

NOV 23 1940

THE DUKE SCHOOL OF RELIGION BULLETIN

Autumn Number

VOLUME V

November 1940

NUMBER 3

DUKE UNIVERSITY
DURHAM, N. C.

THE DUKE SCHOOL OF RELIGION BULLETIN

This publication is issued by the faculty of the Duke University School of Religion through an editorial committee composed of Dean Elbert Russell, Chairman; Professors Cannon, Garber, Rowe and Spence, of the faculty; Reverend C. C. Herbert, Jr., of the School of Religion Alumni Association; and Mr. Dana Dawson, representing the students of the School of Religion.

Correspondence should be addressed to *The Duke School of Religion Bulletin*, Box 4923, Duke Station, Durham, N. C.

NOTIFY CHANGES OF ADDRESS

The *Bulletin* is sent without charge to those who desire it. The only requirement is that you keep us advised of changes in your address. In the Methodist itinerancy addresses change frequently, and unless *Bulletin* subscribers send in notices of all changes the publication is apt to go astray.

In sending in notice of change of address, kindly give the old as well as the new address, as it will facilitate locating your name among hundreds of others if the old address is given.

The permanent mailing list has now been made up, and is supposed to include all alumni of the School of Religion of Duke University and alumni of Trinity College who are in the ministry. A number of other names are included and the management will be glad to send the *Bulletin* to any interested person who will send in his address.

SCHOOL OF RELIGION ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

President, C. C. Herbert, Jr., Concord, N. C.

Vice-President, D. D. Holt, Lynchburg, Va.

Executive Secretary, T. M. Vick, Jr., Longhurst, N. C.

Executive Councilors, Carlos P. Womack, Durham, N. C.; M. Earl Cunningham, Nashville, Tenn.

PUBLISHED IN FEBRUARY, MAY, NOVEMBER, AND JANUARY

Entered as Second-Class Matter February 19, 1936, at the Post Office at Durham, N. C., under the Act of August 24, 1912.

THE DUKE SCHOOL OF RELIGION BULLETIN

VOLUME V

NOVEMBER, 1940

NUMBER 3



WILLIAM PRESTON FEW
December 29, 1867–October 16, 1940

THE DEBT OF THE SCHOOL OF RELIGION TO WILLIAM PRESTON FEW

The debt of the School of Religion to President Few was fundamental and many-sided. He brought a religious heritage from Quaker and Methodist ancestry that was enriched by his personal religious experience and wide acquaintance with religious leaders.

Though a busy university president, Dr. Few gave time and thought unstintingly to the religious and educational work of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, now The Methodist Church. He was a delegate to the General Conferences since 1914, a member of the Educational Commission since 1898, a member of the General Sunday School Board since 1914, and one of the most active officers of Duke Memorial Methodist Church and Sunday School in Durham. He was a member of the commission that prepared the legislation for the Uniting Conference of the three branches of Methodism. He was probably the leading layman in the Southern churches. He shared James B. Duke's desire that Duke University should be distinctly a religious university and that its faculty should be men and women of religious character. He took special pride in the University Chapel, and the preachers and services in it had his careful supervision. He insisted on the importance of biblical and religious courses in the undergraduate curriculum.

President Few was particularly interested in the School of Religion. The plan to use part of the income of the Duke Endowment for aiding rural Methodist churches in the form of scholarships was his conception. It provided a trained ministry with thirty weeks actual experience in country churches under close supervision.

He gave especial attention to the faculty, students and curriculum of the School. He often said that he knew nothing of law and medicine and had to leave those schools to others, but that he did think he knew something about religion. His knowledge of the character and activities of both faculty and students was uncanny. He desired that the School should train both scholars and preachers and often supervised modifications of the curriculum and changes in the staff to secure these.

President Few was interested in many applications of Christianity, especially in temperance and the welfare of the Negroes. He was a trustee of the Jeanes Fund and the General Education Board and a member of the Federal Council of Churches. His attitude was always that of an educator rather than that of a

propagandist. He always rejected the temptation to set up a paper university or school. He would listen to a concrete program for education or human betterment; but he required evidence of a specific need and of the efficacy of a plan.

His death removes a supporter and counsellor on whom we had depended even more than we knew. If the School is able to go on without him, it is because he has established its policies and worked out its organization so that they can endure his removal from our midst.

ELBERT RUSSELL.

RESOLUTIONS OF RESPECT

In the death of President William Preston Few of Duke University, the cultural and moral forces of the Southland, if not indeed of the whole nation, sustained an irreparable loss. For forty years he had been officially connected with an institution whose motto is *Eruditio et Religio*. For thirty years he was the president of this institution. Throughout his entire career he strove with unflagging zeal and unabated energy to make this ideal a reality.

President Few could hardly conceive of education apart from the development of moral character. He was frequently heard to observe that there were no failures except moral failures. A sound mind in a sound body might have satisfied the ancients as a standard for the well-rounded life, but he would have stressed even more the soundness of moral character and the possession of moral integrity.

His great interest in religion was manifest in his attitude toward the teaching of religion in college. Under his direction religion became recognized as a worthy and serious subject in the undergraduate curriculum and it was due largely to his influence that it has maintained its proper place in the studies of the institution. In the extra-curricular activities of the University he also greatly emphasized the place of religion and threw his influence on the side of all worthy moral and religious enterprises. He attended practically every session of chapel worship and was a most interested and enthusiastic member of the Governing Board of the University Church. His last official meeting, in fact, was a meeting with this Board into whose activities and deliberations he entered with his usual zest and keen interest.

President Few's religious influence was not limited to the campus. He was directly connected with many of the conference-wide, state-wide, and even nation-wide religious enterprises. He was for years the leading layman of his conference and was recognized as a national religious and educational leader. While he

rarely appeared on the floor of any convention or conference, he was consulted more frequently than almost any other member of such organizations and his influence was immeasurable. There was no more influential layman in the Methodist Church, and no more capable educational administrator in American University life.

The Duke School of Religion was perhaps the institution in which he was most interested. He made every attempt to assist it in attaining a high degree of excellence and a wide sphere of influence. He frequently interrupted his busy program of activities to attend the meetings of its faculty, where he presided with genial and interested attitude, entering sympathetically into all of its problems. Dr. Few was largely instrumental in securing the endowment that made this school possible, and was greatly influential in popularizing it among the supporting conferences. Under his friendly patronage, freedom of thought and liberty of conduct were made possible. With an amazing insight he thought through the perplexing problems of his day and refused persistently to allow fundamental issues to become confused with moot problems of local and temporary significance. Interested in attitudes, scholarly in intellectual capacity, unimpeachable in character, firm in conviction, uncompromising in moral issues, President Few was both an inspiration and a model for those whose chief interests lay in the field of both moral and intellectual development.

In recognition of the worth of their great leader and in genuine sorrow at his death, the Faculty of the School of Religion of Duke University hereby registers their appreciation of his leadership and their deep sense of sorrow in his loss. They ask that this expression be spread upon the minutes of the School and a copy be sent the bereaved family with all assurance of sympathy and regret.

RESOLUTIONS BY STUDENTS

We, the members of the Student Body of the School of Religion, wish to express our deep sense of loss in the passing of Doctor William Preston Few, President of Duke University. Having been intimately connected with the work of the School of Religion since its opening in 1926, Doctor Few stood in a unique relation to its life and work. His death was a loss the magnitude of which will become even more apparent when viewed in the perspective of time.

