

Volume X

JULY

Number 3

Bulletin

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

OF THE

REFORMED CHURCH IN THE

UNITED STATES

EVANGELICAL AND REFORMED CHURCH



LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA

1939

CONTENTS	
<i>Seminary News Items</i>	99
<i>Anniversary Sermon.</i> REV. GAIUS GLENN ATKINS	104
<i>What is the Point of Contact Between God and Man?</i> NEVIN C. HARNER	114
<i>Shakespeare the Man.</i> N. E. McCLURE	129
<i>The Things Which Unite.</i> THOS. C. PEARS, JR.	139
<i>Book Review</i>	150
<i>Books Received</i>	152

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

President George W. Richards, 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

JULY, 1939

NUMBER 3

SEMINARY NEWS ITEMS

Some of the happenings at the Seminary during the second semester have already been reported in *The Messenger* and elsewhere. For example, the Swander and McCauley Lectures have been so reported, and nothing more need be said about them here, although they were clearly one of the high-spots of the year.

The Seminary Choir had its usual good year under the able leadership of Dr. Sykes. Eight concerts were given in all—at the following places: Rohrerstown, Pa., Columbia, Pa., Newport, Pa., Bethlehem, Pa., Bath, Pa., York, Pa., Baltimore, Md., and the Seminary. In addition the Choir took part in the elaborate Festival of Music at Maple Grove Park, in which all of the groups that Dr. Sykes is conducting at the present time participated. The Choir contributes not only to the musical training of the students, but also quite materially to their fellowship one with another. This fellowship for the current year came to a climax with an informal luncheon during Commencement Week, to which the members of the faculty were invited.

The Society of Inquiry continued its customary activities during the semester. The president for this second term was Mr. Harper L. Schneck. Perhaps the outstanding program in recent months was the one which featured an address by the Rev. Paul B. Rupp. The speaker is an alumnus of our Seminary who for a number of years has served as a chaplain in the United States Army. His topic on this occasion was "Church and State." He developed his subject in a clear and logical manner and, because of this as well as because the subject is now to the fore in world events, the students took hold of the discussion with a right good will.

Weekly devotional services were held in the Seminary Chapel during the Lenten season. The last of these services took the form

of an observance of The Holy Communion. As has been done for several years past, the students and faculty joined in a Lenten offering for a specified cause. The students voted this year to devote the fund to the help of a European student from one of the suffering Protestant minorities. The offerings amounted to about sixty dollars. This money will be sent to its destination through the office of Dr. Adolf Keller in Geneva, Switzerland.

The so-called Missionary Conference was held this year on March 7. As a matter of fact, this annual Conference is an occasion whereon the Boards of the Church in succession have the opportunity of presenting their work to the students. These presentations are so scheduled as to bring all the Boards before the student body once every three years. The Boards of Christian Education and Ministerial Relief conducted the Conference this year. A number of representatives of both Boards were present, and gave interesting and informative accounts of their several activities.

* * * * *

Anniversary Week was observed at the Seminary May 7 to 10. The preacher of the Baccalaureate Sermon this year was Professor Herman. His text was Colossians 2:10, and he spoke of how all men and all things find their completion in Christ. As we left the Chapel, a minister present (not an alumnus of our Seminary) remarked that what he had just heard was good doctrine and the new graduates would be all right if they lived up to it—or words to that effect.

Monday evening of Anniversary Week has generally been distinguished for the reception given by Dr. and Mrs. Richards to the members of the Senior Class and their friends. This year was no exception, and the event lived up fully to the reputation of its predecessors. However, Monday night this year had an additional significance in that the Board of Visitors met that night for the important task of electing a president of the Seminary to succeed Dr. Richards. There was some little joking as to whether the smoke had arisen as yet and, if so, what color it was, and a good deal of serious anticipation of the outcome. When it finally became known for a certainty that Dr. Herman had been chosen, there were many congratulations and pledges of hearty support. Dr. Herman has served the Seminary and the Church long and

ably, and we all wish him Godspeed as he takes up this new responsibility.

Those who came on Tuesday evening expecting to hear Dr. Emil Brunner preach the Anniversary Sermon were doomed to a temporary disappointment, for Dr. Brunner had rather suddenly decided to return to his home and family in Switzerland because of the threatening international situation. The capable substitute who stepped into his shoes as Anniversary Preacher was the Rev. Gaius Glenn Atkins, D.D., professor at Auburn Theological Seminary and widely read author. It is scarcely necessary to say anything about Dr. Atkins's sermon here, because the text of it appears at another place in this issue of the *Bulletin* and it is more than competent to speak for itself.

Wednesday of Anniversary Week was, as usual, a crowded day. The first of the public meetings was the annual program of the Historical Society. The address this year was delivered by the Rev. Thomas C. Pears, L.H.D., librarian of the Presbyterian Historical Society. His subject was, "The Things Which Unite." The officers of the Society were reelected as follows: President, Dr. H. M. J. Klein; vice-president, Dr. Geo. W. Richards; secretary, Rev. Daniel G. Glass; curator, Miss Charlotte Appel.

The meeting of the Alumni Association followed immediately. The Rev. James Riley Bergey, of Baltimore, Md., was elected president for the coming year. Dr. Paul J. Dundore, of Greenville, Pa., was elected vice-president. The Rev. James E. Wagner, of Lancaster, and Dr. Frantz of the Seminary, were elected secretary and treasurer, respectively.

The Anniversary Exercises, by tradition, belong to the graduating class. It is their own hour, and no outside speakers are invited for the occasion. The essays this year were read by Messrs. Mackey, Nagle, Schaeffer, Leiby, and Cheek. As it happens, these five honor-students did their undergraduate work in five different colleges. There were nineteen members of the graduating class, all of them eligible for the Bachelor of Divinity degree. Dr. Hendricks, the president of the Board of Visitors, conferred this degree upon them. Their names are as follows: Robert Cameron Billmyer, of Doylestown, Pa., Arthur Wilson Cheek, of Burlington, N. C., Elwood Thornton Dyson, of Philadelphia, Pa., Eli Reuben Fabian, of Jenkintown, Pa., Nevin Richards Frantz, of

Lancaster, Pa., Arthur Leib Grove, of York, Pa., Russell Conrad Herbert, of Hagerstown, Md., Albert Andrew Kosower, of Cleveland, O., Francis Amandus Leiby, of Pen Argyl, Pa., Sheldon Elias Mackey, of Bethlehem, Pa., Edwin Clinton Nagle, of Allentown, Pa., Henry Arthur Woodrow Schaeffer, of Tamaqua, Pa., Harper Lawrence Schneck, of Schnecksville, Pa., Terrell Martin Shoffner, of Burlington, N. C., William Howard Siegel, of Briar Creek, Pa., William Henry Solly, Jr., of Philadelphia, Pa., Edwin LeFevre Werner, of Lancaster, Pa., Paul Roscoe Wright, of Newport, Pa., and Ralph William Yohe, of Columbia, Pa.

Dr. Richards then announced the winners of prizes for the current year. The subject for the Schaff Prize in Church History this year was "The Influence of John Wesley on Modern Christianity." The winner of this award was Mr. Shoffner of the graduating class. For the Prize in Sacred Rhetoric sermons were written on the assigned text, John 10: 10. This prize was awarded to Mr. Henry S. Raab, of the Middle Class. The Jacob Y. Dietz Prize fell this year within the New Testament Department (it rotates among the departments). The assigned subject was "The Structure and Significance of the Parables as Used by Jesus and the Early Church," and the winning essays were those of Mr. Christopher J. Noss and Mr. Henry S. Raab. In addition to these stated awards Mr. Siegel of the graduating class received a gift of twenty-five dollars from his home congregation, the First Evangelical and Reformed Church, of Berwick, Pa. The presentation was made by Dr. Richards in the name of the congregation.

Rev. Bergey, member of the forty-five-year class and new president of the Alumni Association, presided as toastmaster at the Alumni Luncheon. Two addresses were scheduled for this luncheon—the one by the Rev. Frank L. Kerr of the forty-five-year class, and the other by Mr. Siegel of the graduating class. Both were good addresses. As it happened, a few items slipped into the program which were not scheduled. At a convenient interlude Mr. T. Roberts Appel, a member of the Board of Trustees of the Seminary, claimed the floor. He said that ordinarily he, a representative of the law, would not presume to speak in the presence of so many ministers, but he did want to call upon the assembly to pay tribute to the retiring president, Dr. Richards. This was done with one accord. Then Dr. J. Hamilton Smith, a

member of the Board of Visitors, arose and said that it was the function of the gospel to go beyond the law and complete it. Therefore, he wanted to call upon those present to do honor to Mrs. Richards. This too was done. Naturally all of this led to a similar recognition of Dr. Bromer, who is retiring from the chair of Practical Theology. Then Dr. Richards arose to introduce his successor in the presidency, Dr. Herman. Dr. Richards pointed out how Dr. Herman had succeeded him time and again throughout their careers—first as the pastor of Salem Church, Allentown, then as the writer of the treatment of the International Uniform Lessons in *The Messenger*, then as editor of the *Reformed Church Review*, and now as president of the Seminary. Just how far this following would go was left in doubt, for Dr. Richards said that when he arrived "up there" he was not at all sure that Dr. Herman would still be following. Such a reflection upon one's ultimate destiny would be calculated to unnerve the less experienced, but Dr. Herman was equal to the occasion and made a fitting response. Finally, the round of introductions was nicely finished off with the presentation of the two professors-elect, the Rev. David Dunn and Dr. Lawrence E. Bair.

* * * * *

It is always hard to give an accurate account of the location of recent graduates of the Seminary, because the account must be written in the midst of trial sermons, nominations, and elections. Consequently, the best that can be written is out-of-date before it is printed. To date about half of the graduating class are definitely placed. Mr. Dyson is at Annville, Pa., Mr. Cheek is at Conover, N. C., Mr. Frantz is at Cashtown, Pa., Mr. Herbert is at Orwigsburg, Pa., Mr. Nagle is pastor of the Spies Charge near Reading, Pa., Mr. Schneck is at Dallastown, Pa., Mr. Yohe is in Pittsburgh, Pa., Mr. Wright is at Landisburg, Pa., Mr. Shoffner is at Winston-Salem, N. C., Mr. Schaeffer at Manor, Pa., and Mr. Siegel at Ruffsedale, Pa.

It is a pleasure to supplement previous accounts of the placement of graduates of other years with a few additions. Mr. Reigle of the class of 1937 is at Wathena, Kansas. Of the class of 1938, Mr. Dech is at Pavia, Pa.; Mr. Leiby is the assistant pastor in Memorial Church, Easton, Pa.; Mr. Singer is at Herndon, Pa.; and Mr. Wiley is serving the Pymatuning Charge in western Pennsylvania.

N.C.H.

ANNIVERSARY SERMON*

"For Creation is waiting with eager longing for the Sons of God to be disclosed."—Romans 8-19!

REV. GAIVUS GLENN ATKINS

It needs, I confess, something of the quality which rushes in where angels fear to tread, to announce this text. For if angels have not our terrestrial concern for exegesis and homiletics, one need only change one word in that cautionary quotation to make it fit this place and this occasion, and warn himself against rushing in where scholars fear to tread. My Greek New Testament makes that warning graphic enough. In editing these great chapters, it sets only three or four lines of text at the top of each large page and uses the rest of the page, in quite fine print, for contested readings, word derivations and uses, comments, comparisons and interpretations; as though scholars were mapping the terrain of a battlefield in which every contour, no matter how slight, had strategic significance and wrongly read might decide the destiny of empires—as did the sunken road at Waterloo.

