

A Post-Easter Prayer

Our Father God, it is time to pray, and so we bow our heads and close our eyes. We have learned the words of thanksgiving and praise, and we recite them to thee. We have been taught to confess our sins, and we have said the words. Some have become so pre-occupied with their guilt that it has become their only concern. If forgiveness should come and the sins were forgiven, for these, the center of faith would be removed. But most of us come to thee, not to be cleansed, but to be blessed as we are. . . .

Dear God, we hope the talk of the death of God will soon cease. It disturbs us that there is so much said about death in our faith, anyway. Crosses and graves are not pleasant subjects. We prefer Easter lilies to empty tombs. We accept the empty tomb, even though no one can prove it, for it is a part of our faith. Yet, why is it, Lord, that we do not feel the wonder of the empty tomb as the disciples felt it, or in the way that we used to feel it?

Could it be that something has died in us? We know our souls are bathed in the brightness of Easter, but we do not sense that anything has changed. We have not really participated in the resurrection. Why does its reality elude us? We know that it is thy mercy that withholds thy blessing from us as we are, for we cannot bear to remain as we are. Heavenly Father, as we come before thee, must we face the fact that it is not the talk about the death of God that disturbs us, but the fact that we are not more alive than we are. It is not the empty tomb that troubles us, but the emptiness in our souls. Yet, we know they are not empty. Our beings are fat, stuffed and overflowing with our self-centeredness, our greed, our pride. We have eyes that do not see the living Lord. We have ears that are deaf to the call that thou dost speak to us. We have hearts that do not feel the needs to which we should respond.

Dear divine Father, grant that the new life of Easter may even yet be ours. Bless us with a new hunger for righteousness. Make us alive to the demands of thy kingdom. Strengthen us to take up our crosses and to follow with joy our risen Lord.... Amen.

THE
DUKE
DIVINITY
SCHOOL
REVIEW

Contents

A Post-Easter PrayerInside Cover by Paul Carruth
Theological Education: A Reconsideration of Its Nature 3 by Robert E. Cushman
Comments on Dean Cushman's Address
The Place and Task of "Confessional Families"
The Reformation—Then
The Dean's Discourse
Looks at Books
Selected Bibliography on Theological Education by Harriet V. Leonard
"Out of the Vineyard, Back to the Big House" by Henry Clark

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

Postage paid at Durham, North Carolina (27706)

Theological Education

A Reconsideration of Its Nature in Light of Its Objective

ROBERT E. CUSHMAN

Ι

Our opening Convocation each fall is intended to gather the reassembled Divinity School community for corporate worship. It celebrates our mastering end as a school, namely the greater glory of God. It is the hope and purpose of all, I am sure, that, in the dayby-day acceptance and discharge of our common tasks, we shall likewise be celebrating God's glory and advancing his purpose, for it is in the common tasks of life that devotion is most keenly tested, as it is, also, most fittingly visible.

For the Convocation address of this morning, I believe I have a text from Scripture. It is the familiar line of I Corinthians 13:13: "But now abideth faith, hope and love, these three; and the greatest of these is love." However, entering students are cautioned not to look to my example this morning for an instance of good expository form, for the bearing of the text will only become evident at the end, and that is very poor preaching indeed!

What, in fact, you are going to have to endure is a discourse of some length. It is beamed toward all, but especially in the direction of the entering class of Junior students. The subject is theological education and the question of its nature as correlated with its proper aims and goals. These should be appropriate considerations, both for those who are just setting their course and for those who, for many years now, have been trying to find their way. This pretty well covers the spectrum of those assembled. Hence, with some confidence at least in the relevance of the subject matter, although with much less in its treatment, I will launch my craft upon the sea of your excited attention!

And speaking of the sea (which, indeed, can be very unpredictable), one reason immediately suggests itself for the importance of goal-identification. As in seamanship, so in theological education,

The Opening Convocation Address, Duke Chapel, September 21, 1967.

one cannot chart a course unless he has a fairly clear notion of where he is going. But the analogy does not fully hold, because the voyage in search of Christian understanding is, often, more like Columbus' voyage of discovery than the sailing of the Queen Elizabeth from Southampton to New York or Calcutta. And it is just this distinction between voyages based upon already identified destinations and voyages of discovery that may assist us to differentiate between the proximate and the ultimate goals of theological study.

II

Lately I have been giving second and more careful attention to an impressive study of the state of theological education in North America directed by Charles R. Feilding and published in 1966 under the title Education for Ministry by the American Association of Theological Schools. It is the fruit of long research by a team of knowledgeable and concerned educators. The study, assigned by the Association and with the usual Foundation support, was inspired by a fairly widespread misgiving as to whether the theological schools of the Association were succeeding in discharging their roles and fulfilling their aims as educational institutions claiming to prepare a Christian ministry. The Feilding Report is an important instance of the kind of self-scrutiny to which theological education, quite generally, has been subjecting itself for nearly a decade. What the really solid findings of self-study are remains, no doubt, still uncertain. No general consensus as to the value of several findings is established. Nevertheless, throughout the community of theological educators, complacency has been largely replaced by an earnest concern to square the methods and practices of the educative process with more or less acknowledged goals to which, it seems, seminary education, by its very nature, must be committed.

We must note without attempting comment that one pervasive finding of the Feilding Report is that the Protestant ministry, in role and function, has been and is, by force of cultural circumstances, in process of enforced alteration. The country parson and parish of an earlier day are no longer serviceable norms or images in the face of the vast urbanization of life in North America. The ministry entails different roles and functions in greatly altered contexts. In urban society the ministerial role has been vastly diversified, both by new demands and by unprecedented opportunities.

All this is wholly familiar, almost to the point of tedium, in view of the flood of publications devoted to the matter during the past several years. One observation only I make, namely this, that recent sociological conditioning of the role of ministry in North America, contained in the word "urbanization," has undoubtedly greatly pluralized the ministerial function, fostered uncertainty among ministers as to their role, and contributed, thereby, to a blurring of the ministerial image. Accordingly, the manifest and sometimes scandalous ineptitude of churchmen and ministerial leadership in applying the Gospel to the malformations of urbanized society is attributable not merely to insensitivity and inertia but, rather, a plain inability to know how to relate the Gospel redemptively in and to rapidly altering and uncomprehended burgeoning societal disorganization.

Plainly this external situation, this altered context for the work of the ministry, carries important implications for the educational program of schools charged with the educational preparation of the ministry. One is not surprised, then, yet he may be startled, as I was, by a crucial sentence of the Feilding Report. It is this: "Ministry today is generally discontinuous with the preparation provided for it." To a conscientious seminary educator this sentence is or, I believe, should be shocking for reasons that are manifest. What indeed are the aims of theological education? Are they in fact implemented by existing curricular provisions and arrangements; or are the curricular arrangements provided in the schools simply incompatible with, or at least only obliquely relevant to, the ministerial tasks for which their graduates are allegedly prepared? Or, further, have the aims of seminary education been inherited from another day, prevailed with the years without adequate scrutiny or revision, and become somewhat inviolable and sacrosanct? Have they, in fact, been premised upon other purposes than those publicly announced for a long time in catalogues?

For example, have theological schools, and not merely university divinity schools, taken as their model, as the Feilding Report strongly suggests, a style of "theological education based on graduate schools in the humanities"? The Report testifies to a "growing dissatisfaction" with this model and makes the following statement with reference to it: "Earlier, there had also been an abhorrence of turning a theological school into a trade school. In place of either model, I

believe the emerging consensus is that theological education should be based on the model of professional education."

It is, in fact, toward a conception of professional education, as the proper aim of the schools avowedly committed to ministerial education that the Feilding Report looks and gropes. It seeks to delineate in general outline some characteristics of professional ministerial education today. This is predicated upon the assumption that the tasks of the ministry today and tomorrow call for a new kind of professional competence, namely, that suited to the altered context of ministry in the altering societal structures of today's world.

Ш

Now I would like to make a sort of personal testimony, but first with the open acknowledgment that I myself am a product of the kind of theological education which in fact did, and with conspicuous success in those days, base its style on the model of "graduate schools in the humanities." Moreover, I have been concerned here at Duke over a goodly number of years not only to keep something of that model alive but to foster it, not, however, intentionally in such a way as to hamper, but rather to advance, the distinctive and inalienable requirements of good professional education. Furthermore, it remains a pressing question whether a university divinity school can ever, properly, wholly relinquish the model of graduate studies and remain responsible to its distinctive university context.

This is true for many reasons, not the least of which is that the graduate concept keeps the goal of truth-seeking and high standards of critical understanding as fairly constant norms of excellence for the whole enterprise of professional studies leading to the ministerial career. However faulty some seminary education may have been, and continues to be, in grooming professionals for the application of the Gospel to life in its changing aspects, it is still a steady conviction with me that a primary qualification in the longtime usefulness of any practitioner, minister or doctor—in what around here is called "the nitty-gritty" of life's actualities—is an informed, disciplined and, therefore, critical understanding of that whole range of experience with which the practitioner must deal.

Yet it is probably to be conceded (and this is also a part of my testimony) that—after this has been said in apology for that style of theological education which more or less adopts the model of "graduate schools in the humanities"—the Feilding Report must still be

heard. It must be fairly attended when it affirms that "ministry today is generally discontinuous with the preparation provided for it." It must also be attended when it reports that, in place of either the graduate school model or the discredited training school model, there is an emerging consensus favoring "the model of professional education."

I must now state that I find myself increasingly participant in this emerging consensus. I am participant, not because I understand completely the distinctive characteristics of a "professional education" towards which we are presently groping (although I hope I am not without some grasp of essentials); rather, I am participant because I, for one, must concede that old-style theological education, as I have known it, has in truth not sufficiently and openly faced the fact and the nature of the discontinuity between itself and the actualities of ministerial practice.

IV

Now, unless I were to prolong this discussion to a length which would trespass upon the just rights of professors and students to already scheduled class time, I could not give adequate account of my reasons for acknowledging openly a discontinuity between theological education as practiced and the ministerial calling it purports to serve. However, I can begin by acknowledging the cogency of much sociological appraisal of "churched" religion insofar as it demonstrates that rapid societal change in our time has pulled the rug out from under both the inherited and age-old ministerial functions and the educational preparation that was correlated with the older conception of the ministry and was styled to serve it. This, however, does not mean, forthwith, that all which traditionally has gone to make up the regimen of theological studies is unprofitable. It does, however, call attention to the uses of theological knowledge and, above all, urges reconsideration of the purposes that might better prompt and arrange its structure, if we may hope for a more timely discharge of the vocation of the ministry for tomorrow.

I will illustrate the problem: When my ever-so-many greats great-grandfather, Thomas Cushman, the ruling elder of the Church of Plymouth in 1654, received the grandson of John Cotton as teaching elder of the Plymouth congregation, fresh out of Harvard, young John Cotton had but one primary role. He was to preach the word of God, having been fully introduced to its content by the mastery

of the Biblical languages and by diligent study of the commentaries of Calvin, Ames, and Master William Perkins. For nearly twenty years there had been no stated pastor at Plymouth. But Elder Brewster had administered the sacraments and expounded Scripture, and so had my ever-so-many greats great-grandfather in succession. But neither Brewster nor his successor were learned men. Evidently they commanded neither Greek nor Hebrew. They had not been university-trained. Nevertheless, as laymen, they performed some ministerial functions to the gathered community. Young John Cotton was learned in the Scriptures. This was his certification for full pastoral vocation, and Harvard College was founded primarily to assure a learned ministry for the infant colonies.

I draw a conclusion: for more than three hundred years the preaching role of the American Protestant ministry has provided the controlling purpose and, consequently, has prompted the disciplinary content of theological education. It prepared men primarily for a ministry in the church to the gathered community. That ministry centered in a learned proclamation of the Word.

With the evangelical awakening of the eighteenth century, and the enlarging efforts of the Moravians, Methodists, and Baptists, the field and context of proclamation widened. It was no longer a gathered community of the "saints" and the "elect." The Methodists, following Wesley, took the world to be their parish and sought, by preaching to all and sundry, "to spread scriptural holiness across the land." Thus, the itinerant preacher and the installed "parson" became two dominant types of American Protestant ministry, but their primary roles were similar. If the installed parson retained rather more a teaching function within the congregation, the itinerant fulfilled his role by attention-commanding eloquence in the cabin churches and open glades of the expanding frontier. Even in an age of oratory, the American nineteenth century, the itinerant could hold his own, however rustic his speech or his learning, as a powerful publisher of both the wrath and the mercy of God and of personal and public morality. At length, the itinerant also became installed, or, as we say, "stationed." Then he too began to speak rather more to the the gathered church than to the world. Protestant Christianity which, with the Wesleys and the evangelical revival, had broken out of its introversion gradually fell back into preoccupation with its own self-maintenance, where, indeed, it has largely been, with some very important intervals of relief, since the first World War.

While, manifestly, this historical sketch of the role of ministry in American Protestantism is impressionistic only and is, doubtless, woefully slighting toward many variables, it does serve to explain why theological education—with its curricular emphases—took the shape it originally adopted and which, I think, it has essentially maintained with some important variations of recent years.

Yet, granted these innovations of recent years that prominently involve Christian education, clinical pastoral care, and the application of sociological understanding to various facets of the ministerial task, it is predominantly the case that American theological education was early shaped, in aim and content, by the prestigious image of the installed and learned parson, the teaching elder of the gathered churches of the Massachusetts Bay and Plymouth colonies of sixteenth-century New England. These teaching elders were responsible primarily for the integrity of the Word and correctness of doctrine within the gathered community of the saints. For language mastery and exegetical acumen they were, by comparison with our modern ministry, shining lights. And when the Methodists and Baptists came, in the mid-nineteenth century, to aspire after the certifications of learning, their seminary curricula were in great part shaped on the prestigious patterns of Harvard, Yale, and Bangor. As for the Reformed and the Lutherans, I believe it may be said that they largely transplanted to this country their European modes of ministerial education. And this, too, was education calculated to produce a ministry for the inner group, the justified community, all the more closed to the world by its ethnic self-consciousness and self-defensiveness, from which, indeed, it has scarcely yet emerged.