Quite apart from his official duties, Doctor Few is remembered by students as a deeply human and sympathetic person. His con-

stant willingness to give a sympathetic ear to their personal problems made him a real friend to all who had contact with him. There was in his personality that blending of humility and simple dignity which marks the truly great.

Addressing a meeting shortly before his last illness, Doctor Few illustrated his belief in the world's need of religion by pointing to the central position of the Chapel in the architectural layout of the University. Central likewise in the life of Doctor Few was the expression and practice of religion. Typical of this was his interest in and devotion to the School of Religion.

Therefore, in appreciation of his years of devoted service to the cause of Christian Education and especially to the training of young ministers in the Duke School of Religion, be it resolved that we express through the medium of the Duke School of Religion Bulletin our sympathy to his family and our sincere regret in his passing.

VISITATION OF ANNUAL CONFERENCES

By action of the General Conference in May the Duke School of Religion was designated as one of the nine approved seminaries of the Methodist Church and was given a small annual appropriation. At the Southeastern Jurisdictional Conference shortly thereafter the School was designated as one of the approved seminaries of the Jurisdiction. Pursuant to this action, faculty representatives have visited the fall conferences for the purpose of speaking before the conference sessions and also to meet with the alumni in each area. The annual visitation will be continued each year and a convener or committee of alumni will act to call meetings of alumni.

The annual meeting of the general Alumni Association of the School of Religion, which functions as part of the University Alumni, was held during the North Carolina Pastors' School in June. The address was delivered by Rev. E. H. Nease of the Class of 1931, Charlotte, N. C., who spoke on the subject "The Life and Work of a Minister." In the election of officers the following were chosen for the year 1940-41: president, C. C. Herbert, Jr., '29, Concord, N. C.; vice-president, D. D. Holt, '33, Lynchburg, Va.; secretary, T. M. Vick, Jr., '39, Longhurst, N. C.; executive committeemen, Carlos P. Womack, '30, Durham, N. C., and M. Earl Cunningham, '30, Nashville, Tenn.

Dr. Frank S. Hickman represented the School at the Louisville Conference where E. S. Denton and Robert Prentis are con-

veners. Dr. Hickman's other conferences are Memphis, R. W. Council, convener, and Little Rock, Aubrey Walton, convener. Dr. J. M. Ormond attended the Holston Conference where the alumni representative is F. B. Jackson. Professor H. E. Myers at the Mississippi Conference was aided by P. H. Grice and C. G. Felder. Dr. A. C. Outler at the South Carolina Conference was aided by S. M. Atkinson and at South Georgia by Shannon Holloway and J. F. Jackson. In the Western North Carolina Conference Dr. H. E. Spence represented the School and conveners for this year were A. C. Waggoner and Fletcher Nelson. C. C. Herbert and C. P. Bowles will act next year. Dr. G. T. Rowe visited the North Alabama Conference and W. E. Dean was convener, while at the North Mississippi Conference Kenneth I. Tucker organized the alumni. Dr. James Cannon, III, was the representative at the Virginia Conference where an active alumni group has met annually for several years; new officers of this group are Carl W. Haley, president, and J. H. Blakemore, secretary. At the Upper South Carolina Conference, Dr. Cannon was aided by Adlai Holler and F. B. George. Dr. Paul N. Garber visited the Alabama Conference with the aid of A. Carl Adkins. At the North Carolina Conference, where Dr. Garber spoke also, the alumni representatives are D. L. Fouts, C. E. Hix, Jr., O. L. Hathaway, and C. J. Andrews.

1940-41 STARTS AUSPICIOUSLY

The year 1940-41 in the School of Religion has gotten off to a favorable start. A considerable increase in the first year class raises the enrollment in the school to one hundred and twenty-five working for the B.D. degree. There are also twenty students enrolled in the Graduate School for work in the field of religion toward the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees. Work for these degrees has been authorized in the fields of Church History, Biblical studies, and Christian Theology and Ethics. Further developments in this direction are contemplated.

The formal opening exercises of the School of Religion on September 26 were featured by an address by Dr. Ray C. Petry, which appears elsewhere in this issue, and by a reception to the faculty and students given at University House by Dean Elbert Russell and Mrs. Russell. The annual Retreat was conducted by Dr. Roy L. Smith, Editor of the *Christian Advocate*, November 17-19. Under the efficient leadership of Mr. Dana Dawson, the student association has begun a full program of religious and social activities.

THE CHURCH AND CHURCH HISTORY*

A paper of scholarly character ought, as a rule, to deal with a limited subject. This should be treated in intensive fashion with a minimum of generalization. Upon certain occasions, however, it is imperative that a broad subject of general moment be considered. Its handling may then require the bold, sweeping outlines more appropriate to a brief period of discussion. Such valid generalizations as may be most useful for subsequent reflection will then be in order. This is such an occasion.

The subject proposed for discussion this morning is "The Church and Church History." The implications of this topic cannot safely be ignored by anyone however remotely concerned with the Christian church as a factor in human experience. Least of all can those in preparation for the Christian ministry and those assisting them in that preparation afford to neglect the relationship existing between the contemporary church and its career through the centuries. Theological teachers and students who are unconcerned with, or uninformed as to, the church's history will serve to produce a membership severed from the fullness of its spiritual heritage. An alert faculty and a ministry trained in the history of the church's weakness and strength alike may help to realign the current institution with its enduring purposes.

When viewed in such a connection, church history may be regarded by theological professors and students not only as a course in academic discipline but also as an indispensable aid to the most enlightened churchmanship. This, of course, raises the whole question as to the relationship which should exist between the study of the church's past and active participation in its present. Many approaches have been made to the study and writing of church history. These overlap and diverge in highly confusing fashion. However, three such approaches may be singled out as fairly representative of the major lines of consideration.

The first of these exploits the church's history in a highly uncritical manner. The ostensible search for the truth about the past is more frequently a rationalization of partial data in support of established preconceptions. The facts of Christian history are often distorted in the attempt to defend subsequent traditions and dogmas held indispensable to the church's existence. History is so far subordinated to the demands of the current church as to become not merely its deferential servant but, even more, its ignominious

* Address delivered at the formal opening of the Duke School of Religion for the year 1940-41.

slave. Early experiences and institutions are frequently glorified to the disparagement of all later developments. Segments of Christian thought and life are wrested from their natural contexts and set up as normative for all subsequent times. Thus the evidences for a given type of primitive church order may be dissociated from other, and not always corroborating, evidences and held to be determinative of later church organization. The desire to confirm accepted ideas and usages governs the investigation of past thought and conduct. Testimony from the past which conflicts with present conceptions is derogated, "reconstructed," or ignored. Traditions which are of doubtful authority, but replete with edifying materials, are regularly preferred to a more trustworthy but less moralizing history.

The sources are selected and appraised without due regard to the generally accepted methods of scholarly research. The records are "pieced" and "cut" in cinema-house fashion in order to propagandize the claims of denomination, school of interpretation, or homiletic clique. The lives of great men are not portrayed in accordance with the best probabilities as to what they were in their own day. They are, rather, depicted in keeping with later surmises as to what they ought surely to have been. The net results of this "censored" history are most detrimental to the church. Though inaugurated, often most sincerely, to keep Christian life true to its fundamental character, such a study succeeds only in obscuring the developmental nature and vital resourcefulness of historic Christianity. The artificial promptings of a static, arbitrary institutionalism even deny what has been in order to insure more fully the crystallization of the church as it has since come to be.

