EDITORIAL

What makes one draw, or paint, or write, or create, or concoct? To hear Samuel Johnson tell it, "No man but a blockhead ever wrote except for money." And yet, here are art works, photographs, poems, essays, plays, formal speeches—all presented without pay, to disprove that contention. Mark Twain seems to agree with Johnson: "Write without pay until somebody offers to pay. If nobody offers within three years, the candidate may look upon this circumstance with the most implicit confidence as the sign that sawing wood is what he was intended for." No, that doesn't suffice either. Few if any of the contributors to this journal expect any pay in three years from these works, and none, I dare say, plan to take up wood cutting as a consequence. Alexander Pope put the issue squarely this way:

Why did I write? what sin to me unknown
Dipt me in ink, my parents', or my own?

Byron comes closest, I think to the heart of the matter in Child Harold III.

'Tis to create and in creating live
A being more intense, that we endow
With form our fancy, gaining as we give
The life we image.

That must be it—in creating a poem, delivering a speech, making a dress, we communicate a certain image of ourselves. Any work of art, any act or deed, is an extension of myself, an expression of my inner being that I offer to you. It is the inner me trying to externalize self in a visible or audible form. "What was any art but a mould in which to imprison for a moment the shining, elusive element which is life itself," writes Willa Cather. Aside from the fact that there is a certain sense of pride, of accomplishment, we creatures of feeling, of intellect, of spirit desire to be known and to form an identity of ourselves to each other. In essence, then, here are ten people trying to communicate to unidentified readers out there. We invite your comments in return.

A word of explanation is wanted concerning Dr. Agee's address printed here. Even though Dr. Agee is not, strictly speaking, a member of the present Union community, he is an alumnus, a past Vice-President, teacher, student, and Board member of Union. His speech is included for the significance of its pedagogical subject.

—Ernest Pinson, editor
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...Recently I ran across a statement that has haunted me like some castle ghost that will not go away. David Watson, visiting professor of missiology at Fuller Theological Seminary and a canon in the Anglican Church, began his book on The Called and Committed with the following insight: "It is widely held that the battle of the century will be between Marxism, Islam, and Third-world Christianity. Western Christianity is considered too weak and ineffective to contribute anything significant to this universal struggle." Did you hear what I said?

My Baptist American pride was offended when I read the statement. As I read further, however, my heart sank with the realization that the perspective of world Christians outside of Western civilization was all too accurate. When I consider that during the 1970s, in Europe and the United States alone, almost 3 million (2,765,100) adult professing Christians abandoned the faith to become agnostics, atheists, or adherents of non-Christian religions or cults. During the same period, however, churches in the Third World experienced phenomenal growth: in Africa an increase of 6,152,800 believers, or 16,600 each day; in South Asia, 34,813,000 people added to the churches (Evangelical Missions Quarterly, Oct., 1979). When I realized that in the Western world we now can claim the highest per capita crime rate, the highest per capital divorce rate, and have become the world center for traffic in pornography and drugs, I began to see that Dr. Watson's statement was not inaccurate.

What has happened to render Christians in the Western world so lifeless and so ineffective in representing Jesus Christ in our world? Is it possible that we have watered down the Gospel until it has little to say and makes no real claims on the lives of those who claim to be Christians? Is it possible that we have so separated salvation from discipleship that we say we believe makes little or no difference in the way we live our daily lives? Is it possible that our Christian colleges and universities have fallen into the same trap as the rest of American and European higher education and sown seeds of doubt, undermined students' confidence in the authenticity and authority of the Bible as God's holy and inspired word, made light of the heritage of faith undergirding this great nation, and chosen a value-free or value-neutral approach to the educational process?

Is it possible that our churches and their denominations have been so embroiled in their internal squabbles that the unredeemed world has become convinced that the Gospel has nothing to offer of substance or consequence? Is it possible that we have
bought so heavily into the philosophical assumption that all truth is relative, including talk about morals and ethics, that the Gospel we say we believe has become little more than bland, tasteless pabulum to a starving hurting world? Is it possible that we have tolerated textbooks to be used in our schools which consciously avoid any consideration of our faith heritage and avoid exploration of moral implications within issues thus robbing elementary and secondary students and college students of any sense of who we are and whence we’ve come as a civilization?

A TV evangelist admits to adultery, is found to have misused funds that run into the millions, never repents, and the public is amused and some make him a hero. A presidential candidate drops out of the race because he got caught having an affair with a model. The news media ponders the question of whether leaders or potential leaders should be subjected to that close a scrutiny—and people are amused and some even talk of his being a "good" candidate. A marine officer admits to lying, to misleading Congress, to destroying evidence and contends that leaders should have the right to do the same—and the people are amused and make him a hero. A devastating disease called AIDS reaches almost epidemic proportions in this country and society knows that the principal cause of the disease grows out of illicit, perverted sexual relationships, but he public chooses to promote "safe sex" and debates what ought to be included in the educational process without ever considering the moral dimension of the issue. Drugs destroy the life of Len Bias, one of the premier college athletes of this decade and newspapers are full of stories of prominent athletes and other public figures trapped in the deadly disease of alcohol and drugs but the traffic in both continues to grow at astronomical rates.

Omar Bradley, in his last years was all to correct when he contended that we have become a generation of scientific and technological giants who are moral and spiritual midgets. Allen Bloom, in his provocative best seller The Closing of the American Mind, agrees. He contends that in our society and especially in the college and university today "real religion and knowledge of the Bible have diminished to the vanishing point" (p. 56). He goes on to decry the fact that in the family and in the schools we have offered nothing to our children in the way of a vision of the world, of high models of action or profound sense of connection with others.

We are desperately in need of a moment of new beginnings—the start of some kind of movement to restore integrity, hope and usefulness to Western civilization. Call it spiritual awakening, revival, reformation, revolution, whatever. We must not drift into the twenty-first century with the blandness and with the absence of direction and purpose that now characterizes the societies of the Western world.

Our best hope for change in the early days of the twenty-first century rests in the hands of colleges like Union University. I want to lay before you the challenge of a new agenda for our work as Christian educators. I want to call us to commit ourselves to make a difference in our world—to take up the gauntlet lost by society's leaders in the maze of materialism and hedonism. The pre-occupation with abundance of possessions, the obsession with satisfying personal appetites, the self-centeredness of our me-istic mentality, our propensity for wastefulness, our insensitivity to the needs and hurts of
Let us be bold as to propose an agenda for us to undertake from now into the twenty-first century.

I. High on our agenda must be the desire and determination to restore integrity to the church and her message. It has to be an embarrassment to God that the churches have allowed the values and behavior of contemporary culture to shape the way the church does business rather than the churches shaping the values and behavior of our contemporary society. When social researchers report that surveys indicate no significant difference between the behavior and attitudes of the churched and the unchurched we must know that the church's credibility is being severely weakened. We will help restore integrity to the church and her message by leading our students to re-establish the link between religion and life. We must challenge them to dare to believe and believe deeply and genuinely—but challenge them to make sure that their behavior, their morals, their ethics, their relationships reflect their commitment to Jesus Christ as Lord and Master of Life. Call them to dare to build their lives, their family, their relationships, their professions on the teachings and principles of God's Word. Then and only then will an unredeemed world believe the message of the church.

II. There is a second agenda item that I am convinced must be included. If we are going to make an impact we must re-affirm the Christian heritage and foundations underpinning this democracy. It's time to write new textbooks to be used in history classes in elementary and secondary schools. Even a casual scanning of the most often used books ought to cause embarrassment and irritation for any serious, knowledgeable scholar. One cannot deal honestly with the story of Western civilization without dealing with impact of the Christian faith.

To be sure there have been atrocities committed in the name of the church. There have been those moments when organized religion was guilty of injustice and self-serving. But one cannot ignore the positive influence of the principles and teachings of the Bible on the thinking and decisions of the founding fathers of this nation.

The substance, impact, and value of the Christian faith cannot be limited to the behavior and actions of the churches. To ignore the impact of the hunger for religious liberty on the part of the first settlers of this great nation, to ignore the impact of the Great Awakening and Christian pietism on the shaping of the South, to ignore the influence of Walter Rauschenbusch and the Social Gospel on Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal, and countless other intentional omissions is a crime against legitimate scholarship. It's time for a new generation of scholars to arise who will deal honestly and accurately with the Christian heritage and foundations of this nation. It's time for us as educators to re-affirm and to take more seriously the Christian foundations upon which this nation was built. It is an illusion to think that democracy can survive without a strong personal faith in the living God.
III. The third agenda item is a call to this university faculty and staff for now and for the future. It's time for us to renew our determination and commitment to prepare men and women for the future who will be known as a people of character. Our task is not just to disseminate information in the various disciplines. Our job does not allow a person just to show up and teach his classes and go home. We have a mission that goes far beyond simply passing on a body of knowledge.

