ENCOUNTER-

::—0—::

IN THIS ISSUE

::—0—::

THE DIVINITY SCHOOL

Duke University **Durham, North Carolina**

MARCH 1956

EDITORIALS

The Second Edition of ENCOUNTER

One year ago this spring the first issue of **Encounter** came from the press. Under the editorship of Jack Crum and Robin Scroggs the magazine sought to relate "the theological disciplines we study and the practical life of the parish." This second issue of the Divinity School's new journal seeks to carry on the purpose inaugurated in the first issue.

An effort has been made this time to expand the magazine's coverage; that is, features other than essays and articles have been included. The book section introduced in this issue is one example of what the Editors hope will be the ever expanding services of the magazine.

In the final analysis the success or failure of this venture in seminary journalism at The Divinity School lies with the Student Body. Your response is ernestly solicited. The Editors welcome suggestions and criticisms and will make an effort to heed them.

We are interested in channeling the best of The Divinity School's creative work into **Encounter.** We are asking that the members of the Student Body submit any material they feel merits publication. This may include "letters to the editor," sermons, essays, poetry, book reviews, short stories or news articles. Since **Encounter** is the only publication the Student Body sponsors (other than **The Circuit Rider**), it is our desire to make it as inclusive as possible within the limits of the purpose of the magazine.

Articles submitted should be typed (double spaced) if possible. The author should be sure to include his or her name and state whether it is desired that the manuscript be returned. The judgment of the Editors will, of course, have to be final with respect to what is published.

We feel that **Encounter** can meet a real need at Duke. Are you willing to help us meet that need? Let us hear from the readers.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: FREE

Encounter is financed wholly by the Student Council. The maga-

(Continued Inside Back Cover)

ENCOUNTER is published twice during the academic year by the Student Body of The Divinity School of Duke University, Durham, North Carolina. This magazine is financed wholly by the Student Council of The Divinity School and distributed free to accredited members of the Student Body.

Opinions expressed in articles appearing in ENCOUNTER are those of the author(s) of the articles, and do not necessarily represent the views of the Faculty or the Student Body.

Address all correspondence to: The Editors, ENCOUNTER, The Divinity School, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: Twenty-five cents per copy.

CO-EDITORS: Ted Morton and Moody Smith.

THE GREAT AWAKENING from 1740 to 1750

by Perry Miller

Thomas Aquinas, having to define Theology in the very first Question of the **Summa**, with characteristic skill resolved on the eighth article the problem of to what extent sacred doctrine is "augumentative." His judicious conclusion is that Sacred Scripture can dispute with one who denies its principles "only if the opponent admits some at least of the truths obtained through divine revelation." If the opponent believes nothing, there are then no means of proving articles of faith; Christians have only the negative capability of answering objections. That is to say, we can only show the opponent that, while we cannot convince him of our truth, he has no leg of his own to stand upon. If he can be reduced to recognizing his incompetence, then perhaps the way will be opened for a work of conviction; but that will have to be a work of divine illumination, not of human persuasion.

Inheritors of the Protestant tradition frequently come upon this introductory passage with a feeling of relief—at least, I have found that some students, approaching the **Summa** for the first time, do breathe such a sigh. It says that they do not have to worry about arguing with Thomas; they do not need to fear that he will undermine their commitments. They can settle back to enjoy the subtle play of the Thomistic dialect as they might delight in the development of a fugue. But, on the other hand, in a short time they become obscurely uncomfortable: if Sacred Doctrine is to be spun out to the length of the **Summa** only for dectation of those who already believe in divine revelation, what becomes of that long chapter in Protestant history which we call "missions." If this is what Theology really is, how could there ever have been any evangelists? If, properly speaking, we can preach only to the converted, how did Christianity, even from the beginning, make converts?

In the **Summa** Thomas was not required to give historical explanations for the spread of Christianity through the Roman Empire, or for such mass conversions as that of the Franks. It was enough that martyrs had witnessed to the faith Thomas was expounding. One of the greatest of living theologians, Paul Tillich, remarks that a **summa** by definition deals with all the actual and many of the potential problems of Theology, and so suggests than in the thirteenth century the **summa** was the predominant form primarily because it suited the needs of the time. That is, at a moment when the universal, united, catholic Church ssmed to cover the civilized areas of the earth, there was no need for a genetic account of how it came to be. What was wanted,

---

Dr. Perry Miller is Professor of American Literature at Harvard University. He is the author of innumerable books in the field of colonial American religious development. We are indebted to Dr. Miller for permission to print this lecture delivered here in the fall of 1955.

and what was a joy to supply, was the fascinating statement of what it then stood for. But at the beginning of the modern period, Tillich continues, the situation became so altered as to call no longer for any **summa,** but for the essay, that which "deals with **one actual** problem." Calvin may have dreamed that in composing the **Institutes** he was producing a Protestant **summa**, and the enlargements in successive editions pushed the book toward such comprehensiveness. The final version retains a memory of that supreme grandeur, but the book tacitly confesses on every page that it is at best no more than, in Tillich's terms, an essay on the Calvinistic manner of reading Scripture, as opposed to both the Catholic and the Lutheran.

Hence in the vast literature of Protestantism, the typical work of the theologian is not something to stand beside Thomas or Bonaventura, but the specific treatise on some "great point" in divinity; the Atonement, irrestible grace, the covenant. Protestant polymaths who still attempted a summary of actual and potential problems were likely, in the seventeenth century, to prove such academic compilers as Petro van Mastricht, whose 1300-page **Theoretica-Practica Theologica** could with difficulty be read by only a few Cotton Mathers; the most that busy pastors could afford in the way of summation was John Wollebius' **The Abridgment of Christian Divinity**, the very title of which confesses how far it was from even pretending to be a **summa.** Jonathan Edwards cherished the comprehensive dream, and throughout his life piled up notebooks for an ultimate synthesis; but circumstances in America compelled him, as circumstances in Protestant countries also obliged his fellows, to issue **ad hoc** essays on specific problems: the religious emotions, original sin, the freedom of the will, true virtue. In the nineteenth century it became the custom for long-lived professors in theological seminaries to labor toward the crowning achievement of their career, a ponderous "system of theology." But these were always regarded as Professor Hodges' or Professor Strong's private organizations of the universe. And these were read, if at all, only by a few of the professor's most devoted students; otherwise they gathered dust, and today can be picked up, by those whose curiosity goes so far, on the miscellaneous tables of second-hand book stores for twenty-five cents a volume. The effective books in American Protestantism of the nineteenth century were essays: Finney's **Lectures on Revivals**, Taylor's **Concio ad Clerum,** Lyman Beecher's **The Faith Once Delivered to the Saints,** Bushnell's **Christian Nurture,** Nevin's **The Anxious Bench,** Channing's Baltimore sermon, Josiah Strong's **Our Country.** These were all argumentative, and all strove, with varying vehemence, to overcome the heretic whether or not he originally made any concessions to divine revelation. We may say that the essay, in this sense, comes to its climax in the sermons of such urban revivalists as De Witt Talmage and Dwight Moody, the formal premise of which is that the majority of the audience do **not** accept a single doctrine of Christianity and so must be persuaded against their wills. The prevailing assumption is, somehow, that the book or the preacher can overwhelm the opponent by conveying to him

