

Library

The Seminarian



Trinity

1945

The Seminarian



Published by the Student Body of the Lutheran
Theological Seminary, 7301 Germantown Avenue,
Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania. Vol. XI. No. 1.
Editor: Robert E. Bornemann; Associate Editor:
Earl T. Knaus; Circulation: Edward Wiediger.

Contents

Cover: Christ Sitting in Judgment (Trinity XXV, XXVI).

Editorial . . . "Therefore be ye also Ready."

The Otherness of God.

Robert J. Goescr.

Interscenary Movement.

John W. Vannorsdall,
Earl T. Knaus,
Donald F. Bautz.

Perspective.

Norberth H. Stracker.

Illustration: I am the Vine.

Christ the Vine, A Meditation.

Warren L. Bieber.

Directory of New Students.

Insert: The Prospects of the Lutheran Church in America.

Theodore G. Tappert.

The ancient design of Christ in Judgment was adapted from One Lord: One World by Fulton J. Sheen.

The illustration of Christ the Vine was adapted with permission from an original drawing by A. de Bethune.

Editorial . . .

"Therefore be ye also Ready."

"Ye are all the children of light, and the children of the day... Therefore let us not sleep, as do others; but let us watch and be sober." As the season of Holy Trinity draws to a close, the cry sounds to watchfulness and preparation. Suddenly, as a thief in the night, the Son of man will come with his angels, and upon the throne of glory He will judge the nations of the earth. When mankind sinks back in security and peaceful complacency, destruction will come. Not as the foolish, but as the wise maidens, let our lamps be trimmed and well-filled with oil.

Faith is the preparation for the coming of the Lord. Alert it watches for every opportunity to serve the kingdom of God. It awaits the day when the Son of man will come in all his glory. Springing from the love of God, faith lives in selfless care for fellowman. Waking or sleeping it is living, because it dwells in Christ, the Lord.

But to define our preparation by faith in such broad terms is not sufficient. For each Christian watchfulness, activity and life take on special meaning for activity, which if not a part of faith, accrues to it. For us the seriousness of our calling to the service of the Kingdom of God determines certain responsibilities for our preparation. We are charged with the leading and care of the souls who confess the Christ; we are, moreover, debtors to all men to bring them the Gospel of reconciliation.

These years in the seminary are for sober preparation and development in faith and its expression. They require study, extensive reading and research so that through the records and the life of the Church the spirit of the evangel might be attained. Beyond scientific scholarship we must make what we have learned our very own. It is not enough that we accept the heritage of faith and confession from our fathers; we must make it vital and real in our own religious experience. Even more than this, we are afforded the opportunity of developing our thoughts and knowledge in papers and sermons and articles. The expression of what we think and believe in creative writing has value in the discipline it requires. The straight thinking, clear analysis and organization which is necessary not only aids our own comprehension, but also may stimulate the interest of somebody in the subject. It is good training, for we must always be ready to express our thoughts and ideas clearly and precisely.

This preparation takes on importance when we realize that we shall be pastors. But our responsibility goes even deeper than the individual parish. Careful and thorough training is imperative because it is we who will shape and determine the life of the Church. If we do not know the Word, how can it be preached? if we cannot see, will the blind lead the blind? The spirit of the Church depends greatly upon those who belong to the Church; we are their leaders.

Behold, the Lord has gone forth into a foreign country and has made us His servants to be rulers over His household, and to give them meat in due season. "Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing....Therefore be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh."

With these ideas in mind the Seminarium begins its eleventh year. It sees its task in providing a means for the expression of ideas and thoughts in the whole range of theology. It does not consider itself simply a "literary publication;" and yet, far from being a term of reproach, theology ought to be well and beautifully expressed, in short, good literature. It seeks to encourage writing. It feels that, while the time to have begun creative thinking and composition should have been long ago, if it has not, certainly it should be now.

The Seminarium also sees its task in stimulating interest in the whole world and life of the Church. It hopes to include in its contents articles concerning doctrine, faith and problems of confessional Christianity. It hopes to publish studies in the Old and New Testaments, history of Christianity, and developments in practice. It would reflect the life of the Church at work in missions, ecumenical thinking and activity. Nor would it forget the times of quiet and meditation when the Church retires to its source of strength and vitality. It is scarcely necessary that such a witness to the life of the Church depends upon you; the contributors will determine the tone and spirit of the publication.

Thus, with these aims, the Seminarium publishes the first of eight issues in its new series. You will notice that some changes have been made. The covers and illustrations are being done with block prints by Theodore Casper. A new design for the title page has been adopted, and a table of contents has been added. Much credit must go to the many who have helped and will help in the publication of the Seminarium, and acknowledgement of them will be made in print at the close of the year.

"Prayer is, therefore, a living communion of the religious man with God, conceived as personal and present in experience, a communion which reflects the forms of the social relations of humanity. This is prayer in essence."

(Friedrich Heiler, Prayer (S. McComb, trans.). New York: Oxford University Press, 1932. p. 356.)

THE OTHERNESS OF GOD

by

Robert J. Gooser

The burning continental question of the otherness of God perhaps has jolted slightly the complacent American Lutheran theological mind. Possibly many would prefer that the fire die down from lack of fuel, especially now that Professor Heinecken's article has been answered. For several reasons I believe the question requires further discussion. They are: first, the incorrect presentation of an important idea of Karl Heim; second, confusion regarding the nature of the question of God's otherness; and third, the importance of the concept of otherness in Christian Theology. In this paper, after a brief reference to Pastor Berkemeyer's reply, my task will be a criticism of Professor Heinecken's approach to the question, and second, a sketch of the general lines along which I believe the problem should be developed.

That Pastor Berkemeyer¹ has not given us a more adequate reply to Professor Heinecken's article² is unfortunate. In this reply there seem to be three conspicuous weaknesses. The writer was evidently overwhelmed by the statement of the original question. He saw in it sheer Barthianism. So he proceeded to bring into play several oft heard attacks on Barthianism and assumed that this answered the arguments of the article. He has not concerned himself with those arguments, but has attacked the general Barthian concept of the absolute otherness of God. This hardly seems to be a fair approach and is no real answer. Consequently he has failed to evaluate the underlying ideas which are those of Heim and not of Barth. He has not seen, for example, that Heim does not use the idea of dimensional beyondness as constituting God's otherness. In the third place, he has confused the Barthian concept of the otherness of God with the non-rational element, -or to use Otto's term- the numinous-in God and has equated them. Thus Otto does not say that Islam is the purest modern manifestation of the religion of the wholly Other, but that there the non-rational element is strongest.³

Professor Heinecken's argument and approach, then, were not really evaluated. What is his position apart from shrugging it aside as being Barthianism? What is its weakness, aside from being called a name and accused of identifying God with the non-rational? The weakness is the result of placing an idea of Heim into a different context, and consequent confusion on what is meant by the question of God's otherness. Taking Heim's philosophical concept of dimensions and placing it into a different frame of reference, the author still insists that Heim supports the new position. We must now ask the question, what is Heim's context for the idea?