This university exists to shape lives — to instill a strong sense of personhood and of the value of life itself. Here students should discover more about who they are under God and begin to catch a vision of what they possibly can become. You and I face the awesome challenge of being role models, examples of the best of how to function as responsible Christians in our world. You and I should be examples of how to integrate faith and knowledge — of how to relate divine revelation and human reason — of how a person can cultivate the intellect and be a dynamic, growing, vibrant, witnessing Christian at the same time. You and I should be examples of how one can develop analytical thinking skills without developing critical spirits — of how to listen to the heartbeat of a hurting world because you've dared to take the time to listen to the heartbeat of a hurting student.

Students should be encouraged to dream dreams and see visions of possibilities for a better tomorrow because they have caught from us the spirit of hope and confidence. You and I should be examples of commitment to quality and excellence in our personal lives as well as in our professional deportment and from us students will learn that quality and excellence are important dimensions of their labors. Students will recapture the best elements of the Puritan work ethic because they have seen in us the willingness to find joy and meaning in hard work, the importance of unselfish service, the value of deferring immediate gratification for long-term benefit, the importance of giving a day's work for a day's pay. Such scarce items as honesty, dependability, thoughtfulness, responsibility, courtesy, kindness, fairness, justice, and concern for the needs of others will be underscored and re-enforced in their lives because they have seen them in you and in me.

CONCLUSION:

Watson's statement continues to haunt me. I hope it haunts you too. Hear it again: "It is widely held that the battle of the century will be between Marxism, Islam, and Third-world Christianity. Western Christianity is considered too weak and ineffective to contribute anything significant to this universal struggle."

Today, the call to you and to me is clear. In the midst of the formal launching of a new era in Union University's illustrious story, hear the call to make a difference in our world. I have suggested just a few agenda items to start the wheels of your mind and spirit to turning. If you hear and heed the call, the agenda will be much longer and even more demanding. The truth of the matter is that it has to start inside you and me as individuals and spread like wildfire to the lives of those whom we touch.
Today I call you to have the courage to try to make a difference. Commit yourself afresh to that beautiful integration of faith and learning that will produce the people of character and integrity who will take their places as leaders in the twenty-first century. Dare to believe that we can make a difference in the future of our world. Those colleges and universities who commit themselves to be distinctively Christian in all that they do, say and are will be the institutions who offer Western civilization its best hope for the future. If we mean business with that commitment, We can make a difference.

THE VICTIMS
by Ruth Witherington

Three gray ghosts stand by the road
mute, yet pleading.
The father has one arm uplifted,
as if to halt the onslaught of the enemy.
Smaller than her husband,
the mother covers her eyes with her hands,
horrified by what she sees.
The least of the three has his arms stretched out,
looking for all the world as if he were
going to a picnic.

If only they could speak,
were able to tell us of their final feelings!

But
Death
has
silenced
them
forever.

These trees have,
like many of their relatives,
become victims of
the
kudzu
vine.
THE THREE CORNERED HAT IN CONCEPCIÓN

by Walt Padelford

Intense spiritual drama is sometimes manifested in small towns, or as John Bunyan might have said, the holy war is made evident. Concepción is a particular town in a particular Latin American country, but it could be any small town in any country, simply by changing the religious affiliations of the actors.

There is a struggle in progress in Concepción for the allegiance and affections of men and women. The traditional power of the Roman church is very strong in Concepción, as the painting above the door of the cathedral proclaims: "This is the house of God, this is the gate of heaven." The meaning of the message is that the only way to heaven is through the good offices of the Roman church. Eternity has been placed in the hearts of the people of Concepción, so they are interested in gaining heaven. Therefore, loyalty to the Roman church is required.

The bishop in Concepción is a problematic man. He has used his prestige and honor as a base for far-flung entrepreneurial activities. He owns a large sawmill behind the cathedral for making building materials; he owns a fleet of some forty vehicles complete with a crew of mechanics and workshop. Around sixty laborers are on the bishop's payroll. This would seem to be all to the good in terms of increasing employment in a downtrodden area of the world. However, the bishop pays his workers as hourly employees rather than full-time in order to avoid paying the national social security tax.

The bishop also sells foodstuffs at slightly above market price which he has bought from poor farmers at below the market price. People tolerate this because of the bishop's position. The mayor of Concepción is incensed at the bishop, and his hatred has driven him beyond the pale of religion.

In an effort to free the local populace from the shackles of economic oppression, a group of German antropologists have taken up residence in Concepción. These men are developing and overseeing the operation of producer's cooperatives. These cooperatives are to be peasant-operated. The purpose will be to obtain better prices for farmers' products. The antropologists are having some impact in the local area, not tremendously great, not tremendously small. They are fighting against the bishop and the old guard in order to ameliorate harsh economic conditions. This small group of Germans is atheistic and committed to Marxism; some of the locals say that their funding comes from the Soviet Union via Cuba.

In another corner of Concepción a training center for Christian leaders has been set up. The center is built on property owned by a small, struggling, evangelical church. Lay leaders, evangelists, and Christian workers who are too poor to continue their formal education come here to study the Bible, theology, and practical Christian teaching for two years. In a period of about four weeks, two of these men led ten people in the surrounding area to Christ.
Jesus said, "My kingdom is not of this world." These poor Christian workers have no particular long-term solution to the economic and social problems of Concepción. They simply continue to obey their Lord day after day, rising early for prayer and the morning teaching sessions, noon meal and siesta, afternoon chores, evening meal and sleep.

Brother Lorenzo has been at the center a while now. When the Lord saved Lorenzo, He also delivered him from alcoholism. Lorenzo doesn’t read or write extremely well, but he is doing much better now. He is loving his wife and children more — beginning to be more like Christ to them. Lorenzo doesn’t have many talents, but he has a gift which the Lord has given him. He is able to lead others to Christ.

The holy war is going on here in Concepción. The mayor has been seen attending some open-air preaching and singing services, and it is reported that he allowed some local evangelicals to visit his farm in order to share the gospel with his farmhands.

---

**APOSTASY**

by Bonnie S. Homsley

The stars scream over a writhing, troubled sea; somewhere a lonely tern echoes the break of rushing waves, its cry shrill in the wake of night-winds fleeing seaward from the lee, joining the mad, disjointed melody of squally blasts in primal dissonance, pounding against the shore with scolding, rough vengeance, torrential waves driving relentlessly.

A kindred being, I observe and hear from this cold earth-chained cliff the wild display reflecting bleak discordant spiritual despair.

And fear my master, Music, drawing near, uprooting former calm; for I must pay for desecrating vows, must live with care.
“PROUD TO CARE”

by Dorothy Yarbro

Being a nurse, a registered, professional nurse, for over 30 years has brought me so many moments when I’ve been “proud to care” that I couldn’t possibly mention them all.

As head nurse on a pediatric floor, the joy and pride of seeing children recover has always been among my fondest memories. Watching the miracle of a newborn infant take his first breath and move always fills me with pride and thanks for life. There are also great moments of happiness and pride when I observe the smiles of wonder on the faces of new parents. When patients readily tell others that they have received “first-class nursing care,” I’m proud to be a caring nurse.

Although giving direct patient care has rendered a high level of pride and satisfaction in nursing, much of my pride in nursing comes through experiences with students. When a student’s face lights up with comprehension, of new material, when I hear students’ “ohs” and “ahs” as they visualize tympanic membranes or a retina, when their assessment skills include being able to perform and differentiate various percussion tones, then I’m proud of the students.

When graduates return to proclaim, “I’m using everything we studied and learned in class,” or “I’ve been well prepared for graduate school,” - then, my pride in nursing and nurses is obvious to all.

Reading about the accomplishments of my peers strengthens my pride in our profession. Attending seminars and workshops where I can meet, listen to, and talk with nursing leaders is always a “high” for me. I always return home, proud to be a nurse.

I think that what gives me the most rewarding sense of pride though is seeing RN’s who want to help their professional organization grow; who want to see nursing progress; and who work willingly to share the responsibilities for achievement of these goals.

(This essay won an award at the April 12, 1988, meeting of the Tennessee Nurses’ Association.)
HICKORY DICKORY DOCK: A CRITICAL INTERPRETATION

by Ernest Pinson

Hickory, dickory, dock,
The mouse ran up the clock
The clock struck one,
The mouse ran down,
Hickory, dickory, dock

The symbolic implications of this tiny jewel of a poem are actually rather far reaching, and the astute detective critic of literature must be on his guard lest he miss the deeper, hidden significances. We literary people are often accused of reading beyond the work itself, thereby drawing forced and unrealistic conclusions from the evidence at hand. As I shall hope to show in this exegesis of a famous nursery rhyme, such charges are ridiculous and grossly unfounded.

