

BULLETIN

Theological Seminary of the Reformed  
Church in the United States

VOLUME I

OCTOBER, 1930

NUMBER 4

ABSTRACTS FROM DEAN DeLONG'S REPORT TO  
THE BOARD OF VISITORS FOR  
THE YEAR 1929-30

*Enrollment*

The enrollment for the year is as follows: Seniors, 17; Middlers, 20; Juniors, 21; and 5 special students. One of the Seniors is a minister of the Methodist Church, another is a minister of the United Brethren Church, and a third is a minister of the Church of the Brethren. Two of the Seniors are Hungarians and two are Japanese. All, who are enrolled, in the Senior Class are members of the Reformed Church, either in this country or in Europe and in Asia, with the exception of the three ministers of other denominations. Of the Middlers there are two who are ministers of the Church of God, the rest are members of the Reformed Church. In the group of five special students there are two ministers of the United Brethren Church, one minister of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, one Hungarian who is a member of the Reformed Church, and one Jew who is a member of the Orthodox Synagogue. While our student body is mainly, as is to be expected, made up of students who are members of the Reformed Church, nevertheless the student body as a whole shows interdenominational, international, and inter-racial traits. At our chapel services, in particular, during the year when these services were in charge of the European or Asiatic students, who speak English with an accent different from our own, we were more than once reminded of the Pentecostal experience recorded in the Book of Acts. Now there were in this Pentecostal year dwelling in Lancaster

## THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE

devout men of different nations under God. The total number of students in the regular and special groups is 63; adding to this the enrollment of 91 in the Summer School of Theology, the total enrollment for the year is 154.

### *Society of Inquiry*

The Society of Inquiry held thirteen meetings during the year, with an average attendance of 31. The meetings were devoted to discussions of student problems. Three of the meetings were devoted to a discussion of Pastoral Problems under the leadership of members of the Reformed Ministerium of Lancaster. Members of the Society conducted weekly services at the Rossmere Sanatorium, an institution in Lancaster. Under the auspices of the Society a reception was given to the students for the ministry in Franklin and Marshall, and Ursinus Colleges. There were also two outings held in Long Park, attended by students and professors. The students with financial aid from friends of the Seminary reconditioned the Lounge, installed a radio, and supplied it with magazines and newspapers.

### *Seminary Choir*

The Seminary choir, composed of 20 voices, under the directorship of Dr. Sykes, gave six concerts during the year. These concerts were held at Walkersville, Md.; Reading; Lebanon; Norristown; Tamaqua; and Lancaster. The funds gathered at these concerts were used in part to purchase a Victor Orthophonic and records of music which the choir presented to the Seminary. The treasurer of the choir reports a balance of over one hundred dollars. It should also be stated that the choir rendered Christmas programs in the Rossmere Sanatorium and in the Long Home for the Aged.

## REFORMED CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES

### STATISTICAL REPORT OF LIBRARIAN HELLER 1929-30

The following library statistics for the year from May 1, 1929, to April 30, 1930, indicate, among other things, the growth of the library and the use that is made of it, both by members of the Seminary and others:

Number of books drawn:	1929	1930
By members of Seminary .....	1503	1949
By others, including books mailed .....	980	954
(There were 173 "others" in 1929-30)	2483	2903
Number of books added to library:		
By purchase .....	365	506
By gift or exchange .....	420	75
	785	581

(The last item does not include many old books discarded by the College Library and sent here.)

### IMPRESSIONS OF THE SUMMER SCHOOL

ALFRED N. SAYRES, '18

The venture of the Theological Seminary at Lancaster in turning the Ninth Annual Summer School into a School of Religious Education proved an unqualified success in the minds of the ministers and laymen and laywomen who attended the school. Although these were not many, they were unanimous in their endorsement of the purpose and quality of the program; indeed the comparatively small enrollment proved to have certain advantages in the discussion, fellowship and work periods of the school.

The generous hospitality of the Seminary with its provisions for the physical comforts of the school—good food and sweet sleep—its copious library facilities, its access to tennis and golf equipment, and its improved landscaping formed a stimulating background for a curriculum rich in content and happy in its presentation.



To speak of the several courses of lectures, Prof. Harner's presentations under the general title, "Does Religious Education Do Violence to Our Faith?" were not only a great message for our school, but they should provide a real contribution to the movement at large. They furnished a timely and convincing answer to the many questions that are being raised by those who fear the consequences to religion of the trends of this movement. They furnished also a criterion for the devotees of the prevalent practices in religious education to use in estimating their methods and results. Moreover, they were characterized by a soundness and sanity calculated to disarm the most sceptical critics and by a clarity of thought and orderly structure.

In more theological terms Dr. Herman presented "An Apologetic For Our Day"—what may be called the theology of our modern Christian Education. Against the background of a historical sketch of the theological trends of the recent centuries, Dr. Herman outlined the Christian theology of "personalism," the only satisfactory answer to the mechanistic philosophies of the past decade or two. The best of this thought came to us in the discussions under the trees which followed these evening lectures.

The psychological and sociological aspects of religious education, with particular reference to the home's part in it, were treated in the popular lectures of the winsome and scholarly Dr. Lawrence E. Bair. Out of his extensive studies and experiments in the field of psychology and his experience of its practical application to human life in his parish and community, he brought a wealth of knowledge and insight into this phase of the movement. He, too, was the center of long and heated "chin sessions" in the dark under the trees.

In the field of method our own Rev. Fred D. Wentzel and Dr. Erwin L. Shaver brought illuminating insights. The outstanding merit of Mr. Wentzel's lectures was the broader conception of the notion of leadership training as an enterprise much bigger and more vital than the conducting of a formal study-class, rather an undertaking that utilizes the regular, commonplace activities of the Church School and turns them to account, by means of thoughtful and sympathetic supervision, in the con-

stant growth of all persons in responsible positions. Indeed he dealt with the "brass tacks" of leadership training.

Last but not least of the formal courses, we speak of the significant help that came from Prof. Shaver, whom it was a real privilege to have at the Summer School. Attendance at even one of his ten lecture hours revealed some of the reasons for the position he holds at the forefront of Religious Education. The "project principle," as he expounded it, became much more than a method. Under his guidance we saw more clearly than ever the real meanings of the experience method.

A beautiful unity characterized these five series of lectures. One felt that in this school at least the new movement is finding itself. This was not the rigid uniformity of submission to a single authoritative standard. These men might not answer all questions with a common verbal agreement. But the writer was one of many who were delighted to find all the lectures and discussions marked by an outlook at once sane and conservative in the best sense, yet at the same time unhesitatingly forward-looking. Progressive as all of these men were in their positions, one never suspected them of going off at a tangent. They had their heads in the air, but their feet upon the ground.

A splendid feature of the program was the provision of ample time for discussion and special committee work. Small groups set to work on the study of young people's work, parents' training classes, and a revised plan of catechetical instruction, or training for church membership. Reports of these studies have been or will be given publicity elsewhere. They may be significant beginnings of notable developments to come.

Another feature of the school was the helpful worship service in the Chapel at the opening of each session, conducted by professors and members of the School. They gave tone to the work of the school and enrichment to our individual experience.

One has but a single regret as he looks back upon this Summer School, that is the regret of human impatience. It seems unfortunate that the values accruing from the school should have to find their way into the Church through the channel of so few persons. It is the ardent hope of every one who enjoyed the privileges of this school that next year many more ministers and

lay leaders in our educational tasks will be found sharing the offerings of the school. Mr. Pastor and Mr. Superintendent, make your plans now to be at Lancaster next summer.

Lansdale, Pa.

### THE SEMINARY AT YORK, PA., ONE HUNDRED YEARS AGO

In *The News*, published monthly in the interest of the Kreutz Creek Charge of the Reformed Church, York County, Pa., the Rev. Walter E. Garrett, Minister, published an article on *The Reformed Theological Seminary*, which contains new historical data relating to the Seminary's location at York, Pa., 1829-1836, and its first professor, Dr. Lewis Mayer. A tablet was erected on the building now standing on the site where the Seminary was housed one hundred years ago. The tablet was procured by a committee of Potomac Synod and was unveiled with appropriate ceremonies during the annual sessions of the Synod in York, October, 1929. The article is as follows:

One of the outstanding events in connection with the recent meeting of Potomac Synod, in York, was the observance of the Centenary of the location of the Seminary of the Reformed Church at York from 1829 to 1836. A marker was unveiled on the location of the original site of the Seminary, at the corner of Market and Penn Streets, containing the following inscription:

#### IN THE NAME OF GOD, AMEN

This tablet marking the site of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States during its location at York, from 1829 to 1836, is placed by Zion's Classis in grateful remembrance of the Church Fathers, who here laid foundations deep and strong,  
and who built well.

Erected on the occasion of the  
Centennial Celebration,  
October Twenty-second  
Nineteen Hundred Twenty-nine

Thirty-four students were graduated from the Seminary while in York. Rev. Daniel Ziegler, who was pastor of Kreutz Creek Charge, from 1830 to 1873, was one of the graduates.

The President of the Seminary at this time was Dr. Lewis Mayer, pastor of the York congregation, 1821-25; during the year 1821 he was pastor of Kreutz Creek Charge. (See Kreutz Creek History, page 152-155.) This is shown by the following record in the Minutes of Synod, held September 30, 1821, at Reading, as quoted in the History, where the congregations of L. Meyer for that year are given as "Stadt York, Kreuzkirche Tschochly" (page 35). This one year seems to be thrust into the pastorate of Rev. George Geistweit, who served Kreutz Creek Charge from 1804-1827. In this year, 1821, Geistweit's congregations are given as "Quickel's, Wolf's und eine andere Kirche, York County." From 1822 to 1827 Rev. Geistweit was pastor of Kreutz Creek Charge, as can be seen by the records. (See Kreutz Creek History, page 152.)

It is interesting to note the following entry in the Kreutz Creek Records concerning this short pastorate of the year 1821:

York, January 31, 1821.

Received of Jacob Weitzhoffer, one of the elders of Greitzkrick Reformed Congregation, the sum of twenty-one Dollars and fifty-nine Cents, being the part of Moving Expenses of the Rev. Mr. Myer.

DAVID WEAVER, Treasurer.

Received by me \$21.59.

"The Gazette and Daily," in its issue of October 25, 1929, just after the adjournment of Synod, published an interesting article on the Seminary in the column, "One Hundred Years Ago," which is of more than ordinary interest at this time, and is as follows:

The removal of the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church from Carlisle to York, which was ordered by a resolution of the Synod at their late meeting in Lebanon, has been accomplished. The winter session, which has been somewhat delayed, will commence in York on Wednesday, November 11th, 1829. The Rev. Daniel Young has accepted his appointment as Assistant Professor in the Seminary, and will enter upon the duties of his office at the beginning of the ensuing session. The care and management of the funds and real estate is vested

in a Board of Trustees composed of eighteen laymen. The government of the Seminary is committed to the Professors, subject to the supervision of a Board of Visitors consisting of twelve clergymen. The last named body constitute also a Board of Education, and are charged with the duty of providing funds to aid students, and applying them for the benefit of such as are worthy of patronage. The situation of York is agreeable and healthy. Also very convenient to the cities of Philadelphia and Baltimore.

### THE PASSING OF PROFESSOR ADOLF von HARNACK

Adolf von Harnack, professor of Church History in the University of Berlin, died June 10. He was born in 1851 at Dorpat, Germany. His father was Theodosius Harnack, professor of theology in the University of that city. I heard his son refer in his lectures, with pardonable pride, to *meines Vater's Geschichte des Gottesdienstes*, which is still recognized as an authority on the history of worship. His mother, Marie von Ewers, was of noble family. His wife was the daughter of Professor Thiersch. Young Adolf was born and reared in university and upper social circles of Germany. By heritage, nurture, choice, and indefatigable toil he became perhaps the most widely read and deeply revered scholar of two hemispheres—a cosmopolite in space and in spirit. At the Lausanne Conference, 1927, Professor Deissmann in his address alluded to his colleague, Professor von Harnack, saying: "From whom we have all learned so much." In that assembly there were men and women of every land, of many tongues and creeds, most of whom had read some of the works of the great historian of Christianity.

"There is neither East nor West, border, breed nor birth,  
When two strong men stand face to face, though they come from the ends  
of the earth."

Young Harnack entered the University of Dorpat in 1869 and continued his studies until 1872. He qualified as lecturer in Church History at the University of Leipsic in 1874 at the age

of twenty-three. His academic career extended over fifty-four years. He was professor at Giessen from 1876-79; at Marburg 1886-88; at Berlin 1888-1930.

I have before me a pamphlet of 128 pages, which is of special interest in view of the author's recent death. On the cover, in large red letters, is the following inscription: "*Diese Blätter sind mein Abschiedsgruss. A. von Harnack*" (these pages are my farewell greeting). This tract, entitled *Das Schreiben der Römischen Kirche an die Korinthische aus der Zeit Domitians (I. Clemens-Brief)*, is the swan-song of the distinguished professor. He so announced it in a brief but touching farewell to tens of thousands of his pupils scattered over the earth; some in time, some in eternity.

In the preface of this same tract he writes a little more at length, though only in the space of a paragraph, to his readers: "With the publication of the following pages I shall close my church-historical Seminar, which I have directed in Leipsic, Giessen, Marburg, and Berlin for 54 years (1874-1928), and which was for me the center of my academic work. A large number of studies and of monographs in the history of the Church by my comrades have come out of the Seminar; yet I surely learnt more from these studies than they. For this I cordially thank them; but above all for the hearty confidence which they constantly showed me. These pages are my farewell greeting; they are to remind my co-workers of the spirit of the Thursday evening hours. It was an earnest, joyous spirit; may it be true to them in heavy times—non potest non laetari qui sperat in domino! He is able to rejoice who hopes in the Lord.

Berlin, June, 1929.

V. HARNACK."

Thus the man who lived for the invisible and the eternal, the critic, historian, poet, author, lecturer, teacher, friend, servant of Jesus Christ, the scope of whose interest and sympathy was wide as humanity, long as time, high as the eternal Logos, lays down the implements of his work in the evening twilight, bids adieu to a receding world and looks forward in faith to a coming world.

Space does not permit me, at this time, to define Professor Harnack's place among the historians of the Church who pre-



ceded and who followed him. It needs an article of some length to do justice to his distinctive contribution to Church History and to theological thought in general. It must suffice to enumerate the major works that have come from his pen and through collaboration with other scholars of his time. They are the following:

*Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 3 v.; *Die Altchristliche Literatur bis Eusebius*, 2 v.; *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christenthums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*; *Das Wesen des Christenthums*—Lectures in popular form; *Marcion*; *Das Mönchthum: Seine Ideale und Seine Geschichte*; *Reden und Aufsätze*, 5 v.

In collaboration with von Gebhardt: *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 45 v., completed in 1919. In collaboration with von Gebhardt and Zahn: *Patrum Apostolorum Opera* (Works of the Apostolic Fathers) 3 v.

He wrote scores of tracts, articles, and addresses which cannot be mentioned here.

Historians for all time to come will turn to these works as trustworthy sources and authorities; and the future histories of Christian origins will be profoundly influenced by them. All of Professor Harnack's books and tracts are based upon a critical study of original sources and are written in a style of unusual charm.

It is worthy of note that four of the professors in the Seminary have attended lectures by Professor Harnack at Berlin. His books are referred to almost daily in the classroom, and many of them have been read by ministers and missionaries of the Reformed Church.

When Professor von Harnack preached the sermon at the funeral of Theodor Mommsen, he took for his text words that apply equally to himself and interpret the spirit of his life: "I chose you, and appointed you, that ye should go and bear fruit and that your fruit should abide" (John 15: 16). Of him, also, we may say what he said of Mommsen in the closing paragraph of his sermon:

"The old hymn of the Church: 'O Eternity, thou word of Thunder!' (O Ewigkeit, du Donnerwort!) reverberated, as

I know, through his soul. He was prepared. His death was peaceful. Silently and with tender hand the Lord God took him out of life. He is a God of the living, not of the dead; and we know that the dead live with Him. We trust in His wisdom, which passeth all understanding and in His goodness which is unspeakable. From this coffin, which rests under the cross of Christ, we look upon ourselves and pray God that He may bless our work and that of our successors."

"Let the favor of the Lord our God be upon us;  
And establish thou the work of our hands upon us;  
Yea, the work of our hands establish thou it."

G. W. R.

## PERSONALIA

The editors of the BULLETIN were pleased to receive the following letter from Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y., under date of July 13, 1930:

President George W. Richards,  
Theological Seminary,  
Lancaster, Pa.

My dear Dr. Richards:—

Allow me to thank you for the fine looking and interesting 'Bulletins' of your Seminary, which you were kind enough to send me. I appreciate them very much. They keep me in touch with my old friends in the Reformed Church and also inform me about what is going on in your Seminary. I congratulate you upon securing the endowment of \$25,000 for your department of music. That was a fine gift and will enable you to do fine things in that department.

I am sure that you will find, as we have done with the 'Record,' that such a bulletin is a valuable link between your Seminary and the church, especially the alumni.

I like your feature of the new books in the Seminary Library. That is good enough to be copied by us.

Wishing you much success in your new venture, I am, with kindest regards,

Very sincerely yours,  
WM. J. HINKE.



Fred W. Biesecker, Esq., Vice-President of the Board of Trustees, and Mrs. Biesecker, spent the late spring and early summer in Europe visiting Germany, Austria, Hungary, Belgium, and France. While at Oberammergau they lived in the house of Guido Mayer, who takes the part of Judas in the Passion Play. Herr Mayer visited Lancaster in 1924 and attended services in Santee Hall. He was one of the wood carvers who prepared the carvings in the chancel of Santee Hall.

In Budapest Mr. Biesecker inquired about the Reformed Church and was told that there was no such church in the city. However, when he asked for the "Reformierte Kirche" he was shown many Reformed churches dotting the city.

\* \* \* \* \*

Professor Ray H. Dotterer, '09, has published a volume entitled "Philosophy by Way of the Sciences," pp. 469. A review of this book is promised for the January number of the BULLETIN by Professor T. F. Herman. Professor Dotterer has accepted a call to the professorship of philosophy in State College. For some years past he was professor of psychology in Franklin and Marshall College.

\* \* \* \* \*

William G. Seiple, '05, of Sendai, Japan, has recently collaborated with Professor G. Koriyama in the translation into the Japanese Language of Adolph Deissman's "Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History." The volume in the Seminary Library contains the following inscription:

Presented to the Library of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, with the compliments of the translators.

May 30, 1930.

WM. G. SEIPLE.

\* \* \* \* \*

It is a source of gratification to all friends of Christian Education that the Rev. Henry I. Stahr, D.D. (Theological Seminary, '08), has accepted his election to the position of Executive

Secretary of the newly formed Board of Christian Education. By this action one of the most strategic posts in the denomination becomes the responsibility of a man whose ability and integrity have won for him the confidence of the Church.

His former pulpit, that of Emanuel Reformed Church, Hanover, Pa., is to be filled by the Rev. Edgar F. Hoffmeier, D.D., of Lebanon, Pa.

\* \* \* \* \*

The wedding bells have rung for a number of Reformed ministers of late, including three graduates of the Seminary of the class of '30.

Albert H. Hady and Helen Decsman were married in the Hungarian Reformed Church of Los Angeles on August 19, 1930. The officiating minister was Rev. Edward F. Evemeyer.

John C. Brumbach, '26, and Margaret E. Keefer were united in marriage by Rev. John K. Adams on July 30, 1930, in Rev. Brumbach's church at Bloomsburg, Pa.

Erwin H. Bauder, Theodore J. Schneider, and Augustus A. Welsh, all members of last spring's graduating class, were married during the summer. The charges to which these young clergymen have taken their brides are indicated elsewhere in this issue of the BULLETIN.

## SEMINARY NEWS ITEMS

The July issue of the BULLETIN contained Dr. Richards' schedule of appointments for the summer. Mirabile dictu the appointments have been kept, his "vacation" is now over, and as fall approaches he is again ready to resume work.

The summer has been a busy one for all members of the faculty. Among other engagements Dr. Frantz supplied a number of pulpits in the course of the summer; Dr. Bromer was a member of the faculty at the Kiskiminetas Camp and Missionary Conference; Dr. Herman taught in three Summer Schools,—the Summer School of Religious Education of the Seminary, the Cedar

Crest Summer School under the auspices of the Department of Leadership Training, and the Oak Heights Summer School of the Central Pennsylvania Evangelical Conference; Prof. Harner lectured in the Seminary's Summer School of Religious Education, and taught during the first camp at Camp Mensch Mill.

\* \* \* \* \*

Last year's graduating class contained fourteen men whose membership is in our own denomination. All of these men have been satisfactorily located in pastorates or further study congenial to them. The four who are continuing their studies this fall are in each case students from other countries than our own. The locations of the members of the class of '30 follow:

Alton Wilbert Barley—Hummelstown, Pa.  
 Erwin H. Bauder—The Beam Charge, Jennerstown, Pa.  
 Clair Eugene Blum—Shippensburg, Pa.  
 Scott Francis Brenner—Schwenkville, Pa.  
 Claude Henry Corl—Sabillasville, Md.  
 Bela Pap—Princeton Divinity School.  
 Theodore Jacob Schneider—Christ-Frieden's Charge, McKeansburg, Pa.  
 Zoltan Seres—Divinity School, Berkeley, California.  
 Harvey Samuel Shue—The Manor Charge, Adamstown, Md.  
 Raymond Clarence Strine—The Mt. Moriah Charge, Keedysville, Md.  
 Shiro Takagi—Princeton Divinity School.  
 Paul Leo Troutman—The Armstrong Valley Charge, Halifax, Pa.  
 Tamotsu Utsugi—Union Theological Seminary.  
 Albert Augustus Welsh—Ashland, Pa.

\* \* \* \* \*

Three members of the coming Middle Class have spent the summer in a tour of Europe, including attendance at the Oberammergau Passion Play. They are Harold Raymond Ash, Chester L. Brachman, and Charles Russell Zweizig.

## NECROLOGY

As nearly as can be ascertained eight graduates of this Seminary have been claimed by death since September 1st of last year. It is altogether fitting that we should accord them this brief recognition. We of the living alumni do well to remember that our fellowship embraces two worlds.

Calvin Edgar Bartholomew, '89, was born in 1862 in Pennsville, Northampton County, Pa., and died Sept. 18, 1929. A ministry of thirty-seven years was spent entirely in two pastorates,—the first at Cressona, Pa., and the second in the charge comprising St. Paul's and St. John's congregations at Pottstown, Pa. The burial services were in charge of Rev. N. H. Fravel and Dr. Elmer S. Noll.