The German theologian has dealt with this most fully in Glaube und Denken in its first edition and also in the third edition. The latter was greatly revised through omissions of large sections and also through certain additions, and is called in English translation God Transcendent. Since it is later and makes the context and aim more definite it may be considered more authoritative for our purposes. However, I have also checked with the fuller, original edition.

Heim is attempting to present a philosophic rationale for the belief in God as the groundwork of his dogmatics. In his preface he states clearly that his task is to establish God's Transcendence (God Transcendent, p. xviii.). This task has become imperative because many intelligent people can no longer believe in God. They cannot because for them there is nothing beyond this world. Here then is the situation. For hundreds of years religious men had no trouble with God's transcendence. God was simply above and beyond. But with the discoveries of Copernicus and especially Giordano Bruno this was no longer possible. The world is not within a definite space beyond which is God, but the world itself is infinite space. How then to conceive of God? Or better, where can God exist? As Heim says: "It is not simply the reality of God beyond that is called in question. The shattering is something much more serious than that. The whole idea of transcendence, so essential for theologians and philosophers alike, has become impossible for countless people." (p. 35). A little later he says: "How is it that we who, live in the Copernican age, we, for whom the world has lost its center and its bounds, can still hold to the idea of the Transcendent?" (p. 38)

These statements, representative of Heim's approach are clear. There can be no doubt as to his aim. But I was glad to find that my own analysis was supported in an essay by Channing-Pierce.⁵ He sums up Heim's aim as, "In other words, how can the twentieth century believe in God?"⁶ Heim's work is more than mild apologetic, however. It is in fact a bold answer to the philosophic and scientific monism of our day. It sets forth the reality of transcendence in an age which has been concerned only with the reality of the immanent view. In doing so he goes further and points the way to a possible philosopher's rationale of the relationship of transcendence and immanence. "In the speculation of Karl Heim the suggestion of such a conception of transcendence in immanence which matches our existential experience and the outline of a new analogy drawn from psychology, rather than physics have been seen."⁷ That he has attempted to relate transcendence and immanence Heim makes apparent in his criticism of dialectical theology.

Heim's aim is clear. It is the philosophical question of the relation of God to the universe. He has formulated his concept of dimensions to establish the reality of God's transcendence and the relation between transcendence and immanence. This he believes is an essential prologue to a work in dogmatics because of the scientific and philosophic views of our age. An apologetics for the possibility of the existence of God must precede the dogmatics.

With this in mind we ask the question, into what context has Professor Heineken placed the idea of dimensions? He has taken it out of the area of apologetics and placed it in the area of dogmatics. This I believe is a fair statement, but I must review the author's approach more specifically. There can be no doubt that he has identified God's otherness with dimensional beyondness. The entire article except the last three pages is concerned with the introduction and exposition of that thesis. I think several passages will indicate the general direction. "To all these questions I believe there are answers, and I think they will be contained in an explanation of what is meant by the 'absolutely other.'" (p. 244). "What I want to do now is to define as precisely as I can what is to be understood by God's absolute otherness." (p. 245). "There is no other way out of the impasse into which every

other attempted solution leads then to say, with Karl Heim, that "God's total otherness, His immanence and transcendence, consists of His being of another dimension, of which we who do not share that dimension can form no conception and to which we can point only in paradox." (p. 251).

The author has equated dimensional beyondness with God's otherness and then has ascribed this new position to Heim. Heim, however, does not argue that God's otherness is identical with dimensional beyondness. Rather he has used the idea in order to answer the question, "Where is God?" or, "What is God's nature?" This is not true to Heim.

This criticism I have leveled would not be entirely valid, (Although it would still indicate a confusion in terminology) if Professor Heineken's aim was the same as Heim's. His aim might also have been to prove God's transcendence instead of God's otherness, merely confusing these different, though related, terms. Perhaps he too was trying to answer the question, "What is God?", which is the content of the term God's otherness. Is this a real possibility? From two passages in the article itself I believe not.

Consider first the paragraph in which he lists the implications which arise when God is not the absolutely other. "Then either some form of idolatry or pantheism results and man himself is deified. Then some form of Pelagianism inevitably creeps in. Then you get the sorry and disheartening spectacle of Christians unwittingly betraying their secret belief in a fundamental human integrity, reminding themselves of the spark of divinity within them which needs only to be fanned to burst into flames. Then man's lifelong predicament in sin becomes finitude resulting in weakness and mistakes, forgiveness is like human pardon, and the kingdom of God is identified with a state of human prosperity...and for the resurrection is substituted the entirely un-Biblical notion of the immortality of the soul." (pp. 243-4).

Passing by the question of pantheism, which, of course, would be a legitimate implication if God were not transcendent, we ask if the other implications would follow. They obviously postulate a God who is beyond, who is transcendent. They seem to echo thoughts characteristic of Romanism ("semi-Pelagianism") and of Rationalism and nineteenth-century Theology with their "humanized picture of God" as Aulen calls it. The author is arguing against these approaches which made man essentially good and humanized God, which did not make man utterly sinful and without claim upon God. However, the postulate even of these ideas is that there is a God, a God who is transcendent, beyond. Certainly the Roman Church, and nineteenth century theology as well, insisted upon God's transcendence. Similarly, the implications listed as coming from God's absolute otherness (p. 243) could not come merely from his transcendence, or from his transcendence and immanence.

The second passage constitutes the last three pages of the article. He begins this brief concluding section with these words: "There is, however, one more difficulty to be dealt with. The difference between God and man is primarily an ethical one, it is the difference due to sin; it is the contrast between God's holiness and man's sinfulness. It is this that cuts man off completely from communion with God." (p. 255). After using the first fourteen pages to introduce and develop his thesis that dimensional beyondness constitutes God's otherness, the author sud-

denly realizes that such a concept would not produce the implications described at the beginning of the article. Although this section is not integrated with the main section, it does not prove that his fundamental aim was not to establish God's transcendence, but His otherness, from which certain definite implications would arise.

