



The
Seminary
Journal

of the
Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary
in Virginia

VOLUME II

MARCH 1956

NUMBER 3

Published four times a year in October, December, March and July by the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary in Virginia at Alexandria, Virginia.

Entered as Second Class Matter September 20, 1954 at the Post Office at Alexandria, Virginia, under Act of August 24, 1912.

E. Felix Kloman, Editor

With the Alumni

The End of the "Catholic" Era?

The Seminary and the World

Community

Jazz and Anglicanism

The Markan and Johannine Attitude Toward Miracle

Book Reviews

WITH THE ALUMNI

FREDERIC F. BUSH, JR. (V.T.S. '36)

President, Alumni Association

Only favorable comments have been heard with regard to the change in time and place of the annual meeting of the Alumni Association which was tried for the first time last June. This does not mean that the new way has no shortcomings, but at least there was not the same pressure of time to make us hurry the meeting, and certainly the attendance was satisfactory. In any event, the same plan will be followed again this year. The annual meeting will be held in the assembly room of Sparrow Hall *after* the luncheon get-together at the refectory.

The Executive Committee is trying hard to come up with a program for the alumni which will be of such vital interest and importance that all will want to share in it. A special committee, headed by Hugh C. White, has proposed a plan for a series of regional meetings next year in various parts of the country, each of which will be scheduled to last for 48 hours. A member of the faculty would be present to provide a part of the leadership.

As envisioned, these meetings will be more than nostalgic gatherings. Rather, they should bring together for common benefit the best thinking of our Seminary faculty and the real-life situations of the Alumni for the serious purpose of rediscovering our vocation as priests. If the plan is carried out, it is hoped that the cumulative results of the meetings will be published in book form.

We expect to present the plan to you in detail at the June meeting. In order to do so, the Executive Committee will itself have a 48-hour meeting early in April. We hope to have an answer for your every question that such a program is bound to bring forth.

By the time you receive this, you will have heard from the treasurer of the Association, Gary K. Price, asking for your dues for the current year. At the meeting last June, the amount of the annual dues was raised from \$1.00 to \$2.00. No doubt there will be some weeping and wailing, to say nothing of gnashing of teeth! This one dollar increase represents a compromise, however, because the original proposal was that the dues be increased to \$3.00. We would like to think that all of you will pay up without complaint because without increased income to the Association, it will be impossible to finance some of the projects contemplated.

On a personal note, I would like to say that we are sorry to learn that Dean Kloman has resigned the deanship effective at the end of this academic year. We have seldom seen a man undertake a difficult job with such vigor or pursue it so ably. And he has been a constant help to us who have been working with the Alumni Association. We are glad he will be near-by in Washington, and pray that God will continue to bless him and his work.

“THE END OF THE ‘CATHOLIC’ ERA?”

An Address to the Faculty and Students at V.T.S. on January 4, 1956

WILLIAM A. CLEBSCH (V.T.S. '46)

Professor of Church History, Episcopal Seminary of the Southwest

The Christmas and Epiphany seasons commemorate the Christian fulfillment of the hope of humankind in its *pagan* dimension; they proclaim the universal manifestation of the saving God to His Creation. Jesus Christ, who is that fulfillment, is indeed the same yesterday, today and forever, and nevertheless “time makes ancient good uncouth” and “new occasions teach new duties.” Part of the Christian enterprise at least is to attempt to apply the old and fairly familiar to the new and dimly seen situations of our time and of the days that lie ahead of us.

Now, when I try to speak of your future ministry and the problems which it will face in one particular, you are quite right in your suspicions of fortune-tellers. And you should be even more and not less suspicious when a fortune-teller is one who pretends to wear the garb of Herodotus and Polybius, Eusebius and Crocius, Vico and VonRanke. Certainly by Greek logic a historian has got no business whatsoever fooling with the future; but somehow by Christian Providence he must try to be prophetic. He must try to discern the signs of the times, and see how God's gifts inform the coming day.

Professor Tillich of Harvard has rather persuasively argued that we are at the end of the Protestant Era. I grant his contention, but wish now to couple with it my own contention that you begin your ministry at a time when *at least with respect to the universal mission of the Church* and the Church's way of performing that mission, you stand at the end of the “catholic” era. I first must persuade you that the universal mission of the Church will be a key concern of your ministry and of your Church during that ministry. If that be true, then I think it of immense importance for you to see that the typically “catholic” notion of the growth of the church by cell-division, by cultural extension, by cultic assimilation, or whatever other horizontal means you may want to think of, is not for this day; it is important to see that the typically “catholic” ecclesiastical universalism of which we are inheritors belongs in the dead-letter box of the Twentieth Century; it is important to see that while our *redemption under God is indeed always catholic*, yet it is in our day and the days to come to be manifested in and to be witnessed to by peculiarly “un-catholic” ecclesiastical movements.

I.

Now I admit that I have not made a very persuasive beginning. Episcopalians are the last to want to hear of the end of any kind of Catholic Era. But Episcopalians also have, I think, quite unexpectedly come to the decision that the world wide mission of the Church will be perhaps the major new emphasis of your ministry in this Church during the next generation. Of this I think there are several and various indications.

First, and by no means least, I believe that Post-World War II America can no longer escape international responsibility. I know that a good deal of debate continues in our day on the issue of inter-nationalism. But I submit to you that the debate has changed its terms—that no

longer is the question "whether" but "where." There are plenty who will debate whether we should exercise our responsibility in Western Europe or restrict our efforts to the Island of Formosa. But that few seriously challenge the fact that we have an international responsibility is something rather new for our nation, and insofar as our nation has a culture, for our culture. The question of international responsibility in our day is not a question of "if" but a question of "how." Now it is hard to say just when the tide turned from isolationism to internationalism, and it is hard to prove that the tide has really turned. My own analysis is that a man from Missouri did it when he led these United States into a permanent foreign entangling alliance in the year 1947. And that first action of Mr. Truman's in allying us with the organization of American States was quickly followed by other permanent ones.

Well, at least it took two World Wars to teach us the lesson of international responsibility. But if I am right here, it is an important turn of events, for American Christianity grew up in a culture which was preoccupied with filling up its own boundaries, and a lot of that preoccupation rubbed off on the American Churches. America has had the *lebensraum* problem in reverse gear all through its history. And this was not the only factor in our until lately much vaunted isolationism. Foreign missions in such an atmosphere-world-wide activity of the Church — indeed a universal conception of the Christian faith as such — was sort of an extra. It was like mayonnaise — you might want it on your salad, you might not. Now the boundaries are full and the culture presses beyond those boundaries. The downward drag of the culture on the American Churches against their representation of the universal mission of Christianity is rapidly disappearing. As you will be reminded whenever you set foot in the heart-land, the Episcopal Church was always late in pressing towards the boundaries, and it certainly would be anticipated that it would be slow to leave that still unfinished work for another. It has run on a delayed schedule of ecclesiastical expansion, which would seem very much against our going along with the culture and stepping out toward a stronger emphasis on our universal mission.

Yet, in spite of all that, the most conservative political body ever assembled under the sun, the General Convention, behind the scenes in Honolulu did strange things. It is familiar to you but it bears repeating. It determined that we as a Church would undertake the evangelization of all of Latin America. We determined that we would assume permanent responsibility for our Anglican work in Eastern Asia, and that we would undertake new responsibility in Southeast Asia. We have purposed to establish work which would keep up with the rapidly moving Chinese dispersion all over the world. And as though that were not enough, we then said to our sister Anglican churches that we would provide the financial backing of other Anglican enterprises when they badly needed it. That's a startling development, and it is a second good reason for assuming that your ministry will be richly colored by the universal mission of the church.

I think there is yet another reason which I might mention briefly. You live in a day when there is a greatly heightened consciousness of Anglican denominationalism. Not everybody is happy over it, but

"Anglican" was a term virtually unknown 100 years ago. But it is a term which you will use much more frequently than the generation ahead of you has used it. I think that that argues toward a much greater emphasis upon the world-wideness of the work that we do.

