207.73
A9Q
UNIV. OF MICHIGAN,
JAN 25 1913

THE AUBURN SEMINARY RECORD

Samuel Miles Hopkins, D. D.

A Machine Made Endowment

Reasonable Biblical Criticism--
An Appreciation

Vol. 8. JANUARY 10, 1913 No. 6.

Digitized by Google

THE AUBURN SEMINARY RECORD

[ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER]

PUBLISHED DURING THE MONTHS

OF

JANUARY, FEBRUARY, MARCH, MAY, JULY, SEPTEMBER AND NOVEMBER

BY

AUBURN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
AUBURN, NEW YORK

PRESIDENT GEORGE BLACK STEWART,
PROFESSOR HARRY LATHROP REED,

ALBERT OSCAR CALDWELL, CLARENCE STAFFORD GEE,
CARL EMIL FRANZ, ARTHUR EDWIN HARPER,
EUGENE WILLIAM POCOCK ALVA VEST KING.

Subscription price $1.00 per year, in advance. Single copies, 20c Make all remittances and address all communications to THE AUBURN SEMINARY RECORD, MORGAN HALL, AUBURN, N. Y.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIALS:

The Seminary Camp 425
The Summer School for Laymen 426
The Clark Library 427
Seminary Extension 429

Samuel Miles Hopkins, D. D. Rev. Edward D. Morris, D. D., LL.D. 431
A Machine Made Endowment 450
Reasonable Biblical Criticism .... Prof. Wm. Day Crockett 453

ALUMNIANA 456

SEMINARY ANNALS 479

BOOK REVIEWS 500

Index for this volume will accompany March Number.

Digitized by Google

THE AUBURN SEMINARY RECORD

JANUARY 10, 1913

The Seminary Camp. A new feature in the student life of the Seminary, this year, has been the establishment of a Seminary Camp. The suggestion first came to the students from President Stewart. His thought was that the students needed some easily accessible place where they could get away from the school atmosphere for a longer or shorter period and enjoy living close to nature, and thus refresh themselves for their school work. The thought was somewhat new, and though it was received a little timidly at the first suggestion, it soon came to be a matter of deep interest and great popularity among the men.

Soon after initiating the subject Dr. Stewart intimated that a suitable place could possibly be secured, namely, the large twelve-room cottage at Edgewater on Lake Owasco owned by the Woman's Union of Auburn and used by them during the summer as a vacation camp. The offer was accepted by the students and plans were made to put the camp into practical use. One group spent a part of the Thanksgiving recess there and others were at the camp for different periods during the holidays.

So far the results of the camp have proved it to be an extremely enjoyable and practical institution. For some of the students it has been their first experience in camp life, and all who have taken a part in it have returned to the Seminary freshened and invigorated in mind and body. To know how to chop wood and prepare his own meals is indeed practical, for many a Seminary man has found such skill very useful at times in the years after he has gone out into his work.

Another point in favor of the camp is that it furnishes a

Digitized by Google

SAMUEL MILES HOPKINS, D. D.

A Memorial Address by Rev. Edward D. Morris, D. D., LL. D., delivered at Auburn Seminary, May Fifth, 1902

The manuscript of this address only recently came into the possession of the Seminary. Notwithstanding the fact that it is ten years old, THE RECORD is justified by many considerations in giving it a place in its pages. Among these considerations are the facts that it is an appreciation of one of Auburn's most brilliant professors, by one of Auburn's oldest and most distinguished alumni; it contains much valuable historical material which ought to be preserved in a permanent form; and it has intrinsic merit of more than passing interest fo Auburn men, which has waited all too long for publication.—EDITORS.

The almost simultaneous passage of two venerable men from the earthly into the immortal life, after a little less than half a century of official connection in one instance and a little more in the other, including their lingering sunset when the years of activity were well ended, is an event which makes the year recently closed one that will be ever memorable in the history of Auburn Seminary. An event so impressive never occurred before during the eighty years of its existence, nor is such an event likely to occur for a century to come. And we may well pause with tender interest and reverence, as we behold these two men, long conspicuous in their several spheres, at last bowed under the weight of years, yet strong in the hope which our Holy Faith warrants, passing within the parting veil, and disappearing finally from our earthly vision. Both of them born before the Seminary was founded, they lived and labored together within it during the larger part of its organic life, freely pouring their own vitality into its veins, rejoicing always in its beautiful development as few others could, and breathing upon it at the last their saintly benediction. Precious heritage to this beloved institution are such reverenced personalities and a relationship so remarkable and so gracious.

