

ontological analysis of man's basic questions about his existence in the modern world. Correlated with this analysis is his twentieth century critical and mystical employment of the symbols of Christian theology. I have argued elsewhere that his position raises some vital questions within his own claim that Christianity does indeed provide a "historical type of interpretation of history."¹⁹ Tillich is stronger than Augustine, however, in his stress upon the fact that God's Lordship in history includes his functioning as Judge over the visible Church and also in his recognition that every aspect of cultural life has its "ground" in the religious and may be revelatory of divine action in man's history. Most exciting, perhaps, was the way in which he sought to expand on Augustine's concept of the saving-center of history. While this *kairos*²⁰ or "right time" is all determinative, he claimed that it was meaningful to look for many lesser "centers" (*kairoi*, "right" or "ripe" times) when through the vocations of men and groups in history something of the goodness and justice of God is more fully realized. I can remember when Tillich was propounding this idea at Union Seminary and the graduate students in the history department across Broadway at Columbia were excitedly searching the historical records in the light of this proposal! For Tillich the completely New had come with the Christ, but there can be subordinate Newness, for example, in the Bill of Rights, in Lincoln's Proclamation of Emancipation, in more contemporary peaceful and perhaps violent protest movements. Both fulfillment and frustration, both the divine and the demonic are within history: only at the End (*telos, eschaton*) will the transforming gospel of New Being and the Kingdom be fully realized.

A Modern Theoretical Model

Each of these contrasting frameworks has had a long influence on the lives and actions of millions of people. For the tribal African view the model is one tied to nature's rhythms with the focus on the past. Significance is determined by what supports nature -- including religious rites -- and by what is remembered as tradition in the Now of the tribe. While the established Hindu perspective also is dominated by cycles of time, they are cosmic in nature and oriented toward an eternal future. What is really important is the movement of persons toward fulfillment and history's developments are significant to the extent that they too fit the trans-historical objective.

A careful look at the Christian tradition in the West would show that it too has appealed to cycles of time and has sometimes treated significance as belonging to the life beyond. However, the Augustinian view and its reformulation by Tillich stress a heritage for addressing ongoing human history where all events and persons are important although some events are singled out as particularly revelatory of God and his purposes for mankind.

But it has not been my purpose to provide a cross-traditions form of evaluation. As with cross-cultural studies, objective criteria are difficult to come by. The intent of the paper has been to call attention to what is not