

THE
PRINCETON
REVIEW

Edited by Jonas H. Libbey

FIFTY-NINTH YEAR

JULY—DECEMBER

NEW YORK

1883

JULY.

	PAGE
THE MOST RECENT PHASES OF THE TARIFF QUESTION (<i>Second Article</i>)	1
DAVID A. WELLS, LL.D., D.C.L.	
ANTHONY TROLLOPE	17
BAYARD TUCKERMAN	
THE ALLEGED CONFLICT OF NATURAL SCIENCE AND RELIGION	29
GEORGE P. FISHER, D.D., LL.D., YALE COLLEGE	
ON THE EDUCATION OF MINISTERS: A REPLY TO PRESI- DENT ELIOT	48
PROF. FRANCIS L. PATTON, PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY	
RECENT RESEARCHES IN CEREBRAL PHYSIOLOGY	67
WILLIAM B. SCOTT, PH.D., PRINCETON COLLEGE	
THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN FRANCE AFTER THE DEATH OF GAMBETTA	92
EDMOND DE PRESSENSE, LATE MEMBER NATIONAL ASSEMBLY	

SEPTEMBER.

"A COLLEGE FETICH"	105
PRESIDENT PORTER, YALE COLLEGE	
OUR IRON, WOOLEN, AND SILK INDUSTRIES BEFORE THE TARIFF COMMISSION	129
HERBERT PUTNAM	
INCINERATION	144
REV. JOHN D. BEUGLESS	

ON THE EDUCATION OF MINISTERS: A REPLY TO PRESIDENT ELIOT.

THE article by President Eliot on the Education of Ministers, which appeared in the last number of this REVIEW, has received the attention to which it was entitled by the representative position of its author. As a rule the critics have contented themselves with an earnest repudiation of two or three of its leading ideas. They have not treated it as an uncalled-for and unfair attack upon the integrity of the Protestant ministry, and in this respect they have dealt very leniently with President Eliot; for he has not hesitated to say that ministers are under the strongest temptations to insincerity, and to imply that these temptations are not very effectually resisted. We shall follow the example of the critics just alluded to in avoiding further reference to the spirit of the article under consideration, and shall confine ourselves to the task of commenting upon the several positions taken in it. A higher authority than President Eliot, or even that of Channing or Emerson whom he quoted so approvingly, has told us that "if a man desire the office of a bishop he desireth a good work." With this statement of Scripture the author seems to be in full accord, and here our sympathy with his article begins and ends. President Eliot seems to look upon the ministry as a noble profession that is in danger of falling into unworthy hands. He seems to think that those who ought to enter it keep out of it, and that those who are recruiting its ranks add to a lack of intellectual attainment the greater lack of proper moral discernment. To such a charge, even if it were categorically made, it would be hard to reply in other terms than those of indignant denial. But it is by implication and suggestion rather than by direct statement that the idea has been communicated to the

readers of this REVIEW that the gospel of truth is being preached by dishonest men. The impressions of which we speak are produced by statements made here and there in an article which for vulnerability may safely challenge comparison with anything of recent date within the domain of periodical literature. We may therefore leave the vindication of ministerial character to the sober judgment of those who are the daily witnesses of ministerial life, and devote the few pages that have been placed at our disposal for the purposes of this article to a consideration of the points in President Eliot's paper.

The article in question deals with two propositions: first, that "the position and environment of the Protestant minister have changed fundamentally within a hundred years;" and secondly, that "to fit him for his proper place in modern society much greater changes ought to be made in his traditional education than have hitherto been attempted." What the points of difference are between the minister's position to-day and his position a hundred years ago, and wherein the traditional training of ministers should be modified, the author proceeds to set forth—not very logically and with no great array of fact or argument, it is true, but nevertheless with considerable perspicuity. And the most cursory reading of the article will suggest to the critic that very possibly such a fundamental difference of position and environment does not exist; or that if it does exist it does not call for any great change in the minister's traditional training; or, finally, that if such a change were needed the particular modifications indicated in the paper under review would not meet the requirements of the case.