For one of these venerated teachers a memorial service, in

Digitized by Google

fitting recognition of his valued labors within the Seminary and in other relations, and of the beautiful character which hung about him like a holy robe, has already been held and is still tenderly remembered. For the other, a similar service with equal propriety has been appointed, and the solemn hour of commemoration has now come. By the invitation of the Faculty, one who more than half a century ago was his pupil, and for several years thereafter in a sense his pastor, and always since then his attached friend, gratefully accepts the privilege of sharing in this service and here laying his simple laurel on the grave of an instructor at whose feet he sat so long ago with youthful interest, and for whose personality he has always cherished high regard.

SAMUEL MILES HOPKINS was born in Geneseo, N. Y., August 8, 1813, and died in Auburn, October 29, 1901, in the eighty-ninth year of his life. His father, whose full name he bore, was born of Puritan ancestry in Connecticut, and was a member, though he was not graduated in the class of 1791, in Yale College, from which institution he received, in 1828, the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws—a lawyer of special ability, at one time judge of the Circuit Court of New York, a member of congress and of the state legislature, and an author of repute on various topics of legal and public importance. The son, receiving into his vivid nature the stimulation of such a parentage, also sought the advantage of a classical education, and after due preparation studied awhile in Yale, but afterwards in Amherst, where he entered consciously on the Christian life, and where he was finally graduated in 1832. His theological training he received mainly in Auburn, but in part at Princeton Seminary, graduating there shortly before the death of his father, in 1837—the year of the lamentable disruption in the Presbyterian Church.

Influenced by the positive conservatism of his father whom he greatly revered and whose advice had led him to exchange Auburn for Princeton—influenced also by his conscious revolt

Digitized by Google

against the somewhat erratic revivalism current in the region where he lived, young Hopkins became at this stage an avowed conservative in theology, and this tendency was much confirmed by breathing awhile the Princeton atmosphere, and through his contact with Drs. Alexander and Miller, and their younger associates in the Princeton Faculty. He was even inclined on his return home after graduation to justify or at least to palliate the Act of Excision, but the earnest condemnation of that act by his father as a procedure unwarranted by the Constitution of the Church, and in itself revolutionary and uujust, soon led him to adopt the view of it to which he afterward adhered tenaciously down to the close of his life, and to which he was wont on occasion to give very positive utterance. Residing in the vicinity he was probably an observer of the noted Auburn Convention which sat during the summer of that eventful year, with the venerable Richards as its Moderator, and such men as Lyman Beecher and Samuel Hanson Cox and others of like prominence among its members; and probably through such observation and contact he soon came to see and appreciate the rightness of the position assumed by the Convention, and by consequence to realize the wrong of the Excision against which its solemn and forceful protest was uttered.

The historic Declaration of Doctrine adopted by that Convention had first been presented to the excinding Assembly as an answer to the charges of heresy brought against the excluded party, and as proof of their loyal adhesion to the doctrinal system set forth in the church symbols. It was accepted and proclaimed by the Convention as decisive evidence that the churches and ministers excinded were neither Pelagian nor Arminian as had been alleged, but were truly Calvinistic according to the standards, and therefore entirely worthy of ecclesiastical recognition in the Presbyterian household. This was the primary office of that remarkable document, and thirty years later, after a generation of debate, its claim was recognized as valid and beyond challenge. At the

Digitized by Google

same time the Declaration was as remarkable for its reticence and its omissions as for what it affirmed; it was as broad and free as it was considerate in its statements; it allowed just room for variety in belief at several points where rigid uniformity had been demanded—such as the divine motive in the permission of sin, and the nature and reach of the atonement. In many of its balanced and guarded propositions it revealed the influence of the Edwardean as distinguished from the Turretinian type of Calvinism, and without being formally set up as a commentary on the symbols, it laid a broad foundation for that strong, practical, spiritual theology which was the life and the glory also of the new Church created through the Disruption.

