

Volume X

OCTOBER

Number 4

*Bulletin*

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

OF THE

REFORMED CHURCH IN THE

UNITED STATES

EVANGELICAL AND REFORMED CHURCH

---



LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA

1939

## CONTENTS

<i>Seminary News</i> .....	155
<i>Applied Christianity in the Education of the Minister.</i> EDWARD S. BROMER .....	157
<i>The High Cost and Low Morals of Funerals.</i> JAMES E. WAGNER .....	166
<i>The Finiteness and Finality of Jesus Christ.</i> JOHN S. HOL- LENBACH .....	176
<i>The Aim and Object of the Sermon.</i> REV. E. O. BUTKOFKY	191
<i>Necrology</i> .....	197

Published four times a year, January, April, July, October, by the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the U. S.

President Theodore F. Herman, Managing Editor; Professor Oswin S. Frantz, Business Manager.

Entered at the postoffice in Lancaster, Pa., as second-class matter.

## BULLETIN

# Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States

VOLUME X

OCTOBER, 1939

NUMBER 4

## SEMINARY NEWS

This account is being written several days before the official opening of the one hundred and fifteenth year of the Seminary, which is scheduled to take place on Tuesday, September 12, at 3:00 o'clock. The opening address this year is being given by Dr. DeLong, with the new president, Dr. Herman, presiding.

The onset of this new year, as everyone knows, is marked by considerable changes in the personnel of the Seminary family. We shall miss sorely the work and counsel of Dr. Richards and Dr. Bromer, but we look forward to the fellowship which we shall have with our new colleagues, Drs. Bair and Dunn, and to the leadership of our new president.

It is good to be able to report a large incoming class this year. The last two classes have not been so large as usual. These matters go in cycles—sometimes up and sometimes down. Several years ago we were in some danger of having a surplus of ministers. Then we faced the opposite danger of a deficiency in the supply. The present Junior Class seems likely to redress the balance rather well. As this is being written, we have the applications of twenty-three men for admission to the first-year class—all but one of them members of the Evangelical and Reformed Church. Their academic preparation is on the whole excellent. Their names, residences, and colleges are as follows:

Name	Home Address	College
Morgan R. Andreas	Lehigh, Pa.	F. and M.
William H. Banks	Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	E. Stroudsburg State Teachers College
Alfred C. Bartholomew	Catasauqua, Pa.	Bucknell Junior College
Frederick S. Billmyer	Doylestown, Pa.	Ursinus
		F. and M.

## THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE

Theodore W. Boltz	Lebanon, Pa.	F. and M.
William J. Coulter	Bainbridge, Pa.	U. of P.
Hiram E. Davis	Fairplay, Md.	Ashland College
John Diehl	Butler, Pa.	Grove City College
Robert A. Dilliard	Emerald, Pa.	F. and M.
Elden Ehrhart	Dallastown, Pa.	F. and M.
Karl R. Flocken	Lebanon, Pa.	Lebanon Valley
Thomas Garner	Huntingdon, Pa.	Juniata
Paul P. Haas	Orefield, Pa.	Ursinus
A. Gail Holt	Salisbury, N. C.	Catawba
Alton M. Leister	Hanover, Pa.	F. and M.
Herbert L. Rice	Northampton, Pa.	F. and M.
George A. Robb	Export, Pa.	F. and M.
Richard W. Rubright	Cressona, Pa.	F. and M.
Martin E. Schnorr	Hazleton, Pa.	Catawba
R. Wendell Snyder	Shamokin, Pa.	Amherst
Edwin E. Staudt	Pottsville, Pa.	Gettysburg
George L. Wehler	Thomasville, Pa.	F. and M.
William E. Wimer	Philadelphia, Pa.	Ursinus

\* \* \* \* \*

It is too early, of course, to list the Field Work assignments of these incoming men. However, it can be said that the Evangelical and Reformed ministers of Lancaster city and county, the Lancaster Community Service Association, and the Lancaster Recreation and Playground Association are cooperating fully as in years past, and we expect to be able to locate even this large number without too great difficulty.

\* \* \* \* \*

In the last issue of THE BULLETIN we gave the location of a number of the 1939 graduates. It is a pleasure, now, to report certain additions to that list. Mr. Billmyer has been elected at McKeesport, Pa. Mr. Fabian has gone to the Red Bank charge, Fairmont City, Pa. Mr. Grove has assumed the pastorate of the Mt. Zion charge in Mercersburg Synod. Mr. Kosower is at Sharpsville, Pa. Mr. Mackey has been elected at Orwigsburg, Pa. Mr. Solly is located at Shepherdstown, W. Va. There are perhaps one or two others that should be added, but our information to date is not sufficiently definite to include them.

\* \* \* \* \*

The next important date to which we are looking forward is Oct. 10. That should be a great day in the life of the Seminary

## REFORMED CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES

with the induction of the new president into office, the inauguration of the two new professors, the presence of many representatives from denominational organizations and sister academic institutions, and a general home-coming of alumni.

N.C.H.

## APPLIED CHRISTIANITY IN THE EDUCATION OF THE MINISTER\*

EDWARD S. BROMER

The subject as stated on the program allows me the privilege of speaking as one who gives an account of his stewardship. It was on October 8, 1919, at the meeting of Pittsburgh Synod in Jeanette, Pennsylvania, that I was elected to the chair of Practical Theology. Being at that time pastor of the First Reformed Church in Greensburg, and secretary of the Department of Spiritual Resources of our Forward Movement, it was impossible to take up the work of the professorship until September, 1920.

The name of the department, Practical Theology, to which I was elected becomes a focal point in my address this evening. In the old terminology, Practical Theology was thought of as the department of applied Christianity. It was definitely based on the conception of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ and in the Holy Scriptures. It presupposed, therefore, the Departments of Old and New Testament Science, of Church History, and of Theology, and regarded itself as the application of this Christian revelation to common life. The manner in which it was mediated to men was developed in the Catholic and Protestant forms so well known to us, namely, the institutional and sacramental on the one hand, and the personal and spiritual on the other. In both cases, however, it was centered in the absoluteness, completeness, and permanence of the revelation of the grace of God in Jesus Christ, "who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost, and was made man, who was also crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered and was buried; and the third day rose again, according

\* Address delivered May 23, 1939, at the meeting of Pittsburgh Synod, in Greensburg, Pennsylvania, and printed at the request of the Synod.

to the Scriptures; and ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father; and shall come again with glory to judge the quick and the dead; of whose kingdom there shall be no end." In early Christianity there was no doubt concerning the applicability of this revelation to life. It was clearly something objectively given, as both the gospel and the creed unequivocally declare, as being "for us men and for our salvation." The Christian way of living, that is, the Christian ecclesiastical ethic, was directly related to the revelation, and carried its characteristics of absoluteness and permanence. The problem of the relation of the Christian faith to common life is, therefore, stated easily enough, but its solution seems to be very difficult, if we are to judge by the critical theological and ethical discussions of our day. Modern life, as far as its relation to Christianity is concerned, has become deeply divided. On the one hand, Christians are devoted to this revelation of God in Christ and the Bible as the source and basis of the ways and means of living, which are always thought of as a process of redemption from sin. It is further evident that this revelation is the Gospel of God, bringing time and eternity into intimate relation, and making Christian living both quantitative and qualitative, for this life and the next. On the other hand, Christians find themselves under the sway and in the processes of the scientific view of the world. They are persons educated in all the sciences, which search out the laws of the universe, including man himself. In this revelation through the sciences, they are taught to find the ways of living as individuals, as communities, as races, and nations. It thus has happened that the great human sciences have become the exponents of the new humanism which is so dominant today. Consequently, "a new morality," a naturalistic ethic, has arisen and has been taught freely in our colleges and universities. It has become far too easy for many to say that religion at its best is loyalty to the highest human values, and probably only that.

Nothing is more evident than the fact that the modern world is divided with reference to the question of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ for the salvation of men, mediated through the church on the one hand, and, on the other, with reference to the revelation made through the sciences and applied to human living

as the effective method of culture and civilization, and primarily mediated through the modern state and its institutions.

Between these two polaric approaches to life, we sway back and forth as a pendulum. It is natural, too, that differing attitudes of individuals and groups should constitute the modern church. We have our fundamentalists on the right; our liberals on the left; and our mediationalists in the middle. What concerns us in this brief study of applied Christianity is the points of emphasis that are found in the curricula of our seminaries which determine our efficiency in the training of the ministry.

In order to make our own Reformed Church case concrete, permit me to refer to my inaugural address, delivered before Pittsburgh Synod, October, 1920. After discussing the principle of the Christian community as the norm of Practical Theology, I summarized some of its primary implications and results in the following way:

"First of all, it implies that the individual and the social experience of God in Jesus Christ is the central light and life of the Apostolic literature and Church.

Second, it implies the continuity of this experience throughout history and its present-day reality.

Third, it implies the free and full application of this experience to the whole individual and social life of man.

Fourth, it implies that the individual soul is of infinite worth and that the Kingdom of God is the goal of humanity.

Fifth, it implies that the church or the Christian community is the instrument of God to bring to pass the Kingdom of God in the earth.

Sixth, it implies that the natural history of man as an individual, and of society as a whole, and the present status of our knowledge of man, and of society, are needful to a proper appreciation of the present problems of Christianity as an evangelizing and Christianizing influence in the world. It, therefore, recognizes the value of the historical-critical methods, of research, and of the sciences known as the history of religion, the psychology of religion, and comparative religions, as well as political and social economics in their relation to the moral and spiritual welfare of man. It is at the point where the sciences of political and social economics are related to biology and psychology that the vital problems



for the preacher arise. The doctrine of the Kingdom of God of necessity involves the question of the Christian social order."

It would be interesting, had we the time, to take up the present catalogue of our seminary to illustrate in what we now call the Department of Church Life and Work just how these principles have been thoroughly embodied in our curriculum, covering the activities of the minister as preacher, as priest, as teacher, as prophet, as pastor, as evangelist, and as administrator. The whole scope of Christian Life and Work is treated from two points of view, the functional and the psychological. The personal and social experience of the Gospel is maintained as a unified process. The modern techniques of living, the psycho-analytic, the social-service, and the religious, are coordinated and evaluated under the dominance of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ as the way of Christian living.