These passages leave no doubt that Professor Heineken's problem has been that of God's otherness and not of his transcendence. Let this distinction between transcendence and otherness be questioned, let us pause to consider it. The former is a philosophical term maintaining that God is apart from the universe. Pure transcendence would be equivalent to deism. A god who is both transcendent and immanent, i.e. apart from the universe yet active in it, is the God of theism in the narrow sense. This the gods of theism in the narrow sense and of theism in the broader sense, which would include deism are all transcendent gods. They are to be distinguished from the "gods" of pantheism who are identified in varying ways with the universe. The problem of transcendence or of transcendence and immanence (conceived in terms of dimensional beyondness) is simply that of the relation of God to the physical universe. The otherness of God, however, is a religious term. Its concern is how God is different from man. For practical purposes, therefore, holiness and otherness may be equated.

If the author has identified dimensional beyondness with God's otherness, if this is a change from Him's context, and if transcendence and otherness are to be carefully separated, the next question must be: Can this concept of dimensional beyondness be an adequate explanation of God's otherness? In other words, has Professor Heineken perceived a significant idea in Heim which is valid in another context as well? I think not. The concept of dimensional beyondness tells us nothing of God's otherness. What is God like? Is He Good, evil; righteous, loving; pure will; rational or irrational? One cannot deduce that from a simple statement that God lives in a different dimension, i.e. is both transcendent and immanent. Any theistic god, in the more restricted definition of theism, is both transcendent and immanent. Our author has given us a definition of God's otherness which would fit the Judaistic Jahwe, the Christian God the Father, and the Mohammedan Allah equally well. Likewise within Christian theology it would accurately delineate the God of both St. Paul and Origen, Aquinas and Occam, Luther and Calvin, Schleiermacher and Kierkegaard.

If that is so, what of those implications of which the author spoke at the beginning of his article? These, he said, were the reason the question of God's otherness was so pressing a question which was not mere quibbling. I agree that the question is basic. I do not believe, however, that these implications could ever come from the other with which he postulates. How can the "Christian categories, creation, redemption, sanctification, revelation, sin, guilt, grace, faith, forgiveness, resurrection, etc., in all their awe-inspiring, life-transforming miracle" come from God's otherness evaluated in terms of dimensional beyondness, or transcendence and immanence. If so, Mohammedanism and Judaism would also have these Christian categories. It is impossible to obtain the concepts of redemption, forgiveness, resurrection from a God whose otherness consists only of dimensional beyondness. In the same way those implications which the author says arise from a situation where God is not the absolutely other could come from the otherness he postulates. For

this otherness is theism in its restricted meaning. The theistic God of Romanism, nevertheless, allows a semi-Pelagian theology. And the theistic God of nineteenth century theology was a very humanized God (hardly the Barthian absolutely other) and was placed alongside an anthropology which conceived of man as essentially good.

I can further illustrate the inadequacy of this approach by referring to another sentence in the same general passage of the article. After mentioning the implications---the Christian categories, etc.--which result from the postulate of God as the absolutely other, he continues, "You get a position for Christianity that is invulnerable to the attacks of all learned and scientific criticism, no matter how far a man's knowledge of and control over the world in space and time may extend." (p. 243). Is this true when God's otherness is identified with dimensional beyondness? Is such a position invulnerable? It is a product of twentieth century philosophy and of a particular milieu of philosophical thinking in Europe. May it not be refuted by a succeeding age, or even by our own?¹⁰ As Channing-Pierce demonstrates, Heim has used modern psychology to establish his concept.¹¹ Tomorrow such arguments may no longer be valid, even as arguments for transcendence in the pre-Copernican world were invalidated by Bruno's discoveries. Following such an approach we would be forced to change our concept of God's otherness to meet every change in the psychological philosophical, and scientific world. This would be disastrous for something so fundamental as God's otherness. It must be filled with a religious rather than a philosophic content. To this degree Pastor Berkemeyer's criticism is valid, that the author erred in going to philosophy to explain an idea which is basically religious. This inadequacy the author himself seems to sense in the last few pages of the article. After developing and maintaining his thesis that God's absolute otherness is his dimensional beyondness, he suddenly changes his course. He says, "There is, however, one more difficulty to deal with. The difference between God and man is primarily and ethical one, it is the difference due to sin; it is the contrast between God's holiness and man's sinfulness." (p. 255). This is a different question from that of dimensional beyondness. The author evidently realizes that a philosophical concept is inadequate to express God's otherness. This is the place where he should have begun the discussion. This is the religious point of departure. This alone produces the significant implications for our religion which he listed. In these last few pages, however, he only gives a reorientation. He does not at last give a religious interpretation of God's otherness. He adds nothing to the interpretation of the content. This section is not integrated into the main thesis. Yet it does indicate a Lutheran awareness that it is man's sin which separates him from God. It is not, then, the Barthian reparation of the sovereign-willed Creator from the creature.

I think I have adequately developed these criticisms. Professor Heineken has taken a philosophical idea from Heim, and in changing its context has therefore invalidated his whole thesis. What lines, then, should a study of God's otherness assume? I do not presume to give more than just the general lines. This will mean many gaps, and of course the thorough study would find these general lines only a starting point at the most. Likewise I am ignoring the question of whether God is absolutely other. We need far more study in what constitutes His otherness before we posit that question. In forming these general lines I would emphasize three main sources: first, Biblical theology; second,

comparative religion and history of doctrine; and third, religious experience. In illustrating the contributions of each I will have outlined in part my own estimation of the content of God's holiness or otherness.

I agree with Professor Heineken that the question of God's otherness is fundamental to theology. I agree in general with its implications which he lists. Because the question is so important I believe terms must be defined. The mistake of the article in the Quarterly is that the author has confused the philosophical question of the relation of God to the universe with the religious question of God's otherness. God's otherness is essentially that which makes God different from man, i.e. that which makes Him God. It is always a religious conception. It is not something developed by reason, but rather comes from the intellectualization of religious experience. Thus the term is used in modern theology. But more important than that is its usage in Biblical theology. Here it is the question of God's holiness. This is the approach of the standard Old Testament theologians.¹² Hänel points out that "the holy does not simply represent one aspect of the divine, but signifies the whole of the divine, which insists upon being the basic element in each divine attribute."¹³

If this is the Biblical usage then the problem assumes even greater significance. For then we are discussing the problem of the concept of God Himself, not philosophically, but as he makes His impact in religious experience. This is the heart which determines the nature of all other elements in our religion. Professor Heineken has evaluated rightly the significance of the question. The nature and character of a religion or theology may be determined by the holiness of its God. This is shown by such excellent studies in comparative religion as Söderblom's The Living God and Otto's Idea of the Holy, and in the history of doctrine by Aulen's, Das Christliche Gottesbild. Any study in the question of the otherness of God must begin with Biblical theology. It cannot start in philosophy. What makes Christianity more than merely an evolution of a nature religion, as Söderblom would say? What is Moses' contribution if it is not that of taking an animistic tribal god and raising him to a position entirely apart from man?¹⁴ This is not merely an abstraction or object which is apart, but a living personality who is characterized by will. And what is the work of the prophets but to round out and deepen the concept of this personality. Consider the contribution of Hosea. How passionately he revels to us the reality of God as a living, loving personality.