When the youthful minister entered upon his first pastorate at Corning in 1839, that church was just coming into distinct consciousness. The effort to retain its place and heritage in the ancestral abode had been with sorrow and with reluctance abandoned: the entrance upon a new and independent career had been, all too sadly, recognized as necessary and imperative. By degrees, during the years that followed, down to the close of the first decade in its brief but suggestive and fruitful life (1837-1848), the process of organizing the new communion went steadily on. Its churches and ministers gradually settled themselves into their proper Presbyterial relations, the consciousness of unity in belief, purpose, spirit, increased as time advanced; inspiring signs of a broadening obligation and of a brightening opportunity became more and more manifest. There were indeed, not only theologic disputes, partisan jealousies, ecclesiastical struggles for influence and supremacy, but also the rending of churches in sunder, the rupture of family ties, and widespread alienation in many communities, darkening the very sky, and giving to the movement of the young church the aspect of a pilgrimage through a starless night. Yet the formative process continued to advance, mainly through the progressive unification of those who were heartily engaged in the organization, partly by the

Digitized by Google

elimination of uncongenial elements, partly through the gradual introduction of machineries needful to the denominational development. It was also aided in large degrees by manifestation of almost continental interest in the movement, and the addition of Synod to Synod and of state to state, until at the end of the decade the new church seemed almost ready to cope with the old in the task of winning the entire nation for Christ. So have I seen a staunch vessel on a stormy ocean, at times swayed and racked by assailing winds, almost submerged at times by turbulent waves, yet remaining steadfast in its appointed course, impelled by an interior energy as by some conscious purpose, and moving onward, dauntless and sure toward its predestined harbor.

Such was the denominational situation when Mr. Hopkins in 1847, at the age of thirty-four, exchanged the pastoral office for what was to be his sphere of service for Christ and the Church during the large remainder of his life. How ardently, during his pastorate of four years at Corning and his second pastorate at Fredonia, he had proclaimed the faith of the new communion and in every available way advocated its cause, we may easily conceive. And how heartily, as he entered on his new calling, he gave himself to the task of building up the Seminary as a needful adjunct to the Church, and of defending and exalting the Church in the interest of the Seminary as for other reasons, is well known to those who are familiar with his teaching and service during the twenty years that followed, before the union of the two Presbyterian bodies in 1869. Perhaps it is impossible for those who were born under the mellow light of that union, and are enjoying the relative measure of peace and concord which the union was designed to secure—impossible to appreciate as fully as they ought the labors and the sacrifices, the patience and fidelity of the Christian men, who in various spheres, endeavored for a whole generation to build up the younger of those churches into maturity and fruitfulness, and who at the last consented, not

Digitized by Google

without tears, to see that Church passing out of organic existence in the hope and anticipation of a larger good to be attained through its dissolution.

Some brief reference to the Faculty of the Seminary at the time when Professor Hopkins entered upon his work as a teacher, seems essential here. The Senior Professor, Dr. Henry Mills, who had received his education at Princeton College and had served as a tutor there before the Seminary at Princeton was founded—who had studied theology after the manner of the time under the tuition of the venerated Dr. Richards, and had afterwards for five years or more been a pastor in New Jersey, had entered upon his duties as Professor of Biblical Literature as early as 1821, and for more than a quarter of a century had stood faithfully in his place—a devout man of unchallenged orthodoxy, moderate in his views and positions, scholarly and exact and suggestive in his teaching, genial in manner as he was at heart, gracious in temper and purpose, but already verging toward the close of his active service seven years later. The death of Dr. Richards, in 1843, had brought into the chair of Christian Theology one who was well prepared by antecedent, training and experience to fill the vacancy providentially created—Dr. Laurens Perseus Hickok, who after graduating from Union College in 1820 had, like Dr. Mills, studied theology in private, like him had spent several years as a pastor, and for eight years had filled successfully the theological chair in Western Reserve College—a man of very considerable attainments in both theology and philosophy, of marked originality and vigor of thought, of decided ability in the pulpit, and of commanding personality and influence in the Seminary and also in the region, except perhaps among the small number who regarded his teaching as too strongly tinctured by his New England origin and associations. President Dwight of Yale recently said in a private letter that Dr. Taylor, who was for forty years the theological instructor in the Yale Divinity School, was the most

Digitized by Google

magnetic and stimulating teacher he had ever come in contact with in America. The students who enjoyed the mental and moral discipline under Dr. Hickok—who were taught by him to think, to analyze and reason, to organize truth systematically, and faithfully to hold and state the Christian doctrine in its most rational and persuasive form—could bear equal testimony to the stimulation and the magnetism, and the practical and spiritual quality also, of his work in Auburn Seminary. After half a century it is a welcome privilege to place this wreath of respect and of grateful affection upon his tomb.

