

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY  
AND  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

---

NEW SERIES, No. 5.—JANUARY, 1873.

---

ART. I.—BERKELEY'S PHILOSOPHY.\*

BY REV. JAMES MCCOSH, D.D., LL.D., President of Princeton College.

THIS work has been a labor of love on the part of the editor. He has evidently spent years upon it, and we are reaping the benefit. He has taken immense pains in collating the published works of Berkeley, in searching for manuscripts, and in collecting all that can be known of the man. Much of the new matter is of no great value, as for example the letters, chiefly on business, to Mr. Prior, and his Sermons and Notes of Sermons, which are common-place enough. Others are of inestimable worth, such as his Common-Place Book, in which, as in a glass, we see the rise of his speculations. I have read it with as much interest as I felt years ago on inspecting in Dresden the first sketches which Raphael drew of his great master-pieces. The edition is already the standard one and will never be superseded. The notes of the editor, which are numerous, are sometimes simple enough, and mere repetitions of each other, but are commonly of great utility as connecting the scattered statements of his author on a particular subject. The editor's prefaces constitute a valuable introduction to the treatises. They are always anxiously thoughtful, but they do not clear up the subject. He writes as if he could, if he chose, say something decisive; but as he never chooses, one begins to doubt whether he has anything to say fitted to dispel the mystery. Prof. Fraser does not profess to be an adherent of Berkeley's philosophy, but it is evident that he is strongly prepossessed in its favor. He tells us that Berkeley

---

\* The Works of George Berkeley, by Alexander Campbell Fraser, A M., Professor of Logic and Metaphysic, in the University of Edinburgh, in four vols.

## ART. VII.—BENEFICIARY EDUCATION FOR THE MINISTRY.\*

By LYMAN H. ATWATER, D. D., Princeton.

THE Board of Education finds itself seriously crippled, and without funds to meet the appropriations voted by the Assembly, as they became due. From recent circulars addressed by the Corresponding Secretary to the several Presbyteries and Synods of the church, we learn that the special contribution ordered by the last Assembly to pay previous indebtedness, and the appropriation due May 1st, has, as we now write, been but partially successful. The debt has been paid, but means as yet have not been obtained from it sufficient to pay more than a portion of the May appropriation. The November appropriation of the present year is delayed, and has to be largely met by loans.

We must look for the causes of this appalling deficiency, before we can discover the remedy. It is clearly due to three causes :

1. To the unprecedented increase in the number of candidates for the ministry, who are dependent on the Board for means to prosecute their education. The number is now over seven hundred, and, as the Secretary of the Board, Dr. Speer, informs us, more than double the aggregate number in the late Old and New School churches a few years since. This increase again comes from three, if not more, sources. First is the general and rapid expansion of the church itself, both in the field previously occupied by it, and the unprecedented enlargement of self-denying pioneer evangelistic work on our ever-advancing frontier, in our vast interior, and on the Pacific slope. Next are the German schools theologic, if not the academic, especially the German theological seminaries at Newark and Dubuque, whose students, almost without exception, are unable to pursue their studies without this aid. No church-work in this country is now more

---

\* Fifty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Presented to the General Assembly at Detroit, May, 1872.

Fifty-sixth Annual Report of the Directors of the American Education Society. Presented May 29, 1872.

important than German evangelization. This must be very limited without a German ministry trained in this country. And such a ministry cannot be provided unless assisted in training themselves for the work. The third source of increase is the freedmen who are in various training schools for the ministry, and whose indigence is too obvious to admit any question as to the necessity of aiding them in preparing for it. Nor will any intelligent person question the great importance of rapidly advancing the numbers, the education, and the intelligence of the colored preachers of the country, as our main reliance under God for christianizing the colored population.

2. The second source of the deficiency in question is the order of the Assembly of 1871, repeated by that of 1872, increasing the allowance to its beneficiaries  $33\frac{1}{3}$  per cent. The increase of the regular contributions to this cause by our church for the last few years, has scarcely been equal to the increase of her beneficiaries. Any deficiency from this cause, however, would have been surmounted without difficulty, had it not been aggravated by the latter. But the two united have thus far proved too formidable to be overcome by any means yet employed for the purpose. No *practical* conviction has yet been wrought in the church, commensurate with the exigency which has arisen from these two causes. Liberality to the Board of Education has indeed increased, but not in any proportion to its increased necessities.

3. This is in some measure due to the fact that the sentiment of opposition to all systematic aid by the church to her indigent candidates for the ministry, has lately found expression and advocacy in quarters fitted to invigorate and embolden it. To a certain extent, of course, we know not how far, this counter current has tended to arrest the increase, if not the continuance, of contributions to this cause. This is its natural and inevitable, whatever the intended, effect. We call this opposition a "sentiment," because we think its deepest root lies in a very natural antipathy to helping young men, supposed, in some occupation at least, to be able to support themselves; and in the want of that thorough comprehension of the subject in all its aspects and bearings which is requisite to a judicial and weighty opinion. We have ourselves seen the time when we shared this prejudice. We can therefore more readily appreciate and allow for it in

others. Longer experience and wider observation have changed all this in our case. As we proceed to state the reasons which have weighed with us, we hope they may have weight with others. It is plain that in regard to the first two sources of present embarrassment, the Presbyteries and General Assembly are responsible, whose orders are imperative upon the Board—the Presbyteries deciding who shall be candidates, the Assembly how much shall be allowed them. The General Assembly is also responsible for laying upon the Board pecuniary obligations which it does not furnish, nor sufficiently stimulate our church to furnish, the means to discharge; in short, for authorizing and enjoining outlays in advance of the liberality of the church.

A little calculation will show that the combined increase of the number of beneficiaries, and of the amounts respectively allowed them, making all due allowance for the increase in the membership and wealth of the church, will require an advance of at least 100 per cent in the average rate of giving to this cause, to provide for it. A part, but a part only, of this indispensable increase has been obtained. The effort to procure the residue is, we fear, much embarrassed by the last of the three causes of present difficulties above noted. The principle of systematic aid to indigent candidates for the ministry, has been questioned in ways and through channels likely to reach and influence some of the largest givers to evangelistic causes, for there is, we repeat it, no cause against which it is easier to kindle the groundless prejudices, alike of the really benevolent, and of those who seek excuses for not giving. And yet we think the arguments advanced in this behalf are quite one-sided and inconclusive. There is indeed just enough basis of fact to give a thin plausibility to them. We freely admit that a few incompetent and unworthy men have contrived to obtain a share of this aid, and will continue to do so under any pre-millennial system of preparing for the ministry, certainly until the ministry itself becomes purged of all weaklings and worldlings. Nay, we admit and contend that the methods and procedures hitherto adopted to prevent or lessen this evil require reconsideration, and that, with the help of due discussion, they probably can be more or less improved, that this whole subject urgently needs the attention of the wisest men in the Church,

that thus we ought to lessen what we cannot wholly prevent. But so to reform and improve is one thing. To destroy the system directly, or indirectly by stopping benefactions to it, is another, and most fatal thing. It kills in order to cure.