A second approach swings to the opposite extreme in relating Christian history and the present. Its laudable purpose is to discover the truth about the church's past, be the record what it may. The canons of scientific history are employed in what is declared to be an objective analysis of the facts and nothing but the facts. Critical acumen is brought to bear upon all available sources, which are sought out, classified, and given exposition in accordance with the most rigorous demands of scientific methodology. Interpretation is strictly limited to a statement of what the evidences proclaim when safely immunized from the contagion of the least subjectivity. Church history, which is thus regarded as but a specialized department of history, is presented ideally as a pure science. All concern with values, edification, and lessons from the past is disciplined to the point of near-extinction. In-

terest in the church itself is confined to a scientist's regard for a phenomenon under observation.

The phenomenon in this case is just one of many social institutions to be studied not with a view to evaluation and constructive criticism but with the intent to secure statistical information. The not too amusing inference is sometimes drawn that the dependable church historian cannot be an active Christian. His being more than nominally such might involve sympathies with, and loyalties to, the institution being studied. This would be quite disruptive of the scholarly detachment which ought to characterize the objective scrutiny of an item in social evolution. From this viewpoint, the interest of the church historian in the church is solely that of a scientific researcher for his data. Church history's only service to the church thus becomes a most indirect one. It consists in supplying to those who are committed to church loyalty the authoritatively objective findings discoverable only by those who are not. Students of ecclesiastical history so interpreted are encouraged to pursue their subject with the scholar's devotion to pure research in itself. At the precise moment when they or their professors ask, "Of what use is this to the church and its ministerial work?" they cease to be worthy students of church history and become merely Christians.

A third approach seeks to preserve the scholarly quest for truth about the church's past without being duped by the myth of pure objectivity. It recognizes the grave danger of fabricating the story of the past out of the wishes of the present. But it also challenges the possibility and the desirability of subtracting history and the historian wholly from the realm of personal opinions, meanings, and values. After all, as a ranking church historian has said, "There are no infallible standards on which to base judgment, and all historical research is at bottom an art which, like every art, is primarily founded on the very qualities of the individual himself; but it can be developed by regular cultivation, rich experience, and ever fresh activity in various fields, until a high degree of certainty in opinion is reached."

Proponents of this third approach remind those of the second of significant factors which secular historians have already begun to consider. These scholars know that researchers in the social sciences can command no such rigid control of their data as that which isolates the laboratory experiment. They admit, in increasing numbers, that history which ignores minds, meanings, and values is hardly real history; that pure facts divorced from interpretation are something of a mirage; and that past experiences

which have any meaning for the present necessarily undergo some valuative interpretation at its hands.

Thus the "New History," which has long since attained its years of maturity, definitely commits itself to an interest which extends beyond episodes and events. It is unashamedly curious about the meaning of these facts in relation to ordinary people. Human environment, attitudes, motivations, doings, ideas, and ideals are as definitely the concern of history as they are beyond the sheerly quantitative measurement of pure science. The historical process is rightly seen to include not only the more material elements such as geography and economics, but also the psychic factors, without consideration of which the record of living men cannot be even approximately known. History thus abandons atomistic and isolated approaches for a critically interpretative survey which gladly employs the findings of cooperative research in sociology, anthropology, psychology, art, archaeology, and other related fields. Scientific methodology wherever applicable is in no way compromised. However, the concern of history with man's individual and social integrity, with his mental as well as with his physical activity, goes beyond the findings of pure science into the realm of applications and values as well.

To be sure, the historian as such occupies himself properly with the consideration of human life in its natural, observable interrelations and not with metaphysical speculations as to final causes and ends. That is, he does not assume the philosopher's and theologian's task of speculating critically upon man's relation to supernatural forces and cosmic ultimates. In so far, however, as man's religious beliefs and philosophical ideas concerning the superhuman have influenced human affairs, these conceptions must be related to the whole of his social experience. Thus his standards of worth must be given interpretation even though this involve the historian's opinion, as it invariably will. In every case, events, situations, relating factors, ideas, and institutions form a part of man's discoverable record within the social environment. These, therefore, command the research effort and interpretative powers of qualified historians.

This command is, however, more often acknowledged than it is obeyed. Unfortunately, many of those who have had a wider vision of history's domain still have a pronounced astigmatism where the church and its past are concerned. Too often, they become neglectful or scornful of an institution which has dared to commit itself to ends not fully answerable to historical analysis. In violation of their own principles these secular historians veer

away from a full consideration of society's most significant reagent throughout history.

Obviously, then, there is great need for men equal to the secular historian in ability and scholarly methodology, but superior to him in the interest and training necessary to relate the continuing Christian institution to its total past. Such stipulations indicate the task and requisite qualifications of that historical specialist, the church historian. But one group of church historians, so called, is too scornful or neglectful of tested methods to get valid results; another is too fearful of compromising its objectivity to give due regard to data which cannot be truly known apart from a measure of the subjective and valuative. The third approach therefore makes its claim to consideration. It applies un-deviatingly the tested principles of cooperative research and the courageous interpretation, open always to scholarly criticism, which characterize the only true historical method. In addition, it accords to the church its due primacy in the history of significant institutions. There is, likewise, a frank and unapologetic interest in the church's welfare.

Secular historians, sociologists, and economists, have at solemn moments admitted that social values are not entirely foreign to their interests. Church historians of the third group do not shrink from making available to the present church the implications of its past; neither do they fail to inform society of the debt which it owes to the church of that past. They challenge society to examine its present standards of value in the light of former experiences which it sustained in relation with the church.

Such Christian historians have sufficient evidence that their Christian loyalty need not impair their effectiveness as historians, and that their contribution as historians is invaluable to the progress of the present-day church. To be sure, the historian of Christianity struggles to discipline his very human tendency to read the present back into the past. He tries to be on the alert against distorting past beliefs by imposing upon them his own credo. He is not so lacking in courage, however, as to suppress at all times those personal convictions and theological speculations to which he has a perfect right as a Christian. But he does strive to make a clear distinction between what he believes theologically and what he may justifiably state historically. Thus in the words of Emerson: "If we say that God led the Israelites out of Egypt, we are making, not an historical, but a theological statement. . . . If, however, we say that faith in a divine leading was a powerful motive force in the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt, we are stating a

fact. . . ." With this distinction made clear, the church historian may judiciously go beyond the limits of his special field, at times, to aid in relating his subject to that unity of truth for which the Christian seeks. He is happy in the conviction that his field of study in its own right serves to aid ministers and lay people alike, in a more effective prosecution of the church's present task.

When, therefore, church history is taught in the Divinity School of Duke and other universities like it, three things may be inferred: (1) that church history is a legitimate field of training and research in higher education; (2) that church history is indispensably a part of ministerial equipment; and (3) that, upon occasion, church and society at large may profit from the fruitful conjunction of Christian teachers and ministerial students functioning as researchers for knowledge and servants of the Gospel.

A more adequate conception of what church history as a subject of academic dignity may offer in service to the church can be gathered from its contribution in several related fields. Its services there, as already indicated, are not offered in selfish isolation, but in fullest cooperation with related, scholarly efforts. These contributions may be seen, first, in the research area and, second, in the field of everyday experience.

