

He got the test he had had the year before, and did not even notice it and went back and wrote his exam. There was Dr. Loetcher who taught Church History, whose son taught Church History after him. Dr. Loetcher hated premillennialism. He was always knocking premil. You couldn't be sure-- he was always praising Calvin, but when it came to almost any other doctrine you could not be sure where he stood. For instance, he would say, 'The heterodoxy of today is the orthodoxy of tomorrow, but of course that doesn't mean every heterodoxy including the Fosdickian is going to become ^a orthodox.' So

Neher: What's Fosdickian?

AAM: Fosdick. Most of the professors there were members of the Presbytery of NJ and when there would be a vital issue in the Presbytery as between conservatives and liberals, half the faculty would go there and vote conservative and half would go and vote liberal-- I don't mean liberal in doctrine, but liberal in organizational things. But Dr. Loetcher would go and play golf. He said, Church history made him irenic. Those were sad days as the devil just took over that institution and took it away.

Neher: You talked about the pedagogy at Princeton. You think the seminary teaching in general, the ~~style~~ style was that much worse than today or is it just that that school ?

AAM: I'm not sure how much better it is today in lots of ~~ways~~ places. We had a fellow come here who was thinking of coming to seminary in 1952, 1956 it was. He came down to look into the seminary. He was thinking of coming here. He didn't come, but he thought seriously of coming. He was from the state of Washington. He had said he wanted to study under the great scholars who wrote the textbooks. So he went to Yale. This was not seminary. This was college. He had just graduated from college. He was at Yale. He told me, That's why I went to Yale. But, I found that as teachers they were just nothing. He said they wrote wonderful text-books, they were great scholars, but he said unless you were trying to