Edgar Schaff Hassler, '81, died Nov. 15, 1929. He was a native of Mercersburg, having been born there Sept. 25, 1856. He was a graduate of old Mercersburg College, and was licensed by Mercersburg Classis. His career was a varied one. He served charges at St. Clairsville, Pa., Braddock, Pa., Turtle Creek, Pa., Meyersdale, Pa. (The Wilhelm Charge of which he was twice pastor), Grove City, Pa., Lake, Ohio, and Shelby, Ohio. In addition he taught school several years immediately before entering the ministry and in the year 1911 was Secretary of the Mercer County Sabbath School Association. He was active in civic affairs, especially in his last field of labor where he was twice elected mayor of the community in which he served.

Simon Uriah Waugaman, '92, was born near Harrison City, Pa., on Feb. 5, 1866. He was licensed by Westmoreland Classis and ordained by Juniata. His ministry was spent predominantly in western Pennsylvania. The charges served by him were located at Claysburg, Pa., Rimersburg, Pa., Youngwood, Pa., Export, Pa., Scottdale, Pa., Yukon, Pa., and Osterburg, Pa. His faithful ministry of thirty-seven years' duration was ended by his death on December 16, 1929.

C. Harry Kehm, '05, died the day after his fellow-alumnus, Rev. Waugaman. Rev. Kehm was born near Sellersville, Pa., on June 7, 1877. He served in pastorates at Richland, Pa., and

Pottstown, Pa., until 1926. In that year he became Assistant Superintendent of Bethany Orphanage, succeeding to the position of Superintendent. He administered the duties of this responsible office until the time of his death. Funeral services were held in the Bethany Chapel which he loved so well. Interment was made in Sellersville. The sermon was preached by Dr. C. E. Creitz, President of the Board of Managers of Bethany.

Elam Jacob Snyder, '06, was born at Limekiln, Berks County, Pa., and died Feb. 12, 1930, at Wyncote, Pa., where he had been living a short while in retirement. He was licensed and ordained by Reading Classis and spent a large part of his ministry within its borders. His pastorates were the Alsace Charge, Reading, 1906-08; Grace, Alsace, 1907-17; Quakertown, 1917-21; and Tabor, Philadelphia, 1921-27. The services of burial were conducted by Rev. J. M. Mengel with sermons by a former pastor of the deceased, the Rev. J. R. Brown, and by Dr. Chas. E. Schaeffer who had confirmed him in his youth.

Ezra Douglas Lantz, '97, died on April 26, 1930, at the age of fifty-eight. His birth-place was Keedysville, Md. After being graduated from the Seminary he became pastor of the Reformed Church at Lone Tree, Iowa. Upon the conclusion of his pastorate there he entered other occupations and was not in the active ministry for a number of years. In time, however, he accepted a call to Abilene, Kansas, and then in succession to the Lone Tree Church a second time, to Baltimore, Ohio, and to Payne, Ohio. His last pastorate was in the Beam Charge, Somerset Classis, which he served until his death.

Andrew Hoffa Smith, '92, found rest in death on July 26, 1930, after a long and trying illness. He was born at Womelsdorf, Oct. 2, 1865. The greater part of his ministry was spent at Grace Charge, Newton, N. C., McKeesport, Pa., Toms Brook, Va., and St. Stephen's, York, Pa. In 1917 he became Superintendent of the Hoffman Orphanage. There followed nine years of unrelenting labor in behalf of this institution, to which he gave the last full measure of his devotion. In 1926 he retired, broken in health, in York, Pa. The closing months of his life were full of intense suffering, brightened only by the faithful care of his wife and of his son, Rev. S. S. Smith. Dr. Geo. S.

Sorber was in charge of the funeral service, assisted by a number of fellow-ministers.

As this BULLETIN goes to press the unwelcome news is brought of the passing of one of the fathers of the church, the Rev. W. F. More, D.D., of the class of '86 of the Seminary. Dr. More was born in Northampton County, Pa., on March 2, 1858. His college course was taken at Lehigh University. He is reputed to have been the first Lehigh alumnus to enter the ministry. Following his graduation from the Seminary he was licensed and ordained by East Pennsylvania Classis and entered upon his first and only pastorate at Catasauqua, which he served from 1886-1904. At this time he became Superintendent of Bethany Orphanage, which was the capacity in which he was chiefly known to the denomination. For almost a quarter of a century by spoken word and by written articles he presented the cause of his foster-children to the Reformed Church. Under his gracious and efficient administration the Orphanage grew both in material equipment and in those qualities of the spirit which are difficult to measure but none the less real. He retired in 1927 to live near Bethlehem, Pa., until the time of his death.



## THE PREACHER AND HIS OWN SOUL

CHARLES E. CREITZ, '92

It would be difficult, if not impossible, to define accurately or scientifically the soul of a preacher. For the purpose of this address, it may be sufficient to call it that inner something which furnishes the motive power for his outward life and acts and determines the quality of that life and of those acts.

It may be assumed that in the soul of the candidate for the ministry there are already present, in germ at least, those qualities essential to the holy calling. He has carefully considered the various fields of endeavor to which he might devote his life—medicine, law, teaching, business and the technical professions. But he finds in himself a passion or at least a desire to share in the redemptive mission of Christ. To this quality already present in his soul there comes a call or a challenge to yield itself to the saving of men. Like Isaiah or Jeremiah he may find the call as clear and commanding as if he heard God audibly speaking to him. Or it may come through a parent, a preacher, a teacher, a friend or through the sheer appeal of the need of the world for redemption.

The theological seminary now offers him the training of himself and of his natural qualities of mind and heart for efficient service. Here one would expect to find the most fertile soil and the most favorable environment for the nurture and growth of the purposes already found in the heart of the candidate. But this is not by any means necessarily the case.

The modern seminary is finely equipped for the intellectual training of its students. In scholarship many of them rank with the great universities. But right here lies the greatest peril of the soul of the preacher. He used to go to the opening books of the Old Testament to find the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and to hold fellowship and communion with Him. Now he goes to the same books to find J and E and P. He used to go to the Gospels to find Christ. Now he goes to find Q.

A critical knowledge of the Bible is of course indispensable to the present-day preacher. Perhaps at no previous time in

the history of Christianity was scholarship in the pulpit more essential than now. An ignorant ministry can be of little service to God in the modern world. If I were speaking on the minister and his mind instead of on the minister and his soul, I think I could make out a strong case for the severest intellectual training that the seminary can give. But in the very emphasis that we lay on scholarship today, and rightly so, we are in grave danger of overlooking or neglecting the needs of the soul. For scholarship and piety are not synonymous. Or if you prefer, scholarship and character are not the same. And without character, the preacher is only sounding brass or a clanging cymbal.

Prayer should mean for us the very closest and surest approach to the unseen God. In its exercise we should experience the closest and surest fellowship with God. That kind of praying is a real thing, a vital experience. The peril to the praying student is that now prayer becomes a subject for study, for analysis and dissection and that in his absorption in this new interest in prayer he forgets to pray.

A creed used to be something to live by. It was a conviction that powerfully influenced life. It furnished a strong motive for conduct.

But in the seminary creeds become a part of the curriculum. They become subjects for study in the class room. The student becomes aware that the creeds of Christendom, even the most Christian of them are not in themselves an element in one's personal religious experience. They may be just a part of one's intellectual equipment. Just the fact that the subject matter of them is religious is no proof that they are a part of a man's real religion. There is nothing necessarily religious about just believing that certain facts are facts. The temptation of the student is to look upon creeds as he would look upon a fine piece of architecture or a painting, to criticise or evaluate it, or perhaps to admire, but not as a personal conviction on which to build his life.

Beliefs may be to us much more than this mere acceptance of facts as true. We may hold them with such intense personal conviction that they radically affect our whole life; that they become a real motive in all our acts.



But training for the ministry makes this experience difficult. The student for the ministry meets these great truths first of all in the class room. They are a part of the course of instruction for the sacred office. They are not for him necessarily the outgrowth of his own experience, and unless he can in some way live himself into his beliefs, they will remain for him largely only a part of his intellectual equipment for the ministry.

Unfortunately the student can not leave these perils altogether behind him when he leaves the seminary. Indeed in many instances they become greatly aggravated. They assail the preacher with new virulence and many others may be added to the number already enumerated.

The preacher is constantly dealing with the profoundest truths that have ever engaged men's minds. But many of these truths he has received at second hand. They enshrine the life-blood of generations of men, and are the product of the intellectual and spiritual sweat and toil of those who have lived before us. But the preacher has received them as a gift, and they are as worthless as gifts for the building of character; for only those things that we achieve by our own effort have character-building value. The preacher must live himself into or through the experiences out of which vital faith grows.

The prayer life of the preacher is full of peril. As a preacher he has to pray whether he feels like it or not. In the conduct of public worship he must pray so many times a week. It becomes a part of the routine of his office. In the sick room and in pastoral visitation perhaps he will have to pray. Think of having to pray! How great the temptation to study prayers for the sake of getting prayer material, and of praying for the sake of perfecting the art of prayer.

Prayer may become for the preacher largely a habit, and a mechanical habit at that, so that it comes, not from the heart at all, barely from the mind even, but chiefly from the lips. How could exercises of that sort have any personal religious value in them at all? And yet the preacher must keep in the closest possible touch with God for the sake of his own soul. Prayer for him should mean not only the surest approach to God, but the act for him should mean the closest and surest fel-

lowship with God. Prayer to be real must be something that is lived, an actual experiment in trust and loyalty, a vital communion with God. Prayer of this kind is of the very life-blood of the preacher's health of soul.

Again for the preacher the Bible may become largely a mine merely of sermon material. To it he goes for illustrations, for proof texts, for subjects of sermons. He finds it an indispensable tool of his craft. But to the preacher's own soul the Bible must be more than that.

The Bible is the record of men in search of God and of God in search of men. It is still the most helpful book to those who are seeking God. But the fact that others have sought and found Him does not absolve the preacher from the necessity of seeking and finding Him for himself. What the Bible can do is to point out the way by which others have found Him, but we may have to travel that same way, or at least similar ways, if we would find Him.

One of the clearest teachings of the Bible is that truth and holiness and salvation are achievements, not gifts. There is a profound sense, of course, in which all of life's treasures are gifts, but gifts for which we must work and sacrifice, and ultimately pay the price.

One of our primary needs is the consciousness of God, and this must not be a second-hand experience, but a personal, first-hand experience. Here the Bible can be of the greatest possible assistance, for it contains the record of men and women to whom God was a reality,—a reality in the power of which they lived their daily lives. It can not be emphasized too strongly, however, that this God-consciousness of the Bible will avail us nothing unless by personal experience we too become conscious of God. All that the Bible can do for us here is to furnish an atmosphere congenial to the creation of such an experience, and to point the way by which others have arrived at this experience.

But all vital truth must be earned; it can not be learned. Neither can it be passed from one person to another.

The point I wish to insist on is that we ministers will find the Bible of little use to us personally and as ministers, unless its great spirit and its simple truths have been made our own by the

severe discipline which comes from absolute loyalty and unquestioned obedience in spirit and purpose to its ethical and religious standards. Perfect honesty and absolute obedience to the light as it comes to us will make the Bible a sure road into the presence of God and the source of our power.

The way to God through the intellect is much harder for the modern man than for those of former times. Our knowledge of science and history and psychology has closed for us many avenues that formerly led to the assurance of God. Science has shaken or destroyed for multitudes of men the support of miracle for religious belief. History reveals that one form of belief after another has had to be abandoned in the light of more adequate knowledge, and confidence in the finality or absoluteness of any creed has been seriously undermined or given up altogether. Psychology no longer allows many modern men to trust those ecstatic states and emotional experiences on which Christians in other days relied so confidently for assurance of faith.

To a world like ours there is still one sure road open to God. Surer than ecstasy or miracle or historic creed is the solid and unquestioned fact of Jesus Christ. He not only points the way to God, but he makes it possible for the modern man to believe in God. He is preeminently what we believe God ought to be. "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." One needs no further proof of God than Jesus Christ. The soul of the preacher needs to keep in constant and conscious fellowship with Christ to assure himself of every needful supply of spiritual equipment and power for his task.

We are living in an age of critical significance whose chief need is not material but spiritual. Indeed there are those who tell us that the age is morally and spiritually bankrupt. I would greatly hesitate to say that it is true. But it is true of this age, as it has been true of every other age, that the true foundations of life are spiritual, and that those who are building these foundations are rendering the world its most valuable service.

The preacher for this age needs a trained intellect, and a many-sided equipment for his exacting task, but without the power of God all other forms of equipment are the mere me-

chanics of his profession—machinery without the power to run it. God's power added to man's power, that is what we need. We need this power not only for the hard task of living our own lives according to the Christian standard; but also for the still harder task of gradually bringing the world into conformity to that standard,—its laws, customs and institutions, and that in the face of the thousand obstacles and enemies that gather to prevent it.

I have endeavored to avoid the appearance of having a specific for the preacher's deepest needs, of having a patent remedy guaranteed to cure, of presenting a mechanical or formal program for the preacher to adopt—a kind of daily dozen to assure the health of his soul, for in the last analysis the preacher's power lies in his personality and his personality is largely what his character is, and his character is an achievement of living, not certain religious exercises in which he may indulge. There is no royal road to spirituality. Christian idealism demands active choice, energetic acts as the sole means of proving its authenticity. The interrelation of vision and action, of prayer and conduct, of feeling and will is the strength of Christianity. Christianity insists that action is the measure of one's convictions, and that a man is affected by his beliefs only in so far as his conscience applies them. "Not every one that saith unto Me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of God, but he that doeth the will of My Father which is in heaven."

The preacher's primary task then it seems to me is to build a character that will become a power for God. "Take heed to thyself" is a wise command. It is not necessary, of course, that the preacher must be entirely free from any fault. History records only one example of a sinless person. But character is the preacher's greatest personal asset. He may be scholarly and eloquent and yet be a practical failure if his example out of the pulpit makes it impossible for people thoroughly to believe in him. I might add, indeed, that the preacher must not only have a good character, but he must also have a good reputation. It may be freely admitted that the two are not identical, but as a rule in the long run the two will correspond. Paul mentions in respect to bishops that a bishop shall have a good report

among those that are without. In other words he shall have a good reputation, and this reputation shall extend to those that are not identified with the Church.

Let us not deceive ourselves by imagining that there is some kind of magic connected with our profession, which will enable us to dispense spiritual treasure irrespective of our own spiritual attainments. No ceremony of ordination can bestow spiritual gifts which are not the result of spiritual achievement. Can any of us be satisfied in this crucial time to live below the best of which we are capable or be unwilling to pay the price necessary for its attainment?

### HUMANISM'S NEW CLAIM

EDGAR F. HOFFMEIER

The renewed emphasis on Humanism so evident today has arisen out of the intellectual environment of our time. It is to a great extent a cultural and religious reaction to the vast new world of knowledge which has disturbed, where it has not revolutionized, traditional conceptions in every sphere, and nowhere more so than in religion. No one can live in this day and not be aware of the currents of thought seeking new channels and abandoning the old, leaving them dry beds. "The Modern Mood" is seeking new bases of authority, if it seeks any at all; new sanctions of morality, fearless of old conventions; new interpretations of religion, and above all a new interpretation of the universe and man's place in it.

It is the very swiftness with which the new knowledge has been "dumped" down upon us, faster than we could digest it, that creates the confusion in thinking that is prevalent today and makes us wonder whether or not there is any distinguishable unity or meaning to it at all. We have a tremendous interest and concern in these movements from the point of view of religion. Religion does not live in a vacuum, nor can it sequester itself from the intellectual life round about it. It must face it, come to some terms with it, and find a basis of faith which includes that which is valid in the science of the day.

But in reality we are facing something today more serious than a reinterpretation of life and religion. It has been the contention of men for the past generation, and is the contention of the Modernist now, that the essential truths of religion, in its traditional forms, need only be put into new terms. The traditional conception of God may have to be given up, but not the conception of God; we may have to change our idea of the nature of revelation, but we may still believe in revelation; we may recognize the natural history of morality, but we need not abandon belief in moral standards sustained by a just and holy God; the authority of the Bible may not be in verbal infallibility, but it may still have moral and spiritual authority. Such is the position of the Modernist.

Even this liberal position is questioned today. One has but to read that keen and critical analysis of the trend of thought in religion and morals in Walter Lippman's, "A Preface to Morals," to realize how completely everything moral and religious is called in question; how not only traditional conceptions are displaced, but how even the truths for which the old forms were supposed to stand must be discarded. Men are not only reinterpreting the truth of revelation, but some at least frankly deny that there has been any revelation. They do not profess to advance a new view of the authority of the Bible; but they deny its authority by resolving it into a collection of myths from the childhood of the race. They do not profess a new idea of God, but they reject altogether the supernatural. "The Modern Temper" is a disposition of doubt as to the reality of the values which men have tried to conserve in traditional standards, institutions, and creeds. The older reformations transferred authority from one object to another; from the Church to the Bible; from the Bible to Christ. Lippman says: "The search for moral guidance which shall not depend upon external authority has invariably ended in the acknowledgment of some new authority. This same tendency manifests itself in the midst of our modern uneasiness. We have had a profusion of new cults, of revivals and of essays in reconstruction. But there is reason for thinking that a new crystallization of an enduring and popular religion is unlikely in the modern world." We have reached the culmina-



tion of the history of natural science, a process which began with Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, and Descartes, and was continued by Pascal, Newton, and Darwin, and by the modern biologist, astronomer, chemist, and physicist. The whole effect has been to reveal to the mind the majestic immensity of the natural order of the universe. Step by step man has seen the knowledge of his world expand. It is a familiar story how the earth has been removed as the center for which God created the universe to the position of a satellite of the sun in a vast solar system, which itself is but a little constellation in an immeasurable cosmos with a beginning dating back not a few thousand years but incalculable light years. Step by step those realms, in which the supernatural might still be supposed to reside, have been reduced to the level of natural order with no apparent place for God. "I have swept the universe with my telescope," said Laplace, "and I have not seen God,"—a mechanistic universe to be summed up in a mathematical equation. If the universe has had only a natural origin, then life and man's life may also be accounted for in the same way. Creative intelligence is not necessary to explain it. The world and all it holds is but the outworking of purposeless forces. Then, too, man's mind and ideals and sense of spiritual values arose quite accidentally out of the order of things. They came from nowhere and are going nowhere. Nature is morally indifferent and those aspirations of man's heart, his ideals and his yearnings, the dearest achievements of his spirit, his love of goodness and fellowship and his dreams of a better and more worthwhile life, while he may cherish them for a while and find joy in them while they last, have no answer or correspondence in the nature of the cosmos out of which they sprang. The logical end of scientific naturalism, seeing all things and all life as the product of meaningless force, is the conclusion which Bertrand Russell wrote:

"We see, surrounding the narrow raft illumined by the flickering light of human comradeship, the dark ocean on whose rolling waves we toss for a brief hour; from the great night without, a chill blast breaks in upon our refuge; all the loneliness of humanity amid hostile forces is concentrated upon the individual soul, which must struggle alone,

with what courage it can command, against the whole weight of a universe that cares nothing for its hopes and fears."

Or the sad words with which Joseph Wood Krutch closes his book:

"Ours is a lost cause and there is no place for us in the natural universe, but we are not, for all that, sorry to be human. We would rather die as men than live as animals."

One cannot complete this attempt at presenting the background of our theme without a consideration of the disillusionment that followed the great war. Perhaps it was already on the way, but the war greatly accentuated it and speeded it up. Prof. Walter Marshall Horton, in "Theism and the Modern Mood," pictures the buoyant optimism which was at least superficially abroad before the war came; social, political, religious optimism. Even during the war, with its great exhilaration of fighting for great ideals, religion and moral idealism were riding the crest of the wave. Then came the aftermath; with the subsidence of the war spirit, men sank into the trough of the sea,—a trough of "spiritual depression, wide-spread and devastating."

"We trusted," Prof. Horton says, "our political leaders, when they told us of the villainy of our enemies, and the unimpeachable purity of the aims by which we and our allies were inspired; and, rightly or not, the impression is now abroad that they betrayed us. We trusted our religious leaders when they proclaimed their apocalyptic visions of a new heaven and a new earth, whose coming was contingent upon the military victory of the Allied Powers; and, at any rate since the collapse of the Interchurch World Movement, we are pretty well convinced that they betrayed us. We trusted God would, somehow, balance the stupendous evils of the war by an equal weight of good, that would accrue to us in the post-war period; and if faith in God is declining today, it is because many feel that that faith, too, has betrayed them."

Well, we have lived, in these recent years through days in which every moral convention, every social and religious institution and creed have passed or are passing through a decline



of faith and loss of authority. What else could we have expected. As Dr. Fosdick once put it, "We could not go down to the purlieus of hell and expect to bring back a Utopia." How can we believe in God after such a world-wide catastrophe! Why shall we believe in man or his moral worth when millions have been thrown away in a holocaust of slaughter? Why shall we believe in anything permanent when everything may be wiped out in a day? The result has been a spirit of revolt and cynicism and moral chaos. A disillusioned generation has been saying, "Let us enjoy life in our own way for our own ends while we have it."

Such has been the temper of these recent days. Not the whole temper, for underneath the bewilderment and skepticism there has been a vague yearning for certainty and order, something to tie to and to give a central meaning to life. The age produced such books as Krutch's "The Modern Temper," with its assertion of the futility of life and human experience; but it has also expressed itself in a tremendous interest in the study of man's nature, and strange to say and above all, in the study of religion. To this fact the vast number of books that comes in an uninterrupted stream from the press bears eloquent testimony.

#### *The Turn to Humanism*

The period of revolt against revolt has come. It was impossible that a generation could long go on living a life which had no meaning except its own unregulated impulses; even satisfying mere physical impulses leads to an unspeakable nausea if it is not related to something higher than the physical. Nor could it find any rest, "without some object of religious trust around which their lives could revolve like planets around the sun" (Horton). When the revolt came it was rather inevitable that it should take the form of some kind of Humanism, in a day which had been thrust back with such intense and tragic thought upon man's case in the world. It was also inevitable that, with the empirical method applied in every other realm, it would begin with the undeniable content of human experience, and not with any "a priori" speculations, to deduce from these principles indicating order and purpose.

Humanism is not a new word in the history of philosophy or religion. The name itself was applied first in Italy in the 15th Century, and later in other European countries, to the scholar who was not only proficient in Greek and Latin, but who at the same time preferred the humanity of the great classical writers to what seemed to him an excess of divinity in the mediaeval schoolmen. It came with the revival of Greek and Roman letters during the Renaissance and claimed the right of men to independent study and the drawing of his own conclusions unhampered by the tyranny of the Church. But the spirit of Humanism is older than the name. It goes back to the Greeks themselves; and in their philosophies we see the attitude of frank and fearless acceptance of the world, curious interest in all that was round about them, and an intent to build their own world of beauty and order, not greatly troubled by the gods. Protagoras, the father of Humanism, defined its controlling principle when he said, "Man is the measure of all things"; so, also, Socrates: "Humanity is the measure of all things." It is of this Humanism and of its succession in every age that Lynn Harold Hough writes so brilliantly in his "Evangelical Humanism."