It requires but little reflection on these principles and the point of view they embody to show that applied Christianity in the training of our Reformed ministry was the very key-note of our effort as teachers in our seminary, and that as far as the Department of Practical Theology was concerned, was the expression of the mediating point of view which sought the positive values of both the revelation of God and His laws as manifested in the sciences. It might be said, however, taking the last twenty years into consideration, that in the first decade, the progressive seminaries of America placed the stress upon a better understanding of the revelation of truth, mediated by the sciences, and its adaptation to the Biblical and theological revelation as found in Christ and the Church. In other words, the immanence of God and the self-activity of man were stressed.

The evolutionary and humanistic key-notes became dominant. In the second decade, the pendulum had swung to the other side, under the revolutionary and critical stress of the times and the influence of Kierkegaard and Barth. The transcendence of God received new emphasis, and the objectivity and uniqueness of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ was set forth in greater clearness. The Church as a doctrine and as an institution was also set forth more realistically, not only as a means to the King-

dom of God, but as having a constant historic mission, and being somewhat of an end in itself, in the fact that it is the organism in which and through which the mind and will and passion of God for man are kept alive in the world.

It remains to state briefly several of the points of the more recent renewed emphasis in applying Christianity to common life. I refer particularly to the emphases that have to do with the actual growing points of experience in the education of ministers as well as of our people. In passing, it is but proper to remark that the courses offered in the Department of Church Life and Work in our seminary have been well adapted to meet these so-called growing points, as well indeed as in any of the seminaries of our country.

First, a deeper and more realistic sense of sin. We start with this because it touches upon one of the chief defects of the liberal movement which so prevailingly saw life from the point of view of evolution and a semi-panteistic conception of God. This meant that both truth and life more or less inherently resided in the processes of nature. Sin was largely a matter of ignorance of the laws of nature, or mere immaturity of growth, or a lack somewhere of personal or social adaptation to environment. The character of sin as somehow rooted in human experience in terms of willful transgression and consciousness of guilt was not stressed. Whether from the point of view of Darwin or Hegel, the hope of man lay in a more or less inherent principle of evolution or development. All man needed was a process of education that would make him know and understand himself as at home in the cosmos. We all know to what an optimistic humanism all this led, and how, unfortunately, it crashed in the crisis and calamities of the World War. The new system of education was centered on the so-called drives, desires, and inclinations of the pupils. Religious education followed the same cue. In the last decade, however, we have become very conscious of the fact that our theory and sense of sin in modern liberalism was thoroughly inadequate and not realistically true to the facts of experience. The problem of evil had far deeper roots than we understood. The fact of the matter is that the old theological doctrine of original sin was more nearly true to the facts of experience.

Coupled with this is another phase of the fact of sin, namely,

what may be called the social nature of evil and its implication in human history. We now know that both the good and the evil experienced in personal and social living is so bound up with our national institutions, and our political and economic systems, that there is no possible chance for moral advancement along the higher levels of social righteousness and justice without community and national, and even international repentance. Modern culture and civilization are at a cross-roads at which the signpost of the Christian Gospel stands and proclaims, "Repent and believe the good tidings. The Kingdom of God is at hand." Our deeper sense of sin requires both a personal and a social repentance.

A second note of emphasis is upon the idea and purpose of the Kingdom of God among men. Whether we think of it as present or future, as the Kingdom in heaven or on earth, it is the assertion of the social goal of humanity as heralded by the Gospel of God in Jesus Christ. We may not at any time call any one of our present attempts at a more Christian social order authoritative or final, but we may be sure that the eyes of Christians are set upon the goal of the ever-coming Kingdom of God among men. When we point to the first Christian community reported in the Acts of the Apostles, as a social fellowship in which they had all things in common, the opponents of the social view of Christianity at once say, "Yes, but look at it. It was a perfect failure." But please note that no critic has ever affirmed that that attempt at a higher social order was not Christian. So it is to be expected that the Christian outlook will never be backward toward individual and tribal selfishness, but ever forward toward the brotherhood of man. In our relative situation and plans for social improvement, the absolute Christian ethic points forward to the ever-coming Kingdom of God, and demands personal and social commitment to its higher righteousness.

The third renewed emphasis is on the question of the relation of the present to the future, of time to eternity. So frequently it is said that the teachings of Jesus concerning man and the Kingdom of God must be reduced to their present ethical values. They also say that the doctrine of the last things, or eschatology, is simply a part of the apocalyptic view of the Old and New Testa-

ments, which is now completely outdated. Whatever the form of the apocalyptic point of view may have been, the content of truth set in its temporary framework, namely, the eternal fact of God, and man, and the cosmic order remain, and the whole idea of the present and the future, the quantitative and the qualitative, the temporal and the eternal, must be faced today in our scientific outlook as they had to be faced twenty centuries ago. Along with this goes the fact of God as absolute and eternal, and that He has set eternity in the heart of man, and in Jesus Christ has revealed an absolute ethic for human living. Our present struggle, as contrasted in the liberal and Barthian outlooks, has raised an issue that today is coloring both progressive and conservative Christian thinking, and once more bringing the transcendence of God into primary emphasis. It would be easy to elaborate this point, but we cannot linger here.

The fourth point of new emphasis is upon a more realistic view of the Church as an organic institution. The tendency in Protestantism in developing its chief characteristic, namely, religion as a personal, individual experience of immediate relationship to God through Jesus Christ, naturally worked out in the direction of denominationalism and sectarianism. The idea that the essence of Christianity was in the solitariness of the individual's relation to God made it quite easy for both Protestantism and individualistic democracy to grow up side by side since the days of the Reformation, and make it practicable and necessary in modern society to separate Church and State. The fact is that Protestantism until very recent years never developed a satisfactory theory of the church as an institution. We are now coming to realize that Calvin and certain of the Reformers actually did have a rather high conception of the church as an institution, which we are now trying to recapture. But the real drive for the recovery of a truly organic conception of the church lies not in the revival of Calvinism, but in the movement of Providence in our times. The social conceptions of the modern state have grown so rapidly that the old, individualistic democracy of the French and Anglo-Saxon peoples is rapidly passing into the new forms of a social democracy. The tardiness of our adaptation to the new complex demands of our

present-day civilization on the part of the old democracies is responsible for the rise of the new totalitarian states, whether thought of as Fascistic or Communistic. Perhaps the most significant occurrence, as far as the Christian Church is concerned, is the recent birth of the World Council of Churches. We may well say, as was said so pointedly at the Oxford and Edinburgh Councils of Churches, "Let the Church be the Church." It seems now quite clear that the ecumenical elements of Christianity that make it a world religion are the ones that must more and more clearly come into the consciousness of Christians. In the face of modern conditions, sectarian Christianity is a failure. Consequently we would say that Applied Christianity in our seminaries must surely face the problem of a more highly articulated, federated, and integrated Church organization. What was once the will to divide in Protestantism, we may safely say has been converted into the will to unite. Let us hope that our own united Evangelical and Reformed Church is an indigenous expression of this new will, and not a more or less artificial defense reaction to the dangers of the present religious crisis. We believe that ours is an age when the unity of the Church and the doctrine of the Kingdom of God among men must become the creative issues of a Christian World Council and a program of action.

There is one other point that we wish to state, namely, our conviction as to the supremacy of the person of Jesus Christ in the origin and essential development of Christianity throughout the centuries. This is a point that need not be argued. We affirm it as the essential of a Christian faith. We do so in spite of the fact that it is probably true that at no time in our twenty Christian centuries did the organized political and economic world seem more determined than now to put away Christ and crucify Him again. It makes us recall a statement of Eucken in his book, "The Main Currents of Modern Thought," that "the principal factor in the situation, however, and that which more than anything else gives the contradiction its sharpness, is that the age no longer, out of its own experience, comprises life in one question, the answer to which forms the core of Christianity—the question of moral salvation, of the inner liberation and renewal

of humanity." The world is not saying, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved," or, "There is no other foundation laid than that which is laid in Jesus Christ our Lord." Eucken, however, in closing says, "The desire of the age for religion will not again be strong and overwhelming until the age recognizes great inner complications in human life, makes these into personal experience, and at the same time finds the center of these complications in the moral problem." Such a time we have entered. The return of religion is at hand. Echoes of it are found in our universities, and in the new stirrings in theological circles, and in the futile pessimism of the masses; for it is true that a shallow secular realism has involved our modern world in contradictions which, logically thought-out, lead only into blind alleys of selfish individualism, nationalism and war, and threaten the destruction of our civilization. Under such circumstances we could well make apologies for certain weaknesses in the effort to apply Christianity in our seminaries in the education of the minister, but one thing we may well assert, despite criticisms that have been made, that our own seminary, in its curriculum and teaching, has been keenly conscious of the problems of our age, and has been making the attempt to relate the Gospel to the new conditions of life made inevitable because of our enlarged scientific knowledge of the world. In short, we may say that we have attempted not to *preach life situations and problems*, as secular speakers, but to *preach to life situations and problems* in the motive and power of the Gospel of God in Jesus Christ "for us men and for our salvation."

We might well ask, as the Apostle Paul did, "And who is sufficient for these things?" and answer in his words, "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God; who hath made us ministers of the New Testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."

"Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be glory in the Church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end." Amen.

Lancaster, Pa.



## THE HIGH COST AND LOW MORALS OF FUNERALS\*

JAMES E. WAGNER

*Note:* The earlier and major portion of this paper dealt with such matters as the high financial cost of funerals; the refined but nonetheless persuasively high-pressure salesmanship of funeral directors in selling equipment and services; the predicament in which the directors find themselves with the decline of the death rate, on the one hand, and the overcrowding of their profession, on the other; the increasing resort to cremation as the means of disposing of the bodies of the dead; the handling of funerals as a municipal service as it is done in various countries of Europe; the question of clergymen's fees for the conduct of funeral services; and ways in which cemeteries have contributed to the highly commercialized nature of the present-day funeral business.

Persons who are interested in pursuing the above ideas will find material in the following references: article on "Funeral Orgies" in *The American Mercury* for April, 1927; on "Statesmen At The Bier" in the *North American Review* for September, 1932; an article, title not now recalled, in *The Survey* for February 15, 1928; on "It Costs Money To Die" in *The Nation* for December 19, 1928; on "The American Standard of Dying" in *Common Sense* for January, 1935; on "Profiteering In Grief" in *The New Republic* for August 22, 1928; an article, title not now recalled, in *The Forum* for April, 1934; article on "A Social Worker's Legacy" in *The Survey* for August 15, 1932; an editorial in *The Christian Century* for February 3, 1932; and the book, "Funeral Costs," by John C. Gebhart, published by Putnam's in 1928, and giving the findings of a study financed by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.