the necessary conviction. Actually, this presumption was as much a part of Channing's reasoned statement or of Bushnell's exposition of the Trinity as of Peter Cartwright's frontier exhortations.

Interestingly enough, Paul Tillich is one of several announcing that by now the era of the essay has come to an end, that it can no longer deal with what Tillich calls "the chaos of our spiritual life." But this chaos equally makes impossible the creation of a **summa.** Therefore Tillich addresses himself to composing a **Systematic Theology.** Curiously enough, in this system Tillich, in his "existential" terminology, finds himself virtually reiterating the initial concession of Thomas's intellectualist **Summa.** "The knowledge of revelation," Tillich says, "can be received only in the situation of revelation, and it can be communicated—in contrast to ordinary knowledge—only to those who participate in this situation."

Of course, Thomas Aquinas did not mean that nothing at all could be said to unbelieving opponents. Quite the contrary: if he wrote the **Summa Theologica** for those who agreed, at least in part, upon the Scriptures, he also wrote the **Summa Contra Gentiles** for those who would accept nothing of them. For those who are not Thomists, this work generally proves the more absorbing reading, if only because it is the supreme example in literature of arguing a case not by trying to prove it but by demonstrating that those who deny it have no case of their own. It leaves the gentiles with no alternative. Still, I suppose that many read it with fascination and yet remain unconvinced, or at least undisturbed, because to modern temperaments it appears that Thomas enjoyed too facile a method for establishing his **quod erat demonstrandum,** the classical distinction between essence and existence. I would not vulgarize a magnificent train of thought, but at the risk of vulgarization let me say that it may seem a simple business, once you have got the gentile to acknowledge that the "essence" of man includes everything that might be imagined of archetypal man, to then prove that his own particular existence falls short, and always will fall short, no matter how much existence he takes unto himself, of such essential perfection. From there the argument runs smoothly that man's ultimate happiness can not possibly be found in this life, that it can be attained only when the intellect sees the divine essence (in whom alone are existence and essence synonimous), and that since the created intellect needs the assistance of the divine light in order so to behold God in His essence, the obvious implication follows (though it need hardly be stated) that only Christianity offers the requisite assistance. The gentile is thus left to search frantically for a similar possibility in his own existential theology, which obviously he cannot find; the Christian theologian, having put the poor fellow in this predicament, can afford to wait patiently until the distracted being comes of himself to beg admission to the true church.

Protestantism, it is customary to say, rent the unity of the medieval church. Modern Thomists, especially those who call themselves

"Neo-Thomists," often justify their "Back to Thomas" slogan with a plea for rediscovering the unity of the **Summa,** sometimes appearing to hunger after the comprehensiveness quite apart from any profession of faith. However, to the cold eye of history, it may well seem that the subtle coherence of the Thomistic **Summa** had been torn apart by the scholastic disputes of the fifteenth century, long before Luther was born, and that Protestantism may be interpreted as a violent effort to reassert a singleness of view by Biblical dogmatism rather than by fine-spun logic. Be that as it may, the point I wish to make is that Protestants seldom or never attributed the spread of the Reformation across Europe to the efficient power of their own arguments. They denounced the corruptions of the Medieval Church, and they published thousands of tracts refuting the Council of Trent and defending their positions, and then they published thousands more expounding variations among themselves, but all the while they attributed the progress of the Reform to God. It was "a work of the Holy Spirit." The Protestant preacher, especially the Calvinist, did not conceive of himself as a missionary. He bore witness to God's truth, and then the truth worked of itself in this or that listener. William Bradford started his history **Of Plymouth Plantation** with that moment of "the first breaking out of the light of the Gospel in our honourable nation of England." Satan immediately raised an opposition, but according to Bradford the light of the Gospel continued to spread because the cause was "watered with the blood of the martyrs and blessed from Heaven with a gracious increase." In describing the gathering of the Scrooby congregation, Bradford does recognize the instrumentality of men: "When as by the travail and diligence of some godly and zealous preachers." But their activity is not so much the provoking cause as merely an incidental circumstance: along with (rather than because of) their labors, "many became enlightened by the Word of God, and had their ignorance and sins discovered unto them, and began by His grace to reform their lives and make conscience of their ways." Edward Johnson well knew at what a cost of organizing, scheming, raising funds, the Massachusetts Bay Company was launched; yet as he told the story in 1654, in **Wonder-Working Providence of Sions Saviour,** he declared that in this critical time "Christ the glorious king of His Churches, raises an Army out of our **English** Nation," that "Christ creates a New **England** to muster up the first of his Forces in." Johnson even represents the summons as being broadcast through the land by a herald, crying "Oh yes! oh yes! oh yes!"

Of course, all English colonists advertised that they intended to convert Indians. However, we have to be wary of interpreting their profession in a nineteenth-century spirit. In the first place, critics of both Virginia and New England accused the settlers of doing little or nothing. In the second place, as we can see most clearly in John Eliot's activity in Massachusetts, the conception of the manner in which conversion was to be wrought did not mean sending circuit-riders into Indian territory, but rather the gathering a few tractable Indians into a commu-

nity, like that of Natick, where within the confines of a settled existence, to the accompaniment of steady preaching, the light of the Gospel might (should God be willing) break also upon them, but break out of and by itself.

