

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XX.—NO. 2.

APRIL, MDCCCLXIX.

ARTICLE I.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN UNIVERSITY.

The time has been when the name "Presbyterian" was a synonym for an intelligent and cultivated gentleman. The fact of being an ordained minister of the Presbyterian Church was *prima facie* evidence of learning, talent, and piety. Three-fourths of all the colleges on the continent were, a few years ago, under Presbyterian influence—using the term in its widest signification, to include Congregationalists, (Dutch) Reformed, Associate Reformed, and other branches of the great Presbyterian family. One-half of the Presidents of the United States were nominally Presbyterians; and a large proportion of all the great men who have taken a prominent part in the civil affairs of the country have been educated by Presbyterian teachers. So that our precedence as a learned denomination was universally conceded, and we had some right to be proud of our name.

But we must not disguise from ourselves the unpleasant fact that our enviable *prestige* is gradually but surely passing away from us; not that we have lowered our standard, but that we have stood still, content with past honors. One is never in

VOL. XX., NO. 2.—1.

greater danger than when he is lulled into indifference by fancied security. "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall." Other denominations—all of them—provoked by our good example, are, with commendable zeal, exerting themselves to win the renown of being the first to carry the "torch" to the temple of knowledge. The Cumberland Presbyterian Church—our young and prosperous daughter—has entered into the contest with remarkable vigor and determination. Their University at Lebanon, Tennessee, under the ecclesiastical control of the whole Church, has, in an incredibly short time, become a first-class institution, especially in the law department. And there is no one thing that contributes so much to the respectability and success of that denomination as the influence of that University alone. The Episcopal bishops have by no means abandoned their grand scheme of establishing their "University of the South" on Cumberland Mountain; and with concentrated episcopal action, they will in due time succeed. Our Methodist brethren, so zealous in every good work, and of late so active in elevating the standard of ministerial education, are establishing colleges and universities in different parts of the country, exclusively under ecclesiastical control. And who does not know that the great secret of the success of the Roman Catholics in this country is wholly attributable to their untiring activity in establishing schools and colleges and convents in every portion of the land, and then tempting Protestant patronage on the score of cheapness and safety? *Small cost and bolted doors* are the two principal recommendations of Roman Catholic schools. There is nothing that threatens greater damage to Protestantism in this country than the influence of Roman Catholic institutions, every one of which is strictly under the supervision and management of the Church. From these facts and considerations, so plain that he that runs may read—nay, so patent that it is criminal to be blind on the subject—it is manifest that we are in imminent danger of losing our long established *prestige* as the leading educators of the land.

Nor is the simple danger of being outstripped by other denominations the only or the most important consideration. We

are falling behind the rapid progress of knowledge. Science does not stand still, but marches forward with giant strides. The curriculum that was ample and honorable fifty years ago is wholly inadequate for the domain that now constitutes human knowledge. It is a literal impossibility for the four years' study of our collegiate course, and the three years of our theological course, to place our ministry in the front ranks of learned men and alongside of the distinguished men of science of the present day. Hence the necessity that the Church should elevate the standard of learning, and provide the means for a more thorough intellectual cultivation in the qualification of our clergy for pastoral, professorial, and evangelistic work.

Moreover, such a step on our part is not only essential in order to keep pace with the rapid strides of science and human learning, and necessary in order to maintain our previous honorable precedence as the educators of the land, but it is indispensable as a precautionary measure in order to maintain our own ground as a denomination. No intelligent person need be told of the ineffaceable influence of educational teachers upon the minds and hearts of the young. The soft wax is not more susceptible of the impress of the seal than are the plastic minds of youth of the influences which a wise and adroit teacher may exert upon them. The influence of a teacher is, in some respects, even greater than that of a parent; not only because he possesses for the time the delegated authority of the parent, but because, in nine cases out of ten, the teacher is presumed to be wiser than the parent. Is it, therefore, any cause of wonder that a child trained in a Catholic school should return home a Catholic? or that a son who studies law at a Unitarian university should become a Unitarian? or that a young man who attends the medical lectures of an infidel—as too often happens—should himself be incurably tainted with the virus of infidelity, or so shaken in his religious sentiments, that he is never after of any use to the Church? How very important, therefore, is it that we should have institutions of our own, under our own influence, manned by our own men, and free from the objectionable features just hinted at.

It is a humiliating reflection that we, as a denomination, have no first-class institution of learning, fully up to the times, under our influence and control. Who has not of late years been painfully impressed with the dragging and fruitless efforts to establish presbyterial and synodical colleges in different parts of the Church? The sole cause of failure, in nine cases out of ten, has been the want of funds. These abortive efforts have involved great waste both of labor and money, and are followed by despondency and prostration of denominational zeal. It is literally impossible for a synod embracing only a few score of churches, most of them small and weak, to establish a first-class college. They can provide neither the funds nor the patronage that will guarantee the success of such an attempt. Hence it is a lamentable fact that nearly all our synodical colleges are in a crippled and dying condition. Some are already dead. With an insufficient endowment, a slim patronage, and little to attract in the shape of libraries, apparatus, cabinets, etc., it follows that the salaries of the president and professors are wholly insufficient to command the first talent of the country. A clerk in a bank, or a book-keeper in a dry-goods store, will command a larger salary than is offered to the presidents and professors of our synodical colleges. The *honor* of being an officer in a third or fourth-rate college, struggling for doubtful existence, is not sufficient to compensate for the deficiency of salary. Consequently, as a general thing, the chairs of our colleges are not filled by the first talent of the Church. There are exceptions, of course. We mean no disparagement of present incumbents. Many of them are noble men, and worthy of much higher positions and more generous remuneration than they now enjoy. But the fact, nevertheless, is incontrovertible. Moreover, this is not the only evil. The poverty of these institutions necessitates high tuition to supplement inadequate endowments. The result is, that the poor of our people are not able to patronise them, but are tempted to send their children to Roman Catholic institutions, whose teachers, having taken upon themselves the vow of poverty and consecrated themselves wholly to the service of the Church, labor without any other remuneration than that of

a bare but comfortable subsistence. This is no "cry of wolf"—no idle alarm. There are but few of our readers who would not be amazed with painful astonishment, were they informed of the exact number of Presbyterian children—the children of elders and deacons as well as of private members of the Church—that are now in the institutions of Catholics and other errorists full of deadly hostility to the Presbyterian Church. There is a crying demand, therefore, that we should have institutions of our own, so amply endowed that we, too, could furnish educational privileges to the poor of our Church at small cost. Such institutions, however, cannot be furnished by synods—much less by "voluntary associations" within the bounds of synod, actuated, it may be, by some local interest. But such *can* be easily provided by the united and harmonious action of the whole Church.

