

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY
AND
PRINCETON REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. 21.—JANUARY, 1877.

Art. I.—EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY, ESPECIALLY OF THE OLD
TESTAMENT.*

By CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D., Prof. in Union Theological Seminary, N. Y.

EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY is one of the four grand divisions of Theological Science. It is related to the other divisions, historical, systematic, and practical, as the primary and fundamental discipline upon which the others depend, and from which they derive their chief materials. Exegetical Theology has to do especially with the sacred Scriptures, their origin, history, character, exposition, doctrines, and rules of life. It is true that the other branches of theology have likewise to do with the sacred writings, in that their chief material is derived therefrom, but they differ from Exegetical Theology, not only in their *methods* of using this material, but likewise in the fact, that they do not *themselves* search out and gather this material, directly from the holy writings, but depend upon Exegetical Theology therefor ; whilst their energies are directed in Historical Theology in tracing the development of that material as the determining element in the history of the people of God ; in Systematic Theology, in arranging that material in the form most appropriate for systematic study, for attack and defense, in accordance with the needs of the age ; in Practical Theology, in directing that material to the conversion of souls, and training them in the holy life.

* The substance of this article was delivered as an Inaugural Address, by occasion of the induction of Dr. Briggs (Sept. 21, 1876) into the chair of Hebrew and the Cognate Languages in the Union Theological Seminary, N. Y.

immense amount of labor, the full harvest of which we and our successors are yet to reap and garner, and mark, somewhat our grand vantage-ground over our predecessors over sixty years ago, and still, moreover, those early preachers toiling at the foundations of their work, without even the cost of printing to aid them in disseminating Christian truth. Carry out the parallel in all the other foundations laid—the schools and printing-presses established, the Christian communities and churches organized, and the hundreds of places in every part of the unevangelized world, whose Gospel light has been kindled, and how is it possible, for a moment, to compare our position with that of those early preachers at the inception of their mighty work, without feeling that God has given us facilities for carrying it forward to completion, of which they were able to catch but the feeblest glimpse, and this only in prophetic vision !

ART. VII.—PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGES, AS RELATED TO THE
GROWTH OF OUR MINISTRY.*

By REV. A. A. E. TAYLOR, D.D., President of Wooster University, Ohio.

THE preaching of the Gospel is conceded to be the divinely ordained method of propagating true religion upon the earth. It, therefore, becomes one of the fundamental duties of the church to provide the supply of ministers needful for the task, of course subject to the action of the personal divine call to the ministry. There are two principal reasons that make this labor on the part of the church incessant, as they require a constant supply of new candidates for the pulpit. These are, first, the natural waste of the clergy by retirement from active

* *Annual Catalogues of Allegheny, Auburn, Chicago, Danville, Lane, Princeton, and Union (N. Y.) Theological Seminaries, for 1875-76.*

Annual Reports of the Board of Education, and Annual Minutes of the General Assembly.

duty, by dismission to other branches of Christian work, and such like causes, and by death; and, second, the ever enlarging demand arising from the steadfast increase in number of home churches to be supplied, and in the expansion of the missionary work. In our rapidly developing nation, the home cause of itself requires a large, constant increase of ministers.

Confining our attention in this article to the "Presbyterian Church of the United States of America," as distinguished from other Presbyterian bodies, let us take the Minutes of its General Assembly for the current year as the basis of some estimates relating to the demand and supply of its ministry. So doing, we herein discover that during the past ecclesiastical year 85 ministers have died, and 27 have been dismissed to other denominations, while there has been an increase of 78 in the number of the churches. This creates the need for 190 new ministers, not taking into account now the question of any surplus number that may be already on hand. As an offset to this loss, we have, during the same period, ordinations, 137; ministers received from other churches, 53; in all, precisely 190, thus so far balancing these accounts. There is left, therefore, as the deficiency for the year, exactly that number lost to the church by retirement to other duties, or to rest from active labors, and the increased requirement of new missionary fields during the year. This number of retiring clergymen is difficult to estimate with any approximate accuracy from lack of proper data, but that it must be very considerable is shown by the fact, that *fully one-fourth of our enrolled ministry is not engaged in direct supply* of our churches, and that one-fifth of our churches now stand vacant.*

That there is a serious falling off in the proportionate supply of our ministry, the following comparison will show, as drawn from the Minutes of the following respective years:

1876.	Ministers, 4,744	Churches, 5,077	Members, 535,210
1871.	" 4,346	" 4,616	" 455,378
Gain	" 398	" 461	" 79,832

Here we find that in five years there have been 63 more

* By an accurate count in the Minutes of Assembly of 1875, it is found that of 4,706 ministers, 1,153 are reckoned as either retired, teaching, acting as agents, or

churches added than ministers, and, also, that while the general average at present yields about 112 communicants for each minister enrolled, the comparative increase of these five years has been but one minister to each 200 communicants. Taking into account, however, the fact already mentioned, that one-fourth of the ministry is out of the pulpit, it leaves the present average of one active minister to each 150 members. Thus we have a falling off in these five years in the supply of ministers of at least 25 per cent., or 5 per cent. per annum, in proportion to the increase of membership. If it be suggested that this is no serious loss, since it is remedied by the average increase of membership in each church, the reply is evident that this distribution of increase cannot go on very long, the churches being, on the average, quite large enough for the strength of the ministry now, and it will not do to depend upon it for any length of time, or otherwise than as a temporary expedient. The above result is also indicated by the valuable tables of comparative increase in churches and ministry in the last report of the Board of Education, wherein it is proved, that while the increase of membership for the past five years has been 7 per cent. per annum, the increase of the ministry for the same period has been but 2 per cent. per annum. The comparison of the tables for the last ten years yields a still greater disproportion, while as we run our eye still further back, comparing the growth of the church by decades, the steadfast decline of both ministry and membership is really alarming.

If we now turn to the direct means used for the supply of ministers, we find that our church has made liberal and efficient provision for the *theological* training of candidates, fully equal in all respects to the demand likely to be imposed upon her. We have eight theological seminaries in active operation. Of these the Pacific Seminary has as yet but very few students (seven last year), and in the absence of a printed catalogue, its data are beyond our reach, and have not been estimated or taken into our account at all.

supplies for churches in other connections. Beside these, many are designated as *Evangelists*, which seems now to be the popular phrase, of whom a goodly number are agents, or preach but rarely, and without regular appointments. Also, out of our 5,077 churches, the Minutes show 1,074 to be vacant in 1876.

