Volume VIII OCTOBER Number 4

Bulletin

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

OF THE

REFORMED CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES

EVANGELICAL AND REFORMED CHURCH

LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA
1937

CONTENTS

Seminary News 271
Oxford and Edinburgh. NEVIN C. HARNER 275
Modern Trends in Theology. D. J. WETZEL 290
Necrology 304
Book Notices 308
Corrections and Additions to the Centennial Register 312

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

EVANGELICAL AND REFORMED CHURCH

VOLUME VIII, 1937

LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA

CONTENTS

No. 1

The Centennial Register 1–160

No. 2

Annual Catalogue 161–202

No. 3 AND No. 4

Seminary News 203, 271

Choral Music in the Christian Churches. ALMA S. MUELLER 212

Opening the Sealed Book. OSWIN S. FRANTZ 228

The Religious Life of the Common People in the Late Middle Ages. RUSSEL C. EROH 238

The Place of Eschatology in Present Day Preaching. PAUL J. DUNDORE 254

Oxford and Edinburgh. NEVIN C. HARNER 275

Modern Trends in Theology. D. J. WETZEL 290

Necrology 304

Book Notices 269, 308

Corrections and Additions to the Centennial Register 312

BULLETIN

Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States

VOLUME VIII OCTOBER, 1937 NUMBER 4

SEMINARY NEWS

The opening exercises of the one hundred and thirteenth year of the Seminary were held on Tuesday afternoon, September 14th. Dr. Richards presided, and Dr. Harner gave the address.

There is scarcely a place on earth more lonely than the buildings of an educational institution during the summer recess. For this and other reasons it is good to hear voices in the halls again, and to see the faces of old students, new students, and alumni.

The incoming class of Juniors numbers thirteen men—eleven of whom are members of the Evangelical and Reformed Church. Their names, together with their home addresses and colleges, are as follows:

Name	*Home Address*	*College*
Louis Meid Becker	Baltimore, Md.	Heidelberg
Harry Clare Carolus	Altoona, Pa.	Catawba
Lester Ehret	Mt. Carmel, Pa.	F. and M.
Harry Fister Fenstermacher	Hamburg, Pa.	Ursinus
George Irvin Lehman	Lancaster, Pa., R.D. 1	Eastern Mennonite School, Elizabethtown, Millersville
Christian Neumann	Annapolis, Md.	Elmhurst and St. John's
Christopher Jewett Noss	Lancaster, Pa.	Catawba
Henry Shenberger Raab	Dallastown, Pa., R.D. 1	F. and M.
Frank Earl Reynolds	Bethlehem, Pa.	Ursinus
Albert Edward Shenberger	York, Pa.	Catawba
George Abraham Smith	Bath, Pa.	Moravian
Paul Elwood Strauch	Cressona, Pa.	Catawba
Donald Fritz Thomas	Rohrerstown, Pa.	Findlay and F. and M.

In addition to these Juniors it is our pleasure to welcome three new men to the upper classes. Elwood Thornton Dyson, of Phila-

delphia, Pa., joins the Middle Class. He is a graduate of Franklin and Marshall, and has attended Hartford Theological Seminary and a summer session of Union Theological Seminary. Elmer Aaron Dech, whose home is near Northampton, Pa., joins the Senior Class. He is a graduate of Muhlenberg College, and has attended the Moravian Theological Seminary. Charles Stahr Hartman, of Lancaster, is ranked as a Senior also. He is a graduate of Franklin and Marshall and of the Yale Divinity School.

Rev. Russel E. Etter, of Campbelltown, Pa., comes to us as a special student. He is a graduate of Lebanon Valley College and of the University of Pennsylvania. He is a pastor in the United Christian Church. Rev. James C. McGehee is also a special student. His home address is Charlotte Court House, Va., and he has attended Roanoke College and Columbia Theological Seminary.

It is rather amazing to note that these eighteen men represent among them twenty-one separate schools.

* * * * *

The placement of the incoming Juniors in Field Work positions has been completed—thanks to the hearty cooperation of the Evangelical and Reformed ministers in this vicinity and the Community Service Association of Lancaster, Pa.—Becker, Carolus, Ehret, Neumann, and Shenberger have been assigned to the Community Service Association. They will study the philosophy and methods of social case-work, visit the various social service agencies of the community, and make actual contacts with individuals and families who are in need of help—material or otherwise. Fenstermacher will teach a class of Junior High School boys at St. Paul's Church. Lehman will continue the class which he has been teaching in the Mennonite Colored Mission of Lancaster. Noss will be the teacher of an Adult Bible Class at St. Andrew's. Raab will teach a class of Junior boys at St. Peter's. Reynolds will have an Adult Bible Class at Salem Church, Rohrerstown. Smith will teach a class of young people at Faith Church. And Strauch will go to St. Luke's as teacher of a class of catechetical age.

This contact with the life of the community and Christian work within the community is by no means limited to the Juniors.

Quite a few of the Middlers are attached to nearby churches in one capacity or another, and one member of this class is working with the Community Service Association.

* * * * *

We are happy to note the election of two more graduates to charges. (The July issue of the *Bulletin* contained the names of those who had been elected up to that time.) Rev. George E. Herbert has been installed as pastor of Zion Charge, Blain, Pa. Rev. Richard J. Keen has been installed to the pastorate at Steelton, Pa.

* * * * *

An action was taken at the recent sessions of Potomac Synod which must be of great interest to all alumni and friends of the Seminary. The action in question consisted of instructions to the Trustees of Potomac Synod to transfer to the Trustees of the Theological Seminary at Lancaster a sum amounting to more than $12,000 whose purpose is the permanent endowment of a fellowship for graduate study.

The beginnings of this fund were made almost fifty years ago. At that time Potomac Synod was engaged in raising an endowment for the Potomac Synod Professorship at the Seminary, which is the Professorship of New Testament Science. When the chairman of the endowment committee reported to the Synod at its 1890 meeting in Hanover, Pa., he revealed that several subscriptions had been received toward a Fellowship Fund. The initial subscriptions amounted to about $1,000. The Fund grew slowly, but in due time—chiefly by dint of accumulated interest—it reached and surpassed the original goal of $10,000. When this occurred, the Synod took the above-mentioned action in order that the Fund might be put in operation.

The rules for the administration of the Fund, as found in the minutes of Potomac Synod, are as follows:

"The Fund shall be called 'The Synod of the Potomac Fellowship Fund.' This Fund shall consist of a minimum of $10,000 whose income shall be used for the following purpose:

"The object of this Fund shall be to enable a student designated by the Faculty to pursue a course of study approved by the Faculty of this Seminary in an institution similarly approved.

"Students who are members of the Reformed Church shall be eligible to this Fund; provided, they have completed a full course in a college of recognized standing, and a three-years' course in this Seminary; and provided their scholarship, general culture and physical condition are satisfactory to the Faculty.

"Men in the active work of the Reformed Church, who have fulfilled the above conditions, shall also be eligible to this Fund.

"This Fund shall be given to men for the period of one year; at the discretion of the Faculty, it may be given for a second term. The appointee shall make semi-annual reports of his work to the Faculty, copies of which shall be placed on record."

Here, then, is something new in the life of the Seminary—a Fellowship Fund for graduate study. We shall look forward eagerly to its use for the first time, which may be in the fall of 1938. It should prove of great value to the Seminary and the Church.

—N. C. H.

OXFORD AND EDINBURGH

Nevin C. Harner

It is natural that our thoughts should turn today to the Oxford and Edinburgh conferences. We may be sure that we are not alone in this. During this month and many months to come reference will be made in every corner of the earth to Oxford and Edinburgh. For these two conferences, taken together, constitute an unprecedented effort on the part of world-wide Christendom to find a single voice.

It is hard to capture in words the settings of these two ecumenical conferences. Oxford is a city slightly larger than Lancaster, containing within its borders twenty-five or thirty colleges. Into this ancient seat of learning there came on July 26th representatives of the Church universal with the dust of almost every land under heaven upon their feet. There were Lutheran bishops from the Scandinavian countries, Anglican arch-deacons, French pastors, professors from Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, long-haired and long-frocked Greek Orthodox priests, missionaries from South Africa, bishops from India and Australia, distinguished educators from China, and of course the irrepressible North Americans. There were in all between seven and eight hundred delegates at Oxford, one-third of whom were official representatives of the constituent churches and the rest coopted specialists, associate delegates, and youth visitors. World Christendom was completely represented at Oxford—with two notable exceptions. The one was the great Church of Rome, which was invited to participate but could not see its way clear to accept the invitation. The other was the German Evangelical Church, whose representatives were prevented from coming by the action of the German government.

The task to which the Oxford Conference set itself was severely practical. It was a conference on Life and Work, and particularly the life and work of the Church in the face of the rising tide of nationalism in many sections of the earth. After some preliminary addresses to point the problem we settled down to our five sections, in which the major work of the Conference was done.

Nothing reveals the subject-matter of Oxford better than the themes of these five sections. They were: "The Church and the Community"; "Church and State"; "Church, Community, and State in Relation to the Economic Order"; "Church, Community, and State in Relation to Education"; "The Universal Church and the World of Nations." (It should be said parenthetically that the word "Community" was used at Oxford in a special sense. It did not signify a town such as Lancaster, but rather the self-consciousness of an entire people. It was the English equivalent of the German word "Volk.")