To turn, in the last pages of this paper to the funeral as it concerns immediately the minister and the mourners:—here the course of our immoralities runs the whole gamut from the performance of meaningless absurdities, through the subtly sadistic torture of human emotions, to the utter infidelity of certain funeral

\* The Concluding Portion of a Paper Read at the Spiritual Conference at Franklin and Marshall Academy in the Summer of 1939.

behaviour patterns which deny in their enactment what we profess as our faith—the triumphant belief in the life everlasting.

"Who has not stood in the driving rain," asked the Rev. Samuel Harkness, writing in *Scribner's* of October, 1931, after twenty-five years in the ministry being moved to propose that "we have no more funerals, at least, as they are now conducted": "Who has not stood in the driving rain, listening, perforce, to the recital of a lodge ritual by a gentleman with a Mark Antony complex, with a brief line tossed occasionally to the unofficial brothers, and chorused raggedly?"

A few weeks ago the writer of this paper officiated (what a word!) at the funeral of a grand old man who was a veteran of the Civil War. The "Sons of Veterans" detailed a large guard of honor for the funeral. At regular intervals the guard of two men, uniformed and with guns, was changed to stand at attention before the bier in a room which was so crowded that persons had difficulty getting into a position to view the remains. When the casket was removed from the funeral parlor to the hearse, the detail stood at salute on either side as six of the "Sons" carried the casket through the military line. At the cemetery the officer in command had difficulty in placing his charges in proper position. After the minister had begun reading the committal service, two of the guardsmen who had erred in taking their position clanked noisily across the green, through the gathered mourners, to a place on the opposite side. When the minister's committal service was ended and the benediction pronounced, four of the guard stepped up, two on each side of the casket, and, as it was lowered into the grave, held by the corners in horizontal plane the flag which had been draped over the casket. There they continued to stand holding the flag in that position, while another guardsman began the reading of the ritual. He had the Mark Antony complex, to be sure; he was not quite illiterate; but his attempts to be elocutionary, and the way in which another man who shared in the reading missed his cues with the inevitable and agonizing lapses of silence, was ludicrous when it was not cruel. I wasn't sure, for a moment, whether I was at the burial of a saintly Christian man or witnessing just one formation of a military dress-parade.



It might have been worse, to be sure; I have seen it so myself. And Gilfond's article in the *American Mercury* recites the incident of what happened when "some years ago a Southern Senator died who had belonged to three fraternities, the Masons, the Knights of Pythias, and the Woodmen. Each order insisted on going through its entire funeral ceremony. Even the dirges were sung thrice and so the Senator was buried three times. The day was painfully hot and the members of the funeral committee, in their stuffy mortuary coats, nearly joined their former colleague before the exercises terminated." Compared with that, I still have a lot to be thankful for; and yet, I wonder if there is any excuse at all for a lodge imposing its burial service in addition to the church's usual committal, especially since practically all of the lodges claim to be founded on Christian principles and beliefs. The only occasion I can conceive where the lodge ritual might be proper would be for the brother who was buried without benefit of clergy or church-service at all; and then I would still be wondering how he ever got himself admitted to that Christian order in the first place.

"There is none righteous, no, not one" in this matter of funerals; "for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." Not only the morticians and the military and the fraternities, but you and I as well have sinned.

Why should we embalm a body, enclose it in fine wood and then enclose that enclosure in steel or concrete, or hide the ashes in an urn deposited in a re-enforced concrete columbarium,—and thus be found fighting against God who, in His usual tenderness, hath decreed that "the dust shall return to the earth as it was" while "the spirit shall return to God who gave it"?

Why should we show disrespect to a man's corpse by doing for him in death what in life he would never have thought of doing for himself, posing in a public place while curious crowds passed by in slow procession to gaze upon him?

Why, indeed, should even his dear ones be forced by social convention to have seared upon their memories the picture of his countenance "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of" the mortician's cosmetics, when, as Marian J. Castle suggested in *The Forum* for April, 1934, "It is far kinder to the sorrowing to leave with them

only photographs and memories of him as he was—living, laughing, and loving—rather than the recollection of a painted, dead face?"

Why should choirs or soloists—not always too harmonious or musical—trifle with the heart-strings of grief-stricken people by the rendition of "Safe In The Arms Of Jesus" or "Looking This Way" or some other such sentimental music, although music at funerals is passing rapidly out of use? If there must be music at the funeral, I recall a funeral in which the organist was requested to play the strains of "There's A Long, Long Trail A-Winding Into The Land Of My Dreams,"—which happened to be a song beloved of both the man who was dead and the wife who survived him; and perhaps William Wrigley, the Chicago chewing-gum and baseball magnate, might have made a worse choice than to have requested that his funeral service a few years ago should close with the organist's rendition of his favorite song, "Aloha"—"Farewell to Thee."

Why should we have the almost unbroken continuity of hysterical seizures of dear ones during the service and at the grave, especially on the part of women? I do not think for a moment that this is conscious hypocrisy and pretence; but I do believe that it is socially conditioned:—it is the "expected" thing, and we do our best to live up to what is expected of us. I have seen a woman collapse over the casket of her husband, in seeming grief, when all the years of their married life she had made life so unpleasant for him that I could understand if I could not excuse his predilection for liquor, and when a year or so later—not long at any rate—she was married again; and I have known people to indulge in hysterics at the funeral of a loved one and an hour later, when they returned from the grave, plunge into a nasty family fight over conflicting interests in the reading of the will or the disposition of a few personal belongings of the deceased.

Why should a minister continue to read, just because the conventional burial-services of various denominations prescribe them, such passages of the Bible as these:

"Man is born to trouble, as the sparks fly upward."

"Thou turnest man to destruction. . . . For we are consumed by Thine anger, and by Thy wrath are we

troubled. . . . For all our days are passed away in Thy wrath. . . . The days of our years are three score years and ten; and if by reason of strength they be four score years, yet is their strength, labor and sorrow; for it is soon cut off, and we fly away."

That "man is born to trouble" and is destined to spend his years as the subject of God's wrath is a philosophy of life which no Christian can quite affirm; all we have come to conceive of as the fatherliness of God denies it. And it is just not true, if a man or woman happens to live longer than three score and ten, that these added years are only "labor and sorrow"; we have seen them grow old gracefully, enjoy the fallow years in peace and quietness, and prove in the grandeur of their last days that "the hoary head is a crown of glory."

Why should a funeral sermon take on some of the forms it has: the eulogy which, if true, was scarcely needed, and which, to those who knew the deceased more intimately than did the minister, might not even have been true; the cowardly advantage which the minister has taken, indeed has sometimes been asked to take, to use this opportunity to impress upon wayward members of the family or community the inevitable day of reckoning which they too will have to face; or the delivery of a lengthy theological disquisition, in pompous phrase and polished logic, when, in the very nature of things, his hearers are in no frame of mind to preserve the continuity between the firstly and secondly and by the thirdly will have relapsed into a state of coma from which only the shock of silence at the cessation of the preacher's droning will arouse them?

Why should a family and friends spend money, for funeral flowers—more is spent, you will recall, on flowers for the dead than on flowers for the living—when it may be that there is more vital need for the money in other places? Why, indeed, spend any of this useless money for caskets, mausoleums, flowers, headstones, and the foibles of the undertaker, when, as Miss Castle suggested, a man's memory might be perpetuated with more real pleasure to himself as he looked down from the purple parapets, if a sum had been set aside "sufficient to carry a youth halfway through college, or to pay the salary of a visiting nurse for a year, or to endow a room in a children's hospital?"

One's protest might go on against almost innumerable violations of intelligence and faith and even common decency in funeral customs. Epictetus is quoted by one of these writers as having said: "Beware how you resist the custom." And yet, to use the words of the Rev. Mr. Harkness, "Is it beyond reason to ask that funerals be no longer open to the public, but restricted to such relatives and friends as may be desired? That music of saccharine flavor and unsound speculation be barred? That flowers be sent to hospitals—better, milk and toys to day nurseries—in memoriam, with a note to the family that it has been done? That ministers omit fulsome eulogies and sublime guesses and confine themselves to the reading of an appropriate Scripture or poem and prayer? That cremation become the method whereby the body is re-identified with the earth? And that undertakers be restricted to the care of the body and have no part in the service? Revolutionary? Yes. And civilized. The experiences of a bereaved family ought not to deepen the wound of their sorrow," he concludes.

To sum up, there are several things which it seems clear we ought to do. We ought to encourage at every opportunity the observance of the greatest simplicity on the part of families as they plan for the decent Christian burial of their loved ones,—simplicity in all that the funeral director is asked to do, simplicity in our own part as pastors in the planning and conduct of the services. We ought to be exceedingly careful as to what Scriptures we read, and in the selection or preparation of the prayers we will use. We ought to be especially cautious about funereal mannerisms or a funereal air on our part, so that we do not enact with little disguise the suggestion that, despite all we do and say and pretend, death is an irretrievable disaster.

We ought, and this is perhaps the chiefest thing, both in the educational program of our churches and in our own preaching, aim to develop and recover a truly Christian interpretation of death and that most profound belief of Christians in the life everlasting. We ought to bring this word "Death" out into the light of day, help our people to take a good look at it, and we ought to do this in seasons when they are not sharp up against its reality and thus least conditioned to understand it. Which simply means that, as a forerunner to any of the changes which might be hoped

for in funeral customs, we will have to rediscover and make really a part of our life and thought and commitment the article of faith which has always had the tribute of our lips, namely: that the things which are seen are temporal while the things which are not seen are eternal; and that the world of the spirit, which seems so easily to be less real, is actually more real than the world of the flesh; and that its reality is not subject to the fluctuations of time and space but as changeless as the God who is its source and who changeth not.

Whatever we do, we must do it tactfully and in love. Especially when we attempt to break down fast-imbedded traditions and customs, we must be tender and careful as are physicians when they begin to probe a part of the body inflamed and sensitive. Certainly we must strive, in our contacts with funeral directors and with lodge officials, to preserve the integrity and the true place of supremacy of the Church's ministrations in the household of grief.

Some years ago, when I first began to think about this whole problem, I tried to picture what one's passing might be if it were completely shorn of all the trappings which ancient customs have made so familiar. I put my thoughts down in writing which, with some fear and trembling, I offer now as the close to this paper. As I have re-read and re-thought this picture, I see that it might lack some of those sublimely neutral and so surely other-worldly prayers which are the fruitage of the Church's centuries. I realize, too, that save in a group of friends of above-average spiritual and intellectual calibre, such as my picture pre-supposes, such a marking of one's passing might degenerate to a very low level of maudlin sentimentality and hysteria. But, with these limitations confessed, and begging you to keep in mind that this is what happens when the pendulum of one's thoughts in revolt swings to another extreme, I give you my picture.

