dilemma here.

> *οὐ γὰρ ἀπεστειλέν με Χριστὸς βαπτίζειν ἀλλὰ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου, ἵνα μὴ κενωθῇ ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ:*

the last words the N.E.B. renders by "so that the fact of Christ on his cross might have its full weight." Paul preaches the fact of Christ on his cross. The tense of *Χριστὸς ἐσταυρωμένος* must be given full weight. It is not *aorist* but perfect: Christ is still being crucified.

Later in I Cor. 15, Paul does look forward to a reversal. But the nature of this reversal has to be carefully scrutinized. It occurs in the context of the discussion of the resurrection of the dead. Primarily at least, Paul is concerned not with reversing the suffering of Jesus Christ so that suffering can be conceived of as over and done with, but with asserting that in the End, God will be all in all and even Christ himself subject to Him. Up to that End, Christ is involved in struggle: he is allowed no discharge from his suffering ministry. He puts his enemies under his feet, but these enemies Paul conceived of primarily in demonic terms, and it is through Christ's very suffering and that of those who are to share it with him, who have to fill up the measure of his

suffering, that he does this: Christ's suffering continues to the End.

As over against Is. 49, therefore, Paul does not so consciously seek to resolve the paradox that he faced. True, at the End, all paradox will be resolved when God is all in all. But until that happens, the cross remains integral to Paul's preaching, indeed to its heart: the suffering of Christ continues. Even the resurrection is not presented by Paul as the resolution of the paradox. It is a continuance beyond death of the ministry of Jesus because the Living Lord continues to suffer with his own. When in Philippians 2 Paul speaks of every knee bowing to Jesus, he is thinking not of political subservience to him but religious acknowledgement of him as the Crucified Lord. Perhaps there are echoes of the theme of the resolution of the paradox in terms of the future in I Cor. 15 and Phil. 2: but we can at least claim that Paul began to process where the cheap, easy resolution of the paradox of Christ's suffering by an escape into futurism come to be questioned. That process, present I think in Paul, is carried to its conclusion in the third passage, from John 12:37-50 which, along with other Johannine passages, deals with the paradox in another way.

III

The Paradox of the Word made Flesh

If in Isaiah 49 God's emissary, the Servant, could possibly be taken as Israel, in John 12, starting with the 37th verse, the majority in Israel, though not all, are set against Jesus. John understands the person and ministry of Jesus in terms of the Servant, but he passes beyond that category to find in Jesus the very presence of God himself.

> "When a man believes in me, he believes in him who sent me rather than in me; seeing me, he sees him who sent me."

Christ is the light of the world—the function assigned to the Servant: he brings the ultimate judgment. The thought that the cross of Christ needs to be reversed and Jesus vindicated on the external plane of history does not occur. The cross is the ultimate glory: Christ's humiliation was his glorification: the cross was and is the crown of Jesus. There is no need to look for another crown. That would be to think as the world thinks, and the Christian's ultimate crown is to share in Christ's suffering—his continuing suffering. Christ remains on the cross to draw men to him: he is the Lamb of God who is now taking away the sins of the world. *Ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου.* The present participle must be given full weight. John makes no escape into futurism to resolve his paradox of the glory of God in the broken flesh of Jesus. He leaves it there for us to live with. The glory of the Risen Lord is the glory of the suffering Christ, and the Risen Lord takes up and continues, in suffering, the work of the earthly ministry of Jesus: the cross is the eternal throne of Christ. We might say that John refuses to see a paradox in the Suffering Servant of the Lord.

I suggest, then, that these three texts progressively reveal a wrestling with the suffering of God's emissary, and finally with that of Christ. The wrestling ends in the recognition that the cross is part of the purpose of God from the beginning: it is not for us to try to escape it but to recognize in it the ultimate glory.

Talk is cheap. Far be it from me to suggest that we can participate to any very significant degree in this cross: the cross is for our need before it is for our deed. Yet if we agree with Paul and John in these verses, foreshadowed as they are by Deutero-Isaiah, to be a Christian is to believe that the glory of God lies in the cross of Jesus and to seek to take it up daily. If we recognize that the taking up of the cross can never be the infliction of harm on others but the taking of it upon ourselves, the struggle to which I have referred must still go on in our hearts. We all have a long way to go. If we had recognized this, Holy Week would not have been unholy for Jews or for any others to whom it has, alas, been such. Lord have mercy upon us; Christ have mercy upon us.

The God Who Is There

by Leon O. Hynson

Author, minister, and educator, Leon O. Hynson is president of the Evangelical School of Theology, Myerstown, Penna. Dr. Hynson is an alumnus of a number of graduate schools, including Princeton (Th.M., 1966) and the University of Iowa (Ph.D., 1971) and a contributor to many journals including Religion in Life *and the* Journal of Ecumenical Studies. *This Good Friday sermon was given in 1976 at the Berkshire Mall, Reading, Penna.*

In the words of Psalm 22:1, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me," we gain insight into a universal human experience—man listening for the voice of God.

In his great work, *Man in God's World*, Helmut Thielicke, the German theologian-preacher, tells of three years of spiritual fellowship during the air raids on Berlin. Night after night thousands gathered to hear the word of God. As the bombings proceeded, one church after another collapsed or burned. Still the people came. During one service in an overcrowded hall, the alarm sounded. Thielicke gave the benediction, the organist played an evening hymn and the people left quietly for the shelters. The last person to leave, Thielicke barely reached the shelter. During the raid the organist was killed. Dr. Thielicke writes of these hours of spiritual communion: "It was an overwhelming time for me. Never since have I experienced such intense listening." (Pp. 8-9).

For what were they listening? For political solutions? For an end to the sounds of horror? For the voice of peace? Yes! But above all and in all—THE VOICE OF THE ETERNAL, whose kingdom reigns when man's trembles, crumbles, dies. When foundations are shaking, one listens for the voice of God.

The biblical writer understood this basic ineradicable dimension of the human spirit, voicing it in the memorable words: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Why art thou so far from helping me. . . ? O my God, I cry in the daytime, but thou hearest not. . . ? The Psalter is describing *the depth of silence!*

This seems to be the burden of humanity. Man does not commonly hear the voice of God, it is assumed. Only people whose sanity is suspect hear supernatural voices. Secular man hears other sounds, other voices, but God seems to be silent. The *depth of silence* is the experience of humanity.

Man

Man in isolation from man and from God is the theme of biblical and secular literature. Adam hides from the presence of God. Cain, the murderer, journeys through the earth as a fugitive from society. At Babel the human community is splintered—communication is confused (thus Bābel), societies are divided. Men hear sounds but there is no meaning.

Job, the ancient sufferer, listens for God and looks for him, but he cannot find him. "O that I knew where I might find him! that I might come even to his seat! . . . I would know the words which he would answer me, and understand what he would say unto me. . . .

Behold, I go forward, but he is not there, and backward, but I cannot perceive him; on the left hand, where he doth work, but I cannot behold him: he hideth himself on the right hand, that I cannot see him" (Job 23:3, 5, 8-9).

There is an "infinite qualitative distinction between God and man" which man cannot overcome. Like Jesus' parable of the rich man in Hades, "there is a great gulf fixed" over which man cannot pass. The awesomeness of hell, it seems, is the loss of fellowship—the sounds of silence.

The classic story of man's isolation is Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*. In its original version the novel is an intensely Christian work, and might be called an allegory of man's loss of communion with the voice of man and of God. The entire story is a soliloquy. Never during twenty-six years does Robinson address another human person or God, although he recurrently thinks of both. "This island of solitude," he calls it, evokes the "strange longing":

> "Oh, that there had been but one or two, nay or but one soul, . . . to have escaped with me, that I might have one companion, one fellow-creature to have spoken to me and to have conversed with! In all the time of my solitary life, I never felt so earnest, so strong a desire after the society of my fellow creatures, or so deep a regret at the want of it."
>
> "I believe I repeated the words, 'Oh that it had been but one! a thousand times; and my desires were so moved . . . that . . . my hands would clinch together and my fingers would press the palms of hands, . . . and my teeth in my head would strike together, and set against one another so strong, that for some time I could not part them again.' "

Israel

The silence of God has often been the experience of Israel throughout the centuries. In calling Israel to be the chosen nation, God laid an awesome burden upon this people. Chosen, yes! And overwhelmingly obligated! Unable to escape it—to run and hide. So, in the midst of this struggle which continues even until today, the Hebrew people, the Jews, Israel listens for the voice of God.

"Why have you deserted us? O God of Abraham?" Why? Why don't you answer when we call?

Is God dead? Has the "death of God" become a reality? Some Jewish people have concluded that this is so. Elie Wiesel, who lived through the horrors of the concentration camps states this belief most painfully in his work *Night*:

> Never shall I forget the little faces of the children, whose bodies I saw turned into wreaths of smoke beneath a silent blue sky.
> Never shall I forget those flames which consumed my faith forever.
> Never shall I forget that nocturnal silence which deprived me, for all eternity, of the desire to live.
> Never shall I forget those moments, which murdered my God and my soul and turned my dreams to dust.
> Never shall I forget these things, even if I am condemned to live as long as God himself. Never.

But others went through the tragedy and knew God to be there. The Hasidim, a Jewish pacifist people, believed

that they like Job of old, must accept both good and evil as the will of God. And so they went as lambs to the slaughter and hushed the fears and tears of their children saying: "Soon we shall be with God in his house." So they died—some 300,000. And God was there, although we are reduced to awe in the confession of this faith.

Calvary

It was on Golgotha, the place of a skull, where converged the most profound sense of isolation and silence, *and* the presence of God.

At Golgotha, the silence of God thunders forth. As we must know *silence speaks* and so it did there. In the forsakenness of Christ, we perceive that Jesus shares in the alienation and displacement of man—He walks where we walk—hangs helpless before death as we do, groans in deep pathos as we do—"My God, my God, why?"

The truth is that our questions are sometimes left dangling—hanging from a cross we might say. His cross and ours! Calvary shows us that when all seems lost, when life "tumbles in," when silence seems as deep as the grave and death and hell, God is there.

Our experiences of toil, suffering, isolation, fear, and death are at Calvary borne by Christ. In the silence of Calvary, when God seems to have forsaken His Son, a voice speaks and solitude is vanquished: "Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit." So God was there all the while! And he is here! Listen! He speaks to forgive, to love, to bear us through death unto eternal life. Perhaps we do not hear God because we have not listened. Terrified by silence, we fill our lives with sound. That these sounds often have no form or dimension, no color or beauty, scarcely seems to matter. Our lives become vacuous like the "simple godless men" in T. S. Eliot's *The Rock*, "whose only monument is the asphalt pavement and a thousand lost golf balls."

We acknowledge that the cross of Christ overlooks our world and casts its shadow of crisis across our paths. Once more we are able to hear the words from the cross and in the spoken word know the power and glory which resides behind, above and before the silence. In that power and glory we live! Amen!

Ministry—or Magic?

by Rodney J. Hunter

A native of Detroit, Michigan, the Reverend Rodney J. Hunter is an alumnus of Yale University (A.B., 1962) and Princeton Theological Seminary (B.D., 1965; Ph.D., 1973). Dr. Hunter is a member of the faculty at Candler School of Theology, Emory University, in the department of pastoral theology. He serves also as director of Candler's in-course Doctor of Ministry program and is review editor for Pastoral Theology.

For me one of the most fascinating insights to come from the psychoanalytic movement concerns the phenomenon of resistance. Freud and his successors repeatedly observed that persons who sought their professional help invariably ended up—quite unconsciously—devising complex and subtle means of undermining and defeating the therapeutic process itself. Analytic patients would withhold important information about themselves, distort or fabricate personal data, attempt to distract, deceive, or oppose the work of analysis, repeatedly forget or become confused about appointment times, withhold payment of fees, and so on. Such deep, unconscious resistance to therapeutic improvement suggests that patients would rather suffer than get better—a point Freud eventually elaborated in his celebrated (if questionable) concept of the "death instinct."

One need not agree with that hypothesis or engage in psychoanalytic practice to appreciate the wider significance and truth of the basic insight. I myself am continually surprised and impressed, not only in my counseling work but in my teaching, at the depth, power and complexity of resistance to constructive change, whether the change is personal or cultural and intellectual. And I am sure that parish ministers and others would readily agree that resistance is everywhere apparent in the church and a continuing source of frustration in ministry. What minister has not been frustrated by lay apathy, failure to carry out commitments, or the obstruction of meetings and programs by "troublesome" individuals whose irrationalities interfere with the smooth functioning of an institution? In any case there is usually deep resistance to social and personal change of any kind even when change is professed to be desirable (which often it is not), and the minister's conscientious and well-meaning attempts to promote it are often misinterpreted or irrationally resisted. Such resistances often focus on the minister personally.

But despite the pervasiveness of resistance in the church and the frustration it produces in ministry, most ministers do not take the phenomenon with enough seriousness or understand it in sufficient depth. Instead they assume that there must be ways and means of getting around it or working through it, and when these fail, tend to resort to various unconscious, but nonetheless potent hopes and magical illusions concerning the effectiveness of their preaching, teaching, and pastoral counseling for dispelling it. When this happens ministry fails to understand and acknowledge the real nature, depth, and power of resistance and thereby

fails to relate the Gospel faithfully to the human condition precisely at the points where it is most relevant and most needed.

To put it another way, the measure of a person's ministry is the way in which he or she responds to the tough, stubborn reality of motivational resistance to its aims and ideals. Ultimately everything in ministry, I would be willing to say, turns on how one relates to resistance, for the mode of response in situations where ministry appears to be blocked and the purposes of the church obstructed not only determines the practical "effectiveness" of one's ministry, but, more important, determines its religious significance and ultimate Christian integrity.

Magic in the Ministry

I realize the oddness of my assertion that ministers often do not take resistance seriously enough or understand its importance sufficiently. Ministry very largely consists of coping with one form of resistance or another most of the time. Yet the coping, in my view, is often based on assumptions that underestimate its power. These include the belief that resistance is basically a practical problem that will yield to good leadership technique, or a moral problem for which admonition and exhortation are the answer, or a rational problem calling for education and persuasion, or a personal and emotional problem susceptible to the blandishments of individual pastoral care. Such assumptions have in common the belief that resistance, at least in principle, is not only manageable but soluble, that it presents an impediment to ministry, but not one of such magnitude as to make ministry really impossible. In addition it is usually assumed that these impediments interfere with ministry but that if they can be successfully managed the real work of ministry can get on about its proper business. (A corollary concerning the church is the view that if only the folks could get committed to its corporate life and mission the church could begin really being the church—a view roughly comparable to Governor Lester Maddox's famous lament that the problem with the Georgia prison system was its low class of prisoner.) The difficulty with these views lies in their attempt to circumvent the reality and central significance of the *problem*—the resistance—and to make ministry concerned with something else, or concerned with the resistance in an unrealistic way.

This usually happens by indulging in magical expectations of the functions of ministry—such expectations being magical in a purely unconscious way yet all the more powerful for being so. For instance, there is a common belief among ministers that preaching changes people, or at least that "good preaching" does. Such preaching is said to combine a strong biblical thrust with good illustrative material and personal charisma, and be capable of influencing persons at their deepest levels of meaning and motivation, if not indeed "changing their lives." This conviction, so sacred to preachers, persists despite ample evidence to the contrary. People listen to sermons episodically and impulsively, remember rather little of what they hear (even shortly after delivery), and often "hear" a quite different "sermon" from the one the preacher thought he or she delivered.

The only way to account for the tenacity of this conviction is to assume that it meets certain needs in the preachers themselves (perhaps also in their congregations). What these are we can only guess, but I would suggest that a fundamental impulse toward the illusion that preaching changes people comes from the ministers' frustration with human resistance to the Gospel. If all else fails during the week is it not at least reassuring to know that a "powerful sermon" can accomplish in the realm of stubborn human realities —sin—what the more patient and less dramatic efforts at leadership, education, administration, and pastoral care cannot do?

Such magical illusions about preaching become rationalized through theologies of inspiration and biblical authority that make it quite impossible—or almost impossible—to detect their unconscious origins. Thus, preachers and their congregations can perpetuate one another's illusions that change is possible or that they are changing when in fact the whole dynamic is masking their mutual frustration and despair over their "caught-ness" in resistances that inwardly defeat each other, themselves, and the work of the church. This is possible even (and perhaps especially) when there appear to be dramatic evidences to the contrary—changed lives, energetic programs, and the rest. Such evidences may or may not withstand deeper scrutiny, for often outward change conceals inward resistance; new compulsions are substituted for old—or, more often, corporate compulsions and resistances replace individual ones.

This is not to deny that preaching may actually be meaningful and significant in quite valid and lasting ways. But I tend to think that preachers are tempted to a certain immodesty in estimating its real capacity to dissolve the resistances of the human heart—even when their theology piously attributes such possibilities to the work of the Spirit. Unconscious magic knows no bounds theologically, and the employment of theological doctrine to support illusory beliefs inevitably corrupts theology itself by positing God as a kind of magician himself—one who is able to intervene magically in human lives and somehow "change" them. The problem with such theology is that it violates our integrity as human beings and, I think, profoundly misunderstands the way God saves humankind (more on this to follow).

Similar illusions occur in Christian education and pastoral care. As both an educator and counselor myself I am particularly fascinated by my own susceptibility to magic and illusion in these areas, and suspect that many ministers are also. It is so tempting to believe that a new course or a new curriculum —or even an old one—will set things straight in this world and make significant advances on the problems of ignorance and foolishness. Of course no serious educator believes such nonsense—yet we all do, cherishing in one degree or another the belief that what we do in our classrooms somehow matters decisively in the lives and fortunes of our students, most of whom are moderately interested in and respectful of our efforts, but more likely to remember our personal idiosyncracies than any truths we utter. In ministry the comparable illusion is that social and personal change can be decisively accomplished

through education, that resistance to these challenges is basically a matter of ignorance and misunderstanding. After all, who can long resist logic and the facts?

The problem is, everybody can. Experiments have shown that under quite ordinary psychological circumstances highly trained mathematicians could be induced to falsify their calculations even to themselves, and large audiences of very intelligent, sophisticated people could be led to evaluate a lecture, consisting of literal nonsense and logical inconsistency, as a work of high intellectual achievement. But clever experiments of this sort are hardly necessary to demonstrate the limitations of education when it comes to challenging and changing persons in significant ways. As a teacher I am continually impressed—if not embarrassed—by the many subtle maneuvers that I and my students concoct, quite unwittingly most of the time, to avoid the tough business of learning. We resist thinking problems through clearly, digging up real evidence to support positions, and acknowledging when we do not know or understand something felt to be really important—as if ignorance were a sin to be avoided rather than a problem to be faced. Education, which in my understanding is supposed to be concerned with critical inquiry, time and again becomes one form of indoctrination or another as we attempt to instill our views in students rather than explore problems or master material critically.