When it is said that the position and environment of the Protestant ministry have changed fundamentally during a hundred years, we suppose that the writer means to convey the idea that the relations subsisting between clergy and laity to-day are fundamentally different from those which subsisted a hundred years ago. We are led to put this construction upon the author's first proposition, partly because of the nature of some of the arguments adduced in support of it, partly because he refers to one of them as "the most potent cause of change in the relative positions of the ministry within this century," and partly also because we cannot imagine that any

would think it necessary to prove to the readers of this REVIEW that the minister of to-day is in many important respects different from the minister of a hundred years ago. We do not suppose that President Eliot has busied himself in an effort to elucidate a trifling proposition. As we understand it, however, President Eliot's proposition is far from being one of trifling importance; but so understood the considerations offered in its support fail to make it good.

One of these considerations is the fact that ministers no longer have a monopoly of learning, that it is very common now for lawyers and physicians to be university men, and that the press is a formidable competitor of the clergy in the race for intellectual supremacy. These facts have a bearing upon the problem of ministerial education. They prove that the falling off in the number of candidates for the ministry cannot be accurately estimated by a table of ratios based upon college statistics; that the 45 per cent of Princeton graduates who studied for the ministry between 1761 and 1770, against the much smaller percentage of later years, is due partly, in all probability, to a lessening tendency toward the ministry on the part of educated men, but partly also to an increasing desire to become educated men on the part of those who under no circumstances would have had the ministry in view. But the facts referred to can lend but a qualified support to President Eliot's proposition unless we assume that the ministry have been stationary in the midst of the march of intelligence. We suppose, however, that ministers as well as people have felt the influence of the times. If the people a hundred years ago depended upon the minister's sermons for intellectual stimulus, the minister himself had correspondingly small intellectual resources. If the press is educating the people to-day, it is educating the minister as well; and the new book or the review is quite as likely to be found in the parsonage as in the home of the lawyer or the merchant. If our author means that there has been a general growth of intelligence, and that the intellectual equipments of a hundred years ago will not suit the requirements of to-day, he is saying what is obviously true; but a commonplace is getting more dignity than it deserves when it is spoken of as a fundamental change in the minister's position and environment.

It is said, moreover, that this is an age of great corporations, of concerted action for philanthropic purposes, and that ministers are expected to have opinions on great social questions like "intemperance, prostitution, divorce, and pauperism." That is to say, we are swimming in a larger ocean, we are sweeping a wider horizon; men know more, and more is demanded of ministers. This, however, does not imply any change of relation between ministers and people as compared with a former day, for ministers are quite as likely to take the lead in the discussion of these topics; and while these new subjects of knowledge common to both ministers and people serve to change the ratios formerly existing between them, they cannot be said to do so to the extent indicated in President Eliot's proposition or indeed to imply much more than a re-affirmation of what has been already said, namely, that we have more to think about than our fathers had. Whether we do not lose in depth what we gain in breadth, and whether the minister should not avail himself more than he sometimes does of the law of division of labor and keep to the terms of his commission as a preacher of the everlasting gospel, are questions that might be very properly considered. Waiving these inquiries, however, and conceding that, since the relations of religion to the general problem of life are becoming more complicated and need more careful handling, the minister needs more than ever to be an educated man, this does not support President Eliot's proposition; for, as we have already implied, ministers are quite as receptive of new ideas as the people are.

The author of the pages under review next proceeds to illustrate the fundamental change of position and environment of the Protestant minister by observing that "the temper of the public mind has undergone a wonderful revolution within a century upon points which vitally affect the clerical profession." This change is illustrated under the three heads of repudiation of authority, the spirit of inquiry, and the logical result of political convictions. It is said that "a minister's cloth, his office, and his sacerdotal quality no longer command the respect they once did." This, however, is a generalization that should be qualified. For in certain quarters, that is to say in the prelatic branch of Protestantism, the "sacerdotal quality" of the minister seems on the whole to be commanding more respect than in

former years. The High Church party is growing. On the other hand, in non-prelatic communions the "sacerdotal quality" of the minister was never recognized, tho he has been highly esteemed, and perhaps never more so than to-day, "for his work's sake." If, however, as is sometimes the case, poorly paid and self-sacrificing gentlemen of culture and refinement who serve God in the ministry of his Son are made to feel that the scale of social value is fixed by a pecuniary standard, this is a change (if indeed it be a change) in the minister's position which calls for no corresponding change in his traditional training, but rather for a revolution of sentiment in regard to the mammon-worship of to-day which threatens to be the curse of the Republic.