The remaining seminaries report for the last year, as follows :

Union (N. Y.)	Professors and Teachers,	7	Students,	142
Princeton	"	7	"	120
Allegheny	"	7	"	85
Auburn	"	6	"	48
Lane	"	5	"	38
Chicago	"	6	"	24
Danville	"	4	"	20
Total		42		477

These figures show an average of about 11 students to each instructor. However, the first mentioned four seminaries having 27 teachers and 395 students, have nearly 15 students to each professor; while the remaining three seminaries, with 15 teachers and 82 students, average but five and a half students to a professor.

It is aside from our present purpose or desire to comment on these figures, further than to say, that if the church lack candidates it is evidently not from want of sufficient provision under able and renowned professors, and with large endowments and means of pecuniary assistance in the theological schools. Twice the present number of students might be therein accommodated. But now, taking the number of students in these seminaries, and dividing by three, which is the number of years in the seminary course of study, we have resulting a prospective yearly increase of candidates from this source of about 160. It is, however, to be considered, as will hereafter be illustrated, that a goodly proportion of these students are candidates of various other denominations, seeking here the superior educational facilities offered by our schools, which fact seriously lessens the prospective proportion of candidates herefrom for our own supply. But, as already shown, the average annual number demanded by the wants of the church from other sources than that caused by retirement from active duties of the ministry is 190. This makes apparent the necessity of an increase for estimated demands of our churches, of certainly not less than 100, and probably 150, ministers annually, of whom, if, as last year's figures show, 50 came from other churches, we should have to satisfy the demand of no less than 100 more theological students annually. And this estimate is based upon the present rate of progress in our church without

providing for that enlargement of her work, naturally to be expected, and certainly to be prayed for and looked for in her present position.

Now the grave question inevitably arises, whence are we to reasonably expect this increase, imperatively required to meet the demand which is now steadfast, and that will constantly grow more pressing in its necessity year by year, unless the church decline?

It is a legal requirement of our system, and according to our time-honored custom and inherited principles, that candidates should be prepared, before entering upon their theological training, by a thorough collegiate course, or its full equivalent. It is, therefore, both lawful and expedient to inquire what our church has been doing meanwhile, and what she is now doing, to prepare educated material for her theological schools, by establishing, or fostering, an adequate system of collegiate training preparatory to these technical schools of theology. The answer is as evident as it is damaging, and may reveal, in large part, the secret of this growing insufficiency of candidates. It is a fact that this most important matter has been largely left to provide for itself, in the hands of private educational corporations, often representing her interests, indeed, but very feebly aided by the direct agency and efforts, and, alas! often not encouraged by the sympathies of the church itself. There are a few of these noble collegiate institutions that, through a struggle for many years, a struggle, often, for bare existence, have done most of this preliminary work; but one or two of which have been able to attain, in long years, the rank and power absolutely needed for the demand the church has ever made upon them. The sacrifice has mainly fallen upon a few self-sacrificing instructors, who have devoted their lives, and not unfrequently, besides, their individual means, to the bearing of burdens that justly belonged to the church they were serving.

Now, it is a growing conviction among many of the thoughtful and far-seeing ministers and members of the church, that she has failed, and is failing, just at this point, and that she is suffering, and must suffer more in the future, because of this failure. They feel, that before she can secure to herself such an educated ministry, as she must needs have to insure success

in her labors, she must, as a church, extend her educational work further down toward youth, and lay hold with energy and enthusiasm upon the system of collegiate training. In other words, for the sake of her theological schools, and her coming ministry, not to mention the expanding need of an educated Presbyterian laity in this day of increasing lay effort, the church herself should do for the colleges, also, what has been recognized and performed as bounden duty in the case of theological training. For while we have been in large part neglecting this sphere of work altogether, except in a few special and partial instances, other and rival interests have been quietly assuming control of collegiate training, and turning its practical influence and products into other channels than the supply of the ministry.

A careful analysis of the various colleges whence students come to our theological seminaries will yield abundant light on this subject. Fortunately, the annual catalogues of these seminaries, for 1875-76, furnish us with carefully prepared tables that afford the information desired. There were, as we have already seen, 477 students in these seminaries last year, of whom ten are enrolled as post-graduates, whose colleges are not named, and who, therefore, are necessarily omitted in our count. With regard to the remaining 467 students, an exact collation of the catalogues yields the following results: There are 13 colleges represented in these lists, that are enrolled as "Presbyterian" in *Johnson's Universal Cyclopædia*, which is supposed to be the most recent and accurate authority on this point, and in which it is inferred, on substantial grounds, that the authorities of the colleges themselves have been consulted as to the statement of their denominational connections, since the special accounts of these colleges in this Cyclopædia have been avowedly prepared, in most cases, by some official connected therewith. That no injustice may be done to any, we have faithfully followed, in every case, this authority of the Cyclopædia, which is also confirmed by the Annual Reports of the Commissioner of Education. These 13 colleges labeled "Presbyterian," furnish the following number of theological students for the year 1875-76, arranged in the order of their comparative numbers: Princeton College, 64; Hamilton, 28; Washington and Jefferson, 26; Wooster, 24; Lafayette, 23;

Hanover, 20; Wabash, 18; Maryville, 13; Blackburn, 4; Westminster (Mo.), 3; Center, 3; Highland, 2; Lincoln, 2—total, 230 students. Thus, colleges reckoned as Presbyterian furnish but 230 of 467 students therein—a *little less than half the number*—leaving 237 to come from other quarters. Of this remainder a few are enrolled as from high-school, school, collegiate institute, academy, normal school, and naval academy, not having had any proper collegiate training whatever; while a goodly number of those from colleges named are not enrolled as graduates, but as having been in partial attendance upon their course; both of which facts deserve the earnest attention of the church, and especially of the Presbyteries, in view of *Form of Government*, chap. xiv: sec. 3.*

Of those students from colleges not enrolled as "Presbyterian," the following list shows those institutions represented by numbers of four or upward: Amherst (Cong.) 18; Yale (Cong.) 12; Westminster, Pa. (U. P.) 12; Williams (Cong.) 9; Marietta (Undenom.) 9; Union (Undenom.) 8; Western Reserve (Undenom.) 8; Oberlin (Cong.) 7; Dartmouth (Cong.) 6; Rochester (Bap.) 5; Dalhousie 5; and the following by four each: Allegheny (Meth.), Franklin (P. and U. P.), Monmouth (U. P.), Muskingum (Undenom.), Rutgers (Ref.), Knox (Cong.), Michigan Univ. (State), Univ. of Penn. (Undenom.), and Waynesburg (Cumb. Pres.) These twenty colleges furnish 135 students, leaving the remainder of 102 students either non-collegiates, or scattered among forty-five other colleges mentioned, among which, it may be stated, incidentally, for subsequent use, but eight State universities are named, which give sixteen students in all, an average of two students for the ministry for each State university; while of the larger secular institutions, Cornell gives two, and Harvard but ONE. Now, of these, about sixty students are from Congregational colleges, and twenty others from institutions in which Presbyterians have a partial interest, while the Reserves, such as Marietta and Western Colleges, of nearly all the other denominations, are represented. This last fact has an important

