



**THE
DUKE
DIVINITY SCHOOL
REVIEW**

Autumn 1970

Prayer

Oh God,
whose glory is in all the earth,
and by whose presence we are preserved from
ourselves
and from all else that would quench
Thy light and warmth of life,
We praise Thee.

Forgive our feverish ways,
our random ventures,
our bold and thoughtless prods at life,
our fear-filled and our hate-ridden incubations.

Grace us
with the discipline of trust in Thee,
that we may find footing on the firmament of hope and love,
that our vision may pierce
the low-hung-cloud-ceilings of
self-aggrandizement,
self-deception,
and self-indulgence.

We thank Thee
for this place of service.
Fructify our minds that we may better understand our tasks.
Strengthen our hearts that we may be in warm pursuit of our goals.
Inspire our wills that we may be steadfast in Thee towards all people.

Oh God,
in the midst of the Darkness of our times
grant that we may not succumb
to the strange allures
and gaping easement of
Darkness.

By Thy grace
keep our gaze steadfast on the light that shines forth from
Thy Christ,
and from the refracted rays
leaping all around us in
Thy fractured image that is
Man.

We commit ourselves to
Thy goodness and mercy,
Creator, Preserver, Redeemer.

Seal our commitment by Thy gracious Spirit
with the assurance that
those who labor in Thee and for Thee
labor not alone nor in vain.

And to Thee the only true
only wise
only faithful
living and loving God,
through Christ our Lord
be all honor and glory now and from the ages unto the ages.

Amen

**THE
DUKE
DIVINITY SCHOOL
REVIEW**

Volume 35

Autumn 1970

Number 3

Contents

Prayer (at the first meeting of the Faculty).....	Inside Front Cover
<i>by Franklin W. Young</i>	
Worship, Our Ministry.....	139
<i>by Robert E. Cushman</i>	
A Man to Stand in the Gap.....	146
<i>by Gene M. Tucker</i>	
On Styling It.....	152
<i>by Charles K. Robinson</i>	
Focus on Faculty.....	161
<i>by Paul A. Mickey, Robert L. Wilson, and Robert Terry Young</i>	
Looks at Books.....	167

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

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

Postage paid at Durham, North Carolina (27706)

Worship, Our Ministry

ROBERT E. CUSHMAN
Dean, Duke Divinity School

I.

Today we enter upon the forty-fifth academic year of the Divinity School. As the first established graduate professional school of Duke University, the Divinity School began its distinctive service to Church and University in 1926. Today it is an honor and privilege to greet returning students, in the name of the University and the faculty, and to welcome the new students who come to partake of what we can offer here. We are committed to offer, in word and deed, the substance of Christian faith as a life and a vocation. In the course of your passage, and ours, we hope that your misgivings may recede before enlarged understanding and firm aspiration for ministry in Christ's name. A theological school is not an escalator; it is more nearly a ladder of discipline which may, if you will, assist you "to make your calling and election sure" (II Pet. 1:10).

This morning, as in previous years, we reassemble in this opening convocation of praise and thanksgiving. We remember that our Lord, in discharge of his ministry, arose a great while before day and went into the desert to pray. Because we do not suppose that our need of prayer is less than his, we reassemble as a community for worship. We propose to make our beginning in worship as, indeed, the Christian life—if it is to be possible at all—must begin, continue and end in worship. So today we find worship our starting-point and believe that in this context we may rediscover again, also, our reason for being as a school.

For a theological school, worship is native air. This morning I propose to show that it is not only the matrix of our life as a school, but the substance of it. Our presupposition is God and God as Lord. In this convocation we properly begin our year in acknowledgment of Him.

In the final analysis, all worship is man's acknowledgment of God. Its language is the language of response. Accordingly, this convoca-

tion intends at least two things. First, it convokes the Divinity School community for listening and for self-recognition as a people who are addressed. But, secondly, our convocation intends that our communal self-recognition should take place in the corporate recognition of God. For it is necessary, if we are to know ourselves in our distinctive corporate identity, to recognize ourselves as a community under God. Yet we can do this only as a people at worship. Therefore it is further clear that the prior purpose of this convocation is not, primarily, that we meet here to relate to one another, but that our meeting is open to a wider dimension of Being, which we assemble to acknowledge. Moreover, finding one another in the presence of God may be the only auspices under which we can really meet and get through to one another at all. If there is to be a real community of men with men, perhaps it must begin, continue, and end in worship, that is, under the acknowledged Lordship of God. This at least is the message of the Bible. With it, there is no lasting community of man with man save under the common acknowledgment of God.

II.

No other division of the University avowedly operates on the prior acknowledgment of God either as its presupposition or reason for being. It is not, however, that God as Lord is denied by the other schools; it is only that their reason for being does not have *acknowledgment* of God as the distinctive objective of their function. Even a department of religion in the University may delineate the phenomena of faith, without either enjoining it or inviting acknowledgment of its presumed divine Co-implicate. If a theological school were simply a "school of religion" as a part of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, its faculty would be under no mandate save to exhibit the historic forms of the Christian consciousness in relation to the succession of its institutional expressions, called churches, and possibly to indicate contextually suitable models for today.

But, *eo ipso*, a theological school has God as its presupposition and his acknowledgment as its reason for being. It is the momentous if neglected distinction between *knowledge* and *acknowledgment* which signifies the difference between the kind of study that confines itself to the phenomenology of religion, even of the Christian religion, and the kind of endeavor that goes on here or in any school of theology.

To add that we are a professional school helps but does not fully disclose the differentia of a seminary unless "professional" is taken

in its literal sense—as it may be—meaning “to profess.” In that case, what is entailed in our context is a profession of faith. That profession of faith takes the form of ministry, or, better, is embodied in it. And that ministry is a ministry after the fashion of Christ.

Now, none takes upon himself such a ministry unless he professes its significance for him and its mandate upon him. This is when profession of faith issues in practice. When profession issues in practice, there is evidence that knowledge has been transformed into *acknowledgment*. And acknowledgment of God is worship. Conversely, when, after the analogy of electrical conduits, acknowledgment is transformed downward, “stepped-down” to the voltage level of knowledge, faith gives way to conclusions rated according to more or less probability. Then, worship becomes something else—probably “science” or some form of it. Then profession of faith ceases to be also vocation, that is, a personal commitment, and may become the subject-matter of a learned discourse.

No theologically literate person, responsible for this Divinity School, supposes that it is a school of the science of religion. On the contrary, in a variety of ways—some more informed than others—all recognize that the Divinity School is pledged to education for ministry. But, if so pledged, then by implication pledged also to *acknowledgment of God* in the form of life commitment. Students do and may come here to find out whether they can make that commitment their own, but they cannot rightfully presume or expect that the school, for its part, will share their ambiguity, or that it should intentionally accommodate its purposes to their own ambivalence. The school is prepared to nurture, embrace and assist. It is prepared to illuminate, exalt, and invite participation in the ministry of Christ, but it is not permitted to denature its own distinctive role and purpose as keyed to that ministry.

III.

The subject of this convocation message today is worship. What has so far been said is intended to introduce the subject in relation to our role as a Divinity School. I have suggested that our endeavors after knowledge here have a distinctive difference from those of other schools. It is proposed that all our endeavors after knowledge have their proper issue in acknowledgment, namely, the acknowledgment of God. Acknowledgment entails the involvement of the whole man. On the one hand, it means hearing and being grasped and, on the

other, it means loyalty. Acknowledgment entails a pledge, a commitment; and commitment is a giving up to the other. Generically, I have said acknowledgment of God is the heart-meaning of worship. It is, in fact, self-offering.

So I say also that worship as acknowledgment is the aim and end of this school; the end is not *scientia*, science; the end is consent to the Being of God. As worship is the end, so prayer, as the language of worship, is the medium of its fulfilment. Plainly, then, this school has a distinctive role and purpose just because it has a distinctive presupposition. Every school has its distinctive presuppositions: For Law, it is that, in the strife of counter claims and counter claimants, order is better than disorder and equity the surest bar to injustice. For Medicine, the presupposition is that health is better than disease and that there are ways of avoiding the one and enhancing the other. Neither Law nor Medicine, as such, may wish to probe behind these presuppositions for, let us say, their ontological co-implicates. For Divinity, however, the presupposition is ontological. It is God as self-disclosed, as mysteriously eruptive in history, in the ministry of Jesus called Christ. Plainly, with this presupposition, the derivative purpose of a Divinity School is the nurture of men and women for acknowledgment of God after the manner of and by participation in this ministry. But now, as the acknowledgment of God *is* worship, so the acknowledgment of God by participation in Christ's ministry *is*, precisely ministry in Christ's name. Therefore, from the Christian standpoint, worship and participation in the ministry of Christ are inseverable and, in most respects, one and the same thing. Hardly, therefore, can this school nurture in ministry apart from worship, nor worship without nurture in ministry. Where these fall asunder, worship and ministry, both are denatured.

IV.

This outcome, then, invites a closer look at the question, what is the worshipful life, or what are the parts of worship? If we would know, at least in Christian perspective what is the nature of worship, then, in fact, these things are best disclosed in a life. The meaning of Christian worship is its manifestation in a worshipful life. For it is my thesis that the ministry of Jesus Christ is the fulfilment of worship. Because I cannot say better or more concisely what I wrote and published some years ago in a volume entitled, *Worship*

in Scripture and Tradition (Ed. M. Shepherd, Oxford Press, 1963), I will quote the summation:

“To sum up, in ‘the full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice’ of Jesus Christ, the whole meaning of the Law is fulfilled, in unflinching love of God and unhesitating love of man. This is the *enpersonalization* of worship; therefore the early Church saw it as God’s own deed. God himself set forth this sacrifice to be an ‘expiation’ for sin available to those who receive it in faith (Rom. 3:25). The true worshipper is, first, Jesus Christ himself, and true worship is attained for those who, ‘crucified with Christ,’ walk in newness of life. This is life in which God’s dominion is regnant. It is life in which autonomy is no longer reserved, and in which the stewardship of all life is acknowledged.”

The article might have been entitled “the enpersonalization of worship.” What is meant is that, in the personal history of Jesus Christ, that is his ministry, is fulfilled all that God requires of man in acknowledgment of Him. Accordingly, I also wrote: “The worship of the New Testament is celebration of the fullness of sacrifice. It is the unreserved acknowledgment of God accomplished in Jesus Christ and, *through him*, made possible as the vocation of every man. Worship is living sacrifice, a way of life open to the humble and the contrite heart—but a heart moved to contrition by ‘the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.’” (*Ibid.*, p. 41)

Christian worship is living sacrifice in the likeness of Christ’s ministry. It is a way of life open only to the humble and the contrite heart. It is only this openness that has in it any possibility of participation in the sufferings of Christ or the unreserved acknowledgment of God the Father as the mastering motivation of existence. It is only such openness to the Grace of God’s forgiveness that will sustain and empower a would-be-follower for the hard, long, frequently disappointing and toilsome way of ministry in Christ’s name. Without this openness, this self-abasement in the presence of his sacrifice, without a recurring unreserved acknowledgment of “the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ,” I am convinced that nothing that we do here as a faculty and nothing that may happen to you here as students will count for very much for very long toward the enlargement of God’s lordship among the children of men.

In this and other eras—now in one way, now in another—aspirants after the manner of Christ’s ministry presume to buy it too cheap. Nothing is needed more these days, I think, than to rediscover with

St. Paul what it means "to die with Christ in the likeness of his death" *in order* to be able to rise with him to "newness of life" (Rom. 6:4,5). It is this newness that makes ministry possible. Only so is it supportable through all the chances and changes of this mortal life. Only so can Christ's "yoke" be easy and his "burden" light. To resolve that paradox requires more than all things human.

V.

So far, then, we have identified the truly worshipful life. We have found in it the fullness of worship because also the fullness of sacrifice. It is this fullness that, in fact, we call the ministry of Jesus Christ, and in our own worship we find it fitting to celebrate his victory. Our worship is always, and appropriately, thanksgiving as well as confession, and celebration as well as dedication to mission.

But here we may pause to observe that perhaps a perennial weakness of Christian worship—that of the churches and that of all of us—has been a greater readiness to celebrate than to participate. It may be a greater readiness to celebrate the victory of Christ by way of the liturgy than to endure his sufferings. It is in this way that we divorce liturgy from life. In this way, we reduce ministry to good works and liturgy to ceremony. So, this divorcement fosters, as it also manifests, two perennially recurrent aberrations of the Christian religion, the enshrinement of worship or prayer without works and, conversely, the desacralization of worship or works without prayer. Liturgy is *for* life. It pre-figures ministry and may empower it. Yet the current dismissal of liturgy is understandable insofar as it has become celebration divorced from participation. The recovery of liturgy will be the remarriage of celebration with participation.