Happily—and unhappily—the figure of a battlefield is proper. The Somme and Sedan, Gettysburg and the "Wilderness" were never more tenaciously contested for the sake of vast issues than these great chapters, and always with one difference. Gettysburg was ended in three summer days and the curtain fell at last on tragedy of the Somme, but the theologians return to Paul's Epistle to the Romans generation after generation. It has furnished the foundations for doctrines which great thinkers have built into articulated systems; it has flowered into faiths by which men have lived and for which they have died; its noblest passages have supported the hard beset in their extremity and comforted them in their sorrow as it were said above their confined dead. Its implications have been hardened into numbing fatalisms. Its superb confidences have nerved the lovers of freedom. It has been the homeland of the devout, the endless resource of the argumentative and a no-man's land across which rival systems have watched each other on guard, and into which they have made forays to bring back to their own lines what suited their purposes,

* Santee Hall, May 9, 1939.

hoping amongst other things to take a few prisoners; a great deal of which would now surprise St. Paul almost unbelievably.

All this, is an arresting testimony to the spaciousness of the Apostle's mind and the superb range of his enquiring faith. It is just because his horizons take so cosmic a sweep, his heights are so far above our vision and his depths so profound, that there is room in these chapters for opinions and interpretations which, diverse and opposed as they have been, may nevertheless rightly claim the Apostle's support and authority. In addition—and it is the most significant of additions—these chapters possess a timeless quality.

They were written out of the travail of the soul of a saint and the confusion of an age in which old faiths were dying and a new faith had not yet asserted its sovereignty; they declare the dissolution of an empire, which, although it still ruled the world, was already judged and doomed. They anticipate a new and enduring order and catch the vision of the city of God whose glory shall be undimmed by human tears. To use a current phrase now beginning to be shop-worn, they issued out of a crisis, and they sought a resolution of that crisis in terms which can be traced from chapter to chapter. It is by some inescapable necessity, then, that the Christian Church has returned to them in its own recurrent crises, and the perplexed have sought assurance from passages whose trumpet notes have carried across the centuries. The trumpet has been passed from Paul to Augustine, from Augustine to Calvin, from Calvin to Barth in the great regions of theology, and from troubled soul to troubled soul in the vast anonymous fellowship of Christian believers. The first eight chapters are themselves a kind of Pilgrim's Progress in which almost every individual and social experience can be recurrently paralleled culminating in that ultimately victorious "I am persuaded" in which all our pilgrimages must end unless they end in the dark.

I.

I have no mind this evening either to analyse or retrace that pilgrimage as a theologian, for I am no theologian, nor to press the movement of Paul's mind of which the text is a part, to detailed

conclusions. It is probable that the Epistle was shaped, so to speak, by the confluence of more than one element. It is compact of Paul's own travail of soul, his sense of the disaster of the human enterprise as he saw it, his concern as a Jew for the religious estate of his fellow Jews and, somewhere in the background, the challenge of a contemporaneous system of speculation whose allure he seems always to have felt but which he never definitely acknowledged. Nevertheless the pressure of that system is again and again in evidence in his thought and his writing, and without its provocative backgrounds there is much in many, even most of his Epistles, which it is difficult either to account for or to understand. The system itself is as impossible to recapture as the shifting forms of the clouds which the Apostle saw from the decks of the galleys he used, or from the halting place of a caravan at nightfall.

We call it Gnosticism now for the want of a better name, though the thing itself is older than any name for it, being the quest of the human mind for an answer for the three great questions, "Whence?" and "Whither?" and "Why?" It was the attempt, always renewed, never finished, to find meaning in experience, to account for the shadows and defeats of life, to anticipate the harbors toward which our voyage over seas of mystery is directed, to discover the Power under Whose compulsion we set sail and what stars there are beyond our own dreams to direct us. St. Paul could no more have escaped meeting it than a missionary in India could escape meeting Hinduism, and he must have discussed it again and again with the "seekers" of his time as the caravan rested beneath the stars, the galley drove over the bluest of seas before following winds, or he sewed his black tent cloth in the low rooms of vanished cities.

To many scholars He sought—I am willing to say seems to have sought—to subdue it to the ends and sovereignties of his own Christian faith, to answer its questions in terms of the Christian revelation, and to win for his Master the empire of the always enquiring mind, adding besides to the grandiose conclusions of his questing world, the all resolving answer of the Grace of God in the Cross of Christ. The first eight chapters of the Epistle to the Romans have, therefore, a strategic significance. They are a triumphant Christian faith asserting itself over a troubled world

and a triumphant Christian faith meeting the questing mind with its own insights and interpretations. The very scope of these chapters, their vast and elastic range, gives them an intellectual hospitality which their interpreters have not always exercised. They can accommodate themselves, enforced, to all tested wisdom about life and the world as systems of science and philosophy dissolve and re-emerge and say the final word about them. They speak to the twentieth century as authoritatively as they spoke to the first, and always with overtones of hope.

II

For let us consider, standing far enough from Paul's passionate and travailing argument to follow its contours without being lost in its details, the bearing of it all upon our own minds and our own times. I would note again and first of all, what I have already called the hospitality of the ruling ideas of his argument to the always changing understandings and widening horizons of the living human mind. That is always the hall-mark of nobly creative thought. Its frames are elastic, its terms are spacious, its outlook is inclusive. It has no fear of the dawn of yet undiscovered truth. It waits for sun rises from beyond the hills of time, and when the new light comes, it falls on regions which the prophetic thinker has already claimed for himself and his cause. Like the poet and the prophet, the lords of thought are never dated. The sequent centuries are dated by them.

Note next the time perspective against which St. Paul sets his world and its issues. He had his own eschatology, his own conception of the drama being played out upon this terrestrial stage. That he could not and did not seek to escape. But something vaster emerges here than his Jewish inheritance. He sees an unfinished and waiting creation and moving through it and above and beneath it a directing Purpose, unhasting and unresting. Rome and the cruelty of its emperors are only clouds driven down the corridors of time by the winds of God. Present hardship he counts as nothing against the glory that is to be revealed. For the assurance of the hard-beset he supplies the corrections of time.

Now that comforting phrase "the corrections of time" may be, as Tennyson said of most of our conventional way of comforting other

people, "vacant chaff well meant for grain": something which other people would do well to wait for, but which we ourselves in our more trying experiences are not willing to wait for. I grant we use it often enough simply to save ourselves the trouble of doing something effectively remedial about the present. It all depends. But for all that life without perspective is a sorry business and leads to misleading conclusions.

Some of us have been reading with interest and, I trust, with profit, a series of articles in a distinguished religious periodical in which eminent teachers, preachers and theologians have been telling the world what has happened to their minds in the last ten years. I venture to suggest that the most significant thing in many of those articles, especially by our younger theologians, is their lack of historical perspective. They are thinking on too small a time scale, as if there were no history before the World War and not likely to be much history after the date on which they finished their article. It reminds one of a little jingle of Rudyard Kipling's which I quote with apologies to everybody concerned:

"In August was the jackal born,
The floods came in September
"Now such a fearful storm
As this," he says, "I surely can't remember."

There can be no brave or wise living or thinking ever unless one sets any present, bright or shadowed, in its proper time-frame. Then and then only do we see steadily and begin to see it whole. Of course it is not time alone—moral-time. Confidence may use too small a moral-time scale as well as despair. Many of our younger thinkers—no longer so very young—reproach—and bitterly—the now passing generation of pre-World War Liberals for their baseless optimism, and quote to prove it their glowing and rhetorical periods about the goodness of the world and the brightness of the future. We see now, and sadly, how misleading those eloquent perorations were though those of us who remember that happier time protest that it was easy then for a while to believe in the possibility of a good and peaceful and happy world. We still believe in that possibility. But, we confess now, that our moral-time scale was too limited. We made one long

generation of relatively happy human well-being the one event toward which the whole of creation had been moving.

But those who criticise us and our leaders are making exactly the same mistake. They are measuring history, its meanings and its issues against the confusions, defeats and despairs of their own generation. If our too spacious hopes needed correction, so do their too spacious despairs. We all need to take care not to measure either our brief lives with their chequered experiences or the events of history against any present whether it be bright or shadowed. We personally—all of us here this evening—remember how premature it often was to say the last word about our happinesses or our sorrows and losses till we had fitted them with the assistance of the years, into the unresting movements of life. One sees life, as one sees a landscape, only from its heights. Then its seemingly broken pieces begin to form a whole, its lights and shadows become the seasons of the soul and from such heights of understanding we say of much which once perplexed or saddened us, "That too was best."

And so with history. It is no especial comfort to know that the very territories in Central Europe which are now under threat and in angry debate have been battlefields since the Caesars or that the harvests of their poor laborious folk have been so often trampled into red mire that one wonders how they have courage ever to seed another field. But at least it keeps one from dating history by the collapse of his own philosophy rather than its long and sighing sequences. An interpretation of history which reaches only from Versailles to Munich ought to collapse even if Reinhold Niebuhr's peace of mind collapse with it. One's peace of mind must have a more ample foundation than that. It must be won as St. Paul won his victorious faith from the vision of purposes of God seen in perspectives which reach backward and forward beyond our human vision and which—the faith I mean—is not undone, even by the cries and protests of a travailing order.

III

For here is not only an order whose perspectives are beyond our vision; it is also an unfinished order, whose issues and meanings are not yet revealed, a waiting and expectant order. The

very Greek words which the Apostle uses are arresting. The authorized version, the "earnest expectation of the Creature," is colorless alongside the vividness of the original. The world and all that it contains, animate and inanimate, are waiting, as it were, with uplifted head, peering on and on for the final revelation in which and through which its meanings shall be made manifest, and even its wastes and desolations redeemed.

Here Paul's mind is one with the poets and philosophers. He is contemplating not a dead but a living universe. He is anticipating the insights of our own science which retells in its own words from nebulae to a May world the story of creation's eonian travail and knows itself also to be dealing, as L. P. Jacks says, not with a dead but a living universe. He is one with Haldane who says, "the material world which has been taken for a world of blind mechanism is in reality the spiritual world seen very partially . . . the only real world is the spiritual world." He is one with Carlyle for whom "this fair universe, were it in the meanest province thereof, is in very deed the star-domed city of God," "for whom through every grass blade and most through every living Soul, the glory of a present God still beams." "Creation is not inert, utterly unspiritual, alien to our lives and its hopes."

For all that, Paul sees the shadows which lie across creation and hears its sighs and complaints. It was human sin he would have said that had darkened creation, that was the shadow of which lay dark and long across the animate and inanimate. Our world, he believed, was not meant, when the morning stars sang together for joy that they were made, to be what it has since become. Whether or not one goes with him in all the implications of that belief, no one can deny that the shadows of our human folly and fault do lie deep across the world. If we are involved in creation, creation is also involved with us. Its waters were not meant to be polluted, its fields were not meant to be reduced to bare, gullied wastes, its forests were not meant to be slaughtered. Its wheat-fields were not meant to be watered with blood. It is a sighing order for whose who have ears to hear. It too has been wounded for our transgression and bruised for our iniquities against love and goodness and even common sense.

But what Paul hears most clearly above the complaints of the creation is the still, sad music of humanity, and here he passes far, far beyond the stoic philosophy—for certain passages here sound the stoic notes—to heights of insight the stoic never reached and a faith the stoic never knew. His hope is in God and in a God of Whose love and sharing the Cross is the timeless sign. Here, I think, St. Paul, for all a formalism which he owed to his Jewish inheritance of law and ritual of sacrifice, would not reject Stanley Jones' dear-bought insight that "The cross is the outer manifestation of that hidden Cross which is upon the heart of the Immanent God Who shares our hunger and the crushing cost of our sin." The upright of that Cross is set deep in the travailing order itself, being of the very essence of its travail and its arms embrace the whole of God's order—the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.

Hence his confidence. The entire creation sighs and throbs with pain. Even the faithful who have the spirit as a foretaste of the future, sigh to themselves as they wait, but the Apostle hears a deeper voice above the storm, hears

"* * * at times a sentinel
Who moves about from place to place,
And whispers to the worlds of space,
In the deep night, that all is well."

He has seen in his Lord and Master the first complete revelation of what the world has been waiting for, the revelation of the sons of God. He knows that creation as well as man will one day be freed from its thralldom and gain the glorious liberty of the children of God.

