Volume XII OCTOBER Number 4

Bulletin

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

OF THE

REFORMED CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES

EVANGELICAL AND REFORMED CHURCH

LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA
1941

CONTENTS

Published four times a year, January, April, July, October, by the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the U. S.
President Theodore F. Herman, Managing Editor; Professor David Dunn, 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 XII OCTOBER, 1941 NUMBER 4

SEMINARY NEWS

The opening of the one hundred and seventeenth year of the Seminary, scheduled for September 9, had to be deferred until September 30 on account of the epidemic of infantile paralysis which has been prevalent in many parts of the state, including our own. This step was taken on the advice of health authorities, and in company with many other educational institutions.

The speaker at the opening exercises in Santee Hall this year was Professor Oswin S. Frantz. The subject which he selected for the occasion was "Christianity's New Battle-front."

It is most encouraging to be able to report an incoming Junior class of nineteen students. There had been some misgiving that the trend of events in general and the Selective Service Act in particular might reduce the Seminary's enrolment. It may be that this effect will be apparent in time, but it has not put in its appearance as yet. The new students are all members of the Evangelical and Reformed Church with the exception of two, who holds membership one in the Church of the Brethren and the other in the Evangelical Congregational Church. They represent a wide variety of academic institutions—twelve in all—and four separate states. Their names, addresses, and colleges are as follows:

Name	*Home Address*	*College*
W. A. Baum	Nuremberg, Pa.	Lafayette
D. E. Boyer	New Kensington, Pa.	Duquesne
D. M. Danner	Spring Grove, Pa.	Harvard
P. R. Gregory	Bath, Pa.	Lehigh
A. K. Groff	Baltimore, Md.	F. and M.
R. L. Keiser	Cleveland, O.	Heidelberg
R. L. Koehler	Quakertown, Pa.	Catawba
E. H. Lander, Jr.	Strasburg, Pa.	Elizabethtown

Name	*Home Address*	*College*
J. M. Light	Easton, Pa.	Lafayette
W. T. Longsdorf	Mahanoy City, Pa.	F. and M.
H. C. Musser	Rebersburg, Pa.	Penn State
R. O. Nagle	Allentown, Pa.	Moravian
P. L. Rahn	Souderton, Pa.	F. and M.
A. Seldomridge	New Holland, Pa.	F. and M.
R. C. Snyder	Bethlehem, Pa.	Ursinus
B. C. Stauffenberg	Manhattan, Ill.	Elmhurst
C. L. Voll	Jeannette, Pa.	F. and M.
G. Weaver	Terre Hill, Pa.	Catawba
H. L. Whitebread	Wapwallopen, Pa.	F. and M.

* * * * *

President Herman represented our institution at the inauguration exercises on September 16 and 17 for President Frederick W. Schroeder of Eden Theological Seminary. He also took part in two forums led by Professor H. Richard Niebuhr on this occasion —the one on "Pre-theological Education," and the other on "The Strategy of the Church."

* * * * *

We note with sorrow the death on August 6, 1941, of Dr. Emory L. Coblentz, of Middletown, Md. Dr. Coblentz served for a number of years as a Trustee of the Seminary.

On August 25 Dr. Herman conducted the funeral of Mrs. Reuben J. Butz, of Allentown, Pa. Mr. Butz is a member of the Board of Trustees of the Seminary.

—N. C. H.

THE POSSIBILITY OF DEMOCRACY IN THE LIGHT OF HUMAN NATURE

Nevin C. Harner

The scope of our present inquiry is strictly limited to a single question. We are not asking whether democracy is desirable; whether it is a good thing; whether it is the best possible mode of human relationship. We are asking merely whether it is possible, human nature being what it is. Within the past two or three decades a new and profound distrust of human nature has settled down upon us. This tendency to disparage human nature seems to have had its origin in Europe, where the best that man could do appears—for the time being at least—to have come to such an inglorious and tragic end. Beginning in Europe, it has spread to a greater or less degree throughout the world, bringing in its train a number of far-reaching consequences. Not the least of these is a distinct chilling of our ardor for democracy—in the home, in the school, in the church, and in the state.

The current misgivings concerning the fitness of human nature for democracy seem to fall principally under three heads. In the first place, it is said that human beings, generally speaking, are too dull mentally to be fit for democracy. They have the mentality, we are constantly reminded, of a twelve year old child. Consequently, they can not do their own thinking; they can not make their own decisions; both thinking and deciding must be done for them. Current illustrations of this disparagement of average human intelligence are not hard to find. A young people's conference was scheduled to be held several years ago in a certain church in an eastern city. The pastor of the church in question asked what this conference proposed to do. When he was informed that the delegates intended to think through from the Christian standpoint some of the burning social issues of the day, he replied: "It is not for young people to think through these issues; it is for them to be told what to think." To draw an illustration from another realm, there is the present terrifying spectacle of political philosophies which deny outright the ability of the common man to think and decide for himself; which turn

a legislative assembly into a sounding-board for the leader's oratory, and the ballot-box into a compulsory chorus of approval.

In the second place, it is said that human beings, generally speaking, are too self-centered to be fit for democracy. A picture is painted of each person concerned only for himself, or at most his wife, his son John, and his son John's wife, and that's an end to it. Hence, human beings are unfit for cooperative action, or for seeking the common welfare. We are all familiar with Reinhold Niebuhr's contention that the rich and the mighty and the powerful can not be expected by any stretch of the imagination to yield voluntarily a portion of the immense power they possess. They see only their own individual interests and the interests of their own class. If some of their power is ever to be ceded to others, it must be stripped from them by force—never by the democratic processes of the class-room and the ballot-box. The election of 1940 is being cited by some as a clear instance of class-consciousness, and the inability of either the higher classes or the lower classes to identify themselves with the common good.

In the third place, it is said that human beings, generally speaking, are too fearful of responsibility and too content to have others assume responsibility for them to be fit for democracy. They are always on the look-out for a parent, or a paternalistic government, or a kindly employer, or a priest, or a pope, or a Führer to run the risks and make the decisions and stand as a buffer between them and the storms of life.

In short, human nature is neither *wise enough,* nor *good enough,* nor *strong enough* to be fit for democracy. Let us take up in turn these three misgivings and, as Kipling would say, "sieve their proper worth."

1. *Is human nature intelligent enough, by and large, for democracy; or must the select few do all the thinking and make all the decisions?*

As we face this question, we do well to remind ourselves at once that democracy does not require that all people of every age and every level of ability shall have an equal share in determining policies and executing them. This is as true of the home as it is of the school; and as true of the church as it is of the state. It is a caricature of democracy to assume that a four-year-old child

shall have as much "say" in the running of a home as his father; or that a high school girl shall be put on a theological par with the Archbishop of York; or that an illiterate mountaineer shall share equally with the president in the administration of the federal government. There is a rightful place in democracy for the expert, and democracy is in no sense contravened by the proper employment of specially qualified persons. The role of the average person in a democratic scheme of things is to decide some things for himself; and beyond that to determine in what realms he shall allow others to do the deciding for him, and to choose the persons who will represent him and his interests in those realms.

But, when all of this has been said, our basic question is still before us. Is the generality of human nature competent to make intelligent decisions in some realms? And to allocate wisely other realms to the expert? And to choose the expert?

We must not allow ourselves to take an easy way out of this matter. By definition the average intelligence quotient is only 100—not 120, or 140. There must be none of the wishful thinking to which the Pullman porter resorted when asked what the average tip was. He replied that the average tip was a dollar, but very few got up to the average. Such Pullman-porter thinking will not for long solve our problem. The average intelligence is only average. Can such intelligence be trusted at all to wrestle with the problems of theology, and ethics, and economics, and politics? Can it be trusted even to choose within each of these fields those whom it will follow? And if not, where is our hope of democracy?

The answer is by no means easy. Beyond a doubt the average intelligence of the ordinary man will make many mistakes in all of these fields. It will overlook many factors of the utmost significance. It will draw many false conclusions. It will follow blindly the specious leadership of a demogogue. But can we not affirm, when all is said and done, that the intelligence of the average man will do about as good a job in each of these fields as the intelligence of the intelligentsia? The justification for such a hope—if any can be found—is lodged in the fact that sound thinking on any matter—theological, moral, economic, or political

—is not a function of pure intelligence alone. On the contrary it is compounded of at least five factors: first, sheer intelligence; second, breadth of information in the field under consideration; third, disciplined habits of thought; fourth, what we may call, for lack of a better name, vital homely experience; and fifth, disinterestedness or, if that is too much to hope for, at least a breadth of human interest through being identified naturally with a large number of human beings. In the first three of these—namely, sheer brilliance of intellect, wide range of specialized information, and disciplined habits of thought—the chosen few enjoy a clear edge of advantage. If these three were the only components entering into sound thinking on any matter, it would be extremely hard to make a case for democracy. But, fortunately or unfortunately, this is far from the actual case. Sound thinking requires also vital homely experience—"a heap o' livin' " in other words. It is for this reason that some unlettered persons seem to be able to do sounder thinking concerning home and marriage than Bertrand Russell, for example. And the fifth component also is essential to sound thinking—namely, disinterestedness or at least a breadth of sympathetic identification with countless human beings. And here too the average man enjoys a distinct advantage. For, through no particular merit of his own, he is unavoidably linked by many ties of common interest with more people than is the little group of the select few. He is not better than they, nor more unselfish than they, but he belongs to a larger segment of the human family than they. He is by definition one of the common people, of whom the Lord made so many. Quite without intention he shares the woes and the joys, the hopes and the fears of more people than does the expert or the member of a highly selected oligarchy. And all of his thinking upon any subject is done against the background and in the interests of the great mass of human beings. It is for this reason, doubtless, that the economic judgments of the common man are sometimes sounder than the learned utterances of a professional economist or the circumscribed utterances of an economic royalist.

With considerations such as these in mind, then, we may perhaps dare to affirm that the average intelligence will do no worse a job in wrestling with theology, ethics, economics, or politics

than the intelligence of the select few. Sometime after the onset of the depression *The Christian Century* printed a series of pronouncements made by economic and political leaders of America just before the crash came. All of them without exception predicted continued unbroken prosperity. All of them misjudged the signs of the times completely. The common people of America could have analyzed the economic trends of 1929 about as well as the country's leaders—which is to say, not at all. The masses of the English people probably could have diagnosed the world situation just as soundly during the past decade as the Tory government of Chamberlain, and perhaps even a little more so. A plebiscite might have determined English policy more wisely than a cabinet meeting. The common run of German folk, it seems, could have worked out Germany's problems during this same period at least as wisely as the Nazi hierarchy. In the long run it may be apparent that a few fishermen from the Sea of Galilee did about as well at formulating the new and vital meanings which were resident in Jesus of Nazareth as the theologians have done. Perhaps it was with some of these matters in mind that Reinhold Niebuhr wrote in his latest book: "The common people are no fools. In fact, they react with wholesome common sense to the problems of the day. The fools were the intellectual leaders of our democracy who talked utopian nonsense. . . . They confused the natural and wholesome political instincts of common folk. . . . One is persuaded to thank God in such times as these that the common people maintain a degree of 'common sense,' that they preserve an uncorrupted ability to react against injustice and the cruelty of racial bigotry." (There are of course other passages in the book which speak in less complimentary terms of the common man, but it is our democratic prerogative—is it not?—to choose which expert we shall follow, and upon which mood of a given expert we shall draw for our quotations.)

Before leaving this first question, we may add one further consideration—namely, the rapidly increasing dissemination of vital facts into the humblest home by way of newspaper, radio, and the public school. A recent observer returning from abroad was moved to comment upon the extremely high degree of well-informed interest in public affairs which is to be found among the

American people. Here is one further reason for daring to place some measure of confidence in the workings of the intelligence of the average person.

2. *Is human nature broad enough in its interests and sympathies, by and large, for democracy; or is it incapable of cooperative action for the common good?* (We are deliberately avoiding the terms "selfish" and "unselfish." What we are after is not any mythical simon-pure altruism, but merely sufficient breadth of self to affirm the interests of other individuals and other groups.)

Here again we must not take too easy a way out by claiming any unreal goodness which does not exist outside our own wishful thinking. Orthodoxy has given human nature a bad name, and the neo-orthodoxy has reaffirmed this low estimate. In reacting against this evaluation it is possible to commit an equal error by swinging too far to the other extreme. For example, a good deal has been made of Margaret Mead's discovery in New Guinea of a tribe, the Arapesh, in whose culture a premium is placed upon the so-called feminine virtues—notably kindliness and service. Professor Elliott in *Can Religious Education Be Christian?* quite properly uses this tribe to illustrate the point that human nature is amoral and can be molded into patterns of cooperation as well as into patterns of aggressive self-seeking. But we do well to remind ourselves that for every culture of the Arapesh type a hundred can be found of the opposite type; and that the Arapesh tribe is noteworthy precisely because it is so unusual. In his book *The Church and Society* Professor F. Ernest Johnson has written: "It is no more natural for a person to seek his own private ends than to seek to aid someone else in attaining his ends." This thought-provoking statement is doubtless true if the stress be placed upon the word "natural"; that is to say, seeking to aid someone else is just as truly rooted in human nature as seeking one's own selfish interests. However, we must not draw the inference that human nature is nicely poised between selfishness and unselfishness, between self-concern and group-concern, and can come down on one side of the fence every whit as easily as on the other. Probably a truer appraisal of the situation would be to say that it is just as natural for human nature to help others

as to seek private ends, and richly satisfying in the long run—but quite a bit harder.