To sum it up, what I am strongly suggesting is this. If there is, as the Feilding Report declares, a basic discontinuity between what is called for in ministry today—indeed what is forced upon us—and the preparation for it, this is partly attributable to a long history of theological education that has remained insufficiently revised. Based upon a conception of ministerial function of the past, ministerial education is, even yet, insufficiently designed for the realities and exigencies of the present.

To put it bluntly, the ministry can, I think, no longer be educationally moulded on old and unexamined images of what the ministry once was and, perhaps, could once properly be. The ministry is no longer almost exclusively the preaching of the Word, either to the

closed community or the expanding frontier. The ministry is no longer primarily a service to an inner group of the justified and elect in teaching and sacrament. Ministry is service of the church to the world and not primarily to itself. Ministry is not simply the maintenance and growth of the *congregation*, but the enlargement of the range of grace in the determinative structures of national and international society. One reliable thing which Harvey Cox has said is that ministry today carries an obligation, incumbent upon all Christians, namely, "the stewardship of power" in the orders of society.

I have said enough perhaps at least to adumbrate the emerging pattern of ministry, but the point is that ministry of this conception entails a huge educational problem and task. It is the problem of bringing within the reach of men preparing for it a very wide range of expanding knowledge of the social sciences. Moreover, the distinctly Christian ministration of this knowledge calls for extraordinary creativity in its application. It is, consequently, most difficult to see how the Christian ministry can avoid differentiation and specialization. I, for one, see no necessary reason why this pluralization of ministries means abandonment of the local congregation or the ministrations of Word, sacrament, or pastoral care. But today these roles, together with others that must be added, no one minister can competently discharge. Some of them go well beyond what is conventionally understood as service to the church.

In these extra-mural ministries multitudes of harried clergy have already been engaged for years, but their services have been "extra-curricular" and without official authorization or ecclesiastical endorsement. The result is the proverbial "jack of all trades and master of none." What else could follow but the dissolution of the minister's self-esteem as his own comprehension of his role becomes confused and blurred by the unmanageable multiplicity of functions he has the will to face but not the way. The fact is that, in the past half-century, the ministry has become infinitely pluralized while in education and in practical polity it has stubbornly been conceived simplistically and monistically. Hardly anything seems plainer than that team or group ministry is the urgent need of both the rural and urban situation, not for tomorrow but for yesterday! But we are in bondage to arthritic stereotypes hardly more up-to-date than the late eighteenth century.

Since I am treading on everyone's toes today, I may as well conclude with at least some attention to that model of ministerial education identified as "the graduate school in the humanities." In point of fact, at least in this country, it is a nineteenth- and early twentieth-century graft upon the older model. The older model produced the learned divine disciplined in the Biblical languages, exegesis, and the doctrinal standards. The basic difference between the older and the engrafted model of ministerial education is that the later one presupposes the full employment of the methods of scientific historiography as applicable to both Scripture and tradition. More than anything else, it is the espousal of scientific historiography, as the chief instrument of theological understanding, that styled ministerial education after the manner of graduate schools of the humanities. Yet, despite this change, there was no accompanying alteration of the conception of the ministry or of the ministerial function, and essentially the same ministerial product was expected—as it was certainly demanded-from the newer model as, formerly, had been forthcoming from the old. This presumption has rarely been candidly scrutinized.

Herein lies, I increasingly believe, another basic inconsequence in twentieth-century American theological education. In face of it, the Bible Schools of fifty years past began to flourish, and the reason was neither fully understood by seminary educators nor candidly faced or even acknowledged. Armed with the tools of scientific historiography and engrossed in the excitement of their great utility, generations of theological instructors failed to see that no amount of refined comprehension of historical antecedents in Christian origins or tradition could assure either the judgment or the commitment of faith. Yet it was precisely this that was requisite for a vital publication of the Christian message and a relevant application of its import in any age.

And herein I believe lies another really fundamental cause for the thesis of the Feilding Report: "Ministry today is generally discontinuous with the preparation for it." Bluntly stated, it comes to this: you cannot derive the judgments of faith from judgments of fact, however refined. The *recognition* of this is, of course, what launched the Barthian theology on its way, and the *proof* of it is what has largely animated Bultmann's historiographical campaign

of exposé. And all of this is to say, I think, and to say candidly, however belatedly, that theological education modeled somewhat supinely upon graduate schools in the humanities will not suffice to overcome the discontinuity between ministry and its preparation.

Members of the entering classes, I know that you have, in what I have offered you today, a long and possibly tedious lecture rather than an inspirational address. But inspiration that survives is never separable from understanding. I have been trying to "clue you in" on the immensely complex problems of contemporary theological education as it seeks to reorder itself for the demands of the new day. Comforting or not, perhaps you ought to know that theological educators generally, and I believe here also, do not think, in the polite language of the day, that they "have it made." Our curriculum is frankly in transition after nearly two years of exhausting assessment and reassessment. Its formal revision is probably not completed; its reassessment probably ought never to be.

But there is something else I have sought to do in discussing the problems facing the theological school. That is to warn you of the danger of false expectations. There is, of course, the fact that no regimen of educational disciplines can guarantee the quality of its product. In a measure, there will always be a discontinuity between the practicing ministry and its preparatory disciplines. No educational program will make you a minister or, in every way necessary, equip you to apply the substance of faith to the varying circumstances that fall to you in the diverse situations of your apostolate. Furthermore, there will always be a "lag" between the professional training of today and the demands of tomorrow. In the long pull, it is basic theological understanding that counts, an acquired habit of critical investigation, and familiarity with and respect for the sources and resources of Christian understanding. But, above all, it will be the steadfastness of Christian devotion and commitment that will see us through.

Of this last there is no direct equation between the educational regimen and its product. Yet the content of Christian commitment is classically and timelessly clarified in the trilogy of I Corinthians 13. The content of the Christian life—as it is also, and consequently, the three-fold pattern of all Christian ministry—is faith, hope, and love. The pressing task of the Christian in every age, as also of theology, is not so much to weight them in respect to one another but to perceive the following: Firstly, that they are always correlatives and in-

separable one from the other. Secondly, that no one of them is attainable without the other. Thirdly, that the disposition to affirm any one or two in the absence of the other or others issues in theological abberation and, worse, in truncated ministry and, usually, moribund (or heretical) Christianity. With these abberations the history of organized Christianity is littered.

Finally, and fourthly, when you are tempted to suppose that theological education can safely be modeled upon the graduate school in the humanities (at least as it has generally understood itself for a century) then I urge you to consider these things: (1) that, apart from love, Christian faith is inaccessible; (2) that, without love, faith is unfulfilled and even dangerous; and (3) that faith is directionless without hope and regularly insensible of the urgencies of its vocation in the world.

No doubt theological education, in its long history, has been notably successful in opening minds to the treasures of faith in both Scripture and tradition; but, in the end, it, of itself, is powerless to invoke the love and the hope that transforms belief into the living substance of Christian life and ministry. Understanding becomes faith only by transfiguration through hope and love into the substance of life.

The problem we face, then, the problem confronting the churches, the problem and obstacle in the way of a more authentic ministry for today's world, is, when all else is said and even provided for, the everlasting cruciality. You might say it is the awful task of espousing Christ's Cross as vocation. Or you might say it is the mystery of transition from inherited or even articulated belief to the *wholeness* of Christian *life*. This is the faithful life, enabled and then empowered by love and directed and prompted by hope.

Entering and returning students, I hope that, by wrestling together in collaboration, theological education may be a more serviceable avenue to the point of cruciality, the transition, and the crossing into authentic ministry for you than it has been for many. If so, your eager participation in your own pilgrimage and crossing will be one indispensable condition for the fulfillment that, together, we work for.

Comments

In addition to the following comments on Dean Cushman's opening address, other members of the faculty have been sharing their reactions and interpretations and applications—more privately but more extensively in a bi-weekly Committee for Continuing Study of the Curriculum. Responses or further perspectives on the aims of theological education in today's world are earnestly solicited from pastors, alumni, and other readers.—Editors.

WILLIAM F. STINESPRING, Professor of Old Testament and Semitics:

I find in this address a good analysis of our existential situation. But being a part of a university, we cannot entirely escape "the graduate school in the humanities" syndrome. This is an asset, not a liability, as the Dean avers; for certain very worthy students will continue to look in this direction.

On the other hand, the Duke Divinity School some years ago made efforts to bridge the gap or "discontinuity" between "theoretical" preparation and "practical" ministry. A good symbol of these efforts was our system of vocational groups. While this particular device was far from perfect, and has been discontinued in the new curriculum of 1967, it did serve a useful purpose, and caused a number of students, of whom I have personal knowledge, to choose Duke Divinity in preference to another seminary.

This kind of diversification and flexibility in the curriculum should be continued, and is, in fact, being continued. No mere curricular device or reorganization, however, will insure that each of our students shall have that sine qua non of the Christian faith which the Dean describes as "the love and the hope that transforms belief into the living substance of Christian life and ministry." Such love and hope can be held and mediated only by those who have and continue to have a personal experience of and commitment to the crucified and risen Christ. All of us, faculty and students alike, should strive constantly to improve and modernize the curriculum with respect both

to the tradition which we have received and to the urgent needs that face us today. We should study this tradition and these needs diligently. But we must also examine ourselves constantly to make sure that we have not lost contact with the Source of our faith: "he that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (John 14:9). The cleverest organizational devices of men will fail if there are no consecrated men and women to administer them.

* * *

WALDO BEACH, Professor of Christian Ethics:

The Dean's eloquent statement in analysis of the dilemmas and aims of theological education is one with which this colleague is in hearty accord. Better that we should be troubled and perplexed about our tasks in theological education than that we should be complacent, mechanically grinding out products of a preacher factory. But compared with the atmosphere and morale of our neighboring professional schools of law and medicine, we seem to suffer badly as faculty and students from lack of a clear image of the church and the ministry, a lack reflected in much tired, lonely teaching and aimless, demoralized study.

I would phrase our common malaise in terms of a lost relevance. We are here to learn to preach the Gospel to the world, we say. The basic problem that bothers the world is not as to the truth or falsity of the Gospel, however anxiously we debate these matters in seminary. The prior problem is that of its relevance or irrelevance, how the saving word of God to the world is appropriate or inappropriate to the condition of modern man.

Two sentences of the Dean's address bear repeating—one of diagnosis: "the . . . ineptitude of churchmen and ministerial leadership in applying the Gospel to the malformations of urbanized society is attributable not merely to insensitivity and inertia but, rather, to plain inability to know *how* to relate the Gospel redemptively in and to rapidly altering and uncomprehended burgeoning societal disorganization."

And one of prescription: ". . . . a huge educational task . . . of bringing within the reach of men preparing for [the ministry] a very wide range of expanding knowledge of the social sciences."

Amen. A most urgent innovation needed in theological education would be to include in its scope, in both informal and formal ways, a Christian interpretation of the cultural dynamics of contemporary

urban society. Not just courses in economics, sociology, political science, but an interpretation of the findings of these sciences by the light of Christian theological categories. We need worldly knowledge. As long as the major part of our theological study remains blithely oblivious of the cultural revolutions of our day, the preached word will remain vain and remote rhetoric, floating right over the common needs of men and out the back door.

The Divinity School is in the midst of a university, where there are resources that could be tapped to serve this end of greater relevance. And Durham is a New South city bedevilled with all the disorders of urbanization and racism. How to use both Durham as a laboratory and the worldly knowledge of the university for theological education is a baffling problem which would require imagination, daring, and a marked shift in our present order of priorities. But a move in this direction would bring greater relevance to our whole enterprise.

* * *

Frederick Herzog, Professor of Systematic Theology:

It is gratifying to see Dean Cushman as the administrative head of the Divinity School wrestle so vigorously with the changing direction of theological education. I find little to disagree with in his "A Reconsideration of the Nature of Theological Education in the Light of Its Objective." What I wonder, however, is whether some of the questions he raises must not be dealt with in terms of basic premises that need to be specifically articulated if answers should be forthcoming. Central to his address seems the Feilding Report tenet that "ministry today is generally discontinuous with the preparation provided for it." What type of situation is this kind of reasoning addressed to? Obviously the general trend of American theological education. But a Divinity School never trains people in general. It is always part of a particular situation, a geographical environment, a specific faith tradition and spiritual milieu. For Duke this means first of all the South. Here my questions begin.

(1) What is the particular responsibility of Duke Divinity School for training ministers in the South? In recent years in major metropolitan centers Roman Catholic and Protestant schools have begun to cooperate in teaching efforts and in developing common curricula. Only a few of these have been formalized thus far, the most recent one in Boston under the name Boston Theological In-

stitute. While Roman Catholics are not as numerous in the South as in other parts of the country, Duke Divinity School will have to make up its mind whether it wants to minister to the Church as a whole or only to a segment of the Church. Just what this implies concretely I am unable to state in terms of the brevity required for these comments on the Dean's address. But I have good reason to believe that the whole new scene must soon make its impact on the kind of preparation for the ministry we want to give. Duke Divinity School must become a Theological Center for the South—if it wants to continue to move ahead.

- (2) What is the particular responsibility of the theological faculty in preparing ministers? Theological education in the past few years has become so diverse in terms of a variety of disciplines that we no longer have a universe of theological discourse. And with the freeing of the theological curriculum from too many hours required the possibility of a theological multiverse looms even larger, since students can choose courses more according to their special interests. This need not be negative at all. But in this situation faculty members must engage in dialogue lest centrifugal forces make the whole enterprise fly apart. The dialogue dare not be a "potshot" affair. It needs regular times of exchange and discipline in preparation. And it must be directed specifically also to problems of the particular area we are working in, which is the South. Students have to feel that the faculty is working at the unity of theological education, and that not in a vacuum. And for the outside world Duke needs a theological face.
- (3) What is the responsibility of the *Church* for the training of the ministry? In my view, the Church needs to take a much greater interest in what is going on in the Divinity School, perhaps through the Board of Visitors or some such organ of school-Church relationships. I still need to be asked by a member of the Board of Visitors, a bishop, a pastor or a layman what I as a faculty member think I ought to be doing at Duke in theology. Perhaps others have different impressions. Even so, without a lively exchange on this score among all concerned, theological education will remain very much in the ivory tower.