#### *The Critical Humanists*

Last winter there came from the press a significant book entitled "Humanism and America," a symposium by a group of men little known generally, but scattered among the universities and editorial offices of America. Among them were such men as Norman Foerster, literary critic; Irving Babbitt, Prof. of Comparative Literature at Harvard; Paul Elmer More, Editor and Critic and author of the five volumes of "Greek Tradition" on the relation of Plato and Platonism to Christian Thought; Prof. Robert Shafer, of the University of Cincinnati, and Frank Jewett Mather, Jr., of Princeton. These men are the spiritual successors of the Greek Tradition and represent a type of Humanism that is trying to bring some order out of the chaos of our day. They are the Critical Humanists, critics of our lack of standards in art and literature and even religion. They propose a culture the watchword of which is Aristotle's "golden

mean," "the Renaissance," "Nothing too much," proportionateness, decorum; Arnold's "Culture and Restraint." The spirit of these Humanists is set forth in a paragraph from an essay by Robert Shafer:

"Against romanticism, humanitarian sympathy, mechanistic or vitalistic determinism, the doctrine of progress and the like, has been opposed a skeptical criticism of life and letters which rests ultimately on the proposition that man differs not alone in complexity of organization, but in kind, from the animal, and that his happiness depends upon his recognition and cultivation of that element in his being which is distinctive of him. This is held to be possible; man is held to be, within limits, capable of responsible choice. To choose is to discriminate, and, for this habituation to self-restraint is essential; it is, indeed, the foundation on which the whole structure of distinctively human life rests."

It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss this type of Humanist. With much of it we can agree; its protest against crass realism in much modern fiction, an art divorced from an intelligible human significance, a science wholly naturalistic, a formless poetry, expressed in a free verse, often only a succession of meaningless words. We can have a sympathy for a culture that brings some standards of taste and human relationships to the arts and sciences. Nevertheless, I do not see how it can escape the criticisms made against it by a very vehement school of opponents, that it is individualistic and academic; very beautiful for men living in the shelter of scholastic halls but lacking in social vision and unadapted to the actualities of the social and economic world. Their negative principle of decorum and proportion is certainly wanting in the moral initiative and venturesomeness that the making of a new world requires. Cultured gentlemen may change our literature and art, but they will not be fitted for a world where social and economic evils are challenging men to the exercise of a passionate enthusiasm and devotion and sacrifice which would hardly come within the limits of their "Nothing too much."

It is necessary, however, to distinguish thus briefly this Humanism of the Greek tradition. Prof. Dewey says, "Human-

ism is a portmanteau word, a great many incongruous meanings have been packed into it." This type belongs there too. But it is not the Humanism with which we are concerned.

*"Humanism, a New Religion"*

Charles Francis Potter in his recent book, "Humanism, A New Religion," records with considerable satisfaction that last spring Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin called Fundamentalists and Modernists to unite to fight Humanism, the "scourge of Christendom." Dr. Chas. E. Schaeffer, President of General Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States, characterized Humanism as "the most sinister and serious influence working against the church today." Who is this enemy that has so scared these two Christian leaders, this Humanism that hails itself as a "New Religion?" The Humanists, who are the inheritors of the Greek tradition, do not claim to be interpreters of a new religion. They work and spread their views within many religious households and carefully explain that they are not offering a substitute for traditional faiths. They have an ideal of human culture which they would foster without concerning themselves specifically with dogmatic religious beliefs. A good Catholic may be a Humanist; so may an Episcopalian or a Methodist, or a Jew, without denying the fundamentals of his faith. But here is a Humanism which boldly declares itself a new religion. What is it?

Like all religions it has many varieties of followers. They range all the way from Potter to Ames. As Horton puts it: "Straggling bands of rebels and free lances of every shade of dissent are crowding the ranks of the new religious movement and raising discordant cries among which the only universally popular one would seem to be 'Down with Supernaturalism.' " Can we find one of them who can define the faith common to all of them? I am not sure that in dealing with Humanism of this kind we should take the hostile attitude of Dr. Coffin or Dr. Schaeffer. I agree rather with Prof. Horton when he says:

"The problem of the humanist is the problem we all must face today: how to adjust our religious concepts so as to

square with the valid results of the natural and social sciences while at the same time retaining and if possible enhancing our appreciation of human values and our consecration to the cause of the progressive enrichment of human life."

The most spectacular statement of Humanism's creed is that of Dr. Potter which appears in a series of ten contrasts between the old and the new in religious beliefs on the jacket of his book. These ten points have received most publicity in the popular press; but I believe it is only fair to say that they hardly are true to the seriousness and sincere scholarship which the best of the new Humanists apply to their cause. The superficial character of his statements is evident and the confusion of thought more so. In the case of some of them he has made contrasts where there are none and in others no evangelical Christian would dispute him.

A more fundamental expression of Humanism's position may be gathered from the sermon by Dr. John H. Dietrich in "Humanist Sermons," with the title of "Humanism and Unitarianism." He states his points as follows:

1. "The doctrine that man is an end and not a means toward something else, not a mere instrument to some other unrelated to himself." "With nothing above or beyond him."
2. "The second fundamental tenet of Humanism is our faith in the possibility of improving human life."
3. "The essential unity of mankind and the necessity of bringing men to a consciousness of this unity."
4. "Belief that the power to realize these great ideals lies in man himself. In other words, we have an abounding faith in humanity and in its ability to create this better world."

In these four credos is stated the ethical position of the Humanists and the sufficiency of man to achieve this ethical life. With eyes closed to all but man, ignoring the universe, with no need of guidance or power from without, they seek to build their world.

A more moving and less dogmatic and at the same time pathetic statement is that of Prof. Max Otto of Wisconsin, which I quote from Prof. Horton:

"It is thus a constructive social suggestion that we endeavor to give up, as the basis of our desire to win a satisfactory life, the quest for the companionship with a being behind or within the fleeting aspect of nature; that we assume the universe to be indifferent toward the human venture that means everything to us; that we acknowledge ourselves to be adrift in infinite space on our little earth, the sole custodians of our ideals. There need be no defiance in this. No; accept the stern condition of being psychically alone in space and time, that we may then, with new zest, enter the warm valley of earthly existence—warm with human impulse, aspiration, and affection, warm with the unconquerable thing called life; turn from the recognition of our cosmic isolation to a new sense of human togetherness, and so discover in a growing human solidarity, in a progressively ennobled humanity, in an increasing joy in living, the goal we have all along blindly sought, and build on earth the fair city we have looked for in a compensatory world beyond."

In each of these statements appears the dualism which all theistic challengers have pointed out as the essential characteristic of Humanism,—the assumption of a universe indifferent to the human venture on the one side, and faith in man's moral ability on the other; an attempt, as Dr. Fosdick puts it, "to keep the best spiritual values of religion while surrendering any theological interpretation of the universe"; one world of physical and morally meaningless facts, another world "warm with human impulse, aspiration and affection"; a cosmic chill with an attempt at warmth in human living.

The Humanists never grow weary of drawing this contrast, apparently feeling their faith in man the more triumphant, the more indifferent to man they can show the physical world, in which they live, to be.

"Although the universe cares not particularly about our morality and our ideals, we must care for them. Upon our shoulders is being carried the ark of life through the wilderness. All the virtues, all there is of goodness, kindness, courtesy is of our own creation and we must sustain them, otherwise they will go out of existence as a star goes out. Apart from us they are not." (Earl F. Cook, "Humanist Sermons," p. 129.)



Those, who have frankly faced the issues forced upon us in this age of natural science, have no difficulty in sympathizing with the Humanists in their difficulty in believing in God. It is not easy to believe when so many conceptions have been swept away. Studdert Kennedy in one of his sermons says that the first article of the Apostles' Creed should be proclaimed with a flourish of trumpets. A blare of trumpets has a note of defiance about it; why not with a quiet and unshakable note of assurance as one of the great facts of the soul's life? Is not the very vehemence of it a confession of the difficulty; a kind of defense mechanism against a subtle doubt. It is difficult to believe in a God of creative love, but not to believe in Him is to be thrown back upon a kind of stoic and self-pitying courage, if not into final despair.

There can be nothing but respect for the idealism and social dreams of Humanism; it claims nothing less than Christian idealists have been saying and dreaming throughout Christian history, and in these recent years saying in the same language, aimed at the same social wrongs and in behalf of the same social regeneration. What Christian idealists have said, believing that in them there was welling up the purpose of an eternal good will, these men say in a kind of grim lonesomeness in a world which does not care for their good will. We need not hail them as "the scourge of Christendom"; but the serious question these Humanists, with their divided world, will have to face is whether they can maintain or get any great community of men to maintain this warm enthusiasm in the face of the "Cosmic Chill." It seems to be an heroic and noble adventure to limit the moral horizon to our little human world, and, heedless of the great universe without, to "build on earth the fair city we have looked for in a compensatory world." But the undertaking is bound to fail because by merely wishing it we cannot shut out the universe. What we blandly ignore comes pouring in through every crevice of our being. We cannot thus forever ignore anything so insistent and so immense as the world round about us; what it is and what it does to us and our ultimate destiny in it eventually color the spirit with which we live in it. Man lives at his best by long looks; he thinks in terms of far perspective; he ven-

tures in the strength of great relationships and he cannot escape reflection on the mysteries of the great world about and the possibilities beyond. He may try to make himself believe that he can maintain a sense of the worth of values in his hemmed in and lonely human sphere; but sooner or later he wants to know whether or not they are universal values. If his life is not cosmically worth while after a time the questioning doubt creeps in, whether it is worth the struggle at all if "the whole temple of man's achievement must inevitably be buried beneath the debris of a universe in ruins." This is a short creed hardly big enough to bear the weight of a task as big as the Humanists recognize it to be.

The logic of the Humanist's dualism lands him not far away from the disillusionment of Krutch. The naturalistic interpretation that rules a moral and purposeful intelligence out of the cosmos will rule moral personality out of man. That logic is manifest in the utterance of Dr. John H. Dietrich, who is recognized as one of the founders of the new Humanism, when he says:

"The whole trend of the thought of science today is that man is a purely physical creature and that the processes of life are purely mechanical and in time will be reduced to a problem in chemistry. . . . Science is our teacher. Its methods mark the one sure road to truth. We must follow this road straight through to the very end, though it seems to lead to chaos. Personally I believe that science will lead us not to chaos but to order."

If it leads to anything but chaos, then the Humanists will have to see in man something more than chemical formulas.

That the Humanists are aware of this dilemma is more than a little evident. There are indications among them that they realize that they cannot set off man's moral world as having no correspondence in his physical universe. Last fall John Haynes Holmes published his sermon, "A Humanistic Interpretation of Prayer," which brought forth a symposium of finely tempered answers in the Christian Century. The sum total of his conception of prayer he gives in the following words:



"All of which is based on the postulate that the spirit of man is akin to the spirit of the universe in itself as well as in its myriad separate forms, and that 'spirit with spirit can meet.'"

Perhaps Dr. Haynes does not mean by spirit all that the Theists mean, but certainly he is not far from them, and is *very far* from saying that man can carry on his little adventure in indifference to "cosmic support" when he says, "We must move out beyond the limits of our poor strength and rally the universe to our support." To which Dr. Richard Roberts aptly replies:

"The fact is that to sustain his doctrine of prayer, Dr. Holmes has to postulate a universe of such a character that it is hardly distinguishable from what some of us call God. I can think of only one thing more that is needed,—namely the notion of the universe as knowing. If it is alive, with a life that can reinforce ours, it is a fair assumption that it knows."

Prof. Edward Scribner Ames, himself a leading Humanist, in his chapter on "God and Personality" points out the fallacy of which many humanists are guilty when they try to drop one term of their dualistic conception and retain the other, thus being left with a "truncated world, and the lower half of the old dualistic order," leaving man "suspended between the void of matter on one side and the vacancy left on the other by the removal of the old supernaturalistic deity."

"Even," he says, "if man's desires, springing from blocked ideals, have been hypostatized into entities of another order, giving rise to the contrast between the natural and the supernatural, the error cannot be corrected by assuming a static nature on one side, and man a helpless dreamer in an alien world on the other."

Here, unless we are sticklers for literalism, is a fundamental Theism which acknowledges in the words of outstanding Humanists that Humanism cannot maintain its faith and enthusiasm for the human adventure unless it is reinforced by something in the universe to give it worth.

Again, I think it needs to be said that the Humanists are guilty of a peculiar slip of historic sense when they dismiss the idea of God because of its lowly and naïve origin. It is characteristic of them that in their attacks on Theism they select the conceptions in their crudest forms. For them all conceptions, without discrimination, are Myths and all religionists Mythmakers. To be sure, the conception of God is known to all students of the history of religion to have had a lowly origin; all other conceptions have had. The astronomer, who measures the heavens and defines them with a mathematical formula, is the descendent of the astrologer, who believed the destiny of men was controlled by the stars, but this does not discredit the discoveries of the scientist who today reveals the incredible nature of the universe. The chemist who, Dr. Dietrich believes, will give the answer to the meaning of human life, had as his forebear the alchemist, who would turn lead into gold,—and perhaps he was ignorantly nearer right than modern chemists once believed,—but this does not make the formulas of the modern chemist less authoritative. Men have believed in animism and tribal gods and a "Great Man" and a "King, lawgiver and judge sitting upon a throne in the heavens," but the conceptions did not remain static. The mature spiritual geniuses of the race, whatever the popular conception, have not thought of God sitting upon a throne. He has been a God of light, a being of righteousness, an abiding presence, a creative and energizing power, with whom they were in living fellowship.

To be sure, they have all expressed their conceptions in the language of their time, but back of the language was an inescapable experience which was the tremendous fact of their lives. They have invariably put their religious thought in the form of symbols,—so long as we have to express experience and thought in language we will have to use symbols. Prof. Eddington has pointed out how "the environment of space and time and matter, of light and color and concrete things, which seem so vividly real to us, is probed deeply by every device of physical science and at the bottom we reach symbols. Its substance has melted into shadow. None the less it remains a real world if there is a background to the symbols." And we do not dismiss the

reality of our universe because we can reach it only through symbols. The Theist has not done otherwise; he has found a real world which is the background of his symbols. Walter Lippman seems to think that because naïve ways of picturing God are incredible we are, therefore, disqualified for having any conception of Him at all. Lippman is hard to please; he rejects the early images of God because they could be pictured and then casts a slur at Dr. Fosdick's conception which he says no one could paint. Of course when Dr. Fosdick says "the religious man today must picture his dealing with the divine in terms of personal relationships," this is not the God of the ancient faith, at least it is not "God the Father, Lawgiver, Judge, sitting upon a throne," but Dr. Fosdick is only putting into the symbolism of present thought what the ancient faith put in its terms. He is putting it in the symbolism of the highest we know—personality. True, as the Humanist may say, this is anthropomorphism, but unless we cease to use language at all, we will never express that which reaches beyond us except in terms of that which we know at hand.

But Humanism will have no God in any sense beyond Humanity itself. There is nothing beyond or above man. I do not think I am unfair to the thoroughgoing Humanists in saying this. It may not be true concerning men like Ames and Holmes who should really by their own confession be put down as Theists. When Holmes says we must reach out for the support of the universe, he is certainly not thinking of man as sufficient in himself and the support he is seeking is not different from that which any Theist seeks, a support for his ideals and his striving for them, the support of a spirit akin to his spirit. And when Ames says "there seems to be the same ground for asserting that God is personal as we have for saying that God is order, intelligence and love," he has ceased to be a Humanist in any strict sense of the term and has become essentially a Theist.

But the real Humanist, while he asserts that he does not deny God, has agreed to get along without him. Humanity is the religious-object in his faith. For him it is a question to which he must give serious attention whether it is possible for humanity to be both the worshipper and the worshipped. Even though

he may achieve a high degree of moral endeavor can he call it religion? For religion implies something beyond one's self. That which man sets up as the object of his religion may be like him, but there are always points in which it is unlike him. Can an idealized humanity supply that element when it is but the sum total of humanity's ideals? It will be difficult to maintain that contrast between the worshipper and the worshipped when both are the same. The tendency in human behavior is all the other way. I am not inclined to consider my fellow men as much better than myself. Carlyle once said, "Show our critics a great man, they begin to what they call 'account' for him, not to worship him but to take the dimensions of him, and bring him out to be a little kind of man." Carlyle did not live in the day of the "biography of disillusionment," but if he had he would have found sufficient evidence of this trait in human nature, not to worship man but to belittle him. No great character has been left unaccounted for, unanalyzed. That in him which was once taken to be the manifestation of a great soul is shown up to be the working of some psychological complex. The leveling is never up but always down. I know no better example of this than the Humanists themselves in their constant burying of Jesus at some obscure point among the teachers of the race. The record of what men have done to their greatest seers and teachers and deliverers does not lend encouragement to the faith that man will with any consistency recognize a difference between himself and humanity to give that "otherness," as Dr. Sperry calls it, which is the essence of religion. Humanism may continue as a high form of ethical culture, but without that sense of something which rises above, while it comprehends, Humanity, it can hardly continue as a religion in any real sense of the word.

#### *The Answer of Christian Theism*

What does Christian Theism have to answer to Humanism to supply the "Otherness" of religion and the faith in the worth of the human adventure? Is it not a significant religious fact that the New Testament does not give us a metaphysical conception of God? As Jesus and his early followers lived their faith,

the experience which was theirs gave them a sense of God not dependent upon the cosmology of the time. The terms in which God is expressed are singularly free from mythology and anthropomorphism. He is simply and grandly one who is known through the fellowship of His spirit with theirs. When Christian faith has been most true to itself, it has not concerned itself with the abstract attributes of deity. The Christian God may also be the Absolute; the Christian believes they do merge, but in his venture of faith he does not wait until the fact is philosophically proved. "No one," says Lord Balfour, "dares anything for the Absolute." That is, philosophy never makes moral heroes or martyrs. But religion does, a personal God does; He fires the hero's heart, the martyr's joy and the missionary's labors. The Christian may welcome the findings of science which confirm the belief in intelligence, purpose, and will in the universe. That science now says that all matter ultimately is reducible to centers of creative energy, closely akin to a pervasive spiritual force, is a fact to which he is not indifferent; he does not himself care to live in a world mentally divided, one half of which says the ultimates of life are material and the other that they are spiritual. But Christian Theism does not necessarily wait for that, nor does it identify itself too closely with any current theory concerning the origin and processes of nature. The theories change and it has been one of the sad experiences of Christian Theology that it has often found itself loaded with an antiquated cosmogony. What has happened before may happen again; and Christian faith, while it welcomes the trends of science moving toward a spiritual view of nature, will be wise if it refrains from too close an interpretation of itself in terms of science.

What Christian Theism offers to the life of man is faith in a God who is found in *moral experience*,—the experience of fellowship with One who is working out, on the stage provided by the universe, his moral purposes through creative good-will. This fellowship is not merely a fellowship for the support of humanity's weakness, as the Humanist paints man's dependence on God. That is a futile pose of self-sufficiency which decries man leaning on religion like a cripple on a crutch.

"It must be admitted," writes Frank S. C. Wicks, "that the faith of men that there is a God beyond themselves who cares for them has helped many a man in times of weakness, just as a crutch is sometimes necessary when strength of limb fails. But how much better if the limb be so strengthened that the crutch may be thrown away; how much better if a man can find divine strength within himself rather than expect it of a being above himself."

That is a pose. Man cannot by merely declaring his self-reliance will his independence of external support. There is no humiliation of man in his seeking the support of a spirit akin to his own but greater than himself. Man never rises higher than in those moments when he realizes not his mere humanity, but his essential divinity which makes possible his finding such fellowship of power in his need.

But even so, Christian Theism is not merely the fellowship of helpless clinging to a "Rock higher than I." It is one in which man finds himself, in his moral struggles, his ventures of faith, spiritual aspirations, and his labors for the "good life" both for himself and for his fellows allied with God who has on foot these same great ends. It is a fellowship of purpose; an experience of participation with the "Great Good." It is just those Theists, who have entrusted themselves to Him they call God, who have heroically blazed every trail that has led to humanity's liberation. He has been to them an energizing power, not a paralysis of the nerve of moral activity. They have been the creative and renewing spirits in the world, who have felt that in their devotion they had God with them.

Now we are aware of the fact that the Humanist will say this is simply taking refuge in Mysticism, "the last resort of hard-pressed present-day Theists." They first rule God out of the natural order and then dismiss the possibility of any inner sense of a divine presence. Of course, as Dr. Eustace Haydon points out, Mysticism is universal. "The Mystics may be atheists, pluralists, theists, or pantheists," which is only saying that man instinctively reaches out for a life beyond himself, however he conceives it. But here is something more than a subjective meditation and concentration by which a man reaches some state



of blissful assurance that he is in direct contact with reality. It is mysticism which is creatively active, because it believes man's moral capacity is an instrument of insight and interpretation as valid as his intellect. In the world of man's spiritual life, with his sense of values, his urge to risk himself for them, his love, his devotion and moral heroism, he is finding out something of ultimate reality as truly as he is through scientific instruments by which he measures and charts the natural world round about him.

The Christian Theist is just as sensible to the problem of evil as is the Humanist who is driven away from a belief in God because of it,—and there is no easy solution of the meaning of life which does not take this problem seriously. The Christian, too, is oppressed by the indifference of nature to man, which destroys the habitations of men in earthquake and tornado, taking men and women and children with an insensate cruelty. If God does deliberately will such devastation, we, too, throw up our hands in defiant atheism. There is of course no easy answer. The world is a precarious stage sometimes for the human venture.

What other kind of stage, however, can there be for a venture? It is not a finished world, nor are we a finished humanity. A finished world and a neatly arranged human order would hardly develop a heroic race,—nor a free one. An adverse world does play a part in the making of character and personality. Character and personality are achievements attained by struggle for mastery, calling for initiative, constructive effort, inventive genius, powers of adaptation, discovery and above all for the compassion and sympathy, devotion and self-sacrifice which a world, in which pain is a part, nurtures in the human heart.

But not all the adverse conditions are chargeable to nature, "red in tooth and claw." Even the Humanists admit that ninety-five per cent. of the ills in the world are due to man himself. The moral struggle is not only against nature, it is also against man. The Humanists, it seems to me, in their enthusiasm for the innate good in man have not adequately gauged

the moral resistance against the "good life" in man himself; the heavy drag of human nature, his hostility to that which opposes, with love and goodness, his native impulses of greed and selfishness, his ambitions and pugnacity. They foolishly still believe, as we all once did, that humanity is just naturally on the rise and that a better material estate, a comfortably arranged economic order and a few moral reforms are all that are needed. We ought to know better today. Man has, indeed, the seeds of goodness in himself but he also has a tremendous resistance to good.