New emphasis on the old theme of the universal mission of the Church comes now at a time when the peoples of the world are unreceptive to and in rebellion against the traditional pattern of western ecclesiastical growth, which I choose to call, I think accurately, the 'catholic' pattern of ecclesiastical growth. The 'catholic' Church in western Christendom has always without exception conceived of the universality of Christianity in terms of an institution which would some day horizontally spread out so that it would cover the whole globe. And this has been the main content of the word "universal" in the thinking of western Christendom whether it was catholic or protestant in its theology and worship. It has been the assumption of western catholic Christendom that the New Israel is a nation just like the Old Israel, and that if you want to get in it, you get in it by circumcision. You get in it by joining the nation. I don't mean to question at all the profundity of the idea that every Christian somehow takes Abraham on as a father, but I do mean to question the corollary assumption that every Christian must take on the Archbishop of Canterbury as uncle. The Roman Catholic Church in pressing forward this conception of universality adheres to a universal language. We break with them there and substitute conformity to an Elizabethan liturgy. To see the Church as a nation which one joins in order to be and become a Christian, and say that here is the universality of the Christian faith has been the pattern of 'catholic' Christianity in the west. The pattern is at least as old as Charlemagne's "conversion of the Saxons." As somebody put it recently he gave them a perfectly free choice whether to be live Catholics or dead pagans, and they were promptly converted.

The pattern was unchallenged and unbroken by Medieval papalism, by the Renaissance, by the Reformation, by the Counter-Reformation, nor was it really challenged and broken by the Revolutionary spirit of 1789. It assumes that the universality of Christianity comes to expression by a horizontal expansion of an ecclesiastical organization by means of conquest or colonization or education or imperialism, or affiliation. And it appears in strange garb in various places. The assumption appeared in the habit and cowl of the monk, St. Augustine, in his dream of a universal nunnery for all mankind. It appeared under the Papal tiara in Innocent III's hope of a feudal overlordship by himself, God's vassal, over every throne known to man. It appeared in the doctor's gown of a Melancthon dreaming of listening to every creature chant the Augsburg Confession. Perhaps it even has worn the riding clothes of John Wesley envisioning every heart as strangely warmed as his. Certainly it has appeared in business suit (with diamond stick-pin) of the Nineteenth Century entrepreneur selling Mother Hubbards to Melanesians. And maybe we have seen it close at home in the cope and mitre vision of everybody affirming Apostolic Succession. It is my studied judgment, though many disagree at this point, that its latest dress among us is the underdrawers of liberal humanism, topped by an Anglican double-breasted cassock of the best worsted, dreaming of an ever increasing

number of people being drawn into a massive psychologically hygenic relationship, and filling out Post-Meeting Reaction slips.

But in whatever dress the strange phenomenon of finding your universality through institutional growth may appear, I believe it to be a vain hope for our day, and in the last analysis ill-founded theologically. You will not find the universality of Christian redemption to be attained by any such process. If anything is an obvious lesson to be learned from the contemporary upsurge of nationalism and ethnicism among Asian and African peoples, it is that any Christian message of cultural subjugation is the publishing of Bad Tidings which will be rejected before they have a hearing. However well the pattern may have served in the past to spread ecclesiastical organizations, it holds little or no relevance today, and calls for a deep and strenuous re-thinking of our universal mission.

II.

I think that the beginning of a Twentieth Century understanding of the universal mission of the Church rests first and foremost upon some gigantic act of forgetting so many of the ingredients that have been ground into our inherited doctrine of the Church, a shoving aside of, and a conscious attempt to think apart from, the pre-suppositions of religious uniformity and institutional loyalty. And secondly, I think that that task calls for a picturing of the Church as God's new creation unlike anything in the old creation, be it family, or clan, or tribe, or nation, or even kingdom.

I believe we have a charge to reconsider ourselves as the folk of God, remembering that we are a peculiar people which in time past was no people. We are not simply a plus stuck onto some prior creation. We are a new creation, fresh and spanking new from the Creator of the universe, a new creation, unlike anything in the old. God has done over creation and made it new. He has a second time created His world in Christ Jesus, and has poured out His Spirit on all flesh, on every creature, and every creature regardless of any ecclesiastical allegiance is entitled to be a beneficiary of that grace. And because God has made things over again every kindred has its obligation to seek its own institutional and cultural response to that redemption, indeed in the unity of faith, the bond of peace, and the righteousness of life, but not in a number of other ecclesiastical or cultural trappings.

Now it is profoundly true, I think, that God in his wisdom uses men, and uses things, and uses their relationships in His work of redemption. But that statement can't stand by itself. It must be pushed to its last extreme before its truth begins to stick. God uses man in his work of redeeming other men. It is because every natural creature bears its witness to God that bread and wine and water bear their central and profound witness to our redemption. And also it is because God is not left without a witness anywhere among the sons of men that we can dare to think of our Christian relationships as responses to His grace. But you cannot Christianly put that "relationship theology" of the Church, ministry, and sacraments in reverse without stripping gears. To say that objects carry divine grace only when they rub against a consecrated host is to bow before a graven image. And similarly, to say that people become redeemed only when they get into fellowship with some other people who are previously redeemed, is to manufacture a collection of new christs, whether they be priests, prelates, popes or parish-life-conferees.

The point is that God has redeemed mankind, and they don't need redeeming again. Now it is tremendously important to distinguish between those who, as the old evangelicals put it, "grasp the covenant" with their minds and wills, and those who don't grasp the covenant. But all that has nothing to do with the covenant itself. It is there for all, always. The distinction between such people is more a judgment upon the faint witness of those who have grasped the covenant, than it is a condemnation of those sons by adoption whose sonship is yet unbeknownst to them.

Whatever the Church may affirm of herself she also must affirm in principle of mankind; all mankind, not just some mankind. She possesses no benefit from God which is not also the rightful inheritance of every man. St. Paul never implied that a secret tunnel had been cut through the middle wall of partition through which some may pass and others may be dragged. The middle wall of partition is broken down, it is not there any more.

Now a grateful response to and rehearsal of the wonderful works of God is no small matter. But that the inheritance proffered to all of us is received by few means most of all that the few have received it only in fragments. It does not mean that the inheritance is not proffered to all. You have only in your ministry to witness to the great fact that the inheritance does belong to all equally and fully. And if you can't witness to that, then God help you because you have nothing to say to your fellow-man other than the boring business of passing the time of day. The good and universal news which you tell a technically "non-Christian" man is that in Christ he already stands redeemed; and when he responds in gratitude you baptize him into the fellowship of the grateful; but the form and content of his Christian life is to be found in the perplexities of his culture, perhaps in the continuity with church life elsewhere, but more probably also in sharp and corrective discontinuity with Church life elsewhere.

III.

Now it is perfectly clear, I assume, that the "catholic" era has spread ecclesiastical allegiance far and wide in this world, and, for that, I for one thank God. Within Christendom, I doubt if one can easily reverse the trend—we will probably long go on passing to our children the cultic and the intellectual content of Christianity, tempering it with the prayer that God may then find it good to fire their awareness of their own salvation. I think that that pattern augurs long continuation of ecclesiastical divisiveness and rivalry and disunity in western Christendom. I think that it has so much steam up that as far as the Church at home is concerned there will for a long time to come continue to be a kind of reservoir of nominal and external ecclesiastical loyalty, only faintly inspired by abiding faith and fervent religion. Within the inherited pattern we do the best that we can. But in the uttermost part of the earth the situation is different. I think that the entire trend and shift in the world that I have been talking about can be summarized very easily in a story which I get from a missionary who says: "My father was a foreign missionary because Chinese were foreign to him. I was a foreign missionary because I was foreign to the Chinese." The pattern

of institutional, nominal, external, ecclesiastical allegiance simply cannot come into being because it smacks of cultural subjugation at every point. As we are a part of God's universal people, so a change in the situation of God's other people brings a change to our own. And when we are able to confront mankind abroad as our fellow-redeemed in Christ, hoping and laboring for them to find their own distinctive external response to that redemption, then a peculiar thing happens, and we have already had a sample of it in the influence of the Church of South India. Then their new found witness begins to enrich, correct, judge and deflect our own Church life. The hope of a renewed Christianity within Christendom, the hope of a fervent faith, at this "end of the 'catholic' era" hangs, I believe, in no small part upon our heralding to all mankind their already accomplished redemption, and upon our placing ourselves and our external ecclesiastical forms under the judgment of God as it becomes known in the marvelous variety with which that redemption will disclose itself in the cultures of the world.

THE SEMINARY AND THE WORLD

GEORGE N. HUNT (V.T.S. '56)

The Virginia Theological Seminary at Alexandria is probably no more than representative of all of our seminaries in the wide divergence of back-grounds which her students bring with them when they enter her traditional ivy covered buildings to begin their theological studies. However, she stands out with her traditionally high percentage of men who go into the Foreign or Domestic Mission of the Church. In her long history, she has sent over 200 men into the Foreign Mission Fields alone. Likewise, the number of men who come to "the seminary" to study under the auspices of Foreign or Domestic Missionary Districts is proportionately high among the seminaries of the Episcopal Church. Thus it is that the Missionary Zeal and Spirit of the Virginia Theological Seminary is known throughout the world by the witness of the men who give their lives that they may "go into all the world and preach the Gospel."