At home I have a little leather folder in which I keep the family insurance policies, the title to my automobile, and a few odds and ends of private papers. My wife knows where it is and that in it I have a little note, which I try to bring up-to-date at least once a year, listing the various limited assets we have and any outstanding obligations that we are honor-bound to meet if I should die before they are satisfied.

There is a paragraph in that little note in which I have specified that not more than \$300 should be expended for my funeral. Even that is too much, I think; but it may not be easy for my wife to break completely with custom, as it would not be for me. But that sum will purchase a cheap casket, and pay the undertaker for the limited services I hope he will be asked to render, and care for the incidentals of my burying.

Sometime, if I can be sure that my wife will understand, and that it would not involve too much embarrassment for her in the face of the conventions, I would like to write another paragraph or two, and prescribe what would seem to me to be a 'decent Christian *celebration*' of my passing.

It was an article in *The Christian Century* (July 4, 1934) by Merrill F. Clarke on "Instead Of A Funeral" which first set me thinking along this line. My little note might suggest that, as soon as I had ceased to breathe, she should call an undertaker, order him not to embalm the body nor enclose it in a casket, but to take it away to a crematory and dispose of the ashes in any way he would think fitting without reporting any of the detail to her; and having done as ordered, to present her the small bill no more than which surely these limited services would justify. She might instruct him to put in the usual newspaper notices, except that they should end, not with the day and hour of the funeral service and the place of burial, but with some such simple statement as this: "There will be no funeral service. The family will be at home as usual, and will be glad to receive the visits of friends at any time."

Then, when she had closed the door on the undertaker, let her take an hour of quiet if she desired. It would be a time to think and remember and perhaps even to be thankful. There might even be a few tears, for one can scarcely leave loved ones for a month's absence without the eyes being dimmed and the heart having a little sense of emptiness.

When the hour had passed and calm had come again, I wish she might take our little girl for a walk, perhaps out over the open stretches west of the Lancaster city line. Let them talk of the many happy times we've had together; and, with as much imaginativeness as my wife can muster on the way, I wish she would picture to our daughter the greatness of God and His universe and



the ultimate peace and security we all may find in His fatherly fellowship and care. Let them come home again, light up the lights, read or play games,—they might even sing some of the songs we like to sing together, not omitting the funny ones.

Then, after the little girl was in bed and fast asleep, I wish her mother would call a few friends,—the people with whom we've had some of the happiest hours of fellowship. Tell them that on that day I had gone away and that, if it was convenient, she would like them to come to the house on an evening the next week in time to dine together and spend an hour or two afterward remembering.

If there was a violinist among those she called, he might bring his violin and a copy of something like Kreisler's "Old Refrain," and play it after supper as his contribution to the celebration. The others should bring a favorite book of poetry or prose, prepared to read at least one selection which would be in keeping with the life we had shared before I left them.

I would hope that one of them might choose to read,—oh, most any page, from Donn Byrne's "Messer Marco Polo"; and that someone would have thought to bring James Weldon Johnson's "The Creation"; and surely another would remember the 23rd Psalm or the 100th, and a few paragraphs of the 14th chapter of St. John; someone, if only to justify the absence of my corpse from the celebration, might read Edwin Arnold's "After Death In Arabia"; another might happily come prepared to read Shaemas O'Sheel's "He Whom A Dream Hath Possessed"; and there would be a moment when I would delight to listen in as another read Keats' sonnet which begins

"As from the darkening gloom a silver dove  
Upsoars, and darts into the eastern light,  
On pinions that naught moves but pure delight,  
So fled thy soul."

There would be other quite delightful choices, perhaps a page from Willa Cather's "Shadows On The Rock" or "Death Comes For The Archbishop" (the latter title with no presumptions concerning my own estate). It may be someone, who could not decide on anything to read, might lead these friends in a moment of thankful prayer for all the wonder of life and the splendor of hopes that are deathless.

And when all of them had done, perhaps my wife would have recalled a little poem which I carry always in my funeral-service book, a little poem by Nancy Byrd Turner, and as she read it to those intimate friends I would be hoping that she and they would be able to believe it:

"Death is only an old door  
Set in a garden wall.  
On quiet hinges it gives at dusk,  
When the thrushes call.

"Along the lintel are green leaves,  
Beyond, the light lies still;  
Very weary and willing feet  
Go over that sill.

"There is nothing to trouble any heart,  
Nothing to hurt at all.  
Death is only an old door  
Set in a garden wall."

And they would say "Good-night" to her and go home smiling. And she and they would sleep. And on the morrow, they would be at their usual tasks, and my little girl would be at school, and my wife would be making a home and guiding a life for her. And because they had met it beautifully, they would have found that the death of someone very near turned out to be not what the morticians and society have contrived to make it,—“an extravaganza of grief,”—but what Christian faith has always professed to believe it to be, and what Charles Frohman, the great producer, just before the Atlantic engulfed the *Lusitania* with him on board, affirmed of the prospect: "It is life's most beautiful adventure."

Lancaster, Pa.



# THE FINITENESS AND FINALITY OF JESUS CHRIST\*

JOHN S. HOLLENBACH

The life and labors of any man, whether great or small, prominent or obscure, are determined to a large extent by the human and environmental forces that lie in the background. This is true of Jesus Christ, the greatest character of history, Who, though he was more than a man, was nevertheless real man. He was born of a race of traffickers who were at the same time great dreamers. He sprang from a people who possessed the qualities of practical commercialism and religious idealism. While they were concerned with the affairs of everyday living they yet found time to dream of God, The Holy and Eternal One. Their unity was religious. They were bound together by a common desire, a common dream, a common hope. They longed and looked for a Messiah, a mighty Deliverer, who would throw off the burdensome and humiliating foreign yoke. They wished for one to secure their political independence and to restore their national integrity. These facts and factors had a part to play in producing the personality, perspective, principles, and practice of The One Who holds the center of our attention in this treatise.

The coming of God in human form in the Incarnation was a great event for God and man. God created man in His own image and fashioned him for eternity. He made man free to think and act for himself. Through ignorance, indifference, and wilful disobedience man sinned and set up a barrier between himself and God. But God wanted men to know Him and walk in righteousness. Toward this end God revealed Himself in divers manners especially through the prophets. This was not enough. In the fulness of time He sent His own Son into the world to reveal His character and purpose and to redeem men from sin. This was a voluntary act and an act of necessity on the part of God. God could not have done otherwise and continued to be the kind of God He is, for God is Love.

The divine necessity which culminated in the coming of The Son to earth was not the necessity of external compulsion such as

\* Adapted from paper read at Spiritual Conference in Lancaster, Pa.

is experienced by the thief who is caught and forcibly put into jail. It was the necessity of constraining love such as impels the mother to rush into a burning house at the risk of her own life to save her child.

In the Incarnation we have the infleshing of deity, the humanizing of God. This is a subject that has been the occasion of much controversy and remains somewhat of a mystery. Some interpreters insist on the literal meaning of "eauton ekenosen" in Phil. 2:7, saying that it refers to an actual self-emptying or laying aside of essential elements in the constitution of the Godhead. But the context in which this passage stands is practical and exhortative rather than doctrinal in character. Paul's use of the verb "kenoo" in a literal way is not consistent with the spirit and purpose of the context. Furthermore, Paul's use of the same verb in other connections is figurative rather than literal. Again, such an interpretation of the Incarnation is out of harmony with the assertion elsewhere made by Paul that in Jesus Christ dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. Thus there is indicated that what was actually involved is in the phraseology of Dr. A. B. Bruce the humiliation of God by becoming man rather than a divestment of the attributes of deity.

A number of ways have been suggested whereby to interpret the presence of deity in humanity. There were those who asserted that the humanity of Jesus was apparent rather than real. He seemed to be human but was not human. These are called docetists, or as Dr. Bruce contends, doketists. In the next place there were some who said there was an occultation or hiding of God's glory under the veil of the flesh. The third group contended that there was a depotentiation on the part of the Son, a laying aside of power and the dropping of the metaphysical attributes of omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence, and the retention of only a partial deity! Finally there were those who maintained that Jesus as a man emptied Himself of the attributes of deity to become the Pattern and Redeemer of men, that He voluntarily took the form of a servant and put Himself under the necessity of humanity.

The Logos or The Word that became incarnate was essentially God. This essence of deity was retained in the infleshing proc-

ess. The thing that was parted with was the form of God, not the being or nature of God. Jesus retained His essential oneness with God. The formal aspect of God was laid aside when He became man, flesh of our flesh, and took upon Himself the form of a servant and humbled Himself, even undergoing the humiliation and death of the Cross.

Let us look at a commodity of daily use. Water is chemically and essentially water whether it is in the vapor, liquid, or solid state. What is different in the several states is the form, the properties, and the use. Water in the vapor state is not transparent while it is so in the liquid and solid states unless marred by foreign elements. Water in the vapor state is light enough to rise in the air while in the liquid and solid states it is subject to the law of gravitation. Water in the heated vapor state known as steam has power to move huge trains and steamers, a power that is resident in, but not active in the liquid and solid states. Water in the liquid state can carry objects on its bosom as an avenue of transportation, which it cannot do in the vapor state. Water in the liquid state can pass through cloth or other porous materials which it cannot do in the solid state. But in all these forms and uses it is  $H_2O$ .

So the coming of deity into humanity as manifest in Jesus Christ involved a change of form and function rather than of fact. There was an abandonment of heavenly majesty and an assumption of the flesh, a submission to the confines and limitations of human life and experience. That which is Infinite condescended to appear in and function through a finite instrument. Such attributes as omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence remained potentially in deity as incarnate but were not actively present. Yet God was really and essentially, and therefore efficaciously in Jesus Christ. There was an alteration of appearance and activity rather than actuality. God was God when He was manifest in the Son of Man as well as when He dwelt in majesty in the heavens. God is love and that love was operating in the flesh for the good of men. The incarnation did not mean a change of the Person but a submission of the Person to live under earthly conditions and human limitations.