* "And it is recommended that the candidate (for licensure) be also required to produce a diploma of Bachelor or Master of Arts, from some college or university; or, at least, authentic testimonials of his having gone through a regular course of learning."

bearing on the previous estimate, made to show our delinquency of candidates; since, judging by the denomination of the colleges attended, *one-third* of the students would belong to other branches of the church. This, however, is too large an estimate, considering the fact that Presbyterian students do not unfrequently attend other denominational schools. An estimate of one-fifth of our theological students belonging to other denominations, is certainly within reasonable inference. Nor is this difference remedied by Presbyterian students in theological seminaries of other denominations. This tedious, but accurate collation of figures must assuredly fix the attention of every thoughtful and earnest member of our church upon the startling fact of the utter and lamentable inadequacy of collegiate institutions under our own control, or even influence, as related merely to the wants of the rising ministry.

It is also not impossible that this promiscuous training of half our ministry during their collegiate education, in *sixty-five* (!) non-Presbyterian institutions, may have something to do with the intimation not unfrequently heard as to the character of the coming ministry, and its relative efficiency and power as compared with that of former days; and may further assist in accounting for both the large number of vacant churches, and of unoccupied ministers.

When, however, we enlarge our view, and take into account the necessity of a laity thoroughly trained under Presbyterian influences, and the bias almost certainly given to students, and impressing them for life, by the special religious and denominational influences of the colleges they attend, surely no one who loves our branch of the church, and has hopes for her permanence as a body of believers, can remain unimpressed with the disastrous lack of Presbyterian collegiate education.

Let us now consider some important facts bearing upon this subject, holding the coming ministry especially in view; and, afterward, inquire as to some possible modes of remedy for the evil.

First.—In the first place, it is hardly necessary to do more than mention the absorbing interest taken in the cause of collegiate education by the fathers in our church, and their indefatigable and zealous labors to secure the establishment of such institutions under their own immediate control. We

might, indeed, go back to Geneva, and to Scotland, and to the Reformed Churches of the Continent generally, and show how their position in conflict with spiritual powers that held the means and instruments of education, so far as they existed at all, in their hands, opened before the Reformers, as a prime necessity of self-existence, and of ecclesiastical succession, the establishment of such institutions as would prove promotive of the Reformed principles, and under their own direction ; and, undoubtedly, under a similar pressure from the Established Church, and having the critical position and wise example of the Reformers before their eyes, did our American fathers awaken to their need of the defensive and protective power of colleges in which men after their own heart and mind might be trained. We have reaped the fruit of their far-seeing wisdom in this respect, and, in so doing, we should consider what our ecclesiastical descendants, in turn, may require at our hands. This statement, thus made, does not need verification to those who have even the slightest familiarity with the early history of American collegiate effort. Before the middle of the last century, and when the first synod of our church numbered but fifty ministers, direct action was begun, and a school of an academical character, as preparatory to higher effort, was definitely established, to teach "languages, philosophy, and divinity." And this action was subsequent to the establishment of the Log College of Tennent, and of other schools holding a real though informal relation to the synod, as its records abundantly show. The connection of this synod subsequently with Princeton College is well known, and though, for State reasons, it was not formally recognized, yet, the sending by the synod of Gilbert Tennent and Samuel Davis abroad as agents in its behalf, and the address issued and sent by their hands to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, with the generous response of the National Collection ordered by the Scottish Assembly, amounting to \$12,000, together with repeated ordering of collections in all the congregations of the synod for it, abundantly expound the relations existing between the synod and the college, which has also been illustrated in all their subsequent history. In those days, synod and presbytery, and in due time the assembly, in various forms and modes, all took direct action,

looking to the establishment and maintenance of Presbyterian colleges. In Pennsylvania, Virginia, New York, North and South Carolina, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, and elsewhere, such efforts were countenanced and encouraged. Indeed, there seemed to be but one spirit in the church on this subject, down to a recent period, and the ablest pens of our ministry have devoted their highest eloquence to the maintenance of these views. Perhaps it is owing to the many failures in these efforts, from causes usually wholly beyond the control of the church and its courts, that the zeal of the church herein has grown slack, and the sentiments so ardently advocated have been permitted to find a temporary repose.

But these views, inherited from the Reformers and pressed into activity by the demands of their own times, are no less true and no less important in these present days. And we may, hereafter, attempt to show that the nature of the times calls most loudly for their resurrection and enforcement, and that the difficulties that interposed for their temporary abatement do now no longer exist. If the fathers were wise in these opinions, it certainly behooves the church to re-examine them, and inquire whether certain evils, that are likely to befall her interests, may not be traced to the modern neglect of a subject deemed formerly so essential to her life.

Second.—Attention should also be further directed to the fact, that other Christian denominations are evidently impressed with the extreme importance of these views, and have taken action accordingly in the foundation of institutions that represent and propagate their own doctrinal opinions. The zeal and activity of some of these sister churches, resulting to their vast advantage, should afford us a stimulus for re-awakened exertion, while the comparative decline of others who have neglected them should prove a warning, lest we fall under the same condemnation. We may instance the American Methodist Church, whose growth and power have advanced to a degree parallel with the expansion of their educational efforts, and who now stand in the forefront in the advocacy of the cause of especial education for their own ecclesiastical development. And statistics might be offered to prove, beyond a cavil, that both the ministry and the laity of our church have suffered seriously from the influences thus brought to bear upon our

own youth who have been subjected to the educational direction of other denominational institutions. The only consolation is, that our loss has been their gain, and that the general cause of Christ has not suffered as it might, had these students been given over to the formative power of purely secular education.

We may, indeed, learn some valuable lessons in this respect from the Romish Communion, and its unswerving maintenance of the necessity of education under its own control. *Fas est ab hoste doceri*. For without trenching upon the discussion of the relation of the church to the secular schools, this much will appear evident, that the Church of Rome is right from its standpoint, and only provides for its own safety by insisting upon holding the higher, not to speak of the lower, education of its youth in its own hands. What now appears as an urgent requirement for its self-preservation, may ere long impress itself upon the Protestant churches as an equal necessity for their existence, in these days of the boasting advocacy of so-called scientific opposition to the truth in many educational quarters, and in schools and colleges utterly beyond church control. This secret of the power of Rome and her great gains in many quarters through her educational organizations, so often patronized by Protestants, may admonish us to be warned in time, while the popular growth of skeptical views largely among our youth, and mainly advanced through irreligious or non-religious educational agencies, should fix our attention upon facts and prospects, and guard us against disasters, whose approach is portended not only by hostile, but by friendly voices.