Once more, we are told that the people question everything and accept nothing on trust; and that "the exemption of the minister from instant debate carries with it a loss of influence." Our author continues: "The lawyer daily encounters his adversary, the business man his competitor, and the statesman his political opponent: but no one answers the minister; and the people think that a protected man may not be a strong man." President Eliot has given form to a sentiment that has often been expressed, but we fail to see any contrast between ministers and other classes of men in the matters here spoken of. Do lawyers argue with their clients? Do physicians hold consultations with their patients? Do bankers defer respectfully to the financial wisdom of the clerical members of College Boards of Trusteeship? Do astronomers compare notes with theologians? Is not the rule as prevalent to-day as it ever was, and in all departments of thought quite as much as in theology: *cuique in arte sua credendum est*? So far as our experience goes, ministers insist upon this rule less than any other class of professional men. And as for the minister being "a protected man," we fail to understand what President Eliot means. He surely would not have an open debate take the place of the sermon; and if a stranger should venture to interrupt President Eliot's minister in the course of his sermon, we imagine that President Eliot would be the first to say that his minister ought to be "a protected man." And in what other sense is the minister "a protected man"? He is not shielded from the criticisms

of his hearers. Men and women, and, we are sorry to add, even the children, exercise the right of private judgment as to the minister's sermon, to its fullest extent. After being told that the minister has to face the competition of the press it is amusing to find him spoken of as "a protected man;" for the competition of the press quite commonly takes on the form of very unceremonious criticism of what the pulpit has to say.

There is yet another point illustrative of a change of temper on the part of the people in regard to matters affecting the ministry. It concerns the bearing of political upon theological convictions. Politics and religion undoubtedly sustain relations to one another. Some have found it hard to square their politics with their religion, but we trust that only a very limited number would be willing to say that a man must square his religion with his politics. This, however, is the position taken by President Eliot; and he intimates that "the Protestant ministry as a whole will not recover their influence with the people of this country until the accepted dogmas of the churches square with the political convictions of the people." Then we hope that they may never recover it. The influence gained by sacrificing the language of Scripture to the vocabulary of American politics would not be worth perpetuating. A dogmatic theology made out of the Declaration of Independence is not the gospel of salvation, and the men who preach it will have no claim upon Christian sympathy because they call themselves Protestants, and the Pope the Man of Sin. If the American people have grown so republican that they cannot speak of the kingdom of God, and even the title 'Lord of hosts' is less majestic than it used to be; if they are depending upon the "beautiful conception which rises before our minds at the words 'our country'" to lead them up to a conception of the infinite God; if they have begun to doubt whether men be totally depraved, "to question the authenticity of alleged revelations which are said to contain such doctrine, and to distrust religious teachers whose tenets seem to be so at variance with the cherished political convictions and hopes of the people,"—they have taken a long step in the direction of discarding Christianity altogether. And if President Eliot means to imply that the hearty acceptance of republican ideas leads logically to these results, he has

said the most damaging thing that could be said against republican government. There is a natural connection between the thoughts of men regarding the divine government and their thoughts regarding human government ; and when we find the men of former ages falling into confusion whenever they undertake to argue upon the basis of this connection, we are apt to account for it by supposing that the men of olden time lacked the nice powers of discrimination which mark the thinkers of to-day. But it may seem to enhance our respect for the past, or at least to abate our boastful appreciation of the present, to discover that the President of Harvard University has fallen into the old errors, and *mutatis mutandis* has made the same illicit use of analogy which was common to those who defended the divine right of kings. Indeed the argumentative advantage is altogether with the older writers ; for it is far more legitimate to argue from the revelation of what the kingdom of heaven is to what the kingdom of earth ought to be, than it is to argue from what the experience of the people in the United States has been to what the government of God must be. It is a pity that President Eliot should have given occasion to those who are never slow to ridicule national conceit, because it is, after all, only a partial reply to such ridicule to say that the conceit is altogether provincial and does not fairly represent the American people. Yet the plain logic of President Eliot's article is that the government of God cannot be radically different from the Constitution of the United States, and that any ministry that holds that it is radically different need not expect to hold the confidence of the American people. We believe that President Eliot stands almost alone in the avowal of this belief ; and as his position, commanding tho it be, can hardly be said to constitute an "environment," we cannot say, on the score of political convictions, that "the position and environment of the Protestant minister have changed fundamentally within a hundred years."

We come now to what is spoken of in the article referred to as "the most potent cause of change in the relative positions of the ministry within this century, namely, the rise and development of physical and natural science."