The Lutheran Christology is indicated in the expression, *communicatio idiomatum*, which means a transfer of the attributes

of deity to the human nature of Jesus. This results in the exaltation of His humanity at the expense of its reality. The Ebionites maintained that the descent of the Holy Spirit at the baptism of Jesus marked the entrance of deity into Him and His setting apart for the work of the Messiah. Nestorianism interpreted Christ in such a way as to indicate a duality of personality. Others tried to save the oneness of Christ by saying that He had only one nature. This doctrine is known as Monophysitism which means a blending of the human and divine natures in such a way as to produce a new entity which was unique and constituted the nature and personality of Christ. Because of the strong and wide-spread insistence that Christ possessed two natures an attempt was made to uphold the unity of Christ by way of volition. This doctrine is known as Monothelitism. The divine will and the human will were merged to form a composite will.

But these attempts were not adequate or true methods of interpreting the relation of the divine and human elements in the makeup of the unity of Christ. While it is true that Jesus was true man it is also true that He was not mere man. He was also very God of very God. The divine and the human in Jesus were distinctive but not contradictory. There was communion and compatibility between them without confusion.

The unity of Jesus Christ is not the result of the conjunction or commixture of the human nature and the divine nature or the result of the formation of a composite will out of the human will and the divine will. We must go beyond the manifestation of nature and of will to the Ego or the self. The unity of Christ is a unity of self with a community and continuity of consciousness. All the functions of Jesus, both the human and divine, must be traced to one personal center, His selfhood. In each nature and through each nature there was done that which was proper to it by the one individual. Jesus the Son of God submitted to the natural limitations of humanity. There was one Ego in this unique being that centralized and unified His life and activities.

Dr. Francis J. Hall in his book on *The Incarnation* uses this illustration to show the relation of the Person of Christ to the two natures. An engine is connected by means of a belt or belts to two machines, the one a sewing machine, and the other a cutting machine. The same engine supplies the energy for each machine

to do its proper work, the one to cut and the other to sew. So the one Person of Christ did in and through each nature only that which was proper to it. The Self or the Person of Christ is per se divine and eternal. But that Person was incarnate and became manifest in the flesh so that men might learn to know God by having Him presented in human terms. The divine agent appeared in and acted through a human instrument to perform a work of revelation, redemption, and reconciliation.

Jesus Christ was put under the necessities and confines of humanity. He submitted to a normal human life. He had to undergo growth and development in every phase of life. The manifestation of God in Christ was progressive. All the character and purpose of God that could be revealed at any stage of Jesus' life and growth were revealed.

The Scriptural and historical information concerning the period of Jesus' life preceding His public ministry is very fragmentary. The statement in Luke 2:52 sums up what took place during His childhood, youth, and manhood: "And Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man."

Jesus came into the world as a babe, not as a full-grown man, so that He might experience every period of life in the process of completion. He was put under the necessities of physical life. He needed food and drink just as we do. It was here that the first temptation made its contact. The pangs of hunger and of thirst were a part of the normal and natural experience of Jesus. The body of Jesus grew in size and strength through a gradual process covering the usual period of years necessary to arrive at full physical stature. Christ in His body did not exercise ubiquity or illocality. He was confined to one place at a time.

Jesus grew weary as we do and needed rest and sleep to restore His strength. He was limited in physical strength, for the Cross on which He was to be uplifted proved too heavy for Him to carry on the way to Golgotha. He also assumed our mortality, becoming subject unto death, even the death of the cross.

Jesus grew in wisdom. This indicates a normal mental development. Jesus possessed only relative knowledge which gradually increased. He was not ignorant in the sense that He had and acted on wrong ideas but in the sense of incompleteness of knowledge. At every stage He knew that which it was natural

and needful for Him to know. At the age of twelve He startled the learned men in the Temple with His questions and His answers. It was great wisdom for the boy of twelve but He did not yet possess the vision, knowledge, and experience to preach the Sermon on the Mount. His knowledge was unusual but not unlimited. It was progressively secured and manifested, "first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear." He held opinions in common with His contemporaries on matters not directly connected with His mission. He was not an authority on science, philosophy, or literature. In such matters He was a child of His times. His finality is in the realms of the spiritual and ethical.

Jesus grew in favor with God and man. He grew spiritually, morally, and socially. Here again at each age He exhibited the development proper at that age. In His spiritual and moral progress there was never any commission of error but there was the fact of incompleteness due to a submission to human limitations. Jesus was subject unto His parents and obedient to the commands of His Father in heaven. As the truth and the right were revealed and apprehended He followed them. He came down from heaven to be made perfect through suffering. He came in the likeness of sinful flesh. He assumed our infirmities and was tempted in all points like as we are, but without sin.

Some have held the view that while the temptation was a fact yet Jesus was impeccable, that there was no possibility of His sinning. This is an inconsistency. If Jesus was really temptable and tempted, we need to affirm His peccability. If George Washington could not tell a lie he was not as free as we are, for we can tell lies or refrain from doing so. If Jesus in the human life was not capable of sinning the temptation is robbed of its reality and its value for us mortals. The exclusion of the possibility of sinning from the experience of Jesus reduces the temptation to a sham battle and a dress parade and strips it of vital meaning for us. There is more efficacy in the temptation of Jesus if we realize that He emerged victorious because He would not and therefore did not sin than because He could not and did not sin. To deprive Jesus of the possibility of sinning is to deny His moral freedom and His ethical responsibility which experience and observation teach us to be integral parts of human life.



The temptations were real struggles for Jesus because of the presence of the possibility of overcoming them or of succumbing to them. Jesus was peculiarly sensitive to the reality of sin because the virtuous man feels the sinfulness of sin more keenly by contrast to righteousness than the libertine does. Jesus differs from other men in that He never yielded to temptation and hence never became subject to sin as master. He was not guilty of any transgression. He became perfect through suffering and thus has given us an example how we may overcome sin. From His struggles He has gained and given us power, courage, and inspiration to rise supreme over evil. By being tempted and by overcoming sin He is able to succor them that are tempted.

Jesus became flesh of our flesh. He bore our griefs and carried our sorrows in His own experience. He revealed a creaturely dependence on God in prayer and in subordination to Him. For our sakes He humbled Himself and for our salvation He was made man.

## II

Even though Jesus was human and finite we have already seen that He is also divine and final in spiritual things. He is the supreme authority on spiritual life and relationships. The world is coming to see more and more that never man spake with such authority concerning God and man. And apart from God and man this universe has no meaning or mission.

The scribes and Pharisees confirmed their statements by quoting many authorities. But Jesus spoke with an inner authority. The primary meaning of the Greek word "exousia" is "out of being." It is translated power or authority. But these are derived meanings. Jesus was true to the original meaning of the word. "He brought up His subjects and His teaching from a deep, original, inexhaustible spring in His own being." He spake with authority that came from within, a message "beautiful as the light, sublime as heaven, and true as God."

Some one has been bold enough, and rightly so, to say that "the teaching of Jesus was as different from the minutely detailed teaching of the scribes as the temple of the skies under which He taught was different from the narrow room where the scribe taught his pupils." What a striking contrast! And yet how

true! The teaching of the scribes was narrow, provincial, national; that of Jesus was broad, comprehensive, universal.

The work of Jesus was of a representative character. He represented God to man, man to God, and man to man. This involved the following phases which will be taken up in order but which are so interdependent and interwoven that separation is difficult if not impossible.

- A. Revelation of God.
- B. Realization of Perfect Manhood. Representative Man.
- C. Redemption of Man from Sin.
- D. Reconciliation of God and Man and Man and Man.
- E. Regality or Kingship Over All Men.
- F. Reassurance on The Future Life.

A. Revelation of God. Jesus is the Final Revealer of the nature and purpose of God. Mankind has come into a knowledge of God which reached its fulness in the teachings and life of Jesus Christ. Jesus personalized God. In speaking of God as Father and in His communion with Him Jesus showed God to be a personal being. By this name Jesus also familiarized God. He did not speak of God in abstruse metaphysical or theological terms but brought Him into the range of ordinary human experience. When Jesus wanted a name for God He did not go to the army for it and say "O Invincible Commander." He did not go to the realm of politics and call God Judge or King. He went into the home and there He found His name for God. He addressed God as Father and has asked us to do so. Jesus made God knowable by expressing Him in terms and relationships familiar to all. Dr. Fairbairn wrote: "Since Jesus lived God has been another and nearer being to man." Dr. Fosdick says, "Jesus had the most joyous idea of God ever thought of." There is no more comforting idea of God than that expressed in the word Father.

Jesus spiritualized God. When Jesus, weary with His journey, sat by Jacob's well in Samaria He conversed among other things concerning the worship of God with the socially unclean woman who came to draw water there. In her presence He revealed this important aspect in the conception of God. "God is a spirit, and they who worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."



This makes God Omnipresent and Immanent. The God of Jesus is not the God of deism spatially separate from the world and uninterested in its affairs. He is in His world sustaining it by His power and love. But this immanence is not that of pantheism. While God is in His world He is yet distinct from it and above it. This immanent God is transcendent in character, goodness, love, and purpose, rather than in space and location.

Jesus universalized God by manifesting Him as the one and only true God Who has created all things, Who is the God not of one nation only but Who is no respecter of men, the God of all races.

By His own confidence and by His teachings Jesus portrayed His Father as One Who in love and constancy provides for the daily bodily needs of men as well as for their souls. His care in material things is extended to those who are disobedient and unworthy. God is merciful, not withholding His gifts from the wicked.

Dr. William Adams Brown in a footnote in his book, "Beliefs That Matter," says that in the book "Jesus of Nazareth" written for Jews the author, Dr. Joseph Klausner, takes the position that Jesus can never be given the place among Jews that He has among Christians, one reason being that "He carries His doctrine of the divine forgiveness so far as to imperil the divine righteousness." There was a time when men said, "God must be just, He may be merciful." If we look at God through Jesus Christ we see that God must be merciful in order to be just.

Jesus embodied God in Himself. This is shown in His consciousness, teaching, and work. He was the true answer to the Messianic Hope. In Him was formed the realization of the law and the history, the poetry and the prophecy of the Old Testament.

Jesus had the consciousness of a Unique Sonship to God. He spoke of God as the Father and affirmed His oneness with Him. He referred to God as "My Father" and "your Father." The only time He used the expression "Our Father" was in giving a model prayer to His disciples in answer to their request that He teach them how to pray. He was not included in the "Our." He knew that His Sonship was of a kind not possible for a created being for He is the only begotten Son of God. "Before Abraham

was, I am." He existed from all eternity in the bosom of the Father Who sent Him forth in time to reveal the Father and to save men from their sins. Jesus filial consciousness is attested by His frequent reference to Himself as the Son and His obedience to the Father's will.