Third.—The peril in which our church is placing herself by neglecting direct collegiate education is to be found, not as in some former times, in the state of general ignorance that might result, at least in part, from such neglect. But the danger now is, that the rising generation may be very thoroughly instructed under influences alien, if not positively hostile to the spread of evangelical piety. Since the leaders of our church have ceased to take a prominent and persistent position on this subject—that is, within the last few years, there has been a steadily and rapidly advancing spirit of education laying hold of our American youth. The development of the popular influence of our public schools, through their increasing thoroughness and sci-

entific management in the last score of years, is something really remarkable. New and systematic methods, organized and trained teachers, lavish means of support, and adequate buildings and apparatus, have increased their efficiency ten-fold. Well nigh all the children of the land have been drawn into these schools, and their courses of study have been gradually advanced until many of them land their pupils, moderately well prepared on the average, at the doors of the college course. The subject of compulsory education is also now seriously discussed. Meanwhile, much of the religious education formerly gained for such of them as were of pious parentage, by a certain proportion of home education, and more largely by private schools and academies under avowedly religious teachers, is now almost entirely lost. For the average religious influence of State schools cannot rise, in the nature of the case, above the same influence in the State itself. Even were the reading of the Scriptures and opening prayer permitted—which are not every where allowed—these exercises must necessarily be but formal and general in their religious impression, to suit the views of everybody's children who attend. Thus the educational power of the primary schools has grown to be well nigh universal in the land with a religious influence necessarily infinitesimal; and the church has already lost, and probably irredeemably lost, much in this respect that it formerly held. Also, growing out of this primary education is the growing tendency of the State to enter into contest for the control of the higher education afforded by colleges and all institutions preparatory to professional or purely technical training. In the East generally, where colleges have been taking root for a century past, and where many of them have become fortified in financial means and influence and in public favor, this encroachment of State education does not seem so alarming. But in the Western States and in some parts of the East, not thoroughly furnished with collegiate advantages, the State colleges are rapidly rising into a power that endangers the very existence of all denominational or independent institutions. The vast advantage of State funds upon which to fall back for support renders their success unquestionable, allowing necessary time for growth and experience in work. There are State institutions West of the Mississippi whose annual income fully equals \$30,000, be-

sides large annual appropriations. Looking upon this subject purely in the light of popular education, the rise and growth of these universities may be matters of public congratulation. But, considering the question as purely secular, as distinguished from religious education in the colleges, and the results likely to flow to religion in the land from the grasp of the State laid upon higher education, we do most earnestly feel and contend that the result will logically and necessarily be that the church will thereby become largely shorn of the power that comes through the direction of the education of her youth, and more especially as related to the furnishing of her future ministry. We are aware that we are touching upon delicate ground, and we feel it necessary to express our respect for the general management of these State institutions thus far in their history. But we invoke the candid and foreseeing consideration of religious men to the results likely and, as we believe, inevitably to flow from the wide prevalence of this system. It is admitted that there may be, and that there are, in some, or in all, of these institutions, individual professors who are godly men, and who, from their respective chairs of languages, science, and philosophy, may exert a positive religious influence upon the students under their control. And the general impression of such institutions may be, for a time, in a positively religious direction. But certain other facts are also to be considered, as follows: *First*, from the fact of their control by the State, such colleges cannot be made sure for such a position, because they belong to the people, and are under the direction of the Legislatures, and, as every one knows, these cannot be controlled and permanently held in any religious direction. The same conditions will insure that they eventually follow in the same direction with the public schools of lower grade.

Fourth.—It is beyond dispute, and, therefore it is not invidious to mention, that in many of their chairs there are, and that in any of them there are likely to be placed, professors who are thoroughly imbued with the modern spirit of opposition to religion, which claims support from science, or, at least, to orthodox views of religion. For it is a boast openly made, that clergymen are, and should be, shut out from these chairs, as in the days of Julian, even where their qualifications may be

equal to those of others, and that these institutions are to be kept free from any teachers who may impart a denominational or religious bias. And so, perhaps, it should be. But all direct religious influence is necessarily denominational to this extent, that all religious people belong to one or other of the denominations; and the hue and cry raised against denominationalism is made simply as the most popular appeal by which to oppose religious influence of all kinds in education. Now, as these State institutions succeed in possessing the control of higher education, do they deprive the church, in the same degree, of the influence of education for its own benefit, and obtained by such control. What colleges the church has are compelled to struggle all the more desperately for existence under the rivalry, if not with the aroused opposition, of the State institutions. The question that results therefore, is this—whether the church can succeed, as she might and ought, provided, ultimately, the higher education passes out of her hands into that of the State. We have already seen what were the views of the Fathers upon this subject, growing out of their experience of the control of higher education by powers not in sympathy with the church. And while these State universities have large and constantly increasing attendance, and among them sons of our ministers, and graduates numbered annually by hundreds, the statistics of the seminaries, already considered in this article, show the relatively small proportion of candidates for the ministry furnished from their walls—there being but eight of them represented in the seminaries, with an average of but two students from each institution, and sixteen in all. Looking now at the necessity of a supply, and especially of an increase, of candidates for the ministry who must come through college halls, the importance of securing institutions under church control, in view of the failure of these State institutions to do this work, would seem to be most urgent. And the question, whether the passing of collegiate control from the church to the State has not much to do with the comparative decrease in candidates, is one demanding most serious examination. Leaving the State her institutions for her public uses, can the church neglect to establish and maintain her own institutions for her own use without prospect of serious peril?

Fifth.—As the counterpart of the last consideration,

which we have endeavored to present as mildly as the circumstances of the case permit, there arises the estimate of the value of institutions under church influence, direct or indirect, to the advancement of the church, and especially to the supply of the ministry. And surely the historical argument here should be decisive without any protracted elaboration. Everyone who knows anything whatever about the subject, understands the vast religious power exercised in these church colleges upon all the youth educated therein. This power arises, first, from the presence of men of positive religious views in the several chairs, who, in the presentation of every subject, bring to bear the arguments for religion belonging to the range of that study. There is scarcely a branch taught in any department of higher education that may not be made, that is not made, consciously or unconsciously, by the professor thereof, either subversive or confirmatory of religion. Moreover, the religious character and avowed opinions of the professor create deep and abiding influence upon his pupils. And a teacher, even by incidental comment, or a sneer, and by the general tone of his instructions, without positive and openly expressed bias, will seriously affect the views of the youth in his department. Young men at the period of college education are learning to inquire for themselves into all questions, and religion with the rest. The age of inquiry is the age of natural skepticism, which is well nigh certain to affect every young mind at the point where it begins to think for itself. Inquiring too often begins with displacing the presumption of the truth of religion as the basis of examination. If the doctrine of the natural depravity of the human mind and heart, and that man has lost the image of God in knowledge, be true, it follows that the presumption naturally leans in the direction of the rejection of religion. And the youth, from this standpoint, demands that the truth of religion be demonstrated, contrary to the bent of his natural feelings. This is, then, a very dangerous period in life, and one that demands incessant and positive religious influences ever present, in every department of training, as a safeguard against the dangers of skepticism and the natural unbelief of the human heart.