Finally, then, what is this ministry that comprises the substance of our worship? The answer is openly declared in the New Testament; and, in the Old, there are foregleams of its manifestation. The ministry of Jesus Christ is just exactly suffering God to be Lord of the whole life. It is embodying in the rugged stuff of daily vocation the words of the Psalmist: "O my soul, thou hast said unto Jahweh, Thou art my Lord. I have no good beyond thee." To mean it, to make "I have no good beyond Thee" the spring of thought and action is suffering God to be God in "the muck and scum of things." It is heeding and enacting the words of the Shema: "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is One." Worship is fulfilled in the Old and the New Testament when God is the One, that is, when he is

acknowledged with all the soul, mind, and strength. At that point there is a true worshipper. All idols and lesser gods are dethroned. "I have no good beyond Thee" is the end of both pluralism and ambivalence.

The suffering of Christ is first of all his suffering God to be Lord. Thus was the fullness of worship and sacrifice. It was the onset of ministry.

That was the first victory and after that the other was consequential. The remainder of worship for one who has no good beyond God is the freedom to seek the good that God wills. That good is the inclusion of the neighbor also in the love of God. It is both to care and to labor for the neighbor's good. This is the second part of worship. It, too, is fulfillment of the commandment. For, said Jesus, "and the second is like unto it: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Mk. 12:31). The ministry of Christ, and his victory, is the fulfillment of the two-fold commandment. This is true worship. It is the unreserved acknowledgment of God. It is the prototype both of our worship and our ministry.

The question that confronts us all is the question whether ministry can really be enpersonalized in us? Not, I think, in our own strength without the plainest presumption and the assurance of failure: Surely, not until, like Isaiah in the Temple, we behold the Lord, high and lifted up, acknowledge the uncleanness of our lips, and receive the divine cleansing (Isa. 6:1-8). Only thereafter may we be able to receive a mission and discharge a ministry. If this should come to be in some mode and measure then it will be true that mission and ministry have issued from worship. It will be true that worship is the enablement of ministry, and ministry is the fulfillment of worship. They will remain forever inseverable. So be it, Amen.

A Man to Stand in the Gap

GENE M. TUCKER

Ezekiel 22:23-31
I Timothy 1:18-20

When the invitation to speak at this service first came to me it was inevitable—most of you will know—that I should first ask myself, “What genre, what *Gattung*, is most appropriate for this particular *Sitz im Leben*?” Then I thought: You are leaving, and I am leaving; since many of us are departing from this world, perhaps a last will and testament is called for. But I rejected that idea; the occasion is solemn enough as it is. And, after all, the baccalaureate sermon is a distinctive genre, well-known in our society. It is closely related to the commencement address. It belongs to a distinctive setting, follows within broad limits a certain form, and has a particular intention. Perhaps the most common feature of the baccalaureate sermon, whether it is to the local high school or the great university, is its free use of empty clichés, such as “The youth of today is the hope for tomorrow.” It speaks about the challenge of the great world “out there” and the open future which lies before the new grads. It is full of admonitions to work hard and to remain faithful to some kind of “ideal.” One of the best graduation addresses I know of is one by Art Buchwald, who summed it all up: “All right now kids, we’ve given you a great world. Now just don’t go and foul everything up.”

And what divinity school baccalaureate would be complete without a text from Timothy?

It is inevitable that this sermon will follow some of those patterns. If not I would be contradicting everything I have said to you about genres of speech and their settings. And I don’t want to do that so late in the day.

But I want above all to speak personally, as we think together of what you have before you in the years ahead; and I want to be as faithful as possible to our tradition, represented in the text from the

Dr. Tucker, formerly Associate Professor of Old Testament in Duke Divinity School, is now on the faculty of Candler School of Theology, Emory University.

book of Ezekiel. This is a text which speaks not only to the exiles of Israel in Babylon, but to all of us who perceive our existence in many ways as exile. Further, it has a particularly pointed word for those of us who have responded and do respond to God's call to special duties.

I.

This speech by Ezekiel is presented not as his own thoughts but—as usually is the case in the prophets—as the very word of the Lord. The situation is the exile. The land of Israel—the holy land promised to the fathers and received from God's gracious hand—lies in ruin. The temple—the chosen, holy place—is a pile of stone. All of Israel's old sacred institutions have come to an end. And for the exiles in Babylon as well as the tattered remnant in the land, it is a fate almost as bad as death itself.

Ezekiel is looking back somewhat nostalgically to the days before the fall. What went wrong? How could such a thing happen to God's chosen people? The point of this speech is to answer such questions. And what he says is nothing new. It had already been shouted by the prophets as early as the eighth century: Your corruption and evil and violence—especially in high places—lead to death and destruction. What is different is that now—now that it is too late—the people hear *and* understand. It is just possible that we who feel our world crumbling around us can hear the warning in these and similar words before it is too late.

The prophet first reviews the failures and crimes of all classes of Israel's leaders. He specifies the sins of each in turn—the princes, the priests, the prophets, and the landed aristocracy—in order to emphasize the radicality of the evil in the land. He is not willing to confine himself to one problem or one group, but tries to say it all.

First, the princes: “. . . they have devoured human lives; they have taken treasure and precious things; they have made many widows in the midst of [the land].” Can't you hear that same word in the weekly report of casualties from Viet Nam—and now Cambodia? Statesmen and politicians and princes and presidents are making many widows, not only in this land but in many others. And taking treasure and precious things. Is that the prophetic word in the defense budget and the reports of the systematic destruction of property and vegetation in Viet Nam?

Next he turns to the priests: They “have done violence to my

law . . . they have made no distinction between the holy and the common, neither have they taught. . . ." One of the most important duties of ancient Israel's priests was to teach, not only the distinction between clean and unclean, but all the covenant requirements to the community. Such teaching involved handing down the tradition, and also interpreting it in each concrete situation. If people are not taught, how can they act responsibly? And here is one of those sharp words for us: When and if we fail to teach, or in our teaching distort the nature of Christian responsibility—for example by identifying Christian ethics with the morality of one class or another—we blur the distinction between the holy and the common.

And the prophets: They "have daubed for them with white-wash, seeing false visions and divining lies for them, saying, 'Thus says the Lord God,' when the Lord has not spoken." A lying prophet is a contradiction in terms, for a prophet is simply one who tells the truth. He speaks the word of God. But it is not always easy to tell the truth, and many prefer to follow the teaching of Flip Wilson's prophet Leroy. The prophet Leroy says, "A lie is as good as the truth if you can get somebody to believe it!"

But today we are finding prophets—and prophets of doom—in surprising places: The quiet academician who has spent years in his laboratory examining water samples, the civil servant who spends his days studying specimens of air from above Los Angeles or Durham, and the little slip of a girl who works for Planned Parenthood. These and many like them are telling the truth: Massive action on an international scale is required *immediately* if our planet is to survive!

Finally Ezekiel turns to the landed aristocracy: They "have practiced extortion and committed robbery; they have oppressed the poor and needy, and have extorted from the resident alien without redress." The Lord holds the rich and powerful responsible for the plight of the poor and—if we may interpret the text loosely—for the oppression of minorities. Can't we hear that same accusation in the reports of poverty and hunger in rural communities in the South, of unemployment and underemployment of blacks, South and North? Granted, all are not equally responsible simply because they are rich. But if someone is allowed to starve by those who are able to provide food, there is oppression as surely as if bread had been snatched from a man or milk from a baby, oppression by employers who discriminate or government officials who ignore the hard facts about hunger while storing tons of surplus food.

II.

Thus Ezekiel deals with the crimes of the princes, the priests, the prophets and the landed aristocracy, crimes which led finally to the downfall of the nation. But all of this, his catalogue of sins, is merely background. That was—and to a great extent *is*—the situation. This just summarizes some of the problems—war, poverty, racism, the ecological crisis—and notes some of the duties of leaders. To put it somewhat grimly as Lucy has been telling Charlie Brown recently, “These things are very high on my list of ‘Things You Ought to Know.’” Or only somewhat more optimistically with Pogo: “We are faced with insurmountable opportunities!”

The special word for us—here and now and in the years ahead—is in the sentence which follows the catalogue: “I sought for a man among them who should build up the barricade and stand in the gap before me for the land . . . but I found none.” In that situation, once upon a time in Israel, the result of the Lord’s failure to find a man was disaster. It can happen again—do you believe it?—if you and I do not take this word more seriously than it was taken in pre-exilic Israel.

The Lord seeks, first of all and quite simply, a *man*. No special qualifications are given. No experience is necessary. Behind this search lies the assumption that God’s will for his people will not be accomplished without men who respond to his call. The biblical tradition never lets us forget that men shape history. And now we begin to hear the word of hope in this account of tragedy: The future *can* be changed, if the Lord can find a responsive man.

It is reassuring that all the Lord seeks is a man, but it is also frustrating. The danger, especially in our time of instant communication and greater awareness of the multiplicity of powerful economic and social and political forces which shape our existence, is that we become convinced that the individual is helpless and ineffectual. The result is paralysis. But more and more men and women, especially in your generation, are realizing that the only way one can maintain his humanity is to act as if his decisions make a difference. And they do. Our awareness of history surely teaches that not only do historical circumstances produce men but men affect history.

Next, the Lord wants his man *to stand*. I interpret that as both a call to stand up and an admonition to endure. First, to stand up, to speak in accordance with conscience, lest, in the words of the letter to Timothy, one make a “shipwreck of his faith.” One could, of

course, quibble about the ambiguities of conscience. We all know that conscience depends to a great extent upon training and experience. But let us come clean: On the basic issues we know what is right. Our Christian tradition and training and experience have taught us that much. War is hell. Racism is wrong. There is no way to justify poverty in our rich land. And, as far as I know, according to any doctrine of creation in the Christian tradition, the rape of nature stands condemned.

Naturally, we shall continue to disagree concerning the solutions to these complex problems. But neither these disagreements nor one's lack of total knowledge of a given situation qualify as excuses to remain silent. Our main duty is to call attention to the problems and to point directions, as we see them in the light of the Gospel. The role is similar to the one which historian and philosopher R. G. Collingwood perceived for himself. He said, "When Rome was in danger, it was the cackling of the sacred geese that saved the Capitol. I am only a professorial goose, consecrated with a cap and gown and fed at a college table; but cackling is my job, and cackle I will."

And if we need an example of a contemporary "sacred goose" whose cackling has been heard, look at Ralph Nader. Almost single-handedly he is bringing about reforms in the safety standards of the automobile industry, and now turning to other fields. One young man who had given up a very promising and lucrative career to work with Nader for the protection of the consumer said, "If I don't do it, who is? There is a tremendous amount of satisfaction in knowing that."

But it may turn out to be even more difficult to endure than to stand up. I am confident that most of us can stand up in the dramatic moment, and risk everything when the issues are clear. But, God save us, what is required is standing day by day, when the issues seldom are clear, when the routine and boredom of apparently insignificant duties begin to take their toll.

Two things will enable us to endure. First, we have the knowledge that we are not alone. You and I need one another and—what is more—we *know* that we need one another. However much we are separated geographically, we stand together. We shall think of one another often in the years ahead, and take courage. When I am tempted to despair, I think of the Lord's response to Elijah when he whined that he was the only faithful man left in Israel: "Look around, there are at least seven thousand who haven't bowed the knee to Baal!"

And then we have hope. Pessimism has no survival value at all. But hope and expectation arouse and sustain the determination to act, to do what is possible. The word of judgment, when it is required, is viable because it is predicated upon hope. You know—as did the prophets before you—that beyond and even within the word of judgment lies the word of salvation. You are able to point to wrong and call for change within the church and the society not just because you want something better, but because the Gospel demands and promises a future, God's future.

Finally, God calls for his man to stand *in the gap*. Ezekiel is thinking of the battle, of the city under siege, when the wall has been breached. The Lord needs a man for the most vulnerable place, the front line, where the action is.

Now, as never before in America, the front line is the church at the local level. That's where the action is. William Sloan Coffin said recently, "People say, 'The church is a crutch.' My answer is: 'It certainly is—but what makes you think you don't limp.'" And you are going to be, to a great extent, the church at the local level, whether you are destined for the small parish in rural North Carolina, an assistantship in the suburbs of Chicago, a mission school in Sarawak, or even a private school in New England or a public school in Florida. You will be the church by virtue of your training here and—more importantly—by virtue of your calling, which may be no more than your perception of the human needs around you.

God grant that each of us may be, in the years ahead of us, the Lord's man to stand in the gap.