It becomes obvious to the most amateur of readers that the first line “Hickory, dickory, dock” contains more than a mere rimming of “ory”/“ory”/“ock.” Indeed, the eye trained to look for such things will see casually imbedded in those rime patterns the suggestive ominous reference to a town “hick” (hick—ory). Now this town “hick” obviously goes by the name of “Dick” (dick—ory) and “Doc” (dock)—probably pseudonyms for well known citizens about town. In fact, I prefer to suspect that these were three rather mysterious characters whose real identity was known only to the mouse who hides in the clock.

At least one school of criticism speculates that “hickory” is a reference to that grand southerner General Andrew Jackson who was known in the South as “Old Hickory,” and that Dickory was his detective or body guard, and that Dock (Doc) was his personal physician. Of course this reading rejects the theory put forth by other seafaring critics (no doubt Herman Melville or Joseph Conrad scholars) that “hickory” and “dickory” are the names of two boats that come in to “dock.” It is true that Melville penned his boats with names like Omo, Red Fern, Typee, and it is also true that his famous white whale is called Moby Dick, which of course is not too far removed from Hickory Dick. Although Melville did dabble in detective fiction, nursery rhymes was not his style.

Now comes that tricky second line: “the mouse ran up the clock.” Some historians think the word “mouse” is a transliteration of the Old Norse word for “moose,” but I am inclined to agree with Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary which traces the derivation of the word to the Old English “mus” (plural “mys”) for mouse. After all, a real live moose would have a devil of a time running up and down that tiny clock. This line of thinking would also seem to rule out the view of the French critic La Brunierre who argues that it’s not “mouse” but “mousse.” Such theorizing seems a bit far fetched, however, for logically such a frozen desert in the heat of battle would more likely run “down” a clock than “up” it (ref. again Webster’s Unabridged).
The clock itself presents a puzzle, but it seems apparent that the unknown mouse-ateer poet wished to imply a temporal theme—to wit, time marches on (symbolized by the rhythmical striking of the clock), much like Edgar Allan Poe uses the ebony clock in "The Masque of the Red Death," or perhaps the climatic mood Christopher Marlow gives the clock as Faustus surrenders his soul to the Devil on the 12 strokes of midnight in his play Doctor Faustus.

Except that in this poem, of course, "the clock struck one." But the key question is—struck one what? one mouse? one Hickory? one Dickory? one Dock? or none of the above? and it is entirely possible that this personified clock "struck" another clock, which started the whole rotten war against time, thus accounting for the mouse running back down the clock again (line four). Or, if your prefer, it is entirely possible that the poet wished to establish the leitmotif that it is the mouse who is the villain, and this tricky animal subsequently "ran down" (that is ran "over") Hick, Dick, and Doc? Why would the author wish to return to these same three characters with whom the poem began unless he is trying to emphasize their demise at the hands of the villainous rat (i.e., mouse)?

Shades of Sherlock Holmes? To even the most cursory of readers it surely must be clear that this is a triple murder mystery. When the evil clock "struck one" (probably "Hick"), the villainous mouse "ran down" the other two ("Dick and Doc"). Still, I find it difficult to agree with the so-called "Disney World" critics who claim that this clock mouse is really Mickey Mouse in disguise trying to rescue Minnie Mouse from the fate of the death gong (i.e., the clock pendulum, a well known instrument used by no less than Edgar Allan Poe in "The Pit and the Pendulum" story).

There are, of course, other seemingly simple nursery plots that are in reality facades for deeply structured meanings (e.g., the cow that jumped over the moon, and the dish that ran away with the spoon, while they were shouting "Hey, diddle, diddle, the cat and the fiddle"). It becomes a certainty, then, that we are not dealing here with an innocent, folksy, children's story as it must appear to the casual reader, but rather with a very complex mystery, likely coded to protect the sources, in which the tragedy of the fall of mankind is symbolized by the fate of three heroic men—Hickory, Dickory, and Dock now immortalized by this poem. ("In pace requiescat!")
THE KINGDOM OF GOD IN THE TEACHING OF JESUS

by H. Joseph Blair

The central theme of the public proclamation of Jesus was the kingdom of God. Mark attests that at the beginning of the ministry of Jesus he "came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God, and saying, 'The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand..." (Mk. 1:14-15). Matthew's gospel stresses that Jesus went to the synagogues, the cities, and the villages "preaching the gospel of the kingdom" (Matt. 4:23; 9:35). In Luke Jesus says, "I must preach the good news of the kingdom of God to the other cities also; for I was sent for this purpose" (Lk. 4:43).

Many of the parables of Jesus also deal with the reign, or kingdom, of God. Some of the apocalyptic sayings of Jesus do as well, such as Mark 9:47 and Luke 17:20-21. Joachim Jeremias says that the frequency with which Jesus refers to the kingdom in the synoptic sayings "forms a striking contrast to the relatively sparse number of examples in contemporary Judaism and the rest of the New Testament"—certainly evidence for the importance of the theme to Jesus.

The kingdom of God is in a real sense the dominant theme in all the teaching and preaching of Jesus. It certainly has direct relation to all that he did and said. Thus, it is important that this emphasis be given primary consideration in the teaching of Jesus.

Terminology and Meaning

The phrase "kingdom of heaven" is used in Matthew thirty times and "kingdom of God" only three times. Luke and Mark do not use "kingdom of heaven." The two phrases are clearly interchangeable. Devout Jews were reluctant to let the name of "God" pass their lips because they feared they would be disrespectful. Therefore, they engaged in circumlocution, avoiding the use of the name of God by using something else to mean the same thing. Matthew, the most Jewish of the gospels, engages in circumlocution, using kingdom of "heaven" instead of kingdom of "God."

The usage by Jesus grows out of Old Testament roots, although the exact phrase, "kingdom of God," is not found. However, the emphasis upon his sovereignty is there in three aspects: as eternal fact, as present manifestation, and as future consummation.

God as creator reigns over all that he made. Listen to the words of Daniel 4:3: "His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his dominion is from generation to generation." Psalm 103:19 says: "The Lord has established his throne in the heavens, and his kingdom rules over all." This is an eternal fact.

But God's rule actually was not universal. His reign was confined to heaven. The rejection of the reign by humankind caused this, but God re-established his sovereignty by choosing Israel to be his people. Israel rejected God's reign and came under the rule of heathen nations as a result. However, God's reign did not leave earth, but ex-
isted whenever one obediently discharged the will (or law, Torah) of God. This was the present manifestation in Jewish thinking.

However, it was evident that God's people still suffered even when obeying the law. This meant that God's rule was incomplete. A time would come when evil would be defeated and God would "become king over all the earth; on that day the Lord will be one and his name one: (Zech. 13:9). The Jews looked forward to a future consummation when God would establish his reign over all things.

Kingdom of God (or heaven) does not refer to a place or political or geographical entity, although these may be in the kingdom of God. The Greek work for kingdom is basileia. The Greek word does suggest normally a territory or community ruled by a king. However, behind the word is an Aramaic word for kingdom, malkuth, a word well established in Jewish usage. It is an abstract noun meaning "kingship" or "kingly rule." The term "kingdom" means that "specific aspect, attribute or activity of God, in which He is revealed as King or sovereign Lord of His people, or of the universe which He created."

Even this brief summary seems to indicate that people believed in the reign of God and that at least those serious-minded Jews seeking to worship God had a clear concept of the kingdom, or rule, of God. It is striking that this well-developed and well-known concept became the central theme of Jesus' teaching and preaching. Why? What was the uniqueness that Jesus gave to this emphasis, if any?

*The Kingdom of God Is at Hand*

Jesus came saying that "the kingdom of God is at hand" (Mk. 1:15). What did he mean? Did he mean that the eschatological age, the age which would begin when God broke into history to establish his rule over all things, was about to begin?

Albert Schweitzer thought so. Schweitzer painstakingly studied the New Testament sources and all previous significant interpretations about the life of Jesus. He concluded that the life, work and teaching of Jesus were dominated by set eschatological expectations. Jesus expected the eschatological kingdom of God to come in the future, but in the immediate future, and he was announcing its coming. This is the reason Jesus came saying, "The kingdom of God is at hand;" that is, it was so close that it already was casting a shadow of its coming reality across human history.

Jesus expected, according to Schweitzer, the kingdom of God to come after the sending out of the disciples. When this did not happen, again according to Schweitzer's interpretation, the direction of Jesus' ministry changed. The sufferings of Jesus began. The sufferings were the Messianic woes which were to precede or accompany the coming of the kingdom. Jesus intended, Schweitzer thought, to force the sufferings on himself, even to his death, so the expected sufferings would be fulfilled and the kingdom would come.
Schweitzer misunderstood Jesus at some points, but he did make a vital contribution to the understanding of Jesus’ teaching. Who Jesus was and what he said and did, Schweitzer established, could be perceived only if one perceived the eschatological stance of Jesus. Schweitzer misunderstood, however, when he concluded that Jesus’ proclamation, “the kingdom of heaven is at hand,” referred only to a future expectation of Jesus.