"For I am God and not man,
The holy one in the midst of you;
And I will not destroy."

Combine the concept of God's holiness behind those lines with the suffering servant passage in Isaiah, and one is not far from the Christian picture.

The Old Testament concepts were then taken over into New Testament theology. Some were abandoned, others deepened, modified or combined. Here the student of God's otherness or holiness must again analyze individual apostolic approaches. What of God's holiness according to the Synoptics? What is its content in the cross and resurrection, which must always remain supremely the deed where man sees and knows God's holiness? What is the interpretation of this in the Petrine and the Johannine literature?

It seems to me that research in Biblical theology, although much remains to be done, has shown God's otherness, His holiness to be His ἁγιότης. And the New Testament community always saw the cross and the resurrection as the supreme witness of God's love. Otto says of the position of the cross: "The Cross of Christ, that monogram of the eternal mystery, is its con-letion. Here rational are folded with non-rational elements, the revealed commingled with the unrevealed, the most exalted love with the most awe-inspiring 'wrath' of the nunon, and therefore, inapplying to the cross of Christ the category 'holy', Christian religious feeling has given birth to a religious intuition profounder and more vital than any to be found in the whole history of religion." 15

Only as we come to understand the meaning of the cross and of the atonement, not only intellectually, but in our religious experience, will we know God's holiness.

The student of God's otherness must also go to the area of comparative religion. The studies of Otto and Söderblom are significant but not final. They help us to see what is unique in the Christian concept of God's holiness. By way of contrast with emphases in other religions, we will be able to ascertain more precisely the Christian concept. Such study will enrich greatly our understanding and experience. Söderblom's The Living God illustrates how valuable such comparisons can be.

And Söderblom makes us think of living Swedish theologians and the approach they represent. For none has made greater contribution to grasp of the uniqueness of Christianity than modern continental Luther research, with its stimulus both to Biblical studies and to research in the history of doctrine. And not least important is the Lund school with its Motivforschung. First of all, thinking only of Luther's theology, I would cite two items which I consider of vital importance in building an understanding of the holiness of God. The place Luther gives to the wrath of God is important. This is immediately seen in Luther's substitution of wrath for the medieval righteousness with its very legalistic frame of reference. This Otto has briefly described as one numinous or non-rational element in Luther. Another idea is Luther's concept of deus revelatus and deus absconditus. This must be related to the holiness concept ἁγιότης in our experience. God reveals us thus. In Luther, of course, there is a sharp emphasis upon God as ἁγιότης, and the cross as its focal point.

But in a broader way the history of doctrine makes a contribution. Many of the Lund studies make their contribution here, but especially Aulen's Das Christliche Gottesbild. His keen analysis of the "picture of God" in successive, leading Christian theologians is essential to understanding at least the rational content of the holiness of God in Christian theology. The non-rational elements also receive some treatment--especially in Luther's theology and their absence in rationalism and the theology of the nineteenth century.

The third major element in building up a concept of God's holiness is the intellectualization of over religious experience. This is of greatest importance. For the holiness of God is not an abstract principle. It is rather the impact of God's personality upon human personality. How does God impress Himself, and what is the individual's response by way of sensing God? Does he sense God as righteous, judging his every action?

Does he despair or become fatalistic feeling God to be arbitrary will? Or is he overcome by the mystery of God's agape seen in Christ?

I believe the latter is the way the Christian experiences God. God is agape with all the depth and breadth of meaning and mystery which the New Testament writers give to it. That is His holiness for the New Testament and for Luther. It is not a question then of God's holiness being set alongside His love. When this is done holiness is usually interpreted as righteousness, a common mistake, which immediately tends to introduce a legal frame of reference. It would be far more Biblical and Lutheran to speak of the wrath of God. So it is not a question of love and holiness, but God's holiness is His agape.

This agape is His essence--, it expresses itself in His other attributes. It is strikingly different from our love. God is able to love men as they are--sinful. His love is spontaneous; ours is stimulated. We love an individual because of something within him. There is something there which attracts. Consequently our love does not go out to any who do not in some way stimulate our love. We are unable to love all men. The aim of love is to will to be brought into fellowship with another. And because of our sin, we simply are unable to will such fellowship with all men. In every area of life there are people who may be kind and good to us, but we do not desire an actual relation of fellowship with them. We cannot say, therefore, that we love all men. A distinction between liking and loving, while it may have some value, is not an adequate explanation. Because man is sinful he is unable to love all men. To have such a spontaneous love would mean that we were either divine, or in complete fellowship with God.

For indeed this problem of distinction between God's agape and man's love is not simply that of Creator versus creature. It is not just a more profound way of making the Barthian contrast between Creator and creature, or eternity and time. For then we would have plummeted into the same Barthian pit of identifying our evil with the fact that we are creatures. That we dare not do. This chasm between God's agape and man still exists. Man is not agape. But that does not constitute his sinfulness. His sin is his refusal to accept God's agape--God's desire for fellowship. Man believes he is an absolute himself, forgetting that there is only one absolute--the absolute Thou. If his nature is to be love, he must depend completely upon God. This he refuses to do. Thus our sin is not that we are created as we are, but that we have refused to accept God's offer of fellowship which alone gives life, and which alone can fill our lives with love. Only as our fellowship with God is complete is there agape in us--, not ours, but another's. That is man's continual sin which is a very part of him even while he is a justified Christian; he does not trust and accept God's love completely, nor allow it to work through him.

God's agape is creative. It alone can create the fellowship between God and man. Man is separated from God until God comes to him. Man can not go to God in his love. Such creative love is God's alone, not man's.

In the third place this agape is suffering. The contrast with our love should be sharpest here. When our love is continually rejected

it dries up or freezes up inside of us. Why can't man go out to all men—desiring to establish the closest fellowship with them, a communion—as close or closer than in his two or three deepest friendships? I realize this question conflicts with the like-love distinction, but does our weakness come simply from our creaturehood? I think not. Is it not rather that in his sin man does not dare to love all men? He does not dare because he knows the suffering it would cost him—not mere physical, —but inward suffering. I realize that there is still a sense in which the like-love distinction is valid, i.e., we naturally have certain closer relationships, even as Christ had particular friends. But with Christ's friends was the communion close because they had accepted Him more completely, followed Him more fully? This like-love distinction, at least, must not obscure the truth that man because of his sinfulness, not because of his creaturehood, cannot love sufferingly as God, Who loves simply because that is His nature, His very being. He must love—even so sufferingly that the Son emptied Himself of His divinity, lived a life of complete humiliation, and became completely separated from God in order that God might love to the very limit.