Two full weeks were spent thus; then a week of respite from conferences; and then to Edinburgh for another two weeks on questions of Faith and Order. Our meetings in Edinburgh were in historic St. Giles' Cathedral where John Knox's voice once thundered to the world, in the Assembly Hall of the Church of Scotland, and the buildings of New College of Edinbugh University—all under the shadow of the old medieval castle which dominates the city. There were fewer of us at Edinburgh. The official report seems to be 414 delegates from 122 communions in 43 countries, plus some youth visitors. Once more the circle of representation from Christendom was complete except for the Roman Catholic Church and the Evangelical Church of Germany. As at Oxford the three languages of English, German, and French were in constant use, and every report or address given in one of the three had to be translated into the other two. There was the same variety and picturesqueness of costume, which provided a happy hunting-ground for photographers—both professional and amateur. One reverend gentleman from the Balkan states was so gloriously arrayed that some of us in private dubbed him "His Magnificence." There was a learned Greek Orthodox professor who, for all his length of beard and correctness of costume, could smoke a cigarette with a nonchalance which any college student might well envy. To watch the delegates moving in and out of the corridors was in itself a lesson in church history and a vivid reminder of the universality of the Christian Church.

If the task of Oxford was practical, that of Edinburgh was intensely theological. Again, the titles of the four commissions reveal clearly the business of the Conference. The first com-

mission dealt with "The Grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ." The second, to which both Dr. Richards and I belonged—he as chairman and I as a mere member, studied "The Church of Christ and the Word of God." The third commission addressed itself to the troublesome subject of "The Church of Christ: Ministry and Sacraments." And the fourth explored the theme, "The Church's Unity in Life and Worship."

It would be a hopeless task to attempt to report in any detail either the proceedings of the two conferences or the findings at which they arrived. Many of us have doubtless read the reports in *The Christian Century* and elsewhere, and will continue to read the articles and books inspired by these conferences. What does seem feasible here is to gather up a few major impressions of the scene which unrolled itself at Oxford and Edinburgh. Here was world Christendom assembled on a more truly ecumenical scale than at any time since the days of Nicea and Chalcedon (and perhaps not even then!). What did this world Christendom look like? Of what was it thinking? What did it care for chiefly? In what directions is it moving? At some risk of missing the truth through over-generalization let us try to formulate some answers to these questions.

Perhaps the first impression which one could not help but carry away with him from Oxford and Edinburgh was that there is such a thing as a common, essential Christianity which unites countless millions into one brotherhood and, by any count, is a force to be reckoned with in our modern world. One could not possibly be mistaken about this! Here it was, beneath all differences of language, culture, doctrine, or polity—a common faith, a common experience, a common outlook upon the world, a common allegiance. It was a faith distinguishable from all other faiths, whether of Buddhism, or Mohammedanism, or nationalism, or secularism. It was a sufficient faith, by which a man could live and if need be die. It was an experience which we had all known equally, from whatever part of the world we came. Christianity had meant somewhat the same to all of us. When we came together to discuss or to worship, we did so not as strangers but as people who had walked the same road and seen the same things and felt the some emotions. It was an outlook

upon the world, its issues and problems, which we all held in common. We were not viewing the world from different vantage-points, but from the same vantage-point. Whether it was economics, or world peace, or education at which we looked, we saw them from the same angle and with the same lights and shadows. And it was an allegiance which was well on the way to transcending all other allegiances which a man might have. We were members of different communions, and citizens of different nations, but servants of the same Lord.

This common, essential Christianity was alluded to at the very outset of the first conference. The Archbishop of Canterbury in his opening address, after speaking of the magnitude of the task we were attempting, went on to say: "What then is the basis of our attempt from which it may gain strength and inspiration and hope? It is the reality of what we call our common Christianity. There is often a tendency to belittle this common Christianity in the interests of a strict denominationalism on either a large or a small scale. We have rather to magnify it. Truly if it were only a vague instinct or sentiment, an ideal or an aspiration, it would have little worth or strength. But if it be based as it surely is in the mind of this Conference on great Acts of God wrought within the sphere of man's life and history, on the faith that God has intervened in this world order and revealed Himself in the birth, the life, the death, the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and if this faith transcending differences can combine and hold all who profess it in an active unity, then it must prove to be a mighty force."

When the Oxford delegates prepared a message to their absent brethren of the Evangelical Church in Germany, they addressed them in the name of this common, essential Christianity. The central paragraph of the message reads as follows: "We remember the words of the Scriptures, 'There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling'; 'If one member suffer all the members suffer with it, or one member is honoured all the members rejoice with it.' So we, your brethren in other Churches, are one with our suffering brethren in the German Evangelical Church in love and prayer. Your Lord is our Lord, your faith our faith, your baptism our baptism. We are moved

to a more living trust ourselves by your steadfast witness to Christ, and we pray that we may be given grace in all our Churches to bear the same clear witness to the Lord."

Again when the delegates at Oxford approached the question of the Church and war, their starting-point was not an analysis of the causes of war nor yet a portrayal of the consequences of war, but merely a reaffirmation of this common, essential Christianity against which war is such a heinous offense. The report clearly says: "Here again our starting point is the universal fellowship of Christians, the *Una Sancta*. All Christians acknowledge one Lord, whose claim upon them is such as to transcend all other loyalties. Here is the first obligation of the Church, to be in living fact the Church, a society with a unity so deep as to be indestructible by earthly divisions of race or nation or class."

This conviction of deep-lying unity, grounded in a common faith and experience, grew rather than diminished as the days went by. Gradually there came over us—I suppose my experience was fairly typical—a sense of belonging to something infinitely greater than a congregation, or a denomination even. We belonged to nothing less than a world-wide Christian fellowship. And in that fellowship, together with the faith on which it rested and the ideals to which it was committed, it began to appear that the salvation of the world might be found to lie. This was, I think, the most heartening thing which came out of Oxford and Edinburgh.

A second impression was that the will to visible unity was strong at both conferences. The important word here, of course, is the word "visible." There was no question as to the reality of the underlying unity of faith and experience of which we have just spoken, but this was not enough. What the delegates at Oxford and Edinburgh wanted was *visible* unity. They wanted not merely one faith, and one Lord, but one Church as well. And there were men at both places who wanted this with all their hearts. A few brief examples in substantiation of this point must suffice.

In no one was this passion for unity more clearly manifest than in the truly great chairman of the Edinburgh Conference, Arch-

bishop Temple, of York. In his opening sermon he allowed it to come to clear expression. "How," he said, "can the Church call men to worship of the one God if it is calling to rival shrines? How can it claim to bridge the divisions in human society—divisions between Greek and barbarian, bond and free, between white and black, Aryan and non-Aryan, employer and employed—if when men are drawn into it they find that another division has been added to the old ones—a division of Catholic from Evangelical, or Episcopalian from Presbyterian or Independent? A Church divided in its manifestation to the world cannot render its due service to God or to man, and for the impotence which our sin has brought upon the Church through divisions in its outward aspect we should be covered with shame and driven to repentance." His entire conduct of the Conference was in line with this sentiment.

Or again, there was that plea from India, spoken by Bishop Azariah of Dornakal, who was a highly respected leader at both conferences. He pictured for us the six million Christians in India out of a total population of three hundred and fifty million. In such a situation, he said, the question of Christ or no-Christ was far more important than the relative merits of episcopacy, presbyterianism, and congregationalism. He told us of a conversation he had had with a leader of the depressed classes in India. This leader had intimated that his fellow-Hindus were about ready to come over in large numbers to Christianity. "But," he had said, "we are united in Hinduism; we shall be divided in Christianity." Bishop Azariah confessed that he had no answer to give him. In the close of his address the bishop, representing the younger churches of the world, spoke to us as a son to his fathers in Christ. He thanked us for all that we had done for him and his people in admitting them to the Christian faith, but he wondered if we had considered seriously enough the gravity of our sin in perpetuating divisions within the Church of Christ. To the younger churches, he said, it was a matter of life and death.

This longing of many hearts came to fullest expression in the Affirmation of Unity with which the Edinburgh Conference drew to a close. (At Lausanne a decade previously there was only a

Call to Unity; here there was more—an Affirmation of Unity.) The statement was drafted by a representative committee, adopted unanimously by the Conference, and read by Archbishop Temple in the solemn moments of the closing worship service in St. Giles' Cathedral. Its carefully chosen phrases reveal truly the spirit of both Edinburgh and Oxford.

"We humbly acknowledge that our divisions are contrary to the will of Christ, and we pray God in His mercy to shorten the days of our separation and to guide us by His spirit into fulness of unity.

"We are thankful that during recent years we have been drawn together; prejudices have been overcome, misunderstandings removed, and real if limited progress has been made towards our goal of a common mind.

"In this Conference we may gratefully claim that the Spirit of God has made us willing to learn from one another, and has given us a fuller vision of the truth and enriched our spiritual experience.

"We have lifted up our hearts together in prayer; we have sung the same hymns; together we have read the same Holy Scriptures. We recognize in one another, across the barriers of our separation, a common Christian outlook and a common standard of values. We are therefore assured of a unity deeper than our divisions.

