Volume XI January, 1947 *Number 4*

The Duke Divinity School

BULLETIN

"Information Please"

It is characteristic of humanity that when a man is placed in a new position or has a new office thrust upon him, he immediately begins to cast around for improvements which he may make, that will cause him to appear superior to his predecessor. The new Editor of the BULLETIN was no exception to the rule. When he assumed the editorship, it immediately occurred to him that it would be nice to have a section of the BULLETIN assigned to the alumni where they might learn of each other's promotions, achievements, good fortunes, and the like. He asked the former editor about the value of such a department to be met with the laconic reply: "Tried it. Wouldn't let me." Wouldn't let *you,* thought the new Editor, but watch me. A request was made of the proper authorities. The results were the same. "Wouldn't let me."

However, there was one concession made which seems fair enough. The Editor of the *Alumni Register* has agreed to give a section to the alumni of the Divinity School provided enough material can be secured to justify the setting aside of a special section. If we care to do so, we may have a complete page with the proper heading. Otherwise we may have a section of a page with the notation that the information concerns our own alumni.

Now gentle readers, as the old time editors would say, if you would like to hear from your fellow alumni and would be willing to let them hear from you, send the information along. Let us know if you were moved at last conference. Where did you go? What sort of a place is it? What are you doing in the way of some special project? Have you published a book? Have you built a church? Or got married? Or become a fond papa? Or been made district superintendent? Or what have you?

If you will file any bits of information with us we will arrange it in proper form and see to it that the *Register* gets it for publication. Especially if you have pictures of the "Young Hopefuls" which have not appeared in the *Register,* send them along with the necessary data: age, sex, papa and mama, etc. We will see to it that the photographs get in the *Register* sooner or later.

If you are really interested and willing to help, send your material along and the BULLETIN will see that it is published in the *Register.*

THE DUKE DIVINITY SCHOOL BULLETIN

VOLUME XI JANUARY, 1947 NUMBER 4

The Direction of Theology Today

A lecture presented before the faculty and students of the Divinity School, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, Thursday, December 5, 1946, by Dr. Paul Lehman, Associate Book Editor, the Westminster Press. (This lecture is published at the urgent request of both students and Faculty.—Ed.)

Last August, there was held in Cambridge, England, under the auspices of the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches, a Conference on International Affairs. We all know that the formal achievement of that Conference was the creation of a *Commission* on International Affairs whose task it will be to relate, by study and by advisory counsel, the mind and the conscience of non-Roman Christendom to the critical issues and policies of the society of nations in its struggle to achieve unity and peace. But those who were present at that gathering have returned with oral reports of an *informal* achievement of the Conference which is certainly not less, and very likely even more, important and far-reaching than the resolution creating the new Commission. The word is that contrary to expectation, and quite without advance preparation, the Cambridge meeting was marked by a unanimity of mind and a unity of spirit with respect to the message and function of the Church in the present cultural and social situation that were overwhelming and unique. Theological and ecclesiastical extremes were neither compromised nor repressed. To the astonishment of every one, disruptive divisions were not at hand.

Now, of course, this does not mean that there are no theological issues and that the day of theological controversy is gone forever. Certainly it does not mean that Methodists have become Greek Orthodox and Greek Orthodox, Unitarian. Bishops have not resigned and Presbyteries are not governing the Churches. Indeed, the motives and expectations that have surrounded the appointment of the new

Commission on International Affairs may be, and doubtless are and have been, ambiguous. But I should like to suggest that, whatever may be the ultimate significance of the Cambridge Conference of August, 1946, there is an immediate significance which a responsible Church and responsible Christians cannot ignore.

The Cambridge meeting may be regarded as a sign that a frontier has been crossed in the ongoing story of the Christian movement. Theologically that frontier can be said to have been crossed in the sense that the direction of theology today is toward constructive rather than polemical thinking. This does not mean that polemics have no constructive significance. Without polemics, there would have been no Christian movement, as the Corinthian letters and the Fourth Gospel sufficiently attest. Without polemics, there would have been no Protestant Reformation. Indeed, it was Erasmus' unwillingness to assume the responsibility of polemics that not only deprived the Reformation of his leadership but deprived him of more far-reaching historical significance. And we shall not rightly understand the direction of theology today unless we take proper account of the polemical phase through which we have passed. But the peril of polemics is that the controversies aroused by disputation outlast their true occasion. The ground thus cleared is, then, apt to be reduced to shambles and new growth be stifled in the growing. It is this peril which requires us to refresh our minds about the principal theological controversy of our time so that we may rightly assess the constructive issues now beginning to emerge from that debate.

We have all heard tell of "liberalism" and of "neo-orthodoxy." But we have not always remembered that liberalism was itself a polemical theological movement and that neo-orthodoxy includes more than the dialectical theology of Barth and Brunner. It has, therefore, not infrequently turned out that both liberalism and neo-orthodoxy have been attacked where they ought to have been defended and defended where they ought to have been attacked. These errors are, of course, easier to recognize in retrospect. But they are not always easier to correct. Correction requires not only perspective, but the crossing of a theological frontier.

Theological liberalism is essentially the position that the world and man have an independent and positive relation to the redemptive self-disclosure and activity of God in Jesus Christ. It is both recognized and emphasized that Christianity is a religion of redemption, uniquely centered in the person and work of Jesus of Nazareth and uniquely expressed in the faith and life of the community of believers, howsoever diverse its institutional forms. Liberalism never denied that the world and everything in it was the work of God the

Creator, and that man and all his works were deficient both in goodness and in power. But liberalism insisted that precisely because the world has been created and man was a creature, the purpose and the will of God continued to be operative in both, despite defection and distortion.

In this insistence, liberalism was incontestably right. It was right for at least two reasons: one, constructive, the other, polemical. The constructive reason was that the doctrine of creation was an essential part of biblical and historic Christian faith. But the polemical reason was equally important. It was the responsibility for preserving the biblical and historic Christian faith from arbitrariness. Liberalism had to contend against arbitrariness, owing to pressure from two directions. On the one hand, there was the pressure from inside the Church; on the other, there was the pressure from outside the Church, exerted by an irreversible shift in cultural and social patterns. Actually it was a matter of two sides of the same coin. For what was at stake was the nature of religious authority and the validity of religious judgments. Inside the Church, the claim was tenaciously, and not a little belligerently, made that religious authority was biblical authority and that an inerrant text not only defined the validity of religious judgments but also established religious judgments as the criteria for all other judgments as well. Nothing could be true religiously, unless there was a corroborative biblical text. But neither could anything be true geologically, geographically, biologically, or any other way, if it contradicted the biblical text.

Outside the Church, it was contended that religious authority could not possibly be biblical authority, partly because religion was regarded as more inward and more universal than a written text, and partly because the increase of knowledge about the world and man and society was too impressive to be devoured by the omnivorous claims that were being made in the name of the Bible.

