



# *C* *CRITERION*

---

A PUBLICATION OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

VOLUME ONE • NUMBER ONE

SPRING 1962

# CONTENTS

---

VOL. 1

SPRING 1962

NO. 1

## PAGE

- 1** Editorial
- 2** Called to Unity  
*by Joseph Sittler*
- 6** Report on New Delhi  
*by Walter Leibrecht*
- 13** Religion Faces the Space Age
- 13** Confronting the New Age of Science
- 15** Divinity School News
- 20** Edgar Johnson Goodspeed (1871-1962)  
*by Ernest Cadman Cowell*
- 22** Stages of Encounter with God
- 23** Harold Rideout Willoughby (1890-1962)  
*by Allen Wikgren*
- 25** The New English Bible – The New Testament  
*by Jaroslav Pelikan*
- 29** Society, Solitude, and Salvation  
*by Sidney E. Mead*

---

EDITOR: Edward W. Warner

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS: Gloria Hunt  
Mary Sue Deisher



# Called to Unity

By Joseph Sittler

*"One of those rare occasions when a new vision  
has been opened up for those who listen"*

*He is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation; for in him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or authorities — all things were created through him and for him. He is before all things, and in him all things hold together. He is the head of the body, the church; he is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that in everything he might be preeminent. For in him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell, and through him to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross. Colossians 1:15-20.*

THERE are two reasons for placing these five verses from the Colossian letter at the beginning of what I wish to say about the unity of Christ's church. These verses say clearly *that* we are called to unity, and they suggest *how* the gift of that unity may be waiting for our obedience.

That we are called to unity, that the One who calls us is God, that this relentless calling persists over and through all discouragements, false starts, and sometimes apparently fruitless efforts is what engendered the ecumenical movement among the churches, and steadily sustains them in it.

These verses sing out their triumphant and alluring music between two huge and steady poles — Christ, and "all things." Even the Ephesian letter, rich and large as it is in its vision of the church, moves not within so massive an orbit as this astounding statement of the purpose of God. For it is here declared that the sweep of God's restorative action in Christ is no smaller than the six-times repeated *Ta panta* ("all things"). Redemption is the name for this will, this action, and this concentered Man who is God with us and God for us — and all things are permeable to his cosmic

redemption because all things subsist in him. He comes to all things, not as a stranger, for he is the first-born of all creation, and in him all things were created. He is not only the matrix and *prius* of all things; he is the intention, the fulness, and the integrity of all things: for all things were created through him and for him. Nor are all things a tumbled multitude of facts in an unrelated mass, for in him all things hold together. . . .

We must not fail to see the nature and the size of the issue that Paul confronts and encloses in this vast Christology. In propositional form it is simply this: A doctrine of redemption is meaningful only when it swings within the larger orbit of a doctrine of creation. For God's creation of earth cannot be redeemed in any intelligible sense of the word apart from a doctrine of the cosmos which is his home, his definite place, the theatre of his selfhood under God, in corporation with his neighbor, and in caring-relationship with nature, his sister. The term nature is not used here to primarily designate scientific and speculative models of the cosmos, nor is it used to introduce a covert cosmology. By nature is meant, simply and

JOSEPH SITTLER has been a member of the faculty of the Divinity School since 1957. Prior to that he was Professor of Systematic Theology at Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary for 14 years. Dr. Sittler was a delegate to the Lutheran World Federation in Hanover, Germany, in 1952; World Council of Churches in Evanston, Illinois, 1954; and the Lutheran World Federation in Minneapolis, Minnesota, in 1957. He is chairman of the North American Commission on Worship of the World Council of Churches, and a member of the Commission on Faith and Order.

Dr. Sittler delivered this address (which appears only in part above) on November 21, 1961, to the Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches in New Delhi, India.



task of this moment in our common history. And by common history I refer to that which is common to all of the blessed obediences of the household of faith: Antioch and Aldersgate, Constantinople and Canterbury, Geneva and Augsburg, Westminster and Savoy.

For the problem which first drove the church, as our text reminds us, to utter a Christology of such amplitude is a problem that has persisted and presses upon us today with absolute urgency. We are being driven to claim the world of nature for God's Christ just, as in the time of the Empire, the church was driven to claim the world of history as the city of God, for his Lordship and purpose. For fifteen centuries the church has declared the power of grace to conquer egocentricity, to expose idolatry, to inform the drama of history with holy meaning. But in our time we have beheld the vision and promises of the enlightenment come to strange and awesome maturity. The cleavage between grace and nature is complete. Man's identity has been shrunken to the dimensions of privacuity within social determinism. The doctrine of the creation has been made a devout datum of past time. The mathematization of meaning in technology and its reduction to operational terms in philosophy has left no mental space wherein to declare that nature, as well as history, is the theatre of grace and the scope of redemption.

When millions of the world's people, inside the church and outside of it, know that damnation now threatens nature as absolutely as it has always threatened men and societies in history, it is not likely that witness to a light that does not enfold and illumine the world-as-nature will be even comprehensible. For the root-pathos of our time is the struggle by the people of the world in many and various ways to find some principle, order, or power which shall be strong enough to contain the raging "... thrones, dominions, principalities" which restrict and ravage human life.

If, to this longing of all men everywhere we are to propose "Him of whom, and through whom, and in whom are all things," then that proposal must be made in redemptive terms that are forged in the furnace of man's crucial engagement with nature as both potential to blessedness and potential to hell.

The matter might be put another way: the address of Christian thought is most weak precisely where man's ache is most strong. We have had, and have, a christology of the moral soul, a christology of history, and, if not a christology of the ontic, affirmations so huge as to fill the space marked out by ontological questions.

But we do not have, at least not in such effective force as to have engaged the thought of the common life, a daring, penetrating, life-affirming christology of nature. The theological magnificence of cosmic christology lies, for the most part, tightly folded in the church's innermost heart and memory. Its power is nascent among us all in our several styles of teaching, preaching, worship; its waiting potency is available for release in kerygmatic theology, in moral theology, in liturgical theology, in sacramental theology. And the fact that our separate traditions incline us to one or another of these as central does not diminish either the fact or our responsibility. For it is true of us all that the imperial vision of Christ as coherent in *ta panta* has not broken open the powers of grace to diagnose, judge, and heal the ways of men as they blasphemously strut about this hurt and threatened world as if they owned it. Our vocabulary of praise has become personal, pastoral, too purely spiritual, static. We have not affirmed as inherent in Christ — God's proper man for man's proper selfhood and society — the world-political, the world economical, the world aesthetic, and all other commanded orderings of actuality which flow from the ancient summons to tend this garden of the Lord. When atoms are disposable to the ultimate hurt then the very atoms must be reclaimed for God and his will. . . .

The alembic in which the dynamics of unity stir with life, fuse, give new forms to Godly vitalities, and have the power to generate new obediences amidst old recalcitrancies — is history. That is why there is such a discipline as history of doctrine. For this study discloses that doctrinal statement and development is confession-thinking to the glory of God amidst historical denials or pretensions which would usurp the glory. It has always been within the clutch of a definite historical threat, or necessity, or a sheer intolerable malaise that the church has found her teaching voice. Doctrines are not born out of doctrines in an unchanging vacuum. Doctrines are evoked, clarified, refined, given force and precision within the challenge of exact circumstances. The facts of history are the excitors of insight; the nature of the moment's need engenders the doctrine to serve and bless it.