Our author does not refer to the fact that by means of

physical science we have come into possession of a great body of truth unknown to our fathers. There is no contrast between ministers and people so far as the knowledge of scientific truth is concerned. Clerical mediævalism does not go the length of entire ignorance of recent scientific development. But the particular point insisted upon is that we owe to physical science the development of "a new method or spirit of inquiry" which is characterized by "an absolute freedom on the part of the inquirer from the influence of prepossessions or desires as to results." Hence "even the ignorant have learned to despise the process of searching for proofs of a foregone conclusion. Apologetics have ceased to convince anybody, if they ever did." Connected with the spirit of inquiry is a confidence in progress which it seems is so strong that it destroys confidence in everything else; so that "the lay world . . . is persuaded that there must be incessant progress in theological science;" so that "indeed, fixity of opinion is hardly respectable among scholars." If President Eliot is right here, the difference of "position and environment" contended for in his paper must in a measure be conceded. But we cannot agree with President Eliot. We do not believe that a pure love of truth was unknown before the development of physical science. We should like to ask whether all historians have written under the influence of foregone conclusions, whether all judges have taken bribes, whether philosophers have uniformly built their systems in a dogmatic interest, and whether the students of physical science were the first to commend to us the unbiassed examination of fact without fear or favor. Virtually this is what President Eliot says, and in support of this grave statement he tells us that "it is the electric light of science which has made white and transparent the whole temple of learning." This, however, is not a foundation of fact, but only a pretty figure of a poetic brain. We should also like to know whether among scientific men there is no jealousy, no bitterness, no pride of opinion, no tenacity of individual judgment, no reluctance to part with a cherished conviction, no gathering of evidence to sustain a tottering hypothesis or to bolster up one too young as yet to stand alone. Do scientific men so universally represent the judge, and theologians so universally represent the advocate? We have seen

nothing as yet to convince us that there is any radical difference between the theological method and the method of physical inquiry, and tho attempts have often been made to represent these differences by playing upon the words 'inductive' and 'deductive,' they generally owe their plausibility to misrepresentations.

As for apologetics, it is of course easy to cast ridicule upon it by saying that it is a gathering of evidence to support a foregone conclusion. But will any one say that there is not an honorable place for labor of this kind in all departments of life? If character is assailed, is there no place for defence? If title to property is challenged, does the scientific spirit forbid the search for proofs of a foregone conclusion? If the attempt were made to show that the corporation of Harvard University had no legal right to their endowments, we should expect to see a system of Harvard apologetics, and we are not sure that it would exhibit a very irenic temper. Protestant Christians believe that they have a great inheritance of immortality. They believe that it comes to them through the new testament of Christ's blood. Must they be silent when men try to break the force of that testament, when it is pronounced a forgery, when it is construed contrary to its plain intent, or when it is said Jesus had no power to convey the inheritance to those who rejoice to be called his heirs?

When the spirit of science shuts up the courts and abolishes jurisprudence it will be time enough to say that it is opposed to apologetics and the search for proofs of foregone conclusions. But the spirit of science as understood by President Eliot, with its alleged opposition to creeds and apologetics, seems to exert only a very limited influence, and this according to the showing of President Eliot himself; for he says that "the fault is quite as much that of the churches or sects as that of the individual ministers; for almost every church or sect endeavors to tie its ministers to a creed, a set of articles, or a body of formulas." There is no great difference of sentiment, then, between the ministry and the churches; and as the churches, particularly in America, constitute by far the larger part of the people, it can only be in a very limited sense that the scientific spirit has succeeded in alienating popular sympathy from the clergy. We