The deity of Jesus was impressed upon His disciples through association. When they were at Caesarea Phillippi, with a decadent Judaism on one side and a rank paganism on the other, Jesus asked them a question whose answer was the solution to the needs of both. To the question: Who say ye that I am?, Peter replied for the group, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." The unbelieving Thomas came to see in the Risen Christ his Lord and God. The Gospels bear witness that Christ was the incarnation of God. The prologue of John's Gospel affirms that the eternal Word identical with God became flesh and manifested the glory of God to men. The detailed account which the gospel narratives give to the events preceding and following the death of Christ bear witness to their faith in Him as God. The Epistles and Revelation contain a similar testimony.

Paul the great apostle to the Gentiles probably never knew Jesus in the flesh. Yet He saw in Jesus the Agent of creation and the Sustainer of all things, the One in Whom dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. In similar vein the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews speaks of Jesus as being the effulgence of His glory, and the very image of His substance.

Dr. W. A. Brown in "Beliefs That Matter" says: "When we say that we believe in the deity of Christ, we do not mean that God is in Christ quantitatively, as one puts jewels in a box, but that He is in Him qualitatively, as the sun's light is in the sun's rays." If we dip a cup of water from the ocean we have the ocean in the cup because the quality of the substance in the cup is the same as that of the whole ocean. Thus was God in the character of His being fully present in Jesus Christ.

Dr. H. P. Liddon in "The Divinity of Our Lord," gives a striking resume of the presence of finality in the finiteness of Jesus and the operation of deity in his humanity. "Jesus is The Almighty restraining His illimitable powers; Jesus is the Incomprehensible, voluntarily submitting to bonds; Jesus is Providence, clothed in our own flesh and blood; Jesus is the

Infinite Charity, tending us with the kindly looks and the tender handling of a human love; Jesus is the Eternal Wisdom, speaking out of the depths of infinite thought in a human language; Jesus is God making Himself, if I dare so to speak, our tangible possession; He is brought 'very nigh to us, in our mouth and in our heart'; we behold Him, we touch Him, we cling to Him, and lo! we are . . . partakers of the nature of Deity through our actual membership in His body; we dwell, if we will, evermore in Him, and He in us."

For 1900 years ministers and members of the Church have found their God in Christ. A man like Napoleon whose objectives and way of life were opposed to Christ bears glowing testimony and finds in the influence that Jesus has exerted and the loyalties that He has evoked through the centuries the evidence of His deity.

B. Realization of Perfect Manhood. Representative Man. We have just seen that our theology is Christo-centric. Our anthropology is likewise Christo-centric for Jesus is the expression of the highest and fullest manhood. He is the perfect and symmetrical specimen of humanity. Though tried and tempted like as we are He was without sin. In Him sinlessness was not only the absence of all evil and wrong-doing. His sinlessness implies the presence of all essential human qualities and virtues. When He was arraigned before Pilate he found no fault in Him. That is the testimony of the ages.

Jesus is the Perfect Man, our Exemplar. While He was a true individual, His manhood was universal. He was the Archetypal Man and included in Himself all the essential qualities and powers of all types and races of men. That is why He appeals to peoples of such widely different cultures, conditions, and needs. His righteousness and perfection are the abiding standard and goal of all mankind.

C. Redemption of Man from Sin.

D. Reconciliation of God and Man, and Man and Man. Jesus revealed the real nature of sin by contrast to His own righteousness. He is our Redeemer through His example of what we ought to be and by sacrificial identity with us. He suffered in our behalf and that suffering is a sufficient substitute for any

punishment that might be due us and an eternal challenge to repentance from sin. (In the matter of punishment for sin and the substitute of suffering we must remember God is Father not Judge or Creditor) Jesus made the sacrifice of Himself once for all. Once for all time and for all men was He offered up. While Jesus is the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world we see this eternal sacrificial principle of the universe given concrete visible expression at a definite point in the time process. The heart of God was laid bare on Calvary. By that revelation of His redemptive purpose He has been wooing and winning men to Himself.

I recall a sentence in a sermon by Dr. H. M. J. Klein which I heard in my College days. "Without the Cross of Christ the message of Jesus would be nothing more than a beautiful moral philosophy." By His resurrection from the dead the cross was transformed from a sign of defeat to a symbol of victory. Without the cross there would be no Christianity. By repentance from sin and faith in the risen Lord men have access to the Father. Jesus is the door to the fold of the redeemed. On that He is final. There is no other name whereby men can be saved except the name of Jesus Christ.

When men are reconciled to God through Christ they will come to see their essential oneness and will be reconciled to each other. The Christ of the Cross is our Advocate before the Father and through the Spirit of the Father and the Son the work of bringing men and women into a filial relationship with God and a fraternal relationship with each other is forever going on. Jesus Christ is Mediator between God and man and man and man. By accepting Him shall evil be overcome and goodness enthroned.

E. Regality or Kingship of Jesus over All Men. The unifying factor in the teaching of Jesus was the Kingdom of God. He began many of His parables, "The Kingdom of Heaven is like. . . ." In the model prayer to the disciples he included the petition, "Thy Kingdom come." The establishment of the Kingdom was the purpose of His presence upon earth. He made regal claims which created jealousy on the part of contemporary rulers but which were all validated by His resurrection. The superscription, "The King of The Jews" in three languages was

placed over the cross in the spirit of contempt but these words were indicative of His purpose and power.

The nature of the Kingdom is spiritual rather than spatial. It is the reign of God in the hearts of men. It is the blessedness the redeemed enjoy, suggested in the Pearl of Great Price and the Hidden Treasure found. It is the spiritual society whose marks are righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.

Citizenship in the Kingdom is determined by character not by clime. A man belongs to the Kingdom because of the kind of person He is, not because of the province in which he resides. Membership in the Kingdom is not fixed by longitude or latitude but is dependent upon spiritual aptitude and the sonship attitude. The spiritual birth is the gateway into the Kingdom. There is no other entrance. They who repent and believe are saved and hence the sons of God and citizens of the Kingdom. Those who fail to repent and believe remain outside the Kingdom.

The word of God is the seed to be sown in men's hearts that they may bring forth fruits meet for the Kingdom. The Church of Jesus Christ is given the commission to preach the gospel unto the ends of the earth. A divided church is not equal to such a world-wide task. Too many mistake their particular branch of the Church for the Kingdom. The Church must decrease in order that the Kingdom may increase.

The reign of Jesus Christ shall embrace all mankind. The men of all nations are to become His disciples. Another reason that Dr. Klausner gives in the book to which I referred why the Jews can not accept Jesus Christ as their Messiah is that He is too much of an internationalist. That we believe to be His genius and His glory. The universal reign of Christ which we can but dimly envision is to include the entire life of each individual, every phase of the corporate life of human society among all races and within all nations, for "The Kingdoms of this world shall become the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign forever and ever."

"Jesus shall reign where'er the sun  
Does his successive journeys run;  
His Kingdom stretch from shore to shore,  
Till moons shall wax and wane no more."

We see that the Kingdom through the rule of Christ is eternal as well as universal. Jean Paul Richter characterizes Jesus Christ as the One Who "being the Holiest among the mighty, and the Mightiest among the holy, has lifted with His pierced Hands empires off their hinges, has turned the stream of centuries out of its channel, and still governs the ages."

In the terms of the best we know we venture to say that the final social expression of the Kingdom of God will be some kind of democracy. Jesus and democracy both exalt personal values above material things. When the Kingdom of God shall be established upon earth as it is in heaven it is not possible for us to predict. The consummation shall be when the redeemed in Christ shall enter into the glory and blessing that is the heritage of the faithful. Then shall the Son in the role of Judge call them to their reward.

#### F. Reassurance concerning The Future Life.

We have seen that Jesus Christ is adequate as a solution for the world's problems. He has also spoken with lips and life concerning the world to come. Neither Jesus nor the religion that bears His name originated immortality or the belief in it. It is a human hope as evidenced in many lands before His time. But Jesus has confirmed our faith. He gave an invincible answer to the query, "If a man die shall he live again?" He reinterpreted eternal life. He transferred the emphasis from the quantitative to the qualitative. It is not mere endless existence but excellence of being.

In His teachings, especially in John 14, He assures us of the preservation of our personal identity and that immortality means a life of fellowship with Him and those who are in Him. By making us more discriminating as to right and wrong, justice and injustice, He has added weight to the argument that a sense of justice demands belief in a hereafter where things shall be leveled up and leveled down.

Furthermore, Christ has revealed to us possibilities and capacities within us that we can not fully realize here. This fact is brought home to us when by accident or disease those who have great promise of service are suddenly cut off. Christianity inspires in us aspirations and aims that can not come to full fruition



here but which need the freedom of eternity for their fulfillment. By His resurrection He has given us a surety of our own rising to a higher life.

I trust that in this paper I may have contributed some clarity and cogency to our conviction that in the Jesus of the flesh as revealed in history we have the Christ of faith that leads to victory. May we find in Christ what James M. Campbell found as depicted in his poem, "What Christ Means To Me."

"No mere man is the Christ I know,  
But greater far than all below;  
Day by day His love enfolds me,  
Day by day His power upholds me;  
All that a God could ever be  
The Man of Nazareth is to me.

"No mere man is the Christ I find,  
Standing alone 'mong human kind;  
Living amid earth's sin and strife  
Time's miracle, a perfect life.  
All that a God could ever be  
Earth's Perfect One has been to me.

"No mere man can my strength sustain  
And drive away all fear and pain,  
Hold me close in His embrace  
When death and I stand face to face,  
Then all that a God could ever be  
The Unseen Christ will be to me."

Manchester, Maryland

## THE AIM AND OBJECT OF THE SERMON

REV. E. O. BUTKOFKY

The preacher's primary responsibility is to get his man. He is called upon not simply to proclaim the Gospel—but that with the Gospel he may save the sinner.

Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick has put the idea in this way, "I am always interested rather to get an object for a sermon instead of a subject. No sermon seems to me to get under way until I have clearly in mind some difficulty that people are facing, some question that they are asking, some sin they are committing, some possibility they are missing, some confused thinking they are doing, so that I have before me a goal toward which I aim rather than simply a subject or a text from which I talk."

Style, form and preparation have only one point and that is to reach the man.