The general tone and impression of religious society among students is also a very essential factor in the safeguard of col-

legiate education. Youth run in flocks, and where the public opinion is not vigilantly guarded and directed toward religious belief, the rush of the multitude, the force of public opinion, is a very serious danger to all subjected to its control. And then, again, the great gain made to religious ranks, both in laity and for the clergy, by those revivals of religion that so frequently appear in religious colleges, is universally conceded. There is not a college connected with our church from whose classes year after year there have not gone forth into the ministry young men who were converted within its walls, and whose attention and intention have been therein directed toward this sacred sphere of toil. Many of the brightest lights in the church, and many of its most efficient servants in all fields of her work, at home and abroad, acknowledge the direction thus given to their lives by the specific power of the college revival, and of the college influence when revivals have not appeared. Many of these ministers have been drawn from outer circles not religious, or from other denominations, and have proved a direct gain, which would not have been made but for the control of the college over their spiritual lives. Now the practical question arises, whether colleges not under religious control have done, or can do, this work for the church; and whether the church can endure to leave this kind of work undone. Be it also noted in this connection, that the revivals of religion, so extensive in our religious colleges during the past winter, did not extend, to any appreciable extent, among institutions under secular or non-religious direction; and the material increase of students for the ministry already in our theological seminaries in the present year, of itself, bears ample testimony to the correctness of these views.

Sixth—Another thought, bearing upon the increase of our candidates for the ministry, deserves attention. Connected with the more extensive education of youth in the land, and largely springing from it, is the increase of spheres for the employment of educated talent. The old limitation of the educated to the three leading professions, law, medicine, and theology, has passed away. New fields have been added quite as broad, influential, and to many far more attractive than these. The press, with the various literary occupations connected therewith, demands annually quite as many laborers

as were formerly required for the three learned professions. Scientific occupations have opened in every direction, with amorous charms for the young and ambitious mind. Art has increased her spheres a hundred-fold. The building of railroads, architecture, and the working of the metals, annually demand thousands for their service. Politics have grown into a profession largely followed; every form of manufacture and trade now invoke the aid of educated mind, as never before in the history of the world. The profession of the teacher is calling to our young men from ten thousand school-houses, even in the farthest regions of the West, while the law and medicine need their representatives in every hamlet from Maine to Oregon. The whole world meanwhile is open to missionary labor, and our home fields are but sparsely scattered over with those who carry the glad tidings of salvation. Now whence, amidst all these various calls, are the Christian fields to be supplied with sufficient laborers? The attractions of the other callings are growing every year more fascinating, as these callings are becoming more profitable, and offering increasing opportunities to ambition and love of fame and power. That the ministry suffers very seriously in the loss of the best talent formerly devoted to its service, by the rivalry of these new occupations, any one may see, and the church has already felt the loss. There is also need for renewed and utmost diligence on the part of the church, to increase and strengthen every influence by which our young men may be drawn back, against these rival forces, to her ranks. And where does the secret of her practical power in this respect lie, but in giving herself with a new and great awakening to the necessity of striking early in life, and beginning to train youth for her own heavenly uses, in the stage of collegiate education, during which the young usually decide upon their course in life?

Seventh.—Nor do we dare omit reference to that alien spirit of the age which has reared its head aloft with so much audacity and determination in this latter time, challenging the power of the church, and defying her on every hand, to self-defense. There never has been a valuable scientific discovery, nor any seeming advance in knowledge, that has not been instantly seized by the enemies of religion, and urged on some

pretext against the fundamental positions of the church. The warfare has usually been begun by the boastful declaration, that now the church will be put to her utmost strength to save herself from overthrow, and her downfall has been triumphantly proclaimed in advance. This exultation of anticipated victory carries with it the popular phrenzy, and often weakens the confidence even of believers themselves. The past is repeating itself, in this respect, in the present, and it has taken into alliance with itself all the power of the modern scientific discovery it can seduce or torture into its service; while modern popular philosophy, in its strongholds, is avowedly its guardian and high authority. The science of nature, and the science of the human mind, including the new science of society, have struck hands in an appeal to the widely educated mind of the century for the overthrow of religion, as a superstition of the past. The fickle, but powerful, spirit of the age is in danger of yielding ready submission to this organized combination, and the church has already a terrible conflict on her hands. Without dread as to the ultimate result, the church must yet see and feel that for this battle she must have a ministry fortified in the faith, and widely instructed in science. The well-nigh universal hold which the press has gained upon the public mind, both through the volume and the newspaper, avails to scatter the knowledge of evil as well as good, and to instruct all reading minds everywhere, both in the discoveries of science, and in the influences thence drawn by hostile minds against the positions of Christianity. The pulpit is no longer the only nor the main channel for the publication of opinions upon religion. And the minister preaches on the Sabbath, even in remote districts, to an audience daily fed on religious themes by other teachers, and often by those holding views contrary to his own, of science, philosophy, and religion. It follows, therefore, that the ministry of the present and future must be one versed, at least, as well as are the people upon all themes bearing upon the defence of religion, and upon the phases of its conflict with all other departments of knowledge.

These things are widely reflected upon, and often written about. But they bear with peculiar force upon the position herein defended, that such a ministry as the times demand is not likely to be forthcoming, if the church continue to rely

upon secular collegiate institutions, for the supply of a ministry to be educated along the line of her necessary defence. It is a mistake common to many of our most thoughtful and penetrating minds, if it be a mistake, that the church is already seriously suffering in her highest interests from her remissness in planting and sustaining colleges for her own young men, wherein they may be trained with rigid exactness and exhaustive thoroughness, in those fundamental principles that enter into this modern phase of the contest with unbelief, and in which they may be saved to the ranks of her learned defenders. The enemies of religion have grasped much of this influence, and in many institutions of this land, abundantly patronized by Christian parents, their sons are being indoctrinated, with great subtlety, in the new views, which, beginning with scientific and philosophic skepticism, lead on to practical infidelity and ruin; and by these means, which the church seems slow to employ, her own sons are being seduced to the ranks of those who are proving themselves her most dangerous adversaries.