Dr. Potter talks flippant nonsense with an apparent ignorance of the significance of Christ when he says, "Instead of a cross on which a man is stretched in agony to appease the wrath of an angry sky-god, behold a cross on which is spread a silken covering to carry it skyward to trap electric force for the service of man." (A kite instead of a cross!) He has simply failed to measure the cost at which humanity's progress is made and his moral salvation and good bought. He certainly has not appreciated the fact that that is the price man himself made love and goodness pay. Whether we like it or not men in the real world, outside of books of Humanism, are saved by sacrificial love; they are redeemed, not reformed.

Christian Theism believes that God was in that sacrifice of love and goodness, and that there we envision the "other" who labors with us in that costly adventure by which man is achieving goodness and beauty and strength.

We are the inheritors of the Christian Tradition, not of the traditional theology, but of that current of faith and life and experience which like a great resistless river has flowed beneath all manner of theologies in the hearts of men from generation to generation, in which men have found themselves not alone, but caught up in the embrace of that which is within and about and above. Christian Theism asserts a faith in God who gives cosmic and eternal worth to man and those values which he cherishes as the only enduring ends of life. They are not only Humanity's ends; they are also God's ends.

Lebanon, Pa.

A SHORT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF HUMANISM

CRITICAL HUMANISM: A Humanism based on the Greek cultural tradition:

Literature and the American College, Irving Babbitt, Houghton Mifflin.

Humanism and America, Norman Foerster, Farrar & Rinehart.

Shelburne Essays, Paul Elmer More, Houghton Mifflin.

American Criticism, Norman Foerster, Houghton Mifflin.

Progress and Science, Robert Shaver, Yale University Press.

The Critique of Humanism, C. Hartly Grattan, Brewer & Warren.

Evangelical Humanism, Lynn Harold Hough, The Abingdon Press.

Issues of the Bookman, New York and the Criterion, London.

HUMANISM: A NEW RELIGION:

Humanism: A New Religion, Charles Francis Potter, Simon & Schuster.

Humanism, Curtis W. Reese, Open Court Pub. Co.

Humanist Sermons, Curtis W. Reese, Open Court Pub. Co.

Religion, Edward Scribner Ames, Henry Holt Co.

A Preface to Morals, Walter Lippman, Macmillan.

The Quest of the Ages, A. Eustace Haydon, Harper & Bros.

The Modern Temper, Joseph Wood Krutch, Harcourt Brace.

Things and Ideals, Max C. Otto, Henry Holt Co.

The Community Pulpit, (pamphlets), John Haynes Holmes, The Community Church, N. Y.

THE CHRISTIAN ANSWER:

The Experience of God in Modern Life, Wm. Eugene Lyman, Scribners.

Theism and the Modern Mood, Walter Marshall Horton, Harper & Bros.

Humanism and Christianity, Francis J. McConnell, Macmillan.

Signs of These Times, Willard L. Sperry, Doubleday, Doran & Co.

Does Civilization Need Religion? Niebuhr, Macmillan.

Christianity Reborn, L. L. Leh, Macmillan.

THE TREND OF SCIENCE:

The Nature of the Physical World, A. S. Eddington, Macmillan.

Science and the Unseen World, A. S. Eddington, Macmillan.

Science and the Modern World, Alfred N. Whitehead, Macmillan.

Science and Religion, J. Arthur Thomson, Putnam.

What is Man? J. Arthur Thomson, Putnam.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF  
CONTEMPORARY HUMANISM

The article by the Rev. E. F. Hoffmeier, D.D., on "Humanism's New Claims," suggests the propriety of a second article on the historical background of Humanism. In this discussion I shall refer to the Humanism of the Renaissance of the 14th and 15th centuries and the Humanism of the Aufklärung, or Rationalism, of the 18th century. The Humanism of the two periods had many things in common, but in some respects they differed widely from each other. Contemporary Humanism is closely allied to the spirit of the 18th century and may be said to be its ripe fruit. What was in seed in the leaders of thought in Europe at that time has now opened into flower among the nations of the western world. The influence of it is rapidly spreading over the whole of the Orient.

The Aufklärung was a protest from rational grounds against confessional orthodoxy and a church domineering every phase of life. The reason, suppressed so long, rose in its might and stood in judgment upon the age-old doctrines of the church. The appeal was taken from historical revelation to universal reason. The enlightened man felt himself freed from external authority; his judgment was not fettered by tradition. The past had no power over him. Through thinking he tried to escape the limitation of the temporal and the historical and come into contact with the eternal and the absolute. He expected salvation through clear thinking. He not merely assimilated a given world but ventured to build a new world. This attitude was a reaction against a view of the world and a theory of life which sound reason could no longer tolerate. In place of blind submission to authority, which had divine sanctions and human consent for more than a millenium, the rationalist put scientific investigation and independent thinking. The reasonable became the test of the divine; and the irrational was regarded as a remnant of a stage of culture which is antiquated and outlived. Interest and joy in this world took the place of the asceticism and gloom of other worldliness. Unbounded optimism in refer-

ence to the worth and the outcome of the world-process superseded hopeless pessimism growing out of the theory that Satan is master of the earth. The buoyant faith in progress begot a lively zeal for reform in state and church, in school and industry.

Once the whole of life was interpreted from above downward, from God to man; now it is explained from below upward, from man to God. Men speak of a natural state, a natural religion, a natural morality, a natural art, a natural pedagogy, as well as of natural science, philosophy, and theology. The guardianship and dictation of the church in all these departments of life are renounced forever.

Evidences of this spirit are found here and there in the Middle Age. In the 12th and 13th centuries men cut loose from the apron-strings of Mother Church. Economic changes, the growth of cities, the rise of the third estate, freed forces, intellectual and moral, either ran parallel or entered into controversy with the Church. These tendencies came to fruition in the humanists of the Renaissance, when for the first time men had the courage to project a view of the world and of life without consulting ecclesiastical traditions and authorities. Repressed and overshadowed by orthodoxy, Protestant and Catholic, it worked quietly none the less in the bosom of the 16th and 17th centuries, in the interest of exact science and of historical criticism, until it came into the ascendant in the Aufklärung of the 18th century.

"The Renaissance of the 15th century was, in many things, great rather by what it designed than by what it achieved. Much which it aspired to do, and did but imperfectly or mistakenly, was accomplished in what is called the *éclaircissement* of the 18th century, or in our own generation; and what really belongs to the revival of the 15th century is but the leading instinct, the curiosity, the initiatory idea."<sup>1</sup>

Yet, to understand the historical significance of the Enlightenment, one must consider how it agreed and differed from the Renaissance to which it traced its lineage, and how it was related to evangelical orthodoxy against which it protested.

In many respects the humanists of the 15th, and the rationalists of the 18th century were kindred spirits and held in common

<sup>1</sup> See Pater, "The Renaissance," p. 26.

ideas which are now generally accepted. "The trait common to the first and the second Renaissance," says Paulsen, "was a passionate craving for freedom on the part of the individual."<sup>2</sup> Men affirmed the right of reason and conscience against the dictates and dogmas of the Church. In the struggle for freedom they opposed the natural to the conventional and traditional. Their protest against the existing order was based on the assumption of the possibility of progress and of the supremacy of reason over tradition. They had a new estimate of the value of the world and endeavored to master its resources for the betterment and the enjoyment of men. Men felt it to be their task to grapple with the universe, to discover its ways, to penetrate its mysteries, and to control its forces. The world was not to be avoided, nor to be enthroned, but to be subdued to man's own purposes. These may be either material or spiritual. When the soul is controlled by things, we have materialism; when things are controlled by the soul, we have idealism.

Renaissance and Aufklärung, also, had in common a want of respect for things medieval, enthusiasm for the study of original sources in place of reliance on secondary authorities, critical valuation of legendary, fabulous, and miraculous data masquerading as historical facts. The tremor felt by the man of the Renaissance at the mention of the Middle Age became a shudder in the men of the Enlightenment. So far the two periods were in accord.

Notwithstanding these points of agreement, there were certain glaring differences between humanists and rationalists, that is, the humanists of the 18th century. The former felt themselves free for independent investigations, yet they had not mastered the scientific method which prevailed in the Aufklärung. They were still in bondage to tradition. From Bernard and Thomas they turned to Plato and Aristotle, transferring infallibility from the Schoolmen to the classics, from theology to philosophy. They were far more intent upon discovering the wisdom of the ancients and popularizing it in elegantly bound handbooks than on finding knowledge for themselves by experiment and research. Notable exceptions, like Leonardo da Vinci, Paracelsus, and Vesalius,

<sup>2</sup> "A System of Ethics," Eng. trans., p. 129.



prove the rule. Copernicus was given no more credit by the majority of the Humanists than by the Reformers. Their vision of the new was dimmed by their devotion to the old.

The Humanist did not have the Rationalist's appreciation of the reign of law throughout the universe. He regarded only a small portion of nature under the control of law; most of it he left to chance and fate. He still had the animistic and mythological, instead of the mechanical or organic, view of nature; and with it he held superstitions and fancies which men of the Enlightenment wholly abandoned. "For Pico," says Pater, "the world is a limited place, bounded by actual crystal walls, and a material firmament; it is like a painted toy, like that map or system of the world held, as a great target or shield, in the hands of the creative *Logos*, by whom the Father made all things, in one of the earlier frescoes of the Campo Stanto at Pisa."<sup>3</sup>

Burckhardt shows how Poggio, a man of fine culture, believed in spirits, devils, and prodigies of the antique sort. Pope Pius II, a humanist, deposited gold and silver medallions in the foundations of his buildings. Benvenuto Cellini recites in detail a ceremony of exorcism which he attended in the Coliseum and Ficino and Cardanus were firm believers in astrology. Most of them were astrologists rather than astronomers, alchemists rather than chemists. Even so advanced a thinker as Giordano Bruno (d. 1600) "strangely confused the old and the new, crass superstition and daring speculation, dull pedantry and vivacious originality, ignorant folly and supreme insight."<sup>4</sup>

The humanist's interest in the 15th century was in man, not in nature. The pedagogical literature was replete with prescriptions for the culture of man but leaves scant room for the study of nature. Vergerius in his *De ingenuis et liberalibus studiis* gives first place to history and moral philosophy; astrology and physics have only eighth and ninth place in the curriculum. Rudolph Agricola, the German humanist, in his *De formando studio*, says: "Of the two parts of philosophy, moral and natural, only the first is necessary for life. Physics or natural philosophy serves more for the adornment and the enjoyment of the soul

<sup>3</sup> "The Renaissance," p. 33.

<sup>4</sup> Article on Bruno in Hasting's Encyclo. of Religion and Ethics.

than as an essential part of its being." No one, of course, will deny the lively interest of the man of the Renaissance in the knowledge of nature and of the world, an enthusiasm for discovery and exploration which was a natural outcome of his passion for reality. But there is an evident lack of the analytic mind for a study of nature in its details and for the discovery of its laws by patient research. Aristotle, "the master of them that know," was made to answer questions that are now solved in the laboratory. In an Italian court of the 14th and 15th centuries, the lords and ladies conversed about the classics and the arts, not about science and nature. In a French salon of the 18th century conversation revolved around physics and chemistry; and even ladies were busy in laboratory observations with crucibles, microscopes, and telescopes.

The difference between Humanists and Rationalists appears, also, in the scope of their horizon as well as in their method of study. The Humanists recovered the classics of Greece and Rome and included the pagan world in their historical perspective. The Rationalists went back of historic to pre-historic antiquity, to a stage of human life farther behind the classics than the Renaissance was ahead of them. From Greece and Rome they went to Egypt, Babylon, and India; from civilization and culture to barbarism and savagery; from the crystal phrase of Homer to the "agglomerative grunt of the savage"; from Christ to the fetich; from the temple to the altar of uncut stone; from the Roman emperor with his conquering legions to the tribal chief with his hordes smiting with clubs and piercing with flint. The horizon of men was widened both in time and space, and with new instruments they could see infinite distances and infinitesimal particles. New facts were gathered with painstaking research and collated with scientific precision. This gave men a new sense of reality and a new conception of life.

Though the Rationalists were not influenced by the historical spirit, as that term is now understood, they, by their researches in the past, paved the way for a new interpretation of history. Troeltsch says: "They demolished the hitherto prevailing idea of history, based as it was upon the monarchies of Daniel, upon the Apocalypse or upon Augustine; discovered a hitherto un-

known or unnoticed world, opened up immense vistas of forgotten time, banished the Fall of man from its position at the commencement of history, and constructed a totally different primitive condition as the earliest stage. But since this explanation, excluding miracles and the idea of providence revealed an endlessly confused play of human forces, it was felt with redoubled force that a simple, normal historical content was necessary, and this was found in the idea of natural right and of natural morality and religion.<sup>75</sup>

The Renaissance had little influence upon popular religion. The people and even the leading humanists remained in the church and conformed to Catholic piety though they had lost heart for it. The Aufklärung had a profound effect on Christianity, calling its cardinal dogmas into question and interpreting the gospel in a new and heterodox way. Among the men of the 15th century few became atheists or even heretics, although some raised questions about divine providence and personal immortality. The age of natural science and its materialistic philosophy had not yet arrived. In short there was not yet an independent modern philosophy to shake men's faith in the doctrines of the Church.

Finally, the Humanist of the 15th century was untouched by the democratic spirit of the Enlightenment. He was essentially an aristocrat. He belonged to a small group of cultured men and women who were an aristocracy, not of blood but of culture. He had little regard for nobility of birth alone, but revered genius or talent even though it came from lowly homes. His pride of culture was as much a barrier between him and the people as was the nobleman's pride of family.

The Humanist, accordingly, had no zeal for reform in the interest of the common welfare. He sought the patronage of princes and of magnates, and by their grace he filled professorships, secretaryships, and ambassadorships. In his scheme of education he made no provision for the multitudes but rather opposed the popularizing of the new learning. Men were divided into two groups: 1. The cultured élite versed in the classics and

<sup>75</sup> Real-Encyclopädie für Theologie und Kirche, 3rd edition, article on Aufklärung, p. 231.

freed from irksome conventions and traditions and disdainful of the vulgar crowd; 2. The common people who were untouched by the revival of letters and continued uninterrupted their observance of the ordinances of the church, submitting without protest to prince and priest.

Especially significant in its relation to the conduct of life was the rise of lay-circles, distinct from the officials of church and state. They were an outcome of individualism and of incipient democracy. The laymen faced new problems with keen insight and independent judgment. Among them were physicians, lawyers, and school-teachers, highly educated and often meeting in secret. They were men of pure lives and zealous for moral reforms. They criticized the immorality of priests and monks and put the doctrines of the church to the test of sound reason. Circles like these were the forerunners of the burger's part in politics and the layman's part in religion in the 18th century.

In the light of what we have said, it becomes clear that Humanism in the 15th century was not at once born full-panoplied; nor did it unfold suddenly from bud to flower. It had to undergo modifications and corrections in the Enlightenment and in our own age. Its original ideal was to glorify life by art but not to transform it with religion. It had a passion for the aesthetic far more than for the religious or ethical. It was aristocratic rather than democratic in its spirit. Its enthusiasm was for the classical far more than for the scientific. The difference between Renaissance and Aufklärung is accounted for by the rise of the scientific method and the democratic spirit.

—G. W. R.

(To be Continued)

## BOOK NOTICES

*Ventures in Belief.* Henry P. Van Dusen, Editor. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1930. 242 pp. \$2.00.

Here are assembled a series of papers written by outstanding leaders of the day and constituting in each instance a positive statement of religious belief concerning some fundamental yet difficult problem. Francis J. McConnell states the essence of his belief about God. Henry Nelson Wieman reveals his characteristic and thought-provoking conception of the World. Kirby Page writes about Society; Harry Emerson Fosdick about the Church; and Rufus Jones about Prayer. Other topics are dealt with by leaders of equal fame, but the ones mentioned seem to be especially worth-while. To the list of chapters particularly worth reading should be added the Introduction by Reinhold Niebuhr in which the difficulties to faith in the modern world are analyzed in a fresh and vital manner.

The papers have been prepared with the college student and his religious perplexities in mind, but are of no less value for readers who find themselves some years removed from undergraduate doubts. A rather fine unanimity of outlook pervades the symposium. However, the reader is conscious of a definite break both in viewpoint and in phraseology when turning from Coffin to Wieman, and from Wieman to Rufus Jones. All in all, the editor has succeeded in bringing together in brief compass a series of constructive and stimulating statements on those fundamental issues upon which all men everywhere must take some stand.—N. C. H.

*Bhaskar and His Friends.* By Clara G. Labaree. The Friendship Press. 1930. 110 pp. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, \$.75.

*The Golden Sparrow.* By Irene Mason Harper. The Friendship Press. 1930. 150 pp. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, \$.75.

*The Star of India.* By Isabel Brown Rose. The Friendship Press. 1930. 192 pp. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, \$.75.

*India Looks to Her Future.* By Oscar MacMillan Buck. The Friendship Press. 1930. 214 pp. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, \$.60.

These four books provide materials for the missionary study of India in four age groups. The first two, which are for Primary and Junior children respectively, contain in addition to a number of interesting stories a wealth of teaching suggestions which will prove invaluable to the leader of a mission study group. The third is apparently planned for young people. Dr. Buck's treatise is a serious discussion for adults of the great problem-areas in India's present and future.—N. C. H.

*Children of Sea and Sun.* By Mabel Garrett Wagner. The Friendship Press. 1930. 122 pp. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, \$.75.

*Sugar is Sweet.* By Dorothy F. McConnell and Margaret E. Forsyth. The Friendship Press. 1930. 122 pp. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, \$.75.

*Porto Rican Neighbors.* By Charles W. St. John. The Friendship Press. 1930. 98 pp. Cloth, \$1.00.

*West Indian Treasures.* By Winifred Hulbert. The Friendship Press. 1930. 161 pp. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, \$.75.

*Trailing the Conquistadores.* By Samuel Guy Inman. The Friendship Press. 1930. 236 pp. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, \$.60.

This second series of mission study texts has to do with the Caribbean islands. The first two, designed for children of Primary and Junior age respectively, again combine a collection of stories with detailed teaching suggestions. A valuable feature is a series of reports of actual experiences certain groups have had with this material. The third and fourth appear to have been planned for Intermediates and Young People. The last, which is by Prof. Inman, is a well-documented study of the political and economic history of the West Indies with particular emphasis upon the rather questionable contacts between our own country and these islands. It is well worth the consideration of any citizen.—N. C. H.



EXCERPTS FROM THE PRIVATE DIARIES  
OF WILLIAM RUPP

MADE BY HIS SON, HENRY H. RUPP\*

My father's diaries speak for themselves. In presenting them on this occasion, I think you will be more interested in hearing what these diaries themselves say than in what I may say about them.

However, a word or two of description may be in order. They begin with the date Jan. 1, 1861, and continue with more or less regularity until March 20, 1880. Of a total of eighteen volumes, the first two and a half are devoted to the account of his life during his Junior and Senior years at Franklin and Marshall College at Lancaster. The next two record his experiences as a student in the Theological Seminary at Mercersburg. The remaining volumes contain the record of busy pastorates at St. Clair, Pa., Berlin, Pa., and Manchester, Md. Thus in these eighteen volumes are set forth twenty years of his life—student days, vacation days, courtship days, and days in the active pastorate. They make a mine of information for the historical student who cares to peruse them, a well of inspiration, stirring up a loving appreciation, for his sons and daughters who are privileged to read them and cherish them.

A recent biographer of George Washington says, in reference to Washington's diaries, that Washington, following the custom of his day, wrote down what he *did* about things, and not what he *thought* about things. In father's diaries I find that he wrote down not only what he *did*, but also what he *thought* about things. The College, his classmates, the faculty, the Literary Society, the girls of Lancaster, the Civil War, the United States Congress, and, later on, his congregations, his consistories, the Classis, his fellow pastors, all came within the review of his keen and critical mind, all furnished material for his facile pen. But that he tried to be just, honest, and accurate in his observations, goes without saying. The following record under date of Oct.

\* Read before the Historical Society of the Reformed Church in the U. S. at its annual meeting in connection with the Commencement of the Theological Seminary, May 8, 1929.

23, 1861, during his Junior year at college, reveals the character of his records, while at the same time it sets forth a bit of his philosophy: "Were this book not intended to contain all the facts worthy of notice which occur around me from day to day, or otherwise come to my knowledge, such transactions as those recorded under date of the 19th. inst., should not deface these pages. There was no hostility among the members of our class until last session; and then it was produced precisely by those gentlemen who are now so much bewailing the condition of our Society. He who unchains the lion may be the first whom he will tear to pieces. Since last Saturday I have heard little as to what turn things are likely to take. It is extremely unpleasant to live at strife with one's neighbors; and yet this is sometimes not to be avoided. I have long since made up my mind to take the world as it comes. Therefore, I care but little whether affairs are good or evil; it will in the end all amount to the same thing. Let this suffice."

With such an abundance of material, then, at my disposal, and limited as I am by the circumstances of this hour, I am naturally compelled to make a choice of material to present to you this morning. Accordingly, I have chosen the first period of the twenty years represented in these diaries, namely, the period of his student days at Lancaster. In presenting it to you, I shall, as I said at the beginning, let the diaries speak for themselves.

Of course, I would not be my father's son if I did not at least attempt to be logical. In order to present the material logically, therefore, I shall disregard the chronology of the various events and set forth the records under certain headings or topics.

*The Civil War*

The one subject that is discussed more than any other in the first five volumes of these diaries is the Civil War. Though he learned to hate the war and escaped the draft in the Fall of 1863 only by the refusal of the doctor to pass him ("Functional disease of the heart" is mentioned in his exemption papers), nevertheless the following entries attest his interest in the war and what the war meant for the nation: Jan. 1, 1861—"A dark cloud is lowering on the political horizon, and unless an omni-

potent Deity, who maketh the wrath of man to praise Him, preserves us from ruin, our ship of state must be dashed to pieces upon the rocks among which it is entangled. I am anxiously waiting for the proceedings of the convention in South Carolina, though it is hardly possible to expect anything else but the secession of that State."

Jan. 10—"This evening I spent partly in reading and partly in arguing about the Union. Secession is treason, it is true, but the South has also been wronged by the North, and concession on both sides ought to be made. In Congress there is nothing being done towards settling the slavery question, and the prevention of more states from seceding. . . . Civil war seems to be what our politicians want. Buchanan seems to be rising again in the favor of the people. There is no doubt that if the question were brought before the people of the United States, they would settle it peaceably at the ballot-box."

Jan. 11—"In the afternoon I attended the German Society. The question, 'Should coercion be used against South Carolina?' was discussed in general debate. I took the negative and spoke twenty minutes. We had some pretty fiery speeches, and mine was not less fiery than those of any of the others. Our fair temple of liberty is falling into pieces. In the language of the London Times, 'The best government ever devised by the wisdom of mortal man may in a few days be demolished by the folly and selfishness of a few wicked politicians.'"