C.H. Dodd found in Jesus, especially his parables, a different viewpoint. He concluded that while Jesus was speaking and acting from an eschatological stance, he was doing so from the stance that the kingdom of God was already present, and present in a unique way in himself.

Any Jewish teacher might have said, “If you repent and pledge yourself to the observance of Torah, then you have taken upon yourselves the Kingdom of God.” But Jesus says, “If I, by the finger of God, cast out demons, then the Kingdom of God has come upon you.” Something has happened, which has not happened before, and which means that the sovereign power of God has come into effective operation. It is not a matter of having God for your King in the sense that you obey His commandments: it is a matter of being confronted with the power of God at work in the world. In other words, the “eschatological” Kingdom of God is proclaimed as present fact, which men must recognize, whether by their actions they accept it or reject it.13

Dodd supports his conclusion with sound exegesis. For example, he deals with the pivotal passage of Mark 1:14-15. In what sense is the kingdom near, in point of time or within reach? Dodd claims that the Aramaic words which stand behind ἐγγίζει (to draw near or to be at hand) mean “to reach,” or “to arrive.” Thus, he concludes, with an eye on the Aramaic original, that the phrase in Mark 1:15 should be translated “the Kingdom of God has come” rather than “the kingdom of God is at hand.”14 In other words, the rule of God had broken into human history and it was there in the person of Jesus Christ, there whether humankind accepted it or not. Dodd called this “realized eschatology.”15

In his interpretation, Dodd did not allow for a future development to the Kingdom of God. The emphasis upon realized eschatology was accepted generally, but many felt that some New Testament material could not fit under this category. In fact, it appears that Dodd himself later modified his position and accepted a future aspect in the eschatological emphasis of Jesus.16

Another pivotal contribution was made to the process of interpretation by Joachim Jeremias. His study of the parables led him to conclude that both a present (he was very much in agreement with Dodd at this point) and future aspect exist in the parables of Jesus, so instead of “realized eschatology” he proposed an eschatology “that is in the process of realization.”17
A few examples will help to illustrate the present and future emphases of the kingdom in the teaching of Jesus. The presence of the kingdom is inherent, for example, in the message of some of the parables. Consider the twin parables of The Hid Treasure and The Costly Pearl (Matt. 13:44-46). The emphasis in both is upon the decision which had to be made concerning the treasure found. The laborer and the merchant sacrificed all they had in order to have their respective treasures. As the two in the parable were confronted with the crisis of decision about the treasure, so Jesus was confronting his hearers with the crisis of decision brought about at that moment by their encounter with the kingdom of God. Dodd states the argument of Jesus in this way:

You agree that the Kingdom of God is the highest good: it is within your power to possess it here and now, if like the treasure-finder and the pearl-merchant, you will throw caution to the winds: “Follow me!”

Of course the hearers encountered that treasure, and consequently the crises of decision, in the person of Jesus himself—his presence, his teaching, his preaching, and his actions. So, the kingdom was present in Jesus himself, and it was present whether others chose to accept it or not.

As regards the future aspect of the kingdom, consider the parable of the Mustard Seed (Mk. 4:30-32). The parable depicts a sharp contrast between the beginning of the process and the final stage of the process. Look at the result, a great shrub with large branches in which birds make nests, and compare that with the beginning, a tiny mustard seed! This parable was an answer to those who asked, “Where? Where is the kingdom of God?” They had expected the kingdom of God to come with such fanfare, but a Galilean and a few disciples did not meet those expectations. Jesus was saying, in effect, that the future visible impact of the kingdom would far exceed the present visible impact of the kingdom. However, the shrub in the parable grew out of the beginning, for all that the shrub became existed inherently in the seed. Even so the kingdom, for all that the kingdom would be was inherently present in the beginning. There is a future realization to the kingdom of God in the teaching of Jesus; it is present, but it is also in the process of realization.

_Father, The Sovereign Whom Jesus Revealed_

Israel believed that God was father. God was the father of all peoples, but he was the father of Israel in a special sense. God had adopted Israel as his own, even as his son (Hos.11:1; Ex. 4:22; Jer. 31:9). Then, too, there is the emphasis that Israel was cared for as a father would care for his children (Deut. 1:31; 8:5; Is. 1:20). The emphasis upon the fatherhood of God was present, also, in early Judaism and Rabbinic teaching.

So the emphasis upon the fatherhood of God was present in Israel’s understanding. What, then, did Jesus contribute to the concept which made such an impact on his fol-
lowers? Manson investigates the sayings of Jesus in regard to his usage of "Father" and comes to the conclusion that it was not a formal part of the teaching of Jesus. "Jesus did not preach in public about the Fatherhood of God, but occasionally spoke privately about it to his closest friends and followers."\(^{22}\) Manson does conclude, however, that the experience of God as Father "dominates the whole ministry of Jesus from the Baptism to the Crucifixion."\(^{23}\) That is as it should be since Jesus is the "only Son from the Father" (Jn. 1:14). The followers of Jesus perceived this as being the true relationship of Jesus: "You are the Christ, the Son of the Living God" (Matt. 16:16). Out of his relationship with his Father, Jesus taught his followers also to say "Father" in a special way out of a special relationship.

The special relationship is discerned in the unique way in which Jesus addressed his father as *abba* (Mark 14:36).\(^{24}\) It should be understood that the Old Testament and Judaism may refer to or speak of the fatherhood of God or of God as father, but God is not addressed as "Father," except in a few cases in post-canonical Jewish literature.\(^{25}\) And in no case, not even in the extensive prayer-literature of Judaism, is there an instance of the Aramaic *abba* being used as an address to God. The Jews felt it necessary to keep this distance between themselves and God out of respect for his holiness.

Jesus, however, addressed God as *abba*, "Father." "*Abba*" was the word used by sons and daughters in the home to address their father. It speaks of intimate relationship. It speaks of the presence of God with his Son. For some time it was believed that this was an address used only by very small children (in fact, one of the first words children learned to say was abba). However, Jeremias discovered that even in the period before New Testament times, grown sons and daughters addressed their father as *abba*.\(^{26}\) Jesus was not making the sound of a tiny child, but was addressing his father as a mature son. Even so, it would have been unthinkable, even shocking, for Jesus' contemporaries to address God in this way.

Jesus led his followers into this intimate relationship with the Father. As Manson says, "For them he made God the Father real, not by argument or by much speaking, but because it was obvious that the Father was the supreme reality in his own life."\(^{27}\) Jesus taught his followers to say "*abba*." This use of *abba* as an address to God was widespread in the early church. Paul uses it, for example, and assumes that it is not only an address to God in the churches for which he was directly responsible (Gal. 4:6) "but that it also rings out as a cry of prayer in congregations which he has not founded, like that in Rome (Rom. 8:15)."\(^{28}\)

*The Kingdom's Subjects*

Jesus' preaching and teaching were unique because of whom he invited and included into the kingdom. The kingdom was for the poor (Lk. 6:20); the wealthy were at a disadvantage, not an advantage (Mk. 10:23); the childlike rather than the proud experts in the study of the scriptures would enter (Mk. 10:14-15); tax collectors and sinners had more opportunity than self-righteous Pharisees (Matt. 21:31); and not only Jews but those from East and West, North and South would enter (Matt. 8:11-12).\(^{29}\)
This was revolutionary, and Jesus became the object of scorn for daring to say and to demonstrate that such persons were included into the kingdom. To say that the kingdom belonged to sinners and outcasts was “apparently the dissolution of all ethics; it seemed as if moral conduct meant nothing in God’s eyes.”\(^{30}\) Was it not the duty of all the pure to keep from being contaminated by the unrighteous? Jeremias quotes one Jewish prayer which is revealing: “I (the person praying) will have no pity on all who depart from the way. I will offer no comfort to the smitten until their way becomes perfect.”\(^{31}\) Consider this statement of the Pharisees: “But this crowd, who do not know the law, are accursed” (John 7:49). Yet Jesus came and included the unrighteous; he was the “friend of tax collectors and sinners” and he was “eating and drinking” with them (Matt. 11:19).