Thus a theological movement which was endeavoring to relate the vast range of new knowledge about created things to the long-acknowledged activity and purpose of God the Creator had to take the form of a "liberal" movement if Christianity was to be preserved from the stagnation of pursuing "the letter which killeth," while "the Spirit which giveth life" passed to other auspices than those of the Christian heritage and the Christian Church. If the Christian God is a God who "made his ways known unto Moses, his acts unto the children of men" (Ps. 103:7), and if history means anything at all, this was an inescapable responsibility. But it *was* polemical. Liberalism was and is, characteristically the protest against the arbitrariness of biblical authority and the isolation of Christianity from historical and cultural meaning.

Liberalism rescued the Bible from idolatry and irrelevance. But its polemics overshot the mark. Polemics always do. This is alike their strength and weakness. And what it means is that polemics are neither to be avoided for the sake of tranquility, nor pursued for the sake of consistency. In exchange for textual literalism, liberalism offered textual criticism; and instead of isolating the Bible from significant cultural and social changes, liberalism underlined the continuity of human experience in the *Bible* with human experience *generally*. These exchanges saved the Bible from discard; but they did not allow the Bible to speak sufficiently of and for itself. A new polemic was called for if the Bible which had been delivered from arbitrariness were not to be rendered impotent. The cultural and social patterns of a world in which all authority was being radically re-examined and re-orientated could not be allowed to ignore the influence and wisdom of the Bible. But neither could such a world be allowed to mistake the wisdom and influence of the Bible for its own. To prevent this confusion and to make room for the Bible to speak its own word to a completely altered world, was the true occasion and the true significance of the theological movement which we know as neo-orthodoxy.

This term was first applied to the "dialectical" or "crisis" theology, associated with the names of Karl Barth and Emil Brunner. Such terms as "dialectical" and "crisis" are certainly not obviously "biblical." And certainly, since the Reformation, people had not been used to reading the Bible in a dialectical way. But as Barth and Brunner tried to preach the gospel and to think about what it meant, it became more and more clear to them that the Bible could *only* be read in a dialectical way.

Your dictionaries will tell you that "dialectic" has to do with "speaking between." That is to say, affirmations are made which, as *statements,* are in opposition to each other; but which, nevertheless, do not cancel each other out. Not all statements, of course, are dialectical statements. I cannot say, for example, about this paper from which I am reading, both that "it is white"; *and* that "it is black." The situation, or object to which those statements refer, requires that they cannot both apply. They cancel each other out. But if I say, "Mr. X is a good man"; "Mr. X is a bad man"—both those statements *do*—in *fact*—apply to the situation or object to which they refer. We may soften the opposition between them by noting that Mr. X is more good than he is bad, or more bad than he is good. We may say that Mr. X is better today than he was yesterday; and suspect that tomorrow he will behave worse than he has behaved today. But when all is said, the fact remains that Mr. X is both good and bad.

Thus, a dialectical situation is one about which one must say both "yes" and "no," a situation which requires both positive and negative affirmations if one is rightly to describe and understand it. "I believe in God," say you; say I. But if, in making that affirmation, we really give attention to what is going on, it is plain, is it not, that we always, at the same time, do *not* believe in Him? And this also is plain, is it not, that we believe in God most surely when we ask most intensely concerning Him? In other words, when the question *about* God becomes the question *of* God, when our asking for God becomes God's asking for us, then we know surely that what we believe is the truth, for both faith and life have lost all illusion and pretense.

The dialectical theology tries in this way to face the actual human situation in the midst of which the question of faith arises. It calls this situation a crisis situation. "The word crisis," according to Brunner, "has two meanings: first, it signifies the climax of an illness; second, it denotes a turning point in the progress of an enterprise or movement."[1] And while the accent falls upon the "turning point," the suggestion of "climax" is somehow always also kept in view. The point is that the course of events in an individual human life or in a cultural epoch ever and again moves toward a climax at which point a radical turn about must come if the life of that individual or culture are to have meaning. A decision must be made between the shadow of death which hovers over the old way and the promise of life which lies at the turn of the road.

Such decisions are familiar to us all, I am sure. They inspire the "creative minority," without which, as Professor Toynbee's monumental *Study of History* has shown, no civilization or culture can endure. They inform the skepticism of the youth who goes to college and finds that the religion of his childhood simply will not reach, so that as an honest human being he simply must repudiate that faith for the sake of the truth and the life. They attended that night in Aldersgate without which the heritage of this institution would certainly be other than it is, if indeed, this institution would be at all. Such a decision, such a crisis situation confronted Barth as he stood in his little parish church in Safenwil, Switzerland, with the rather terrifying responsibility of saying something about the God of the Bible to a congregation shattered by the first world war. It was plain that somehow the pulpit, on which there was an open Bible from which preaching was done, must either become a relic of a bygone age or be the outpost of a new and living connection between the ways of the God about whom the Bible spoke and the confused, broken, despairing ways of men.

[1] Emil Brunner, *Theology of Crisis*, pp. 1f.

In the theological seminary, Barth had been taught the liberal understanding of these things. But there seemed, in 1919, no way of moving from men to God, for the ways of men, if not paralyzed, were badly marred. And if the important thing about the Bible was the continuity of deepening moral and religious sensitivity between the people of the Bible and the people to whom Barth had to preach, the Bible could only be as badly discredited as the people knew their own experience to be. Here was no abstract situation, compounded of a hundred and one possibilities to be weighed and sorted in reflective detachment. This was a very concrete situation, circumscribed as every concrete situation is. The demand is to act within the limits of the situation or to abandon it. The limits were imposed upon Barth. He did not make them. The Reformation had put the Bible open on the pulpit. And the urgency of the times, as it always does, had made the choice as simple as it was critical. One could only take up the Bible *again* and *afresh,* or take up some other responsibility outside the Protestant Church. It is not strange that Barth should have described himself as being like a man ascending the dark and winding staircase of a Church tower, and, reaching for the bannister to steady himself, got hold of the bell rope instead.

Barth's re-reading of the Bible led essentially to the discovery that the crisis of the war was at bottom the crisis of man and that the crisis of man was the crisis of his separation from a God whom he could not escape. It is sin which separates man from God; and it is God who pursues man in his sin. That is why man is perennially restless; and why man sooner or later experiences this restlessness as a judgment upon him. It is exactly as Pascal's fragment puts it: "If man is not made for God, why is he only happy in God? If man is made for God, why is he so opposed to God?" (Fr. 438.)