do not deny, of course, that there is a "lay-world" outside of the churches, and that this lay-world, meaning the author of the article under consideration "in common with millions of thoughtful men," believes that ministers "are peculiarly liable to be deficient in intellectual candor;" nor do we challenge the statement that with a certain class of men "fixity of opinion is hardly respectable." But the influence of this "lay-world" and of these "thoughtful men" is very limited after all: it only means that a great many do not believe in revealed religion; and this is not a new condition of things. It, therefore, is no proof of a fundamental change in the minister's position and environment, and instead of calling for a modification of his traditional training it only shows the absurdities into which men may be easily led when they allow themselves to be victims of over-statement and a one-sided view of the world. For it would seem that the extreme desire of men to be sure of truth ends in making them sure of nothing, and that the pursuit of knowledge ends in nescience. If, then, it is not respectable to have fixed opinions, religion must cease to be respectable or cease to have any fixed beliefs; and what need there is of religion, or what basis remains for religious belief after all fixity of belief has been discarded, we are at a loss to know. We do not believe that fixity of opinion has ceased to be respectable. We believe that it will be possible for many a day to come for a man to appear in good society who has unabated confidence in the multiplication-table, in the doctrine of the excluded middle, and the law of gravitation. If, however, the antithesis between the ministry and the world of thoughtful men is not that of dogmatic science and dogmatic theology, but of agnostic science and positive religion; if men can oppose Christianity only by saying that we do not know whether anything is true and therefore do not know whether Christianity is true [or false], we need no modification of the minister's traditional training to remedy this condition of affairs. We have only to wait and see how long it will take for men to grow sick of this perpetual seesaw between "yes" and "no."

Finally, we are reminded that "the position of a minister is less stable and his livelihood less certain than it was in the last century." It would be better to say that the pastoral relation

is less permanent than it once was; and while this may be regretted, it cannot be looked upon as a radical change in the minister's position and environment. The minister is quite as apt to seek a dissolution of the pastoral relation as the people are, and the instability of his position is due to many causes—to increased facilities of travel, to more frequent interchanges of thought through the press, to inequalities of support which vary all the way between salaries ridiculously small and salaries temptingly large, to the disaffections of congregations and the discontent of ministers themselves. This is a condition of things which, however deplorable, calls for no modification of the minister's traditional training, and which no such modification can remedy.

Had President Eliot been more successful than we suppose him to have been in the support of his first proposition, it would not have followed from it that any change in the minister's traditional training was called for. The minister has a special work, and needs for it a special training. The growth of general intelligence may make it more important for him to be a man of general information, but general information can never properly supersede the special studies of his profession. The multiplication of questions bearing upon religion may make it desirable that he should be able to speak intelligently in regard to them. But he cannot be expected to speak with the authority of a specialist, and in the majority of cases outside of the range of his own profession he must make use of the ordinary sources of information that are open to other men; and if he brings the powers of a well-disciplined mind to bear upon these, he will suffer no serious inconvenience by reason of the limitations of his traditional training. If, however, the alleged decline of ministerial influence be due to a general repudiation of authority, to the antagonisms of the scientific spirit, or to the preaching of doctrines that are incompatible with cherished political convictions, the remedy for this lies not in changing the curriculum of ministers' education, but in changing the traditional conception of the ministerial office, and of so changing it as practically to abolish it altogether. For the Protestant conception of the minister is that he is a divinely appointed officer in a divinely founded institution, and that he is charged with the duty of de-

claring a specific and authoritative message in the name of God. If these elements in the Protestant conception of the ministry be discarded, the minister's office and occupation are gone.

Let us, however, attend to the suggestions which are brought to our notice in the second part of President Eliot's paper. It is contended here that "to prepare the minister for his work in modern society grave changes ought to be made in his traditional education." These grave changes are considered under three heads, which we may indicate as (1) the encouragement of freedom of thought; (2) the abandonment of beneficiary education; (3) the modification of the theological curriculum. We do not believe that any good reasons can be given for these changes, and we are sure that there are very strong reasons against them; but whether they be good or bad in themselves, it needs little argument to show that they must be particularly inoperative in the direction where President Eliot looks for their best results.

For it is not theological education but ministerial education that is under discussion. And a ministry implies a church. The church, however, holds certain definite convictions regarding God, the future life, and a way of salvation through the blood of Jesus Christ. It is pledged to the propagation of this faith through all the world and its perpetuation through all time. To this end it educates and ordains a ministry. If the church had no definite convictions, it would cease to be; and if it ceased to have the definite convictions just referred to, it would have no need of a ministry and certainly no divine warrant for one. It is absurd, therefore, to say that the theological teacher should be allowed to teach what he pleases if he teaches under the authority of the church. And it is absurd to suppose that the church should not take the oversight of the theological training of her ministers. Grant now that the "academic freedom," which, according to President Eliot, is more likely to abound in "universities and seminaries situated in large cities," were made so ample as to attract the attention of those "young men of force" who are said to be deterred from entering the ministry by reason of a lack of this freedom: this would not have the effect which President Eliot anticipates. For we must remember that the minister is not merely a man who is to pursue theolog-