History is too full of individuals whose circle of concern was gathered narrowly about their own persons to draw any other inference. And history is just as full of instances of concern which indeed went beyond the circle of an individual's interests, but stopped far short of a universal sympathy—being limited to a family, or a clan, or a class, or a nation. There is, for example, the narrow class-consciousness of labor unions at the New York World's Fair. The State of Nevada desired to include in its exhibit an intricate model of Boulder Dam. The wiring of the model had been done in the first instance by unionized labor, but the labor leaders at the Fair were not content. They demanded that the wiring be ripped out, and replaced by union labor on the grounds. In the end the State of Nevada had no exhibit at all. It has been estimated that demands such as this cost the exhibitors at least $4,000,000—a rather striking example of a narrow circle of concern. Then there is the financial manipulation of the Jews in Germany at the time of severe inflation, by dint of which they enriched their own circle at the nation's expense. And there is the narrow-gauged international policy of the British Tories during the past decade or so, which seems actually to have lent strength to the growing Nazi power. The motivating desire of the Tories was to counterbalance Russian communism, and thus safeguard capitalism in general and their own class-interests in particular. At this moment their whole nation is paying a heavy price for their narrow class-concern. And there is German nationalism which draws a circle including all Germans and excluding all others; and Japanese nationalism, and American nationalism, and others too numerous to mention. One may well ask, Is this the stuff from which democracy can be made?

The prospect would be highly discouraging were this the whole picture; but it is not. There are at the present time upwards of a hundred different relief agencies in the United States whose funds flow throughout the world. In every one of them we have a group of human beings cherishing the interests of peoples widely removed from them in language and race, or at least in distance. That too is human nature. We see also the strange

spectacle of the foreign missionary enterprise through whose channels men and money are sent to the uttermost parts of the earth at great sacrifice and little benefit to the senders. That too is human nature. We see Sidney Hillman and his Amalgamated Clothing Workers lending money to manufacturers so that their factories may be kept running. That too is human nature. If it be said that this is merely enlightened self-interest, the comment is entirely beside the point. We are not concerned for the moment about motives; we are concerned only to discover whether human nature is capable of working in larger and larger social units. The answer seems to be that it is capable of so acting. More often than not it has acted otherwise, but the capacity is there—waiting to be developed.

3. *Is human nature emotionally independent enough to make its own decisions and conduct its own affairs; or must it be tied indefinitely to someone's apron-strings?*

Here again there is much to be said on the anti-democratic side. One of the most challenging bits of evidence is the adherence to Roman Catholicism of a number of men of great intellectual power not in their helpless childhood but in the full bloom of their maturity. The list runs from Cardinal Newman, through Orchard, and Heywood Broun, and latterly Henri Bergson who now appears to have become a convert to Roman Catholicism five years before his recent death. In a comment upon the latest and in some respects the most striking of these cases *The Christian Century* sums up well the significance of them all. "What then shall the aged philosopher do, a Jew by race but not by faith,—a racial outcast in a turbulent world, unable to think his way clearly to conclusions which would give as stable a conviction as his heart desired? His answer was to attach himself, even though secretly, to a great institution which would carry for him the burden of all his doubts. This is ever the temptation of the tired liberal who craves a certainty he can not find until at last he mistakes the voice of authority for the assurance of certainty." If this be human nature, how can democracy with its demand for emotional independence and self-dependence ever be a success in any sphere of human relationships?

The same reflection is called forth by the sight of the German

people—a great people, a talented people—accepting fanatically the leader-principle with what appears to be almost a sigh of release and relief. Countless other phenomena on the human scene point in the same direction. There are doubtless many employees who are happier in their dependent relationship than they would be if they were seated at the manager's desk. In all probability there are many share-croppers who for all their debasing poverty are happier than they would be if they owned their own farms. And then there is ever and anon the student who can not rest content until he asks the professor, "But what do *you* think about it?"

It is useless to dispute the fact that an autocratic regime contains rich satisfaction for all concerned—the leader and the led. And yet it is equally true to human nature to say that the deepest and the most abiding satisfactions are not so found—for either the leader or the led. There is no better proof of this than the sure fact that when we have dearly purchased a transitory peace by yielding to someone else's authority, we hate ourselves for so doing. The intensity of this hate is clearly shown in the violence with which the authority is overthrown sooner or later—theological, ethical, economic, or political. For the violence which attends all reformations and revolutions is somewhat more than a mere excess of vigor thrown in for good measure to insure that the job is well done; it is the outburst at long last of a pent-up desire for independence. This desire for full and complete selfhood is inseparable from self-consciousness itself, and is never completely obliterated even in the spurious happiness of a sheltered life. It belongs to human nature as such—rich and poor, old and young, educated and illiterate. In the so-called Maryland study some thousands of young people were asked what degree of self-government they wished in their organizations. The choices set before them were: "None," "Slight amount," "Much," "Complete." Only 11 per cent chose the first two; almost half of them said "Much"; and more than a third of them went all the way and replied "Complete." That too is human nature.

It seems then that we are made for democracy. Human nature is made for democracy—ultimately, if not immediately. For the

time being it may fall more readily into other patterns of living, but there is always a yearning for something beyond. These intermediate stages are dimly recognized for what they are—not the final destination but merely half-way points.

We may conclude therefore that human nature has the capacity for democracy; only this capacity needs to be cultivated with care. Such cultivation is the perennial task of home, church, school, radio, press, industry, and government.

Human nature contains within it the capacity for intelligent decision. If children are given an opportunity from their earliest years to develop this capacity, they will do so to a high degree. But it does not descend upon them as a gift from heaven.

Human nature contains the capacity for a breadth of sympathy, interest, and concern. But there is nothing in the nature of human nature or of the social scheme to guarantee an automatic flowering of such sympathy. It must be cultivated assiduously.

Human nature contains the capacity for emotional independence. But it too is a potentiality and nothing more. The stuff of which we are made can be molded and shaped into dependent forms, from which we make our escape only by dint of much struggle and suffering.

In short, democracy is not a gift to humanity. It is not an endowment. It is not an automatic outgrowth of human nature. It is not made inevitable by the nature of human nature. But it is the goal toward which we are headed irresistibly by virtue of what we are. And it *is* possible in the light of human nature. In the long run it is probably the only thing that is possible.

Lancaster, Pa.

PENNSYLVANIA AND THE OECUMENICAL IDEAL*

John Joseph Stoudt

I

In one of the most influential theological propositions ever formulated, the Lausatian shoemaker, Jacob Boehme, wrote:

> The reader is to know that in Yes and No consist all things, be they divine, diabolic, terrestial, or however they may be named.[1]

This is the source of modern dialectics for ideas, as well as nature and man, participate in the tension of *Realdialectik*. Ideas are not born full grown. They arrive by the Yes and the No. They grow. They come to be out of the tensions of existence and they are dialectically interdependent.

Thus, for example, the idea of revelation is related in a dialectical fashion to the idea of tolerance, for the man who claims revelation is necessarily intolerant, crying out from the depths of his heart: "Thus speaks the Lord."[2] So too the oecumenical idea is dialectical. It was born in the turbulent seventeenth century, and, in spite of the word's obvious Greek origin, it is a thoroughly modern idea, depending for its power and persuasiveness upon the vigorous existence of another idea. The oecumenical idea cannot be understood without knowing the idea of separatism, for oecumenicity and separatism are dialectical ideas, each one being necessary for the others' existence.

It was the long struggle for religious liberty, for tolerance, which made the oecumenical ideal possible because this struggle for freedom led to the establishment of "free" churches, separated from the universal church. And the oecumenical idea of the present, conceived as an attempt to unite in organic union

* The address by the Reverend John Joseph Stoudt before the annual meeting of the Historical Society of the Reformed Church in the U. S., in Santee Chapel, on May 7, 1941.

1 Jacob Boehme, *Questiones Theosophiae*, iii, 2.

2 This idea is presented in a remarkable but nevertheless neglected book: Johannes Kühn, *Toleranz und Offenbarung, Eine Untersuchung der Motive und Motiveformen der Toleranz im Offenbarungglauben Protestantismus*, Leipzig, 1923.

the various churches in the world, is inconceivable without the achieved fulfillment of the struggle for religious liberty, the origin of many of our present-day denominations.

Thus, the long and courageous struggle for freedom of conscience and purity of cultus, culminating in the establishment of the many religious groups which we have today, was the necessary basis upon which the idea of church union could arise. The oecumenical idea is dialectical, the counterpart to the idea of separatism, these two ideas constituting the Yes and the No.

The circumstances of history made our own Pennsylvania the battleground on which these two ideas clashed. And the story of the struggle between them may throw needed light upon the problems of the modern church.

II

The Renaissance and the Reformation had unleashed tremendous forces which finally consumed themselves in the fury of the wars of religion. And the Peace of Westphalia (24 October 1648) was no guarantee of religious freedom for its famous provision, *cujus regio illius religio,* was merely a Protestant attempt to regulate the disastrous results of the *ius reformandi.* As a result of these unfortunate provisions of the treaty the idea of religious liberty did not become *religious* in Germany until near the end of the Seventeenth Century for it always remained to some extent a juridical principle, originating in the Renaissance interest in the doctrine of natural right. Hugo Grotius had based his idea of religious freedom upon social need and upon the *ius naturale.*[3] Hobbes similarly granted tolerance because it was essential to his *corpus politicum.*[4] John Locke, both in his *Essay on the Human Understanding* and in his *Letters on Toleration,* advocated religious freedom upon these same humanitarian and humanistic grounds, thus expressing the revolt of emancipated, enlightened man from medieval dogmatic authority in the form of critical self assertion.[5] Puffendorf and Thomasius,

[3] *De Jure Bell. et Pac.,* I, i, 10.

[4] Hobbes, *Leviathan,* Chapter xxi.

[5] Locke, *Essay on the Human Understanding,* pp. 337–338 in the abridged version of Pringle-Pattison. It is dubious if the tolerance ideas expressed in the Appendix to Book iv of Spinoza's *Ethica* were religiously motivated.

German advocates of the secular idea of religious liberty, failed to advise tolerance and freedom of conscience on religious grounds.[6]

These advocates of tolerance were moved by coldly political and humanitarian reasons rather than by the religious duty of love. It was the re-birth of piety which followed the hideous devastation of the Thirty Years War which laid the basis upon which the religious idea of tolerance could be built.

Other oecumenical attempts had proceeded—attempts to unite the churches which originated in indifference rather than in tolerance. Georg Calixtus, Professor of Theology at Helmstadt, had sought to reunite all Protestant groups by the creation of a minimum set of articles upon which all groups might agree. This idea of the *articuli fundamentales* had been part of a theology of retreat, an attempt to state Christianity in minimum terms, and, like the liberalism of the Nineteenth Century, it had offended sincere believers, ultimately ending in further divisions.[7]

Probably the first great Protestant theologian who advocated tolerance and proposed oecumenicity on religious grounds, that is, on the basis of Christian love, was the pride of Saumur, Moïse Amyraut, the foremost of the Huguenot theologians. Amyraut's doctrine of the *universalismus hypotheticus,* of the universality of Grace, is the necessary theological basis of all oecumenicity and it is implied in all attempts at church union. It also was the theological principle directly responsible for the rôle that Pennsylvania played in the oecumenical drama. Amyraut

Kühn, in *op. cit.,* defines four main motifs of tolerance: 1) the spiritual, as in Caspar Schwenkfeldt, Roger Williams, and the English Baptists; 2) the tolerance of the other Baptists, including the Quakers! 3) the mystical motif as in David Joris and Jacob Boehme; and 4) the ethical and rational motif in Castellio, Acontius, the Arminians, Chillingworth, Taylor, and Spener.

[6] Puffendorf: *De habita religionis Christianae ad vitam civilem,* Brema, 1687; 6th edition, 1727. Thomasius: *Programma de tolerantia dissidentium in controversiis religionis,* Halle, 1693.

[7] The Syncretistic movement, seeking to reunite the divided Protestant churches, ended in dismal further divisions. *Vide* Heussi, *Kompendium der Kirchengeschichte,* Tübingen, 1933, pp. 328ff. Paracelsus (d. 1541) was an early oecumenical theologian, for he wanted neither Lutheran, Zwingli, Anabaptist, nor Romanist, but a Catholic church. Paracelsus's theological writings are not available.

stressed the universality of the Grace of Christ without descending into Arminianism, and the reputation that his tract, *La Morale Chrétienne,* enjoyed bordered upon the sensational.