This hope may also have been in Paul's own mind, associated with his inherited conception of the day of the Lord, but it is too spacious thus to be confined. It gives meaning to the mystery of the scientist, the vision of the prophet, the perplexities of the historian and our own entangled lives, or else there is no meaning. And so finally, all that I have so far tried to say reaches us, here and now. We do need to correct our haste and confusion by the vision of the reach and range of the world order, by the reach and range of human history. We do need the assurance that nothing is finished yet, not the Dictator nor the War

Lord, nor the bombing of little children, nor the hysterias and madresses of our contemporaneous world in which the murder of a thousand helpless people rates only a dozen lines in the morning paper. But we need above all to become ourselves the revelation of the Sons of God. The world is waiting for that, here and now.

For the revelation of the Sons of God is in life and fellowship, in character and conduct, always, always. I quoted Haldane's sentence, so rich in insight, that the only real world is the spiritual world. Now hear Jacks' comment: "But if you would find its reality, do not content yourself with *saying* it is spiritual, but *act* it." Act then the revelation of the children of God. That is our Christian task. This Seminary and all Seminaries are here to train prophetic youth not only to summon youth and maturity to become the children of God in confession, but to live the revelation of the children of God. Otherwise it is a mirage in the desert, a retreating light along horizons which recede as we approach them.

It is never easy to become a revelation of that sonship. Now it seems impossibly hard. I pray you—and myself—do not let the glory of the challenge be defeated by its difficulty. We know enough to go on with. We have power enough to do better than we are doing. We know that the children of God should not murder one another in war. We know that the children of God should seek full and happy lives for all their fellow-children. We know that the children of God should be patient and kind and good. We know that the children of God should bear one another's burdens. We know that the children of God should be teachable. We know that the children of God, being themselves transformed, have the power to transform the world. We know that St. Paul wrote the twelfth chapter of Romans as well as the eighth and that two thousand years ago in the liveable light and splendor of those exhortations the Sons of God began to be revealed. We know that unshattering and unshattering that revelation has changed the centuries, and that whatever is bright and right in our past has been the outshining of it laying hold of the souls and the societies of men.

We know that there is another civilization than our civilization of pride and power destroying itself. We know that there might be a civilization of the revelation of the children of God, a civilization of the way, the truth and the life of Jesus Christ, in which every man's gain would be his neighbor's wealth, every man's strength would be his neighbor's support. We know that there are spiritual values that lie hidden and waiting to be revealed. That is the revelation of the Sons of God. Each one of us has at least a little province in which he or she can begin and continue the revelation. We may not be able yet to reach Hitler on his Bavarian mountain top, or Mussolini in his Roman Palace, though time will reach them and the justice of God. We can reach our homes and our churches, our friends and our associates in the manifold relations of our lives. We can reach our own souls. There are thus possible for us all such revelations as shall touch with their light and beauty and power our fellowships, our days and our deeds. No one of them is whole dawn for which the world is waiting but each one of them is some gleam of the brightness of its rising, and together, together they might become that dawn.

We have for our marching music the trumpet notes with which the chapter ends. For what follows from all this? If God is for us, who can be against us? One by one Paul summons the powers of darkness and defeat only to have them trampled under foot by his victorious Lord and his undefeatable faith. What are heights and depths or principalities and powers of life or death in the victorious outgoing of the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord. It is to such music as that we go on in our revelation. Who can be afraid with such an assurance as that—even in a time like ours.

Auburn, New York

WHAT IS THE POINT OF CONTACT BETWEEN
GOD AND MAN?

NEVIN C. HARNER

This question of the point of contact (Anknüpfungspunkt) between God and man has been brought forcefully to our attention by the school of thought of Barth and his associates. So long as God's immanence is stressed, the question is not an urgent one. If God and man are close to each other, it may be assumed that each will experience no great difficulty in reaching the other. But once God's transcendence, His "otherness," comes to be stressed, the question becomes a truly crucial one. How, then, shall man get to God? And how shall God get through to man?

Karl Barth's answer in the fully developed stage of his thought is a clear and uncompromising one. There is no point of contact, nothing in sinful man to which God can make an appeal, except that which God specially creates for that purpose. Barth denies "any connection between God and man, that is, any knowledge of the Word of God by man and therefore any knowability of the Word of God by man, in the sense that a capacity in man in abstraction from the Word of God is to be the condition of that connection. . . . It is the man who really knows the Word of God who also knows that he can bring no capacity to this knowledge, but must first receive all capacity." (Barth, *Doctrine of the Word of God*, p. 224.) Again: "Men can know the Word of God because and so far as God wills that they should know it, because and so far as over against the will of God there is only the weakness of disobedience, and because and so far as there is a revelation of the will of God in His Word, in which this weakness of disobedience is removed." (*Ibid.*, p. 224.) We may put alongside these quotations some conclusions reached in a seminar on preaching conducted by Karl Barth in 1933, as these conclusions are summarized in a student's digest of the seminar. Barth took the altogether logical position that the preacher should seek for no point of contact (Anknüpfungspunkt) whatsoever with the hearers—whether in the introduction, or the body, or the conclusion of the sermon. God's Word has no need of man's art; it is capable of finding its own entrance into the lives of men. (Monsma, *Karl Barth's Idea of Revelation*, p. 161.)

It is possible to find other quotations from other thinkers which take the same extreme position. For example, Kraemer in his recent book, *The Christian Message in the Non-Christian World*, says flatly: "There are no bridges from human religious consciousness to the reality in Christ." However, there are not many to be found who are willing to occupy this radical position. William Temple, Archbishop of York, and outstanding leader of the ecumenical movement, arrays himself squarely against it, as the following words clearly indicate: "Either all occurrences are in some degree revelation of God, or else there is no such revelation at all. . . . Only if God is revealed in the rising of the sun in the sky can he be revealed in the rising of a son of man from the dead." (In *Revelation*, edited by John Baillie and Hugh Martin.) Tillich likewise takes his stand on the side of a revelation on a wider front, open to man at a variety of places. He says, "mind cannot receive a content which is entirely strange to it." And again, "Revelation could not be an event in human history if it were entirely strange to history." (Quoted in Monsma, *Karl Barth's Idea of Revelation*, pp. 188 and 189.) As is well known, Brunner broke with his master at this point. Brunner holds that there is in man a formal *imago dei* and a material *imago dei*. The formal image of God in man is simply his humanness, that which distinguishes him from the animals. The material image of God in man is his original righteousness, which was lost in the fall. This latter is gone, to be sure, and God can make no appeal to it; the former, however, remains. It is that which is the Anknüpfungspunkt, and it is present in every man by virtue of his being man. (Taken from Monsma, *Karl Barth's Idea of Revelation*, p. 175.) In his *God and Man*, p. 116, Brunner commits himself unequivocally in one short statement: "Only because man has some kind of knowledge about God can he be a sinner."

It is interesting to note that Barth himself has not always held such an uncompromising view of man's incapacity for knowing God, as is shown clearly by the evolution of his doctrine of faith. In his earlier writings faith was for Barth not a specially created faculty by which alone man could have any knowledge of God. Instead he wrote in 1916 (which, it will be remembered, was in the midst of the World War): "faith is construed to be the atti-

tude and childlike joy that should be man's because of God's eternal righteousness." (Quoted in Monsma, *Karl Barth's Idea of Revelation*, p. 191.) The Barth here speaking had not as yet been disillusioned by the post-war collapse of Europe, and was not as yet bound within the confines of a rigorous theological system. One can readily understand why he changed later in the direction in which he did, but it is an open question whether his later insistence on a man's inability of himself to know God may not do the cause of true religion more harm than good. In this connection a pertinent warning is sounded by Dean Weigle in his latest book, *Jesus and the Educational Method* (pp. 112-113): "It may be salutary for us to read again Dean Mansel's *The Limits of Religious Thought*, in which he sought to exalt revelation by portraying the incompetence of the human mind to think consistently of God; then to recall the fact that this book served as one of the premises of Herbert Spencer's agnosticism. . . ."

The extreme position of Barth can no doubt be supported by some texts from Scripture, but it can not be validated by reliable evidence drawn from a painstaking study of man, past and present. Surely there must be some more general point or points of contact between God and man, some limited yet true community of life between the Divine and the human. How else, for example, can one account for the fact that Helen Keller, deprived of both sight and hearing, unable to communicate or be communicated with, nevertheless formulated in her solitariness some rudimentary notion of a Supreme Being? With the two chief avenues of contact with the outside world totally blocked, she nevertheless got through to God and He to her.

It is easier, however, to affirm one's faith that there is a point of contact than to define just what it is. Neither theology nor psychology offers us much help. Theology has been occupied with the Godward side of the relationship. Psychology has been occupied with man, but not with this question concerning man. Most of the psychologists—unfortunately—would never think of asking, What is it in man's nature to which God addresses Himself? Not even the psychologists of religion have faced this question to any degree. They may have asked, What are the roots of religion

in the soul of man? but that is not quite the same as asking, What is it in man's nature to which God addresses Himself? Furthermore, most psychologists of religion have been unduly taken up with a study of the more spectacular phenomena of the religious life—mysticism, conversion, etc., and have devoted all too little thought to the religious life of the average individual. We shall have to make our journey, therefore, without a great deal of company and without much assistance on our way.

At the outset, we may clear the ground somewhat by uprooting and discarding some false notions of what this point of contact might be. It is not to be found in a religious instinct. I think we can safely say that no reputable psychologist today would speak of a religious instinct in man, a little specialized portion of his nature which induces him to reach out toward the Divine and to which the Divine can address Itself in reaching down to him. For one thing religion in various times and places is too diverse a thing to permit us to think of a religious instinct. An instinct, if there were any such thing, would show itself invariably in virtually the same beliefs and practices—semper, ubique, ab omnibus. The facts of the case are just the opposite. Furthermore, psychology, is hesitant nowadays in talking about instincts of any kind. Animal life can be conceived in terms of neat bundles of instinctive behavior, but not human life. The instinct is a category of explanation which psychology has virtually given up. We shall not look, therefore, for the point of contact in a religious instinct.

Secondly, we shall not look for the point of contact in the subconscious. That, we remember, was where William James looked for it in his *Varieties of Religious Experience*. He drew three concentric circles. The inner circle represented the conscious life of man; the middle represented the subconscious; the outer circle represented the enveloping Divine. Between the middle and the outer circles there was a break, signifying that it was through the subconscious that the Divine made its way to man. Without going here into a discussion of the nature of the subconscious, we may simply say that there is something repellent in the notion that God reaches man on the margin of himself, at the spot where he is least himself.

Thirdly, we shall not look for the point of contact in any special religious faculty, any sixth sense like Otto's "Numinous Feeling" or sense of the Holy. Uren in his valuable survey-volume, *Recent Religious Psychology*, says of Otto's conception (p. 266): "The religious feeling is, according to Otto, a specific kind of feeling, a reflex resulting from the impact upon the human mind of an objective Transcendent Presence. This feeling-response in its most primitive manifestations is at once non-rational and non-moral; it is simply the pure a priori apprehension of Transcendent Reality." It is worth noting that the current experimentation with mental telepathy may force a revision of this judgment. For mental telepathy, if true, is precisely a "pure a priori apprehension" of some reality—namely, the content of the mind of a person with whom there is no sensory contact whatsoever. If "extra-sensory perception" should prove to be true between two humans, it would be reasonable to suppose it operative between the human and the Divine. Meanwhile, however, it seems wiser not to look for the point of contact in any religious sixth sense.

Where then is it to be found? Before attempting to formulate an answer, let us lay down several assumptions on which the subsequent inquiry rests. First, let us assume that there is a God, and feel ourselves under no obligation to prove His existence. We take for granted for the purposes of this paper that there is a God, a personal God, who is eager to break through and hold commerce with men. What is there in them to which He can make His appeal? With what can He establish contact? As the Divine flows out toward men, what in men flows out toward the Divine?

Secondly let us assume that God's address to man is not limited to the Scriptures, and that His address to them within the Scriptures—that is, within the bounds of the distinctively Christian revelation—is different in degree but not in kind from His more general address to them in history, in nature, et cetera.