These and similar facts having impressed themselves deeply upon the minds of some of our younger clergy, who, as chaplains in the army, had observed the mighty power of concentrated and systematic action in producing great results, with their minds and hearts full of the subject, they came up to the Nashville Assembly (1867) with the hope of inaugurating a grand scheme of education, under the supervision and control of the whole Church, which would not only restore our former precedence, but form a bulwark against the open and insidious encroachments of enemies and errorists. These brethren were not themselves members of the Assembly, but they engaged one who was fully in sympathy with their views to bring the matter before that body, which, although it met with some opposition, yet was received with general favor, and the following paper was adopted and referred to the presbyteries, with direction to report on the subject to the next Assembly:

"WHEREAS, The Presbyterian Church has at all times been distinguished for the high degree of mental culture of its ministers and people—an honorable precedence, which it will be commendable in us to try still to maintain; therefore,

Resolved, 1. That, in the judgment of this Assembly, it comes clearly within the province of the organised Church of God to look after the mental as well as the moral culture of the people

of God, with the view to their highest attainments in active and vital piety.

"2. That, in view of this fact, this Assembly deems it of the utmost importance that the Church elevates its standard of learning and widens its domain of instruction in prosecuting the educational interests of the people over whom it exercises a controlling influence.

"3. That the Assembly request the presbyteries throughout the bounds of the Church to take this subject into consideration at their next regular meetings, and report their action to the next General Assembly."

This action looks to the establishment of a great institution of learning, under the exclusive supervision and control of the whole Church—a grand university, concentrating all the appliances for the development and cultivation of the human intellect and the improvement of the human heart—whose several departments shall embrace the whole sphere of human knowledge; whose chairs shall be filled with great and good men of our own faith and order; where the poorest of the gifted youth of the Church can receive instruction in any and every department at a nominal cost; and where our clergy, if they are so minded, can attain an eminence in mental and moral cultivation and learned acquirements, that will entitle them to no second seat amongst the learned men of the age.

The only difference of opinion was on the *first* resolution, viz.: "*Resolved*, That, in the judgment of this Assembly, it comes clearly within the province of the organised Church of God to look after the *mental* as well as the moral culture of the people of God, with the view to their highest attainments in active and vital piety." The ground taken by the few in the Assembly that opposed the resolutions, was, that it is *not* the province of the organised Church of God, as such, to engage in what is termed in the resolution the "*mental*" culture of the youth of the Church. As the subject was introduced just at the close of the sessions of the Assembly, there was not sufficient time to discuss its merits on the floor of that body. It was, however, the intention and expectation of the friends of this great scheme to discuss it *in extenso* during the too short interval that elapsed

between the dissolution of the Nashville Assembly and the convening of the Baltimore Assembly in the following May. But, in consequence of the deepening gloom that brooded over the land, and the despondency that weighed heavily upon the public mind, disqualifying it for giving just heed to any new enterprise looking to a large expenditure of money; and also in consequence of the ill health of some of those most interested in the success of the proposed undertaking, the subject was not discussed through our public journals and in our presbyteries, except to a very limited extent. The result was that the great body of the Church either never heard or lost sight of the overture of the Assembly; whilst many of the remaining few wholly misconceived the real *animus* of the resolutions, and by a strange misnomer, or a singular perversion of terms, interpreted "the mental culture with the view to the highest attainments in active and vital piety," to mean "*secular education!*"* The result was, as might have been expected, that there was no decisive action, on the part of the presbyteries, on the subject. Only *twenty-two* presbyteries out of forty-eight took any action on the overture. And of these, only "seven deny the *right* of the Assembly to engage in the work of (so-called) secular education." From these facts, it is clearly manifest that the Church has made no utterance on the subject. In compliance with the suggestion of some of the friends of the enterprise, the Baltimore Assembly made no deliverance touching the matter, but simply postponed it to an indefinite future, leaving the whole subject open for discussion, and the authoritative decision of the Assembly at some other time. (See Minutes of Baltimore Assembly, page 266.)*

* It never once came into the mind of the Nashville Assembly to commit the Church to what is *strictly* and *properly* termed "*secular*" education—that is, to teach men the art of becoming blacksmiths, wagon-makers, farmers, ship-builders, and other purely secular trades and handicrafts, with secular purposes or ends in view; but so to superintend their mental as well as their moral training as to guarantee their receiving a *Christian education*. There is not a word or a syllable in the overture that can by possibility be construed to mean "*secular education*" in the sense just defined.

There can be no question as to the IMPORTANCE of such an institution as contemplated. The only difference of opinion relates, *first*, to the "*right*" of the Church to engage in such an enterprise; and, *second*, the *feasibility* of so great an undertaking. We have profound respect for the opinions of those brethren—few in number, as we believe—who take the ground that the Church has no *right* to engage in "the *mental* as well as the moral culture of the people of God," etc. When we see to what lamentable results latitudinarian views as to the legitimate province of the Church have in other places and in times past led, we cannot but respect the excessive caution of brethren who err on the other extreme. We have no sympathy whatever for that loose construction of ecclesiastical prerogative which converts the Church into colonization, temperance, antiquarian, and such like societies, or allows its ministers to preach politics, and its courts to make political deliverances. This is to convert the temple of God into a house of merchandise. But, at the same time, there is error in the opposite direction. Appalled at the unhallowed lengths to which latitudinarian views have beguiled others, we are in danger of being driven to the other extreme, which, whilst it is error on the safer side, is nevertheless error, into which it is not desirable for the Church to fall. Error is necessarily and essentially an evil, it matters not on which extreme it is found. Whilst we avoid Scylla, let us not founder on Charybdis. *In medio tutissimus ibis*. The energies of the Church may be greatly weakened by being too strict in our construction. Let us not hamper her power by being too straitened. The Church should have free action and room to exert herself. Without this she fails to fulfil her true mission. Whilst the Church is a FOLD into which the people of God are to be gathered for their mutual safety and edification, yet it is at the same time a FORTRESS—a barracks of strength—a magazine of moral forces for the invasion and overthrow of the kingdom of darkness. Nothing is more plainly taught in the word of God than that the Church is an aggressive power in the earth, destined to overcome all antagonisms and conquer the whole world. "It shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the

Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it." Consequently, it is a great mistake to suppose that the Church is only a fold of safety, a city of refuge from our enemies, a school of piety and devotion for our own individual comfort and growth in grace. If this was the only design of an organised Church in the world, then its true mission would be accomplished by prayer and praise, and the exposition, in the most contracted sense, of the plan of salvation through the Lord Jesus Christ. This being true, monachism would not be so far wrong after all. But the Church has another, and, in its organised capacity, a higher destiny: it is to "pull down the strongholds of Satan," and to plant the standard of the cross on the battlements of all opposition.

All agree that "Christ's kingdom is not of this world." Consequently it is not to be set up and maintained by worldly means—that is, by bayonets and bomb-shells, by standing armies and garrisons, by constabulary forces, fines and imprisonments. This is what our Saviour means in his memorable answer to Pilate: "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews." (John xviii. 36.) We stoutly maintain, therefore, there are certain prescribed boundaries defining the legitimate province of Christ's visible kingdom, which it is not lawful to transcend. It is not lawful for the Church to usurp the prerogative of Cæsar—to make and administer civil law, to become an arbiter in civil or political matters, or to engage in any purely secular business, with secular aims and ends in view. But, at the same time, does any one imagine that Christ's kingdom is not *in* the world, and composed of living, moving human beings, clothed with flesh and blood? What, therefore, is the distinguishing difference between the kingdoms of this world and Christ's kingdom? Simply and plainly this: The former demand obedience from, and exercise control over, the bodies of men; *the latter* over the minds and hearts of men. The one is a carnal kingdom, the other a spiritual. The one cultivates the material part of man, the other the immaterial. The dominion of the

one takes hold on that which is mortal in man, that of the other on the immortal. Consequently, all that is mortal of man belongs to the kingdoms of this world; all that is immortal to Christ's kingdom. It is therefore an exceedingly narrow and mistaken view of the province of Christ's kingdom to suppose that it is to be restricted to the affections and moral faculties of man, passing by his intellectual attributes. Nay, in a religious point of view, the heart and the intellect are inseparable. To cultivate the former to the neglect of the latter is to make a fanatic. To cultivate the latter to the neglect of the former is to make an infidel or an atheist. Satan's emissaries diligently and sneeringly inculcate the figment that the Church's legitimate province pertains only to the *moral* part of man, his heart and affections, developed by "*faith*," in their own contemptuous sense of that term, meaning blind and authoritative belief, whilst the reason and the intellectual powers must stand clear of "*the shackles of superstition!*" Doubtless the great enemy of souls would gladly compromise with the Church, by reserving to himself the development and cultivation of the intellectual faculties in man, freely resigning to the Church his heart and affections. For whilst he might not be sure of winning, yet he would be sure of circumscribing and greatly embarrassing the power of the Church for good. These two parts of man's nature, therefore, must be cultivated in conjunction, in order to make a well-balanced and normal Christian.

That the great mission of the Church is to save souls by the overthrow of error and the promulgation of divine truth, none will deny. On this subject there can be no difference of opinion. But there may be difference of opinion as to *how* this great work is to be accomplished. It would seem from the position taken by some who oppose the scheme of the united and concentrated action of the entire body in the great work of educating the youth of the Church, that the sole and restricted duty of the organised Church, and of its ordained ministers, was simply and literally to "*preach*." And not only to preach, but to be consistent, to preach in the exact manner and style of the apostles, using the very words of Paul and Silas to the jailer, "*Believe*

on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house;" and of the apostles on the day of Pentecost, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." But how utterly impracticable and absurd this would be! The position taken by our strict construction brethren would be more appropriate for the millennium, after the whole world should be gathered into the Church, than for the present times, when the Church is emphatically militant, contending with great opposition. What success would our foreign missionaries have in their arduous labors if they were confined in their work to the simple utterance of the plan of salvation through the atonement made by Christ? The attempt would be like trying to build a stately edifice upon a heap of rubbish. The sand must be first cleared away, and the rock made bare before a house can be built that will stand. The Church was organised and the apostles were commissioned for *missionary* work, so that missionary work is the *normal* work of the Church. This is its true and legitimate province. Consequently, what is lawful for the missionary in a foreign land cannot be unlawful for the Church at home. Paul said that he was "made all things to all men, that he might by all means save some." Does not this manifestly imply that any and every instrumentality whose exclusive aim it is wisely and righteously to bring about this glorious consummation, is legitimate means for the organised Church of God? The only question, therefore, to be decided by the regularly authorised ministers of the gospel, or by the properly organised Church, is, what is *necessary* to the advancement of Christ's kingdom in the world? what will contribute most wisely and effectively to the salvation of souls? Whatever is *necessary* to this end *is* lawful. If making *tents* will effectually contribute towards the furtherance of the gospel, then the Church may engage in tent-making with that sole end in view. If building a ship will contribute directly to the planting of the gospel on a distant island or a foreign shore, then the Church may build a ship. If making and laying bricks, or squaring stones, or hewing cedars on the mountains, or making fine twined linen,