This year there are 10 men studying at Virginia either from foreign countries and Dioceses, or under their auspices, and here we present for our readers a brief picture of what led them to the Seminary and what their plans for the future are.

James Yashiro is a native of Kobe, Japan, and came to this country several years ago to study at Kenyon College in Gambier, Ohio. He first became interested in studying at Virginia when he came under the influence of several of the graduates of this Seminary who are now serving our Lord in the Church in Japan. He is 24 years old and is not married. Jim says that he is "planning to go home after graduation to work in the rural areas of the Diocese of Kobe, since most of the church activities are centered in the highly urban areas." He is now a first-year student at the Seminary.

Roger Greene was originally a resident of Washington, D. C., but has lived in the Panama Canal Zone for the last forty-two of his 57 years. He was ordained to the Diaconate last year and is now studying at

Virginia prior to his returning to the Canal Zone next June for Ordination to the Priesthood. He was treasurer of the Missionary District before receiving a call to the ministry. His "wife is an Episcopal Missionary currently serving as the Director of Christian Education for our Missionary District." Roger does not know yet what type of work he will be called upon by his Bishop to do when he returns, but he has expressed the hope that he and his wife can work together as a team, doing all that they can to help make the Department of Christian Education more effective in their District.

Carl Krohn-Hansen is a 28 year old student from Bodo, Norway, and a member of the Lutheran State Church of Norway. He has already completed seven years of the theological training at the University of Oslo, during which he was an active member of the Student Christian Movement (he was modest in admitting that he served as president of this group for one semester). Through Carl's Ecumenical interests he applied for a scholarship through the World Council of Churches to come to the United States and do graduate study in Pastoral Theology. He says that "this seminary's interest in foreign missions and its high standards in the field of Pastoral Theology made it natural" for him to come here to study. When he finishes his work here he anticipates doing Youth Work in Bodo, and perhaps serving as a field secretary in Oslo for the S.C.M.

Twenty-four year old Allen Stuhl is originally from St. Louis, Mo., but now makes his "home" in the Panama Canal Zone. He first became interested in the seminary and its foreign mission work while on duty with the Army in the Canal Zone. He was active in the work of the Church while there and found it easy to see the tremendous needs of the people which an undermanned church is trying to meet. It was there that he met his charming wife, Ruth. Allen is unsure of the plans his Bishop will have for him when he returns, but he and Ruth are anxious to get back into this vital missionary area of the Church which needs them desperately.

After doing two years of volunteer work under the Rt. Rev. Harry Kennedy of Honolulu, Richard (Dick) Aiken's interest in the work of the Church in the South Pacific led him to come back to the United States and study for Holy Orders at the Virginia Seminary. Dick is 26 and was married last fall to Carole Chapin of Springfield, Mass. Before going to Honolulu he lived in West Hartford, Conn., and attended Trinity College. While a volunteer in the missionary district, Dick worked in small missions, and summer camps; in youth and school work. When he and Carole return to the Pacific in June, there is a possibility that he may be doing the same type of work he did there as a volunteer, but he may be sent to some outlying island to do pioneer work for the church there.

Also studying at the Seminary from the Missionary District of Honolulu is George Hayashi, a 32 year old Japanese-American who was reared and educated in Japan. He now makes his home in Chicago. Being called by God into the ministry of His Church, George expects to go to Okinawa when he graduates from the Seminary.

Stephen Trapnell, 25, of Bristol, England, having completed two years of his theological training at Ridley Hall Theological College, Cam-

bridge, heard of a scholarship offered for study abroad by the World Council of Churches. He was granted this scholarship and came to this Seminary. After receiving his degree here at the Seminary, he plans to return to England to complete his studies at Cambridge. Then he plans to be ordained by the Church of England, and to work in England in the Parish Ministry. On being asked the purpose of his study abroad, Steve said, "The purpose of my scholarship is to benefit the Church of England as a whole rather than further my own education; I shall return home with many new means and methods by which the Gospel may be brought to bear upon the lives of those to whom I minister."

Sumio Takatsu, a 28 year old Japanese citizen, migrated with his family at the age of five to Sao Paulo, Brazil. He graduated from the Virginia Theological Seminary last spring, and is now a candidate for the degree of S. T. M. here. He was ordained to the Diaconate just a few weeks ago in the Seminary Chapel by Bishop Melcher of Brazil. He plans to become a citizen of Brazil and work in the Missionary District of Central Brazil. After spending several years in the parish ministry, he would like to teach in a seminary there.

Robert Tsu is a native of Peiping, China, and is studying under the auspices of the Diocese of California. Since Bob himself is one of those stranded students in this country who do not wish to return to Communist China, his interests naturally gravitate toward serving these students and the heavy Chinese population in the coastal cities of California. (Bob's father was a Bishop of the Church in China until he was exiled to this country several years ago when the Communists overran his country and forced him to leave.) Bob is 28 years old, and is in his second year of study at the Seminary.

Twenty-nine year old Joshua Iida is just recently a convert to Christianity. His home is Utsunomiya, Japan, and he is married and has two children. He became a Christian while teaching English at Hokiado University in Japan where he made the friendship of William D. Eddy (a graduate of V.T.S.) who is currently serving the Church of Japan as Chaplain to the Episcopal students at the University. Joshua's prime interest is to go back to Japan and do work in the schools there, because he feels that this is the best opportunity for the Christian Church to make its approach to the peoples of Japan.

This is just a brief sketch of the foreign students now studying at the Virginia Seminary of OUR Church. We hope that this may give you some idea of the many and varied ways that all of the seminaries of the Episcopal Church in the United States seek to serve the world-wide Church.

COMMUNITY

STEPHEN H. TRAPNELL (V.T.S. '56)

Ecumenical Exchange Student from England

Introduction.

It would be well nigh impossible to explain in detail exactly how a year in the United States has been of profit to me. Hardly a day has gone by without my gaining a deeper understanding into some aspect of life. I have been greatly impressed by many things, but in one field especially I have been fascinated in making the comparison between what exists at home, and what I find over here. Therefore, instead of naming some of the many areas in which I have acquired something of profit to the Church of England, I shall dwell upon just one issue: the concept of Community.

Coming to the United States has taught me much about England, as I view my homeland from an objective standpoint, but at the same time, I have had the privilege of observing some characteristics of American Society which might be missed by one who spent his life in the context of that Community. It is, perhaps, in the concept of Community that England and the United States differ most, and an understanding of these basic differences is vital for a full appreciation of these two countries.

Community and the State.

When I arrived in America, I was impressed immediately by the colossal size of the country: most uninformed Englishmen think of the United States as being just a little bigger than England; San Francisco being little more than a day's drive from New York (which of course is the home of the President!), while the individual States are to America, what counties are to England. England is a country which is governed on a national scale and as a single unit, the laws being equally binding the country over, and the daily newspapers having a national circulation. An Englishman coming to America naturally takes it for granted that the same conditions will prevail in the United States.

I was most surprised to discover the large measure of individuality that exists on the federal level, despite the fact that it is the *United States*; this is apparent both in political and legislative affairs. Never before had I realized the truth of the phrase "The United States"; each State guarding its individual particularity, though belonging to the larger Community. This paper will be a study in the concept of Community, with especial reference to the apparent contradiction that exists between Community and Individuality.

The great strength of the Community known as the United States, is the freedom that is given each member State to be distinctively individualistic: this is an example of Community and Individuality existing side by side, a quality which is unfortunately not manifested on the level of family and social relationships.

Individuality, like Personality, is that which makes us distinctively personal, and distinguishes one individual from another. On the other hand, Individuality only grows and develops in relationship to other individuals, namely in the context of Community.

A Community, in its turn, is composed of Individuals in relationship to each other, and thus the supreme form of Community is that which allows for the greatest individuality. All communities start because a group of individuals come together because they share some common interest or experience and it is this interest which causes some to be included and other to be excluded: in that some are left on the outside, a community is by nature exclusive, and nearly always begins with an Exodus.