Essentially this same assumption was at the bottom of all the Protestant colonies, the Dutch Reformed and the Scottish Presbyterian as well as the New England Puritans. There may be exceptions here and there, but in general the aim was to hew a civilization out of the wilderness, to put a church into the center of the new community, and then to pray that the grace of God would flow through these channels as already it had flown through the societies of Europe and Britain. Hence in 1740, when that commotion started which we call the Great Awakening, all parties began with the ancient assumption that this was a recognizable "pouring out of the grace of God upon the land." It was the long-prayed-for, the overdue "supernatural work." Whitefield, Edwards, Tennent were not instigators, not fomenters; they were simply eager Christians whose hopes were being miraculously realized, as though by no action of their own, and they fell upon the opportunity providentially given. In their conception, Christ's herald was again crying "Oh yes! oh yes! oh yes!"

Historians have variously pointed out that the decade of the Awakening, 1740 to 1750, is a watershed in American development. They have difficulty putting their fingers on just precisely what the transformation was, since there were no revolutionary changes in political institutions. Except for the splintered churches of Pennsylvania, New Jersey and New England, the social scene in 1750 seems fairly much what it was in 1740. And yet you feel, the moment you go to the sources, that after 1750 we are in a "modern" period, whereas before that, and down to the very outburst, the intellectual world is still medieval, scholastic, static, authoritarian. Before 1740 ministers labored in their communities, but their effort could still be described by what Thomas had defined as the only legitimate function of Sacred Doctrine—that is, to use human reason and the liberal arts "not, indeed, to prove faith (for thereby the merit of faith would come to an end), but to make clear other things that are set forth in this doctrine." After 1750, whole segments of Protestant America have made the fatal break: they have dared to say, or at least to act as though they had said, that the merit of faith is not one whit diminished if a passionate preacher arouses, excites, creates the faith in an opponent. The immensity of this revolution becomes apparent the moment we recognize that it did not come to an end in 1750, that it contained a dynamic that took fifty years to work itself out. After a lull, which can be accounted for by the distraction of the War for Independence, the spiritual revolution again went forward in the Second Great Awakening of 1800. Whitefield on the Boston Common, Edwards at Enfield, the Tennents at the Log College, point the way inevitably toward the first gigantic mass meeting at Cane Ridge in 1801, where some twenty thousand people assembled on August 11 and by night three thousand of them had fallen in a trance to the

ground, while hundreds were "jerking, rolling, running, dancing and barking."

This revolution wrought between, let us say, the evangelism of the English Puritans or the French Hugenots and that of Asbury, Barton Warren Stone, or Alexander Campbell is so fundamental and pervasive, and yet so amorphous, that the historian has a problem in taking stock of it. It is everywhere, and yet it is nowhere. It can be described; but can it be analyzed? Social historians and sociologists do, of course, explain it as a cultural phenomenon. From their point of view the frontier is the environmental factor—though as Whitefield first suggested and as Finney later proved, the revival technique could be carried into the city as well as to the fire-lighted camp-meeting. But there is another question to be asked, toward the answering of which sociologists are of no help at all. That question is: what did it mean for Protestantism in this country, and what does it still mean for American Protestantism, in a purely **religious** sense, to have gone through this revolution? By this I mean to ask not what it did to the denominations, not what it signified in numbers, organizations, controversies, attitudes toward slavery, etc., but what the reorientation did to the religious mentality itself.

Naturally, one has to point out that a great change also took place, in varying degrees, in some Protestant quarters of Europe. We can say that all the many movements on the Continent which we lump together as Pietism—to distinguish them from sixteenth-century expressions—are analogies to the American revival and camp-meeting. And then there is the Wesleyan revival of eighteenth-century England, which exhibits many of the phenomena to be noted in America, which indeed fed the American flame, at first through Whitefield and then through the pioneer Methodist missionaries. But over against Pietism and Methodism in Europe there always stood powerfully entrenched institutions, the Catholic Church on the Continent and the Established Church in England, which kept the new conception from spreading like the wildfire of the Great Awakening and the wilder fire of the Second Revival. Also, older forms of Protestantism there clung to their Reformation heritages, and resisted the sheer emotionalism of these newer energies. And finally, the hold of the Enlightenment on the educated classes meant that in Europe the revival remained primarily a lower-class affair. When it did win a few aristocratic converts, like the Countess of Huntington's "connexion," these moderated its more violent tendencies. So, if there was a new logic conceived in the Great Awakening, which had to force itself to an ultimate conclusion, only in America was the opportunity provided. Across the mountains lay the wilderness of Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois: in this wilderness there was no established church to hinder, no cultured aristocracy to sneer, and into it swept hordes of simple, excitable, optimistic people, and with them came the revival, the shouting and the gesticulating. Out of their ecstatic experience emerged, without anybody's quite formulating it, a stalwart

conviction that Christ can be preached to unbelievers in so aggressive a manner that they will be swept into faith, will-they nill-they.

It must be said, or at least whispered, that when the sensitive Protestant of today looks back upon the period from 1800 to the Civil War, the period when the evangelical revolution triumphed and dominated the churches, he is bound to feel uncomfortable. Considered as a chapter in the history of the Christian spirit—aside from what it amounts to in the statistical increase of professions—it is often a melancholy spectacle. Compared with almost any chapter in the history of Protestantism in the time of Luther or Calvin, on in that of the Puritans, it is vulgar, noisy, ignorant, blatant. In a perceptive enumeration of the elements in this chaotic situation, Professor Sidney Mead in an article for **Church History** of December, 1954, distinguishes an anti-historical sectarianism, a voluntary principle, a missionary zeal, a cult of revivalism with a consequent oversimplification of traditional theological problems for the sake of results, a general flight from reason, and a ruthless competition among the denominations. Taking all these factors or forces together, and watching them at work in simultaneous frenzy, a tender sensibility cannot find the resulting picture pretty. Professor Mead entitles his dissertation "Denominationalism: The Shape of Protestantism in America." To the extent that the shape given in the pre-Civil War period is still with us, we should not be surprised that some of our best minds look back with nostalgia to the comparatively dignified unification of the individual and the community at which Puritanism aimed, or even to the serene syntheses of the Middle Ages.