But the precociousness of college Juniors is without limit. Before it even Presidents stand or fall. Witness this: Feb. 22—"Mr. Lincoln passed through Lancaster today. He stopped only eighteen minutes. He spoke perhaps ten minutes. Inasmuch as he is soon to speak in an official manner, he said he had no speech to make. His appearance is better than I expected. I was more favorably impressed with him than I had hoped. College exercises were suspended at half past ten o'clock in order to afford the students an opportunity to see the President. It will soon become evident what the issue of the present crisis will be. Mr. Lincoln treats it very lightly, indeed much *too* lightly. He says there is only an artificial crisis. Now in this idea he is certainly mistaken. If there is any reality whatever,

the fact that six states have renounced their allegiance to the Union and are now in hostile array against the Federal Government is a reality. I trust that Mr. Lincoln will soon learn it and treat the matter as it deserves."

Evidently Mr. Lincoln did learn and came around to father's way of thinking. Or was it the other way? Under date of Mar. 13 he writes: "I am a Democrat, but in any measure calculated to preserve the peace of the country I can heartily concur with a Republican president."

But in spite of the objections of college students, wars will break out. And so we read:

Apr. 18—"The news by today's papers are startling and sad. Fort Sumter has been taken by the secessionists after a severe bombardment. The war has now commenced, and God only knows where it will end. Thus, after an experiment of upwards of eighty years, all at once it turns out that we are not able to rule over ourselves peaceably, but must shed each other's blood."

Then follow, during the succeeding months, many reflections on the unhappy war between the North and the South, the war which to the most of us here is a mere matter of history, but which to the fathers of '61 to '65, was a bitter reality. I cull a few of these reflections: Apr. 19—"Who would have believed six months ago that Americans would ever bear arms against Americans? In the midst of prosperity, when united we would have been able to bid defiance to the whole world, we commence to cut each other's throats. All my hope in the intelligence and good sense of the people has now vanished."

Apr. 23—"The war is all the talk. Old men and boys, women and children, all are excited. Some laugh and some weep, some curse and some pray. Men whose childhood had fallen in 'times that tried men's souls' express their apprehension of what is to come. The most fertile imagination can form no conception of the scenes of horror, desolation, and woe which this war may produce."

But it was not until father became a student in the Seminary at Mercersburg that the war really came home to him. Under date of Oct. 11, 1862, he writes: "Last night and today I felt

the fearful effects of the war. The excitement and anxiety were high. Last night nobody slept soundly. At the Seminary we kept watch all night. I performed guard-duty from twelve until one o'clock, passing the time in the prayer-hall and in the tower. The rest of the time I slept in my clothes as well as circumstances would permit sleep. In the morning the first thing was to go into the town and ascertain the state of things. But nobody knew any thing. However, sometime in the forenoon it was ascertained that the rebels were not supported by infantry in the rear. This lightened the minds of the people. A U. S. cavalry company came into town about nine o'clock, being in search of the rebels. Reports soon came that the rebels had burned Chambersburg and were retreating by way of Mercersburg. Again there were fear and uncertainty. Thus things remained until towards evening when the report came that Chambersburg had not been destroyed, but that the rebels had proceeded on to Gettysburg. . . . Whether we are out of danger I do not know. . . . I commit myself to God."

Evidently the war was not popular with the little group of students at Mercersburg. Read this: "March 31, 1863. The examination, the session, and the month, all three are over together, and I am not sorry for any. The examination was a tiresome piece of business and a good deal of a humbug. Still it passed off pleasantly enough. One circumstance connected with the occasion, for its ridiculousness, deserves to be recorded. Some four or five weeks ago, during a season of great excitement on account of the conscription act, the following theses and superscription were written on the blackboard and suffered to remain there, as expressing the political views of all the students with only three or four exceptions:

O tempora! O Mores!

Abraham I and his unconstitutional acts!

1. Suspension of the writ of Habeas Corpus.
2. Suppression of free speech and free press.
3. Suppression of state rights.
4. Emancipation Proclamation.
5. Confiscation Act.

6. Conscription Bill.
7. Indemnification Bill.
8. Centralization of military power and assumption of dictatorial authority. Result—Military despotism.

"As these theses contain nothing but historical facts, it was not considered disloyal to leave them stand upon the board, not indeed for the perusal of any one in particular, but for all who might choose to read them. But the Board of Visitors thought differently, and they ordered Tut. Riley to read us the following censure: 'The faculty are requested by the Board of Visitors to announce to their students before their dismissal that their feelings were pained, in entering the Prayer-hall, with the public display of disloyal sentiments placed on the blackboard—as though for their perusal. The Board does not intend to censure the innocent with the guilty, but to express its decided disapprobation of the utterance of sentiments against the government in this hour of its great peril. They have felt pained to have such things flouted in their faces after traveling a distance to attend the examination. It is hoped that this will not be repeated.'

"The resolution speaks for itself and deserves to be noticed and remembered only for its absurdity and littleness. To an immortality of this kind let it be resigned."

Wars also cannot go on forever. And so, Apr. 29, 1865: "The report of the surrender of Johnston is confirmed. The same terms were given him that were given to Lee. The Confederacy is now at an end. The *rebellion* has failed. Had it been successful it would have been a revolution, a war of freedom for the South; and Jeff. Davis would have become a father of his country. Now he is a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth. How much the merit of a cause depends upon its success! That the merit of the Southern cause was of a very high order I never believed. In the conduct of the war I think both sides sinned very often. Thanks be to God that it is over."

#### *The Literary Society*

Feb. 2—"Saturday night! A rainy day. I attended Society in the forenoon. We had a hot time. The question was whether



gentlemen shall perform according to dates or alternately according to the number of meetings. In my mind there is not the least doubt that, both according to the letter and the spirit of the constitution of the Goethean Literary Society, members must perform their regular exercises alternately according to the number of meetings and not according to dates. . . . This is my view, though it was *not* adopted today."

Apr. 11—"In the evening the Goethean Exhibition was held in Fulton Hall. The program stands as follows: . . . This was the twentieth annual exhibition of the Society. The Goethean Society is alive yet, and in a prosperous condition besides. We have twice as many members as the Diagnothian Society, and I do not think that they will be able to get up as good an exhibition next May as ours was this time."

That he took his duties as president seriously is evident from this: June 15—"The otherwise pleasant meeting of the Society today was rendered unpleasant at the close by W. R. G. Having been fined for absence at the first calling of the roll, he swore in my hearing, for which I felt bound to fine him. I did so, when he swore again, and at me, after which I fined him again. He then expressed a third oath, and left the hall. What will be done with him is not yet determined."

#### *The Seniors*

On Sep. 21, 1861, he pays his respects to the Seniors in this language: "I am a Senior! Well do I remember the time when I used to look up to the Seniors with a feeling of reverence and awe. Men who have devoted so many years to study, and after having passed through so many classes in college have at last almost reached the culminating point in their course, I used to think, may well be allowed to carry a cane and wear a high hat. And yet, now I belong to this strange, mysterious class of beings too, all the mystery with which I used to invest the Seniors has now vanished. How does a Senior feel then? Well, he certainly feels that he has studied Philosophy and Logic already. He knows that he is of some consequence, and feels that Freshmen will have to learn a good deal yet before they will know as much as he does. He is pleased with the respect with which the mem-

bers of the lower classes treat him, and often amused that he does not deserve it. But of this some other time."

#### *The Ladies*

It was not until the Spring of his Junior year that he gives any consciousness of the existence of the fair sex, in these words: Mar. 27—"Nothing important took place today. Dr. Gerhart in Psychology today advised us not to marry a lady who loves a pet dog."

On Oct. 18, after his return from a party half a mile out of town, during which trip they were caught in a rain, he delivers himself of the following: "Here I have a fine opportunity to take some notes on Lancaster society. I cannot do much, but something I must say, to rescue it from oblivion. I find that our Lancaster ladies and gentlemen are lacking, to a wonderful degree, in that gem of humanity, education and good sense. They mean to be civil; they mean to be sociable, yet it is truly painful to be in their company. They will not engage in plays nor in conversation. When they talk, a good Grammarian could not wish for better examples of false syntax than they furnish in almost every sentence. Rhetoric may be studied too in their society. But of this some other time. I would not wrong them in any way. They have treated me kindly. . . . Indeed, I am getting to be a favorite with the ladies."

However, even Lancaster society began to make its impression, for on Nov. 8 he wrote thus:

"While pensive here alone I sit,  
A form does o'er my vision flit;  
That form I have but lately seen, etc."

But not without a struggle. Nov. 14—"Eleven o'clock. Just returned from guard duty. In plain language, I was with the ladies. E. N. and Mr. C., E. H. and myself had gone down somewhere near the South Pole of the city to spend the evening. The place was not altogether in the wilderness, for there were some few houses around it. But, *res maledicatur, horribile*, and all the epithets both in Latin and English, we had a dull time. Dear me! if I had spent the evening reading good old Will, how

much more benefit I would have had of it. But take the world as it comes. There is a time for every thing, and, as a necessary consequence, also for disappointment."

And that the Lancaster ladies finally conquered is proven by the fact that his bride was a Lancaster lady, and—my mother.

And this: July 27—"The sun has set. The evening zephyrs are playing (gently) among the green leaves of the trees. I am breathing the healthful atmosphere of my native hills and dales. But I am lonesome. I want something, and know not what, though if I were to give the reins to my inclination they would soon find an object on which to rest. This, under present circumstances, I can not do. I bury myself in the depths of philosophy, and thus, like the worshippers of Brahma, drown all worldly aspiration. During the present vacation I do not intend to do any thing but read philosophy and study the French language. I expect pretty well to master French until I go to Lancaster again."

Yes, he is on "vacation."

#### *Spiritualism, Pessimism, Royalty*

Evidently he took little stock in spiritualism. On Nov. 24 he wrote: "I had always very low views of Spiritualism; but, holy horror! I never thought it such a monstrous doctrine of hell as it seems to be expressed in the mind and person of this gentleman. Good God, deliver me from anybody that believes in Spiritualism. What a monstrous conglomeration of error, falsehood, wickedness, blasphemy, foolishness, nonsense, and stupidity is this Spiritualism. But I want to go to bed; let Spiritualism to the Devil, its father."

Nor had he any use for the pessimist. While home on his summer vacation in 1861, he got into an argument with a certain gentleman of his neighborhood. He writes: "According to him, all who direct our public affairs are corrupt, and robbers of the people. He believes that honesty and good faith are no more to be found among men, and that the world is infinitely worse now than it was fifty years ago. Such opinions cannot be refuted, for the simple reason that he who holds them has not wit enough to see the force of any argument."

Little better was his opinion of royalty. Aug. 8—"What are kings and princes?" he asks. "I for my part cannot regard them as in any way different from other mortals. I have seen Buchanan and Lincoln, who both through their own exertion rose to the chief magistracy of one of the first nations in the world, and I would any time be willing to pay infinitely more respect to either of them than to a man who has never done so much as to merit the least respect of the meanest slave, though he be called a king. In being born great there is no honor. Mr. Lincoln did not in his youth spend millions, like the Prince of Wales did last year, to attract attention, and yet he is now at the head of affairs which may change the destinies of the world. Such a man's greatness is his own, and he deserves honor for having achieved it."

#### *Sermons, Theology, Philosophy, Science*

His diaries of this period abundantly testify to the fact that he was a student for the ministry. Many pages are given to reports of sermons he heard in the churches of Lancaster and elsewhere. Having an analytical mind and retentive memory, after having heard a sermon he could reproduce it almost *in toto*. This he did while a student both in the college at Lancaster and in the Seminary at Mercersburg.

He had evidently learned to discriminate. Thus on Nov. 10: "I heard Rev. Mr. C. this evening. Mr. C. pursues the analytic method in his preaching. This is very right on certain topics; but if it is used in all cases it must become uninteresting and dull; because no subject will be analyzed to death."

His interest in theological discussions was intense. Jan. 3—"In an old paper of the *Kirchenzeitung* I found an article entitled 'Why the Reformers could not agree.' Among other things the doctrines held by the two parties concerning the Eucharist were mentioned. Having a correct anthropological idea of the 'body,' this expression, 'this is my body,' is more easily explained than the Reformers thought."

Jan. 10—"Read a little book by Dr. Baker on 'Baptism.' 'Believe and be baptized.' Here faith is placed before baptism, and children not capable of exercising faith should not be bap-

tized. Granted; but now, inasmuch as the Saviour goes on further, and says, 'he that believeth not shall be damned,' it follows that children not capable of exercising faith must be damned. This is a revolting doctrine, and yet if the reasoning of the Baptists be correct in the first proposition, it must be correct in the second. Neither is correct. So much I learned."

Nevertheless, he had an evangelical faith. On Sep. 8 he attended the funeral of a cousin, Eliza Held, and on his return he wrote: "Blessed are they that die in the Lord, whether young or old. What a comfort is Christianity! It is when standing at the open grave of a dear friend or relative that the consolations which the religion of Christ brings fall upon the heart like sweet balmy dews. Then it is that we fully realize the benefits of Christ's death. He has sanctified the grave, and those who sleep in Him shall rise again."

In 1861 to be a theological student meant also to be a philosopher. So we find this young student (he was only 22 years old at the time) not only reading abstract philosophy, as already set forth, and the lives of the philosophers, but also expressing his opinions of the subject. Let two quotations suffice. July 30—"I also read the life of Fenelon today, and commenced reading the lives of the ancient philosophers. I do not believe that by the pursuit of science a man can free himself from all worldly evil, and fit himself for the enjoyment of pure happiness in heaven, as the Brahmins and the Pythagoreans believed, but I do think that the pursuit of philosophy is well adapted to raise a man above the possibility of despairing under any load of worldly affliction—not indeed the philosophy of the Stoics, but true Christian philosophy." Aug. 7—"I finished the Lives of Ancient Philosophers. What I said of Diogenes a few days ago may be applied to most of the so-called ancient sages. It seems that they established their reputations for wisdom merely by supporting an odd manner of life. Thales, Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus, deserve the name. Pythagoras did something for philosophy, but he was too great a liar to merit our admiration. Vanity seems to be the great characteristic of most of the ancient philosophers. Diogenes was as proud in his tub as Croesus was in his palace."

*End of College Days*

But however slowly time flies, even a college course comes to an end. June 28, 1862—"This morning the doom of the Senior Class was pronounced. All the members of the class and all the members of the Faculty assembled in the President's room at nine o'clock. The time occupied by the President in making some preliminary remarks and observations was a trying one. Everybody was in suspense, except the knowing ones, who, however, all belonged to the faculty. At last the President began reading out the result of the test examination, then the final result of the whole course. After that came the honors: Marshall Oration, Rupp. First Franklin Oration, Hess. Second Franklin Oration, Kealhofer. First Salutatory, Schultz. Second Salutatory, Mays. German Oration, Gerhard. Valedictory, Keener. Mays refused to accept the honor conferred upon him. After this the class retired to the chapel, where we elected Mays and Reed master orators for 1865. Also elected a committee of arrangements for next commencement. Of course the members of the class who received the honors were in for a treat. Keener and I made the arrangements at Gruel's. . . . At four o'clock we gave the class treat. Thus today ended."

And finally, July 30, 1862—"This was Commencement Day—a day long wished for, and yet, on my part at least, passed with sorrows. The exercises commenced at nine o'clock. . . . Every thing passed off very smoothly. There was no breaking down, as on some previous Commencements. The Commencement is generally pronounced the best ever held in Lancaster. The class of '62 has acquitted itself nobly. Notwithstanding all its heterogeneous elements I now feel proud of it. More of this some other time."

And then away to his home in Lehigh County, from which he set forth the following September to enter upon the experiences of a student in the Theological Seminary at Mercersburg, which experiences, together with those of the first sixteen years of his active ministry, are they not recorded in the remaining fifteen volumes of his diaries?"\*

\* The above paper was read before the Historical Society at its annual meeting in Lancaster in May, 1929. At that time the action to print the



*Dr. Schaff*

Mercersburg, Pa., Dec. 28, 1863. In the evening at half past nine the students in a body took formal leave of Dr. Schaff, who is going to leave with his family for New York tomorrow morning. The ceremony took place in the basement of the Seminary, in the dining hall. I delivered the address in behalf of the students, which took me about eight minutes. Dr. Schaff then addressed us for about fifteen minutes. After prayer by the doctor, we all shook hands with him and left. There is none here who does not feel that Dr. Schaff's absence is a misfortune to us. It is very doubtful if he will ever return to the Seminary. At least he will not do so before the end of two years, and by that time we who are here now will already have passed out.

*Dr. Harbaugh*

Jan. 10, 1864—This morning I preached down here in the German Reformed church. Dr. Harbaugh was present, and I felt as though I were out of place, while I was in the pulpit. I would rather have heard the Doctor than preach myself, and I think it would have been better for myself and the audience. Nevertheless, I was in for it, and I managed to get through comfortably enough.

Jan. 15—At eleven o'clock Dr. Harbaugh delivered his introductory address. Subject, "Importance of the study of the history of doctrines." This was very interesting, and in listening to it I was reminded of college days, when such addresses came regularly once a session. In Harbaugh we have some one again who will *guide* us in our studies. We are no longer left entirely to ourselves. We have a pilot to direct the vessel. While we will of course have to study *ourselves*, we will at least no longer need to do it entirely *by* ourselves. I am very glad for the change.

Jan. 18—Had the first recitation under Harbaugh this morning. Papers read before the Society had not yet been taken, and consequently the length of the paper had to be limited to the time and circumstances of the occasion on which it was read. At that meeting the action to print the papers was taken, whereupon it was deemed advisable to make a more comprehensive survey of the diaries. This was done, and the following additional excerpts are transmitted herewith, without comment.—H. H. R.

ing in the History of Doctrines, using Shedd as a textbook. In the evening the students in a body extended a formal welcome to Dr. Harbaugh. The speaker for the occasion was Kieffer, who discharged his office in a very happy speech. We spent an hour and a half very pleasantly.

Jan. 20. Was over to see Dr. Harbaugh. Agreed to give his son a lesson in Latin every day.

*Two Debates*

Feb. 12, 1864. In the German Society in the evening—Debated the question "Ist die Römisch-Katholischen Kirche die Apokalyptische Babel?" Had the negative side of the question. Society showed its good sense by every one voting *non liquet*.

March 14. Attended Society this evening. We had decidedly a poor meeting—only one skeleton read. Debate was suspended because the question was too difficult. The question was, "Was the chaotic state of the earth previous to the six days of creation owing to the fall of the angels?" What a concern this seminary is. What theologians will proceed from hence! O Mercersburg, thy glory is departed!

*Dr. Higbee*

May 14, 1864. Wrote my reception speech for Prof. Higbee. Nothing further to record.

May 17. In the evening we gave our reception to Prof. Higbee. We were very well treated—cakes, lemonade, oranges, etc. The evening passed off very pleasantly.

*Seminary Days Come to an End*

July 19, 1864. The examinations commenced at nine o'clock this morning in the presence of the Board. . . . At ten o'clock in the evening I got my dismission, as did also the other members of the class who applied for it, namely, Bachman, Hauser, Haupt, Heller, Lefevre, and Noss. Now I am through. A great burden is off my shoulders. It is just about eight years since I commenced my course. What times I have seen since! Constantly struggling, constantly in want of means, constantly poor, a considerable amount of debt now, no money and no clothes.

During the last two years particularly I have had misery enough in more ways than one. But there was also a bright side. I have also spent many happy days. Hitherto hath the Lord helped me, and I now consecrate myself to His service, to labor wherever he may call me in His vineyard. At present of course I know not whither to go; and notwithstanding the weary days I have spent here I am sorry to leave. I feel just about like a poor monk torn from his cell and made a homeless wanderer. But the Lord will take care of me; to Him I leave myself, for "His we are both in life and death."

#### *Ordination and Installation*

Jan. 8, 1865—St. Clair, Pa. Preached three times today, German at St. Clair in the morning and at Port Carbon in the afternoon, and English at St. Clair in the evening. An election for pastor was held today at both places, and I was unanimously elected. At St. Clair there were twenty votes and at Port Carbon sixteen. But I believe Lutherans and Presbyterians all voted, all who are going to contribute towards the salary. I think there is element here to build up a good charge. But I do not yet know much about it.

Jan. 27—I am now about to enter upon a new course of life. All is new to me. For eight years I have been under the control of my masters and superiors, but now I am on my own responsibility—no, not exactly on my own responsibility either, for the Lord and Head of the Church is still my Master. I am about to engage in His work, and to Him I will be responsible. May He bless me in my work, so that this may not be in vain. Without His aid I feel that I can do nothing. I shall try to do my duty faithfully and leave the results in the hands of the Lord.

Feb. 6—Pine Grove, Pa. Meeting of Classis commenced at seven o'clock. Was received a member of Lebanon Classis. My call was confirmed, and provision was made for my ordination. The Ordination Committee consists of Revs. F. W. Kremer, J. E. Hiester, and G. Wolff. The ordination sermon was preached by Rev. F. W. Kremer.—Now my last step is taken. I am *rectus in ecclesia*. I am in the service of the church and of the Lord. May He own and bless my labor, and may He make me an efficient workman that need not be ashamed.

Feb. 26—St. Clair. This afternoon took place my installation. The Committee consisted of Revs. Bucher, Klein, and Stein. Bro. Klein preached the sermon in German. Bro. Stein made an English address. Bro. Bucher conducted the installation ceremony. Now I am pastor, having upon me the care of a flock. May the Lord grant me ability to perform my labor, and give me abundant success.

#### *The Liturgical Question*

Father's interest in the liturgical question began when he was still a student, and continued throughout the entire period of the controversy, as the following extracts from his diaries amply testify.

Oct. 23, 1862—Mercersburg. Just returned from Synod (at Chambersburg). . . . The long vexed question of the Liturgy is at last not settled, but the whole subject postponed for five years. It was altogether impossible for Synod to take any other action. The discussion on the subject was long, full, and severe, particularly carried on by Drs. Bomberger, Schaff, Fisher, Nevin, Harbaugh, and Revs. Gans, Giesy, Derr, Foulk, etc. All attempts at revision of the Liturgy are given up, and the book is left to work its own way for five years longer. The Liturgy movement is highly important for the church, involving great and vital principles and interests. The question engaged the attention of Synod during four entire days with the result as stated as above.

Feb. 18, 1867—Berlin, Pa. The all absorbing question in our church now, and the one which occupies all our papers to a considerable extent, is that of the Liturgy. The Liturgy of the Eastern Synod gained a grand triumph at the General Synod. The argument in favor of it was overwhelming. And now the publication of Dr. Nevin's "Vindication" ought to kill the opposition altogether, and in the eyes of all reasonable people it will do so. The Liturgical question will no doubt agitate the church a good deal yet, but finally it will, it must, prevail, because the Liturgical is the only true order of worship. "Truth crushed to earth will rise again." It may take a hundred years yet, as Dr. Kieffer intimates in this week's *Missionary*, but finally things must come right.

