

THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 4.

MAY, 1891.

No. 2.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

MORAL EDUCATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

BY THE HON. JOHN JAY.

A NOTABLE controversy is now being waged between two parties of Roman Catholics in the Republic, one composed chiefly of ecclesiastics, who recognize allegiance to the Court of Rome, and the other in great part of loyal American laity, who stand by their rights as Americans, and who hold to the public schools and American institutions. This conflict has much of interest and instruction for the American people, who are being asked by the Court of Rome to substitute for their common school the Roman parochial school, which the hierarchy finds itself unable to force upon the more intelligent members of its own communion, even by the thunders of the Vatican and spiritual penalties.

While the American press has been reserved on this subject, the Roman Catholic sheets have, at times, spoken frankly. The *Catholic Review* (December 23d, 1888), speaking of the two parties in their Church, asked, in regard to their opponents: "Is it too harsh to say that such men are traitors to the Catholic camp?" Another Roman journal, the *Lake Shore Visitor*, remarked that "no traitors are to be allowed in camp;" and emphasis is given to these sharp questions by the recent remark in the *New York Herald*, in a notice of Bishop McQuaid's assault on public schools in the *Forum*, December, 1889, that "the worthy bishop had arrayed himself against the vast majority of the co-religionists." They recall also the remark, attributed to the late E. C. Corrigan, of Boston, that "if a vote of the Irish Americans of Massachusetts were taken, nine tenths would give the public schools the first place."

Archbishop Purcell warned the Ultramontanes in his letter to Bishop Dupanloup, and said: "Our citizens of Irish nationality will have much difficulty in admitting that Pope Adrian IV., who was an Englishman, was infallible when he gave Ireland to

Henry II., of England. Until now," added the archbishop, "we have been permitted to say that the Roman Church had nothing to do with the transaction, and that it was not responsible for all that the Popes have done or might do."

The clear voice of O'Connell is still remembered by his countrymen in America: "I am sincerely a Catholic, but I am not a Papist. I deny the doctrine that the Pope has any authority, directly or indirectly, in Ireland. We have all denied that authority on oath, and we would die to resist it."*

The late Mr. McMasters, of the *Freeman's Journal* (March 12th, 1887), exposed the character of the Roman parochial schools in America, where "a smattering of the Catechism is supposed to fit them for the duties of life," and demanded schools that were not "apologies, compromises, systemless pretences," and proclaimed in words that should be heard over the entire continent and in Rome itself, "Methods that worked in the Old World will not work here."

Father Hecker, in the last book of his life, "The Church and the Age," pointing to France, Austria, Italy, Spain, Bavaria, Baden, South America, and Brazil, where the Roman Catholics, outnumbering all other Christians, are controlled and governed by hostile minorities, attributed the fact to the system of education adopted by the Jesuits of "increased personal dependence," "at the expense necessarily of those virtues which go to make up the strength of Christian manhood." In this fact Father Hecker "found the explanation why fifty millions of Protestants have had generally a controlling influence for a long period over two hundred millions of (Roman) Catholics in directing the movements and destinies of nations." The historic fact, thus plainly stated and

* "The Select Speeches of O'Connell," edited by his son, 1882, p. 447.

moral of sin; the conception of righteousness in the Old Testament; the later Jewish theology, and the New Testament. A sort of appendix to the discussion of the theological idea of righteousness is the chapter on the moral standards and the moral ideal in this period. The teleological idea is treated in two chapters, on the Kingdom of God and on the Eschatology. The division seems to me to have disadvantages which more than counterbalance its manifest convenience. For it obscures the fact that the kingdom of God is the eschatological idea of the older religion, and makes it difficult to show, without much repetition, how the hold which, in later times, incongruous ideas gained upon the faith of the Jewish people, and the attempt to combine them with the established doctrine, was the cause of the confusion which reigns in this whole sphere. The reign of God on earth, or what is the same thing, the reign of the saints of the Most High, was, for the old faith, a necessary corollary of the supremacy of Israel's God; it was a necessity of theodicy. The resurrection of the dead of Israel to participate in the glory and blessedness of that reign is, in turn, a corollary of the theodicy. So far all is simple and consistent; but the growing force of the belief in the immortality of the soul and in retribution for all mankind in another life, the increasing distinctness of the notes of universality and individuality in religion, found no adequate expression in this scheme. The new ideas did not succeed in displacing the old, but made for themselves a place beside them. In the next stage they were reconciled by the hypothesis that the earthly kingdom of the saints is of limited duration—in Fourth Ezra, four hundred years; in the New Testament Apocalypse, a thousand—and from being the end and justification of God's ways in history, the Messianic age becomes an episode, the meaning of which is no longer apparent. It is succeeded by the final judgment and the retributions of the other life. The inadequacy of the compromise is seen in the persistence of the disturbing question whether the times of the Messiah are to be reckoned to the world that now is or to the world that is to come. It is one of the consequences of this drift of thought that the figure of the Messiah becomes, I will not say of less prominence, but of less significance in the eschatology. After the Jews had come face to face with the world powers, had felt the grip of Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome, it was not easy to conceive the triumph of God's cause on earth as achieved by the conquering progress of the armies of Israel under the lead of a second David. The immediate intervention of God in a stupendous catastrophe of nature and history alone could accomplish this miracle. In Joel, for example, the Messianic figure is wholly absent; in later books he appears upon the scene only after the enemies of God's kingdom are overthrown.