Just as Professor Hopkins received his election, Dr. Baxter Dickinson, a teacher and preacher of special ability, best known to many as the chief compiler of the Auburn Declaration, who after filling for four years the chair of Sacred Rhetoric and Pastoral Theology in Lane Seminary, had held the same position for an equal period in Auburn, resigned and retired finally from the service. The vacancy was not filled until the following year (1848) when Dr. Joseph Fewsmith, a graduate of Yale who had studied theology under Dr. Hickok in Western Reserve College, and who brought into the position an experience of some years in the pastorate, was chosen to fill the place—a cultured and estimable man who speedily won all hearts by his Christian character and bearing as well as by his teaching, but who after three years of experiment preferred to return to the pastoral relation in which he labored efficiently for many years, until his decease.

These were the men with whom Professor Hopkins was for a brief period to be associated. The period was far too brief; change after change soon followed, involving serious consequences to the bereaved institution. When in 1851, Dr. Fewsmith resigned his chair, the vacancy was filled after a year, by the election of Professor W. S. I. Shedd, whose brilliant and forceful instructions in that department are still remembered, but who, in 1854, accepted the chair of Church

Digitized by Google

History in Andover, and after eight years of successful service there as a historian of rare ability, crowned his life by many years in Union Seminary, first, as Professor of Biblical Criticism, but chiefly as Professor of Systematic Theology—a scholar of the highest rank whose departure from earth the American Church has not yet ceased to mourn. In 1852, Dr. Hickok, making what was regarded by many as a serious mistake on his own account, and which certainly involved grievous disaster to the Seminary, accepted the vice-presidency, and afterwards the presidency, of Union College from which he was graduated, and where the remainder of his active life was passed—a step that involved his leaving a sphere in which, like the revered Richards, he might have continued to serve the Church with steadily increasing influence and usefulness for many long years. His retirement was followed by the election the same year, of Dr. Clement Long who had been the successor of Dr. Hickok in the Western Reserve College, but who retired from the service in Auburn after two short years, and was succeeded in 1854 by Dr. Edwin Hall. In that year, the venerable Dr. Mills, after thirty-three years of valuable service, terminated his active relationship to the Seminary, and the vacancy was supplied the same year by the election of Professor Huntington who filled the place so long and so successfully. To complete the story of change, it should be mentioned that on the retirement of Professor Shedd, Dr. Jonathan B. Condit was called from the Chair of Sacred Rhetoric and Pastoral Theology in Lane, as Dr. Dickenson had been called before him, to fill the same position in Auburn. Thus within seven short years after Professor Hopkins began his work, the Faculty with which he was first associated had entirely disappeared, three other professors had come and gone, and three new professors, Hall and Huntington and Condit, now filled the vacated places. As a natural consequence of such sweeping changes, the number of students fell away largely, and the general interests of the Seminary suffered a serious decline.

Digitized by Google

Professor Hopkins was elected, as his two predecessors had been, to the Chair of Ecclesiastical History and Church Polity, and from first to last he had charge of these two departments of study, in some aspects related, but in others quite separate. This arrangement had existed from the earliest period, Dr. Matthew La Rue Perrine from 1821 to 1836, and Dr. Luther Halsey, from 1837 to 1844, having given instruction in both departments. But for three years after the resignation of the latter incumbent, only provisional arrangements for such instruction could be made, and when the young professor entered upon his task, both departments were in need of fresh organization, and of a restoration to that measure of prominence which under both Perrine and Halsey they had previously reached.