This dynamism that characterizes the church's stance and movement throughout her history, this momentum and promise inherent in the church by the spirit, furnishes us with hope as we try to construct a fresh doctrinal counterpoint between the *ta panta* of the claims of Christ and the facts of nature's pathetic openness to glorious use as to brutal rapacity.

# Report on New Delhi

By Walter Leibrecht

*The Third World Assembly of the World Council of Churches  
stirs the imagination and provokes a sensitive criticism*

NEW DELHI was chosen as the site for the Third World Assembly of the World Council of Churches for various reasons. First of all, the International Missionary Council was to merge with the World Council of Churches. It seemed proper for this important event in the history of the church to take place in a country where the churches had made a major missionary effort over recent centuries. This merger was to demonstrate to the churches that mission is not to be considered as merely the task of missionary-minded societies, but that it is the function, the expression of the whole church. It was further to be emphasized that increased energy should be given to the missionary effort and that, in order to make the Christian message believable to the non-Christian people, the missionary effort should be integrated rather than split up into many competing and thus confusing factions.

Further, New Delhi was selected as the site to give churchmen from all the world a first-hand impression of the tremendous problems the new nations in Asia and Africa are facing. But primarily, the city was chosen as meeting ground for the WCC Assembly to show the younger churches that the older and larger churches of the West are taking them really seriously.

However, in the Assembly it soon became apparent that the representatives of these younger churches were not suffering from any inferiority complex. They seemed to assume happily the part of the 'angry young men,' chastizing the 'responsible churchmen' of the older churches for their sluggishness in ecumenical matters. The

leaders of these younger churches interpreted to us the harsh social realities we saw around us as demonstrated in the stark realities of life in Delhi. They asked us to understand the outbursts of nationalist emotions which presently are so strong in these younger nations. Colonialism was often interpreted by African and Asian nations as robbing them of their national dignity, and their fierce reaction against colonialism must be understood as their effort to make sure of their own new identity as independent nations. But the younger churchmen told us that the anti-imperialistic revolution and its nationalism are only the outward signs of deeper and more inward changes taking place in these countries, changes which affect the whole structure of society.

The leaders of the younger churches told us that a realistic and responsible political and economic action on the part of the Western nations — attempts to help these new nations cope with their most overwhelming problems — is definitely needed. But they also told us that we would indulge in a fallacy if we would think that by pouring money into the young and yet undeveloped nations the soul of the people there will automatically take care of itself. Relief action in itself cannot answer the most crucial question which is "what will happen to the minds and souls of those millions who come to the big cities — of those who have lost their primitive faith and who no longer belong?" The great question seems to be "what will fill the vacuum in their souls?" We were told that there are signs of growing cynicism among the masses of the people as well as among

WALTER LEIBRECHT is Director of the Ecumenical Institute, Evanston, Illinois, and is presently also a Visiting Professor at the Divinity School. Previous appointments were Assistant Professor of Theology at Harvard Divinity School and Professor of Theology at Garrett Theological Seminary. Dr. Leibrecht is the editor and co-author of *Religion and Culture* (Harper Brothers: New York, 1958); his book, *The Theology of Johann Georg Hamann*, is being published by the Muhlenberg Press this fall.



the real life of his people. Taking a junket through the fifty incredibly overcrowded churches in Moscow on a Sunday morning would show him the illusory character of his prophecy. Percentage-wise the proportion of church attendance in Russia to the whole population as far as it can be established is far better than in England or Scandinavia where Christians are entirely free. But no doubt the future will hold more suffering in store for the churches in Russia, and in such times, lively contacts with other churches will be of help.

Of course, the joining of the Orthodox Churches of Russia and also of Rumania and Bulgaria will have many consequences for the whole make-up of the WCC. The dominance of Protestants in the World Council of Churches has come to its end. No longer can the World Council of Churches be misunderstood as a movement for pan-Protestantism. The Orthodox served notice that they are planning to change their attitude in the WCC and they have given visible proof during the days at New Delhi that they mean business. One Orthodox spokesman declared that the Greek, Russian and other Orthodox will no longer remain in an apologetic attitude, but from now on will exercise energetic leadership and initiative in ecumenical debate.

The keynote address of the Orthodox churches was delivered by the able young theologian of the Church of Greece, Dr. Nikos Nisiotis. Addressing his own brethren from the Orthodox Churches, Nisiotis distinguished between a narrow, self-complacent concept of Orthodoxy expressed in the claim that the Orthodox Church alone is the church, and that outside orthodoxy there is no salvation; and the dynamic understanding of orthodoxy which refrains from simply equating orthodoxy with the church of Christ, a dynamic orthodoxy which is conscious that it must offer itself humbly in order to find its fuller realization in the universal church of Christ. Dr. Nisiotis' words contained a ringing appeal, making one of the most remarkable contributions to the ecumenical dialogue and to the New Delhi Assembly in particular when he stated:

*"This dynamic understanding of Orthodoxy enables us to see church history in new perspective. It excludes labeling movements within the church as 'apostasies' — thus placing them 'outside' the church. It is impossible to locate an ecclesiological event extra ecclesiam. Neither the Roman schism nor the Reformation which resulted from it should be described in this way. The Orthodox witness as service to unity can, by self sacrifice, put all separations in their right place within the one undivided church, and share the glory of God with them. This means in practice that Orthodoxy must give up its defensive, confessional, apologetic attitude, and*

*in the glory of the Holy Spirit, become a mighty river of life, filling the gap, complementing opposites, overcoming enmities, and driving forward toward reunion. This was how the church lived in the time of The Fathers, creating new ways for achieving dynamic unity, richer forms of worship, a really ecumenical theology which regenerated the world through its authentic interpretation of the mission of the church. The pseudo-conservative attitude which simply condemns the path of our confessions is not a genuine Orthodox attitude. Perhaps our negative judgement on the part of other churches is one of the reasons for our own weakness today."*

For the first time at this Assembly the Orthodox did not come out with their own resolutions and statements as they had done at all the earlier ecumenical meetings. This new approach to church unity on the part of many of the Orthodox is possibly the most constructive and promising development in the present day ecumenical movement.

With the Orthodox churches all within the World Council of Churches, the Council has become much more interesting to the Church of Rome. This became apparent by the fact that for the first time the Roman Catholic Church appointed official observers to attend the New Delhi meeting. Some of these highly qualified theologians were not only observers in a passive sense but contributed in important ways to the discussion. Knowing that as observers, according to the rules of the Council and their own church, they were not supposed to talk, they nevertheless entered on occasions quite actively into the discussion. One of them declared with tongue in cheek that, in spite of the rules, as a theologian he simply could not keep quiet when he was exposed to heresy.

In the Faith and Order Committee discussions as well as in the discussions of the Unity Section, it became evident that there is a widespread desire to see new and increased contacts with the Church of Rome. This was expressed in the report of the Committee of Faith and Order as it was accepted by the whole assembly. It stated, "The Committee notes with appreciation the present growth of conversations, notably those rising out of biblical studies between theologians of the Roman Catholic Church and those of other communions. It welcomes the many new contacts with Roman Catholics in an atmosphere of mutual good will and, in particular, by the establishment by the Vatican of a Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity. The Committee requests the Faith and Order Commission to make a special provision for conversations with Roman Catholics and asks member churches and local councils to take

about the fact that they took up one issue at a time, discussing it sometimes for years. And when they came up with a new answer or formula, it made history. But the World Council is not making history as long as its resolutions appear in such profusion and wordiness and as long as the rank and file of Christians do not really pay attention to what the World Council has to say, but only seem to acknowledge the World Council and its existence for its symbolic value.