1. It is certain that no sufficient supply of liberally educated ministers can be provided, unless indigent candidates for the sacred office can be aided by the Church. This arises from various causes. First, the instances are as rare as noble, in which the sons of abundant wealth and luxury will devote themselves to the laborious and self-denying life of the ministry. They mostly persuade themselves that they can better serve the cause by contributing to sustain others in the work, and to aid them in preparing for it. And even if it be otherwise, they rarely have that robust health, and power of persistent and wearing toil, which are requisite to the due and successful discharge of the office in most places. Nor can the ranks of the ministry be duly replenished by voluntary enlistments of the sons of well-to-do people, who, though not affluent, may and often do, by struggles and self-denial more or less severe, educate at college and professional schools one or more of their offspring. The great majority of this class, even if pious, feel that after the great and self-denying struggle to procure an education, so wearing and exhausting to themselves, and their families as well, they are bound to enter some occupation which promises a more certain, competent and enduring support; first for themselves, and then in many cases to aid in supporting those in the family who may have become straitened and dependent, by their very sacrifices made to educate the favored one. They feel that after the sacrifices already made, they cannot risk all for a precarious clerical support. Nor can the deficiency be supplied by that exceptional class, of which we hear so much and see so few, who, without means of their own, or aid from others, succeed in earning enough to defray the expenses of their education. For ourselves, after an extended experience and special observation in some important colleges and seminaries, we have yet to know the first man who has educated himself without other means than his own earnings during the period of study. We hesitate not to pronounce it utterly impossible, unless by means of some special endowment, and opportunity (as conducting the music of a church on a

handsome salary), without spending so much time and strength in outside labors, as to greatly injure the health or education: probably, as experience has shown, ruin both. We need spend no time to show that no dependence can be placed on this exceptional class, which, scarce as they always were, are and must be now scarcer than ever before, for reasons which will presently appear. At the best, the foregoing classes will only supply ministers enough on the average to fill the more inviting positions in the church, scarcely that. All experience proves this, and none the less, although occasionally those born to affluence and reared in luxury, may make a noble consecration of themselves to missionary and other self-denying work.

The only resource then for an adequate supply of ministers for the missionary, aggressive, and other more arduous service demanded, is for the church to make systematic provision for aiding the due education of those aspirants for the sacred office, who cannot properly prepare themselves for the work without such aid, or without suffering hindrances and drawbacks that go far to neutralize its benefits. We do not mean, of course, all aspirants for it. We mean only duly approved young men of promise, who seek thus to serve the Master, and, so far as human wisdom and vigilance can prevent, no others. We mean not every and all young men making a credible Christian profession, who would like to be ministers, but such only as give such positive and discernable tokens of intellectual, moral, spiritual, and shall we add physical, aptitude for some work in the ministry, as afford a reasonable presumption of a divine call to prepare for it.

It may prevent misconception if, before going further, we define a little more closely what is meant by indigence as related to this subject. It does not mean extreme poverty, or inability to support one's self in any calling. Few beneficiaries come from the absolutely poor and destitute. They are simply poor, relative to being able to spend eight or ten years of the spring time of life, and not merely a hundred, but hundreds of dollars a year, to qualify themselves for the ministry. Many of them are sons of clergymen with a support more or less slender. A few are sons of mechanics who may be pillars in their churches, and yet toil for their daily bread, finding themselves strained to the utmost to obtain a decent living and carry a small policy of

life-insurance. The most, however, come "from that great middle class which is the very strength and backbone of society, and which furnishes the vigorous and successful actors in almost every department of life. These young men are, more often than otherwise, the sons of small farmers, working hard for a livelihood, but lifted above want. Their sons are poor, not in the sense that they are not able to obtain a good living in the common forms of industry, and many of them, like their companions in the same class, would in this way become rich men. But they are *poor, exceedingly poor*, in reference to an enterprise which demands that they shall take ten years of their early life away from productive industry, and make them instead years of heavy expense. A man often congratulates himself proudly that he did not have to call upon any society for help to make himself a successful carpenter, or manufacturer, or tradesman. Very true; and he never had to pass one single year under the conditions in which these men are kept for ten years. The circumstances are entirely different, as any one can easily see who will look at the problem with a fair and candid mind."—*Report of Am. Education Society.*

Arguments, however, are urged in opposition to these views with an earnestness which entitles them to serious consideration. Some of them we will consider.

It said that the secular professions are supplied with ample recruits from volunteers who prepare themselves for the work at their own charge. But it is easy to show that this is true only in part, and that so far as it is true, the case is no way parallel to the ministry. The allegation is untrue, first because all candidates for the other liberal professions, who are furnished with a liberal education, in fact receive a large amount of gratuitous aid. We do not believe there is a college in the land, the students in which do not receive two dollars or more, as the fruit of benefactions to endow and furnish it, for every dollar they pay to support its teachers. The income of the moneys given for the buildings, libraries, apparatus, cabinets and productive funds of such colleges, we think would be nearer five, than two, dollars for one that the students now pay for tuition and other means of instruction. Without such charitable donations and foundations, colleges and liberal education would be simply impossible. Not only so, very large aid is afforded in most colleges by scholar-

ships, the partial or total remission of tuition, and by other donations to indigent and promising students, for whatever profession they may be destined. Many colleges possess some, a few very considerable, permanent funds for this purpose. Very many needy students for secular professions are aided privately by individual benefactions to them. The question, therefore, is not whether indigent students for the ministry shall receive eleemosynary aid in procuring their education while others do not; but whether they shall receive that special systematic aid for a portion of the cost of education, which all churches requiring an educated ministry have found cause to provide.