What these considerations indicate is that education, like preaching, is constantly tempted to indulge in illusions designed to solve by magic the stubborn resistances of the soul to truth and goodness. And I might add that the same temptations, with appropriate modifications, beckon us in the area of pastoral care and counseling as well. Here the illusion is that psychology and psychotherapeutic methods, or simply a warm heart, can achieve what the other forms of ministry cannot, that is, provide the basic answer for dealing with resistance. No doubt that many ministers are attracted to counseling ministries out of such magical yearning, only then to encounter in actual training experiences the painful limitations of what can and cannot be accomplished. Yet illusions die hard; more experience, more knowledge, more "growth as a person" or whatever is thought to hold the key to success. Such "illusions" affect even the most sophisticated and experienced counselors, and I sometimes feel, as many of the wiser in my field have said, that at the most basic levels of need "there isn't a damn thing we can do to help." But unmasking the clinical illusion to that extent is too scary for most of us and we push ahead with our hopes and illusions of being able to make a really basic lasting difference.

Whatever the form, magic in ministry simultaneously underrates the really dreadful depth and power of resistance while oddly, indirectly, bearing testimony to its uncanny unconquerability. For why are we driven to illusion and magic if not because what we dimly sense we are up against in ministry—in any work with people—is more than we can handle? Remotely felt impotence, helplessness and rage at the persistence of defeating and resisting forces in human life gives birth to magic and illusion. To admit that we are struggling in ministry with realities that we cannot conquer, with resistances that

seek to undermine and defeat all higher purposes, is an insight we can scarcely bear. For in that case ministry would be quite helpless and our efforts ultimately futile.

The Cross—God's Answer to Magic

The answer—at least the Christian answer—requires coming to terms with the persistence, inevitability, and unconquerability of resistance. Nothing short of this can deliver us from the flight into illusion; and only full acknowledgment of the depth and power of resistance can allow ministry to proceed faithfully and authentically. This is because acknowledging its inevitability and unconquerability means recognizing that we have to do here with a problem that exceeds ordinary dimensions. Though both practical and moral in nature, it exceeds practicality and morality and is therefore appropriately understood as an aspect of the human condition as such. We are indeed not up against flesh and blood but principalities and powers, meaning realities of an ultimate, inclusive, theological nature. The myriad resistances large and small that challenge, undermine, and frustrate our ministries at every turn are therefore expressions of the central human dilemma which ministry is all about and are not mere impediments on the way to something else. Thus nothing short of a genuine theological understanding and a theologically informed ministry can be adequate in response.

But what kind of response? It seems to me that Christian ministry has fundamentally the task of engaging the contrary, destructive forces of human life on a qualitatively different plane from the one on which they operate, acknowledging fully their persistence, inevitability, and unconquerability but not according them ultimacy. Resistance is unwittingly granted ultimate status in ministry whenever we either despair (because our best intentions are always twisted and defeated) or resort to magic and illusion in a desperate attempt to overpower the overpowering. In either case the contrariness of the human soul, our entrenched determination to defeat ourselves and one another, gets the best of us and we end up inwardly worshipping its power to destroy and defeat.

Furthermore, we devise theologies that unwittingly pay the same tribute by conceiving of God as a superior Power who meets the problem of the human soul by an act of power, magically intervening to do what we cannot. Many honored and traditional theologies have expressed one version or another of this fantasy, for humankind ever longs for a God who has the power and the will to do things our way only more effectively. But in reality no such God comes except in our magical illusions, where for a time we may gain a sense of such power in ministry, and secretly exult in the theological grandiosity about ourselves that it entails. Yet in the end this is not truth but illusion; it is not ministry but demonics. For the truth of things in Christian faith does not entail a magical God or an equally magical ministry that can forcibly change the mysterious intractable realities of the cosmos or the human soul and its sin. Instead, the truth is a Man dying on a cross, and true ministry finds its life and hope only in the way of the cross.

This means that true ministry begins where we usually think it ends, in the

midst of human resistance and contrariness. What distinguishes it is not the mighty works we would like to perform or feel we have performed, but a certain quality of involvement and identification with sin itself, grounded in trust that Christ himself is there so nothing can ultimately separate us from God's love in him. This faithful involvement, this loving identification, is all there is and, in some basic sense, all there needs to be.

There is of course a continuing need in ministry as in all higher endeavors to struggle against sin, to wrestle with resistance, to curb its effects and make such temporal improvements as may be possible. Preaching, teaching, caring, and other functions of ministry go on and their efforts are not necessarily futile; God enables us to prosper even in our sinful state. But what distinguishes these activities as Christian ministry, insofar as they are genuinely Christian in given instances, is that they hold no illusions about the nature of the problem, its irrational depth and power, but rather see it for what it is and enter ultimately and faithfully into it. Thus the crux of ministry is the faith, hope, and love we express when, instead of pushing against resistance, we identify with and involve ourselves in it. This action refuses to let it alienate us from one another, even as God in Christ has identified himself comprehensively with us in the fullness and forcefulness of our sin.

In practical terms this can be seen, for instance in teaching, when the teacher responds to learning resistance not basically by punishing (though "grading" or its diagnostic equivalent is essential) but by focusing on the resistance itself, allowing it, standing with the student in it, exploring it, and so on. Most teaching ends at the point of student resistance and failure (and discipline or other expressions of teacher or faculty frustration take over); but good teaching only begins there. Does this mean that good teaching can only be done with failing students? Yes, because all students (and professors) are failing students in the sense that unless one's ignorance and foolishness are in some measure exposed and addressed nothing of significance will be learned. Good teaching means sharing openly in the anxieties of being fellow failing students, of seeking knowledge and wisdom in the midst of confessed ignorance and foolishness.

What this view of ministry might mean for other functions of ministry cannot be elaborated adequately here though some indications can be given. One minister of my acquaintance experimented along these lines with a church committee that had become frustrated and demoralized, was seldom meeting, and seemed unable to carry out its task. Interpreting this situation as a phenomenon of resistance, he established a consultative relationship with the chairperson, and later with the committee as a whole, in which her own resistance and that of the members was explored on several occasions. This approach implicitly interpreted their frustration as potentially meaningful and valuable in itself, thus undermining its apparent power to destroy. Eventually they found a way to get on with their mission—and became a more authentically Christian community with one another in the process.

In pastoral care and counseling a similar principle applies. Good care and counseling do not end when persons

refuse to cooperate in the personal quest, but the refusal becomes itself the occasion for ministry and in fact can become the opening for significant deepening of purpose, insight and faith. What people most expect, in counseling or any other form of ministry, is to be abandoned when they resist our care; but Christian faith speaks of the God who allows nothing ultimately to separate himself from us even when resistance is at its height.

Likewise, in preaching this principle could well find its expression in greater honesty from the pulpit about life as it is, greater realism about our common plight, and a simple word of grace concerning the possibility we have of finding true life and hope within rather than beyond things as they are. Such a word will not bring the comforts of illusion, but may bring for those who will hear it a peace that passes understanding—because it surpasses, in the way the cross surpasses, the way we understand ourselves.

The Holy Spirit and the People of God in the Theology of Joseph Haroutunian

by Omar Otterness

An alumnus of the University of Illinois (A.B., M.A.), Luther Theological Seminary (B.D.), and the University of Chicago (Ph.D.), the Rev. Omar G. Otterness is an associate professor at Saint Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota. Dr. Otterness served pastorates in California, South Dakota, Illinois, and Wisconsin, and spent a year in missionary work in China. As a student of world religions he has done research in India, China, and at the Center for the Study of World Religions at Harvard University.

Joseph Haroutunian devoted much of his theological career to reflection on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. It is the church's loss that his projected major work on this doctrine was not completed before his sudden death in 1968.[1] However, there is sufficient material from his publications and his unpublished manuscripts for us to discern the direction of his thought.[2] It was his purpose to "uncover the logic of this doctrine and make suggestions toward a doctrine of the Spirit which shall have salutary consequences for the faith-and-life of the church."[3] The purpose of this article is to suggest what those salutary consequences might be for those who critically reflect on the riches of the Haroutunian theological legacy.

I. The Problem

The doctrine of the Holy Spirit has been the traditional locus in theology for the account of how the God made known in Jesus Christ is encountered in contemporary experience. That the doctrine is a puzzle in the church is indicated by her confusion as to how to celebrate Pentecost. In the minds of many Christians the Spirit is associated only with ecstatic speaking in tongues or as no more than a vague power whose main virtue is that he completes the Divine Trinity. Yet if one is not able to designate the work of the Spirit, one is not able to affirm a living God. Because of the confusion in the church about meaningful ways of speaking about the action of God in the world, Haroutunian's theological endeavor was to find a way to relate the work of the Holy Spirit to some process empirically available to us and thus en-

[1] Joseph Haroutunian, 1904-68. He was a member of the faculty of MacCormick Theological Seminary (1940-62) and of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago (1962-68). His books include *Piety Versus Moralism: The Passing of the New England Theology*; *Wisdom and Folly in Religion*; *Lust for Power*; and *God with Us*.

[2] Extensive manuscript materials in Haroutunian's handwriting have been deposited in a "Haroutunian Archive" in the Joseph Regenstein Library of the University of Chicago. Two excerpts from his proposed book on the Holy Spirit were published posthumously as "The Church, the Spirit, and the Hands of God" in *The Journal of Religion*, 54 (April, 1974), 154-65. His most complete statement on the doctrine of the Spirit is an article completed in 1967 and published as "Spirit, Holy Spirit, Spiritism," in *A Dictionary of Christian Theology*, ed. Alan Richardson (London: SCM Press, 1968), 318-27.

[3] From the manuscript of Haroutunian's introduction to the unfinished book on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

able us to affirm the presence of the living God.

It is sufficient for our purposes to sketch briefly the problems related to the historical development of the doctrine of the Spirit. The Scriptures are replete with references to the work of the Spirit but they are not of much help in giving a systematic statement of the doctrine. In the early years of creedal formulation the church was primarily occupied with Christological problems and it was not until Constantinople (381) that the Capadocian Fathers formulated the confession of the Holy Spirit as "the Lord and Life-Giver." The Trinitarian formula of God "in one substance and three persons" was correct in insisting that the Spirit was not less than God. If that were not true, he could not "reconcile us to God nor re-create us according to the image of the Son. In that case our redemption can only be expressed in terms of semi-Pelagianism, of a deeper knowledge, or of a moral improvement."[4]

The subsequent development of this essential doctrine shows the ambiguity of the various interpretations. Haroutunian maintains that

> . . . when the Spirit is spoken of as God in action, the power of God, the presence of God, and the like, it is hard to think of him as the third person of the Trinity. When he is referred to as the Spirit of Christ, the living Christ, or again as the presence of Christ, the personal influence of Christ, etc., the situation is not changed. When he is thought of in the analogy of the human spirit, or spirit in general, we are hardly nearer to the doctrine of the Trinity.[5]

Although these traditional references to the Spirit are not necessarily wrong insofar as they have a basis in Scripture, Haroutunian claims they do not provide the church with "disciplined reflection" on the Spirit as "Lord and Life-giver." Unless something can be said about how the Spirit works and "a more coherent conception with a proper referent" given, the doctrine serves theology in only a formal way without any material content or essential function. R.P.C. Hanson makes the same point when he asks the question: "What is the point of maintaining a doctrine of the Holy Spirit if we can say nothing at all about how his mode of hypostatic existence differs from those of the other two persons of the Trinity except that it differs?"[6] Without some clarity at this point, Haroutunian states that the ways of the living God remain shrouded in mystery or reduced to supernatural magic. He does not maintain that all of the mystery can be removed, but he does suggest that we are called to seek the measure of intelligibility available to us in describing God's action as Spirit.

II. Constructive Proposal

Ireneaus' metaphor of "the two hands of God" provides the model for Haroutunian's constructive proposal to meet the problems related to the interpretation of the doctrine of the Spirit. According to Ireneaus, it was essential to speak of the two hands of God because the church knew no salvation apart

[4] R.P.C. Hanson, *The Attractiveness of God, Essays in Christian Doctrine* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1973), 111.

[5] "Spirit, Holy Spirit, Spiritism," *Op. Cit.*, p. 319.

[6] *Op. Cit.*, p. 133.

from the work of both the Son and the Spirit. The immediate intention of Ireneaus was to combat the Gnostic belief in semi-divine mediators between God and man, but it also had the important function of affirming the two modes of God's action in the world. God had become incarnate in the Word for the salvation of the world. Hence the Word, Jesus as Son of God, was the one hand of God. The second hand of God was the Spirit. The metaphor thus provided support to the Constantinopolitan confession that God cannot be without Spirit anymore than He can be without the Son.

However, Ireneaus' suggestion of the "the two hands of God" model did not bear "proper fruit" in the development of the doctrine of the Spirit. Haroutunian maintains that this was due to the identification of the Spirit with the Word and the sacraments as the "means of grace" controlled and administered by the institutional church. The result was that the Spirit was depersonalized and grace came to be understood as a supernatural power infused through the ministry of the church. There was the loss of personal categories for the understanding of the encounter between God and man and a failure to understand the church as the covenant people of God.

Haroutunian proposes that it would be more fruitful to reflect on the Spirit in the communion of the covenant people with God and one another. In a way that goes beyond the intention of Ireneaus, Haroutunian develops the metaphor of the two hands of God to suggest that the communion in the church is the personalized expression of the Spirit. He writes:

> If the first Hand became flesh and was one Person with two natures, we should ask if it be logical to think of the second Hand as having remained Spirit, with only one nature or perhaps no nature at all. . . . In God's use of his second Hand there must logically be something analogous to his use of his first Hand. There must in a sense be an incarnation of the Spirit as there was of the Word; otherwise, Ireneaus' notion of the two hands loses any real cogency.[7]

This argument for a necessary parallelism between the two hands is the basis for Haroutunian's main thesis that as Jesus is the incarnate personal referent for the Word, the church as the people of God are the personalized incarnate referent for the Spirit.

Disclaiming that it is his intention to merely play a logical game with the metaphor of the two hands, Haroutunian proceeds to support his thesis by evidence from the lived experiences of salvation among the people of God. There is no doubt in the church as to what God did with his first Hand—"God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself." (2 Cor. 5:19) According to Haroutunian, it should be just as evident what God is doing with the second Hand—he is also at work reconciling the world to himself through a covenant people. Although this work is not the basis of salvation in the same way as the work of Jesus Christ, it is essential to salvation history. We would not know the work and love of God apart from the love of a covenant community. Haroutunian describes the relationship between the

[7] "The Church, the Spirit, and the Hands of God," *Op. Cit.*, p. 159.

work of the Word and the Spirit as follows:

> If it is true that Jesus Christ alone is Savior, it is also true that there is no salvation without the Church. My fellowman is not my savior, since Christ is Savior alone. On the other hand, I am not saved without the service of my fellowman. If I reject the service of my neighbor, I have neither Christ nor God.[8]

Haroutunian seeks to avoid the reductionism of the earlier forms of American theologies of personalism and empiricism by insisting that the work of the Spirit in the covenant community be related to the person and work of Jesus Christ. He supports this with Biblical and historical evidence:

> The advent of Jesus Christ was followed, as a matter of history, by the coming of the Church or a community of people who confessed that Jesus is Lord and Reconciler. The Church of Jews and Gentiles came into being and has been upon earth ever since the Ascension. But this Church was constituted as a transacting people, and their transactions were by and for reconciliation. A people being reconciled with God with the first Hand were being reconciled one with another, thus acting as reconcilers, that is, the second Hand of God.[9]

The action of God through the covenant people is the referent which supports the claim of Ireneaus "that without the Spirit it is impossible to behold the Word of God."

The implications of Haroutunian's views for the interpretation of the life of the church are clear. He maintains that if there is no forgiveness of one another within the community where the Word is proclaimed, the Word is not heard and the community as a people of God does not exist. There is no experience of God's forgiveness apart from the forgiveness of fellowmen. There is no knowledge of God's love apart from the love of fellowmen. This is not to say that the forgiveness received from fellowmen is the same as the forgiveness received from God and his Word. The forgiveness received in the Word proceeds from the Sinless One. The forgiveness received from our neighbor is from a fellow-sinner. This giving and receiving of forgiveness by fellow-sinners takes place in a community that gathers around the Word and is established by the Spirit. Thus the individual who gives forgiveness is a means of grace to his neighbor and is at the same time a sinner who lives by the forgiveness which he continues to need and receive both from God and his fellowmen.[10]

That people should break out of the bondage of their ego-centric existence to live in freedom and love for others is nothing less than a miracle of grace which actualizes reconciliation as the work of God through the Word and the Spirit. Haroutunian maintains that this understanding of God's action gives an essential role to the person and work of the Spirit in a way that traditional theology has failed to do. To acknowledge that my neighbor in the covenant community is the bearer of

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 161. [9] *Ibid.*, p. 160.

[10] See Haroutunian's development of these themes in *God with Us* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), pp. 54-55.

the grace of God is to acknowledge the Spirit and to confess that there is no salvation apart from him. This in no way replaces the confession of Jesus as the Word and the acknowledgment that there is no salvation apart from him.

III. Critique

This is not the place for a full evaluation of the theology of Haroutunian. However, there are two responses relevant to the constructive proposal which has been outlined above. The first response calls into question the way Haroutunian identifies the person of the Spirit with the people of God. The second response suggests that the strength of his proposal is a dynamic understanding of how the Spirit works through the church.

Firstly, a critical examination of the manner in which Haroutunian applies the model of the two hands of God to the person of the Holy Spirit reveals an inadequate understanding of the Trinitarian formula for the doctrine of God. The intention of his proposal was to provide an empirical and personalized referent for the Holy Spirit which would parallel the incarnation of the Word in Jesus Christ. However, the identification of the Holy Spirit with the communion among God's people is a misplaced concreteness and limits the understanding of the freedom of the Spirit's work. R.P.C. Hanson concludes that the desire to go beyond Scripture in finding an empirical reference for the Holy Spirit is neither possible nor desirable.

> This 'openendedness' of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, the measure of freedom from Scripture which it has, is a witness to the freedom of God himself. We cannot make theology about the Holy Spirit in quite the same way as we can make theology about Christ, because Christ is God as he has chosen to limit himself to an historical career whereas the Holy Spirit is God as he has chosen to manifest himself as also free and sovereign over even the history of salvation. . . . He has pledged and promised himself to us in Christ. Of that we can be sure. But he has not done so in such a way that we can confidently map out the future. . . . We cannot tie him down to sacraments, to Scripture or to philosophy. God is the Holy Spirit.[11]

It is essential in the monotheistic faith which the doctrine of the Trinity was formulated to sustain that the understanding of God be able to account for his work in universal history. The recognition of the Spirit's work in the covenant community remains primary to the Christian confession, but to limit his work to that community restricts the freedom of God to work where and how he will. God is free to work in new and different ways than in the salvation history of the covenant people. Thus there are those who seek to discern the work of the Spirit in secular revolutions and every movement toward human liberation.[12] The problems related to giving a coherent understanding of this work of the Spirit as related to his work in the salvation history of the church are difficult, but it is clear that any limitation of the Spirit

[11] *Op. Cit.*, pp. 125-26.

[12] This theme is developed in Gustavo Guitierrez, *A Theology of Liberation* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1973).

to the transactions in the church is too limited a view for the cosmic vision of Biblical faith. It is not clear that Haroutunian would have denied such an understanding but his writings do not make this explicit and his commitment to church theology in the Barthian style indicates that this was beyond his concern.