James M. Gillis, of the Paulist Fathers, in New York, writing in Fort Newton's Book "If I had only One Sermon to Preach" tells the following: "My dear old preceptor, Father Walter Elliot, a Michigan man, used to tell the story of a boat crew that came from some lake in the depths of the woods of his native state—back in the 70's, I think—and surprised the sporting world by defeating the crews of all the big colleges. Some one asked the captain, "What stroke do you use? Is it the Harvard stroke?" "Nope. Not the Harvard Stroke." "The Yale stroke?" "Nope." "The Oxford stroke?" "Nope." "Well then what stroke is it?" "No perticler stroke, it's just the git thar stroke."

This emphasis should not lead any one to be careless about preparation of sermons. It is a caution not to get side tracked from the main purpose toward which one should drive.

Let me now suggest some preaching results which if they could be achieved would make me very happy as a preacher.

I.—First of all I would like to preach the kind of a sermon which would make some men change their minds. If a sermon can take down some old pictures in a man's mind and hang up some new ones the way is prepared for great things to happen in his soul.

Several years ago a number of students made a tour of some



cult centers in New York City. We visited first a group with a strange philosophy centering about the stars. Our stars, we are told, were the determiners of our destinies. Next we went to a vegetarian center. Here we were urged to believe that blessed spinach and other vegetables were the key to salvation. Another cult proclaimed that every one thousand years a new Messiah appeared. A numerologist tried to convince us that the key to history and the universe was a trinitarian numerical devil 666. A spiritual medium wanted us to know assuredly that he had supernatural means of communicating with the dead.

The amazing thing about this experience was the fact that there were multitudes of people who earnestly believed in these various cults. One comes away from a visit of that kind just a little ashamed of his preaching. If there are people who can be made to believe that kind of thing surely the preacher ought to be able to get people to believe those noble and life giving concepts which make up the Christian Faith.

If we can get the skeptic, the cynic, the atheist, the super-graduate of the Sunday School, the critic of the church, to change his mind about some religious concepts, take down some old pictures, hang up some new ones, we shall open for him a highway to richer living.

Now, of course, we all know that the intellect is not an entity by itself. It is tangled up with feeling. Thought is greatly colored by complexes of emotion. As a matter of fact I sometimes feel that atheism is to be explained not on intellectual grounds at all—but often on the inconveniences of morals or an inflated ego.

Some one asked the famous humorist, Dooley, to pay fifty cents to hear Robert Ingersoll, the atheist, speak on "The Mistakes of Moses." Dooley said to this man, "I would never pay fifty cents to hear Ingersoll speak on the mistakes of Moses but I would give five hundred dollars to hear Moses speak on the mistakes of Ingersoll."

We must recognize that it takes more than an intellectual process to win the atheist, the critic of religion and the scoffer.

In Shamokin we had a fairly prominent citizen who spoke of himself as being an atheist. In 1936 during the flood a good many Sunbury people were made homeless. They packed up in a hurry and were brought to Shamokin by train. Our atheist friend stood

on the Market Street bridge and watched the scene; haggard men, unshaven for days, carrying bundles, tired women, weeping for children or husbands separated from them, and here a tired, hungry child clinging pathetically to a doll. The atheist saw all this. Not far away was the old Moose building, the headquarters which Shamokin had established for all kinds of help to the refugees. The atheist looked on. Here men came carrying beds and blankets, Boy Scouts came with beds, doctors, druggists, and nurses with medical supplies, and great truck loads of food came pouring in from other parts of the state. In time of great crisis human nature rises to divine heights and if ever the Christ came to our town it was in those days. Nothing but God in human life could do such good and great things. Our atheist friend looked on all this and at last was so deeply moved as to say, "Now, now I believe in God."

If on that empty ghastly wall of the atheist's unfurnished mind we can hang a new life giving radiant picture of God—that would be the aim and object of the sermon fulfilled.

II.—A second thing I would like my preaching to accomplish is to change some practice or habit of living which has had social consequences. Some years ago there lived in our community a man, let us call him Henry. Henry had a saloon and it was called Henry's Inn. Every once in a while this man was called on to drive a certain minister to a funeral. The minister had very earnest convictions on the matter of liquor. Invariably when these men got together they discussed the question pro and con, the hotel-keeper arguing that because the law allowed it liquor must be all right. On this particular occasion the discussion became quite heated. The minister could not be budged from his conviction and brought the discussion to an end by saying, "Henry, the business is rotten and wrong and you know that nothing you can say will make it right." A few days later as the minister walked down town he passed Henry's place. He was amazed at what he saw. The name of the hotel had been changed. It no longer read "Henry's Inn"—but read "Henry's Out," and down in front was Henry selling fish. And he confessed to the minister that for the first time in his life he felt that he was in an honest business.

The minister got his man. Now if we can achieve that kind of thing either in the pulpit or out of it our preaching is effective.

It is my conviction that some habits are the behavior aspect of some moral weakness which goes to the very core of personality and I believe you have to recondition the core of personality before you can do anything fundamental about habit.

III.—I would like to preach the kind of a sermon which could change a man's feelings. It is in this area that one's sense of value lies. It is important that a man believe the right kind of things. But it is just as important that he should feel happy in believing them and that he should want to believe them.

Here is a young married woman—self-centered, cynical, critical of religion. For her, life has only one value, namely: to serve one's self. A number of experiences have brought her to a sense of disillusionment with regard to her present values. She hears a sermon. The sermon touches an area in which her thought has already begun to move. A process which started long before is brought to a focus by the sermon and a new set of values which has already begun to lure her is enhanced. She has found a new value, desires to live by it and is happy about it. Life has taken on a new tone. She feels differently about many things.

A recent writer tells a story which illustrates how faith can effect one's attitude with regard to the fearful things of the world.

Sir John Franklin, a navigator, discovered an ancient map on which the map-maker had drawn what was the then known world. England, France, Italy and the outlines of the European Continent were indicated. But in that vast unknown which to us is the Atlantic Ocean the map-maker had pictured some fearful creatures. "Here" he wrote, "are demons"—"Here be dragons"—"Here sirens" and "Here be they that worship the devil." The unknown was to this map-maker a ghastly, fearful place. But Sir John Franklin was a man of God. He took his pen and across that great unknown he wrote "Out here is God."

It would achieve a great deal for the soul of man if we could preach such sermons as would make people feel happy about the good values of life and lead them to those attitudes of trust and security which grow out of a firm faith in a Father God.

IV.—I would like to preach the kind of a sermon which would change a man's heart. Habits, ideas, feelings and attitudes can be changed. But as one aims at these things specifically he discovers sooner or later that only part of a man is involved and

that finally the motivating center of personality must be reconditioned. God wants the whole man.

To lay the Gospel before the souls of men in such a way that of their own choice, without coercion, they will choose to open themselves to such radical transformation of spirit that new life begins—that is the aim of preaching. To bring a man to rebirth, to convert him, to bring him to completeness of integration, to open the way to complete commitment to the will of God, to lead him to self-surrender—these are different ways of describing the same process or experience. This is the most comprehensive aim of preaching. When God uses a minister's preaching to change a man's heart he has bestowed on the minister a great power.

In the way in which I conceive it that experience comes not very often. But when it comes there is born in the soul of one man a mighty army for God. When Stephen preached his last sermon he got one man—Saul of Tarsus. That sermon came to fruit at Damascus. And from Damascus came the Light of the World to three ancient cultures: Hebrew, Greek and Roman.

It is not only that the heart changed by faith brings new power to the soul but also that life is enhanced and made more radiant. New horizons are opened and all life takes on a new joy. Masfield has tried to picture that new vision of life as he describes the experience of Saul Kane after his conversion:

"O glory of the lighted mind.  
How dead I'd been, how dumb, how blind.  
The station brook, to my new eyes,  
Was babbling out of Paradise,  
The waters rushing from the rain  
Were singing Christ has risen again.  
I thought all earthly creatures knelt  
From rapture of the joy I felt.  
The narrow station-wall's brick ledge,  
The wild hop withering in the hedge,  
The lights in huntsmans' upper storey  
Were parts of an eternal glory,  
Were God's eternal garden flowers.  
I stood in bliss at this for hours.  
O glory of the lighted soul."

V.—Finally I would like to preach the kind of a sermon which would make for better community life, and I think of community

here with a national and international as well as a local meaning. How far a sermon can go along this line each man must judge for himself. It is difficult to escape the conviction that we have a great responsibility for shaping the trends of our community life and civilization. Thomas Jefferson once said that he got his best ideas about democracy in the churches of Virginia.

I have no doubt that the day has come when preaching will have a new significance. Old phrases, having to do with community life, now quiver with new vitality—democracy, liberty, freedom, justice.

In conclusion let us note that there is something terrifying about the idea of preaching to get a man. It suggests the demagogue and ambition for power. Only a very good man dare be trusted with such power. If pride or a passion for power creep into a minister's effort to reach the man he is unworthy of the responsibility God has placed upon him.

And that brings us to one final word about the preacher himself. It is hardly necessary to say what we all know, namely: that more important than preparation, more important than timeliness and finding an object for a sermon is the preacher's own dedication and sense of mission. Authority for most folks as to our preaching will depend not on whether our message accords with the Bible, or whether we live what we preach—authority for people in the pew will rest more on the earnestness and sincerity and vitality of a man's own communion with God. So much depends on this aspect of the preacher's life.

Henry Ward Beecher was lecturing one time to a group of students on preaching. One of the students asked him, "Dr. Beecher, what do you do in your church when people fall asleep while you are preaching." Dr. Beecher replied, "In our church we have a very good way of taking care of that situation. The ushers are provided with long poles and at the end of each pole is a pin." "Now," he went on to say, "when any one in the congregation falls asleep the usher takes the long pole and sticks the preacher."

Shamokin, Pa.

## NECROLOGY

At the beginning of each new Seminary year as the work of training men for the Christian ministry is taken up once more, it is fitting to remember those who studied here in days past and have now been translated from the Church militant to the Church triumphant. To the best of our knowledge twelve alumni of the Seminary have died during the past twelve months, including one whose death was so recent that we do not as yet have the details necessary for including him in this memorial roster.

