THE DUKE DIVINITY SCHOOL REVIEW

Spring 1971

DEDICATION

to

ROBERT EARL CUSHMAN

Dean of The Divinity School

Duke University

1958-1971

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

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

Waldo Beach takes an overview of the Divinity School through these thirteen years and interprets its present outlook and promise;

Arthur Kale testifies to the Dean's leadership in relating seminary and church;

Vincent Arthur Yzermans adds a personal and Catholic word about Dean Cushman's ecumenical service;

Frank Baker reports on the development of the Wesley Works project;

Kelly Ingram and Robert Colver give a preview of their voluminous studies of our ministerial students and their subsequent ministries;

Richard Goodling tells of developments in Pastoral Psychology programs and Clinical Pastoral Education;

Robert Wilson interprets the new J. M. Ormond Center for Research, Planning, and Development;

and the Chairmen of the Biblical, Historical, Theological, and Ministerial Studies Divisions bring readers up to date on our Faculty and its teaching ministry.

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

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

May 24, 1971

THE DUKE DIVINITY SCHOOL REVIEW

Volume 36 Spring 1971 Number 2

Contents

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)

Theological Education at Duke Today: An Overview

Waldo Beach*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bridging Troubled Waters

William Arthur Kale

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

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

The Troubled Waters of Mistrust

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

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

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

"Serving One Another in Love"

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

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

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

Cooperative Ventures

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

individuals involved and also enhances dialogue between the associated institutions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Turbulent Financial Waters

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

An Unusual Appointment

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

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

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

Bridges Between Classroom and Life

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Moulding Culture Through Distinctive Education

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

Two Strangers Become Brothers

Vincent Arthur Yzermans*

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

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

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

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

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

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

* * * * *

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

* * * * *

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* * * * *

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

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

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

The Oxford Edition of Wesley's Works

Frank Baker*

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

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

The Need

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

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

a service . . . cannot long be refused the friends of Methodist research."[1]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Beginnings

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Editorial Preparations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

largest collections in the U.S.A. being at Drew University (741) and Garrett Theological Seminary (602).[5]

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

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

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

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

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

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

Units, Editors, Consultants

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

X. *Letters* (Vols. 24-30), Dr. Frank Baker.
XI. *Bibliography* (Vols. 31, 32), Dr. Frank Baker.
XII. *Miscellanea and General Index* (Vol. 33), Mr. John Vickers.

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

Publication

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

O. Kelly Ingram and Robert M. Colver
(In collaboration with Robert M. Poerschke)*

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

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

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

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

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

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

Vocational Categories Into Which Graduates Distributed Themselves

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

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

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

Analysis of Alienation-Identification According to Age Groupings

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Analysis of Alienation-Identification According to Date of Graduation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Attitudes of Graduates Toward Their Seminary Education

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

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

The second question designed to elicit an expression of attitude

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

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

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

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

Reflections on Outcomes

Richard A. Goodling*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Robert L. Wilson*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Divinity School Faculty and Our Ministry of Teaching

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

The Faculty

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Richard E. Gillespie (1971), B.D., *Instructor in Historical Theology*

Richard A. Goodling (1959), B.D., Ph.D., *Professor of Pastoral Psychology*

Thor Hall (1962), B.D., M.R.E., Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Preaching and Theology*

Stuart C. Henry (1959), B.D., Ph.D., *Professor of American Christianity*

*Frederick Herzog (1960), Th.D., *Professor of Systematic Theology*

*Osmond Kelly Ingram (1959), B.D., *Professor of Parish Ministry*

William Arthur Kale (1952), B.D., D.D., *Professor of Christian Education*

Creighton Lacy (1953), B.D., Ph.D., *Professor of World Christianity*

Paul A. Mickey (1970), B.D., Th.D., *Assistant Professor of Pastoral Theology*

Roland E. Murphy (1971), M.A., S.T.D., S.S.L., *Professor of Old Testament*

Ray C. Petry (1937), Ph.D., LL.D., *James B. Duke Professor of Church History*

McMurry S. Richey (1954), B.D., Ph.D., *Professor of Theology and Christian Nurture*

Charles K. Robinson (1961), B.D., Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Philosophical Theology*

John Jesse Rudin, II (1945), B.D., A.M., Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Christian Communications*

Dwight Moody Smith, Jr. (1965), B.D., M.A., Ph.D., *Professor of New Testament Interpretation*

Harmon L. Smith (1962), B.D., Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Moral Theology*

David Curtis Steinmetz (1971), B.D., Th.D., *Associate Professor of Church History and Doctrine*

**William Franklin Stinespring (1936), M.A., Ph.D., *Professor of Old Testament and Semitics*

Robert L. Wilson (1970), B.D., M.A., Ph.D., *Research Professor of Church and Society*