I appreciate the opportunity afforded by the Review to comment on matters of import in the life of the Divinity School. I at least have been compelled again to think about the basic premises of theological education at Duke.

MOODY SMITH, Associate Professor of New Testament Interpretation:

"Ministry today is generally discontinuous with the preparation provided for it." Dean Cushman quotes this statement from the Feilding Report and agrees with it in large measure. It appears to be true in at least two senses. First, theological education does not adequately prepare the ministerial candidate to perform the functions of his office as these are understood by many, if not most, laymen, by some denominational officials, and by others who lay down the criteria of "success" in the ministry. Insofar as it does, theological education may well fall under suspicion of being neither theological nor education, given the present state of American church life. But second, and more importantly, theological education does not prepare the ministerial candidate to minister to man in society in a time when both that man and his society are in a state of rapid flux. To a certain degree it cannot, since the state of man in society ten or even five years hence may differ from what it is today, or even from what can be anticipated today. Moreover, with the exception of certain well established special ministries such as the campus ministry or the ministry of personal counseling, the forms of ministry relevant to our own day and for the remainder of the twentieth century are not yet clearly discernible. Are we then to conclude that the statement of the Feilding Report is true, but not helpful, inasmuch as nothing should or can be done about the situation? No, I do not want to say that, partly because I believe something can be done, but also because I am not certain that this statement and its corollaries in themselves lead us to a right understanding of whatever is amiss.

For instance, it is perhaps true, as the Feilding Report alleges, that theological schools, especially good ones, have modelled themselves upon graduate schools in the humanities. Yet I wonder to what extent the relationship between theological study and such graduate education arises out of a common history in which the study of theology once played a leading role. I would venture to suggest that the relation between theological education and the graduate school in the humanities has not been strictly a one-way street. Moreover, if it is the purpose of graduate education in the humanities better to equip the presumptive heirs of the intellectual leadership of society to think about mankind, its problems and prospects, in the light of the best of our cultural traditions, this model ought not to be wholly

irrelevant to the purposes and goals of theological education in any age. Therefore, the problem may not be simply that the theological school has modelled itself upon graduate education, but that it has taken its lead from graduate education in the process of petrification and furthered the process. If theological education and graduate education arose together, as I suspect they did, it is certainly arguable that many present patterns of theological education represent more a corruption than an adoption of anything approaching a classical ideal.

Turning more directly to the Dean's address, the example of the very erudite young Reverend John Cotton is appropriate insofar as it illustrates the centrality of preaching in American Protestantism. It is, however, far less apposite as an example of the degree of preparation that has ordinarily been accepted as sufficient to qualify a man for the task of preaching. Yale, Union, of late Duke, and several denominational seminaries (especially those of the Presbyterian and similar churches) have fairly well emulated the example of theological education established in Great Britain and on the continent. But in all candor I doubt whether even their typical graduates have been more learned in scripture and tradition than the Dean's ancestors, not to mention the very learned Reverend John Cotton. should dislike to compete with the latter in knowledge of Hebrew and Greek! This is simply to say that I doubt whether the American Protestant ministry, not to mention the Methodist ministry-much less the Methodist ministry in the South¹—suffers from an overdose of theological education in the classical tradition, i.e., along the lines of really good graduate education in the humanities.

Assuming for the moment that this conclusion may be correct, I would nevertheless not infer from it that the cure for whatever problems we have is a return to a classical model of theological education in the European or traditional sense. What do we need? We must discern our ailment or problem before we can recommend a cure. Dean Cushman has rightly referred to the increasing complexity, and especially the urbanization, of society. He has also noted a need for the development of specialized skills in the ministry and for commensurate preparation in theological education. Certainly I do

^{1.} Duke Divinity School draws many students from outside the Methodist Church and outside the South. According to our most recent catalogue, however, 198 of 250 candidates for professional degrees are Methodist and almost exactly the same number, 199 of 250, are from Southern States (West Virginia and Kentucky included).

not wish to quarrel with this. On the other hand, I believe that Dean Cushman would not deny that the fundamental question for the student of theology in our time and any other is that of the nature, meaning, and implications of Christian faith. He himself says: "It is still a steady conviction with me that a primary qualification in the longtime usefulness of any practitioner, minister or doctor . . . is an informed, disciplined and, therefore, critical understanding of that whole range of experience with which the practitioner must deal." I think he would agree that a fundamental component of such experience in the case of the Christian minister is the content of scripture and tradition. He has well said that, "in the long pull, it is basic theological understanding that counts, an acquired habit of investigation, and familiarity with and respect for the sources and resources of Christian understanding."

The problem with our graduates has not been that they knew too much useless theology. Rather it has been that they did not know how to use the theology they knew. Consequently, many of them have either withdrawn from the ministry, at least from the pastoral ministry, or have slowly and reluctantly conformed to the demands and mores of a culture Protestantism which desires a ministry long on superficial piety, building programs, and program building, but with little inclination to speak a word of judgment or renewal. Discontinuity with such "ministry" is to my mind a desideratum of theological education.

Inseparable from the problem of devising forms of ministry relevant to the present world is the urgency of judgment and renewal in the institutional church. *Ecclesia semper reformanda* is more often a slogan than a reality. Before the churches of our society, and particularly of this region, will think to undertake new forms of ministry, they must first face the challenge of whether they are interested in comfortable folk religion or in the gospel. Such a challenge implies the question of what the gospel is or means. This being the case, the theological school will do well to continue to entertain this question, recognizing that it demands continual reflection. It is not, however, sufficient to allow it to remain at the level of pure reflection. Such a course would promote a necessary, but as yet ineffectual, discontinuity between ministry and preparation for it and would perpetu-

^{2. &}quot;A Reconsideration of the Nature of Theological Education in the Light of its Objective," p. 6.

^{3.} Ibid., p. 12.

ate fear, frustration, and impotence in ministerial candidates. We have now reached the point of considering the proposal of the Feilding Report, endorsed by Dean Cushman, for remedying this problem of discontinuity, insofar as it needs to be remedied, namely, "professional education."

To ask whether theological education should be "professional" or whether it should embrace the model of the "professional school" is actually to raise the question of the nature of professional education, as Dean Cushman also recognizes. Both he and the Feilding Report reject the concept of the trade school, which presumably means a school designed to train men to perform already well-defined tasks. Such a concept, while perhaps viable in the past, becomes obsolescent in a day in which the tasks themselves are in the process of change. Even if the minister's task is taken to be teaching and preaching, so that the proper vocational training would include a large dose of Bible, theology and ethics, it cannot be safely assumed that knowledge of the subject matter automatically equips a man effectively to communicate it nowadays. At its best, therefore, the trade school concept seems inadequate. What then may "professional education" be?

Perhaps we should begin by asking what the product of this professional education ought to be. This may sound redundant, but it is not superfluous to say that he ought to be a professional. In what sense? At least in the sense that he should be worthy of his reward. Although no one would want to stop with that definition, it is not the worst place to begin. The member of the learned professions, among which the ministry is traditionally numbered, does not work simply to gain a reward. Otherwise he might better pursue some other line of endeavor. Yet he should be possessed of the kind of competence which those who retain him for pay have a right to expect. If they do not expect much, and pay little, this may be because they do not have an adequate idea of what to expect and need to be taught to demand more. The professional knows who he is and what he wants to do, and he has the skills in hand to accomplish his purposes. The trouble with many of our graduates today is that they do not know—either vocationally or in any more profound sense—who they are. They do not really know what they can expect to accomplish, and if they knew, they would not know how to go about it. Now, that is an exaggerated statement, but its kernel of truth is borne out by the fact that we are discussing this subject with such earnestness. Moreover, the departure of many able young men from the ministry is probably testimony to the existence of some such condition as I have just briefly described.

If there is any truth in this diagnosis, it would be delusive for the theological school to propose to correct it singlehanded. On the other hand, the theological school is not helpless. What can it do? I want to suggest a few measures which will probably seem unspectacular and perhaps obvious. First, the theological school ought to teach theology. By this I do not mean only Biblical theology, the history of doctrine, or "theology in the abstract"—if there is any such thing. It should above all teach the student to think theologically. Theological thinking involves encounter with the tradition at a serious level so that the student's whole self-understanding and conception of the church and ministry is called into question. It involves the freeing of the imagination and of the critical powers, so that the sinfulness of the world and of the church is seen against the background of the righteousness of God and His kingdom. It ought to be a grasping and shaking experience. But the job of professional theological education is not completed when the student has been grasped and shaken. Yet this is precisely where we leave many, if not most, of our students, excepting, of course, those who have eluded our grasp altogether.

In the second place, the theological school must help the student understand how, in the light of his theological perspective, he can carry out an effective ministry in the church. This may not be through the usual route of ordination and the parish, but for the foreseeable future it probably will be. We had better not delude ourselves and our students into thinking that any form of ministry which they deem appropriate is going to be available to them for the asking. It is usually a struggle to bring into being and sustain a new form of ministry. It requires money. Right now the institutional church has access to money. If for no other reason most people will have to work in, with, and through this organizational entity. The student need not despise it because it is an organization. If he breaks with existing structures and tries to accomplish anything of significance or lasting value, he will probably have to start his own organization -prophecy cannot be a permanent state of affairs. Quite apart from the theological problems inherent in such schism, any new ecclesiastical organization is eventually overtaken by the same threat of institutionalism that plagues the old ones.

At Duke we have probably done a fair job in teaching our people

to think theologically. We have not done as well in helping them understand how they can effectually express their theological concerns in the church and in the world. Hence the large number of able students who choose the profession of teaching in which they can at least see the possibility for gaining competence and being able to use the understanding and skills they are acquiring. (Many of these able men are probably heading for frustration, since despite more favorable prognostications, there still seem to be more good men than good jobs in the academic field of religion. Others who could become exceedingly useful churchmen are likely headed for positions of mediocrity in the academic world. It is a shame, for we ought to be able to help able men perceive their concrete possibilities for various ministries in the church.)

The seminary cannot alone define the forms of ministry, nor can it alone fully prepare the student to exercise a ministry. Thus, in the third place, there ought to be greater cooperation between the theological school and the church. Such cooperation has in the past been made difficult by the obduracy and theological know-nothingness of some ecclesiastical moguls. But the day of the paternalistic official who plays God with his subordinates and with churches is probably passing. This is happening, I think, for two reasons. Men of theological understanding are coming into positions of leadership, and the institutional church sees stormy seas ahead and is willing to listen to constructive criticism and advice. While the institutional church has presented some difficulties and obstacles to the goals of genuine theological education, theological faculties have for their part been all too ready to dismiss with lordly disdain any and all criticism from outside the walls. Perhaps it is because our enrollments have dropped and we have sensed that the stormy seas without may set us adrift also that we too have become more tractable. God moves in mysterious ways his wonders to perform!

Fourth and finally, despite the churches' alleged need of ministers, we ought to make it more difficult to become a minister. Paradoxically, the ministry is one of the most difficult professions and at the same time the easiest to enter. This is because it is possible to fail utterly and to survive. This failing and yet surviving—which, incidentally, has nothing to do with the Pauline paradox—begins even before theological school. It begins when we admit inferior students who would not gain admission to any decent law, medical, graduate, or, in some cases, undergraduate school. It continues as

we nurse along students who never perform adequately, as well as those who may be intellectually competent, but who in other ways can not or do not really prepare themselves for ministry. The theological school ought to be more demanding, yes, ruthless, in the former case, the school and the church in the latter. It is reasonable to suppose that the enforcement of higher standards would result in fewer ministers. But I also believe it would result in more really competent, professional, ministers. Moreover, we have no way of knowing how many men do not enter seminary or leave seminary to enter another professional group, e.g. the academic, because they do not want to be identified with mediocrity.⁴ What Paul says in I Corinthians 1 and 2 is no argument against this, for Paul was no fool, and he did not bear fools gladly in responsible positions in the church.

We do need a more professional, in the sense of professionally competent, ministry. Therefore, we are in need of better, or more, professional education. But the concept of "professional education" is one which requires definition in terms that are theological as well as pragmatic. Our failure has not been in being too theological, but in not being sufficiently pragmatic. I would therefore understand a more adequate professional education to entail a better articulation of the interrelation of the theological and the pragmatic. Such a concern is fully justified in view of the fact that Christianity is itself grounded in event and act rather than in abstract ideas. I firmly believe a much better job can be done. But can it be done in the traditional three-year period? There are grounds for serious doubts. One reason for our lack of pragmatism is that it takes most of the available time to accomplish the basic theological task. Must we not find ways of either beginning theological study earlier (before a man is twenty-one or twenty-two) or extending it later, either through advanced degree programs, the extension of the basic degree, or continuing education? Some kind of positive answer seems necessary if we are to accomplish adequately the task of preparing men for ministry in times such as ours.

* * *

C. RANDAL JAMES, '68, Chairman, Co-ordinating Council for Community Life:

No small furor has arisen since Charles R. Feilding published

4. Cf. Van A. Harvey, "On Separating Hopes from Illusions: Reflections on the Future of the Ministry," *motive*, November, 1965, pp. 4-6. Harvey argues vigorously and persuasively for higher professional standards for the ministry.

his Education For Ministry with its basic thesis, "ministry today is generally discontinuous with the preparation provided for it." Simply stated, this meant the seminaries were and are not doing their job, which job was and is articulated generally as preparing men and women for the Christian ministry. Thus, much seeking and searching, adjusting and revising, has been engaged in, especially within Protestant circles, to determine the conditions and problems which produced the Feilding thesis. These probings have revealed two predominant models now extant for theological education, viz., that of the professional school, and that of the graduate school in the humanities. The former appears to be the more popular. But whatever the choice, the tacit assumption is that one or the other of these models, or perhaps a combination of both, when properly manipulated and practically implemented by a curriculum congenial to the model, will, in some way, eliminate the discontinuity between the ministry and the preparation for it.