Amen

On Styling It

CHARLES K. ROBINSON

Associate Professor of Philosophical Theology

Skillful adaptiveness, we all know, may be an important virtue. After all, that ultimate authority, "SCIENCE," teaches—does it not?—the adaptive "survival of the fittest." Yet we have also learned not to give unqualified respect to skillful adaptiveness in any and every form. Take the middle class, establishment-oriented conformist, for example—and that is the example we usually take: we all know as a current "self-evident truth" that establishment conformism, wherever it rears its ugly head, is bad. However, I would derive little satisfaction, and you small benefit, were I merely to belabor today's version of self-evident truth.

Rather I am going to say that conformism is where you find it. Or more accurately, conformism is wherever it functions—whether or not you "find" it, that is recognize it, there. I would even be willing to say that, functionally viewed, some of the prime loci of conformism in our culture are cults of "nonconformity."

Now that we have the material essential to all theology to work with—namely, a "paradox"—let us begin to demythologize it. We can, of course, only do this by means of another myth. So let me sketch out one. Let us pretend that there are imaginary creatures whom, for want of a better name, I will call "cool stylists."

The cool stylists are the children—twenty years later—of the "other-directed" members of David Riesman's *The Lonely Crowd* (1950, read it!). They are indeed the appropriate offspring of their parents' seed, come to harvest in due season in a space meanwhile grown much closer together and light years more distant apart and in a time now hot as "the lake of fire" and cold as "the outer darkness" of Apocalypse.

Style—if you'll pardon something as out-of-style as a little metaphysics—is the *analogicality* of concrete expressions of sensibility mediated through concrete modes of embodiment. As analogical, style is a concretely perceivable integration of relationality and individuation: of participation and differentiation, of dependence and origination. The stress, however, is on the side of *relationality*:

participation and dependence. As an embodying expression of sensibility, style is functionally adaptive.

For our imaginary creature, the cool stylist, his life-embodiment *is* his expressive style; his life-sensibility *is* his interiorizing adaptiveness. Life as he lives it has little by way of larger purpose or end for the sake of which adaptiveness and style might function as means. Life is simply lived as adaptive stylizing.

The *embodiment* of the cool stylist is the style of his external image as projected by him and received by others—namely, others who count, other cool stylists who are “in.” The embodiment of the cool stylist is thus constituted by the principle of Bishop Berkeley: *esse est percipi*, to be is to be perceived. If the style of his image-projection is perceived favorably, he is “in”; he exists. If it is unfavorably perceived, he is “out”; he exists not; he is nihilated.

The *sensibility* of the cool stylist is the adaptiveness of his finely tuned computer adjustment which is constantly calculating the feedback he is getting on his radar screen. The sensibility of the cool stylist is thus constituted by the principle of B. F. Skinner: to be is to react to determining stimuli. (Though, indeed, Professor Skinner might be hard put to account for the tacitness and subtlety of the behavioral clues to which the skilled stylist reacts!)

In the life of this imaginary creature, the cool stylist, the dialectic of the functional relation between inwardness and outwardness is a basically simple one. He indeed interiorizes. He is in a peculiar sense quite introspectively “reflective.” He may even be at times painfully “self-conscious.” But the controlling mode of his inwardness is simply the interiorization of externalities. He is, again, indeed “expressive.” Style is expressive or it is nothing. But the controlling mode of his outwardness is simply the momentary expression of his immediate impressions.

His immediate impressions, moreover, are immediate impressions of the immediate impressions of other cool stylists. In the game of cool stylism it always takes at least “two to tango.” Though indeed “group grope” is better. “Instant intimacy” is best served in mass phenomena. The ideal is total interchangeability. The open secret of every cool stylist is that he does not know who he is. His only really functional identity is a group-identity. Hence he is radically vulnerable to rejection by and isolation from the group.

I spent one summer during college years living alone in the fire lookout tower on top of Bald Mountain in Idaho. I had no radio

and rarely used the phone except for reporting fire information. I went for weeks at a time without beholding a human face. I had nature and God and silence and no man but myself. That summer was one of the richest experiences of my life. But, for the cool stylist, a summer at hard labor in Siberia would be preferable. There, at least, would be a group!

The circular dynamics of cool stylism as a group phenomenon reminds me of one of my favorite cartoons by one of America's great cartoonists, Thomas Nast. (Actually, I had to wait awhile to enjoy the cartoon. It was published in *Harper's Weekly* in 1869.) Nast himself, while a master of style, was nobody's cool stylist. He indignantly rejected a private offer of half a million dollars to "cool it" and take a European vacation! In this cartoon Nast pictures the members of a political organization known as Tammany Hall standing around in a circle. The caption reads, "Who stole the people's money?" In the picture each person in the circle is pointing to the person standing next to him. The conclusion is perhaps that every *body* did it and hence no *person* did.

The *circularity* of the game of cool stylism is a trick with mirrors. Every body in the group is reflectively mirroring every body in the group. The mirroring game has no transcendent in-put of content. Some content there must, of course, be—but only as a contingent necessity. The kind of content matters little. The game has no transcendent purpose beyond the exhibition of adaptive skill in playing it. "The play's the thing." The circularity is hollow and empty. But boredom and futility are staved off by dynamisms of change and interchangeability, novelty and feeling.

Intensity of feeling is not incompatible with the "coolness" of cool stylism. Feeling is okay as long as it is not kept private and as long as it serves the superficial group rapport of pseudo-intimacy. Indeed the more intense and sensation-al the generation of immediate feeling the better. For boredom is never more than a step away. But through it all the cool stylist must not "lose his cool." Through it all he must remain peculiarly detached. Yet for the adept adaptor this is scarcely difficult. He does not know or believe in himself enough to be capable of involving and committing himself deeply and enduringly.

Let me indulge in a little more metaphysics. *Integration* involves the complementary interpenetration of transcendence and immanence. The *level* of integration is a function of the *depth* of the *transcendence* and the *comprehensiveness* of the *immanence* involved. Now, the

experiential togetherness of cool stylism is integrative. Indeed, integration is its only essential positive function (though its negative functions are manifold). But the integration tends to operate downward toward the level of the lowest common immediate contextual denominator. The depth of the integration is essentially superficial and the comprehensiveness of the integration is essentially exclusivistic.

The cool stylist can find his functional identity only as an "in-group" identity in reaction to others. Similarly, a collectivity of cool stylists can find its functional group identity only as an "in group" in reaction to some other group which functions in *negatively identifying contrast* as an "out group." YAF needs the SDS as surely as the SDS needs YAF. Thus if any of my imaginary creatures, the cool stylists, actually existed they could as well stylize themselves on the radical right as on the radical left. Attitudes, slogans, and ideology the cool stylist must have. But *which* is essentially a matter of indifference. (Though if the cool stylist were to recognize this fact he might begin to discover himself as a self.) Cool stylists are not leaders, but they are peculiarly susceptible to manipulation and exploitation by the charismatic leader of the left or right. All they like sheep have gone astray and may be led . . . to the slaughter.

Cool stylism is characterized not only by superficial relational immediacy but also by *ahistorical* absorption in the temporal *present*. In his rhetoric the cool stylist may appeal to heroes, real or imaginary, in the past and extol the ideological program of the "inevitable" wave of the future. But he is substantially concerned neither with mastery of comprehensive rootage in historical traditions of the past nor with enduring commitment to practical action and long-range planning toward the task of shaping the historical future. He lacks the temporal-historical transcendence to live in the sustained dialectical tension between *recollection* and *hope*. He lives only in the present tense where experience is to be experienced. There is neither yesterday nor tomorrow. There is only always now. Satisfaction must be obtained and tensions relieved now. Instant victory, instant euphoria, instant capitulation, instant sex, instant interchangeability. All values of life are ideally concentrated in the *instant pay-off*: the enduring climax of the "good trip" in which time stands still and euphoria is all there is . . . is all there is . . . is all there is . . .

Now I have been saying, somewhat with tongue in cheek, that cool stylists are creatures of my imagination. There is some truth in

that. No one can simply *be* a cool stylist without remainder, anymore than a man can simply be a machine. Yet human beings can asymptotically approach becoming simply cool stylists. Frankly, I have yet to meet a Duke Divinity student who approximates very far toward cool stylism. And, while my contacts with undergraduates are now rather limited, I would doubt that the majority of college students could be classified as "cool stylists" without many important reservations and qualifications.

But this sketch of cool stylism might be tentatively suggestive in pointing toward one direction in which a considerable part of our culture, especially among teen- and subteen-agers may be moving. I say this with concern and—God knows—with compassion. It is not as though youth were somehow perversely opting against meaning in favor of meaninglessness! It is rather that they are increasingly unable to *find* significant meaning.

I have thus far talked, not too happily, about "cool stylism." However—if I may paraphrase and reverse Shakespeare—I come not to bury style, but to praise it.

I have good reason to praise style: like . . . namely . . . I could use some. If you've ever happened to notice how I walk down the hall, you'll recognize that I have some stylistic problems that are quite unsolvable—and you won't bother to ask me whether I used to be a basketball star. I have other stylistic problems that may be equally serious. I am, for example, supposed to be a professor of "philosophical theology" and yet I know everybody knows there isn't any such thing. I am, to my shame, as Bultmann would put it, not only "weltanschaulich" but also "metaphysisch." And you just can't be anything more out-of-style than that. I could add that I'm still in the process of "questing for the historical Jesus." (I wouldn't, of course, mention these things, except that they've already leaked out.) The sum and substance of my anachronistic professional plight is that I have somehow or other gotten myself irrevocably committed to the lifetime task of system-building, trying to integrate into one comprehensive world view all kinds of unlikely partners, such as wave-particles and Jesus. Now, for being out-of-style, man, you just can't beat that!

But I'm really not hostile to such stylistic helps as I can get. For example, I noticed awhile back that men's ties had gotten wider while I wasn't looking. I rushed right down to Sears and bought one. I would have been willing to buy several, but even with my SRC

I couldn't quite afford that. I would have worn it this morning but it doesn't go with black. And under this robe you can't really tell what I'm wearing, anyway. Also, I noticed last summer that men's hair styles were getting longer. So I've let my hair grow a little longer too. I was glad to make that stylistic adjustment since I've long been in process of losing my hair, anyway.

Also, I pay some slight attention to women's styles. I have, for example, noted the existence of the mini-skirt. I might add, by way of cultural observation, that in the midst of transience, flux and rapid social change, there is a basic human need for some stylistic stability somewhere. Accordingly, it would, I think, be helpful in this transitory life if the mini-skirt, at least, can endure. As for the maxi-coat, neither time nor stylistic proprieties allow me to express myself.

Clearly, and on any accounting, there is a great deal of novelty in the stylistic factors of contemporary life. Yet the degree of novelty is likely not as great as may appear on the surface. A great deal about style is *not basically new*.

The centrality and essentiality of style in human life and culture is, as such, certainly not new. The achievement of any great human *civilization* has always been in considerable measure correlated with the richness and comprehensive integrativeness of its stylistic components. Style has, in antecedent epochs, served the functions of concretely mediating, expressing and communicating the transcendent values and depth insights and commitments, as well as the more superficial orientations, of human interpersonal life in more or less comprehensively integrating ways.

Style, we say, can either "turn-on" or "turn-off" receptivity in the processes of would-be communication. But this in itself is not new. Style has always functioned to facilitate communication or disfunctioned to block communication. Style affects, often crucially, *interpersonal* and *intergroup relations*. It always has. Stylistic rapport has always served to mediate community. And major stylistic differences have always operated as both effect and cause of interpersonal and intergroup alienations. None of this is fundamentally new.

What is *new*—relatively new, since there is no absolutely new thing under the sun—is the contemporary cultural matrix which affects and is affected by style.

New is the *interconnected complexification* of our global culture. The increasingly intricate network of interconnectedness means that

escape from interrelation with one another in ever-more-complex ways is impossible or, even if possible, disastrous. This complexification is a more bewildering challenge to human life-integrative powers than that faced in any previous and relatively more simple epoch. Insofar as the overwhelming tasks of effective and comprehensive integration are not accomplished, the options are schizophrenic rejections of the integrative tasks or lowest-common-denominator superficial commonalities.

New also is the ever-increasing momentum and *acceleration* of the global processes of interconnected complexification—yet further complicated by the *differential* paces of acceleration in different components and dimensions of global culture, with resultant “cultural lags” and increased tensions.

In tribal communities and even in previous great civilizations, especially among the masses who were not style innovators, contextually appropriate style could be adaptively acquired by the young, one might almost say, “by osmosis.” Little conscious attention to style and certainly no painful “self-consciousness” about it was required. That day is gone, presumably forever.