In addition to the violence done to the doctrine of God, Haroutunian's position also has the danger of divinizing the church in ways similar to some understandings of the church as the mystical body of Christ.[13] Although he is not making such claims for the church as an institution, he nevertheless claims that the communion which takes place among the people of God is to be regarded not only as the fruit of the Spirit's work but also equated with the person of the Spirit. The intention here is also to find personalized categories to replace the traditional understandings of the Spirit as a supernatural power, but the result is a misplaced concreteness which claims too much for the church.

In a paradoxical way, the result of this position is also to claim too little for the church. In ascribing the communion within the church to the Holy Spirit, there is the denial that the redeemed man can actually practice the forgiving love which is at the heart of communion. Haroutunian, in a manner similar to Barth, finds it necessary to ascribe such acts to God as Spirit. This is a strange consequence for Haroutunian's theology because it was one of his main themes to find ways of describing grace other than as a supernatural power which short-circuited man as an authentic being.[14] He sought a way to restate Calvin's understanding of the sovereignty of God so as not to reduce man to a cipher by denying authentic existence to the creature. Haroutunian wanted to affirm both the sovereignty of a gracious God and man as God's intelligent creature. He maintained that a theology which celebrated one at the expense of the other was unfaithful to the biblical drama. Yet the implication of the way in which he develops the model of the two hands of God is not only to divinize the church, thus compromising the transcendence of God, but it is also to deny that man is the agent of communion in the church. There is a significant difference between maintaining that such forgiving love is the fruit of the Spirit's work and in identifying it as a personalized incarnation of the Holy Spirit.

These difficulties raise the question as to whether it is necessary to have an empirical referent for the Holy Spirit in order to personalize his work. Hendrikus Berkhof suggests that it is essential not to interpret the three persons of the Trinity in such a way that they deny the unity and the personhood of God. Thus he interprets the doctrine of the Trinity as an expression of the biblical account of the divine movement in reconciliation.

> In all this God is Person, acting in a personal way, seeking a personal encounter. The triune God does not embrace three persons; he himself is

[13] See the account of the shift in terminology about the church at Vatican II in Kristen E. Skydsgaard, "The Church as Mystery and as People of God," *Dialogue on the Way*, ed. George A. Lindbeck (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1965), pp. 145-174.

[14] See his essay on "Grace and Freedom Reconsidered," *God with Us*, pp. 136-74.

> Person, meeting us in the Son and in his Spirit. Jesus Christ is not a Person beside the Person of God; in him the Person of God becomes the shape of a human person. And the Spirit is not a Person beside the Persons of God and Christ. In creation he is the acting Person of God, in re-creation he is the acting Person of Christ, who is no other than the acting Person of God. Therefore, we must reject all presentation of the Spirit as an impersonal force. The Spirit is Person because he is God acting as a Person. However, we cannot say the Spirit is a Person distinct from God the Father. He is a Person in relation to us, not in relation to God; for he is the personal God himself in relation to us.[15]

The intention of Haroutunian was sound, but the conclusion must be that the way he develops the two hands of God model for the purpose of saving the personal character of the Spirit's work results in an inadequate doctrine of God.

If our first response to Haroutunian's proposal is negative, the second is positive. It is my conviction that his major contribution is to a new creative interpretation of grace as it relates to the understanding of the church as the covenant people of God. This is not the place to fully develop this theme in the theology of Haroutunian, but I believe the above description and critique of his thought are sufficient to indicate its direction. If, as we have suggested, the communion within the church can properly be identified as the fruits of the Spirit's work without being identified with the person of the Holy Spirit, we have the possibility of a clearer understanding of how God's grace is at work in the world. According to Haroutunian, grace is not an impersonal infused supernatural power which works in man through the ministry of the institutional church. It is rather the bestowal of a new relationship to God and neighbor established in the fellowship of forgiven sinners. We know God through the reception of his benefits. The fruits of the Spirit are empirically available to us in the actualization of a community in which alienation is overcome and one is set free to live for others. It is the neighbor who forgives and loves as a sinner redeemed by Christ who is the means of grace to the neighbor.

The theology of H. Richard Niebuhr presents the meaning of revelation as the discovery of the "inner history" which ties Christians to Christ and gives them a centered self.[16] Haroutunian would add to that description an emphasis on the actualization of the community in which acceptance, love and forgiveness are practiced as the primary datum of revelation and the empirical evidence of the living God active in history. It is God's action by Word and Spirit which calls into existence the community of reconciliation within which the verbal confession to its "inner history" is heard. The proclamation of the Word and the celebration of the sacraments take place and are effective for the knowledge of God in the context of the communion of saints created by the work of the Spirit.

A significant contribution of Reforma-

[15] *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1964), p. 116.

[16] *The Meaning of Revelation* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941), pp. 89-90.

tion theology was the interpretation of grace in relational categories in contrast to the scholastic categories of substance. The concepts of *gratia operans* and *gratia cooperans, gratia praeveniens* and *gratia subsequens* presented grace as a substance or power doled out by the clergy in various quantities. In contrast the reformers insisted that grace was the restoration of the sinner to a personal relationship with God through forgiveness. Yet the full implications of this relational understanding of grace were not fully incorporated into the Protestant understandings of the church and the means of grace. The consequence, according to Haroutunian, has been an institutionalism and an individualism which fails to understand the church as the people of God.

> The doctrine becomes that when a man hears a sermon or partakes of the Sacrament, God, the grace of God, or the Spirit of God, or the power of God (and these expressions are used interchangeably), works within him, upon his mind and heart and will, regenerates and sanctifies him, illumines his mind, cleanses his heart, and bends and redirects his will toward a godly and sober life.[17]

> . . . Our churches are means of grace primarily in that they dispense grace to a gathering or assembly of people. The churches as institutions, with their equipment, personnel, organizations, and practices, stand in contrast to the "church people," who receive from the churches the benefits of their services.[18]

Haroutunian states that when the focus is shifted to the church as the people of God, then it will be recognized that "God has revealed his grace to us in making us his people and binding us together in the bundle of life as fellowmen. . . . The very existence of the communion of saints as the body of Christ means that if we reject our fellowmen as the bearers of God's grace, there shall be no grace given to us and no freedom evoked in us."

It is my conviction that the views of Haroutunian on grace and the church could help both Protestants and Roman Catholics in their current efforts to reaffirm the church as the people of God. No more profitable study could be made by any pastor-theologian than to explore the essays in Haroutunian's *God With Us*. These essays are rich with insights which could have salutary consequences for the faith-and-life of the church. If Christians were led to take seriously that there is no salvation outside of the relationship to the neighbor, even as there is none apart from Christ, then they would see the urgency of attending to the church as community. It is in this understanding of God's grace as operative in the covenant community that Haroutunian helps us to make intelligent our confession of the Spirit as "the Lord and Life-Giver."

[17] *God With Us*, p. 140.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 138.

On Reaching A New Turn in The Road*

Edward J. Jurji

The French crooner/actor Maurice Chevalier (1889-1970) enjoyed a worldwide reputation. His last film, *I Remember It Well* (1970) proved a huge success, a smashing hit as they say in the industry. Upon one occasion he was asked how it felt to be 75. His offhand response was: "Marvelous, considering the alternative." The future must inevitably bring danger, Alfred North Whitehead reportedly observed. However, it quite frequently brings surprises, opens new doors, and leads to creative opportunities. When such a new turn is upon us, the time to transcend nostalgia is ripe. For, to dwell on past memories of the way we were can turn into an exercise in futility. Yet it does have certain merits.

Once upon a time a young lad set out from his ancestral home in quest of knowledge. His wanderlust led no further than Piraeus, seaport of Athens, Greece. Stricken by remorse for leaving a spouse behind—although by mutual understanding—he returned to the native habitat. Yet, together, in just a matter of days, the voyage was resumed. By this first turn of the road, the town of Princeton became my journey's end.

In three years a second turn was to occur when I cast about for data in shaping up a Ph.D. dissertation on Sufism. The more I delved into the subject of Islam's mystics the more realistic was recovery of New Testament faith and a strong initiation into the history of religions bolstered by the Good News. This second turn could not have happened apart from long association with a justly celebrated school of the prophets.

The third turn began with discipline in the meaning of tragedy. Steadily a Calvinist persuasion took over as one began to see that

> The book of life is short
> And when a page is read
> Only love remains

Strangely enough, of all the Old Testament, the Book of Ruth in particular was the one whereby the Savior reached out to instill courage and to dispel self-doubt, to bestow the needed stamina to see it through.

And now for the inescapable question: What did Princeton Theological Seminary really mean to this twentieth-century mystic and pilgrim?

Not so long ago I heard Senator William Proxmire of Wisconsin publicly admit on a TV show: "When I first became a senator, I spent six months asking myself, what am I doing here? Later on, as perspective and experience were gained, every time a new colleague arrived at the senate chamber I would wonder what on earth is he doing here?"

* A response given to a presentation from the Faculty and Administration to Dr. Edward J. Jurji on the occasion of his retirement. Since 1939 Dr. Jurji has been Professor of the History of Religions and has served also as Book Review Editor of *The Bulletin*.

Anyhow, future historians might find space to record concerning our era that it was a time when in church and state foundations shook. New structures and dynamics took over and old traditions lapsed. In 1960, for instance, Americans sent a Roman Catholic to the White House as president. In ecclesiastical circles, the schools of theology saw the dawn of a bright, new day. They began to welcome the modern world as their appropriate vineyard.

Here, under administrations of John Mackay and James McCord academic life set new records. I had the honor to serve under both presidents. An openness to the nature of things, the ties that bind our common humanity, the power of the rational and the irrational made the gospel more real and the Totally Other a clue to personal religion. A liberating pace was achieved in the battle of the races and the sexist controversy. Such reforms brought hope amid the clash of ideologies and discordant ways of life. A challenge was thrown at that murky vision of earthly peace geared to the balance of terror.

In a 1952 volume words such as these were used in the preface: I owe the Seminary an indescribable debt of gratitude. More than they themselves realize, the President and Faculty, the Librarian and Administrators, as well as several student generations, delivered many a concept from error and ambiguity. The many changes that have taken place since confirm the validity of that verdict.

In short, Princeton challenges us but never lets us down. In return, I trust the response was as honest, warm, and responsible as it was consistent with the mandate of a great cause. For moving from rags to riches, it is the rags of decadence and obsolescence that give way to the unsearchable riches of Christ, to the glorious liberty of the children of God, to the truth in its manifold manifestations, and to splendor in the abyss.

For Ruth and me this has been a joyous experience. We wish to express, Mr. President and Mrs. McCord, to you and this esteemed audience our deep appreciation of the gifts received and the memorable evening of gracious hospitality and Christmas good cheer.

BOOK REVIEWS

A Jewish Understanding of the New Testament (Augmented Edition), by Samuel Sandmel. Ktav Publishing House, New York, N.Y., 1974. Pp. xxxiv + 336. $10.00 cloth; $3.95 paperback.

This book is a reprint of the 1936 edition which had been published by the Hebrew Union College Press; a new introduction, however, has been written and the bibliography has been updated. The author is Distinguished Service Professor of Bible and Hellenic Literature at Hebrew Union College —Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, and is well known as an authority in biblical studies.

The book consists of five parts: Preliminaries, Paul and the Pauline Epistles, the Synoptic Gospels and Jesus, Other Writings, and the Significance of the New Testament. This study was prepared for Jews who have an earnest desire to become acquainted with the New Testament. The author acknowledges his obligations to Protestant learning and the "fair-mindedness of most liberal Christian scholars," and he hopes that this volume will serve as a medium through which Jews may find a better comprehension of Christianity. His view is that the New Testament is to be understood as a contrast, though not quite in opposition, to the Old Testament.

Even though Sandmel's work is intended primarily for Jewish readers, the Christian minister will find the volume interesting and helpful in studying the New Testament. The author notes that Jews believe that a person works out his own personal salvation through repentance and good deeds, while Paul, the "helpless man requires atonement to be made for him, and that the death of Jesus was this atonement." The chapter on Paulinism and Paul is informative, and Sandmel believes that Paul was admirably qualified for his missionary task. It was the apostle who brought to birth out of Greek-oriented Judaism and its search for salvation a new religion, which was clearly the product of its ancestry, yet remained uniquely itself. The writer observes that according to Paul's teaching the crucifixion was not a defeat for Christ, but necessarily paved the way for the resurrection. From the reading of this book it is obvious that Sandmel knows the contents of New Testament theology.

In Chapter X the writer maintains that Pauline Christianity offered a way less burdensome than the regimen of the Law, but that it was equally efficacious. He recognizes that circumcision deterred pagans from embracing Judaism, since it could not compete successfully with Christianity in demanding a more arduous requirement for the relatively similar salvation.

Sandmel points out that Christians have consistently maintained that they are monotheists; instead of compromising Old Testament monotheism in the Trinity they claim that their view of God is more profound and more perceptive than that of Judaism. Although the minister of the gospel will not agree with various statements and views expressed in this volume, he will find it a good book and worthy of serious study. The author concludes by saying: "The New Testament, although it is not ours, is closer to us than any other sacred literature, which is not our own. It shares a legacy that is eternally precious to us."

HENRY S. GEHMAN

Old Testament Form Criticism, ed. by John H. Hays. Trinity University Press, San Antonio, Texas, 1974. Pp. xv + 280. (no price).

This book is the second volume of the Trinity University Monograph Series, of which the editor is John H. Hays. This volume contains six chapters, of which the first, "The Study of Forms" comes from the pen of an alumnus of Princeton Seminary, Martin J. Buss, Associate Professor of Religion in Emory University. In this section he discusses the classical theories of public speech and poetry, genre considerations in early and medieval Biblical studies, post-medieval Biblical form criticism, a temporary eclipse of genre studies, and the renewal of

interest in this field. He recognizes the difficulty of defining *form*, but he thinks the term is better employed in the broad sense of a pattern of relationship such as a dynamic pattern including normal cause and effect. He observes that different styles were developed and recognized as appropriate for particular contents and occasions. In the course of his discussions he refers to Origen, Augustine, Lowth, Carpzov, John Locke, Herder, Durkheim, de Saussure, Matthew Arnold, R. G. Moulton, A. vonHumboldt, Gunkel, Gressmann, and others. In his survey he shows a wide range of knowledge and astounding erudition, and it is apparent that he has done his homework very thoroughly. His contribution to the volume, however, cannot be called easy reading.

The second chapter "Narrative" is by Jay A. Wilcoxen, Associate Professor of O.T. in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. He observes that by 1925 Gunkel and Gressmann had done their work on the form criticism of O.T. narratives and that their last years were occupied with their studies of eschatology and form criticism of the Psalms. Chapter III on "Law" is contributed by W. Malcolm Clark, Associate Professor of Religion at Butler University. He notes that O.T. casuistic law is not linked to treaty stipulations. In connection with the covenant he maintains that the assertion that treaty parallels validated the early date of the O.T. covenant proved to be methodologically and factually erroneous.

The fifth chapter on the Psalms is by Erhard Gerstenberger, a Privatdozent at Heidelberg and a pastor in Essen. After a discussion of the various types of Psalms he concludes that form criticism of the Psalms is still extremely young and promises to be a very exciting pursuit in the dacades to come. The final chapter on Wisdom is by James L. Crenshaw, Associate Professor of O.T. at Vanderbilt University. In this section he considers the proverb, the riddle, fable and allegory, hymn and prayer, dialogue, confession, and didactic poetry. He rightly believes that form study should have a standardization of vocabulary, and he stresses the difficulty of finding English equivalents for German genre terminology. Another problem is the definition of what *wisdom* actually is.

Each chapter contains an extensive bibliography, which may be bewildering, unless one is making further investigations in one of the subjects treated in the book. The volume concludes with useful indexes of authors, of Biblical references, and of subject matter.

HENRY S. GEHMAN

Honor Thy Father and Mother—Filial Responsibility in Jewish Law and Ethics, by Gerald Blidstein. Ktav Publishing House, New York, N.Y., 1975. Pp. xiv + 234. $15.00.

The author of this work is professor of Jewish Thought at the Ben Gurion University, Beersheba. He gives a rather comprehensive treatment of the subject in six chapters: The Significance of Filial Responsibility; The Scope of Responsibility; The Support of Parents; Responsibility and Conflict; Parental Initiative and Filial Response; Fathers and Teachers; Faithfulness and Growth. Professor Blidstein refers to *morah* and *kibbud*, the Hebrew words he uses in reference to honor or reverence of parents. He regards these vocables as expressions of inner personal valuation and a pattern not only for the period of youth, but for a lifetime. The honoring of parents does not discriminate between the parents, but each is entitled to the same *kibbud* (honor) as the other. In this connection the author points out that in Ex. 20:12 the father is placed first, while in Lev. 19:3 the order is reversed.

As is well known, there are two methods of dividing the Decalogue on the two tablets: three and seven, four and six. Thus four are considered as relating to man's duty to God and six to his duties to his fellow man. Even though this arrangement is ethically correct, it lacks symmetry. According to the Jewish concept, however, the commandments are divided symmetrically: five and five. According to this scheme the commandment to honor parents is placed on the first tablet, because the honoring of parents is regarded as an act of piety.

In the discussion of filial responsibility Jewish thinkers teach that gratitude begins where life begins and that primacy of gratitude is a Biblical concept. Blidstein quotes Saadiah Gaon (892-942), who said that divine wisdom forbade fornication in order that

men might not become like the beasts with the result that no one would know his father and thus be unable to show him reverence for having reared him. The author also refers to Maimonides (1135-1204), who considered the family unit as essential basis of social organization, and this naturally requires respect for parents.

This is a thorough study of the fifth commandment and its implications. It has 67 pages of notes. The index contains one page of references to the Bible and Apocrypha and almost two pages of references to Jewish sources. Almost two pages are devoted to subject matter.

For preaching on the Fifth Commandment this is a valuable book, and the minister will find that it gives him a broad approach to this important subject.

HENRY S. GEHMAN

Proclamation and Presence—Old Testament Essays in Honour of Gwynne Henton Davies, ed. by John I. Durham and J. R. Porter. John Knox Press, Richmond, Va., 1975. Pp. xx + 315. $9.95.

It is always difficult to review a Festschrift on account of the diversity of subjects and the lack of a continuity of thought in a succession of essays. The fourteen essays contained in this volume are presented as a tribute to Dr. G. Henton Davies, the principal of Regent's Park College and a distinguished O.T. Scholar. The book is divided into four parts with these headings: O.T. Hermeneutics; The Hexateuch; The Former Prophets and the Latter Prophets; The Psalms. John I. Durham is associate professor at the Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, N.C. and J. R. Porter is professor of Theology at the University of Exeter.

The Preface is followed by a Biographical Appreciation of the well-known British O.T. professor; the biography of an eminent scholar can always be an inspiration to students and pastors.