". . . We pray that everywhere, in a world divided and perplexed, men may turn to Jesus Christ our Lord, Who makes us one in spite of our divisions; that He may bind in one those who by many worldly claims are set at variance; and that the world may at last find peace and unity in Him; to Whom be glory forever."

It is not strange, in the light of such a clear will to unity, that both conferences should have committed themselves to a step toward visible unity which may prove to be of great significance. Both conferences approved the setting up of a World Council of Churches. This Council may well be thought of as a Federal Council, only on a larger scale. The tentative plans provide for a General Assembly of representatives of the Churches of the world with a membership of perhaps 200, and an Executive Committee

of about 60 members. The General Assembly, it is planned, will meet every five years; the Executive Committee every year. This plan must be submitted, of course, to church judicatories throughout the world. If it is approved, there will no longer be a separate Life and Work movement, and another on Faith and Order, but both of these interests will be subsumed under the new World Council. It may be that we are about to see the whole of non-Roman Christendom federated in a single unity, and able to act and speak—in some matters at least—not with many voices but with one.

A third impression which a delegate was bound to carry away with him from both Oxford and Edinburgh was that, if we fall short at present of visible unity, the chief obstacle to such unity is nothing more nor less than differing conceptions of the Church. The Archbishop of York said so, in as many words, in committing the several subjects to the various commissions at Edinburgh. The trend of both conferences abundantly supported his statement.

It became clear at Oxford that the chief obstacle to Christian unity is not some basic cleavage concerning the practical meaning of Christianity. It might have been supposed that when the representatives of so many different communions assembled, as they did at Oxford, to consider the bearing of the Christian faith upon economics or war and peace there would have been uncovered differences of conviction that were well-nigh insuperable; but it was not so. There were differences, of course, but these were not of the sort to keep denominations apart. As a matter of fact the degree of unanimity manifested at Oxford was little short of amazing. As I recall now, only one opposing vote was cast there in the course of the consideration of five separate reports. If nothing more were needed for union than a fair measure of agreement on the practical meaning of Christianity, reunion could be effected tomorrow.

Similarly, it became clear at Edinburgh that there is nothing in the realm of the doctrine of grace which is sufficient to keep the several branches of Christendom apart. The first commission, whose subject was "The Grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ," opened its report with the sentence: "With deep thankfulness to

God for the spirit of unity, which by His gracious blessing upon us has guided and controlled all our discussions, we agree on the following statement and recognize that there is in connection with the subject committed to our Section no ground for maintaining division between Churches." Incidentally, it is interesting to note that at Lausanne ten years ago the theological problem of the grace of God was a source of considerable division. Today that is no longer true.

Virtually the same can be said of the theological problem of the Word of God. I was in the commission which dealt with this subject, as was Dr. Richards. I think he will agree with the assertion that if reunion of the churches waited only upon a reasonable consensus of opinion concerning what we mean by the Word of God, the reunion could be consummated without further delay.

The fourth commission at Edinburgh by the very nature of its subject disclosed no stubborn barriers to unity. Its task was to explore practical ways of promoting unity, rather than to examine obstacles.

By a process of elimination, then, we come to the work of the third commission at Edinburgh on "The Church of Christ: Ministry and Sacraments." It is in this area, clearly, that the difficulty lies. The word went around at Edinburgh, while the commissions were still hard at it, that Commission III was having a difficult time. When the reports came out before the entire conference, our fears were vindicated. The statement of Commission III did not move forward confidently and surely. Instead, it moved haltingly, uncertainly, and with many "if's" and "but's." It was interlarded with footnotes and parentheses, in which one group or another had recorded their reservations. At the end of the discussion, though the report was accepted by the conference, it contained a minimum of inspiration and hope for the future.

The fault, of course, lay not with the personnel of Commission III but with the difficulty of the subject assigned them. On the one side were the so-called high churches, such as the Anglican and Greek Orthodox, with their distinctive emphases upon apostolic succession, a valid ministry, and the centrality of the sacraments. On the other hand were the so-called low churches, such

as the Baptist, Congregational, Methodist, and—I suppose—our own, with less emphasis upon the sacraments and no insistence at all upon the principle of apostolic succession. Between these two ecclesiastical groups there is a great gulf fixed, which no man as yet knows how to cross.

It was doubtless a severe strain upon the patience of the high church advocates to put up with us who attached little importance to things central to them. And certainly it was hard for us to possess our souls in patience while they talked at length of matters which were largely outside the circle of our interest. And yet be patient we must—all of us! The high church emphasis came to the fore time and again—sometimes at the most unexpected points. For example, on one occasion we were considering the following sentence: "We acknowledge that through Jesus Christ, particularly through the fact of His resurrection, of the gathering of His disciples round their crucified, risen, and victorious Lord, and of the coming of the Holy Ghost, God's almighty will called the Church into being." The sentence was on the point of being passed without objection, when an Orthodox delegate rose to take exception to the phrase "called into being." God could not have called the Church into being, he maintained, because the Church had existed from all eternity coeval with God Himself. I was reminded of the good Moslem doctrine that the Koran has existed from all eternity coeval with Allah. It seems that the human mind operates in much the same manner in all parts of the earth. At any rate we changed "called into being" to "constituted," and both sides were reasonably well satisfied. Perhaps the high church emphasis reached its logical extreme in a note on the place of the Society of Friends which was embedded in the report at one stage in its development. The note said in part: "We greatly hope that in the United Church the members of the Society of Friends may be included, but we are unable as yet to see what place they will have in a Church united on the basis of genally acknowledged Ministry and Sacraments." Consider for a moment what this note does! In the face of the matchless quality of Christian life which the Quakers have exhibited to the world they are on the verge of being read out of the United Church—merely because they lack an acknowledged ministry and sacra-

ments. This seemed to some of us dangerously close to putting the cart before the horse. Happily this entire note was later stricken out, and a statement in a different vein substituted for it.

But if the high church emphasis was predominant (as I frankly think it was at Edinburgh), the low church point of view was not without its occasional spokesmen. There was the time, for example, when Prof. Vischer of Basel, Switzerland, quietly reminded the Conference that in the prayer which our Lord taught his disciples the petition reads "Thy Kingdom come," not "Thy Church come." And there was also the Sunday evening session when Harold Cooke Phillips, Baptist minister of Cleveland, let loose a mighty protest against all institutionalism. The Conference had spoken a great deal of the Church as the body of Christ. So it is, said Dr. Phillips, but the body was made for the spirit, and not the other way around! There were some who felt that Dr. Phillips was unnecessarily outspoken, but his address was the belated expression of sincere convictions earnestly held by quite a few but largely repressed until that moment. When they finally came to the surface, it is not to be wondered at that they did so with a mild explosion.

It seems clear, then, that in this realm of the Church, her ministry, and her sacraments the chief barriers to visible unity are to be found. Because of differences in this realm it was not possible for us either at Oxford or at Edinburgh to hold a truly joint service of Holy Communion, in which ministers of any church might officiate and to which members of any church might come. We could not eat together at the Lord's table, because we could not agree concerning the meaning of that table and the qualifications of the ministers who should officiate thereat. It is upon these points that the ecumenical movement will need to concentrate a large share of its attention in the future.

A final impression to be noted concerns theology. I think it is fair to say that there was discernible at both conferences a rather clear theological trend, and that this trend is in the direction of a return to the modes of thought of the sixteenth century in preference to those of the twentieth, the modes of thought of Europe rather than those of America. Any such generalization is of course dangerous and is vulnerable to attack from many quarters,

but perhaps in the by and large it can stand. A few examples drawn from behind the scenes as it were—discussions in small groups and stray conversations—may serve to illustrate the point.

In our section at Oxford I took occasion in the midst of one discussion to mention the key-phrase of the Christian youth movement of America, "Christian Youth Building a New World." Somewhat to my surprise (although not entirely, because I was partly prepared for it by that time) the chairman of our section, President Henry Sloane Coffin, of Union Seminary, rebuked me mildly for introducing the phrase. His reason, of course, was that the phrase is repulsive to perhaps a majority of the Continental delegates. To begin with, they find it hard to envision the possibility of building a new world. They have been through too much in the past twenty years. Furthermore, if a new world could be built, many of them would hold that it is scarcely the church's business to address itself directly to this task. The church's business, rather, is to bring individuals one by one under the power of the gospel. (Emil Brunner said in an address at Oxford: "There is nothing more easy, and nothing more fruitless, than to construct a Christian social program.") Besides, if a new world is to come at all, man can have little to do with its arrival. It must come down from above, from God Himself. This exaltation of God and corresponding distrust of man was clearly marked throughout both Oxford and Edinburgh, particularly in the thought of the Continental delegates. I have pondered many times a conversation which I had in the streets of Oxford one night with a young Swiss theological graduate. He is a personal disciple of Karl Barth, very keen mentally, and one of the interpreters at both conferences. In the course of our talk he said: "It would have been a good thing for you in America if the coming of Roosevelt had been delayed four years; your theology might have been better." In other words, if we had gone deeper into the pit of the depression we would have learned to trust ourselves less and God more. I could hardly believe my own ears, but that is what he said. Here, then, is one evidence of a theological trend which, while not universal, was considerably to the fore at both conferences.