Today, and for all our foreseeable tomorrows, *inattention to style is a luxury of irresponsible sloth which our humanity can no longer afford*. Some basic *principles* of what is required are simple enough to state: (1) The interconnected complexification of our culture demands sensitivity to and some mastery of not one style, but many. (2) The ever-increasing acceleration of cultural change demands constantly alert adaptiveness to changing contexts and stylistic innovations. (3) The communicative will to understand will increasingly demand a depth sensitivity toward significant meaning which can penetrate beneath superficial differences of styles to discern the depth of content, meaning and intention which they express—not being easily “turned off” by stylistic differences. (4) On the other hand, the will to communicate will increasingly demand a flexible stylistic adaptiveness so as not unnecessarily to “turn off” those to whom we want to, need to, must communicate.

There are two, *opposite*, ways of “copping out” on the human stylistic task. The cool stylist cops out by reductionistically equating human life with life-style, reducing himself to mere stylizing for the sake of nothing beyond the empty circular game of reactive adaption, foregoing depth commitment and forfeiting transcendent purpose and meaning. The rigid traditionalist cops out in the other direction:

unable or unwilling to distinguish between style and meaning or form and content, he clings inflexibly to the relative simplicity of prior weddings of transcendence and immanence, determined statically to hang on, even at the cost of the break-down of the immanence of communication and the break-down of interpersonal life.

The Apostle Paul once wrote: "I have become all things to all men that I might by all means save some." Paul was keenly sensitive to the possibility of and need for a variety of viable weddings of immanent style and transcendent meaning. Paul had some fairly definite notions about the transcendent meaning of the gospel of Christ and the Christian life. But he was too *wise* to equate these with externalities of stylistic expression. And he was too *compassionately* committed to restrict his communication to those who might respond to a single style. Paul's task is the task of the Church today and tomorrow. Doubtless that task is much more complex than it was in Paul's day. But the same Spirit is with us. And He is able insofar as we are willing.

If style becomes everything; if "the medium" simply "is the message": the message is nihil; the message is that *there is no message*. But, on the other hand, if the message is not relevantly mediated *there is no message* either: for the message exists only in its being communicated.

Now and again I am haunted by the words of the Simon and Garfunkel song, "The Sounds of Silence." God in heaven knows . . . I want to communicate. I know—I say I "know" it—there is something overwhelmingly, incommensurably important to be communicated. For that I live, and insofar as I cannot do that I die. But so do we all—whether or not we know it.

Not everything in life can be measured. Insofar as reality is *transcendent* it cannot be measured: it is *incommensurable*. Skillful adaptiveness as a basic life-orientation (whether in unlimitedly flexible cool stylism or in establishment-oriented conformism) undercuts the human capacity to recognize the incommensurability of transcendent reality and thereby undercuts the possibility of genuine faith, love, trust, obedience and worship. The adept adaptor may be, if he so chooses, quite skillful in using language and performing acts which would be relevant and appropriate to love or even to worship. But his language and acts are hollow style without relational depth and meaningful comprehension, though he himself—never having ex-

perienced, and being securely insulated against, the real thing—may have little awareness of self-deception.

All genuine experience of transcendent reality exhibits a two-sided paradox: on the one hand, a *recognition* of the *incommensurability*, such that no possible expression can be fully or adequately expressive in response to the reality known; yet, on the other hand, an inescapable *compulsion* to *express* some relevant, appropriate response.

So it is with the experience of falling in love. The “lover” who thinks he can adequately express his love is—whatever he may be—not in love: he has not experienced an incommensurable relationship. Falling in love cannot be adequately expressed. But, on the other hand, the “lover” who can avoid any expression of love, perhaps because it is not adequately relevant or appropriate, is not genuinely in love either. For falling in love compels expression—no matter how inadequate.

So it is with faith. So it is with worship.

There may be principles of style, but there is no such thing as a “manual of style.” Style is communicated and learned tacitly and concretely.

But I will conclude with just two little suggestions for life-style: humor and seriousness. If you cannot “hang loose” to the jolts and surprises of life with a transcendent sense of humor, especially toward yourself, God have mercy on your mortal life; you’re in for a pretty rough time of it. But if, on the other hand, in and through all the relativities and contingencies and trivia of life, you cannot serve the times with an ultimate seriousness, God have mercy on your soul. This life matters. You had better believe it, baby. You had better live it. The task of Christian life-style is, in ever-changing contexts, to say in ways that may be heard, two words, which are distinguishable but not separable: “God” and “love.”

PAUL A. MICKEY
Assistant Professor of Pastoral Theology

One year ago I had no inkling that I would be in Durham, let alone on the Divinity School faculty this fall. But our whole family is taking it in stride. One thing about being a minister's son, having wrestled in school, being a private pilot as well as an ordained clergy, I've learned to take my opportunities when they come. So it is. The opportunity to come to Duke was surprising and offers unexpected potential to me, my family, and hopefully to the students and fellow faculty members who must bear the brunt of my insights in the field of pastoral theology.

Being here continues to amaze me. Growing up in Ohio one went to college at Ohio State either to study medicine or play football. I enjoyed both football and medicine in high school but never went to Ohio State. In fact I joined the Air Force right after high school in order to avoid going to Ohio State or that now famous university, Kent State, where I attended high school and where, in a revolutionary fit of insight my senior class nominated and elected me president from the "convention" floor. Kent State or Ohio State would have been all right but long before the days of Joe Kapp or Joe Namath I held out for a grant-in-aid to attend Harvard College. After four years churning through the enlisted ranks of the Air Force, winding up as one of the youngest (if not the youngest looking) peace time Staff Sergeants, I jumped at an early out, took my accrued leave-time pay, bought a diamond (at PX prices), being a firm believer in the "theology of hope" five years early, for someone in the future who I trusted would eventually become known to me!

After getting in shape for freshman football by working on construction work during the summer of 1959 I started Harvard four years behind my times. Through sleight of hand or lapse in imagination I was admitted to the first of the Harvard Freshman Seminar programs, not, as I found out later, because of academic qualifications but because I had made enough money sharecropping while in high school to buy a car. The Seminar was the best part of my freshman

year because seminar was a joint Harvard-Radcliffe group. The professor had statistically proven (at Sarah Lawrence) a positive correlation between bust size and intelligence; this astute academic insight was further exchanged by the fact that these seminars began in the dark ages of undergraduate education when Radcliffe girls did not try deliberately to look ugly as they seem to today! That seminar was the saving grace for three years of Harvard. The fourth year and all years since, have been saved by my marriage to the former Jane Becker, of Lancaster, Pennsylvania. With good Dutch "plain folk" blood cheerfully coursing through her presence, Jane, long before the public was aware of the "tell it like it is" campaign, showed the value of calling "a spade a spade" in the Mickey household—and we're all stronger for it.

At Princeton Seminary I spent most of my time scrambling: grubbing for grades, negotiating two new foreign languages (Greek and Hebrew), part-time jobs, time with my family, and a more mature understanding of the church, due largely through a wonderful relationship as student assistant under Ken Wildrick at the Community Congregational Church, Short Hills, New Jersey. I finished out my B.D. work with a senior thesis on "Hartshorne and Freud" under Seward Hiltner, took an inner city assignment in the Ohio East Conference (EUB), and became, almost on schedule a father for the second (and thanks to miracle medicines!) and last time. The inner city work was nip and tuck all along including my promise to Jane that I would paint the driveway and sidewalks at the parsonage green so my children would at least know what color grass (lawn type) looked like.

Through the sudden availability of a Fellowship I began doctoral studies in September, 1967 under Seward Hiltner in Theology and Personality. By May 1970 my dissertation (which my wife claimed was harder to understand than some of the physics papers she had typed as a secretary) was complete, and immediately following my oral examination Jane and I drove from Princeton to Durham to house hunt.

My greatest concern before coming to Durham seems unfounded now: my "southern drawl" has not thickened. We are settled comfortably, enjoying the warmth and privacy of our home in Durham and the openness of airways for private flying. A lingering but daily reminder from my parish in Bay Head, New Jersey, calls me forth

to my tasks here: the senior highs in that parish gave me a desk pen set as a going away present, inscribed: "Do It To It, Rev."

ROBERT L. WILSON
Research Professor of Church and Society

In an age of mobility one may come from many places. My childhood and youth were spent in the anthracite coal region just outside Scranton, Pennsylvania. Graduation from high school which came during World War II was followed by three years as a medical corpsman in the Navy. A portion of this time was spent aboard an escort carrier in the Pacific.

With the end of the war, I joined the returning veterans crowding the college campuses. My undergraduate work was taken at Asbury College. This was followed by an M.A. in American History from Lehigh University.

At this point two significant events occurred. First, I was married to Betty Berenthien of Macon, Georgia. Second, we moved to Havana, Cuba where we taught English to Spanish speaking students at Colegio Metodista Central. After two interesting years, punctuated by the revolution which ended Cuba's last elected government, we returned to the United States.

We moved to Chicago where I became pastor of the Wyclif Methodist Church, an inner city congregation located just southwest of the Loop. I also attended seminary at Garrett and became a member of the Northern Illinois Annual Conference.

Upon completing seminary I became a Research and Teaching Fellow at Garrett, a post I held while completing a Ph.D. in Sociology of Religion at Northwestern University. During this period I also taught at the National College of Education.

After graduate school I joined the research staff of the National Division of the Board of Missions which was first located in Philadelphia and subsequently in New York. I remained with the National Division for twelve years, the last seven as Director of the Department of Research and Survey. This department serves as the research arm of the National Division and conducts a variety of research and planning studies for churches and Methodist denominational organizations throughout the United States.

Here at Duke I shall be working in two related areas. The first will be teaching in the area of church and community. The second will be as Director of the J. M. Ormond Center for Research Planning and Development, which will involve studies for churches and denominational groups. The center will therefore have both an educational and service function.

We moved to Durham from New Jersey in mid summer and are living on Monticello Avenue. We have two children, Keith, fifteen, and Marian, ten.

ROBERT TERRY YOUNG

Assistant Dean for Admissions and Student Affairs

There were thirteen children in my large, active, and independent family. We were all born in a small, rural section of Buncombe County in the Western North Carolina mountains. I am the twelfth of these thirteen children and I was born some thirty-five years ago now.

Until I became a student in Scotland, all of my education was gained in North Carolina schools—in the public schools near Asheville, undergraduate studies at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill, and seminary work at the Divinity School of Duke University. When I finished Duke, my family and I spent the year 1960-61 at the University of Glasgow in Scotland where I was a special student in Trinity College.

And then, to work in a local parish. There for nine years and now back at Duke—in a new role, of course.

In the process, many things have happened to me and with me.

The most important experience that has happened to me continues—in my relationship with my wife, Jackie. She has worked hard now for fourteen and one-half years trying to keep me honest and real and open. Not an easy task! Our relationship began at Carolina on February 19, 1956, continued through an election where she ran for secretary of the student body and I for president. We both won and served in 1956-57. She was Miss Alumna and I Mister Alumnus of the U.N.C. Class of '57.

We made "Mr. and Miss" into Mr. and Mrs., and she went to work teaching to put me through Divinity School. We have expanded

our family and now have four young Youngs—Sherri Leigh, Terri Lynn, Robby, and Andrew—the oldest eleven and the youngest four.

We have served in three parishes—when I was Associate Minister in a Church of Scotland church (1960-61), Minister at Skyland Methodist Church (1961-67), and at Boone United Methodist Church (1967-70). Hopefully, we have ministered and served in each place. Surely, we have learned in each.

I have always been related to the church—baptized in a little Baptist Church at twelve years of age, joined the Methodist Church at fifteen, and have been there ever since. I was moderately active in the church in high school and college—after all, a young man's interests are wide and varied at these times!

Seminary was a mind-stretching, faith-deepening experience for me. I began to learn that the church, and its people, are to serve and love and care rather than just to be loved and served and cared for. This learning came as I saw some people really concerned about others. Included in my seminary days was a period of cynicism, and I was ready to leave the church. From all I could see, the church was a money-seeking, self-satisfied, and prejudiced institution that promoted those ministers and laymen who "played the game" and rejected or ignored those who did not. And, I did not care to waste my ministry in such an institution.

I then met a friend who helped me to see that a man can be a man and serve God also; that a man compromises and "sells himself" only if he wants to; and that a man can have a creative, honest ministry if he seeks it. With this friend's guidance and support, I headed for the parish ministry.