Now the theological student, the one toward whom the model is aimed, is somewhat befuddled by all of this. Certainly he is cognizant of the foregoing issues even if he does not have complete comprehension of the full range of implications therein contained. He is not a professional theological educator. Yet be that as it may, the theological student is aware that he does have a stake in all of the talk, and he too wants to be heard.

When given opportunities to speak to the problem at hand, it appears that the contemporary theological student, in his scrutiny of the aims and purposes of theological education, wishes to raise a prior question to that of "models for theological education." The question is that of his own self-understanding within the context of the professional Christian ministry. That is to say, he seeks some professional identity. At first, this identity is usually a derived one, one appropriated from older "ministers." Hence, unless he comes from a unique situation, his experience and observation of the ministry largely has been centered around his pastor. He sees his pastor engaged in fragmented, discontinuous, and unrelated tasks. haps," he says to himself, "it will all make sense once I enter sem-But when he makes his entrance into formal theological education, he soon becomes aware, to his consternation, that fragmentation exists there also. All he has to do is peruse the curriculum, with its divisions and subdivisions. What does church history have to do with leading an authentically Christian official board? Or what does

Ignatius of Loyola have to do with the student he will face one day in his classroom?

Thus it is that the theological student earnestly endeavors to discover some model (not necessarily a person) of his own for the professional ministry, a model which will unify and dovetail the multifarious theological tasks and disciplines. If he fails to find such a model, he is usually frustrated and confused during his three years in residence at the seminary. Or, at the extreme, he may drop out of school and leave the professional ministry. Hence, the questions I wish to raise are, what is a viable model for professional self-understanding for the contemporary theological student, and, does such a personal model have implications for a model of theological education in general?

In the past, the student may have been "forced" to choose one model among several possibilities. For example, until 1967 the student at Duke Divinity School could pick from the categories of parish minister, teacher, missionary, pastoral psychologist, religious educator, or campus minister, for his model when he chose his "vocational group." Of course, Duke no longer operates with these categories, each of which is, in point of fact, unacceptable as a model which will encompass all of the theological tasks. Rather, it seems to the present writer that the only viable model for professional selfunderstanding is that of "theologian," understood in the broadest possible sense. That is to say, the "theologian" is to understand his task as threefold: to determine God's will, to follow this will, and to interpret this will to others in order that they may follow in the same direction. Thus, the model calls for radical theocentricity, where this theocentricity implies the triadic relationship of God, man, and neighbor. Further, radical theocentricity forces the theological student to understand all the disciplines he studies in relation to the core of his own professional self-identity. Even when he graduates, the total spectrum of his tasks must also be seen in relation to that core. The result, then, is not fragmentation, but unity, no matter whether the "theologian" be studying American Christianity, engaged in preaching, caring for the sick, planning a commission meeting, or preparing to teach an undergraduate class on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Radical theocentricity also implies that the "theologian" must be existentially involved in his tasks; he cannot theologize in the abstract. He must be constantly on the alert to discern the will of God in each existential situation insofar as is possible in order that he might embody that will to others. Hence, the model of "theologian" provides the theological student the unity he seeks in his professional self-understanding.

But what does this model of professional self-understanding have to say about a model for theological education? It says, first of all, that theological education must keep a clear eye cast upon its goal, namely the training of theologians. The model of theological education is constructed after its goal is determined, not before. A viable model for theological education must be predicated on "theological grounds," as it were, rather than predicated on some model that happens to work for some other type of education. Thus, if theological education resembles a graduate school in the humanities or a professional school, it is coincidental, not predetermined. Secondly, our model implies that theological education is not a closed experience, but an open-ended one. What begins in seminary never ceases. The theological student becomes a "theologian" the moment he enters seminary. He does not attain the title of "theologian" upon receipt of his degree and understand his training to end there. Rather, he is engaged in theological education not only during the three years in seminary, but throughout the remainder of his life. The authentic "theologian." using the basic tools acquired in seminary, tools mastered not for their own sake but for the larger task, is constantly "growing" or "becoming" in his professional self-understanding. The Pharisaic theologian is the one who never writes a new sermon, who uses the same lecture year after year, who has the same answer for the counselee before him. Thirdly, the model implies that the practical implementation of a model for theological education can never be static, but must be dynamic. A curriculum "long established" is worthless. A curriculum which thwarts the theological growth of students is deficient. What is good for one student is not good for all students. Theological curricula must provide for individual tailoring. A student forced to take three years of "requireds," be they specified courses or specified "areas," is serving the faculty and not his God.

In conclusion, then, the discontinuity between the ministry and the preparation for it will be overcome when students, faculty members, and administrators recognize what it is they are about. It is only when they recognize their primary three-fold task as delineated above that they will be more fully able to proclaim the Christian gospel to the world at large.

The Place and Task of "Confessional Families" in the Ecumenical Movement

LUKAS VISCHER

Director, Department on Faith and Order, World Council of Churches

The place and task of confessional families in the ecumenical movement is today undergoing lively discussion. Some consider it a self-evident necessity for national churches which agree in doctrine, preaching, and order, and are able mutually to recognize each other as churches in the full sense, to express their fellowship at the universal level, to try to strengthen and support each other, and to make a common witness. It is inherent in the nature of the Church for it to reach out over the borders of individual nations. Any church which did not strive to live the catholicity involved in the gospel would be robbing itself of an essential characteristic. Others see in the development of the confessional alliances a problem for the ecumenical movement. Is it not inevitable that individual traditions harden if they organize at the universal level? Will they not be reinforced in the conviction that they are able to represent the one Church? Will not international obligations to distant sister-churches weaken the immediate obligations to churches in one's own country? Will not unions be made nearly impossible or at least postponed to the distant future? In the opinion of the latter people, the confessional alliances are indefensible entities; the alliances do not take seriously enough the fact that the one holy catholic and apostolic Church extends beyond the separate traditions. On the other hand, they also do not take seriously enough the fact that Christ's Church always lives at a particular place, wherever the Word is proclaimed and the sacra-

The Duke Divinity School Review is proud to publish this significant treatment of a timely topic, through the courtesy of Dr. Eugene L. Smith, Executive Secretary in the U.S.A. for the World Council of Churches. It is timely in anticipation of the Uppsala Assembly of the World Council this summer, and of the Methodist General Conference, which will shortly be considering some radically new proposals from COSMOS (the Commission on the Structure of Methodism Overseas).—Editors.

ment celebrated, and that for this reason the unity of his disciples can be realized first and foremost in this particular place. . . .

Let us present the following thesis: It is difficult to determine the significance of the confessional alliances because neither the World Council as a whole nor the individual churches have a clear enough idea of the way in which the unity of the Church must be expressed at the universal level.

The churches which belong to the World Council have, it is true, made a first attempt at describing the unity which must be realized. The outcome of the discussion on this point is to be found in the so-called "New Delhi formula." But the description adopted there is extremely weak precisely in regard to the universality of the church, and it is clear that the common image of unity must be expanded considerably if it is to exercise a determinative influence upon the further progress of the ecumenical movement. The text places all the emphasis on the concept that unity must manifest itself in each individual locality. All those in that locality who are baptized and confess the name of Christ are to be led by the Holy Spirit into a totally committed fellowship. But the text hardly touches upon the subject of how fellowship is to be effected between the different individual churches. After the Third General Assembly has emphasized the fellowship of "all in one place" it must now be stated what sort of fellowship exists among "all in all places."

The individual confessions are hardly in a better situation. Although some are of the conviction that they are and represent the one holy Church, none of them is in a position to explain how the unity of all the churches ought to be expressed today at the universal level. They are all still trying to find ways to do this. Even those churches whose ecclesiological assumptions are clear and unequivocal in this respect, such as the Orthodox or the Roman Catholic Church, must rethink these assumptions in view of the ecumenical movement and in the impact with the modern world, and must authenticate them anew. But until the goal has been clarified by all jointly, it cannot be said what tasks the World Council on the one hand and the different confessional bodies on the other have to fulfill in the ecumenical movement. Only as the goal to which they are striving becomes clearer can their mutual relationship and responsibility be determined.

^{1.} The New Delhi Report (London: SCM Press, 1962), p. 116. Report of section on "Unity," stressing the oneness of "all in each place."

The following considerations are presented as a small contribution in this direction:

1. The Origin of the Confessional Alliances

The divisions which have come about in the course of history occurred at first in particular, limited areas, the result of a long historical development within them as yet unbroken fellowship of the church. Because the churches which were separated in one particular place drew others with them and the divisions became set, larger groupings arose which opposed one another, and were mutually exclusive. Again, separation has never immediately resulted in the formation of two churches, both of which regarded themselves as the one holy catholic and apostolic Church. Rifts occurred first within the fellowship of the one Church, and the churches which confronted one another still knew themselves to be parts of the one Church. For a long time they lived in relationship with one another; they sought the unity and the renewal of the una sancta, and they went their own ways only after many attempts at restoring unity had failed. The consciousness of being the one holy Church and of representing that Church in the face of other "churches" developed only gradually, and even after the breach had been formally completed a certain fellowship remained, if only the fellowship of a bitter struggle.

These observations apply to the divisions in the East, to the schism between East and West, and to the divisions in the West. . . . The different cultural backgrounds between East and West gave the two halves of Christendom a different stamp from the beginning, and the resulting differences in thought and in church life created at least the possibility of a division. Rome's unjustified claim was therefore able to destroy the unity of Christendom, and the events of 1054 only clinched a division which in certain respects already existed. The schism did not prevent the Roman Catholic Church from continuing its claim to be the one Church. Admittedly, the Eastern Church also raised this same claim, but it never developed it in the same way—not only owing to theological convictions but also to historical circumstances. In any case, it has retained through the centuries a deeper consciousness that the one Church would have to include the patriarchate of Rome.

The Reformation began in particular, limited areas, and although intensive relations were immediately established both between the individual Reformers and between the territories which had gone over to the Reformation, the fellowship was not immediately understood as a new church. It was regarded rather as an alliance within the one Church, a provisional alliance in order better to guarantee the reform of the *one holy* Church. The provisional character of their relations is evident from the fact that for several decades the Reformers demanded that a Council be convened. If the Council had taken place, it would never have been necessary for Lutheran or Reformed Churches to come into being. The Reformation would have remained nothing more than a movement within the one Church. But because the Reformation movement was not completely successful nor completely suppressed, the division developed into a permanent fact. . . .

The Anglican Communion is a particularly clear example of how a universal fellowship can gradually develop out of a relatively limited division—if favored by historical events. While the Reformation in England was at first geographically limited, the Church experienced a tremendous expansion through emigration and through the mission work which took place as the British Empire extended; the Anglican Church thus became a wide Communion. This process has, in turn, had its effects upon the Church's character. It is hardly accidental that precisely in this period of wider responsibility a movement arose which began to give Anglican theology a "catholic" orientation. But the Anglican Communion has never designated itself as the "one holy and apostolic" Church confessed in the creed. Precisely because even to its name it has remained marked by its origin, it has, perhaps more strongly than other churches, always understood itself as a function directed towards true catholicity. Nor were the Methodist, Congregationalist and Baptist churches universal fellowships in the beginning. They arose as movements of renewal, and it was only in the course of time that they developed from relatively modest beginnings into world-wide families and had to be given (or at any rate were given) a certain organizational expression. Thus we see that the confessional alliances represent a hardening and solidification of the differences between the churches. These world alliances raise division to the universal level and give it visible expression at this level.

2. The Historical Place of Confessional Alliances

Although the confessional alliances represent on the one hand

a hardening and deepening of divisions, we must not forget that on the other hand their development and in some cases even their origin coincide with the beginning of the modern ecumenical movement. To be sure, the confessional families existed potentially before. But in recent times all the churches have felt much more strongly than earlier the necessity of manifesting their fellowship at the universal level. As relations between the nations became closer and the world became smaller, international structures had to be created. An undivided church would also have had to develop in this direction. . . .

The modern ecumenical movement originated not only from the impulse to restore the unity of faith and order. Without a doubt it originated also in the desire to make a common witness at the universal level. The possibility of joint action in international problems has from the beginning been an important motive for ecumenical encounter and work, and the readiness with which the churches were prepared to co-operate for joint action at this level is astonishing—as a rule, the preparedness has been far greater on the international level than at the national or local level.

The universal character of the Church, however, could not be expressed exclusively by the fellowship into which the churches had been led through the ecumenical movement. Although it opened to them new opportunities for witness, it was nevertheless clear from the beginning that it could be only a provisional and imperfect fellowship. The profound differences in doctrine and order could not be ignored, and to preserve the truth entrusted to them, it was felt necessary by some individual churches to foster fellowship with their sister-churches.

Some of the confessional alliances are older than the modern ecumenical movement. Others arose later. But in any case all received important stimuli through the ecumenical movement and cannot, in their present form, be imagined without the ecumenical movement. Through the ecumenical movement they have been limited as well as strengthened and supported. The ecumenical fellowship took over some of the tasks which they could have carried out. But at the same time the ecumenical movement deepened the relations within the individual confessions, and some churches came together only because they had contact in the ecumenical movement. The Ancient Oriental Churches are a particularly clear example.

