

NAVE BOOKS  
G-47  
P9345  
v.51:3  
copy 3

PRINCETON SEMINARY  
1958

# The Princeton Seminary Bulletin

The Form of A Servant  
John A. Mackay

The Atonement and Contemporary  
Theology  
James S. Thomson

On Spiritual Resources  
Georges A. Barrois

The Dedication of  
The Robert E. Speer Library

Volume LI · January 1958 · Number 3

# The Princeton Seminary Bulletin

Vol. LI

JANUARY, 1958

Number 3

Donald Macleod, Editor

Edward J. Jurji, Book Review Editor

THE FORM OF A SERVANT	<i>John A. Mackay</i>	3
THE ATONEMENT AND CONTEMPORARY THEOLOGY	<i>James S. Thomson</i>	13
ON SPIRITUAL RESOURCES	<i>Georges A. Barrois</i>	24
GEMS UN CUT	<i>Thomas L. Thorne, Jr.</i>	26
PRINCETONIANA		32
EVANGELISM FOR TOMORROW	<i>Roger A. Huber</i>	39
DEDICATION OF THE ROBERT E. SPEER LIBRARY		43
ALUMNI NEWS	<i>Orion C. Hopper</i>	60
BOOK REVIEWS:		
An Introduction to the Apocrypha, by B. M. Metzger	<i>Eugene A. Nida</i>	68
Ministers in Training, ed. by J. Christy Wilson	<i>Edward S. Golden</i>	69
The Jung Codex, by H. C. Puech, G. Quispel, and W. C. Van Unnik	<i>Otto A. Piper</i>	70
Christian Eschatology and Social Thought, by Ray C. Petry		71
The Life of Our Lord upon the Earth, by Samuel J. Andrews		71
Studia Patristica, ed. by Kurt Aland and F. L. Cross	<i>Bruce M. Metzger</i>	72
The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels, by Wilfred L. Knox, ed. by H. Chadwick		74
A Year with the Bible, by John Marsh	<i>Howard T. Kuist</i>	74
Emotional Problems and the Bible, by Geo. H. Muedeking		74
The Reformation, by Will Durant	<i>Norman V. Hope</i>	75
Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers, ed. by G. H. Williams and Angel M. Mergal		76
The Three Worlds of Albert Schweitzer, by Robert Payne	<i>J. Christy Wilson</i>	77
Revolution in Missions, by Blaise Levai		77
Spiritual Renewal through Personal Groups, ed. by John Casteel	<i>E. G. Homrighausen</i>	78
The Way to Biblical Preaching, by Donald Miller	<i>Donald MacLeod</i>	79
Christian Faith for Today, by John Ferguson		79
The Principles of Christian Worship, by Raymond Abba		80
Beliefs That Matter, by Ganse Little		80
Religious Dimensions of Personality, by Wayne E. Oates	<i>Edward S. Golden</i>	81
Byzantium: Greatness and Decline, by Charles Diehl	<i>Glanville Downey</i>	81

# THE FORM OF A SERVANT

The Restoration of a Lost Image

JOHN A. MACKAY

THIS evening Princeton Theological Seminary enters upon its 146th year of service to the Presbyterian Church and to the Church Universal.

Let me begin by extending a warm welcome to those members of the Faculty and the student body who are here for the first time, or who begin this year in a new academic position. Very especially let me welcome those of you who have come to us from abroad, from beyond the frontiers of this nation. We trust you will feel yourselves at home in our midst, that our Seminary community will become for you like a family, and that you will not be disappointed in any way with our campus or our country.

Now to the theme on which I want to speak.

I have aimed across the years in these opening addresses to take up some idea, or some issue, which is basically important and which is at the same time manifestly relevant to the thought and life of our generation. I have chosen for this evening's talk what I call the restoration of a lost image.

A few weeks ago, in a small township on the Hudson, the Executive Committee of the World Presbyterian Alliance decided to make the servant image the theme for the next world gathering of the Alliance, which will take place in Brazil in 1959. It is designed that this image shall inform and inspire the entire program of the meeting. For a number of years now the

Biblical image of the "servant" has fascinated me. I have come increasingly to feel that it is the symbol which, on the one hand, is most deeply significant in the Bible and in Christianity, and which, on the other hand, is most needed by the religion, the culture, and the civilization of our time.