At Edinburgh it fell to the lot of our second commission to

define the meaning of the phrase "the Kingdom of God." The result of our attempts is embodied in a section of the Edinburgh report, but behind the present wording of that section there lies a significant history. Three separate conceptions of the Kingdom are noted in the report as it now stands. The first is to be found in the following words: "Some lay emphasis on the actual presence of the Kingdom within the Church and the continuity of the two, holding that the coming of the Kingdom can be seen in the progress of the Church in this world and the work wrought through believers." Here the Kingdom is roughly identified with the Church. The second conception is contained in these words: "Others lay emphasis on the Kingdom that is to come in glory." Here is the apocalyptic conception of the Kingdom—a divine gift from above, presumably at the time when Christ shall come in glory. The third conception is found in these words: "and others again think of the Kingdom as the ever-increasing reign of the righteousness and the love of God as manifested in Jesus Christ in every realm of life." Now the significant thing is that the original report contained only the first two conceptions. The third, which is doubtless the one most congenial to American thought during the past quarter of a century, had to be added as a sort of afterthought. Here is another straw which shows how the wind is blowing.

If time permitted, it would be interesting to examine the conception of revelation which obtained at Edinburgh, and of Jesus Christ, and of the Church, and of the sacraments, but we must forego any mention of these points. Perhaps enough has been said to support the statement that the theological trend at Oxford and especially at Edinburgh was toward the modes of thought of the sixteenth century and away from those of the twentieth, toward the thought-forms of Europe and away from those of America.

There can be little doubt that the net results of this trend will be, in part, good. For one thing it is restoring in us a lively sense of God's greatness, His majesty, His power, and by the same token is begetting a revival of worship in its original meaning—"worthship." The worship at both Oxford and Edinburgh did the soul good. In every service—without, I think, exception—we

were led straightway to fix the eyes of our spirits upon God Himself, and in that mood we worshipped. Again, the current trend is effecting a higher regard for the Church—unmistakably so! This, too, is good—if not overdone. But there are dangers in this theological trend which gave some of us much concern and at times actually depressed us. We saw, or feared we saw, a type of belief rising in power which is losing touch with the world in which we live. It is losing touch with the thought-forms of the twentieth century. It does not speak the language of today. It runs the great risk of failing to appeal successfully to the educated adult or youth of the modern age. And, likewise, this type of belief which is in the ascendant is measurably out of touch with the burning needs, individual and social, of the twentieth century. At least that is the danger!

In a recent issue of *The Christian Century,* almost alongside of one of Charles Clayton Morrison's reports upon Edinburgh, I came upon a striking headline: "Churches 'Fail' Central Europe." What follows is the correspondence from Central Europe, and it is not so irrelevant to an evaluation of Oxford and Edinburgh as would seem at first. The correspondent begins by saying: "I have just been traveling in what might be called 'Everyone's Land.' It is the rich and beautiful Danube valley, which has become the home of more than a dozen different racial groups. . . . Among these distinct racial elements are also several rival forms of religion. They have all become static, and upward-striving humanity has left them far behind." After speaking in turn of the Jewish, Catholic, Orthodox, and Protestant Churches which he observed, he closes in words of scathing judgment. "These churches have all failed a terribly wronged humanity, striving for a better life. They have let the people down. When the masses gain courage enough to move out of their subhuman state toward a fuller life, they look outside of the church for leaders and champions. In Italy they flocked about Mussolini, in Russia about Lenin, in Germany they now follow Hitler, and in Spain they know not what to do. . . . This is a terrible European reality. The churches can beat the dictators only by serving the masses better."

There is a grim warning in these words which the ecumenical

movement may well ponder with care. It will be a sad day for the churches of the world if, in order to achieve unity or for any other good reason, they espouse a theology and a churchmanship which "let the people down."

But it would be unfair to Oxford and Edinburgh and untrue to close this consideration in a minor key. In spite of weaknesses and dangers, these were great conferences. It was good for brethren to dwell together in unity, even for a short while and imperfectly. Such days of dwelling together are but the foretaste of that fuller unity for which we all hope and pray.

To me the high spot of the summer was an unexpected moment at the close of the business sessions at Oxford. We had finished our work; all that remained was the final service of worship on the following day. When the last item had been completed, Archbishop Eidem of Sweden called upon us all to stand. Then quite simply and distinctly he read in German, French, and English the majestic passage from the seventh chapter of Revelation. "After these things I saw, and behold, a great multitude, which no man could number, out of every nation and of all tribes and peoples and tongues, standing before the throne and before the Lamb, arrayed in white robes, and palms in their hands; and they cry with a great voice, saying, Salvation unto our God who sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb. And all the angels were standing round about the throne, and about the elders and the four living creatures; and they fell before the throne on their faces, and worshipped God, saying, Amen: Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honor, and power, and might be unto our God for ever and ever. Amen." Some day that will come true, not only in heaven but on earth as well.

Lancaster, Pa.

MODERN TRENDS IN THEOLOGY

D. J. Wetzel

Let us begin by defining our terms. Theology is the science and philosophy which treats of God, His existence and character, attributes and actions. In a broader sense, it is the science of religion.

We shall think of the word modern in terms of the last three decades, with particular reference to the years since the world war. Modern trends in theology, then, are those which have been prominent in the present generation. This does not imply that these trends are totally new in their thought concepts. In fact, some of these trends are ancient theological ideas recaptured and clothed in modern phraseology. I doubt whether the modern mind has created, de novo, any single theological concept.

I. We have given a background in definition of terms, let us now construct a second background for the further projection of our thinking. We shall view the cultural environment which existed just prior to and at the beginning of the twentieth century. The limitations of this paper will allow only the treatment of a few of the cultural influences of life.

(a) The field of the sciences: Scientific method and the findings of science have been revolutionary in their effect upon thought and life.

Science has given us a totally new cosmology. In the animal and plant kingdoms, it has created new forms and new species. The scientific method has evolved a new medical and surgical science. By analysis and synthesis it has discovered new laws and created new products. It has stimulated invention by which the industrial world has been literally transformed.

The scientist and theologian have recently become companionable intellectual bedfellows. The theologian no longer goes to his bible for his cosmology. He turns now with respect to the scientist for his explanation of the material universe, recognizing the physical world as the special sphere for the labors of science. The scientist, on the other hand, no longer claims that the only

real world is the material, physical, tangible world but recognizes the claim of the theologian that there is a very real world in the realm of moral and spiritual values, a real world beyond the apparent world of the senses. To wit: Eddington, Thompson, Millikan.

The scientist has ventured three new attitudes of far reaching significance. From his former position of positive finality, he now gives us "pointer readings" or "sign boards." Dr. Theodore F. Herman in a recent lecture in Reading likened these "pointer readings" to a thermometer. The thermometer is not the weather but indicates what the weather conditions are round about us. Furthermore, the outstanding modern scientists have shifted from a deterministic concept of the universe to an indeterministic concept. Finally, the scientist is no longer regarding the universe as mechanistic but organic and vitalistic. This means that he has concluded that the physical world with which he deals has in it values not reducible in the test-tube. He recognizes a world of reality and value beyond the demonstrable. He asserts, thereby, a universe in which there is thought and purpose and for which there is intelligent destiny.

(b) The inventor: The inventor has added definite color to our cultural environment. He has worked hand in hand with the scientist, employing the facts and principles of scientific discovery. He has produced the machine age. The machine has had transforming power over our thought, life, and conditions.

For one thing, the machine has magnified man and minimized God. In the bathysphere, we have surveyed the ocean's depths. In the góndola, we have taken readings in the stratosphere. We have lived at the poles, and we have flown the oceans. Man is looking for more worlds to conquer. It is common parlance to hear "what can man not do?" The achievements, speed, and power of the machine have all too totally absorbed man's interest, talent, and devotion. The net result religiously has been a forgotten God and a forgotten church.

The machine does another thing to man. It de-personalizes him. It makes him a cog in a wheel Nineteen centuries ago, Jesus liberated man from the notion that he was a miserable worm. He raised him from slavery to sonship. He revalued

man in terms of His own personal life. He showed us the potential Christ in every living soul. Nineteen centuries after this welcome news we plunge man into another type of slavery. By the machine, we make of man a machine, de-personalize him, rob him of the privilege of craftsmanship and the expressive quality of creative work.

Another significant influence has been set in motion by the machine. It has revolutionized the economic and industrial world. It has presented us with more problems than we its creator can solve. This bewildering complexity of life has caused many a preacher to reduce his message to a social gospel, ignoring the power and resource of the Supreme Reality, God.

(c) Education: We shall merely mention one more influence in the cultural environment of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. We refer to the large number of educational institutions of all sorts of species and pedigrees which sprang up almost like mushrooms. Besides the new institutions, we note in this period rapidly mounting enrollments in the colleges and universities already established which prompted building programs on a vast scale. Also, something happened within these institutions. Old established church colleges called from the housetops to all the world that they were strictly non-sectarian. Daily chapel was supplanted by weekly chapel. Voluntary attendance at chapel displaced compulsory attendance. Baccalaureate sermons became commencement addresses. I leave it to you to visualize the *character* of the influence and the challenge offered by the thousands of students of our colleges and universities to religious thinking today.