Those who are accustomed to hearing that sinners are included in the kingdom’s invitation have difficulty understanding how revolutionary were the words and actions of Jesus. The whole point for religious Jews was to keep a remnant of Israel pure for the coming of the kingdom. The Qumran community considered themselves to be the true Israel, God’s true people under his reign, and table-fellowship in that community was open only to the pure, those who were full members.\(^{32}\) The same sentiment existed among the Pharisees. In contrast, Jesus, in whom the kingdom was being realized, went home with the likes of Zacchaeus (Lk. 19:1-10). Many would not accept Jesus for this very reason. Jeremias is right when he says that the “offence after Easter was Jesus’ accursed death on the cross — his table-fellowship with sinners was the pre-Easter scandal.”\(^{33}\)

**The Uniqueness of Jesus**

The uniqueness of Jesus’ teaching, preaching, and action has been viewed from three perspectives: First, Jesus came announcing the kingdom of God. The kingdom was breaking into human experience in his teaching, preaching, and action. This is as we would expect, because Jesus is uniquely the Son of God. Second, Jesus was God’s Son, and he addressed his Father as “abba,” an expression of intimate, family relationship of Father to child. Jesus taught his followers to say, “abba,” and to this intimate relationship of Father to child. Third, Jesus invited and included outcasts, sinners, and tax collectors into the kingdom of God.

This is Good News.

*(This article was published in the Spring, 1982, edition of *The Theological Educator*.)*
Notes

1 All quotations are from the Revised Standard Version of the Bible.

2 See also, for example, Mk. 10:14; 23-25; 14:25; Lk. 9:2, 60; 10:9; 11:20.


5 See *Ibid.*, pp. 145–146, for full discussion on these three aspects.


8 Dodd, *Parables*, p. 21.
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13 Dodd, *Parables*, p. 29.
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23 *Ibid*.

24 For excellent discussion of *abba*, see Jeremias, *Theology*, pp. 62-68.


27 Manson, *Teaching*, p. 102.
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DIVIDED

A Play in One Act

by Wayne Alford

Scene 1

Time: The Present. Place: Atop a hill overlooking Silicon Valley, California. HUPER TECHNE (High Technology) enters L with attendants, as ANTHROPOS (Mankind) enters R with one attendant.

ANTHROPOS. We meet again, Techne. It's been a long time since Mt. Olympus.

TECHNE. (Looking about him) Yes, and my compliments, Anthropos, on your selection of this site—Silicon Valley, California. What an improvement over Olympus—that wet and dreary place. I haven't stopped rusting since I left there, and my transistors have been fouling out, too. Ahhh—but now, look at all that sunshine!

ANTHROPOS. They do have fog around here sometimes, Techne, but maybe you won't have the same problem with your solar power battery that you had at Olympus, when a cloud covered the sun.

TECHNE. (Frowning) You didn't have to mention that, Anthropos.

ANTHROPOS. Sorry.

TECHNE. Never mind. I have determined that nothing can dampen my spirits today—not even the repulsive prospect of making peace with humanity.

ANTHROPOS. That was our agreement on Mt. Olympus—Humanity and Technology are to work cooperatively to save civilization from future holocaust and annihilation.

TECHNE. (Scowling) The same civilization that humanity has tried repeatedly to destroy since the dawn of human history.

ANTHROPOS. Now, now, Techne. Remember what you just said about dampened spirits.

TECHNE. (Surveying the Valley) Look at that valley—a veritable treasury of the latest developments in microchip and software design and high-speed computers. Doesn't the very thought turn you on, Anthropos?

ANTHROPOS. And don't forget the highly select designers—the human brain-power that's behind it all. And—this is the really beautiful part of it—chip, software,
and computer designers rub elbows in the same setting with genetic engineers and other humanist technologists.

**TECHNE.** What do you mean “rub elbows?”

**ANTHROPOS.** I mean that the technologists and humanitarians are working together down there to harness technology for the good of mankind, and not for its destruction.

**TECHNE.** (Flaring) Harness technology? Blast it, Anthropos. Don’t you human fools ever learn? You won’t be satisfied ’till you’ve burned up the planet! (Rising to anger) You talk about harnessing technology? It’s you homosapien idiots that ought to be shackled and sold into slavery. Technology, man, is our only means of survival, and you’re telling me those imbeciles down there are working together to harness technology? Comvac, what are you staring at?

**COMVAC.** You’re smoking, Techne. You must be careful, or you’ll overheat again!

**ANTHROPOS.** (Fanning him with his robe) All right, Techne, all right—just simmer down. All I’m saying is that they’re laboring for the good of the human race and the advancement of technology.

**TECHNE.** (Not placated) I smell a double-cross, Anthropos! You gave me that same snow job at Olympus—all that folderol about “our united effort to save the world”—and you didn’t mean a word of it, did you? “It is left to us—Humanity and Technology together—to save civilization. . . .we—you and I—have a chance, perhaps our last chance, to change the direction of our destiny and develop a civilization more decent and humane than ever before.” Those were your exact words at Olympus, Anthropos. I recorded and stored them in my data bank!

**ANTHROPOS.** Yes, they were. But I never meant to. . .

**TECHNE.** (Moving toward him) Was it not your real intention to get me over here in this human stronghold called America, the very heart throb of democracy, and seduce me with mankind’s favorite weaponry—flattery, empty promises, and creature comforts, all set in a paradise of grandiose technological achievement—and ultimately neutralize my status as the dominant world power? What kind of a moron do you take me for, Anthropos? (Glaring down at the Valley) That commune of high technologists and humanists working together to solve the world’s problems is like throwing a bunch of mongooses and cobras into a rat hole together and expecting them to congenially agree on how to divide up the prey! (Suddenly staggering backwards) Ohhhhhhh — —

**UNIVAC 17.** (Supporting him) Comvac, his temperature is rising again, shall I . . .

**COMVAC.** Yes, quickly, Univac 17! Robo I, Robo II, help him. (Robo I and Robo II respond).
UNIVAC 17. No, Robo II, you fool—not water! Here, take this (giving Robo II a CO₂ bottle, which he discharges on TECHNE) There!

ANTHROPOS. (Approaching TECHNE) Techne, you must control yourself!

TECHNE. (Weakly) ...or, maybe, Anthropos, it was your purpose to short-circuit my cooling system and burn me up! I should have known better. First, you got me to agree to Mt. Olympus, then you continued to bewitch and poison me with all your emotional trickeries. Now I've even got a temper to lose control of!

ANTHROPOS. (Settling him down) Now, Techne—just listen to me for a moment. Let's forget about Silicon Valley for right now. We agreed to come here today, each with a specific proposal to integrate high technology and human creativeness into a workable plan to save and prosper humanity and advance technology. First things first. We'll hear each other's ideas, then we'll clear up the other misunderstanding later, O.K.?

TECHNE. (Back to normal, begrudgingly) All right, Anthropos. But I'm warning you, from now on, you'd better watch your Ps and Qs. No shenanigans, you hear?

ANTHROPOS. Agreed. Now, let's have a look at your proposal.

TECHNE. (Soothed momentarily, he brightens, as he unfurls a set of blueprints) Now, what I have here is a set of plans for a delivery system that will decimate those Valley whiz kids down there all the way back to Romper Room School. Believe it, Anthropos, this system, together with its master control unit is the last word in computer technology.

ANTHROPOS. (Looking at the blueprints) Hmmmm—interesting.

TECHNE. More than just interesting. It'll make NASA's spacecraft computer look like an abacus.

ANTHROPOS. (Turning a page, pointing) What is this?

TECHNE. (Triumphant) Ah-ha! The coup de théâtre! The component that will not only tie this globe together with a world-wide network of computerized telecommunications and calculation capabilities never before dreamed of, but one which will extend such capabilities throughout the entire universe at two thousand times the speed of light! Anthropos, you are now looking at UNIVERSE I, the master control computer unit!

ANTHROPOS. UNIVERSE I?

TECHNE. (With eyes flashing) Yes! With this system, we'll be able to control the whole cosmos from Planet Earth. Anthropos, we'll be masters of the universe!!!
ANTHROPOS. (Awestruck, as he scans the blueprint) Great Scott, Techné, it’s beautiful—what an incredible creation! It’s—it’s like a high tech robot god!

TECHNE. It is the ultimate achievement in high technology, Anthropos, and—it is self-sufficient and self-sustaining. After the first one, it depends in no way on human beings for its manufacture, maintenance, or for its succeeding generations. It will never become obsolete because it updates itself periodically on a regularly scheduled basis. And, as you humans would say, here’s the kicker. Once the first computer is built and activated, it duplicates itself—makes carbon copies, so to speak—thus, it can never be destroyed. It becomes at once an electronic brain superior to and dominant over any known human intelligence. In a word, my organic friend, it will make humanity obsolete!

ANTHROPOS. And you propose to build one of these things?

TECHNE. Not things, Anthropos. Beings!

ANTHROPOS. But what will happen to the human race?