I also missed at the meetings of the World Council a sense of urgency, or may I even call it a sense of "eschatological urgency"? Only a few weeks prior to the World Council's Assembly we were confronted with the real threat and possibility of a new world war breaking out over Berlin. We all realize what such a war would mean for life on this Earth. This terrible threat to a stronger or lesser degree has been with us for years, and as we know, it will continue. Therefore, is not the number one problem we should have faced in New Delhi: "How to live as a Christian and a human being in a world threatened by disaster and possible annihilation." Is it not even more directly the concern of the churches, more so even than the equally important problem: "What to do to avoid the disaster." The World Council's document said practically nothing to the problem of man living in a world constantly threatened by destruction. It is to this situation that the Church has a definite word to say and must say it. If the Church has not a word to say to this desperate situation in which man finds himself today — who will?

There was an evident eagerness to simply concentrate on the other problem question of "what to do to avoid the disaster." However, in dealing with the causes of our dilemma, the deliberations and resolutions of the World Council did surprisingly not deal with the deep ideological spiritual issues which to a large extent have created the antagonism between the various camps of mankind, but the deliberations of the delegates concerned themselves rather with the political technical issues some of which are merely the outcome of this deeper tension. The discussions of the CCIA (Church Commission on International Affairs) mirrors some of the attitude of a psychiatrist who restricts his treatment to the pathological manifestations of a neurosis without going at the deeper conflict in the personality of his patient which caused the neurosis in the first place. There is no question that at the level of our deep ideological commitments — our total orientation to the world which is always an aspect, yes an expression of man's faith — the Church has

to say a legitimate and important word. That is the proper business of the Church. It is doubtful, however, whether the Church or a council of churches is competent or really has any business to express its more or less authoritative opinion on every technical political issue.

The question of our deep ideological political commitments which separate us as men and as Christians was kept from the offered debate. Both church leaders from the East as well as from the West seemed eager to avoid a thorough debate on this issue, aware probably of the possible negative repercussions such a debate could cause in their home country. The Commission of the Churches on International Affairs came out with an eight thousand word document which was accepted and authorized by the whole Assembly. This document dealt with every possible issue of foreign policy — even making recommendations on highly technical and detailed recommendations. Yet, it carefully sidestepped the ideological question by making a virtue out of this evasion, stating "the churches must not be identified with any ideology. They must be in the world but not of it, for they can stand only for Christ." This might be ideally so, but as to the real commitments of Christians, the statement is sheer hypocrisy. Most Christians participate in the Cold War and by no means do they stand above the battle simply by virtue of their being Christians — in fact they contribute to the ideological tension as much as anybody else and have not yet shown their capacity to become a source of understanding and reconciliation in our divided world.

One of the participants in the debate, anxious to evade the ideological issue, argued that we should concentrate on what separates us as Christians rather than on what separates us as human beings, as if this could be distinguished. Such separation strikes me as academic and also impossible theologically as well as empirically. Our ideological, political and national commitment is a matter of deep passionate involvement. The very fact that the delegates can remain relatively calm while discussing the differences in their understanding of baptism, while hot explosions of tempers are to be feared when the question might turn to our ideological and political orientation shows how deeply such commitment divides us as Christians as well as human beings. In case of war Christians will no doubt fight one another, destroying one another, giving preference to the national and ideological commitment over their commitment to the Church of Christ. As long as this is so, the ideological question is not only a legitimate subject for the World Council and its

problem was discussed at length and in depth in study groups of the National Council and others held prior to the New Delhi Assembly and in summing up the comments I no longer remember what was actually said at this debate or what was said at the earlier preparatory discussions in which I participated. The question was raised, "Is not the WCC actually developing a creed, and if it does so, is it not acting like the Church which it is not supposed to be?" There were some who seemed to hope to increase the prestige of the WCC by giving it a new "ecclesiological role" and dignity, calling the Council a "new churchly reality" or even "a church," emphasizing the Council could be called such with the same justification as a denomination is called a church. Several of the pioneers of the consiliar association movement who had once seen in the establishment of the World Council the fulfillment of all their dreams, have obviously a sense of disappointment, recognizing that the World Council does not yet present church unity in its fullness. A number of these churchmen have apparently come to the conclusion that increasing the ecclesiological prestige of the Council, reversing the present relationship of Council and member churches and thus setting up the Council as a master and even judge over the denominations, this might lead to the fulfillment of the Council's role. They highly deplored that, at the present stage, the Council is in "the role of slave to its master" — the denominations — and that accordingly the operations of the Council are too tightly controlled by the denominations. One delegate emphasized that the World Council of Churches does not really derive its authority merely from the constituting denominations but directly from the Holy Spirit and that therefore the World Council represents the one Church of Christ more fully than any one of its member denominations.

Over against those few who wanted to see in the WCC such "new churchly reality," Dr. Fry, Chairman of the Central Committee, categorically stated that the total development of the ecumenical movement is the "most convincing refutation of the notion that the World Council is trying to build a super church. We who are closest to the Council are constantly puzzled how any such charge can be made or any such misconception can still exist except in critics who are deliberately self-deceived."

I am sure, however, that this debate on the

nature of the WCC and its future course will increase as there are many questions left unanswered yet. The question to which an ecclesiological answer was offered was in actuality a very practical one, namely this: Why is the impact of the World Council of Churches and also of the National Councils in the local congregations negligible compared with the great effort made by these councils and the valuable work done by their various departments? Why do the people in our churches pay no real attention to the resolutions of the World Council? Lifting the Council into heights of ecclesiological dignity to enhance its authority would in no way solve the Council's major problem, which is its lack of actual communication to the people in the congregations. There is no ready and joyful identification yet of the people of the churches with the World Council of Churches. The World Council is felt by many to be an entity in itself; and by striving to be recognized as a church, the Council's image would only further deteriorate in that direction.

Besides, the Council, which would claim to be at its present stage a supreme manifestation of *The Church*, would make co-operation for many churches impossible. It would also foreclose in its new form any future possibility of including the Church of Rome in ecumenical discussions of an official nature. In other words, the Council would no longer be a forum for all the churches. But being, and wanting to be such a forum for all the churches, the Council must accept certain restrictions.

Rather than trying to become a church, the Council should be eager to be a true *council*, working solely toward the achievement of real fellowship among the churches. The Council's sole ambition should be to provide the possibility of rigorous and frank encounter and dialogue among its member churches; to create occasions of actual contact and study, dialogue and fellowship in order to enhance mutual understanding; to achieve consensus, to reach unison in will and effort among its members. The essential element in all such efforts should be to create occasions for *the members* to meet and decide together rather than the Council acting for its members. One may raise the question whether the further expansion of the World Council into a multiple purpose service agency for the churches does not threaten to distract the Council from its sole purpose of working toward unity.