Is this historical connection accidental? Or does it contain a deeper significance? The rise of the ecumenical movement is cer-

tainly more than an accident. It is the sign given by God that no one of the individual traditions can ever really represent the one holy catholic and apostolic Church. It arose at the moment when the necessity increased to appear as a larger fellowship. We have already seen that the individual confessions responded to this necessity only with hesitancy. The ecumenical movement is the expression of this hesitancy and as a result of it none of the confessional alliances could really become an exclusive, self-sufficient entity. ecumenical movement helped the unity given by Christ to break through anew at a time when this unity was on the point of breaking up completely. It set a limit to the sin which maintains division. In the face of the ecumenical movement, the individual traditions must recognize that they are provisional, transient structures on the road to the manifestation of the one church. The ecumenical movement makes it impossible for them to set themselves up as absolutes. It constantly reminds them that they arose out of division and can transcend this division only in fellowship with the other churches. This is true even for the Roman Catholic Church, which seemed to have solved the problem of unity. It, too, had its self-satisfaction shaken by the ecumenical movement, just when it had developed its conception of itself as the One Church to a particularly high degree.

On the other hand, the confessional alliances are a result of the fact that the ecumenical movement was only partially, and not completely, able to bring unity to light again. As long as the deep causes of separation are not overcome, the individual traditions must create separate expressions for themselves. Their separate existence is even beneficial, since it prevents the ecumenical movement from slipping into a pragmatic universalism. Their separate existence aids in bringing the causes of division to the level at which they must be solved, if a truly stable unity is to come about.

However, the confessional alliances are necessary not only because the causes of division have not yet been overcome. They are also necessary because some churches have as yet not even been drawn into the ecumenical movement. This is shown especially by the fact that some churches have not yet joined the World Council, but participate in the life of their own fellowship. For these churches, the confessional bodies represent the only expression of universal fellowship. Without this fellowship they would be completely isolated. In some cases this fellowship may be a hindrance. Membership in the confessional family may block the way to the wider ecu-

menical fellowship. But the confessional bodies can also be an important link. They can manifest the universality of the Church in a limited, preliminary way in those places where the ecumenical movement has not yet broken through and where the ecumenical fellowship is not yet mature enough for a co-operation transcending the limits of the individual tradition to be considered.

Thus we see that the ecumenical movement (and also the World Council) and the confessional alliances are very closely linked. They are related to each other and cannot exist without one another. This has found expression again and again at the meetings which bring together the Presidents and Secretaries of the world federations. The statement issued in October, 1965,2 first points out that it is "pre-ecumenical" to regard one's own confessional family as the only spiritual reality to be taken seriously. It then declares that it would be premature to regard Christendom as a world-wide fellowship. Finally, it calls to mind that all the confessions must ask themselves the ecumenical questions: what is the significance of their common faith and how can this common faith be expressed in and for the modern world? However important these observations are, they describe the close connection between the ecumenical movement and the confessional families only in a superficial way. The deeper relationships are not brought to light. The expression "pre-ecumenical," for example, is misleading because it obscures the close interrelation between the two movements. The general description of the ecumenical task overlooks the fact that the confessional alliances have a particular responsibility for realizing the universality of the Church. The short statement does, it is true, point to the tension in which the confessional bodies exist. But it is not sufficiently based on the fact that the World Council and the confessional families are constitutive elements of a single whole. They must be seen together.

The World Council and the confessional families should be aligned with each other, but instead of that they merely coexist. They are beginning to get into closer touch, but the links are not yet organic enough to be really effective. This difficulty was already seen and thoroughly discussed when the World Council was founded. Some had suggested that the World Council ought to be conceived as a fellowship of confessional families. However, the original plan prevailed: the organization is based on the principle of geographical representation. The aspect of confessional representation was, it 2. Cf. The Ecumenical Review, Vol. XVIII, No. 1, 1966, pp. 91ff.

is true, not completely ignored. Provisions were made, for example, that a confession could send no more than a certain number of delegates to the General Assembly. Without this sort of limitation, confessions consisting of a great many scattered churches would have had a disproportionate influence on the life of the World Council. But the individual churches are members of the World Council directly, and not through the mediation of the confessional families. The Constitution also requires that each church be autonomous, i.e. in a position to administer itself—a requirement which was to prove particularly significant for the participation of younger churches.

Undoubtedly this organization has many advantages. An ecumenical fellowship in which the churches of the individual countries and areas are direct members is a fellowship of churches in a much more immediate way. If the principle of confessional representation had been chosen as the point of departure, the life of the World Council would have been dominated by confessional points of view and would probably have become bogged down in them. But the geographical representation made it far more possible for the problems which the churches had to face in their struggle with the modern world to receive appropriate attention in the ecumenical discussion. It thereby also made it easier to break through the confessional boundaries. Just as the confessional families are a reminder that the World Council is primarily no more than an instrument for dialogue, the World Council with its present organization is a particularly powerful reminder that the confessional alliances are only of provisional nature, the aim being the una sancta.

This organization also has advantages for ecclesiological reasons. It expresses "proleptically" something of the insight that on the one hand the Church is the whole fellowship of the local churches, and on the other hand each individual local church—each concrete fellowship of believers which gathers in the celebration of the Eucharist.³ If the World Council were organized according to a different principle, the fundamental significance of the local congregation could not have been recognized and made itself felt the way it has in the ecumenical conversation and in the joint work of the churches.

Despite these great advantages, it must be recognized that the confessional families have been given no real place in the World Council. They have developed alongside of it, and since effective

^{3.} Cf. on this point The Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order, Montreal, 1963 (London: SCM Press, 1964), Section I, par. 24-25, pp. 45ff.

co-ordination was lacking, it was easy for a certain tension to arise. A genuine relationship becomes more urgent as the ecumenical movement progresses and leads to concrete results. Every union which takes place in any country has repercussions for the whole ecumenical fellowship, and the difficulties which may arise can be overcome only in close co-operation. But above all, the unity of the Church at the universal level can only be solved jointly.

3. What is a Confessional Family?

We have, up to this point, spoken of "confessional families" or "confessional alliances." But are these terms suitable for expressing what is meant? What is meant are those structures through which the supranational fellowship of churches with the same faith, the same doctrine and the same order finds visible expression. originated in the Protestant, and in particular in the Lutheran, churches. Since there the Confessio, the confession of faith, represents the link between the individual churches, the whole family could be called one "confession." It is thus not surprising that some churches cannot accept the expression "confessional alliances." The only "confessional" family is the Lutheran World Federation and, to a more limited extent, the World Alliance of Reformed Churches. The expression is not really suitable for Methodists, Congregationalists and Baptists, but presents no problems; whereas those churches which are of the "catholic" type do not feel that this term applies to them.

This difficulty in terminology would not be disturbing if it did not result in confusion and misunderstandings and lead to practical complications. By stressing the question whether or not a fellowship of churches can be called a confessional family, the ecumenical problem here involved is obscured. Every supranational fellowship has its own peculiarities. It represents a particular faith, particular doctrines, and a particular order. It is marked by its own history and especially by the historical circumstances under which the division took place. As a result of this background it also has definite ideas about the form which the fellowship of the churches should take. Each regards the links between the individual churches in a slightly different way. Each understands the relationship between the individual churches and the total fellowship in its own way and also defines the relationship to the *una sancta* in a different way as a result of its particular ecclesiological convictions.

The only solution then is to broaden the concept and conceive of the fellowship in such a way that all fellowships of churches fit into it and that the differences in their nature and structure can really be arbitrated. No fellowship of churches can exempt itself from the ecumenical confrontation with others. If it is to become clear what is to be understood by the one holy catholic and apostolic Church of the Creed, then the Orthodox and the Ancient Oriental churches, as well as the Anglican Communion or the various Protestant federations must accept each other as participants in a multilateral conversation. The Roman Catholic Church must also be included in this conversation. Since it has expressed the universality of the Church in a special way, rejected by all other churches, it is a particularly important partner in this conversation. And although the moment has perhaps not yet arrived in which the number of participants can be complete, we must nevertheless strive to reach this goal. The term "confessional family" is obviously an obstacle on the road to this goal. It means that only some of the supranational fellowships are brought together for conversation, and mainly those of a Protestant nature. The term ought, therefore, to be replaced by the preferable concept of fellowship (koinonia, com-

The statement worked out by the consultation mentioned above (1965) gives a definition of the expression "confessional body," which remains superficial and is formulated in such a way that the Orthodox, as well as the Roman Catholic and the Anglican churches can hardly recognize themselves in it. First, it recognizes that the different fellowships have varying conceptions of themselves and of their task in the ecumenical movement. Then it points out that each of the confessional fellowships confesses not only the general tradition which is common to all the churches but also specific traditions, namely traditions which are the outcome of a spiritual crisis in the history of the Church. In addition, each confessional fellowship desires to render witness to its specific doctrinal and ecclesiological convictions. Is this formal definition all that can be said? Does the common ground which links the different fellowships consist solely and simply in the fact that each has specific doctrinal and ecclesiological convictions to support? Is not precisely this sort of definition "pre-ecumenical"? A satisfactory definition can be given only on the basis of the Creed: "I believe in the Holy Spirit ..., in one holy catholic and apostolic Church." For only when it becomes clear that both the World Council and the individual fellowships of churches are subordinated to this confession and are seeking to *live* this confession in the world today will the true common ground be comprehended. Any definition which speaks only of convictions which must be upheld is ecumenical formalism, which fails to do justice to reality.

A deeper difference exists between those churches whose ecclesiology is based on the model of the Early Church, and the different fellowships of churches which originated directly and indirectly in the Reformation. In this context the main question is what significance is to be attached to the historical model of the first centuries. The Orthodox Churches have retained a structure based on the Episcopal constitution as it had developed by the third century at the latest. They are convinced that the one Church can be expressed only by means of this structure. The confessional bodies did not arise on the basis of this model. They are, in part, based on the synodical principle, but in some respects they have developed pragmatically without much theological consideration. The model of parliamentarian constitutions and international organizations has been a determining factor. Not that such a procedure is a priori questionable! But the difference must be seen and its significance be recognized if the question how to express the universality of the one Church is to be answered.

However, even if all the traditions represented in the World Council open genuine relations with each other, it will still not be possible to recognize all the aspects of the problem. It will become fully visible only when the Roman Catholic Church also enters the conversation. It is one of the confessional fellowships, and the nature and organization of most of the other fellowships have been strongly influenced by their conflict with the Roman Catholic Church. The manifold complications which the problem has experienced in the course of history will thus become evident only when the Roman Catholic Church presents itself for this conversation. Only then will both it and the other churches be in a position fully to recognize themselves and their relationship to the una sancta. The Roman Catholic Church even makes the conversation at this level particularly urgent. Since it represents a world-wide fellowship to a greater extent than any other confession, it involuntarily seeks debate with a fellowship at this same level. The very fact that the Roman Catholic Church has officially decided in favor of dialogue with

other churches has already made encounters between the confessions more important, and the more intensively the Roman Catholic Church engages in the ecumenical movement, the more important the conversation will become. But if the conversation is not to get bogged down in confessional emotions or superficial pragmatic propositions, it must be taken up with conscious theological reflection.

4. A Few Suggestions

(a) The time seems to have come for the Churches to enter into more intensive conversation at the international level. Although the World Council is primarily a fellowship of national churches in separate countries or areas and must remain such a fellowship, closer connections within the World Council on the supranational level are becoming increasingly urgent. This does not mean that the present structure must be given up—it is essential that it be retained. The ecumenical fellowship would lose much of its vitality if the individual churches were no longer to belong to it directly, but only through the mediation of the confessional families. The present organization of the World Council is a source of healthy unrest in the confessional structure of Christendom. But if the problem of unity is to be brought closer to a solution, it is crucial at the same time to bring about a closer fellowship at the universal level.

The conversations, or at least the plans for conversations, between fellowships of churches have become more numerous in recent years. We mention the following: Orthodox and Old Catholic Churches, Orthodox Church and Anglican Communion, Orthodox and Ancient Oriental Churches (planned), Anglican Communion and Lutheran World Federation (planned), World Alliance of Reformed Churches and Lutheran World Federation (in North America and Europe), World Alliance of Reformed Churches and International Congregational Council, Roman Catholic Church and Anglican Communion, Roman Catholic Church and Lutheran World Federation, Roman Catholic Church and World Methodist Council, Roman Catholic Church and Disciples of Christ (planned). All these conversations are of the utmost importance for the ecumenical movement. They have an influence upon each other and it is thus important that the results of each be made fruitful for the others.

For this reason, the various fellowships need a common point where they can meet as fellowships, can discuss their task in mutual responsibility and cannot merely adjust their actions to one another but really coordinate them with each other. The consultations up to this point have been too incomplete and insignificant to be able to perform this service.

(b) If the Churches' relationships to each other are to be further clarified, one of the first steps must be to clarify *together* the question of the unity, holiness, catholicity and apostolicity of the Church. The different fellowships must therefore find a way to enter into a multilateral study—which should be as binding as possible—not only on this theme but also on other related questions.

The Commission on Faith and Order concerns itself with the theological problems related to unity in a multilateral way. The results of these studies must be aimed not only at the member churches but also at the fellowships as entities. For this reason closer relations between the Commission on Faith and Order and the different fellowships would be desirable. Both sides ought to see to it that the theological work be better synchronized (cf., for example, the separate studies on the episcopacy in Faith and Order, in the Anglican Communion and in the so-called Wider Episcopal Fellowship, in the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, and in the Lutheran World Federation).

The confessional fellowships ought particularly to examine together more carefully the unions between churches in individual countries—a process which is of great importance for the further development of the ecumenical movement. They must concern themselves with this process for the simple reason that the increasing number of negotiations cannot fail to have an influence upon interconfessional relations. But in certain respects joint consultation could also help to further the movement. Not that the negotiations should be moved exclusively to the universal level! That would mean postponing the unions for a long time. But agreement between the confessions might throw light on some general theological and above all practical questions. Many unnecessary difficulties could be eliminated if the confessional fellowships would co-operate in tackling them.