Saumur and its famed Amyraut was the mecca of Protestant students from all of Europe. Near the end of 1662 a rebellious, dreaming son of an English Admiral took his seat in Amyraut's classroom. Of all of Amyraut's students, William Penn was the only one to whom it was granted to experiment with *La Morale Chrétienne.* Through the writings and the activity of this young Englishman the ideas of the French Reformed Church of the Seventeenth Century were grafted onto Quakerism and transplanted into the oecumenical ideas of the New World Church.[8]

In Germany the ideas of religious liberty and of the universality of Grace—respectively the empirical and the theological bases of oecumenicity—were forged out on the hard anvil of persecution. It must be borne in mind that under the terms of the Peace of Westphalia dissent or separatism meant either exile or banishment. The Church was the Prince's Church. Thus the struggle for religious liberty was essentially a political struggle, possible only in an absolute state and necessarily involving separation. Under the Peace Treaty there were only three alternatives: first, the Christian might accept the Prince's religion and all would be well; secondly, he might attempt to convert the Prince, a dangerous and almost impossible task;[9] and thirdly he might emigrate, that is, separate himself from both Church and State. The hard provisions of the Treaty of Westphalia forced sincere but unorthordox believers to separate from the church-state; leading directly to the many dissenting churches which we have today.

Thus the great struggle for religious liberty, which gained for the American Church its most cherished heritage, had separatism as an inevitable by-product. This was unavoidable. It could only have been different had the church-state settlement been of a different kind. And the significance of the oecumenical movement of the present lies wholly in this historico-logical relation-

[8] M. R. Brailsford, *The Making of William Penn,* London 1930, p. 118.

[9] Both Spener and Francke, particularly the latter, were seeking to convert the Princes. *Vide* Hans-Walter Erbe, *Zinzendorf und der Fromme Hohe Adel seiner Zeit,* Leipzig, 1928.

ship, for how can these separated but free churches unite? This is our problem.

One solution was worked out by our forbears in Eighteenth Century Pennsylvania in tears, sweat, and heart-rending failure. Perhaps their hard-won solution can help us now.

III

William Penn and Nicolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf were both stubborn idealists. Penn, believing that the seal of divinity had been stamped upon him, planned his refuge for the persecuted across the sea. Zinzendorf, fretting at the sterility of the churches and secretly admiring the vitality of the sects, felt called to create a church in Pennsylvania in which the Redeemer's presence would be so perceptively felt as to halt words, prayer, and singing. Both dreams were failures—but significant failures. Penn's vision was a significant factor in shaping the American political pattern, while Zinzendorf's ideal forms the working principle of modern church cooperation.[10]

Pennsylvania's religious conditions were peculiarly adapted for an attempted actualization of Zinzendorf's ideal. Penn's tolerance, grounded upon Amyraut's doctrine of universal Grace, bore significant fruit, for, with neighbouring Delaware, Pennsylvania gave equal footing to all sects. German Christians here found a freedom they had not previously enjoyed. However liberal the *ius tolerandi* and the *devotio domestica* of the Westphalian Peace had seemed to be, only 'established' churches had been allowed and dissenters from their Elector's choice had been granted the generous *beneficium emigrationis.*[11] And emigrate they did—to Pennsylvania!

This Colony was the religious melting-pot. Zinzendorf lists the following groups:[12] English Lutherans, Swedish Lutherans, German Lutherans, Dutch Reformed, Scotch Reformed, Palatine Reformed, English Baptists, *Vereenigte Vlamminger en Water-*

[10] Zinzendorf's church ideal was not the same as that expressed by Gottfried Arnold in the *Vorrede* to his famous *Unpartheyische Kirchen und Ketzer Historei.*

[11] Francesco Ruffini, *Religious Liberty,* London, 1912, p. 199–200.

[12] *Naturelle Reflexiones,* n.d., n.p., pp. 199–200.

lander, Danzig Mennonites,[13] Socinians, Arians, Quakers, German Old-Baptists,[14] German New-Baptists,[15] 'New Lights', Inspired,[16] Sabbatarians,[17] Independents, and Freethinkers. He omitted several important groups from this impressive list: The Swiss Mennonites or Amish; the Newborns[18]; the Labadists; the followers of Jacob Boehme; the Schwenkfeldians; and his own group, the Moravians.

In Colonial Pennsylvania, where religious freedom had nursed religious individualism, there was unique opportunity to unite divided Protestantdom.

The oecumenical ideal early had been a part of the moving Pennsylvania dream, for when William Penn proposed his Penn-

[13] The Danzig Mennonites here referred to were probably the descendants of the Sixteenth Century Anabaptists of Dutch nationality who had settled in the North Sea cities and along the Baltic. Danzig and Altona had large Mennonite congregations during the Seventeenth Century. The pericope of Jacob Denner, one of the Altona ministers, was widely circulated among the Mennonites in Pennsylvania, particularly in Bucks County. *Vide Mennonitischer Lexikon, passim.*

[14] The German 'Old Baptists' were the descendents of the Anabaptists who had survived in the Palatinate.

[15] The German 'New Baptists' were the followers of Hochmann von Hochenau who had come to Pennsylvania under the leadership of Peter Becker and Alexander Mack. They are the present-day Dunkers. Included in this movement was a left-wing Spinozist-Mennonite group known as the 'Dompelaars.' On Hochmann and his followers *vide* Heinz Renkewitz, *Hochmann von Hochenau (1670–1721): Quellenstudien zur Geschichte des Pietismus,* Breslau, 1935. This is an able new work on unknown materials. *Vide* also the article 'Dompelaars' in *Mennonitischer Lexikon.*

[16] The Inspired originated with the Cevenese Camisards and appeared in Germany in 1704, led by Johann Friedrich Rock and Eberhard Ludwig Gruber. Gruber was one of the first Würtemberg Pietists. *Vide* C. Kolb, *Die Anfänge des Pietismus und Separatismus in Württemberg,* Stuttgart 1902. Gruber's son, Johann Adam Gruber, was Zinzendorf's thorn-in-the-flesh in Pennsylvania. *Vide* Max Göbel *Geschichte des Christlichen Lebens in der rheinisch-westphälischen evangelischen Kirche,* Coblenz, 1849, 1852, 1860, III, pp. 126–165.

[17] The 'Sabbatarians' were the followers of the mystical Johann Conrad Beissel at Ephrata, undoubtedly the most significant of all religious experiments in Colonial Pennsylvania. *Vide* Lamech and Agrippa, *Chronicon Ephratense,* translated by Max Hark, Lancaster, 1890.

[18] The 'Newborns' were the followers of a *Volksprophet,* Matthies Baumann, in Oley. Literature is scarce.

sylvania Constitution, a contemporary pamphleteer had suggested:

> let all Protestants unite in mutual condecension, affection, and interest; it is high time . . . nothing will save but union.[19]

In 1702 the *Curieuse Nachricht* of Daniel Falckner—a book which had large influence in turning the tide of German migration to Pennsylvania—asked as its hundreth question: 'What hope is there that the divers sects may come together as one?' And the answer was:

> This, viz., that the Lord Jesus will cause to be royally proclaimed in every conscience that all men are liars, so that all flesh may be indebted to him, and relinquish the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and take refuge under the fig tree and vine of charity (love); so that they can at once abandon all judaizing dialogues, oppositions and anathematization, and preserve themselves by the word of patience from the horrible hour of temptation, which is coming over the whole surface of the earth. They who will not come in, in this summer, let them tarry until all the different colors which are spread over the world become as one by themselves, which is more probable than that so many godless heads should become as one.[20]

The oecumenical ideal already had been planted in Pennsylvania by the Dutch Quakers who settled Germantown,[21] and the followers of Johann Kelp actually had attempted about the turn of the century a reunion of the then existent Pennsylvania religious groups.[22] Thus the eager, zealous Pietists offered to the early settlers of Pennsylvania the hope that the monstrous divisions of the church would again find union here in Penn's lands.

Inherent in the many groups which came to Pennsylvania

[19] *Three Considerations Proposed to Mr Pen,* London, n.d., seen in the Pamphlet Collection of the Library of New College, University of Edinburgh, Scotland.

[20] Cf. Daniel Falckner's *Curieuse Nachricht von Pennsylvanien* in 'proceedings of the Pennsylvania German Society,' Volume xiv, 1903, pp. 227ff. The relationship of Pietism and the settlement of Pennsylvania, and the consequent effect upon the oecumenical ideal in America, has been little studied.

[21] *Vide* William Hull, *William Penn and the Dutch Quaker Migration to Pennsylvania,* Swarthmore, 1936.

[22] *Vide* Heinz Kloss, *Um die Einigung des Deutschamerikanertums,* Berlin, 1936, p. 36.

there was, then, this oecumenical ideal of Pietism—an ideal born of the deep and revolutionary struggles for religious freedom during the latter half of the Seventeenth Century. Although these groups bore many strange and unfamiliar names, the real differences, especially among those of Continental origin, were not great. In spite of divisions into 'economies' and 'congregations', they maintained their dependence upon the German evangelical cultus by allowing its patterns of worship to dominate: the church year was followed, the pericopes used, the sacraments celebrated, and the rich fund of German hymns drawn upon.[23] Furthermore, these groups saw themselves as primitive Christianity revived,[24] as a restoration of the church of the Apostles.[25] They were not 'sects' in Troeltsch's simplified classification, for their ideal of a revived Apostolic church implied more than simple obedience to the prime law of Christ.[26] The Thirty Years War, Seventeenth Century French Quietism, the *Innerlichkeit* of German Mysticism, and those natural forces of self-reform inherent in the Reformation itself had led the German Evangelical church to self-examination. And, comparing the Seventeenth Century church with that moving picture of the Apostolic Church in the New Testament, the inevitable conclusion was that somehow, somewhere, the church had fallen upon evil days. Thus the *Verfallsidee* was rediscovered by the Pietists. Building upon Luther's idea of *Zeugen der Wahrheit,*[27] which Flacius had introduced into the stream of church history,[28] a distinction arose

[23] Many of these groups produced their own excellent hymnology.

[24] William Penn, *Primitive Christianity Revived in the Faith and Practise of the People called Quakers,* London, 1936.

[25] The idea of restitution had a double significance: first, it meant the restoration of a fallen church. Secondly, the restitution of the unity of all things to what they originally had been before Adam's fall. The former idea was directed towards the reformation of, or separation from, a fallen church and the restoration of the true church of the Apostles. The latter was the Boehmist *Wiederbringungslehre,* the restitution of all things by an 'Everlasting Gospel.' Cf. Boehme, *Signatura Rerum,* vii, 78.

[26] Ernst Troeltsch, *Social Teachings of the Christian Church,* London 1931, I, pp. 461–462.

[27] *Vide* Friedrich Breckling's account 'Mehreren Zeugen der Wahrheit' in Gottfried Arnold's *Kirchen und Ketzer Historei,* 1729, ii, pp. 1089a–1110a.

[28] *Vide Magdeburger Zenturien,* Magdeburg 1559–1574, 13 Vols. Flacius

between 'true' and 'false' Christianity. Johann Arndt's *Wahres Christenthum,* Jacob Boehme's *Gespräch einer Erleucht-und Unerleuchteten Seele,* the legends of Christian Rosenkreuz,[29] Valentin Weigel's *Gespräch vom Wahren Christenthum,* Spener's *Der Klagen über das Verdorbene Christenthum,* Francke's idea of *Empfindlichkeit,* the prophetism of Rock and Gruber,[30] and the melodious spirituality of the poets—these emphasized the Verfallsidee, thus laying the basis for Pietism and for Separatism. To the idea of the state church, then, there must be added this idea of a fallen church, for the full idea of dissent became important because the nature of the church, her character and her rôle in the world, was at stake in the war-torn Seventeenth Century. Separation was really unimportant, for the idea of a fallen church is already implied in Spener's *ecclesiolae in ecclesia.*

From this Pietism within and this Separatism without the world-church's fellowship there arose an ideal of religious life which sought to preserve both liberty of conscience and the apostolic purity of the Christian cultus. Separatists were willing to sacrifice unity for purity, thus calling the church to renewed self-examination, protecting her from final loss of her essential character by subjecting her to the criterion of the New Being in Christ Jesus. Buddeus of Jena said that God's children were to be found in all groups, and that the *true* church consisted of those who lived in intimate communion with Jesus Christ.[31] This intimate communion with Jesus Christ was the goal of the Pious and it also served as the motivation of the first

sought purity of doctrine in opposition to the Syncretistic views of the Crypto-Calvinists.

[29] *Vide* Will-Erich Peuckert's *Die Rosenkreutzer,* Jena 1928.

[30] Eberhard Ludwig Gruber's definition of 'true' separatism carries a strange note. Since it was implied in his son's view of the church and thus helped to defeat Zinzendorf's plan it is of interest: 'Die wahren Separatisten fangen keine neue Secten an, als welchen wiederaufbauen heisse, was zuvor abgebrochen (war); sondern sie gehen in das inwendige Christenthum, in ihr Herz, und suchen Gott in der Wahrheit zo dienen, auf dessen selige Offenbarung und Erscheinungen in und aussen ihnen sie dann mit freudiger und glaubensvoller Wandel führen.' Quoted by Göbel, *op. cit.,* III, p. 131.

[31] L. T. Reichel, *The Early History of the Church of the United Brethren,* Nazareth 1888, pp. 68–69. Spangenberg had studied with Buddeus.