But the Bible not only makes sin plain. It makes plain too that God forgives sin as well as judges it. Indeed, this judgment and forgiveness are, according to Barth, what the Bible is centrally about. This judgment and forgiveness are the central significance of the life and death and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth. And this judgment and forgiveness, humanly and divinely brought to man in and through Jesus of Nazareth, enable man to understand and to live in the crisis of his situation. "I have often been asked," says Brunner, "what the 'Dialectical Theology' is really driving at. The question can be easily answered. It is seeking to declare the Word of the Bible to the world. . . . What the Word of God does is to expose the contradiction of human existence, then in grace to cover it. . . . It is only by means of the contradiction between two ideas—God and man, grace and responsibility, holiness and love—that we can

apprehend the contradictory truth that the eternal God enters time, or that the sinful man is declared just. Dialectical Theology is the mode of thinking which defends this paradoxical character, belonging to faith-knowledge, from the non-paradoxical speculation of reason, and vindicates it against the other."[2] Thus, we may say, in a word, that the dialectical theology is that theology which is concerned to interpret the contradictions of the Bible in their bearing upon the contradictions of human existence.

The dialectical theology is, in genesis and spirit, neo-orthodox rather than liberal. It began to read the Bible again from the standpoint of the insistence of the great Reformers that Scripture is the sole norm of Christian faith and life and it has sought to state in a new way not only the great ideas of the Bible but the great doctrines of the heritage of Christian faith. Liberalism also insisted emphatically upon the re-reading of the Bible in the light of the teaching of the Reformers. Indeed, it is not too much to say that liberalism did as much to restore and retain the significance of the Bible for the cultural and religious situation of the nineteenth century as the dialectical theology has done for the twentieth century. Yet if one considers more specifically the way in which the Bible and the Reformers were appealed to by each of these two movements, one comes in sight of the true relation between them and of certain emerging issues which require a constructive rather than a polemical theology.

So far as the Bible is concerned, the stress of liberalism lies upon the religion of Jesus and upon the long history of its emergence as the complete and perfect expression of the moral and religious quest. The Bible was studied with phenomenal zeal and prodigious knowledge in terms of the historical, cultural, and religious context of its *own* time. And though its distinctiveness was always kept in view, it was a superiority of degree rather than of kind. As for Jesus himself, it was the exemplary character of his life and death and teaching that commended him to the loyalty and emulation of men rather than the substitutionary character of his death and resurrection. The latter was looked upon as an overstatement of the apostle Paul rather than as the key to the real significance of Jesus.

The dialectical theology, on the other hand, lays stress upon the uniqueness of the biblical message of salvation, upon Jesus as the object of faith and the lord of life rather than the supreme Example and Teacher, and finds the Pauline forms of thought a help rather than a hindrance in the understanding of the gospel. So far as the Reformation is concerned, liberalism was inclined to emphasize the religious and moral attitudes of the individual and the community of

[2] Emil Brunner, *The Word and the World,* pp. 6, 7.

the Kingdom of God as operative everywhere where men of good will were broadening and deepening spiritual life and fellowship. The dialectical theology, on the other hand, finds the Reformation significant not because of its individualism but because of its understanding of the Bible, and the community of the Kingdom of God becomes the community of believers in the forgiving grace of God mediated by Word and sacrament.

How then, are these contrasts to be appraised? I venture to think that from the standpoint of the contribution of each to the meaning and the survival of the heritage of Christian faith both movements must be regarded as positive and indispensable. But the polemical relation of these two movements has been sufficiently intense as to suggest that the issue which divides them is very fundamental indeed. *This issue is the issue of the nature of the authority by which Christians think and live as believers in the world,* and *the relation of that authority to whatever else Christians think and do in the world.* Liberalism is "liberal" because its conception of this authority is broader than that of the dialectical theology. It finds the insights of the Bible and of the great doctrines of the Church an indispensable guide to Christian thinking and living. But the validity of these insights is derived in the last analysis from their correspondence with the general moral and spiritual aspirations and achievements of men. The superlative excellence of Jesus, for instance, is established not so much because he is the revelation of the nature and the will of God but because the highest aspirations and deepest intuitions of men respond to and confirm this excellence. Indeed, liberalism insists that precisely in the assent of human life at its best to the excellence of Jesus, the God of Jesus is not less but more truly and more surely known.

Dialectical theology, on the other hand, is orthodox because its conception of the authority by which Christians think and live as believers in the world is at once narrower and more traditional than is the case with liberalism. The insights of the Bible and of the great doctrines of the Church are indispensable to Christian thinking and living not because they are the superlative but because they are the sole guide to such thinking and living. The validity of these insights is derived in the last analysis from what is believed to be the self-authenticating character of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. This revelation is given content and meaning by the inner logic of biblical ideas and it is assented to because of the activity of God, the Holy Spirit, rather than because of the highest aspirations and the deepest intuitions of men. These aspirations and intuitions cannot

authenticate revelation because of the contradictions of human nature and the paradoxical message of the Bible.

How can this understanding of Christianity be related in a positive way to human history and human culture? This is the point at which the polemics of the dialectical theology seems to have overshot *their* mark. If liberalism, in rescuing the Bible from arbitrariness, gave too much away in failing to distinguish properly between what was "Christian" and what was "religious" and just plain "human-at-its-best," the dialectical theology, in restoring the integrity and independence of the Bible, seems to have taken too much back, so that it is not clear that Christianity has any positive relation to human creativity at all. In its zeal to correct and preserve us from the errors of liberalism, neo-orthodoxy has encountered the peril of a new cultural isolation, which it was the great achievement of liberalism to have overcome. The remarkable aspect of the meeting at Cambridge last August was that this division over the *nature of the authority* by which Christians think and live as believers in the world and *the responsibility* of Christianity for the ongoing cultural and historical life of man was lifted above the level of polemics and accepted as the common task of a common mind of the Christian movement. Theology has crossed a frontier. It is the line at which the issue of the authority and independence of the gospel has become the issue of the responsibility of believers in the gospel for the world.

As I survey the field of theological discussion today, and try to reflect upon the constructive task of theology in the light of the polemical history through which we have passed, there are at least three pressing problems which will shape the direction of theological thinking. The first of these problems concerns the interpretation of the Bible. It may be identified by the contrast between biblical criticism and biblical theology. The issue is this: how shall what we know *now* about the inner logic or biblical faith be related to what we know *now* about the actual historical and cultural situation out of which the biblical record came? If we ignore, for example, the time, and place, and situation in which *Genesis* was written, we shall be in danger of imposing upon *Genesis* theological ideas which are actually not in *Genesis* but in ourselves. If, on the other hand, we localize *Genesis* too completely, we are in danger of missing its significance as revelation.

The second problem concerns the interpretation of revelation. It may be identified by the contrast between revelation as creation and revelation as saving knowledge. The issue is this: how shall what we know *now* about the depth and destructiveness of sin and the desperate urgency of the saving initiative of the grace of God in

Christ be related to what we know *now* about the sustaining structures of nature and society within which both sin and grace are operative and apart from which sin and grace have no meaning at all? If God, for example, can be said to act in history, history and nature must, in some sense be revelatory. If they are not, the redemptive act of God in Jesus Christ would seem not to be historical. But if history and nature are revelatory, how shall we understand the special significance of what happened in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth? In short, what is the relation of act to knowledge in revelation?