But still further, a large part of the legal profession, and by far the greater part of the medical, enter them without liberal education, and this, we have abundant cause to know, to the great injury and degradation of their profession.\* In saying this, we only say what their own most eminent members declare. This is none the less true, although there are enough poor physicians and lawyers who have college diplomas, while some are eminent in their professions without that advantage. The same might be said of military and naval officers, educated or not educated at West Point or Annapolis; yet whence have the officers, as a whole, come, who have carried us triumphantly through our wars? At all events, Presbyterians demand a liberally educated ministry, and even then tax its resources to the utmost. And none the less so, although in exceptional cases we have a "bright

---

\* So far as the medical profession is concerned, this is largely due to that impossibility of judging of their knowledge by their patients, which makes it so tempting a field for quackery. With regard to lawyers, so many of whom have political aspirations, it is undeniable that universal suffrage has made success largely dependent on gaining the immense vote of the most ignorant and debased of our varied population. This brings other qualities into requisition besides high education, in order to success; such as wealth, editorial eminence, military power, skill as demagogues, adroitness in touching the lower passions. There yet remains and, we trust, always will remain, among our legislators, a wholesome infusion of men high in culture and statesmanship. But that, from this and other causes, the politics of the country are too largely drifting away from its educated mind, has been remarked by De Tocqueville, and more recently by John S. Mill, and is evident enough from the fact, that, during the senatorship of Samuel L. Southard, one-sixth of the members of the U. S. Senate were graduates of Princeton College; now, Harvard, Yale and Princeton together have less than one tenth of its members among their graduates. Less than half its members are graduates of any college. In the House of Representatives the ratio of college graduates is much lower, only 31 per cent.

particular star" who has risen to eminence in spite of his want of it. There is no parallel, therefore, between them and professions largely filled with men not literally educated.

But this is not all. The legal and medical professions draw not, only or chiefly, from the religious class. They draw also and largely from the much greater worldly, and from the positively irreligious, class. They, therefore, have an immensely greater field from which to enlist volunteers. Withal they do not restrain or hinder their members from engaging in worldly speculations or secular enterprises, to eke out any insufficiency of professional earnings, or to contest with other men for high prizes which tempt covetousness or ambition. On the other hand, the ministry, except its few more lucrative positions, few at best, certainly offers no opportunity for accumulation; too often a scanty support, in our feebler churches and frontier stations, so utterly insignificant and precarious as to mock hunger, and only expose the nakedness it should cover. We shall recur again to the bearing on this subject of the miserable support so largely awarded to the profession. We think it clearly proved, therefore, that the argument against aiding needy candidates for the ministry, from this analogy, utterly fails.

It is sometimes said that the churches in the old country find no difficulty in obtaining an ample supply of educated ministers without this aid. But the fact that in these old and thickly settled countries, there is little missionary ground, few parishes not giving a fair support to their ministers, little uncertain and precarious tenure of charges worthily filled, little that is analogous to our vast frontier stations and new settlements, and far fewer openings for secular adventure and enterprise than are afforded by our great undeveloped country, destroys the supposed analogy, and the argument founded on it.

Nor is the argument from the experience of our own country, prior to the last half century, any more to the purpose. Not only was the foreign work substantially unknown, but the home work was in a vastly smaller relative scale than now. But the average support and permanency of the ministry in rural towns, *i. e.* in the great majority of congregations, was above what it is now, as compared with the average income and style of living of other people, and with the reasonable demands upon each class respectively. It on the whole gave greater security, dignity and

comfort than now. It was less in dollars, but more in purchasing power, as compared with the average standard of expense in living. Aside of all other things, the greater permanency and less precarious tenure of the office, pastorates often lasting for life, gave an immense advantage. Thus the office was relieved of disabilities and drawbacks which now repel many from aiming at it. On the other hand, this diminution in the purchasing power of money, with equal advance in all the standards of decent living, prodigiously increases the difficulties of youth with small means or no means, and of families in slender or moderate circumstances, in bearing the expense of liberal education. Within forty years the tuition fee at Yale College has been trebled, and in most colleges at least doubled. This is only typical of a proportionate average advance in the cost of subsistence, of a general if not equal increase in the price of living in colleges, or elsewhere, of the embarrassments therefrom to be surmounted by families of small means in supporting a son in college. We have lived long enough to see and know that the average country minister of the last generation could sustain his son at college, and pay tuition too, with greater ease than he can do it now and pay no tuition, both because he now finds it more difficult to spare any thing from his salary, and what he does spare by the hardest effort is so much less effective than formerly. The simple fact that the wages of labor, skilled and unskilled, including indispensable domestic service, is never less than double, often triple and quadruple what it was formerly, at once proves and explains all this. For all expense of living is either for labor or the products of labor. The salaries of a large portion of clergymen are now less, often very much less, than the average compensation of good mechanics.

But the supposed analogy between the present and past fails still further, from the lessening of the opportunities for indigent students to help themselves by teaching and otherwise; first, because the main vacations are now during the heated term when nearly all schools and teaching in the country are suspended, then because there is now little demand for teachers of public schools who have not before had special training in normal schools; and, still further, because the curriculum of college studies has been so expanded by the wedging in of new sciences, physical and metaphysical, and of modern languages

and literature, that the good student requires his whole time and thought for the successful pursuit of his studies ; and any serious interruption or addition to his labors makes havoc alike with his education and his health—his capacity for further usefulness. As to other resources for self-help besides teaching, such as clerkships, etc., it is notorious that the crowd into them has of late been so great, that for every vacancy there are scores of applicants, and that only those who have already attained expertness by a previous business training can obtain more than nominal, if any, wages. This was not always so. The causes of this change are obvious and certain, but we have no time to detail them. The fact is enough. All occupations for impecunious gentlemen, or which are more mental than manual, are so over-crowded, that an advertised vacancy is usually answered by applicants enough to bewilder the advertiser. At best, all resources of this kind are slender and precarious, and like teaching, nay, worse than teaching, they consume strength needed alike for study and health. At present, the actual labors of the course of study are all that can prudently and safely be exacted of the student. In a recent number of the *Insurance Monitor*, Rev. Walter Nichols, who was driven by loss of health from a ministry of great promise, at its very beginning, to the editorial desk, has proved, by a wide induction of ascertained facts in regard to the Alumni of Andover, Princeton, and Union Seminaries, that the average mortality of clergymen in the earlier years of their professional life, quite exceeds that of men in other professions and vocations ; while those that survive the exhausting labors incident to this period, exceed the average of other callings, in longevity. The reason he assigns is quite indisputable, viz., that clergymen, unlike other professions, at once enter on the fulness of their labors and responsibilities immediately after their ten years of confinement to preparatory study. If they survive this period, they have accumulated resources and aptitudes which steadily reduce this draft upon their health and strength. Moreover, many of them, after beginning their ministry under pressure of their heaviest labors, are thrown out of place and regular employment just at that age of three-score, when the labors of other professions culminate in amount and intensity. Hence, those who live to this period reach an extra longevity. But the principal

fact remains, that from the depressing effect of their long-continued labors in preparation for the ministry, and the exhaustive labors which attend its early years, the mortality of young clergymen exceeds that of other professions. Is it not, then, the worst conceivable economy to aggravate this prostration and mortality, by burdening the period of training for the ministry with the additional labor of earning the means of support, and the cost of education? Other considerations aside, is it not a most wasteful and destructive procedure?