March 12. The Liturgical movement, which has been working now for twenty years, is about coming to a crisis. The Liturgy seems to be set for the rising and falling of many in the German Reformed church. All the Puritanism, the rationalism, and the semi-rationalism, is of course on the side of the opposition. But I believe the church will pass through the crisis without much injury. What injury she may sustain will ultimately be for her welfare.

Sept. 24, 1867. This evening the convention met at Meyers-town, Lebanon Co., for the purpose of "stopping the Liturgy." This convention was secretly gotten up by Bomberger, F. W. Kremer, and a few other disaffected spirits. Their object is to "roll off from the church the great liturgical evil, etc." A good deal has been written and printed about it of late in the *Messenger*. What will come of it (the convention) I do not know. The movement looks to schism; and if it amounts to anything, that is what it will be. The Liturgy they cannot stop.

Oct. 21. Got the "Christian World," late the "Western Missionary," with the proceedings of the famous Meyerstown convention. These amount to very little. The convention said nothing new on the subject. It only adopted Dr. Bomberger's and Prof. Good's denunciations and insinuations, and now asks the Synod at present in session in Baltimore to stop the Liturgical movement. The roll of the convention is given, which proves the assertion of Dr. Nevin that the opposition to the movement is only "a miserable faction." This is what it is—*miserable* in every sense of the word. Twenty-eight ministers only were there—not forty, the number which was by the fathers of the convention supposed to be necessary to give it respectability. Forty could not be gotten out—only twenty-eight, and these what a faction! Wonder whether Bomberger by this time is not ashamed of his company. . . . I hope the action of Synod will be of the right kind. I presume, however, there is not much danger that Synod will be persuaded to see things in the light in which the Meyerstown conventionists see them. What will come of the movement is now a serious question. This is a time of action, of motion and commotion everywhere. In state and church the powers are shaken as they were never before in mod-

ern times. Witness the fact that the Pope is about losing Rome. What will be the result of this? History will answer.

Nov. 28. Read the *Messenger*. Dr. Nevin is reviewing the proceedings of the Meyerstown convention. He has now written four articles. The last two are on Prof. Rust and Rev. A. S. Vaughn. I was looking anxiously for the article on Vaughn; and now that it has come I am not disappointed. Vaughn, as also Prof. Rust, is mauled with a heavy hammer. The wind is taken out of his sails most beautifully. But so also of the whole convention. I have no doubt that by this time some of the conventionists are heartily ashamed that they ever had anything to do with it.

Jan. 19, 1868. One thing I have frequently observed, namely, that those persons most deeply tinged with the spirit of revivalism are the most illiberal and close-fisted. Their religion certainly, whatever else may be said of it, is not comprehensive enough to reach their purse. Those are the most liberal who are in spirit and doctrine the most strictly Reformed. It is really wonderful what strange things happen sometimes. Thus I was told this evening that people object to the Liturgy on the ground that they are always called on for money!

Feb. 7, 1868. Finished an article for the *Reformed Church Messenger* on the subject of Liturgical Worship. Which is formalism, liturgical or free worship? If published I intend to follow it up with a number of articles on the same subject. We have had a great deal of controversy on the doctrines of the Liturgy, but not much has been written on the advantages of Liturgical worship over the free system; and that is what the people now need. I intend to write for the people, and to refute such objections as I daily meet among my people, and to present such arguments as the people can understand.

March 14—This afternoon I spent mostly in reading—an article in Herzog's Encyclopedia on Catholicism. What led me to read this was an article in the last number of the *Messenger* by Vaughn, charging Dr. Nevin with—well, it is hard to tell what, but something outrageous at all events. Vaughn is mad. Dr. Nevin has intimated that he has not much theological culture. That has made him angry, and now he scolds, attempting



to do it in a very profound style. He always pretends to be profound. At the Meyerstown convention he had the audacity to tell that august body that he believed that no one had ever spoken philosophically on the Liturgical question before himself. . . . His loose, angry sentences in the *Messenger*, however, seem more like the raving ejaculations of a maniac than the utterances of a philosopher. The last article is written professedly to enlighten the world in regard to the idea of catholicity, but it is successful in nothing but abusing Dr. Nevin.

Sept. 18, '68. In the evening I got the *Messenger*. This number is bristling at every point with weapons of the truth. Dr. Nevin has the eighth article on Dr. Dorner. The combat deepens. It may be regarded as a matter for congratulation that Dr. Dorner, the eminent Professor of Berlin and earnest "defender of the true Reformed Apostolic faith," as Bomberger calls him, has been mixed with the controversy; for it has given Dr. Nevin a chance to discuss again the whole subject in such a way as must tell powerfully on the final result. Nevin so handles the church question that it is hard to see how Dorner himself can help seeing the truth as it is here brought to light. Dorner is no partisan; he is not blinded by prejudice. It is to be hoped, therefore, that the discussion will result in good to the German professor himself.

#### *Prepares for the Liturgy*

July 25, 1869—This morning I used for the first time the Third Service in the Sunday School Hymnbook in full in opening the Sunday School. I was much pleased with the way the teachers and the children fell in with the service. That is the way to prepare for the Liturgy.

Aug. 24, '69—In the evening I got a lot of books which I had ordered—Delitzsch's Biblical Psychology for myself, two dozen copies of Creed and Customs, and one dozen copies of the Order of Worship, which I intend to sell. The Order of Worship is pretty well circulated already. I could not tell how many copies are among the people, but I presume between three and four dozen. I am glad to be able to record too that all those who have it in their possession are pleased with it and would not be willing

to part with it. Its enemies may say what they please, the people who have seen it are favorably disposed to it, a proof it does bear the face of a friend.

Sunday, Oct. 31, '69—Had communion in the morning. The church was full, and the liturgical service was very good. If by the common consent of the people we could once use the Liturgy in our worship, I doubt not that the effect would soon be seen in the better attendance that we would have at church. The people must have something to do in the church, or they will grow tired of going. But how strange! The Roman Catholic Church has taken away the Bible from the hands, and prayers from the lips, of the people, and when we want to restore to them their heritage, there are some who cry out *Catholic*.

#### *Dr. Nevin Advises to Give Up*

Sept. 16, 1869—Got the *Messenger*. Dr. Nevin has an article on the Church Crisis, which is significant as revealing his position in reference to the Liturgy. The Doctor is evidently tired of the subject and wants to get rid of the long war. His advice is that the General Synod should now let the subject of the Liturgy alone, inasmuch as it is perfectly clear that the church is not prepared to accept the Order of Worship and use it to any considerable extent, and no other Liturgy that could now be produced would meet with any more general favor. I am not sure that all the friends of the Order of Worship will quite agree with him in this opinion. I cannot believe, either, that this long Liturgical movement will now come to an inglorious nothing. I still believe that the Order of Worship will triumph at last. I have, however, long been convinced that this will not come to pass suddenly. It may take years—ten or twenty. Dr. Nevin is undoubtedly right that the agitation concerning the subject should cease, and that hereafter the same freedom in worship should be allowed that we have had hitherto. But this I think is just what the opposition will not allow. They know well enough that in this way the Order of Worship will "work its way" into the favor of the church, since all who really become acquainted with it get to like it at last. Moreover, what would they do if the agitation should cease? They live by negation;

and in case there should come a calm, their occupation would be gone and they would have to die. What would the *Christian World* live on if it were to cease its tirades upon the *Messenger*? But enough. It will not be long any more until the General Synod meets; then we will see how the matter goes.

Dec. 4, '69—Home again (from the meeting of the Synod at Philadelphia). . . . When I left Philadelphia on Thursday noon, the Synod had not yet adjourned, but the principal matter, that of the Liturgy, had been decided favorably; and from that I judged how the remaining matters would be decided. The Liturgical question was *the* question. The avowed intention of our opponents was to kill the Order of Worship, and when they failed in that, they failed in the accomplishment of their main purpose. The Synod allowed the provisional use of the Western Liturgy, and reiterated its former action in reference to the Order of Worship. The opponents, headed by Bomberger, made some weak efforts to reach another result, but the above action was adopted by a vote of 117 in the affirmative, 52 in the negative, and 9 *non liquets*. It is not my purpose to write a history of the Synod; and so I stop. Enough, the Synod was right.

Apr. 4, 1871—I have commenced to write an essay on Liturgical Worship. My object in doing so is two-fold: to familiarize myself thoroughly with the whole subject of the Liturgy, and to exercise myself in composition. I feel the need of such exercise particularly now, since I very seldom write my sermons any more.

July 24, 1871. Read the *Journal of Commerce*, which came only this evening. It contains full reports of the New York riots of the 12th inst., the anniversary of the battle of Boyne. Some thirty persons were killed and about seventy wounded. . . . The Republicans call it a Democratic riot, and call upon everybody to vote the Republican ticket. Some Protestant religious newspapers, like the *Christian World*, sound loud the tocsin of war against the Roman Catholic Church. The *World* advises its readers to keep their powder dry. . . . What a fine theme for religious journalists to write flaming sensational editorials on, and thus cater to the depraved tastes of their readers. Wonder whether the *World* will not turn it to advantage also

as an argument against the Liturgy. It would be as good as any it has used on the subject for a long time. The argument would stand somewhat as follows: Mercersburg and the Liturgy are Romanizing. But at New York you see what Romanism is. Therefore, ye children of the *World*, hate and execrate Mercersburg and the Litany.

Aug. 7, 1871—Read again Dr. Nevin's treatise on the Apostle's Creed, which bears reading often. This treatise was written and published first in the *Mercersburg Review* in 1849, twenty-two years ago. It is a tract of seventy-five pages. And what struck me in reading it today is the fact that Dr. Nevin has not said or written anything within the past five years that does not flow legitimately from the views and principles of this tract of 1849. Dr. Nevin has in these twenty years made no departure. How comes it then that the cry of heresy was not uttered long ago? Such men as Bomberger, Good, and Williard were alive then, and if there is any heresy in Mercersburg Theology, they ought to have seen it then already. It is these men that have changed, not Dr. Nevin; though it may be admitted that they did not then understand the drift of the new theology. Indeed, Bomberger admits freely this himself. But I think it is fair to assume that they do not understand it even now. This is certainly the most charitable way of explaining their frequent miserable caricatures of it. Either their heads are badly out of fix, or their hearts are sadly demoralized. Wonder which horn of the dilemma they would be most willing to admit.

"Union With Rome"

April 19, 1867—Good Friday. Had church at home in the morning, at Hay's in the afternoon, and at home again in the evening. The church was tolerably well attended. But the stores were open, and the people in the country were ploughing and hauling as though this day were like any other. Mr. Winecuff, the Lutheran pastor, was teaching school and planting potatoes, and no doubt looking at us with pity for our "Romanizing tendency." But so it is. Alas for such spirituality!

March 14, 1869—I was at T's for dinner. It was reported to me several times that Bro. T. was in the fog again, and I was

anxious to convince myself of the real state of the case. I think it is clear that Bomberger's *Monthly* has somewhat blinded him again, but not as much as I was led to anticipate; and I took pains of course to illuminate his mind and set him straight. I tried to make him understand that the worship of the early church was liturgical, and that we must be liturgical, if we would not surrender the early church to Romanism. The cause of Romanism would be immensely weakened if Protestants, instead of surrendering the whole field of church history, would plant themselves firmly on the basis of the early church, and from that standpoint oppose the pretensions of Romanism. Romanists pretend that their system goes back through every age to the time of the Apostles. Protestants foolishly allow the pretensions, and hence set themselves against any doctrine and custom which they imagine cannot be proven from Scripture. Thus liturgy and creeds, and everything else that is found in the early church goes overboard. Accordingly the Romanists seem to have the whole weight of church history, from the age next succeeding that of the Apostles, on their side. This is a vast disadvantage to Protestantism and one of the causes of the rapid advance of Romanism. Why, Protestants themselves grant that "Popery" goes back to the very first age of the Apostles. As long as the Apostles lived all was right in the church, but as soon as they were gone, then all went wrong. Then came liturgies, ritualism, images, saint-worship, and all the errors of Popery. But what a notion that is! Who can believe it? And men who cannot believe it, entertaining the false notion that Romanism is as old as the church, cannot help but turn Romanists. Sensible men will be Romanists rather than believe the monstrous notion that the church was all wrong from the first to the sixteenth century and a good while afterwards. Hence, effectually to oppose Romanism, we Protestants must study the early church, and ourselves take our position there. Then of course we become liturgical and begin to believe in sacramental grace; we cease to be Puritans. But then we may also turn the authority of the early church against the Papal pretensions. To fight Romanism on any other grounds is to fight it under a vast disadvantage.

Oct. 18, 1869—In the forenoon I read Dr. Nevin's article in the *Mercersburg Review* on Brownson, which bears reading a good many times. After all, Romanism would not suit us, however much we may be dissatisfied with the extreme left of Protestantism. I wish there were something more satisfactory than either Protestantism or Romanism. But I think that will come by and by. . . . However, the union of the church, if ever it does come, will not be the result of man's advice. God will bring it about in his own time. We must have patience.

*Prof. Budd Goes to Rome*

March 21, 1871—Got a letter from John O. Johnson this morning, who tells me that Prof. Budd of F. and M. College has joined the Roman Catholic Church. Prof. Budd, I believe, is of Quaker extraction, and was up to this time no member of any church. In joining the Catholic Church, therefore, he does not become an apostate. I have no acquaintance with him, but he is said to be a very intelligent man. How could such a man join the Catholic Church, if that be the church only of ignorance and superstition? Again, how could a man reared in Quakerism find his way to Rome? Such a fact suggests material for reflection. There is an affinity between Quakerism and Romanism. They are opposite extremes of the same pole. One, therefore, leads over into the other. But what affinity between learning, intelligence, and Romanism? In this view it is not so easy to account for the step of Mr. Budd. Now this will give an occasion to Bomberger again to rave about "Nevinism," although Budd was never in the Reformed Church. But what does that matter? A cry can be raised anyhow. This comes of putting outsiders into our institutions, when the church has plenty of better men herself.

*Wolff and Ermentrout Go to Rome*

Oct. 3, 1871—I learned this evening that there had been another defection to Rome. This time the subjects are two ministers of the Reformed Church, Rev. G. D. Wolff and Rev. J. S. Ermentrout. Neither of these gentlemen has within my recollection been in the active duties of the ministry. Mr. Ermen-



trout has been county superintendent of common schools and Principal of the State Normal School at Kutztown. Mr. Wolff has been speculating in lumber, in saw mills, in lands, in coal, and in iron. Mr. Wolff contrived to keep himself before the church by various communications to the *Messenger*, while Mr. Ermentrout never took any interest in the church at all. Now these two worthies, it seems, have gone together to Rome, and so prepared the church of which they were unworthy members another scandal. The cry will of course be now that they followed out to its result the tendency of Mercersburg Theology. That such a cry would be raised they very well knew. Whatever their motive may have been, they knew that they would get credit for having acted honestly and conscientiously according to Mercersburg theories. Bearing this in mind, and remembering their antecedents, one may well question their honesty. Having become so secularized in their employment, may they not have felt their ordination vows an uncomfortable burden, and been anxious to get rid of them? And now to go to Rome would be a relief in this regard, and they would at the same time get credit for having acted according to certain convictions which they were supposed to entertain. This I have no doubt is the true explanation of their apostasy, though the blame of it will of course be fastened upon Mercersburg Theology, as it was in the case of John Wagner. I am anxious to see how the *Messenger* will dispose of the matter. The course of the *World* may easily be predicted.

Oct. 5, '71—Read the *Messenger*. Mr. Russel makes a sort of obituary notice of the ecclesiastical death of Messrs. Ermentrout and Wolff. But I must say I was disappointed. To talk of conviction, as Mr. Russel does, is giving them credit for more than they deserve. But now for the *World* and Bomberger.

#### *Himself Is Accused of Romanism*

Feb. 23, 1873—In the evening, after service, I read the *World*, in which I myself receive the compliment of a somewhat lengthy notice of my late article in the *Mercersburg Review*, besides two extracts, one from the *Interior* and the other from the *Independent*, on the same subject. According to these gentlemen I

am guilty of teaching the very essence of Romanism, and ought to go to Rome forthwith, or at least to that which is next to it, namely, Anglicanism. This is news to me. I am afraid I would not be comfortable in either. Rome I do not believe in, and Episcopacy I do not believe in. I might shift to get along in Episcopacy, if it were not for the thing of having to believe in the necessity of what they call Episcopal ordination, which I do not. My offending it seems consists in saying that, "according to Scripture and the ancient faith of the church, baptism is the subjective medium or instrumental cause of regeneration." About this sentence the *World* goes into a tremendous bluster, and not obscurely threatens terrible things. But, though I am quite a young man yet, I am still too old much to fear such thunder.

March 13, '73—Read the *Messenger* in the evening. Dr. Fisher defends the orthodoxy of my article on "Regeneration and Conversion." It seems there has been a "hue and cry" made about it throughout the theological public generally. I am glad, however, that I have sympathy. To be indorsed by Dr. Fisher without qualification is no small comfort. I think I will have to write something in self defense. I had intended to let the matter go unnoticed, but as such a course might be misinterpreted, I suppose I will have to say something.

March 20, '73—The *World* has several articles again in relation to my article in the *Review*. I must pitch in too after this.

March 27, '73—Read the *Messenger* and the *World*. Both contain articles relative to my *Review* article. I must now write something of a defense. I had intended to do so several times, but always gave up the idea again in view of the fact that there has been nothing yet on the opposite side but denunciation, to which it is hard to reply. But I will now have to do it, lest silence should be construed into a confession of inability to defend my doctrine on Protestant ground.

March 31, '73—Was in the study during the day, and spent the time in writing. I want to write about three or four articles for the *Messenger* on "The Grace of Baptism." I think I can make it apparent that the doctrine that "The objective medium or instrumental cause of regeneration, according to Scripture

and the ancient faith of the Church, is the Sacrament of Baptism" is neither Romanism nor a monstrous absurdity, as it has been declared to be.

April 1, '73—Finished and transcribed my first article on the "Grace of Baptism." Of course, I am not certain whether Dr. Fisher will publish it. I would not blame him much if he would not, for long controversial articles are not best calculated to advance the financial interests of the paper.

Apr. 2, '73—Received a letter from Rev. J. W. Santee relative to the storm caused by the publication of my article on "Regeneration and Conversion." He wants to see a free fight, and urges me to go into it especially. Well, I have commenced doing so.

Apr. 3, '73—Received a letter this evening from Dr. A. H. Kremer, in which he utters the request of himself and Drs. Apple and Gerhart that I should answer the assault made by the *World* and others upon our theology lately on the ground of my *Review* article.

Apr. 15, '73—Tried to write something at a third article on "The Grace of Baptism," but did not accomplish much. It had occurred to me that Dr. Fisher might not publish what I write, and my trouble might be in vain. I am going to wait now and see what he does with my first article before I write again. I cannot write anything unless I have a particular motive. In this week's paper the first article will appear if it appears at all; and if it does not, I will not have the trouble of writing any more. In some respects I wish this would be the case, for I am tired of the undertaking, and, besides, I care not for the notoriety. I think perhaps I might spend the time more profitably than by writing controversial theology.

Apr. 17, '73—The *Messenger*, which came this evening, has the first of my articles on "The Grace of Baptism." I must now prepare the rest, which will be a greater burden than I care to bear; but being begun, the thing must now be done.

July 14, '73—Dr. Bomberger does me the honor of devoting a great deal of space (in his *Monthly*) to a discussion of my article on Baptism. He had one article in the June number, now another in the present, and the thing promises to run out

into quite a number more. But I am sorry to say that the style in which Dr. B. discusses the subject gives me no exalted idea of his theological ability or honesty. I may say, however, that if my view were what B. represents it, I would join him in denouncing it.

Nov. 20, '73—Spent the forenoon in preparing an article for the *Christian World*. The *World* for this week has a short article in which the charge, which Bomberger has been repeating for many months, is echoed, that my definition of regeneration is: "Regeneration is a conveyance by emanation of a portion of the substance of God into the centre of man's soul." I have now sent a number of extracts to the *World*, in which my doctrine is set in its true light.

Nov. 25, '73—Bomberger is now done with me; and in conclusion he says he will notice no replies, unless they are made in honesty, or something of the kind. What an idea! In the first place, his whole performance is beneath notice; and in the second place, he is the last man that ought to talk of honesty. It is like a sermon on honesty by a pick-pocket.

Nov. 18, '73—Commenced writing an article for the January number of the *Review*, on "The Relation of the Bible to Science," or something like it. Perhaps prudence would dictate the waiting until my last January article has been forgotten, but at the editor's request I will try it again.

Dec. 3, '73—Writing all day, and finished my article on "Bible and Science." I am very glad it is done, and hope it will not be heard of as much as my last was.

### *Dr. Rupp's Theology*

Mercersburg, Pa.

June 8, 1863—In society in the evening. The resolution that "there is no salvation outside of the church" was discussed, and elicited a good deal of interest. For my part I believe that both sides are true. If the question be confined to the present order of existence and life in this world, then the affirmative; but if it be extended to the future world, then the negative is true. If a man is saved, he is saved by the free grace and election of God. If he is lost, he is lost by the determination of his own will. These two propositions may be proven clearly enough from the

Bible. But the two propositions involve a contradiction. A man cannot receive the means of grace unless they are offered to him. But this depends upon the election of God. It does not lie in the power of a man's will whether he will have the Gospel preached to him or not, whether he will be *called* into the church or not. And yet without this no salvation. But on the other hand it is true also that a man will perish only in consequence of self-determination against Christ and the offered means of salvation. No man will be damned who has not had salvation offered to him. How reconcile the two propositions? It is clear enough that this cannot be done if the present world is assumed as the only state of probation, for here all have not the means of salvation offered them, consequently can come to no decision either for or against salvation. The only alternative then is to assume another state after death, between death and the final judgment, in which men who had no opportunity here either to embrace Christ or to reject him will have this opportunity offered them. This world is not the only theatre of the operation of God's grace. This is the only way in which the contradiction between the two propositions above can be removed. If it be not removed, it is fatal at once to the whole order of redemption. For then one or the other of the above propositions must be denied. If the second be denied, we have fatalism, which leaves no room for freedom and morality. If the first be denied, we have Pelagianism, which destroys Christianity itself. But solve the contradiction in the method above, and all is right. Thus then it is correct to say that there is no salvation outside of the church, and correct also to say that there is.

Dec. 14, '63—In society in the evening. Was appointed on the debate. Question—"Would the Incarnation have taken place if man had not fallen?" I was on the affirmative, which side I could defend with a good conscience. I believe that the interests of a sound theology and Christology require an affirmative answer to this question. I cannot see how else the unity of the divine plan of the world, of which Christ historically holds the central point, and at the same time the freedom of the human will could be maintained.