Such a God—whose words by Hosea must surely express His inmost being:

"For I am God and not man,
The holy one in the midst of you;
And I will not destroy."

—a God Who is the God of the cross,—is not a doting and dottering old grandfather. He takes hold of men and brings them into fellowship, to accept His love not because of legal righteousness, but because of His very love. Here is the absolute personality—living, loving—Who gives the most profound impetus to a man's ethical life—because He moves man.

Only such a God can effect an ethics with teeth in it. A God of righteousness is capable of producing an ethics of bourgeois pharisaism or puritanical legalism. The God of love, however, is the absolute Who takes hold of us because of His spontaneous, suffering love, of which we are certain in Jesus Christ.

We are so sinful that we would not have such a God either because we would like to go to God in our own righteousness, or because we think God would not dare be such a God. But let us pause a moment to consider our religious experience. Such experience is essentially that of standing before God (*coram deo*). This might be in our regular prayer life, in our partaking of the Eucharist, or in those moments when we suddenly seem to feel that we are standing before God. Think first of all in terms of prayer life. There we feel our sin most deeply, we are most fully experiencing the impact of God's holiness. Then we are impressed not only with our creaturehood, but with a sinfulness which is not alone the result of creaturehood. We feel that we are before an absolute Thou Whom we have offended. It is a Thou Whom we have offended,—not simply an abstract principle. It is a loving personality, not a righteous judge. Some place in this context I suppose the wrath of God should play its role. This is an important non-rational (numinous) element in God's holiness. And the non-rational elements must be preserved, although they must not surpass the rational elements. *as Otto has keenly perceived.* Just how the element of the wrath of God fits in, I cannot as yet determine in my own theology and religious experience. Nevertheless, Luther's

vivid feeling of it cannot be ignored, particularly since of all Christian theologians his is the most agape centered.

Sin to be felt most deeply must be sensed as the rebuff to God's love—to the absolute Person who has a control over us,—who is our Creator and Sustainer, yet who wills to come to us only in love. But even while we are most convinced of sin, we are also certain of God's love. In fact, just because of our sin we are confident. We become most aware of God's love, when we realize our sinfulness most deeply. We do not have to worry about our righteousness; we are certain of God's love. There can and must be confidence and trust even when I experience God's holiness most deeply--which is another way of saying when I feel my sin most keenly. This confidence is no mirage; there isn't only Barthian uncertainty.

The Eucharist must necessarily be the experience where God's holiness is felt most profoundly. There are focused the ideas and feelings which I have attempted to describe above. There is mystery, a hidden God, a certain awfulness; and there is rational love, a revealed God, a confidence and thanksgiving. All of these are but aspects of the divine agape as holiness. As I partake of the communion service, I realize most surely God's holiness--His love--and also my sinfulness. yet my spirit is one of confidence and praise. The communion must always be the focal point of Christian worship and life.

I have tried to indicate that there is an irrational element to God's holiness, but it is simply the mystery of God's agape. The cross is the supreme witness of God's love, but it is also a mystery. Though God stands revealed there, behind it is a God who is also a hidden God. The cross must ever stand as The symbol of God's holiness—with all its love and all its mystery. Man before God cries out, "Depart from me for I am a sinful man." And in the same moment he knows God's love crosses that chasm of sin. Luther's simul iustus et peccator stands with all its rationality and irrationality, the expression of the Christian's experience of God's holiness.

God's otherness, His holiness, is not a philosophical question of His relation to the universe. It is a religious question of that which makes God, God and different from man. Speculation does not grasp it; religious experience does. A study of God's otherness must concern itself first and foremost with Biblical theology, then with the history of doctrine, Luther, and comparative religion, and finally with religious experience—especially as the truths of the former two find expression therein. This otherness I believe to be God's agape. The agape of the cross which comes to us in its rationality and in its mystery is truly God's holiness.

The following words of Aulén say succinctly what I have been attempting to explain: "From the point of view of basic Christian motifs, any competitive relationship between holiness and love is out of the question. The mysterious and unfathomable are not coordinated with the divine love, but this very love is unfathomable and 'irrational', it is itself the 'holy'. The unfathomable does not disappear according to the degree with which we apprehend the divine love. The proportion is rather this: the more fully we apprehend divine love, in exactly the same do-

grec, the divine love stands out in bold relief as the unfathomable.....
If the divine love maintains its quality without being watered down, the
distance between the divine and the human cannot disappear."¹⁶

FOOTNOTES.

- ¹William C. Berkemeyer, "Is God Merely the Wholly Other?" in the Lutheran Church Quarterly, October, 1945, pp. 424-8.
- ²Martin J. Heineken, "Is God the Absolutely Other?" Ibid., July 1945, pp. 241-257.
- ³Rudolf Otto, The Idea of the Holy, pp. 77, 94.
- ⁴Glaube und Denken is the first volume of his four volume dogmatics.
- ⁵In a volume of essays entitled, The Terrible Crystal.
- ⁶Ibid., p. 121.
- ⁷Ibid., p. 161.
- ⁸Glaube und Denken, pp. 422ff.
- ⁹Gustav Aulen, Das Christliche Gottesbild, pp. 279-343.
- ¹⁰Dorothy Emmet has made a critical study of Hein's I-Thou concept of dimensions in The Nature of Metaphysical Thinking. The book unfortunately is not yet available in America.
- ¹¹Op. cit., p. 122.
- ¹²E. g. Eichrodt, Köhler, Seelin, Davidson.
- ¹³Hänel, Die Religion der Heiligkeit, p. 4.
- ¹⁴Cf. the views of Söderblom and Albright, for example.
- ¹⁵Rudolf Otto, op. cit., p. 177.
- ¹⁶Gustav Aulen, op. cit., pp. 393, 395.

"The irrationality, the superstition of the conception that climbing stairs should make a sinner acceptable to God revolutionized Luther's faith. Tradition held a view that was discreditable both to the conception of a gracious God and to the conception of an achieving person. The 'cake of custom' was dead against him. On the surface, tradition was against him. In a profounder sense, tradition was with him; but he had to discern the implications of that profounder sense. The fact is that living tradition does make progress. As in the case of all living things, cessation of growth spells death. Luther's faith took on life, and in the courage of it he acted."

Sanders, Charles F., The Taproot of Religion and its Fruitage. New York: Macmillan, 1931. p. 105.