The difficulty is that however dramatic or heroic figures like Lyman Beecher, Peter Cartwright, James McGready may be as personalities, we can hardly give them much intellectual respect. At the same time, a student of the period receives little spiritual sustenance by turning from these rowdy figures to the cold rationality of an Andrews Norton. Many of us sympathize with Horace Bushnell in his effort to find a way out of the sterility of revivalism without having to settle for "the corpse-cold Unitarianism of Brattle Street and Harvard College"—to use Emerson's devastating phrase. Still, admirable as Bushnell is, he is a limited figure; his culture was starved and narrow, and his formulations seldom seem profound enough to become more than historical curiosities. Indeed, the mighty pundits of Andover Thelogical Seminary had brains, and they used them—Leonard Woods, Moses Stuart, Calvin Stowe, Edwards A. Park—and there are also the ponderous tomes of Nathaniel Emmons. But who today can read these dinosaurs with anything like an assurance that from their pages emerges such a sense of genuine Christian piety as speaks directly to us from the works of Thomas Hooker, of Thomas Shepard, or of Job Scott?

The worst of it is that in this period these proliferating Protestant churches almost wrecked the American mind. The dismal consequences for education are just now tabulated by Richard Hofstadter and Walter Metzger in **The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States.**

This volume is more than a history of academic freedom in the technical sense; it is a highly literate history of education. The chapter on "The Old-Time College," in the years 1800-1860, is a bitter pill that should be resolutely prescribed to all those suffering under the illusion that the pioneer colleges of that era, especially the denominational ones, were something glamorous. They were a national disaster, from the ravages of which we have only partially recovered. The anger of the authors is barely held in check, and they say with studied moderation: "The worst thing that can be said of the sponsors and promoters of the old colleges is not that they failed to foster sufficiently free teaching and research in their own colleges, but that when others attempted to found freer and more advanced institutions the denominational forces tried to cripple or destroy their work." For page after page there comes the shameful story of the clergy raising a cry of "Godless" against state universities, of the bleak intolerance of organized piety, of presidents and professors humiliated, of curricula stuffed with sectarian bigotry, of the inhibition of science and of the deadly pall of doctrinal moralism. And out of these pages emerges the anguished wail of good men defeated and chagrined—not merely deistical rationalists like Jefferson, but sincere religionists like J. M. Sturtevant. Out of sad experience Sturtevant wrote in 1860 that this spirit of sect "elevates minor denominational peculiarities into tests of fitness for the highest and most dignified stations; it tends to fill the most important chairs of instruction with men of inferior talents and attainments, because they are supposed to be right in the matter of denomination, and thereby to impair the efficiency of the Institution in the discharge of its appropriate function." No modern can frame a more damaging indictment of the era.

What then should we do with this early national epoch in American Protestantism? Should we shudder over it, turn our backs upon it and try to forget it? Perhaps the haunting memory of this unlovely spectacle excites many students to greet as glad tidings Paul Tillich's thesis that the Protestant era is at an end, that the work of the Reformers is accomplished, that a new prospect of theological enterprise is beginning in which we can justifiably free ourselves from the clutch of evangelical ancestors. It is certainly interesting, and I think significant, to see how Tillich's audience—and he is not an easy author to comprehend—is steadily expanding. However, he is not the only one who lately has sketched the outline of a new "shape"—I am not forgetting Reinhold Niebuhr or Richard Niebuhr. But there is discernible in many Protestant centers a growing feeling that, though we may still pay our respects to Luther, to Calvin and to the Puritans, the descendants of those prophets who held sway in the nineteenth century were a decadent lot, and they have nothing whatsoever to say to us.

Even if you think this is overstating the case, you can, I am sure, see that here we confront a predicament. None of us likes to repudiate his grandfathers; the churches were so eminently successful in keeping up with the march of the frontier, and they put up so valient a struggle

to civilize the wilderness, that we seem to have no right to berate them for failing at the same time to create a great theological literature. But I am ready to insist there is something more to be said, something that, if it can be properly put, will help us to perceive that this era in American Protestantism was not so much the decline of an older epoch as it was the birth-pangs of a new. Something was then wrought in the religious life of this nation that is entirely without precedent in the Christian past, which can not be paralleled in Europe.

This is much too vast a thesis to be documented in one lecture, but let me try, for simplicity's sake to put my argument bluntly. The Great Awakening of 1740 was at first hailed by its partisans, we have seen, as a supernatural work. Hence much of the effort in the first delerious months went into formulating the signs or symptoms of authentic conversion, this being still conceived as a seizure from above. The sermon that Edwards delivered on September 10, 1741, at New Haven, entitled **The Distinguishing Marks of a Work of God,** is the best memorial of this early conception, though similar essays were produced by the Tennents. But even in this year, opponents of the Awakening were starting their attack, and everywhere their main charge became that, far from being a supernatural work, the outburst was criminally excited by artificial stimulations. Charles Chauncy's **Seasonable Thoughts on the State of Religion,** published in 1743, is the principal indictment, but the "Old Lights" and the "Old Side" repeated it again and again. They accused the revivalists of abusing human nature under a pretence that God Himself was working the harm. Consequently the revivalists, led by Edwards were obliged to answer that their techniques did not do violence to the human constitution, either physically or psychologically. Though to the bitter end they contended that the Awakening was a pure act of God, they had progressively so to expound it that in effect they represented Almighty God as accomodating His procedures to the faculties and potentialities of His creature. From the time of Calvin, the focus of Calvinist and of most Protestant thinking had been the will of God; the great divide that we call the Awakening forced both American parties, whether proponents or opponents, to shift the focus of analysis to the nature of man.

As has been often demonstrated, the line of development from Charles Chauncy to William Ellery Channing is direct. Hence Channing does summarize a century of reorientation when, upon collecting his papers in 1841, he said of them that they are "distinguished by nothing more than by the high estimate which they express of human nature." He recognized that many would call him a romancer or, what is worse, one who exalted man against God and so pandered to moral vanity. But he was determined not to permit such striking contrasts between man and God as would imply that man had no ground for hope; instead, he would show forth the "likeness" between the Creator and the creature. His is the ultimate rejection of Calvinism because his motive was to keep man from being swallowed up in the absolute. "By looking at the

sun," he said, "we lose the power of seeing other objects." Therefore, he concluded, "The finite is something real as well as the infinite."