The Divinity School  
The University of Chicago

*Presents*

LECTURES

by

KARL BARTH

**"INTRODUCTION TO SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY"**

**Place:** Rockefeller Memorial Chapel — 59th and Woodlawn Avenue  
**Time:** 11:00 A.M.  
**Dates:** April 23-27 (Monday through Friday)

**Questions to and Discussions with Professor Barth**

**Place:** Rockefeller Memorial Chapel  
**Time:** 8:00 P.M.  
**Dates:** Wednesday, April 25  
Thursday, April 26

**Panel Moderator:** Professor Jaroslav Pelikan  
The Divinity School  
The University of Chicago

**Participating Theologians:**

Professor Edward Carnell  
Fuller Theological Seminary  
Professor Bernard Cooke, S.J.  
Chairman, Department of Theology  
Marquette University  
Professor Hans Frei  
Department of Religion  
Yale University

Professor Schuber Ogden  
Perkins School of Theology  
Southern Methodist University  
Professor Jakob Petuchowski  
Hebrew Union College  
Mr. William Stringfellow  
Lawyer, New York City

**Please send ticket requests to:** **BARTH LECTURES**  
Divinity School  
University of Chicago  
Chicago 37, Illinois

Enclose self-addressed stamped envelope with money order or check.

**Price:** \$5.00 for the seven lectures or \$3.00 for any part of the series.

---

## Divinity School News

---

In September, Professor Grant presented a paper entitled, "Were There Gnostics at Corinth?" at a conference on "The New Testament Today" held at Oxford, England. He also worked briefly at the Office of the Admiralty in London preparing a manuscript on anti-submarine warfare in World War I.

Two books by Mr. Grant were published in the fall of 1961: *The Earliest Lives of Jesus* published by SPCK in London and by Harpers, and *Gnosticism: An Anthology* published by William Collins in London and by Harpers.

In May of 1962, Professor Grant will give a lecture at Lawrence College.

---

JOSEPH KITAGAWA, Associate Professor in the Field of History of Religions, is on leave of absence from the Divinity School from September of 1961 to the end of March, 1962. He is doing research on a Ford Foundation Grant from the Social Science Research Council for the study of Buddhism. Mr. Kitagawa is spending time in Japan, Taiwan, and Hong Kong.

---

JAMES H. NICHOLS, Professor in the Field of History of Christianity, gave two lectures to the students and faculty of Franklin and Marshall College in the spring of 1961. The lectures were on "The Blake-Pike Proposal" and "The Meaning of the Darwin Centennial—the Significance of Darwinism."

Mr. Nichols is a member of the Committee on Advanced Theological Studies of the American Association of Theological Schools, which is concerned with setting standards for graduate theological degrees.

Professor Nichols received a D. D. degree from Monmouth College in the spring and gave a lecture at that time on the relationship of past and present in religion in connection with the Festival of the Arts.

Dr. Nichols' book, *Romanticism in American Theology*, was published by The University of Chicago Press in May of 1961.

---

JAROSLAV J. PELIKAN, Professor of Christian Theology, edited Volume 3 of *Luther's Works*, which was published in the autumn of 1961. His book on the theology of Athanasius entitled, *The*

*Light of the World*, was published by Harpers in February.

Dr. Pelikan has lectured at Harvard, Lancaster Seminary, Brown, Claremont, The University of Michigan, The University of Minnesota, Valparaiso University, and the Mennonite Biblical Seminary in Elkhart, Indiana during the past year.

---

W. A. FITCHER, Associate Professor in the Field of Ethics and Society, has been appointed Chairman of the Commission on "Concentrations and Aggregations of Economic Power" of the Department of the Church and Economic Life of the National Council of Churches.

---

J. COERT RYLAARSDAM, Professor in the Biblical Field, taught at Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary during July and August of 1961.

In November of 1961, Mr. Rylaarsdam gave the Convocation Address at Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa.

During the past year, Professor Rylaarsdam has given lectures on the Old Testament and the Middle East under the auspices of the American Association for Middle East Studies at Westmar College, Wabash College, and Bowdoin College.

---

NATHAN A. SCOTT, JR., Associate Professor in the Field of Religion and Art, has prepared a book entitled, *Albert Camus*, to be published this spring by Bowes and Bowes, England.

Mr. Scott has edited a book entitled, *The Realm of Faith in Recent Literature*, which will be published by Seabury Press in late spring, 1962.

Dr. Scott contributed a chapter on Graham Greene to *The Art of Graham Greene* edited by R. O. Evans. This book was published by the University of Kentucky Press early in 1962.

In November, Mr. Scott lectured at Antioch College and at Wabash College. The title of his lecture at Wabash was, "The Christian Ethos in the American Literary Tradition." In December, he delivered three lectures at Luther Theological Seminary entitled, "Christianity and the Arts in Our Time." In January, Dr. Scott presented a lecture entitled, "Nietzsche and Buber—Two Prophets of Our Destiny," at Atlanta University as a part of the winter forum sponsored by the Graduate School of the University. In August, Mr.





## JOSEPH HAROUTUNIAN

The Reverend Joseph Haroutunian has been appointed Professor of Systematic Theology in the Divinity School of The University of Chicago effective July 1, 1962.

Dr. Haroutunian, who has served on study commissions of the World Council of Churches, has been a member of the faculty of McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, since 1940. The author of three books and numerous articles and the translator and editor of a volume on Calvin, he has traveled widely as a lecturer and preacher.

The Rev. Joseph Haroutunian was born in 1904, in Marash, Turkey. His father was a minister of the Armenian Evangelical Church and Professor of Practical Theology at the Marash Theological Seminary. After the first World War, he attended the American University in Beirut, Lebanon, 1919-1923. In February, 1924, he came to Columbia College in New York City, where he received his B.A. in 1926, and did a year of graduate study in philosophy and history of religion. He received his B.D. degree from Union Theological Seminary in New York City in 1930 and his Ph.D. from Columbia University in 1932.

In 1932-1940, he taught in the Department of Biblical History at Wellesley College, Wellesley, Massachusetts, first as an instructor and then as Assistant Professor. In 1940, he came to McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago, where after two years he became Cyrus H. McCormick Professor of Systematic Theology.

He has received the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity from Lawrence College, Appleton, Wisconsin (1949), Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Indiana (1958), and Knox College, Toronto, Canada (1958).

He has written *Piety Versus Moralism: The Passing of the New England Theology* (New York: Henry Holt, 1932); *Wisdom and Folly in Religion* (New York: Scribners, 1940); and *Lust for Power* (New York: Scribners, 1949). He has translated and edited *Calvin: Commentaries*, in collaboration with Louise P. Smith, in the Library of Christian Classics (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1958).



Harold R. Willoughby

## In Memoriam

A Memorial Service for Harold Rideout Willoughby, Professor Emeritus of Early Christian Origins, was held in Bond Chapel of the Divinity School on Friday, February 16, 1962.

Professor Willoughby was a member of the faculty of the Divinity School and the Department of New Testament and Early Christian Literature from 1924 until 1955, when he retired as Professor of Christian Origins. Always devoted to the University of Chicago, he was head of Goodspeed Hall from 1919 to 1936, member of various administrative boards of the University, and creator of "the Hermitage" at Disciples Divinity House both before and after his retirement. His scholarly contributions were diverse and numerous, ranging from *Pagan Regeneration* to numerous studies in Byzantine art and iconography, as well as essays on the English Bible. The symposium of the Chicago Society of Biblical Research on *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow* was created and edited by him. Last autumn it was the privilege of the Divinity School and the New Testament Club to present him with a volume of essays on *Early Christian Origins*, edited in his honor by his colleague, A. P. Wikgren. Professor Willoughby's high standards of scholarly achievement and his devotion to the University and to the cause of New Testament scholarship will preserve his memory among us. As he wrote in a memorial volume for Dean Case, "in deo vives."