Fourteen scholars have contributed to this volume. Norman W. Porteous of Edinburgh has an article on "The Limits of O.T. Interpretation." He maintains that there is plenty for the Biblical exegete to do if he confines himself to the historical study of the text he is interpreting. He points out that much of what goes for interpretation is patently arbitrary and throws light on the minds of those who put it forward or on the period which produced it rather than on the Scripture, since the only complete unity is to be found in the purpose of God. He believes in a creative conversation with the text to be studied by the exegete, since such an approach makes audible to us the word of the living God. By carefully studying this article the parish minister will gain valuable insight in his study of the Bible.

In the second article George Widengren of Upsala opens by saying that of the great founders of religions Moses is one of the least known and most enigmatic figures. He closes by referring to a task for further research. Sometimes we may wonder why a scholar does not finish his research before publishing and informing the reader that further investigation of the subject is necessary.

Richard de Vaux of Jerusalem is the author of the article: "The Revelation of the Divine Name YHWH." On page 59 he well refers to the Arabic root *hwy* (to fall). On page 75 he makes the important observation that YHWH is the God "who shows himself in events which follow one another in time and which he directs towards a goal." By combining these two elements he could have defined YHWH as the one who befalls us or happens upon us (cf. *The New Westminster Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 453, col. 2). In other words, he is the God of revelation. He correctly takes the name as the *yiqtol* of the root *hayah*. In other words, if God calls himself *'eyeh*, men would call him by the third person YHWH. The seventh article by D. R. Ap-Thomas on "All the King's Horses (I Kings 5:6)" concludes that *parashim* in that verse means 'mares.' It seems strange, however, that on page 136, note 8 he quotes the Tregelles edition of Gesenius (1846).

Professor Walther Eichrodt of Basel contributes Chapter 9: "Prophet and Covenant: Observations on the Exegesis of Isaiah." In this theological article, with his usual thoroughness the author asserts that it cannot be maintained that the prophet knew nothing of the covenant relation of Israel with God. Isaiah had an encounter with the holy God and received the particular task

of announcing the irresistible approach of a horrifying reality which would sweep away the entire well ordered world of Israel and the other nations. Isaiah cleared the way for a purification of the covenant idea from all heathen admixtures and impurities. This important article merits careful study by the minister of the gospel.

Other contributors to the volume are J. Weingreen of Dublin, O. Eissfeldt of Halle, J. R. Porter of Exeter, E. Wutthwein of Marburg, John Bright of Union Theological Seminary (Richmond, Va.), and H. Cazelles of Paris.

The fourth part of the book is devoted to the Psalms. The thirteenth article "Psalm 23 and the Household of Faith" is by Aubrey R. Johnson of Alderley, Wottonunder-Edge, England. The minister in preparing a sermon on that Psalm will find numerous suggestions for his exposition. In the final essay John I. Durham discusses the extensive meanings of *shalom* and concludes that it is a gift from God and can be received only in his presence.

The volume closes with an index of 12 pages of Biblical references and one of 7 pages of the names of the authors quoted in the book.

HENRY S. GEHMAN

The Bible through Stamps, by Ord Matek. Ktav Publishing House, New York, N.Y., 1974. Pp. 230. $7.50.

The author of this attractive book is now Associate Professor in the Jane Addams Graduate School, University of Illinois, Chicago. He has produced a rather unusual work, which contains pictures of stamps from numerous countries: United States, Brazil, Poland, Italy, Israel, Spain, Colombia, Hungary, Egypt, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, Australia, New Zealand, Iceland, Yugoslavia, France, Yemen, Lebanon, Ethiopia, and Rumania. The Vatican also is represented. There are, furthermore, reproductions of stamps from Armenia, the Maldive Islands, Granada, Togo, Oman, Surinam, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Helena, and other places.

Beside the picture of each stamp appears a quotation from the Old Testament and there is also given a commentary or an historical explanation of the scene depicted or a reference to the occasion for which the stamp was issued.

On page 176, however, in the commentary the author has made a serious error in his reading of the Greek alphabet. He says that the Greek name of Jesus means "a fish"; *Jesus* actually is the Greek form of *Joshua*. As regards the Greek word ichthys (fish), it was interpreted by the early Christians as representing the first letters of the expression *Iesus Christos theou (h)uios soter* (Jesus Christ son of God Saviour).

For the philatelist this is an interesting book. It may encourage him not only to seek unusual stamps, but also in that connection to become interested in reading the Bible.

HENRY S. GEHMAN

Cyprian, by Michael M. Sage. The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, Ltd., Cambridge, Mass., 1975. Pp. vi + 439. $7.50.

Ronald E. Heine, *Perfection in the Victorious Life*. A Study in the Relationship between Edification and Polemical Theology in Gregory of Nyssa's *De Vita Moysis*. The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, Ltd., Cambridge, Mass., 1975. Pp. iv + 247. $4.50.

Robert C. Gregg, *Consolation Philosophy*. Greek and Christian *Paideia* in Basil and the Two Gregories. The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, Ltd., Cambridge, Mass., 1975. Pp. v + 285. $5.00.

These are the first three titles of the newly established "Patristic Monograph Series," distributed by Greeno, Hadden & Co., Ltd., Box 142, Cambridge, Mass. 02138. They form an auspicious beginning of a newly established and much needed series in which meritorious doctoral dissertations on patristic subjects may be published, reproduced from typescript.

Sage's monograph, done under the supervision of T. D. Barnes at the University of Toronto, is a general account of the life and

times of St. Cyprian in the light of imperial sources as well as Christian literature of the third century. According to the author's statement, his work "attempts to combine the two, in order to better comprehend the context of the Cyprianic corpus through the study of its secular background." The resulting volume, unlike most dissertations that focus upon a specific point in order to substantiate a particular hypothesis, covers a broad spectrum of Cyprianic research, introducing the reader to most of the aspects of the role of Cyprian in the development of third-century African Christianity.

Heine's monograph, done under the supervision of William R. Schoedel at the University of Illinois (Urbana), investigates the question of the contribution made by Gregory of Nyssa, particularly through his *De Vita Moysis*, to the development of Christian mysticism of the fourth century. Unlike Daniélou and other investigators of Gregory's spirituality, Heine finds nothing in *De Vita Moysis* that can properly contribute to an understanding of the soul's journey to the mystical life. Inasmuch as Ekkehard Mühlenberg came to a similar negative conclusion about mysticism in Gregory through a study of the "ascent" in Gregory's treatise *In canticum canticorum*, Heine raises the question whether scholars should not cease to use the term "mysticism" in describing Gregory's spiritual thought.

Gregg, who acknowledges the guidance in research that he received from Robert Evans (University of Pa.) before his death, investigates "the consolatory letters of a Greek-speaking Cappadocian Christian of the fourth century by viewing them against the background of the ideas and kinds of literature emanating from both the Hellenistic and biblical worlds." Depending chiefly upon nineteen letters of consolation written by Basil of Caesarea (329-379), the author looks also at letters and orations (sermons) composed on the same subject by Basil's brother, Gregory of Nyssa, and by his lifelong friend, Gregory of Nazianzus. The result is a first-rate monograph which deserves to be set side by side with the treatises by Charles Favez and M. M. Beyenka dealing with Latin Christian contributions to the literature of consolation.

BRUCE M. METZGER

Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies, by J.N.D. Kelly. Harper & Row, New York, N.Y., 1975. Pp. xi + 353. $7.50.

This volume is the first full-scale biography in English of a fascinating and learned Church Father—a man who was by turns gentle, vicious, cantankerous, charming, infuriating, brilliant, and stubborn—but always commanding the respect if not the affection of all. As a scholar Jerome was enormously learned, insatiably interested in words and names, marvelously well-equipped linguistically.

The son of Christian parents who were moderately well-to-do, Jerome received a first-class training in grammar and rhetoric at Rome under the illustrious teacher Aelius Donatus, of whom he always spoke with great respect, calling him *praeceptor meus*. He became familiar with the Latin classics and developed a feeling for literary style in the Ciceronian tradition. His scholarly tools included Greek and Hebrew. The latter he learned with great labor in his mature years, first from a converted but anonymous Jew during Jerome's five years' ascetic seclusion in the Syrian desert of Chalcis, and afterwards in Bethlehem from the Palestinian rabbi bar-Anina, who, through fear of the Jews, visited him by night. Such was the philological training of the man who was destined to fix the literary form of the Bible of the entire Western Church. Although he could occasionally be slipshod and slapdash in his methods, Jerome was by all odds the most competent scholar of his age.

Kelly's work is a straightforward biography, based on thorough acquaintance with the large and diverse literary output of Jerome's long life. The letters that Jerome wrote to a variety of correspondents provide many of the data from which Kelly is able to construct a life-like portrait. The account is honest and makes no attempt to conceal the grave flaws in Jerome's character—he was certainly the "unangelic" doctor, for whom the prefixed "Saint" was granted more in deference to his learning than for sanctity of personality. Of irascible temperament, Jerome must have enjoyed pilloring his theological opponents. Against Pelagius, for example, he expostulates, not only on theologi-

cal grounds, but also with personal invective. As a sample of the latter, Jerome refers to Pelagius as that "dolt weighted down with Scots porridge" (*Scotorum pultibus*, which happens to be the earliest reference in literature to oatmeal), who is a "bloated Alpine dog, able to rage more effectively with his heels than with his teeth" (Jerome's *Commentary on Jeremiah*). On another occasion Jerome referred to a former friend as a "grunting pig" for daring to disagree with him.

It is as an exegete and Bible translator that we chiefly honor Jerome today. He had profound respect for the difficulty and complexity of his subject and poured some of his most picturesque contempt on the "gossipy old women, old men in their dotage, and long-winded sophists" who thought they could interpret Scripture with no linguistic equipment and no intellectual training. "Others—oh, the shame of it!—learn from women what they teach to men" (*Epist.* 53, par. 7).

The task of making a standard Latin version of the Bible was not easy, for there was a shocking diversity among the Old Latin manuscripts. Various persons at various times and in various places, with varying degrees of success, had translated various parts of the Bible into Latin. The result was chaos. The different versions had become so mixed and corrupt that, as Jerome remarked, there were "almost as many forms of text as there are manuscripts."

Jerome knew that to bring order out of diversity would expose him to opprobrium for tampering with Holy Writ. His apprehension that he would be castigated for changing the wording of the Bible was not unfounded. But Jerome, for his part, defended his work with forthright vigor, referring on occasion to his detractors as "two-legged asses" and "yelping dogs"—persons who "think that ignorance is equivalent to holiness." In the course of time, however, opposition to the revision subsided, and the superior accuracy and scholarship of Jerome's version gave it the victory. It was a clear case of the survival of the fittest.

But the production of the Latin Vulgate was only one part of Jerome's rich and variegated career. He was also a prolific commentator on Scripture, an apologist, a preceptor and teacher of wealthy Christian matrons and their daughters, a propagandist of asceticism and of monastic withdrawal, and much else—for all of which Kelly's volume provides the general reader with an interesting account and a judicious evaluation.

BRUCE M. METZGER

Scripture, Tradition, Infallibility, by Dewey M. Beegle. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1973. Pp. 332. $4.95 (paper).

In 1963, Dr. Beegle, now professor of Old Testament at Wesley Theological Seminary wrote a book entitled, *The Inspiration of Scripture*, in which he, an evangelical, argued with other evangelicals about the untenable position of the inerrancy of Scripture. Some evangelical journals attacked the book as rank heresy, while others welcomed its reasoned defense of the authority of the Bible while disavowing inerrancy.

Now he has written a sequel to that volume entitled, *Scripture, Tradition, Infallibility*, which enlarges the scope of study to include Roman Catholicism's situation since Vatican II as well as the role of tradition in Protestant circles.

The recent publication of *The Battle for the Bible*, by Harold Lindsell, editor of *Christianity Today*, which makes inerrancy of Scripture a test of orthodoxy, highlights the relevancy of Beegle's book in the present controversy among evangelicals. In fact, Lindsell elevates inerrancy as the watershed between evangelicals and liberals which saddens many because he has caused an unnecessary rift among evangelicals.

Liberals have given up a belief in the errancy of Scripture many years ago maintaining that the discussion of infallibilty is irrelevant. During the first part of this century the Modernist-Fundamentalist controversy occupied the stage with the infallibility of the Bible, one of the planks of the Fundamentalist platform. In the forties this warfare moderated and the two sides somehow fell into a militant cessation of battle. In the last decade this truce has been broken especially among the Fundamentalists, or at least the evangelical branch of that group, raising the issue again. Even the Roman Catholic church's liberal scholars like Hans Kung

began to question inerrancy and infallibility. These Roman Catholics were encouraged by Pope John XXIII who is reported to have said, "I'm not infallible. I'm infallible only when I speak ex cathedra. But I'll never speak ex cathedra."

Now there is renewed interest among evangelicals concerning the inspiration of Scripture and what that entails about revelation, canonicity and authority. In view of this, and in the light of Vatican II, Beegle treats these ideas among both traditions, Protestant and Roman Catholic.

Revelation, according to Beegle, is basic to an understanding of the proper concept of the inspiration of the Scripture. After considerable discussion of Scripture as revelation and revelation history and interpretation, he concludes, "The Bible is God's self-disclosure of his redemptive purposes. Its chief themes see Theological (man's nature and need), and Christological (the provision for man's healing). Primary revelation ceased with Christ and the New Testament interpretation of him, but in-as-much as God was saying more through the biblical writers than they realized, the secondary process of reinterpretation and application will continue as long as man exists."

Secondary revelation receives full treatment because it depends upon individual and group interpretations of Scripture which develop into traditions. He traces the traditions of the biblical period, Jesus, Peter, Paul and non-canonical traditions such as post apostolic, Medieval, Renaissance, the Council of Trent, post-Tridentine, Roman Catholic tradition today and Protestant tradition today. In other words, a tradition will determine to a large extent, one's interpretation of Scripture.

He next deals with theories of inspiration such as tuition, illumination, dictation and the dynamic view in which "The inspired person has the extra-ordinary help of the Holy Spirit without violating his individuality and personality."

There are also concepts of inspiration; prophetic, Greek, Judaistic, New Testament, early church fathers, later church fathers, the Reformation, counter Reformation, post conservative Protestantism and modern Roman Catholicism. In all of these ideas of inspiration, Beegle points out that modern linguistics have placed a large burden on proponents of inerrancy. From here he argues that the standard of reference for defining an error has shifted from generation to generation so that even at the present time those who hold to inerrancy do not have a consistent definition of their theory.

The subject of autographs and translations also demonstrate how difficult it is to hold to the inerrancy of Scripture. Beegle cites a number of passages of Scripture which makes this theory practically untenable.

He also considers verbal and content inspiration and plenary inspiration both of which he regards as unacceptable to a large extent.

It is the theological and psychological ramifications of the doctrine of inerrancy which is at the core of the question because inerrancy involves an inerrant meaning of Scripture and there is wide difference of belief in this area.

In the Roman Catholic Church the doctrines of an inerrant Bible and an infallible Pope have been used to establish true doctrine. But theologians like Kung dispute both of these claims.

Those who hold to inerrancy claim that to admit error will lead to apostasy, lack of security and the untrust worthiness of all Scripture. But Beegle argues that it is the doctrines and practices founded on their (inerranists) doctrine attributed to God as really at stake. In fact, infallibility is used to validate an established order of religion in both scholastic Protestantism and in Roman Catholicism where an infallible church is buttressed by infallible Scripture and Pope.

Beegle agrees with a statement by Francis L. Patton in *Fundamental Christianity*, "I like when I go to sea to know that the ship is provided with bulkheads and watertight compartments, so that in case a collision comes, whether it be on bow or bilge, she will float. I do not care to put all my hope of heaven in a theory of inerrant inspiration, so that if a hole were bored in it the great ship would go under. I like to feel that the historicity and the inspiration of the Bible cooperate and help to strengthen faith, so that if either is sufficient how much better both will be."

This book is a scholarly, reasonable and ironic presentation of a "hot issue" among evangelicals. The main theme of the Bible, according to Beegle, is the fact that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself,

and that this concept is not impaired by a lack of faith in an infallible and inerrant Scripture. The Bible is an authoritative revelation from God to man and fully trustworthy of conveying the message of redemption in Christ to all the world.

We recommend the wide reading and study of this volume to everyone and especially to evangelicals.

EDWIN H. RIAN

Habakkuk: The Man with Honest Questions, by Walter J. Ungerer. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1976. Pp. 71. $1.45.

Walter J. Ungerer is a United Presbyterian minister of uncommon sensitivity and articulateness, who shares with us in this small expository volume his own contemporary appreciation of a neglected Old Testament prophet. The genre of discussion-oriented biblical commentaries intended for laypersons on the whole tends to lack excitement and penetration. This book is a happy exception. It uses critical method without trying to teach it as an end in itself. It treats the reader as an intelligent person who happens not to be a biblical specialist, but who does not on that account have to be preached *at*. The author's personal involvement is clear, but not cloying, and leads us into serious thinking about the message of Habakkuk for life today. One can imagine that a reader who wanted to combine a life of honest piety with committed awareness to social responsibility and unanswerable questions would find this book both supportive and informing.

Discussion questions are provided at the end of each chapter, and while the book lacks any suggestion for how they might be used in an educational setting, the questions themselves are unusually good. They contribute to the very content of the chapters themselves, and are clearly more than mere afterthoughts. It would be a mistake to use the exposition without the questions. Also of interest is the rich variety of quotations from sources as different as Walter Rauschenbush and Leighton Ford. One wishes for either footnotes or a bibliography, not so much for scholarly apparatus as for the guidance of readers who would like to explore some of the author's ideas further through the reading which has proved so fertile for him.

The book would be useful in lay study groups to demonstrate a kind of "working hermeneutic" for use of the Old Testament in Christian discussion. Ungerer does not discuss his hermeneutical and exegetical framework; but it is clear that he is working at the level of basic religious perception, where the life of faith can be interpreted by particular religious language without depending on it. In other words, the book shows how Christian discussion can appropriate the Old Testament without doing it violence, and that is something lay Bible study sorely needs.

J. RANDALL NICHOLS

Twentieth-Century Men of Prayer, by Mark Gibbard. SCM Press, Naperville, Ill., 1974. Pp. 120. (no price).

Mark Gibbard is a member of the Society of St. John the Evangelist at Oxford University. In this short, fact-filled and inspiring book he provides the reader with a series of succinct chapters on the life, pilgrimage and experience of twelve men—and women—of prayer. Some of them are well known: Frederich von Hugel, Simone Weil, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Teilhard de Chardin, Dag Hammarskjold, Alan Paton, Thomas Merton, Michael Quoist and Frere Roger Taize. Three of them, Madeleine Delbrel, Charles de Foucauld and Anthony Bloom (Eastern Orthodox) may not be so familiar.

The objective of Gibbard's book is to help individuals whose old ways of prayer may have gone dead, and to point them to the several ways of prayer practiced by some of the "greats" of our time. There are other ways to explore—often unexpected and unexplored—even if the going may be tough and sometimes bewildering. But we need not be discouraged. We are not expected to imitate precisely any of the great men and women of prayer; they worked their ways through to astonishingly different types of prayer. In this book, the author tries to spotlight what seems most helpful to us today from the lives and practices of those about whom he writes. In looking at these persons, he tries to see how they developed and to get some clues from them for our exploration.