THE INTERSEMINARY MOVEMENT

by

John W. Vannorsdall
Earl T. Knaus
Donald F. Bautz

(Editor's Note: This article was written both to present the aims of the Interseminary Movement and to make a report of the Colgate - Rochester Conference held November 1-3, 1945.)

I

Past months at Mount Airy have shown an interesting increase in the use of the phrase, Interseminary Movement. In this and the following pages an attempt will be made to give the phrase a fuller meaning.

The success of any movement depends to a large part on the vitalness of the purpose for which it exists. Does the Interseminary Movement have a vital purpose? The Interseminarian partially answers this question when it states, "The goal of the Interseminary Movement is to be a comprehensive and vital student movement in the theological seminaries, dedicated to exploring the meaning, for seminary students, of the ecumenical development in the Church, and to securing the dedication of students to it." Coupled with this desire to support the ecumenical movement is a second purpose stated in a similar definition: "The Interseminary Movement is a fellowship of theological students and faculty dedicated to the basically missionary character of the Christian faith and to the cause of furthering unity among the Churches." And thus we have before us two aims of the movement; appreciation of the ecumenical movement, and support of the missionary character of the Christian faith. There is a third which is even more immediately applicable. The movement hopes to serve as a medium through which a deeper spiritual life in each participating student may be developed. Its program brings students of Christian ideas, concomitants of new insights, and the sharing of Christian experience. The movement thus has three purposes, each of which warrants our support.

The primary manner of achieving these purposes is through a series of conferences. Annually a regional conference is held at one of the seminaries at which some theme of an ecumenical nature is fully developed with lectures and seminars. A report of the delegates to the Rochester Regional Conference is to be found on the succeeding pages. Perhaps even more valuable than regional conferences are area conferences in which the proximate seminaries unite in discussing topics commensurate to the program of the movement itself.

Visiting speakers for the individual seminary is also one of the channels through which these goals are achieved. Each Interseminary Committee is urged to help bring to its campus men with a broad outlook and deep, spiritual insight. Conferences and guest speakers are followed up with many types of literature. The Interseminarian is the national organ which is published from time to time to present conference information and noteworthy data. The Middle Atlantic Region also publishes a

monthly Newsletter which is under the auspices of a different seminary each month and contains information concerning that seminary together with news of local Interseminary activity. Augmenting these two publications is an ever changing supply of pamphlets concerning the movement and its aims.

Of particular interest at the present time are the future activities of the movement as they concern this campus. On December fifth we will have as a luncheon speaker Mr. Charles Germany of Drew Seminary who is the field secretary for this region. His purpose will be to present the movement and its program and to answer any questions that may arise concerning it. On December seventh it will be our pleasure to have with us a distinguished group of faculty and students from this and near by states who are meeting to lay the groundwork for the 1947 national convention. Similar plans are being made all over the country in order to prepare five volumes which will in turn give the national conference a basis on which to begin fruitful discussions. Dr. Nolde is Chairman in charge of preparing volume four of this series. A conscious effort on our part to welcome these men can be both an inspiration to them and of value to us.

At a planning meeting on November ninth a conference for the Philadelphia area was developed for March of next year. The details of this conference will soon appear. This seminary has been asked to plan the morning devotions and in doing so to use Matins. This is an important chance to give others an opportunity to understand our worship and our success depends upon the support of Mount Airy students.

In a brief way these are the things which stand behind the Interseminary Movement. It has a vital purpose and a means of fulfilling that purpose. Through it this seminary has an opportunity to make a definite contribution to other denominations and the Church. At the same time we have an opportunity to learn from others. Too often in the past such opportunities have been ignored; we can not allow self-satisfaction to prevent future cooperation.

II

The Regional Conference

The Interseminary Movement in the Middle Atlantic region held its twenty-third annual conference at Colgate-Rochester Divinity School during the first three days of this month. The theme of the conference was "The Church and the Emerging World Community." The conference started with a banquet at which the representatives of the visiting seminaries were welcomed. After the banquet we had an opportunity to tour the very beautiful and inspiring plant of the host seminary. During this tour the Reverend Professor Emeritus Erb conducted the visitors through the chapel explaining the very exquisite symbolism. Following this the Reverend Dean Thomas Wearing led a service of worship for the delegates.

Walter Rauschenbusch

The evening of the opening day was largely taken up by a lecture and discussion period on "The Life, the Work, and the Gospel of Walter Rauschenbusch." This discussion was led by the Reverend Professor William Arthur Mueller. The first part of professor Mueller's talk was

devoted to giving the life and work of Walter Rauschenbusch, whose father was a descendent of seven generations of Lutheran pastors in Germany. His father received his training at home and in German universities and came to this country in 1845. Here he was a pioneer missionary and some time later became a Baptist, and in 1858 joined the faculty of Colgate-Rochester.

Walter Rauschenbusch was thus "born into a German Baptist home where piety and learning prevailed" on October 4, 1861. He received his early education in Germany and his university and theological training in the United States. After his graduation from Colgate-Rochester Divinity School he became a pastor in New York City where his interest in social issues was aroused. During the next few years of his life he studied in Germany, married, and joined the faculty of Colgate-Rochester where he taught in the German Department. The following years he travelled widely in the interests of the denomination and in 1902 joined the English Department of the faculty of Colgate-Rochester. Shortly after this, in 1907, his first important book, Christianity and the Social Crisis, was published. This marked the beginning of his leadership in the social gospel.

After this talk had been delivered a lively discussion period ensued. It was interesting to note that Professor Mueller protected Walter Rauschenbusch from the charge of his being a utopian optimist by pointing out that that interpretation of Rauschenbusch comes from a misinterpretation of his works and could be corrected by a thorough study of his personal convictions and life.

Religion and Labor

The second day of the conference started with morning devotions in the chapel. Following this the first address, "Religion and Labor," was given by Mr. John Ramsey of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. The emphasis of Mr. Ramsey's talk was the necessity and the opportunity for the Church to provide Christian leadership in the labor organizations. He countered the charge that labor movements are anti-Christian because of their materialistic emphasis by pointing out they have arisen out of a human need. This need he felt was the sin of poverty amidst the God-given plenty of the American economic scene. Because organized labor feels this problem so keenly he frankly stated that, "it will fight for its new standards." On the other hand he admitted that one of the great dangers of organized labor was that minority leaders struggling to get control were apt to be selfish. Because of this he called for Christian leadership which we must provide, or else compromise with the situation. And he felt we can no longer justify compromise because the Church has already done this too much in relation to labor.