---

# *Divinity School News*

---

## **Degrees Conferred**

At the Spring Convocation on June 9, 1961, the following degrees were conferred:

### **MASTER OF ARTS:**

DAVID GORDON ALEXANDER  
A.B., Trinity University, 1950  
D.B., San Francisco Theological Seminary, 1953  
CHARLES HARVEY ARNOLD  
D.B., University of Chicago, 1950  
RAWSON PAIGE BIRDWELL, JR.  
A.B., Knox College, 1953  
D.B., University of Chicago, 1958  
CHARLES HENRY CHURCH  
A.B., Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut, 1956  
HERMAN FORREST COLE, JR.  
A.B., West Liberty State College, 1956  
KEITH ARLINGTON DAVIS  
A.B., Hillsdale College, 1952  
D.B., University of Chicago, 1956  
WILLIAM VAN BUREN DORN  
A.B., University of Rochester, 1937  
D.B., Crozier Theological Seminary, 1941  
RUTH PENELOPE EMORY  
A.B., College of the Pacific, 1947  
MYRON JEAN FOGDE  
A.B., St. Olaf College, 1955  
B. Th., Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota, 1959  
ELMORE GILES, JR.  
S.B., Tuskegee Institute, 1953  
D.B., University of Chicago, 1959  
KENNETH RICHARD JOHNSTON  
A.B., Augustana College, 1959  
DONALD ROBERT KOEHN  
A.B., University of Illinois, 1953  
WESLEY ALBERT KORT  
A.B., Calvin College, 1956  
D.B., Calvin Theological Seminary, 1959  
ROGER WILLIAM LUYSTER  
A.B., Dartmouth College, 1958  
ALBERT EARL NICHOLS  
A.B., Occidental College, 1952  
D.B., Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1956  
MAC LINSOTT RICKETTS

A.B., University of Florida, 1952  
D.B., Emory University, 1954  
TOM MC CLAIN SHERWOOD  
A.B., William Jewell College, 1958  
WALTER STANLEY STEPHENS  
A.B., William Jewell College, 1954  
D.B., Andover Newton Theological Seminary, 1957  
GERRIT JAN TENZYTHOFF  
D.B., University of Utrecht, Holland, 1950  
S.T.M., Union College, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, 1958  
JAMES MC KENDREE WALL  
A.B., Emory University, 1949  
D.B., *ibid.*, 1955  
JOHN S. WILLIAMS  
A.B., Cornell College, 1958

### **BACHELOR OF DIVINITY:**

MING-CHUNG CHIU  
B.Th., Taiwan Theological College, Taiwan, Formosa, 1952  
MARJORIE L. FELDER  
A.B., Agnes Scott College, 1951  
JOHN GEORGE KOEHLER  
S.B., University of Pennsylvania, 1930  
ALEXANDROS CHARLES MICHALOS  
A.B., Western Reserve University, 1957  
A.M., University of Chicago, 1961  
KEITH EDGAR TENNIS  
A.B., Upper Iowa University, 1957

### **DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY:**

LOWELL GWEN COLSTON  
A.B., Drake University, 1943  
D.B., Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1947  
JOHN WESLEY HUNT, JR.  
A.B., University of Oklahoma, 1949  
D.B., University of Chicago, 1952  
FRANKLIN EUGENE SHERMAN  
A.B., Muhlenberg College, 1949  
A.M., University of Chicago, 1952  
D.B., Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, 1953  
PAUL RONALD SPONHEIM  
B.Th., Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, 1957  
A.M., University of Chicago, 1960  
JACK AUSTIN WORTHINGTON  
A.B., Southwestern-at-Memphis, 1953  
D.B., Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, 1956

# Edgar Johnson Goodspeed

## 1871-1962

By Ernest Cadman Colwell

*No man's career is more intimately associated with one institution than is Edgar Goodspeed's with the University of Chicago*

EDGAR GOODSPEED was a child of the Church and a child of the University. He grew up into the Baptist Church; he lived and worked in it all his life, and he died in its faith.

For several years we were members of the same church in the city of Chicago. In that church, one could not help but perceive that he rejoiced in his Baptist heritage. He held it firmly, and he held it with pride. He responded positively to the challenges his church brought to him. He served it on Board, on Committee, and Commission. He participated in its educational program. Without hesitation, but with eagerness he brought his special gifts to the service of the Church.

Those who knew him in the fellowship of the First Baptist church of Los Angeles would give the same testimony. He belonged to the Church.

But he belonged also to the University, and the world of learning. In a unique way. As he grew up, he grew up into the University. His father, Thomas Wakefield Goodspeed, was one of the influential founders and developers of the University of Chicago. Edgar, as a boy at home, listened to the dreams of a great university which

he later helped to make a reality. No man's career is more intimately associated with one institution than is Edgar Goodspeed's with the University of Chicago. He entered the University as a student in the year it opened, 1892. Forty-five years later he retired as the distinguished Chairman of a distinguished department. This very chapel [Bond] and the jewelled splash of color in its windows are two enduring witnesses to his generous interest in this University.

All that came before his career at the University was Preface. At a young 18, he graduated from Denison, and the next year at Yale studied under William Rainey Harper. After one year of study and teaching at Morgan Park, he was in the University.

There he studied for six years, receiving the degrees of Bachelor of Divinity and Doctor of Philosophy. He won the latter degree "with highest honors"; as a reward, President Harper appointed him to an assistantship in the university *provided he spent two years in travel and study abroad.*

Edgar Goodspeed was a great scholar. He paid the price of arduous, technical, specialized

ERNEST CADMAN COLWELL, Dean of the Southern California School of Theology, Claremont, California, received his Ph.B. from Emory University, his B.D. from Candler School of Theology and his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago. He served as Instructor in English Literature and Bible at Emory University from 1924-28, came to the University of Chicago as assistant then associate and then professor of New Testament Literature. He served as Dean of the Divinity School of The University of Chicago from 1939-45, as dean of the faculties from 1943-45, as Vice-President of the University of Chicago in 1944, as President of the University of Chicago 1945-51, became Dean of the Faculties of Emory University in 1951 and Vice-President of Emory University in 1954. He is the author of several books which include *An Approach to the Teaching of Jesus*, 1947 and *What Is the Best New Testament?*, 1952, *The Gospel of the Spirit*, 1953. He wrote "The Text and Ancient Versions of the New Testament" in *The Interpreter's Bible*.

Dr. Colwell was principal speaker for the Goodspeed Memorial. President Colwell was one of Goodspeed's outstanding students and was associated with him for many years, first as a teacher, then as a colleague, and finally as a counselor and friend in Goodspeed's later years.



the interest of his students in the subject itself. In the late 20's, he presented to a seminar of graduate students his fruitful but complicated hypothesis on the origin of the Epistle to the Ephesians. In spite of the fact that the class came at eleven o'clock in the morning, we students became so involved in discussion and partisan debate that after class we stood arguing on the street corner outside the graduate apartment building until one wife after another would come out and drag her reluctant husband in to a belated lunch. And this interest led many of these students to make their own novel contributions to the study of Ephesians; as, notably, in John Knox's brilliant identification of Onesimus as an important actor in that drama.