There is the story of Charles de Foucauld, from an artistic French family, who served in Algeria and who possessed a fierce "pig-headed" temper. He traveled, learned to speak Hebrew and Arabic, and finally met Abbe Huvelin of Paris. After a sleepless night he went to St. Augustine's Church where the Abbe was curate. There, he wrote, "I was asking him for instruction in religion. He told me to kneel and confess, and told me straightway to receive holy communion. Clouds of doubt dispersed and faith in God at once returned. . . . As soon as I believed that there was a God I was clear that I could do nothing except live for him. My religious vocation dates from the same hour as my faith." After a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, he joined the Trappists as being the most likely to provide him the "lowest place." He lived from one day to the next with the one Lord. His chief business was praying to his Lord for those he loved. Deep in the heart of the Sahara desert at Tamanrasset, he flowered. Gradually he saw that love not severity was the heart of the matter. He came to the end of his life by being bound and shot. This is all there is to it—a grain of wheat falling to the ground. The day of his death he wrote to his cousin, "Our annihilation is the most powerful means we have of uniting ourselves to Jesus and doing good to others." His life was a failure; he left no followers. Then his writings circulated. And little fraternities arose to live and work in the poorest situations. Now there are over one hundred Brothers of twenty nationalities in thirty countries.

Charles never set out to be a teacher of prayer. "The art of prayer is that there is no art." Prayer for Charles was of supreme importance; it keeps us in touch with God, the Love that stands at the heart of reality. He advises others to use their wits with imagination to prevent spoken prayers from becoming boring habits. He stresses contemplative praying: "thinking of God with love." And he found that his love for Jesus impelled him to reflect daily upon the Gospels, to follow him literally and share in his sufferings. And he found learning to pray hard work, as it is hard work to learn to love. "It is the work of a lifetime to begin fresh every morning."

And so Gibbard brings out the essential core of prayer to be found in those about whom he writes. "Alan Paton cannot pray as Archbishop Anthony prays. It is no good picking up ideas, one here, one there, and stirring them all up together. We must use common sense. We may well need a guide. Our way cannot be authentic until it is real for us."

Each of the persons described in this book shares a "progressive enrichment, a growing depth and unity, in their personalities." "They are on the way to discovering the secret of their own identity, 'hidden' as Merton would say 'in the love and mercy of God.'" "Their true self grows in inverse proportion to their growth of egoism" (de Chardin). Each passed through an endless series of conversions: "God does not make copies; he makes originals." "Souls are never dittos." "Everyone needs to make his or her own desert (Tamanrasset), the place where one can every now and then leave men and look for solitude to restore, in prolonged silence and prayer, the stuff of the soul."

Gibbard finds that a time of silence, of listening and of contemplative prayer is a universal need and desire. "He who no longer listens to his brother will soon no longer be listening to God either," said Bonhoeffer. "Out of contemplation and listening and loving emerges the determination to rid the world of man's injustice to man." "Action is the stream and contemplation is the spring." And there is no spiritual life without persistent struggle and interior conflict. "We are what we pray." These engaging men and women of prayer were first and last like "true explorers, all-weather people." They went on and on. They all sensed "It is not I who have looked for him. It is He who has looked for me first."

For those who are interested in gaining an introduction to some of the explorers into the dimensions of life with God, this book is a splendid guide.

ELMER G. HOMRIGHAUSEN

Lutheranism in North America 1914-1970, by E. Clifford Nelson. (Foreword by Kent S. Knutson). Augsburg Press, Minneapolis, Minn., 1972. Pp. 315. $7.50.

This is the most comprehensive scholarly study of 20th century American Lutheranism to date. The author not only engaged in solid

research in providing this definitive story of Lutheranism from 1914-1970, but he has called upon vast resources of experience gained from his personal involvement in the processes about which he writes.

A comprehensive index is included as well as graphic charts of Lutheran groups inside the covers of the book. If the writing of a book of history is a "consummate art" as Kent Knutson writes in the Foreword, then this book is history writing at its best! Yet, Nelson has taken sides on controversial issues; there are statements in this book which will bring about critical responses. Debate on substantive elements in this history is what Nelson wishes as the Lutheran community in America faces a future which demands several crucial decisions.

The author takes the reader from the Lutheran Church (Churches?) at the dawn of the new age, 1914-1930 through World War I, the economic depression, the theological and ecumenical concerns of the thirties, the impact of World War II, to American Lutheranism in the sixties. A final chapter brings Lutheranism to the new decade and inter-Lutheran relations (Missouri Synod, American Lutheran Church, Lutheran Church in America), ecumenical dialogues with Roman Catholics, Orthodox, Presbyterians, and a fascinating profile about Lutheran beliefs, social views, generational conflicts, clergy-lay differences, and differences among Lutherans due to region and sex. This book closes with a list of issues Lutherans confront in the seventies: the nature of the Gospel, the questions of confessional integrity in an ecumenical age, the church and its purpose, the problem of the church's unity, and the problem of ecclesiastical structure.

The Lutherans who came to America were probably the most divided along national lines (Norwegian, Danish, Swedish, *et. al.*), and these national groups divided among themselves. Like other immigrants, their divisions were cultural and linguistic, as well as theological and ecclesiastical. Personal leadership contributed to these divisions. Further, their dispersion into protective enclaves in the new land made them somewhat provincial and ingrown. They were preceded by Anglo churches which preempted the central religious tradition of a growing nation. Some of them were confronted with revivalism which was cause for alarm because pietistic groups threatened the unity of certain churches in the homeland.

Nelson writes about the Americanization of these groups especially in the matter of language, public education, World Wars I and II, the generation gap, the lodge question, conflicting ethnic loyalties, and other factors, all of which forced the Lutherans to reach out for each other for unity, to conserve their confessional heritage, and yet to react with acclerated speed to the new demands of the 19th and 20th centuries. Nelson thinks that one of the most significant periods in American Lutheran history took place from 1917-1920.

In this book the reader will understand the origin and substance of the current controversy in the Missouri Lutheran Church as regards the *form* and the *substance* of Biblical authority, an issue which the historic communion has not settled intellectually but resolved on the basis of accepted Scriptural authority and the Lutheran confessions. Here the reader will see the growth of Lutheranism beyond its ethnic, cultural and geographical boundaries into an identity which is now one of the most impressive and formidable religious traditions in America. Here the reader will sense the struggle of Lutheranism to be the church in the contemporary situation beset by violence, secularism, immorality, urban blight and the failure of the melting pot. Here the reader will be encouraged by the fact that while the generation gap does present problems, there is evidence that youth are not rejecting the faith but desire the reformulation of its application and style of life.

And while the mission of the church is of crucial importance in Lutheranism, there is a strong feeling that a greater appropriation of the faith by members of the congregation is necessary if the Lutheran Church of the Reformation and the Apostolic faith is to remain and to be motivated for its mission.

And as for Lutheran unity, it has progressed on the national level of leadership; unity is now shifting to the congregations in local communities. And that unity is forging ahead at great speed with or without national leadership.

This volume is an encouraging record of a great church that is strong in piety, communal commitment, theological perception, spiritual zeal. It has come a long way from

its year of parochialism and fragmentation to its present unity and integrity. On the basis of its strong historical foundation, its serious theological character, its creative spirit, its evangelical-traditional liturgy, it ought to grow into an even greater instrument for the glory and mission of Jesus Christ.

ELMER G. HOMRIGHAUSEN

John Calvin: A Biography, by T.H.L. Parker. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, Pa., 1975. Pp. 190. $10.95.

Dr. Thomas H. L. Parker is a Church of England clergyman who has been a student of Calvin for many years. In 1947 he published "The Oracles of God: An Introduction to the Preaching of John Calvin"; in 1969 "Calvin's Doctrine of the Knowledge of God"; and in 1971 "Calvin's New Testament Commentaries." Now he has written a major biography of the great Genevan reformer.

The general course of Calvin's life is well known, and in his telling of the story Dr. Parker covers the ground in much the same fashion as such earlier biographers of Calvin as Williston Walker and James Mackinnon. But his presentation has certain distinctive features of its own. For one thing, he gives a full account of Calvin's formal education, first at Paris and then at Orléans and Bourges, and suggests reasons for dating those student experiences of Calvin rather earlier than has traditionally been done. Again, he examines the much-discussed question of the date of Calvin's "sudden conversion" to evangelical Christianity, and gives reasons for thinking that this probably took place as early as late 1529 or early 1530.

Once more, Parker devotes particular attention to Calvin's literary work. For example, one of his chapters analyzes the *Institute* as it first appeared in 1536; and he takes note of the various changes which this seminal volume underwent till its definitive issue in 1559, which was patterned on the model of the Apostles' Creed. He also describes Calvin's Bible commentaries, which must rank, next to the *Institute* as his most important literary effort. His first commentary, on the Epistle to the Romans, was issued in 1540; and the series went on to cover most of the New Testament books and some of the Old Testament, ending with Joshua, Chapters 1-20, which appeared posthumously in 1565.

Parker also emphasizes the important role which preaching played in Calvin's work as a reformer. Calvin frequently used the most explicit language in asserting that the preaching of the Gospel is the Word of God; and by continuous exposition of the various Bible books he sought to let Holy Writ speak its life-giving message concerning the redemption of God in Jesus Christ and the believer's life of Christian devotion.

Above all, Parker portrays Calvin not merely as an ardent reformer of 16th century Roman Catholicism in Europe, but—more significantly—as an outstanding doctor of the Universal Christian Church who, deeply concerned for its inner renewal, sought, both by word and action, to make it a more worthy expression and representation of the body of Christ.

Perhaps Parker might have said more of Calvin's participation, while in Strasbourg between 1538 and 1541, in the Reunion Conferences of Hagenau, Worms, and Regensburg, in which he served his apprenticeship as an ecumenical Christian statesman. But be that as it may, his lucid, readable and well-informed study of Calvin's life, presents a sympathetic portrait of the great Reformer whose labors helped to shape the Reformed Church tradition not only in the 16th century, but right down to the present day.

NORMAN V. HOPE

Division in the Protestant House: The Basic Reasons Behind Intra-Church Conflicts, by Dean R. Hoge. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, Pa., 1976. Pp. 166. $3.95.

Protestant denominations have existed in America since colonial days, though, of course, they have increased in number since the Revolution. During the past century or so, however, American Protestantism has developed cleavages and divisions which cut across denominational lines and affect virtually all the old line standard-brand Protestant Churches.

Several theories have been advanced to explain such intra-Protestant divisions. The late H. Richard Niebuhr attributed them

mainly to social and economic factors. Jeffrey Hadden thinks that they stem from the divergence between clergy and laity; Martin Marty and others have suggested that the real explanation lies in the realm of sociology—that is, that the divisions have arisen from differing understandings of the nature and implications of the Christian faith.

Dean R. Hoge is a skilled and experienced researcher in the field of religious sociology. Besides being familiar with the research of others, he has engaged in several studies of his own, particularly in the predominantly middle class United Presbyterian Church. In this book he analyzes the causes of Protestant divisions. His carefully documented and well-reasoned conclusion is that the basic explanation is neither Niebuhr's nor Hadden's, but Marty's. He concludes that there are two groups with differing conceptions of the Christian faith, the Private Protestants and the Public Protestants. The Private Protestants emphasize personal morality and evangelism, whereas the Public Protestants lay greater stress upon Christian social witness and action.

Hoge, however, goes on to probe more deeply into the basic life commitment of Protestant Church Members, and finds that both groups, Private and Public, give their basic allegiance to family, career, and standard of living, with health as the fourth factor where it is a problem. Church allegiance is related to these three or four basic loyalties; that is, members strongly support such Church action as they think will enhance these basic loyalties, and oppose action which seems to threaten them. As a prime illustration of this Hoge cites the Angela Davis case. In 1971 Angela Davis was on trial for conspiracy in connection with a courtroom kidnapping and subsequent shoot-out in San Raphael, California, in which a judge and three other persons were killed. The United Presbyterian Council on Church and Race sent a check for $10,000 to the Angela Davis Legal Defense Fund. This action touched off one of the most explosive issues in the recent history of the United Presbyterian Church, since many loyal Presbyterians were unalterably opposed to any money being given to an avowed Communist. As the furor mounted, a group of twenty black Presbyterians presented a check for $10,000 from their personal funds to the moderator of the denomination; but even this had only a limited impact in damping down the controversy.

Dr. Hoge not only analyzes the causes of Protestant divisions, but he also suggests ways in which they may be overcome, or at least softened. He thinks that the most promising development is the emergence of what are called Neo-Evangelicals, who, though conservative in their theology, have developed a sensitive social conscience, and are in open communication with more liberal groups on social questions.

In writing this book Hoge has done mainline Protestantism in general, and the United Presbyterian Church in particular, a signal service in so competently analyzing the causes of what he calls "Division in the Protestant House." At present the prospects for the ending of these divisions do not seem bright; but it may well be that the Neo-Evangelicals, whose work Hoge views with such approval, will be instrumental in beginning a ministry of reconciliation and bringing American Protestantism to more of a common mind with respect to its character and mission as part of the body of Christ.

NORMAN V. HOPE

John Witherspoon: Parson, Politician, Patriot, by Martha Lou Lemmon Stohlman. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, Pa., 1976. Pp. 176. $5.95 (cloth); $2.95 (paper).

John Witherspoon, an immigrant Scotsman, and the only clergyman and college president to sign the Declaration of Independence, had three public careers; and in all of them he made a unique and distinctive contribution.

First of all he was a Church of Scotland minister, in Leith and then in Paisley. As such he not only carried out his parochial duties faithfully and fruitfully, but he also took an active part in ecclesiastical politics. In the Church of Scotland of his day there were two parties—the Moderates, who were thought to be more concerned about ethics and culture than about distinctive Christian doctrine; and the Evangelicals or Popularists, who stressed the uniqueness of the Christian scheme of salvation and who wanted local congregations to have more say in the calling of their minister, than the existing law,

supported by the Moderates, then allowed. Witherspoon was an ardent Popularist; and in his widely circulated book *Ecclesiastical Characteristics* he pilloried his Moderate opponents with polished ridicule.

In 1766 Witherspoon was elected President of the twenty-year-old College of New Jersey (later Princeton University); but his wife's unwillingness to go—she even took to her bed as a gesture of opposition—delayed his acceptance. Eventually, however, her misgivings were overcome and in 1768 the family arrived in Princeton to occupy the President's house. As head of the College, Witherspoon not only had to engage in money raising—a perpetual presidential chore, then as now—but he also expanded the College's curriculum, sought to teach by means of lectures rather than by quizzes based on an assigned text, and procured for his College William Rittenhouse's first orrery—a piece of mechanism devised to represent the motions of the planets about the sun by means of clockwork.

By the time Witherspoon came to America the arbitrary and high-handed actions of the British government were goading the Colonies to opposition and eventually to open rebellion. Right from the start Witherspoon identified himself with the cause of the Colonists. He was a member of the Continental Congress and served effectively on several of its most important committees—notably that on Foreign Affairs and that on financing the war. Indeed, it may be justly claimed that he was one of the leaders in the struggle for American independence.

In this book *John Witherspoon: Parson, Politician, Patriot*, Martha L. L. Stohlman has presented an admirable account of Witherspoon's life and work. She has mastered the known facts about him and presented them with clarity and grace. In her preface she says that Witherspoon deserves to be better known. Her well-written volume will make an excellent contribution to that end.

NORMAN V. HOPE

A Nation of Behavers, by Martin E. Marty. University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1976. Pp. 239. $8.95.

Martin E. Marty, who is perhaps the most perceptive and surely the most articulate observer of religion in contemporary America, has written a lucid and fascinating analysis of the baffling complexity of religion in twentieth century American society. Marty notes that previous interpretations of religion in the United States have utilized essentially three common methodologies. The first, and most enduring, was the technique of intellectual history, in which theological ideas formed the core of the investigation. The second was primarily institutional in character, and various denominations were examined as the history of a particular organization and its changes. The third approach, which has been the dominant methodology in American church history for the last several decades, surveyed the political implications of religion—its interaction with social, economic, and political movements and its significance for the history of American society.

In this new work, Marty joins a growing number of historians who insist that while these previous methods should not be rejected, a fourth one is necessary, one which focuses less on ideas and institutions and more on behavior, the difference that religion seems to make in the way people act. What signals this new departure is the conscious employment of the social sciences—psychology, anthropology, and sociology particularly. The subject matter also shifts; the history of American religion becomes increasingly the story of how religion operated in the lives of lay people, rather than famous clergy, church leaders, and theologians. While Marty recognizes that this methodology is not totally new, it has not been extensively utilized, and it shows signs of perhaps becoming the dominant method in the writing of American religious history for the near future.

Using this perspective, Marty offers what he calls a "new map" of religion in America, and he argues that all contemporary religious behavior falls into one of his six categories: "mainline religion," "evangelicalism and fundamentalism," "pentecostal-charismatic religion," "the new religions," "ethnic religion," and "civil religion." What is rewarding about seeing religion in these terms is that it seems to deal effectively with the one overwhelming characteristic of religion in America today, namely pluralism. Any pastor will probably find people in the congregation, and certainly the community, who behave accord-

ing to more than one of these models, at times simultaneously. One might even venture the same observation about the clergy.

In each chapter, readers will find many aspects of Marty's analysis familiar, but this is partly Marty's gift and the value of this book. In clarifying what is obvious but so frequently unnoticed, he has rendered a service to both students of American religion and those in the church who are its "behavers." Moreover, Marty does not eschew the difficult task of looking ahead, asking what religious life will look like in the future. For religious mainliners, he sees a somewhat brighter prospect after decades of triumphalism in theology and mission strategy and subsequent disillusionment. Evangelicals continue to prosper, but their compromises with the society will increase. Fundamentalism, Marty says, has probably spent its capital, and social conditions will probably lessen its appeal. The new religions are fadish and fading, while the pentecostal and charismatic movement holds as yet unknown significance and impact. As the subdued celebration of the Bicentennial makes clear, civil religion has fallen on bad days and seems unlikely to be rejuvenated quickly.

Yet the dominant movement of modern society is secularization, and readers will profit from Marty's astute analysis of how religious behavior continues to function in an alien society.

JOHN M. MULDER

A Georgian at Princeton, ed. by Robert Manson Myers. Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, New York and London, 1976. Pp. 365. $12.95.

In 1972 Robert Manson Myers published *The Children of Pride*, a collection of family letters of the Rev. Charles Colcock Jones (1804-1863), a southern Presbyterian minister in Georgia who was caught up in the tumultuous currents of mid-nineteenth century America. That volume won the National Book Award, and Myers has now issued another segment of the Jones family correspondence. It covers a mere two years, 1850-52, when Jones accepted the post of Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Missions in Philadelphia and sent his two sons, Charles and Joseph, to Princeton.