will contribute directly to the salvation of souls, then the Church may lawfully engage in these several works. If casting and setting types, making paper and printing it, and binding books and selling them, is one of the efficient means of advancing Christ's kingdom, then the Church may legitimately engage in these works. This is no *new* doctrine. Its opposite is the *novelty*. Ever since the day that God commanded Noah to build the ark, and Moses to erect the tabernacle, down to the present time, it has been the settled policy and practice of the Church to control all the agencies and appliances necessary to the advancement of Christ's kingdom in the world. Was it not for this very principle that our fathers, many of whom still live, contended so earnestly thirty-five years ago, and won so glorious a victory? The theory of "voluntary associations" to do the Church's work has long since been repudiated by the Old School Presbyterian Church. So that now the Church does actually make paper, cast type, print and bind books, build houses, navigate the seas, and do whatever else is deemed necessary to preach the gospel to a dying world. And yet with these facts staring us full in the face, shall we take the ground that the Church has not "the right" to superintend the education of her baptized children and youth, and to train them in the nurture and fear of God? How preposterous! Some will not allow bricks to be made for the Church, funds invested, stocks managed, or books printed, by irresponsible agents; yet they will allow the plastic and immortal minds of the children of the Church to be moulded with ineffaceable impressions, lasting as eternity itself, by agents not responsible to the Church—nay, in multitudes of instances, by secret and bitter enemies of the Church! What can be more absurd? Alas! absurdity is not the worst that can be said of it—it is wicked! Do not the Bible and the Confession of Faith recognise baptized children as legitimate members of the Church? And, as such, do they not come under the care and supervision of the Church to train them up in the principles of the Christian religion? And how can this be done if infidels and errorists and worldlings have control of their early education? And how can we prevent this, unless we have schools of our own—great

schools, attractive and cheap, and commanding in their influence? Do you say that the Church may not provide such schools, but that she may *recommend* our people to establish and patronise such? Where, we ask, do you find in the word of God authority for the Church to *recommend* anything? Where do you find an example of God's *recommending* the performance of any act? Where did God's prophets *recommend* any line of duty? When and where did Christ recommend or advise the discharge of any line of duty, or the abandonment of any vice? Are not ministers the "*ambassadors*" of God? They are not sent to recommend, but to *command* in the name of the Lord God. Is not the Church "the bride of Christ," and is the bride of Christ clothed only with *advisory* power? Has not the Church the right—nay, is she not commanded to speak with authority, whether men will hear or whether they will forbear? This reducing of the Church from an authoritative institution to an advisory council is not only to degrade the bride of Christ, but, in the case under consideration, it is trenching upon dangerous ground. For if the Church may not engage in, but *recommend* "*secular* education," on the supposition that education is "*secular*," why may she not recommend colonization, temperance, and other good things? No; if the Church has no *right* to establish institutions of learning for the mental and moral development and training of her children, on the ground that they are purely "*secular*" institutions, then she has no *right* to recommend their establishment, any more than she has to recommend African Colonization or historical societies. It is not the province of the Church to recommend, but to command. It is true that the different courts of the Church have fallen into the habit of "*recommending*." But such phraseology is not the Church's genuine vernacular. She is driven to the use of it from a conscious sense of weakness and consequent timidity. But when she shall "look forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners," she will not *recommend*, but COMMAND.

If it were necessary to add any thing more in vindication of the position taken by the Nashville Assembly, that "it comes

clearly within the province of the organised Church of God to look after the mental as well as the moral culture of the people of God, with the view to their highest attainments in active and vital piety;" or, in other words, that they might be useful members "and intelligent office-bearers in the Church of God, whilst at the same time they may pursue different professions and callings in life,"—we would refer to the general practice of the Church, and point to schools, academies, and colleges throughout her entire border, established by ecclesiastical authority, and strictly under ecclesiastical supervision and control. If the new and extreme doctrine which we have been combating be true, then this is all wrong, and the sooner the Church abandons these institutions, the better. Nor can we consistently stop here. We must send an order to our missionaries in foreign lands to close their schools, or to hand them over to "voluntary associations," since the Church has no more right to teach an African than an Englishman, a Mongol than a Caucasian, a Chinese than our own baptized Anglo-Saxon! Nay, we must go still further, and stop the printing and publishing operations of our "Committee of Publication;" since it is perfectly manifest that if the Church has no right to establish a school and superintend the education of the baptized children of the Church, with the view to their highest attainments in piety and active usefulness, *a fortiori*, she has no right to engage in type-setting, book-binding, and such like "secular" employments! But this is not all. We must not only reform our practice of establishing synodical schools and colleges, and of appointing publication committees, but we must *revise* the Confession of Faith itself; for it expressly provides that "to the deacons also may be properly committed the *temporal affairs* of the Church." (See Confession of Faith, *in loco*.) Now, it follows, as we think, conclusively, that if one part of the regularly organised Church of God may engage in what is termed "the temporal affairs" of an individual congregation, with the sole purpose of advancing the religious interests of said congregation, then, by parity of reasoning, a higher court—a presbytery, for instance—may engage in like affairs for a like purpose. And if a presbytery may do this,

then may a synod; and if a synod, then may the General Assembly. And, *vice versa*, what is unlawful for the General Assembly, that is, forbidden by the word of God, is unlawful for a synod, for a presbytery, for a bench of deacons. Consistency, therefore, will require our new theory brethren to strike that particular clause from the Confession of Faith.

Still another perplexing question springs up in our path as we contemplate this new doctrine. It is this: May a regularly ordained minister of the gospel, as such, teach school or become a professor in a college? We doubt it, provided the new theory be true; because it would be "secular" business, which the Church has no right to engage in, and consequently no right to authorise any one of her consecrated ministers to engage in. It is plain that if one minister, as such, may lawfully engage in teaching—which is "secular" business, according to the assumption—then may another and still another; nay, every minister in the whole presbytery may be lawfully engaged in "secular education." But the moment the "last moderator present" constitutes these teaching brethren into a presbytery, *presto!* their calling becomes unlawful! Is a presbytery, therefore, more holy and more consecrated to the sole work of "preaching the gospel" than an individual minister? We think not. Consequently, according to the theory, the presbytery has not the right to authorise one of its ordained ministers to engage in any work which the presbytery itself might not do. If this be true, then another question of great practical importance immediately presents itself for solution. It is this: May an ordained minister of the gospel, who has been "called of God," and solemnly consecrated and set apart to the service of the Church, who belongs to the Church and has vowed obedience to it, engage in any kind of secular business whatever, without the permission of presbytery? We answer in the negative. If, therefore, teaching school is "secular business," in which the Church may not engage, and if the Church has no right to authorise her ministers to engage in secular business, and if her ministers are not allowed to engage in any business which the Church may not sanction, then, in this dilemma, what is the duty of the legion of ministers already

engaged in the "secular" business of teaching school? The adoption of this new theory will involve the Church in a mass of inconsistencies out of which it will be difficult to extricate herself.