Eighth.—It is worth while to mention, if not to elaborate, the most popular argument urged against Christian colleges, and pressed with especial fervor by the leaders in the ranks of secular education. Assuming the position of friends of genuine religion and a pure Christianity, they display their zeal in behalf of the church by avowing themselves the particular champions of her unity, and the baptized defenders of her consolidation as against sectarian divisions. One could think, to hear them argue, that denominationalism were the highest phase of apostasy, worse than skepticism, worse than atheism—even the betrayal of Christ by his own people. In their eyes, denominational colleges are the crying evil of the day, since they tend to keep alive sectarianism and to postpone the day of consolidated unity. It is apparent to every penetrating observer that such theorists have mounted this hobby merely for the purpose of advancing their own particular schemes of education. But in this age of sincere, loving desire for unity, and for organic union among God's people, the dogmatism of these teachers and their followers affects many truly devout persons even of our branch of the church, and renders them cautious in their support of their own church institutions. We need

only pause to show that this outcry against sects and sectarian institutions is pure and silly sentimentalism, unpractical and impracticable sensationalism. The existence of denominations representing different phases of interpretation of the meaning of the Scriptures, in the statement of its doctrinal truths, does by no means imply or necessitate mutual hostility or even enmity between these various branches of the church. Through their instrumentality and the power of their various organizations, all classes of people and nearly all nations have been reached by the gospel. We doubt whether as much could have been accomplished for Christianity by any other system of propagation. The mingling of all branches of the church into one heterogeneous mass, while their conscientious views differ as to leading truths of the gospel, would be folly, as absurd as destructive. And to compel or persuade all Christians to the same religious convictions, while they remain in an unsanctified condition, is an Utopian dream, possible only to the most visionary theorists. What is needed is not organic union, but spiritual unity. Experience also shows that the more zealous each Christian is in promoting his own especial theories of work, the more effectually does the general cause of pure religion advance. The entrance of coldness and want of zeal into any denomination opens the door to liberalism and consequent feebleness in pressing on the gospel. And the catholic spirit is invariably found to be broadest among those who maintain the greatest activity in their particular spheres of Christian toil. But looking at the matter in the only possible, practical light, we see that the various denominations do exist and are certain to endure for a considerable time to come. What then shall be done in the church meanwhile, before the boasted day of absolute unity arrives? Shall each denomination cease its individual efforts, surrender its particular schemes of activity, and fall in with any general current that may chance to sweep it away? As for ourselves, so long as we have a Presbyterian organization, no necessity would seem more imperative than that of urgently maintaining in full power and efficiency all our own methods of self-support and advancement. And until, as a denomination, we are prepared for surrender or death, it would be egregious folly for us to listen to the syren voices of those enthusiasts who decry denominationalism and invoke us

by their delusive songs to the strait betwixt the shoals of liberalism on the one hand, and the whirlpool of absolutism on the other. If such enemies, whom we believe to be the most dangerous foes of the true spiritual unity of the church, can persuade us to abandon the only efficient means by which our ministry, and consequently our branch of the Lord's Zion, can be maintained, they will gain an easy victory for their heresies, and strike a serious blow at the cause of Christ itself. How much of the apathy of the church as to her own educational organizations may have sprung from the wide-spread diffusion of these liberal notions of church unity we cannot tell, but that such views naturally would produce precisely such an effect, and that they have been most zealously advocated in the ears of our people, we all do know.

And this fact is especially patent as relating to our collegiate system. For while there is no question as to the vital importance of pure religious family training that precedes the college course, or as to the same necessity for denominational theological training for the ministry that follows the college work, the no less important duty in regard to the collegiate education that intervenes, seems to have fallen into disrepute and largely into neglect. That many earnest efforts formerly organized have failed, for various reasons, has undoubtedly caused the loss of heart therein. But the change of the sentiment of the times as to education in general, and especially the awakening of zeal in the endowment of educational schemes, show that the former causes of failure may now be largely remedied, and that the church may press on her collegiate system to success, if she will but apply her energies to the inviting task.

It only remains to consider what *practical means* may be employed for the reorganization of this system of collegiate instruction, and its future efficient administration. The first appeal must evidently be made to the educated ministry and laity of our church, who should carefully consider the vital bearing of this subject upon the coming life and energy of our own church organization. This is a call for personal activity and influence in support of our own organized colleges, and for the establishment of new colleges, where the future may reasonably seem to demand their existence. The ministry,

from the pulpit, and in private, should bring their whole influence to bear in encouraging Presbyterian parents to shun the dangers of educating their children in other schools, and to send them where they know every lawful power will be brought to bear to save them to our own faith, and to our own church organizations. Parents need not only instruction but example here. And the sons of our ministers, from whom our ministerial ranks are so largely recruited, should be sent conscientiously to our own schools, in preference to all others, despite convenience of location, and other comparatively trivial advantages. That our own institutions accomplish this training quite as efficiently and successfully, will be conceded by those who take sufficient pains to examine. The laity of our church, who believe in her divine calling to an especial mission among men for Jesus Christ, should also be awakened, not only to encourage and support our own colleges, but to contribute liberally of their means for their endowment. If our laity were as keenly alive to our own interests, as are those of many other denominations, there would be comparatively little difficulty in the support of our colleges. For Presbyterians are notably an educating church, as we have ever been, and we need only to preserve our own forces within ourselves, to ensure eminent prosperity. And we have reason to know that our own sons are urgently and systematically spirited away by exaggerated representations to other schools, even of other denominations.

That our synods and presbyteries should likewise enter with revived zeal into this cause is also apparent. The power of their approval and support is one of the strongest aids that can be rendered, and is eagerly sought in many quarters by schools whose influence is not directly to our advantage, to say the least. That their active sympathy and approval should be withheld from others, where thereby a disadvantage falls upon our own colleges, is evidently the first step. After that the discussion may fairly be opened as to what measures may be taken that will best elevate and strengthen those institutions that represent their own principles, and furnish candidates for their own ministry. The influence of local jealousies that have often proved so disastrous, and the partiality of ministers for their own alma maters, often distant from their present fields

of labor, should be considerably repressed, and, with one heart and mind, all should unite for the maintenance of the institutions most directly advantageous to their own Presbyterial or Synodical interests. We feel that such counsel is not only wise, but absolutely essential to our church extension, and that it needs to be openly expressed, and considered carefully, in these times of the pressure of many-sided education upon the people at large. The Presbyteries might likewise direct candidates for the ministry to our own schools.

