

theoretically everything was decided by action of the faculty as a whole.

I do not wish to pass judgment on how this system, how good or poor this system was for running the school, ^{but} I will simply point out that it gave me a much greater idea of the problems of seminaries ^{program and} and possible ways of dealing with them than would ordinarily ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ be gained by a teacher in the school with a normal president. I remember for instance one time when Professor ~~Kuiper~~ ^{Kuyper} ~~xi~~ said that he had a letter from someone inquiring whether the seminary taught the limited atonement. The question was, what reply should he give to this man who asked this question. Incidentally the so-called teaching of the ~~xi~~ limited atonement is one which is made something of a banner by the ultra-Reformed.

teaching of the so-called limited atonement is one which is made something

Yet after Kuyper presented the wording he thought should be used, and it was approved by the faculty, what he wrote the man was that the atonement was sufficient for all but efficient for the ~~xi~~ elect. I don't see how anybody could question this statement. Surely nobody no one who believes in election thinks the atonement is effective for anyone except ~~xi~~ those who are to be saved. If the atonement is sufficient for all then there is every reason for us to preach the Gospel in the fullest way possible. This wording would strike right at the root of those who make such a fuss about this, but I heard Dr. Van Til say in later years that hardly ^{could} would a student be in the seminary more than a few days before he would hear discussions about the limited atonement and rarely would one be there a few weeks before he would become a strong promoter of the idea of limited atonement. Well, with this background, and with the complete freedom of being subject to the dead hand of tradition, there was a real freedom in planning the new seminary.

I remember ~~xi~~ one of the traditions at Princeton which I had never heard of before. This was that at the end of a course, at the end of the last class of the course, the students would clap. This of course ~~xi~~ was expressing approval of the course and thanks to the professor. I ^{have (?)} had never seen this done elsewhere. At Princeton it was done at the end of every course. The precedent was continued at Westminster and I confess to having something of a thrill of pleasure at the end of each of my courses, at hearing the students clap loudly as if showing their approval of the way it had been done. (Since the following week in the following ^{week} they would be examined in the course one can question just how fully symptomatic this clapping was ~~xi~~ as to what they really thought about the course, but nevertheless I ~~got~~ derived pleasure each year time it occurred at the end of one of my courses. When we started Faith nobody thought of this. Actually we had very few students who came with us. The largest class by far was the entering, I think much larger than the other two put together, and this precedent simply died as far as Faith was concerned.