Therefore, a tension exists in every community between the development of individuality, and the conformity to the interests of the Community. The contradiction that exists is not between Individuality and Community, therefore, but between Individuality and Conformity: pure conformity is the denial of all individuality and personality; pure individuality is the denial of all Community, and thus, all conformity. Where Community is eliminated, the Individual becomes stunted and warped; where individuality is non-existent, the community resorts to pure conformity. There has to be some conformity in order to have a community, but the supreme form of Community is that which makes room for the greatest individuality.

In application of this principle, David Riesman, in his book, "The Lonely Crowd," observes that America is becoming what he calls "Other-directed," as opposed to his other two categories, "Inner-directed" and "Tradition-directed."

To be "Other-directed" means to conform to the interests and dictates of the Community: it is the emphasis on Conformity at the expense of Individuality. Because of the great distances involved, the "rugged individualism" of the early frontier-men such as Daniel Boone, is dying out in America, and the present mobile society is based on the conforming of the individual to the community which he chooses for himself. This fact struck me as I came to live in the United States, since England generally comes under the other two categories of Riesman; namely, "Inner-directed," and "Tradition-directed."

This emphasis on Conformity within the Community is manifested in every walk of life, political, social and economic. This fact is to be seen especially in the whole realm of mass production, where the purpose is to conform to a given standard, rather than specialize on each individual item. For instance, every car that comes off the assembly line in Detroit, is identical to the one which precedes it, but for color and special appointments. The emphasis on specialization is another aspect of the same truth: each worker is like a single cog on the wheel of a huge and complex machine, thereby losing his individuality. Where the emphasis is on mass production, that is to say, the production of the greatest number of items, at the minimum cost and the maximum efficiency, you will find the tendency to conformity exists, because of the denial of individuality. Super markets, huge chain stores, large department stores, powerful manufacturing combines, and giant housing estates are further examples of this tendency to do everything on the biggest scale possible.

Even in the field of education and medicine the same characteristics of mass production exist: larger and better equipped hospitals and schools are being built where more and more people can be trained for

their work in life: public relations officers at schools teach boys and girls how to fit into their community as responsible citizens, and every effort is made to help young folk adjust to their community, through conformity; even the process of grading by age, and 'required assignments' are symptomatic of mass production—each boy is told what to read and then examined on the reading, so that the results of the examination are more an indication of a good memory than of original thought. Where the emphasis is on mass production instead of individual particularism; on quantity rather than on quality; on conformity rather than individuality within the Community—you will find that the pace of life gets faster and faster till it becomes a race to produce more and more, and the individual gets lost in the huge machine of Community.

This emphasis in the United States, on Conformity does not mean that all individuality is denied the member of the community; it is at the moment just an "emphasis" or "tendency" toward this end: in every community there is always *some* individuality because it is composed of individuals, just as there is always some conformity because it is a community: to speak of individuality or conformity as mutually exclusive is to describe the hypothetical.

In England, however, the predominant emphasis on Individuality is leading to the denial of all Conformity, and thus even Community itself. England is what Riesman would call, "tradition-directed" and "Inner-directed": that is to say, individuals are directed in some cases according to tradition, and in others, to use Riesman's analogy, it is as if a gyroscope were set in motion within the individual, so that no outside force has any bearing upon the direction of his life.

This form of individualism perhaps is best seen in the context of the family relationship such as exists in England. Because of the lack of mobility in England, there is still a strong family tie: many people live in the same town all their life, and never travel more than thirty miles away from home. In most cases, therefore, the family is the basis of Community for the Englishman: this tradition-directed community is composed of all age groups, blood relationship being the bond of community. The delimitation of the Family-Community should be considered as a vertical line, transecting all age groups: accordingly we shall call this the "vertical" type of relationship.

In America, on the other hand, because of the huge distances, the vertical type of Community which is analogous to the Family, has been replaced by a community based upon the "horizontal" relationship of the age group. Young people, as soon as they are old enough to leave home and go to work, travel hundreds of miles from their families seeking employment. An example of this is to be seen in Washington, D. C., where very few of those who work there were born in that city. This "horizontal" type of Community exists, because when people are away from their relatives, they tend to make friends with people of their own age group, so that they are drawn into a new form of community, where the lines of delimitation run horizontally.

It would be out of place to try and evaluate which type of Community, the vertically- or the horizontally-based, is the better, because each has emerged in the context of the environment to which it is best suited.

The basis of relationship can only be changed by altering the structure of society as influenced by political, social, and economic forces, which in turn depend on geography and natural resources: this is obviously an impossible. Thus we have to accept what exists, and not try to evaluate its merits.

English Individuality arises out of her geographical position and material resources, such as they are. If England is to compete in the world market, it will have to be more in the realm of quality rather than quantity; individual particularism rather than mass production; community, which stresses individuality rather than conformity. An illustration of this is to be seen in the manufacture of automobiles. I have counted nearly twenty different makes of cars in the United States, most of which belong to huge concerns such as General Motors; in England there are very nearly fifty different makers, and each maker produces a variety of cars of varying sizes. Further, I understand that in America, the chassis of the Buick, Pontiac, Oldsmobile, and Cadillac is identical, thereby saving the expense of making different parts; in England, each car has a chassis designed for that particular model alone.

English individualism is to be seen in many different areas of life: for instance, in the multitude of small business concerns; in the secrecy of incomes, in the educational system, in the system of weights and measures, in the monetary system, in family life, and clothing. Though many would disagree, perhaps even the game of cricket is expressive of British individualism!

Here we have a dilemma, therefore: two Countries, each stressing one aspect of Community and neglecting the other. America stresses Community with Conformity and tends to forget individuality; England stresses individuality and tends to forget community. The supreme form of Community is that which allows the greatest individual diversity to co-exist with some measure of conformity. Community without individuality lacks character and personality: I would far rather live in Greenwich Village than downtown Manhattan, or in Georgetown rather than downtown Washington, because both Greenwich Village and Georgetown are communities which have an individuality all of their own, and a characteristic personality which distinguishes them from any other Community. Downtown New York and Washington have very little personality by comparison, because all the streets are arranged in regular uniformity: as Communities conforming to this uniformity, they deny their real individuality.

The greatest value for me in coming to America, has not been to study, but to live in the context of an American Community. I can study with American books in England, but much of the value of such a study would be lost because it would be carried on outside the environment of which the books spoke. I have found it most valuable to have had the opportunity to mix with and get to know all kinds of people, in all walks of life, and from all parts of the country. Though I should find it hard to explain it in detail, I am sure that I must have profited richly from such an experience, so that I may return to England with a broader understanding of the meaning of Community.

Community and the Church.

The Church is the Community of Christian believers, of which the common interest and bond of fellowship is faith in Christ and life in the Spirit. Therefore, the same principles of community will hold good for the Church: herein lies the value of an enriched understanding of the concepts of Community, and herein the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U. S. A. stand to gain, each from the other's understanding of what it means to be a community or Church.

It is generally true that there exists a parallel between Church and State, and that what holds good for the political, social and economic, also holds good for the ecclesiastical. In that Christianity comes to men in the context of daily living, what is true of all the other aspects of life, will also be true of the religious life in the context of the Church. Thus we may apply the same principles of Community to the Church.

Therefore, the supreme form of Christian community is that which allows for the greatest individuality: here the Anglican Communion is a good example, allowing for all the diversities of Protestantism and Catholicism.

As might be expected, the general emphasis in America is, in stressing community, to tend to conformity. It is certain that Americans think in terms of Community, because the doctrine of the Church is given especial prominence: this is also an instance of the way the Church is adapting itself to the current social trend in society.

The development of "relationship" theology (with its mysterious vocabulary—acceptance, fulfillment, etc.); of "Buzz" Groups, of Rôle-playing, of youth programs, of coffee hours, and many other social functions, shows that the Church is meeting a demand inherent in the life of the American people, who have a desire to belong to some group. The figures of Church attendance have never reached such a high peak, and I feel that this is not because the general public has suddenly become more religious, but they feel the need for acceptance and participation in some group. It is obvious that many young people attend youth meetings, in the first place, for social pleasures rather than spiritual benefit. Jane says that she will attend a meeting if John is going to be there; John says he will not be there when they have a discussion or a talk on the Christian life—he will only be there when they have a dance. The result is that the Christian Community, in an endeavor to include more has tended towards conformity in the form of compromise: very often the only thing specifically religious about a youth group is the fact that the meeting takes place in the Parish House! People come to Church with all sorts of motives other than the desire to worship God: this is at once the Church's opportunity, and danger; her challenge and responsibility.