There are three things I want to say, three affirmations I wish to make, about the servant image.

## I

First, *the servant image is the most significant symbol in the Bible and in the Christian religion.* It pervades the Old Testament. Moses, the lawgiver and prophet of Israel, is called the "servant of God." So, too, is David, Israel's greatest king. Israel itself, the people of God, is called the "servant of God." "You are my servant, Israel, in whom I will be glorified." Through Israel God would make his nature known; through the Hebrew people his purpose would be achieved upon earth. Israel's true destiny was to serve God, to be "a light to the nations," that God's salvation might be carried to the ends of the earth.

So, too, in the New Testament. The One greater than Moses and Solomon, David's greatest son, Jesus Christ, who knew that he was one with the Father, the only-begotten Son of God, gloried in making clear that he came to be a servant. "I have glorified Thee on the earth," he said. "I have finished the

work that Thou gavest me to do." Picking up the ancient designation of Israel as a "servant," even as the "suffering servant," he exclaimed, "The Son of Man came not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many." It was as a servant that Jesus unveiled the splendor of God and served the purpose of God. It was as a servant, and to fulfill his destiny as a servant, that he allowed himself to be captured and manhandled. He was eventually crucified as the "suffering Servant," who rose again from the dead to reap the reward of his faithfulness.

So, too, with St. Paul, Christianity's greatest convert. The man from Tarsus interpreted the significance of Jesus Christ as that of one who "though he was in the form of God did not think equality with God a thing to be grasped" (or to be graspingly retained), but who took "the form of a servant." In the "form of a servant" he unveiled the splendor of Deity and fulfilled the divine redemptive purpose for mankind. It might be said that God was never so truly God as when he took the form of a servant and became man. It was no wonder that being fascinated by that Figure, and in thrall to his allegiance, Paul was proud to call himself "a servant of Jesus Christ" who was "called to be an apostle, set apart for the Gospel of God" (Rom. 1:1). He, too, the greatest Christian of all time, "took the form of a servant." The man who knew what it meant to be in an ecstatic rapture "in the third heaven" labored with his own hands to support himself. On his last voyage to Rome Paul was the one man who behaved like a hero during the hurricane in the Adriatic. Yet when he and his shipwrecked companions got ashore he did

not try to cash in on the prestige he won aboard. Rather he scurried off among the bushes to get sticks to make a roaring fire for storm-battered, rain-soaked, weary men. Like his Master, he did not regard honor or status as a "prize to be grasped."

How can we best describe the servant image? There is, happily, in the New Testament itself an episode which provides us with the pictorial setting and the psychological inwardness necessary to understand what it means truly to be a servant in form and in spirit. I refer of course to the foot-washing in the Upper Room. The same night in which our Lord was betrayed, he laid aside his garments after supper. Girding himself with a towel, he poured water into a basin and washed his disciples' feet. In this scene we have both the divine pattern of the servant and the human possibility of assuming the servant form.

To appraise the significance of any deed it is important to know the mood in which it was done, the psychological state out of which it was born. What was the state of mind which gave birth to the act, the menial act, of the foot-washing? Says the writer of the Fourth Gospel, "Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands," being intensely aware that all power, cosmic power, was his, that he was the Lord of History, did not take into his hand the symbol of a scepter to overawe his disciples or to engrave upon their imagination a regal image. Instead he borrowed a towel with which to perform a menial act. Again, "knowing that he had come from God and was going to God," aware that is of his essential nature, of his kinship with God, of the source and goal of his

life, Jesus broke out of the divine cycle. He did not summon his disciples to an act of worship at his feet; no, he moved from Deity towards humanity, to express to men what is in the deepest heart of God, a loving concern for human welfare. Here is a perfect transcript of what it means to be a "servant" in the Biblical sense. It denotes a complete absence of external compulsion. It means voluntariness, spontaneity, a certain inner joy and even exultancy. Nobody obliges the true servant to assume a menial role. Knowing fully who he is and aware of his high destiny as one of God's elect children, a man is moved to perform the lowliest act, joyously, voluntarily, in the "form of a servant."