But, rising to a still higher point of view, we are led to inquire what may our church do through her general agencies, for the spread of the gospel, in the advancement of this cause. This brings us to the discussion of a question of considerable delicacy, and which is approached with much hesitancy, after long and serious deliberation. Our church has organized certain general schemes for the direction of particular spheres of church activity, and has committed the same to Boards, appointed to the control of these several departments. Among these, is this vast educational field, with its Board of Education. It is fair to inquire, in a friendly and thoroughly loyal spirit, laying aside all tendency to mere criticism, what this Board is doing, and what it may lawfully do, for the encouragement and maintenance of our colleges. It becomes necessary, at this point, to revert to the past. In what may be termed the palmy days of the educational work, under Assembly direction, when Van Rensselaer and Chester on the one side, and Thornton A. Mills on the other, gave their enthusiasm, and well-nigh their lives, to its promotion, the cause of denominational education was constantly and eloquently advocated throughout the bounds of the church, both by the secretaries themselves, and by the great masters in Israel, summoned to their aid. Both the *Reviews*, of which this REVIEW is the successor, bear abundant testimony in their pages to the efficiency of these efforts. The "*Home, School, and the Church*," an annual magazine, edited by the able and zealous Secretary, Van Rensselaer, was conducted through ten volumes with great power, and furnishes well nigh 2,000 pages, containing about 200 articles bearing directly upon our own church educational schemes. The address of the leading educators were therein carefully collected, and published to the church,

among them the various exhaustive discussions of the editor himself, presented previously in person before various Synods and Presbyteries and educational institutions. These volumes form, without exception, the most valuable repository of information and argument, on this subject, to be found in this country. The General Assembly was itself encouraged and rallied every year to zeal in this cause; many institutions were organized, and others were lifted up to conditions of temporary efficiency. Had the work been pressed on to the present, in the same spirit and power, there would be less need of the argument and plea here presented. In those days, the secretaries visited the various institutions, in person, as required by the constitution of the Board, wrought among the teachers and youth, awoke a lively spirit in all hearts toward this cause, as well as toward that of personal religion, and gained many valuable accessions to the ministry, not a few of whom are now in active labor in our ranks. The course of education stood well-nigh abreast with those of Home and Foreign Missions, and the annual pleas made to the church in its behalf, presented the highest arguments, and rang with electric appeals, that the church could not resist, showing "that the educational institutions of the church have ever constituted a part of her true glory and power, from primitive times, through the Reformation, down to the present period."

In addition to this advocacy of the claims of this cause, plans were organized for the raising of funds, through this agency, to support such institutions as needed immediate assistance. And while no effort was made to raise permanent funds for endowment, in one branch of the church at least, grants were annually voted to aid professors and teachers in such institutions to reimburse them for their expenses in the education of candidates for the ministry, while collections were taken in the churches for the securing of funds to be thus used. Scholarships were also founded in various institutions through the agency of the Board and as authorized by the Assembly. Thus, for example, we have the action of the Assembly (O. S.) as follows:

1848. "*Resolved*, That colleges, as an integral part, and in their widespread relations to the best interests of society, a vitally important part, of a complete system of Christian edu-

cation, demand the fostering care of the church, and that the Board of Education be, and hereby is, authorized to assist in the promotion of the cause of collegiate education by means of any funds that may be given for that purpose."

1851. "It is recommended to our churches and members to assist, as far as possible, in the endowment of our colleges, and to co-operate with the Board of Education in sustaining them during the interval for which they may need aid."—*Baird's Digest*, p. 411.

The protracted alliance of the other branch of the church with the American Education Society, or its branches, and the more recent organization of its own committee of education by its General Assembly, insured large success to this cause in that field. And the enthusiasm awakened, and the generous offerings made in its support, need no comment. Suffice it to say that the whole Presbyterian Church was thoroughly aroused to the importance of constant and active exertion in its behalf, and that its growth in both branches was steadfast, exceedingly profitable to the church, and beneficial to the ministry. We have the authority of the present administration of the Board of Education for saying, that a careful examination of the Minutes of Assembly for the present year shows that out of 4,744 ministers enrolled, 1,853—about one-third of the number—have been aided by the Boards of our church, as constituted before and since re-union. If we add to these those who were assisted by local organizations in the late N. S. branch before 1862, when the Assembly's committee was organized, the proportion will be greatly increased.

In turning to consider the condition of this work in our reunited church, a candid statement reveals the fact, that the pleas and appeals to the church, except as to the general work of the promotion of revivals of religion, which is the remote and indirect mode of advancing this cause of education, have fallen into comparative desuetude; that the visits of the representatives of this cause to our educational institutions have well nigh ceased; that collections are no longer made in the churches for aid of the academies and colleges; that all popular enthusiasm in the church on the subject has expired; that the work of this Board has fallen into an humble and subsidiary place beside the other great agencies for the spread of the Gospel; and that no zeal

is enkindled in the Assembly in its behalf. And all this has come to pass while education in society and in the State has awakened more and more the popular enthusiasm, and has advanced with liberal expenditures and rapid strides. And we state the literal fact when we assert, that the sphere of this Board has been reduced well-nigh to the single agency whereby food and clothing are doled out to a moderate number of candidates for the ministry every year. Meanwhile, many in the church have grown incredulous as to the propriety of even this much effort and expenditure; influential organs of the press have called in question the necessity and propriety of the existence of the board; for which, and other reasons, it has been steadily losing popular favor, and the comparatively small sum needed for its meagre and recently reduced appropriations is with difficulty obtained. Instead of assisting the colleges in the support of the young men who are passing through their course, the Board does nothing in this direction whatever, all its funds being needed for their temporal necessities. Every one of our colleges in which candidates are educated has to expend annually, in furnishing free tuition to the candidates under the care of the Board, *fully as much money* as the Board gives these students for the supply of their material wants—estimating by the proportionate expense for the education of each pupil. The college takes care of his brains, and the Board takes care of his body only. Whether or not the colleges should be required to bear this burden alone, year in and year out, without any remuneration from the church therefor, is a question that it would not seem difficult for justice to answer. When the Board has the annual collections of the church to fall back upon, and the colleges, especially in the West, wherein so many of our candidates are educated, have only the narrow income from very insufficient endowments upon which to draw, it would seem but right that the church should at least lift this burden of expenditure in her own behalf from the backs of the colleges, through the agency of her educational administration.

Thus the broader and wider sphere of increased usefulness may be re-opened to the Board, whereby it may enlarge its operations, invoke new sympathies for its efforts, and increase its usefulness to the church and to the world, in laying plans

for the establishment of scholarships, and for the payment of the tuition of the youth committed by the Presbyteries to its care, to add nothing as to the new zeal it may awaken in behalf of our colleges. That we are justified in fixing this duty upon the Board may be seen by quoting from its constitution, as adopted by the re-united church, as follows: .