And finally, the third problem concerns the interpretation of the Christian life. It may be identified by the contrast between believing and doing. The issue is this: if the inner logic of biblical ideas focusses upon the redemptive significance of Jesus Christ, and if this significance is apprehended by faith, what difference does this faith make in the way in which we live in this kind of world? To put together something old with something new: what is the relation of justification to sanctification in a world of moral anarchy, psychoses, economic and political revolution? What seems to be called for here, is a constructive re-statement of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

Even if these questions could be answered simply, it cannot lie within the scope of this discussion to answer them. If, however, the consideration of the polemical character of the theology of our time has prepared us with a sense *both* of the complexity and seriousness of our theological responsibility *and* of the resources of insight and faithfulness in our heritage of faith, we may look out with clearer eye upon the direction of theology today and seek with patience to pursue it.

The Kingdom of God Is within You

Chapel Meditation

By Robert E. Cushman

Perhaps, like myself, you were impressed the other day by a student's word uttered in this place. It was suggested that we people of the Church are too frequently discovered *pursuing Spiritual things in unspiritual ways*. The point struck home, and I found myself impaled upon it. Here, it seemed, is another evil to which professionals are liable—those who take up a cause rather than being taken up by it.

Think of the official board meetings you have attended with the stewards and the deacons, the executive committee meetings of the Ladies Aid. The air was electric, was it not, but hardly with Christian charity and resignation? Rather it was electric wtih the anxiety of people to have their way. Is this the "anxiety" which our Lord said withers away the gospel? Must we not penitently confess that, even in the Church, we are bent more upon our own will than God's—with satanic consistency reversing the prayer of Jesus—not Thy will, but mine be done! So the devil takes his place among us doing yeoman service for the Lord!

It is not our finitude that is the trouble. It is not that in this world of space-time the laudable ends which we espouse require the instrumentation of means and intermediate steps. It is not that everywhere calculation and foresight are required to select and dispose those means toward the end which seems to justify them. To be sure, fallibility of judgment enters here and sometimes contention, and our hands are soiled and our spirits grow rancorous. Even St. Paul was familiar with the corruption that seems to accompany work in institutions, even in the Church. Yet who does not realize that ideal causes are necessarily nourished, advanced, and actualized, insofar as they are given social embodiment, by institutions?

To refer to institutions is perhaps a way to describe the unspiritual pursuit of spiritual things, but it does not probe the mystery of iniquity. We go deeper when we perceive that this evil comes of pursuing the Kingdom of God while *not possessing* the Kingdom. It comes of building the Kingdom rather than being built by it. It is producing the Kingdom out of *our* means; but, because we are not

in the Kingdom, they are not God's means. In this way, through those who profess the Kingdom but who are not in it, the devil works for God. Idealism is the devil's last and most effective defense. Idealism is man's working without God's helping.

What is the antidote to this? It is in the word of Augustine: To love God above all and to derive all else from that love. Or it is, as Wesley said of the Christian: He is one who loves God with all his heart and soul and mind, and such a one can be trusted to love his neighbor.

But the world is too much with us and *in* us, or, better, *we* are too much with ourselves. The I, the love of it, is in all we do. Because we are not in the Kingdom, we must needs pursue it. We identify ourselves with all the means which we suppose will educe it. When our means are opposed, *we* are opposed. Thus, we prove to ourselves that the Kingdom we pursue is *our* Kingdom, not God's Kingdom.

Have we not somewhere along the way missed the words of the Psalmist: "O my soul, thou hast said unto the Lord, thou art my God. I have no *good* beyond Thee" (Psa. 16:2). Has it not come to this: that we have no good beyond ourselves?

When a man can say: I have no good beyond Thee, he is in the Kingdom. He no longer pursues the Kingdom to take it by the violence of his own volition with which his own ambition is mixed. It is no longer an end toward which he constructs means. Rather, the Kingdom is a means *in him* through which God pursues His ends. There is no escape from "absolutizing the relative," of identifying our ends with God's ends and our means with God's means, unless God has provided a way whereby man's love for himself can be transmuted into the love of man for God. Apart from that, I think Christianity has no relevancy to the problem of human existence, and God is forever alienated from the processes of history. If this transformation is possible, we are not forever destined to pursue spiritual things in unspiritual ways. But a man must be born again.

Trends toward Traditions

The Editor sat in what used to be called his "Easy Chair," but could more appropriately be called "uneasy," and mused about the difficulty of getting help from his colleagues in the publication of the BULLETIN. Suddenly there was a light tap on the door and a timid student entered. He informed the Editor that he was a reporter from the *Chronicle* and wanted an interview on the traditions of Duke. He had been told that the Editor, and possibly Father Time, could give him the necessary information. "Duke has no traditions" or so say our enemies, he declared with the flat tone of despair which a Back Bay Bostonian would use if he announced that the family had lost the receipt for his remote ancestors' passage-money on the *Mayflower*. Other schools have such traditions, but not Duke.

It was very easy to explain to the young reporter that traditions grow up around walks, trees, wells, and other physical things. Since Duke has had three main campuses this makes the formation of traditions a bit difficult. Hence we have no "Horse Ponds," "Washington Elms," "Davie Poplars," "Flirtation Walks," "Town Pumps," and the like. By the time a tree gets old enough to have a tradition form around it, it is a bit too big for moving. And everyone knows how hard it is to move a walk, well, graveyard, or church. The young man was assured, however, that Duke was making traditions of a far greater sort.

The Editor began to muse about the traditions of the Divinity School as compared to those of schools of a longer existence. Does it have traditions? Are traditions in the process of being made? Certainly there are no old halls with ancient worthies looking down upon the students as if to say: "This is what Paul (pardon me), the Writer of the Hebrews, was talking about when he (or was it she?) wrote about the 'Cloud of Witnesses.'" But it is forming traditions of a different sort and it might be well to indicate a few of these.

Among the activities which bid fair to become traditional are the "Senior Breakfast" which is given Saturday morning of Commencement, and the Easter Cycle of services which take place Holy Week. A fuller account of these will appear in a subsequent issue. This article will deal with a group of activities which have become well established enough to claim that they are already traditions or at least may be classed as "Trends toward Traditions." The special group to be described is:

The Christmas Cycle

The activities which comprise the Christmas Cycle are not strictly limited to the Divinity School. They were, however, either created or produced by teachers in the school and are participated in by the Divinity School students to a great extent.

The Christmas Cycle begins formally with the presentation of Handel's Messiah, directed by J. Foster Barnes, an Instructor in Music in the School. This has been given for many years, usually the next to the last Sunday before the beginning of the Christmas holidays. The following Sunday morning the regular Chapel Christmas service is held. That evening at eight o'clock the Christmas Pageant, written by Professor Spence of the Department of Religious Education, is produced with music by the Chapel Choir. This pageant incidentally is being produced by Duke alumni and others in different parts of the country. One of the most unique presentations yet made was by the colored people who are employees of the North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Company. It was simply but very effectively done. The regular Student-Faculty Christmas party was an unusual success this year and at its conclusion the participants went over to York Chapel to take part in a service which may well become a tradition also. This was a candle-light service during which unusual Christmas carols were sung under the direction of Dr. Waldo Beach.