Both of these assumptions can be questioned and both are questioned by many intelligent persons. However, if we are to pursue our inquiry from the vantage-point of psychology, both of these assumptions are necessary—the first to avoid questions in metaphysics with which psychology can not properly deal, and the second to avoid stating the question in a way foreign to the

thought-forms of modern psychology, so foreign that psychology would be of limited use in the search for an answer. For we are deliberately trying to formulate an answer in the thought-forms of modern psychology. What does psychology have to say about man, or what does it allow us to say, that is relevant to the point of contact between God and man?

If there is anything on which modern psychology is agreed it is the concept of man as a dynamic creature—wanting, seeking, struggling, achieving. Man is not a tabula rasa, a clean white piece of paper waiting passively to be written upon by the experiences of life. Neither is he a dispassionate, coldly rational thinking machine. He is rather a bundle of wishes. There is no precise agreement on what these wishes are. However, there is one statement of these wishes which is well-nigh classic—namely, the Four Wishes of W. I. Thomas. Thomas does not attempt to say whether these wishes are inborn, or whether they are the product of experience. He merely says, on the basis of wide observation and careful study of humankind, that when you look at man there they are: (1) The Wish for Recognition; (2) The Wish for Response; (3) The Wish for Security; (4) The Wish for New Experience.

The first is the Wish for Recognition. Men, says Thomas, universally want recognition by their fellows; they crave social approval; they desire status or standing among the fellow-humans with whom they associate. I suppose there can be little question as to the reality of this wish. We see it operating all too clearly in ourselves as well as in others.

The second is the Wish for Response. A person, says Thomas, wants not merely to be acclaimed by ten or a thousand, but he wants to be loved by two or three. He craves intimate, affectionate response from a limited circle—wife, parent, child, friend. The actuality of this wish, too, needs no argument.

The third is the Wish for Security. Men, says Thomas, desire to be safe—safe from harm, safe against the contingencies of tomorrow, safe in the affections of those about them. There is a great deal of psychological evidence that this Wish for Security constitutes one of the basic needs of life, the denial of which plays havoc with personality. No more striking evidence of the deep

significance of this Wish can be found than the simple fact that fifty per cent of our American delinquents come from broken homes—that is, from homes whose foundations have been shaken either by death or by divorce. Children want and need security within the material and emotional worlds which they inhabit. Adults likewise greatly desire security—witness the lengths to which we will go to buy insurance of all sorts!

The fourth is the Wish for New Experience. Men, says Thomas, want to make new things, go new places, see new sights, think new thoughts. They are restless, active, never content. Psychologists are rather generally agreed that there is something in human life corresponding to this wish. Some would call it Exploratory Behavior, obviously trying to explain in behaviorist categories something which is not behavioristic at all. Some would describe the same restlessness in neurological terms by advancing the hypothesis that the organism derives a subtle satisfaction from establishing new connection in the higher nerve centers. However the Wish may be spoken of, the fact of its existence is scarcely open to question. It constitutes, in part at least, the driving force of explorers, inventors, gay pleasure-seekers, and learned philosophers. One of the forms it takes is a ceaseless exploration of the nature and causes of things. It makes us ask Why? and Whence? and Whither?

These four Wishes constitute a vest-pocket edition of the science of dynamic human nature. They are psychologically reliable, both in the sense that many psychologists would find them acceptable and in the sense that they coincide rather well with our ordinary lay observation of human nature. There is nothing striking about them. There is nothing noble about them (although it may be noticed in passing that they do for the most part serve to distinguish the human species from other levels of creation; none of them is present, explicitly and fully, in any other living thing; in their full implications they do not form a bad definition of man's humanness). There is nothing unselfish about them (although they lay the groundwork—as we shall see later—for whatever measure of unselfishness man can lay claim to). They do not seem to offer any promising leads for a point of contact between God and man. On first glance, at least, there is nothing

in them which would seem to lead mankind out toward the Divine, and nothing to which a living personal God could address Himself in His desire to make Himself known to His children. Let us, however, assume nothing but these four Wishes and see how far we can get in bridging the gap between God and man. Let us meet the psychologists on their own grounds, take raw human nature as it is described by a non-religious scientist, make no attempt to beg the question or make its solution easier by slipping in a hypothetical religious faculty of any sort, and see if we may yet erect a ladder between heaven and earth on which angels (that is messengers) may ascend and descend. It will be convenient to take these four components of dynamic human nature in reverse order.

Let us take, then, the Wish for New Experience, and examine it to see what clues it may have to offer for the point of contact between God and man. As was said above, one of the forms which this Wish assumes is a restless inquiry into the nature and the cause of things. There is good evidence that this inquiry begins quite early in childhood. Dr. Pierre Bovet, Director of the Institute J. J. Rousseau in Geneva, after careful study of small children says that at about the age of six there is a "characteristic and spontaneous outburst of metaphysical curiosity." He says further: "Speculations regarding the origin of things, the creation of the world and of God himself" manifest themselves. (Quoted in article by Mrs. Fahs in *Religious Education*, Dec., 1929, p. 914.) An observer of a group of rather talented American children says that questions such as the following began to be raised by children of three to four and a half years of age: "When was the first cow? When was the first mother? Who made the grass? Who taught the first little girl to break an egg? Why are the rocks so smooth? What makes the wind blow so fast? Where was I when you were a little girl?" (*Ibid.*) We have it on good authority, likewise, that this same sort of inquiry began quite early in the history of the human race. Dr. Goldenweiser, eminent anthropologist, says: "Our familiarity with man, modern, ancient, and primitive, leaves no room for doubt that at all times and places man was strongly susceptible to the impressions produced upon him by the phenomena of nature, and that such im-

pressions assumed in his consciousness the form of quasi-religious sentiments." (Quoted in Uren, *Recent Religious Psychology*, p. 133.)

It has long been recognized by most psychologists of religion that this restless, awestruck curiosity in the face of the wonders of nature is one of the roots of religion—both in the individual and in the race. Quite a few primitive tribes have had the conception of Creator-Gods. These gods are frequently not worshipped at all. They are remote from man; they have little to do with the supplying of his daily needs; they serve chiefly as an explanation of things. For example, the Todas, a primitive tribe living on an isolated plateau in southern India have a god whom they name Ōn. He is not publicly worshipped, and plays an insignificant role in the daily life of the Todas. The significance of Ōn is that he and his wife created the buffaloes (on which the livelihood of the Todas depends) and Ōn himself created mankind.

However, to say that this restless metaphysical curiosity is one of the roots of religion is to state the matter from the human side. Suppose now we view it from the side of the Divine, if we may presume to do so. To what but to this restless spirit of inquiry in man would *God the Creator* address Himself, unrolling before man the marvelous panorama of His creation, intriguing his interest, half-concealing and half-revealing the endless glories of His handiwork, until some day a sensitive spirit (and the very sensitivity was created by God for this purpose) cried out: "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork." Man alone has been endowed by the Creator with a questioning mind and an eager, restless spirit—and to what end? To the end that it might serve as a point of contact to which *God the Creator*, the Maker of all that is in the heaven above and the earth beneath and the waters under the earth, could appeal in revealing Himself to mankind.

Secondly, let us examine in like manner the Wish for Security to see what clues it affords as to a point of contact between God and man. One of the first things to claim our attention under this head is the obvious fact that some of the most characteristic religious doctrines are, humanly speaking, the direct flowering of the Wish for Security. The doctrine of salvation is the most striking

ing example. The word "salvation" comes from a Latin word meaning "safe." We are not far from the truth, therefore, if we say that every doctrine of salvation that has been formulated, every way of salvation that has been followed by mankind the world around is part and parcel of man's timid, wistful search for security both in this world and the next. The major role played by the doctrine of salvation in Christian theology, the salvationist sects of Buddhism in present-day China and Japan, the ancient Greek mysteries with their blood-baths and other sacramental devices—in all of these we see man, weak, incomplete, insecure, trying with all his might to be safe both now and hereafter. The doctrine of immortality manifestly has the same psychological root, as does Schleiermacher's feeling of dependence.

From whatever standpoint we view man, then, we gain a picture of him half cowering before life's difficulties and uncertainties, haunted by a craving for security—some firm foundation on which he can stand. To what but to this longing for security in man would God the *Sustainer* reveal Himself, dropping hints here and there—in the regularity of the seasons, in the rising of the sun and the going down of the same, in the falling of the rain upon just and unjust alike, in the inexorable moral law running through life whereby a man or a nation must sooner or later reap as it has sown—that behind the ebb and flow of circumstance there is One who is the same yesterday, today and forever. Many years ago in western Asia some unknown seer wrote: "The Lord is my Shepherd; I shall not want. . . . Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for thou art with me; Thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me." Some centuries later another, who had caught a new glimpse of the providence of God in and through Jesus, cried out triumphantly: "For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord." And later still another wrote: "Change and decay in all around I see; Oh, Thou who changest not, abide with me." To all of these in their human quest for security *God the Sustainer* made Himself manifest, and through these to many others.

In the third place, let us examine similarly the Wish for Response. The significance of this Wish for our present inquiry is that it serves as the basis of all our capacity for social experience. It is this Wish which puts us in quest of love, affection, intimate understanding. It is not so obvious, but probably just as true, that it is this same Wish which enables us to stand on the giving end of social experience. Psychology suggests that the way this is brought about is somewhat as follows: Each of us begins life thoroughly selfish. (Incidentally, if American theology has been unrealistic in its estimate of man's sinfulness, it did not learn this false lesson from modern psychology. It got it rather from Rousseau and the general optimism which has characterized American civilization. Modern psychology has never cherished any illusions concerning human nature. It has been as far removed as possible from any sentimental talk about native goodness or automatic unselfishness or easy devotion to noble causes. Modern psychology has rather consistently drawn human nature as being basically selfish, and winning its way to regard for others and devotion to high causes only with the greatest difficulty.) But, to return to the former point, modern psychology suggests that each of us begins life thoroughly wrapped up in himself. Each of us approaches others in the first instance to get, and not to give. How, then, do we make any beginning at all at regard for others? One answer at least is: Through reading into others what we first experience in ourselves. Because we know how intense the hunger for affection is in ourselves, we can begin to posit such a hunger in others and make a start at satisfying it. Because we know what it is to suffer pain, we can bring ourselves on occasion at least to shield others from pain. Our love for others, then, is rooted in self-love; our pity for others is first of all self-pity; our campaigns for justice for others would be impossible if we had not first known what it was to want justice for oneself. It is in this sense that we may say that the Wish for Response is the basis of all our capacity for social experience—both the giving and the receiving aspects of it.

Now what has this Wish to do with the question of a point of contact between God and man? Why, it is this Wish which causes us to reach out for a companionship which is more than

human. It is at this point in human nature that we may look for and find the psychological root of that intimate companionship with the Divine which we call mysticism. Very often, it seems, people turn to mysticism because their hunger for Response has not been satisfied by human companionship, and they must satisfy it—if not in the earth beneath, then in the heavens above the earth. Confucius on one occasion lamented: "Alas, there is no one that knows me. I murmur not against heaven. I grumble not against men. My studies lie low, and my penetration rises high. But there is heaven; that knows me." This is the coldly practical Chinese temperament speaking. Confucius is not able even to say "He"—merely "that." And yet how precious to him is the assurance—"that knows me." Tulsi Das, a sixteenth century poet from the warmer southland of India, cries out to Vishnu: "Lord, look thou upon me! naught can I do of myself. Whither can I go? To whom but Thee can I tell my sorrows? Oft have I turned my face from Thee and grasped the things of this world; but Thou art the fountain of mercy; turn not Thou thy face from me.—Lord, Thy ways ever give joy unto my heart. Tulsi is thine alone; and O God of mercy, do unto him as seemeth good unto Thee." And Pratt, studying the religious experience of twentieth century Americans, "discovered that it is not as a giver, but as a companion God is valued and sought; it is not His gifts, but Himself which the religious soul desires." (Summarized in Uren, *Recent Religious Psychology*, p. 95.) In all these instances we see clearly the Wish for Response leading men toward God.