All along there have been persons who have helped me see what living and ministry are to be—Bernard Boyd and Hugh Lefler and Bill Poteat and Jim Wallace at Carolina; John Carlton and Egil Grislis and Don Williamson and Bob Cushman at Duke; William Barclay and G. H. C. McGregor and Willie Wright in Scotland; Carlyle Marney at Interpreter's House; Ed Harrill and Ruth Ingle and George Kirchoff and Ruth Petrey in the parish.

There are many experiences that have been meaningful to me, but my greatest vocational satisfactions have come from two types of experiences: being a pastor and being a preacher. No greater or deeper joy can a man feel than that he knows when he feels claimed by God to preach a given message or when he feels led by God's Spirit to show compassion for a person in need.

Life is caring. My purpose in the church, and specifically in being here at this time, is to try to let someone (and hopefully many “someones”) know that I care. To be human and to allow others to be human, all the time knowing that we are loved by God and are to love one another. It’s hard to care. Or, it is, for me. But, this is what life’s all about to me—at least for the present time.

Thomas Coke: Apostle of Methodism. John Vickers. Abingdon. 1969. 394 pp. \$14.50.

During his own day Dr. Thomas Coke was misunderstood and vilified by many who were jealous of his speedy rise to prominence in the Methodist movement, and especially of the great trust reposed in him by the aging John Wesley. Such men too readily jumped to the conclusion that Coke was little more than a vain and ambitious man who in his zeal for pre-eminence inserted his finger in too many Methodist pies. In spite of occasional tributes to Coke's enthusiasm, generosity, and self-sacrifice, he has constantly been pursued by this tradition of being a little man with grandiose ideas about his own importance and destiny. At long last we have a carefully-documented and honest portrait of the man, in the pages of Mr. John Vickers' *Thomas Coke: Apostle of Methodism*; at last we are able to see him in the round.

The word "round" is deliberately chosen, for what struck most people when first they set eyes on Dr. Coke was his rotund figure, five foot and one inch tall, but compensating with corpulence for what he lacked in height, topped off with what William Wilberforce described as a "smooth apple face, and little round mouth," so that "he looked a mere boy when he was turned fifty." This is revealed by his portraits, though not so fully in the one chosen as the frontispiece for this volume.

Until now, however, it has been much more difficult to visualize Coke in the round spiritually. Earlier writers have not tried, or have found it an almost impossible task, to portray his global enthusiasm from every angle, but have concentrated a malevolent, or a myopic, or even an admiring eye, on one aspect or another only, so that they have drawn little more than a two-dimensional plan of one part of the man, instead of giving us an experience of the spinning globe of Coke as a restless ecclesiastical conjuror dizzily changing his many hats. Only a multi-volume work could adequately accomplish this formidable task, but Mr. Vickers has come as near a definitive biography in this handsome volume as we can reasonably expect.

This book began to take shape when the author was invited to deliver the Wesley Historical Society Lecture for 1964 on the subject of Coke, upon whom he had been working for some years. His researches have continued during the following years, greatly enriching the final product. Especially valuable has been Mr. Vickers' search for Coke's letters and other manuscripts, and his researches among many allied documents not touched by Coke's earlier biographers. The mass of materials thus accumulated has been carefully gleaned to provide many hitherto unknown details about Coke's life, as well as illustrations serving to bring him to life for the modern reader.

The first few chapters deal chronologically with the early phases of Coke's life—his childhood and youth at Brecon in Wales, his carefree career as a gentleman commoner of Jesus College, Oxford, his ordination and curacy at South Petherton in Somerset, where John Fletcher's writings led to a deepened sense of his spiritual calling, so that he became more and more "Methodist" in discharging his parish responsibilities, even trying to substitute Wesley's hymns for the Psalms in public worship. In 1776 he was dismissed from his

curacy, and his enemies celebrated the event by pealing the church bells and by broaching several hogsheads of cider in the street.

When they first met that year Wesley was 73, Coke not quite 29. Although Wesley was served by many trusted senior lay itinerant preachers, and even by one or two ordained helpers, Coke quickly gained his confidence, and became his right-hand man, at first travelling with him, and then setting forth as his deputy on various missions, both as evangelist and as trouble-shooter. This culminated in the epochal year of 1784, when Wesley signed the Deed of Declaration which incorporated the annual Conference to take charge of Methodism after his death, prepared a revised Book of Common Prayer for overseas Methodists, and began ordaining preachers for America. In each of these important steps Coke was in close consultation with Wesley, though in each instance Wesley himself was in control, and apparently pushing Coke rather than being pushed, as has frequently been charged.

This year of 1784 witnessed the proliferation of Coke's own activities to the point where his enthusiasms almost ran away with him. He continued to serve as Wesley's chief supervisor over British Methodism, he published his first appeal for overseas missions, and he became the senior bishop and co-founder of the Methodist Episcopal Church of America. Over three-quarters of Mr. Vickers' book is devoted to following these three major themes through the remaining thirty years of Coke's life, in a series of overlapping and inter-meshing chapters, with one chapter devoted to a fourth theme—important, yet subsidiary to the other three—his literary work.

Although Coke had at first been somewhat prejudiced against the Americans, he was sincerely converted to a deep sympathy for their cause, a genuine love of the American landscape and people, and a keen desire to serve American Methodism fully as their senior bishop. In this he was constantly being frustrated by Francis Asbury. Asbury was two years older than Coke, had loyally served American Methodism through its most trying decade, and had insisted that if he were to accept ordination at Wesley's behest and at Coke's hands he would only do so after a vote of confidence from his American brethren. Coke's wanderlust seems to have justified Asbury's reluctance to yield him any real episcopal power. In spite of the Welshman's sincere offer to put America first and to live there permanently if accorded authority and loyalty, after his ninth visit he left in 1804 intending to return but in fact never did, having married a frail English wife—though he continued in readiness for the recall that never came. Nevertheless his ministry in America left lasting marks, not only in conversions and new societies, but in securing the overthrow of Asbury's proposed government of American Methodism by a permanent council, for which Coke won the substitution of the system of annual and general conferences which still prevails.

In his attitude to Negro slavery Coke was well ahead of contemporary American opinion, and this occasionally involved him in serious trouble, as when he urged the Christmas Conference of 1784 to threaten slave-holding Methodists with expulsion. In order that the general work should not suffer unduly, however, he found it expedient to moderate the vehement expression of his views. Although he was similarly deeply concerned about slaves in the West Indies also, he was less militant about slave-owners there, possibly because American opposition had convinced him that it might be wiser to attack some social evils indirectly and gradually, even though this was quite contrary to his temperament.

Coke's standing in British Methodism was prejudiced not only by jealousy over his comparative youth but by his involvements both with America and

overseas missions. Nevertheless he maintained his position as Wesley's lieutenant. He shared the direction of Irish Methodism to such good effect that even though at the Irish Conference immediately following Wesley's death the preachers elected one of their own members to preside, in most subsequent years this honour and responsibility was accorded Coke, who maintained, "I do love Ireland above all other places"—though it must be acknowledged that he said the same thing about America also. It was Coke who was chiefly responsible for founding in 1799 a successful mission to the native Irish, followed a year later by a similar Welsh-speaking mission in his own native country.

In England also Coke remained a dominant force after Wesley's death, even though in their desire to avoid having "another king in Israel" the preachers at the 1791 English Conference similarly passed over Coke to elect the relatively obscure William Thompson as their first President. Mr. Vickers points out that this rebuff was graciously taken by Coke, although Alexander Mather, who was also rejected, was "deeply wounded," and circulated an angry handbill. Coke accepted instead the arduous though less prestigious task of serving as secretary to the Conference, a position which he occupied for seventeen of the twenty-three conferences between Wesley's death and his own. When in 1797 Coke intimated that he intended returning to America permanently the British preachers pleaded with him not to do so, and showed their sincerity by belatedly electing him as President, which they did a second time in 1805. He was, indeed, one of their best friends, and it was he more than any other preacher who was responsible for the formation in 1803 of the Committee of Privileges, and for its subsequent success in defending Methodists from discriminatory legislation.

Despite his genuine claims to lasting gratitude as a builder of both British and American Methodism, however, Coke is chiefly remembered as the undoubted father of Methodist missions. In 1784 he published *A Plan of the Society for the Establishment of Missions among the Heathens*, following this up in 1786 with *An Address to the Pious and Benevolent, proposing an annual subscription for the support of the missionaries in the highlands and adjacent islands of Scotland, the Isles of Jersey, Guernsey and Newfoundland, the West Indies, and the Provinces of Nova Scotia and Quebec*. Almost unaided he wrestled with Wesley and the British preachers to secure men and money for such ventures. His mission to the Caribs of St. Vincent was unsuccessful, as was one to Sierra Leone in 1796, but other undertakings were eminently successful. This was especially true of his great missionary love, the work in the West Indies, the dearer to him because he regarded the storm which drove him and his Canadian-bound missionaries to Antigua in 1786 as a providential sign. He made only four tours of the islands, occupying about seven months in all, his last ending in 1793, but he continued to supervise the expanding mission there, he fought successfully in 1808 for the right of the Jamaican Methodists to minister among the slaves, and in the midst of all his other labours compiled *A History of the West Indies* in three volumes (1808-11).

Thomas Coke could not be confined to the West Indies, however, no more than to the varied aspects of home missions in Britain, among the soldiers in Gibraltar, in the Channel Islands, and even in revolutionary France, for which he brushed up his French. He wanted the world for Christianity. In 1798 the Methodist Conference legitimized what it could not ignore by officially designating him for the task that he had long been carrying out, naming him superintendent of overseas missions. His was almost a one-man show. He generated what little missionary enthusiasm there was; he raised money, often by arduous collecting from house to house, as well as by dipping deeply into

his own pocket and that of his wife; he recruited men; he formulated and directed policy, so that when he was absent in America the committee appointed to assist him was almost helpless.

Frustrated by poorly-chosen leaders and the killing climate from realizing his persistent dream of founding Methodist missions in Africa, increasingly Coke's eyes turned to the east. In 1800 the Conference authorized him to send a missionary to Madras, though the project did not materialize. During the years 1805-6 he sounded out the Directors of the East India Company, and made several abortive attempts to begin an Indian mission. In 1809 his attention turned to the more promising prospect of Ceylon as a springboard for India, and in 1811 he secured Conference authorization for the venture. During the years of preparation he lost one wife, married another, and lost her also, yet pressed on through his grief with what was becoming his master project. In 1813 he even secretly offered himself as a candidate should an Anglican bishop be appointed for India, apparently having in mind the needs of India far more than the merits of Thomas Coke, though this indiscretion furnished further evidence to his enemies of his personal ambitions. Rescued from an imprudent third marriage by the skin of his teeth, and plagued by controversy over the expenditure for the mission, on 30 December 1813 Coke set sail with his companions, only to die and be buried at sea. The mission itself continued, however, and became his lasting memorial.

Mr. Vickers has told Coke's complex story with sufficient detail to bring it to life, but not to distort the perspective. The secular background is touched upon only so far as it is essential for grasping the main point of any incident, and further research in those fields is needed for a full understanding of Coke's relationships with the leaders of British politics and the interactions of Methodism with the world of the Napoleonic wars. Coke himself is painted "warts and all." We see his simple piety and his gullibility, the Welsh charisma of his eloquent preaching and his administrative acumen, the charm and courtly manners which readily won friends, and the impetuous lack of tact that lost them. We are not surprised to discover that he needed to be handled with kid gloves, so ready was he to take offence, though swift and generous in forgiveness. We realize that his many projects, his mercurial enthusiasms, were in some part the side-effects of emotional instability, though beneath lay a solid foundation of deep concern for people deprived of the gospel, which sustained him in the courageous facing of monotonous labours, frequent frustrations, and constant criticism.

Thomas Coke: Apostle of Methodism appears in a handsome format—indeed one wonders whether the margins on the heavy paper are somewhat too ample, especially at the foot. The printing is well executed, with a minimum of the almost inevitable printing errors, though two of these are in prominent places—"Louisberg" instead of "Louisburg" on Mr. Curwen's attractive front endpaper map, and "Cosumation" as the Contents title for Chapter 23. Some of the errors are probably slips in the typescript, such as William Newcome (correctly) in the text for the Archbishop of Armagh, but "Newcombe" in the index, and the consistent spelling Edward "Smythe," though the evidence of Smythe's many publications shows that he spelt his name without the final "e". The apparatus is of real value, especially the list of 62 publications by Coke, but this reviewer would have valued a chronological summary that enabled the reader to find his way at a glance through the complexities of Coke's life. These, nevertheless, are minor flaws in a work of major importance, which will almost certainly remain the definitive life of Thomas Coke for this generation.