II. The Theological Background. Let us turn now from the cultural to the theological background. We shall refer to the influences of four thinkers. We shall not assay a presentation of their systems of philosophy. That is beyond the scope of this paper. We shall merely indicate the controlling principle within their systems of thought.

(a) Let us begin with Immanuel Kant who definitely broke with the pure rationalists of the past. Neither their method nor their findings satisfied him. By their own weapons, the power of thought and reason, he triumphed over them.

Kant's philosophy has been called the "critical philosophy" because of his constant and repeated use of the word "critique." Kant distinguished between a pure and a practical reason. He observed that the dogmatic philosophers made belief rest upon knowledge. Kant, in his critical philosophy, sought to show a clear distinction between the functions of knowing and of believing. The provinces of knowledge and of belief were clearly separated.

By pure reason, scientific investigation, we can know the apparent world, the world of things. But by faith alone can we get at the inner moral sense of those things. Faith does not rest upon pure reason, nor can it be overthrown by it. Faith lies deeper than reason, deeper than analysis. Thus by the practical reason, or faith, we apprehend the hidden meanings and inner purposes in the material universe. In short, there was for Kant a sense in life, and moral good was the absolute and ultimate aim in life. He resolved the pure rationalists and declared a noble ethic for life. His supreme religious interest was in morals and conduct. To him religion was life. He exemplified his philosophy in his personal and private life. Religion was real to him.

(b) Hegel followed Kant in time and in one respect in manner of approach. He was a pure intellectualist. Hegel was not primarily interested in the unknowable. Historian, as he was, when he became a student of Christianity, he became intensely interested in the thought processes by which conclusions had been reached. He was interested in the process in progress, in the experience with the actual. God to him could only be known by observable manifestations, as in nature and man. Jesus was the highest point of God's revelation in man as a part of nature. There were only two sources of knowledge, nature and man. The bible was no third source. Scripture was only a record, produced by man. Thus Hegel regarded for life only the apparent which he approached purely and solely with the intellect. Note that will and emotion and the affections were totally ignored by him.

(c) Contemporaneous with Hegel, and at first overshadowed by him but certainly more permanent, was Schleiermacher. Schleiermacher took up an idea neglected both by Kant and Hegel. He was the prophet of "feeling" in religion as Kant was of the

ethical and Hegel of the intellectual. His fundamental principle may be epitomized in the words "sensing God," "feeling the presence of God." This involved on man's part a simple, child-like feeling of dependence upon God. His religion was subjective, almost purely so, based upon experience. It possessed the element of the mystical. One can readily understand why Schleiermacher became popular. He laid claim upon the hearts of the masses. We can understand why his influence continues with us. To many today, as in any age, religion is emotional experience and nothing more.

The fervor with which he believed in his idea is expressed best in his own words "Those who hold to dogmas, rites, institutions in such a way as to obscure and overlay this sense of God are nearest to being irreligious."

Salvation took place within the soul. It was not purchased, imputed or conferred. Those ideas were impossible to Schleiermacher. All of the above is to say that his religion was purely subjective, a sensing of God, an apprehension by feeling.

(d) Next, let us turn to Albrecht Ritschl. He moved in another direction altogether, differing in his chief contention from all his predecessors. He repudiated everything mystical with a feeling of aversion for a piety which rested its sole claim upon inward experience. He also repudiated the metaphysical, preferring to work from the known toward the unknown. Religious thinking was to him but one of the many functions of religion. To what did Ritschl turn? To the one field practically untouched by his predecessors. Ritschl dealt with the volitional aspect in religion. The will was fundamental. Ritschl thus emphasized the moral and social aspects of our religious living. He became definitely the forerunner of the Social Gospel. His was a religion of action, of doing. Religion must remain hollow and empty except as God energizes within man his will and thus sends him into action for the moral welfare of self and others.

In summary, what do these foregoing observations mean? They simply mean that the Twentieth Century was ushered in on such a high tide of progress, power and achievement as the world heretofore had never witnessed. In science, invention, education, theology, the watch-words of the civilized world were Power and

Progress. This was as true in theology as in science. The riddle of the universe was rapidly being solved. To wit: Haeckel. August Comte, scientist, declared that we could now "dismiss God with thanks for his past services." David Starr Jordan, one of the world's greatest historians, said the world was standing upon the threshold of the greatest era of peace in the history of mankind. Three months after this declaration of anticipated, peace, a world drunk with power and pride was smashed to smithereens by a war that involved almost all the Christian nations upon the earth. I repeat: "Christian nations of the earth." The tools and ingenuity of science and invention, boasted saviors, became the instruments of destruction. The minds of the tutored were put to work designing new devices and new strategies of violence. The theologian on the allied side was praying for victory to make the world safe for democracy.

After the storm, what? No, it was not the calm, but the most colossal collapse in human history, the collapse of *governments, morals, ideals, institutions.* Confusion and bewilderment reigned in the nations of the world and in every human heart and mind. The world is restive while the work of rehabilitation and re-adjustment continues.

In the areas of religious thinking, the church was bitterly censured for not preventing the war. From non-religious and irreligious quarters came the same criticism. The church has also been told that it is strictly up to her to prevent war in the future. In short, the church had failed. In fact, *humanity* had failed. Theologians began a re-examination of religious philosophies and doctrines. They were eager to produce a philosophy and a theology that were true to life, and that would stand any test. The outcome has resulted in numerous trends.

What are some of these modern trends and what do they say?

I. First, we wish to present a group of words, familiar and prominent in the theological thought forms of this modern period with which we are dealing. Though these terms have distinctive meanings, we will recognize that they share in common a certain inner significance. Alike, they emphasize the value of the human, present, immediate world.

(a) Collectivism is one of these words. The evidences of col-

lectivism are apparent in practically all spheres of human life. Life in our modern world is becoming constantly more social. Means of communication and the character of our industrial life make it so. Thus, individualism has been toned down by the very inevitabilities of social life. In government, Russia, Italy and Germany are experiments in collectivism. Internationalism is a manifestation of collectivism. In combines of groups of persons of like interests we have another form of collectivism. Such groups may be represented by bankers, merchants, laborers. In religion, we see the same tendencies, manifested in sects of Protestantism. We have it at work in our various efforts in the interest of organic church union and in the pursuit of unity of thought and action for all Protestant groups. The Roman Catholic Church is an example of collectivism in that it recognizes the authority of the Church. Collectivism has been a strong trend in modern life both in the sacred and secular world. This philosophy of life would make both religion and the church the cooperative instruments of the state. Thank God for those heroic German pastors who have stoutly withstood the demands of the politician for a totalitarian state. In Russia, the program of regimentation has already extended greater freedom to the church and the exercise of religion.

To this collectivistic mood and movement there is a strong reaction, expressed by a reassertion of individualism. Crises always produce powerful individualists. The individualistic reaction is expressed in the preaching of today. There is renewed demand for personal religion, for individual experience, for a conscious personal sonship in God and for personal responsibility for sin. Even in our idea of God this tendency is noted. In the collectivistic thought form, God might be spoken of as a "cosmic power," "cosmic good," "the ethereal essence," yea, as one put it, "an oblong blurr." The individualist demands that God is a person, an individual. Collectivism and individualism are fighting it out in the front line trenches of theological thinking.

(b) Our second word is immanence. The idea of the immanence of God has dominated our thinking during the past quarter century. By immanence we mean, indwelling. By this idea we brought God very close to human life. To this idea, the *past*

few years have shown a marked reaction in the exaltation of the transcendence of God. There is a fresh demand for the sovereignty and absoluteness of God. Thanks to my beloved and esteemed teacher, Dr. Theodore F. Herman, who, in the days when the idea of the immanence of God dominated the idea of transcendence, taught us to believe in the immanence of a transcendent God.

(c) Our third term is subjective religion! This means a religion of inner experience. In religious thinking, experience has been a household word. The influence of Schleiermacher persists. Recall those days of great revivals with Billy Sunday and his imitators going strong. Remember Gypsie Smith, and Stidger with his symphony sermons? In churches where revivals were not the practice, great mass meetings were held. We spoke much of fellowship and the moving powers of religion. This subjective religion drew upon resources within the person experiencing religion and from the contagion set in motion by others. It was all too human in resource, inspiration and result.

To correct this over-emphasis upon subjective religion, a cry is going out for a religion more objective. There is today demand for the recognition of that objective reality which inspires us and has created us. It appeals to an authority outside of us, over and above us. It inspires fear, awe and reverence. It finds its feet on earth but its head in heaven.

I consider this a very wholesome reaction. Human souls need a sure and safe retreat. They cannot find that place in other human souls. Only God will suffice. How many have chosen the way of self-annihilation in this bewildering world because they lost the way to God?

(d) Our fourth word is ecclesiasticism. Still another trend in protestant churches generally is toward ecclesiasticism and away from the free, spontaneous, non-liturgical worship service. Gowns, symbols, chants, responses, have been introduced in churches where they are perfect strangers. In many cases this may be an easy substitute for clean hard thinking; a retreat from the essential realities of life. A monastery theology lies behind the scenes of this movement. Personally, I have been brought up with the liturgy and decidedly prefer it to a free service.