But we are willing to answer as well as to ask questions. Do you ask us whether the Church may deliver lectures on **ASTRONOMY**? We unhesitatingly answer yes, if thereby you overthrow heathen cosmogony, and prepare the way for the reception of the gospel. Should the Church deliver lectures on **GEOLOGY**? By all means, we answer, if an infidel or atheistic theory is thereby shown to be false. Is it allowable for the Church to teach **NATURAL SCIENCE**? Most assuredly, we answer, by her appointed and responsible professors; so that not pantheism, or materialism, or positivism, or naturalism, but genuine Bible theism shall be taught to our baptized youth. The extent to which anti-biblical sentiments are inculcated or insinuated by officials in many distinguished institutions of learning, is alarming to a believer in the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. We ourselves have heard the declaration of the Apostle Paul, that "God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth," ridiculed by a fascinating medical professor in lecturing to his class; thus infecting with the poison of scepticism those whose superior learning and intelligence gave them more than ordinary influence in society, and whose profession introduced them to the privacy and confidence of our families. Even the great Agassiz, whose name is a mighty power in the scientific world, publicly declared in a course of lectures delivered to the students of Cornell University, at Ithaca, New York, that "Moses was not reliable authority." He also controverts the doctrine of the "unity of the races." Here, then, is a danger, appalling in its menacing attitude and insidious in its workings, that, unheeded, will ere long sap the foundations of Christianity. Even on the supposition that great institutions can be found in this country and elsewhere, in which no such error is promulgated, yet is not *godlessness* itself a horrible heresy? Will the Church be satisfied to have her sons trained in Godless and Christless schools? This

is a dreadful mistake. The apostle exhorts the Church and her ministers "to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." When and where shall this contest begin? Shall we allow the child to be subjected to the influence of the Catholic, the Ritualist, the Unitarian, the Infidel, the Atheist, the Godless and Christless, to be indoctrinated, moulded, trained, biassed, prejudiced, corrupted with error or irreligion, and then, after that, to be reformed by "preaching the gospel?" Do you say, Let the Church discountenance such institutions, and warn her people against patronising them? This is all very good in its place; but what will such warning amount to? A few, perhaps, may respect the recommendation of the Church. But, after all, will it not be requiring too much, to expect all our people to patronise some little local third-rate log-college, controlled by a "voluntary association" of irresponsible trustees, a majority of whom happen to be Presbyterians, and officered by three or four second-rate men, struggling with poverty, and consequently compelled to place the price of board and tuition at high figures? Is it reasonable to expect our people to patronise such institutions, when the doors of the greatest universities of this and other lands are open to them at comparatively small cost, and where they can sit at the feet of the most learned and scientific men of the age, and drink at inexhaustible fountains of knowledge, though their tempting waters be impregnated with some deleterious ingredients? To expect this would betray a deficiency in the knowledge of human nature, and an ignorance of the secret springs of human action. No; the only successful method of remedying this evil is to establish rival institutions of our own, second to none, and whose halls shall be open, free of tuition, to all who may choose to enter them. Such, however, cannot be built up by local and circumscribed efforts. It is an impossibility. But they can be easily by the united and harmonious action of the whole Church.

.But let us inquire of those who deny the *right* of the Church to engage in what they call "secular education," what is the distinction between that and theological education? What is it that renders the one unlawful and the other lawful? In con-

trasting the course of instruction given in a "secular" institution with that given by the Assembly's Executive Committee of Education, we find that the one teaches the elements of a common education; so does the other. The one teaches the ancient languages; so does the other. The one teaches natural sciences; so does the other. The one teaches mathematics; so does the other. The one teaches history and the fine arts; so does the other. The one teaches metaphysics and philosophy; so does the other. The one teaches moral science; so does the other. So far, the two courses of instruction run precisely in the same channel. What, then, makes the difference? Wherein is the one unlawful and the other lawful for the Church to engage in? Do you answer that the difference does not lie in the instruction given, nor in the manner of giving it, but in the *end* for which it is given?—that is, for the qualification of pious youth to preach the gospel. It is the end that justifies the means. True, in this instance, the end fully justifies the means. And for the same reason precisely, we advocate the right and the duty of the Church to exercise a supervision and control over the education of the baptized youth of the Church, in order that their minds may be shielded against injurious and dangerous error, and that their mental and moral faculties may be developed and cultivated in harmony with the truths of the Bible and in subjection to the benign principles of Christianity. This certainly is a justifiable end. In these and similar instances, we have no doubt about the end justifying the means, any more than we have about the right of Paul to make *tents* at Corinth, or of the Church to print books at Richmond. This we maintain, even on the supposition the education was a "secular" and not a religious business.