(c) As a rule, divisions were accompanied by formal condemnations. Some churches today ignore this fact as if it did not exist. They consider the condemnations to be (if not expressly, then at least implicitly) rescinded by the ecumenical movement. However, if unity is to be on firm ground, the past must be overcome. Conversations between the fellowships provide the place where these

obstacles can be removed. Express elimination of divisive factors is highly important for the future of the ecumenical movement, even if these factors are no longer alive in the consciousness of the churches (for example, the condemnations which the Lutherans and the Reformed have pronounced against each other). The elimination of divisive factors paves the way for a deeper fellowship between all confessional groups. For just as each division affects the whole of Christendom, every elimination of such divisions also influences the whole.

(d) Joint studies ought not, however, be limited to ecclesiology. The fellowships would be taking an important step toward unity if they were also deliberately to co-ordinate their work on contemporary theological questions. All the churches are faced with the necessity of giving an account of their understanding of the gospel in our time. They must provide answers to the problems which arise in confrontation with the world today. Some "confessional families" are trying to achieve this goal by means of theological studies on the supranational level. They are trying in this way to create a common consciousness. If closer relations were established between the World Council and these efforts, this common consciousness could be broadened.

This is all the more necessary since the ecumenical movement does not necessarily free the churches from the danger of turning round in circles. The "ecumenical study of one's own navel" is even more dangerous, for it is more difficult to recognize. The churches appear to have been led beyond their own borders, but they are still in a ghetto which is equally isolated from the world. Because attention must be centered on ecclesiological questions, the ecumenical discussion may even lead to still greater concern with oneself. Thus the multiplication of dialogues of all kinds is not always a gain. The expansion of the themes discussed is in any case an urgent necessity, and we must not fail to take any step which prepares for and furthers common witness.

(e) For these reasons the fellowships must also ask themselves to what extent they can co-operate in practical matters. They are all of the conviction that they should co-operate in the ecumenical movement. Some have even expressly declared that they consider it their duty to further this movement. Would it therefore not be natural for the fellowships expressly to commit themselves consistently to apply the principle formulated at Lund, and to do everything

together (also at the universal level) which conscience does not command them to do separately? The framework for the application of this principle would, in most cases, be the World Council; in some cases joint action in which the identity of the individual fellowships is still retained might be preferable. In any case, the fellowship could be considerably deepened in this respect.

If the different fellowships join and co-operate in this way, if they clarify the ecclesiological problems and at the same time strengthen the consciousness that they belong together, the separating walls will gradually be broken down by a growing consensus, and through the joint action of the World Council and the individual fellowships the moment will approach when through a truly ecumenical council it will be possible not only for unity to be restored but also for a common united witness to be made. It is this goal which must determine the further progress of the ecumenical movement, and the fellowships must recognize their own provisional character by deliberately and concretely working toward this goal. Whether it can be achieved is not for us to say. But if this goal is maintained, the relationship between the fellowships will certainly prove fruitful for the future.

The Reformation—Then

Hans J. Hillerbrand

On October 31, 1967, Protestant Christendom celebrated its 450th birthday. According to the traditional version at least—here quoted from the German historian Heinrich Böhmer—the beginnings of Protestantism were as simple as they were far-reaching: "On the day before All Saints (October 31, 1517), shortly before twelve o'clock noon, accompanied only by his famulus, Luther walked from the Black Cloister to the Castle Church, about fifteen minutes away, and there on the door of the north entrance, which had often been used as a bulletin board before the great festivals, he nailed the placard with the Ninety-five Theses." With the publication of the Ninety-five Theses the Reformation began.

Few epochs in the history of the Christian Church have been so extensively examined and yet so divergently interpreted, perhaps even persistently misunderstood, as the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century. The reason for this is not difficult to discern. Both Protestants and Catholics have seen the Reformation as more than a historical epoch to be viewed in cool and detached manner. Ecclesiastical and theological presuppositions have oriented the view of the age which was seen as a battlefield of good and evil, of light and darkness, of the proper interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures and unbiblical perversion. Such diversity of perspective has characterized not only the sixteenth century itself but subsequent centuries as well and thus constitutes the eminent feature of the historiography of the Reformation.

Thus, there has not been only one Reformation, but there have been two—the one sketched by Catholics who were disposed to see the Reformation as *the* tragedy of modern times and the Protestant Reformers as a motley crew of moral and theological misfits. Thus, a papal encyclical of 1897 spoke of the "rebellio Lutherana" which had led to the "ruina morum ultima" and in 1907 the "error of the Protestants" was described as the first step on the way to atheism. The other "Reformation" was sketched by Protestants who returned

A Convocation Address delivered at the Duke Pastors' School, October 31, 1967.

the compliment by bewailing the moral and theological perversion of the Catholic Church on the eve of the Reformation, and glowingly painted the picture of a vibrant Protestantism, the source of all that has been good in the West during the past four centuries—from the ideals of democracy to women's suffrage. There have been, in short, two kinds of "histories" of the Reformation, the one written by Catholics, the other by Protestants.

If this situation was not perplexing enough, it was made even more so by the fact that on the Protestant side there were actually not one, but two, three, indeed four "Reformations"—the Lutherans, the Calvinists, the Anglicans, and last but not least the Anabaptists. Protestantism was a house divided unto itself where no less than four factions competed with one another, each one claiming to propound the true apostolic faith. And each one had its own way of looking at the sixteenth century. Diversity and even chaos have ruled. That all of these four traditions have persisted, more or less, through the centuries seems sufficient evidence that no individual claim was fully persuasive.

In short, the Reformation of the sixteenth century can easily become the cause of despair both of those who seek simple answers in history and of those who desire the answers of a simple history. Any effort to speak about the Reformation faces, first of all, the bothersome question of which Reformation we are speaking about. After all, we must not talk about the "Protestant" view of the Reformation or the "Catholic" view, but about the historically accurate one. It will not do to act like the man who in the bookstore asked for a scholarly history of the Civil War, written from a Southern point of view. The legacy of how subjectively men have spoken about the Reformation in the past is a heavy one indeed for the present. How shall we talk about the Reformation? Our knowledge of the sixteenth century is still far from being comprehensive and, what is more, we, too, tend to attach importance in the past to that which is meaningful to us, regardless of its actual significance in the sixteenth century.

The first comment to be made about the Protestant Reformation is that it was neither precipitated nor dramatically furthered by wide-spread ecclesiastical abuse and perversion. Such is the traditional Protestant picture, time-honored and persuasive, one that depicts the pristine glory of the reformers against the gloomy picture of worldliness and abuse. Still, it is an erroneous view. To be sure, at the

present juncture of research we know far too little about the actual ecclesiastical conditions in the early sixteenth century, but we do know enough to justify the conclusion that the notion of extensive perversion, which saw every priest as a drunkard, every monastery as a brothel, and every spiritually sensitive man as an advocate of reform, is surely incorrect. Needless to say, the ecclesiastical situation in the early sixteenth century was not perfect. It never has been and one suspects that it never will be. There was some worldliness, even as there were tensions between church and society. And from some quarters, notably from Erasmus and the humanists, the ecclesiastical establishment came in for a good deal of vigorous criticism. Not all was well in the state of Denmark, to paraphrase Shakespeare, and two concerns in particular were mentioned fairly often: the place of the church in society, especially the perpetuation of her traditional legal and economic prerogatives, and the inadequate training and dubious conscientiousness of the clergy.

But by no means was early sixteenth-century society some sort of ecclesiastical pressure-cooker with the heat turned on. The undeniable existence of criticism, as well as its substance in fact, must not mislead us to assume that worldliness and abuse were the rule. These were the exceptions, and both rule and exception need to be kept in proper perspective.

In the main, the ecclesiastical situation on the eve of the Reformation was a stable one. It might well have survived without major turmoil and upheaval for the remainder of the century.

One might perhaps find a striking parallel with our own time. An appraisal of the state of the church today will come to different conclusions depending on the kind of evidence that is used. Any assessment will be erroneous if only the voices of our critics are heard. To be sure, we have our critics, our concern for reform, and naturally even the need for reform. Still, if nothing more is said, the picture remains incomplete. The same comment can be made about the early sixteenth century. It was a stable situation mixed with an uneasiness concerning certain ecclesiastical practices. Nothing, however, gave any hint of impending revolutionary upheaval.

This conclusion is supported by a second consideration; namely, that Luther's initial proclamation was a call for a theological reorientation rather than for a new church or a new "reformation." Luther's early tracts contained few comments about the general state of

the church, about ecclesiastical perversion, about power-hungry or worldly prelates, or about the need for church reform. There was little interest in power-hungry prelates or immoral clerics. Luther was concerned about something altogether different, namely, a new understanding of the Christian faith. This is what he had himself experienced and this is what he sought to convey to others. His own spiritual struggle had not been over the worldliness of his church or its lack of spirituality, but over a theological problem. And this problem-Luther himself put it into the question, "How do I obtain a gracious God?"—was resolved through a profound insight into the distinction between "law" and "gospel," between God's demand and God's gift. Even if early sixteenth-century Catholicism had shone in pristine splendor, this insight would have been dramatic, since, as Luther himself promptly realized, it proved to be the key to a host of related theological problems, so that before too long he had re-cast a new theological system.

Of this theology it must be said—and with this I come to my third point—that it was strikingly new and did not have any real connection with the immediate theological past. With this I do not mean to say that Luther did not have any theological sources, for indeed he did. Nor do I mean to say that he was utterly original in his theologizing, for this he was not. What I do mean to suggest, however, is that the whole was greater than its parts—and this both in form as well as content. In form, because Luther's was a biblical theology, far more so than had been the case for a long time. In content, because he propounded a Pauline theology, such as had not been done, with the possible exception of St. Augustine, since the Apostle himself.

To be sure, there was a "catholic" Luther, who had manifold ties to his ecclesiastical and theological background, who could never emotionally divorce himself from the way he had first prayed and worshipped. Still, he was rather like a fish out of water. There was little kinship between him and his tradition. And at the crucial point—namely that of what we conveniently call "justification"—his position was one that the Catholic Church had really never embraced. Accordingly, Luther's program was not so much a "reform" as a "reconstruction" of theology.

His was a "new" theology. But, if we would have asked him, he would have resented having his theology labeled "new." He was persuaded that it was old, that it was biblical, and apostolic. By the

same token, he accused the Catholic Church that her teaching was new and not apostolic. In a tract entitled *Against Hanswurst* (Hanswurst was a German carnival figure, a "broadly farcical or burlesque" character) published in 1541, Luther provided a systematic exposition of the matter.

"We will come to the point at issue, namely, why the papists . . . call us heretics. And the point is that they allege that we have fallen away from the holy church and set up a new church. . . . We have been unable up to now to get the papists to prove willingly why they are the true church, but they insist that according to Matthew 18 [:17] one must listen to the church or be lost. Yet Christ does not say there who, where or what the church is; only that where it is, it ought to be listened to. We confess and say that as well, but we ask where the church of Christ is, and who it is. . . . It is just as if I asked a drunkard or a fool or someone half-asleep, "Tell me, friend, who or where is the church?' and he answered me, ten times over, nothing but, 'One should listen to the church!' But how am I to listen to the church when I do know who or where the church is? 'Well,' they say, 'we papists have remained in the ancient and original church ever since the time of the apostles. Therefore we are the true church, for we have come from the ancient church and have remianed in it; but you have fallen away from us and have become a new church opposed to us.' Answer: 'But what if I prove that we have remained faithful to the true ancient church, indeed, that we are the true ancient church and that you have fallen away from us, that is, the ancient church and have set up a new church against the ancient one."

Luther, in short, propounded an understanding of the Christian faith that was new and yet old. The response to his proclamation turned his personal experience into a widespread movement. This is my fourth point, for this response surely constitutes the most remarkable aspects of Reformation history. Within a few years a movement of a vast dimension had emerged, not only throughout Germany but in other European countries as well. What were the reasons? One plausible explanation is that the people had tired of the worldly and perverted Catholic Church. Or one might suggest that people found it advantageous and profitable to object to the Catholic Church and embrace the new faith. But for the former explanation the evidence is lacking and for the latter the facts point very much in the other direction. The main factor seems to have been the inner persuasive-

ness of the Protestant message. Luther and his fellow reformers propounded a version of the Gospel that was striking in its simplicity and persuasive in its profundity. Those of us who labor through the sophisticated contributions of Luther scholarship—or even through the writings of Luther himself—can easily get an erroneous picture of the nature of Luther's proclamation. It was astoundingly simple, for Luther reminded his contemporaries that the Christian religion was essentially faith and trust, that it had to do with God loving the unlovable, and with the acceptance of God's offer of forgiveness.

In other words, the striking and profound notions that subsequently characterized Protestant theology, such as the doctrine of justification or of the sacraments, did not rank very prominently in the early years of the Reformation. We are woefully in error if we assume that every follower of Luther and other reformers committed himself to these sophisticated notions. What the people read from pens of the reformers in those early years were basic, simple, and comprehensive pronouncements—pronouncements that lacked the esoteric sophistication of the scholastic theologians of the thirteenth and of the Protestant divines of the seventeenth century. Luther's early pronouncement on Christian ethics, for example, as found in his tract on The Freedom of a Christian Man. No weighty theological tome, but a slender pamphlet, well written and at the same time incisive in its formulation: "A Christian man is a perfectly free lord of all, subject to none. A Christian man is a perfectly dutiful servant of all, subject to all." Even though Luther's inevitable paradox crept in here, the fact remains that this was a simple diet, one that offered basic and staple fare. "It will not hurt the soul if the body is clothed in secular dress, dwells in unconsecrated places, eats and drinks as others do, does not pray aloud, and neglects to do all the things mentioned above, which hypocrites can do. . . . One thing and one only is necessary for Christian life, righteousness and liberty. That one thing is the most holy Word of God, the Gospel of Christ."