Nevertheless, with scarce an exception, the beneficiaries, notwithstanding these risks, to our certain knowledge, seek out every opportunity of vacation work, in order to help themselves, and if they fail to find what they would like to do, cheerfully do with their might what their hands find to do. On this subject there is quite too much uncharitable surmising and insinuation. We have been conversant with many of them, and have known few who did not crave chances of employment during their vacations, and at other times, if practicable, to eke out their support. One who had been trained to printing, spends every hour he can spare in a printing office. Another, trained an accountant, spends his vacations, which are needed for rest, in a counting-house, and came back to resume his studies worn down, when he should be recruited in vigor. Others work on farms at harvesting, with more advantage to health; others obtain positions as colporteurs or book-agents. Most toil through their vacations, according to their best opportunities, and to their utmost strength. Some board themselves in their rooms, with great detriment to their health; others get their own board by keeping boarding clubs for others. In all these ways they help themselves, and then, with all the help the church gives or promises them, they can scarcely make ends meet. If the church fails to fulfil these promises, they must give up the effort to be liberally educated, or prosecute it with injury or danger to their education, or to the health and strength left to turn it to account when once gained.

As we now write, a young man of excellent character for piety, talents and scholarship, calls upon us to ask leave of absence from college for the winter, in order to take a school, while he expects to keep up with his class by studying out of school hours. He has no means except his own earnings, and has exhausted the fruits of years of teaching in supporting and preparing him-

self for college, and reaching the present period in his Sophomore year. He has kept along till now by boarding himself at about \$1 per week. He had expected to continue to do it, and meet other expenses, with the aid of the November appropriation of \$40, till January. But that has not come. He has no other means. We loan him something for the present distress, and the Faculty are compelled with great reluctance to let him devote the very heart of the college year to outside labors; as we know, with certain injury to his education, and the more serious peril to his health. Many others, after toiling as above through the summer vacation, are imploring us to find something for them to do, because, greatly as they need all their time for study, dire necessity is laid upon them to provide for the debts incurred by the loss and delay of the appropriations due May 1st and November 1st, not a dollar of which, as we now write (Nov. 15th), has yet been received. (That for Nov. has since come.)

Besides, aid to needy young men in preparing for the ministry is nothing new. Its necessity was perceived and acted on before the era of Boards of Education. Only, in this case, as in that of Missions, Bible circulation, etc., it had not been developed into an organized, systematic shape. Princeton College has a considerable fund, conditioned that its income shall be given to needy students preparing for the Presbyterian ministry, which was given to it before the day of our present Board of Education, and has been religiously applied to this purpose. It was probably, in its day, as much proportioned to the needs of those who then enjoyed its benefits, as the present appropriations of the Board of Education are to its existing beneficiaries. This is but a sample of the private and public aid even then provided for this cause by the friends of Christ.

But, it is said, we have now a surplus of ministers. What we want is not more, but better ones; and better ones can best be otherwise obtained. This allegation is not true in any such sense as to warrant the inference drawn from it.\* It is true indeed that less than half of our churches have regularly installed pastors. It is no less true that nearly one-third have

---

\* *The Presbyterian* of Nov. 9, makes some valuable statistical footings, from the *Minutes* of the Assembly for 1872, which we thus summarize: Total number of churches, 4,730, of ministers, 4,441, of pastoral churches, 2,075, pastors, 1914, churches with stated supplies, 1492, number of stated supplies, 943; thus making

stated supplies, in which quasi form of pastorate, some ministers remain longer over the same flocks than some who are in the more normal relation of pastors by formal installation. It is to be further considered, that more or less churches are always temporarily without either pastors or stated supplies, because they are for the time in transitu, seeking the regular pastors or supplies of which they are for the time destitute. Meanwhile, they are employing a portion of the licentiates or ministers who are without regular charges. Then a very large number of churches are pioneer, missionary, or otherwise weak churches, yet in the germ, too feeble, even with missionary aid, to sustain a settled ministry, and obliged to depend on casual supplies. They thus occupy another portion of those who have attained the degree of W. C., which is far from being always, or even presumptively, as is too often heedlessly and even cruelly implied, a badge of dishonor. It is often a consequent or attendant of most honorable service in the ministry. Then there is the large body of missionaries, and others who are engaged in purely evangelistic work, and set loose from all particular congregations. Who would have presumed to reproach Whitefield, Nettleton, the missionaries who are doing the work of evangelists, before they gather or are set over particular churches, as dishonored W. C.'s? Then comes the long catalogue of those ministers who are serving the church, and their generation in the capacity of teachers and propagators of the truth as it is in Jesus, through the issues of the press, periodical or otherwise, or in some department of Christian education, as their main work, while they do much preaching and other important ministerial service for vacant churches or other fields of evangelism, or for the relief of pastors when unavoidably absent or disabled. Look at the men toiling in the indispensable work of superintending the administration of the different departments of church work. Then consider the number of W. C.'s who are actually employed more or less, and often to the full measure of their strength, in preaching and other ministerial services. How small the re-

---

3557 churches with 2857 ordained ministers over them; churches in some sense vacant, 1173; ministers without charge, 893; professors and teachers, 147; foreign missionaries, 125; home missionaries not otherwise enumerated, 52; secretaries of Presbyterian or other boards and societies, 47; agents, 25; chaplains, 15; city missionaries, 12; editors, 12.