It was natural that Church Polity rather than Ecclesiastical History should have become the more conspicuous discipline. While the latter study was comparatively in its infancy, so far at least as its treatment in the theological seminaries was concerned, the former had evoked considerable attention, and in many quarters become the center of intense discussion. The claim of a *jure divino* authoritativeness had been ardently urged by both Episcopacy and Independency as well as Roman Catholicism, and there were not wanting those who maintained that the Presbyterian was the only polity which could justify itself by Holy Writ. And within the domain of Presbyterianism many serious and practical issues were current,—especially such as had grown out of the disruption, and such as had arisen while the New Church was developing into form and system. It was natural therefore that in both directions the mind of the young professor, coming into his chair from a region where such problems were constantly discussed, often with great earnestness, should have granted to Church Polity the prominence which not only marked his earlier teaching, but may be said to have remained as a special feature of his instruction, even down to the end of his professorial service.

Digitized by Google

He was constitutionally as well as by conviction an ardent opponent of hierarchy in whatever guise. The Roman polity as it was developed historically into the imperialism of Leo and Hildebrand and their successors in the papal see, he intensely abhorred as a human usurpation, blasphemously claiming supremacy within the Church of Christ. While he was wont to sketch with graphic skill the career of the great popes individually, the evolution of the governmental scheme, the gradual rise of what he recognized as the grandest and strongest ecclesiastical organism among men, he never swerved from the belief that, although the Church of Rome ought not to be regarded as a synagogue of Satan, papacy itself is a dreadful, a Satanic delusion. For Episcopacy, especially so far as it manifested itself on one side in the claim of divine prerogative and the refusal to recognize other communions with their ministers as true churches, and so far as it decorated itself on the other with robes and sacerdotalisms and occupied itself with spectacular demonstrations, he had almost equal dislike—often manifesting his conviction in sarcasm and invective hardly less intense. This was the more striking when set in contrast with that special regard for form in worship, for the stately liturgies and dignities of the Anglican service, which he had imbibed possibly while serving as tutor in Hobart College, and to which he often gave public expression in his later years, especially in his compilation published in 1883, *General Liturgy and Book of Common Prayer.*

If he was opposed to hierarchal or prelatic pretension appearing in other quarters, he was no less but rather the more hostile to it when it revealed itself in Presbyterianism. The assumptions of the Westminster Assembly wherein it arrogated to itself the supremacy which it had condemned in Episcopacy, he was always prone to criticise, and to whatever of like character appeared in the Form of Church Government as devised by that Assembly, he was a resolute opponent. It may be said in general that a polity which has in it so many

Digitized by Google

delicate checks and balances—which aims so carefully to protect at once the rights of the individual believer, or church, or Presbytery, and the supreme jurisdiction of the whole Church in matters of faith or of practice, but which is of necessity more or less imperfect both in conception and in application, exposes even its most thoughtful and candid adherents to mistake or even to serious error in practical administration. In their actual working, all forms of church polity sometimes make their infirmities manifest, and from that liability even our Presbyterianism is not exempt. Under its training it is possible on one side to produce a technical and rigid class of adherents, as narrow and zealous as they are dogmatic, ready to suspect their brethren if they swerve by ever so little from the Standards as they interpret them, and prompt to pronounce upon every aberration, the ecclesiastical anathema. It is also possible on the other side to produce an equally unlovely class who, having volunteered adhesion to the system, are quick to violate their own covenant by criticising it and resisting its fair application, who are ready to scoff at the Symbols which they have publicly declared themselves to believe, and are prompt in advocating revolution whenever the polity of the Church conflicts with their own belief, or feeling, or interest.

That the independence of spirit derived from his Puritan ancestry, and the love of liberty which was a part of his very nature, inclined Professor Hopkins to moderate or low rather than high, technical, rigid conceptions of the Presbyterian system, is quite manifest. That in the ardor of advocacy, he sometimes enunciated opinions or proposed measures which the conservatism, almost always dominating in Presbyterian circles, could not adopt or even admit by tacit approval, is certainly no less manifest. A strict constructionist by conviction and habit, he never ceased even in the latest years of his life to condemn the Excision of 1837 as both unwarranted by the Constitution and in itself revolutionary. His chief concern respecting the Union of 1869,

Digitized by Google

and afterward respecting the effort in the interest of Revision, lay in the serious query whether these transactions might not tend to limit rather than expand the area of denominational freedom. Some more recent occurrences in ecclesiastical administration, which seemed to him to be carrying churchly authority beyond legitimate bounds, excited in his breast what might be deemed by many an extreme radicalism. But his admirable *Manual of Church Polity*, published in 1878, before such issues had arisen, illustrates both his general theory of that polity, and his sound views respecting its wise and righteous administration.