American oecumenical movement: Zinzendorf's 'Pennsylvania Congregation of God in the Spirit.'[32]

IV

When Nicolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf landed in New York, 30 November 1741,[33] his presence in the New World was due to four things:

In the first place, after the collapse of the Moravian experiment in Georgia, the leaders had come to Pennsylvania. Augustus Gottlieb Spangenberg, formerly *Magister* at Jena,[34] had come to live in the Skippack with Christopher Wiegner, a Schwenkfeldian. He had preached and itinerated, observed religious conditions among Germans and Indians, farmed the fertile Perkiomen, and had written letters to Zinzendorf in Herrnhut saying that many thousands of these people care so little about religion, that it has become proverbial to say of a man who does not care himself about God and His Word: he has the Pennsylvania religion.[35] In response to Spangenberg's pleas, Andreas Eschenbach had been sent to minister to the Germans and Christian Henry Rauch to the Indians. Peter Böhler also had come to Pennsylvania—the same Peter Böhler who had gained the stubborn ear of John Wesley in England.[36]

[32] Zinzendorf catholicity was natively Moravian as well as Pietistis. In 1660 Comenius wrote in his *An Exhortation of the Churches of Bohemia to the Church of England,* London 1661, that four things were necessary for the church's safety: 1) that Christendom unite, 2) that order be reestablished, 3) that bands of Apostles reappear, and 4) that the spirit of life prevail. (p. 22) He desired another Apostolic church, believing mere reunion insufficient. Order also was necessary. (pp. 25–26) 'O how happy the church would be if we could get back to the times of the Apostles.' (p. 54) Purity and catholicity both are sought.

[33] Levering, *A History of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania,* Bethlehem 1903, p. 72. All dates following are old style.

[34] Gerhard Reichel, *August Gottlieb Spangenberg, Bishof der Brüderkirche,* Tübingen 1906, p. 44f.

[35] Spangenberg, *Leben des Herrn . . . von Zinzendorf.* Barby 1774, p. 1380.

[36] *Vide* John Wesley's *Journal,* passim. In Pennsylvania Böhler was associated with Whitefield's attempt to 'establish a negro school in Pennsylvania.' Cf. Levering, *op. cit.,* p. 43. He also aided Spangenberg in the Associated Brethren of the Skippack.

Secondly, George Whitefield had passed, comet-like, through the Colonies, leaving a fiery path of religious unrest in Pennsylvania. On the morning of 24 April 1740 he had preached at Wiegner's with 2000 present and in the afternoon at Henrich Antes' with 3000. He was also seeking to establish a school for negroes at Nazareth.[37] Orthodox clergy had been offended and Whitefield says that the Quakers 'spat out a little of the serpent.'[38] His letters to Zinzendorf in Herrnhut had been welcomed as open invitations to journey to Pennsylvania and help in fishing for men.

Thirdly, when Zinzendorf came to America he had already been in correspondence with the leaders of Pennsylvania's sects, and this in spite of later denials.[39] These letters, still preserved in the Archives at Herrnhut, show that the religious possibilities of Pennsylvania had tempted the Count as early as 1736.[40]

Lastly, German religious leaders were themselves stirring into action. Moved by the chaotic conditions in Pennsylvania, Johann Adam Gruber had sent out in 1736 his *Gründliche An-und Aufforderung an die ehmalig Erweckte Seelen in Pennsylvanien.*[41] This was an invitation to the religious leaders of the Colony to form a group for devotional meetings, prayer groups, and mutual edification—a colony-wide conventicle. The result of Gruber's appeal was the 'Associated Brethern of the Skippack,' an organization which had been meeting once every four weeks since 1736

[37] *Two Centuries of Nazareth, 1740–1940,* Nazareth, 1940, p. 5.

[38] *The Works of the Reverend George Whitefield,* London 1771, I, pp. 438ff.

[39] Spangenberg, *Apologetisches Schluss-Schrifft, Erster Theil,* Leipzig und Görlitz 1752, *passim.*

[40] Zinzendorf was in correspondence with Gruber, Beissel, Saur, and others before he came to Pennsylvania. The war has interrupted the reproducing of these materials in the Herrnhut Archives.

[41] Gruber's tract was originally printed in 1736, probably by either Christopher Saur or Benjamin Franklin. It was twice reprinted: 1) in *Pennsylvanische Nachrichten von dem Reiche Christi, Anno 1742,* n.p., n.d., and 2) in *Büdingische Sammlung Einiger in die Kirchen Historie Einschlagender Sonderlich neuere Schrifften,* (Leipzig 1742–1745, xviii pieces) Vol. III, pp. 13–37. Albrecht Ritschl discovered that Zinzendorf tampered with the text as given in Johann Philip Fresenius *Bewährte Nachrichten von Herrnhutischen Sachen,* (Franckfurth u. Leipzig, 1748), III, pp. 271–380. Cf. Ritschl, *Geschichte des Pietismus,* III, p. 324.

at Christoph Wiegner's.[42] The membership of the Skippack Brethren formed the nucleus of the Synods which Zinzendorf later established, and the Count considered Gruber's *Call* a personal one.[43]

These four reasons brought Zinzendorf to Pennsylvania, along with his ardent desire to fish for souls, red and white. He arrived at Philadelphia 29 November 1741 and said:

> I have been destined by God to preach the Word of the blood and death of Jesus, not with over-refinement, but with the power of God, without regard for what will happen to me . . . I cannot restrict myself in my witness to one religion, for the whole earth is the Lord's and all souls are his, and I am debtor to all.[44]

Again:

> I sought to enthrone the Lamb of God as real creator, preserver, redeemer, and sanctifier of the whole world; and to introduce the catholicity of the doctrine of his passion as a universal theology for the Germans in Pennsylvania, in theory and practice.[45]

After spending several days with friends in Philadelphia and Germantown, Zinzendorf went north into the country to Wiegner's and Antes'. This was 9 December 1741. Six days later Henrich Antes sent out a *Call* to all religious leaders to unite in a movement of Protestant Union: "The Pennsylvania Congregation of God in the Spirit."[46] In his *Call* Antes described the deplorable condition of the Christian Church, saying that "for several years" the suggestion for Union attempts had been made.

[42] *Vide* Kloss, *op. cit.*, p. 100. The membership of the Skippack Brethren included: Heinrich Fry, Johann Hooken, Georg Merkel, Christian Weber, Johann Bonn, Jacob Wenz, Jost Schmidt, Wilhelm Bossen, Jost Becker, Heinrich Antes, Wilhelm Frey, Georg Stiefel, Heinrich Holstein, Andreas Fry, Matthias Gemähle, Abraham Wagner, Jean Bertholet, Franz Ritter, Wilhelm Pott, Johann Bechtel, Johann Adam Gruber, Blosius Mackinet, Georg Benzel.

[43] Fresenius, *Nachrichten*, III, p. 291.

[44] L. T. Reichel, *Early History*, p. 93ff. The Doctrine of the universality of grace is clearly evident here.

[45] Levering, *History of Bethlehem*, p. 81.

[46] The text is given in Fresenius, *op. cit.*, pp. 303–305. It was altered by Zinzendorf when published in *Bud. Samml.* and *Penn. Nach.* A translation of the altered text is found in J. J. Sessler's *Communal Pietism Among the Early American Moravians*, (New York, 1933), p. 29.

Thus

> to remedy the frightful evil wrought in the church of Christ . . . through mistrust and suspicion

more than one hundred Pennsylvanians met at the house of Theobald Endt in Germantown, New Year's Day, 1742. Lutherans, Reformed, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Quakers, Mennonites, Dunkers, Sabbatarians, Inspired, and Individual Separatists gathered in the hope that

> with the Saviour's blessing they could do away with the judging and condemning, gossiping, injuring, and defaming

which had made Pennsylvania the laughing-stock of the world—a "Quakerland!"[47]

The Ephrata Solitary, led by their capable Prior, Israel Eckerlin, were given the places of honour—a signal recognition of the genius of their leader, Johann Conrad Beissel.

At this first session a tract was introduced wherein the American sermons of Zinzendorf were attacked, and the Count was accused of deliberately misleading his hearers.[48] Prior Eckerlin of Ephrata asked the Synod to refuse future consideration to similar writings unless they were personally presented by their author, as evidence of good faith. Synod so decided, and, after defining the scope of future discussions, the first session adjourned.

In the evening Zinzendorf addressed the delegates, describing the new tide of Enthusiasm which was bearing many into the Lord's land. He urged the delegates to guard their precious liberty of conscience, for if zeal died Pennsylvania might become a Babel of unregenerate consciences.

At the third session, held the next day, the delegates discussed the preliminary problems of motive and procedure. The first question, characteristically Pietistic, asked: "Since it is a mark

[47] The Minutes of the Synods were recorded by Johann Jakob Müller, the private secretary of Zinzendorf. This Johann Jakob Müller is not to be confused with the Johann Heinrich Müller who was Zinzendorf's printer, and who set up these minutes in Franklin's shop. On the first Synod, *vide: Authentischer Relation von dem Anlass, Fortgang, und Schlüsse der am 1sten and 2ten Januarii 1742 in Germantaun gehaltenen Versammlung . . . Gedruckt bey Benjamin Francklin* (1742).

[48] The Tract was by Johann Adam Gruber.

of creaturehood to seek fellowship, why do we wish to unite? Is our desire for union simply the result of creaturely gregariousness?" Synod asserted that there was a spiritual fellowship which bore little relationship to gregariousness, and prayed that this might be the basis of the proposed union.

Next: "What is the church?" And the answer was threefold: the "Congregation of God in the Spirit" is Christ's universal body; all who belong to Christ are in this congregation; and in so far as each economy remains true to Jesus, the diversity of the church is her beauty.

After setting up machinery for the settlement of disputes, Synod asked: "What are the articles on which we agree?" And the answer was the first American Creed, formally composed and formally subscribed to by the qualified delegates of at least ten Colonial churches.[49] It is a temperate but typical expression of Zinzendorfian theology—subjective, Christocentric, with the *praxis pietatis* dominant.[50] It is noteworthy neither for its profundity nor for the sweep of its theological architectonics, but for the fact that varied groups could and did subscribe to it. There was in this creed no syncretistic tendency for the idea of formulating *articuli fundamentales* was superseded by the Pietistic desire to formulate a definition of common Christian experience.

Two days before the Second Synod was to open, Zinzendorf as *Syndicus,* visited a venerable but unnamed Mennonite leader to explain to him the purposes of the Synods and the aims of the *Unitas Fratum,* and to invite him to attend the Second Synod.[51] The elderly Mennonite received the Count graciously, listened patiently, but declared that the time was really too short to send qualified delegates to the Synods from his Meeting. Zinzendorf

[49] The creed defines the nature of Christian 'experience,' rather than sum up the articles on which they agreed.

[50] Wilhelm Bettermann, *Theologie und Sprach bei Zinzendorf,* Gotha 1935. All decisions at the Synods were made by use of the Lot (*Los*), in typical Pietistic fashion.

[51] *Authentische Nachricht von der Verhandlung und dem Verlass der am 14den and 15den Januarii . . . 1742 . . . behaltenen Zweyten Versammlung . . . gedruckt . . . bey Benjamin Franklin* (1742).

also made unsuccessful overtures to Gruber to change his mind and attend the Second Synod.

The delegates gathered for the Second Synod at the home of the Schwenkfeldian potter, Georg Hübner, 14 January 1742.[52] After devotions the Ephrata delegates declared that they no longer held the decisions of the Synod binding upon their community. The Lutheran, Reformed, and Mennonite delegates replied that no group stood to lose autonomy and urged the Ephrata Brethern to reconsider their decision. Synod counseled patience and Ephrata's men agreed to postpone action.

Zinzendorf then presented another tract by Gruber which attacked the doctrinal bases of the Moravian leader, and he also presented his line-by-line answer to Gruber's attack.[53] Synod began next to discuss twenty-two further questions, seeking deeper basis for union. Three topics were discussed: evangelism, education, and the relation between the economies. An evangelistic method was proposed for work among the Indians,[54] and conversion among the whites was said to be hindered by doctrine, personalities, and the ever-present, busy devil. Synod counselled any method tested by the evangelist's experience and self-examination. Synod's attitude towards education resulted in the Moravian schools. The third problem, however, offered the rock on which the Synods ultimately floundered. The twentieth question dealt with the differing views of marriage in the congregations at Bethlehem (Moravian) and Ephrata (Sabbatarian). The latter held a high, even mystical, view of marriage, while the Moravians expediently married each other off by lot. The twenty-first question dealt with the personal relationships between the members of the several congregations, how they were to treat each other, and what attitude they should take towards the differing rites. Synod counselled a general interchange of preachers and devotional literature, and the common celebration of the Lord's Supper, foot-washings, and love feasts.

[52] *Ibid.*

[53] Gruber's tract: *Einfältige Warnungs- und Wächterstimme An die Geruffene Seelen dieser Zeit.* Zinzendorf's answer: *Liebes Echo einiger Versammleten Seelen die geruffen sind. . . .*

[54] Cf. 'Methodus der Wilden Bekehrung' in *Bud. Samml. . . .* III, p. 90.