II. Another prominent and persistent trend has been the Social Gospel. I recall distinctly the beginnings of this approach by such men as Rauschenbusch, Peabody and Ross who wrote in a philosophic and scholarly style. Theirs were well studied, dignified works. The movement they set in motion has continued upward on an inclined plane to the present.

The Social Gospel propagandist seeks the Kingdom of Heaven on earth as a present reality, not an unworthy ambition. He is interested in right relationships between all peoples. His big word is "justice." He concerns himself with international and interracial relations, with the relationship between employer and employee, with the questions of slums, rents, wages, hours, working conditions, sanitation and health, war and peace.

All these are vital and worthy concerns for the Christian minister. What are the weaknesses of this philosophy of life based as it is on the Christian ethics of the New Testament?

The Social Gospel preacher is very likely to have just one half of the gospel. The very heart of his philosophy is materialistic and pragmatic. He aims to save people by groups and in masses. Can that be done? He hates the word individualist. The phrase "to be good" means little to him. He insists you must be good for something. His gospel demands a program of action. The historic creeds and doctrines of Christendom he generally ignores. The great doctrines of the church pertaining to miracle, revelation, inspiration, atonement, resurrection and immortality, he seldom preaches.

Hand in hand with the social psychologist, he blames heredity and environment for the sins of the people—thus exonerating the individual of personal responsibility. He says "make environment right and the people will be right." Against this theology which limps on one leg, there is at present a very strong reaction. The reaction says: "Man does not live by bread alone." Man needs more than self-help and the help of the other fellow. He needs God. The Kingdom of Heaven is vastly more than social good or goods. It consists also of moral values and spiritual experiences. The reaction to the Social Gospel concerns itself less with method and more with motive; less with ways and means and more with great functioning principles.

It has been interesting to note that many of our *social workers* with an apparent passion for the humanitarian ideals, are so short on religion. In our city, a check reveals that few are interested in church and seldom attend. Only religion rooted in God can give power and motivation to life that will carry through to the end.

III. Another modern trend is the theology of Karl Barth, Swiss pastor, whose thinking has evoked wide discussion and wields strong influence in England and America. Barth's theology is profoundly influenced by the war. This raises the ever present and interesting question, "How much does the cultural environment influence theology and how much does theology determine the cultural environment?" I leave that for your consideration. Before we state Barth's theology in general principle, may we remind you that he was before the war a Christian Socialist.

Barth believes in the existence of two worlds totally unrelated, and as distinct as two circles which are not tangent. The one is the super-natural world with which we have no communication, to which we have no access, a world beyond human apprehension. The other is our world of sin, tragedy, crisis. One of the great heresies according to Barth is our current and commonly accepted belief in evolution, continuation, progress.

God is transcendent and unknowable. He is not only greater than we are; he is totally other than we are. We, in our sinful state and with our finite minds cannot pretend to know God. We have no means of approach to Him. Our concept of God's immanence, that is, His indwelling in life, is practically ruled out by Barth.

As for man, Barth sees him caught in a web from which he cannot extricate himself. He is in and of a sinful world. Man is not only a part of a hopeless worthless world; he is in himself a very sinful and helpless creature. His life is a crisis, a contradiction and a negation. Human life is a negation in that our efforts bring us to exactly nothing, our knowledge culminating in ignorance, our reason running in circles, and life itself ending in the perfect negation—death.

We have in Barth a theology of despair, in fact, the theology of a desperate man. His theology and philosophy are a pure war

product. Barth, the Christian Socialist, lost all faith in men and their works, when the war destroyed the boasted plans of human ingenuity.

IV. Another most interesting trend of recent times has been that expressed by the Oxford Group of which Frank Buchman is the originator and leader. Its aim: "A New World Order For Christ, the King." Its four cardinal points are: (1) Absolute Honesty, (2) Absolute Purity, (3) Absolute Unselfishness, (4) Absolute Love. The manner of attaining these is more significant to our thinking than the goals themselves. These qualities of life are to be attained by (1) sharing of our sins and temptations with another, (2) by surrender of our life, past, present, and future to God, (3) by restitution to all whom we have wronged, (4) by relying on God's guidance. Here, as in many other religious efforts, is the magnification of one aspect of religious living to a point where it becomes the whole. A partial truth has been substituted for the whole truth. In the Oxford Group you have another endeavor of escape from the realities of a stern world. Its many weaknesses are apparent. Surely it was the product of the cultural environment as much as the Barthian movement. Environmental experiences do breed theologies.

V. The fifth trend we shall consider is modernism in religious thinking. Modernism in theological terminology is strictly a method, a way of approach to the study of religion. The method is scholarly and critical, scientific and historical. It is scholarly because its proponents are men learned in the arts and sciences whose integrity and industry in pursuit of truth are unquestioned. Its method is scientific in that it analyzes, dissects, resolves. The method is similar to that of the botanist seeking data for the classification of a plant or flower. The modern approach accepts and uses the discoveries of archeology and etymology, and it also uses many of the truths revealed by the natural sciences. In theological inquiry, modernism is using the scientific method.

The modernist's approach is also historical. He studies religions comparatively, appraising the similar and dissimilar. He seeks religious origins and traces them through their historic experiences and processes. The Christian modernist will study his religion beginning with its earliest foundations. He begins

with Abraham, tracing the religious experiences of the Hebrews and Jews to their culmination in the revelations of Jesus Christ. He takes into account the environmental influences of other religions, of forms of government, law and politics. There is, for example, no doubt about the impact of certain Roman and Greek ideas upon the Christian religion in its earliest days of organization. To wit: the Agapae or love feasts of the Greeks and the practices of the Greek mystery Cults; also the impress of the legalistic perfectly organized Roman State upon the organization of the Christian Church. One may easily observe the fluid minds of the early Christian taking shape under the pattern of the Roman State. Who will say that Paul's ideas of justice, retribution, atonement are not tinctured by both Jewish and Roman legalism? Such influences the historian discovers and appraises.

The modernist is, therefore, opposed to the traditionalist and the fundamentalist. He is also to be distinguished from the liberalist, who is not bound by any outside authority, tenets, or customs. Is it unfair to speak of the liberalist as the Epicurean of the intellectual world? The modernist of today is the liberalist of yesterday which is another way of saying that the heterodoxy of yesterday becomes the orthodoxy of today. To illustrate the difference between liberalist and modernist we quote a recent actual experience. "In a recent stratosphere flight, Professor Compton and Professor Millikan, who hold opposing theories regarding cosmic rays, both had instruments in the góndola. Professor Compton assumed the responsibility of checking carefully Professor Millikan's instruments to insure him the maximum benefits of the flight. This is typical of the attitude of modernism at its best." Both are modernists, neither are liberals.

The modernist has more than a way of approach. He has a goal. His objective is truth. He is therefore constructive, using his findings as the basis for his philosophic superstructure and his faith in God and man.

He faces grave dangers. He is prone to lose himself so completely in his processes that he misses his objective. He is in danger of pure rationalization. By his analytic and critical methods, he is apt to become destructive, losing imagination and vision.

What then has the use of the scientific method in religious research accomplished? By the scientific, historical and critical approach to the study of the Scriptures, we have delivered the Bible from the concept that it is a literally inspired document, of equal value in all its parts. We have released it from the notion that it is an inerrant, infallible book whose words were dictated by the Holy Spirit. The literalist and fundamentalist simply cannot use intelligently the whole Bible. The literalist, claiming infallible inspiration as he does, can only end in confusion and bewilderment.

The discoveries of science pertaining to the age-long processes at work in the development of the universe and the world in particular, have clearly demonstrated that the Bible is not a book of science. For example, the two narratives of creation in the book of Genesis are not a scientific but a religious interpretation of the origin of the universe. The sequence of the events in creation differ in these narratives so as to make them mutually exclusive. But these beautiful stories of creation are one in fundamental, essential fact; the fact that God created the heavens and the earth. That statement connotes a master mind behind the universe, a purposeful mind controlling the universe, and all that is implied in the order, law, beauty, and destiny of the universe. This universe came either by chance, fortuituous concomitance, or by creation. Take your choice. I cast my lot with confidence and joy with the writer of the story of creation.

Another religious realm in which science has been quite disturbing has been in the life of prayer. Once we prayed to have diphtheria cured, now we depend upon medical science. This simple principle applies in many of life's experiences. The total effect in the minds of many has been to displace God with the works of science. God is no longer necessary. This unhealthy conclusion has destroyed in many lives those very essential factors of poise, balance, confidence, security and joy. For me, God creates and man discovers. Thus, every new revelation of fact by science enlarges my God-idea, increases my faith, raises anew my voice in adoration and praise of Him who is creator of all.

Is it possible in any way to summarize? to make a few general

observations from such divergence of thought as represented above?

First, we observe that the theological outlook is lifting from a horizontal to a vertical plane. We are lifting our eyes from earth to heaven, from man to God. The *objective* sense is laying hold on us. This swing of the theological pendulum is healthy, yea, essential to man's redemption. Long enough we have tried to lift ourselves by our own bootstraps.

In the next place, we observe that we do not have a systematic theology giving us concrete affirmations. A new theology is in the making in this new world of ours. Out of the depths of the complexity, confusion and chaos of our present world order, we are earnestly groping for a few definite assurances.