Following the first main address the morning sessions of the seminars started. These were as follows: "Religion and Labor," by Mr. Ramsey which was a more thorough study of the problems presented in his address. "The Ecumenical Movement," by the Reverend Doctor Slosser, Professor at Western Theological Seminary. "The World Mission of the Church," by the Reverend Charles C. Roadarmel, Missionary to India. This seminar was an expansion of the address which the Reverend Roadarmel gave later. "Community Politics and the Church," by Mr. Thomas Kochen was concerned with crucial political issues and the relation which the local church has to them. One other seminar in the morning on "Reorientating

Christian Evangelism," by the Reverend Oren Huling Baker dealt with the problem of working out an effective evangelism for these days.

After luncheon of the second day the afternoon and final sessions of the seminars were begun. Another seminar was added at this time on "Catholicism," by the Reverend Emeritus Professor Conrady Henry Mochlman. When these were finished a recreational period followed.

III

The Church and Politics

Mr. Thomas Koehn, director of the Congregational Church's Council for Social Action in Washington, D. C. opened the second main address with the statement, "A World Community may not be emerging, but disappearing!" Speaking at the second evening session, Mr. Koehn, recently graduated from Union Seminary, quoted the Old Testament: "Where there is no vision, the people perish" and went on to point out the New Testament text of St. Paul: "Having done all, nevertheless, I must stand."

Regarding the problem of living in an atomic age, the speaker reminded us of the recent statement in the New York Times: "The problem of atomic energy is here to stay--the question is are we?" A Senator with whom he had talked just before coming to the conference, and whose opinion he highly regards, said that: "We are heading toward World War III, not in a matter of years, but months, and that the churches had better start training men to die again."

Mr. Koehn seemed to think that our Foreign Policy was at its lowest ebb at the present time. He substantiated his views by the fact that General Marshall's report on the War was defensive in character, the plans for a gigantic armed force in peace as well as in war, the slowness of demobilization because of the uncertainty of the times, the emphasis upon the celebration of Navy Day, and the agitation for peace time military training.

A new political force has established itself in the nation's capital in the small group of scientists who developed the atomic bomb. Hysterical, because they have blood on their hands, they seem to be the only ones who have sensed the problem of establishing a central commission for the control of atomic energy. While the House Military Affairs Committee has passed a bill to keep the control within the hands of the military, the Senate has gone a step farther and established a special committee to decide the more logical means for control. The scientists agree that the international aspects must be considered, because there is no possibility of keeping it a secret, and it will be only a matter of years before other nations will be as well equipped as we are to stage the greatest armament race in history.

The Church must face the problem of atomic energy with the same sense of responsibility for arousing public opinion, as it did for World order. There are times in our history when issues demand action by the churches as an official body. The Church must not be afraid to speak on those issues. There must be groups within the churches who act unofficially and speak as such, not only to the nation but also to the church

members in order to stimulate their action so that they will fulfill their individual responsibilities as true Christian citizens. In closing Mr. Keehn restated the fact that the Protestant Church has a responsibility to the political order which it has not fulfilled. It must serve as a critic and guide more effectively than it has done in the past.

The World Mission of the Church

Doctor John Lennox, Medical Missionary and Associate Professor of Internal Medicine at West China Union University, called our attention to the shrinking world in which we live today. As the third and final main address speaker on the third morning of the conference, Dr. Lennox, who spoke out of a vast background of personal experience on the mission fields, stated that the world mission of the Church was to "establish Jesus Christ in every walk of life throughout the world."

Advocating a world crusade in which all Christians must take a serious part, he pleaded with the future ministers not to hinder the progress toward this goal by emphasizing our theological differences, but we must emphasize our united Christian front. In order to solve the problems that stand before the Church, we must know them and adopt an intensive scientific study of them.

Conclusions

After a final reporting session of the seminar groups, the spirit of the whole conference was climaxed in the "Ordinance of Holy Communion" which was administered by the faculty of the host seminary. Throughout the entire three days, we were reminded of the necessity for united action on the part of all Christians and especially the vital role which we as Lutherans can play in bringing this about.

"There are three great petitions which the disciple of Jesus should bring before God's throne. He should ask for the coming of the Kingdom, for his daily bread and for forgiveness of his sins in the past as well as in the future. The first and the last of these petitions are understandable in themselves. the petition for bread embraces the disciple's livelihood and --we may add--all things which he needs during his earthly existence. They are not to be mentioned verbally, for "your heavenly Father knows that ye have need of all these things." Those who are expecting the Kingdom have in the present age, during the time between the times, no other needs than the Kingdom of Heaven, the earthly life and God's forgiving grace."

Martin Dibelius, The Sermon on the Mount. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1940. p. 75.

PERSPECTIVE

by

Norberth H. Stracker

A young seminarian student on the threshold of ordination stood before a retired minister whose life work had been very rich and fruitful. To the youth's request for a word of advice, the aged man replied, "The very title of your calling is the highest honor you will ever receive. If you are indeed a 'minister', one who goes forth habitually and confessedly, 'not ministered to, but a minister', and to give your life for the recovery and the renewal of many, you need ask for no more exalted title.

"The spirit of service and the habit of ministry are caught and held by many great-souled men in all legitimate callings which open their doors to competent effort, but yours is pre-eminently, in the minds and in the speech of men, 'the ministry'. It is your business then to make yourselves adequate to the demands of that supreme calling. You will be a scoundrel and a rascal if you do not set yourself by hard, serious, manly study, and by high, fine, spiritual discipline, to make yourself competent. You must learn to think, speak, and to live."

Such were the gems of wisdom that poured from the mouth of this aged man of Christ. Words that carried with them the conviction of the years and the fruits of a life of experience and sacrificial service.

It behooves each of us here at seminary occasionally to take time out to think on these things. The Christian ministry can be the laziest job in the world or it can be the busiest; it is as we will have it! Every one of us should carry the conviction deep in our hearts that God, in His infinite goodness, has given us talents that can best be realized in the Christian ministry. We should, therefore, study to know ourselves and to discover wherein lie our talents, that we may take them and fit them into the great pattern of the ministry.

One day a motorist picked up a hitch-hiker and asked, "where are you going?" "Wherever you will take me," came the reply. In this response was the same indefiniteness and dependency upon the "driver" in which we find ourselves today. We seminarians are to a great degree victims of acceleration. We have been rushed through college and seminary by no will of our own; much of our time is planned for us and most of our courses of study are proscribed. Now this is not a fault, but it does place us on the "receiving end" most of the time, and before we know it, we are graduated and accepted into a parish before we have had chance to mature or fully to realize the extent of the responsibilities which are suddenly thrust upon us.