And this suggests the important inquiry whether the developing and training the mental and moral faculties of youth, and storing their minds with knowledge and ideas that are to be incorporated with their spiritual being and lasting as eternity, to be placed in the category of "secular" or religious things. On this subject, our convictions are very clear and decided. We have already pointed out the difference between the kingdoms of this world and Christ's kingdom. The one exercises dominion

over the bodies of men; the other over the spirits. The one includes the material and mortal part; the other the immaterial and immortal. The duration of the one is limited by time; the other reaches into eternity. It cannot be, therefore, that any thing that is immortal and spiritual in man does not come directly within the purview of Christ's kingdom. How absurd the idea that a *part* of man's immortal and spiritual nature belongs to the kingdoms of this world, which come to an end, and another part to the kingdom of Christ, which is everlasting! Whilst the corporeal and the spiritual may be separated in thought and in fact, yet the latter cannot be divided into parts. We cannot draw a line across the immortal attributes of man's nature, and say, Over *this* part Christ's kingdom has a *right* to exercise its influence and to take supervision; but over *that* the Church claims no direct authority. *This* the Church may legitimately look after; *that* leave to the kingdoms of this world! Is not the inference inevitable that it comes clearly within the province of the organised Church of God to look after all that is *spiritual* and *immortal* in man? Is not this the legitimate field of the Church's labors? Can the Church fulfil her true mission in the neglect of such supervision? Therefore, to educate, to draw out, to exercise, to cultivate the mental and moral faculties of youth in accordance with the principles of Christianity, is not a "secular," but a *religious* business. Any supposition to the contrary strikes us as a dangerous delusion, akin to that which forbids to marry, and commands to abstain from meats, which God has created to be received with thanksgiving."

We have observed one or two other objections—not involving ecclesiastical prerogative—urged against this grand scheme, which it may not be amiss to notice in passing. The danger of "centralised power" has been made a ground of opposition to the whole Church's engaging in the establishment and support of one great institution like the one proposed. This is a very remarkable objection, the exact force of which it is difficult to state. The Presbyterian theory is, that the Church is a *unit*—that synods, presbyteries, and individual congregations, are but component parts of one grand whole. This being granted,

wherein consists the danger of centralised power? Danger to what? Who is to suffer? Not the Church; for the power belongs to the Church, and is the Church itself acting. The institution in question is to be the creature of the Church, the child of the Church, the agent of the Church, the servant of the Church—a part and parcel of the Church itself. The Church has already centralised its influence upon other and kindred schemes, as, for example, upon the Executive Committee of Education. Where is the danger of that? Also upon the Committees of Sustentation, Publication, and Foreign Missions. Where is the danger of such centralised power? It is a fallacy—it is a phantom. The truth is, the UNITY of the Church requires unity of action. This is its normal condition; and every thing that tends to distract and dissipate its power tends to weakness. As one Committee of Foreign Missions, Publication, etc., is better than many, so one great and efficient institution of learning, supported by and under the supervision and control of the whole Church, is better than a score of little ones scattered throughout the borders of the Church. Simplicity and unity of action are the two great elements of power in the Church.

This great undertaking has also been objected to on the ground that “it would cost a great deal of money!” Such a plea is not allowed in the Bible. It is forbidden by the letter and spirit of the word of God. It is weak, it is wicked, it is infidel! Where in the whole range of the Scriptures do you find the slightest ground of justification for putting money in the scale over against the *glory* of Christ’s kingdom? The ministers and people of God, in consulting with regard to the perfection of Christians and the salvation of sinners, ought never to *think* of money. Let it not be once named among you as an *objection*. The only question to be considered is, in right, is it desirable, is it duty, will it promote the salvation of souls and the glory of God? To oppose, or hold back, or hesitate in a scheme demanded by the interests of the Redeemer’s kingdom, because it will cost money—nay, a great deal of money—is to take sides against the woman who anointed the Saviour’s head with “ointment of spikenard very precious.”

Suppose the life of a child in jeopardy, and the father should hesitate to fly to its rescue on the score of *expense*—would not the whole world condemn him? And is not the life and prosperity of the Church of greater importance than any earthly interest? No; the Church can do any thing that is fit and proper to be done, provided her heart is in it. Therefore, in discussing this great subject, let no one object on the score of the scarcity of money. Let us begin. Money will not always be scarce. If the scheme be right, and the heart of the Church becomes interested in the matter, money will not be wanting.

It is not the design of this article to set forth, in minute detail, a PLAN for the proposed institution. This would be premature. Sufficient, however, at this stage of the discussion, to state that as the matter now lies in the minds of its friends, nothing less is contemplated than a FIRST-CLASS UNIVERSITY, in the broadest acceptation of that term. It is intended to embrace the various fields of ancient and modern learning and literature, together with law, medicine, and theology; the whole to be under the control of a directory appointed by the General Assembly, and over whose appointments and operations the Assembly shall exercise a *veto* power. It is not contemplated that this institution shall be *sectarian* in any department except the theological. In that, of course, the distinctive tenets of the Church will be inculcated. But not in the other departments. Over these the supervision of the Church will be satisfied in guarding the instruction given against any thing inconsistent with a pure Protestant Christianity. The entire establishment will embrace about nine different colleges or departments, viz. :

I. THE DEPARTMENT OF ANCIENT LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE.

II. THE DEPARTMENT OF MODERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE, INCLUDING THE ENGLISH.

III. THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL SCIENCE.

IV. THE DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL AND MORAL SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY.

V. THE DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS—PURE AND MIXED.

VI. THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND THE FINE ARTS.

VII. THE DEPARTMENT OF LAW.

VIII. THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE.

IX. THE DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY.

These several departments shall each be independent of the other—having their separate faculties, presided over by their respective presidents, and shall be authorised to confer diplomas or certificates of proficiency in the course of study pursued in that department. The presidents of all the several departments shall constitute the FACULTY of the university. A chancellor appointed directly by the General Assembly shall be *ex officio* the president of the faculty, and also of the board of directors; and shall be the official organ of communication between the University and the General Assembly.

It is not without hesitation that we have ventured to suggest this outline of a plan. But it may serve as a starting point for such as are better qualified to elaborate a plan than we are ourselves.

Just here, perhaps, we may have to engage in a final skirmish with regard to the “*right*” of the Church to appoint instructors in law and medicine. But, when we take into consideration the mighty social and moral influence exerted for good or evil by these two learned professions, we think the contest will be brief. We have already, in this article, alluded to the lamentable fact that many of the professors in the medical colleges of this and other countries are infidels and scoffers, and, to say the least, utterly godless. There are noble exceptions, it is admitted. But the fact remains notwithstanding. The moral influence of this profession is great. A godless, scoffing physician has it in his power to do much evil; whilst a pious, devout one, whose professional duties take him to the house of suffering, distress, anxiety, fear, and danger, has it in his power to administer balm to the troubled spirit as well as medicine to the suffering body.