In conclusion, what have we a right to expect from our new theology? Also, what have we a right to hear from the Christian pulpit of today?

I believe that with profounder conviction and positive assurance we must preach the eternal realities: God, Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit. We have been strong in apologetics and short on affirmations. We must reverse the process. Our affirmations are not without foundation in reason. Many excellent, practical reasons may be given for our faith in God, in Jesus Christ, in the work of the Holy Spirit. But there comes a time along life's way when reason simply becomes exhausted. At that point a true religious faith must lead the way. Long since we learned that true faith is not only a certain knowledge but a hearty trust. I take absolutely for granted God, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit. To try argument or proof for these eternal realities weakens the Christian message. We need not prove them, we know them. The new theology must say some things with positive assurance. People need sky-hooks upon which to hang their garments of faith. They need anchorage for the soul.

Reading, Pa.

NECROLOGY

"After this, it was noised abroad that Mr. Valiant-for-truth was taken with a summons by the same post as the other, and had this for a token that the summons was true, that his pitcher was broken at the fountain. When he understood it, he called for his friends, and told them of it. Then said he, 'I am going to my Father's; and though with great difficulty I am got hither, yet now I do not repent me of all the trouble I have been at to arrive where I am. My sword I give to him that shall succeed me in my pilgrimage, and my courage and skill to him that can get it. My marks and scars I carry with me, to be a witness for me that I have fought His battles who now will be my rewarder.' When the day that he must go hence was come, many accompanied him to the river-side, into which as he went he said, 'Death, where is thy sting?' And (as he went down deeper, he said, 'Grave, where is they victory?' So he passed over, and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side." (*The Pilgrim's Progress* by Bunyan.)

Edwin Hartzell Laubach, '96, was born in Northampton County, Pa., Nov. 7, 1871. He died Oct. 10, 1936, at Zelienople, Pa. He prepared for the ministry at Lafayette College and the Theological Seminary. In the year of his graduation from the latter institution he was licensed to the ministry by East Pennsylvania Classis and ordained by East Ohio Classis. There followed a long pastorate, in the course of which he served the following charges: Warren, Ohio, 1896–98; Athens, Michigan, 1898–99; without charge, 1899; Monroe, Pa., 1900–03; Braddock, Pa., 1904; Fairview charge, Chicora, Pa., 1905–06; Niles, Ohio, 1907; W. Milton, Pa., 1907–08; Bethany, Bethlehem, Pa., 1908–11; Robertsville, Ohio, 1911–16; Macungie, Pa., 1917–18; Scottdale, Pa., 1918–23; Trafford, Pa., 1924–28; without charge, 1929–30; Fort Loudon, Pa., 1931–34. He lived in retirement from 1935 until his death.

Jonas Leidy Yearick, '07, was born at Hilltown, Bucks County, Pa., July 21, 1870, and died Nov. 3, 1936. After graduation from this Seminary he was immediately licensed by Tohickon Classis

and ordained by North Carolina Classis. The record of his pastorates is as follows: Maiden, N. C., 1907–08; E. Rowan charge, Rockwell, N. C., 1908–12; McConnellsburg, Pa., 1912–18; Boswell, Pa., 1918–20; Export, Pa., 1920–27; Ruffsdale, Pa., 1927–28; Denmark Manor charge at Harrison City, Pa., 1928–33; without charge, 1933–35; Saegertown, Pa., from 1935 to his death. There survives him a brother who is a veteran alumnus of this Seminary, Dr. Zwingli A. Yearick of the class of 1875.

Elias William Stonebraker, '92, was born at Cedar Hill, Washington County, Md., on Oct. 29, 1860. He was for a while a student at old Mercersburg College, and subsequently a graduate of the Seminary at Lancaster. In 1892 he was licensed and ordained by Juniata Classis. From 1892 to 1903 he was pastor at Loysburg, Pa.; from 1903 to 1912 at Fairfield, Pa.; from 1912 to 1915 at Quarryville, Pa.; and from 1916 to 1918 at Lovettsville, Va. During the turbulent days of 1918–19 he served as a chaplain overseas. He was without a charge from 1920 to 1922. His last pastorate was at Wapwallopen, Pa., during 1922–29. He died at St. Petersburg, Florida, on the last day of the year, 1936.

George B. Smith, D.D., '92, died suddenly on Feb. 20, 1937—a few months after the death of his classmate, the Rev. Mr. Stonebraker. Dr. Smith was born in Maxatawny Township, Berks County, Pa., on July 8, 1867. His preparation for the Christian ministry was received at the Keystone State Normal School of Kutztown, Pa., Franklin and Marshall College, and the Theological Seminary at Lancaster. He was licensed and ordained by Lehigh Classis in 1892, and in that same year he entered upon the pastorate of the Maxatawny Charge, Kutztown, Pa., to which he was to devote his entire ministry of forty-five years. He was buried on Feb. 24 from the Maxatawny Church in which he had preached every Sunday without exception for almost half a century.

Adam Jacob Bachman, '78, died Feb. 24, 1937, at the advanced age of almost eighty-five years. He was born June 5, 1852, in Lynn Township, Lehigh County, Pa. He studied at the Keystone State Normal School of Kutztown, Pa., Palatinate College, Franklin and Marshall College, and this Seminary. In 1878 East

Pennsylvania Classis licensed him to the ministry and Lebanon Classis ordained and installed him as pastor of the charge at Schaefferstown, Pa. Thus began an almost unparalleled pastorate of fifty-nine years' duration, for he remained active in this charge until a short while before his death. He, too, was laid to rest from the church which had been the scene of his labors during so many years. He is survived by a son who is a graduate of this Seminary, the Rev. A. R. Bachman, '16.

Frederick Andrew Cook, '04, was born at Baltimore, Md., on Sept. 4, 1876. He was graduated from Franklin and Marshall College in 1900, and from the Seminary in 1904. In that same year he was licensed by Lancaster Classis, and ordained by Maryland Classis. He served four pastorates in the Reformed Church: Union Bridge, Md., from 1904 to 1905; Mainville, Pa., from 1909 to 1910; St. John's, Pa., from 1910 to 1912; and Steelton, Pa., from 1912 to 1914. He then entered the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in whose fellowship he served parishes in Pennsylvania, Florida, and Maryland. He died March 16, 1937.

Albert Orlando Bartholomew, D.D., '98, was born April 12, 1873, at Lehighton, Pa. He died suddenly on Sunday morning, July 4, 1937. After graduating from Franklin and Marshall College and the Seminary at Lancaster he was licensed by Lehigh Classis and ordained by East Pennsylvania Classis. During the ministry which followed he rendered faithful service not only to the charges he served but to the Church at large, proving himself thus a worthy member of the family to which he belonged. The record of his pastorates is as follows: Grace, Easton, Pa., 1898–1903; Manheim, Pa., 1903–14; Freeland, Pa., 1914–1921; St. Peter's, Allentown, 1921–25; Royersford, Pa., 1925–1930; and Littlestown, Pa., 1930–37.

Ambrose Matthias Schmidt, D.D., '89, was born at Hanover, Pa., on June 12, 1857. He was graduated from Franklin and Marshall College in 1881 and from this Seminary in 1889. Following licensure by Gettysburg Classis and ordination by Maryland Classis he entered upon his first pastorate in Christ Church, Baltimore, Md., where he served from 1889 to 1892. He was pastor of St. Mark's Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., from 1892 to 1896.

During the years 1896 to 1901 he served Franklin and Marshall College as financial agent. In 1901 he reentered the pastorate at Bellefonte, Pa., where he remained until 1925. During 1926–27 he was assistant at St. Paul's Orphans' Home, Greenville, Pa. For the years 1927 and 1928 he was director of the centennial observance of the *Reformed Church Messenger,* and assistant editor of the same from 1929 to 1936. He was an able student of hymnody, and assisted in the preparation of The Hymnal of the Reformed Church, The Sunday School Hymnal, and The Church School Hymnal. His long and useful ministry came to a close with his death on Aug. 3, 1937.

Henry Harbaugh Rupp, D.D., '01, died Aug. 15, 1937, after less than a day's illness. He was born at Berlin, Pa., Nov. 12, 1874, of a family which has given many ministers to the Church. He is survived by one brother in the ministry, the Rev. Paul B. Rupp, '07. His father was for some years the beloved Professor of Practical Theology in this Seminary. Dr. Henry Harbaugh Rupp was graduated in turn from Franklin and Marshall College and this Seminary. He was licensed to the ministry by Lancaster Classis, and ordained by Reading Classis. During 1901 to 1904 he was pastor of Olivet Church, Reading, Pa., and assistant at the First Church of Reading; from 1904 to 1909 he was pastor of Grace Church, Easton, Pa.; and from 1909 to the beginning of 1914 he served churches at both Wyomissing and Temple, Pa. There followed several years during which he was engaged in agriculture. From 1917 to 1920 he was pastor at Steelton, Pa. His last pastorate was at Lewisburg, Pa., from 1920 until the time of his death.