The Third Synod, held at the home of the Huguenot, Jean DeTurck, 21 February 1742, marked the high-water mark of this Colonial oecumenical movement.[55] A significant event at this Oley Synod was the baptism of three Delaware Indians, Shabash, Kiom, and Kiop. They were named Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob —the "first fruits" and patriarchs of the sleeping lost tribe of Israel in the American Wilderness.[56]

When the first session convened the Brethren from Ephrata presented a series of tracts in which Zinzendorf's theology was ably and sharply attacked. They were written by Johannes Hildebrand, a melancholy but learned man, who had his doctorate from Giessen under Rambach. The first tract was a neat little systematic theology—a thumb-nail dogmatics—in which the mysticism of Jacob Boehme was clearly evident.[57] The second tract was a clear, concise statement why Ephrata could not continue in association with Zinzendorf.[58] The third was an able exposition of the Boehmist doctrine of the Virgin Sophia, an answer to the question on marriage raised at the Second Synod.[59] With the introduction of these tracts argument ran high, and the sentimental, enthusiastic Zinzendorf was no match for the brains from Ephrata. The Solitary—as the men from Ephrata were known —were trained theologians and disciplined minds: Peter Miller had his doctorate from Heidelberg and Israel Eckerlin from Strassbourg.[60] After argument grew uncontrollable the Ephrata delegates withdrew and their chronicler records:

> After that Zinzendorf spoke so violently that he had to

[55] *Zuverlässige Beschreibung der Dritten Conferenz, gedruckt bey Benjamin Franklin,* (1742).

[56] G. H. Loskiel, *A History of the Mission of the United Brethren,* London, 1794, II, pp. 20–21.

[57] *Mystisches und kirchliches Zeugniss der Bruderschaft in Zion von den wichtigsten Puncten des Christenthums* . . . in Fresenius, *Nachrichten,* iii, pp. 462–474.

[58] *Ein kurzer Bericht warum die Gemeinschaft in Ephrata sich mit den Grafen Zinzendorf* . . . *eingelassen* . . . in Fresenius, *Nachrichten,* iii, pp. 462–474.

[59] *Schrifftmässiges Zeugniss von den himmlischen und jungfräulichen Gebährungswerck,* in Fresenius, *Nachrichten,* iii, pp. 474, 503.

[60] Peter Miller, while at Heidelberg, worked with Mosheim on the *Ecclesiastical History,* compiling the chronological tables.

> surrender his office . . . and one of the Scottish church was put in his place, and thus in an angry spirit the session was closed.[61]

This was the high tide of oecumenicity in Pennsylvania.

The Synods, of course, continued, but the delegates were engaged in vindictive shadow-boxing. Zinzendorf's desire for vindication dominated the Fourth,[62] Fifth,[63] Sixth and Seventh[64] Synods, and the delegates who remained were cowed by the Count's will into subscribing to and underwriting his petty schemes for self-justification. The Saxon nobleman had found free Pennsylvanians who refused to bow before his array of titles, and who could match his unbridled enthusiasm. The general conclusions at the Seventh Synod gave a clean bill of fare only to the Quakers and the Moravians. All other groups were heartily condemned.[65]

One important task was accomplished at these later Synods: a new Catechism was produced, edited by a Reformed layman, Johannes Bechtel,[66] but really the work of Count Zinzendorf and his theological assistant, Pyraläus.[67] Benjamin Franklin, who did rushing business printing Zinzendorf's materials, published two German editions and an English edition in 1742; while a Swedish version appeared in 1743. Doctrinally it was tame and colourless, but showing an eager spirit. It simply could not compare, either with the vigorous Saxon faith of the *Shorter Lutheran,* nor with the mild, irenic spirit of the *Heidelberg.* Zinzendorf's religion was really not teachable, based as it was upon

[61] *Chronicon Ephratense,* p. 151.

[62] *Vierte General Versammlung der Kirche Gottes.* . . . Franklin, 1742.

[63] *Johann Jakob Müllers Gefürten Protokoll.* . . . Franklin, 1742.

[64] *Extract aus der Conferenz-Schreibers* . . . *Registratur,* Franklin, 1742. The Sixth and Seventh Conferences are reported in one tract.

[65] *Einmüthiger Schluss den General-Synodi von Pennsylvani wegen der Religionen,* in *Bud. Samml.,* II, pp. 810ff.

[66] *Kurzer Catechismus vor etliche Gemeinen Jesu, aus der Reformirten Religionen.* . . . (Philadelphia, 1742.)

[67] The Bethlehem *Diarium,* a communal Journal MS. under date of 22 July 1742 says that Zinzendorf wrote the Catechism and Bechtel edited it. Johann Philip Boehm, the Reformed preacher, said in his *Faithful Letter of Warning* (Philadelphia 1742): 'It is plain that he (Bechtel) only shot off the bullet which had been cast by Zinzendorf.'

enthusiasm. The pretended Creedal Basis of this catechism—and of the Synods for that matter—was the Synod of the Protestant pastors of Berne, 9 January 1532.[68]

V

Instead of unifying divided Pennsylvania Protestantism, these Seven Synods of "The Pennsylvania Congregation of God in the Spirit" had the opposite effect: denominational consciousness emerged in more stubborn, permanent form. The divided congregations grew more self-contained, independent, and self-centered. Differences were sharpened. The year 1742 was, then, the turning point in Pennsylvania church history—and therefore proportionately in American church history—because it was the moment of crystallization. Before 1742, the year of these Synods, there had been a great measure of fluidity, warmth, neighbourliness, and bonds of fellowship. After 1742 there was rigidity, firmness, and almost unyielding self-assertion of denominational absolutism. This was the tragic result of Zinzendorf's attempt.

Each denomination grew to be an organic unity.

The Moravians gained hundreds of converts, and viewed simply from the point of view of sheep-stealing, the Synods were rather successful. After the discontented delegates from the other groups withdrew the Moravians continued the Synods until 1748 when they became distinctly denominational in character. Moravian oecumenical energy was dissipated. Now they preached to and tended their Indians, built their famous communal economies, founded their excellent schools. and carried on unique experiments in Christian living.[69] But Zinzendorf's dream of the catholicity of the doctrine of Jesus' passion was dead.

The Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania was born out of the failure of these Synods. Heinrich Melchoir Muhlenberg arrived in Philadelphia 25 November 1742 to counteract Zinzendorf's influence among the Lutherans, and armed with credentials

[68] Gruber reported that Zinzendorf also intended to have a Lutheran Catechism printed to parallel the 'Reformed' Catechism of Bechtel. Cf. Fresenius, *Nachrichten*, iii, p. 189.

[69] L. T. Reichel, *Early History*, 139ff.

from Professor Francke in Halle. He relieved Zinzendorf of the pastoral duties of the Lutheran congregation in Philadelphia, even though the magistrates were finally forced to ask the reluctant Count to surrender the books.[70]

The Mennonites rebounded from near surrender of their denominational consciousness with a concerted program of publication, aimed at recalling the sufferings of their Anabaptist forbears. In 1742 Christopher Saur published the Anabaptist hymnal, *Ausbundt*, the oldest Protestant hymnal in continued use.[71] In 1745 the Mennonites had their *Güldene Apfel in Silbernen Schallen* printed,[72] and in 1748 the translation and printing of their great work, *Blutige Schauplatz, oder Martyrer Spiegel*, was completed, a monument to the Colonial printers. The works of Menno Simons and Phillip Schabalie were also introduced to counteract the union attitude.[73]

The German New Baptists, or Dunkers, reasserted their denominational consciousness by publishing the *Glaubensbekenntniss* of their patron saint, Hochmann von Hochenau, thus becoming what he did not wish them to be—a denomination.[74]

The Schwenkfeldians, for sixteen years the wards of Zinzendorf's paternalizing generosity, firmly but politely absolved the Count from further responsibility, and began to assemble materials for catechisms and hymnals.[75]

Ephrata, at first open-minded if not even favorable to the Zinzendorfian plan, was alienated by its doctrinal deficiencies and by the Count's greediness for converts. Conrad Beissel and Israel Eckerlin penned attacks and continued with renewed vigour the building of Ephrata.[76]

[70] *Hallische Nachrichten*, English Translation, Reading, 1882, pp. 17ff.

[71] *Die Ausbundt, das ist: Etliche schöne Christlichen Lieder. . . .* Germantaun, 1742.

[72] Ephrata, 1745. Letters, confessional writings, and instructions for hymnody constitute this volume.

[73] Simons, *Ein Fundament und Klare Anweisung:* Schabalie, *Die Wandelende Seele.*

[74] *Ernst Christoph Hochmanns von Hochenau Glaubens Bekenntniss. . . .* Germantaun, 1742.

[75] H. W. Kriebel, *The Schwenkfelders in Pennsylvania*, Lancaster, 1904, p. 118.

[76] *Chronicon Ephratense*, pp. 151–152.

Presbyterians wrote tracts against Zinzendorf, and, when the Synod of Holland suggested that they unite with the Dutch and German Reformed, the Synod of Philadelphia in 1743 refused to consider the proposal.[77]

The Reformed Church, beset by internal strife, floundered for a few years, but soon united behind Michael Schlatter to form its Coetus. Schlatter was the missionary of the Amsterdam Classis, sent to Pennsylvania to aid the ageing Johann Philip Boehm.[78]

The individual separatists were grimly antagonistic to Zinzendorf's plan, and wary of attempts, however they might be disguised, to win them back into the church. Gruber sent a barrage of letters to Germany, warning of Zinzendorf's zealous greed for converts.[79] Samuel Güldin, an old Swiss Warrior of the Pious, broke a silence of twenty years to attack Zinzendorf.[80] Christopher Saur[81] and Johann Franz Regnier[82] added their bolts. Even Whitefield and Wesley in England were annoyed.

Thus the first American oecumenical movement failed. Small congregations and individuals began to be absorbed by the renewed vigour of the denominations. Lutherans, Reformed, and Presbyterians reaped the harvest of religious anarchy in Pennsylvania resulting from the failure of Zinzendorf's plan, and within a few years the patterns of church life in Pennsylvania began to assume a permanent form.

Four causes lay behind the naked tragedy of Zinzendorf's attempt, and, in the order of increasing importance, they were: the incompatible views of the church, Johann Adam Gruber, Zinzendorf's personality, and the timing.

Zinzendorf's idea of the church was a barrier to Gruber and Hildebrand, because the "Congregation of God in the Spirit" was but a new name for the old Moravian "Diaspora," or a

77 James I. Good, 'Early Attempts at Union of Presbyterian with Dutch and German Reformed' in the *Reformed Church Review.*

78 Joseph Henry Dubbs, *The Reformed Church in Pennsylvania,* Lancaster 1902, p. 120.

79 Fresenius, *Nachrichten,* iii, passim.

80 *Samuel Güldins . . . unpartheyisch Zeugniss über die neue Vereinigung aller Religions-Partheyen in Pennsylvanien.* Germantaun, 1743.

81 Saur's Letters were published in Fresenius, *Nachrichten,* iii.

82 *Ibid.,* i, pp. 321ff.

League of Spener's "little churches within the church." In the "Diaspora" there were "tropes" of "economies." A corporate, organic union in the modern sense was not in Zinzendorf's mind, and, as the Questions at the First Synod show, merely a League of the "awakened" was all that was contemplated.[83]

Gruber's objection to Zinzendorf's Diaspora idea was its self-assumed and transparent self-righteousness. Gruber argued that Christ dwelt not only in the Diaspora but in every believer's heart. These Tropes (*Häufflein,* as Gruber calls them) were really non-existent. The true church, like God, is unknowable and transcendent. God allowed the creature certitude of his own "awakened" state, but it was the Devil who tempted man to declare that his neighbour was not in the church. Gruber's church was a fellowship of believers in which there was no power to bind or to loose—only to share.[84]

Hildebrand pressed the same distinction, but in figurative language. He argued that a sect differed from a church as a man differs from a woman: the male sect is self-assertive, self-appropriating, self-willed, while the feminine church—the true bride of Christ—is yielding, self-denying and Christ-centered. The power of the church lies in the Catholicity of Pentecost rather than in the dialectical disputes of the Councils.[85]

Broadly speaking, Separatists like Gruber and Hildebrand held a high, rather than a low, view of the church. They had separated from a corrupt church, and they refused the judgments that they were schismatics. They believed that they had found the true Apostolic church, both pure and catholic, but their search was rather for purity than for catholicity.

The second reason why the "Pennsylvania Congregation of God in the Spirit" failed to become a reality was Johann Adam Gruber. Gruber, a leading Separatist, instigator of the Skippack Brethren, liaison man between European Separatists and the Americans, stubbornly refused to attend even the first Synod which was held only two doors away from his own home in Ger-

83 Sessler, *Communal Pietism,* pp. 34ff.

84 Gruber, *An und Aufforderung,* in Fresenius, *Nachrichten,* iii, pp. 474–503.

85 *Schrifftmässiges Zeugniss,* in Fresenius, *Nachrichten,* iii, pp. 474–503.

mantown. The reason was that Zinzendorf's tactlessness had offended two of Gruber's European friends: Andreas Gross[86] and Johann Friedrich Rock.[87] Gruber's correspondence with the Europeans is partly reprinted in Fresenius *Nachrichten* and it shows that Gruber was acting on forewarning, not in spite. Gruber was fully aware that Zinzendorf's personality would spoil what might have grown to be a native Pennsylvania church.