The first research contribution of church history to the church has to do with the founder of Christianity. Students of early Christian history have joined with New Testament scholars in establishing the facts of Jesus' historical career. Not only has his historicity been convincingly evidenced, but his primacy in the whole Christian movement has been impressively documented. A widening range of primary sources has been critically appraised, and the life of Jesus placed in intimate relation to the ideas and circumstances which environed him. The dangers of modeling his life and character to suit the easy reconstructions of his modernizing biographers have been soberly set forth. The need for tentativeness and the scholarly weighing of conflicting evidences on moot points has been sufficiently demonstrated. Many problems such as those involving his Messianic consciousness and his eschatological thought forms have been given intensive study.

The difficulties involved in providing a trustworthy biography of Jesus have been honestly faced. Some reputable scholars have declared a true *Life of Christ* to be an impossibility. However, the church historian has helped to establish a remarkably dependable picture of the fundamental Jesus. His historical witness is increasingly clear on issues basic to the church's life in every age. He did advocate absolute loyalty to God's Kingdom. This was

yet to come in its eschatological consummation, but it laid its full demands in the present upon those pledging uncompromising allegiance to it. In the interval between the present and the future age, no "interim" pattern of behavior but the way of the ultimate Kingdom was to prevail among Christ's followers. Thus, there was an overlapping of the present and future æons. The new "had already begun, before the old had collapsed. . . ."

Christ's expectation, in faith, of the imminent new age did not, therefore, result in any paralysis of action in the social present. He demanded of himself and all true followers "a preparatory discipline in the present measured by ideals that were no whit below the standards of perfection to prevail in the coming Kingdom." Jesus was not, as certain confused interpreters have tried to make him out, a modern social reformer who hoped to make the future Kingdom out of the evolving present. He felt it his duty to show the way in which man's present must conform to the decree of God's future.

Whatever else he may have been, Jesus was a prophet unique among prophets. Whether or not he thought of himself as the Messiah is a point hotly disputed. That he did regard himself as having a singular function in the preparation for the Kingdom which God should bring in is hardly debatable. That he advocated creative sacrificial love, not as the desperate opportunism of his day, but as the only way of eternal victory in God is also clear. The ingenious rationalizations which are inseminated by fratricidal conflicts would have it otherwise. But even they cannot successfully portray him as resorting to violent coercion upon special occasions, so that the option on loving one's enemies might be defended as a general principle.

The Jesus whom church history presents from critically reconstructed sources is one who exacted and promised more than any "Fuehrer" before or after him. No ascetic, except in the disciplinary sense, he gave an heroic embodiment to the uncompromising ideals which he required of all unreserved disciples. He challenged all relativism and all accommodation to lesser ideals which were promulgated in the name of human weakness. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect" may have been impossible of literal fulfillment. An attempt at its application was none the less requisite upon those who followed him.

The church has seen fit when its comfort is menaced to denature Christ's demands. But a great Christian and church historian, Harnack, has here interposed a grave observation. The church

may feel it necessary at times to declare its independence of Christ in order to repudiate any obligation laid upon itself by his less "reasonable" sayings and doings. However, it cannot deny that these were his sayings and doings. The church historian as a historian is hardly called upon to preach. He is not forbidden to recall the disturbing judgment of numerous prophets of the Christian past. These have suggested that it may be more honest for the church to deny Christ openly, and repudiate his way of life frankly, than to label its distortions and cover its retreat with his name.

In any case, church history has helped to delineate Jesus' character and influence more clearly. It clarifies not only his earthly career but the continuing challenge which his life has issued and still issues to his church which is in the world and so susceptible to the temptation to be of it.

* * *

Christian history has made a second research contribution in its study of the early church and its developing organization. Evidences as to the true character of the primitive "ecclesia" have been gathered from the writings of Christian Fathers throughout the ages. Proper attention has been given to the church as the true foundation of Christ. The arguments which represent the ecclesiastical institution as having been founded by him at a given time and under a specific circumstance are placed in contrasting relief over against another group equally insistent. This school sees in the church a community spiritually engendered by Jesus, but never instituted as an organization separate from the Jewish religion. It is pointed out that Jesus' constructive criticisms of Jewish religious life were never other than those of a loyal Jew.

Church historians have not reached agreement as to the genuineness and historical significance of Matthew XVI, 18-19, in which Christ is purported to have committed his church to Peter. The most likely relation of this passage to the whole problem of the church's institutional origins has been repeatedly and intensively studied. Perhaps an increasing number of scholars find the evidence most convincing which presents the church as having both genuine continuity through Christ with its Jewish heritage and a fresh commission from him as the "New Israel."

That the perpetuation of Jesus' distinctive ideal made inevitable its institutional investment by his followers seems obvious. It is equally apparent that they came to think of the church increasingly as having a fundamental unity under a duality of aspects. As a mystical body of which Christ was the head, the

church was an organism, a "communion of saints," a pneumatic association, a *koinonia*, a transcendent fellowship of all those called out of sin and the world to help make men ready for the returning Christ and God's Kingdom. As a terrestrial institution indispensable to the propagation on earth of God's will as declared in Christ, the church was an organization, an empirical society seeking to disentangle itself from its human defects and to rise triumphant over the world's evil. Mysteriously, paradoxically, but surely, this church of two natures was one in Christ. The "ecclesia" on earth, that communion outward and physical, thought of by the Protestant Reformers as the church "visible," sought, however unsuccessfully, to pattern itself after the church "invisible," the communion inner and spiritual. It was the church "organic," with its true community of saints in Christ, which the church "organized" struggled to make more visible in itself.

Church history has made appreciable progress in ascertaining the organizational processes through which the institutional church functioned. The rapid transition from the pneumatic community of Pauline days to the highly institutionalized church of the later second century is, at least, understandable. The transcendent Kingdom was long in coming. The pragmatic considerations of economic survival, social solidarity, and propaganda facility necessitated system and functional cohesion. Organism could survive only with the aid of organization.

Church order in the early centuries has been of great interest to subsequent churchmen. Not the least concerned of these have been Christians who feel it imperative that the later church reproduce primitive forms. In this connection church history has yielded evidences which may well serve to warn as well as to inspire. Best indications are: (1) that exact and comprehensive data on early church order are not at hand and such as are available can well be viewed with critical tentativeness; (2) that early church order was not of a uniform type but diverse as to areas and functionally responsive to varying needs; (3) that the inductive deduction from the history of primitive organization is hardly that some form was utilized which must be slavishly reproduced regardless of later circumstances and needs; it is rather that the early church met its problems with vigor and versatility in the light of its own requirements, as the church in every age can well afford to do; (4) that wherever, and whenever, diaconate, presbyterate, episcopate, or papacy emerged, this was in all likelihood not owing to some prescription of Christ, direct or indirect; it was more probably the recognition of agencies which were proving

themselves useful in perpetuating the emphases of dominant Christian groups. That these groups may have felt their institutional procedures to be in harmony with Christ's purpose need not be denied.

The church historian scarcely needs add that the history of the church at its best reveals a ministry of forms to the spirit, an employment of organization as means to the end of true community, the subordination of static but necessary institutions to the dynamic realization of ideals.