ical science in a university, but he is a man to receive support in the service of an ecclesiastical organization; and the conditions of that organization are such that it must either impose its creed upon its ministers or else it will sooner or later reach a position where it will need no ministers at all. We do not doubt that young men of force are often kept out of the ministry because they cannot accept the church's creed, just as others are kept out because they have no love for the church's work or no special aptitude for the duties of the ministerial office. But President Eliot seems to think that it is hard for a man to sign a creed and be sincere: he cannot realize that it is possible for a man to adhere to his religious convictions without material modification through a long life, or that he should have the moral courage to leave a church whose doctrines he has discarded. "No other profession," he says, "is under such terrible stress of temptation to intellectual dishonesty as the clerical profession is," and "this," he continues, "is the state of things which deters many young men of ability and independence from entering the profession and causes the acknowledged dearth of able ministers."

Let the fires of Smithfield, the graves of Covenanter and Huguenot, tell whether Protestant ministers have been insincere. Let the lives of ministers everywhere be interrogated that it may be seen whether hypocrisy is the minister's besetting sin. But let these "young men of force" who fear that the obligations of a creed would prove too great a strain upon their honesty rest assured that no change in the minister's traditional training will be inaugurated for their advantage; for the authority of the minister, as we learn from the article under review, depends largely upon "the purity and strength of his character," and they are not wanted in the ranks of the Protestant clergy upon any terms.

The second of the "grave changes" proposed is indicated in the following way: "Two practices which greatly discredit the ministry in the eyes of laymen ought to be stopped: I mean, first, the practice of subsidizing boys in academies and colleges from the funds of sectarian societies on the understanding that the beneficiaries will subsequently go into the ministry; and secondly, the practice of supporting in theological seminaries,

and ultimately imposing upon parishes, young men of small mental capacity and flaccid physical or moral fibre."¹ The objection to beneficiary education urged by President Eliot is that laymen believe that "incompetent and unworthy persons are drawn into the seminaries by the standing offer of gratuitous board, lodging, and instruction," and that this belief "works incalculable injury to the Protestant ministry" because "it impairs confidence in its sincerity." Yet President Eliot tells us that "the profession is not unattractive pecuniarily." And he adds: "It is not the average earnings in any learned profession but its few prizes which induce ambitious young men to enter it." Suppose, then, that the present system of beneficiary education were abolished, and that the other "grave changes" contemplated in the article under notice were to go into operation, so that ambitious young men should be induced to enter the ministry: would not those who love to criticise the ministry be apt to say that these men were drawn into it by the hope of winning the "few prizes" that are offered? And would not such a belief, if it were prevalent, be quite as detrimental to the ministry as the belief that young men are drawn into it by the offer of free board and lodging? We should like to see everything done

¹ The statement is often made that the ablest men among college graduates do not in any fair proportion enter the ministry. Dr. Duffield has examined the statistics of Princeton College with reference to this matter, and has embodied the results of his inquiry in the following communication which he has kindly placed at our disposal. These results, it will be seen, are of the most gratifying character:

COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY,

PRINCETON, N. J., April 12, 1883.

The number of graduates of the Academic Department of the College of New Jersey for the decade ending with the year 1880 is 894. Of these, 192—about 21½ per cent—have entered the ministry. The number receiving Honorary Appointments for Commencement, for the same period, was 300. Of these, 103—about 34 per cent—have entered the ministry.

Of the 26 graduates of the College of New Jersey now students in the Princeton Theological Seminary, 18—over 69 per cent—received Honorary Appointments for Commencement. Of these, 12 received "Special Honorary Orations," for special excellence in scholarship. One was the First Honor man of his class, three were Second Honor men, one was third in rank for scholarship, one received the Valedictory Oration. Nine of the 26 represented their respective literary societies as Junior Orators.

JOHN T. DUFFIELD,

that can be wisely done in order "that the ministry be not blamed," but we cannot see that much would be gained in the direction contemplated by President Eliot by abolishing beneficiary education. But there are strong reasons why the existing system of beneficiary education should be continued and placed upon a more generous footing; and tho these reasons have been given again and again by different writers, the importance of the subject is a sufficient justification for repeating them here.

1. All forms of the higher education partake of the beneficiary character. The buildings, apparatus, and professorial endowments of great educational institutions are provided by private benefactions or public grants, and the fees of students pay only the smallest fraction of college expenses.