siduum of really unemployed ministers. And this residuum consists of three classes: first, the superannuated, and those disabled by various maladies, who have worn themselves out in the ministry; next, the few who have fallen out of service because they mistook their calling, and who, therefore, ought to be allowed in some regular, orderly manner to demit the exercise of the ministry. But the proportion of such failures in the ministry is much smaller than in any other profession. What a proportion of lawyers or merchants fails? Thirdly, there is the class, unduly large we admit, who being still able and willing, yea, often ardently desirous to continue pastoral work, have been, without serious fault of their own, thrown out of their former charges and are not able to find their way to new places. This happens much more in small and feeble than in strong churches, because here a few, or even a single one, who becomes disaffected, can often render a minister's situation intolerable, and compel him to leave. The very fact too of possessing this power is of itself a temptation to wield it, by parties who would be as quiet as insignificant in large congregations. Not only so. But the material and composition of congregations in our new settlements, and again by emigration from old churches to the frontier, change so rapidly and entirely, that the kind of minister suited to them in one decade, or semi-decade, is often unsuited to them the next. Thus, from these and other causes mostly special to a rapidly growing and changing country, it comes to pass, that many worthy and excellent ministers are set afloat at from fifty to sixty years of age, who find it exceedingly difficult to get settled in new pastorates afterward. This gives origin to many of the stated supplies or vacancies in churches. For the secret of this difficulty we have not far to look. The great majority of churches, especially small churches, while quick to unsettle ministers thus advanced in life, every way worthy and more than worthy of them, are slow to call men to be over them in the Lord who have attained this ripe age, unless they are unusually brilliant and prepossessing. At this period of life too, when all their habits and tastes have been rooted and fixed in our older states, men cannot easily or without peril migrate to the frontiers for a totally different kind of work. Nor will health and strength usually outlive such a change. It is like transplanting old trees; most likely they will not survive. If they do, perchance, they

cannot thrive. Another cause of the increase of this class of ministers is the starveling support granted them, so that, finding themselves unable to support their families and pay their debts, they are driven into other occupations for this purpose. This fact explains in part the rush of candidates to the more desirable vacancies, but only in part. This crowd of candidates is most largely made up, not of W. C.'s, but of those now having pastoral charges and seeking a change. This rush proves no surplus of ministers.

But how does the case of this class of W. C.'s bear upon the question of supplying church aid to needy candidates for the ministry in order to replenish its ranks? Does this state of things attract or repel that class who prepare for professional life at their own charges? Are the future prospects of the ministry, as thus indicated, such as draw or turn back spontaneous recruits? All know its natural effect upon those who are not impelled to the work as by a fire in their bones, so that they say "Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel." It proves that we must draw largely from the ranks of those requiring aid, to carry them through the nine or ten years of expensive preparation for the ministry, such as are ready thus to "endure hardness as good soldiers of Jesus Christ."

Again, this view is supported by the experience of other Christian bodies who demand an educated ministry, and by the course of the State with reference to the training of her military and naval officers. Long experience has proved that the State cannot supply itself with officers and commanders adequate to large and successful military operations, except as it trains them in its own schools and at its own expense. It is notorious that the Roman Catholic Church provides itself in this way with a priesthood, which, however faulty according to our standard, is indisputably efficient, and amply furnished with able and brilliant leaders. We have known instances of candidates for the ministry attracted from Presbyterian to Episcopal training schools, by the more generous assistance there provided, sometimes not less than \$300 per annum. It is even so in the various branches of the Reformed and Evangelical Church. The Congregationalists, after an experience of nearly half a century, in the early stages of which the system was brought under a shadow by the over-

doing and other oversights in the conduct of it, such as are incident to the inexperience of all new undertakings, have been gradually but surely restoring the American Education Society, and other like agencies for this end, to more than their former vigor. It has passed the stage of partial eclipse and embarrassment with which ours has been threatened. After trying the effects of first supporting and then partially abandoning it, the final and deliberate conclusion is, that it must be fully and permanently sustained, in order to supply a ministry adequate to the wants and growth of the denomination. It never was on so firm a footing as now. It aids three hundred and fifty young men. This, too, let it be noted, in a denomination covering those sections of country, and including that order of people, which from various causes spontaneously furnishes the largest proportion of liberally educated young men, who are pressing into all professions and occupations which require cultivated mind. Surely no part of our country compares with New England and portions of our Middle States in this particular. "The character of our New England population is such," says the Annual Report of Am. Education Society, "that it furnishes young men for an education more largely, probably, than a like population as to numbers in any other part of the land." Yet during the past year the Education Society has given aid to 216 young men in their theological seminaries. This can scarcely be less than two-thirds the whole number of theological students. If such is the result of trying to sustain and advance religion at home and abroad, with and without aid from the church to help her needy sons train themselves for the ministry, what must it be among us?

If it is thus past all doubt that such systematic aid must be provided by our church in order to maintain her due position in the present and the future, it is no less evident it should be allotted in such a way as to reach worthy and not unworthy recipients. To look for perfection here, so that no mistakes will ever be made, and no unfit persons ever partake of these benefactions, is of course visionary. Nothing human attains this immaculate-ness. To refuse to do good, unless it can be wholly unmarred by imperfection, in itself and its workings and fruits, is to refuse to do it at all. Among the twelve apostles, one denied, and another betrayed his Master. Nevertheless any

scheme claiming Christian support must be, in its normal and average operation, good. And the youth educated in whole or in part by church aid for the ministry, must as a class be worthy recipients of that aid, or contributions for the purpose cannot reasonably be asked, and if asked, will not long be given. We believe that the system pursued in the Presbyterian Church has in the main accomplished this object. There have been exceptions unavoidably, but we are quite sure that the average standing, as to scholarship, of beneficiaries in our colleges and seminaries, has been ordinarily above the general average. They have included many now among the brightest ornaments and strongest pillars of the church, who otherwise would have failed of a liberal education, or procured it under disadvantages that would have impaired it, and put at hazard health and usefulness. Still there have been and constantly are some few enjoying its benefits, who give feeble evidence of being worth educating by public charity for the sacred office. It is a duty to do our utmost to reduce the number of such to the lowest, if possible to a vanishing point. Not only is this right in itself, but every unworthy beneficiary costs the church enough, in the loss of contributions, to educate two good candidates. What then can be done in this behalf? And still further, what can be done to enable the Board of Education to fulfil its promises to worthy candidates, on the faith of which they have undertaken the arduous work of equipping themselves with a liberal education for the ministry, and from the breach of which, they are now suffering untold embarrassments?

As we understand the present system, in its practical operation, whatever may be its formal or theoretical details, it amounts to this: the General Assembly orders the amount to be paid by the Board to the several classes of beneficiaries. The Presbyteries determine, each for itself, what persons under their care shall be beneficiaries of the Board, entitled to receive its appropriations. Each and every Presbytery can recommend to the Board whomsoever it pleases, and the Board regards and treats such recommendation as practically conclusive. True, the Board requires a testimonial from the teacher, or some representative of the institution where he is pursuing his studies, that he has been present and pursuing them for the quarter covered by the appropriation, as the ordinary condition of pay-

ing it. It also calls for a report of the standing of the student in various particulars to which we shall yet advert. But we do not understand that a damaging report, in these particulars, from a teacher or professor against any student, is itself conclusive with the Board, or avails at once to stop the payment of appropriations. It is usually sent by the Board to the Presbytery, and thither the whole case is remanded for decision.