—FRANK BAKER

The Bible Reader: an interfaith interpretation. Prepared by Walter M. Abbott, S.J.; Rabbi Arthur Gilbert; Rolfe Lanier Hunt; and J. Carter Swaim. Bruce (New York) and Geoffrey Chapman (London). 1969. 995 pp. \$7.95.

Here is a book of a thousand pages at a modest price (paperback), prepared by no less than four editors of three faiths. It consists of many things, all in one. Foremost, it is a shorter Bible (about fifty-fifty) including something from every book except Second and Third John. Even the Apocrypha is represented, in six of its major books, and is here entitled "deutero-canonical" (reflecting Catholic usage, as contrasted with Jewish practice). The Biblical text printed is a mixture of the RSV, the Catholic Confraternity edition, and the Jewish Publication Society ("Old Testament") plus the *Torah*; unfortunately, the separate passages are not labeled.

Further, the book has brief and elementary commentary—on the Bible, on each Testament, on each book, and on each passage; it is again unfortunate that the distinctive contribution from each editor and so from each faith is not identified. The Commentary is a pot-pourri of interfaith ideas, not resolved in harmony or agreement but merely standing in juxtaposition. The editorial philosophy holds that "if we know more about each other we can hope to live together in harmony." This is certainly not a truism, and yet it expresses the optimistic reason for this mixture of ingredients. Most of the Commentary is commonplace, and some would impress one as indoctrination.

The intellectual position of this book is a humanistic liberalism such as was common among us a generation ago. We are reminded of our "pluralistic society," of current extra-religious legal opinion, and of objective decisions as to scriptural questions. The

editors would "live together" in matters of history, literature, culture, and religious institutions; implying that this way lies harmony, if not unity. It is considered useful to learn merely "why another believes differently" though we still remain different. Our Bible is optimistically defined as "a book that binds the world together," even though this Bible belongs to a minority of the world's population showing little cohesion in our time.

The Biblical criticism reflected in the editorial Notes is quite conservative. The "Gospel according to Matthew" is attributed to Levi the tax-collector disciple. "The Letter of James" is attributed to James the Less, "the brother of the Lord" (said to mean really "cousin"). Other literary problems are alluded to but delicately. Of course, "The Bible Reader" here is seen to be an uninstructed layman unaware of the many scholarly investigations that underly this "interfaith interpretation." One may hope that as he reads, serendipity may reward him.

—Kenneth W. Clark

Amos and Isaiah: Prophets of the Word of God. James M. Ward. Abingdon. 1969. 287 pp. \$6.50.

The stated reasons for treating these two prophets together in one book, instead of the more usual combinations of Amos and Hosea or Isaiah and Jeremiah, are that they were the first literary prophets to Israel and Judah, respectively and also that there is considerable literary and theological affinity between the two, in addition to their near contemporaneity. One may add that the amount of genuine literary material from each of these two prophets is approximately the same: most of the nine chapters of the book of Amos may be considered as coming from the prophet of that name, whereas of the sixty-six chapters in the book of Isaiah, barely ten can be reliably

attributed to the original prophet. Thus it comes about that this study is divided almost equally between the two protagonists.

Professor Ward believes that the book of Amos is mainly "a collection of oracles composed initially for oral publication," afterwards recorded in haphazard fashion. Thus our author feels no need for minute literary analysis and so uses most of the allotted space for discussion of the prophet's message and of the prophet's theological stance as deduced from his message.

This discussion begins with the confrontation of the prophet by Amaziah, priest of Bethel (7:10-17). Here our author scores a good point by returning to the use of the past tense in 7:14bc, as in the King James Version, against the present tense of more recent translations. Since the passage stands in a past context, a past translation of these nominal clauses is grammatically valid. It may indeed be true that Amos *was* not a prophet originally; but he could hardly have said "I am no prophet" while in the very act of delivering one of the most significant prophecies in the entire Bible.

In general it can be said that Ward is not trying to be old-fashioned or new-fashioned; he looks calmly at the whole gamut of critical study and tries to reach sensible and constructive conclusions. We have space only to summarize a few more of his conclusions.

The visions of 7:1-9; 8:1-3 are really only one vision, a "visionary drama," and is not necessarily to be connected with the call of the prophet. It is erroneous to assume that all prophets had inaugural visions. In any case, the implied doom is unconditional with regard to the political existence of the Kingdom of Israel; Amos never changed his mind on this, though he could very well have allowed for the survival of a remnant of the faithful.

With regard to the antiforeign oracles, Ward is somewhat conservative in denying the genuineness of only the oracle against Judah. In the presentation of these oracles under the head of "Liturgical Forms," a broad background is sketched, extending all the way from the Egyptian execration texts and the curses from the royal archives of Mesopotamian Mari, both of the early second millennium B.C., to Jeremiah 19, Deuteronomy 28, and Leviticus 26, long after the time of Amos. Good background material is also presented for the cosmological doxologies (4:13; 5:8; 9:5-6), leading to the conclusion that they might have been adapted by Amos from his liturgical environment instead of having been added by a post-exilic editor. This is not to say, however, that Amos did not criticize the sacrificial cult in Israel. He criticized it bitterly and probably even rejected it in principle, though without rejecting in principle all public worship.

Finally, with regard to the "happy ending" (9:8b-15), Ward, rejects it flatly and completely as belonging to Amos: "There is not a single word in these lines about the righteousness that God demands of men." Here our author turns away from some of the newfangled criticism that allows a prophet to say something one day and contradict it the next. Was this prophecy without hope? No Amos's faith in the unwavering righteousness of God "was one of the truly hopeful factors in the religious consciousness of Israel in his time." That is probably why his little book survived.

We must deal more briefly with the second half of the book. Isaiah 6 is treated first, though Ward is not sure that the vision therein is inaugural. There is the problem of why the people were to be made too stupid to hear. Ward struggles with this without a very clear result, except that perhaps it was already too late for them to be saved or that they must

become deaf to the wrong teaching which had misled them so long. Later, Ward says that Isaiah's "dominant tone" was negative and included "harsh criticism."

In Chapter 6, Ward deals with Isaiah 7 and 8, especially the three children and their naming at the time of the Aramaeo-Israelite attack on Judah about 735 B.C. *Shear-Yashubh* is translated A-Remnant-Still-Return, but interpreted as "a remnant of them would be left," that is to say, both a warning and a promise. There would be a time of trouble, but not all would be lost if Judah trusted in God rather than in political expedients. *Immanuel* is taken as another child of the prophet; the name means God-Is-With-Us, which is to say that God will be with us if we trust in him rather than in political expedients—the same message as before. The reviewer has been teaching this interpretation for years and welcomes support for it. The name of the third child, *Maher-shalal-hash-baz*, is translated as Speedy-Spoil-Quick-Plunder, and refers to what will happen to Aram and Israel if Judah stands firm. In other words, all three names carry essentially the same message for Judah: practice your religion properly and stay out of international politics. The prophet's warning was not heeded.

Chapter 7 treats of "Zion in the Oracles of Isaiah." Ward's view on Zion's inviolability is best expressed in his own clear words: "Isaiah never proclaimed the military or political inviolability of the city of Jerusalem, either in the present or future." The prophet could never have said, "My country, right or wrong," for righteousness was a key word with all the preexilic prophets. Ward feels that Isaiah felt that the sacrificial cult in Jerusalem was so bad that it must be destroyed at any cost. Only a purified city inhabited by a purified remnant could have satisfied the prophet. Such a concept is expressed in 2:2-4 and 4:2-6, though both of these

passages, and especially the latter, may be later interpretative additions to the original book.

Chapter 8 deals with "The Remnant and the Future King." Isaiah has traditionally been credited with the doctrine of the remnant and with much messianism. Ward takes up the latter idea first. The question is whether 9:1-7; 11:1-9; and 32:1-8 are from the prophet or from a later editor. Ward is not sure about this, and so allows the possibility that these passages may be from the prophet, since they avoid the old nationalism and instead "represent a prophetic transformation of the Judean royal ideology." If they are not by Isaiah, they are by someone who was in his tradition in repudiating nationalism and cultism in favor of righteousness. With regard to the remnant idea, it does belong to Isaiah, as seen in the name of his first son, and as developed in 10:20-27, where we see present tragedy leading to a great hope for the future.

This is a worthwhile book, with much of which the reviewer agrees; but it is not an introductory work, and had best be read by those already somewhat advanced in their study of the Old Testament prophets. On the whole it is well written, well edited, and well printed. Two questionable translations may be noted: p. 234 (Isa. 1:18), "Though your sins are like scarlet, they shall be as white as snow" probably should read "could be white as snow," since the promise was conditional, depending on good conduct; p. 242 (Isa. 4:4), the translation "daughter of Zion" is clearly erroneous, since Zion did not have a daughter—Zion was the daughter; the proper rendering is "daughter Zion" or "maiden Zion."

—W. F. Stinespring

The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition. E. P. Sanders. Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series 9. Cambridge. At the

University Press, 1969. 327 pp. \$14.50.

Although form critics and others have for more than a generation spoken of tendencies and laws governing the development of the synoptic tradition, the latter cannot be regarded as having been clearly established. Form critics have classified the gospel material according to form and have shown or suggested its relationships to situations in the early church. They have not, however, established any "laws" for the transmission of tradition on the basis of a systematic study of comparative folk literature or oral tradition. While Gerhardsson has attempted to define these matters precisely on the basis of rabbinic procedures, his effort is less than convincing. For, on the one hand, he takes rabbinic statements concerning the transmission of tradition uncritically as indicative of actual rabbinic practice; while on the other he assumes that the analogy between the Christian church and rabbinic Jewish communities is apposite.

Given this state of affairs, Sanders proposes to examine several commonly held principles or assumptions frequently employed in gospel criticism as criteria of whether traditional materials are early or late. While the relevance of Jewish and other sources is not denied, Sanders sets about to examine, as of primary importance, the tendencies of the Christian tradition, using the evidence of the textual tradition, the early fathers and the apocryphal gospels. Sanders principally investigates three widely held principles or tendencies thought to be reliable indicators of change, and therefore lateness, in the tradition: increasing length, increasing detail, and diminishing Semitism. His canvassing of the manuscript traditions, the fathers and the apocryphal gospels is not, of course, comprehensive, but wide enough to be adequately representative. The balance of the evi-

dence supports neither the view that the later recension of a pericope is the longer nor the principle that Semitisms diminish in the transmission of Christian traditions. Yet on the whole increasing detail does seem to be a rather reliable indicator of lateness.

Sanders' investigation, while necessarily not exhaustive, is an exemplary piece of scholarly research both in conception and in execution. The material he has collected will prove valuable for further study and reflection. Interestingly enough, however, Sanders' results are most closely analyzed with a view to their implications for source criticism rather than form criticism; and the author concludes that his research lends no unambiguous support either to the Marcan hypothesis or to its alternatives. It is nevertheless arguable that the implications of his study for form criticism may be equally, if not more, significant. Sanders' research may not support the Marcan hypothesis any more than it supports Farmer or Griesbach. But the Marcan hypothesis is basically a judgment based on the comparison of specific New Testament texts, not a theory dependent upon alleged general tendencies of the tradition. The argument from order, recently under such sharp attack, does not, as Farmer has pointed out, prove Marcan priority. It does, however, suggest either that Matthew and Luke used Mark or that Mark conflated Matthew and Luke. If these are the alternatives, most critics will probably go on believing that the more probable explanation of the relationship in view of the character of the texts and the state of our knowledge of early Christianity is that Matthew and Luke used Mark.

At the least Sanders' research should put an end to loose generalizations about the development of tradition. Moreover, it shows that the Marcan hypothesis is neither confirmed nor overthrown by the evidence of

the tendencies which actually emerge in later tradition. Readers of this *Review* will be interested in the fact that Sanders' work was done originally as a Th.D. dissertation at Union Seminary in New York under the direction of W. D. Davies, now George Washington Ivey Professor in the Divinity School.

—D. Moody Smith, Jr.

Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel. M. Jack Suggs. Harvard University Press. 1970. 132 pp. \$6.00.

This new book by Professor Jack Suggs (Brite Divinity School at Texas Christian University) revolves basically around the examination of several synoptic pericopes which the author argues have been influenced by ". . . Jewish and early Christian speculation about Sophia [Wisdom]." (p. 1) The thesis is that Wisdom speculation is not a "tangential" but an important and central part of Matthew's Christology.

In Chapter I, "Traces of a Wisdom Speculation in Q," the author assumes the existence of Q and interprets it in the light of a "gnosticizing Wisdom speculation." Matthew 23:34-36 (and its parallel, Luke 11:49-51), the saying about the rejection of the prophets and wise men, is examined. It is concluded that this saying was derived from a lost wisdom apocalypse originally given as an oracle by personified Wisdom. The use of this saying in Q demonstrates that Q has moved toward a Wisdom Christology, and therefore, does not have (at least in this saying) a Christology but rather a "Sophialogy."