* * *

In a third area the researches of church history are today serving to focus the significance of a neglected Christian heritage which is an indispensable resource of the church. The historian, alone, can adequately trace the vicissitudes of Christian community and catholicity as exemplified through the centuries. The thorough student knows how effective was the *koinonia* of the ancient church. He is both inspired and startled by that authoritarian medieval unity which put such definite restrictions upon catholicity, and which identified spiritual community with the visible, hierarchical church. The church historian knows, also, and would have others appreciate a valuable bequest from the Protestant Reformation, which is all too often neglected. He is keenly aware, as Protestants generally are not, that the abiding tradition of Protestantism is not, as the Roman Catholic charges, a schismatic individualism. The Protestant tradition is, rather, the passion to reincarnate the true "communio sanctorum"; to realize as never before that Christian solidarity in which every man is a priest in Christ to every other; to revive the genuine catholicity of the "universitas fidelium"; to place the whole "congregation of the faithful" under the headship of Christ, one and indivisible.

Church history witnesses effectively, therefore, to the fact that a united Christendom is not the restless imagining of a decadent civilization but the enduring ideal of the church throughout history. Christian historians, Orthodox, Roman, and Protestant, have often begun their tasks by examining the claims to superiority of their respective communions. They have, not infrequently, remained to marvel at the unused resources of a Christendom which may yet some day be one church, holy, catholic, and united.

In the meantime, Roman historians survey the very real tragedies of Christian divisiveness and exploit the history of community as it is conceived and practiced under the Roman obedience. The Protestant historian puts at the disposal of churchmen in his communion the lessons of the past which show the way to greater

unity and ecumenicity. The contributions which church history, in cooperation with theology, has made in laying the basis for denominational reunion and ecumenical progress can hardly have gone unappreciated. Wherever authoritative information is solicited and a sane challenge is desired as to the religious basis, the ecumenical outlook, and the constitutional principles of unitive Protestantism, the researches of church history are in demand. And when, in time, the craving becomes strong enough to confront the pagan world with an undivided Christendom, the whole cumulative record of the church's struggle for enduring community will be discoverable at church history's hands.

* * *

In any survey, however brief, of church history's researches, a fourth contribution to the church should be mentioned. This has to do with worship's place in Christian history. Historical researches of the highest caliber have been concentrated on early types and evolving forms of Christian worship. That this worship has in every era of the church's greatness been the heart of its being is plain for all to see. It is, likewise, clear to the student of Christianity's past that subtractions from, and additions to, primitive forms of worship have brought both undoubted glory and lamentable degeneration to the "service of God." The historian has a vantage position from which to view and analyze worship's accretions from pagan as well as from Christian sources. He can trace the distortions which have been accepted, in time, as the natural outgrowth of Christ's own will. Fortunately, the historian has, likewise, the welcome opportunity to record the healthful reaction of worship forms to the constructive criticism of genuine worshipers. The liturgical strength and weakness of the major historical communions have been indefatigably evidenced by such masters in research as Duchesne, Lietzmann, and Will. The positive elements of Orthodox, Roman, and Protestant worship have been given a most irenic treatment in the versatile writing and experience of Friedrich Heiler.

The church must also pay tribute to the many researchers of all faiths who, in whatever area of theological or sociological investigation they have labored, have employed proper historical techniques at appropriate times. The mere mention of their colossal projects would pass the limits of a lengthy paper. Of prime importance are the historical analysis and interpretation of that fraternal solidarity which is insured by "the pure preaching of the word and the right administration of the sacraments." What the church has been, and can be, when welded into the unity of a

common faith, the community of sacramental grace, and the prayerful incorporation of the Gospel, has significance not only for church historians but also for those who may be guided by their disclosures. Thus, recent ecumenical conferences have wisely had recourse to the researches of church historians. These scholars have been called upon to testify anew that worship at its highest has made the church, not an esoteric band, but a community of service for the world's salvation.

The church today could, presumably, reexamine its dedication to God in an age of competing, final loyalties. Church history stands ready to review with a minimum of bias the record of the church in its long development as a community of worship. That record will, without question, be found to confirm Dr. J. H. Oldham's contention that "Insofar as it achieves its true and full purpose, the worship of the Church may be regarded as the most potent and fruitful form of social action."

* * *

This reference to social action reminds us of a fifth research contribution to the church provided by its historians. For, as church history shows, the Christian movement has not been something done in splendid isolation by a few, individualistic leaders. It has, from the first, claimed the loyalties of the people and demanded investment in a living society. No greater service has been rendered by the Christian historian than the elucidation of social ideals and the assessment of social contributions which came as a noble by-product of the church's loyalty to the Divine. Christianity's prime dedication was made in love to God, but the inevitable concomitant of its loyalty was growing affection for all fellow men. The story of an eschatology which resulted in mounting social activity; the account of a growing band of men, women, and children adjusting themselves to environmental circumstances but never quite surrendering their function of challenging the world to something higher; the amazing career of a spiritual household which started out to save a few brands from the burning and then went on to rebuild the whole social edifice—all this and much more is the open secret of the church historian. What is more important, these are the vital statistics of our spiritual ancestry.

For, with all of its faults, Christian society in the past has been vital. It is not the church historian's business to weave his materials into sermonic form. But it is his research obligation and the ministerial student's responsible privilege to look closely at a living record which is good for innumerable sermons. For

that record is the story of people cast like us in the perpetual crisis of continuing life. The church historian's examination of their thoughts and actions had an interest for him and a value for the church which is paralleled by no other type of research. What they did or neglected to do cannot, and should not, shackle our response to contemporary problems. But it may have some instructive suggestions for the meeting of such problems.

True, it may not be reassuring to know that Christians have compromised their ideals before and defended their actions as realistic; but our disappointment at their surrender in the past may throw a little light on the possible regard of the future for our own policies of convenience. On the other hand, the resourcefulness of former Christians who not only survived but thrived in the face of apparently insuperable obstacles is a portion of history which ministers and people ought to find useful at just about this time.

The everyday experiences of our Christian forefathers when clarified by, not buried under the weight of, documentary research are invariably found to be both fascinating and serviceable. They were well acquainted with menaces to the good, competing philosophies of existence, and life and death struggles, both material and spiritual. Such stimuli were surprisingly like those which make our own parish sojourns anything but placid. These predecessors of ours sometimes stretched the definition of Christian enterprise, reinterpreted their doctrines to accord with their actions, and found their souls again only in days of adversity. Facts such as these can hardly fail to arouse some interest in people who are now doing these same things.

An undergraduate some years ago paid his tribute to the social interest which Christian history may hold for modern people. He declared that it was a shock to him when he realized for the first time that even the apostles had to make a living, eat, sleep, and agonize with real problems like other fallible creatures. But he hastened to add that they certainly were more interesting to him as real people than as perfect beings remote from all ordinary experience. Such at least was his idea, though not his picturesque idiom. And I believe that he was right. One of the greatest fascinations of Christian history is the interest of real people in each other down the ages.

Some twenty years ago, a distinguished professor declared that church history would not come into its own until it was studied, written, and taught as a living, growing experience related, as all human life is, to specific environments and circumstances. Only

then, out of its wealth of individual and social experiment, could the Christian past enrich the Christian present. The professor, like the student, was right. I suspect that other professors and students like these two have had something to do with the titles and contents of later textbooks in church history such as the recent *History of the Christian People*. In any event, it is a step in the right direction to include the everyday problems of average people in histories designed for us, their descendants.