This leads directly to the third reason for the failure of these Synods: Zinzendorf's personality. Wealthy, titled, trained at Court, he was the epitome of what the Pennsylvanians distrusted. They hated titles, civil or ecclesiastical. And the fact that Zinzendorf, in a fit of overmodesty, assumed the name "Brother Ludwig" for use in Pennsylvania, did not help. He was both Count and Bishop! By nature he was antagonistic; he made enemies easily; he was changeable, impulsive, restless, uncertain. With all his imaginative depth and religious fervour he was not the man to lead an oecumenical movement among the Pennsylvania Pietists. Had he allowed the genial, lovable, Spangenberg—the man who sowed the seeds of John Wesley's great heart-warming experience—to continue his work in the Associated Brethren of the Skippack, the disastrous effects of Zinzendorf's personality would not have been a barrier to success. Spangenberg has left us an exquisite oecumenical hymn, written in 1747, which Catherine Winkworth included in her *Lyra Germanica* in fine translation:

> The Church of Christ that He hath hallow'd here
> To be His house, is scattered far and near,
> In North and South and East and West abroad,
> And yet in Earth and Heaven, through Christ her Lord,
> The Church is One.[88]

The least obvious but certainly the most important reason for the failure of the Pennsylvania Congregation of God in the Spirit

[86] Zinzendorf, *Erwartete Erklärung über Herrn A. G. wider ihn Gerichtete Klag-schrifft.* (non-videt) Cf. *British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books.*

[87] The Correspondence between Rock's 'Inspired' in the Wetterau and the Herrnhut communities was published in *J.J.J. Extracta aus dem Allgemeinen Diario der wahren Inspirations-Gemeinen,* Berleberg, 1739.

[88] *Lyra Germanica,* Translated from the German by Catherine Winkworth, London, 1901, ii, p. 68.

was the timing. Zinzendorf's impatience led him to attempt in 1742 what would have come about naturally within ten or twenty years. The Count was dealing with the immigrant generation, many of whom had experienced the whip of intolerance wielded by magistrate and priest. And to these Pennsylvanians religious freedom was a great achievement; it did not seem to them the mother of religious anarchy. The next generation would have been better prepared, first by the compounding evidences of the evil effects of religious individualism, and secondly by their independence from old world patterns and personalities, to achieve a permanent Pennsylvania Congregation of God in the Spirit.

VI

The ultimate issue between Count Zinzendorf and his Pennsylvania opponents was neither new, unique, nor incapable of theological formulation. In its final form it presents the dialectical nature, the Yes and the No, of the doctrine of the power of the keys (*potestas clavium*). This doctrine is linked with that of the church, for, in the end, and in spite of disapproval of a few ecclesiastics, the problem of church union is theological, not political. Oecumenicity is the definition of the church.

And this is a problem of Yes and of No, of dialectics.

The oldest theological distinction between the church visible and the church invisible is thoroughly dialectical because it accepts the tension between the transcendent and the immanent church. This is sound theology. As long as we naively believe that all the world's saints are churched, and conversely, that all the churched are the world's saints, then the problem is disgustingly simple. But when once the transcendence of the church is acknowledged then the problem takes on a deeper significance.

Pietism believed that it had discovered a sure way to determine just who was in the *invisible* church. Zinzendorf's plan for church union was to league together these little groups of certified Christians. Spener's idea of the little churches within the church thus became the instrumentality for the revitalization of Christianity itself. Zinzendorf really believed that by the addition of the groups of "saved," "awakened" Christians in all de-

nominations the invisible church could be known. Already in 1730 he had outlined his ideas:

> 1. All fellowship which is founded on the concordance of meanings and without the conversion of the heart is vile sectarianism.
> 2. The proper congregation of Christ is invisible.
> 3. The members of the invisible church are within all sects.
> 4. The invisible church can become visible in the world by an alliance of its members.[89]

No one can disagree with the first three of these propositions but there are many who will strenuously object to the fourth. The invisible church will always remain invisible. Only on the Judgment Day will it become visible. There is no man, no plan, which will ever bring God's invisible congregation into the scope of man's visibility.

The churches of the Reformation had been symbolic churches[90] defining their differences in creeds and in symbolic documents. Pietism, however, replaced this emphasis upon creed with an emphasis upon experience, upon "awakening." But both Reformation theologians and the Pietists defeated their own ends when they tried to codify the transcendental church.

Against the rationalizing tendencies of Pietism the Pennsylvania sectarians protested. They were opposed to any attempt to rationalize the irrational. Indeed, the "Pennsylvania Congregation of God in the Spirit" was defeated by the same idea that led to the creation of the Reformation churches. In their opposition to rationalizing eccleciasticism Gruber and Hildebrand are supported by the Reformers, and all other attempts at church union during the Seventeenth Century were similarly thwarted by this supra-confessional mysticism—a mysticism which seeks to maintain the noumenal, mysterious, and irrational nature of the Christian religion. It seeks to hold to the mysterious in the church. It opposes all who seek to reduce that mystery, all who

[89] F. A. Voigt, *Zinzendorf's Sendung, Ein Rückblick zur Orientierung über die Kirchlichen Lage der Gegenwart,* Berlin, 1922, p. 31.

[90] *Vide* George W. Richards, 'The Church: Its Nature and Function in the Genevan, the Heidelberg, and the Westminster Catechisms,' in *The Presbyterian Register,* Vol. xvii, No. 17, Edinburgh, 1941, pp. 480–491.

try to define what is and what is not Christian. This is the essential principle of Protestantism itself.

Hear what Zwingli has to say about the church. In his *Reply to Emser* he sets up his clearly formulated ideas about the church:

> The church that embraces those who falsely assume the name of Christ is not the spouse of Christ. . . .
>
> The church that with form rests upon Christ . . . is the catholic (universal) church, the communion of the saints which we confess in the creed. . . .
>
> This church . . . walks not . . . in the way of the Gentiles; for it is on its guard against sin, in which it beforetime lay dead. And since its way is polluted as long as it walks in the flesh, it has need of repentance and of expiation through Christ, its head.
>
> This church is known only to God, for man looks on the outward appearance, but God on the heart.[91] Luther even refuses to admit that a Christless church is a church, for he argues that the Church is only the church of Christ where the sacraments are honoured. This church, though, is not for the eyes of the flesh. It is hidden (*Verborgen*)[92] and it moves only in the free and open Confession of Jesus as Christ. Luther's church is not politico-juridical, but an assembly of believers, *Zeugen der Wahrheit,* which has little to do with men, receiving Christ and His Word from God.[93] Calvin similarly defended his separation from Rome on the grounds of corruption within the church of Rome. His simple principle was: where there is corruption there the church of Christ is not, and no man is a schismatic who separates himself from such a church. He says:
>
> > In withdrawing ourselves from the pernicious participation of so many enormities, there is no danger of separating ourselves from the Church of Christ.[94]

[91] *Reply to Emser,* in the *Latin Works of Hulderich Zwingli,* III, Philadelphia, 1929, p. 281.

[92] *Et autem imago dei, quantum ad dominationem et dominum non ratione justitiae.* Cf. Seeberg, *Christus Wirklichkeit und Urbild,* (Luthers Theologie, Band II), Stuttgart, 1937, p. 397.

[93] *Ibid.*

[94] *Institutes,* IV, ii, 2.

And it was John Calvin who formulated the principle which ultimately defeated Zinzendorf's plan for church union:

> All union which is formed without the Word of the Lord is a faction of the impious and not an association of believers.[95]

What is the mark of church corruption which justifies schism? How can the separatist be sure that his judgment is justified? And the answer, according to the reformers was that a man is justified in separating only from a church which claims infallibility. A corrupt church claiming infallibility is the justification for separatism, for Christianity is a religion of repentance and when the world church claims infallibility, when it fails to repent, separation is justified. This is the Protestant principle.

Here there begins to emerge the final Yes and No. The heavenly church triumphant is both pure and universal. The visible earthly church is neither. Some think that the church's witness is defeated because of her diversity and they seek to reunite the diversified elements to gain unity of witness. Others believe that the church's witness is defeated because of her corruption and they seek to restore the apostolic purity of the church.[96] Here is the final Yes and No.

What was the solution to this problem discovered by our forbears here in Pennsylvania? This: that separation is justified only when the world church pretends to be what it is not. Separation is justified only when the arrogance of ecclesiastics defeats the ends for which the church came into being. Similarly, union can be attempted only on the basis of fellowship; reunion must be motivated by surrendered wills.

Which man, Count Zinzendorf or Johann Adam Gruber, was right? Neither and both. Here is an insoluble antinomy. The world church is inevitably both impure and divided. But the world church also stands under the judgment of the New Being in Christ Jesus. The visible church is always under the judgment of the New Being in Christ, necessarily creating reformatory, sectarian, schismatic movements, which, while splitting the historical unity do protect it from final loss of its essential character. On the other hand, the lack of unity within the world church shows that the church is subject to the conditions and structures of existence, and the oecumenical attempts to regain essential unity are as necessary for the life of the church as the reformatory movements which divide it.

[95] *Ibid.*, IV, ii, 5.

[96] An eminent modern psychologist suggests that the four hundred or so divisions of Protestantism, instead of being a sign of weakness in the church, are really a sign of the life of the church. *Vide* Carl G. Jung, *The Integration of Personality*, New York, 1939, p. 61.

Thus the life of the church is a continual Yes and No, looking forward towards that glorious day when the church on earth will become the church triumphant, and when all mankind will partake in full measure of the New Being in Christ Jesus. Then sin and the Devil will stand revealed in their shame and Christ will triumph in glory, in all the ends of the earth.

Meanwhile, in the words of the Oxford Conference, let the church be the church!

VII

After two centuries it is easy for us to see the failures and fix the blame. But these are the facts, historical and doctrinal, for the failure of the first American oecumenical movement.

Perhaps in his old age, surrounded by the peace and security of a successful experiment in Herrnhut, when he recalled his tragic failures in America, Zinzendorf remembered that old Saxon proverb

> Durch viel Zanken und disputiren
> Thut man öfters die Wahrheit verlieren.

Allentown, Pa.

THE STATE AND THE CHURCH

Frank W. Teske

The mere mention of State and Church brings to mind, certain spheres of action, rights as well as limitations. The Church claims certain religious liberties beyond which, even the most sagacious rulers should not trespass. Jesus, who inspired the founding of the Christian Church, held to the conviction that God was supreme in the area of the Spiritual, and the State in other areas—a division of supremacy between God and Caesar. That great, wise statesman of Great Britain, Stanley Baldwin remarked, "The old doctrine of the divine right of kings has gone, but we have no intention of erecting in its place a new doctrine of the divine right of state, for no state that I have ever heard of, is worthy of man's worship."

It is quite evident that Baldwin's remarks were inspired by the growing tendency toward centralization of power in some states, as other states have become totalitarian in attempts to defy them. Some leaders openly defend the supremacy of the state, in nearly all relationships, while others are publicly silent, yet resort to the principle in their practice.

The unfolding of this drama will not only be interesting to watch, but it will have an important bearing on the future development of the State and the Church, as well as of individual and social life. The belief that the Church is both supernatural and supernational will be put to the severest test in the near future. While up to the present we have had no open conflict between the State and Church in America, there have been a number of individual Christians whose conception of their loyalty to Jesus has brought them into open conflict with the demand of the State. Let us notice that these conflicts came not because of war but on account of refusal to register for military service. There can be little doubt that if America goes to war this conflict will increase, so that it will include thousands.

The principles that govern State and Church have been similar throughout history. We have seen periods when the State was absolute and other periods when the Church was in absolute control. The application of the principles has differed greatly ac-

cording to the prevailing ideas of the times. This change in application is partly due to the ever changing conception of the State, as well as the changing emphasis of the Church. Lately however, the tension has been heightened by the tendency of some States to control human life in all of its individual and social aspects. The Church has a mission to the individual and society. She is the trustee of the redeeming Gospel of Jesus, and hence cannot abandon her responsibility for the welfare of both without betraying her trust.

On the other hand, the state has a distinctive service to perform. She is the guarantor of justice, law and order, protection of property and life, as well as religious and civil liberties. While the state is primarily concerned with the immediate welfare of the individual and society, and the Church with the spiritual realities, the two institutions must work in harmony to achieve the best results.

However, the Church and State differ not only in their objectives, but also in the methods of reaching their objectives. The objective of the Church, to establish the Kingdom of God, cannot and must not be reached by force or coercion. On the other hand the state can hardly preserve law and order and property and life without using coercion.

Since the adoption of the first amendment to the Constitution, in force Dec. 15, 1791—"Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," the American people have assumed that the church and state are two great co-ordinate institutions and that each has its sphere of action so that there could be no conflict between them. As time has gone on we have learned that in this separation, the sphere of activity is not always clear and that in many cases there are functions which rightfully belong to both—so that it is not always easy to say which is Caesar's and which is God's.

The idea that the Church and State should be separate institutions was not even dreamed of by the ancient world. In ancient times, the priestly class and the ruling class were closely allied, and often one and the same. In the Jewish state the officials of the theocracy, whether judges, priests or Sanhedrin, also had powers in directing temporal affairs. Even in Rome, the most

perfect example of power, the emperor, was likewise the pontifex maximus or high priest. Any separation would have struck the Latin mind as an absurdity. To them all governments were one.

There was little change in the relationship of the state and church up to the Protestant Reformation although there were times when the power of the papacy so increased that tensions were felt between the state and the church. The Reformation brought little change. Both Protestants and Catholics obtained some concessions, but it was hardly more than tolerance. The Peace of Augsburg allowed the ruler to fix his beliefs upon the people under his rule. Hence the religious faith of the people of the realm had to be that of the ruler.