The people accepted this word. This was no simple matter, for we need to remind ourselves that the men who embraced the new evangel had earlier committed themselves to the old form of religion, that those who renounced pilgrimages as unbiblical had themselves gone on them, that those who rejected relics had themselves bequeathed money to further the veneration of the saints, that those who rejected monasticism had themselves made monastic vows. The

personal change required was radical; one's religious background had to be labeled erroneous and cherished notions had to be disregarded. All the same, this was done widely. But we need to remember that sixteenth-century men were not saints by definition. nor were they so religious in orientation and outlook that they thought about religious matters every waking moment. Though the general religious orientation of the time was great, there was a great deal of a-religiosity prevalent, and people were concerned about matters other than religion and the church. The widespread illiteracy had something to do with this situation, the fact that the majority of the people were unable to read or write. This meant that their ability to comprehend theological truths, except on the most elementary level, was limited. A host of visitation records from Protestant areas in the sixteenth century tells a woeful tale of theological and religious ignorance. Take, for example, the record of a visitation undertaken by the English Bishop Hooper in his diocese in the 1550's during the reign of Edward VI. At that time many clerics were unable to answer satisfactorily about such simple aspects of the Christian faith as the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the Apostles' Creed. One well-meaning though ignorant divine was prompted to observe that the Lord's Prayer had its name from the fact that it had been promulgated by "our Lord, the King."

If we speak about the popular dimension of the Reformation, then, we must be aware that we cannot speak about the proverbial man on the street, about the peasant behind his plow, or the artisan behind his bench. Quite likely, these did not know what the religious controversy was about in the first place and were unable to do more than routinely follow one party line or the other as it was imposed by the political ruler. Still, some people did have religious convictions which enjoined them to become Protestants.

It must not be said that everyone who rejected his Catholic heritage and embraced the Protestant faith, however, did so for the right and proper theological reason. Some did so because they read their own personal theologies into the proclamation of Luther and the other reformers. Some found ecclesiastical change politically advantageous and others economically profitable. For Henry VIII it was a matter of obtaining a new candidate for his royal bed. In short, the cause of ecclesiastical transformation became quickly embedded in complex, though blatantly non-religious considerations. To see the success of the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth

century as the result of the glorious working of the Holy Spirit is to assume its devious activity.

The Catholic Church, as an ecclesiastical institution, showed itself remarkably vigorous when it came to the repudiation of the Protestant challenge. With very few exceptions, no eminent Catholic churchman or theologian deserted the Catholic Church to join the new evangel. The enthusiastic proponents of the Wittenberg theology were the "angry young men," the theological and academic outsiders, the learned laymen in cities and towns. To be sure, the over-all Catholic response to the Protestant challenge was weak—there were few incisive theological treatises, few martyrs, little valiant defense on the past of Catholic churchmen. Still, the Catholic Church was remarkably strong, despite the losses she suffered.

This, then, takes me to my last point. The Catholic Church countered the Protestant proclamation with a resounding "no." She did so swiftly and categorically, making it obvious to the reformers that there was no room for them in the Catholic inn. This unequivocal fact of history, the consequences of which are still with us, easily obscures the more fundamental fact that this parting of the ways was by no means theologically inevitable or ecclesiastically necessary. As we have noted, Luther propounded a version of Christian faith that was different from that of the late medieval church. But this difference—no matter how radical—was not of such a sort as might not have existed within the broad folds of Catholicism. One need only remember that neither the doctrine of indulgence nor that of justification had been normatively defined when the controversy erupted in 1517. Considerable leeway existed with regard to these undefined theological issues, and the outright condemnation of Luther and his followers was by no means an inevitable theological necessity.

The paramount question facing the Catholic Church in the first years of the Reformation was whether the interpretation of the Christian Gospel as propounded by Luther could be considered a legitimate expression of a truly "catholic" church? In my opinion this was an open question which could have been answered either way. Luther, in other words, might well have died peacefully as a respectable Catholic professor of theology. That the question was answered negatively had many reasons, and few of them were strictly theological ones. There were shortsightedness, lack of charity, narrow-mindedness, doctrinaire zeal, indeed, guilt on both sides.

If the protagonists had been determined from the outset to bring about a schism, they could not have done it more beautifully.

There was no theological inevitability for Luther's condemnation; indeed, the contemporaries did not think that it had been definitive. The actual course of events in Germany between 1521 and 1541 shows that in the opinion of many a split could yet be avoided—despite Luther's condemnation. The deep awareness of a profound gap between the two sides is the product of a later time. During the early years of the Reformation the notion of the one Christian body was still real and both sides were committed to it.

Such, then, was the Reformation of the sixteenth century—a peculiar combination of men, of ideas, and circumstances. Current research challenges us to revise both the traditional Catholic and the traditional Protestant understanding. If history is not only to be an antiquarian venture, but have relevance for the present, then this revision might well be a most hopeful sign for a common future.

The second Convocation Address by Professor Hillerbrand, entitled "The Reformation—Now," will be published in the next issue of *The Duke Divinity School Review*.

The Dean's Discourse

Of the many things I might, as Dean, have elected to say in this column, I am not sure that my choice has always been either fully pertinent or properly discriminating. So I wish to begin this New Year, not with an inviolable resolve, but with "the general confession," accepted for myself, that there have been "some things done that ought not to have been done and some things undone that ought to have been done." Nevertheless, I have welcomed the opportunity to speak somewhat directly to our alumni (who are our principal reader group) about both affairs of the Divinity School and others affecting it that have more than passing significance. These sundry things that form the "warp and woof" of our existence as a school are, perhaps, worthy of such public notice and record as these pages afford. Apart from this, school affairs would have either the ephemeral and rather superficial attention accorded them by the recently established Alumni Newsletter or only the solemn sequestration of the official Faculty Minutes.

Apart from the real satisfaction of harboring a celebrated German professor of theology this year, Dr. Jürgen Moltmann of Tübingen, who has—as anticipated—brought escalating vitality to theological discussion in our midst, and, apart from the surprising increase in enrolment (with the largest entering Junior class of our history), the introduction of a new or, at least, rather drastically revised curriculum comprises the salient event of the current year. This kind of event is apt to command scant attention; however, it is as significant as it was taxing to effect. The innovation was cautiously acknowledged as "experimental," and, to prove it, a faculty committee for the continuing study of the curriculum, chaired by Professor Creighton Lacy, has been at work this year probing prior questions on the nature of the ministry in relation to which any really serviceable course of studies must be shaped for tomorrow.

One of the factors which has recurrently confronted our reflections in this area is the seemingly amorphous state of the mind of the churches—ranging from traditional conventionality to radical plural-ism—about the shape and function of ministry in today's world and for tomorrow. No doubt a new consensus on the nature of the min-

istry is in ferment and, hopefully, in the process of formation. Until it begins to crystallize, however, the task of the educator is as risky as it is puzzling.

Two important studies, the one by Charles Feilding, Education For Ministry (American Association of Theological Schools, 1966), the other by Charles Taylor and Nathan Pusey, Ministry For Tomorrow (New York: Seabury Press, 1967), assist immensely in sharpening the issues, clarifying the problems, and laying out certain guidelines that may well contribute to the hastening of the needed new consensus. Meanwhile, the widespread confusion, or at least strife of tongues and perspective, among practicing churchmen on the role of the minister, complicates the task of curricular re-formation for educators, even if they are earnestly moved, as I believe they are, to provide an adequate vehicle of more relevant theological education. But it is precisely the question, relevant to what? that presently has no clear consensus, but toward which, surely, both responsible churchmen and seminary educators must be groping.

One thing that is becoming fully manifest is that the diminished stature of the ministry in contemporary society is something that has overtaken us in the very era of unprecedented aggrandizement of the institutional church in American Protestantism. However paradoxical this may seem, it may not really be unintelligible, for the consequent pluralization of the ministerial function in the institutional church has resulted precisely in a loss of certainty about the distinctive task of the ministry. Needed urgently, therefore, is a new consensus respecting both the "center of gravity" of the ministerial vocation and an honest consent to an inescapable division of labor and diversity of ministries. On both points St. Paul himself might be appealed to. In any case, the long-standing presumption about a hoped for omnicompetent pastor for any given congregation is certainly in for the most thorough reassessment in the days ahead. The implications for educational planning are many-sided and as perplexing as they are challenging.

-Robert E. Cushman

LOOKS

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Allen, Yorke. A seminary survey; a listing and review of the activities of the theological schools and major seminaries located in Africa, Asia, and Latin America . . . New York: Harper, 1960.

Bridston, Keith R., ed. The making of ministers; essays on clergy training

today. Minneapolis: Augsburg Pub. House, 1964.

Caemmerer, Richard Rudolph, ed. Toward a more excellent ministry. St.

Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1964.

Coburn, John B., ed. Horizons of theological education; essays in honor of Charles L. Taylor. Dayton, Ohio: American Association of Theological Schools, 1966.

Dittes, James E. Vocational guidance of theological students; a manual for the use of the Theological School Inventory. Dayton, Ohio: Ministry Studies Board, 1964.

Feilding, Charles Rudolph. Education for ministry. Dayton, Ohio: American

Association of Theological Schools, 1966.

Hodgson, Leonard. The Bible and the training of the clergy. London: Darton,

Longman & Todd, 1963.

International Missionary Council. Theological Education Fund. Five years; a report from the Theological Education Fund, 1958-1963. New York? 1963?

Lee, James Michael, ed. Seminary education in a time of change. Notre Dame, Ind.: Fides Publishers, 1965.

Moss, Basil Stanley. Clergy training today. London: S.P.C.K., 1964.

Poole, Stafford. Seminary in crisis. New York: Herder & Herder, 1965.

Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. Special Committee on Theological Education. Ministry for tomorrow. New York: Seabury Press, 1967. (Nathan Pusey, chairman; Charles L. Taylor, director of the study.) Wagoner, Walter D. Bachelor of divinity; uncertain servants in seminary

and ministry. New York: Association Press, 1963.
Wagoner, Walter D. The seminary, Protestant and Catholic. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966.

JOURNAL ARTICLES

Alexander, James E. "New formula for theological education," Religion in Life 35:30-44, Winter 1965-1966.

Bender, R. "Christian education in theological education," Religious Education

62:18-24+, Jan. 1967. Clinard, T. N. "Suggestion for required pre-seminary studies," Religion in Life 36:216-22, Summer 1967.

"Colloquies on seminary education; the growing edges of the theological disciplines." Encounter 25:291-313, Summer 1964. (6 articles)

Frost, S. B. "Selection and training of candidates for the ministry; post-graduate theological training," Expository Times 74:112-4, Jan. 1963.

Funk, R. W. "Creating an opening; biblical criticism and the theological curriculum," Interpretation 18:387-406, Oct. 1964.

"The future of our seminaries," Lutheran Quarterly 18:305-50, November 1966. (seven articles on this topic)

- Graves, A. W. "Ecumenism in theological seminaries," Religious Education 62:200-2+, March 1967.
- Hazelton, R. "The face of theological education today," The Educational Record 46:217-22, Summer 1965.
- Lindsell, Harold. "Tensions in the seminaries," Christianity Today 11:789-792, May 12, 1967.
- Loomer, B. M. "Reflections on theological education," Criterion 4:3-8, Autumn 1965.
- Marty, M. E. "Theological education in an ecumenical age; a position paper," Criterion 4:23-30, Autumn 1965.
- Miller, S. H. "Education for insecurity," Harvard Divinity Bulletin 29:27-34, January 1965.
- Miller, S. H. "Philosophy of theological education; toward the creation of meaningful communities," Encounter 25:314-23, Summer 1964.
- Mitchell, H. H. "Key term in theological education for the Negro: compensatory," Christian Century 84:530-3, April 26, 1967.
- "The needs of theological education," School and Society 95:174-5, March 18, 1967.
- Oden, T. C. "Christian ethics amid pietistic culture—Protestantism," Christian Century 83:525-6+, April 27, 1966.
- Repp. A. C. "Some directives for the education of a more excellent ministry," Concordia Theological Monthly 35:701-9, Dec. 1964.
- Spitz, C. T. "Theological education and the special ministries," Concordia
- Theological Monthly, 36:385-97, June 1965. Theological Education. (Journal). Dayton, Ohio: American Association of Theological Schools, 1964 to date. (vol. 1, no. 1 = Autumn 1964).
- "Theological Education Number," Journal of Bible and Religion 34:98-165, April 1966. (9 articles on the Lilly Study)
- "Toward fewer and better seminaries," Christian Century 84:1147, Sept. 13, 1967.
- Van Dusen, H. P. "Theological education in the ecumenical era," Princeton Seminary Bulletin 56:4-11, Feb. 1963.
- Wagoner, W. D. "Time, tide and seminary priorities," Christian Century 83:519-21, April 2, 1966.
- Wagoner, W. D. "Uneasy aggiornamento: the changing profile of American
- Protestant seminaries," Christian Scholar 50:129-36, Summer 1967. Wentz, R. E. "Is there a new establishment of religion?" Christian Century 84:463-5, April 12, 1967.
- World Council of Churches. Division of Studies. "What kind of ministry? What kind of training?" South East Asia Journal of Theology 6-7:67-72, April-Tune 1965.
- Ziegler, J. H. "Ferment in theological education," Journal of Pastoral Care 20:65-73, June 1966.

-Harriet V. Leonard Reference Librarian OUT OF THE VINEYARD, BACK TO THE BIG HOUSE: A REVIEW-ESSAY. Who Speaks for the Church? Paul Ramsey. Abingdon. 1967. 189 pp. \$2.45.

When the ministers of Little Rock found themselves in the midst of racial crisis, they used a variety of homiletical techniques to help their parishioners (and themselves) avoid concrete decisions and action regarding the most pressing issues raised in the struggle over school desegregation. The "deeper issues" approach allowed evasion of responsibility concerning equal protection of the rights of Negro citizens while calling on churchmen to be sure that "good will" and "brotherhood" were in their hearts. The "every-man-a-priest" technique permitted a few prophetic words on the school situation, so long as their moral authority was immediately undercut by the assurance that every man, after all, is entitled to his own opinion (the implication being that nobody has much of a right to try to persuade his brethren in the household of faith that they ought to do something they don't want to do).