A very young pastor, age twenty-three, finds himself in a position where, for the first time, he must be the aggressor. He is expected to be an efficient administrator of his parish; he must have a knowledge of law and finance; he must have a sense of values in a world that has gone economic-mad. The new pastor must also be an organizer. He must be the leader of a church council of men who have come face to face with life, in other words, men who know the "score". He must have a thorough-

going knowledge of the whole church, its various boards and committees, and he must be able to fit their programs into that of his own local parish. In short, he must be a business man among business men, a professional man among those in the professions, and he must be a labor man among the laborers. Yet above all this, and by far the most important, he must be a pastor, a shepherd to all of his flock which God has entrusted him. In order to bring consolation and comfort to the sick and sorrowing, he must first know what sorrow himself. If he is to be sociable when the occasion warrants it, he must have a vital, positive personality. But above all this, he must be able to make Christianity vital in the lives of his people and to make the Gospel meaningful and appealing. In all things the pastor must be a living example of the Christ-like way of life!

The young pastor is called upon to fulfill all this and more as he begins his work of ministering to others. Is there one of us who feels equal to the task? It is easy to see that we will need more than native intelligence, book knowledge, and a pleasing personality, though these are indispensable. The one thing that we will be most sorely in need of is experience!

It is not my purpose, therefore, to attempt an answer to the afore-mentioned problems and situations, for I too feel the strain of inadequacy, yes, fear of the great task that lies ahead in the near future. But I hope to bring to light some thoughts and convictions that will have a bearing on our future effective ministry if we will but reflect on them from time to time -- to stand off, as it were, and get a clearer perspective of the things that we unconsciously anticipate during the brief span of time that we are here.

Not only now, but many times in our ministry, we will be up against unsurmountable obstacles with no apparent escape from them. In such situations we must lean more heavily upon God's grace for sufficiency and guidance. But must we wait until we are shepherds of a flock before learning of His power to sustain and deliver? Must we wait until some future time before we can come to feel His power to transform our feeble efforts into genuine witnessing? The art of communing with God, prayer, is something that all of us must cultivate especially here at seminary. How often we tune Him on and off like the radio, so that we are deprived of our greatest source of power and strength! Let us resolve to develop our shallow prayer life to the point where God is really given a chance, and where constant communion with Him becomes the rule rather than the exception.

Next let us examine our deepest motive or purpose for choosing the ministry as our life work. It should, above all things, be rooted in an unquenchable thirst for souls, a burning desire to win all men to Christ and His saving love. If your motive is other than this, then you had better sit right down and have it cut between God and yourself. The crying need of the world today has not changed since that day when He gave the great commission to His followers. The one thing that ministers lack most, yet need most desperately is the spirit of personal evangelism. Let's not kid ourselves about it; without it we cannot possibly be effective witnesses for Christ! More than this, to ignore it or to give it secondary importance, is to deny our high calling.

As a summary let me list a number of qualities or attributes which I believe can contribute to an effective ministry. Here they are in short, revealing flashes:

Consecration and devotion is pre-eminent: Our task is one of self-dedication to the work of Christ among men. We must submit our wills wholly to the Father's will and give ourselves without reservation in bringing all men to a closer walk and fellowship with God. With St. Francis of Assisi, we must be able to say and believe, "Lord, make me an instrument of your peace; where there is hatred let me sow love, where there is injury --pardon, where there is doubt --faith, where there is despair --hope, where there is darkness --light, where there is sadness--joy. O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled --as to console, to be understood --as to understand, to be loved --as to love. For it is in giving that we receive, it is in pardoning that we are pardoned, it is in dying that we are born to eternal life."

In spiritual ministrations, let us strive to emulate the same spirit of faithfulness, sacrifice, and devotion that has characterized the great saints of the past.

As preachers of God's Word, we should develop aesthetic sensitiveness, mental variety, spirituality, and Christian charity. We should cultivate our speaking ability so that our preaching is clear, concise, convincing, sincere, and such that it embodies expression and imagination.

Be a visiting pastor. The heart of our ministry is in our personal relationships with our people. In order to know and understand them and their needs, we must get to know them at home and at work as well as at worship on Sundays. It is through your personal visitations that they will get to know and to love you. Without this, one cannot hope to be really effective.

Neglect neither the youth of the church nor the aged. It is the youth of today who will be the church of tomorrow, and it is the aged who, today, hold much of the spiritual resources of the congregation. We must have both.

Cooperate with all the welfare agencies of your community. Take an active interest in the ministerial association, YMCA, Boy's Club, Inter-racial organizations, and the like.

Accept every opportunity you have to visit in the prisons, schools of correction, and similar institutions. It is here that you will come face to face with those who need the Gospel most. It is here that you will see the need for a genuine witnessing for Christ.

Cultivate the art of making friends easily. Be a good conversationalist and a good listener. Always be your true self, not pretentious, but always genuine and sincere.

Seek ever for the gifts of learning, but never forget Him who is the fountain of all true wisdom. Keep your minds open and flexible to change, following always where the truth shall lead you. Continually enrich your life with good reading and conscientious study.

Be an executive. Lead, don't boss. Always be open to constructive criticism and be able to accept it for profit. Be business-like in all your dealings, maintaining a high standard of efficiency and tact. Remember that the physical aspect of your church building is a living witness of Christ and His church. Let it always speak of good order and repair.

Do not incur debts. "Costly thy habit as thy purse affords." Let us therefore live always within our means.

Never forget that cleanliness is next to godliness. Be neat, clean, and well-groomed at all times.

In choosing a wife, let us remember that she is to be a co-laborer with us in God's vineyard. Many a cross has been laid upon the minister who was not careful in the selection of a helpmate. She should be sympathetic with your work as well as being your best critic. She should not dominate the organizations of the church for her first duty is in the home. Be a family man, and be sure you take out enough time to be a real father and husband.

Finally, we are first, last, and always -- "ministers" whose primary function is to bring the Gospel and its message of salvation to those who still walk in darkness. Let us always bear in mind the words of Dr. Offerman when he said, "Never preach a sermon that does not have the Gospel in it."

So, take time out once in awhile to see where our path is leading us; pause to get a clearer perspective of the approaching horizon, then set out afresh with renewed vigor, strength, and conviction to achieve that for which God has called us. In this way He bless us all and grant us both the wisdom and the will to lead all men to Him.

ON THE SACRAMENT:

"In actual fact, this Sacrament gathers into itself all the elements of the Christian Gospel, No other act of worship contains them so completely. The work of Christ for the salvation of the world, the gracious will of God in which the work of Jesus had its source, the forgiveness of sin, the hope of the life to come, the reality of the Christian fellowship that has grown out of Christ's work --all of these things come to expression in this Sacrament, and all of them are offered to the communicant. In the Lord's Supper he may hear God saying to him, 'All this is yours, if you will but claim it as your own.'"

(C.H. Jacobs, in The Ministry and the Sacraments, (Editor, R. Dunkerley.) London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1937)