2. No good reason can be given why poverty should be a bar to a liberal education if any individual or if a corporation will so far act *in loco parentis* as to pay the expenses incident to a young man's college life that are not otherwise provided for endowments. It is hard to see that benevolence of this kind becomes wrong by being made systematic and by being specially directed to the aid of those who study for the ministry.

3. The church is in need of ministers. She is the organized agency for the conversion of the world. It is her duty to use every wise endeavor to secure men and means for the dissemination of the gospel throughout the earth. There is a great difference in this respect between the ministry and the professions of law and medicine with which it is so often compared. When it is said that we do not organize societies to aid lawyers and physicians in securing their professions, it is enough to say that aid is given to theological students not as a favor to them but as part of the church's work in the evangelization of the world.

4. The supply of ministers falls far short of the demand. We have to face the fact that there is a falling off in the number of candidates for the ministry, and at the same time a rapid development of the church's work that calls more loudly than ever for an increase of the ministerial force. It is in vain to point to the fact that in older, smaller, and settled countries there is no lack of ministerial candidates. It is absurd to apply rules that suit one set of conditions to a set of conditions altogether dif-

ferent. The beneficiary system does not account for a falling off of ministerial candidates. It is idle to suppose that the abolition of it will remedy the difficulty.

5. Candidates for the ministry are very commonly poor. It were to be wished that a larger proportion of the sons of those who are well-to-do would enter the ministry; but we shall not succeed in getting them by abolishing the system of beneficiary education. It is sometimes said that men of this class are kept out by their unwillingness to be associated with a system that lives so largely on benevolence. But we doubt the correctness of this remark, and we should not think highly of the zeal that could be diverted from the greatest of all callings by a consideration so worldly as this. If, however, there is any force in the criticism, the objection to the existing method of beneficiary education would be obviated by making it conform more closely to the cadet system in the army and navy.

6. There are special difficulties attending efforts at self-support in the great majority of cases. Only a few can find remunerative employment during the progress of their studies. It is easy to recommend students to support themselves rather than receive aid; but those who have ever interested themselves in securing employment for a student know what a difficult thing this is to do. And self-support, even when employment is found, often means pinching poverty. It is said sometimes that discipline of this sort is what gives the church an able and efficient ministry; but this is a cruel application of the law of the survival of the fittest. Some go safely through the ordeal, but some die, and a great many suffer through life as the result of the privations to which they were subjected in their fight with poverty. Besides, the student's time can be more profitably employed in the prosecution of his studies than in doing any work, even tho it be religious work, that turns his thoughts away from the particular duties that pertain to him as a student of theology. It is wise for the church to make such provision for him that he will be under no necessity to earn money by performing services that lie outside of his duties in the seminary.

7. It is not fair to condition the right of a poor man to enter the ministry by his ability as tested in a competitive examina-

tion to exceed the ordinary requirements of the theological curriculum. This, however, is what is involved in the system advocated by some. For the man who can support himself needs only to perform the ordinary work prescribed in the curriculum; but the poor man, according to the plan which many favor, must win a scholarship or he will fail to prosecute his studies for want of funds. We have nothing to say against a system of scholarships and fellowships awarded after competitive competition. We only object to that part of the system that would make the ability of a poor man to secure the advantages of a thorough theological education depend upon his ability to outstrip another in a race for intellectual pre-eminence.

8. The existing system has worked well. It is said that unworthy men are drawn into the ministry by means of this system, that it fosters insincerity, and particularly that by this means the way is made easy for men of inferior ability and feeble physical vitality to enter the ministry. That individual cases can be found illustrating these positions we do not doubt, yet the value of a system must not be judged by isolated cases, and still less should be condemned on the ground of certain *a priori* judgments respecting its tendency. This system has been in operation in the several seminaries of this land long enough to give those who have watched it opportunity to form a judgment respecting its effects. The judgment of those who have been in closest connection with it is uniformly in its praise, and their opinion must be regarded as having more right to consideration than the judgment of those who have never been known to have a very deep interest in ministerial education, or of those who somewhat hastily condemn a system which was planned with special reference to the exigencies of this country by contrasting it with the methods which have operated successfully under very different conditions in other lands.¹

President Eliot next proceeds to tell us what "the mental furnishing of a minister ought to be." We should not accept everything that President Eliot has said upon this subject, but