Chapters II and III deal with Matthew 11:28-30 and Matthew 23:37-39 respectively which, the author argues, are dependent on Jewish Wisdom speculation. As an envoy of Wisdom Jesus (and John as well) is rejected, but in addition Jesus is a sender of

prophets as was Sophia. Thus Matthew has moved away from "Sophialogy" toward the *identification* of Sophia with Jesus. "Jesus is Sophia incarnate." (p. 58) "I hope that our investigation thus far has served to establish that speculation about Wisdom emanated from circles which tended to see Jesus' significance largely in terms of his function as Sophia's finest and final representative, as the mediator of eschatological and divine revelation. . . . Matthew is at pains to correct the tradition in certain ways. First, he brings the tradition within the framework of the passion-dominated gospel form. Second . . . Matthew proceeds to an identification of Jesus with Sophia." (p. 97)

Chapter IV, "Wisdom and Law in the Gospel of Matthew," contains the argument that for Matthew Jesus is the "Wisdom-Torah," "the embodiment of Torah." The Sermon on the Mount is naturally the locus for this investigation.

Dr. Suggs concludes: "My thesis was that Wisdom speculation was a major current in Matthew's Christian environment and that Matthew was a lively participant in the current." (p. 130)

It is difficult in a work such as this to argue with the author unless one has the space to argue in detail. This is not possible here. The author has made his point in a well-written and logical monograph. The present reviewer, however, feels that the case has been over-stated, but this criticism is not intended to detract from the very fine work and presentation by Professor Suggs. Perhaps it would have been better had the thesis been directed toward a broader interpretation of Matthew's gospel. This was, as the author stated, *not* the purpose of this work, but it would be useful and helpful to see a second volume with the thesis of this book applied systematically to the gospel as a whole. It may prove to be enlightening especially in some passages. And

further it would test the thesis that "Jesus is Wisdom Incarnate" in the broader context of the Gospel rather than derive this hypothesis from a few selected passages which are already recognized to have wisdom motifs and overtones. This kind of investigation would possibly lend support to the conclusion of the author and also demonstrate where the thesis needs to be modified.

This is a scholarly work not primarily suited to the needs of the average pastor, but those who will read it will find some interesting insights.

—James M. Efrid

Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel. Willi Marxsen. Translated by Roy Harrisville et al. Abingdon. 1969. 222 pp. \$5.50.

Marxsen's book first appeared fourteen years ago, and the second edition is now over ten years old. It has been extensively reviewed and discussed, so there is scarcely need for another thoroughgoing *Auseinandersetzung* or summation at this point. (For a full report and critique see J. Rohde, *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists*, pp. 113-140.)

The appearance of the English translation does, however, afford an opportunity for calling attention to the importance of the book. After Conzelmann's *The Theology of St. Luke*, Marxsen's monograph stands as the second major work in the field of gospel redaction criticism. It takes up and continues the tradition of Wrede, Lightfoot, J. M. Robinson and others who have sought the theological meaning and purpose of the Second Gospel.

Unlike the form critics (and unlike earlier interpreters), the redaction critics have concentrated upon the editorial framework of the Gospels as the key to the intention of the

Synoptic writers. Given the hypothesis that the framework is editorial, while the stuff of the individual stories and sayings is traditional, this procedure is altogether logical. Redaction critics have by the separation of tradition from redaction and the close analysis of the latter successfully contested the view of the early form-critical works that the Synoptic Evangelists were little more than collectors of traditional materials. They were authors in their own right.

Perhaps Marxsen's chief contribution is rigorously to set forth and advocate the redaction-critical task both by precept and by example. His attempt to see Mark as theologically informed proclamation rather than history is a healthy antidote to historicism, if somewhat exaggerated or one-sided. His effort to distinguish the purpose and character of Mark (an *evangelion*) from Matthew (a *biblos*) and Luke (a *diegesis*—the terms are found near the beginning of the respective gospels) may be somewhat overdrawn. Nevertheless, it is a needful corrective of the once common opinion that the Synoptics embody a common point of view. While Marxsen may be correct in seeing eschatological expectation still very much alive in Mark and in taking 16:8 to be the end of the original gospel, his theory that Mark is a Galilean gospel calling Christians to assemble in Galilee for the parousia of the Lord lacks unambiguous support in the text. There is, for example, considerable evidence that Mark was written for a Gentile audience (presumably not in Palestine), as Rohde (p. 138) has pointed out. Moreover, if one were trying to assemble Christians for the imminent parousia, would writing a Gospel in which this purpose is at best subtly expressed to be the most expeditious way to go about it? To ask the question is to imply an answer.

Nevertheless, Marxsen's book is full of valid and stimulating insights

and worth the expenditure of effort entailed in working through it.

—D. Moody Smith, Jr.

Bonhoeffer's Theology. James W. Woelfel. Abingdon. 1970. 350 pp. \$6.95.

As William Kuhns observed in the preface to his study of Bonhoeffer's theology (*The Pursuit of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 1967), Bonhoeffer's emergence as a focal theological figure for the thought and efforts of our time—from civil rights to a theology celebrating the "death of God"—has been rapid and unmistakable. Further evidence of the validity of this scarcely debatable assessment of Bonhoeffer is this latest addition, by Woelfel, to the growing, if not burgeoning library of Bonhoeffer interpretation. Hardly without exception the watershed that finally distinguishes the interpreters is, of course, the question of how one reads Bonhoeffer's call from the Tegel prison for a "religionless Christianity." The conservative approach, represented for instance by Thomas Torrance, reads the letters from prison altogether in terms of Bonhoeffer's previous writings and these, incidentally, in terms of Barth. The revolutionary interpreters, such as William Hamilton, regard the letters as offering a radically new vision, to be pursued not by reference to Bonhoeffer's past but in the creativity and imagination of his successors who admittedly must go beyond Bonhoeffer himself. The middle road is taken by those who see "religionless Christianity" as the last phase of an organic evolution of Bonhoeffer's polyphonic, highly dialectical thought which focuses according to Woelfel (and also John Godsey in *The Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 1960) on Christology. On this assumption Woelfel is persuaded that another interpretation of Bonhoeffer is in order, one that would analyze Bonhoeffer's thought systematically, thematically, so as to trace the poly-

phonic interaction and development of these themes in the organic evolution of his thought. Thus he finds at the beginning and traces through to the end, Bonhoeffer's "liberality" and openness to the secular world, as well as his Barthian-based respect for revelation as opposed to religion, and the integrity of dogmatic theology vis-a-vis natural theology and apologetics. I came away from Woelfel's study persuaded, both by the theological evidence Woelfel adduces as well as by the image of the man Bonhoeffer that emerges, that Bonhoeffer was simply a classical theologian, as Woelfel contends, who, like his mentor, Barth, is both markedly consistent and yet just as radically open, for whom the mystery of Christ infinitely and always transcends the knowledge of theology. Woelfel is therefore justified when he eschews the historical, chronological approach taken, for instance, by Godsey, Phillips and Kuhns, in favor of his more systematic study. However, because his argument depends so heavily on cross references between the *Letters and Papers from Prison* and the earlier writings, having to turn to the back of the book for the footnotes is a serious handicap. As for the substance of the argument, I was a bit put off by his handling of another matter of contention among Bonhoeffer students, namely the issue of Bonhoeffer's debt to Karl Barth who, without question, was the most formative of the influences on the young Bonhoeffer. Woelfel convinces me that while Bonhoeffer was indeed in debt to Barth, he nevertheless was an independent thinker who went beyond Barth, especially in his very concrete Christological focus, at a time (in the early thirties) when Barth had yet to free himself from notions of transcendence that inhibited a fully Christological concentration. It is tribute enough to Bonhoeffer to show that he did anticipate Barth's later Christocentrism, but the eminence of Bonhoeffer is

hardly enhanced when Woelfel, reinforced by the very dubious criticisms of Emil Brunner, takes Bonhoeffer's charge of "revelational positivism" as the definitive word about what finally emerged in the *Church Dogmatics*, so that we are asked to believe not only that Bonhoeffer moved ahead of Barth, but that when Barth finally caught up he had sold out to a scholastic fideism. A much more flattering tribute to Bonhoeffer would be to demonstrate, as could be done, that while Bonhoeffer learned from Barth *how* theology would be done, Bonhoeffer showed Barth *what* it is finally all about—namely, Jesus Christ.

This is a fine book. Read the last chapter, "Paths in Bonhoeffer Interpretation," first, then cut out the footnotes for a ready reference, and finally read Karl Barth to see where the direction Bonhoeffer was taking does indeed lead.

—Robert T. Osborn

Companion to the Hymnal. Fred D. Gealy, Austin C. Lovelace, and Carlton R. Young. Abingdon Press. 1970. 766 pp. \$10.00.

The *Companion to the Hymnal*, a handbook to the 1964 *Methodist Hymnal*, has been awaited with much interest. The authors and publisher have gone to great effort to make this a complete hymnody, and they have very nearly succeeded.

The work is divided into four main sections. Part I contains three historical articles; two concerning hymns, their texts and music, and a third on the "American Methodist Hymnal," past and present. Part II is devoted to comments on the texts and tunes in the 1964 hymnal; Part III is a biographical study of each composer, arranger and author; and Part IV contains the bibliographies and indexes.

Part I begins with a rather complete article on "The Psalms and

Hymns of the Church" by Fred D. Gealy. In this study are especially good sections on Greek, Latin and American hymns. However, the second article, "A Survey of Tunes" by Austin Lovelace seems very brief and too shallow in its coverage. Both the Lovelace and the Gealy articles are hampered by the way they use the hymn examples. Dr. Gealy, in most cases, uses only the number of the hymn in the new hymnal, while Dr. Lovelace uses the tune name and number. It seems to this reviewer, that using the first line and number of the hymns would have been preferable in both cases, since most persons who will use this handbook are more familiar with the first line of the hymns. The third article, "American Methodist Hymnbooks" by Carlton Young, is interesting, informative, and contains a useful chronological chart on Methodist hymnals from 1780 to the present.

The real meat of the book is Part II, which deals with the study of the texts and tunes of the hymns, canticles, service and communion music in the new hymnal. The hymns are listed alphabetically by first line which makes for easy usage and quick identification. This is an excellent work and covers most of the texts, their authors and sources, in a very thorough manner. Unfortunately, coverage of the music is uneven, often very brief, and in some instances incomplete since it is often the greatness of the tune that gives a hymn its appeal. However, considering how bad the coverage of music has been in most hymnodies, this is a small complaint indeed.

In Part III, Dr. Young has compiled concise, to-the-point, biographical sketches. Again, this reviewer would have appreciated more information concerning the composers, their musical style and compositions.

Most readers will find the bibliography in Part IV very adequate. It contains a complete list of hand-

books (Hymnal Companions of other denominations), a long listing on hymnology, and a general list of church music.

To sum up: The general articles are for the most part very good, although a consistent system of reference to hymns would have been helpful. The study of the texts and tunes is the best available so far, even though the treatment of the music is still not quite what it could be. The biographies and bibliographies are excellent. The criticisms made by this reviewer are in no way serious enough to impair the real value of this book. For the average minister, choirmaster, organist and layman, it should prove most valuable in aid in the successful use of the 1964 *Methodist Hymnal*.

—John Kennedy Hanks

Companion to the Book of Worship.

Edited by William F. Dunkle, Jr. and Joseph D. Quillian, Jr. for the Commission on Worship of the United Methodist Church. Abingdon. 1970. 207 pp. \$4.50.

This long-awaited book is addressed to central and urgent needs of our church as we seek to reclaim and effectuate our unique Wesleyan "campmeeting and cathedral" heritage. Addressed to any and all who use the *Book of Worship*, and the *Hymnal*, it is intended to aid us in "creative use of the traditional forms," and "in the creation of new forms, without sacrificing continuity and integrity." I have tested it by use in a Divinity School summer class of student-pastors, and we have found it a useful book.

We now have a Methodist equivalent of Massey Shepherd's Protestant Episcopal *Oxford Prayer Book Commentary*, and so crucial are the issues of Christian life and work it addresses that every serious owner of the *Book of Worship* and of the *Hymnal* should own and consult it.

For it is intended to explicate Christian worship personal and corporate, in study and classroom no less than in the great congregation.