* * *

Granted, then, that here are five great fields of research in which church history has served, and still serves, the whole church. What more does it offer of everyday use to the busy pastor and his parish? Anyone who can read a moving story or profit from its recounting can enter into the heritage of historical Christianity. From it he may derive a new sense of fellowship with those of the past who have believed in the victory of Christ over all things. In the turning pages of Christian history he may read the indisputable proof that true Christianity has been dynamic, developmental, and creative rather than static and effete. He may be interested to learn that each time the church has been urged to die peaceably and be decently buried it has stubbornly demonstrated that it is just ready to begin living more abundantly. It must surely be worth something to the average Christian to discover that no institution has so invited criticisms from within and without, and that none has so thrived upon it as the church.

This living book of the church's past is full of tested remedies for human fear, a contagious disease widespread in our time. In this volume, also, are numerous accounts of Christianity's battle, lost through adopting the weapons of its enemies, and won through the employment of Christ's sacrificial love against brute force.

But Christian history has other ministries than that of demonstrating how to shatter the dictator's arm. It shows unerringly which men have been great and which not. It even has some hints as to what makes men great—and women, too. It provides the one satisfying, synoptic view of triumphant living, not only on the part of a few spectacular leaders, but in the experience of obscure, yet victorious millions as well. In short, church history, when heard or read, provides the great primary source book of immortal Christianity. It contains the secret of the things that live and the things that die, together with a chart of the course pursued by them.

But however little the people of a pastorate review Christian history, they cannot but profit from the service of a minister richly

endowed with such historical knowledge. His clearer perspective, better trained mind, and more vigorous spiritual leadership thus derived from his fraternity with the past should greatly augment his usefulness to his people. His sermons, like his life, should continue to grow and bless those committed to his care.

It has already been suggested that it is not the professor's province to leave his chair of history for the honilist's pulpit. However, there is something wrong if his ministerial students get no materials for good sermons. The fault may be his, theirs, or the responsibility of both. He and they can hardly be expected to harbor the kind of pride which filled a scientist's heart years ago when he proposed to his class the following toast: "Here's to pure mathematics and may it never be worth a dash to anybody." The church historian is proud that the knowledge of the Christian past may be worth much to a great many. He is anxious that those in the pulpit and those in the pew may profit alike from this too little used resource.

This, of course, is not all that church history means in relation to the church, nor is it all that church history can do for teachers, ministers, and people. Some may not believe that it has done, or can do, even these things which I have claimed for it. Perhaps the fairest test to which such doubts may lead them will be the study for themselves of historic Christianity's records. They may then judge more accurately of church history's possible usefulness in their own experience and of its potential ministry not only to the church of tomorrow but also to that of today.

RAY C. PETRY.

FACULTY NOTES

DR. B. HARVIE BRANSCOMB is president of the National Association of Biblical Instructors for 1940. He served as a member of the American Theological Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order representing Southern Methodists; delivered an address at the dedication of the new Library at the University of Alabama, May, 1940; participated in the group selected by the Hazen Foundation to discuss Contemporary Theology Problems. This group meets twice annually at Yale University. Dr. Branscomb has had published *Teaching with Books. A Study of College Libraries*. Association of American Colleges and the American Library Association. New York and Chicago, 1940.

DR. JAMES CANNON, III taught in the first term of the Duke Summer School. He represented the Duke Chapter at the Phi

Beta Kappa Convention in San Francisco, August 28-31. Preached twice at Chapel Hill Presbyterian Church.

DR. KENNETH W. CLARK taught in training schools at the following places: Duke Pastors' School, June 5-10; Lynchburg (Va. Conference Pastors' School) June 24-29; Lake Junaluska Leadership School, July 31-August 6; Danville School for Christian Workers, September 15-20; Winston Salem School for Christian Workers, September 22-27. Dr. Clark made an address at the Granville County Courthouse Centennial at Oxford, N. C. on June 30; preached at Moseley Memorial Methodist Church, Danville, Va. on September 15; and preached at Centenary Methodist Church, Winston-Salem, N. C., on September 22.

DR. HOMER H. DUBS attended the meeting of the Southern Association of Philosophy of Religion at Blue Ridge, N. C. in July, 1940, and there read a paper entitled "Concepts Suitable for a Philosophy of Religion." He also worked on the fourth volume of his translation from the Chinese of *The History of the Former Han Dynasty*.

DR. PAUL N. GARBER has delivered the following addresses: Baccalaureate address at Blackstone College, June 10 and at Textile Industrial Institute, June 30; "The North Carolina Way of Life" before Rutherford County Club, Ellenboro, N. C., July 20; "Our Church" at Methodist Assembly, Lake Junaluska, August 20.

Dr. Garber served as director of the Junaluska School of Religion (affiliated with Duke University) July 15-August 24, 1940, and attended the meeting of the Board of Publication of The Methodist Church, Chicago, Illinois, July 25 and of Commission on the Course of Study of The Methodist Church, Cincinnati, October 9. He appeared as an expert witness on Methodist history in the lawsuits in the Federal Court of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C., July 9-10 and in Court of Clarendon County, S. C., Charleston, S. C., August 8-9, involving the legality of the Plan of Union for Methodist Unification and attended Biennial Meeting of American Association of Theological Schools, Lexington, Ky., June 5-6.

Recent articles by Dr. Garber include: "Young Man from Maine," in *Epworth Highroad*, May, 1940; "Our First Foreign Missionary," in *World Outlook*, September, 1940; "Methodism in the Saddle," in *Epworth Highroad*, November, 1940.

During summer and fall he has preached in the following Methodist churches: Glenwood, Greensboro; Central, Asheville; Dillou, S. C.; Central Terrace, Winston-Salem; Greene Memorial, Roanoke, Va.; Pineville, N. C.; Jonathan; Wesley Memorial,

High Point; Franklinville; Rehoboth, Terrell; Rock Spring Camp Meeting; China Grove; First Church, Salisbury.

DR. HORNELL HART preached at Shipley School, Pa., on June 2; at Moravian Seminary and College for Women on June 10; Baldwin School, Pa., June 11; Duke University Chapel, June 6; Purdue University Summer Convocation, June 23. He delivered a series of nine addresses at the Summer School of Ministerial Training of the Cincinnati Area of the Methodist Church, June 17-21 and a series of addresses at the Student Peace Service Institute at Denison University June 22-July 3. Dr. Hart's book, *Chart for Happiness*, was published by Macmillan on Nov. 6.

PROFESSOR H. E. MYERS taught in the first term of the Duke University Summer School and served as University chaplain, preaching at the service on Aug. 4. Other preaching engagements were at Duke Memorial Church, July 28, First Methodist Church, Knoxville, Tenn., August 18, and at a union service of four Knoxville churches on the evening of the same day.

DR. J. M. ORMOND served as Dean of the North Carolina Pastors' School and Rural Church Institute at Duke University June 3-8, and taught the course, "The Program and Administration of Circuits" in both the Missouri Pastors' School held at Central College, Fayette, Mo., June 10-15, and the Oklahoma Pastors' School held at Oklahoma City, Okla., June 24-29. Preaching engagements were at the Missouri Pastors' School, Melrose Church, Kansas City, Mo., June 16; Boston Ave. Methodist Church, Tulsa, Okla., June 23; Linwood Circuit, Aug. 11; Morganton Circuit, Aug. 30; Duke Chapel, Sept. 22.