All this makes me seriously question the premises of Professor Toy's criticism of the oracles in the books of the older prophets in which a Davidic king is the central figure. He is disposed to relegate them, one and all, to a post-exilic date. "The people without a head thought of a royal leader as the natural saviour" (p. 316). Thus not only Isaiah xi. 1-9, but ix. 5, 6, "and perhaps several of the preceding verses," are carried over to this period. So also all passages in which the note of universality is distinct, as Is. xix. In general, the author leans to late dates. Genesis ii., iii. assumed its present shape after the fifth century B.C. The pre-exilic prophecies enumerated on p. 315, note, are certainly a minimum. I am not insensible to the considerations which may be urged on this

side of the question; but there are difficulties on the other side which may well give us pause. Criticism on the ground of theological contents is a legitimate branch of criticism; it has been too much neglected. But its criteria are, in the nature of the case, less capable of verification, its conclusions more liable to be influenced by our own construction of the lines of advance in religious thought than almost any other. Its results, when unsupported by more objective grounds, need to be received with double caution.

Of greater consequence, in the present case, than the author's positions in Old Testament criticism, is his attitude to the mooted questions of the origin and age of the New Testament literature. It would have been, perhaps, to many readers a convenience if the critical premises in accordance with which the New Testament sources are used had been succinctly stated at the end of the chapter on the Jewish literature. Those who are familiar with the present state of the question will have no difficulty in ascertaining what the author's views are, from the text or from occasional foot-notes. They are in main those of what, with a name we would gladly avoid if we knew where to find a more suitable one, we may call the prevailing critical school. The four great epistles, Thessalonians and Philippians are Paul's, Ephesians and Colossians are of the Pauline school—we miss a definition of their relation to the Johannine literature—to which, in successive removes, belong also First Peter, Hebrews, and the Pastoral Epistles. The Fourth Gospel is "a product of the first part of the second century, made up of Christian material shaped under the influence of Jewish-Greek philosophy." The Epistles of John fall in the same category. The apocalypse has perhaps a Jewish core. A discussion of these positions does not belong to my province. It may not be improper to remark, however, that the question of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel loses very much of its importance when it is recognized, as it seems to be by the most recent defenders of its authenticity, that it contains, as really as the Pauline epistles, a theological interpretation of the person and work of Christ. The essential thing in a work like the present is not the determination of authorship or date, but that we rightly apprehend the nature and scope of the interpretation. It seems to me that in this Professor Toy is less successful than in his presentation of Paul's teaching. The point of view inclines to that of an older generation of critics, and certain notes in the Gospel appear to me to be forced. But I gladly leave this side of the book to the hands of scholars who have better right to speak than I.

Professor Toy has given us a work of thorough and cautious scholarship, from which, however we may dissent from some of his positions, we may all learn much. It is clearly and forcibly written, and takes hold of our interest. The publishers have done their part well; good paper, sharp type, and an open page give the reader a sense of luxury. There are Indexes of Passages of Scripture, and of Subjects.

GEORGE F. MOORE.

ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

REASON AND AUTHORITY IN RELIGION. By J. MACBRIDE STERRETT, D.D., Professor of Ethics and Apologetics in Senbury Divinity School. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1891. 12mo, pp. xiii., 184, \$1.

Professor Sterrett prints together in this little volume a brace of essays which, though they have