But here we confront a problem. How can men who are by nature self-centered and want to be like God, be made willing to take the form of a servant and fulfill the imperative which Christ left with his disciples, namely, that if he, their Lord and Master, washed their feet, so they, too, in lowliest mien and obedience, should wash the feet of their fellows. The answer to this problem is found in the context in which the footwashing scene occurred. The washing of feet was preceded by the "breaking of bread." We can be like Christ; we can take the "form of a servant" and obey Christ's commands only when He Himself is formed in us. We must live *by* him if we would act *like* him and *for* him.

In the background and preceding the footwashing is the Holy Supper, the Eucharistic feast. Christ gave an imperative to his disciples because he had already invited them to partake of the symbols of his broken body and his shed blood. The only way in which

a Christian imperative can be fulfilled, the only way in which Christian ethics can take on concrete reality, is when the Crucified and Living Christ enters into and becomes part of our humanity, bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. In other words, in the background of the footwashing and preceding it, stands the eucharistic meal. This must always be the order. First the Real Presence, Christ becoming a part of us, through faith, and we living upon him, participating in his being, that we may express his spirit, and, like him, take the servant form. This is of supreme importance. It lifts the whole question of ethical obedience out of the realm of pure morality and puts it where it belongs. The possibility of likeness to Christ derives from that communion with Christ, that realization of the Real Presence which is at the heart of the Lord's Supper.

There have been notable cases in which the episode of the footwashing has made a transforming impact upon thought and life. Some of you have heard me speak of that young Oxford tutor, H. A. Hodges, now professor of philosophy in the University of Reading, England, and one of the most original minds in British thought today. Strolling along an Oxford street one Saturday afternoon, Hodges, a thorough-going agnostic, saw in a bookstore window a picture of the footwashing. The scene gripped him. He himself tells the story, "As I looked at that picture," he says, "I knew that the Absolute was my footman." The doubting philosopher passed through an experience of conversion. Memories of childhood, of home and Sunday School, were set in a new perspective. There was born a flash of spiritual insight

and intuition. He said to himself: If Ultimate Reality, if the Absolute, is like that stooping Figure, that God has my allegiance. Young Hodges became a Christian. His whole world view was changed. He knew that in God's world the human absolute is the servant, that it is the meek who "shall inherit the earth," that there is no ultimate place for pure force, for the tyrant or the dictator, but only for those who are willing to serve God and man in the form of servants.

## II

The second affirmation which I would make is this: *The servant image has been degraded in our time.* There is a contemporary thinker who discusses this question, the French Christian existentialist, Gabriel Marcel. In a remarkable book entitled, *Men against Humanity*, Marcel stresses the point that in our time the servant image has been degraded. "To think of a servant," he says, "is to think of one who is obliged to do what he does because of compulsion, who is merely passive, whose obedience is forced, who would not do what he does if he could do anything else to avoid it." That is to say, in our contemporary culture and civilization, to be a servant tends to be interpreted in terms of enforced obedience and pure passivity. Colonialism and Communism have been responsible for this in large sectors of the world. In vast regions of the globe today to be a servant is to be a person who lacks freedom because of social or political subjection. A servant is one associated with social servitude or with racial inferiority, so that nobody would be a servant if he could be anything else. Elsewhere, industrialism, the child

of technology, has tended to depersonalize, to dehumanize man, and so to take all pristine and inherent value from the concept of the servant. Men become types and mere cogs in a wheel; they have value not in themselves but because they are useful, because they fit into a system. The supreme norm whereby ordinary human beings are judged is their utilitarian value for an organization.