That *per se* does not sound like the makings of a fascinating and engrossing book, but the Jones family is not a typical family, and these letters should be of wide interest to anyone interested in the history of Presbyterianism and Princeton. Too often the daily life of the past seems lost to historical treatment and the contemporary imagination, but in these pages the Jones family takes on a freshness and humanity that make the book compelling. What is finally most striking about the letters is how extraordinarily literate these people were, their capacity for expressing themselves and conveying a sense of their thoughts and feelings. From the mundane details of everyday life to more lofty reflections, the collection reveals a glimpse of a transplanted southern family slowly sensing their distance from their northern counterparts and the growing sectional antagonisms.

The central characters in the story are Charles C. Jones, Jr., class of 1852 at Princeton (then still called the College of New Jersey), his mother, and his father (who studied at the Seminary from 1829-30). Charles Jr.'s letters are a trove of daily information about student life and Princeton itself during the 1850's. Like many residents before and since, he complains vigorously of the bad water and the monotonous diet broken only by an occasional "stewed fly." His life and that of his colleagues is a common, though still incongruous, mixture of piety and pranks. The students beat up Vice President John Maclean, defend the campus from town rowdies, debate the issues of the day, and even study. From Charles' letters one sees Archibald Alexander in his final years: "He appears very aged, though apparently enjoying a green old age. His voice is very fine, and his neck is quite bent." By October 1851, Alexander is dead: "Death quietly marks his victim. The land hears not the tread of the last enemy, for he has singled out one upon whom no distinction has been lavished, who lived and died unknown save to a chosen few."

The letters from his parents range from the ridiculous to the sublime, and back again. Mrs. Mary Jones can write of the natural world teeming with "objects of sublimity which cannot fail to excite and elevate the soul—the lofty mountain, the butting crag, the fearful precipice, the foaming cat-

aract," etc., and yet close her letter with the injunction: "P.S. Do not play shinny or bull with your watch in your pocket." Like many ecclesiastical bureaucrats' wives, she found her life and that of her family "one of the most undesirable in the community. There were no special ties to any church or any people, and no one thought of them with any feelings of interest." She is, as she confesses, "Southern born and Southern reared," never feeling quite at home in Philadelphia and fearing that "the liberalizing effect of a Northern education" for her sons "is desirable, but not alienation, leading to dishonorable and traitorous conduct."

In Charles Sr.'s letters the reader will learn relatively little about the Board of Missions, but there are acute observations about America at mid-century: On a visit to St. Louis—"The great West is more pleasant to visit than to dwell in. So much mixture of people from all places; so much driving, speculating, selfishness; a world of strangers, a world of changes; moving, pushing, sickening, dying. Many like its ideas of greatness, its excitements, its adventures, its creations and annihilations." On the telegraph: "Surely these wires are wonders. What messages of love, of joy, of sorrow, of hope and fear, of life and death, tremble with viewless speed along them!" On urbanization: "Large cities do not appear to me to be favorable to personal religion. At least, my experience is somewhat that way."

Two aspects of this book diminish its value and appeal, both to the general reader and the historian. Myers has provided no critical apparatus, identifying the numerous references to people and events. This might have become cumbersome, but it would have broadened the value of the collection beyond mere family letters. An index would also assist someone in checking names and following the movement of the story.

The final justification and attraction of these beautiful letters comes from the pen of Charles Jr., reporting to his parents on his reading of Ovid: "It is an endless source of pleasure to be able in this manner to converse with the shades of departed greatness, to mark the great conceptions of their minds; for thereby we are enabled to mark the changes of time, the differences which it has wrought in the conceptions of men; and therein we trace the notions and feelings which, unlike the present, have passed through no editions but are the fresh productions of the minds by whom they were originated."

JOHN M. MULDER

The Revolutionary College: American Presbyterian Higher Education, 1707-1837, by Howard Miller. New York University Press, New York, 1976. Pp. 381. $15.00.

One of the distinguishing features of the Calvinist tradition has often been seen to be the impulse it provided to education in the western world. The rapid rise of literacy in Protestant and Calvinist areas has been traced to the emphasis placed upon a laity who could read the Scriptures and a trained clergy who could properly interpret them. John Knox's *First Book of Discipline* in 1560 admonished that "everie severall churche have a school maister" and that each father in a congregation be compelled, no matter what his "estait or conditioun," to bring up his children in "learnyng and virtue." The Puritan founders of Harvard proposed "to advance Learning and perpetuate it to Posterity; dreading to leave an illiterate Ministry to the Churches, when our present Ministers shall lie in the Dust."

Despite this widely recognized and acknowledged connection between Calvinism and education, there have been relatively few studies which have tried to analyze American Presbyterianism and higher education. Howard Miller, an historian at the University of Texas, has provided a rich narrative of perhaps the single most important period of American Presbyterian involvement in founding colleges. At the same time he has helped shed light on the most complex period of American Presbyterian history. He has avoided the common approach of chronicling the various aspects of an institution's development; instead, he argues that the history of education can only be written within the context of American society itself. The result is a contrapuntal analysis, seeing how the larger forces of American life interacted with the development of American Presbyterianism and its effort to define and defend higher education.

Though other colleges are treated, the

main focus is Princeton, founded as the College of New Jersey in 1746 while the fires of the First Great Awakening still burned brightly. Through the waning of religious zeal to the trials of the Revolution and the ferment of the early nineteenth century, Miller's book provides a superb analysis of what was perhaps the first American college with a national constituency. During this period Princeton always attracted its students from the Middle Atlantic region, but also New England and the South. Its tuition was relatively low, thus making it attractive to families who could not afford Harvard or Yale. Though always associated with the Presbyterian church, Princeton was never formally connected with the denomination, and the student body was both geographically and religiously diverse.

Miller follows earlier interpretations of American Presbyterianism and the history of Princeton in writing his story as one of progress and then retrogression. John Witherspoon salvaged what was clearly a faltering operation and helped to broaden the training to other fields and professions besides the ministry. The Witherspoon tradition was carried on by his son-in-law, Samuel Stanhope Smith. Both shared the philosophy of the Scottish Enlightenment, perhaps better known as "common sense philosophy," and Miller argues that "within a generation of Witherspoon's arrival" in the colonies, it became "the reigning philosophy of the American republic."

Miller is a sensitive, if occasionally overbold, interpreter, and his treatment of both Presbyterianism and the curriculum at Princeton suggest the broad and humane dimensions of its educational philosophy. Miller is less skilled in describing the common sense philosophy and how it was implemented, but even here his description of the importance of science in the Princeton of Witherspoon and Smith opens a side of Presbyterianism which has not received much attention.

The ogre of Miller's story is Ashbel Green and a terrified Presbyterian Church, uncomfortable with the apparent results of the European enlightenment—revolution, deism, atheism, social disorder. "The Great Retrogression," according to Miller, virtually destroyed Princeton, left a narrow, calcified curriculum in its wake, and created Princeton Theological Seminary. Though Miller recognizes that other factors were at stake in the establishment of the Seminary (e.g., the growing professionalization of the clergy), the book ends on a wistful note, pondering what might have been and what had to be revived in the late nineteenth century under James McCosh, and still later, Woodrow Wilson.

New interpretations may someday alter those of Miller and T. J. Wertenbaker, but that is not a reason to avoid reading this important, stimulating and provocative book.

JOHN M. MULDER

The Patristic Roots of Reformed Worship, by Hughes Oliphant Old. Theologischer Verlag, Zurich, 1975. Pp. 382. (Available from Blackwell's, Oxford, England).

Hughes Oliphant Old completed his doctorate at the University of Neuchatel in Switzerland, under the direction of Jean Jacques von Allmen, and this book is basically his doctoral dissertation. The book bears the marks of doctoral research under such a giant as von Allmen, and is replete with scholarly apparatus. It attempts a formidable task, and accomplishes it well.

The book shows a broad knowledge of the Church Fathers as well as of the writings of John Calvin and other reformers. It begins by studying the pre-Reformation harbingers of liturgical reform and then traces the evolution of services of worship in the reforming churches of Zurich, Basel and particularly Strasbourg. The study culminates with a consideration of developments in Geneva, and holds up the Genevan Psalter of 1542 as the epitome, the fruition of theological and liturgical study and concern.

In an appendix to Chapter I, Dr. Old lists thirty-two service books that were published in the period, 1524-1542. He documents the ways in which the Genevan Psalter utilized and refined previous insights and practices, building on its antecedents. Thus he establishes that this book of worship is much broader than the word Psalter now connotes. It was a full blown theological and liturgical document which had the full advantage of Calvin's mature theological thought.

However, the central thesis of the book, and the substance of the doctoral research,

focuses on the phrase in the title of the Genevan Psalter which claims that it contains forms of worship which are "according to the custom of the ancient church."

Old points out that most protestant historians and theologians who concern themselves with reformed worship seem to disregard developments before the sixteenth century. Old's research was an attempt to find out whether or not we can take Calvin at his word. Was this a real or imagined relationship with the early church? Did the Reformers really have access to sufficient patristic documents to warrant such a claim?

Old concludes that "the early Reformed Church knew well the tradition of the ancient Church and valued it highly" (p. xiii).

This superb study then documents and demonstrates the patristic sources which find their expression both in the theology and in the worship practices of the Reformers. One encounters quotations from Calvin's sermons as well as from the *Institutes*, from Bucer and Oecolampadius, from Zwingli and Hedio, from Capito and Le Fevre, from Musculus and Pellikan. Even more impressive are the references to some sixty Fathers of the church, including voluminous references to the many works of the most influential, such as Augustine, Chrysostom, Ambrose and Jerome.

Dr. Old is most convincing as he speaks of the extensive, almost encyclopedic, patristic knowledge which was represented in the scholarly environment of Strasbourg. He is convincing as he speaks of a Reformation that was nurtured by a voracious appetite for apostolic and sub-apostolic church documents and practices. He is convincing as he documents the way the worship of the sub-apostolic and patristic church informed the worship practices of the Reformed Church.

In an appendix to Chapter II Dr. Old provides an annotated bibliography of eighty-five (85) printed editions of the literature of the ancient church which were used by the Reformers, and he provides examples of this use for many of them. He also suggests that a number of patristic references in the reformers indicate that they probably also had access to manuscript sources which were not yet printed.

It is an inescapable conclusion that the Reformers sought to model their reform after the Scripture and the Father's interpretation of the Scripture. It is also an inescapable conclusion that subsequent Reformers, and the successors to the Reformers were less than diligent in continuing to probe the roots which informed the original Reformers. This neglect prevails to this day.

Hughes Oliphant Old laments that protestant worship has often been cut off from its roots and has lost the self-conscious catholicity from which it arose.

After establishing the nature and form of reformed worship, and substantiating this with a dazzling array of patristic references, Dr. Old concludes his book with three chapters dealing with the three primary areas of worship, 1) proclamation of the word, 2) prayer, and 3) the Lord's Supper. In this section he highlights specific reformed practices, documenting patristic usage. In order that the readers may have the essence of Dr. Old's findings, I will enumerate the distinctive marks of reformation worship which grew directly out of patristic practice and which were correctives to the Western practice of the 16th Century. We would do well to evaluate our worship practices by these criteria.

Proclamation of the Word

1. Preaching. From the second to as late as the 6th century, preaching was central in the worship of the church. The emphasis was not on the production of great literature, but on "getting a biblical message across to people in a language they can understand" (page 187).
2. Lectio Continua. Preaching from successive passages of the scripture was the practice of the early church and of Judaism as well. It was characteristic of the reformed tradition to criticize the fragmented treatment of scripture that developed in the early middle ages, and to reintroduce the practice of "preaching through a book."
3. Preaching from the Old Testament. The Fathers drew many series of sermons from the Old Testament, a practice that had been lost in the Medieval Roman Church, inasmuch as the Old Testament was virtually eliminated from the lectionary.
4. Prayer for Illumination. The reformers sought to avoid a mechanistic or literalistic understanding of scripture and insisted that the reading of scripture not be under-

stood as achieving its end in any magical or automatic way. Rather, the reading of scripture must be preceded by a prayer for God's blessing and the bestowing of the Holy Spirit.

Prayer

5. Prayer of Invocation. Worship always begins in the name of the Lord, with Psalm 124:8 being the most frequently used (Our help is in the name of the Lord who made heaven and earth). The service of worship begins with an affirming prayer.
6. Prayer of Confession. The reformed tradition insisted that the prayer of confession should not be private as was the medieval Confiteor. Rather, it should be a congregational prayer, and all examples of this prayer from the 16th Century are "strongly shaped by penitential passages of scripture" (page 225). This prayer is not a preparation for worship, but is an integral part of the worship service itself.
7. Prayer of Intercession. In the 16th Century the prayers of the people had been lost from Roman Catholic worship. The reformers insisted that the patristic practice of inclusive prayers of intercession be reinstituted. This prayer, together with the prayer of confession, is to be informed by a strong ecclesiology. It is to stress the individual and yet to avoid an individualistic religion.
8. Psalmody and Hymnody. The Psalms had been truncated and almost lost in Western Medieval worship. The reformers, emphasizing the doxological nature of the liturgy, insisted on returning the psalms to the people, seeking to reestablish the understanding that the whole of the Christian life must be doxological.

   At the same time, it was the conviction of the reformers that the music of worship should remain simple in order that it remain within the reach of the congregation. Lavishness and undue ornamentation tend to rob the people of their right to praise God.

The Lord's Supper

9. The Dismissal of the Unrepentant. The liturgical concomitant of church discipline was the Dismissal. The reformers were concerned both with the integrity of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper and with the curative and pastoral function of the church.
10. The Creed. The reformers emphasized the inclusion of an affirmation of faith as the beginning of the celebration of the Lord's Supper. The singing of the Creed is itself the beginning of the great Thanksgiving for in it the congregation rehearses the whole of salvation history.
11. The Communion Invocation. This prayer is first, "an invocation or epiclesis. Second it is a prayer of Thanksgiving. Third, and most important, it is a prayer in which we make the vow of the covenant" (page 289). The Eucharistic Prayer must make manifestly clear that it is the sanctifying presence of the Holy Spirit in the congregation which makes possible our true worship and that our worship must be characterized by Thanksgiving.

    Dr. Old points out, with reference to this particular prayer, that the reformers were not content to accept the entire teaching of the Fathers, not even of Ambrose and Augustine. With reference to the concept of "the sacrifice of the Mass," the reformers contended that in this matter, Ambrose was not a witness to the teaching of scripture. "This is a good example of the limitations which the reformers put on the authority of the Fathers" (page 289).
12. The Weekly Sharing of the Bread and the Cup with the whole Church. For the reformers the culmination of the service of worship is not the sermon; Nor is it the Eucharistic Prayer or the words of institution. Rather it is the sharing by the whole church of bread and the cup. The people are to eat and to drink together.
13. Communion each Lord's Day. The standard of the church should be the celebration of the Lord's Supper on each Lord's Day.
14. The post communion Thanksgiving. This prayer is primarily a supplication that "the gift of communion might take effect" (page 319). In some cases the reading of the Ten Commandments followed the communion service as the stated charter for the christian life which the

community now committed itself to lead. Dr. Old indicates that in conjunction with this prayer the alms were collected and the people committed themselves to service.

15. The Benediction. There was a strong emphasis on the prerogative, indeed the imperative, of the clergy to bless the people. The most frequently attested form of this benediction is the Aaronic Benediction which, Pellikan points out, "powerfully draws attention to the true nature of the blessing of God" (cited on page 336).

This book is indispensable. It is thoroughly indexed, both as to names and to subjects. It includes 18 pages of general bibliography as well as additional listings of collections of source literature. Appendices are available for critical study. Quotations are often given in Latin, French and German, and are provided with English translations.

The only criticism that I have of the book is that it lacks evidence of editorial care. I understand that this is the first book in the English language that has been published by Theologischer Verlag and it is evident that they did not have the services of an English speaking (or reading) copy editor. The work is marred by misspellings, infelicities of style and awkward phrasing. It is my hope that the book may find an American publisher and that these rough edges may be removed in another edition. In the meantime, it is hoped that these barriers will not too much hinder readers from reaching the vast resources which are made available through this book.

The value of the book lies in the corrective which it provides to previous historical studies of protestant worship. This is its noteworthy scholarly contribution. At the same time, it bears the marks of an author who became a pastor immediately after graduating from Princeton Seminary, and who again is the minister of a congregation. The book is pastoral in tone and scholarly in content. In this it epitomizes the tradition about which it writes.

(This book is now available from the Theological Book Agency at Princeton Theological Seminary.)

ARLO D. DUBA

Marriage, Sexuality and Celibacy, A Greek Orthodox Perspective, by Demetrios J. Constantelos. Light and Life Publishing Company, Minneapolis, Minn., 1975. Pp. 93. $3.95.

Most of us in the Western Church, while fully aware of the ferment and unrest in the Roman church with regard to the subject of this book, have not been aware of the nature of the discussion in the Eastern Orthodox church. This small volume by Demetrios J. Constantelos may serve as a most informative and helpful introduction for many of us.

The book is informative. It gives persons who are not Orthodox an insight into problems which may have touched us through the Orthodox friends of persons in our parishes.

Much more important is the helpful aspect of this book which introduces us to the writings of the Church Fathers on the subject of marriage and sex.

Father Constantelos is fully aware of the approach of the Western Church. He is an alumnus of Princeton Theological Seminary with the Master of Theology degree, and brings this background to his field of Byzantine history. It is from his historical knowledge that he discusses a theological foundation for marriage and traces the historical and theological development of marriage.

It is evident that Constantelos is concerned about a development within Orthodoxy which seems to value the celibate life more highly than the conjugal state. His book is addressed to this issue. He draws from historical sources to show that such a development is not true either to Scripture or to the practice of the early church. He briefly traces the attempts made to impose celibacy on all the clergy, beginning in the fourth century, but points out that in apostolic and early church practice, this was an optional matter. Indeed, Constantelos seems to advocate a change in the Orthodox practice of not permitting ordination after marriage and in restricting the rank of bishop to celibate clergy only.

There is a critique of some of the liturgy of the Orthodox church of which Constantelos says, "No doubt all these prayers were

composed by monks who erroneously identified original sin with the sexual act or even with sexual desire." (p. 34).

To counter this, the author cites the evidence of both scripture and the fathers that "sexual desire is not only natural, it is holy, for it is through its fulfillment in marriage that the human person becomes a collaborator or *synergos* of God in the creation," not only in reproduction, but also in "the development of deep interpersonal relationship between husband and wife." (p. 35).

In Chapter F, Constantelos addresses himself to the subject of "mixed marriages," and points out the difficulties of holding that marriages contracted in Protestant or Catholic churches are not valid. He cites the 72nd canon of the Synod of Trullo which said that a couple, already married, need not be remarried after their conversion and Baptism. How much less should a marriage be considered invalid if the partners are baptized in the name of the Triune God, inasmuch as the Orthodox Church accepts such Baptism, regardless of the church or denomination in which the Baptism took place.

It is pointed out that there is no stated decision on birth control in Orthodoxy, but rather that this subject must be dealt with individually and pastorally. The same spirit prevails with reference to divorce. The Orthodox Church, however, has been definite and unanimous in its opposition to absortion.

