

# THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

---

NO. 14.—OCTOBER, 1890.

---

## I. CHRIST AND HIS MIRACLES.

“His glory consists, not in being banished from history; we render him a truer worship by showing that all history is incomprehensible without him.”—  
RENAN.

It may be said, without disparagement of the labors of able men, that our learned treatises on the person of Christ and on his miracles fail to exhibit in a satisfactory manner a certain necessary relation between them, apart from which neither can be clearly apprehended. The confusion that attends, even to the present day, the discussion of these subjects is evidence of something wrong in our conception and method of dealing with them.

There is a troublesome feeling in many minds that the best and final word respecting the divinity of Jesus and the place and value of miracles remains to be spoken, and that, when it is spoken, it will discover a new line of thought touching the relation of the two things. It would be sheer egotism for a paper like this to propose more than a suggestion, when one takes into consideration the magnitude of the two-fold subject, and of the literature already extant; but it ought to be possible to set forth in brief, yet clear and satisfactory form the main features of a doctrine which, to our thinking, promises so much to faith in its conflict with science and philosophy.

It may be assumed that the deity of Christ is one of the best established doctrines of Christianity, in so far as the consensus of faith is able to secure a dogma. While it involves the profoundest mystery of religion, and rises beyond intellectual apprehension, it is yet in its relations seen to be indispensable. The religious

### III. OUR CHURCH AND EDUCATION.

THE writer of this article does not expect to command universal assent to the positions which he may take upon the subject of the relation of the church to education. He will be satisfied if he can succeed in directing the thought of the church to this matter, and in securing the careful consideration of the educational policy which our church ought to pursue, especially in regard to those institutions of learning which are, to some extent at least, under her control. He has chosen to illustrate and fortify his positions by ample quotations from writers and educators of acknowledged eminence, especially from those of our own church, in the hope of adding thereby to the influence which he hopes to exert in the cause of Christian education under church control. The exciting and absorbing issues which have agitated the church for some years past have been adjusted with a greater or less degree of satisfactoriness, and the present seems an appropriate time to discuss the vitally momentous theme of the educational function of the church. This topic is especially practical and timely on account of the educational revival which is one of the characteristics of our day. This revival is seen in the establishment of chairs of pedagogics in our leading institutions, as well as in the founding of normal institutes of every grade, the object being the stimulation of the study of the science and the art, the history and the methods of education. The large number of publications relating to education, with which the press now literally teems, is another indication of the deep and wide-spread concern which the public now accords to this great interest. The articles of the religious and secular press, the contributions of magazines and reviews, the weighty publications of the National Bureau of Education,<sup>1</sup> the valuable volumes issued by eminent educators—all show the di-

---

<sup>1</sup> The valuable monographs on the history of education in the various States, now being issued by the Bureau of Education, entitle it to the hearty thanks of every student of education. See especially *Histories of Education in South Carolina and Alabama*, and *History of University of Virginia*.

rection toward which popular attention is largely directed. Even the *questio vexata* of the relations of religion and science lapses into relative insignificance if we estimate its importance by the place it holds in the literature of the day, when contrasted with the more commanding interest and larger place which educational questions receive.

It is well, therefore, to inquire, now and anew, What is the relation of the church to education? Has the church an educational function to discharge?

There are four chief theories as to the agent by whom education should be conducted: (1), There are many who hold that neither church nor state has the right to intrude upon the educational sphere, but that the parent under God is responsible for the education of the child, and through private enterprise, in one form or another, this duty is to be discharged; (2), There is a second class who maintain that education is a function of the state, which, under the supreme law of self-preservation, is obliged to provide for its future citizens such training as will fit them to discharge the duties which rest upon them as enlightened citizens of a free state;<sup>1</sup> (3), Others hold that, on account of the religious element which ought to be made prominent in all education, the church is the agent properly charged with this work, to the exclusion of both state and private enterprise; (4), There is a fourth class, whose doctrine is, that the parent, the church, and the state have each alike certain rights in education, which neither of them can afford to surrender to the others, and where an alliance between them cannot properly be formed, each ought to insist upon its rights, and, if necessary to their protection, engage directly and immediately in the work of education.

This is the view which the present writer would adopt as his own, for he sees no necessity in the nature of things for arraying the three classes of institutions, viz., those supported by the church, the state, and by private enterprise, in antagonism against one an-

---

<sup>1</sup> For able arguments for state education see Woolsey's *Political Science*, Lieber's *Political Ethics*, Dr. R. J. Breckenridge on "Denominational Education" in *Southern Presbyterian Review*, July, 1849; also Dr. Thornwell's letter to Governor Manning.

other. The highest results for education will be reached if they all harmoniously coöperate in the same good cause, stimulating each one the others to higher efficiency by the mutual example of honest and faithful work. It is foreign to the present purpose, however, to argue so large a theme as that; our present concern is to vindicate the right of the church in education, and to show that if it is necessary to the protection of this right, the church may not only rightfully enter the whole field of education, but that it then becomes its bounden duty so to do.

The right of the church in education springs out of the very conception of education. Let eminent educators tell us what the end of education is.