In England, it is said that only about ten per cent of the population are Church-goers, and yet I feel that this is not an indication of paganism so much as an expression of individuality and the denial of community. Many with whom I have talked have said that they sense a greater Christian Spirit in England than in America, but this does not draw people to Church. There are many reasons for empty Churches in England, which do not relate to the subject of this paper, but one of

the chief factors is the prevalence of the concept of Individuality. Since the family relationship still exists to a large extent in England, the Church has maintained much of its teaching through the medium of the family. However, since the family relationship is breaking down in America, and sons who have left home to take a job fail to return home for several years, what I have called the horizontal basis of relationship is replacing this community of the family, while, alongside of this, the Church has had to make adjustments and re-orientate itself to the changing times. Many of these changes and innovations have already been mentioned, being those which are based on a horizontal basis of relationship; but the most significant adjustment is the "New Curriculum," which is an attempt to replace the teaching that is lacking in the context of the family. By tradition, the Church has relied on the family for the nurture of children in the Christian faith: this was the practice in the Hebrew families, as can be seen from Deuteronomy 6. Perhaps this is why the Jews today have some of the strongest ties of family relationship, and some of the strongest feelings of parental responsibility. Since this emphasis still exists in England, the Sunday Schools, which have always tended to be a substitute for parental instruction of the children, generally leave much to be desired. This reveals one disadvantage of the Sunday School: the parents feel that they are relieved of the responsibility of instructing their children in the Christian faith, when in fact, during the most crucial years, the children are not attending Sunday School, being too young to leave home.

This difference in emphasis between individuality and community, between the vertical and the horizontal bases of relationship, even extends to the realm of theology. The Americans have a greater understanding of the concept of the Church, being community conscious; the English, on the other hand, lay a greater importance on the individual and personal use of the Bible. In this respect, the same differences appear in the realm of authorities: the Americans stress the authority of the Church, the ministry of the Sacraments, and call themselves (generally speaking) more Catholic than Protestant; the English emphasize the authority of the Bible, the Preaching of the Word, and profess to be rather more Protestant than Catholic, being mindful of the Reformation that took place in England. The American concern for the relationship of one believer with another in the fellowship of the Church is a direct outcome of what I have called the horizontal basis of relationship, such as has been outlined above: the English stress the vertical aspect of relationship in their emphasis on man's personal dealings with God — this again is reflective of the Individualistic approach. These two concepts of relationship are not contradictory, but are rather complementary; they are two sides of the same coin; two dimensions of the same relationship.

With regard to the doctrine of Salvation, Americans think primarily of Eternal life beginning here and now in the fellowship of the Church; the English think first of the eschatological aspect of Salvation, and always in personal and individualistic terms.

Thus to evangelize, in the United States, begins with drawing the person into the fellowship of the Church through Baptism, and then lead him to a knowledge of God; in England, the emphasis is to win

him as an individual loved by God, and having entered into personal relationship with God, to draw him into the fellowship of the Church. In other words, the Americans lead to the vertical relationship through the horizontal, while the English start with the vertical and lead to the horizontal; the one begins with the community, and the other with the individual.

I am very grateful that this opportunity has been given me to live and study in the United States, and I would like to express my sincere thanks to all those who have made it possible. I am sure that in many respects I have profited a great deal in the context of this different emphasis on Community, and it is my prayer that the Church of England, the Community in which I have been called to serve as an individual, may profit in like manner, to the Glory of God and the spreading of His Kingdom among men.

JAZZ AND ANGLICANISM

WILLIAM L. HICKS (V.T.S. '54)

St. Philips, Southport, N. C.

In the music of jazz is found a perfect illustration of the life of the Anglican Christian. Therefore, an understanding of either jazz or Anglicanism can lead to a better understanding of the other.

In a story about piano player Dave Brubeck, TIME magazine* had this to say: "As always in jazz, its essence is the tension between improvisation and order—between freedom and discipline." Where this tension is present in the music of jazz musicians, the music they play is jazz; and where this tension is present in the life of a Christian, he is living as an Anglican, whether he calls himself that or not.

When a group of jazz musicians set out to play, they agree on what tune they will play. This tune is usually written by someone else, in a given key and will be played at a given tempo, according to plan. This is the agreed-upon framework within which the musicians will operate. This is the subject about which they wish to speak. When he speaks through his instrument, each musician functions with complete freedom within the previously agreed-upon framework. Thus the tension between freedom and order is set up and maintained. Each man speaks on the subject, but what he says is deeply personal, and is never said in exactly the same way twice.

The musician cannot be told by someone else how to make his statement, because that part of the performance is where he is exercising his freedom. He has chosen, with this freedom, to limit himself to improvisations on the agreed-upon theme, within the rhythmic pattern set down, and for a specific amount of time.

This situation in the music of jazz is paralleled in the life of the Anglican Christian. He has agreed beforehand to limit himself to a certain framework, but within that framework he will exercise complete freedom, as was given to him by God. The framework he has chosen is the Book of Common Prayer, which is the peculiarly Anglican expression of the faith found in the Holy Bible. In the Book of Common Prayer are found services of worship which cover all of life and make

*Nov. 8, 1954.

explicit statements about the principles of the Christian life, but these are merely the framework within which the individual operates.

The service of Holy Baptism, with its complementary service of Confirmation, is the place where the Christian life begins. The reasons for Baptism are clearly stated in the opening section of the service. After an examination of the parents and Godparents, in which they take vows later renewed by the child himself at Confirmation, the actual Baptism takes place. Marking a cross on the child's forehead with water, the minister declares that he does this

"in token that hereafter he shall not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified, and manfully to fight under his banner, against sin, the world, and the devil; and to continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto his life's end."

This is the principle stated. How this principle is carried out varies with the individual, because the individual is free to carry it out as he wishes. This recognizes his freedom under God, which he chooses to keep within the stated framework. Thus one man may enter the ministry as his way of confessing "the faith of Christ crucified" and another may choose to remain in his job as a salesman, witnessing to Christ in the world of business. Each makes his own choice, thus accepting the responsibilities of freedom.

The period in the child's life between Baptism and Confirmation, at which time he makes a conscious and responsible ratification of the Baptismal vows, corresponds in the life of the musician to the time in which he is learning to play his instrument. Just as the musician must learn to play the scales, so the child must learn the Apostle's Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments. Just as the musician learns to read music, so the child must learn to read his Bible and his Prayer Book. There are, of course, notable exceptions in both fields.

Another outstanding example of how this tension between freedom and order is maintained is in marriage. The service of Holy Matrimony states very clearly the principles of Christian marriage. In the various parts of the service we find these features: the necessity for complete honesty between the two people; the willingness to state publicly, in the presence of the people of God, their intention to live together as man and wife; the completeness of their relationship, where the partners "love . . . comfort . . . honor . . . keep in sickness and in health; and, forsaking all others, keep only to (this one) so long as (they) both shall live;" the blessing of the Church; the prayerful atmosphere in which this married life should be lived, always acknowledging the presence of a Third Person; and the desire for children if this be the will of God. How these principles are carried out vary with the couple involved. One man may honor his wife by letting her handle the family finances, because she is capable in this. Another man may honor his wife by *not* letting her handle the family finances, because she has difficulty with figures and this would lead to discord and confusion. Once the marriage relationship is entered into, the ways in which it is carried out are determined by the man and the woman. They may at times seek advice, just as the jazz musician is always listening to others play, for ideas and development, but the final decision rightly rests with the couple involved.

In the world of jazz there are two types of performances, which are on most occasions combined. One is the complete improvisation on the theme agreed upon, within the rhythmic pattern set down. This is when a small group plays together. There is also the written arrangement, which is best typified by the music of the Benny Goodman orchestra of the late 1930s. This orchestra had written arrangements, which was a way of playing a tune where everybody knew what everybody else was going to do and when he was going to do it. Within this arrangement there are usually places where a certain instrument play a solo, in which the musician is given freedom to improvise as he wishes for a certain number of bars. In Anglican Christianity this situation corresponds to Prayer Book worship, in which everybody knows what everybody else is going to do and when. This is all written down in a book. The service, e.g., Morning Prayer, is the subject at hand. Within this framework, with its unchanging parts, there are the variables. The Psalm, the two lessons and a special prayer are changeable according to the calendar. The minister in charge exercises freedom in the choice of hymns and his sermon material, which are additional ways to improvise on the theme. Depending on conditions in his parish, the minister may or may not use additional prayers.