When Goodspeed's collaborator, Ernest Dewitt Burton, became president of the University in 1923, Edgar Goodspeed became Chairman of the New Testament Department, a position which he held for fourteen years — until his retirement in 1937. In those fourteen years, 46 men received their doctor of philosophy degree in that department. These "doctors" of his have taught New Testament in colleges like Goucher, the University of Virginia, Southern Methodist University, and the University of Southern California. They have held or now hold professorships in theological seminaries, such as Yale University, Union Seminary in New York,

the University of Chicago, Colgate Rochester, Emory University, Claremont Theological School, Duke University, Iliff at Denver, Columbia in Georgia, and Augustana at Rock Island. And four out of five of the scholars studying the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament in America today received their motivation either directly or indirectly from Edgar Goodspeed. The great scholar produces scholars, and the great teacher produces teachers.

It is a commonplace of Sunday School study now to ridicule those dull chapters in the Old Testament that repeat monotonously that "so-and-so begat so-and-so, and so-and-so begat so-and-so." But I know of no other symbol adequate to the recognition of the role of the great teacher, than the symbol of the Begetter. He is one in the successive generations of teachers. Thus Goodspeed stands as a genetic link between the great teachers who were his — William Rainey Harper, Ernest Dewitt Burton, Adolph Harnack, Friedrich Blass, and others — and the teachers of my generation and of all generations to come.

For him the trite words are true: He was a loyal churchman. He was a gentleman and a scholar. Today we rejoice to honor the memory of Edgar Johnson Goodspeed, and thank God for him.

---

## STAGES OF ENCOUNTER WITH GOD

If you ask your friends why they read history, they will probably all say, "In order to learn the lessons of history." That is the stock answer. But the vast majority of folk who read history do so out of sheer fascination. Now, in one respect that means that the reading of history is a religious pursuit. It is one way of being on the track of the holy. But before we point out wherein the holiness lies, let us point out that besides alluring and charming us, there is much in history that may repel and drive us away from our fellowman. But for the most part we are vastly interested in what we call human nature, not only individually but in its multitudes and groupings, its families and tribes, its peoples and nations, its cultures and civilizations, its inhumanities and its philanthropies. He must be a misanthrope indeed who does not respond with curiosity to the human cavalcade and its pageantry. But empires rise and fall. Persons pass through the arc of career and stumble. Nations know the blessings of peace and lose them in the agonies of war. After days of plenty terror stalks the land. We are hard put to it to make sense out of it all. Yet through the seeming shambles we sense that judgment is taking place. Out of the blessings of peace and the agonies of war alike we gain a sense of righteousness and justice. This is what is fascinating about history, and what is religious: that amidst the seeming contrasts and the ambiguities, the glories and grandeurs succeeded by decline and disaster, there is a fulfillment of law — precepts, commandments and true ordinances which bring us to the fear of the Lord. Even the enemy, he is the sword of the Lord, used by the Lord, discovering to us and disclosing to us what God demands of us, and by these things are we taught, even when we cannot fully explain.

W. BARNETT BLAKEMORE, *Associate Dean of Rockefeller Memorial Chapel, in a sermon preached in the chapel on January 29, 1961.*

contributions also in the area of New Testament and Byzantine iconography, as in his volume on the miniatures of the Rockefeller-McCormick New Testament. His work here was recognized as that of an expert, and was published in such media as *The Art Bulletin*, *Parnassus*, *Byzantion*, and the *Kondakov Semanarium*. He leaves also as a monument to his interest and industry in this field a comprehensive collection of photographic materials—which might well be named in his honor. Other areas of special concern were early Christian archeology, in which he gave courses regularly, and the history of the English Bible. In connection with the latter one may mention *The Coverdale Psalter and the Quatrocentenary of the Printed English Bible*, published by the Caxton Club in 1935, and one of the “fifty books of the year.” Of various honors which he received over the years he was particularly happy over his recent election as a “Fellow of the International Institute of Arts and Letters.”

Amid all this specialization Professor Willoughby did not lose sight of the central concerns of biblical studies; and during his presidency of the Chicago Society of Biblical Research in 1945-46 he conceived and carried to publication a monumental symposium, *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*, the values of which were recognized in the demand for a second edition.

In the midst, also, of his research and publication Harold Willoughby did not overlook his students and his classes. In fact he rarely missed a class in all of his teaching career. Much of this concern must have derived from his close association with students throughout the years. For he was “headmaster” of Goodspeed Hall, when it was the residence for Divinity School men, from 1919 to 1936; and thereafter his home and study (“The Hermitage”) was in the Disciples Divinity House. Moreover, interest in students and their problems did not end with their campus days. He continued, also, a close and helpful association with them in their subsequent careers. An alumnus secretary without portfolio—and of course without pay, except for the satisfaction which it doubtless gave him—he carried on a prolific correspondence with alumni and former students everywhere. This little known aspect of his activities was immensely valuable to all of us. Some time before his retirement he divulged the information that about two-thirds of alumni news items in a typical issue of the Divinity School News came from his pen. He was forever the bearer of good news about alumni and others, whether it was in sessions of the New Testament Club, or in chance meetings at the Quadrangle Club, or elsewhere. It was a

rare occasion when he was not able happily to extract a letter from his pocket and share its contents.

It was no wonder that we received such an enthusiastic response to an invitation to a number of scholars—former students and colleagues—for participation in a volume in honor of his seventieth birthday, as well as to an announcement of its publication. The book, appropriately dealing with and entitled *Early Christian Origins*, was deeply appreciated by Professor Willoughby, and it was a matter of great satisfaction to the collaborators that we were able to present him with this token of esteem before he was so suddenly taken from us. He himself was particularly happy to be presented with a special, leather-bound copy of it at a dinner party on November 20, 1961, when several of the contributors and also members of the faculty of the Divinity School were present.

There are many other facets of Harold Willoughby's character to which we cannot here do justice. But perhaps we may be permitted—in Willoughby fashion—to share with you some communications which will recall certain of these. Here are extracts from two letters received on the occasion of retirement and read at a session of the New Testament Club. Professor Amos Wilder (now at Harvard) contributed a true-to-life vignette, in which he wrote:

*“When I recall the inimitable and meticulous phrases in which he on occasion spoke his salutations or valedictories to others at these banquets, I do not envy any one called on to salute him at this time. Those who have known the impeccable order of the Hermitage; those who have served on committees with its tenant; those who have taken part with him in oral examinations, even on the receiving end; those who have served with him as editor, or, I am sure studied with him as teacher—all such will to some extent carry a bad conscience through life. To paraphrase a passage from Othello: ‘He hath a daily order in his life, that makes me sloppy.’”*

And among other things Professor Emeritus William Irwin wrote as follows:

*“. . . Among my earliest memories of you is of the occasion when I sat in your room in Goodspeed Hall and you chatted about your classes with Ernest DeWitt Burton and the student who undertook to rebuke him for his methods. Then my recollections increase: all the rich associations we had through twenty years. They were always stimulating occasions for me, whether a visit to your study in the Disciples Divinity House, or one of your illustrated lectures on Byzantine iconography, or your participation in the deliberations of the Biblical Field. Of your scholarly attainments, and the high prestige you brought to the University I shall say nothing; both are too well known for me to add anything . . .”*

usually known as the King James Bible or Authorized Version, whose 350th anniversary we celebrate this year. Incorporating as it did many of the features of earlier English translations of the Bible, the King James Version has an unrivaled place in the history of English literature. Its words and phrases have become a permanent part of our language.