And now let us turn the matter around and view it from the Godward side. To what in man but this longing for Response and this capacity to give it would *God the Father* reveal Himself? In fact, how could He reveal Himself as a Father except to men who knew from personal experience what it was to want affectionate understanding, as well as to give it? Dickie in his *Revelation and Response*, (p. 101) says: "and many perhaps would acknowledge that for them adumbrations, suggestions, or symbols, at first sight purely human, have proved to be the medium of the Word of God. Many are prepared to believe that such adumbrations are given in the loyalty of friends, the love of husband and wife, the

affection between parents and children, and that these are not less divinely given because they are manifested in human nature." (He says this, incidentally, in reply to a statement from Barth's *Credo*, p. 24 which inverts this process: "So we must not estimate by natural human fatherhood, what is meant by God being our Father. But from the Fatherhood of God natural human fatherhood acquires any meaning and value inherent in it.") Without denying the elements of truth in Barth's statement it seems reasonable that Dickie is on the whole right. It is only because of our human longing for fathering and our capacity—however slight—for fatherhood that *God the Father* can make Himself known to us.

And it is but a step from *God the Father* to *God the Redeemer*. When Jesus wanted to describe to his hearers the redeeming grace of God, the love that will not let men go no matter how far they stray in their sin from the Father's house, he chose a parable whose central figure was a father. His hearers would have had no understanding of that parable if they had never seen a father, or experienced anything akin to a father's love. So it is that the Wish for Response, which leads us first to seek understanding, sympathy, and affection from others and then to manifest these qualities ourselves in some slight measure at least—this Wish for Response may be thought of as the point of contact in men upon which *God the Father and Redeemer* lays hold in order to make Himself known to us. We may believe that He made us so, in order that He might so reveal Himself.

And, finally, let us examine in like manner the Wish for Recognition. The point of contact which this Wish affords is not apparent on the surface. The connection between the Wish for Recognition and God's self-revelation lies in the fact that this Wish is the foundation of the moral sense in each human being. Our first steps toward a sense of what is right and wrong do not consist in hard thought on ethical issues, nor yet in quick flashes of ethical intuition. Our first and second steps (and many steps thereafter) toward a moral sense consist in trying to apprehend and live up to the customary standards of the society in which we live—to steal no more than those about us steal, to lie no more than those about us lie, to hate no more than those about us hate. And why do we make this attempt to conform? Because we want

the approval of our fellows, and must conform in order to get it. This social origin of the moral sense or conscience is clearly seen in the words "moral" and "conscience." Moral means that which is customary. Conscience—"cum" and "scio"—means a knowledge which is held in common with others. We may hold therefore, I think, that the foundation of the moral sense in each individual is the Wish for Recognition, which makes him sensitive to the moral code of the social group to which he belongs. Later he may, perchance, go beyond the moral code of those about him and become an ethical pioneer, but that step is taken by comparatively few and it is for them a last, not a first step. We may fittingly use here a Biblical quotation which Dean Sperry aptly used in another connection: "And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another's, who will give you that which is your own?"

But this is not the end of the process! In due time people take the moral code which has been formed within the matrix of their common life, and with a sublime leap of faith affirm that this code is the will of God. That this is the true order of events is borne out by no less an authority than George Foote Moore, who says, "Religion was not made ethical, but morality religious." Now the moral code is supported not merely by social sanctions, but by the weighty sanctions of religion. Behind it is not merely the approval of men, but the approval of God. Every set of Commandments is finally believed to originate not down in the valleys where men live and move, but on the mount which burned with fire. Are men deluded in thus identifying their highest moral insights with the will of God? By no means; their understanding of God's will may be very imperfect, but God Himself, who made them and the world in which they live, has been leading them onward and upward at every step of the way, and they are perfectly justified in holding that the best and highest they know has come to them from a source outside themselves and represents, however incompletely, that which is eternally true and high.

But now let us retrace our steps somewhat. The child who begins his moral pilgrimage out of a heart-felt Wish for Recognition by his fellows, ends it by standing bare-headed and shame-faced before a God of righteousness, crying out: "Search me, O God, and know my heart: Try me, and know my thoughts; And

see if there be any wicked way in me, And lead me in the way everlasting." . . . All of which is only another way of saying that if it were not for this deep-seated Wish for Recognition in mankind *God the Law-Giver*, the God of righteousness, the God of Amos, would have difficulty in making Himself and His ways known to men. Any account such as the foregoing must do some violence to the facts through over-simplification, but perhaps we may be permitted to feel that in essence it is true. If so, the Wish for Recognition affords a point of contact to which *God the Law-Giver* can appeal in revealing Himself.

We have tried to take human nature as a non-religious psychologist would describe it and inquire if there are within it any points of contact between God and man. The line of thought we have followed may seem to be unduly winding and roundabout, and the conclusions to which it leads unduly tentative. The concept of revelation we have employed is so much less warm and sure than the prophet's "Thus saith the Lord"; or the Oxford Group's consciousness of divine guidance day by day; or the biblicist's Word of God. And yet one sometimes wonders if indeed God's self-revelation is so sure and plain, why there must be so many books written about it. As a matter of fact, God's revelation of Himself seems to be far more indirect than direct, and it conceals as it reveals. God would have defeated His own purpose if He had revealed Himself too suddenly and plainly. He might by that procedure have produced men and women who could pass a perfect examination in theology, but they would not be sons and daughters.

So it may well be that His Wisdom and His love have shown themselves in this: not to unveil Himself suddenly, but to disclose His nature and His will here a little and there a little; not to create man with some sure religious faculty which would enable him to reach out unerringly for the Divine, but rather to endow him with a nature to which, through many points of contact, He could slowly make Himself known as *God the Creator, God the Sustainer, God the Father and Redeemer, God, the Law-Giver*.

Psychology permits us still to say: "Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our souls are restless till they rest in Thee."

Lancaster, Pa.

SHAKESPEARE THE MAN¹

N. E. McCURE

Few scholars, I think, would question the statement that the three books that have left the most important impress on Anglo-Saxon civilization on both sides of the Atlantic, on English speech, on English thought and feeling—the three books that have done most to shape our daily living—are, first, the King James translation of the Bible, incomparable in the strength and beauty of its language; secondly, the Book of Common Prayer, used in the English Church and in the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, an anthology of the piety of a thousand years, a book for four centuries familiar from childhood to learned and ignorant alike, a book that has disciplined and shaped English speech and English feeling through the years; and, thirdly, Shakespeare—if we consider his thirty-seven plays as a single book—the secular Bible of the English-speaking world—Shakespeare, who of all men seems best to have understood our common human nature, who clothed his thoughts in language hauntingly beautiful and moving, who gave us in his dreams a picture of life that, like all true art, is life itself seen through the personality of the artist.

The personality of Shakespeare is naturally of interest to a reader of his plays: it is natural to wish to find the man in his writings—not Shakespeare the poet, or Shakespeare the actor, or Shakespeare the successful business man (as he assuredly was)—but the man himself; to form some idea of the disposition, the likes and dislikes, the attitude toward life in general, of the human being named William Shakespeare.

This afternoon I shall not perplex you with an account of the conflicting and contradictory conjectures that have been made about Shakespeare the man, or of the books—many of them most annoying—that attempt to prove that he was a devout Catholic like Isabella in *Measure for Measure*, a scoffing materialist like Macbeth, a lawyer, a soldier, a sailor, or to prove that Bacon or some other wrote the plays. Books about Shakespeare are as the sands of the sea, and nothing is so fantastic that it has not at some

¹ The second of the McCauley Lectures, January 17, 1939.

time or other been said about him. He has, of course, not escaped the notice of the biographers of the newer schools. He has not escaped the gossips and the psychoanalysts. He has been "psychoanalyzed" by Frank Harris, from whom we learn that Shakespeare was a man of an utterly base and debauched life, that his plays are the product of the moral wreck of a great nature. The book, as Professor Felix E. Schelling has remarked, tells us very little about Shakespeare but a great deal about Frank Harris.

If we are to learn much of Shakespeare's personality we must put aside books of this kind, and turn instead to what his contemporaries said about him, then to inferences that can be drawn from the known facts of his life, and finally to what Shakespeare himself wrote.

Most of the contemporary references are to Shakespeare's work, and very few indeed to the man himself. Several of his contemporaries, including Ben Jonson, who knew him well, call him "our gentle Shakespeare." The word "gentle" had, of course, a broader meaning than now: it meant "well bred," "possessing the qualities that mark a gentleman or well-born person." Henry Chettle, who knew him slightly, writes of his gracious and pleasant manner and of his reputation for upright and honorable conduct. Finally, after Shakespeare's death, we have from Ben Jonson the most important testimony of all: "I loved the man, and do honor his memory, on this side idolatry, as much as any. He was, indeed, honest (*i.e.*, honorable), and of an open and free nature." And Ben Jonson, be it remembered, was not given to extravagant praise of his contemporaries.

Next, let us consider what inferences about his character can be drawn from the known facts of his life. We know that he was born of a well-to-do middle-class family, that during his boyhood had met with financial reverses; that at the age of twenty-three he found himself with a wife and three children to support; that he went to London, became an actor, and rewrote old plays; that he put his savings back into the company that employed him; that he prospered, acquired considerable wealth, and bought property, including the best house in his native Stratford; that he enforced the payment of certain debts; that he obtained the grant of a coat of arms; and finally that before he reached the age of fifty, after

a quarter-century in London, he retired to Stratford, where his wife and daughters were living. From this bare outline all that we can safely assume is that he was practical and adaptable, that he worked hard, that he was at least moderately thrifty, and that he was fond of his family and the pleasant neighborhood of his youth.

When we turn to his writing to discover something about his character and personality, we find ourselves in the midst of dangers and difficulties. He built his plays on old stories, many of them familiar to his audience, and for that reason he was not always free to change the story or the characters as he may have wished. He was no more free to make a noble Richard III or a benevolent Shylock than a modern dramatist is free to make a dishonest and cowardly Abraham Lincoln.

We must therefore ask, How much of any one of his plays is referable to Shakespeare's sources, and what changes did he make in these sources? We must further ask, How many of his characters are merely stock figures? We might hastily conclude, for instance, from his picture of Holofernes in *Love's Labour's Lost*, that Shakespeare disliked schoolmasters did we not know that the pedantic schoolmaster is a stock character in Italian comedy, and is here merely borrowed by the youthful Shakespeare as a convenient means of producing laughter. In short, we must remember that his work is modified by the literary and ethical conventions of his day, and by the prejudices and predilections of theatre-going London three centuries ago. Without a knowledge of Elizabethan England, the reader cannot see wherein Shakespeare differed from the other men of his day, and why, in some respects, he differs from us.

Still other difficulties present themselves. We must remember that Shakespeare wrote, not autobiography, but drama. It is autobiography only if we can read between the lines. With which of the hundreds of men and women that he created did he sympathize? When can we safely say, "Here is William Shakespeare speaking?" No evidence is more misleading than that of a quotation torn from its context. We read "Put money in thy purse" and elsewhere "Neither a borrower nor a lender be" and we exclaim, "What a shrewd, worldly-wise old fellow Shakespeare is!" But who said, "Put money in thy purse?"

Not Shakespeare, but Iago, the most villainous of Shakespeare's villains. And who said, "Neither a borrower nor a lender be?" Not Shakespeare, but foolish old Polonius. Or we read:

"There's such divinity doth hedge a king
That treason can but peep to what it would,
Act little of his will."

And we say that Shakespeare believed a divine providence protected the sacred person of the king. But in their proper setting these words are bitterly ironic: they are the words of Claudius, who has recently murdered his brother, the King of Denmark. Or we read that magnificently sombre passage from *Macbeth*:

"To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow,
Creeps in this petty pace from day to day,
To the last syllable of recorded time;
And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
The way to dusty death. Out, out, brief candle!
Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player
That struts and frets his hour upon the stage
And then is heard no more: it is a tale
Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
Signifying nothing."