William Darius Happel, '95, died Sept. 24, 1938, in Lebanon, Pa., where a large part of his ministry was spent. He was born Dec. 4, 1867, near Reading, Pa. After preparatory training at the Keystone State Normal School at Kutztown, Pa., he was graduated successively from Franklin and Marshall College and this Seminary. He was licensed to preach by Schuylkill Classis, and ordained by Wyoming Classis. His entire ministry of forty-five years was devoted to the service of two churches. From 1895 to 1910 he was pastor of First Church, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., and from 1910 until his death he was pastor of First Church, Lebanon, Pa. Throughout his life he was a man of scholarly habits. In 1902 he received the Ph.D. degree from the University of Wooster. He maintained a life-long interest in the larger work of his denomination, particularly its educational institutions. Especially noteworthy is his long and faithful service to our Seminary as a member of the Board of Visitors from 1904 until his death and as Secretary of the Board during twenty-eight years of that period. He was buried from his own church in Lebanon on Sept. 27, 1938, with Dr. George W. Richards preaching the funeral sermon.

David Bowman Schneder, '83, was born in Lancaster County near Bowmansville on March 23, 1857. During the forepart of his long life he never moved far from his birth-place. His college and seminary training were received at the institutions of his Church within his native county. He was licensed and ordained by Lancaster Classis in 1883. His first and only charge was nearby at Marietta, Pa., which he served during the years 1883-87. Then came a decisive turning-point in his life. In 1887 he went to Japan as a Christian missionary. For almost fifty years his life was actively bound up with our North Japan College at



Sendai, and even after he had to relinquish the presidency of the College in 1936 and retire from active service his heart remained with this institution in his adopted country. A close rival in his affections, one may well believe, was our own Seminary. He often spoke here during his furloughs. During 1897-98 he lectured on Buddhism, and in 1923-24 he held the McCauley Lectureship. During the course of his long and distinguished career honors were heaped upon him galore. Franklin and Marshall College awarded him the degree of Doctor of Divinity in 1899; Ursinus College the degree of Doctor of Laws in 1924; and the Japanese government on several occasions decorated this humble servant of the Lord. During his last furlough he moved among us in his quiet way, still serving the Church in every way open to him, and then—as he himself said—went back to Japan to die. On Oct. 5, 1938, the Church was saddened by the news of his death.

Francis Williard Kennedy was born at Pittsburgh, Pa., on April 3, 1874. He died suddenly on Nov. 22, 1938, at Tiffin, Ohio. He received his collegiate training at Ohio Northern University and Heidelberg College, and his theological training at our Seminary, Heidelberg Seminary, and the University of Chicago. He was a student in the Lancaster Seminary for one year only, 1899-1900. Ursinus College conferred the Doctor of Letters degree upon him in 1920. He was licensed to preach by Tiffin Classis in 1903. The bulk of his ministry was given to the service of Heidelberg College, where he performed faithfully the duties of a professor over many years and in addition those of dean of the College from 1920 until his death.

Robert Lee Bair, '02, was born at Hanover, Pa., Dec. 28, 1875. He prepared for the Christian ministry at Franklin and Marshall College and at this Seminary. In the year of his graduation from the Seminary he was licensed by Gettysburg Classis, and ordained by Philadelphia Classis. His ministry of thirty years was spent in the following charges: Wyoming, Del., 1902-03; Emmanuel-St. Stephen's charge, York, Pa., 1903-05; St. Stephen's, York, Pa., 1905-10; Mountville, Pa., and St. Peter's, Lancaster, 1910-16; supply at Trinity Church, Altoona, Pa., 1916-17; Brunswick, Md., 1917-19; Utica charge, Frederick, Md., 1919-24; Woodstock, Va., 1924-28; Boonsboro and Funkstown, Md., 1929-31; missionary at

Hagerstown, Md., 1931-32. In 1932 he retired from active service and lived at York, Pa., until his death on Jan. 4, 1939.

Joseph Albert Eyler, '06, died suddenly on Jan. 7, 1939. He was born at Thurmont, Md., Feb. 8, 1879. He was educated in the institutions of his Church—Mercersburg Academy, Franklin and Marshall College, and this Seminary. Upon the completion of his training for the ministry he received licensure from Maryland Classis and ordination from East Ohio Classis. For a brief period of a little over a year he was pastor at Lisbon, Ohio. In 1907 he was called to St. John's Church, Bedford, Pa., where he ministered ably and faithfully until his death. Franklin and Marshall College conferred the Doctor of Divinity degree upon him in 1929. This was but one evidence of the esteem in which he was held by all who knew him.

Earl Gerhart Kline, '22, was taken by death on Jan. 23, 1939, in the very midst of a life of usefulness. He was born at Lebanon, Pa., on Feb. 26, 1897. After completing his studies at Mercersburg Academy, Franklin and Marshall College, and the Seminary, he was licensed and ordained to the ministry by Lebanon Classis and Gettysburg Classis, respectively. From 1922 to 1926 he was pastor at Littlestown, Pa. In 1926 he assumed the pastorate of St. Paul's Church, Selinsgrove, Pa. His untimely death was subsequent to an operation for brain tumor, from which he had suffered for several years.

Ernest Newton Evans, '02, was born at McConnellstown, Pa., Dec. 16, 1876. He was graduated in turn from Franklin and Marshall College and our Seminary. Following his licensure by Lancaster Classis and his ordination by Kansas Classis, he entered upon a varied and fruitful ministry. He served four pastorates, as follows: Abilene, Kansas, 1902-07; Xenia, Ohio, 1907-14; Kansas City, Missouri, 1914-19; and the Second Church, Indianapolis, Ind., 1919-23. During the years 1923-24 he was superintendent of Spiritual Resources and Evangelism of the Pittsburgh Synod. In 1925 he became executive secretary of the Church Federation of Indianapolis, a position which he held until his death. The Mission House conferred the Doctor of Divinity degree upon him in 1922. On Sunday, April 2, 1939, he was stricken suddenly while in the midst of a sermon and he died that same day.

Harry Jacob Donat, '16, was born at Wanamakers, Pa., on Sept. 9, 1887. He died April 21, 1939. His academic training was received at Franklin and Marshall College. Upon graduation from the Seminary he was licensed by Lehigh Classis and ordained by Lebanon Classis. His active ministry extended over a period of nineteen years and included service in three charges: Rehersburg, Pa., 1916-18; Macungie, Pa., 1918-26; and Spinnerstown, Pa., 1926-35. He made his home at Wanamakers, Pa., from 1935 until the time of his death.

Irwin George Snyder, '12, was born near Hadley, Pa., Oct. 11, 1882. He was graduated from Franklin and Marshall College in 1909 and from this Seminary in 1912. St. Paul's Classis licensed him to preach, and Allegheny Classis ordained him and installed him in his first pastorate at Duquesne, Pa., which he held from 1912 to 1915. During the period 1915-25 he was pastor of the charge at Monroe, Pa. For a brief period in 1925-26 he served our Church in Hamburg, Pa. In 1926 he returned to his former pastorate in Monroe, Pa. This he relinquished in 1930 to accept a call to Conyngham, Pa. Last spring he visited relatives in the western part of the state. While there, he was taken ill with pneumonia and died on April 23, 1939.

George W. Gerhard, '83, died June 29, 1939, at the age of almost eighty-two years, fifty-six of which were spent in the Christian ministry. He was born at Stouchsburg, Pa., Sept. 6, 1857. In the face of real difficulties he prepared himself for college, and in due time was graduated from both college and seminary at Lancaster. In 1883, fifty-six years ago, he was licensed by Lebanon Classis and ordained by West Susquehanna Classis. His first pastorate was at Lock Haven, Pa., from 1883 to 1893. His second was at Hamburg, Pa., from 1893 to 1908. In 1908 he received a call from the West Reading charge, consisting of three churches. He served this entire charge until 1929, and retained an active connection with a part of it until his death.

Urban Clinton E. Gutelius, '97, was born April 1, 1868, at Littlestown, Pa. He died July 7, 1939—somewhat past the three score years and ten mark. He was graduated from Franklin and Marshall College in 1894 with the A.B. degree, and received the D.D. degree from his alma mater in 1932. Upon graduation from

the Seminary in 1897 he was licensed by his home Classis of Gettysburg and ordained by Somerset Classis. He served first St. Mark's Church in Cumberland, Md., from 1897 to 1901. He was at Evans City, Pa., 1901-04, and at Irwin, Pa., 1904-10. In this latter year he accepted the pastorate of Grace Church, Philadelphia, where he spent the remainder of his life in a faithful ministry.

"And these all, having had witness borne to them through their faith, received not the promise, God having provided some better thing concerning us, that apart from us they should not be made perfect. Therefore let us also, seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and perfecter of our faith."

N.C.H.

#### A RARE FIND

The following letter is on file in the British Museum, London—British Museum Additional Mss. 21646, Folios 65-66. It was copied in the summer of 1938. Through the courtesy of Mr. C. W. Unger it came into the hands of the Rev. Thomas R. Brendle, Egypt, Pa. He sent it for publication to the Editor of the BULLETIN. Since it is directly related to the history of the colonial period of the Reformed Church and was written by the pastor of the First Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa., the Editor was glad to give it space in the BULLETIN. The letter written by the Rev. W. Stoy to Col. Henry Bouquet of Pittsburgh is not dated; Stoy was pastor in Lancaster from 1758 to 1763, during which time he must have written it. Both the Editor and the readers of the BULLETIN acknowledge their indebtedness to Pastor Brendle.

Sir:—

I very humbly hope that it will not be disagreeable to you if I write you these few lines since I am constrained to do it not having another person more fitting than you, Sir, to address in this affair. It is now about two & a half years since the savages (or Indians) took a little fort in Virginia near a river named the South Branch, where the brother of my brother in law had taken refuge, with all

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE

his family. He is called George Maus (or Mans) a German Palatine. The Said George Maus with his wife & three of his children having been killed by the Savages, three other children were carried away by the same into the saddest captivity. The eldest of these poor prisoners was a boy of 14 years & the latest report that I have had of them given me by a girl named LeRoy, herself escaped from the hands of the savages, tells me that these poor prisoners, my relatives, are not far from Fort Pitt, or Pittsburg among the Indians. That is why, Sir, that I very humbly and ardently pray you to intercede for these poor captives, if it is at all possible to deliver them from the most miserable & dismal captivity where they are deprived not only of liberty as men but as Christians, and because there is another woman whose husband is called Michel Mallo who was made prisoner at the same time and place and who it is said is at Montreal where she was sold by the savages to a Frenchman. Therefore, Sir, if you will be pleased to take some pains in regard to her deliverance you will do me a very great favor. I will be responsible for all your expenses and I will never fail to testify sincerely that I do myself the great honor to call myself; Sir.

Your very humble and  
Very Obedient Servant  
W. Stoy  
Minister of the German  
Reformed Church at  
Lancaster

To Col. Henry Bouquet  
at Pittsburgh.