Yet an increasing number of these words and phrases from the King James Bible can no longer be said to communicate their meanings to 20th-century audiences in Britain and the United States. It uses "let" to mean "hinder" and "prevent" to mean "precede," and its "begats" and "doths" do not slide smoothly from a modern tongue. In addition, the study of biblical manuscripts and of biblical languages has made so much progress since the Authorized Version was issued in 1611 that even its most conservative defenders — whether their conservatism be literary or theological — must admit the need of a new version.

The New English Bible, whose New Testament was published on March 14, is an attempt to meet that need. Originally the British planned to do what the Americans had done in the Revised Standard Version of 1946 and following: to revise the King James Bible as drastically as was necessary in view of the changes described above, but to keep its patterns and rhythms as nearly intact as possible. This British plan yielded to a more radical one, namely, to prepare a new translation, one that did not indeed ignore earlier versions, including the Authorized Version, but nevertheless proceeded independently. The committee charged with translating the New Testament was the first to complete its work, and the results are before us.

The results are impressive. A reader who knows nothing about the Greek text, or for that matter about the English Bible, can pick it up, read it, and understand it. That is certainly the primary test of a translation. But the way to evaluate its quality as a translation is to examine it

in the light of the problems a translator faces and to decide how well the translators of the New English Bible (already nicknamed the NEB) have done.

The first problem faced by a translator is to establish the meaning of the original text. He must decide which words belong in the original text and which do not, and he must seek to determine what those words mean. In the case of the New Testament, which exists in thousands of manuscripts and which has been read, interpreted, translated, and argued over for many centuries, this is no easy job. Determining the original text of the New Testament with finality is probably beyond our reach; all we can do is to approximate it as well as possible. Inevitably, therefore, a translator will have to make certain decisions about the relative value of the manuscript evidence before him. For example, in Romans 5:1, the Revised Standard Version translates: "We have peace with God." From the evidence of the manuscripts alone, it would seem that a better reading would be an exhortation: "Let us have peace with God." Nevertheless, because this reading does not appear to make sense in the setting of St. Paul's argument, most translators and commentators have preferred the declaratory or indicative reading, "We have." The NEB, however, translates: "Let us continue at peace with God."

Other problems connected with establishing the meaning of the original text are due not to the state of the manuscript evidence, but to theological and religious questions. For example, in the prescriptions for a bishop enumerated in 1 Timothy 3, the original lists as one requirement that a bishop be (and here I am translating literally) "a one-woman man." Does this mean that a bishop may be married only once in his life, or does it permit him to remarry if his wife dies? The former possibility is the one chosen by many modern interpreters, and therefore the Revised Standard Version translates: "married only once." The New English Bible, on the other hand, finds a translation that is simultaneously as

JAROSLAV JAN PELIKAN, JR.: Professor of Historical Theology, The Divinity School, The University of Chicago, graduated from Concordia College in Fort Wayne, Indiana, received his B.D. from Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, and his Ph.D. from the Divinity School of The University of Chicago. He is the author of the books *From Luther to Kierkegaard*, *Fools for Christ*, *The Shape of Death*. He won the Abingdon Award for 1959 for his prize-winning manuscript published as *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism*. His most recent book is *The Light of the World: A Basic Image in Early Christian Thought* (Harpers, 1962). He is the editor of *Luther's Works*, several volumes of which have already appeared. He is a contributor to several theological journals including "Christian Century," "Church History," "Journal of Religion." Dr. Pelikan is Departmental Editor for Religion for Encyclopedia Britannica and a member of the editorial staff of "The Library of Protestant Thought," "Cresset," "Journal of Religion," "The American Lutheran," "The Christian Scholar." The above article appeared in the Chicago "Sun-Times," March 19, 1961, and is used by permission.



sharply. Recognizing this quality of English vocabulary, the translators of the NEB have been alert for shades of meaning in English synonyms as renderings of the same word in Greek. An interesting example of this is in two passages from the Gospel of St. John. Both of them employ the Greek verb *marturein*, which means "to bear witness." In the first, John 10:25, the NEB translates *marturein*: "My deeds done in my Father's name are my credentials." In the second, John 18:23, it translates: "If I spoke amiss, state it in evidence." The English reader would not guess that the same Greek verb has been employed in these two passages, and it would be sheer pedantry to use the same English verb in both cases; for the words "credentials" and "in evidence" accurately convey the meaning that the Greek verb acquires in these two contexts.

Another advantage of the English language for the translation of the New Testament today is its acquisition of new words or of technical words, some of which would not fit at all in a translation of the Bible, but others of which can precisely reflect the connotations of the Greek. For instance, 2 Peter 2:6 speaks of Sodom and Gomorrah and of the punishment visited upon them. The NEB translates: "making them an object-lesson for godless men in future days." Certainly this is an improvement on a translation like "example." The phrases rendered by the Revised Standard Version as "the cares of the world, and the delight in riches, and the desire for other things" (Mark 4:19) became in the NEB: "worldly cares and the false glamour of wealth and all kinds of evil desire." Or in the introduction to the Gospel of Luke, the addressee of the Gospel is referred to as "most excellent Theophilus." But the NEB, recognizing that "excellent" is a title rather than merely a compliment, employs a historic English term for men of high position and translates it as: "Theophilus . . . your Excellency."

Still another advantage of English is its wealth of colorful words in which to express the exact meaning of the original text. John 6:60, for example, is translated in the Revised Standard Version: "This is a hard saying; who can listen to it?" That is a literal translation. But the NEB finds a stronger equivalent in English and translates: "This is more than we can stomach! Why listen to such words?" In Mark 12:14 the Pharisees are represented as saying to Jesus: "We know that you are true, and care for no man." Again, a literal translation, but a misleading one. The NEB translates: "Master, you are an honest man, we

know, and truckle to no man, whoever he may be." The word "truckle," which in this sense goes back at least to Pepys, conveys precisely the meaning of servility that the original suggests. The soldiers at the cross said of the seamless robe of Jesus (John 19:24): "Let us not tear it, but cast lots for it to see whose it shall be." The directness of soldiers' speech comes through much more clearly in the NEB's version: "We must not tear this; let us toss for it."

Above all, of course, English is rich in invective, though not as rich as languages like Arabic. The NEB exploits the riches of the English vocabulary of abuse to render the expletives and insults in the original Greek. Acts 8:20 is one of the most illuminating instances. The Revised Standard Version, translating literally, renders it: "Your silver perish with you, because you thought you could obtain the gift of God with money!" The NEB translates: "You and your money, may you come to a bad end, for thinking God's gift is for sale!" Ephesians 4:14 describes the condition of those who have been firmly established in their faith: "no longer children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the cunning of men, by their craftiness in deceitful wiles." The NEB translates the same words with fresh vigor: "We are no longer to be children, tossed by the waves and whirled about by every gust of teaching, dupes of crafty rogues and their deceitful schemes." Thus the committee for the NEB employ the riches of English invective to give color and strength to biblical language, by contrast with those translators and readers who wish the language of the Bible in English to be dainty and even prissy.

Not all the translations are this fortunate. Some, it seems to this reviewer, have not improved upon earlier renderings, but have made them more awkward. One illustration of this is Acts 7:28. The Revised Standard Version translates: "Do you want to kill me as you killed the Egyptian yesterday?" The NEB translates: "Are you going to kill me like the Egyptian you killed yesterday?" Even if one is not allergic to the slovenly use of "like" as a conjunction, the NEB rendering is still clumsy. It is hard to understand why the translators of the NEB, after replacing "deny" with the better "disown" in Matthew 26:34, then retained "deny" in John 13:38, where "disown" would also have been more appropriate. The discourse of Jesus in John 6:46-51 is broken up by the NEB into eight separate sentences, with the result that the entire paragraph sounds more choppy than it does either in the other English translations or in the original.