Here again we can be sure that it is not Shakespeare speaking: it is Macbeth, broken and desperate, who cried out against life. Life to Macbeth, but not to Shakespeare, was "a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury." No passage of Shakespeare should be quoted for itself and out of its context.

It is only after repeated readings of all of Shakespeare's plays against the background of Shakespeare's England that one can with any certainty discover the man Shakespeare in the plays, or can judge with any sureness of Shakespeare's sympathies and antipathies, or can say that here indeed is the voice, not of Brutus or Hamlet or Prospero, but of Shakespeare himself.

A reading of Shakespeare reveals, of course, that the tone of the plays changed as he grew older. How much of the change is referable to his growing experience of life and to the natural maturing of his powers, how much to personal experiences of which we know nothing and about which it is hazardous to guess, how much to changing literary conventions in London and to the

changing taste and demands of his audience—these are questions that no one can answer. It is clear, however, that the gaiety of his earlier plays is followed by greater seriousness and a brooding melancholy which at times approaches bitterness and misanthropy; and it is clear also that in the last three plays that he wrote—*Cymbeline*, *The Winter's Tale*, and *The Tempest*—we find a more serene mood, the mood of the older and wiser man who lives again in recollection the past that once was his and who seeks his happiness in the joy and hopefulness of those who are shortly to succeed him.

But to return to our main question: What does a thoughtful reading and re-reading of the plays reveal of the man who wrote them? The evidence of the plays seems to support the evidence of Shakespeare's contemporaries: that he was a man of gracious and pleasant manners, gentlemanly, honorable, of an open and free nature. A reader of the plays finds it hard to believe that Shakespeare was other than sweet-tempered, modest, and unassuming. The early plays leave the impression of a disposition more gay than grave; they seem like the work of a young man, happy, alert, light-hearted, blessed with a keen enjoyment of absurdities, and disliking pretense and affectation. Kindliness and true courtesy are other qualities that the general tone of these early plays leads us to believe Shakespeare possessed. In *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, when the yokels are attempting to present a play, the kindly spirit of Shakespeare seems to speak in the words of Theseus:

Never anything can be amiss
When simpleness and duty tender it.

And I believe that we hear the voice of Shakespeare, and not of Hamlet, when that prince bids Polonius see that the visiting actors are properly entertained at Elsinore. It should be noted that this passage has nothing to do with the plot and no essential relation to Hamlet himself. Says Hamlet: "Let them be well used." And Polonius replies: "My lord, I will use them according to their desert." Whereupon Hamlet answers: "Use them better than they deserve. Use every man after his desert, and who should 'scape whipping? Use them after your own honour and dignity. The less they deserve, the more merit is in

your bounty." These are the words of a man honorable and of an open and free nature.

It is clear from a reading of the plays that Shakespeare was more at home in the country than in the city, that he preferred the Cotswolds to London, that he was neither physically feeble nor inactive, and that he was fond of field sports. He seems, however, to have had no strong natural love of adventurous deeds. The exploits of Drake and Raleigh and the dreams of national expansion shared by so many of his contemporaries find no place in Shakespeare's dramas. The England that he knows and loves is the little England,

this little world,
This precious stone set in the silver sea,
Which serves it in the office of a wall,
Or as a moat defensive to a house.

His England is not the mistress of the ocean, but

England bound in with the triumphant sea,
Whose rocky shore beats back the envious siege
of watery Neptune.

The reader does not seem to hear Shakespeare's voice in the warrior speeches of Hotspur, Henry V, Othello, Coriolanus. He does not feel Shakespeare's presence in the ambition of Macbeth or in the fierce pride of Coriolanus. When we hear Shakespeare's voice—and we hear it from many mouths beside Romeo's and Hamlet's and Prospero's—it is the voice of a man with a happy, enjoying, and in the later plays reflective nature, not the voice of a man boastful, pushing, self-assertive, or eager for strenuous action.

The reader of Shakespeare will notice that he shows no particular admiration for or dislike of any one class of society. In his plays men and women in all stations of life—kings, nobles, and common people—exhibit at times stupidity, incompetence, cruelty, and selfishness, as well as true nobility and unselfish love. But he recognized—as who does not?—the inherited or acquired superiority of some men—that some men are superior to other men in character and ability and therefore better qualified to rule, and he believed in the necessity of recognizing that superiority.

Shakespeare did not like man in a crowd. He knew that crowds are fickle and dangerous. He knew that the history of human progress is made up of a series of triumphs of the minority over the majority. Shakespeare likes the common man as a man—not as a political animal and not when ruled by mob spirit, and he has left us many sympathetic pictures of country people, farmers, and shepherds. In all classes of society and in all circumstances what he paints with most affection is the tenderness and fidelity of women, the honesty, justice, and good sense of men, the unselfish love that ennobles men and women whatever their station in life. He recognized—as we all must recognize—that if we are to have a better world it will come from a change, not in any social or political machinery, but in the hearts of men, in the character of the rulers and the ruled.

Most readers will agree with Professor Andrew C. Bradley in believing that Shakespeare was a man almost devoid of envy, hatred, revenge, or avarice. We may recall Jonson's words, "He was honest (*i.e.*, honorable) and of an open and free nature," and we may observe that these words are true also of most of Shakespeare's heroes. Jonson, indeed, almost quotes Iago, who in speaking of Othello said,

"The Moor is of a free and open nature,
That thinks men honest that but seem to be so."

The words "open and free" apply also to Hamlet, Brutus, Lear, Timon. Antony and Coriolanus are men naturally frank, liberal, and large. Prospero lost his dukedom through his trustfulness. Romeo, Toilus, Duncan, Macduff, and many slighter characters are of the same type. Now, as Professor Bradley has pointed out, such a free and open nature is especially exposed to the deception, treachery, and ingratitude of others. If it is also a nature sensitive and intense, but not vigorous and active, such experiences will tempt it to melancholy and embitterment. If such a nature is active, it may become the prey of violent and destructive passion, such as that of Othello and Coriolanus. These sufferings and passions of free and open natures are Shakespeare's favorite tragic subjects, and one cannot help thinking that he chose to depict what he understood best and what his own nature was most inclined to feel.

If Shakespeare was indeed this kind of man—of an honorable, open, and free nature, generous, sensitive—in short, a man who would be easily and deeply hurt by the treachery and ingratitude of those in whom he too readily trusted, one can account for the tone of melancholy and disgust that pervades the plays of the period from 1602 to 1606—*Hamlet*, *Troilus and Cressida*, *All's Well That Ends Well*, *Measure for Measure*, *Othello*, *Lear*, *Timon*, *Macbeth*.

For certain qualities and for certain types of character Shakespeare seems to reveal admiration. He admires self-control in men. He seems to dislike coldly selfish natures, and prudent, cautious, calculating men, and people who lack, or have deadened, the natural desires for joy and sympathy. The reader must detect Shakespeare's particular aversion to servility and flattery (especially when deliberate and practised for the purpose of self-advancement), for feigning in friendship, for ingratitude.

As Professor Bradley observes, some of the vices that seem particularly odious to Shakespeare have a special connection with prosperity and power. Men feign and creep and flatter to please the powerful and to win their own way to ease and power; and they envy and slander their competitors in the race; and when they succeed, they are ungrateful and hard and unmerciful, and despise and bully those below them. So, perhaps, said Shakespeare to himself in those years when, as we imagine, melancholy and embitterment overclouded his sky, though they did not obscure his faith in goodness.

Throughout his plays the moral issues are central with him. He has the English interest in conduct. His code has a solid ethical foundation. To himself he seems to say: "I must rule myself with a rule of iron, but to my fellow-man let me extend all understanding and sympathy, and a forgiveness that wipes out all memory of former sin or failure." It is a precious possession, this high Shakespearean ideal, in an uncharitable world, for above the plays—with all their truth and beauty—is this greatness of heart, this true magnanimity, which brings one close to the spirit and the words of a greater than Shakespeare, "And the greatest of these is charity."

Of Shakespeare's religion it may be safely said that he was not an ardent Puritan or an ardent Roman Catholic or an ardent

atheist. He perhaps concerned himself little, if at all, with differences of doctrine or church government. He felt very keenly the sufferings and wrongs of men, the strength of evil, and the hideousness of certain forms of it. He depicts sinful men, but leaves us in no doubt that goodness has a touch of divinity in it. One thought recurs in his plays again and again: that to befriend, to support, to help, to cheer and illuminate our fellow-men is one of our first duties:

Heaven doth with us as we with torches do,
Not light them for themselves; for if our virtues
Did not go forth of us, 'twere all alike
As if we had them not.

Like the true Englishman that he was, he appreciated both material and spiritual values. Without despising the good things of this world—riches, fame, rank, power—he knew that these things are of no weight when set in the balance against duty and virtue. He saw the sublime background to the pettiness and insignificance of our existence. He knew, if any man ever knew, the sickness of heart, the sorrows and sufferings of mankind. He knew, if man ever knew, the beauty of goodness.

What, it may be asked, is Shakespeare's attitude towards evil and its consequences, towards the power that rules the world? He looks at evil as a foul and corrupt condition or growth produced by the world order, yet alien to it, as disease is to a body, a disease which, if health is to be restored, must at all costs be expelled. In his tragedies, Shakespeare shows man in conflict with some law or universal acceptance—shows us man involved in a rebellion against fate, against God, or against some accepted human code. He shows us a world governed by a force that destroys those who so rebel, even though the destruction of what is evil entails the destruction of much that is good—the destruction of Desdemona as well as of Othello and Iago. "Poetic justice," in the ordinary sense of that term, we do not find in Shakespeare's tragedies—that is, we do not find that prosperity and adversity are distributed in proportion to the merits of men. Such so-called justice is, as we know, in flagrant contradiction with the facts of life, and it is absent from Shakespeare's tragic picture of life. Although villainy in Shakespeare never remains victorious, the innocent suffer with the guilty. Evil is ultimately

destroyed, but with it is destroyed priceless good. This, of course, offers no solution of the riddle of life: that riddle remains a mystery—a painful mystery. And it is in this mood of mystery that Shakespeare closes:

The cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The splendid temples, the great globe itself,
Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve
And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,
Leave not a rack behind. We are such stuff
As dreams are made on, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep.

Of this world that we see—this puzzling imperfect world in which men know so much of joy and pain—we are the inheritors, the transitory possessors; we live in it for a little, and then we depart from it; we pass from sleep to sleep through a waking dream.

A poet, wrote Wordsworth, is "a man speaking to men! a man . . . endued with more lively sensibility, more enthusiasm and tenderness, who has a greater knowledge of human nature, and a more comprehensive soul, than are supposed to be common among mankind; a man . . . who rejoices more than other men in the spirit of life that is in him."

Shakespeare was such a man. He was, as we have seen, a man gentle, honorable, of an open and free nature; generous, warm-hearted, kindly, smiling at the absurdities of man, yet sensitive to beauty in nature and in character; a man who admired self-control, patience, forgiveness; a man who had nothing but scorn for the selfish and calculating; a man who knew human nature at its best and at its hideous worst; a man who again and again depicted the ennobling power of unselfish love. In short, he was of all writers the wisest, the sanest, the most kindly.

As we read Shakespeare, as we come to a deeper appreciation of the beauty and truth that inform his work, as we become more and more familiar with the greatness of his nature, the wonder of his achievement grows upon us. But the greatest wonder is this: that the wisest, the kindest, most charitable mind that the modern world has produced was not a great theologian; not a cloistered scholar; not a philosopher dwelling aloof in contemplation; not a poet dreaming in his ivory tower. The greatest

wonder is that the wisest, kindest, most charitable mind in modern history should have been given to us in the person of a poor country boy who became a common player, and who, as a busy man in noisy, crowded, dissolute, plague-ridden London, achieved the supreme place among those who have employed the magic of the written word.

"Read him," wrote his first editors, who were also his friends and fellow-actors. "Read him, and again and again: and if then you do not like him, surely you are in some manifest danger not to understand him."

Ursinus College,
Collegeville, Pa.

THE THINGS WHICH UNITE*

BY THOS. C. PEARS, JR.