Strangely enough, however, a form of false equalitarianism, which distinguishes a certain type of democracy, has done the same thing to the servant image. There is a kind of democracy in which this sentiment is common. Why should I do this? I am *your* equal; I am *as good as* you. The suggestion is that readiness to do a certain job is to admit inferiority. Might one not even say that there is an extreme form of democracy, based upon an abstract sense of equality, which can be, and is becoming, positively satanic in its implications. Recall that in John Milton's interpretation of the psychology of Satan, the Archangel fell because he could not endure the thought that anyone should be better than he. He wanted to be equal with the Highest, and, if possible, his superior.

". . . . .aspiring

To set himself in glory above his  
peers,

He trusted to have equalled the Most  
High."

Even to feel gratitude was a sign of  
weakness. So,

"Better to reign in Hell than serve in  
Heaven."

Another celestial spirit

"Rather than be less cared not to be  
at all."

One thing is becoming clear. The typical servant in our time lacks a sense of belonging, a great attachment, a something beyond equality, an inner compulsion, a spiritual motivation, a joyous self-giving. But to be a servant in a deeper, truer sense is to give oneself with enthusiasm and unreserved abandon to something that is conceived as being bigger than oneself, in which one can and should lose oneself. Our Lord in the footwashing gave a native, symbolical expression to what he, the Son of God, accepted as his role in taking the "form of a servant," when he undertook to be God's redemptive instrument for human salvation. The obedience unto death of the suffering Servant of the Lord was something voluntarily and joyously accepted. What is needed in our time, if the servant image is to become meaningful and potent, is an individual's sense of reverence and commitment to something bigger than himself. Let this something be one's brother man; let it be a human need, a great idea, a worthy cause. Above all, let it be a sense of God, and of one's indebtedness to Him and one's partnership in His divine, redemptive purpose.

### III

I come now to the third affirmation. *One of the major tasks of our time is to restore the servant image.* This needs to be done both in secular society and in the Christian Church.

The statesmen of today need to envisage the servant image. They need to realize that the state or nation whose destinies they seek to control exists not for its own sake but to serve God and man. The totalitarian state, of course, assumes the role of Deity and takes

on all the airs and attributes of the Master. Because of that the world has witnessed the tragedy of Hungary; it has witnessed, too, the tragedy of Spain, an equally sad country. Yet, in what we call, mythically and unreally, the "free world," a responsible statesman has dared to affirm that a state or a nation, and this nation in particular, must act from pure self-interest as its highest motivation. Could anything be sadder, or more tragic? Could anything be more perilous for our national life and destiny than to affirm to the world that the good that is done by a people naturally generous above all the peoples of the earth, is done ultimately because it is in our national interest that it should be done. How can anyone acquainted with history and human nature affirm that it matters nothing whether or not this country has friends in the world, or whether people love us or hate us, so long as they serve our purpose and contribute to our security? It is time that we realized as the English historian, Butterfield, puts it, that "civilization needs forgiveness." "There is none righteous, no not one."

Yes, the time has come for the rulers of men to forget their "cold war," to sit down together in penitence before God, each to listen to the other, and to be brutally frank with one another. It is time for statesmen who claim to represent the Christian tradition in politics to do their thinking in terms of the light and majesty of him who took the form of a servant. Repentance, too, is needed, as we contemplate our national sins and shortcomings, the betrayal of Republican Spain, for example, and our alliance with contemporary tyrants and slave dealers because they serve our interests. This

does not mean that we should be unaware of the necessity of self-defense, or of national security. It does mean, however, that we should realize that we belong to a society of sinners in need of forgiveness. It means that we should become vividly aware of the great inexorable principles of God's government of human affairs. It means a concern for truth and righteousness and a desire to understand why certain nations and peoples think and act as they do. When we come to understand them we can perchance forgive them. God, moreover, can operate in human hearts. The outlook of men and nations changes. Many a political theory breaks down when it confronts the stark realities of human nature. Men were made for freedom and they will affirm it. Profound changes are taking place even within Communist countries. Let us contribute to social change by increasing human contacts and by an exchange of commodities rather than by a mere increase of armaments. Let us beware of sanctifying hate under the guise of disliking a system. Let us, in a word, be willing to be the "servant" of another people's best interests and cease equating our own interests and actions with the will of God and his righteousness.

