Are these procedures of Tillich and Wieman actually parallel to Anselm's ontological argument? It should, at least, be pointed out that Anselm sought to prove the existence of the being with richest conceivable attributes, while Wieman and Tillich seek to prove by definition a being of minimum specifications. In other words, Anselm sought to prove by a definition with maximum specification of attributes, while Tillich and Wieman seek to prove by definitions with minimum specifications.

Do not most theologians think that God is ground or author of all being and source of all good? How does Tillich's dilemma regarding evil differ from the dilemma of other theists?

Compare The Christian Century editorial review of Wieman, The Source of Human Good, characterizing his view as "cosmic behaviorism."  

When revised in response to these criticisms and to self-criticism, Mr. Martin's work promises to be an excellent and useful scholarly achievement.

Theodore Filby and S. Paul Schilling

Second Reader's Report, by S. Paul Schilling

26 February 1955
Boston, Mass.

Schilling concludes that King's first draft is "competently done—carefully organized and systematically developed," showing "sound comprehension and critical capacity." Schilling's criticisms emphasize "stylistic improvement," as well

as the addition of "a discussion of Wieman's use of specifically Christian symbols in his conception of God." He approves the draft with the assumption that "the changes indicated will be made."

This piece of research has been competently done. It is carefully organized and systematically developed. The expository chapters are accurate, objective, and clear, presenting a true portrayal of the views of Tillich and Wieman. The writer seems to have made judicious use of all the available sources, which are considerable in extent. The comparisons and evaluations are fair-minded, balanced, and cogent. The author shows sound comprehension and critical capacity.

Stylistic improvement is needed at various points. Since the entire dissertation, except Chapter VI, has already been read chapter by chapter, the reader lists here only those items not previously listed or so far uncorrected (mostly because of lack of time). Particularly in Chapter IV the construction at various points is awkward, rough, or ungrammatical. Presumably these lacks will be corrected in the second draft.

Among various suggestions regarding content made previously to Mr. King, one may be mentioned here: the desirability of including in Chapter IV a discussion of Wieman's use of specifically Christian symbols in his conception of God. This aspect of his thought should be brought out clearly.

The reader is appending a list of needed corrections, to be added to those previously pointed out. The present list concerns mainly Chapter I, II, and VI.2

As a first draft, and assuming that the changes indicated will be made, the manuscript is approved.

TFmS. SPS.

---

2. This list has not been located.

To Julian O. Grayson

2 March 1955
Montgomery, Ala.

With this letter to Grayson, King enclosed the "Recommendations" and a program from his installation ceremony on 31 October 1954.3

---

1. Julian O. Grayson (1916–) received his M.Div. from Crozer in 1950, a year ahead of King.