The Chapel services took on a Christmas aspect during the week before the holidays also. On Tuesday, Dr. Gilbert T. Rowe spoke on the subject: "The Higher Realism Implied in the Observance of Christmas." On Wednesday, Professor H. E. Spence read Roark Bradford's "How Come Christmas." Friday morning the Lord's Supper was observed with Dr. Frank S. Hickman as the Celebrant.

Other Christmas activities participated in by the School were the singing of carols and the presentation of a Christmas play, "The Trial of Father Christmas," written by Professor Spence and broadcast by the Class in Religious Drama. This was broadcast over station WDNC and announced by Al Wallace, a regular announcer over that station and a member of the Divinity School student body. The season closed with the presentation of Zona Gale's "Neighbors" by the Class in Religious Drama.

Many of these activities, especially the Pageant and the Messiah, have been produced long enough and often enough to claim that they are a part of the traditions of the University. The Pageant has been presented for fifteen years and grows rather than diminishes in popularity. A second showing of the tableaux was necessary this year for those who could not get in the Chapel but heard the program from Page Auditorium.

Doubtless many other activities will be added to these and eventually the "trends" will in reality become "traditions."

With the Faculty

Dr. Kenneth W. Clark preached at Clinton (N. C.) in the interests of the Methodist College Advance, and at State Street Methodist Church in Bristol (Va.). He taught in the Bristol Training School, and represented the Divinity School at the Mississippi Conference. He participated in the annual Educational Conference of Methodist Theological Schools at Evanston, Ill., and led the devotional service on the second day of the conference.

He attended the annual sessions of the National Association of Biblical Instructors, and the Society of Biblical Literature, and was elected Secretary of the Society of Biblical Literature. He was a delegate at the Conference of Secretaries held in January by the American Council of Learned Societies at the Westchester Country Club, Rye, N. Y.

During the Christmas holidays, Dr. Clark collated the text of a twelfth-century manuscript of the Greek New Testament, in the Pierpont Morgan Library; and made a second trip to the Library late in January for further research. He initiated in December a Textual Criticism Seminar for American scholars, in conjunction with the Society of Biblical Literature, having proposed the plan originally at the 1945 session of the Society.

Dr. James T. Cleland delivered the following sermons and addresses during the recent weeks:

On November 8 Dr. Cleland spoke at the Duke Banquet of the North Carolina Conference at Henderson, N. C. Beginning November 17, he delivered three addresses at Hollins College, Virginia, on the topic: "The Basis of Christian Faith." On December 5 he spoke to the Duke alumni at Greensboro, N. C., and delivered the graduating address at the Graduating Exercises of the Nursing School of Duke University on December 21, 1946.

Professor Cleland also preached at the following places: The Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, Greensboro, N. C., November 10; at Chatham Hall School, Virginia, at night the same date; at Sweet Briar College, Virginia, November 17; at the Hill School, Pottsville, Pa., and St. Timothy's, Catonville, Md., December 1; at Yale University and Connecticut College, December 15; and at Germantown Unitarian Church, Pa., on December 29.

Dr. Hornell Hart gave a series of lectures on Courtship and Marriage at Roanoke College, Virginia, on November 6 and 7. He

spoke before the nurses at their Alumni Association banquet at Duke Hospital on December 17. On December 23 he addressed the Rotary Club at Greensboro, N. C. On February 25 he addressed the Health and Welfare Institute in Cleveland, Ohio, on Strengthening the Family Life.

His sermons included engagements at Sweet Briar College, Va., and Germantown Unitarian Church, Pa.

Professor Ray C. Petry presented a paper entitled "Emphasis on the Gospel and Christian Reform," before the joint session of the American Society of Church History and the American Historical Association meeting on December 30, in New York. During the second semester he will utilize a Sabbatical leave to do research and writing on two projects in Christian social history. Grants from the Duke University Research Council and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching have been made available to him during this period.

Dr. H. Shelton Smith delivered a series of addresses before a group of Baptist ministers and laymen in Religious Emphasis Week, the week following November 25 at Raleigh, N. C., on the theme "Christian Response to the Kingdom of God." On December 11 he gave a radio talk over WDNC on the topic "The Influence of the Bible in the World of Today." Dr. Smith also delivered a series of lectures before the Prebyterian Theological Seminary at Austin, Texas, the first week in February.

Professor W. F. Stinespring spent December 29, 30, and 31 in New York, where he attended meetings of the American Schools of Oriental Research, the National Association of Biblical Instructors, and the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis. Since the first of November he has delivered five addresses on the Palestine problem before various organizations in and around Durham. On December 5 he attended the annual meeting of the Archaeological Society of North Carolina and was made a member of the executive committee of that organization.

Methodist Conferences on Ministerial Education

Dr. J. M. Ormond attended the twenty-seventh annual conference on ministerial training held at Garrett Biblical Institute November 25-28, 1946. This conference was participated in by eight or ten of our Bishops and by quite a number of teachers from our seminaries and colleges and by prominent preachers and others. Addresses were delivered and papers presented dealing with all aspects of ministerial education, both doctrinal and practical. Addresses and papers were followed by interesting and profitable discussions.

A conference of representatives of Methodist seminaries immediately followed the conference on ministerial training and on November 29-30, presidents, deans and professors from ten institutions educating Methodist ministers joined with members of the staff of the General Board of Education in discussing the work now being done in our seminaries and possibilities for improving their work.

At each session two papers were presented, the first dealing with questions of doctrine and the second with practical application. At the first session a paper on "The Christian Doctrine of God" was read by Dr. J. T. Carlyon of the Perkins School of Theology, and this paper was immediately followed by one on "The Relevance of the Christian Doctrine of the Kingdom of God in Life Today" by Dr. Albert E. Barnett of Garrett Biblical Institute. These papers provoked lively discussion.

On Saturday morning a paper on "The Christian Doctrine of Man" was read by Dean Walter G. Muelder of the Boston School of Theology. An address was then delivered by Mr. Lawrence A. Appley on "The Relevance of the Christian Doctrine of Man for Life Today." These papers were also followed by extended discussions. In the opinion of most, the layman delivered the most profitable address of the conference.

The theme running through the whole conference was "The Relevance of Certain Christian Doctrines for Life Today." The representatives from Duke were Professors Gilbert T. Rowe, Kenneth Clark, J. M. Ormond and H. E. Spence. These representatives participated in the discussions, and came away with the satisfaction of being assured that our Methodist seminaries are fully abreast of the times and thoroughly awake to all of the vital problems which concern the Church and its ministry. Altogether they regard it as one of the most valuable conferences of recent years.