The early settlers of America brought to their new country various shades of religious types, some maintaining real connection with the state, others a quasi-relationship and still others no relationship at all.

It was not until after the American Revolution that the problem became acute and had to be faced. Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and others who played a great part in creating the new state, wanted the government free from religious bias. They viewed with distaste that any religious test should be put to the prospective candidate for office.

However, a powerful opposition developed in the Constitutional Convention in 1787. Patrick Henry, no friend of the federal state idea, and Luther Martin of Maryland, an exponent of the State Church idea, fought the measure bitterly. But finally, the religious test was defeated by a vast majority. The Constitution was adopted, with the first Amendment.

Thus this great government broke with tradition and it became possible for the various states to establish their own state churches, which was actually done and continued in force in Connecticut until 1817 and in Massachusetts until 1833.

While we have held to the idea of separation of the two institutions, there are at least four different relationships which have grown up in modern times.

1. In Russia, the relationship of state and church, is that of rivals or even enemies. In such a relationship the state will do all

it can to discredit the church with the hope of destroying her altogether.

2. The second type is that of the Greek Orthodox Church, the exact opposite of the Russian situation. There the relationship is friendly, cooperative so that the two blend into one authority. In fact, the relationship is so intimate that membership in the one carries over to the other. This is especially true of the Balkan States.

3. The third relationship is that of the Roman Catholic Church, which claims temporal power, at least in theory, which is indicated by the fact that the pope has his own representatives in many of the capitals of the world. In such a situation there has been compromise from time to time, but no yielding, so that the result has been constant tension between state and the church.

4. Between these three relationships is the fourth type or types which hold the middle ground among those already mentioned. In some cases the Church is recognized by the law, as in Sweden, and in other cases it is just tolerated.

While there has been a certain tension between state and church since the enactment of the first amendment which brought about the separation of the two institutions, the tension today is more acute than ever in the history of this relationship. The change is partly due to the changed attitude of the state and the changed emphasis of the church. There is a growing tendency toward the centralization of more powers in the state. Then, too, the church has changed, not so much her central message, but her emphasis. She has shown a keener interest in applying the Gospel not only to the individual, but to society as well. The church is bound to show interest in moral issues, in matters of having to do with public morals, clean politics, better living conditions. As the Church denounces wrongs wherever they exist, she is bound to create tension between herself and the state.

Let us list a few possible areas of conflict between the state and the Church.

1. The church is to a certain degree subject to the state because of the exempting of church property from taxes. Thus the state is indirectly subsidizing the church. As long as the relationship between the two institutions is friendly, there can be little danger

in it. Should the state, however, become centralized and make demands of the church which the church would consider inconsistent with her mission, the state could demand acquiescence or withdraw the tax exemption privilege.

2. The second possible conflict is in the judicial process. The church is granted her charter by the state so that she can operate as a legal body, but in so doing the church does not surrender certain matters of faith and spiritual order. More than that the church deems it as its prerogative to endeavor in every way to influence the state both in theory and practice to make them conform more nearly to Christian ideals. Here is also a reservation of autonomy in thought and action sufficient to maintain a degree of tension. To add to the confusions the churches do not have a generally accepted theory of their relation to the state. There is a difference between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant churches, and the attitudes differ in the Protestant churches, from the Episcopal church to the Quaker. Whenever the church appeals to the civil courts for settlement of disputes on doctrine or discipline, the church yields authority to the state. It may be added that the Roman Catholic Church assumes final authority in settling its own disputes, while many of the Protestant Churches appeal to the civil courts for settlement.

3. Another area of possible conflict is that of education. Theoretically, the parents are the final arbiters of what their boys and girls should learn, but it does not work out in practice. In practice the state is supreme. It has become a tradition to omit religious teaching from the public schools and state subsidized or endowed colleges and universities. In recent years there has been a change. New York State for example, permits religious education on school time, but not in school buildings.

There are other areas of possible conflict. A change in our government from democracy to a strong centralized power, seeking to indoctrinate our youth with a philosophy opposed to the Christian teaching of the churches, would lead to a tension or conflict. The laws regulating marriage, divorce and child labor, all of these can bring about a tension between church and state.

The greatest tension between church and state today is in the field of military service. So far during the period of registration

a few ministerial students and a few clergy who were opposed to registration holding that it violated their consciences have been arrested, tried, and in most cases sentenced to terms in prison. The government claims full authority over its citizens, to draft both men and property for the welfare of the nation as was shown in the case of Dr. Macintosh, a Canadian by birth who applied for United States citizenship. When Dr. Macintosh was asked whether he would fight in war in case the United States were involved, his answer was that he would do so only if he believed the war to be just. He was refused citizenship in Connecticut. The case was taken to the federal supreme court, which upheld the supreme court of Connecticut. Chief Justice Hughes pronounced the decision which is as follows: Undoubtedly a duty to the state exists within the domain of power, for government may enforce obedience to laws regardless of scruples. When one's beliefs collide with the state, the latter is supreme within its sphere, and submission or punishment follows.

However, the government has not insisted on this right without modification. It allows the draftees to file as conscientious objectors, who will not be compelled to bear arms, yet their lot is an unenviable one. But according to the teaching of the Church it has been held that in the forum of conscience a duty to moral power higher than that of the state has always been maintained.

The new law reads: "Nothing contained in this act, shall be construed to require any person subject to combatant training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form." This by the way differs from the conscription law of the last war.

In the light of this action it is clear that the conscientious objectors were given concessions not because the state lacked the power, but rather for the sake of expediency. Hence while the church and state are separate in theory, there is tension at many points. With some of the minor groups there has been open conflict. Members of a sect known as Jehovah's Witnesses instructed its members to refuse to salute the American flag in the public schools. The case was brought before the supreme court of New Jersey which has a law requiring the pupils to salute the Ameri-

can flag. The members of the sect held that saluting the flag was equal to worship, and that worship belongs to God alone. The supreme court of New Jersey held that it had a right to demand that the flag be saluted. The case has been appealed to the supreme court of the United States.

My own denomination, like several others, has taken action in dealing with conscientious objectors. The supreme body made it clear that the conscientious objector would not lose standing in the Christian community but it pointed out that when the state calls its citizens to war, the church member is free, if not in duty bound, to respond, without the loss of standing in the Christian community. The church has offered its ministers to serve as chaplains in the government's branches of service.

Here is the official declaration of the Methodist Church. "The Christian is bound to serve his own nation in all ways that are compatible with the Christian faith and the Christian way of life, but his supreme allegiance is to God." The state and nation belong to the sphere of relative, earthly values, God alone is absolute, and he alone has the claim of our unconditional loyalty.

Having endeavored to show the historic as well as the present relationsip between the state and the Church, and having pointed out the areas of tension and possible conflict, let us now look to a solution. In most cases a diagnosis is easier than a cure, and this subject is no exception. Since the problem is complex, we cannot expect a simple solution. The problem would indeed be simplified were the churches united, or even if the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America could draw up articles on the sphere of the church. The various Protestant churches are not united as to their attitude toward state relationship, and there is a variety of attitudes and convictions in the groups themselves. The church is bound in the near future to rethink and restate its sphere of influence and action. Christianity began its career by preaching pacifism. It would seem that absolute pacifism as an ideal is not adaptable to the western world. Pacifism is an oriental mood adaptable to the type of character that the orient produces. Even there there is a change of attitude as in India and China. The Western World has never

taken Gandhi seriously. Even Tolstoi's doctrine of non-resistance was a mystifying theosophic sport in Europe. In the hour of revolution India turned to Gandhi, but Russia turned to Lenin. The western world by its very temperament prefers active resistance to passive non-resistance. It seems to us that an adjustment should be made on this question of war by the Church. The Church has held fast to the theory of non-violence in its preachment, but acquiesced in practice in every emergency. We believe that the ideal of universal peace and the seeking of methods other than war should be found to settle differences among nations. We do believe, however, that the Church here must be idealistic and realistic at the same time recognizing, that wars will continue until the causes of war are eliminated. Thus peace becomes a future hope rather than a present reality.

Broadly speaking, we have had at least three groups according to their respective attitudes in the relationship between the state and the Church.

The first of these we shall call *the non-co-operative group*. This consists mainly of the plain sects. Not only does the church as a body refrain from recognizing the state in their action, but also instructs its members to have nothing to do with politics and the state. They leave public morals, social justice, decision on war and peace entirely to the state.

The second group consists of churches, that under the leadership of social action committees have set up standards for social relationships as well as definite statements on war and peace and have sought to promote them within their own ranks. Some in this group have frequently proposed to go into politics under the name of the Christian Party, holding that the Church has a right to bring about a standard of ethics, morality and social justice in harmony with her teachings.

The third group which we believe includes by far the largest group of Protestants and Catholics accept their responsibilities for the spiritual welfare of the individual and society by using every fair means to hold before the state Christian ideals. They do not believe in forcing them upon the state, but by persuasion hope to raise the moral standards of the state. In this group the Church urges its members as citizens to take an active part in the

affairs of the state, with the hope of bringing the methods and character of the state near to those of the church. They realize that it is through constant experiment, that the needed knowledge is gained to bring in the Kingdom of God. This third relationship seems to the writer to offer least cause for conflict. However, we believe that there should be constant tension between the state and the church. The Church must ever hold before the state a new and better social order. The Church must not only give light to the mystery of life, but also leadership to the mastery of life. The Church should always be a critic of the state. She is the bearer of a Divine Word which she is duty bound to proclaim to men. It is not only the function of the church to preserve the ideals of her founder in a particular generation, but to challenge the ideas and the culture that are not in accord with the Christian understanding of man and society.

A tension between church and state is not only desirable, but absolutely essential. The tension between the institutions is a sign of spiritual life in the church. When that tension ceases to exist it is a sign that the church has lost her true character and has become just another ethical society or cultural association.

Moreover the church must be supernational. Her authority in spiritual matters should remain supreme, for she is committed to a Divine purpose in the world. One reason why states have become arrogant is that the church has been on the defensive. The Church has failed to gain an adequate conception of her supernational character. The Church must be concerned not only with the perpetration of her ideals but she must be left free to criticize, challenge and seek to change the order of the state which is not in harmony with her fundamental teaching. She must always be a transmitter of the Divine to the community.

On the other hand, the church must respect the sphere of authority of the state. She must recognize that the state has functions to perform and that her members are also members of the state. In a crisis when the state holds that the manufacture of planes, guns, tanks, ships, with a trained army is necessary for the respect of law and order and the defense of its citizens, the church should remember that the state and not the church is responsible for the protection of life and property.

In this particular crisis, the church has a definite responsibility as a trustee of the Kingdom of God. The state is bending every effort to end a wrong. That alone will not solve the problem. We must look forward to a peace that will eliminate the causes of these sporadic outbursts of slaughter. The church must ever hold before the state a social order which will eliminate the causes of the war.

In time of war, the church must ever maintain her true character and minister to the spiritual needs. She cannot abandon her ideals and become a stalking horse for militarism. Even in time of war the church must hold before the state justice and good will. Man at his best knows that wars do not settle basic problems. The best that war can do is to create conditions for settlements, not voluntary settlements, but forced settlements, and it is evident from history that peace obtained under duress is not a lasting peace. While the state is girding her forces to end a wrong, the church must marshal her forces to redeem individuals and society, so that greed and the grasp for power which are among the chief causes of war shall be removed. Thus even in time of war there must be tension between the two institutions. The church must be creative as well as critical.

In our nation there need not be open conflict between the two institutions. Most of our churches display both the Christian flag and the American flag. Neither is out of place. We have a loyalty to each of them in their respective spheres. We believe that both institutions without yielding any of their fundamental principles should be able not only to maintain this greater experiment of separation, but by wisdom and co-operation make it an instrument and example for the welfare of the nations of the world.

Easton, Pa.

NECROLOGY

The toll of death among the alumni of the seminary has not been so heavy numerically during the past twelve months as in some other years. Nevertheless, our loss has been a serious one. Good and great men, whose passing leaves us much the poorer, are with us no longer in the flesh.

Zwingli Albert Yearick, '75, died on September 17, 1940, at the advanced age of ninety-five years. For some time he had been the oldest living alumnus of Franklin and Marshall College, in whose name the torch was handed each Commencement to the graduating class. He was born August 12, 1845, at Madisonburg, Pa. Following a period of school-teaching in his youth, he entered upon studies preparatory to the Christian ministry. He was licensed and ordained in 1875 by West Susquehanna Classis. From 1875 to 1877 he served the charge at New Berlin, Pa.; from 1877 to 1882 at Turbotville, Pa.; from 1882 to 1889 at Aaronsburg, Pa.; from 1889 to 1895 at Mercersburg, Pa.; from 1895 to 1899 at Lewisburg, Pa.; and from 1899 to 1915 at Shenandoah, Pa. Being then seventy-five years old, he retired—as he thought—at Bethlehem, Pa. But he was recalled into active service as the pastor of St. John's Church, Bethlehem, from 1917 to 1924. At that time he withdrew finally from the pastorate, and lived in retirement at Bethlehem until his death.