Gustav Rudolph Poetter, '98, was born Jan. 29, 1873, at Baltimore, Md. His undergraduate study was done at Johns Hopkins University. Upon graduation from the Seminary he was licensed by German Maryland Classis and ordained by Juniata Classis. His entire ministry was spent in four churches: Martinsburg, Pa., from 1898 to 1902; Christ Church, Baltimore, Md., from 1901 to 1910; St. Mark's Church, Easton, Pa., from 1910 to 1916; and St. Mark's Church, Reading, Pa., from 1916 to 1937. He died suddenly on August 23, 1937.

—*N.C.H.*

BOOK NOTES

The Way of Christian Worship

Worship (Most recent addition to The Library of Constructive Theology), by Evelyn Underhill, Fellow of King's College Oxford, Author of *The Mystic Way, Mysticism, The Life of the Spirit and the Life of Today,* etc., Harper Brothers, 1937. $3.

An Outline of Christian Worship, its Development and Forms, by William D. Maxwell, B.D., Ph.D., Minister of Hillhead Parish, Glasgow, Author of *John Knox's Genevan Service Book.* Oxford University Press. 1936. $2.75.

A History of Christian Worship (a volume of the new series, "The London Theological Library") by Oscar Hardman, M.A., D.D., Professor of Pastoral and Liturgical Theology, University of London. Cokesbury Press. 1937. $2.

Our Heritage in Public Worship, by H. D. Hislop, M.A. (Kerr Lectures, 1933). T. and T. Clark, 1935. $4.50.

The revival of interest in worship which became manifest some twenty-five years ago is still growing. We have become accustomed to its emphasis not only in the many books published but in new courses of study in our Theological Seminaries, in its large recognition in the theory and practice of modern religious education and its new forms of expression in the weekly worship of many churches. The four recent volumes here under review bear testimony not only to the sustained interest in the subject but also to its fundamental importance. A survey of the whole literature of the revival would seem to verify Frederick Heiler's view, that the approach to the unity of Christendom through worship is most suggestive and fruitful. It runs parallel with the attempts at larger cooperation through life and work and those through faith and order. Indeed, it underlies both and constantly fosters their inner oneness and completion, of which the new World Council of Christian Churches just inaugurated at Oxford and Edinburgh is prophetic.

The four books here presented have a special significance for teachers, students and ministers as leaders of public worship. All

of them combine the theory and historical development of worship but in differences of emphasis and method of treatment. Miss Underhil's and Dr. Hislop's put the primary stress and the nature and meaning of worship, whilst Drs. Maxwell's and Hardman's place it on its historical development. A thorough-going, documented, concise and yet comprehensive history of Christian worship has been long awaited. The two latter volumes fill the great need, being works valuable for study and reference.

For an intensive and also comprehensive appreciation of worship Miss Underhill's book is a classic. Its fine style combines accurate scholarship with the emotional appreciation of a true Christian worshipper. In Part I she studies the nature of Christian worship and analyzes its chief constituents: ritual, symbol, sacrament and sacrifice. Part II illustrates this estimate of its spirit and content by a consecutive and comprehensive review of the varied forms and distinctive liturgical types,—Catholic, Orthodox and Protestant from early Christianity to modern times. The whole treatment is positive and stimulating. From the beginning to the end it carries the conviction and power of the living experience of Christian worship running in varied forms down through the centuries. Worship is "the surge of the collective life Godward." It is at once the acknowledgment of the transcendental and incarnational approach to reality. It is individualistic and ecumenical. In Part II Miss Underhill presents its varied historic forms with amazing insight and understanding. In our age of secularism and atheism this book anchored in the historic movement of Christianity, interpreting its faith in God and hope for man, is like an oasis in a desert. As an appreciation of Christian worship it is a classic.

The volumes by Drs. Maxwell and Hardman are both primarily histories of worship, for which students will be deeply thankful, for beside the translation of L. Duchesne's elaborate work, "Christian Worship, its Origin and Evolution," no satisfactory history covering its whole development was available in the English language. Both bring the study down to our times and both do full justice to worship as found in the Protestant churches. Both also have a fine conception and understanding of worship as a corporate experience. In his preface Dr. Maxwell is careful to

state that "a large proportion of the space is devoted to the worship of the Reformed Churches, particularly to the liturgies of these churches. This has been necessary because of the strange neglect shown toward these liturgies by the British scholars, resulting in a widespread misunderstanding of a most important period." It may be safely said that Maxwell's Outline of Christian Worship is the best student's handbook for the study of Christian worship now extant in English. Dr. Hardman's method of treatment of each of the periods differs from Maxwell's in that he presents each one in a cross section view thus: I. A survey of the period. II. Estates of men and their function in worship. III. Places of worship; and liturgical books and music. IV. Initiation and ecclesiastical discipline. V. Corporate worship. VI. Hallowing of life. VII. Popular devotions. He accordingly offers a more comprehensive view of worship as worship and as related to life. Maxwell restrains his treatment entirely, as he says "to the Sunday Morning Worship of the Church and that which has grown out of the Quire Offices." Consequently the combination of Maxwell's and Hardman's books constitute an exceptionally sound historical basis for the study of the nature and development of Christian Worship and its further development in our own times. Both authors are representative English scholars and their treatments are erudite and thoroughly documented. The bibliographies given are complete and lead to the reliable sources. Hardman offers "A Suggested Library of Twenty Books for Further Study," which is particularly adapted to English students.

A further word about Hislop's volume appeals to the interest of members of the Reformed Church, holding the Presbyterian System. He is a minister of the Church of Scotland. In 1933 he delivered the Kerr Lectures before the students of Glasgow College of the United Free Church of Scotland. They were published in somewhat enlarged form in 1935. He finds a rich heritage for the Scottish Church in the worship of the Eastern and Roman Catholic Churches and in that of the churches of the Reformation. He interprets the worship of the Reformed Churches in a fundamental and proportionate way. In this respect his historic basis and outlook are similar to the above-

mentioned histories, making amends for the usual neglect by British writers of the development and influence of Reformed worship.

His chapter heads are significant: I. Worship—Types and Value. II. Worship—Psychological Factors. III. Worship in the New Testament and its Development. IV. Worship in the Eastern Church, or The Christian Mystery. V. Worship in the Roman Church, or The Idea of Sacrifice. VI. Non-Roman Western Rites. VII. Lutheran Worship, or The Word in Human Experience. VIII. Reformed Worship, or The Word as God's Will. IX. The Anglican "Via Media." X. The Quaker Reconciliation, or Worship through Silence. XI. Eucharistic Worship. XII. Weekly and Daily Worship. XIII. Symbolism, or The Drama and Beauty of Worship. XIV. Prayer, or The Offering of Sacrifice. XV. The Declaration of the Word.

An irenic spirit pervades the whole treatment. The ritualistic and the puritanic conceptions have always existed side by side and often hostile to one another. Dr. Hislop interprets the puritan ideal at its best but is equally frank and sincere in setting forth the ritualistic. In each he finds a mystical approach both through the ascent of man's spirit and the revelational descent of the Divine. And he argues that these are not antagonistic but complementary. "The march of history has shown us these two tempers at war, but have we not transcended the division that cripples them both? And can we not dream of a Church universal and catholic, evangelic and free, whose worship will contain all that the spirit of man in its strange pilgrim quest has learned from the Grace and Guidance of the Eternal Father."

These four books constitute a well balanced basis for the study and appreciation of Christian worship. Historicity, meaning and experience are so interwoven as to make worship and life one in reality.

CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS TO THE CENTENNIAL REGISTER

Page 5. Line 2. *For* Shaffer *read* Shaffner.
Page 13. Line 3. *For* 1905–06 *read* 1901–05.
Page 50. Hoffheins, J. A., Gettys C 58–59; Pottsville 68–70, Allegheny 70–75.
Page 57. Schaeffer, N.C., LLD Western Uni of Pa (now Pittsburgh Uni) 95; lecturer on educ graduate dept Uni of Pa 00–01.
Page 82. Stonebraker, E.W., wc 20–22.
Page 86. Kerr, F. L., 91–94, BD 30.
Page 87. Bald, F. W., BD F&M 04.
Page 88. Krome, L. P., d Jun 19 36.
Page 94. Bartholomew, A. O., lic Leh Cl 98, ord E Pa Cl 98.
Page 100. Keller, J. H., DD F&M 35.
Page 101. Ratzell, J. P., d Apr 13 36.
Page 104. DeLong, C. M., DD F&M 33.
Page 104. Faust, E.F., 00–03, BD 25.
Page 110. Herman, A. J., *Erase* Wilhelm chg . . . 15.
Page 111. Yearick, J. L., line 3. *For* McConnellstown *read* McConnellsburg.
Page 120. Ehrgood, G. A., 12–15, BD 29.
Page 124. Nace, I. G., wc St. Paul's Orphans Home Greenville Pa 33–34.
Page 128. Althouse, H. D., 19–22 BD.
Page 130. Reifsnyder, W. E., 21–24, BD 31.
Page 131. Böszörményi, S. M., 22–25, BD 31.
Page 134. Holland, R. L., Jan 24–1926, BD 29.
Page 134. Hucke, R. W., p Olyphant Pa 36–.
Page 136. Seltzer, W. V., 26–29 BD.
Page 141. Eroh, R. C., STM Western Theol Sem 36.
Page 142. Frantz, J. B., *For* Bortzfield *read* Bertzfield.