Plans are already underway to call another similar conference to meet at about the same time and probably at the same place this year.

Dr. Ormond also attended the Annual Meeting of the Board of Missions and Church Extension at Buck Hill Falls, December 12-18.

Dr. Clark Receives Recognition

At the annual meeting in December of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, Professor Kenneth W. Clark was elected secretary of the society. This national organization was founded in 1880, and now numbers about 700 members. It holds annual sessions each December, and publishes the *Journal of Biblical Literature.*

Dr. Clark has been a member of the society since 1930, and has frequently presented papers at its meetings and published in its journal. As secretary, he succeeds Professor John W. Flight of Haverford College who served for fourteen years. He has recently returned from the Conference of Secretaries held by the American Council of Learned Societies, at the Westchester Country Club in Rye, N. Y. In attendance there were the secretaries of a score of constituent learned societies in the United States, and all attended as well the regular sessions of the American Council of Learned Societies.

In recognition and acknowledgment of this distinctive honor the Faculty requested that the above note be spread on the minutes of the meeting and published in the BULLETIN.

Dr. Petry on Leave of Absence

Dr. Ray C. Petry is on leave of absence for the second semester. He and Mrs. Petry will be located in or near Boston. Dr. Petry is doing research work in the Harvard Library.

Gift of Altar Brasses

By K. W. Clark

In the fall of 1945 the Chapel Committee of the Divinity Faculty, under the Chairmanship of Professor Clark, devised a simple rearrangement of the York Chapel furnishings in order to secure a divided chancel effect. The pulpit was moved from its original position in the center over to one side, and the altar table was placed against the burgundy hangings over the north window. During an experimental period, altar ornaments were borrowed consisting of unmatched cross and candelabra.

In December, 1945, Rev. George B. Ehlhardt, librarian of the Divinity School, expressed to the chairman of the committee his desire to present to York Chapel a permanent set of altar brasses, as a memorial to his grandmother who had been one of the first contributors to our Divinity School Loan Library in 1943. It required about a year to design and execute the brasses.

On November 18, 1946, the brasses were formally presented at a service of dedication in York Chapel. Professor Clark presided and read the scripture, after which Professor Cushman offered the prayer. Bishop Clare Purcell delivered the sermon, on the subject, "The Cross." The dedication followed the sermon, as the brasses were presented for the donor by Dr. Clark as follows: "In memory of Emma Hahn Brinkmann, who through this School has shared in its service to the Church and to its ministry, this memorial is presented to York Chapel, to be dedicated to the glory and praise of God." The gift was formally accepted for the University by President Flowers, who responded: "We accept this gift, and pledge to use it reverently, to the honor of the faithful and devoted life in whose memory it is here placed, and for the inspiration of all who worship here."

The brasses consist of a cross and matching candlesticks, designed by T. G. Neiland, cast in England, and imported by Black, Starr and Gorham. The gift also included a white linen cloth for the altar table. The engraving on the cross reads: In Memoriam. Emma Hahn Brinkmann. "Eternal rest grant unto her, O Lord, and may light perpetual shine upon her."

Student Activities

By John W. Carter
Secretary of Student Body

An extraordinary and unusually rich and varied series of events has characterized the Divinity School program of activities for the Fall Semester under the leadership of Wayne Coffin, our president, and the cooperation of the various committee chairmen.

Student initiative has been most dependable and the hearty cooperation of the faculty with the student council has been the secret of making our past semester the best yet. The monthly council meetings, composed of the student body officers, committee chairmen, and Dr. Franklin W. Young, Dean of Students, has been most successfully attended and helpful in planning and carrying out the various activities of the Divinity School program.

The Spiritual Life Committee, with J. Walton Spitzkeit as chairman, in cooperation with the faculty committee, has given "spiritual food" for our daily living as well as served to eliminate something of the classroom air that tends to perpetuate itself in the chapel services, it is, at the same time, retaining its intellectual respectability and aesthetic and devotional significance.

Special notice should be given to E. H. Nease, Jr., and his Divinity School Choir who give so much of their time to making the musical part of the York Chapel services of such a high standard both musically and devotionally.

The Social Committee, under the Chairmanship of E. H. Nease, Jr., has sold us on the idea that we should include a course in "the lighter moments" as well as one on "the sources." The first in the series of social events was the party held at the beginning of the semester in the Divinity School Social Room honoring the new students. A joint social was held with the School of Nursing, from which better relations have definitely been established between the Divinity Students and "The Angels of Mercy." The Social Committee provided the students, their dates and wives, with a cabin party at Turner's Cabin about the middle of the semester. The climax of the social events for the semester was the Student-Faculty Christmas party which was held in the Union Ballroom which was covered by *Life Magazine* photographer, Mr. Hoffmann, and feature writer, Miss Beck. The Christmas party ended with that rich quality of devotion in the Candlelight Service of Worship in York Chapel under the direction of Dr. Waldo Beach.

The Publicity Committee, led by William P. Combs, has rendered

a great service to the student body by publishing the *Divinity School Weekly News Bulletin,* which has been published each Monday, giving the events of the coming week and any important information concerning general student activities.

The Christian Social Action Committee under the leadership of George Rumbley, has given the various public institutions in and about Durham worship programs each Sunday morning. Those who have given so willingly of their time and talent are: Anna Ruth Scott, Robert Howard, Ray Hook, and Carlton Hirschi.

The Church Relations Committee, with Stacy L. Groscup as Chairman, is laying plans to include in its activities a project out at Camp Butner for a Sunday School and Church Service. This offers a challenge for service to the Divinity students.

As usual, the youth of Durham has received special attention by the Committee on Boy's Club Work, with I. Grant Dunlap as Chairman. The boy's clubs were guests at one of the football games in the fall. During the basketball season between the halves, the boy's clubs have played basketball which has brought many thrills to the spectators. The clubs with such active programs not only furnish recreation and inter-club sports competition but regular weekly meetings for worship and instruction.

The Athletic Committee with Henry F. Buckingham as Chairman ended the season by taking fourth place in the intramural league of touch football. There has been keen competition among the four teams in bowling.

The Christian World Mission Committee, led by Troy J. Barrett, has kept the students informed concerning the missionary activities. The committee arranged for a number of student interviews with Mr. M. O. Williams, personnel secretary of the Board of Missions of the Methodist Church during his visit to the campus. Troy's committee has made plans for the Divinity School to participate in the annual World Student Service Fund Drive in order that we may have the privilege of supporting the seminary at the University of Prague.

The Communion Committee with the cooperation of the student ministers has served in the two communion services held in the Duke University Church. Dr. Kenneth W. Clark, Chairman of the Communion Committee of the University Church and the Communion Committee chairman of the student body, John Carter, have worked out a plan of serving communion which is much more effective than the old plan in that it requires only 36 instead of 52 junior ministers and less time in serving.