From this system it comes to pass :—

1. That the body furnishing, and determining the amount of, money to be paid, *i. e.*, the whole church through its Assembly, Board, and the contribution, of its churches, exercises no immediate control over the number or the character of the candidates to whom it is to be paid. Hence the liability to such exigencies and dead-locks as the present, in which the number of candidates entitled to the stipends ordered to be paid, goes beyond the funds provided for them by the church, with all the evils of a bankrupt treasury, and unfulfilled engagements.

2. It results further, that the Board, as the agent of the whole church to receive and disburse its contributions for this purpose, is powerless to bring its dues within its means, by reducing the number of its beneficiaries. It cannot decline whatever new candidates are offered and certified by Presbyteries ; it cannot reduce the number on hand by withholding appropriations from the apparently less promising of its candidates, or, without Presbyterian approval from those, who are *prima facie*, according to reports made to it, in some respect unworthy ; or by lowering the *rate* of allowance to the level of its funds. It is helpless to avoid financial shipwreck, unless the contributions of the church rise with the demand thus created. Alone it cannot control the character of its candidates, which has such an intimate connection with its ability to persuade people to give for their support.

Now it seems to us that some slight changes would give us a more excellent way. Certainly, while the Assembly should direct that a certain stipend should be paid to beneficiaries if the funds can be obtained, it should make the order subject to this condition, and require no more than a *pro rata* payment to each beneficiary of the funds actually provided. Then some discretion should surely be given to the Board as to accepting new candidates when its means are exhausted, until a sufficiency is obtained. Then, if the funds are insufficient to aid all that are

offered and certified by Presbyteries, cannot some method be found of lessening the allowance to those less advanced, or as yet showing no decided marks of promise, and of reducing the demand upon the Board, by eliminating, besides those proved positively unworthy, those who as yet are only negatively worthy, or those who show no positive marks of promise? May not the Board (itself) have some voice and some tests, in such emergencies, and for such cases? Some way it must have of adjusting its obligations to its means, if it would preserve its credit, dignity and usefulness. And it is important, if possible, that this should be accomplished, first by enlarged and adequate contributions; but if this cannot be, by giving the full allowance to those evincing positive promise, and withholding or shortening allowances, if any where, in the case of those least needy, or of least positive promise.

Under the present system, the only resource for accomplishing this end is for the Board to appeal to the Presbyteries to exercise increased vigilance and care in its recommendations of candidates. In their last annual report they say: "Care as to the recommendation by the Presbyteries of devoted and capable men, as has been said year after year by those related to the work of education, is the one point upon which most of all its value, usefulness and success depends." Nothing can be plainer. This care should extend to two points, viz. that the candidates be 1. "devoted," and 2. "capable." But, so far as we are informed, the examination of candidates by Presbyteries, with reference to being recommended to the Board of Education, is no other than that for the purpose of being taken under their care as probationers for the ministry; *i. e.* as to personal piety and motives in seeking the ministry. Now personal piety, and right motives in seeking the ministry, are merely qualifications *sine qua non*. The want of them would indeed be an absolute disqualification. Personal piety positively entitles to church communion. But it is not of itself, without other gifts, any token of a call to the ministry, or to prepare for the ministry. It does not necessarily involve the "capacity" for the ministry, whether potential or actual, which our Board so justly urges the Presbyteries to make sure of. How shall this be attested? If the Presbyteries can ensure it ultimately by means of their trials and examinations for licensure, can they ensure it by any prac-

ticable examination in those previous stages of education to which the Board gives aid? It is very plain that they can obtain evidence of the existence of these gifts, *in posse* or *in esse*, only from the testimony of teachers or other disinterested parties who have had some proof of them. If then it depends upon the Presbyteries to determine who shall receive the benefactions of the Board, ought they not, in all cases, to require satisfactory evidence of piety and "capacity," and to include in this latter, proof of whatever is essential to a fair prospect of usefulness in the ministry? Besides, ought they not to have evidence of some real need, on the part of the candidate, of the aid he seeks? And ought not the Presbytery to certify to the Board that they have satisfactory evidence on these three points, viz., piety, capacity, indigence?—the latter not in the sense of absolute poverty, but still of being unable to procure the requisite means for high ministerial education, without unreasonable embarrassment to his family, or detriment to his education? The constitution of the American (Congregational) Education Society requires that all applicants for aid produce, from serious and respectable characters, unequivocal testimonials of hopeful piety, promising talents, and real indigence; and that each annually present from his instructor, or instructors, "satisfactory evidence that in point of genius, diligence, literary progress, morals and piety, he is a proper character to receive aid from these sacred funds."

It is quite clear that testimonials worth anything must come from parties having knowledge; and that the only parties having present knowledge of those who have once entered on a course of study, must be the persons, with and under whom they study, and among whom they for the time live. These are the only parties competent to give evidence on all points, except indigence; generally they become pretty conversant with that too. Hence in some form such testimonials from teachers are required by all Boards of Education. To whom should they be made? It is plain that to whomsoever else they may be made, they should be made directly to the party that really determines whether the candidate shall or shall not receive the benefactions of the churches. The authority that decides should not learn the facts about the beneficiary merely at second hand. No evidence, especially on subjects so delicate as this, is comparable to that received immediately from the witness. If unfavorable,

it is more likely to be gently intimated than expressly and positively charged, unless in gross cases; hence to be incapable of a second transmission. If our Presbyteries are really and finally to decide the question, it seems to us that they, by their proper officers, should write immediately to the institution in which their beneficiary is a student, for information. The present system requires reports from these to the Board, and mediately from the Board to the Presbyteries. It should indeed be given directly to the Board as now. But if the ultimate decision rests with the Presbyteries, they should procure direct reports also. We have more than once seen the evils arising from the want of them.

But in the very nature of things, if the Presbyteries recommend candidates, which, at the rate of allowance ordered by the Assembly, more than exhaust the funds provided by the church, the Board must have the power of adjusting its outlays to its means, either by reducing the payments pro rata to all the beneficiaries, or by some method of dropping from its list enough of the candidates recommended to meet the deficiency. A few plain principles, it seems to us, suffice to guide us here, other things being equal.

1. Those of feeble piety, zeal, talents, scholarship, diligence, eloquence, or any requisites to an efficient ministry, should give place to those of decided eminence, or who are beyond all reasonable doubt, in these respects.