Franklin Woodrow Young (1968), B.D., Ph.D., *Amos Ragan Kearns Professor of New Testament and Patristic Studies*

Visiting Faculty

Christopher Ludwig Morse (1971), B.D., S.T.M., *Visiting Instructor in Systematic Theology*

Associates in Instruction

P. Wesley Aitken (1963), B.D., Th.M., *Chaplain Supervisor, Duke Medical Center, and Part-time Assistant Professor of Clinical Pastoral Education of the Divinity School*

John William Carlton (1969), B.D., Ph.D., *Adjunct Professor of Preaching*

James H. Charlesworth (1969), B.D., Ph.D., *Lecturer in Old Testament and Assistant Professor of Religion, Duke University*

Philip R. Cousin (1969), S.T.B., *Lecturer in Church and Society*

John C. Detwiler (1966), B.D., Th.M., *Chaplain Supervisor, Duke Medical Center, and Instructor in Clinical Pastoral Education*

John Kennedy Hanks (1954), M.A., *Lecturer in Sacred Music, Director of the Divinity School Choir, and Professor of Music, Duke University*

M. Wilson Nesbitt (1958), B.D., D.D., *Adjunct Professor of the Work of the Rural Church*

Harry B. Partin (1964), B.D., Ph.D., *Lecturer in History of Religions and Associate Professor of Religion, Duke University*

William Hardman Poteat (1960), B.D., Ph.D., *Lecturer in Christianity and Culture and Professor of Religion, Duke University*

William C. Spong (1965), B.D., Th.M., *Chaplain Supervisor, Duke Medical Center, and Instructor in Clinical Pastoral Education*

Orval Wintermute (1959), B.D., Ph.D., *Lecturer in Old Testament and Associate Professor of Religion, Duke University*

Emeritii

Kenneth Willis Clark (1931), B.D., Ph.D., D.D., *Professor Emeritus of New Testament and Co-Director of the International Greek New Testament Project*

James T. Cleland (1945), M.A., S.T.M., Th.D., D.D., *James B. Duke Professor Emeritus of Preaching*

Hiram Earl Myers (1926), S.T.M., D.D., *Professor Emeritus of Biblical Literature*

H. Shelton Smith (1931), Ph.D., D.D., Litt.D., *James B. Duke Professor Emeritus of American Religious Thought*

Hersey Everett Spence (1918), A.M., B.D., D.D., Litt.D., *Professor Emeritus of Religious Education*

Arley John Walton (1948), B.S.L., D.D., *Professor Emeritus of Church Administration and Director of Field Work*

---

* Absent on sabbatical leave 1971-72.

** Retires August 31, 1971.

I. *The Division of Biblical Studies*

FRANKLIN W. YOUNG

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

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

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

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

Father *Roland Murphy*, the distinguished Roman Catholic Old

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

II. *The Division of Historical Studies*

STUART C. HENRY

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

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

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

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

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

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

III. *The Division of Theological Studies*

CREIGHTON LACY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IV. *The Division of Ministerial Studies*

WILLIAM ARTHUR KALE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A Dialogue With James Buchanan Duke

Norman L. Trott*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Robert E. Cushman, Dean

LOOKS at BOOKS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This eventually meant separation, as witness the decisive actions

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

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

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

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

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

McMurry S. Richey

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

—Ray C. Petry

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Harriet V. Leonard
Reference Librarian
Divinity School Library

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

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

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

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

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

—Kimsey King
B.D. '58

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

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

Although Oden skips over the issues of woman-consciousness and

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

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

Martha M. Wilson
M. Div. '70

PROGRAM

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

6:30 P.M. — Ballroom, West Campus Union
May 24, 1971 — Duke University

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

Invocation and Grace
Miss Katherine Ann Belton, President Divinity School Student Body

Greetings from a Former Administrative Colleague
Dr. R. Taylor Cole, James B. Duke Research Professor of Political Science and Former Provost of Duke University

Greetings from a Faculty Colleague
Dr. Waldo Beach, Professor of Christian Ethics

Greetings from the United Methodist Church
Bishop William R. Cannon, Raleigh and Richmond Areas

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

Greetings from the American Association of Theological Schools and Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
Dr. Olin T. Binkley, President Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary

Greetings from the Association of United Methodist Theological Schools and Introduction of Speaker
Dr. Gerald McCulloh, Executive Director, Association of United Methodist Theological Schools

Address
Dr. Norman L. Trott, former President, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D. C.

In Appreciation
President Terry Sanford

Presentation to the Cushmans
The Reverend William K. Quick, Dinner Chairman

Closing Prayer and Benediction
Bishop Earl G. Hunt, Charlotte Area