So, too, the leaders of culture need to recover the servant image. Too long have they lived with the image of the "master," the image of him who masters facts, who acquires knowledge, who becomes encyclopedic, who wins the \$64,000 prize, and who, nevertheless, may be a plain jackass in matters involving ordinary human wisdom. Not knowledge but wisdom is man's supreme need and glory, a capacity for right relations between man and God and between man and man. "The be-

ginning of wisdom," let it never be forgotten, is the "fear of the Lord." Wisdom comes, truth is envisaged, when man takes up a true servant's attitude of reverent, joyous devotion to the Great Master.

It is time, moreover, that some thinkers go beyond the idea that to be cultured is to be a mere master of dialectic, to be aware of the dialectical movement in thought and in history, so that a person comes to the point of never being able to become a servant of any single idea or attitude. In that case, the only absolute becomes the absolute of compromise, which is sanctified by a plea for forgiveness. When that happens, when it becomes the mark of a cultured person to refrain from making a forthright decision that is followed by dynamic action, then creative endeavor will be carried out by people whom we may despise and who live on the fringes of our traditional and classical culture.

How common it is in our university system to consider that the training of minds, the production of a critical intelligence, is the ultimate ideal of a liberal education! God forbid that our minds should not be trained, that our intelligence should not be critical, or that we should not have the gift of forming right judgments. But how true it is that many people who call themselves cultured are mere patrons of truth. They see in life so many ambiguities and ambivalences, they are so overwhelmed by a dialectical view of things, that they do not commit themselves to any single idea or cause. The oncoming generation of educated youth are becoming aware of this. In the course of the last year a Student Council Committee of Harvard Uni-



versity issued a very significant document.<sup>1</sup> It lays stress upon the need of commitment in any person who would claim to be educated. Here are some of the emphases in the document in question: "Commitment is an active, personal affirmation of ultimate worth. . . . Commitment is important to a man's full development. . . . The idea of commitment has a central place in the theory of the liberal university. . . . An unclear understanding of ultimate ends is frequently the cause of the misuse of means; this is as true in private as in public life. . . . The greatest men of history have been strongly committed and yet have retained wide vision and broad sympathies." What is here involved is not necessarily religious but some ultimate value to which one gives allegiance. The truth is that if a person is to be truly educated and alive he must sooner or later find his value, his idea, his cause, and commit himself to it. That is to say, he must become the "servant" of something to which he can give himself with adventurous abandon.

At an early stage in my own young manhood this truth was burned into me by that great Spanish thinker, Miguel de Unamuno, to whom I personally owe more than to any secular writer. When face to face with Spanish intellectuals who gloried in butterflying over the realms of truth, without committing themselves to any truth in particular, he used to say, "Get a great idea, marry it, found a home with it, and raise a family." Just what was Unamuno saying? He was saying this: Become the servant of an idea, or a cause that is big enough and true enough, and let yourself go in devotion to it, taking all the consequent risks.

<sup>1</sup> Religion at Harvard

But today people are in a mood of conformism; everyone is engaged in the great quest for security. Students are literally afraid, as we say vulgarly, to "stick their necks out." I found the same situation in Guatemala last May. In a meeting with students of the University of Guatemala they told me frankly that, unlike their predecessors of a generation ago, Guatemalan students today were pursuing a policy of conformism. They lacked enthusiasm, they were afraid of taking risks, they wanted to play safe. This is one of the hallmarks of student life in our time. There are reasons for this, of course. Our generation is suffering from the disillusionment that has followed two world wars. People ask, "Is it worthwhile getting excited about anything?" There is a tendency to regard with suspicion, or as an inferior sort of being, the man who has strong convictions, or who links his destiny to an idea or cause which means everything to him. And yet, we should remind ourselves that it is not natural for true men to be mere conformists in some comfortable status quo; it is not natural to live for the mere sake of being secure. The uncommitted life is as unworthy of human beings as the unexamined life. Life begins for a man when he commits himself to a worthy Master, when he joyously takes the form of a servant.