Yes, one may say, Channing here made articulate certain qualities of the age and of this country; nevertheless, he spoke for a relatively restricted number of persons in eastern New England. The majority of Protestants, whether orthodox Congregationalists in New England or revivalists in Illinois, were incited by the spectacle of Unitarianism not to exalt man but to humble him even more, to insist officially upon the dreadful reality of natural depravity and to cultivate still more energetic methods for exciting conversion. Peter Cartwright, for instance, defended the jerks—though he disapproved of the more histrionic "exercises"—because he saw in them a judgment from God and also a demonstration "that God could work with or without means, and that he could work over and above means, and do whatsoever seems to Him good, to the glory and salvation of the world." Indeed, this thesis the revivalists advanced over and over again; yet the same Peter Cartwright once found himself forbidden by a Presbyterian minister to form a Methodist society within the area of his church, and to him Cartwright answered, "The people were a free people, and lived in a free country, and must and ought to be allowed to do as they pleased." When the Presbyterian cleric still endeavored to suppress the Methodists Cartwright relates that members of his own congregation objected on the grounds that he was Un-American. "I told them," Cartwright continues, "that my father had fought in the Revolution to gain our freedom and liberty of conscience; that I felt that my Presbyterian brother had no bill of sale for the people."

Here, I suggest, we get a sudden insight into the paradox really at work within the heart of the period. On the whole, the great figures of the era are men of embullient spirits, vigorous men, far from being cloistered and neurotic scholars. It is customary to say that the Awakenings of 1800 were a reaction to what seemed to good Christians the threat of an advancing infidelity, of French deism or even atheism. There is undoubtedly much truth in this version, even though the orthodox may have much exaggerated the ravages of the Enlightenment among the masses. Still, even if they did exaggerate, they were sincerely convinced in 1800 that the country hovered on the brink of disaster. Hence the pronounced anti-intellectual character of their counter-reformation. As Peter Cartwright always contended, there was then no time for the devout to train themselves for their task by dallying with education: "If Bishop Asbury had waited for this choice literary band of preachers, infidelity would have swept these United States from one end to the other." But what Cartwright unwittingly confesses in this remark is that when a situation seems so desperate, Christians do not retire to their chambers, get down on their knees and pray that God may pour out His grace upon the land: they gird up themselves, and they go out to do something about it. Though they go forth in the name of the Lord, preaching the sinful inability of man and the necessity of

supernatural salvation, yet they also go on the tacit premise that man in America, having fought for liberty in the Revolution, is the sort of creature who can be wrought upon by evangelists.

We must never forget that the great revival was enacted in an arena where the conception of religious liberty was so taken for granted that it had hardly ever to be stated. Therefore, in this open field, the very competition among the denominations which Professor Mead emphasizes as the fundamental characteristics of the time becomes, to the analytical eye, not so much a manifestation of individuality as a curious, one might say an almost unconscious, method of maintaining some perverse form of solidarity. Rivalry among the churches, even while appearing as contention, proclaimed that they were all members of one single society, that they were not disparate atoms but all conjoined in emulation.

The vehemence of the Protestant counteraction does seem, viewed simply as a historical phenomenon, out of all proportion to any real danger that America might become a nation of Voltaires and Tom Paines, or even of Jeffersons. No doubt, still speaking historically, we can comprehend how the pitch of intensity was kept up by the churches' fear lest the wild West lapse into pagan barbarism. But neither these nor any other historical influences fully explain the depth and passion of the religious anxiety unleashed by the Second Awakening. There was at the center of the impulse a motive that can not be explained by any configuration of environmental factors: there was a spontaneous movement of the people to redress the balance of a religious life fragmented into the most incoherent individualism the Protestant world had yet confronted. It was an instinctive, and in that sense a profound maneuver, to redress the balance by carrying the general desire for a living religion into cultural forms. In these circumstances, such concrete embodiments had perforce to be competing churches; but in the whole panorama of unending competition there was, by the very similarities among the denominations—if only by their universal acceptance of ecclesiastical rivalry as the law of institutional life—a kind of achieved stability. In effect, the United States built out of potential chaos a state church, the internal law of which is competition.

It is the obvious thing to say, yet it cannot too often be said, that in the effort to meet the challenge of Tom Paine, of the masses of the unchurched, of the immense spaces of the West, the Protestant churches found their instrument in revivalism. Thereupon, it is fitting and proper to raise the question, as for example does Jerald Brauer in his **Protestantism in America,** of whether, once the churches thus found ways of answering the needs and prejudices of the frontier, they also could carry with them resources to judge and criticize? In the shape that Protestantism took during these decades of the nineteenth century are many components that must appear to most of us repulsive: village censoriousness, crabbed sectarianism, an ignorance of and contempt for the continuity of the historic church, and above all a dumb hostility to the religious intel-

lect. To the extent that these qualities are still with us, we have a problem. However, it ill behoves us, even if we deplore their persistence, to pronounce a blanket condemnation upon the situation of a hundred years ago. Actually, these traits are in substance crude consequences of an effort to discover modes of solidarity. Once they are seen in this light, they take on more meaning than when they are written off as mechanical results of a frontier environment.

There is a sense in which historic Christianity, in every age and throughout changing situations, has driven a wedge between man and man, painfully forcing upon each his individuality. Yet on the other hand, it has with equal force inculcated participation, the collective, the community. When challenged by a revolution, a frenzy, a new technology, or by the fall of an empire, Christian leaders have struggled—often without quite knowing what they were doing—to preserve both the poles of their antinomy, to prevent the one extreme from detaching itself from the other, to keep religion from becoming demonic, as it assuredly would should either prevail to the exclusion of the other. Faced by the stupendous challenge of continental America, with the sudden and convulsive opening of the West, the churches responded. They too hardly knew what they were doing, and the reasons they gave for themselves are pitifully unperceptive. These have to be studied deeply, in order to yield up that which churchmen could never quite say. In this perspective both their successes and their uglinesses remain, it is true, data for history, but they also become symbolical renderings, in a concrete situation, of the ever-changing and yet always unchanged terms of man's relation to the divine life.

MISSIONS

OUR APOSTOLIC CHURCH

By Jackson W. Carroll, Jr.

"Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is the one true Church, apostolic and universal, whose holy faith let us now reverently and sncerely declare."

These words we have heard read as an introduction to our Affirmation of Faith. What do they mean to you? Have you ever stopped to think what we mean by the "one true Church, apostolic and universal"? Perhaps most of us are guilty of letting the words go in one ear and out the other. They are just "words" to us with very little meaning. Nevertheless, when leaders of different denominations get together today to talk about the meaning of the Church and consider any hope for a union of the denominations some day, this brief phrase, the apostolic Church, has a great amount of significance.