The informal but deeply interesting Memoir which Dr. Hopkins wrote out in later life for his children, contains an impressive statement of the feeling and purpose with which he entered on his labor in the department of Church History. It was his earnest desire, as he declares, not only to restore this study to the degree of prominence it had previously held in the Seminary, but to give it a greater and even a commanding place among the disciplines of the theologic course. In estimating his work in that department, it should be borne in mind that, although this study had from the beginning held in the various seminaries a recognized place, it was generally regarded as at best a coördinate, sometimes as a merely adjunctive discipline, to be provided for as the exigencies of each institution in other directions might require. It is doubtful whether it was made anywhere the sole work of an instructor prior to 1850; at that date, such instruction even at Yale was in the hands of the Professor of Latin in the college. The splendid evolution which the department has more recently enjoyed, was at that period an unanticipated possibility. Even in Germany the development had but just begun, under the quickening touch of Neander and his school of disciples. Milman had but just published in England his notable History of Christianity. The great historical works of Mosheim had but recently been translated from the Latin original, and the small compend by

Digitized by Google

Murdock was almost the only available text-book. Smith and Shedd and Schaff had not then furnished those contributions to the department which have made their names memorable in the annals of American scholarship. Specific branches such as the history of doctrine, of philosophy as related to the faith of the Church, of ritual and worship, of the four great polities, of the Christian life in its multiform phases, were nowhere thoroughly discussed. In a word, the entire historical discipline half a century ago was only in an infantile stage of development.

Of the historical instructions of Professor Hopkins during his earlier years of service, memory chiefly recalls his vivid portrayals of great church leaders such as Origen, Augustine, Ambrose, Aquinas, Luther, Calvin, and his graphic accounts of notable events and movements such as the Rise of Monasticism, the Evolution of the Papacy, the Crusades, Scholasticism and the Reformation. It was rather in the presentation of such specific topics than in the delineation of the one organic, complex, magnificent growth of the Church through the interaction of a multitude of human agencies, and the superintending energies of the Spirit of God supreme over all, that his interest seemed then to be chiefly centered, and the deepest impressions were made on the young minds at that time listening to his teaching. In any company of such minds it must be confessed that there are always some who have neither the historic temper and appetite, nor the ability to appreciate instructions of this class, and doubtless, there were times when the youthful teacher grew discouraged in the presence of such indifference, and was even tempted to surrender the vocation to which he had been called. Such is too often the experience, even in theological schools, of those who are laboring as earnestly as he, and in other departments than his, to convey useful information and to discipline well those under their regimen for the functions and responsibilities of ministerial life.

Early in his career of service in this department, Professor

Digitized by Google

Hopkins delivered full courses of lectures on Jewish Antiquities and on Biblical Geography and Chronology, as preparatory especially to the study of the history of the Church as recorded in the Scriptures. Respecting his general work during the generation and more that followed those earlier years, it need only be said here that he was always intelligent and zealous in the effort to erect Church History into an independent and commanding department in the Seminary culture,—that his personal reading and studies in this were unintermittent, and his attainments were steadily multiplying,—that the years added to his conscious mastery of the great theme, and to his ability to impart valuable knowledge respecting it to others,—and that his instructions continued to an unusual degree to be fresh, invigorating, helpful, to the end. Yet he was ever ready to admit that the history of the Christian Church is a topic too vast to be exhausted by any single mind, though it should have half a century to work in, and his teaching habitually had an aspect of humility and candor natural to one who felt himself still a learner, only a little in advance of those who came to his classroom for instruction.