American jazz and Anglican Christianity are thus alike in that each is committed to the principle of maintaining the tension between freedom and order. In Anglican Christianity this principle has evolved from a theological understanding that man is free, but his freedom is most complete when he accepts its responsibilities and limits himself to a framework of action which is neither chaos nor strangulation. An understanding of American jazz can lead to an understanding of Anglican Christianity because the jazz musician has always insisted on his right to be free to do as he pleases within his chosen framework. This is not something he read in a book or was told by someone. This is of the very nature of his music.

THE MARKAN AND JOHANNINE ATTITUDE TOWARD MIRACLE

LOREN B. MEAD (V.T.S. '54)

Trinity Church, Pinopolis, S. C.

When we come to the Gospel of St. John and the Gospel of St. Mark with the idea of "miracle" in our heads, we must remember that we are operating in a different way from either Mark or John. We have visions of natural law being unnaturally broken when we hear the word "miracle;" but this is a foreign way of thinking for Mark and for John, or for that matter for any Biblical writer. Both Mark and John see "miracle" as an expression of power. Having made this distinction between us and the Biblical writers, we must now attempt to understand the similarities and differences between Mark and John in their understanding of "miracle." We shall do this by first considering Mark's point of view, then John's, then summarizing the comparison.

I. *Mark.*

St. Mark's Gospel is a less sophisticated document than St. John's. This is not to say that it is less powerful or less penetrating, but it has less of the literary craftsmanship of St. John. But one of the ruling conceits of Mark's Gospel is that of the "Messianic secret." This is a literary device by which Mark says in effect that Jesus, while on earth, lived incognito to the world. He did not proclaim boldly to the world who He was.

This idea of the Messianic secret is the context within which Mark deals with miracle. An inevitable corollary to an act of power on Jesus' part is a word of caution to the healed person or to the "demons" to be silent, not to speak of what has happened, not to say who He is. "And he sternly charged him . . . 'See that you say nothing to anyone';" (Mk. 1:43-4), or again "And he strictly ordered them not to make him known" (Mk. 3:12). See also Mk. 1:25, 5:43; 7:36; 8:26. In other words, Jesus acts in the fullness of His power as the eschatological Son of Man, and in His act He is sometimes recognized for what He is (especially by demons); but at first He does not seek to be known by the people at large for what He is. Constantly He enjoins silence.

But at the same time, Jesus is speaking secretly to His close band of followers, giving them more hints as to the meaning of His miraculous acts and His teaching. This becomes especially true in the final journey through Samaria and on south to the cross. This is expressed concretely when Jesus is telling the twelve about His parabolic method of teaching. He says: "To you has been given the secret of the Kingdom of God, but for those outside everything is in parables" (Mk. 4:11). This is as true of His acts (which might be interpreted as acted-out-parables) as it is of His parables themselves.

This, then, is Mark's conception of Jesus' wonder-working. He acts in great power, but His glory is hidden, camouflaged. His glory, the source of His power is only slowly divulged to the inner circle.

II. *John*.

John's Gospel has extraordinary nuances and much variety of shades of meaning. I have Dodd¹ to thank for opening up to me the extraordinary nature of this book as a work of sheer art—to say nothing of its deeper qualities.

With John, the idea of Miracle is similar to the Markan idea in that it is a *sign* of something beyond itself. The Miracle is a sign of the power of the Son of Man and of the new age. But John does not hold with the idea of the Messianic secret in the way that Mark does. True, the followers of Jesus are led through the signs to progressively deeper understandings of who Jesus is, but the *whole truth* about Him is witnessed to in *each* sign, and then emphasized in a dialogue or discourse. In each of the "miracles" the full glory of the Christ is set forth. Actually the whole gospel is there in germ at the marriage at Cana.²

But the miracles in John have a similar final effect to the miracles in Mark; each miracle alienates some of those around Jesus. Each miracle is an offense to some. Schism follows every time until at the last we are left with only eleven followers—and even these desert. So in John as in Mark, the full revelation of Christ's glory is appropriated only by the few, and even these fall away.

Let us now, however, examine concretely one of St. John's "miracles" to see his point of view. Let us take the Lazarus story in Chapter 11. Dodd considers this to be one of his seven episodes in the Book of Signs, and he calls it "The Victory of Life over Death."

In this miracle story we have several themes developed concurrently by use of John's method here of combining the narrative element with the dialogue and discourse element which elaborates the significance of the narrative. But the literary method here is extraordinary. The levels of meaning are parallel (as in Dante and Spenser's *Faerie Queene*) but there is interpenetration of meaning from one level to another (as in the irony of *Oedipus Rex*). When Jesus says it is time to go to Lazarus, he also says in meaning it is time for the Son of Man to fulfill His vocation (11:16). When He speaks to Martha, then to Mary, there is the double meaning of resurrection (11:23 ff.) (1) back into this earthly life and (2) into the life beyond death. Death in these dialogues carries the double meaning of *end* and crucifixion-resurrection (11:21, 50). The manifestation of power in raising Lazarus means that some believe (11:45) and that at the same time the Sanhedrin is forced to condemn Him to death (11:53). And supremely ironical is Caiaphas' statement that "it is expedient . . . that one man should die for the people and that the nation should not perish" (11:50).

In this miracle the glory of Christ is expressed, His lordship over life and death. Yet there are those who, having seen the light, prefer to live in darkness! The whole message about Christ is embodied in these dialogues, and yet some believe and some do not. John includes in this story the life-giving quality of Jesus, His status as judge, the reality of His coming vicarious sacrifice, the quality of agape. All is revealed in this parabolic action of raising Lazarus from the dead.

¹C. H. Dodd, *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*.

²Cullmann's *Early Christian Worship* correlates each of the miracles most effectively with the proclamation of the gospel in the early church's worship.

John's conception of miracle is basically rooted in his understanding of Christ's vocation in the world. The world is in the power of darkness, of the evil one. Christ's vocation is to come into the realm of darkness and evil and to manifest the light. His "miracles" are concrete acts which show forth the true light, the true life. Those who turn away from the light are judged by their very rejection of Him. And Christ's vocation is not complete until after the resurrection, ascension, and communication of the Spirit, when He has returned to the Father and yet abides with and in us.

III. *Summary.*

The differences between John and Mark in their respective ideas of miracles are noticeable, but they are not as great as might be supposed by a quick study. The differences are startling in one respect: the Messianic secret vs. the full revelation of Christ's powers. But I think essentially the difference is not so startling as this. Both evangelists explain at least to their own satisfaction the fact that some hear the gospel and some reject it. Both men see in the miraculous act an expression of the power of God working in a somehow alienated world. Mark's view is handicapped by having a less complete and worked out conception of the rule of the evil one; his understanding of the alienation of the world is less precise and schematic (but more satisfactory, I think) than that of John. John, on the other hand, with his many levels of meaning, with his double (and triple) *entendres*, speaks of and makes the most of the wondrous "signs" for the explanation of the glory of God. Both men admit that only the eye of faith can see in the wondrous work the hand of the Lord.

BOOK REVIEWS

MURRAY L. NEWMAN, JR., *Editor*

Shadows of Irreality. By Rufus King Nightingale. New York: Comet Press Books, 1955. \$2.00.

This slender volume of poetry by Rufus Nightingale, Class of '53, is the stored-up song of a shy and attractive young cavalier for Christ. Chords of friendship and affection sound through the verses, above the dissonances of query and perplexity, on almost every page.

Rufus confesses that the way to life in Christ has been tortured and slow.

"Somewhere the sure unreason is resolved;
But all persists, involved and insecure."

But these lines would never have seen a publisher's press had the time not come when

"The selfish motive and the wrong relation
Are transformed to a mode of Revelation."

The author is assistant to Kenneth Morris, Class of '25, at St. John's Church, Columbia, S. C. Earlier he was assistant to Richard Fell, Class of '42, when the latter was rector of St. Andrew's Church, Arlington. One of the poems on "Reconciliation" is offered to Dick. The book as a whole is dedicated to Ken Heim, to whom many another as well as Rufus looks with grateful appreciation.

A poem on "Finitude" is offered to Cliff Stanley, of the faculty, and one to Bob Hammett, Class of '54, on "Doing Something."

There are numerous references through the verses to one he loves. Those who know and love Rufus can hope that this is a real girl and that the throbbing and passionate lines are tantamount to a proposal.

R. O. KEVIN

Theology of the New Testament, volume II. By Rudolf Bultmann. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Scribner, 1955. \$4.00. Pp. 278.