On the one hand, there is the so-called "high-church" view which says that there can be no true Church without ministers who are ordained by bishops. And these bishops differ from our Methodist bishops in that they have received their authority as bishops through an unbroken line going back to the original apostles. Without this apostolic succession, they say, there can be no true Church.

On the other hand, our church and others, such as the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists, would not agree to this. While we affirm that the Church is truly apostolic, as we did in our affirmation of faith, we would not agree to the need for tracing our pedigree back to the original apostles through an unbroken succession. But since we do affirm, then, that ours is an apostolic church, without believing in apostolic succession, what do we mean by it? Let us look at the meaning of the word apostle and see what significance it has for us. Let us see what we mean by an apostolic church.

BY WAY OF DEFINITION

The word apostle comes from the Greek word, **apostolos**, meaning "a messenger" or "one sent on a mission." Most of the interpreters of the New Testament find that the Greek word **apostolos** corresponds to

---

JACKSON W. CARROLL, JR., is a Senior B.D. Candidate from Chester, South Carolina. His sermon is a penetrating analysis of the Christian Church's "apostolic and universal" nature. In a day when missions and ecumenicity have come into a new focus in Christian thought, we are challenged to think in terms of the Church's global responsibility. Mr. Carroll relates that challenge to the life of the Christian in the local church.

the Hebrew word, **shaliach,** also meaning "messenger". For the Hebrew, the emphasis is on the sender rather than the one sent. In fact, the messenger was regarded as so completely representing the one who sent him that when the messenger arrived at his destination, the sender was actually thought of as being there in person. So you see, for the Hebrew, the messenger was actually thought of as being an extension of the personality of the one who sent him. For example, if John Doe sent me on a mission for him, when I arrived at my destination, the people there would regard me as actually being John Doe. This is very important for our understanding of the meaning of the word. So, the word "apostle" means "one sent on a mission."

In the New Testament, the word first came to be used as a title for Jesus' disciples. They were men sent on a mission by him. In Mark 3:14-15, we read that Jesus "appointed twelve, to be with him, and to be sent out to preach and have authority to cast out demons." They did this during his ministry, and after his death and resurrection, they believed that they still had a mission to accomplish for him. They believed that it was their task to testify to Jesus' resurrection and in general to share the message of Jesus' life and teaching with others. These men thought of themselves as apostles and were referred to as apostles.

When we come to Paul, we find a man who was converted to an enthusiastic faith in Jesus by his Damascus road experience. Paul felt himself called of God to become a preacher of the Gospel message to the Gentiles. It was a divine commission, and, because of this, he did not hesitate to call himself an Apostle of Christ. It was a divine commission, as he said in Galatians (1:1), "not from men nor through men." Christ had called him. And for Paul, the task of an apostle was that of planting Christianity. It was a missionary task.

In later years the term apostle came to mean a number of things. There were those called "false apostles." Some believed that the bishops were successors to the apostles. Several ideas were developed. Nevertheless, when we go back to the New Testament sources, it would seem that an apostle was one called or commissioned by Christ to do a certain task. This task was the winning of men to faith in Jesus Christ and building them up in this faith. It was essentially a missionary task.

Now that we have seen something of the meaning of the original word and how it was used in the New Testament, let us look more closely at the word apostle to see what significance it has for a church which affirms that it is an apostolic church.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE DEFINITION

I.

The first thing that we must notice in the meaning of the word apostle is that it implies a "sender." If someone is sent to do a job, doesn't there have to be someone to send him? Now, who is it that sent forth the first apostles? Who gave them and, later, Paul their commis-

sion to lead people into the Christian faith? Why of course it was Christ himself. On several occasions Jesus sent forth the disciples on a mission. On one occasion there were only twelve. Another time, he sent forth seventy. Perhaps the best known of all the commissions Jesus gave to his disciples is the Great Commission: "Go therefore and make diciples of all nations. . . ." (Matthew 28:19). And Paul believed himself, as we have seen, to have been sent forth by Christ to minister unto the Gentiles. So, for the Christian apostle, the sender is none other than Christ himself.

Now, how then is the Church apostolic? Is the Church under a commission from Christ? Are individual Christians, as church members, called by Christ to be apostles? The late Dr. Clarence T. Craig, an outstanding New Testament scholar and Methodist seminary dean, said that "Protestants need not shy away from the idea of an apostolic church, for a continuous sending of the Church belongs to its very essence. This is a sending, however, from the only one who can do so—the crucified and risen Lord." (**The One Church,** p. 74) So the Church is apostolic in that it is sent by Jesus Christ.

Now, what does this mean for us here today? Can we too be an apostolic church? Are we ever given a commission by Christ? Just as surely as the Apostle Paul felt a commission by Christ to bear witness to the Gospel, we too are confronted with the risen and living Lord here in the church, and the command is still the same as it was for the disciples. "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations". It is a commission which we cannot shirk.

When Albert Schweitzer was reaching the pinnacle of success as a theologian, philosopher and musician, there was still something that troubled him. "What have I done to deserve this? . . . To whom much is given of him shall much be required." So, he made a vow that he would give himself to study and teaching, to science and to music, until he was thirty years of age. Then, as circumstances made possible, he would give himself to the direct service of humanity "as man to my fellow men." And yet, he was uncertain as to how and where he was called to serve humanity. He had tried to serve tramps and discharged prisoners. Then came the resolution that expressed the vow. "One morning in the autumn of 1904 I found on my writing-table in the College one of the green-covered magazines in which the Paris Missionary Society reported . . . its activities." He opened the magazine mechanically turning the pages. His eyes caught an article, "The needs of the Congo Mission." The article concluded with the words, "Men and women who can reply simply to the Master's call, 'Lord, I am coming' those are the people whom the Church needs." So Schweitzer decided that he would become a doctor and go. (Oxnam, G. Bromley, **Personalities in Social Reform,** pp. 154-156.)

So, Jesus Christ is perpetually "sending" or "commissioning" those in his Church to carry on the ministry which he began and his

early apostles continued. Just as surely as he sent them, he is sending us. Even though not one of us here may ever spend a day on the mission field ourselves, Christ commissions each of us for some missions task, whether it be taking part in a misions program in our church here, giving of our resources to support missions, remembering our mission work in our prayers, or participating in some home mission work or evangelism. Eash of these tasks is important, and we are being sent by Christ to do them.