Moreover, medical knowledge is of great advantage to the foreign missionary, in that it is a means of obtaining the respect and confidence of the heathen, and opening the way for the speedy reception of the gospel. The evangelist Luke was a

physician, and doubtless practised his profession at the same time that he preached the gospel. And the blessed Saviour spent most of his ministerial life in healing the sick and removing the physical maladies of the people, whilst he preached the gospel of his kingdom. In view of these facts, therefore, the Church certainly has the right to guard her people against the malign influence of godless and scoffing physicians. And there is no more effectual method of doing this than by superintending the professional education of such of her sons as devote their lives to the healing art.

The moral influence of the legal profession is greater and more responsible than that of the medical, from the fact that the one comes more directly in contact with the public mind than the other. Whilst the physician practises his occult art, and whispers his advice in the secluded chamber of the sick, the lawyer vociferates his harangues in the hearing of a multitude. He is therefore, in a certain acceptation, a public instructor. If, therefore, the lawyer be a courageous Christian, he can, in every speech he makes before judge and jury and listening crowd, inculcate the morality of the gospel. But if he be an infidel, or a scoffer, or an unscrupulous worldling, he may, as is exemplified in too many instances, make deadly thrusts at Christianity, her ministers, her morality, and her sacred ordinances. Here is a great and telling evil in the land, which the Church ought to guard against if she can. It is confessed that the Church cannot prevent men from becoming infidels; but she can prevent her own sons from being taught infidelity, by providing able and pious instructors of her own to teach such as enter the learned professions.

But great as is the moral influence of the lawyer in the ordinary practice of his profession, yet there is another aspect in which his influence may be viewed of perhaps greater responsibility. It is the fact that a very large proportion of the LEGISLATORS and RULERS of the land are taken from the legal profession. The transcendent influence of this class of the community may be appreciated when we reflect that legislators are, for the most part, armed with *threefold power*. *First*: As a general

rule, they are selected from the most *intelligent* class of the community, so that they possess the power consequent upon superior intelligence. *Second*: The *dignity* of their office, as law-makers, invests them with more than ordinary moral influence. And *third*: They wield the mighty power of law itself, which they themselves make. Law is not only powerful in that it holds the sword, but in that it possesses a *moral* power within itself. Multitudes are not able to distinguish between the obligations of moral and civil law. "So tremendous is this influence that the terms *unlawful* and *immoral* have become in the minds of unreflecting people synonymous! To pronounce an act contrary to law is regarded by many as the same thing as pronouncing it morally wrong. Consequently, in the minds of multitudes, the standard of moral right and wrong is not the table of the ten commandments or the precepts of the gospel, but the civil code." (See this *Review*, Vol. XV., p. 597.) Hence it is exceedingly important that the law-makers of the land should be free from atheistical taint or bias, as well as from the shackles of despotic superstition. The danger of infidel legislation is illustrated by such enactments as render it unlawful for a dying Christian to leave, by bequest, one farthing for any Christian charity whatever, as exemplified in the civil code of the State of Mississippi, and by such provisions as disfranchise ministers of the gospel, not for felony or crime, but simply because they are ministers of the gospel, which characterise the constitutions of other States. When, therefore, we take into consideration the fact that the great majority of the law-makers and rulers of the land are taken from the legal profession, it becomes a part of Christian prudence to provide that so many of the sons of the Church as practise the legal profession shall not, whilst engaged in the prosecution of their studies, be so perverted in their religious sentiments as to prejudice them against the Christian religion, or to bias them in favor of dangerous error. This precaution can be effectually exercised only by establishing institutions of our own of high order, affording such advantages and facilities for a professional education as will obviate all temptation to go elsewhere.

THE FEASIBILITY of so great an undertaking is the only thing that remains to be discussed in this article. There are many, especially amongst those who have formerly participated in the abortive attempts of presbyteries and synods to establish colleges, that are appalled at the thought of engaging in a scheme involving the outlay of so much money; whilst there are others who seem to think that it is their peculiar mission on earth to serve as *brakemen* on the train of human progress, and to *scotch* the wheels of every noble enterprise. They not only do nothing themselves, but they hinder others from doing. So "*canis jacebat in præsepi bovesque latrando a pabulo arcebat.*" They feel sure that they will be on the popular side in opposing any enterprise that costs money. This class we have no hope of convincing, except by actual success. We expect, therefore, to prosecute the great scheme not only without their aid, but in the face of their opposition. The first named, however, are constituted of different material. They have already shown by their works that they appreciate the importance of the proposed institution, and would rejoice at its success. But they fear that it is impracticable. Such, nevertheless, are the very men we need, as they have already learned wisdom by experience. Having been over the road, they can point out where the danger lies.

All undertakings are difficult or easy in proportion to the means at command and the power exerted for their accomplishment. A Pharaoh could erect a pyramid as easily as a peasant could build a stone cottage. What *one* man cannot do, *two* can. "And if one prevail against him, two shall withstand him; and a threefold cord is not quickly broken." That which would be a great labor for ten men, would be but play for one hundred. Consequently, an enterprise that might be difficult or impossible for a presbytery, or a synod, or two synods, would be of easy accomplishment for the united energies of the whole Church. Our Church, including those that are friendly and would coöperate with us, can, with God's blessing, accomplish any thing it may undertake. Consequently, the first thing to be done is to awaken a general interest in the Church on the subject. This cannot be done in an instant. It will take time, and a longer

time than many impatient spirits imagine. There must be "precept upon precept, line upon line, here a little and there a little." Every great enterprise, as well as every great reform, begins in a minority of one. It must at first contend with opposition—often determined and continued opposition. But as truth is mighty, success is eventually certain. God's word shall not return unto him void, but it shall accomplish that which he pleases. Therefore, let none of the friends of this great and philanthropic scheme be discouraged at *this* stage of the discussion. Little as has been said on the subject, it is perfectly manifest that its friends have multiplied tenfold since it was projected. It takes time to stir the foundations of great masses of people. A nation cannot, any more than the ocean, be moved in a minute. But as the uniform and constant wind will in time agitate the whole sea and lift into action irresistible waves, so of this great enterprise—if it be right, if it be wise, if it be eminently desirable, if it will redound to the honor and glory of God and the advancement of Christ's kingdom, as we sincerely believe it will, then its friends must not become weary or impatient, but in a Christian temper and spirit and in faith continue the discussion, until the mind of the whole Church is stirred and brought to make an intelligent and an authoritative utterance on the subject. Consequently, it will require time—we trust, no great while—to bring this great scheme fairly before the mind of the whole Church, and elicit united, harmonious, and energetic action.