So varied are our interests, so limited my space, I have decided to identify authors, and make a brief and too-general statement about each chapter. It would be helpful were each reader to open his *Book of Worship*, noting its five divisions, which are treated in ten chapters, by nine writers. Thus you may be "clued" to your concerns.

Chapter I "The Order of Worship: The Ordinary Parts," by James White, teacher and co-author of *The Celebration of the Gospel*, is the best account I know of the tortuous process by which our present Morning Service, displacing the Lord's Supper, is today "a curious but workable fusion of ancient Christian tradition with Nineteenth Century evangelical Protestantism, tidied up in the Twentieth Century." Stronger historically than pastorally, and descriptive rather than prescriptive, here are identified "points of leverage" at which creative pastors are working.

II "The Order of Worship: The Proper Parts" is also by James White. Since most of the proper (or changeable) Aids to Worship and Acts of Praise—as well as hymns—are intended to flesh out the Christian year Sunday by Sunday, this expounds its development and values. It will help us to remember Christ in gratitude and participate in his ministry as we offer praise, prayer, and preaching to the Father and are built up to participate in his work in his world.

III "Baptism: Its Historical, Theological and Practical Considerations" is by David James Randolph, former teacher of preaching, now Associate Director of the Board of Evangelism, and editor of *Ventures in Worship*. Released in 1968 by the Commission as an official brochure, the title would imply that it was also written for this book. Pastoral rather than formally

theological and scholarly, it suffers from lack of footnotes, and does not adequately communicate the present world-wide concern with our theories and practices of baptism, child and adult.

I must report with consternation that there is no chapter on "the Order for Confirmation and Reception into the Church." In the light of Dean Quillian's earlier statements that this service is our most significant liturgical recovery, and the appointment by General Conference in 1968 of a special three-commission group to study and effectuate this experience in young people's lives, this is amazing.

IV "The Lord's Supper or Holy Communion," is by Dean Joseph D. Quillian, Jr., former chaplain, pastor, teacher, editor, and a Methodist member of the liturgical commission of C.O.C.U. The three-page history of the Lord's Supper (51-4) is helpful indeed, meanings of the Supper (drawn from *The Celebration of the Gospel*) less felicitous, with the *anamnesis* motif separated from Eucharistic thanksgiving. "The great offertory" (55-6) is a less successful attempt to explain our participation in Christ's self-offering.

Throughout the careful explication of the *shall* and *may* rubrics I detect discreet suggestions for strengthening and contemporizing our weak liturgy, safeguarded by faithful adherence to its basic "shape" and intent. Predictably, these focus at sermon, offertory (65), fraction (67), and sharing of bread and cup (69-70). The muted notes of Eucharistic thanksgiving and hope are not sounded, the Wesleyan "evangelistic sacrament" motif is not mentioned, and the lack of specific allusions or footnotes deprives us of Dean Quillian's experiences with several more contemporary and celebrative liturgies.

V "The Order for the Service of Marriage," by Professor Paul Hoon, of Union Theological Seminary in

New York, one of the most scholarly and theologically explicit, expounds Biblical data concerning sexuality, covenant and sacrament. As throughout the *Book of Worship*, the note of Eucharistic thanksgiving and memory is muted, and liturgical participation and response by the congregation is not highlighted.

VI "The Funeral," is by Professor Grady Hardin, Duke alumnus, pastor, teacher of liturgy and preaching. Brief historical preamble leads into explication of the rubrics, by which means helpful pastoral-liturgical practices are suggested. Values and function of the sermon are highlighted. He neglects to mention the emerging values of a brief *spoken* obituary, and he could well have showed how skillful use of the name of the deceased can personalize the service. Again, sources would have aided.

VII "The Ordinal" by Albert C. Outler, Duke alumnus and teacher, and "Mr. Ecumenical Theologian," is a scholarly and detailed exposition of Protestant, Wesleyan and later Methodist doctrines of ministry and ordination services. Made cogent by excellent sources and the Outlerian wit, it ends on an ecumenical note.

VIII "The Lectionary" is by William F. Dunkle, Jr., pastor, author and co-editor. After a brief, illuminating exposition of lectionaries (lists of lessons or Bible readings, usually following the Christian calendar), he explains the principles shaping our lectionary. Then follow thirty-eight pages charting the lectionaries of all the major denominations. Valuable as this may be for scholars, Dr. Dunkle's own skills in preaching the Gospel following the Gospel Year, are not brought to our aid, as we endeavor to recover Biblical Praise, prayer, and preaching in a Christ-centered context. I regret that he did not write chapter II.

IX "Uses of the Book of Worship in the Home and with Small Groups," by M. Lawrence Snow, United Meth-

odist pastor and author, is so luminous, cogent and helpful that one could wish that he had written chapter II, or that this chapter had been expanded to include "Morning Worship." Every pastor, church school teacher, and every editorial writer for the *Upper Room* should study these suggestions for small group devotions, love feasts, and household communions. This pastor brings alive his Methodist "campmeeting and cathedral" heritage and the subtitle of the *Book of Worship*"; "for church and home."

X "Other Occasional Services" by Professor Roy A. Reed, teacher of worship in one of our United Methodist theological schools, highlights theological, liturgical and pastoral elements in the Wesleyan genius for guiding ministers and people into numerous experiences of personal and corporate dedication and consecration, focused by various occasions in our common life. For through such we may recognize and communicate our identity as God's people, grow in *Koinonia* with Christ and each other, grow in grace by "using the means of grace," and do Christ's work. Here a sacramental theology begins to emerge (195-7), and the term "sacramental celebrations" becomes an apropos term for all these "life-experience" occasional services. Anyone concerned with realistic and authentic pastoral leadership is wrestling with the problem of wholeness of life and celebration: here are suggested fundamentals—fundamental because they root back into Christ's consecration of himself and our constant renewal in *Koinonia* and liturgy with him.

Imperfect though it is, this book is useful and we should use it. And we should hope that the Commission will now plan a careful series of "tracts for the times" "bracketing" and supplementing this book: several brief background expositions of New Testament-Wesleyan Eucharistic theology, explicating the central, unifying and

vitalizing functions of grateful *anamnesis* of Christ and thanksgiving in each of our sadly drab and wordy services. And several "practical" articles, supplementing *Ventures in Worship*, should make available various creative recoveries of corporate prayer, Concerns, and contemporary idiom by pastors and their people. These should appear in the national *Advocate*. And let them seek authors outside their own group. Thus they may break out of the in-group approach which so seriously limits their work and this book, and we shall be led into the larger meanings of liturgy as Christ's work, done by his people.

—John J. Rudin, II

Crisis in Eden: A Religious Study of Man and Environment. Frederick Elder. New York. Abingdon. 1970. 172 pp. \$3.95.

Frederick Elder seeks a theological base for both interpreting and hopefully correcting man's careless exploitation of nature's forces and forms. In light of western man's historic disregard for environmental impacts of his technologies the writer proposes an "environmental theology" which leans heavily upon tutelage of the natural sciences. In this context *Crisis in Eden* provides Elder with an interdisciplinary forum for distinguishing environmental "doves" from their hawk-like counterparts.

Elder classifies his line of thought on environmental issues with particular reference to man's place in the natural order. Arguing this "inclusionist" position, he asserts the necessity of regarding "man as an inextricable part of nature," differing primarily in intellectual power and technical prowess from less developed biotic forms but sharing with them, nonetheless, an essential unity. Elder indicts a number of well known theologians, among them Teilhard de Chardin, Herbert Richardson, and

Harvey Cox, for abstracting *homo sapiens* from the ecological calculus and making of him merely *homo faber*. These "exclusionists" assume man potentially controls and will eventually generate his own environment, an environment of simplified, self-contained subsystems for biological and social support quite apart from what one currently knows as nature. For Elder and the representatives of the inclusionist approach, biological and social *interdependence* hold infinitely greater survival value and fulfillment potential in man's evolutionary relationship with his environment than either artificial environments or abstracted independence from nature. The exclusionist mentality, devoid of awe and reverence (Otto's sense of the numinous) and remiss in wonder before nature's complex webs of life, invites simplified reductions of inherently complex processes and unified systems. The viability of these interdependent systems, argues Elder, depends directly upon highly perfected levels of natural integration and inter-system integrity. Elder's criticism of the exclusionist attention to technology without regard to ecology raises several questions about Elder's own theological groundings.

Although Elder chides exclusionist thinkers for brands of callous anthropocentrism instrumental in buttressing unenlightened views of nature's economy, his own theological perspective reveals admitted anthropological proclivities. Early he notes as fundamental to the environmental crisis "the issue over the correct perspective on man." He attributes increased "desacralization" of Nature and concomitant exploitation for narrowly conceived gain to a historical destruction of theological unity between nature, man, and God. He observes this trend beginning in early neo-orthodox theologies in which man is elevated above nature as God's chosen instrument of creation. Elder will not agree to Richardson's proposal for

a God-concept designed specifically to ". . . undergird the primary relations of the cybernetics world. . . ." He insists that the environmental theologian's task is to move from human centered systems of relations to those in which man and nature interface. "The inclusionist could well agree that God is the unity of manifold systems . . . emphasizing that relations, to be truly encompassing, must include those of nature to man as well as man to man." At this point Elder stands open to the tradition of Schleiermacher, though one might question the author's awareness of that tradition. The danger of latent pantheism in this system certainly exists. Despite this possibility, however, biological pan-entheism provides an evaluation more responsive to Elder's intent. This notion, articulated by Ian Barbour, includes a hierarchical system of reality, in this instance biological interfaces, levels of which share and incarnate the encompassing unity of the Divine. Such a system resurrects possibilities of awe and wonder. Depth and reverence before nature's organic diversity rejuvenate.

Throughout his study the author is malcontent to allow discourse about theological implications of environmental crises to remain at strictly erudite levels. Elder's commitment to a fundamentally interdisciplinary approach to theology well prepares him to present poignant glimpses of the inclusionist position applied. Close personal relation to Berkeley ecologist Daniel Luter and equally strong affection for the work of landscape environmentalist Ian McHarg reinforce the writer's perception that natural consequences of undetermined magnitude await already deployed technologies. If technology alone is not Elder's *bete noir*, then man's predelection for insensitive and uninformed application of technology certainly is. His call for broadening interdisciplinary interaction on academic and professional levels in which theology may

take note of its own historic misconceptions and move to more inclusive orientations bears serious consideration by those who fashion models for theological education. Perhaps Elder heralds a theological holism which swings wide for the 70's doors which theological pluralism merely cracked for past decades. In Elder's words:

The human race probably has no more than a generation left in which to decide whether it will live in a diversified, balanced world or one either biologically devastated or imperialistically controlled in order to avoid biological devastation. This means that environmental theology, and its concomitant environmental ethics, must emerge The time is now; a failure to proceed properly insures a future that is bleak.

—William M. Finnin

Professional Education for Ministry: A History of Clinical Pastoral Education. Edward E. Thornton. Abingdon. 1970. 301 pp. \$7.50.

This is essentially the story, as the subtitle indicates, of the Clinical Pastoral Education movement treated historically, with the opening chapters centering on men, the middle chapters on structures, and the closing chapters on issues and processes.

Articles by Tom Klink whose conceptualizations of the supervisory process are unsurpassed and by other recent articles on preparing students for ministry in the 70's such as those appearing in *Theological Education*, the journal of the American Association of Theological Schools would be valuable and necessary supplements to Thornton's discussion of issues and processes.

The appeal of this book may be limited to professional educators, whether in academic or clinical settings. Nevertheless, it is interesting reading in what is considered as the most significant movement in theological education in our time.

—Richard A. Goodling

A Pastoral Counseling Casebook. Aldrich C. Knight and Carl Nighswonder. Westminster. 1968. 224 pp. \$5.95.

Would you like to join a group of fellow ministers weekly with a psychiatrist and a chaplain supervisor to discuss pastoral counseling cases? *A Pastoral Counseling Casebook* is the next best thing. Discussions at such weekly case conferences were transcribed and edited and published in this informative and very readable book. The consultants were Aldrich, a psychiatrist, and Nighswonger, a chaplain, both at the University of Chicago School of Medicine. Cases considered deal with grief, anxiety and depression, suicidal threat, marital conflict, delinquency, adolescence, alcoholism, and one with a couple which called for collaboration with a psychiatric consultant. The spontaneous, conversational style of a case conference is retained but the material was carefully edited to provide clarity and precision of thought. Good use was made of the "teaching moment" to draw out the pastor's investment in each case, to introduce in a natural and relevant way conceptual material on the life problems being considered, and to enhance professional counseling skills. An introductory chapter on personality development provides an excellent theoretical framework for the behavioral patterns revealed in the case materials.

—Richard A. Goodling