Dr. Ormond dedicated Frisco Methodist Church, July 7, Bethel Methodist Church, July 14, two churches on the Garland Circuit, Sept. 8, Mount Tabor Church, Sept. 29, and an organ at Siler City Methodist Church, July 28. He attended the organization meeting of the Board of Missions and Church Extension at Chicago, July 23-25, the Missionary Conference at Lake Junaluska, July 30-Aug. 6, the Executive Committee meeting of the Board of Missions and Church Extension at Philadelphia, September 18, and the meeting of the Salaries Committee of the same board in New York on Sept. 18.

DR. ALBERT C. OUTLER published an article, "The Platonism of Clement of Alexandria" in the *Journal of Religion*, July, 1940. He was a Seminar Leader at the Southeastern Student Christian Conference, Blue Ridge, N. C., July 8-17, Assembly Speaker at the Young People's Assembly, Louisburg College, June 8-17,

Forum Leader at W. C. U. N. C. "Y" Cabinet Retreat, Sept. 21-22 and at the University Christian Student Conference at Duke, Nov. 5-7. Dr. Outler taught in the Junaluska School of Religion, July 15-Aug. 24 and read a paper before the Southern Society of Philosophy of Religion, June 26-28. Preaching engagements have been at Duke Chapel on May 25 and Sept. 15, Canton Circuit, July 21, First Methodist Church, Cordele, Ga., Sept. 1, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va., Oct. 23.

DR. RAY C. PETRY delivered the opening address for the School of Religion on "The Church and Church History." He also made an alumni address at Louisburg, N. C. on October 24. During the summer Dr. Petry worked on the reorganization and development of syllabi for Freshman Religion in Duke University.

DR. GILBERT T. ROWE preached through a camp meeting at Pleasant Grove, August 11-18, with Dr. Norman Huffman. He taught a course, "Survey of the New Testament" in Catawba County Training School at Hickory, N. C., September 12-20.

DR. W. F. STINESPRING has contracted with the Macmillan Company to translate from Modern Hebrew Dr. Joseph Klausner's new book entitled *From Jesus to Paul*. This work is a sequel to *Jesus of Nazareth*, which first appeared in English in 1925 and was widely read throughout the English-speaking world.

DEAN ELBERT RUSSELL lectured at the North Carolina Institute of International Relations June 23-26, held at Chapel Hill; preached at the Myrtle Beach, S. C., Methodist Church, July 7 and September 8, 1940; taught courses on "Old Testament Theology" and "Life of Christ" at the Junaluska School of Religion, July 11-August 23; made a talk at the Waynesville Rotary Club on July 19; attended N. C. Yearly Meeting of Friends at Guilford College August 8-11; preached at the Central Methodist Church, Asheville, August 18; attended Five Years' Meeting of Friends in Richmond, Indiana, where he was Chairman of Commission on "Trends and Ecumenical Movements," October 16-22.

DR. H. E. SPENCE, in addition to several sermons preached in Durham and nearby churches, delivered several lectures before civic clubs and other organizations throughout the state. Among these were an address before the North and South Carolina Textile Operatives' Association held in Blowing Rock. The subject of the address was, "The Loom of Americanism." Professor Spence addressed the Cotton Seed Crushers' Association at Myrtle Beach, S. C., on the topic, "Smiling Through." He was Platform Speaker at the Pastors' School of the Memphis Conference held at Jackson, Tenn.

Other speaking engagements were in Winston-Salem and Burlington, N. C. and Norfolk, Va. He taught a class on "The Methodist Church at Work" in the Henderson Training School in September and preached in Druid Hills Methodist Church, Atlanta, Ga., for a week in October.

BOOKS BY BRANSCOMB, HART, ELLWOOD, CRUM

Dr. Harvie Branscomb, Director of the Duke Libraries as well as Professor of New Testament in the School of Religion, while on leave of absence two years ago, worked under the direction of the Association of American Colleges with a grant from the Carnegie Corporation in making a survey of American college and university libraries. His book, *Teaching with Books, a Study of College Libraries*, appeared during the summer. It was published jointly by the American Library Association and the Association of American Colleges and has received wide notice.

Dr. Charles A. Ellwood, Professor of Sociology in Duke University, is the author of *The World's Need of Christ*, published by the Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. The book contains a foreword by Dr. Samuel McRae Cavert, Secretary of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

Dr. Hornell Hart, Professor of Social Ethics in the School of Religion, has just published through Macmillan *Chart for Happiness*, embodying some of the results of Professor Hart's "eurometer" tests with many groups.

Gullah, A Story of Negro Life in the Carolina Sea Islands, is the title of Dr. Mason Crum's book, the most recent publication of the Duke University Press. Dr. Crum is a native of South Carolina and has spent many years in the study and presentation of the subject of his book. He has frequently lectured on the Gullah Negroes and their customs. Dr. Crum was the chief organizer and first president of the North Carolina Conference of College Teachers of Religion. Dr. Crum is Assistant Professor of Biblical Literature in the Duke University Department of Religion.

THE CLASS OF 1940

On June 3, 1940, twenty-one young men were awarded the degree of Bachelor of Divinity by Duke University. Seventeen of these graduates are entering Methodist annual conferences and two will serve as Moravian preachers. One of the number is continuing further graduate study and another is teaching religion in public schools.

Five members of the Class of 1940 are members of the Western North Carolina Conference. Their appointments are as follows: W. E. Andrews, Whittier; R. O. Brown, Jonathan; W. R. Bustle, Rowan; J. L. Pittard, Moriah; J. C. Reichard, Troutman.

W. K. Barrs and W. H. Brady are the representatives of the Class of 1940 in the North Carolina Conference, their appointments being Lakewood, Durham, and Ocracoke-Portsmouth, respectively.

W. W. Dodge and H. A. Milstead joined the Baltimore Conference. Dodge has been assigned to Shenandoah Junction and Milstead is serving the Jarrettsville-West Hartford charge.

Members of the Class of 1940 are to be found in eight other annual conferences as follows: R. N. Arbaugh (North Arkansas); Steadman Bagby, Calvert City, Ky. (Memphis); F. A. Crutchfield, Assistant Pastor, First Church, Oklahoma City (West Oklahoma); L. P. Foley, Moneta (Virginia); R. L. Freeman, Barnhill (Tennessee); V. R. Hickman, Eutawville (South Carolina); S. M. Kiker (North Texas); H. P. Richardson, East Tazewell (Holston).

John W. Fulton is pastor of Freidberg (N. C.) Moravian Church, and D. E. Weinland will be given his appointment in the Moravian Church in the near future.

M. H. Kelley has enrolled in Union Theological Seminary and W. G. McLeod has been appointed director of religious studies in the public schools of Burlington, North Carolina.

PAUL NEFF GARBER.

NOTES ON RECENT BOOKS

In this section attention will be called to new books which can be recommended as being likely to prove of special value to ministers and others particularly interested in religious questions. No attempt will be made to take notice of all the principal volumes coming from the press or to review extensively even those which are mentioned. A brief notice of a book here means that it is accounted worthy of more than ordinary consideration.

The Book of Revelation. E. F. Scott. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940. 191 pp. \$2.00.

An excellent brief treatment of the always fascinating but frequently misunderstood Christian Apocalypse. Since the *International Critical Commentary on Revelation* is too ponderous for popular use, this volume meets a real need, particularly since in time of war and disaster the Revelation of John has always been given special attention.—H. B.

The Search for the Real Jesus: A Century of Historical Study. C. C. McCown. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940. xviii + 338 pp. \$2.50.