¹We are indebted to the Rev. W. H. Roberts, Librarian of Princeton Theological Seminary, for the following statement illustrative of the results of beneficiary education: The total number of students matriculated at Princeton Theological Seminary, from 1849-50 to 1873-74, a period of twenty-five years, was 1355, of whom 961 received aid, and 394 were self-supporting. In the year

we cannot see that the programme of theological education as he has sketched it (except as it concerns the principle of elective studies) can be regarded as a grave change in the minister's traditional training. The churches generally hold that a candidate for the ministry should have a liberal education before entering upon strictly professional studies. American colleges have been very generally founded with special reference to the securing of these results, and so far as their means will allow they are offering to their undergraduates at this moment the opportunity to study the very subjects which President Eliot thinks every candidate for the ministry should master. Indeed, with the exception of Hebrew these preliminary studies described by President Eliot are comprehended in the ordinary college curriculum. Some topics have been omitted which we think are very desirable. We should have added mathematics; and then a knowledge of logic, the history of philosophy, and philosophic jurisprudence are quite as important to the minister

in 1881, or at date of previous death, the occupations, etc., of these students, as furnished by the General Catalogue, is shown in the following tabulated statement:

OCCUPATIONS, ETC.	NUMBER.		PER CENT.	
	Aided.	Self-sup- porting.	Aided.	Self-sup- porting.
Missionaries.....	64	20	6.6	5.1
Secretaries, Editors, and Agents of Bene- volent Societies.....	16	10	1.5	2.5
Presidents, Professors, etc.....	62	26	6.4	6.6
In charge of churches.....	652	198	67.8	50.1
Died before Ordination.....	19	7	1.9	1.7
In Secular Employments.....	33	48	3.4	12.1
Without Charge, or Occupation unknown in 1881.....	115	85	11.9	21.5

This statement places the ability and usefulness of aided students in most favorable light. Even in the matter of vitality the figures favor them in comparison with the self-supporting students. During the twenty-five years covered by the statement, 134 aided students (13.9 per cent) died, as against 63 self-supporting students (16 per cent). But the emphatic fact of the statement is that 33.6 per cent of the self-supporting students were at death, or in 1881, in secular employments, without charge, or their occupation was unknown.

A statement made by Prof. Phelps of Andover Theological Seminary in 1873, covering the occupations of living Andover students for the years 1849-73, presents practically the same results as the Princeton statement. This will be seen by a comparison between the two classes of students with reference to Pastoral service. In 1873, 72.4 per cent of the aided students of Andover Seminary were in charge of churches, as against 55.9 per cent of self-supporting.

as are some of the topics which find a place in President Eliot's list. Turning then to the scheme of professional education, which according to President Eliot should consist of Semitic studies, New Testament criticism, ecclesiastical history, comparative religion, psychology, etc., systematic theology, and charitable and reformatory methods, our main criticism would be directed to the elective feature which in President Eliot's mind seems to be so essential to its successful operation. We are not saying that no place should be given to elective studies in a theological curriculum, but we are sure that a scheme of studies which makes it possible for a young man to be graduated from a theological seminary without having studied Old or New Testament exegesis, ecclesiastical history, or systematic theology is radically wrong. Yet President Eliot's scheme makes it possible for a candidate for the ministry to give his entire attention during his stay in the theological seminary to comparative religion; psychology, ethics, and the philosophy of religion; and charitable and reformatory methods, etc.

It is quite true that the "minister's education should not end with the theological school, but should be prolonged like that of the teacher or physician to the latest day of his life;" and we think that the minister will compare very favorably with the physician so far as the matter of keeping up his studies is concerned, tho like him he is liable to endless interruptions. We doubt the wisdom of keeping on hand "some more continuous and erudite work than sermon-writing." A pastor's best powers should go into his sermons. Authorship of this kind will be continuous enough whether it be erudite or not. We would not advise a man "sometimes to comment upon a fresh book instead of preaching a sermon." His business is to "preach the Word." And after all these grave changes in the minister's traditional training, whereby "young men of small mental capacity" are to be kept out of our theological seminaries and "young men of force" are to be brought in, it ought not to be necessary for the minister "sometimes to read other men's sermons instead of his own." President Eliot gives these advices because he emphasizes more than he ought the literary side of the minister's life. And he does this because he has a wrong conception of the ministerial office.

FRANCIS L. PATTON.