*Five Years Since Graduation*

July 28, 1867—It is five years now since I graduated. How the time passes! . . . But what have I done in these five years? Not enough. It is time that I begin to be somewhat more active than I have been hitherto. Hitherto, I have only been taking in, in the way of reading, etc.; it is time that I also begin to give out something.

*Need For a New Eschatology*

Berlin, Pa.

March 21, 1868—I got a pamphlet (from Mr. Oldfather) on the sleep of the soul and destruction of the wicked. This is a subject that for some time past has been agitating the minds of people about here. One Büchley, a Dunkard preacher, from the West, made his appearance here last Fall and began to peddle the fantastic doctrine that the soul (of the righteous) sleeps between death and the resurrection, and that the wicked are utterly destroyed, both body and soul, that is, annihilated. Ben Knepper has been preaching the same doctrine, and was taken to account for it last Fall at Classis. Some of Knepper's friends around here have taken up his notions and parade them everywhere. Of course all this amounts to very little. It gives one trouble sometimes to have to combat long-exploded errors; it is a little provoking, but that is all. The phenomenon is, however, significant in another view. It shows that the subject of eschatology generally is being discussed and pressing towards a solution. It has not yet sufficiently received the attention of the church. Christology, Anthropology, Soteriology have in succession been discussed and settled, but not so Eschatology. The doctrine of Purgatory has been denied by Protestantism, but denial is not the settlement of a doctrine. There must be position as well as negation. The church will have earnestly to grapple with the general subject and bring it to a positive settlement. And this will have an influence also upon some other doctrines. Some things, for instance, that have remained dark in the sphere of Soteriology (election, predestination) will yet receive light from the discussion of Eschatology.



*Mercersburg Theology*

July 8, '68—I got the July number of the *Mercersburg Review* in the evening. It is always a welcome guest. I do not see how we could do without the *Review* any more. The present number is up to previous ones in interesting matter. I wonder what the *World* in its heart thinks about these Mercersburg writings. One thing is certain, they cannot remain without influence. The time must come when the American theological public will take a different view of Mercersburg Theology from what it does now. It is the only living theology, the only theology in which there is substance, the only theology that can satisfy the wants of the church. If American Protestantism would be secure against the encroachments of Romanism as well as Rationalism, it must come away from the barren heaths of Puritanism to the green pastures of Mercersburg. Romanism is making rapid progress in these United States at the present time. The cause of this is nothing else than the growing dissatisfaction with the common Rationalism of popular Protestantism.

*The Atonement*

Aug. 17, '68—I commenced writing a sermon on the atonement, with which I made, however, but little progress, owing perhaps as well to constant interruptions as the difficulty of the subject. The atonement has of late been studied again. The old theory of satisfaction and imputation is felt to be unsatisfactory. Hence such men as Bushnell, etc., are again giving it their attention. The Christological, or Christocentric standpoint of the Mercersburg School of Theology is alone sufficient to render a satisfactory theory.

*On Baptism*

Dec. 31, 1870—Up town in the evening. While in Mr. Poorbaugh's store the conversation turned upon baptism. Some one made the remark that there is too much controversy concerning baptism, and that some denominations, especially the Dunkards and Baptists, make too much account of it. Now no idea could be more erroneous than that. They make not too much, but too

little account of it. They empty the sacrament of all its supernatural grace and power, and turn it into a *mere form*, that must be observed because Christ has *commanded* it. Hence having nothing but the form, it is no wonder that they should stickle for that. They demand that a person should be inwardly and spiritually a Christian before he can be baptized. Then baptism, having nothing to do in making one a Christian, what else is it but a mere form to be gone through, because Christ has *commanded* it? But if a mere form, then it is important also that it should be observed in the manner or mode supposed to have been commanded by Christ. Here is the root of the Baptist heresy.

Feb. 11, 1871—In the afternoon I was reading Campbell and Rice on infant baptism. And I must say that if this institution could not be better defended than is done by Rice, it would not stand long, in my estimation. Without the doctrine of original sin and the old doctrine of baptismal regeneration, infant baptism cannot be successfully maintained. This ought long ago to have been discovered by Pedo-Baptists.

July 31, 1873—Was aroused up this morning at four o'clock and requested to come to William Glessner's to see a young man who is sick with typhoid fever. He is eighteen years old, but is not baptized. When I came there he was unconscious and knew nobody. I could, therefore, not administer the sacrament. I have strong faith in baptismal grace, but I do not believe that the sacrament works magically, and believe therefore that it ought not to be administered where there is known to be no preparation and no receptivity for it. I was there about an hour and a half and had worship with the family. More than that I could not do.

*Psychopannychianism*

At a meeting of the Ministerium at Frostburg, Md.

March 1, 1871—Had service at 10:30 o'clock. Rev. B. Knepper, who is here also, preached the sermon, such as it was. Had dinner, all of us, at Ruhl's, and spent the afternoon at his house discussing Psychopannychianism with Bro. Knepper. He still holds the theory of annihilation of the wicked after judg-

ment, and of the sleep of all souls in the intermediate state. In fact his theory of the soul in this state amounts also to annihilation. The soul, according to his view, has no personal existence at all. It goes back to God, "as the waters of the earth flow back into the ocean." This comparison is his. And this heresy he is preaching. He is badly muddled.

#### *Mercersburg Theology and Romanism*

July 24, 1873—Got the *Christian World*, in which the case of E. O. Forney is ventilated once more, and I suppose not for the last time. There are extensive quotations from the *Catholic Standard*, edited by George D. Wolff, to prove that Forney's conversion was due to the teachings of Mercersburg Theology. Wolff says, in effect, that Forney was set on the way to Rome by the instructions of Drs. Nevin, Gerhard, Apple, Harbaugh, Higbee, etc. For the fact that these men do not go to Rome Wolff accounts by saying that they have not grace enough. They are involuntarily made to serve as instruments for the attainment of blessings by others, which blessings they are judged unworthy of obtaining themselves. This diatribe is, of course, a god-send to all the votaries of the "World." But the notion is too shallow to impose upon anybody. The more intelligent among the opponents of Mercersburg Theology do not believe in it themselves. I look upon the matter in the following way: It is true that Mercersburg Theology has been the *occasion* for some of these perversions, in like manner as the coming of Christ was the occasion of the treason of Judas, but it is not true that the principles of Mercersburg Theology have been the *cause* of them, just as the coming of Christ was not the *cause* of the treason of Judas. The agitation of the Church question, the discussion of the weakness and the defects of Protestantism, may have unsettled some minds which were not capable of grasping the positive principles of Mercersburg Theology, and these may have and may yet desert our ranks. The positive principles of Mercersburg Theology do not lead to Rome, but to a better form of Christianity than Romanism and to a better form of Christianity than much at least of modern Protestantism; although they exist in the bosom of Protestantism inasmuch as they in-

volve a protest against the errors and corruptions of Romanism. Mercersburg holds firmly the idea of *historical development*, which can never lead back to Rome, nor stop in our present Protestantism, but must lead forward to something better than either, something in which all that is good in either is conserved. This, as I take it, is our idea, the idea for which we labor, although we do not expect to see it realized in the present generation.

#### *His Churchliness*

Berlin, Pa.

Dec. 24, 1866— . . . The work of decorating the church is done and it looks well. We are determined to spend Christmas in the good old way, even at the risk of being called Romanists by some whose piety is too "spiritualistic" and too "evangelical" to be bound to the observance of days and seasons, especially such as are hallowed by the practice of the Catholic Church of the past.

Apr. 21, 1867—Service here (in Berlin) in the morning and at the mountain in the afternoon. Both English. Choir sung the Te Deum, something that had never been done in this church before. A sign of progress in the right direction, etc.

Tuesday, May 7, '67—In the evening I had church at Hay's. Next Sunday I will have Communion there; and I intend to preach there now until the end of the week. People here are great on "big meetings." I have determined to gratify them to some extent in connection with the Spring Communion. And for this reason I intend to hold somewhat protracted services all around. I avail myself, however, of the opportunity thus given to preach sound doctrines. By means of "big meeting" (in my sense) I am trying to take the notion of "big meetings" (in their sense) out of them.

Nov. 27, 1868—Next Sunday will be the first in Advent. During the festival season I intend to confine myself somewhat closely in my preaching to the order of the pericopes. Indeed, I do so always, still not as much so during the church season as during the festival season. It is objected to this order of preaching sometimes that it involves too much sameness. But in truth I consider it a most effectual bar to sameness. A man

cannot follow the church year and at the same time get on a hobby, like the perseverance of the saints, revivalism, episcopacy, etc. It is an effectual bar to individual arbitrariness and caprice. But this is not all. A sense for the church year belongs to a sense for the church itself; just as a sense for the truly liturgical always goes with proper faith in the church itself. A minister who on Christmas would preach about the crucifixion might be set down as unchurchly and unliturgical. Hence following the order of the church year will be a means of developing in the people a proper churchly and liturgical spirit.

#### *His Studies*

June 8, 1867—I am reading "The Fathers of the Reformed Church," by Dr. Harbaugh. It is pleasant to commune thus with the worthy dead. Besides, in order to understand the present condition in the Reformed Church in this country, it is necessary to see it in its origin, and to have a glimpse of the men who labored to raise it up.

Aug. 16, 1869—Spent the day in reading. Read in Goethe's *Faust* during the forenoon. In the afternoon I read the *Comedy of Errors* in Shakespeare. I consider it necessary to devote more attention to studies of this kind than I have been doing for some years. I have been cultivating the understanding and the reason to the neglect of the imagination and the fancy. My natural inclination is to metaphysical studies, and I am in danger of becoming too metaphysical and dry even in my preaching. I know it very well—a preacher, in fact a public speaker of any kind, ought to cultivate the imaginative faculties as well as the ratiocinative or logical faculties. Thoughts clothed in forms derived from the imagination are better understood and make a more lasting impression upon the common people than if they are presented in their own naked form.

Feb. 15, 1870—Was in the study most of the day. Read about a hundred lines of Homer, the commentary on the 10th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and the play of Henry VIII in Shakespeare. My studies at present are mainly in the department of language, poetry, and exegesis. For some time

I have been reading on the average one play of Shakespeare a week. In Homer I have read two books, and am now in the third. I am reading Homer both on account of the poetry and the language. Poetry is something I have hitherto neglected in my studies. While I was at college I paid no attention to it at all. Even the whole department of Aesthetics was to a large extent neglected. Prof. Nevin used to lecture on Greek Literature, which if he had done it thoroughly would have amounted to something in the department of Aesthetics, but as it was it was not of much account. I believe it is better now since Dr. Nevin lectures in the science of Aesthetics.

#### *His Scientific Studies*

March 23, 1868—Analyzed a plant which I happened to find blossoming in the yard, the first of the season—*Helleborus Viridis*, of the family of the *Ranunculaceae*.

Jan. 23, '72—Reading most of the time Dana's *Manual of Geology*. Everybody about here talks of "strata," "beds," "formations," etc., and it would not do for a minister to know less of such matters than his parishioners. I remember that Dr. Wolff told us once that a minister ought to know more than anybody else in all departments and to be able to give information on any subject, in order that people may have confidence in his learning and ability even in a theological regard; and I have no doubt that there is a good deal of truth in the idea, though it is a question whether it would not require too much of a minister.

Sep. 2, '72—In the afternoon I read again Prof. Apple's series of articles on *Cosmogony* published in the *Messenger* during the Spring of 1870. I want to resume my Bible-class again and I intend to lecture on Genesis. I am now studying how to bring the account of the creation into harmony with the results of modern Astronomy and Geology. A number of dark points have already been cleared up, but still there are some difficulties which I see not yet how to reconcile. I hope, however, to be able to do so, at least to an extent.

July 30, 1873—I am engaged in reading the *Popular Science Monthly*, the loan of which I obtained from Dr. Miller. This is a journal entirely devoted to the interests of physical science, in



the sense of Darwin, Spencer, Huxley, Tyndall, etc. In philosophy it is materialistic, and in religion it is nothing. The articles are generally well written, but they are with few exceptions cold and repulsive. There is no spirit in this kind of science, no life and warmth. Its votaries are so infatuated with the phenomena of mere material nature that they have no sense for anything else. I am to some extent a lover of natural science too, but for science like this I have no taste. . . . I cannot have much respect for science that looks upon the universe as the product of blind chance, upon mind as a function of matter, upon man as a transmutation of the monkey, and upon religion as a dream of the past. But there are strong efforts made to instil such principles in the popular mind. It is time that the fallacies of this science falsely so-called were exposed.

March 10, 1874—I have commenced studying Hebrew in earnest. I want to try whether I cannot read the Hebrew Bible through before the close of the year.

#### *Interest in Temperance*

Feb. 10, 1869—Today I attended to a case of discipline—a private admonition on account of drunkenness. There is a great deal too much of that sort of thing among us. A number of our young men, and some of the older men too, are in the habit of getting drunk occasionally. It has annoyed me a great deal already; and I have done what I could to check it, but it is hard to keep down the abominable weed. We are, however, not alone troubled in this way. The Lutherans also have their full share of it, and the Methodists are, of course, no better. So it goes. Some one said the other day in a melancholy sort of way that all the "big meetings" seem to do no good. No, in truth, not; and if that were all that could be said of them, it would be fortunate for those who are interested in them. But it is worse than that. They minister a direct occasion for iniquity and sin. The worst characters in the country flock to them during these seasons, and offend good people by their outrageous conduct. Thus I heard the other day that a fellow threatened to stab the Methodist "preacher," etc.

Feb. 20, 1874—I have noticed for several weeks reports of a movement going on, especially in the West, to abolish the liquor traffic by praying and singing. The principal movers in the crusade are the women. They assemble in crowds of from twenty to a hundred and visit the places where liquor is sold and engage in singing and prayer, sometimes in the barroom, and sometimes on the pavement before the door. In some places, it seems, they have, for the time, at least, prayed out all the liquor dealers. The movement is rapidly spreading from Ohio, where it first commenced, to other states in the East as well as in the West. It is certainly a novel thing, and a great sensation. A hundred ladies marching through rain and mud, and halting in front of a tavern or drinking saloon to engage in religious service, praying for the hard-hearted wretches within, certainly presents a strange sight. Whatever may be thought of the movement, and whatever the result may be in the end, it is just now the wonder of the times.

#### *Pastoral Practices*

Sunday,

Oct. 11, '68—This was a hard week. Since Thursday I preached seven times, and catechized every afternoon since Wednesday. That was equal I think to holding a "big meeting." I am satisfied that I did more labor than a revival preacher would do in two weeks, not to mention the fact that I have been catechizing all Summer. During the coming week I will have a similar amount of labor at the Mountain church. A revival preacher would not do such an amount of work in the Summer. As to catechizing, he would consider that a hindrance to conversion rather than a help, and so he would save himself an immense amount of burden by attending to the matter all Summer long. But that is not our way. We are Reformed, not only in name, but also in practice.

Oct. 18, 1868—My year in the Berlin charge will be up on the 25th of October; and as I do not expect to be here at that time, this may be as good time as any to take a sort of retrospective view of my labors, etc. Within the year I have traveled 1778 miles in the discharge of ministerial and pastoral duties.

Preached 186 sermons. Delivered 105 lectures, catechetical and others. I think I have not been wanting in labors, and labors too not for money, for my salary is small (\$700) and that not paid up very regularly, but rather for the good of the church and the upbuilding of the Redeemer's Kingdom in this part of our Reformed Zion. Perhaps I have not done my duty. I might have done more; and for many things I will have to ask pardon. But then I think I have done as well as any man would have been likely to do. My health has been good; and I have not missed a single appointment on account of ill health. On this account I have great cause for gratitude. I think too that my labors have not been without good results. But this will appear only in the Judgment. The people generally have been kind to myself and family. I have no cause to complain. I know that I have many fast friends in the charge who will not let me suffer. . . . There is some opposition to me, but it comes of course from principle. I am loyal to the church as it is represented in the General Synod. Of course those who are not so do not like me. But they would like no other man occupying the same position any better. It is for being loyal to the church therefore that I am hated. This I cannot help. I believe that I have truth and righteousness on my side. And hence I cannot do otherwise. I cannot go against my conscience and the Synod.

Sep. 4, '68—This morning Prof. Apple and I and Bro. Koplin went out again to see the Wilhelms. We found them at the church, and William I. Bear being there also, we had a long talk with them. The object of Prof. Apple was to get them to give something to Franklin and Marshall College, and he talked to them on the subject a good while, I think to good purpose. Still they would not say just immediately what they would do.

Sep. 20, '69—This charge contributed this year to all objects (of benevolence), \$685.45. This is pretty good. . . . Since I am here things have been steadily improving. Whether all is given willingly, I know not, though I think I may say that some at least was not given with pleasure. But that is not my fault; and I hope that the Lord will nevertheless bless it to a good purpose, and so change the hearts of the unwilling givers also, that He may be able to bless them for it. These people have never

been trained to benevolence; and in some cases the money must be screwed out, but in that way they are broken in, and I think it would even now be impossible for them to fall back into their old ways.

Dec. 18, '69—Today I wrote a sermon. I was at it from 9 A. M. to 12, and from 1 to 5 P. M., when I was done, although in the afternoon I was disturbed more or less. Shedd in his *Homiletics* advises that a sermon should be written at one sitting and in about five hours. There is wisdom in the advice.

Feb. 19, '70—Prepared a sermon for tomorrow morning on the subject of feet-washing. It has come to my knowledge that some of our people entertain Dunkard notions on this subject; hence I have concluded to preach a sermon on it at once. Besides, even those who are not thus affected with error may need information.

Apr. 6, '70—Was in the study during the forenoon. Reading and making preparation for my lecture in the evening. I am lecturing, at these Wednesday evening services, on the Acts of the Apostles. I am now in the 17th chapter. I always make preparation to the extent at least of reading the Greek text and the commentary on the passage I intend to lecture on. In this way I study at least some exegesis every week. This is what Dr. Harbaugh urged us once to do. His advice was on Sunday to preach on the Gospel or Epistle, and at the weekly service to lecture on some book of the Bible consecutively. He said, always take a long text. The Reformers preached on whole books of the Bible still.

Sunday, Oct. 16, '70—Service at home in the evening. At this service we used the Order of Worship in full, the congregation taking an active part. This was the first time that we used the Order in full, except on extraordinary occasions. . . . Everybody seemed to be pleased with it. Why then should not the use of it be continued? I think the time has come for its full use. My waiting and cautious movement in the matter has at last been crowned with its natural fruit. In ten years more I have no doubt that it can be used in all the congregations of this charge, and if the same systematic and cautious efforts were made in all our charges east and west, the same results would

follow everywhere. The success of the Liturgical movement has been hindered not only by its avowed enemies, but also by some of its overzealous friends. *Persevantia omnia vincit.*

Oct. 27, '70—This morning I used the full service in the Order of Worship. In the evening I have been using the regular service ever since the meeting of Classis. But I never used the morning service until this day. I had a good deal of hesitation and inward questioning in the matter, but finally concluded that, as I never heard any objection to the evening service, although I made frequent inquiry, so there would probably be none either to the morning service. I do not think either that any one was offended. Why should there be? I think the opposition here is dead; and I praise the Lord for it.

Mar. 22, '71—Today (while in the country) I saw two young men who promised me to attend catechetical lectures and connect with the church at Mt. Zion. I am making it a business more and more to preach the Gospel wherever I go. Wherever I meet people, in the highways, at the store, in the family, I endeavor to speak to them about the Kingdom of God. It is the only way in which some people can be reached.

Apr. 16, '71—Service in the afternoon at St. Luke's, and afterwards I lectured to my catechetical class for about an hour, the congregation also being present, or at least a good part of it; and I think that catechizing would do them as much good as preaching. I find in attempting to catechize that even grown men and women are ignorant of the first elements of Christianity.

Sep. 1, '73—Was in the study during the day. Spent the forenoon in reading Augustine, and much of the afternoon in worrying myself for a text on which to preach a thanksgiving sermon. I have generally more trouble to find a text than to prepare a sermon. The text is already more than half a sermon. But this seems to be the way with most preachers. I have but little homiletical literature, in fact nothing but the useless stuff in Lange, a want which I often feel.

#### Observations

Nov. 13, 1863—Was present at a meeting of the German Melancthonian Society, of which I was elected a member last

Friday. This society was organized for the purpose of giving to the German language the honor which justly belongs to it. As long as our theology is what it is, an acquaintance with the German language will be indispensably necessary to understand it fully. The German Reformed Church has no sympathy with the loose popular theologies of this country. She has always looked to the profound thinkers of Germany for her theological material. We have but one really philosophical theologian in this country, Dr. Nevin, who, though of Scotch descent, is yet in thought and feeling a thorough German; and even he has as yet given us no system of theology. Dr. Ebrard's Dogmatics, at present, holds the highest rank in the Seminary, and moulds our theological thinking.

St. Clair, Pa., Mar. 20, 1866—I am for the first time reading Pilgrim's Progress. Of course a book which is so universally pronounced good, I cannot but pronounce good too. Still, I believe it might have been much better had the author not been what he was, a *Baptist*. Had there been more of a churchly and sacramental spirit united with his piety and earnestness, he could have written a better book.  
Berlin, Pa.

July 3, '68—The Fourth is to be celebrated here by a union Sunday School picnic. I am to make a speech on the occasion. I do not know yet what to say. It is considerably a task for me to make a speech on such an occasion. A man is expected to talk "pretty nonsense"—to be eloquent and say nothing—something it is very difficult for me to do. I must, however, say something. But I have made up my mind to depend on the occasion for inspiration.

Nov. 4, '68—This is a troubled age. Both in church and state the foundations are shaken as they were not shaken since the Reformation of the 16th century. . . . My interest of course is principally in the church; for it is after all the church question that is of prime importance and of determinative force for every other question. Are not perhaps the Government and genius of our country antagonistic to the government and genius of the church? Whatever may be the true principle of church government, it is not republican, and still less, democratic. Un-



questionably the spirit of democracy (lawless individualism), which has come to prevail so widely in our country, is hostile to the spirit of the Church. This may account for much of the broad infidelity and want of reverence for the church and for sacred things generally in our country. Should it in the end turn out that our form of government is responsible for the bad state of the church, then of course it must give way to something else. But this is a matter that is by no means settled yet. The spirit of individualism is abroad in Europe too, where the governments are monarchial.

Nov. 13, '68—I got a letter today from J. H. Wagner, requesting me to interest myself in behalf of a fair to be held in Pittsburgh in behalf of St. Paul's Orphans' Home. I am a friend of the Orphans' Home, of course; but as to these fairs, I must say, I cannot endorse them. I consider the principle to be wrong. It is an ingenious plan to get money from the world which could not otherwise be gotten. It is not charity. It does not benefit the world to give in this way. Should the church consent to obtain her money in that way? It might be hard to get money without these devices, but I am sure the church would be more respected without them. Whenever the church adopts a worldly policy, she suffers in the estimation of the world itself.