The students have enjoyed a semester well balanced with spiritual, social, physical, educational, and recreational emphases; and they have been of service in many fields.

The Phillips Brooks Club

Some seventeeen years ago, a small group of ministers in Durham, under the leadership of Professor Frank S. Hickman, formed themselves into a little study group whose purpose was simply that of broadening the margin of their cultural interests. In the course of time this little group extended in numbers and influence to the point where from forty to sixty ministers were meeting regularly once a month, and their number included many who lived far beyond the boundaries of the City of Durham. Out of this movement grew what is now known as the Phillips Brooks Club.

During the recent war it became impossible for the out-of-town men to attend due to the impossibility of automobile travel. When this condition became apparent the Ministerial Association of Durham undertook to keep the Club alive. The result was that for a considerable time the Club functioned virtually as the program side of the Durham Ministerial Association. But with the close of the war and the resumption of automobile travel efforts were at once made to bring the Club back to its old standing. At the beginning of the present school year meetings were resumed on the Duke University Campus, following the practice of prewar years.

At present the program for our monthly meeting includes an informal luncheon group at noon in the Oak Room of the Duke University dining hall system. As many as care to come to the luncheon do so, and then remain for two hours of lectures beginning at 1:30 p.m. The lectures are held in York Chapel, which is the Chapel of Duke University Divinity School. The lectures are of wide range and the lecturers come not only from Duke University faculty, but also from many other sources. The Phillips Brooks Club is broadly interdenominational, with no set requirements for membership. Sometimes the lectures deal with theological problems, but often with subjects considerably removed from the theological field. The only criterion observed is that of broadening the cultural margin of the preacher's mind. All clergymen and church staff people are not only welcomed but urgently invited to identify themselves with the Phillips Brooks Club. This Club is Duke University's friendly bond of contact with those whose professional interests are bound up with the Christian ministry.

Loan Library to Issue Catalogue

By Geo. B. Ehlhardt

Within the next few weeks the Divinity School Loan Library will issue a complete catalogue of the books which are available to ministers and religious workers. The publication of the catalogue has been made possible through the generous support of Mr. and Mrs. James Paton, Jr., of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

The circulation of the Loan Library has grown to nearly 20,000 within the past year and has made it necessary for provision to be made for the registration of prospective borrowers. A registration form will be sent with each copy of the catalogue. As soon as the catalogue is off the press copies will be sent to all our Divinity School alumni and any minister who has requested a copy. Requests should be addressed to Rev. George B. Ehlhardt, Librarian of Duke Divinity School, Durham, North Carolina.

Book Reviews

Man and Society in the New Testament. Ernest F. Scott. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946. Pp. viii, 299. $2.75.

In the manner so characteristic of all his writing Dr. Scott has blended erudition with simplicity to produce this most recent book in a long series of works on the New Testament. The title by no means suggests the wide scope of New Testament concepts considered.

Dr. Scott, convinced that the individual is threatened by current tendencies toward collectivism, writes to show that the individual soul is the one reality in life and the supreme source of value. For the knowledge of this fact we are indebted to Jesus: "It was Jesus who first discovered that every man is a person, with a value and destiny of his own." Dr. Scott does not overlook the social aspects of the Christian message; however, his extreme emphasis on individualism leaves the impression that the social implications of Christianity are only secondary. He contends that the Christian religion is primarily personal. Jesus' teaching "is determined by his individualism" (p. 102); in a sense the social teaching of the New Testament is incidental (p. 198); the one reality is the individual soul (p. 295). The result is an unbalanced approach to the problem of man and society from the standpoint of New Testament thought.

The neglect of two concepts helps to explain this lack of balance: Christian love and the Kingdom of God. Jesus did not conceive of personality in the abstract; he thought of individuals in terms of the Kingdom as well as of the Kingdom in terms of individuals; each individual was potentially a member of the family of God and it was in this community relationship, established in love, that Jesus saw the value of individual souls and individual ethics. Dr. Scott fails to give sufficient attention to the inevitable polarity which exists between the individual soul and the community of God. In his treatment of Jesus he seems to overlook the fact that he is not dealing with a Greek from Athens but with a Jew from the "seed of David."

With a warning to the reader to beware Dr. Scott's surprising use of the term "individualism" in his exposition of the New Testament the reviewer recommends this book to ministers and teachers. It is stimulating and suggestive.

FRANKLIN W. YOUNG.

The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament. Norman H. Snaith. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946. 251 pp. $2.75.

We have here a book by an English Methodist theologian published in America by a Presbyterian publishing house. It is really a work in the field of Biblical theology as a whole, since the author concludes with a lengthy study of "The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament as they appear in the New Testament."

A word-study method is used. First, the root meanings in Hebrew of such attributes of God as Holiness, Righteousness, Salvation, Covenant-Love, Election-Love and Spirit are investigated. Then follows a study of the development of these terms and ideas in the course of the religious history of Israel. Holiness at first, thinks the author, denoted the separateness from the merely human of any deity. Then it came to denote something unique to Yahweh. The prophets made this uniqueness of Yahweh consist largely in righteousness. This righteousness is something more than mere ethics or justice. Yahweh went beyond ethics and justice to vouchsafe Salvation to his people. He continued his steadfast Covenant-Love, even though the people had broken the covenant. Moreover, he manifested an Election-Love that went beyond any covenant obligation. He infused man with the Spirit of the Lord, enabling man to do what man was unable to do otherwise.

In the section on the New Testament, our author makes a strong plea for the unity of the Testaments. He believes that New Testament words such as *Dikaiosune* (righteousness) should be interpreted according to Hebrew and not Greek modes of thought. Man is not righteous, nor made righteous even by God, but man is saved by the "over-plus" of God's Election-Love. Greek thought starts with the good in man. Real Hebrao-Christian religion starts with the redeeming love of God. There has been too much humanistic Greek philosophy in Christian theology. We must get back to the whole Bible. That means interpreting the New Testament against the background of the Old, not against the background of pagan thought and culture.

Mr. Snaith undoubtedly has given us a challenging and stimulating little book. The reviewer believes that he is on the right road, but may have gone a little too far. The Hebraic background of Christianity is surely more important than the Greek; and yet the Greek element cannot be altogether denied. Perhaps the author did not mean to go so far, but his conclusion sounds a bit as though he did.

W. F. Stinespring.

Successful Letters for Churches. Stewart Harral. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. 247 pp. $2.00.

In this book alert ministers will find valuable suggestions for expanding their own personal influence in the parish and for strengthening weak spots in church administration. The author makes it clear that letters are never to be regarded as substitutes for the personal ministry of the pastor. The value of a letter will depend upon both how and why it is written. If written without justifiable reason and in improper form it may become harmful rather than helpful. But one which is thoughtfully planned and written for a specific, worthy purpose, and carefully worded to convey accurate meaning, is an able and favorable representative of the entire organization.