This volume contains part III, The Theology of the Gospel of John and the Johannine Epistles, part IV, The Development Toward the Ancient Church, and an Epilogue in which the author discusses the task of New Testament theology and its history. The first volume treated the Message of Jesus, the Kerygma of the Earliest Church and the Kerygma of the Hellenistic Church aside from Paul under the heading of Presuppositions and Motifs of New Testament Theology, and then the Theology of Paul. That organization of the material expresses Bultmann's belief that New Testament theology should deal with the varieties of New Testament thought, and his judgment as to what the principal varieties are.

It is perhaps not perverse to suggest that readers who are not in fairly close touch with the debate that has centered about Bultmann and his *Entmythologisierung* ("de-mythologizing") proposal might find it more instructive (and certainly easier!) to read his *Theology* backwards, that is, to start with the Epilogue, then read the remainder of volume II and finally volume I. For the Epilogue explains what New Testament theology is, on Bultmann's view, and what its tasks and methods are. Its task is to set forth "the theological thoughts of the New Testament" which are "thoughts in which faith's understanding of God, the world, and man is unfolding itself" (p. 237). What is presented therefore is not a body of theology which is the object of faith, but faith itself in its own self-interpretation. This faith is a new understanding of the self made possible by God, opened up by His dealing with men. The story of that dealing is the kerygma, and so faith is faith in the kerygma. This means moreover, that New Testament theology must be written afresh generation by generation. For both the kerygma and faith's self-understanding are presented in the New Testament already interpreted in some particular way—in a particular theological terminology which presupposes a particular understanding of the terms used. So the believing comprehension must ever actualize itself anew—the 'faith' must become my faith, my understanding of self in relation to God and world in response to the Word.

Hence tradition properly means the handing on not of historical testimony, but of the kerygma, a subject discussed in the chapter on the Development of Doctrine. Hence also faith's independence of historical criticism and of historical tradition in the usual sense of the term. Hence also Bultmann's preference for the Fourth Gospel.

For it is in the Johannine writing that the paradox of the kerygma (that the Word was made flesh) is most clearly set forth. Here the revelation of God in the man Jesus is reduced to the mere fact that he so revealed himself. The history-of-salvation element is entirely lacking, and Jesus is presented not as "a reliably protestified person of the past but as he is constantly present in the word which proclaims him in the power of the Spirit" (p. 127). On the other hand, the paradox is not resolved "in another direction by sacrificing from the kerygma its reference to the historical occurrence". (p. 126) Hence it is clear in the Fourth Gospel that we no less than Jesus contemporaries are addressed by the word of God declaring what He has done in Christ and demanding the decision of faith.

It is certainly no injustice to Bultmann to suggest then, that after reading his own Epilogue in which he explains his task as he sees it, one might find his best introduction to the *Theology* in the chapter on John.

Whether one shares Bultmann's existentialist and critical positions or not, his *Theology* is undoubtedly a first rate work, thoroughly grounded in a lifetime of painstaking and brilliant philological and historical study and expressing a clear and definite theological position stated in a forthright and honest manner. There are, of course, abundant references to contemporary works in the body of the book; in addition, there is in the back of each volume a full bibliography of works in English and of works in German and other languages.

HOLT H. GRAHAM

Christianity and Symbolism. By F. W. Dillistone. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955. Pp. 320. \$4.50.

Dr. Dillistone's book is directed to the predicament of modern man who has been cut off from the traditional and "natural" symbols by which he once understood himself and his world. In this situation modern man apparently must choose to give up his human identity and become a "thing" in the power of mass industrialism or to attempt to find life-giving "communal" symbols in the fanaticism of modern nationalism, racism and the like. Therefore "it is in part the purpose of this book to inquire whether any other patterns of symbolism may be found to guide man through the complexities of the world in which he lives" (p. 13).

In the first chapter "Signs, Symbols and Sacraments," the author addresses himself to the basic questions: "What are the nature and function of Symbols?"; "What are the distinctions which differentiate symbols from sacraments and signs and which distinguish different kinds of symbols the one from the other"? From here Dr. Dillistone undertakes his major task which he describes as follows:

"I shall first, therefore, seek to examine man's relation to his natural environment and his creation of symbolic form within this context. Next I shall look at the various kinds of time symbolism, giving particular attention to its development within the Christian tradition. Passing then to man's social environment, I shall examine in turn the significance of symbolic personal figures, of symbolic language-forms and of symbolic outward activities. This will lead finally to a more detailed study of ritual dramas (including word and gesture) which have so large a part in traditional Christian symbolic activity" (p. 37).

In carrying out his task Dr. Dillistone has brought together the thought of many scholars in and outside of the Christian orientation. Examples of this are: Philosophy—M. Foss, S. K. Langer, R. G. Collingwood; depth psychology—E. Fromm, S. Freud, C. G. Jung; Biblical studies—H. W. Robinson, W. R. R. Smith, G. W. H. Lampe; theology—P. Tillich, Fr. Greald Vann, O. Cullmann; liturgical studies—O. C. Quick, D. Dix. A merit of the book is that the inquiry is not carried on in a confining or narrow way but rather in an open search for truth in several disciplines.

For the preacher and Christian educator, the chapter on "The Symbolism of Language" provides a structure of thought to look at the baffling problem of communicating Biblical truth today. This problem confronts the Christian every day because so much of Biblical truth is contained in the form of myth, legend and ancient cosmology. But modern man cannot think in these forms and so is unable to hear the truth.

The chapter on "Symbolic Persons" suggests a basis to study the symbolic roles of a clergyman in relation to the congregation and to the community. Increased awareness of the actual roles which a clergyman lives out in the day to day relationships in parish life can help the Church to carry on its mission more effectively.

The main theme of the book moves toward the suggestion of principles for liturgical reform of the sacraments of Holy Baptism and the Holy Communion. The author's brief sketch of the development of Eucharistic understanding and practice in the Roman, Greek, Prophetic and Legalistic traditions is particularly enlightening. Dr. Dillistone is sound in his belief that in our present times the Gospel cannot be communicated more effectively by simply adding various and sundry ritual acts to the administration of the Scriptural sacraments. The fact that such ritual acts carried symbolic power to men at other periods of Christian history does not mean that they can do so today. Rather the author indicates that liturgical reform should move in the direction of simplicity.

This is a book to be studied carefully by those seeking to increase the symbolic power of the Christian message for modern man. Whether one agrees or not with Dr. Dillistone's conclusions the book provides a structure for creative thought in many areas of the Church's activity.

JOHN E. SOLEAU

Sex in Christianity and Psychoanalysis. By William Graham Cole. Oxford University Press, New York, 1955. XI, 323 pp. \$4.00.

This book has been needed for a long time and it is an excellent book. Inevitably it will provoke controversy for it attempts not only an historical survey of representative Christian and psychoanalytic thinkers, but also a reconstruction of the Christian understanding of sex and a resultant revision of sexual morality.

For the ground it covers, it is remarkably accurate in its representation of Christian teaching from Jesus to contemporary Catholic and Protestant positions. The selection of psychoanalytic theories of sex and sexual behavior is well made. The restatement of a Christian position is forthright, courageous and morally responsible. Whether one agrees with particular judgments or not, one must be grateful for the great contribution to the subject which this author has made.

The thesis is that Christianity's generally bad record in attitudes to sexuality and its meaning is due not to its Hebrew origins but to Hellenistic dualism. This, I believe, is correct. St. Paul, at least as I see him, ought not to be placed so near the Hellenistic side since his *interims ethic* in I Corinthians 7 is not as influenced by Greek mind-body dualism as is suggested.

The really controversial part of the book is the reconstruction of the Christian understanding of sex and of the Christian ethic of sexual conduct. No reader can fail to profit by honest wrestling with the Christian "naturalism" which is advanced. "Naturalism" is the author's name for the Hebrew strain in the history of Christian views of sex which he thinks has been lost to a great degree and which he seeks to help recover. Perhaps "creationism" better describes the position but it is an awkward word.

Everyone probably would desire to write his own "reconstruction" but this point of view will certainly be influential in a Protestant Christian consensus if that consensus emerges. I shall not suggest revisions in so short a review.

The book is highly commended for all who are concerned with Christian Ethics and who are engaged in pastoral care.

A. T. MOLLEGEN

Protestant—Catholic—Jew. By Will Herberg. Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1955. Pp. 320. \$4.00.

If you are one of those people who are tempted to allow the reading of a review to take the place of reading the book reviewed, then I beseech you to lay this article aside at once and go after the book itself. It should be on every parson's "must" list, and on those of many laymen too.

Will Herberg is a Jewish layman who is one of America's leading theologians. I hope you know him already through his other writings, for he is a frequent contributor to several important journals, and the author of *Judaism and Modern Man*. He is also a good friend of ours here at the Seminary, and one whose occasional visits are among the high points of excitement of any academic year.