2. Those studying in Presbyterian institutions should be preferred to those studying elsewhere.

3. Those more advanced are to be preferred to those less advanced in their course. Especially those in their collegiate course, to those who have not entered it, both because the tokens of promise, or want of it, become more decided with progress, and because the further education has advanced, and the more that has been expended upon it, the greater the loss from arresting or crippling it.

4. On the same principle, those already on the Board are entitled to the preference over new candidates, in regard to the acceptance of whom the working system of the Board must be elastic enough to equalize its obligations with its means. All these grounds of preference are distinctly recognized in the present allotment of aid to different classes—largest to theological

students, less to those in college, still less to those preparing for college, while our last Assembly excluded from all share in it those who had not been preparing for college at least a year. The American Education Society helps none till they have entered college. It certainly is a fair question whether, in most cases, tokens of promise for the work of the ministry can have been very decidedly developed at an earlier stage.

Such a relation of the Board of Education, as *quoad hoc* representing the whole church, to the Presbyteries, is precisely what it is in the case of the other Boards for the benevolent work of the church. In Home and Foreign Missions, Sustentation, Church Erection, the endorsement and recommendation of the Presbyteries within whose bounds they are, is usually an indispensable condition of aid. They are a negative *sin qua non*. But it is left to these Boards, in view of the means at their command, and the comparative urgency of different calls, or advantages of different openings, to determine the fields to be occupied, the ministers to be sent, the congregations to be aided in building churches and supporting pastors, from among those recommended by the Presbyteries. So the church, acting through its Board of Education, must wisely and well, in view of the means at its command, and in more or less conformity to the principles just laid down, determine to what classes of persons, and in what proportions, among those certified by the Presbyteries, it can most advantageously for the great cause distribute what is cast into its treasury for this purpose, if there be not enough to respond to all properly attested calls.

And let not Assemblies by their votes promise what they are unable to perform, or suppose that mere votes to appropriate given sums of course ensure the contribution of them, even though pathetic and impassioned speeches about the trials and privations of beneficiaries bear away the members on a "tidal wave" of sympathy. It requires more than all this to bring the money so pledged from our people. A vote to make such pledges is justifiable on the part of those only, who intend within the sphere of their influence, and who really believe a sufficient number besides themselves likewise intend, to use such means for persuading the church to give the promised amount, as may be reasonably expected to secure it.

A word more as the best means of securing the needed infor-

mation in testimonials from teachers and professors, in regard to the character of the beneficiaries under them. This, too, has tasked the wisdom of those charged with it. We have seen what that required by the American Education Society is,—“satisfactory evidence that in point of genius, diligence, literary progress, morals and piety, he is a proper character to receive aid from these sacred funds.” It would seem that such a testimonial, intelligently and sincerely given, were sufficient, and could not well be made more decisive. It is, however, notorious that such certificates may be given in a way of loose generality, without due consideration of all the points they fairly imply. To obviate this danger, our Board has elaborated a blank form of testimonial to be rendered by teachers, under several distinct heads, in respect to each of which it asks that the grade of the candidate be reported. These heads are, Piety, Talents, Diligence, Scholarship, Eloquence, Economy, Prudence, Zeal, General Influence and Enterprise, Health. The Board tells those concerned:

“This form is for the use of teachers or professors of literary or theological institutions, in reporting to the Board the progress and character of students for the ministry, under their care, who have been recommended by the Presbyteries for aid from the funds of the Church.

“The most convenient and accurate method of specifying the points of information desired by the Board is to employ the numerals 1 to 10; 10 indicating the very highest grade, (attained by few individuals, it may be said), 1 the very lowest, and 5 a medium. Reports, however, will be received in which the words *high, medium and low*, are employed under the several heads. Any additional remarks or statements (upon the back of this, or on a separate sheet of paper) will be gratefully received, and may be very useful to the Board.”

This method at first sight seems exhaustive and mathematically exact. When we first saw it we confess we felt that the venerable fathers whose wisdom had devised and elaborated it, had found the sovereign specific for the difficulties involved. We felt somewhat of the “rapturous eureka” of the ancient geometer, when he discovered the 47th proposition of Euclid. Experience, however, in the attempt to use it, somewhat chilled our enthusiasm. It often happens that the theoretically perfect is practically impossible. This is manifestly the case when we

attempt to estimate arithmetically, or mathematically, moral, religious, or analogous qualities. Let any pastor, however long he may have been over his flock, and intimately acquainted with them, undertake to gauge them on a scale of 1 to 10 under the foregoing heads; let him be required to do it four times a year, and this not merely as a matter of personal private opinion, but with the responsibility of reporting it to the officers of an organization, in writing, (*littera scripta manet*), and he will understand the force of what we say. It is only possible, even approximately, with regard to the single element of scholarship—and this as the result of a series of direct searching recitations, with an exhaustive examination, conducted partly or wholly for this very end, and each exercise numerically marked as it occurs. Then each department of study makes out its own average, and at last a resultant average is made by combining the several averages. Even this is possible only after the formal examinations occurring from one to three times a year. Reports to the Board of this kind can only be upon scholarship as shown by the last examination. This, however, is impossible in Theological seminaries, where no such numerical account of recitations is kept, and examinations occur only at the end of the year. The same is partially true of some colleges. But in regard to everything except scholarship, such an arithmetical estimate, worth anything, is simply impossible.

But is not the other allowed system of grading, as “high, medium and low,” practicable and reasonable? Again we say, let any pastor try making a report upon his own membership, upon this scale with reference to the several heads above required, to be the basis of conferring or withholding important privileges. Will he be willing or able to execute the task? The difficulties are manifold. The general presumptive character of men in a community may reveal itself very soon to those who have much to do with them. In the present case, the presumption of course is that the character of young men entering institutions of learning to prepare for the Christian ministry is above question, till the contrary appears. But suppose the contrary does or does not appear sooner or later; how long may it be, even as long as the collegiate four years, before any clear indications appear, which would warrant the teacher in reporting his pupil as “high,” “low,” or “medium,” in piety, prudence,

economy, zeal, diligence, general influence, enterprise. And as to "eloquence," it is often long before those in the end most eloquent, manifest or even acquire it. It is most frequently developed in the later stages of education, and as the result of laborious culture. So with the other religious, moral and semi-moral qualities under the several heads specified. Occasionally one may exhibit marked defects, or marked excellencies at once, in reference to such things as economy, enterprise and the like. And he might exhibit nothing special or noteworthy, that would come under the eye of his instructors during his whole educational course. Desirable, therefore, as such minute specifications and exact grading might be, if practicable, it is hardly practicable, because not applicable to the moral and prudential sphere; and, at all events, commonly beyond the possible means of knowledge of those called to render it. Plain as this seems to us, we should state it with a diffidence proportioned to our reverence for the wise and holy men who instituted it, had we not found all others who have been called, like ourselves, to apply it, and whom we have had opportunity to consult, of a like opinion. It seems to us, therefore, like all standards of such ideal perfection as to be impracticable, to be likely to secure less satisfactory reports than one more level to the requirements of the case. At least we know that we only voice the sentiments of many of the most devoted friends of the Board, when we suggest that this subject deserves the careful consideration of all concerned.