In conclusion, Father Constantelos affirms that Orthodoxy accepts both marriage and celibacy as equally holy states, although he points out that while marriage is considered to be a sacramental state, celibacy is not. The author seeks to hold the strong monastic and ascetic emphasis of Orthodoxy in harmony with an equally strong emphasis on the marriage relationship. He see sexuality virtually as a means of grace.

The book is thoroughly documented. I would judge that full half of the eighty-seven footnotes refer to material pre-dating the present millenium. This is a gold mine of quotations and references to a multitude of subjects in the Fathers. For example, for Chrysostom it was as much an obligation to achieve sexual fulfillment in marriage as to bear children. The use of pornographic depictions "which incite to the enkindling of base pleasures" by christians is condemned, but the frequency of reference to this problem indicates that this is something with which the church has dealt long before the present generation.

Dr. Constantelos has written a lucid, interesting and well documented book. The historical perspective which he provides would be most helpful to Protestant writers on the subject of Marriage and Sexuality. Both pastors and students will find in this work much that is of value.

ARLO D. DUBA

Hunger for Experience, by John E. Biersdorf. Seabury Press, New York, N.Y., 1975. Pp. 174. $7.95.

This book by the Director of the Institute for Advanced Pastoral Studies in Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, reports on studies of thirty-five groups which are trying, sometimes in novel ways, to meet the spiritual hunger which the author conceives to be the most significant concern of millions in our time.

The central thrust of the column is set forth in these words, "The decline in institutional maintenance statistics is indeed lamentable when it is due—not to faithfulness to the social implications of God's message—but to neglect of the authentic interpersonal and religious experiences people are seeking. Theologians' devotion to accommodating modern thought has left the realm of religious experience largely to the charismatics, unregarded groups of mystics, followers of Eastern disciplines, and, ironically, humanistic psychologists who are not so awed by the authority of scientific paradigms. We have seen the group dynamics movement, the clinical pastoral training movement, and now the first fruits of the human potential movement all attempt to reintroduce experience in general and religious experience in particular. . . . Too seldom are they regarded as signals from the secular culture itself to recall churches and synagogues to their true vocation of furnishing occasions for living in the presence of God."

Reports deal with enterprises as varied as King's Temple (Pentecostal); St. Francis Presbyterian Church in Fort Worth; Sh'ma, a Jewish journal; St. John's Abbey, a Benedictine monastery; St. Francis de Sales, a Catholic cathedral in Oakland; Open End, a non-residential community in California;

Lighthouse Ranch, a commune of "Jesus people," also in California; and New Community Projects, Inc. in Boston, a development of Interseminarian Incorporated. Using this material, the chapters explore the current individualism, styles of participation, what it means to belong, religious vitality—both conservative and liberal, and the challenge to mainline churches.

Appendices describe all the groups and the conference which examined "a certain failure of nerve?" among churches and synagogues and highlighted responses suggested by the experiments now under way among the groups.

ARTHUR M. ADAMS

Methodist Worship in Relation to Free Church Worship, by John Bishop. Scholars Studies Press, Inc., New York, N.Y., 1975. Pp. xviii + 173. $6.95.

In 1950 John Bishop published in England a helpful study of Methodist worship. He has now greatly revised and expanded that work. It is unfortunate that both books have exactly the same title; indeed the 1975 edition does not even indicate on its title page that it differs from the 1950 version. But fully half of the material in the new edition did not appear formerly. Therefore it is to be hoped that no one will casually dismiss this new edition with a mere reprinting of the earlier work.

In particular the book published in England dealt exclusively with British Methodism; now Bishop has included an analysis of Methodist worship in America. Furthermore sections on both Baptism and the Lord's Supper have been greatly strengthened; this may be the greatest contribution of the revised edition. More historical research is evident throughout the book; and, of course, liturgical developments of the past quarter century are reflected.

Another important change in the new volume has to do with the placing of Methodist worship in the perspective of the ecumenical liturgical movement. In fact, the subtitle ("In Relation to Free Church Worship") is no longer adequate to reveal the full scope of the work. The old lines between the liturgically free churches and those with fixed liturgical formulations have grown hazy and in some cases no longer exist at all. One of the clearest evidences of the distance travelled in twenty-five years is found by comparing the epilogues of the two Bishop editions. In 1950, the epilogue argued that free and liturgical worship were essentially two distinct patterns which might profit from dialogue. But as has been the case in the political sphere, "peaceful coexistence" has given way to "detente." The 1975 epilogue speaks much more positively and hopefully of a liturgical renewal common to both traditions.

Methodist Worship opens with a concise but useful statement concerning the historic evolution of Free Church worship. The remainder of the book is divided into two parts. The first half surveys the form and order of worship in the Free Churches, devoting sections to praise, prayers, the lessons, the sermon, and the sacraments. The second half is a study of Methodist worship which begins with its origins and development and then discusses its distinctive features—particularly the love feast, the watchnight service, and the covenant service. Next Baptism and the Lord's Supper are examined both in terms of doctrine and practice. Finally there is a section on Methodist hymnody.

Bishop writes in a style which is both interesting and informative. His discussion is documented with 310 notes; there are nearly 150 entries in the bibliographical section. Separate indices are provided for authors cited and for subjects discussed; the latter index is rather limited, but the clear organization of the book as a whole helps overcome this lack of comprehensiveness.

The treatment of Methodist worship is incomplete in two respects. First, the discussion is confined to the largely-white denominations. This is particularly regrettable since in many ways the black Methodist denominations (AME, AME Zion, CME *et al.*) have preserved the Wesleyan spirit of worship more faithfully than the rest of us. Second, the *terminus ad quem* for the discussion of Methodist liturgical developments in the United States is the 1964 *Book of Worship*. While mention is made in passing of the 1972 "Alternate Text for the Lord's Supper," there is no evaluation of this and related subsequent developments; nor is there indication that this text (which is more than a

provisional or trial use rite) represents an understanding of eucharistic worship significantly different from that of the 1964 formulations.

On the whole, Bishop's book is a valuable work which commends itself to all who are interested in the history and theology of Methodist worship. The volume presents a digest of a great volume of literature on the subject; it provides ample clues to further study for those who desire more detailed examination of particular issues.

LAURENCE H. STOOKEY

Wesley Theological Seminary
Washington, D.C.

Preaching for the People, by Lowell O. Erdahl. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1976. Pp. 127. $5.95.

This decade so far has not been a good season for books on preaching. Most of them have been a backflow of what Phillips Brooks, P. T. Forsyth, Harry E. Fosdick and H. Grady Davis have said better already. One or two, e.g., David Randolph and Clyde Fant, have broken new ground and we are their debtors. This most recent effort, a rather slim volume, by Lowell O. Erdahl, senior minister at the University Lutheran Church of Hope, Minneapolis, Minn., deserves considerable commendation. It comprises three sections: Why Should I Preach? What Should I Preach? and How Should I Preach? Two appendices provide examples of the homiletical process the author espouses and a series of perceptive questions for reviewing the preacher's aim, materials and method.

Dr. Erdahl's approach is quite different from the usual homiletical text. His congregation is just not his audience; they are, as he says, "possibilities waiting for fulfillment" (p. 18). Hence his is an expectant pulpit from which he aims to "proclaim God's YES to create faith" (p. 22). The section on "How Should I Preach?" is the best discussion of all three; here the author deals with the characteristics and principles of effective sermon writing and avoids the blight of rules. Teachers of preaching and younger ministers will read this helpful book with much satisfaction. What is especially satisfactory is that one comes away from these chapters knowing what the author believes theologically as well as what he advocates homiletically.

DONALD MACLEOD

Sermons for Christian Seasons, by Merle A. Johnson. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1976. Pp. 111. $3.50.

The author of two earlier volumes, *Religious Roulette and Other Games Christians Play* and *The Kingdom Seekers*, Merle A. Johnson is minister of the First United Methodist Church in Forest City, Arkansas. Here are sixteen sermons, four for each of the main seasons of the Christian Year: Advent, Lent, Easter and Pentecost. Above average in quality and traditional in format, these sermons are marked by flashes of insight and perception which stimulate our thinking and bring miscellaneous ideas into clearer focus. Each sermon is scripture oriented and shows the result of careful exploration of the human needs to which the Gospel speaks. The author tends, however, in some instances to mythologize too freely (e.g., the case of the innkeeper) which is easier to do than to demythologize some of our cliché ridden and all too readily accepted traditions and thereby to delineate their deeper meaning for the twentieth century. Thoughtful preachers will find, nevertheless, much in this volume to stimulate thinking and preparation for the festival seasons. (Errata: p. 14, "principle" should read "principal"; p. 27, J. S. Whale is a Congregationalist, not an Anglican and "cannot help but notice" is bad grammar for "cannot help noticing"; p. 42, "humans" is incorrect because "human" is an adjective, not a noun; p. 52, "mourning" should be "morning"; and p. 54, those of us who knew Dean Hough would never cite him as "dour.")

DONALD MACLEOD

Christian Worship in Transition, by James F. White. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1976. Pp. 160. $6.75.

To the liturgically well read, this book will be regarded as either a *potpourri* or,

what Milton said of his own poem *Lycidas*, "He touches the tender stops of various quills." By now the revolution and ferment of the 1960's in the worship practices of all Christian churches have abated. The human instinct is to back off momentarily and assay the positive values of these changes and to discover thereby a new perspective upon the present. Henry E. Horn of Cambridge, in his *Worship in Crisis* (Fortress), has done a competent piece of liturgical reflection for the Lutheran tradition. Now James F. White, professor of Christian Worship at Perkins School of Theology, sets down in well organized fashion something akin to "business arising out of the minutes." White is well informed, well read, and sensitive to what John Mackay used to call "the great proprieties." In eight chapters he surveys where we are now in view of where we have just been. Our interest and attention are sustained, however, by White's occasional telling sentence rather than by a considerable measure of his substance which has been said already by W. S. Maxwell, H. Hageman, H. M. Davies, J. H. Nichols, and others. Nevertheless, we do not fault him for some necessary reiteration.

This reviewer found chapters II-IV of considerable value (Basics of Sacramental Theology; Starting from Our Tradition; Reaching Our Culture). More than a few ministers of the Reformed tradition, however, will question Dr. White's somewhat truncated interpretation of baptism (administered to children), his missing of Communion as being our witness to the redeemed life (which little tots are incapable of grasping or demonstrating), and his generalization about the sacraments being "an extension of the incarnation."

For students breaking into the study of worship this volume will be helpful to them in securing a vision of the contours of the liturgical terrain. For more advanced persons, such as preachers and teachers, it will provide a useful refresher course.

Teachers of worship will await with interest a further chapter from Dr. White in which he will forecast how our re-discovery of the theological rationale of the Reformed tradition should engage as a liturgical catalyst the world of the arts.

DONALD MACLEOD

Humor in the American Pulpit, by Doug Adams. The Sharing Co., North Aurora, Ill., 1976. Pp. 241. $6.95.

Currently Doug Adams is the Carl Patton Professor of Worship and Preaching at Pacific School of Religion and a member of the Graduate faculty of the Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, California. His predecessor, Dr. Harland Hogue, says of this new book by Adams: "It is a pioneer work of scholarship, in addressing the significance of humor theologically and historically in American preaching." Taking his cue from Reinhold Niebuhr (see *Discovering the Signs of the Times*, pp. 130-131), Professor Adams explores "the dynamics of humor in Christian worship" from George Whitefield to Henry Ward Beecher. His chapter titles indicate the breadth of his inquiry: two chapters deal with patterns and motivation in pulpit humor and three describe its use in "exorcising idolatries" of power, wisdom, and wealth. Appendices include a list of American preachers noted for their pulpit humor (for Princetonians, the name of Archibald Alexander is of interest) and a rather extensive bibliography.

DONALD MACLEOD

Will Our Children Have Faith? by John H. Westerhoff, III. The Seabury Press, New York, N.Y., 1976. Pp. 126. $6.95.

John Westerhoff is today's most influential spokesman for Christian education. Through his teaching at Duke, Princeton Seminary, Harvard Divinity School, and elsewhere; through his consulting with hundreds of local congregations, denominational groups, boards and agencies, public and private foundations and corporations, secular educational institutions, and national and international organizations; through his work on the Board of Homeland Missions of the United Church of Christ as editor of *Colloquy*; and through his lecturing and writing Westerhoff has stimulated, excited and challenged as many laypersons, students and professionals as anyone in the field. The reason for this is that he has a compelling vision of what Christian education can be,

and enormous energy to communicate it to whoever will listen—including many who didn't think they were interested.

Westerhoff's vision has developed and changed over the years; partly as a result of more thorough academic study, but mostly because of his continuing interaction with people who are trying to understand what Christian education is and how to go about it. His latest "tract" is a statement of his present convictions on the matter. He has basically two things of great importance to say: (1) since the early 20th century Christian education has been operating under the domination of "the schooling-instructional paradigm," and that is bankrupt; and (2) the search for a new paradigm will require much greater attention to theological resources and less dependence on the social sciences and general education.

The schooling-instructional paradigm, according to Westerhoff, assumes that education in the Christian faith takes place in some form of school and that instruction is the means by which such education takes place. Therefore, we build Sunday Schools, develop curricula, train teachers, gather children, youth and adults in classes and seminars, and teach them. As educators we ask, what do I want the students to know or be?—and then we try to get them there. Churches that can do this (and usually it is only some of the large ones that can really pull it off) are considered "successful"; those that can't, "fail" while struggling along trying to emulate the model. The problem with all this, says Westerhoff, is that the schooling-instructional paradigm has little if anything to do with educating for faith. We can teach about religion in that way, but it will not do much to help persons live as Christian disciples.

> Faith cannot be taught by any method of instruction; we can only teach religion. We can know about religion, but we can only expand in faith, act in faith, live in faith. Faith can be inspired within a community of faith, but it cannot be given to one person by another. Faith is expressed, transformed, and made meaningful by persons sharing their faith in an historical tradition-bearing community of faith. (p. 23).

Westerhoff has argued before that the schooling model of education is not broad enough to encompass the concerns of Christian education. This is not something new for him. But in previous publications (especially his *Generation to Generation*) he was arguing this on social scientific grounds (i.e., the socialization process is just too big and pervasive to be accomplished in Sunday School). But Westerhoff himself was still operating on the premise that Christian education involves doing something to somebody else in order to bring them to the point where you think they ought to be. Here he is doing something *quite* different. He is arguing that faith depends ultimately and primarily on the activity of God. And he is arguing this on theological rather than social scientific or general educational grounds.

This major shift of ground is the real reason why we must pay more attention to theological resources than we have in the past. But unfortunately, here Westerhoff is less helpful. He claims to find significant help from liberation theology, but it is difficult to see much peculiar to that movement directly influencing his own constructive work. Rather, he uses a fairly standard series of theological affirmations to support his thesis that "the context or place of Christian education is best understood as a community of faith" (p. 50). An adequate theological analysis of just what this community of faith is and what makes it distinctive is not given. But even though Westerhoff cannot tell us too much new about it, he can recognize it when he sees it. And he helps *us* to see it by the deft use of one of his greatest skills: the telling of stories.

One of his most illuminating stories concerns an incident on a retreat at which over $200 was stolen from the members of the group. In an atmosphere of anger and hostility Westerhoff brought the 400 retreatants together and read John 7:53-58, the story of the woman caught in adultery. After reading the story and hearing the good news that Jesus does not condemn, Westerhoff prayed. As he tells it,

> At the end of the prayer, the young man who had stolen the money came forward to make his confession and return the money. They were going to send him home when someone cried, "Do you want to stay?" "Yes," he mumbled. "Stay! Stay!"

> everyone cried. "Let us sing 'Amazing Grace,'" I exclaimed, and we did. With tears running down their faces, one person after another came forward to embrace the boy. (p. 63).

Here what Westerhoff means by Christian education is taking place. The divisions between teachers and students, leaders and learners fall. The motivating question for the educator shifts from "what should the student be or do," to "what can I bring to share with another as a believer in Christ and member of his church?" (p. 103). In this context "the means of Christian education is best understood as the actions between and among faithful persons in an environment that supports the expansion of faith and equips persons for radical life in the world as followers of Jesus Christ". (p. 50).

Westerhoff calls this sort of educational process enculturation (unfortunately, I think; it is still a social scientific category which does not carry the freight of the theological dynamics operating here). It constitutes the second major axis of his alternative model: "the community of faith-enculturation paradigm."

Westerhoff does a good deal more to fill in the picture which his paradigm presents when he discusses the place and importance of ritual, tradition, experience in the community, and community action in the world, and when he presents his typology of four styles of faith. But the study is not complete, as Westerhoff acknowledges. We still need to know in detail what the human dynamics are in the community of faith context. We still need to know what place teaching does have in this over-arching paradigm, and where, when and how we should do it. Is he really suggesting that we completely abandon church schools, seminaries, and denominational boards of education? Or is he simply saying that these institutions need to see themselves in a different light? And we still need to know how to get from here to there. Furthermore, we need to know all of this in the light of a profoundly understood and deeply felt theological perspective.

We can be grateful to Westerhoff for challenging us and stimulating us once again. One hopes, however, that someday he will provide us with more systematic reflections on our whole enterprise.

CRAIG DYKSTRA

Foundations for Christian Education in An Era of Change, ed. by Marvin J. Taylor. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1976. Pp. 288. $5.95.

Periodically, the Abingdon Press publishes a survey of the current state of religious education theory and practice. This book is the fifth in that series which began in 1931 with *Studies in Religious Education* edited by Lotz and Crawford. It is the third such book that Dr. Taylor has edited. A scanning of the articles contained in these volumes provides a capsule history of development of the field of Christian education so far as the major issues and concerns of the day are concerned. In this volume, what seems to be bothering Christian educators is the future: we don't know how to get there. This is primarily because we don't know where we are now. The "era of change" phrase in the title is accepted by all of the writers of the twenty-one articles, and interpreted by most to mean "era of confusion" or "era of disarray."

Articles on religious education as it relates to public education, evangelicalism, the ecumenical movement, the situations in Western Europe and in the Third World, Roman Catholic education, and higher education; articles on liberation and black theology, women in the church and in religious education; and Robert Lynn's analysis of "a historical perspective on the futures of American religious education"—all point to sources of ferment. None of the authors, however, are willing to venture firm predictions about where the present situation will lead (except, perhaps, James Michael Lee who seems pretty sure that things are eventually going to go his way).

Robert Lynn's essay is, in an analytical sense, the most comprehensive investigation of this situation. He argues that if we are to understand the past, interpret the present, and anticipate the future of American religious education, we must look at the "ecology" of institutional relations of which reli-

gious education is a part. If we do look at religious education from this perspective, we find that religious education is at the end of an era. This is most conspicuous for Catholics who are no longer "aliens in a Protestant Zion," but it is no less true for mainline Protestant religious education (represented by theorists from Coe to Westerhoff) which depends on what Lynn calls a "victorian American marketplace" that finds its ground shifting out from underneath.

If Lynn is right, the present search must be for foundations (new or old, reconstructed or transformed) for religious education. But it is precisely here that Taylor's volume is mistitled. We must settle rather for issues and approaches; not foundations. A few of the articles suggest briefly what the foundations of their approaches might be but there is little indication that these foundations may not be inadequate or mutually incompatible. No one argues *for* a position *over-against* another. There is no real staking-out of the options at the foundational level.