It is to be regretted that so little of all that he knew and taught has ever passed into printed form; even his monograph on "Augustine and the Pelagian Controversy," once prepared for publication but never issued, would have been a valued relic as illustrative alike of his historic temper and his literary methods. One of his productions, happily preserved in type, is his fine address delivered in 1872, before the General Assembly by special appointment, on the "Reformation in France and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew." Among his articles in our Review, one especially worthy of mention is that on the "Synod of Dort in its Relations to the Reformed Faith." His fine paper on "Liturgy" in the Encyclopedia of Schaff is still another illustration of what he might have done, had he been inclined to that form of literary service. But he lives chiefly and

Digitized by Google

will long live in the annals of Auburn Seminary as a diligent and stimulating teacher; and his influence and instructions live and will long live as quickening forces in many lives.

The general scholarship of Professor Hopkins, his unusual attainments in various directions, his broad literary culture, his living interest in all learning and knowledge, were conspicuous characteristics which can only be alluded to here. While disinclined to mathematical and metaphysical studies, he was a fine classical scholar; was familiar with German, French, Italian, Spanish, and read extensively in these languages as in the classics—read largely also in lines outside of his professorial studies, and thus made himself specially familiar with the best literature of many lands. His four journeys abroad, visiting most of the countries of Europe, and extending in one instance to Egypt and to the Holy Land, added much both to his personal information and to his ability to interest and instruct other minds. Though a graduate of Amherst, he became an adopted son of Yale, receiving from the college in 1835 the special degree of Master of Arts; and in recognition of his place and standing as a Professor, he also received the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity, first from Amherst in 1854, afterward from Union College in 1858. Though disinclined to take part in ecclesiastical affairs, excepting where some issue arose that excited special interest in his mind, his representative position in the Seminary and the Church led to his election in 1866, as Moderator of the General Assembly—a dignity which had befallen no less than five of the Professors of Auburn before him. His sermon at the opening of the next Assembly, when the matter of union between the New and the Old Churches had become one of absorbing interest, was a characteristic discussion of the "Wants and Duties of Our Own Church." Some references in it to the assumptions of Episcopacy became the occasion of comment and debate in the religious press. His notable discourse on the history of Presbyterianism from the period of the Revolutionary war

Digitized by Google

to the constituting of the first General Assembly in 1789, delivered at Philadelphia by the appointment of the Assembly and printed with other papers in the volume of Centennial Historical Discourses, contains some passages which are quite significant as to his denominational attitude and loyalty. There is no doubt that he loved his Church, loved it strongly and constantly, though quite alive to its defects—loved it with a passionate desire that it might become, like the Church of Scripture, a glorious Church without spot or wrinkle or any such thing.

Yet such ardor of affection did not deter him from differing occasionally and sometimes radically on particular measures or issues, from the judgment of his brethren, or even from the judgment of the Church itself. Descended from a distinctively Puritan ancestry, he was himself largely a Puritan in temper—so far at least as fidelity to his personal convictions was concerned. He formed his own opinions, perhaps too spontaneously at times, not always accurately, but always independently and always conscientiously, and when once they were formulated, he adhered to them with a truly Puritan positiveness and vigor, no matter how far they might diverge from the opinions of others, or how strenuously they might be assailed. Liberty—liberty, as against anything like undue authority, especially within the ecclesiastical sphere—liberty, as involving the right not only to hold essential truth, but also to affirm with unlimited freeness whatever is upheld—was his constant watchword and law. Like his pious ancestors, he feared God and feared God only; he desired to know what God taught and cared to know little, at times too little, about what men might think. To those who are familiar with his course in all such matters, illustrations of this statement are needless. And surely it is always pleasant to contemplate a man who knows just what he believes and why he believes it, and who is loyal to his beliefs, carry him whither they may. The Presbyterian Church in all its broad domain has no adherents of a worthier

Digitized by Google

type or of greater practical usefulness than men of just this stamp. That he was such a man, we may be well assured, vividly verifying in himself the old version of the Psalm,

> Who sticketh to God in stable trust,
> As Zion's mount he stands full just;
> Which moveth no whit, nor yet doth reel,
> But standeth forever as stiff as steel.