Suppose that in place of all this, the call be made for an answer to the question, now in the column last but one, "whether they can consistently be recommended for patronage," and, if not, why not? With possibly the two following, in addition: "What signs of promise of future usefulness in the ministry do they thus far exhibit?" "Do you know of anything specially high or low which deserves notice in their grade of piety, talents, diligence, scholarship, eloquence, economy, prudence, general influence and enterprise? If so, please state it?" We apprehend that something like this would be far less perplexing to teachers and professors than the present form, and would bring out more adequate and reliable accounts of the merits or demerits of the beneficiaries.

And all the more so, because, aside of the indispensable requisites of piety, diligence and zeal, the qualities that lead to useful-

ness in the ministry are so diversified. It will not do to make scholarship the only criterion. For so it is, that men low in scholarship sometimes have other gifts which make them successful preachers and pastors. Nor can we make eloquence the only criterion. There are great numbers of ministers successful as pastors and in other spheres, by their prudence, tact, zeal, activity, scholarship, power as thinkers and writers, who are in no proper sense eloquent; "in letters weighty and powerful, in bodily presence weak and in speech contemptible;" all which was true of one "not a whit behind the chiefest of the apostles." In short, we must be slow to limit the Holy One of Israel as to his allotments of grace or gifts, or that concrete assemblage and manifold proportion of powers which may be so attempered together as to make a "good minister of Jesus Christ," if not for one field, for another. "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Lord." "As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another as good stewards of the manifold grace of God." We must not fetter the Holy Ghost with man-made limitations.

A word now on another point, emphasized in some recent documents of the Board of Education, a clear understanding of which, it seems to us, would have saved a vast deal of discussion and complaint in, and in relation to, Presbyteries and Synods geographically including, or near to, our Theological Seminaries. Such Presbyteries usually have a large body of candidates who are in the connected seminaries, that leave the distant Presbyteries in which they were born and bred, and join those near their place of study, for the sake of convenience in their examinations and trials for licensures, and to avoid the expense and interruption to their studies, involved in journeys to distant Presbyteries for the purpose. This has caused complaint in the Presbyteries thus burdened with the labor and responsibility of watching over and examining so many candidates, in a sense, "naturally belonging" to other Presbyteries. Moreover, it has been alleged that it produces an "unhealthy plethora" of candidates in such Presbyteries and neighborhoods. The Secretary of the Board has expressed this opinion in recent circulars, urging that Presbyteries and Synods should aim to support their own beneficiaries, and that those specially burdened and disabled from doing so, by the causes referred to, should generally

be slow to receive candidates from a distance. Thus they might equalize their own contributions to the cause, with the appropriations asked for their own candidates. In regard to these views and claims we observe:

1. That there is, and ought to be, no power to prevent church sessions from receiving to their membership young men of piety, who come to reside within their bounds for a term of years, to be educated for either of the learned professions, or any other pursuit.

2. If candidates for the ministry thus become members of a church in any Presbytery, they "naturally belong" to that body for all purposes of Presbyterian supervision. Nor can such Presbytery refuse to receive them under its care on any recognized principles of our system.

3. No churches or Presbyteries have such opportunities and advantages for the proper "inspection and government" of them, as those where they must constantly reside.

4. To say that candidates may receive licensure only from the Presbyteries within whose bounds they resided before they began to study for the ministry, is to say that none can study in seminaries distant from their homes, without incurring the expense and interruption to their studies involved in the necessary successive visits to their respective Presbyteries. This is but another form of saying that they, and especially poor and beneficiary students, shall not be at liberty to go to the seminaries of their choice, if far distant, e. g. that the students from New Jersey and other Eastern States, who have chosen to go to Lane, Chicago or Danville should not be free to do so. The Church will not make such restrictions on reasonable liberty.

5. Presbyteries who are thus crowded and loaded with special labors and responsibilities, must bear them patiently, as being the burden which the Master has specially laid upon them; and consider that other Presbyteries also have their special cares.

Finally, while Synods and Presbyteries should do their utmost to have their churches contribute to the Board according to their ability, whether this be enough, or more or less than enough, to sustain the beneficiaries within their bounds; and while they should recommend no beneficiary for aid, whom they would not deem worthy, if his support wholly came from themselves, it is quite another thing to say that the aid to candidates

in any Presbytery or Synod should be graduated by the contributions of the latter to the Board. This would be virtually to leave the whole thing to Synods and Presbyteries to help their own candidates as best they may, and relieve from the obligation of proportionate giving those having great wealth and few candidates. It would do away with all need of a central or Assembly's Board of Education. The very idea of that Board is to bring the resources and the indigent candidates of the church together; to obtain the money where it can be found, and the men where they can be found; and thus to let each make the necessary contribution towards raising up a duly qualified ministry for the church, and sending forth more laborers into the harvest.

---

#### ART. VIII.—WHO WAS THE SISTER OF OUR LORD'S MOTHER?

By the Rev. C. C. STARBUCK, Berea College, Ky.

We read John xix. 25: "Now there stood by the cross of Jesus, his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleopas, and Mary Magdalene." The question is, Are three women mentioned here, or four? It is usually assumed that three are mentioned, and that the evangelist means to say, that his mother's sister was Mary the wife of Cleopas. This opinion is supposed to be confirmed by the parallel passage, Matt. xxvii. 56, where, omitting the Virgin, we have mentioned Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joses, and the mother of Zebedee's children; and in Mark xv. 40, which mentions Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James the Less, and Salome, who is doubtless the mother of Zebedee's children. The fact that in these two passages three women are mentioned (the mother of Christ being omitted from both) favors the interpretation of the passage in John, as also mentioning three besides the Virgin. But waiving this for the present, let us see what bearing the relation of Mary, the wife of Cleopas, or Alphæus (two forms of one name) to James and Joses has on the ques-