During my pastorate at Braddock, Pennsylvania, back in the fateful days of 1917, the Knights of Columbus launched a drive for their community war-chest, and invited the pastors of the local Protestant churches to be their guests at the dinner which was to open the campaign. Upon my arrival I was somewhat disconcerted to discover that none of my brethren were present. However my welcome was cordial, and I was seated with the "fathers" at a long table on a raised platform at one end of the room. After dinner I was called upon to speak, and took occasion to preface my remarks by observing that although we recognized the serious differences between us, nevertheless it was my firm belief that the things which united us were mightier than the things which divide. Later on in the evening I found myself walking home with a Catholic layman, who remarked in the course of our conversation that he wished we might get together oftener, as he had been brought up to believe that a Protestant clergyman had horns and hoofs. Finally, when the results of the drive were published in the local newspaper, together with a note of appreciation for the generous support

* An address delivered before the Historical Society of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, May 10, 1939.

which had been received from the Protestants of the community, imagine the satisfaction with which I discovered, embedded in the text of the report and without the use of quotations, the very words in which I had expressed my own profound conviction—*The things which unite us are mightier than the things which divide.*

A FORTIORE

If this be true with regard to Presbyterians and Roman Catholics, *how much more* is it true with regard to Presbyterians and Reformed—your great Communion and mine!

This fact was first brought home to me by an examination of the files of the *Journal* of the Presbyterian Historical Society of which I am Secretary, in the opening number of which publication occurs the following statement of policy: "The Presbyterian Historical Society belongs to no single branch of the Presbyterian family. . . . This Society represents catholic Presbyterianism. The so-called 'Southern Presbyterian Church' is represented herein. . . . That vigorous offshoot known as the 'Cumberland Presbyterian Church' is one of our family. The United Presbyterian Church and the several Reformed Presbyterian Churches, known by diverse titles, are represented here. The 'Reformed Church,' a child of the Mother Church of Holland, and the 'Reformed Church' of the German Palatinate are both actively interested in our Society. This is 'Pan-Presbyterianism' engaged in the sacred work of preserving the memory of the noble founders of that Scriptural church which has had so large a part in the foundations of our national prosperity, and which, more than any other force, has moulded the ecclesiastical and civil history of those European nations from which we derive our descent."

These are fair words to be sure, "but," you may ask me, "how about performance?" In regard to your own Church permit me to state that three of your great historians,—James Crawford, James I. Good, and William J. Hinke—have been among its most active members, and that two of them were Vice-Presidents for many years. But even more impressive is the relative amount of space devoted to articles and to the printing of source material

in the pages of our *Journal* during the course of the last forty years. Indeed you may be surprised to learn that one-tenth of its contents, at least, has been devoted to documents of primary interest to the student of your ecclesiastical history, making a volume of well over 800 pages, and including among other valuable contributions, the Diaries of Samuel Guldin and Michael Schlatter and the Letters of John Philip Boehm. Incidentally, it gives me great pleasure to place in your hands this morning a full bibliography of all this material which is of particular interest to you.

THESIS

Surely it should not be difficult for me to support my thesis this morning, that the things which *unite us* are mightier than the things which divide. "All the American branches of the Reformed and Presbyterian family," to cite another extract from the opening number of the *Journal*, "may be said to have an origin which is substantially one. In our Colonial days the unity of British and Continental Presbyterianism was recognized quite as cordially as it is to-day. The noble Reformed Church, which has grown to such vast proportions, the Church of the Palatinate, the Church of Zwingli, was fostered in its origins in the Classis of Amsterdam, and rooted itself on our soil beneath the Dutch Reformed Church of Holland. The Presbyterian Synod and Assembly gave sympathy and active aid. Our history is one, our polity is substantially one, and we are united in a common purpose."

As we examine this statement in the light of the evidence, we are not only convinced that it is true, but that it can be amplified without doing violence to the facts of history. Thus it can be said that our roots are the same; the occasion of our coming to this continent, identical; the time of our arrival, synonymous; the territory we occupied and the fields within which we sought to serve, largely within the same limits; while the pattern of our development throughout the colonial period, including our zeal in behalf of civil and religious liberty, and our service in the cause of American Independence, was likewise the same, with such differences only as one might expect to find in our use re-

spectively of the English and the German tongue. Alike Calvinistic or Reformed in doctrine and Presbyterian in polity, *our distinctive names combine* to designate our essential unity in all which we consider vital in a pure and Scriptural Church.

EARLY CONTACTS

Turning, however, from these broad generalizations, there is no more fascinating field of investigation than that of the early contacts of our two Communion during those pioneering days in which our Presbyterian Fathers described themselves as "the skirts of Christ's Church in this American wilderness."

Our own official Records contain a number of references, from which the limits prescribed by the present occasion will permit us to cite but a few. There is the reference, for instance, in the Minutes of the Synod of Philadelphia, dated, May 27, 1737, under which the Clerk of the Synod records the following: "A letter was brought in from Mr. Henricus Goetschius to Mr. Andrews, signifying his desire, and the desire of many people of the German nation, that he might be ordained by order of Synod to the work of the ministry, upon which the said Mr. Goetschius was desired to appear before the Synod, that they might see his credentials and have some discourse with him; which being done, he produced testimonials from Germany, which were ample and satisfactory to the Synod respecting his learning and good Christian conversation; whereupon he was recommended to the care of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, to act upon further trials of him, with respect to his ordination, as to them should seem fit." This candidate fared far better than another whose application to the Presbytery of Donegal is recorded under date of April 7, 1742, as follows: "A Paper containing a representation of several high Germans in Lancaster County, being Calvinists, requesting that we would examine & ordain one Mr. Templeman, who has been exercising all the parts of the ministerial office for several years, was read; as also a letter from Mr. Ricor a Calvinist Minister in Lancaster cautioning us against the same enforced with some reasons, after reading of which, parties being removed, the Pby agree that we have not the least clearness to ordain sd Mr. Templeman; but rather, if he were under our

jurisdiction, severely to rebuke & censure him as a presumptuous intruder into sacred work and office of the Ministry, even tho he had learning & parts which upon tryal we find he hath not and further we Judge that seeing there are other Ministers of his own Chh & nation, he ought to apply to them."

Perhaps the classic reference to these early contacts, however, is found in the letter of the Rev. Jedidiah Andrews, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, addressed to the Rev. Thomas Prince of Boston, and dated October 14, 1730. Although extracts from this letter have appeared in print again and again, as it seldom appears in full and is so detailed and racy withal, I beg your indulgence in bringing it once more to your attention at this time:

"There is, besides, in this province, a vast number of Palatines, and they come in still every year. Those that come of late years are mostly Presbyterians, or, as they call themselves, *Reformed*—the Palatinate being about three-fifths of that sort of people. They did use to come to me for baptism for their children, and many have joined in the other sacrament. They never had a Minister until about nine years ago, who is a bright young man, and a fine scholar. He is at present absent, being gone to Holland to get money to build a church in this city; but they are scattered all over the country; those that live in town are mostly a kind of Gibeonites, hewers of wood, &c. They are a diligent, sober, frugal people, rarely charged with any misdemeanor. Many of that class who live in the country, and have farms, by their industry and frugal way of living, grow rich, for they can underlive the Britons, &c. The first comers of them were called Palatines because they came last from that country, but are mostly Switzers, being drove from the Canton of Bern, for they are Baptists and will not fight or swear. They do not shave their beards, and are many of them wealthy men, having got the best land in the province. They live sixty or seventy miles off, but come frequently to town with their wagons laden with skins, (which belong to Indian traders,) butter, flour, &c. There are many Lutherans and some Reformed mixed among them. In other parts of the country they are chiefly Reformed; so that I suppose the Presbyterian party are as numerous as the Quakers,

or near it. There has lately come over a Palatine candidate of the Ministry, who having applied to us at our Synod for ordination, it is left to three Ministers to do it. He is an extraordinary person of sense and learning. We gave him a question to discuss about Justification, and he has answered it in a whole sheet of paper in a very notable manner. His name is John Peter Miller, and speaks Latin as readily as we do our vernacular tongue, and so does the other, Mr. Weis."

I could wish that I had the time to speak of the part played by our Synod in the establishment and carrying on of the German Schools in Pennsylvania, and of the years at the beginning of last century when Commissioners from your Synod and our Assembly sat as fraternal delegates in one another's supreme judicatory; but I must confine myself to a brief account of the earliest effort to achieve organic union, which some of you may be surprised to learn occurred almost two centuries ago.

CHURCH UNION

In the year 1743, the Rev. Peter Henry Dorsius returned to Holland on a visit, and reported to the deputies of the North and South Holland Synods, who inquired whether the "Dutch and German Churches could not be united with the Presbyterian Synod." On his return to America they furnished him with letters to the German Reformed congregations of Pennsylvania and to the Presbyterian Synod of Philadelphia. The latter acted favorably upon the matter at its session held May 25, 1744, and addressed a letter to the Dutch Synods in which they wrote in part as follows:

"Your concern for the churches in these American regions has filled us with the greatest joy. As to the information given you by Reverend Dorsius concerning the deplorable state of religion among the Hollanders, and especially the German Reformed, we attest to its truth. From our most diligent inquiry into the truth of the matter, we know that in this whole province there is no one, except one or two pastors, who exercise any care over the many thousands of people. They consequently are in the greatest danger of gradually losing all knowledge of true religion, or of joining the Moravians or other sects who are continually chasing

after them to lead them astray and pervert them. We have observed these evils for a long time to our sorrow and have proposed to the people to connect themselves with our Synod. Though they admitted the proposition to be good and reasonable, nevertheless the matter remains undone. Your letters having been read in the Synod, it was unanimously agreed that the Reformed congregations, both the Dutch and the German, should receive the Communion together with their pastors, and help one another as far as lies in their power in promoting the common cause of religion. And if this union would be effected we cannot but hope that much good will result from this people and their prosperity, and if the matter will progress favorably it will tend to promote every Christian affection among them and their pastors."

Unfortunately this effort at union failed to materialize, the following objections having been urged against it by John Philip Boehm:

"1. They (the German Reformed) did not wish to give up their Congregational constitution drawn up by himself. 2. They did not understand English, and union would, therefore, be useless. 3. They did not want to give up their Creed, the Heidelberg Catechism. 4. They were not willing to give up the Canons of Dort, to which, as a part of the Reformed Church of the Netherlands, they had been pledged. 5. They did not wish to give up their use of liturgical forms on extra occasions, as at sacraments and marriage."

It may not be considered irrelevant to the present occasion to remark parenthetically that the two most weighty of these objections have long since disappeared. It has been many decades since the use of the German language offered any obstacle to our closer association; just as it was many years before I was born that our General Assembly passed its historic resolution approving the use of the Heidelberg Catechism, and recording its "cordial rejoicing at the continued and increasing evidence of agreement and union, among those whose symbols maintain the faith once delivered to the saints."

Aware as I am, that this is an exceedingly brief and sketchy account of this early attempt at union, it must suffice. It is, however, an important historical event in that it was not the last

but the first of a series of attempts that have been made in the course of nearly two centuries to consummate such a union, all of which have failed. Does this record of uniform failure, therefore, disprove my thesis that the things which unite us are mightier than the things which divide? My own answer to this pertinent question is an emphatic "No!" It is rather my profound conviction that the true explanation is to be found in "the will not to unite" which has characterized the Reformed family of churches throughout their history.

THE WILL TO UNITE

If we but had *the will to unite*, organic union would come to pass almost overnight, easily overcoming every obstacle that remains in the way. For any serious study not only of the history of our respective churches, but of their purposes and ideals at the present time, is enough to convince us that the things which unite us are at least *more important* than the things which divide. And if the day of union is still far distant, it is due to the fact that the will *not* to unite is stronger than the will to unite.

If then it be a matter of *will* more than any other single thing, as I firmly believe, permit me to pose this question: Is this *will not to unite* the will of God for us? Is it the mind and will of Christ? I for one dare not say so in view of His intercessory prayer that "they may all be one that the world may believe."