This book is an incisive historical and sociological study of contemporary American religion which seeks to make some sense out of two apparently contradictory facts: on the one hand, "religion" is today commanding unprecedented attention and loyalty in America, while on the other hand the American national consciousness is informed by a pervasive spirit of secularism, that is, it lives and thinks "in terms of a framework of reality and value remote from the religious beliefs simultaneously professed."

Statistics are of limited value in setting forth a thesis of this kind, and Mr. Herberg is well aware of that fact. But he has a good many statistics, some of them plenty alarming. For example, in a recent survey 83 percent of Americans

declared that they held the Bible to be the revealed word of God in some sense, but only 44 percent could name even one of the four Gospels, and 40 percent admitted that they read the Bible never or hardly ever. Or again — surveys indicate that about 96 percent of Americans “believe in God.” Eighty-nine percent even believe in the Trinity, and 80 percent in the divinity of Christ. (The discrepancy between those last two figures would seem to indicate either that some nine percent of Americans are Nestorians, or, what seems more likely, that there is something a little slippery about public opinion surveys on religious beliefs. But never mind.) Of those same Americans, however, more than 50 percent were prepared to declare that they were following the rule of loving one’s neighbor as one’s self “all the way” — and 54 percent said that their religious beliefs had no effect on their ideas of politics and business. What resemblance can there be between the god in whom these people believe (even if they are prepared to state their belief in Trinitarian terms) and the God of absolute holiness and righteousness before Whom man stands sinful and broken, and who exercises His sovereignty and demands the faithfulness of His creatures in every realm of life?

Mr. Herberg concludes that the real religion of the American people, that is, the real “framework in terms of which the crucial values of American existence are couched,” is not their professed theism, albeit this profession is unquestionably sincere, but rather that “structure of ideas and ideals, of aspirations and values, of beliefs and standards” which is known by the phrase “the American Way of Life.” It is this structure of beliefs and values, not that of the Jewish-Christian interpretation of existence, which really commands the loyalty of the American people as a whole.

One should not be cynical about this “American Way of Life,” for it turns out upon analysis to contain much that is in itself worthy of admiration. Its fundamental characteristics, in fact, is its idealism — its generosity of spirit, its faith in the supreme worth of the individual human being, its stern affirmation of abiding moral standards, its hope in the future. It is thus a kind of “spiritual structure,” a more-or-less full-fledged framework for the interpretation of the nature and purpose of human life, built out of noble, inspiring principles, many of them not without their roots in the Christian past.

Americans believe firmly in the importance of “spiritual values” — contrary to the widespread assumption even among ourselves, that we are “materialistic” — and therefore they also believe that religion is of great importance, because religion allegedly sustains spiritual values. (It doesn’t matter much what religion it is — President Eisenhower says that our government must be founded in a deeply felt religious faith — “and I don’t care what it is” — and the Rev. Dr. Daniel A. Poling says that the way to get a running start for every day, if you are interested in having that kind of start, is to begin each morning by saying the two words, “I believe” — “with nothing added.”)

Yes, we’re all for spiritual values, and for religion as their bulwark. But during these past weeks many ministers of religion in the Commonwealth of Virginia were publicly condemned and privately insulted because they ventured to speak out as citizens on an issue of public concern having to do with matters like obedience to the supreme law of the land, the future of universal public education, and man’s humanity to his fellow-man. “Let the clergy mind their own business,” people said. But if these matters are not the clergy’s business, if these are not “spiritual values,” then what in Heaven’s name are?

Aye, and there’s the rub. For although the American people think religion is a swell thing, they apparently know very little about what the religion we preach and they profess is all about, and the more they find out about it the less they like it. As long as we talk in pious generalities, about “God” and “spiritual values” and “love of neighbor” and “faith” and “down with materialism,” we will be understood to be simply bolstering those unquestionably uplifting “ideals” in which our people already believe. We will be keeping our preaching and teaching within the carefully guarded compartment of life in which modern man thinks religion belongs; and the Church will remain, in David Read’s fetching figure, like the clock in the glass case on a Victorian mantelpiece — “remote, dustproof, and losing time.”

Are we condemned to being misunderstood or rejected every time we try to transform pallid religiosity into living Christianity? Happily Mr. Herberg has the perspective of history to help us to see how we got the way we are, and therefore to understand both the dangers and the promise of our present situation. There is not space here to go into this discussion of the ethnic history of the American people and its relation to the development of the three great religious

traditions in their distinctively American forms. This discussion merits careful study. It may help us to realize, among other things that we are a young people, and that our present "religious revival" is furthermore a rather young phenomenon. Perhaps it has not been with us long enough for its deepest ramifications to be felt. Perhaps our national character is just beginning to be shaped anew by a fresh impulse of the Judaeo-Christian faith. Perhaps God is only firing the opening guns in his campaign with this land we love and its people "brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues."

But it is important that we should know how to discern the signs of the times. I believe that this book will help you to discern those signs, and therefore I urge you to read it. As you read it, think about your preaching and the kind of impact your words have upon the minds of people who believe as Americans do. Think about your own position in the eyes of your congregation and your community, and what you and your unsullied round collar (or black tie) represent to them. Think about the life of your parish and ask yourself whether you are helping your people to fulfill their calling to share the sorrows and the triumph of Jesus Christ and thus to be the People of God in Middletown, U.S.A., or just offering them the consolation of "belonging" for which the American so deeply longs. If you do, I think you will find the reading, as I did, a sobering and challenging experience.

JOHN W. TURNBULL

Surprised by Joy. By C. S. Lewis. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1956. Pp. 238. \$3.50.

Surprised by Joy tells the story of C. S. Lewis' return to the Christian Faith after having lost the nominal faith of his childhood. The book was written in response to a popular demand that Lewis tell how he passed from Atheism to Christianity but he gives notice that his account probably will not be interesting or convincing unless the reader has had somewhat the same experience. Lewis fears that his story is "suffocatingly subjective" and says that he tried to write the first chapter in a way that those who "can't bear such a story will see at once what they are in for and close the book with the least waste of time." The result is disarming and serves only to whet the appetite.

The story is personal in nature but is not actually an autobiography since it is highly selective. The story is free from polemic and even from evangelism in the usual sense but beneath the surface there is a strong apologetic undercurrent which is Lewis' main purpose in telling his story. The main thread follows the development of Lewis' awareness that the deliberate search for joy or satisfaction or even for a pleasant emotional experience in life or in religion is self-defeating. Lewis passed from the conventional religion of his parents and boyhood associates into an atheistic phase because he found his early religious experience incongruous with life and with the culture of the world around him. The moralistic and emotional quality of his early religious life lost its hold on him and he deliberately gave it up in order to be free from its restrictions.

It was not until Lewis had steeped himself in philosophy, particularly of the Idealists, that he discovered a way to return to Christianity and confesses that from these philosophers he learned the maxim: "it is more important that heaven should exist than that any of us should reach it." He also observes that "the surest way of spoiling a pleasure is to start examining your satisfaction."

The conclusion drawn by Lewis is that the search for joy cannot be an end in itself but can serve as a pointer to something "other and outer." At various stages in his life he had pursued joy through literature, the fine arts and music as well as through philosophy without any real or lasting satisfaction. It was only after he had passed through a barren phase when the search began to seem futile and hopeless that he was suddenly and unexpectedly overtaken by the very thing which he previously had been seeking and was surprised by joy in the discovery that the true end of life is God himself. It is only in the simple act of surrender and of putting the search for God before everything else that true satisfaction in life can be found. Joy is a by-product, one of the fruits of the Spirit and not an end in itself.

The story is told delightfully in typical Lewis style with colorful details of school life in England and Ireland and with penetrating insight into human motivation and character. The book is highly recommended as a companion to other writings by the same author and as a consolation to anyone who may feel that his Christian conversion and way of life is not conventional or even orthodox.

LOWELL P. BEVERIDGE

THE SEMINARY JOURNAL
OF THE
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SEMINARY
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

ENTERED AT THE POST OFFICE
AT ALEXANDRIA, VA., AS SECOND
CLASS MATTER

Return Postage Guaranteed

The Rev. Murray L. Newman
Virginia Theological Seminary
Alexandria, Va.

PAUL SOREL SAYS,

Can you imagine so miserable a thing as a home without a book?
Sure—a book without a home. Join The League To Find Homes For
Orphan Books Today. Act now. Send an Order.