This volume, the title of which paraphrases Schweitzer's famous volume, reviews a century of research on the life of Christ. The author shows how various approaches have dominated the study from the Hegelianism of the days of Strauss to the Barthianism of the last few years, his conclusion being that progress has been real, though in a number of important respects the movement has been in a circle. Recent exhortations that the Jesus of history must be abandoned for the Christ of faith are a flight from reality and are quite unnecessary, since enough is known of the historical Jesus to "stir the conscience and challenge the world."—H. B.

From Morality to Religion. W. G. deBurgh. London: Macdonald & Evans, 1938. 352 pp. 12s. 6d. net.

This is an attempt to synthesize Kant and St. Thomas, in order thereby to erect a reasoned argument for Christian faith that will meet the objections of current philosophy. A closely reasoned book which constituted the Gifford Lectures for 1938.—H. H. D.

Record and Revelation: Essays on the Old Testament by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study. Edited by H. Wheeler Robinson. London and New Cork: Oxford University Press, 1938. xi + 539 pp. \$4.00.

American, English, French, and German scholars have here joined in happy collaboration to produce the best survey of the entire field of Old Testament study that has yet appeared in English. Particularly noteworthy are the essays on "Prophecy" by N. W. Porteous and "Theology of the Old Testament" by the editor. May the war soon cease, so that once again hands may be joined across the sea in more fruitful fellowship like this! —W. F. S.

A Practical Grammar for Classical Hebrew. J. Weingreen. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1939. xi + 316 pp. 10s. or \$3.50.

A Hebrew Grammar for Beginners. Duncan Cameron and Salis Daiches. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1939. viii + 207 pp. 10s. 6d.

The very fact that works like these continue to be published by reputable presses shows that Hebrew is not a mere dead language, but a living reality in the hearts and minds of those who would truly understand the Scriptures. Another pleasing fact is that both these books are the result of collaboration between Jews and Christians at the very time when such collaboration is not everywhere possible. Students and teachers should examine both books for possible class use; the reviewer has drawn class material from them, but continues to use Creager and Alleman, *Beginners' Hebrew Grammar* (D. C. Heath, 1927), as the text in First Hebrew. —W. F. S.

Monastic Studies. Watkin Williams. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1938. 199 pp. 10s. 6d.

This simply written, interesting account is "intended for all persons over twelve years of age." It should render a genuine service in acquainting the laity with the vital history of their church.—R. C. P.

A First Church History: With An Illustrated Time-Chart and a Short Book List for Students and Teachers. Vera E. Walker. London: Student Christian Movement Press, Second Edition, 1939. 278 pp. 6s.

Such scholarly papers based upon primary sources throw added light on the institutional and social life of the Cluniacs and Cistercians. They also help to illumine the vigorous personalities of Benedict of Aniane, Berno, Odo, Peter the Venerable, Robert of Molesme, and Bernard of Clairvaux.—R. C. P.

Paul, Man of Conflict. Donald W. Riddle. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1940, 244 pp. \$2.00.

A new "life of Paul," based upon the judgment that Paul's own letters comprise a source to be preferred over Luke's account in Acts.—K. W. C.

Religion Yesterday and Today. Henry Sloane Coffin. Cokesbury Press, Nashville, 1940. 183 pp. \$1.75.

A series of lectures delivered at New York University in 1939 and at Emory University in 1940 setting forth trends in religious thinking in a section of American Protestant Christianity. The author traces in broad outline the tendencies in religious thought during the last half century as seen in the writings of numerous leaders, indicating some of the factors that influenced religious thought during the earlier period and also some of the factors that have led some of their successors to modify their views.—G. T. R.

The Faith We Live. Albert Edward Day. Cokesbury Press. Nashville, 1940. 256 pp. \$2.00.

The Fondren Lectures for 1940 delivered at Southern Methodist University. A strong vein of theology runs through this volume. The first section presents God as he is revealed in the Bible and religious experience, and the second section discusses the nature and possibilities of faith. The author endeavors to bring religion down into the realm of actual living, suggesting methods or techniques through which the conquering power of faith may be applied in the solution of life's daily problems.—G. T. R.

The Social Function of Religion. E. O. James. Cokesbury Press. Nashville, 1940. xi + 312 pp. \$2.50.

Through the use of a wealth of historical material the author shows that religion has always been relied upon to give stability to human society. He holds that the spiritual factors that determine the social structure are autonomous principles which transcend the social order and not mere functions of society. The aim of the book is to interpret the integrative function of religion in terms of the eternal verities enshrined in Christianity.—G. T. R.

THE DUKE SCHOOL OF RELIGION FACULTY

- BRANSCOMB, BENNETT HARVIE, A.B., M.A. (Oxon), Ph.D., Litt.D.
Professor of New Testament
- CANNON, JAMES, III, A.B., A.M., Th.B., Th.M., D.D.
Ivey Professor of the History of Religion and Missions
- CLARK, KENNETH WILLIS, A.B., B.D., Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of New Testament
- DUBS, HOMER HASENPFLUG, A.B., M.A., B.D., Ph.D.
Acting Professor of Philosophy
- GARBER, PAUL NEFF, A.B., A.M., Ph.D.
Professor of Church History
- HART, HORNE LL NORRIS, A.B., A.M., Ph.D.
Professor of Social Ethics
- HICKMAN, FRANKLIN SIMPSON, A.B., A.M., S.T.B., Ph.D.
Professor of Preaching and the Psychology of Religion
- MYERS, HIRAM EARL, A.B., S.T.B., S.T.M.
Professor of Biblical Literature
- ORMOND, JESSE MARVIN, A.B., B.D., D.D.
Professor of Practical Theology
- OUTLER, ALBERT COOK, A.B., B.D., Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Historical Theology
- PETRY, RAY C., A.B., A.M., Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Church History
- ROWE, GILBERT THEODORE, A.B., S.T.D., D.D., Litt.D.
Professor of Christian Doctrine
- RUSSELL, ELBERT, A.B., A.M., Ph.D., Litt.D.
Professor of Biblical Interpretation
- SMITH, HILRIE SHELTON, A.B., Ph.D., D.D.
Professor of Christian Ethics and Religious Education
- SPENCE, HERSEY EVERETT, A.B., A.M., B.D., D.D.
Professor of Religious Education
- STINESPRING, WILLIAM FRANKLIN, B.A., M.A., Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Old Testament
-
- ADAMS, DONALD KEITH, A.B., M.A., Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Psychology
- BARNES, JAMES FOSTER, A.B., A.M.
Instructor in Church Music
- CRISPELL, RAYMOND, A.B., M.D.
Associate Professor of Neuropsychiatry
- ELWOOD, CHARLES ABRAM, Ph.B., Ph.D., LL.D.
Professor of Sociology
- HAINES, HOWARD N., B.S.
Instructor in Church Architecture
- JENSEN, HOWARD EIKENBERRY, A.B., A.M., B.D., Ph.D.
Professor of Sociology
- LEVER, OSCAR WILLIAM, A.B., A.M.
Instructor in Homiletics and Biblical Literature
- LUNDHOLM, HELGE, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology
- MORGAN, GEORGE ALLEN, JR., A.B., A.M., Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Philosophy
- THOMPSON, EDGAR TRISTRAM, A.B., A.M., Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Sociology
- WIDGERY, ALBAN GREGORY, B.A., M.A.
Professor of Philosophy