Two foundational options do, however, seem to be operating beneath the approaches prescribed in several of the articles. Some place their faith in the social sciences and in the assumption made explicit by Robert L. Browning that

> there is now available a body of research findings and tested practice about the structures and capacities of persons in their mental and personality development, a body of findings about the basic structures of knowledge and how core ideas can be structured for persons at different age levels, a body of research concerning patterns of teaching and learning which are effective at different ages and stages of growth (p. 139).

Given all of this, we merely have to decide where we want to go. And then "when we know where we are going, we can get all the subsystems working in line with these objectives" (p. 138). Robert Worley's understanding of "church education as an organizational phenomenon" makes similar assumptions, as does Charles Melchert's discussion of "theory in religious education."

Others, however, are not so sure that we can ever achieve the social scientific ideal of transparent description and accurate prediction. There is, they would maintain, a fundamental mystery about human life and its relation to the Creator. Thus, James Loder concludes his exposition of current theories of the psychology of human development by pointing out that

> it is still the fundamentally rationalistic tendency of behavioral science which governs research even in religious development. Theological views of human nature should begin to play an active part in guiding research as well as in evaluating its significance (p. 66).

Sara Little, H. Edward Everding, Jr., Ross Snyder and Grant Schockley each in their own way make similar suggestions.

Unfortunately, this engagement never really takes place here. This is a significant weakness of the book, but it does not make the book unimportant because the weakness of the book reflects a weakness in the field as a whole. In fact, this is a very important book when it is viewed as a summary of the current state of the field.

There are several very helpful articles, too, about some particulars in Christian education. D. Campbell Wyckoff presents an informative summary of the state of curriculum theory and practice, and Paul M. Dietterich provides one of the best examples of an introduction to a particular educational method (simulation games) I have ever seen. Taylor's twelve page bibliography of contributions to the field since 1966 is immensely helpful to practitioners and theorists alike. Together with similar bibliographies in the previous two volumes, Taylor has provided the best readily available bibliography of the field since 1950 that we have.

Taylor's book, like those that appeared earlier in the series, will be used a great deal by church education professionals and in Seminary classrooms. We are grateful that it is inexpensive, but it is shameful that the binding is so poor that reviewing the book leaves sheets of text fluttering all over one's desk.

Craig Dykstra

BOOK NOTES

by Donald Macleod

PALMER, Earl F., *Salvation by Surprise*. Word Books, Inc., Waco, Texas, 1975. Pp. 198. $5.95.

The senior minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Berkeley, California, has given us the fruits of an in-depth study of Paul's Letter to the Romans which formed the nucleus and framework of a season in his pulpit ministry. A perceptive and thorough student, Dr. Palmer has availed himself of the rich resources of exegetical scholarship and shows intimate acquaintance with the writings of Bornkamm, Dodd, Kittel, Käsemann, Barrett, Pannenberg, Jeremias, Bruce, *et alia*. This book has a theological comprehensiveness which does not lose sight of the treasures of meaning to be found in the linguistic nuances which the untutored tend to overlook. Moreover, the author provides us with a useful study guide for an understanding, through the medium of *Romans*, of man, his world, and the redemptive means God chose to provide eternal salvation.

MILLER, William McE., *A Christian's Response to Islam*. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Nutley, N.J., 1976. Pp. 178. $3.50.

Here is the story of the work and witness of a missionary whose vision, zeal, and exemplary life have written a great chapter in the record of Princeton in world evangelism. The pioneer missionary to Arabia, Samuel M. Zwemer, known as the *Apostle to Islam* (the title of his biography by J. Christy Wilson, Sr.), visited Princeton Theological Seminary during World War I and appealed for volunteers "to go to the Muslim world with the Good News of Jesus Christ" (p. 8). Two of those who went were J. Christy Wilson and William McE. Miller. The latter served in Iran from 1919 to 1962 when he retired. This paperback is his story—a first hand account of the origins, beliefs and practices of Muslims; differences between Islam and Christianity; missionary means and methods; and a strategy for the future. This is a useful book for study groups but basically it is a compelling witness to the saving character of the Christian faith.

STACEY, John (ed.), *In Church*. Garden City Press, Letchworth, England, 1975. Pp. 224. £1.30.

This book has been published under the auspices of the Division of Ministries of the Methodist Church in Great Britain. It comprises twelve essays on matters related to preaching and worship. Each chapter ends with a helpful bibliography and the book itself concludes with a scheme of study by which its materials may form the basis for a discussion course. The range of topics explored enhances the usefulness of this volume: The Nature of Worship; The History of Worship; Young People at Worship; Justification for Preaching; Sources of Sermons; Visual Aids; and so forth. Lay preachers will find these chapters to be especially helpful. Preachers with experience will receive benefit from them as a refresher course.

YOUNG, Henry J. (ed.), *Preaching the Gospel*. Fortress Press, Philadelphia, Pa., 1976. Pp. 89. $2.95 (paper).

Here are nineteen sermons by contemporary black preachers. They are a useful contribution to the literature of the black pulpit because they show how the traditional theological concepts of the Christian faith have been addressed to those social, economic, and political conditions which have affected an ethnic community. Each of these preachers—and they include such well known names as James H. Cone, Benjamin E. Mays, Martin Luther King, Jr., Leon Sullivan—speaks out of his own unique experience, yet there is a dimension of universality about their common message. They call for the eradication of those basic factors which create racism,

injustice and oppression among all members of the human race. There is, however, a strong element of hope here which is based on nothing less than the promises of God and which looks to its fulfillment both in and beyond history. Students of comparative preaching in America will in this paperback find a resource book of real value.

COX, James W., *A Guide to Biblical Preaching*. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1976. Pp. 142. $6.50.

As a successful teacher of preachers, Professor Cox of Louisville Baptist Theological Seminary comes to the writing of a textbook on homiletics with not only a measure of real professional competence, but also a sense of discrimination as to what such a volume should include. This book is a rich blend of scholarship, careful theme selection, comprehensive homiletical know-how, and common sense. In the course of five cogent chapters, Dr. Cox deals with the main principles of biblical interpretation as they pertain to the preacher's craftsmanship and through examples, illustrations, and references to wide reading he provides us with a study book of exceptional quality and usefulness.

MAIER, Paul L., *First Christians*. Harper & Row, Publishers, New York, N.Y., 1976. Pp. 160. $6.95.

All of us owe a debt to Professor Maier for his two earlier volumes, *First Christmas* and *First Easter* (Harper & Row). This new volume completes his trilogy on the major festivals of the Christian church. This volume and its predecessors represent original research of high order and provide a fascinating account of the "rapid spread of the faith" after the first Christian Pentecost. With many illustrations and careful annotations, Maier's writings are a happy blend of imagination and basic scholarship and provide excellent companion volumes for study groups on the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles. Moreover, his recreation of the leading characters in the drama of "the explosion of Christianity across the Mediterranean world" gives a personal complexion and flavor to this saga of unusual interest.

SUELTZ, Arthur F., *New Directions for the Ten Commandments*. Harper & Row, Publishers, New York, N.Y., 1976. Pp. 101. $2.95 (paper).

For exciting lines, fresh slants, and the impression that the Gospel is a lively business, this little book makes inviting reading. Minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Lakewood, California, Arthur F. Sueltz writes with a clear-cut style which arrests the reader's (or hearer's) attention. He deals with the Ten Commandments not as rigid mandates but as living principles which, if permitted, can energize human lives. Not everyone will appreciate Sueltz's method and approach and may shrink from the usual terms used to describe this kind of preacher —hard-hitting, on target, spirited, striking— however, there is a frankness about this mode of writing which provides an elixir against the heaviness of the essay style.

MORRIS, Colin, *Mankind My Church*. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1972. Pp. 160. $2.45 (paper).

This book of sermons reflects a more steady message and affirmation than earlier treatises and tracts by Colin Morris who was then "a fiery English missionary to Africa." Presently the parish minister at Wesley's Chapel in London, Dr. Morris is a preacher of striking relevance and effectiveness. Here are thirteen thoughtful sermons marked by theological literacy, wide reading, and social sensitivity. Preachers will find here not only "thought starters" but also the means to stretch their minds.

MacQUEEN, Angus J., *Superman Is An Idiot*. Lancelot Press, Windsor, Nova Scotia, 1976. Pp. 180. $3.95 (paper).

Here are fourteen sermons and four addresses by one of Canada's distinguished clergymen. Presently the senior minister of St. George's Church, Toronto, Dr. MacQueen has served a number of outstanding pulpits in eastern and western Canada and was one of the youngest men ever to be elected (1958)

as Moderator of the national church. These sermons are almost wholly topical and are not intended to be homiletical models (as MacQueen says in his Foreward, "They have been taken, for the most part, from tapes and still retain much of the style of the spoken word"). However, they are the obvious product of a perceptive mind, of unusually wide reading, and a grasp of interesting detail which keeps one's imagination racing along with the writer.

All these virtues aside, a reader of these sermons cannot help (i) flinching, howbeit mildly, from the number of blunt expressions ("That's claptrap") and other literary infelicities which are always dubious techniques for impact; (ii) sensing the absence of any real encounter with extended passages of scripture and the shaping of the sermons from them; and (iii) noting the inclusion of no great theological or biblical scholars later than John Baillie and Reinhold Niebuhr (as contrasted with names and references to an endless number of secular writers of today). Preachers, nevertheless, will come away from this book with armfuls of apt quotations and illustrations.

ODEN, William B., *Liturgy As Life-Journey*. Acton House, Los Angeles, Cal., 1976. Pp. 141. $4.95 (paper).

This paperback results from creative liturgical projects within the context of a parish situation. The minister of the Methodist Church, Norman, Oklahoma, and an alumnus of Harvard University and the Boston University School of Theology, Mr. Oden has taken a comprehensive look at the liturgical patterns of the trendy 1960's and the more reflective 1970's and has written an opening chapter (pp. 1-16) of unusual competence. The remainder of the book presents liturgical resources for the main festivals of the Christian Year, followed by forty pages of prayers and occasional liturgies which are among the best materials in the book. Probably the main weakness of this volume lies in the need for a stronger and more articulate theological orientation. The author pays tribute to a whole host of great persons to whom he feels indebted (p. ix). Too bad he had not found John Calvin! This would have given him the necessary theological meaningfulness to his hodgepodge order of worship (pp. 15-16) and helped to avoid the liturgical aberration that the sermon is "central to the act of worship." (Errata: Randolph, not Randolf, p. 13; Read, not Reed; Sundays *of* Advent, not *in* Advent, p. 19; and Easter Day, not Easter Sunday, p. 50).

MEAD, Frank S., *Talking with God: Prayers for Today*. A. J. Holman Co., Philadelphia, Pa., 1976. Pp. 96. $3.95.

As a collection of prayers, both classic and modern, this is a choice example of good editing, of wide devotional interests, and of genuine sensitivity to contemporary needs. An author and editor of recognized competence, Frank Mead was associated for many years with the Revell Publishing Company and has been the compiler of the annual *Handbook of Denominations in the U.S.A. and Canada*. This is a book to start the day with; moreover, its riches will support the careful reader throughout any and every day.

van DAALEN, David H., *The Kingdom of God Is Like This*. Epworth, London, 1976. Pp. 111. £1 (paper).

The problem of accurate interpretation of the parables of Jesus has occupied the minds of biblical scholars for centuries from Augustine to Jeremias. Today the traditional interpretations are questioned from modern perspectives and in the noise of verbal conflict, frequently the essentially simple messages of the parables are apt to be lost. The author of this modest paperback is a native of the Netherlands, a graduate of Leiden and Utrecht Universities, and now a parish minister in England. He writes out of an informed and scholarly background and singles out eight themes from the message of Jesus and explores and expands them by the composite evidence of the parables. A very worthwhile book!

RASSIEUR, Charles L., *The Problem Clergymen Don't Talk About*. Westminster Press, Philadelphia, Pa., 1976. Pp. 157. $3.95.

A professional counsellor and a Presbyterian clergyman, Charles Rassieur is in a favor-

able position to collect data, analyze it, and to reflect competently upon it. Every pastor brings to the counselling situation not only his own personal feelings but he has to meet the challenges and temptations each encounter lays before him. Many a career and domestic relationship have been wrecked through either a mishandling of a case or the lack of caution on the part of clergymen as they become more and more involved with persons whose needs they have tried to help. This is a very sensible book and a helpful guide for any clergyman; it is professional without being heavily technical.

COGGAN, Donald, *Convictions*. Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1975. Pp. 320. £4.95.

When Donald Coggan was enthroned as the 101st Archbishop of Canterbury, the London Sunday Telegraph commented: "The Church now has a preacher at its head, a preacher who will try to turn back the tides of doubt and fear." Those of us who know Dr. Coggan personally can vouch for this and more; he is a competent scholar, a prudent churchman, and a pastor with a great heart and keen devotional sensitivity. His publisher gives us here a collection of Coggan's lectures, sermons, and addresses delivered when he was Archbishop of York and during his early months in Lambeth Palace, including the text of the enthronement sermon in Canterbury Cathedral on January 24, 1975. These chapters are a delight to read, not only for those who appreciate a finished literary style, but for Coggan's advocacy of the power of the spoken word, his defense of the central facts of New Testament faith—the biblical revelation of God, the life and death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, the promise and authenticity of the Holy Spirit—and for his familiarity with those resources by which human faith is strengthened.

MOTTER, Alton M., *Preaching on National Holidays*. Fortress Press, Philadelphia, Pa., 1976. Pp. 120. $2.95 (paper).

The Planning Director of the Buffalo Area Council of Churches, Alton M. Motter, has edited many books of sermons, among them originally was the publication of sermons given at the Chicago Sunday Evening Club. Many preachers find the demand of national celebrations an extra burden and the resources rather slim. Here are twenty-two short sermons for Memorial Day, Labor Day, Independence Day, Veterans Day, Thanksgiving Day, and so forth, by some well known and highly respected preachers and writers: R. H. Edwin Espy, Cynthia Wedel, J. Robert Nelson, Robert V. Moss, and others. These are bright, topical treatments of patriotic themes which any minister will profit from reading, especially during those fallow periods of the homiletical mind.

DAVIES, H. M. and SLIFER, M., *Prayers and Other Resources for Public Worship*. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1976. Pp. 96. $4.95.

Conscious of the extent of "disorderliness and irreverence" in much of our divine worship, two clergymen of the United Church of Christ—one a university professor (Horton Davies of Princeton) and the other a parish minister (Morris Slifer of Quakertown, Pa.) —have assembled an anthology of liturgical resources of splendid quality and literary style. Their objective was "to be thoroughly biblical, reverent in spirit and expression, simple, honest, and contemporary" (p. 8). Here are prayers for the seasons of the Christian Year, for various locations in the regular services of worship, and for special occasions and celebrations. Although the number of collections of prayers and devotional materials is staggering these days, the quality of these pages justifies their publication.

BISHOP, John, *Courage to Live*. Judson Press, Valley Forge, Pa., 1976. Pp. 127. $3.95 (paper).

The opening sentences of the Introduction suggest the central thrust of this book: "The basic human need is not for money or material things but for courage to live. . . . People today are frightened and anxious. They find the burdens of living too much for them, and when some crisis arises, then the bottom

drops out of their lives." Covering a wide range of human problems—disappointment, loneliness, fear, suffering, grief, death—Dr. Bishop presents fourteen sermons of a traditional format and character, representing wide reading and the fruits of some forty years experience in the ministry of the Methodist Church in Great Britain and the United States of America. The author of a number of books, including his widely read, *The Man in the Manse*, Dr. Bishop is now retired and makes his home in Princeton, New Jersey.

MORRIS, Wm. & Mary (eds.), *Harper Dictionary of Contemporary Usage*. Harper & Row, Publishers, New York, N.Y., 1975. Pp. 650. $15.00.

Here is a magnificent volume which should serve as the linguistic conscience of our gabby generation. It is dedicated to two great writers—W. H. Auden and H. L. Mencken—who were crusaders all their days for the prevention of cruelty to the English language. A panel of some 136 consultants, including such names as Canfield, Amory, Ciardi, Thomas, Cronkite, and Newman, were involved in the project and provide an interesting feature, the Usage Panel, by which opinions about certain words and usages are explored and their most acceptable meaning and form are brought into focus. With the fruit of four years of word studies and the compiling of ballots and questionnaires, the co-authors, William and Mary Morris, two recognized authorities on linguistic usage, deserve high praise for their magnificent job and for an invaluable instrument for the betterment of our literary and spoken expression.

LARSON, Bruce, *The Relational Revolution*. Word Books, Publisher, Waco, Texas, 1976. Pp. 143. $5.95.

In his eighth book, Bruce Larson carries some stages further his thinking upon the human problem and the jumbled complex of personal relationships. Already an established author (his books have reached sales of three-quarters of a million), Larson picks up the concept of relational theology and finds it leading him into a book on "relational revolution." Ordinary observation has shown him "the tragic loss of the relational dimension in our daily lives" (p. 20) and the Christian gospel has indicated our only hope lies "in the belief that God has entered into a relationship with us of unbreakable love and all-encompassing forgiveness which is sealed by the life, sacrifice, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, his Son" (p. 106). He calls for a new strategy for human relationships which is person-centered and person-concerned. Written in a delightfully interesting style and amply illustrated from personal experience, the author, with acknowledged indebtedness to Tournier, Glasser, Menninger, and others, has given us a very helpful volume in which principles as old as Plato and as authentic as the Christian gospel take on living forms of action in twentieth century life.

ADDRESSES OF PUBLISHERS

Abingdon Press, 201 Eighth Avenue South, Nashville, Tennessee 37203
Augsburg Publishing House, 426 South Fifth Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415
Baker Book House, 1019 Wealthy Street, S.E., Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506
Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 225 Jefferson Street, S.E., Grand Rapids, Mich. 49502
Epworth Press, 2 Chester House, Pages Lane, London, England N10 1PZ
Fortress Press, 2900 Queen Lane, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19129
Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 747 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017
Harper & Row, Publishers, 10 East 53rd Street, New York, N.Y. 10022
Hodder & Stoughton, 8 Warwick Lane, London, E.C. 4, England
A. J. Holman, 1222 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19105
Judson Press, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania 19481
John Knox Press, 341 Ponce de Leon Avenue, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30308
Ktav Publishing House, 120 East Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10002
Lancelot Press, Windsor, Nova Scotia, Canada
New York University Press, Washington Square, New York, N.Y. 10003
Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing House, Box 185, Nutley, New Jersey 07110
SCM Press, 56-58 Bloomsbury Street, Bedford Square, London, W.C. 1, England
Seabury Press, 815 Second Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017
The Sharing Company, P.O. Box 190, North Aurora, Illinois 60542
Trinity University Press, 715 Stadium Drive, San Antonio, Texas 78284
The University of Chicago Press, 5801 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60637
The Westminster Press, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107
Word Books, Inc., 4800 West Waco Drive, Waco, Texas 76701