TECHNE. (Candidly) It’ll have to be redefined—if it wishes to survive. (Casually) Oh, not to worry, Anthropos, your kind—the more highly developed of the humans—will be needed for the menial tasks of servitude. (Sardonically) Now, Anthropos, would you like to show me your proposal—merely as a formality, of course! Ha! ha! haaaaaaaah!

ANTHROPOS. (From shocked to incensed) Talk about a double-cross! Why you oversized Darth Veda—(Restrained by ADAM, his attendant, as he goes for TECHNE’s throat).

ADAM. Anthropos, control yourself!

TECHNE. Temper, temper, Anthropos!

ANTHROPOS. Techné, you fool, you’re talking about the cessation of us all—humanity and technology alike!

TECHNE. I don’t blame you, Anthropos. I’d feel the same way if I were in your shoes. But, don’t worry, I’ll see to it that you’re taken care of—in a more humane way than the others. Ha! ha! ha!

ANTHROPOS. (Resorting to reason) Listen, Techné. Put your transistorized brain in gear for a moment and try to do what you tech-nuts do best—use logic! What happens to you when this...this UNIVERSE I is activated? Do you think for one minute it’s going to let you survive? Why, you spawn that thing and it’ll snuff you out like a candle. Think, Techné, if you have that capability at all—this UNIVERSE I won’t need you any longer (looking at the others)—any of you! It’ll promptly make enough clones of itself to rule the universe on its own terms.
COMVAC. Oh, my goodness!

UNIVAC 17. Techne, we mustn’t!

ROBO I. We shall all surely perish!

ROBO II. And what’s worse, there’ll be no third generation Robos!

TECHNE. Shut up, Robo II—and the rest of you ninnies, too! Can’t you see what he’s trying to do?—befuddle you with a log of human hocus pocus, just like he did with me. This new generation of computers will be of our genre, our family, and therefore, friendly and accepting of us. Besides, they won’t be our gods, we’ll be theirs. They will behold us with awe and fear—even worship us. Why shouldn’t they? We would be their makers.

ANTHROPOS. (With disgust) Another Emperor Jones!

TECHNE. What?

ANTHROPOS. I was just thinking that what you’re describing is much like O’Neill’s Rufus Jones, who made himself emperor of some ignorant West Indian natives until...

TECHNE. (Ignoring him) In this respect, our relationship with UNIVERSE I would be no different from you humans and your Hebrew God, Anthropos. (Scornfully) Though, I dare say our new civilization would do a little better than let ours die pinned to a wooden cross!

ANTHROPOS. (Continuing). . .until the natives suddenly awoke to the realization that power lay in numbers. Then, they ran their phony emperor off.

TECHNE. Face it, Anthropos, you’re doomed!

ANTHROPOS. What happened to Jones will happen to you, too, Techne, only worse. When your newly created subjects get wise to your devious scare tactics, you won’t last as long as a worm in a henhouse!

TECHNE. Enough of this pointless jabbering. We’ve wasted too much time already. (To attendants) Come, let us retire from this place and get to work on UNIVERSE I.

ANTHROPOS. Never, Techne! (as he snatches up the blueprints, tears them to bits, and scatters the pieces over the hilltop). There! There goes your monster to the wind. You’ll never realize this mad scheme. Instead, you’ll be forced to continue negotiations with humanity for a new civilization mutually beneficial to us all!
TECHNE. Fool! You’re just delaying the inevitable! You can’t stop us. We’ll just print out another set of blueprints for UNIVERSE I, and, this time, humanity will not be spared at all!

ANTHROPOS. No, Techne, wait! (Sighing, as TECHNE and others exit down the hill). Do you think he means it, Adam? Or, will he have second thoughts and come back for more talks?

ADAM. (Watching the bits of TECHNE’s blueprints whirl around in the wind and blow over the Valley) I don’t know. He can easily build that monster if he wants to, and if he does, it may mean the end of everything.

ANTHROPOS. (Looking after TECHNE) Maybe the monster has already been built, Adam.

ADAM. You mean—

ANTHROPOS. I mean perhaps there goes the monster down the hillside now, and mankind, the “fool” who made him, stands here helplessly looking after him.

ADAM. You’re saying, then, that Techne, the “monster,” himself a product of human ingenuity, is already out of control and threatening to destroy the universe by creating a technological force much greater than himself?

ANTHROPOS. What difference does it make whether it’s Techne who builds the destructive force UNIVERSE I who destroys everything, or whether its Mankind who created Techne, who, in turn, built UNIVERSE I?

ADAM. None, I suppose. The outcome would be the same.

ANTHROPOS. We shall soon see, Adam. Indeed, we shall soon see.

Scene 2

Time: 2,500 A.D. Place: In this solar system near Planet Earth, aboard a spacecraft from another galaxy. The beautiful, gleaming planet Earth pleasantly greets the eyes of the space travellers. A quick analysis by the craft’s sophisticated computers is made and the following message is printed out: “The Great planet Earth: Clear atmosphere, pure air and water, an abundance of food; peaceful, healthy environment for intelligent human life; highly advanced technologically. It is estimated that peace and prosperity have reigned here for at least five hundred years.” STOP

Alternate Scene 2

Time: 2,500 A.D. Place: In this solar system near Planet Earth, aboard a spacecraft from another galaxy. An ugly, grey, charred and heavily clouded cosmic body greets the
eyes of the space travellers. A quick analysis by the craft's sophisticated computers is made and the following message is printed out: "The late, Great planed Earth: Atmosphere clouded with heavy concentration of radioactive dust. No air, no water, no food capable of sustaining life. It is estimated that nuclear holocaust ended all organic life on Earth approximately five hundred years ago." STOP

CURTAIN
This book, produced and distributed by UMI Research Press, contains much significant material never before available in published form. Fresh sources include diaries, letters and an unpublished manuscript which was compiled by Lowell Mason’s grandson, Henry Lowell Mason. Admittedly, some of this new material does not add much from a pure research point of view, but definite insights and color perspectives are achieved that were missing in many of the earlier treatises on Lowell Mason. In addition, the book also contains much standard material which has appeared in various published sources of long standing. However, the fact that numerous scattered sources already available and previously unpublished materials are now combined into one well organized unit, make this book a major contribution to students of American Music History.

Mason’s early apprenticeship and orientation into the American music scene was negotiated during an eight year tenure in Savannah, Georgia, from 1814-1822. His music preparation as a church choir organist and director, and his business skills cultivation as a banker are ably chronicled and detailed in the book.

On Mason’s return to Boston he formed a fortuitous association with the famous Handel and Haydn Society. Mason’s subsequent publications for the Handel and Haydn Society assured his success and notoriety in Boston and surrounding centers of music activity as well. Eventually his publishing efforts were successful both musically and financially. Mason’s son once boasted of one of his father’s publications, “This is the book that made $100,000 for my father.” Mason’s total book sales numbered easily over one million copies and brought him a veritable fortune. He was very protective of his published material and insisted that it be printed exactly as he had prepared the manuscript with no additional editing. On at least one occasion he wrote a rather straightforward “cease and desist” type letter to one who he felt was infringing on his material. However, Mason himself apparently followed the practice of freely “borrowing” material of European composers for editing or arranging purposes. The latter practice seems to have been commonly accepted for the time and Mason’s indulgence was no exception.

Mason’s interest and activity in children’s music training has long been recognized as a major contribution. The sequence of events in this area of Mason’s activity is fully detailed in this volume although very little new information is added. The well known struggle between Mason and the Boston School Board is presented in great detail. The advent and success of music instruction in public schools led to a great demand for qualified music teachers. Mason alertly and astutely capitalized on the situation. The organization of the Boston Academy of Music was an important pioneer event in music education. Among Mason’s unique professional moves was the organization of a convention to bring music teachers of wide geographical distribution together to establish
rapport and share ideas. The success of these conventions grew steadily over a seventeen year period and largely under the impetus of Mason’s fame. These early conventions were the prototypes of our modern day occurrences.

From the conventions Mason moved to teacher training institutes. The early institutes ran for three months. They were highly successful and were quickly extended to nine months with a curricular format similar to a normal college term. The 1853 institute was hailed as “the first musical establishment in the world having for its purpose the education of teachers.”

As Mason’s wealth and free time accumulated he traveled in Europe. He never ceased to be amazed to find his name quickly recognized and highly respected. Although he did not consider himself to be a scholar Mason frequently collected manuscripts and research materials during his travel for “...young men who are beginning to feel the necessity of a more liberal education for the profession of music...” One of Mason’s purchases contained 33 previously unpublished Bach Chorale Preludes for organ which remained undiscovered until 1984.

Additional activities of Lowell Mason include a joint venture into instrument manufacturing which eventually led to the Mason and Hamlin Piano Company, pioneering in music therapy, and association with music instruction in institutions of higher education such as Andover Theological Seminary and Union Theological Seminary.