Although Dr. Harral's book should be of interest to all ministers who have pastoral and parish administrative responsibilities, it has especial significance for the minister who serves a city church with a large membership even though he may have a selected and efficient staff of workers to assist him. It will have similar significance for the rural minister whose several local churches are situated some distance from each other, whose pastoral duties are numerous, and his responsibilities of supervision of the organizations are heavy.

J. M. O.

A Guide for Bible Readers. Edited by Harris Franklin Rall. New York-Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. 60c each.

The Books of the Law (Pentateuch). Walter G. Williams, 1945.
The Prophets (Isa. to Mal., excluding Dan.). William G. Chanter, 1946.
Poetry and Wisdom (Job to Eccl.). Elmer A. Leslie, 1945.

The Synoptic Gospels. Montgomery J. Shroyer, 1945.
The Fourth Gospel and the Later Epistles. John Knox, 1945.
The Acts and Apocalyptic Literature (Acts, Rev., Dan.). Edward P. Blair, 1946.

This is a series of simple and popular commentaries to cover the more important parts of the Old and New Testaments. They will be useful to training schools, Bible classes, and Conference courses of study for ministers. Each Volume contains about one hundred reading assignments in the Bible itself, followed by appropriate comments, simple exegesis and sometimes stimulating questions. There are also assignments of written work. These Guides are primarily

intended for ministers, but they will be useful to laymen also. A thoroughly modern point of view is taken, although hairsplitting critical problems are avoided. At the price they are a good buy for Bible readers who do not wish to enter into the more complex problems. Two more volumes will appear to complete the set: *The Books of History* (Josh. to Esth.) by John H. Hicks and *The Letters of Paul* by Albert E. Barnett.

W. F. Stinespring.
F. W. Young.

Christian Ethics and Social Policy. John C. Bennett. New York: Scribner's, 1946. 124 pp. $2.00.

This is a good book, and an important one in the development of contemporary Christian ethics. Professor Bennett of Union is one of the most thoughtful of those in the liberal tradition who have been taking sober account of the strictures liberalism has been lately undergoing. This book, showing even more than his earlier ones the influence of Reinhold Niebuhr, presents the point-of-view of a reconstructed liberalism. This is much more than merely the older liberalism uttered in a lowered tone of voice, or a self-defensive liberalism covering a retreat. Rather it is a positive liberalism corrected, though not converted by, neo-orthodoxy. It addresses itself significantly to Item No. 1 on the present addenda of Christian theology and ethics: the rapprochement between the deepest theological insights of the Barth-Brunner school with the social passion and the yearning for concrete application of the liberal school. The book is drawn up in broad strokes, and at many points only suggestive of new leads to follow, but the leads are enticing ones.

Bennett examines, with commendably little partisan bias, the varieties of Christian social strategies: (1) that of Catholicism, with its "two-story" and natural law philosophy, (2) withdrawal, represented by sectarianism of Quakers and Mennonites, (3) that of identification of Christianity with particular social programs, "the constant temptation of liberal Protestantism," and (4) the "double standard" strategy, sometimes typical of Lutheranism, which draws the line between private and public morality.

Out of his criticism of the ethical weakness of these various strategies, Bennett suggests the axioms of a fifth Christian social strategy which he espouses. This would be a view "which emphasizes the relevance together with the transcendence of Christian ethic and which takes account of the universality and persistence of sin and the elements of technical autonomy in social policies" (p. 59). By this the pitfalls of irresponsibility, sentimentality, and moral

provincialism are voided. Living by this strategy, "The Christian should be controlled by Christian faith and ethics in the motives that prompt him to make his decision." Self-Criticism would be the ethical product of Christian humility, and Christian love the guide as well as the critic of his policies. The Christian ethic provides "the goals which represent the purpose of God in our times," as the "middle axioms" between abstract norms and specific immediate policy. And in personal love the Christian can redeem and transcend all the impersonal relationships to which modern flesh is heir. The book concludes with a chapter on the ethical role of the church, and a note on Christian ethics and natural law, wherein Bennett expresses a careful disavowal of Barth.

The argument of the book, thus given in skeleton form, cannot do justice to the apt illustrations from modern problems of economics, race, and politics with which Bennett convincingly supports his contentions. There are gaps and thin points in the book, to be sure: Bennett avoids a question very germane to this whole problem of reconstructing liberalism, namely, the Christian philosophy of history and the motivation for social strategy and change. The older liberalism had its hearty answer to that question: the Kingdom of God on earth. One wonders what philosophy of the Kingdom Bennett's social strategy is posited on. One wonders too how successfully certain dialectical axioms ("the transcendence as well as the relevance" of Christian ethics) would work out at the hands of an undialectical thinker like Bennett, if further explicated.

These reservations do not detract from the worth of a book important in its timeliness, sobriety, ethical acumen, and penetrating judgments on the contemporary scene.

Waldo Beach.

The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament. H. H. Rowley. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946. Pp. 320. $3.00.

Professor Rowley defines the re-discovery of which he writes as "a return to religious values, but without depreciation of all the literary, historical and archeological work of the past century and more. It is rather to values which have become clearer in the light of all that study." With this plan in mind he endeavors to indicate what religious meaning the Old Testament has for us today. One of his most valuable chapters is "Archeology and the Bible," a remarkably complete summary of recent important archeological discoveries. The significant Ras Shamara literature is suggestive of the material considered.

With an approach that refreshes, Professor Rowley reconsiders

many of the ideas of the Old Testament such as monotheism, election, covenant, revelation, the law and worship. All of these he endeavors to understand in the light of both the Old and New Testament which for him are "parts of a single whole, as the several acts of a drama belong together." This book will assist the reader in the reorientation of his mind to Biblical ideas made necessary by the increasing knowledge of recent centuries. It is the work of a man whose critical faculties of scholarship have served to deepen both his understanding of, and faith in, the basic religious insights of the Bible.

FRANKLIN W. YOUNG.

Problems in Religion and Life. Anton J. Boisen. New York-Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1946. 159 pp. $1.50.

This book is written specifically as a manual for the use of pastors, and it must be judged as such. It has three general divisions, each with several chapters.

The first division, called "Preliminary Studies" is concerned with the orientation of the individual to his home and to his community. The second, "Types of Maladjustment," ranges over a wide field of physical, social, and mental abnormalities. The third, "General Problems," mixes studies of general principles with varieties of personal religious development. It could well be divided into two general sections along these lines.

This manual is certainly comprehensive—much too comprehensive. It would do very well for a general reference guide to the minister who wishes to go to it for direction in reading on this or that particular problem. But it would be a difficult book to use as a class guide. It covers enough problems and reading references for a series of groupings of studies in the field of pastoral care and counseling.

The book has real value as a reference guide. But it lacks a good deal as a unified approach to pastoral problems.

FRANK S. HICKMAN.