no direct connection with one another, have this in common, that both bring into discussion—the one in direct exposition, the other through a contrasting criticism of *Lux Mundi* and Dr. Martineau's *Seat of Authority in Religion*—the source and nature of authority in religion and the ground of religious certitude. All who call themselves Christians rest on God alone as the ultimate source of authority in religion. But differences emerge when we ask after the *media* through which God's authoritative voice is conveyed to us, and consequently after the proximate ground of religious certitude. The Rationalist finds in his individual reason the only voice of God in which he can place implicit confidence. The Romanist points to the Church as the infallible organ of the divine author of all truth. The Protestant, while seeing in the Church the divinely instituted witness to the truth, and in reason the divinely ordained organ for its reception, finds the authoritative delivery of the truth in the Scriptures, which he declares to be the only infallible rule of faith and practice. He offers, indeed, a synthesis of the Church, reason and the Scriptures, as the sources of knowledge of divine things. The Church, he declares, preserves the Scriptures and lays them before men with her testimony that they are the authoritative revelation of God. Reason examines into their credentials as such, tests and tries their credibility, apprehends their meaning, and systematizes their contents. But these contents the soul receives and rests upon as the very word of God, not on the authority of the Church, though in accordance with her testimony, and not on the authority of reason, though in accordance with its judgment, but solely on the authority of God, their author, witnessed to be such by the Church and evidenced by reason, but believed on His own authority. The Hegelian philosophy, though springing out of Protestant ground, offers a different synthesis—one by which the authority of the Scriptures is depressed and that of reason and the Church exalted. It appeals to reason as strenuously as the Rationalist, but not to the abstract, individual, but to the concrete, corporate reason as done into history. This corporate reason is but another name for the Church. So that it is equally true that it appeals to the Church as strenuously as the Romanist; but not necessarily to a single ecclesiastical institution, but to the communion of saints. Professor Sterrett occupies Hegelian ground; and accordingly finds the ground of authority in religion in "the Divine reason done into the historical institution of the Church," or in other words, in "the communal Christian consciousness." Certitude is no doubt personal, but it comes through *media*, and the inclusive medium is the Church (p. 26). "The rational 'I believe' thus rests psychologically and historically upon a 'we believe.' The rational 'we believe' rests upon the Christian consciousness of the community of which we are organic members. This consciousness rests upon the primal and perennial vital bond of God with His offspring. Thus the ultimate ground of authority and of certitude is God's adhesion to man. The secondary or mediating ground of certitude for the individual is the Church, which represents the adhesion of man to God, through consciousness of this bond" (pp. 107-108).

The consequences of this view are followed out by Professor Sterrett moderately but logically; and accordingly the chief familiar Hegelianizing positions find expression in his pages: the overestimation of the Church and its authority (pp. 25, 163, 166); the confusion of the real and the rational with its resultant doctrine that might is right (p.

170); the depreciation of the Scriptures as a product of the Church (pp. 24, 59, 88, 158, etc.), and the like. Criticism in detail is impossible here. It is enough to say that in spite of all this Dr. Sterrett has said many things noble and well, and his book will repay perusal.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE GOSPEL AND MODERN SUBSTITUTES. By the Rev. A. SCOTT MATHESON. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell, 1890. 12mo, pp. 319, \$1.50.

The purpose of this book is worthy of all praise. It is an attempt to show that all that is valuable and helpful in those systems proposed as substitutes for Christianity is already found in larger measure and greater purity in the religion of Christ.

The method pursued is properly conciliatory and irenic in conceding in many respects the merits of Socialism, Positivism, etc., and becomes aggressive and polemic only in the endeavor to exhibit the superiority of Christianity in the very respects in which the merits of its proposed substitutes are cordially recognized. The task which Mr. Matheson has set for himself is one requiring intellectual powers and scholarship of the highest order, and while he has made an interesting and suggestive book, we confess to a sense of disappointment at his comparative failure to accomplish successfully the admirable purpose which he has undertaken.

The successful execution of his plan demands, among other qualifications, and in a high degree, the power of clear and profound thought and careful and accurate definition; but in many parts of the volume there is a hazy and nebulous-like atmosphere which confuses and distresses the careful reader. For example, the treatment of the relations of religion and science is vitiated by the failure, which is so common in books of this class, to score plainly and deeply the distinction between science and philosophy, and between religion and both science and philosophy.

Much of the so-called conflict between religion and science is a conflict between religion and that metaphysical speculation which falls entirely within a department of philosophy with which science is in no wise connected.

The best part of the volume is that which relates to the application of Christianity to the social, economic, and political problems of our time. It is cause for joy that there is with every year a clearer recognition of the truth that the religion of Christ has its mission not simply to the individual, but as well to all of those corporate bodies in which men are organized—the family, the school, society, the state, the church. The reader will find much that is suggestive in this connection in the chapters in which our author discusses the Gospel and Socialism.

THORNTON C. WHALING.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

THE LIVING CHRIST AND THE FOUR GOSPELS. By Rev. R. W. DALE, LL.D., Birmingham. New York: Armstrong, 1890. 12mo, pp. xii., 299.

This book is composed of fourteen lectures which were delivered on Sunday mornings and weekday evenings to "a congregation in the heart of a great manufacturing community (Birmingham, England)—a congregation in which there are never many masters of arts, although there are in it many