There are a number of disturbing similarities between the line of reasoning followed in Paul Ramsey's Who Speaks for the Church? and the escape mechanisms employed by the Little Rock ministers. Some of the things Ramsey advocates are just as unassailable as good will and brotherhood, but one fears that the consequences of his book may be equally disastrous: just as the deeper issues approach and the every-man-a-priest technique in the context in which they were used were mechanisms of evasion, one fears that the arguments of Who Speaks for the Church? will function mainly as a convenient rationalization for indecision and inaction in the homes, studies and classrooms where they are taken at face value. One fears that many an unwary moderate will overlook the astonishing political and sociological naiveté of the book and will be hoodwinked by its spurious logic, and that many disgruntled conservatives (the sophisticated ones in the seminaries as well as the simple-minded ones at Christianity Today, which praised the book) will seize upon it as a handy confirmation of their misplaced faith in fundamentalism, pietism or academic virtuosity.

Who Speaks for the Church? is presented, according to its subtitle, as a critique of the 1966 Geneva Conference on Church and Society, but it is also, in a more general sense, as assault upon the way Christian ethics are "done" by many contemporary theologians and active churchmen. One-half of Ramsey's argument consists of criticisms of the errors of what he calls "the social action curia" of ecumenical Protestantism. He attacks four shortcomings of the WCC's Church and Society Conference in Geneva; (1) its procedural arrangements (which did not allow sufficient time for "adequate deliberation sufficient to sustain its numerous findings"), (2) its condemnation of U.S. policy in Vietnam, (3) the way in which various Americans and delegates from the Third World were allowed to exercise an influence out of all proportion to their importance in the ecclesiastical bodies supposedly represented at the conference, and (4) its statement on nuclear war (pp. 58-118). It is in connection with (1) above that he denounces the "truncated Barthianism" of the conference (pp. 77ff.) and ridicules its working group paper on "Theological Issues in Social Ethics":

A Christian theologian or ethicist would have to be out of his mind to regard the working group paper on 'Theological Issues in Social Ethics' produced at the Geneva conference as the basis (or even a basis) for future discussion in any other than the trivial sense that it may on occasion be useful to start talking. It cannot be emphasized too often that the propositions affirmed by this conference, whether by receiving them or by adopting them as in either case a report of its thinking, are no more and no less than exactly that:

the thinking that went on at this particular gathering, composed as it was and structured to think and act as it was. Its statements have exactly the inherent meaning and importance they themselves manifest. No additional authority or persuasiveness should be attributed to them. The same statements issuing from another source would have had the same force; these same statements known to have been pondered under better deliberative conditions could be set forth in the wider human discourse of church or state with better backing; and more searching statements issuing from this or another source would have greater intrinsic force. If anyone thinks otherwise, he thinks more highly of ecumenical statements than he ought to think. If anyone persuades a church member or a civic leader otherwise, he appeals to some other authority than Scripture and right reason to bolster some partisan particularity.

This criticism of the conference per se is based on a conviction that its planners and the sizeable school of thought they represent are victims of a "Church and Society syndrome" which expresses itself in a form of culture Christianity that would turn the Church inside out and make of it a secular sect. Contending that Christian social ethicists err in seeking to proclaim directives (policy recommendations) instead of merely pointing a direction (a range of permissible action), and castigating them especially for "trying to compile a Christian social ethic by leap-frogging from one problem to another," Ramsey declares that "It is a yen for specific involvement that betrays us from our primary calling, and from the world's most urgent need." (p. 140)

What, then, is the primary calling of the Church in the social arena? The other half of the book gives a very thought-provoking answer to that question:

(a) The Church should look for something distinctive to say, something that its official gatherings can announce without faulting the consciences of other faithful Christians on the authority of long established and widely accepted Christian truth. (See pp. 15-16, 49-50, 56-57.)

(b) That "something distinctive" will almost always be a declaration which lies between a vague generalization or a pious injunction, on the one hand, and, on the other, a specific policy pronouncement. It will be, above all, an utterance which promotes further intelligent discourse instead of cutting it off, an utterance which promotes a wholesome ethos for rational discussion. It must not disturb the consciences of good Christians who are serving in the army or some other lawful vocation associated with actions being called into question, for so long as they are carrying out duties lawfully assigned to them by the magistrates, they are expressing obedience to God.

(c) The churches ought to submit themselves to a self-denying ordinance which leaves the details of policy formulation in the trustworthy hands of the magistrates, and "statements made with a view to opening a larger consideration of issues and possible particular actions ought not even to be formulated so as to leave the impression that Christians as such have insights that would supplant the office of political judgment and decision on the part of magistrate and citizens, bind or fault their consciences." (p. 119).

(d) Ramsey calls on fellow Protestants, finally, to quit dodging potentially disruptive questions about basic doctrinal matters in their quest for cooperation in programming. He quotes with approval a Faith and Order document which warns that "the specific problems refuse to be treated apart from the deeper questions." (p. 145)

A comprehensive and scrupulously "fair" review would require many pages of carefully qualified "Yea's" and "Nay's" based on painstakingly constructed interpretations of the exact import of various insights and assertions contained

in the pages of Who Speaks for the Church? His complaint about the procedures followed at Geneva have considerable merit, and even though his alternative proposal is neither realistic nor desirable, some movement in that direction would be. Point (d) above is likely to elicit assent from all kinds of churchmen (for all kinds of reasons!); (b) can be interpreted in a congenial sense; and (c) is especially welcome to the extent that it encourages churchmen "not to allow themselves to advocate particular policies in the public forum without also specifying how we are to get from where we are" and "not to allow ourselves to specify only the optimistic among the prospects if certain steps are taken without specifying also that to take these steps may entail that other steps be taken that are rather grim, even if possibly less grim than where we are." (p. 119)

But the congenial interpretation one finds it possible to put on Ramsey's dicta (or the real content one reads into them) is more often than not, one fears, the exact opposite of what he had in mind. The welcome interpretation of (c) implies more emphasis on strategy development, not less—more emphasis on directives, not simply on a direction. The only acceptable interpretation of (b) would require faulting many a conscience, Christian and otherwise, in the name of the God of the prophets. (Thank God that Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, et al., not to mention Jesus of Nazareth, were less cautious than Ramsey urges!) And the first item on the agenda of the kind of eyeball-to-eyeball discussion invited in (d) would have to do with the bankruptcy of propositional theology and of the brand of scholastic casuistry Ramsey practices.

Perhaps Ramsey's most fundamental error is revealed in recommendation (a), which values Christian distinctiveness more than the articulation of policies designed to meet pressing human needs and mobilization of Christian and secular energies for the implementation of these policies. The function of such an emphasis is to keep ethicists forever embroiled in a process of symbol manipulation regarding the theological warrant for whatever is said, and churchmen forever obsessed with the church instead of the world.

That, in sum, is why Who Speaks for the Church? is such a dangerous book: since it is written by one of the most learned, versatile, prolific and highly regarded members of the guild of Christian ethicists, the book is in effect a rallying cry designed to focus energy once again on the "proper" concerns of the discipline. But the focus called for by Ramsey is reactionary and fruitless, a part of a monstrous process of institutionalized evasion which enables religious intellectuals and their followers to avoid their top priority moral responsibilities just as neatly as the Little Rock churchmen avoided theirs.

When Professor Ramsey urges us to articulate directions instead of directives, when he recommends the cultivation of an ethos for discussion rather than mobilization of support for specific policies, he is using the "deeper issues" appoach. To follow Ramsey's advice on this score would be to play right into the hands of the ruling elites of our society by allowing them to determine the policy that supposedly implements the values which religion is asked to sustain. That's exactly what the more cynical among the magistrates* want: they are quite happy for religious leaders to talk on and on about values and principles so long as the magistrates have the final say about laws, budgets, administrative procedures and all of the other factors which actually decide what happens in the world—and they are no doubt delighted whenever they find a Christian ethicist who wants the church to keep its mouth shut about policy

^{* &}quot;Magistrates" is a nice medieval euphemism which helps to obscure the fact that the men who make public and corporation policy are by virtue of their office dedicated to national self-interest or profit, and are thus very much in need of having a prophetic word addressed to them by the church.

Die Christliche Welt, opposition to liberal Biblical scholarship, the rediscovery of Paul, Otto's "wholly other," open rejection of cultural Protestantism (19th century liberalism), dialectical theology, and the journal of that new theology, Zwischen den Zeiten. But, eventually to prove much more significant, there were the differences that generated into the "divided mind" of modern theology. Many of these early variances have been obscured because of the tendency of liberalism to lump its opponents into one indiscriminate whole. But from the beginning there were decisive disparities-Barth began his career as a pastor. Bultmann as a professor; Barth was a dogmatician in the service of the Church, Bultmann an historian in the quest of cientific truth; that is, Barth looked, together with theologians of the past, for the World or dogma in scripture, whereas Bultmann, as a lifetime member of the Religionsgeschichtliche Schule (history of religions school) critically examined the Bible in light of its historical and cultural setting; Barth viewed historical scholarship as necessary but penultimate, whereas Bultmann regarded it as necessary and decisive: for Barth the Jesus of history veiled the presence and revelation of God, for Bultmann, the otherness and transcendence of God; accordingly Barth sought to translate the witness of scripture into theology, while Bultmann would speak anthropologically. Other differences of emphases could be cited, and regardless of the fact that both theologians repudiated liberalism agreed that "the revelation event in which faith is born . . . /is/ an encounter between man and the living word of God himself," these diversities proved decisive and therefore dirisive of modern theology. What emerged then, by 1933, where Professor Smart's story concludes, is the Church Dogmatics of Karl Barth, and the existentialist hermeneutics of Rudolf Bultmann, "The crucial issue is whether theology is to be focused upon the word to which faith responds or upon the faith that responds to the word." (p. 197). In other words, is true anthropology theology, or is true theology anthropology? I suppose contemporary theology could be understood as an attempt somehow to say both and thereby overcome its schizophrenia.

I know of no other account of this terribly interesting story of Barth and Bultmann, 1908-1933—which is also the story of modern theology. For the student who is already familiar with the thought of Barth and Bultmann, this study provides the fascinating Sitz im Leben that will make his theology not only more lively but also more accurate. For the reader who would be introduced to the theologies of these scholars, I can recommend no better source. In other words, this is an excellent volume, theologically and historically. I do find fault, however, with the footnotes-they are too few and at the end of the book. I have little doubt that Barth had misgivings early about Gogarten's philosophical bent (p. 108), but I would like to know where he expressed these. And as a student of Barth, I found it quite inconvenient to have to flip to the back to discover in which article Barth states that he was not conscious of "any conversion away from" Herrmann (p. 36). One final word: Professor Smart is a craftsman in the arts of theological and historical writing, so The Divided Mind of Modern Theology is just plain, good reading.

-Robert T. Osborn

Recent Homiletical Thought: A Bibliography, 1935-1965. Edited by William Toohey, C.S.C. and William Thompson. Abingdon. 1967. 303 pp. \$4.75.

This modest book is an exciting chapter in the story of the renewal of the Church in our time, and it will aid in that renewal. Its genesis and genius are related in the Preface. In 1960 the officers of the Catholic Homiletical Society began the project; they soon invited Protestant cooperation; certain teachers of speech and preaching in the Speech Association of America joined them, and the resulting "labor of love" is both symbol and useful proof of the values of such a team-approach.

Statistics will show its scope. Two editors, Roman Catholic and Northern Baptist, 36 contributing editors, 20 of them teachers in graduate Divinity Schools, searched the literature, read, annotated, and organized the resulting 2137 items under 15 helpful

"topics."

The topics, likewise descriptively annotated in pages 6 and 7, combined with the item-annotations, multiply the usefulness of the book, and reveal both standard themes and some of the cutting edges of American preaching theory and practice. They are: General Works; Preaching and Theology: Topics of Preaching: the Preacher; the Congregation; the Setting-Liturgical; the Setting-Special Occasions; the Sermon; Delivery; History-Individual Preachers: History-Groups; History-Periods; History-Theory; Teaching; and Bibliographies.

Abingdon Press can be proud of this book, and we should be grateful. It will be indispensable to teachers and students of public address and preaching, and useful to thoughtful ministers who would break out of the "preach the Word" stereotypes of Southern American and European Protestantism. I surmise that the periodical articles will be even more fruitful than the books, for they reflect the cutting edges of preaching as thoughtful pastors and teachers in related disciplines write. Three examples must suffice. In item 906, under "The Congregation," Earl Ferguson editorializes in Pastoral Psychology concerning the role of psychology and psychotherapy, they deal with "how" and with "what."

John Casteel, teacher of speech and preaching in several major seminaries, and author of several books on prayer and the small-group movement, in 898 and 899 offers principles and methods by which the minister may utilize his counseling experiences in sermons, and "describes in detail the 5 steps in sermon construction and presentation which he believes will make preaching an effective counterpart of the ministry of counseling."

Equally suggestive is the topic "The Setting-Liturgical," where even descriptions of articles hint at the latent biblical, theological and pastoral power of the gospel year as it can focus our praise, prayer and

preaching.

This review must be ended "Con-The Catholic Homiletical Society now has over 2000 members, and a full-time executive director. William Thompson is ecumenical editor, and their periodical Preaching, is widely read. Our Protestant future is not so clear. Most Divinity Schools are breaking the barriers between "scholarly" and "professional," and have learned team-teaching from the clinically-oriented disciplines. own Divinity School is handicapped by our rural environment, and we do not have a tradition of team work with each other or with the Church. And the biblical and theological renewal has shifted attention from pastoral preaching and interdisciplinary teaching. But ecumenical, denominational and faculty resources are available, and our new curriculum challenges

Likewise, you ministers who read this must write your own chapter in the story. The staff of the Divinity School will be honored to aid you—in clinics and seminars on worship and preaching, and by personal correspondence and suggestions for study. This book can aid you even more in the arena where you must work out a whole ministry—your study and pastorate, as you and your people together do the work of Christ.

-John J. Rudin, II