So, you see, in the first place, the word apostle implies a sender. The sender is Jesus Christ, our risen and living Lord, and he is continually "sending" his Church, commissioning it for the apostolic task.

II.

Now, might we not go on, in the second place, to look at another implication of the word "apostle"? If, as we said in the first place, that the word implies a sender, it just as surely implies someone sent forth. This is such an obvious observation that it appears to be rather trite at first glance, doesn't it? Let us remember, though, what we said about the way which the Hebrews thought of their **shaliach** or messenger. Do you remember that the messenger was thought of so completely to represent the sender, that when the messenger arrived at his destination, the sender was thought actually to be present himself? Think of what that means for the Christian apostle. If Jesus Christ is the one who sends the apostle on his mission, then the apostle is supposed to become an extension of the personality of Jesus Christ. Could this be a part of what Paul meant when he said "I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me. . . ." (Galatians 2:20)?

"A popular magazine was anxious to discover why Dr. John Henry Jowett packed the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church in New York. It sent one of its best writers to discover the secret of Jowett's drawing power. Here is what he reported:

"I could not determine where the secret of Dr. Jowett's power over his people lay. It could not have been in his oratorical manner, for he had none; he read every word of his address, and his voice was slightly monotonous. He made almost no gestures, but stood practically motionless behind his desk. What most impressed me, I think, was that the longer Dr. Jowett spoke the less his audience was conscious that he was there at all. He seemed gradually to disappear, and it took no great imagination to feel that instead of Jowett standing there, the Christ concerning whom he spoke stood in his place." (J. T. Cleland, **The True and Lively Word,** p. 103)

Might we not see now what it means to be an apostle of Christ. If Christ is the sender, then there must be someone sent. And that someone who is sent must bear witness to Christ so completely that those to whom he is sent might be able to see Christ in him. "It is no longer I who live, but Christ who liveth in me."

It does not take much imagination to see what this means for the Church today if it is to be apostolic. If the Church is to be apostolic, then those to whom it ministers must be able to find Christ in its ministry. In our witness, as we are called to be apostles, Christ must be in our lives.

Then it matters, doesn't it, how we go about this task of missions? Can we go about it in a sloppy manner? Can we who are at home say that it is no concern of ours what happens in India or Africa, or just a few miles away in the Cherokee Reservation and the H-bomb area in Aiken? Too often we find it easy to say, "we have so much to do here in our local church. Let's get that done first, and then we'll support missions". Missions cannot survive that way. Jesus Christ does not call us to look after our own needs first. It is not those who think of themselves first who inherit the Kingdom of God. It is those who give bread to the hungry, clothes to the naked, and a cup of cold water to those whose mouths are dry.

A church official returned from a trip to India to report to his denominational convention: "Brethren", he reported, "we are playing at missions, and that is all the Church of Christ has been doing—playing at missions". But it is not the ones who have gone out on the missions field who bear the guilt. The ones who have been playing are we who have sat complacently at home.

If we are to affirm as we did that our church is apostolic, then we must be more than concerned about our own welfare here. We must have a genuine concern for our mission program through our stewardship of possessions, our prayers, and our opportunities for service here in the home mission work around us. It is only in this way that we who are "sent", who are commissioned by Jesus Christ, can be an extension of his personality to those we serve.

We have seen then that the word apostolic implies in the first place a sender. That sender is the risen and living Christ. But it also implies someone sent. And that someone sent must be an extension of the personality of the sender. Is there not one further implication of the word apostolic?

III.

THE CHURCH'S MISSION

If there is a sender and someone sent, it logically follows that there must be some destination to which the messenger is sent. Paul recognized that his mission was to the Gentiles. He was sent, not to those who already had a knowledge of the Christian Gospel, but to those who did not have it. His destination was the Gentiles. Again let us also refer to the Great Commission, "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations." This is the universal message of Christianity. Jesus did not intend the Gospel for his own people alone. It is not a Gospel on which any race or nation has a priority. St. Paul was not dreaming the

dream of sentimental idealist when he said, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Galatians 3:28).

No, Christianity is not a faith for a few. It is not narrow and exclusive. It is a Gospel for the world. And, as the World Council of Churches appropriately stated its theme, Christ is the hope of the world.

Then, if the Church is apostolic, it has as its destination the world. It is to seek to bring all men into its fellowship. The world is its destination.

When we look at this challenge in the light of our own situation, what can we say? When representatives from the mission boards of the various denominations met together to consider a theme for the united missions emphasis during the past year, they had this destination in mind. And they decided that the theme for last year's emphasis would be "The Christian Mission in a Revolutionary World." Could anything be more fitting than this description of our world as revolutionary?" "The world today is caught in the most dynamic social revolution in history," says one minister, and "the Christian Church everywhere plays a part in the making and shaping of the revolution". (Skoglund, J. E., **They Reach For Life,** p. i).

There are giant forces, playing a game of tug of war with each other, and that which they are seeking to win for themselves is the soul of man. It is difficult for us here in America to realize this fact, for we are in some ways far removed from the struggle. But the battle is being waged for men's loyalties all over Asia and in the Orient. A militant nationalism is one of the forces seeking to win men's devotion to the nation. We see this force at work here in America in the attitude of some who believe that whatever America does is right. Closely connected with nationalism is the revival of ancient religions—Hinduism, Buddhism, and others. And when these religions are made the state religions of the various nations, then Christianity is looked upon as being foreign and, in some cases, might be outlawed. Another giant force is materialism—the making of material goods—food, clothing, wealth—the supreme goal of life. Again, this is not so hard for us to understand here in America. 'Keeping up with the Joneses' is the best way to sum up this materialistic tendency here at home. But the most important, and at the same time, most dangerous of these forces, is Communism, with all of its insidious propaganda and doctrine.

You see, the world is in a turbulent state of change, and over against all of these giant forces, stands the Church. Because of this basic insecurity in the world, the Church has one of its greatest challenges and one of its greatest opportunities to make a witness for Jesus Christ, to be apostolic in the truest sense of the word, to bring men and women all over the world into that redemptive fellowship with Christ.