Charles Erwin Creitz, '92, veteran and beloved minister of our Church died September 20, 1940. He was born at Lynnport, Pa. on October 24, 1865. Following the completion of his studies at Franklin and Marshall College and our Seminary, he was licensed to preach by Lehigh Classis and ordained by East Pennsylvania Classis. During the years 1892–95 and 1895–99 he was pastor respectively at Weissport, Pa., and Huntingdon, Pa. For a brief period, 1899–1900, he served as field agent of the Board of Home Missions. In 1900 he became the assistant to Dr. Benjamin Bausman in St. Paul's Church, Reading, Pa. The remainder of his active pastorate was spent in this church, first as assistant pastor, and from 1909 to 1937 as pastor. In that year he retired to make his home with his son, Rev. George A. Creitz, '29, in Easton, Pa. The record of Dr. Creitz's services to the denomination is a varied and honorable one. Outstanding among these was his long presi-

dency of the Board of Foreign Missions. We remember with especial gratitude the fact that for twenty years he was a member of the Board of Visitors of our Seminary.

C. Ernest Wagner, '88, was born at Blue Bell in Montgomery County, Pa., on October 10, 1864. His academic training was received in Muhlenberg College, and his theological training in this Seminary. In 1888 he was licensed by Lehigh Classis, and ordained by the same Classis the following year. From 1889 to 1893 he was assistant to his father in St. John's Church, Allentown, Pa. This was his only pastorate. Following study abroad, he joined the faculty of Franklin and Marshall College in 1893 as professor of English literature. In 1911 he resigned from this position, and made his home in Lancaster until his death on November 9, 1940.

John Wilson Albertson, '00, was born near Conyngham, Pa., on January 27, 1867. He died March 21, 1941. He was licensed to preach by Wyoming Classis, and ordained by St. Paul's Classis. During 1900–01 he was pastor at New Hamburg, Pa.; 1902–06 at Laurelton, Pa.; 1906–13 at Ligonier, Pa.; 1913–21 at Jennerstown, Pa.; and 1921 to his retirement in 1932 at Curryville, Pa. The sermon at the funeral service was preached by his son-in-law, Rev. Jerome A. Wenner, '36. Among his other survivors are the following alumni of this institution: a brother-in-law, Rev. John K. Adams, '99; a nephew, Dr. Ralph L. Holland, '26; and another nephew, Dr. Russell C. Eroh, '32.

William Franklin Curtis, '01, died May 5, 1941. The word of Dr. Curtis's death reached us in the midst of Anniversary Week, and cast a shadow upon the commencement exercises. He was born at Garisville, Bucks County, Pa., on February 12, 1873. He prepared for the ministry in the Lancaster institutions—both College and Seminary. Following his licensure by Tohickon Classis and his ordination by Kansas Classis, he entered upon his only pastorate—St. Paul's Church, Kansas City, Mo., which he served from 1901 to 1908. In that year he was challenged to accept the presidency of the Allentown College for Women, later renamed Cedar Crest College, to which he literally gave his life. For his devoted and highly successful labor of love in the interests of that institution he will be long remembered.

David Wagner Kerr, '93, was born February 6, 1864, at Marsh Run in Perry County, Pa. His licensure and ordination were at the hands of Clarion Classis. He was pastor at Worthville, Pa., 1893–1900; Grove City, Pa., 1900–02; New Hamburg, Pa., 1902–05; Apollo, Pa., 1905–14; Fayette, N. Y., 1914–21; Orangeville, Pa., 1921–24; and the Community Church of Tyringham, Mass., 1924–27. During the latter years of his life he lived in retirement at Bloomsburg, Pa., where he continued to render such ministries as were possible for him. He died May 24, 1941. Rev. Frank L. Kerr, '94, is a brother of the deceased.

William Henry Landis, '93, a class-mate of Rev. David W. Kerr, followed him in death on July 15, 1941. He was born at Harmony, Pa., December 31, 1866. Subsequent to licensure by West Susquehanna Classis and ordination by Juniata Classis, he entered upon a ministry which was to extend almost half a century. The record of this period of faithful service is as follows: Orbisonia, Pa., 1893–95; Saxton, Pa., 1895–99; Penbrook, Pa., 1899–1900; Mann's Choice, Pa., 1900–04; Rockwood, Pa., 1904–09; a brief interval in 1910 when he was without a charge; Fort Loudon, Pa., 1910–13; Derry, Pa., 1913–23; Duquesne, Pa., 1923–28; Hyndman, Pa., 1928–31; and Derry, Pa., for a second pastorate, 1931–40.

Charles Edward Meyers, '05, professor in Franklin and Marshall College, died suddenly July 21, 1941. He was born February 20, 1880 at Hanover, Pa. In 1905 he was licensed by Gettysburg Classis, and ordained by Zion's Classis. His first pastorate was in Emmanuel Church, York, Pa., from 1905 to 1909. A second pastorate was served during 1909–15 in St. John's Church, Philadelphia, Pa. At this time he was called to the faculty of Franklin and Marshall College, where he taught for more than a quarter of a century.

"Therefore let us also, seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and perfecter of our faith."

—N.C.H.

VALUABLE GIFT TO THE SEMINARY LIBRARY

The Reverend Doctor Henry Riley Gummey, a retired Episcopal clergyman and teacher who passed away this summer, has given his large collection of liturgical books to our library.

Dr. Gummey was easily the leading authority on liturgics in the state. He was prompted to make this donation because of his appreciation of the contribution to liturgical worship by the Mercersburg group of our church. He considered the work of Nevin and Schaff among the most constructive liturgical efforts on the western continent.

He became more closely attached to us because of his friendship for those of our alumni who took post graduate work with him.

The collection consists of more than two hundred volumes of valuable source material for the study of worship and makes our library outstanding in a field which is becoming increasingly interesting to our ministers.

Dr. Gummey had an international reputation as an authority on liturgy and formerly taught that subject in addition to dogmatic theology and canon law at the University of the South and the Philadelphia Divinity School. He was a native Philadelphian and a graduate of Episcopal Academy, University of Pennsylvania, General Theological Seminary, New York, and the Philadelphia Divinity School where he was awarded the Doctor of Divinity degree. The University of the South conferred the degree of Doctor of Civil Laws on him.

The Seminary is most grateful to his widow, who in accordance with the wish of her husband, presented to us the following collection of books.

L.E.B.

Henry Bradshaw Society publications. 60 v.
Alcuin Club. "Collections," 34 v.
"Tracts," 20 v.
"Prayer Book pamphlets," 12 v.
"Leaflet," No. 1. 1 v.
Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft, Münster in Westf. v. 1, 4, 9, 13.
Abyssinian Church, Teaching of. Translated by A. F. Matthew. London.
Apostolic Eastern Church, Orthodox doctrine of. London, 1857.
Andrieu, Michel. Les ordines Romani du haut moyen age. Louvain, 1931.
Baudot, Jules L. The breviary . . . London.

Blackmore, R. W., tr. The doctrine of the Russian church. Aberdeen, 1845.
Blomfield, John. The eucharistic canon . . . London, 1930.
Brittain, F. Latin in church . . . Cambridge, 1934.
Braun, Joseph. Der christliche Altar, München, 1924. 2 v.
Callewaert, C. Liturgicae institutiones: Tractatus primus . . . Brugis, 1925.
Christian doctrine and practice in the twelfth century. London, 1950.
Cooper, James, tr. The Testament of Our Lord. Edinburgh, 1902.
Church and school hymnal. London.
Deamer, Percy, and others. Lectures on the Russian church. London, 1916.
Dionysius of Alexandria. The letters; edited by C. L. Feltoe. Cambridge, 1904.
Dowling, T. E. The Armenian church. London, 1910.
The Orthodox Greek patriarchate of Jerusalem. London, 1913.
Sketches of Georgian church history. London, 1912.
Duckworth, H. T. F. Greek manuals of church doctrine. London, 1901.
Edmunston, George. The church in Rome in the first century. London, 1913.
Emhardt, W. C., and others. The Eastern church in the western world. Milwaukee, 1928.
Ethelridge, J. W. The Syrian churches. London, 1846.
Franz, Adolph. Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter. Freiburg, 1902.
Hackett, J. A history of the Orthodox church of Cyprus. London, 1901.
Hawkins, L. M. Allegiance in church and state. London, 1928.
Headlam, A. C. The teaching of the Russian church. London, 1897.
Holloway, Henry. The confirmation and communion of infants and young children.
Irenaeus, St. Adversus haereses. 2 v. Edited by W. W. Harvey, London, 1901.
Höller, Joseph. Die Epiklese der griechisch-orientalischen Liturgien. Wien, 1912.
Hoppe, L. A. Die Epiklesis der griechischen und orientalischen Liturgien. 1864.
Jorga, N. The Byzantine Empire. London, Dent.
Jungmann, J. A. Die Stellung Christi im liturgischen Gebet. 1925.
Kidd, B. J. The later mediaeval doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice. London, 1898.
Kirch, C. Enchiridion fontium historiae ecclesiasticae antiquae, Friberg, 1910.
Laach, A. M. Die betende Kirche. Berlin.
L'eucharistia canon primitif de la messe. Lille, Paris, 1914.
L'eucharistia canon primitif de la messe. Paris, 1912.
Liturgiarum orientalium collectio. London, 1847. 2 v.
Lowrie, D. A. The light of Russia. . . . London, 1924.
Mabillon, J. De liturgia gallicana. . . . Paris, 1729.
Martyr, Justin. The Apologies. Edited by A. W. F. Blunt, Cambridge, 1911.

Monumenta veteris liturgiae alemannicae. Ed. M. Gerbert. 1777.
Provisional offices of the Mexican Episcopal church. [1895].
Mouravieff, A. N. A history of the Church of Russia. Oxford, 1842.
Mogila, Peter. Orthodox confessions of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church. 1898.
Neale, J. M. A history of the Holy Eastern church: The patriarchate of Antioch. 1873.
Ormanian, M. The church of Armenia. . . . London, [1912].
Rae, George M. The Syrian church in India. Edinburgh, 1892.
Richards, W. J. The Indian Christians of St. Thomas. London, 1908.
Riley, Athelstan. Athos, the mountain of the monks. London, 1887.
Robertson, J. N. W. B. The acts and decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem. . . . London, 1899.
Smirnoff, Eugene. A short account of the historical development and present position of Russian Orthodox missions. London, 1903.
Swainson, C. A., ed. The Greek liturgies. Cambridge, 1884.
Tertullian. De baptismo. Edited by J. M. Lupton, Cambridge, 1908.
Wigram, W. A. The separation of the monophysites. London, 1923.
Wilbois. Russia and reunion. Tr. by C. R. Davey Biggs. London, 1908.
Wilpert, Joseph. Die Gewandung der Christen in dem ersten Jahrhundert. Köln, 1898.
Wilson, H. A., ed. The Gelasian sacramentary. Oxford, 1894.W
Wriothesley, Charles. A chronicle of England during the reigns of the Tudors. 1877.
Yeaxlee, Basil A. Religion and the growing mind. London, [1939].
Zähringer, Damasus. Das kirchliche Priestertum nach dem hl. Augustinus. 1931.
Irenikon Collection: 3 numbers.

SOME RECENT LIBRARY ACCESSIONS

Bates, E. S. The American faith. 1940.
Bennett, J. C. Christian realism. 1941.
Berdyaev, N. Freedom and the Spirit. 1935.
Blackwood, A. W. Preaching from the gospel. 1941.
Bryan, D. C. The art of illustrating sermons. 1938.
Case, S. J. Christianity in a changing world. 1941.
Dobson, J. O. Worship. 1941.
Eddy, S. The kingdom of God and the American dream. 1941.
Gilson, E. Christianity and philosophy. 1939.
Gray, H. D. A theology for Christian youth. 1941.
Haydon, A. E. Biography of the gods. 1941.
Holt, A. E. Christian roots of democracy in America. 1941.
Hopkins, C. H. Rise of the social gospel in American Protestantism. 1940.
Johnson, F. E. The social gospel reexamined. 1940.
Jones, E. S. Is the kingdom of God realism? 1940.
Kagawa, T. Behold the Man. 1941.
Kiddle, M. Revelation of St. John. 1940.
Kierkegaard, S. Stages on life's way. 1940.
Kirk, K. E. The vision of God. 1935.
Knox, J. The man, Christ Jesus. 1941
Lewis, E. A new heaven and a new earth. 1941.
Lieberman, J. New trends in group work. 1938.
Maritain, J. Introduction to philosophy. 1932.
Niebuhr, H. R. The meaning of revelation. 1941.
Niebuhr, R. Nature and destiny of man. 1941.
Oman, J. W. Honest religion. 1941.
Page, K. Living prayerfully. 1941.
Pratt, J. B. Can we keep the faith? 1941.
Riddle, D. W. The Gospels. 1939.
Riviere, W. T. A pastor looks at Kierkegaard. 1941.
Scott, E. F. Nature of the early church. 1941.
Seidenspinner, C. Form and freedom in worship. 1941.
Soares, T. G. Origins of the Bible. 1941.
Stamm, F. K. Good news for bad times.1941.
Strachey, E. J. St. L. A faith to fight for. 1941.
Susott, A. A. A practical handbook of worship. 1941.
Thorndike, E. L. Human nature and the social order. 1941.
Tigner, H. S. Our prodigal son culture. 1940.