This book keeps constantly to the forefront that first, last and always Mason was a man of deep religious convictions and never departed far from his initial commitment to reform and improve the quality of church music in America. His musical style efficiently moderated between the revival-gospel music on the one extreme and “high church” hymnody on the other. Even the critics of Mason’s hymns readily admitted that they were very popular with congregations. Further tribute is paid to Mason’s hymn tunes by their incorporation in larger works by such well-known composers as Charles Ives and Seth Bingham. Perhaps the endurance of Mason’s hymns lies in his emphasis on their spiritual potential and not just on artistic quality.

In general, this is a well written and comprehensive treatment of the life of Lowell Mason. Some weak points of the book include spending too much time on background information. The information is undoubtedly accurate but frequently so far removed from the main point of reference that it adds little value to the context of the situation. There is also a strong tendency to include too many peripheral references to distant relatives, in-laws, business partners and so forth. As previously mentioned, the book is organized by major activity sequences in Mason’s life and not by chronology. Because of the organization, a person may be presented several times at different places in the book. It is somewhat irritating, if not actually confusing when, such references are made as though the people have not been previously identified.

In addition to the main body of the book two very useful appendices are included. The first appendix is a detailed chronological listing of the main events of Mason’s life
from birth to death. The second appendix is a comprehensive list of Mason’s music publica-
tions.

*Lowell Mason: His Life and Times* is a book which is a valuable reference resource for all important phases of the life of a historic American music figure. While achieving definite clarity of style, the book also provides interesting and captivating reading which doubly rewards the reader.

*(This review appeared previously in the “Southern Baptist Church Music Journal.)*
A MEDITATION ON THE CATHEDRAL OF CHARTERS

by Bonnie S. Homsley

Stanza one  Oh, Lord, make my soul a cathedral
    fit for thy divine presence withal
    immaculate as the Blessed Virgin’s person,
    light as the blazoning vault of Heaven,
    towering over human conflicts of every season.

Stanza two  Will that its foundation of Faith be granite,
    unyielding, its vertical structure soar to the Infinite-
    seat of the triune God served humbly by His Maid;
    its walls in symbolic sculpture and painting arrayed,
    its outer portal with the blood of Christ graced,
    its arches of prayer with His intercession laced.

Stanza three  Set in the nave a shrine fit wholly
    to receive my bridegroom and priest—a Holy
    of Holies—a sanctuary of prayer and praise,
    thanksgiving and supplication forever to raise
    in honor of thy miraculous feast set here
    on the altar of thy salvation—charisma ever near.
INTEGRITY: BEING THE TRUTH

by W. Clyde Tilley

The centuries have hallowed Jesus as a great teacher of truth. Yet one of the most astounding claims of Jesus for himself is this: “I am...the truth” (John 14:6).

What does it mean for Jesus to be the truth as well as to teach it? What we have here is the claim that the Teacher is the complete embodiment of his truth, the Truth incarnate. In Jesus there is a total lack of discrepancy, a complete continuity, between what he taught and what he did. Whereas there is customarily with the teacher, even the greatest of them, a gap or break, be it ever so slight, between what he says and does, there is no such gap with Jesus. In him is a full eclipse of word and deed.

But that is not all: there is also a complete continuity between what Jesus says and what (who) he is, his being. Indeed, in the bond of his being, his word and deed are held intact, inseparable.

Can anyone besides Jesus be the truth? Insofar as we are called to follow him, we are called to be the truth as well. Insofar as we are sinners, fallen, the bond of being that binds our words and deeds together is broken so that we cannot be the truth perfectly. Insofar as we are the recipients of God’s grace, progressively being redeemed, this breach of word and deed is being healed. In redemption grace operates for us as pardon for our failure to attain God’s righteous demand (i.e., His demand for us to be the truth), and in us a power to close and to heal that wound.

In thinking about truth as something we are called to be, we must regard it differently from the way we customarily think about truth, as more than something merely cognitive that we may know, or than something merely propositional that we may utter. It must refer to something of greater dimension, something ontological which is bigger than we are and which engulfs us. We are now speaking of truth in much the same way that we ordinarily speak of Reality, something which transcends both the grasp which we have of it and the statements that we can make about it.

To aid further in our analysis, let us introduce three similar but non-identical words: honesty, sincerity, and integrity. To avoid overlap and the interchangeability that often accompanies the use of these words, it will be helpful to use them as follows: Honesty can be a way of referring to the authenticity of our words, the conscientious correspondence between the statements we make about what is real and the state of affairs we intend to describe. Two shortcomings may interfere with this “conscientious correspondence” on our part: In our creaturely limitation, we may be in error about the actual correspondence between our statement and a state of affairs. In our moral imperfection, the conscientiousness which makes us faithful to that correspondence as we perceive it may be defective. Yet only the latter is ordinarily regarded as an infringement upon our honesty.
Sincerity ("without wax") can refer to the authenticity of our deeds insofar as they relate to the truths we profess and believe to be so. Of course believing and professing themselves must be included among those deeds for they too may be claimed in sincerity or insincerity. Integrity refers to that bond of being which holds our words and deeds together, keeping the former honest and the latter sincere while safeguarding their correspondence to each other, insofar as this correspondence is a matter of moral concern. Thus one speaks honestly, acts sincerely, and is a person of integrity. Insofar as we speak and insofar as we are complete in our honesty, sincerity, and integrity, we will be the truth. (This is no claim, of course, that these words are always used in this way. The imprecision of language being what it is, we sometimes use them interchangeably. These definitions function in somewhat of a theoretical sense, as if to say, "If we use these words in this way, at least for the duration of this discourse, it is likely to clarify our discussion and provide a clearer analysis of what 'being the truth' means." At the same time, the etymology and historic usage of these words provide a precedent, however imperfect, for their being used in the sense I am prescribing.)

So Jesus can be and is the truth, and we can, at least potentially, be the truth. But there is a difference in the way that he is the truth and that we can be the truth. He is the truth because he is one with Reality. This is true in the sense that the Scriptures bear witness to him as the Word (Logos) who was in the beginning with God (John 1:1–2) in the sense that “all things were created through him and for him” (Colossians 1:16). In a very practical way, his oneness with Reality was communicated in terms of the amazing authority with which he taught (Mark 1:22), an authority not derived from written codes and scribal interpretations.

Furthermore, in his humanity — his incarnation — his integrity, the bond of his being which holds together his word and deed, was subjected to the utmost limits of moral strain. This was the meaning of his temptations and of his suffering by which he was made perfect (Hebrews 2:10). He “in every respect has been tempted as we are, yet without sin” (Hebrews 4:15). He persisted in being the truth as the bond of his integrity resisted the pressures to break and destroy the unity of his word and deed.

Insofar as it is possible for us to be the truth, this can happen only as we come to be “in Christ,” in him who is the truth. This is not a oneness of absorption in which we lose our personal identities. It is the oneness of participation in which we as distinct persons find both our vocation/calling and our fulfillment in him. Although we still have our separate existence, it is a separateness that is never the same again. The person in Christ knows at each moment, at least in those moments when she is true to herself, that she both is in Christ and is in him with others who also are in him.

The cost of being in Christ is the cost of self-denial, of cross-bearing, and of following Jesus (Matthew 16:24). We come to be in Christ, i.e., enter him, as we take up our cross to follow him. In taking up our cross we are crucified with him (Galatians 2:20), present our bodies as living sacrifices (Romans 12:1), are no longer our own (1 Corinthians 6:19), and “share his sufferings, becoming like him in his death” (Philippians 3:10). But to share his sufferings is to “know him and the power of his resurrec-
tion” (3:10). To have Christ’s mind of suffering servanthood is also to be exalted with him (Philippians 2:5–11; Mark 10:35–45; 2 Timothy 2:11–12). Thus by losing life we find it (Matthew 16:25).

But one cannot take up his cross until he has denied himself. The self finds the cross repugnant. The cross is antithetical to all ambitions except for the ambition to do the will of God. The self attempts to rationalize the cross, seizing upon the half-truth of Christ as our substitute and pretending it is the whole truth. It conveniently forgets the call to take up our cross and to enter the fellowship of Christ’s suffering as preparatory to the new life available in Christ. Only as we cease to have private ambitions of our own and relinquish our wills unconditionally to the divine will can we approach the cross and take it up. Only as we refuse to press our rights as Jesus did (Philippians 2:6–7), foregoing them in our complete surrender to God’s will, have we denied ourselves and taken up our cross. God has no will for any of us until we have complied with his universal will that we take up our cross and even then his will will always conform to the image of that cross. It is only in this weakness that we can ever be strong (2 Corinthians 12:9–10) and in this folly that we can ever be wise (1 Corinthians 1:18–25).