But we must enter another *caveat* for the benefit of the too sanguine, and of such as do not sufficiently reflect on the magnitude of the undertaking. Even after the Church puts forth her mighty hand and commences the gigantic work, we must not expect it to become an accomplished fact in a day. This would be folly. Solomon consumed seven years in building the temple, although his father David had previously made all the necessary preparations for the work. It will require at least that length of time to establish and perfect in all its arrangements the great scheme contemplated. But whilst we may not hope to see so grand an enterprise perfected short of six or seven years,

or even a longer period, yet we may make a useful beginning much sooner. Should it accord with the judgment of the several synods which have under their control colleges and seminaries to surrender them into the hands of the General Assembly, to be united and consolidated into one, the foundation of the aforesaid university would at once be laid. Should the endowments, and libraries, and apparatus, and cabinets, and all the appliances of these several colleges, be concentrated into one institution, and should those who control our two theological seminaries in like manner surrender them unreservedly to the General Assembly, to be united into one, as the theological department of the proposed university, then, in that event, the Church could at once, without delay, establish an institution greater far than any now under our control or within our borders. Such an event would instantly be hailed with joy, and inspire the whole body of the Church with hope, activity, energy, and the certainty of success. *

But suppose that this consolidation, which seems so easy, if all the brethren concerned were so minded, is *not* effected, what then? The Church would only be a little *longer* in perfecting the scheme. She certainly has ample power and means. Taking into the count the synods of Kentucky and Missouri, which would doubtless coöperate with us, and we may calculate that we have in round numbers *a thousand* ministers and *fifteen hundred* churches. Let the Assembly appoint three of our *younger* clergy, free from cranks and crotchets, up to the times, full of hope and energy, whose experience in the army, whilst chaplains, taught them what mighty results can be brought about by rigidly systematic means, and to them let the whole business of speedily bringing this subject before the mind of the entire

* We can now call to mind some seven or eight colleges and skeletons of colleges under synodical control, viz.: Fulton, Mo., Danville, Ky., Stewart and Lagrange, Tenn., Austin, Texas, Oakland, Miss., Oglethorpe, Ga., and Davidson, N. C. If all these, including libraries, apparatus, etc., were consolidated into one, in some central and healthy part of the Church's territory, we should at once have the foundation laid for a magnificent institution, which, in a very few years, would rank second to none on the continent.

Church be committed. For on the shoulders of such will rest the burden, and on their brows the honor of carrying into successful effect this magnificent scheme. Their first labor, of course, will be to see that this matter is brought fairly and intelligently before the mind of every minister, elder, and member of the entire Church, in order to a free, full, and decisive expression of opinion on the subject. If this decision shall be in favor of the scheme—as we doubt not it will—their next duty will be to organise and put into execution a rigid system of contribution, by which every member of the Church throughout our remotest borders shall be reached, and have an opportunity of contributing money, lands, books, and whatever else is necessary to thoroughly furnish a great institution of learning. Let us suppose that we put the machinery in motion with the view of raising a half a million of dollars, as the *minimum*, with which to begin—postulating that no subscription, or instalment of a subscription, shall be due until a half a million of dollars are subscribed. Let the subscriptions be made payable in five annual instalments, thus running through five years. This would place in the hands of the directory one hundred thousand dollars a year for five consecutive years. Can any one imagine that a *thousand* ministers, whose hearts were engaged in the matter, with *fifteen hundred* churches equally alive to the subject as the field of their operations, could not raise this amount with all ease? Could not each one of these thousand ministers average within the circle of his influence at least *one hundred dollars* a year? If so, then that will make the half million to begin with. The enterprise is accomplished! But, assuming that a lively interest in so great and so good a cause should move the hearts of the whole Church, might we not *double that* amount? might not each minister within the bounds of his own congregation or field of operation obtain contributions, on an average, to the amount of two hundred dollars per annum for five years? This will amount to a *million* of dollars.

With these facts and figures before our eyes, who can doubt the FEASIBILITY of the undertaking? Let the grand scheme once start under the unfolding flag of success, and it would

soon, like Harvard and Yale and Princeton, become a favorite legatee of great and good men, who, nobly ambitious, would, with their unstinted munificence, embalm their names in an institution that will become a monument to future generations of the wisdom, piety, and energy of the Southern Church, which, with renewed life and vigor, arose, phoenix-like, out of the ashes of a wasting and desolating war.

ARTICLE II.

A PLEA IN BEHALF OF THE WIDOWS AND ORPHANS OF DECEASED MINISTERS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, at the sessions held in November, 1867, at Nashville, Tenn., adopted the following minute and resolutions, being a report of the Committee of Bills and Overtures, in reply to Overture No. 10 ; the said overture being a letter from the Rev. J. T. Pollock, asking aid from the Assembly for the family of a minister of this Church recently deceased :

“Inasmuch as this Assembly has control of no funds for the purpose proposed, and this request cannot at once be granted, and yet the Assembly appreciates the importance, not only of this special case, but of all such as it represents :

“*Resolved*, 1. That the Committee of Sustentation be authorized to appropriate five per cent. of all contributions to its object to the relief of destitute widows and orphans of ministers, and to indigent ministers in infirm health: *Provided*, That no such per centage be appropriated from the contributions of any church or person prohibiting such appropriation: *And provided further*, That this plan of operation shall not continue longer than the meeting of the Assembly for the year 1869.

“2. That this present application be referred to the Committee of Sustentation, who are hereby charged, in the exercise of due diligence and discretion, with the duty of considering it and all others of like character.”