The whole Christian world is rejoicing today in the recently consummated union of the three great branches of the Methodist Church. While I was neither invited here today to speak of Church union, nor have I been authorized to speak officially for the Presbyterian Church, I cannot refrain from saying that if I were to be permitted to live to see the union in one mighty body of all the great branches of our dearly beloved and glorious Church, I would be ready to say, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word: for mine eyes have seen thy salvation." And I do not hesitate to affirm that such a union would mark an epoch in the history of Christianity, and that through our unity many would be turned from unbelief to belief.

An ancient strategy that has won many victories has been "to divide and conquer." In this day, therefore, when the forces of

evil are threatening the very foundations of all that we hold dear as at no previous period since the Reformation, can we afford to lend aid and comfort to the enemy through our divisions? Has not the hour come when a united Protestantism, under the leadership of the Great Head of the Church, should marshal its combined forces in order that we may be able to withstand in this evil day? "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." Wherefore let us be "not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is."

LIST OF ARTICLES ON THE DUTCH AND GERMAN REFORMED CHURCHES PUBLISHED IN THE JOURNAL OF THE PRESBYTERIAN HISTORICAL SOCIETY

1. Historical Sketch and Characteristics of the Reformed Church in America. By P. H. Milliken. (Vol. I, pp. 25-31.)
2. History and Characteristics of the Reformed Church in the United States. By James Crawford. (Vol. I, pp. 32-40.)
3. Church Record of Neshaminy and Bensalem, Bucks County, 1710-1738. By Wm. J. Hinke. (Vol. I, pp. 111-134.)
4. Recent Ecclesiastical Researches in Holland. By E. T. Corwin. (Vol. I, pp. 161-188.)
5. The Reformed Church in the United States. By James I. Good. (Vol. I, pp. 358-359.)
6. Items of Historic Interest in the Reformed Church in America during 1902. By P. H. Milliken. (Vol. I, pp. 361-362.)
7. The First German Reformed Colony in Virginia: 1714-1750. By Wm. J. Hinke. (Vol. II, pp. 1-17; 98-110; 140-150.)
8. Henry Sassaman Dotterer. By Wm. J. Hinke. (Vol. II, pp. 243-250.)
9. The Early History of the First Reformed Church of Philadelphia. By Wm. J. Hinke. (Vol. II, pp. 292-309.)
10. The Magazine of the Reformed Dutch Church. (Vol. II, pp. 340-342.)
11. Memorial Volume of the Classis of Amsterdam. (Vol. III, p. 55.)
12. Diary of the Rev. Michael Schlatter. Edited by Wm. J. Hinke. (Vol. III, pp. 105-121; 158-176.)

13. Early Attempted Union of Presbyterians with Dutch and German Reformed. By James I. Good. (Vol. III, pp. 122-137.)
14. Diaries of Early Missionaries Traveling Among the German Reformed Churches: 1743-1749. By Wm. J. Hinke. (Vol. III, pp. 219-223.)
15. The Early History of Wentz's Reformed Church, Montgomery County, Pa. By Wm. J. Hinke. (Vol. III, pp. 332-346.)
16. The Origin of the Reformed Church in South Carolina. By Wm. J. Hinke. (Vol. III, pp. 367-389.)
17. The Early German Hymn Books of the Reformed Church in the United States. By Wm. J. Hinke. (Vol. IV, pp. 147-161.)
18. The Reformed Church of South Africa. By Henry Beets. (Vol. V, pp. 22-30.)
19. Calvin and the New World. By James I. Good. (Vol. V, pp. 179-187.)
20. The Earliest Account of Protestant Missions. By James I. Good. (Vol. V, pp. 367-373; Vol. VI, pp. 1-6.)
21. The Old Reformed Churches of Prussia, Germany. By Henry Beets. (Vol. VI, pp. 69-74.)
22. The Writings of the Rev. John Philip Boehm, Founder of the Reformed Church in Pennsylvania. By Wm. J. Hinke. (Vol. VI, pp. 295-324; Vol. VII, pp. 24-60; 113-141; 274-303; 305-333; 353-384; Vol. VIII, pp. 70-89; 97-113; 162-183; 210-225; 258-281.)
23. The Heidelberg Catechism and Its 350th Anniversary in 1913. By James I. Good. (Vol. VII, pp. 96-104.)
24. The First Presbyterian Synod in America. By James I. Good. (Vol. IX, pp. 208-214.)
25. Incidents of Reformed Church Life in New York City During the Revolutionary War. By Charles E. Corwin. (Vol. IX, pp. 355-367.)
26. The First Protestant Confessions of Faith in America. By James I. Good. (Vol. X, pp. 13-16; 49-56.)
27. Ye Ancient Pastor's Busy Week. By Charles E. Corwin. (Vol. X, pp. 84-93.)
28. The Introduction of the English Language into the Ser-

- vices of the Collegiate Dutch Church of New York City. By Chas. E. Corwin. (Vol. X, pp. 175-188.)
29. The Influence of Luther upon Manhattan Island During Its Childhood. By Chas. E. Corwin. (Vol. X, pp. 230-236.)
30. A Calvinistic Founder of America. By James I. Good. (Vol. XI, pp. 260-267.)
31. James Crawford, 1841-1923. By J. P. Wickersham Crawford. (Vol. XII, pp. 1-4.)
32. Rev. Prof. James I. Good, D.D., LL.D. By Wm. J. Hinke. (Vol. XII, pp. 65-81.)
33. The First Dutch Minister in America. By Chas. E. Corwin. (Vol. XII, pp. 144-151.)
34. Efforts of the Dutch-American Colonial Pastors for the Conversion of the Indians. By Chas. E. Corwin. (Vol. XII, pp. 225-246.)
35. The Bi-Centennial of the Reformed Church in the United States. By Wm. J. Hinke. (Vol. XII, pp. 325-338.)
36. The First Ministers of the Middle Colonies. By Chas. E. Corwin. (Vol. XII, pp. 346-384.)
37. Efforts of the Dutch Colonial Pastors for the Conversion of the Negroes. By Chas. E. Corwin. (Vol. XII, pp. 425-435.)
38. Early History of the Lower Saucon Reformed Church. By Wm. J. Hinke. (Vol. XII, pp. 464-479.)
39. The Tercentenary of the Reformed (Dutch) Church. By H. S. Demarest. (Vol. XIII, pp. 226-236.)
40. Diary of the Rev. Samuel Guldin, Relating to His Journey to Pennsylvania, June to September, 1710. By Wm. J. Hinke. (Vol. XIV, pp. 28-41; 64-73.)
41. The Reformed Dutch Churches of the City of New Brunswick, N. J. By the Hon. Joseph S. Frelinghuysen. (Vol. XIV, pp. 267-280.)
42. Record of New Publications Relating to Presbyterian and Reformed Church History: 1903-1930.

BOOK REVIEW

The Educational Work of the Church. Nevin C. Harner, Ph.D. The Abingdon Press: New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1939.

This book, recently published, promises to rank high among the Abingdon Religious Education Texts of which John W. Langdale is the general editor. It is a comprehensive treatment of the ideal of religious education and the method by which it may be achieved in the local church. It appears at an opportune time and meets a definite need. It reflects the results of Dr. Harner's own prolonged study and experience in his chosen field and of numerous conferences with ministers and laymen on the topics so graphically stated as chapter heads: I. What is Christian Education? II. Building a Program to Fit the People. III. Bringing Order out of Chaos. IV. Why Bother with the Children? V. Putting the School Back into the Church School. VI. Training for Church Membership. VII. The Minister and His Young People. VIII. Developing Lay Workers. IX. Reaching the Home. X. Christian Education in Strange Places. Under the cover of these attractive titles, the vital principles and issues of Christian Education are thoroughly treated. Nothing is more apparent throughout the volume than the author's conviction "that the Church greatly needs the insights and methods of Christian Education," and that "the minister holds a strategic place in building the insights and methods of Christian Education into the life of the Church." The spirit and method of the treatment is manifest in his definition, "Christian Education is a reverent attempt to discover the divinely ordained process by which individuals grow toward Christlikeness, and to work with that process." It is a process which is neither haphazard nor miraculous, but orderly and amenable to the laws of personality growth. Its ways and means are psychological and sociological. "The program of religious education must, therefore, fit the people."

The chapter, Bringing Order Out of Chaos, is a striking analysis of the complexity of local church organization and an attempt to simplify it on the basis of the psychological and sociological point of view. In order to do this, religious education is conceived so broadly as to include all the functions of the church. The diges-

tive center of the organism becomes a Board of Spiritual Planning. One cannot, however, escape the feeling that such a board is a new creature, not naturally born out of the traditional constitutional polity of the church. It is wheel within a wheel. Despite the difficulty, the analysis is illuminating and the new type of organization is prophetic of things to come. One would have to go far to find a more interesting chapter than "Why Bother with the Children." Its historical perspective and insight mark it as one of the most telling chapters of the book. "Putting the School back into the Church School" clearly sets the new educational emphasis and illustrates its method. It views all the operations of the local church as educational. What makes it notable is the concreteness of the suggestions offered to ministers, how to make the church truly educational in spirit and power. In taking up the question of "Training for Church Membership," one of the high points of the treatment appears. It assumes that Protestantism has not had a thorough-going view of the Church as an organism, but in the statement of the significance of the Church and training for membership, the chapter seems to fail to offer a substitute, in that the means of grace as transmitted by the historic church are not considered. The practical suggestions offered for training into membership cover all the special problems a minister finds in dealing with the issue. Training for church membership is a training for life and service in the Kingdom of God. It is quite probable that when pastors read the chapter on "The Minister and His Young People," they will almost instinctively subject themselves to a self-examination as to their attitude toward young people. It is quite apparent that the author has had much experience in dealing with children and young people and comes to the treatment of this chapter with a variety of effective suggestions that is remarkable. The same is true in analyzing the problem of developing lay workers and reaching the home. In all these the same psychological point of view revealed in the other chapters appears. The real difficulties are faced in a very frank and fair way. The pros and cons are always given. The special applications of the last chapter, Christian Education in Strange Places, sets the whole educational process squarely into the issues of community life and the welfare of humanity.

The entire volume is written in a fine, concrete and effective style. The author's faith in humanity is unbounded. His enthusiasm for young people pervades the volume like an atmosphere. It should be read by all ministers and workers with young people. We do not know of a more comprehensive treatment of the question, How the Educational Ideal may be achieved in the Local Church.

EDWARD S. BROMER.

BOOKS RECEIVED

The Friendship Press, publishers of the finest missionary education texts imaginable, are kind enough to send us a copy of each new book as it comes from their presses. The nature of these books makes an extensive review unnecessary, but the brevity of this notice is no measure whatsoever of the worth of the books. They deserve the attention of any minister interested in missions and missionary education.

Dinabandhu: A Background Book on India. By Ruth Isabel Seabury. Friendship Press. 1938. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, \$.60. A source-book on India for American youth.

Rebuilding Rural America. By Mark A. Dawber. Friendship Press. 1937. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, \$.60. Written by an outstanding authority on rural church work.

Homeland Harvest. By Arthur H. Limouze. Friendship Press. 1939. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, \$.60. A discussion of the past, present and future of Home Missions.

Right Here at Home. By Frank S. Mead. Friendship Press. 1939. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, \$.60. Home Missions stories that should be of interest to older children, young people, and even adults.

Welcome House. By Jessie Eleanor Moore. Friendship Press. 1939. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, \$.50. A children's reader containing true stories of a missionary family in Iran which returned to the United States for a year. There is an accompanying teacher's manual.

Far Round the World. By Grace W. McGavran. Friendship Press. 1939. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, \$.50. Missionary stories—true ones—for Juniors.

"Heaven Knows." By Margaret H. Brown. Friendship Press. 1939. Cloth, \$1.00. An account in narrative fashion of the present desolation in China and the help being given.

Through Tragedy to Triumph. By Basil Mathews. Friendship Press. 1939. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, \$.60. The sub-title describes it well: "The World Church in the World Crisis." Based rather freely on Oxford, Edinburgh, and Madras.

N.C.H.