Much more disturbing than any of these

literally "saving" belief that his life has meaning within himself, in his solitude — *but* only if he is at the same time actively engaged in "society."

Ralph Waldo Emerson saw this clearly and I borrowed my basic insight and terms from his essay, "Society and Solitude," published in 1870 when he was sixty-seven years old and had grown mellow — and perhaps a little gloomy. Emerson's conclusion seems to have been that "solitude [alone] is impracticable, and society [alone] is fatal." Therefore, "we must keep our head in the one and our hands in the other. The conditions are met, if we keep our independence [our private lives] yet do not lose our sympathy [our public lives]." And, he added, "these wonderful horses need to be driven by fine hands" in order to keep them balanced as a team. And I have concluded from my own swing through the twentieth century's "lonely crowd" of "other-directed" people that while Emerson's words seem a little dated his sentiment rings true and sounds surprisingly modern.

In the ninety-one years since he said it, our society has grown vastly more complex and of necessity — with the sheer increase in population — vastly more organized. We move within circles of wheels within wheels, caught in organizations piled on organizations — all of our own making — which more and more determine what we shall do and be and when we shall do it and be it. Our organizations aggressively invade our solitude. We know in the midst of our rush what Emerson meant when he said, "We do what we must, and call it by the best names we can, and would fain have the praise of having intended the result which ensues" — if, I would add, it be judged good and receive acclaim.

This immersion in the constant round of work, meetings, committees and so on, we commonly call our "rat race." But our attitude toward it is ambivalent. We rebel against it. But at the same time we love it.

Often we say that we would like to escape from it. This I discovered when it was announced that we (the Meads) were leaving Chicago for Southern California. Practically all our friends, when they heard this, said first, "We shall miss you." This I believed. Since we had lived in the community for twenty-four years we had become to most of these people a part of the landscape — a permanent fixture — and to some, a lamppost against which to lean in their occasional giddy moments. For them our leaving, like the cutting of Thoreau's tree, left a vacant space against the sky. But having said simply and honestly, "we'll miss you," about half these friends added — usually in a confidential

tone of voice — "Really I envy you for getting out of this rat race."

I think I know what they meant. And certainly I sympathize with the mood they were in when they said it. We are a busy people, cogs in the wheels of our numerous institutions and organizations, all of which demand our time and energies primarily because each is furthering some good cause. But there are so many things to do that we are likely to discover sooner or later that what the Red Queen told Alice is true:

*Now, here, you see, it takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that!"*

And then, as the prophet Isaiah said, we are in danger even though youthful, of becoming faint and weary — of falling exhausted. For this weariness comes with the feeling that "we do what we must" to keep up and have time for precious little more. Thus we begin to feel trapped in "society."

But the inner spirit of man is sound and will not be thus trapped. People, it asserts, are not born to fall into a way of living that creates a weariness with life itself. So when we look about us today and listen to what is being said from every side in our society, we note — even without his help — what Emerson called "the plaint of tragedy which murmurs from it in regard to persons, to friendship and [to] love." For our spirits tell us that in persons as such — in friendship and in love — lies the reality our hearts seek and are restless until they find rest there. Hence when we begin to feel ourselves so involved in doing what we must that these "dearest events" are escaping us, we may exclaim with Emerson, that if this *activity* is all that is left of our lives, then "nothing [real] is left us now but death. [And] we look to that with a grim satisfaction, saying, there at least is reality that will not dodge us." We are sound in sensing that this kind of immersion in society is fatal to the individual.

Much has happened during the years since Emerson wrote his essay. We have learned much about the human mind and spirit, and we have become very sophisticated. But out of our awesome learning and sophistication comes much to confirm Emerson's insight. Witness, for example, the pronouncement of one who aspires to be a latter-day seer, in a book called *Life Against Death*:

*It also begins to be apparent that mankind, unconscious of its real desires and therefore unable to obtain satisfaction, is hostile to life and ready to destroy itself. Freud was right in positing a death instinct, and the development of weapons of destruction makes our*

can live in society and do effective work if we can live with our solitary selves. Many of our counselors say this.

And so did Emerson in his delineation of the individual who must live both in his society and in his solitude. Solitude complete, aside from being impracticable and impossible, is the lonesome road to the peace of "dusty death." But society complete, without solitude, is fatal to the individual. So "we keep our heads" in solitude, our hands in society, and live our lives in both at the same time.

We must live and act in society simply because *human* individuals are inconceivable except in communities, and we must run the communities in which we live. In society we are nourished and sustained by the sympathetic understanding and companionship of other people—as we by our sympathetic understanding and companionship nourish and sustain them. So in bearing one another's burdens, we make possible for each the salutary solitude he needs. For in that solitude the harassed individual, listening to the still, small voice, finds meaning in himself and in it all. It is in that solitude, and there alone, that the individual glimpses what Whitehead called "the eternal greatness incarnate in the passage of temporal fact."

The gospels are the myth which suggests where this saving glimpse of the "eternal greatness in the life of man is to be looked for. And to me the striking thing about the story is that it is not a supercolossal, stupendous, extraordinarily expensive, five-star production such as our movie-makers would conjure up out of this astounding thing. It is the story of very ordinary people, engaged in very common work—fishing, collecting taxes, sowing, reaping, preparing meals, entertaining visiting teachers, and so on. To many, perhaps a majority, of his contemporaries even the chief character seemed all too common. "Can anything good come out of Nazareth?" some inquired, with you know what inflection. Nicier and more religious people called him a winedrinker and a glutton. And they noted with delicious

moralism that he ate with Publicans and sinners and talked with prostitutes as if they were people. And finally they had a big laugh because he hung on a cross, dying, and they saw that he who had talked of saving others could not save himself from them—the clever people of society alone.

But this teacher had said—and the ages cannot forget it—that his kingdom was not of this world—not of "society"—but existed in that realm of solitude where I and God are one—in which kingdom men find quiet strength to overcome the world.

Whatever else the myth may convey, to me it seems to teach that the "eternal greatness" is incarnate in the mundane everyday activities of people—even in Chicago and Long Beach and Claremont—it is within them all the time, wherever they are. It is in that vision incarnate in everyday affairs—in that glimpse of meaning resident there—that one's strength is renewed. Then he may run the same course in society as before, "and not be weary"; walk the same outward path, "and not faint."

Without such inner solitude, while in a society as complexly organized as ours, man becomes "mass man," without individuality, his life indeed "a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing." In such solitude even as one can achieve in the midst of the sound and fury itself, and wherever his "rat race" may be set, belief that one's life has meaning is found—and that is "salvation."

We are saved, if at all, by what we can really believe in our solitude. We are saved not by what we tell others, but by what we can honestly tell ourselves: and while living and participating fully in our modern society, which by its very nature tends to make such belief extremely difficult.

We are saved, if at all, not by escaping from society and not because we have found or achieved some final and unshakable certainty, but rather because however often in society we feel meaning slipping away and must pray with apprehension, "help thou my unbelief," we can in our solitude bravely affirm, "I believe!"