“Art. II.—*Objects.* The Board of Education shall be the organ of the General Assembly of the church, for the general superintendence of the church’s work in furnishing a pious, educated, and efficient ministry, in sufficient numbers to meet the calls of its congregations; to supply the wants of the destitute classes and regions of our own country, and to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. It shall provide for the collection and judicious distribution of the funds which may be requisite in the proper education of candidates for the ministry under its care, and it shall, in co-operation with the ecclesiastical courts, do whatever may be proper and necessary to develop an active interest in education throughout the church.”

Two things, by this showing, the Board is expected to do, as the organ of the church: first, to superintend the furnishing of a ministry in sufficient numbers for the demands of the church; and, secondly, to superintend the raising of necessary funds. And yet in the report of the Board for the current year, by the presentation of elaborate tables, it is shown, in its own words, that “the number of candidates for the ministry in the Presbyterian Church is not commensurate with the necessities and obligations of the Presbyterian Church in this country; the number of ministers is not enough for the churches and communicants, and it is relatively diminishing.” The report of the last Assembly Committee on Education, in considering this report of the Board, states that there has been a falling off in the number of candidates from the previous year of 38, and from two years past, of 92; and adds, that “the ratio of ministers, both to the communicants of the church and to the increasing population of the country, *has continued for many years to decline.*” The statistics presented by the Board also show, that while the present number of candidates is 460, “the probable total annual average, in both branches of the church, from 1850 to 1869, would be 572,” including 155 acad-

emical students now dropped, leaving the church just where she has stood, in this respect, for the last quarter of a century, except that she has ceased her academical work. Meanwhile, the church has gone on increasing, and other boards of the church have advanced with its progress.

A comparison of the present status of the church with that of the O. S. branch alone, in 1860, will further illustrate the subject, as follows :

1876—	Home Mis.	\$287,717	For. Mis.	\$517,689	Ed.	\$72,041	Mem.	\$535,210
1860—	“	“	118,904	“	“	237,583	“	70,970
								292,927

To these figures add, 1876, candidates 460 ; 1860, candidates 492 ; while the average amount annually contributed to education in the last five years is, according to the report, but \$62,000.

Thus, while the mission funds have both been more than doubled, and the church membership is well-nigh doubled also, education has barely held its own ; all the academical students, being one-fifth of the whole number, having been cut off ; and while, in 1860, \$6,340 were raised for the school-fund, not a dollar is reported as now secured for this purpose. The case would have appeared more hopeful if, in connection with this unfortunate showing of the Annual Report, some plans had been presented, by way of superintendence, for giving the cause a new impetus ; had some adequate efforts been put forth for arousing the failing zeal of the church, or, at least, for putting an end to the gradual but sure decline. We believe that the figures prove that from the time when the church began to lose her zeal and to cease her activity in behalf of her own colleges, the public interest waned, the funds ceased to flow, and the plan of struggle for existence by the Board began. The church surely has a right to look for the progress of this cause in relative proportion to the progress of her other schemes of work, especially since the furnishing of a ministry lies at the basis of success in every other department.

We have no disposition, as before stated, to reflect upon the Board or its executives, past or present, we are even zealous in our sympathy. But the statement of these facts seemed absolutely necessary both for the information of the

church, and for its benefit, and for the proper strength of our argument. The present time, moreover, when a change in the administration of the Board has occurred, and when there is a brief interval before full work may begin with new plans and higher purposes, seemed less offensive for the presentation of the facts, than a subsequent occasion might have proved. Under this new administration, opening with such promise of renewed vigor, may we not hope for an era of better things for church education. We have several strong colleges in the East, and quite a number on comparatively safe footing, though with very limited incomes, in the West—all are striving with much self-sacrifice on the part of capable professors to do the preliminary part of the training for the ministry that falls to their lot, conscientiously and effectively. We believe, after quite extensive examination into their condition, that they are in every respect worthy of the confidence and affection of the church. And not writing in any sense in behalf of any one of them, but sincerely desiring the success and enlargement of them all, to the utmost extent, we do with intense earnestness invoke the attention of our ministry and of our thoughtful laity to the work the institutions are doing so quietly, and to the necessity of fitting them adequately for the attainment of higher efficiency and larger results. As essential to the consecration of the purity, power, and very life of the church, as so intimately connected with the character and force of the ministry of the future, they assuredly do deserve the prayers, the cheering words, the helpful hands of all who love our Presbyterian fold. As against the encroachment of the world, as against the boasting attack of organized skeptical and materialistic forces, as against the inducements offered by other branches of the church, drawing many of our youth to their service, our colleges, though comparatively weak and much neglected, are doing duty that the future will be glad to recognize, though the present may underestimate its intrinsic value and ignore its wide extent.

The serious question, therefore, that presses upon the church in connection with their work, is not merely whether they are sufficient for the adequate supply of the ministry, provided the church do not increase but come to a stand-still, but what they are capable of doing in this direction, pro-

vided her work extend as it should. And the other question follows, if these church colleges do not afford that supply, from whence have we any expectation, founded upon experience or reason, that the necessary supply can be elsewhere secured.

Art. VIII.—THE VOWEL-POINTS CONTROVERSY IN THE XVI, XVII, AND XVIII CENTURIES.

By REV. B. PICK, Rochester, N. Y.

IN the second half of the last century, the controversy as to the age of the Hebrew vowel-points was terminated by the general acknowledgment that they were of comparatively recent origin. It is not our intention to review the whole range of literature treating on that subject, which is in part enumerated in Malcolm's Theological Index under *Vowels*.* We will give the gist of the matter in the briefest possible manner.

As early as the ninth century, Natronai II. ben Hilai,† in reply to the question, whether it is lawful to put the points to the Synagogal Scrolls of the Pentateuch, distinctly declared the points not to be Sinaitic (*i. e.*, sacred), but invented by the sages, hence we must not put the points to the scrolls of the law. "The same opinion as to the recent origin of the vowel-points was expressed by no less an authority than Ibn Ezra (born 1088, and died 1176), in his Hebrew Grammar, entitled *On the Purity of the Hebrew Style* (*Zathuth*, p. 79, ed. Fürth, 1827.) From Ibn Ezra, this opinion was also espoused by some Christian scholars in the middle ages, such as the celebrated Dominican, *Raymond Martin* (died 1287), who in his *Pugis Fidei* (pars iii, dissert. iii, cap. xxi, p. 895, ed. Carpzoo, Leipzig, 1687), boldly asserted that the vowel-points in the text of the Old Testament were put there by Ben Naphtali and Ben Asher, *circa*

* Malcolm puts Scaliger among those who defended the antiquity of the vowel-points, but this is a mistake, as he opposed it.

† Comp. our art. *Natronai II. ben Hilai* in the Cyclop. of McClintock and Strong.