It is important for us to know that the self we renounce is a broken self. Its bond of being is broken so that in it word and deed can scarcely agree. We cannot speak with total honesty nor act with total sincerity. We often find it the case that when we would do good, evil is present (Romans 7:15–21). We recognize our spiritual poverty (Matthew 5:3) acknowledging it mournfully (5:4) and meekly (5:5). Hungry and thirsty for righteousness (5:6), we lose that self within ourselves to find it beyond ourselves through merciful self giving (5:7). We do so with an increasingly purified motive (5:8) and through peacemaking (5:9) even to the point of accepting persecution (5:10). Yet the suffering of persecution can be joyful (5:11–12) as here we find a new self that we could find at no other time or in no other way.

To find a new self is to lay hold of a new integrity because we have found our new self in Christ. This new integrity as an accomplished fact is his and not ours. Yet in his grace we have found resources by which our brokenness is dealt with, a pardon for our failures and a power for our progressive mending. Since it is not our accomplished fact, this integrity must be continually renewed (Romans 12:2) and our taking up the cross and our dying must be a daily discipline (Luke 9:23; 1 Corinthians 15:31).

There is no way to know what this self–denial entails in advance. It is never done in the abstract but always in the concrete moment. It has to do with the relinquishing of particular ambitions, the foregoing of particular rights. These ambitions and rights are experienced as barriers to the work of God’s grace in our lives and as contradictions to the new existence we have in Christ. And though we renounce them in principle, still they must be faced and dealt with singly and specifically. In institutional settings these ambitions and rights are especially insidious, since all institutions partake of the character of the “principalities and powers” against which we contend (Ephesians 6:12). Until all personal ambitions are relinquished and all exclusive rights foregone, specifically and individually, the new integrity which binds words and deeds together cannot be fully operative in our lives.
How is it that grace operates specifically as power, as opposed to pardon, so as to restore integrity as an accomplished fact for us? First, it can never be an accomplished fact for us alone for we can never have a personal existence that is separate from our existence in Christ. Also, this integrity can never be an accomplished fact in the sense of a finished product that is not perennially vulnerable to the threats of that self which continues to insinuate itself into our new existence and so must be the object of repeated crucifixions. But still, this does not answer the question of “how”; it simply serves to draw some parameters round any answer that can be given.

To answer this question, it will help if we note a crucial difference between integrity, on the one hand, and sincerity and honesty, on the other. Insincerity always seems to be, to some degree, a conscious matter. It makes little sense to talk about someone being unconsciously insincere. We blame a person for insincerity as though, at the moment, she knows what she is doing and could have done otherwise, as in a belief she professes or in an offer she makes. Also one’s sincerity can be incongruent with Reality as when we say that a person is sincerely wrong. The same can be said of honesty, that an honest person is making an erroneous statement, i.e., it does not correspond to reality, even though he thinks it does. This is the case because being dishonest requires a measure of conscious deliberation and of deliberate consciousness on his part.

But these sorts of statements cannot be fairly assigned to integrity. Somehow one’s integrity may be impugned at a level below the threshold of consciousness in a way that his honesty and his sincerity cannot be. People without integrity may often be unconscious of the fact that they are without it in a way that people who are being insincere or dishonest cannot. And although a person may be wrong though sincere, or erroneous though honest, a person with integrity cannot find himself similarly pitted against Reality. What one may say or do in relation to Reality may obviously be at variance with Reality when there is nothing morally blameworthy about that person: he is both honest and sincere. But what one is in relation to Reality cannot be at variance with that Reality; otherwise he is less than he ought to be.

In fact, there does not seem to be an adjective that corresponds to the noun, “integrity,” in the same way that “honest” corresponds to “honesty” or that “sincere” corresponds to “sincerity.” To say that a person has integrity is to say much more than that he is integrated. The condition of being integrated is a wholly internal matter but the condition of having integrity speaks of an external relation as well. Whereas one can be integrated along lines that are wholly uncommendable, if one has integrity he is not only integrated but he is integrated in terms of, and in line with, moral values that have their origin and existence quite apart from him.

Although truth in its spoken sense can and ordinarily will have a point of contact with a state of affairs quite apart from the speaker, infringement upon that truth represented by our word “dishonest” is committed through a discrepancy that exists wholly within the person, between what he believes to be the case and what he attempts to pass off as his belief. Similarly, sincerity as we are using it here, unlike integrity but like honesty, refers to a relationship exclusively within the person, between what he believes
to be the case and what he decides to act like he believes. The internality of the relationship in the cases of sincerity and honesty corresponds to their being conscious states, and yet the notion of the internality of the relationship would seem to have its own merits as a consideration apart from their being conscious states. Honesty and sincerity are within themselves good which, while although conscious processes, are being held together by integrity which, as is claimed, exists below the threshold of consciousness.

How is it that a person can be unconscious of his integrity or of his lack of it? Perhaps in consideration of the fact that one pole in the line of contact which constitutes integrity, unlike honesty and sincerity, is outside himself. As such it is that bond which one is, holding together that which one says and does. Personal consciousness can embrace what we say and do in a way that it cannot embrace what we are. It is a function of our person and thus cannot embrace the person.

For the Christian, since our existence is in Christ, he is the Reality outside us with whom we have that point of contact and from whom our integrity derives. The decision to be in him is the decision to partake of that integrity as a bond for our word and deed. Integrity may thus be unconsciously eroded at those points where we consciously choose to compromise our word and deed through dishonesty and insincerity. Although integrity is a gift, it is a gift that brooks no complacency and boasts no immunity from our particular discrepancies of word and deed. Again, in grace we have pardon for these discrepancies and power for their healing.

The truth which we are called to be is thus the truth that corresponds to integrity and that embraces the truths that correspond to honesty and to sincerity. What we are, which knows its perfection in integrity, is the source and the bond for what we say and do, which know their perfection in honesty and sincerity. But similarly our integrity can be eroded through imperfections in our honesty and sincerity. And it is possible if not likely that we may be none the wiser of this compromise in integrity.

What shall we say of the role of one who endeavors to teach the truth with regard to her obligation to be the truth? When the truth being taught is significant truth as opposed to trivial, value as opposed to mere fact, the Christian teacher works under the mandate to embody the truth she articulates, to be the truth she utters. The uttered truth is incomplete apart from the truth of doing and of being. The spoken truth needs to be demonstrated by deed and completed by life. Significant truth is trivialized when this does not happen.

Owing to the character of our fallen world, the Truth which is in Christ is often at variance with the truth that is outside him. In every generation, the Truth has suffered rejection, hostility, and even violence by the world to which it is sent. This rejection in our day, as in his, is elicited no less from inside the church than from without it. The challenge to the committed teacher is to demonstrate, incarnate, and thus complete the truth which has been spoken, despite its hostile rejection. To do otherwise may be like leaving before the lesson is over.
Weighing such decisions is no light or simplistic matter. For one thing, there is a
time to "shake off the dust of your feet" (Matthew 10:14). In addition, since one can be
unconscious of the compromises of his own integrity, this is true of the teacher no less
than of the hearer. His way too is fraught with the temptations to self–will and pride.
To be forewarned of this should mean, in a degree, to be forearmed. It is not without
the most intense of pains–taking and soul–searching that such commitments be made.
Only with the most rigorous of spiritual discipline and the ongoing assurance of the
Holy Spirit can one know whether to shake the dust or whether perhaps God may be
about to effect another resurrection in response to resolute suffering. Even here, the
pledge of his certainty can be no more than his willingness to risk himself and his fu-
fure to be true to his insights.

It must be recalled that the Truth that is in Christ is always cruciform, in the shape
of the cross. At bottom line, it is the truth that through losing life, life can be found.
This is the cross that the world finds offensive today no less than then (1 Corinthians
1:18). What better embodiment of this truth could there be than the Christian teacher
putting her life where her mouth is, in utter dependence upon God?

The model of transparency is one which commends itself for our use here. The per-
son in whom word and deed hold together perfectly in the bond of being has become
totally transparent. Always bearers of integrity–in–the–making, we struggle against the
milky clouds that ever besmirch our authenticity. Perennially in need of the refinement
that comes from that grace that transcends us, in much the same way that blood is
purified by the dialytic agent to which it is attached, this grace works as pardon to hold
us in its mercies and as power to make us ever more nearly transparent.

To the extent that we are transparent, to that extent we are truth. And the truth for
which our lives become bearers has its own power to establish and defend itself, to win
its own victories. Mahatma Gandhi spoke of this power as soul–force and Dr. Martin
Luther King, Jr., spoke of it as truth–force. When the life as well as the mouth becomes
the bearer of truth, that life has entered the realm where its word becomes one with
that word which can never return void (Isaiah 55:11). It becomes one with dying for
which power of the resurrection is our promise (Philippians 3:8–11).
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