#### IV

All this is still more true and relevant in the community of Christians. Churchmen need to recover the servant image. They need to recover it for example in their thinking about the Church as an institution. We face no greater peril in the Christianity of our time than the peril of the Christian

Church regarding itself as an end in itself, whether as a world body, as a national denomination, or as a local congregation. The Church as "The Israel of God," exists as did its prototype, God's ancient people, to be the "servant of God." The standard by which the Christian Church, wherever located or whatever its name, must be judged is by the measure in which it has taken the "form of a servant" and shows itself, by every evidence, to be in very truth, "the servant of Jesus Christ."

The purity of the Church and the unity of the Church are not enough if purity and unity come to be regarded as ends in themselves. It is not Christian to lay claim to absolute purity, whether of belief, worship or church organization. Some glory in their theological purity, that is, in their orthodoxy. They glory in having the right ideas; they defy anyone to prove that they are tainted with false doctrine.

Now orthodoxy, that is, right or sound doctrine, is important. Yet we can *have* the truth in a purely intellectual sense without the truth having us. And Christian truth, let it never be forgotten, is personal truth; it centers in a Person and it must possess the lives of persons who in the fullest sense become servants of the Truth. Christian truth must not only be believed, it must be obeyed. Men must *do* the truth. "Dead orthodoxy," as Archibald Alexander, the founder of this Seminary called it, can deny the faith, and even betray it. Here is the paradox. Loyalty to ideas about Christ can become a subtle substitute for loyalty to Christ Himself. Ideas can become idols. The heresy of orthodoxy, that is, the heresy to which orthodoxy

is everlastingly subject, can be the most soul-destroying, mind-shattering of all heresies.

Others say, "Ours is the true ministry. We can trace our descent to the apostles." So what? Can apostolic succession save you and give you good and regular standing in the Church of God? Who are you? Do you serve? Do you truly minister? Do you measure up to him who took the "form of a servant"? Do you do the work of Christ? Do you manifest the spirit of Christ? The proof of a true ministry is that it serves Jesus Christ the Truth.

Still others say, "Our Church is the true Church; it was founded by Christ himself and its structure was revealed by the Holy Spirit." The answer is, structure of any kind is not the essence of the Christian Church. Structure, too, must be a "servant," and must be judged by the degree in which it shows itself to be a servant of the redemptive will of God in Christ. In the ecumenical movement of today it is only on the road of Christian obedience that the Holy Spirit will reveal the structure which is most consonant with, and can best express, the truth and unity of the Church of Christ.

But even the unity of the Church cannot be an end in itself. The question must be asked, "Unity for what?" At the risk of becoming an idol the Church's unity cannot be for its own sake. The possibility that this should happen is one of the perils of the ecumenical movement to which I am so deeply committed. The ideal of Christian unity can never be tensionless harmony. The unity of the Church must be for the sake of the mission of the Church. The unity of the Body of Christ is fulfilled when all the mem-

bers, functioning harmoniously together, serve the mandates of the Head and the impulses of the Heart. The unity of the true Church must be that of a *world missionary community*, that is, a community which is both missionary and world-wide.

It is possible to conceive a form of Church organization world-wide in its scope. Church structure may be created which would fulfill all the proprieties and prerequisites of true Christian relationship. It would have an equal place for people of all races. It would transcend nationality. It would grant equal status to missionaries and "fraternal workers" among the native-born sons and daughters of the Church. Ecclesiastical autonomy would be effective and Christian harmony would prevail. But autonomy and harmony for what? A Church can never be in very truth the Church unless it shows itself to be *the servant of Christ*, unless it takes seriously the missionary task of the Church. A true Church of Christ must be loyal to the last mandate which Christ gave his followers to make disciples of all nations. The Church's unity must be above all a unity in mission. It must carry the whole Body to the frontiers, not merely to the geographical frontiers, but also to the unnumbered frontiers which begin in the home and extend to the backwoods and the high places of Government.

Christians as individuals must recover the servant image for themselves. When is a man truly a man? When he fulfills his human vocation. In a document of the reformed tradition to which this Seminary belongs there is a famous question which runs, "What is the chief end of man?" What does man exist for? When does he fulfill his destiny?