Dec. 23, '68—In the afternoon and part of the evening I was trying to prepare a sermon for Christmas morning, but made no headway; and so I will have to fall back upon an old sermon written three years ago. I never like to do this. A sermon written so long ago does not fairly represent me now. I have grown since then. Moreover a sermon can be entirely appropriate to only one time and place. But still a few changes will sometimes make an old sermon new again; and these can mostly be made in the delivery. The Methodists, who change charges every two or three years, practice this system generally. But I think the effects are injurious to the preachers themselves. . . . It is not often that I take refuge in an old sermon. It is only when it is absolutely necessary; and then I generally make some changes. And, after all, truth once is truth always. Only our apprehension of truth changes.

Apr. 9, '69—I heard an amusing incident today which illustrates Methodist piety. A few Sundays ago as two Methodists were going to church together, hearing the Reformed church bell ring, the one said to the other, "The damned Heidelbergers have preaching too. What need they to have preaching for? They will not be saved anyhow." I have not heard who it was that made this pious remark, but simply that it was one of their new "converts." "They compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, they make him twofold more the child of hell than themselves." The more I observe the effects of this fanatical revival spirit, the more I am convinced of its utterly unchristian character.

### *Thirtieth Birthday*

Saturday, Apr. 17, 1869—This is my birthday. Thirty years old today. I am more than half up the hill. Twice thirty is sixty; and that is near the foot on the other side. A few more years and I shall be called an old man; providing that I live so long. Why, I am getting gray already. The white hairs are beginning to make their appearance. And how fast the years go! They used to be very long; but now they seem to be getting shorter. May the Lord give me grace to be useful in my day and generation.

Jan. 20, 1870—In the evening Johnston preached a sermon. Subject, "The church festivals—why we keep them." . . . I think all were well pleased. Some remarked that it was a revival in a true sense. I think it was. Would that we could have many such. We are not opposed to true revivals. It is only the spurious counterfeit that we oppose. But it is with these that the word "revival" about here is identified.

Apr. 21, '70—Dr. Nevin's articles (in the *Messenger*) on his own life are constantly growing more interesting from a theological point of view. He is now engaged in a kind of criticism of himself as he was when he left Princeton. Of course, it is a criticism of Presbyterian theology at that time, and I suppose also of much of the theology that exists in the same quarter at the present time. The Doctor states that when he left Princeton and was about entering the Theological Seminary at Allegheny, he did not know the Apostles' Creed.

Nov. 17, '70—For some weeks now the proceedings of the Eastern Synod have been given in the *Messenger*. These are brought to a close in this number. There is an interesting discussion on the subject of lay baptism. This subject has been before the Eastern Synod for a number of years. The conclusion reached is that where any doubt exists as to the validity of such baptism, hypothetical baptism ought to be administered: If thou art not baptized, I baptize thee in the name, etc. In regard to the validity of lay baptism in general, the Synod was unwilling to pronounce judgment. There was a good deal of difference of opinion. And, strange to tell, those who have rather low views of baptism profess to have very exalted views of the ministry. The arguments of these brethren are sometimes amusing.

*The Passing of the Year (1870)*

Dec. 31, 1870.

And now the year of grace 1870 has come to an end. The last hours of the dying year are always, to me at least, solemn moments. It is a time to review the past and look forward into the future. The last year has again been a year of blessing and prosperity. Myself and family have enjoyed uniformly good health, and enough of the good things of this world. We have abundant reasons for gratitude to the Father of lights, from whom cometh down every good gift and every perfect gift. In my pastoral work also the Lord has prospered me. My charge is in a good condition. Peace and harmony have prevailed generally. For this the Lord be praised. Our church has generally enjoyed peace. The Liturgical controversy has in a measure subsided. Our own land and nation also have been preserved from war and civil strife. Peace and prosperity have reigned throughout our borders. In Europe, however, the year closes upon a scene of conflict and bloodshed, such as the world has not often seen. In a world-historical point of view the year 1870 has been a most remarkable one. The fall of the French Empire, the unification of Germany under the Empire of Prussia, the utter humiliation of France, the proclamation of the dogma of papal infallibility, the fall of Rome and the abolition of the

pope's temporal power, these are some of the remarkable events of the year, any one of which singly would have been sufficient to mark it as an important epoch in the world's history. And what will the era be that is now commencing? None can tell but the Omniscient, in whose hands is the fate of nations and of individuals. To Him I commend myself and mine during the year to come.

Aug. 1, '71—Special meeting of Classis to dissolve the pastoral relation between Rev. J. Grant and the St. John's charge. . . . According to some developments today, there must be a wretched state of things in St. John's charge. When Mr. Hoyman years ago commenced a "big meeting" in one of the congregations of the charge, it is said that he announced to the people, that the devil had for a long time been sleeping on the roof of the church, but that he was about to chase him off once; but, when afterwards the meeting was in full blast, a simple old lady told him that he had now chased the devil down into the people, making matters worse than before. Now it seems that the new measure devil is in the people still, and that is the reason they can keep no pastor.

Oct. 6, '71—In my going about through the country I have frequently observed a fact which I have never seen stated in a book, and which I may as well record here. It is this, that a minister on entering a house is invariably met with a broom in the hand. Somebody is either already sweeping or somebody is just going to begin to sweep. For the first half hour after entering a house I am always very uncomfortable on that account.

*Church Publications*

Dec. 30, '72—Read "College Days," a new monthly paper to be published in the interests of the alumni and students of Franklin and Marshall College. Papers and magazines are becoming quite numerous in our church. Our Synod also has commenced publishing a newspaper. If all the papers and publications we now have were of the right sort, and were well sustained, they might accomplish a large amount of good. But some of them were better not published at all. There are now

no less than sixteen English and German periodicals published under Reformed auspices, not counting Bomberger's monthly slub. There are enough men living who remember the time when our church had not a single publication of any kind. There has been progress within the last thirty or forty years. Even so late as ten years ago, or when I entered the ministry, which is only eight, we had nothing but the *Messenger*, *Guardian*, *Kirchen Zeitung*, *Pastor's Helper*, in the East, and the *Western Missionary and Evangelist* in the West. Judging from the rate at which publications have multiplied, there must have been progress in the Church. . . . They will all do something towards educating the people and making them a reading community. And when that has been accomplished something will have been gained. The truth will prevail at last.

Jan. 7, 1873—I have for some time been getting subscribers for *Our Church Paper*, the paper to be published by the Pittsburgh Synod. Am getting along pretty well. I was originally opposed to the Synod's publishing a paper, but now, as it is to go forward anyhow, I will do for it what I can, and thus help to control it. It may do good.

Jan. 12, '73—Got a number of subscribers for *Our Church Paper*. Have thirty now. Including my own, there will be thirty-one. That I think is pretty good for one who originally opposed the new enterprise. But I have determined to do for it what I can, so that if it fails no blame can attach to me.

Speaking of the *Christian World* reminds me of the proposed changes in the publication enterprises of the Eastern Synods. These are to be combined. The *Era* and the *Messenger* are to be consolidated into one paper. There is to be one editor-in-chief, and three assistants, elected by the three Synods. Dr. Davis, of Chambersburg, has been elected editor-in-chief, Dr. Fisher has been reduced to the rank of an assistant, and Dr. Russell has been pushed overboard. The other assistants are Dr. Higbee and Mr. Titzel. All this combination of force ought certainly to result in the production of a strong paper, and I fondly hope that we are going to get—something better than either the *Messenger* or the *Era* has been during the last year. But the *Messenger* last week brought the intelligence that the

new paper will be a folio of the present size of the *Messenger*, with wider columns and smaller print.—*Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus*. That is all I have to say.

## MISCELLANEOUS

*Boarding One's Self*

Mercersburg, Oct. 30, 1862—Heilman and myself have at last come to the conclusion to board ourselves, and have made arrangements to commence tomorrow morning. How long we will keep at it I do not know. I hate the work most dreadfully. The chief difficulty consists in getting provisions. Things like butter, potatoes, eggs, etc., are not to be had for almost any price.

Oct. 31, 1862—This morning we got up at half past six o'clock, feeling that there was something wrong. However, we took our breakfast of bread and molasses. The thing would not go well. However we kept on boarding ourselves until eleven o'clock when we agreed to go down again for dinner. We have now sold our provisions again and given up all thought of boarding ourselves for this session. But next session we are going to try it once more, that is, provided we stay here, which I trust we may not be compelled to do. I still hope to go to Lancaster.

April 4, 1863—Fox, Hauser, Schaible and I have resolved ourselves into a boarding club and made Hauser our chief cook. Of course we do not calculate on living *well*, our only object being simply to preserve life, and I think if we do that we shall be doing well.

Apr. 20, '63—Today Fox, Hauser, and I dissolved our little boarding club. I got a loaf of bread and am now prepared to set up for myself. During the last three weeks it has cost us \$1.21. This is cheap boarding, but it is cheap living too. But I do not suppose I shall be able to do better alone.

Apr. 23, '63—Heilman and I are now boarding ourselves; and a glorious time we are having of it. We live principally on bread, butter, dried beef, and water—all substantial but assuredly not dainty food.

*His Faith*

Dec. 30, 1862— . . . At present I do not see my way clearly. Indeed the future, so far as the means of life are concerned,



looks very dark. I do not know now where the money is to come from to take me through the Seminary, to say nothing of anything else. But blessed are they who live by faith and not by sight. Though I am not able to see how things will go, I do not despair. In my past life I have been so signally favored by Providence, and led through so many difficulties, that I can without the least hesitation submit myself to the guidance of God in the future too. I have not yet forgotten what difficulties beset my path sometimes during my college course, and yet I got through. Many a time I was without a cent in my pocket, and did not know where the next dollar was to come from. But I got to the end of my course and have as yet neither starved nor frozen. I got so far and will get farther too. To do my duty shall be my whole endeavor, and by thus doing I doubt not that all will go well.

*Dr. Harbaugh Dies*

Jan. 1, 1868— . . . Was informed of the death of Dr. Harbaugh. He died last Saturday. He had been sick for a long time, and was not expected to recover; and yet we can scarcely realize that he is gone. It is a heavy loss to the church. It will be difficult to fill his place, although we have men able to fill it. There is some consolation in that. God has not left us without resources. His will be done.

*Dr. Gerhart Succeeds*

March 12, '68—Got the *Messenger* and see that Dr. Gerhart has been elected to the professorship in the Seminary which became vacant by the death of Dr. Harbaugh. That is all right. Dr. Gerhart will do well. He is a good teacher. He initiated me into the mysteries of philosophy. He is a theologian of the Mercersburg School, which is to say that he is truly German Reformed. Mercersburg is Reformed in the spirit of the fathers of the church as well in the third as in the sixteenth century. But enough. Time to go to bed.

*Dr. Nevin Visits Somerset Co.*

Oct. 8, 1869—Called on Dr. Nevin in the forenoon and heard him talk some hours. The Doctor is not much a talker on com-

mon matters, but if one gets him started on some subject in Theology or Philosophy, he will talk ahead for a whole hour without stopping. This evening he preached for us in the church. The church was nearly full. Every body was anxious to see and hear Dr. Nevin. I hope they were all pleased. He preached over an hour, and yet the attention was very good.

Oct. 13, '69—I have been told that Dr. Nevin with his preaching here and at Salisbury made a bad impression. Some people think he knows nothing and cannot preach at all. That is the judgment of some of the outsiders, and some who ought to know better. It is astonishing how thick the darkness of some people is. If some smattering Methodist were to come along with a lot of big words culled from a Dictionary or Spelling Book and roll them out with agony, he would be called a great preacher. Of course it will not do to get angry with people whose misfortune it is to be ignorant. But this case reminds me of the saying in Prof. Nevin's "Antipodes": "Young folk think old folk fools, but old folk know that young folk are fools." This needs to be only a little changed to make it applicable to the case in hand: "Ignorant folk think wise folk fools, but wise folk know that ignorant folk are fools."

*Dunkard Hymnology*

Apr. 29, 1870—In the afternoon I went to Alexander H-s (whose wife was a Dunkard). While there I picked up a Dunkard Hymbook, and happened to meet the following elegant specimen of a hymn:

When Jesus Christ was here below,  
He taught His people what to do,  
And if we would His precepts keep,  
We must descend to washing feet.

I looked at the preface and there found the following definition of a hymn: "Hymns are lyrical discourses generally addressed to the feelings." In the above specimen, however, there is not much that is lyrical. I should call it doggerel. And what a notion this is of a hymn! Instead of singing to God, they sign to the feelings.

Aug. 21, 1871—(For a convention of ministers, elders, and deacons of Somerset Co.) I am to write an essay on the history of the Reformed Church in Somerset Co., which, I apprehend, will give me a good deal of trouble. And I do not know whether the study of the subject will prove at all interesting. But I shall try to make the best of it. The history of the founding of the church in this county has not yet been written, and it ought to be done; though I hardly think that I am the proper person to do it.

Dec. 19, '72—Read the *Messenger* in the evening. Dr. Apple delivers himself in regard to the late General Synod. Dr. Fisher promised to do so hereafter, but says in this paper that it was fortunate that the opposition became so excited in regard to one or two subjects of comparatively small importance as to forget all weightier matters, whereby they were prevented from doing the mischief they might otherwise have done.

#### *Christmas Harmony*

Dec. 23, '73—All Berlin is going to celebrate Christmas this year. The Lutherans and the Methodists are each going to have a Christmas tree. A few years ago they abused us for doing these things; now this year, I hear, they are going to *beat* us. Well, let them do that. We have at least taught them how to do it.

#### *Death of Strauss*

Feb. 26, 1874—The *Messenger* brings the notice of the death of Dr. Davis Friedrich Strauss, which occurred a few weeks ago, and which I have seen noticed before. This famous personage had outlived his fame by some thirty years. The mythical theory of the life of Jesus was dead long before its inventor, though when first proclaimed it threatened to make havoc with the faith. "Why do the heathen rage, etc?"

#### *Semi-centennial of the Seminary*

March 11, 1875—(Meeting of the Theological Association). In the evening Bro. Heilman delivered a discourse on the history of the Theological Seminary, today being the semi-centennial

anniversary of the Institution. Fifty years ago today the Seminary was opened by Dr. Mayer with five students at Carlisle, Pa. This event is to be celebrated throughout the church, and the occasion is to be improved further by increasing the endowment of the Seminary. I hope the enterprise may prove successful in this view.

#### THE FLORIDA TRIP

##### *Reformed What?*

Dec. 16, 1875— . . . Fortunately last night on the train, just as I was beginning to feel miserable, I got into conversation with a Methodist preacher, who told me that he had a family of six boys and one daughter and that he was on the way to the Eastern Shore, Maryland, to buy a farm for them. I thought of my own six, and wished I had a farm for them too. I told this Methodist that I was a clergyman, too, of the Reformed Church, but he did not seem to be able to make out what the Reformed Church is. He thought at first it must be the Reformed Episcopal. How strange! The Reformed Episcopal is only two or three years old and numbers only a few dozen ministers and a few thousand members, and yet the American public knows all about it; but of the Reformed Church of the Reformation it knows nothing. After I had assured my Methodist friend that I was not a Reformed Episcopal, he made up his mind that it must be a branch of the Lutheran Church, and then I tried to enlighten him on the subject of the Reformation, and especially the relation of the Reformed to the Lutheran Church. But while we were thus talking, the train stopped in the depot at Washington, D. C., and we separated, he to go on his way and I on mine.

##### *New Year's Eve*

Dec. 31, 1875—And this now is the last day of the year. If there were about a foot of snow, if the thermometer were at zero, and if the wind were whistling around the corners of the house, then I could realize it; but with this summer weather I can not make myself feel as if this were New Year's Eve. And yet it is.

Everybody says so, though many who say so, also like myself, say that they cannot realize it. But the Almanac says so, and that decides the question.

*Wishes for a D.D.*

Feb. 12, 1876—Since my return from St. Augustine my life in Palatka has been so uneventful that I have had no material to enter in this journal. Today however the monotony was broken by an excursion to an "Indian Mound" on Dunn's Creek. The party was quite large, though I did not count them, and among them were two Doctors of Medicine and two Doctors of Divinity, and my humble self—who am called by so many names here, like Elder, Parson, etc., that I have often wished I were a doctor too, so that I might be certain of one definite title.

*Going to Heaven "On High"*

Feb. 27, '76—There is one colored church here which seems to be a favorite resort of strangers on Sunday evening. A number of persons from this hotel went there this evening, and I was invited to go too, but as I never go to places of amusement on Sunday, I staid home. What sort of amusement is to be had there may be judged from the following lines of one of their hymns, which I heard one of the ladies repeat in the parlor this evening:

"When we get to heaven on high  
Then we'll make the splinters fly."

*Chorus*—"We all belong to the union band."

That sort of performance draws people more strongly than the earnest preaching of the Gospel does.

*Washington, D. C., Congress, and the  
Supreme Court*

Mar. 23, 1876—Spent the day once more in Washington, seeing the sights. First in the morning I went over to Georgetown, where I had a good view of the Arlington Heights, on the opposite side of the Potomac. After this I spent about three hours in the Corcoran Art Gallery; and here I enjoyed myself more

than anywhere else in that city, that I have been yet. This institution and the Smithsonian are worthy of a special visit to Washington. In the afternoon I walked through the Capitol once more, taking another look at both houses of Congress, and also at the United States Supreme Court. This last body impressed me favorably. In the first place, there are no Negroes there, as in the galleries of both houses of Congress, where a white man may count himself fortunate if he obtains a seat. And in the second place there is dignity there, and decorum. And finally one there does not notice the party strife which is always noticeable in Congress. The men in Congress are either Democrats or Republicans, and if they are not that, they would be nothing; for they are neither patriots nor men. The judges of the Supreme Court have also on a few occasions manifested a good deal of party prejudice; still this is not so evident to the passing stranger.

Washington is a city of politicians and Negroes—a city of low morals also, and bad manners, as could not be otherwise in the circumstances. Just at this time the Belknap business is the topic of conversation, wherever there is any conversation.

*The Manchester Pastorate*

Manchester, Md., Dec. 31, 1878—It is now three years since I have not kept a regular diary. These were years of tribulation and trial; but the clouds seem to have dispersed, and a brighter sky appears to be drawing; and I have resolved to return again to my old plan, followed from Jan. 1, 1861, to about the close of 1875, of daily recording the principal events of my life. Tomorrow would be the proper time to make this beginning; and indeed I shall do nothing today but take a brief retrospect over the past few years.

Three years ago about this time I was in Florida on account of my health, which was then much broken down. I do not believe that that trip did me any good, but since then my health has been gradually improving, until I now feel comparatively well again. In the last four years I have suffered much. Until within the last six months there was not a day in four years that I was well. Sometimes indeed I was altogether wretched, and



life itself was a burden; and I was convinced for a long time that my life would be of short duration. My complaint was of such a nature that I expected consumption to end my existence here in a few years. But, thanks to a gracious Providence, I am now pretty well restored, and have hopes of my life being prolonged. If it please God, for any thing I know now, I may live to a mature age. My throat is not as well as it used to be and perhaps will never be so again. But I can now preach twice a day without inconvenience or suffering, and if it continues this way I shall be satisfied.

We have been living in this place since July 2, 1877.

#### *The Church at Peace*

Jan. 31, 1879—Read the *Christian World* in the evening. This paper I did not get for a number of years. But last May, at the General Synod in Lancaster, after the adoption of the "peace measures," I subscribed for it again. Said "peace measures" have thus far given quiet to the church. Of course the end is not yet. But I do not think there will be much agitation any more. The "Messenger" and the "World" do no longer bristle with controversy. The *Mercersburg Review* also, which has been transformed into the "Reformed Church Quarterly," has taken a new position, and now proposes to be an organ for the *whole* church, and invites articles from all theological parties and tendencies, on the simple condition that they have "literary merit." How that will work remains to be seen. I should not like to be editor of such a publication.

#### *Why a Protestant*

Mar. 29, '79—Received a letter from Dr. Davis, of the *Messenger*, in reply to one which I wrote him suggesting some articles against Romanism. He asks me to write on some of those subjects, which I might do if I had the time, and if I were not afraid that the confinement and study might be prejudicial to my health. With Dr. Davis' letter came one from Bro. Truxal of Somerset, who tells me that people in that section prophesy that I am going to Rome too. I guess I ought to write articles to vindicate my Protestant orthodoxy. I do not see how

I could ever go to Rome. With my present conviction I am farther from Rome than I was ten years ago. I have been moving during this time, but it has been away from Rome. But then I am not a Protestant in the old "evangelical" sense either. I believe the old Protestant doctrine in regards to the church needs reconstruction. I go with Protestantism in accepting the Bible as the only rule of faith, and in rejecting the claims of the papacy and the whole system of the papacy, but it seems to me that to swear to the dicta of our dead Reformers is only another species of infallibilism no better than the Roman. Protestantism admits of the hope of something better in the future, and therefore I am a Protestant.

#### *The Peace Commission*

Sept. 3, '79—This evening the Eastern Synod meets at Lebanon, Pa., and the church anxiously looks for its action in regards to the peace movement. It will be the first to elect commissioners. What will be the issue of this movement? What is the commission to do? To my mind the action of General Synod has always seemed like the practice of many deliberative bodies of burying an unpleasant thing in a committee. If our troubles can be *buried* in this way, if the commission can box the matter up, and keep it boxed, then there will be peace; but if the commission should feel called upon to *do any thing* in the business for which it is appointed, then I doubt whether there will be any peace. I am very anxious to see whom the Eastern Synod will appoint on the commission.

Sept. 10, '79—The Synod has elected its commissioners, namely, Dr. T. G. Apple, and Dr. F. W. Kremer, and Elders Gross, Seibert, and Kelker, all of Harrisburg. I do not consider this committee a strong one. Dr. Apple is the only one on it who may be considered as representing our side of the church. But we shall see what the result will be. I have not the least idea.

#### *All's Well That Ends Well*

Dec. 6, 1879—Called on Rev. Joseph H. Apple, one of the Peace Commissioners, who is visiting his relatives in town. The

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE

Peace Commission has adjourned, and has at least done no harm. In *doctrine*, they have adopted ten theses, which are of such general character that there is certainly no reason why all should not be able to unite on them. The trouble with them perhaps is that they contain nothing new, nothing that may be considered as an advance on the position of the Reformed Church in the past. In *cultus*, the Commission recommends the formation of a new committee by the General Synod for the purpose of making a new Liturgy. This is perhaps the worst part of the program. Must we be set once more to the work of Liturgy making? A church whose cultus is unsettled is at a disadvantage in comparison with others. But perhaps there is no relief. In *government*, the Commission recommends a revision of the constitution with a view of bringing the District Synods into closer organic union, and supervising the theological teaching of the different Synods by a Board of Visitors appointed by the General Synod. I am glad the thing is over. We will now rest for at least one year longer.