A man of such temperament and habitude of mind, set in such relations, is sure to be more or less involved in controversy. Conservatism is never liberal, and rarely indulgent—especially where the parties concerned are living together a little uncomfortably within the same ecclesiastical tent. Positiveness on one side arouses obstinacy on the other, and obstinacy when it is finished bringeth forth deadly antagonism. Zealous advocacy of cherished opinions is easily interpreted as partisanship, and is consequently opposed by what is real partisanship, often narrow and prejudiced not only against the opinions advanced, but against him who affirms them. Dr. Hopkins was never afraid, as he once said, to stand in a minority, since, as he added, he had lived to see a good many minorities grow into majorities. He was ready at any time, perhaps too ready sometimes, to do battle for what he believed, but he was a generous warrior, giving and taking hard blows without rancor, and at the end harboring little real bitterness of spirit. Like most men of his temperament, he was not circumspect always as to the conditions amid which such conflict was to be carried on; his keen wit, his incisive sarcasm, and his remarkable powers of intense expression sometimes stood in the way of the victory he sought; he did not always look carefully enough at all sides of the matter, and occasionally he failed to estimate duly the force of him that, in the phraseology of our Lord, cometh against him with twenty thousand. Himself frank and open even in battle, he expected like openness and frankness in others, and was more than once deeply wounded by the absence of such

Digitized by Google

qualities where he had the right to expect their generous exercise. But why need we linger here? The noises of controversy die away as the evening of age draws on, and partisanship suppresses its clamors at the open grave:

> There comes a good hour when conflicts must cease;
> When the soft light of eternity flashes,
> There is nothing to do but to whisper of peace,
> For none can make war on a handful of ashes.

There remains much that might properly be said, did the occasion permit, respecting the relations of Dr. Hopkins to the Seminary and its Faculty, to the Christian churches of the city, and to the educational and moral interests of this community—much that might be said in regard to his views and course in public and national affairs, and to his ardent Americanism—much concerning his intellectual aptitudes, his æsthetic tastes, his love of plants and flowers, his intense interest in nature, his enjoyment of outdoor activity and sport, his keen pleasure in his summer cottage beside the lake—much in respect to his tender love of home and family, his fatherly ministries in a hundred ways to the enjoyment and training of his children, his facile interest in childhood universally, and his marked attractiveness of person and manner to the young and the old alike—much regarding his beneficient ministries to the poor and the unfortunate, his sympathetic and buoyant outlook upon life generally, and his earnest endeavor to live out a manly and upright character before the world. All this must of necessity be waived, but we may linger for a moment further upon the period of his retirement from active service, his years of peaceful decadence, and the ending of the prolonged sunset in his falling on sleep.

The daily and even the annual life of an instructor in such a position as he so long occupied, contains but little that can be told. Classes come, take their places, pass under the assigned regimen, and go out after a while, with the benediction of their teacher upon them, to fill their ordained

Digitized by Google

spheres of service—utilizing in part what they have learned, perhaps in part forgetting it, though its influence may survive as a silent force through their active ministry. But he goes on and on in his allotted work, through the earlier years of youthful enthusiasm, through the years of maturer growth and power, through the added years of toil and strain incident to declining vitality, until at length the hour of retirement draws on, and the old man realizes that for him life is at last practically ended. It is given to few, as it was to Dr. Hopkins, to continue in a task so complex, so delicate, so exhausting, down to the end of the eighth decade of life—so remarkably free meanwhile from those multitudinous aches and pains which in many cases creep through or rush through the aged and worn bodily organism. In his case there were trials as well as labors to be borne. As far away as 1855 memory recalls an infant child, bearing his own name, graced with the seal of baptism in its last hours, and tenderly carried from his home to its grave. In 1872, a young daughter whom he fondly cherished and concerning whom he had special hopes, was transplanted from this world into another—a loss which he never ceased to mourn. In 1885, in the decease of his beloved wife, there fell upon him what is the sorest of all earthly bereavements, and for sixteen years thereafter he lived in a sacred loneliness which only those who have experienced like affliction can ever appreciate. In 1898, an endeared son, in whose work and prospects he felt a keen paternal pride, was taken away in the midst of his professional course. So sorrow and service, service and sorrow, were intermingled during the prolonged period of his active career, and down through the years of resting and waiting until the end came. For that end he had long been looking, especially after he had the greater leisure to contemplate its solemn approach and to gird himself for the supreme event. And when the decisive hour came, with serenity and with hope, the minister, teacher, scholar, Christian, gathered his robes about him and ascended unto God.

Digitized by Google