Is the Church meeting this challenge? The Golden Rule Founda-

tion pointed out that we Americans spend twenty-five times as much money on dogs than all the Protestant churches together spend upon the missionary enterprise. That is a damning accusation isn't it? Consider it in the light of these facts: in India alone, six hundred thousand villages have not been reached by the Gospel. Only two and one half percent of the population in India is Christian. This many people in India alone have not had the Gospel brought to them, and yet, we here in America spend more money caring for our dogs than we spend on the missionary enterprise!

But the Christian Church can and must meet the challenge. These other forces are offering the people material aid along with their propaganda. But, not only can the Church offer the revolutionary world bread and clothing, but it can also offer that which brings unity and wholeness to life. It can offer the message of salvation and reconciliation to God through Jesus Christ.

What then is our destination if the word apostle implies a destination? This revolutionary world is the destination if the Church is to be apostolic, and it is our destination if we are to be apostles of Christ.

We are presented with a tremendous challenge and opportunity, and it will take the combined effort of each of us, working not as John Doe or Mary Smith or Joe Brown, but working as apostles of him who sent us, working in such a fashion that the world sees not us, but the Christ who sent us. And this means doing the best that we can right here in our own home church to further the cause of the Christian mission in this revolutionary world. When we are doing this, we can truthfully say that we believe in the "one true Church, apostolic and universal."

SIGNIFICANT BOOKS FOR THE MINISTER

Several years ago the Student Council of the Divinity School published a list of "Necessary Books for The Minister's Library." The booklist was compiled by various members of The Divinity School Faculty, financed by the Student Council, and edited and mimeographed by a Committee from the Council. The project was well received by both the Student Body and the Faculty.

Since the publication of that booklist, two new classes have entered The Divinity School. Seeking guidance in purchasing books for their libraries, a number of the new students have requested a re-edition of the booklist. Feeling that the project is a worthwhile one that should be perpetuated, the Editors of **Encounter** have solicited the aid of the faculty in issuing a revision of the booklist. An effort has been made to select the most significant cross-section of theological literature currently available. Insofar as possible, only those books presently in print have been listed.

This booklist is not exhaustive. Many valuable works are not listed. However, the books cited will provide a valuable and significant nucleus for any minister's library. If you desire additional information, the members of the Faculty and The Divinity School Librarian are always glad to advise you.

Due to limited space in this issue the booklist will be concluded in the next issue of **Encounter.**

We appreciate the cooperation of the Faculty in this project.

— The Editors

—0—

HISTORICAL THEOLOGY

Dillengerger, John and Claude Welsh. **Protestant Christianity.** Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954.

Dix, Gregory. **The Shape of the Liturgy.** Dacre Press, 1952.

Kirk, Kenneth E. **The Vision of God.** Longman, Greens and Company, 1950.

McGiffert, Arthur C. **A History of Christian Thought.** (Two Volumes). Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932-33.

Mackintosh, H. R. **Types of Modern Theology.** Nisbet and Company, 1945.

McNeill, J. T. **A History of the Cure of Souls.** Harper and Brothers, 1951.

Neve, J. L. **A History of Christian Thought.** Muhlenburg Press, 1943-46.

Pauck, Wilhelm. **The Heritage of the Reformation.** Beacon Press, 1950.

Randall, J. H. **The Making of the Modern Mind.** Beacon Press, 1940.

Seeburg, Reinhold. **Textbook of the History of Doctrines.** Baker Bookhouse, 1950.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS

Bennett, John. **Christian Ethics and Social Policy.** Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946.

Brunner, Emil. **Christianity and Civilization,** Volumes I and II. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948-49.

————. **The Divine Imperative.** Westminster Press, 1942.

Cave, Sidney. **The Christian Way.** Philosophical Library, 1951.

Long, E. R. **Conscience and Compromise.** Westminster Press, 1954.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. **The Nature and Destiny of Man** (Two Volumes). Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941-43.

Niebuhr, Richard. **Christ and Culture.** Harper and Brothers, 1951.

Ramsey, Paul. **Basic Christian Ethics.** Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950.

Thomas, George. **Christian Ethics and Moral Philosophy.** Charles Scribner's Sons, 1055.

JOURNALS:

Christianity and Crisis. $2.50 per year, payable to **Christianity and Crisis,** 537 West 121st Street, New York 27, New York.

Social Action. $1.50 per year, payable to **Social Action,** 287 Fourth Avenue, New York, New York.

(Continued From Front Cover)

zine carries no advertising in its pages. Through the cooperation of a member of the Council the magazine has been able to secure printing service at a cost within the limits of our budget. For this reason the magazine is being distributed free to all members of the Student Body who have paid their dues. Those persons who have not paid their dues will be expected to pay the regular subscription price of twenty-five cents per copy.

"I WOULD ATTEND, BUT. . . ."

In recent months it has become apparent that the lack of interest in all things except classes has begun to spread more extensively through the Student Body. We have no figures to cite, but the empty pews at Student Body meetings, Lectures by guests, the Hickman Preaching Contest, even the daily Chapel Services, speak for themselves. If something is not done to revive student interest in the other-than classroom activities, the time is not too distant when all programs other than classes will collapse from lack of support. Spotting the "disease" is the easiest part of the diagnosis. What remedy can we administer?

BOARD OF EDUCATION SCHOLARSHIPS

The Methodist Church last year instituted a scholarship and traveling seminar program designed to acquaint a representative group of students from the ten Methodist theological seminaries with the functions of the national boards and agencies that constitute connectional Methodism. Last year one scholarship was awarded at each seminary, and the rising middler awarded that scholarship joined those selected from other seminaries on a two-week traveling seminar that visited headquarters of the Methodist Church in Washington, New York, Chicago and Nashville.

The Board of Education, which has initiated this program, announced recently that this year two juniors from each Methodist seminary will be selected for the scholarship and seminar award. The Scholarship is a $500 cash stipend, and the tour, held in early September, is worth approximately $250. The insights into the function and nature of the Methodist Church to be gained in the seminar tour are invaluable. One is impressed by the diversity of functions represented in the structure of The Methodist Church.

By this program the Board of Education hopes to educate the ministry to the functions of the church beyond the local charge. In the national boards, many important decisions which affect the local pastorate are made as to the implementing of the overall program determined by the general conferences. The Board of Education hopes to improve understanding of the operation of these boards among ministers in local pastorates with an eye to improving overall co-operation and facilitating the program of the church.