The answer is, "Man's chief end is to glorify God, and to enjoy Him forever." Man is truly man when he becomes God's medium, God's servant. Through such a man God manifests the splendor of his character and carries forward his purpose, in holy fellowship with him who becomes his human instrument. Such a man becomes like his Master, who said, "I have glorified Thee on the earth; I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do." This is what man is for, to unveil the splendor of his Maker and Redeemer, in his thinking, in his behavior, and in his daily toil. It is on the road of obedience, in the "form of a servant" that a Christian comes to know in his deepest heart the meaning of God's presence, and to experience "fellowship with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ." Christlikeness means letting oneself go in obedience to the Crucified and Risen One, making some facet of the divine nature visible to men, fulfilling God's redemptive will to the last frontier and till the sun of life goes down.

In the historic Plan of this Seminary there occur two great words, "learning" and "piety." These two dare never be separated. "Learning," the pursuit of knowledge, the exercise of thought, the cultivation of intellectual judgment is supremely important; but it can never stand alone or be an end in itself. It must always be related to true piety of heart. Piety means a sense of the presence of God, an experience of communion with God, a dedication to the service of God. It is my dream that when a few weeks hence, we dedicate our new Library, which is the symbol of learning, we shall relate this great building and its books to a deep and

creative piety. We will dedicate the Speer Library to the aspiration and hope that the light of learning may illumine the life of piety in the service of Jesus Christ the Truth. He who him-

self took the "form of a servant" asks that we whom God has called into the "fellowship of His son," may also bear the servant likeness, in spirit, word and deed, on this campus and beyond.

---

### LENTEN READING

In the Protestant tradition Lent does not feature a catalogue of negations, but more appropriately a positive reassertion of belief and devotion. As a useful guide, few books are of such high quality as *Prayers for Daily Use*, by Samuel H. Miller (Harper & Bros.). All who have read his earlier books, *The Life of the Soul* and *The Great Realities* are familiar with the freshness of his style and the depth of his Christian faith. Here are 263 prayers which are unusual examples of the fruits of meaningful devotion and which will take their place worthily among other classic expressions of human aspiration.

Not only does Lent call us to the lower levels of prayer, but equally to a fresh encounter with the Holy Scriptures. A new book, *The Authority of Scripture* (Harper & Bros.), by J. K. S. Reid, should be on every preacher's desk as a slow, steady menu for several months. It makes great reading—authentic, informative, and scholarly. Given originally as the Kerr Lectureship in the University of Glasgow, these chapters interpreting the authority of the Bible according to Luther, Calvin, Roman Catholicism, and Neo-Orthodoxy are, to quote William Neil, "wholly admirable."

Few experiences are more invigorating spiritually than reading the biography of "a good soldier of Jesus Christ." George Seaver, who gave us that well-balanced biography of Albert Schweitzer, has written the story of David Livingstone in which he presents in exhaustive detail the heroic figure of the missionary-explorer-scientist who opened up Africa in the 19th century. *David Livingstone: His Life and Letters* (Harper & Bros.) is a biography on a grand scale, because a man and a whole continent are involved. We see the man Livingstone behind the legendary and sentimental and emerging as a real person with human weaknesses, but with a many-sided greatness that excites our wonder and admiration. Also, we have a new glimpse of a vast continent and of the complex problems, then in embryonic form, over which governments and tribes are struggling today. This definitive and fascinating volume should be in the missionary library of every church in America.

No program of Lenten reading would be complete, or even meaningful and proportionate, without a renewed contemplation of the Cross. For our thinking upon the sufferings of Christ, we are indebted to Professor John Knox for an instructive volume entitled, *The Death of Christ* (Abingdon Press). The quality of his discussion of this central event of history is indicated by the author's own words: "One can do three things with the Cross—and only three. One can deny that it happened because, if acknowledged, it would make nonsense of life; one can acknowledge it and decide in consequence that life is meaningless; or one can find in it a clue to a deeper meaning in life than otherwise appears." Readers of all branches of the Christian Church will find here a profound and deeply moving study of the significance of the Crucifixion.

D.M.