"The end of education is complete human development. This is attained by leading the several parts of man's nature to a harmonious realization of their highest possibilities. The finished result is a noble manhood, whose highest exemplification, the ideal of all culture, is Christ. The elements of this manhood are a healthy body, a clear and well-informed intellect, sensibilities quickly susceptible to every right feeling, and a steady will, whose volitions are determined by reason and an enlightened conscience."<sup>1</sup>

"The instrumental powers, the appetites, the desires and natural affections, and the intellect, are given us that through them we may build up a perfect body and a perfect mind. . . . Of the instrumental powers it only remains to speak of the intellect. The necessity of training, and, if possible, perfecting the intellect, if a man would do much for his own good or that of others, is admitted. To this every seminary of learning testifies. Its relative importance is doubtless over-estimated, since education has come to mean chiefly the training of the intellect. . . . We now pass to the governing powers. It is one thing for a person to improve his instrumental powers, as he might his knife or his reaper, and another to improve those which are more distinctively himself. For the education of these powers there are no institutions except those of Christianity. The church, with its Bible and ministry and the Spirit of God pervading all, is God's institution for the education of these powers and training them up in the likeness of Christ, and so of God."<sup>2</sup>

These extracts present the truth that man has a moral and religious nature, which needs development and training just as truly as any other part of his complex being. Both morality and religion ought therefore to be parts of the educational discipline through which he passes, but there can be no sound morality without religion.

---

<sup>1</sup> *History of Education*, p 2, by Prof. F. V. N. Painter. The most complete and philosophic exposition in the English language of the history of pedagogy.

<sup>2</sup> *Law of Love*, by Mark Hopkins; Part II., Class I., Div. III., Chapter I.

"Everything religious in Christianity is made to furnish a motive to morality. We all condemn the fanatics who make religion sufficient without ethics. Some teachings of this sort are absurd and some disgusting. But, on the other hand, shall we think it wise to regard ethics as sufficient without religion? Is it not true that he who would divorce religion and morality is an enemy to religion, and at best only a mistaken friend to morality?"<sup>1</sup>

All that loud and noisy talk, which abounds in some quarters, about teaching morality without religion, is of a piece with the gilded pretentiousness with which weak eyes are dazzled and deceived. In order that the moral nature may be trained there must be distinct religious instruction and training, for all genuine morality strikes its roots in religious ground and can only live when planted there. Religion is, therefore, a necessary part of education, if the spiritual nature is to be developed, and the same reason which excludes it from the school would exclude it from the life.

"Those who do not accept the Christian notion of character, who do not believe in Christ as the object of man's confidence, and the light and hope of his life, may see no propriety in connecting these influences with his training in youth. They would exclude religion and Christianity from the college for the same reasons, and no other, for which they would exclude them from the conduct of the life. Conversely, the same reasoning which would exclude them from a place in the college, would require that they be rejected altogether."<sup>2</sup>

The mode in which religion is to be introduced into the school so as to become really and effectively a part of the education received there, is a grave problem, which, however, must be solved if there is to be such a thing as that complete education<sup>3</sup> which provides for the development of all the powers, including the spiritual nature to which religion is addressed. Much may be accomplished in this reference by the selection of teachers whose religious influence is strong and decided, and much may be done by definite effort to make religion a part of that "corporate life of the school" of which Dr. Porter has written so ably in the volume from which we have already quoted. But the one effective and decisive mode in which religion can be made a part of the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Jesus of Nazareth*. Dr. J. A. Broadus, pp. 39, 40.

<sup>2</sup> *American Colleges*, Ex-President Noah Porter, p. 212.

<sup>3</sup> See a valuable pamphlet on *Complete Education*, filled with suggestive thought, by Dr. J. B. Shearer, President of Davidson College.

life of the school is through the introduction of the Bible as a part of the curriculum of study. Those whose good fortune it has been to study under the guidance and inspiring influence of that eminent scholar, Dr. Philip Schaff, will remember the emphasis with which he repeats, "Christianity is a *book* religion." The influence and educative power of Christ's religion is inseparably connected with that sacred book which now, as always, is the inspired word of God, ever electric and aflame with divine energy. If our educational system, therefore, is to have any place in it for the training of the spiritual department of man's nature, the Bible must of necessity constitute an inseparable part of that system.

"By common consent man has a religious nature. Few, if any, will dispute a fact so self-evident. And now, if he has such a nature, should it not receive the most careful culture? And as this culture cannot be secured in the highest degree without the constant, prayerful study of the word of God, it at once becomes evident to all thoughtful persons that the Bible should be enthroned in the highest place in all our institutions of learning. It is, we believe, generally admitted that goodness, as an element of character, is worth more than cleverness, and yet our prizes are all offered for cleverness rather than goodness. In this way the heart is subordinated to the head, while intellectual achievement is honored at the expense of moral worth. This will all be changed when the Bible becomes the most important text-book in our colleges and universities."<sup>1</sup>

But the value of Bible study in the school is not simply confined to its influence upon the moral and religious nature, but the mental powers share as well in the stimulation and development which come from contact with the range of supernatural truth found in its sacred pages. As a mental tonic, and for purpose of intellectual discipline alone, the Bible deserves a central place in the studies of the school. One of the commonplaces of religious literature is the influence of biblical and theological studies in intensifying and strengthening the mental activity of the earnest student.

"The value of theological studies, in an intellectual point of view, does not consist so much in the amount of information as in the amount of energy imparted by them. The doctrines of theology, like the solar centres, are comparatively few in number; and while the demand they make on the memory is small, the demand they make upon the power of reflection is infinite and unending. For this reason theological studies are in the highest degree fitted to originate and carry on a true

---

<sup>1</sup> Editorial from *London Christian Commonwealth*, reported in *O. T. Student*, February, 1890, p. 121.

education. There is an invigorating virtue in them which strengthens, while it unfolds the mental powers, and therefore the more absorbing the intensity with which the mind dwells upon them, the more it is endued with power."<sup>1</sup>

Further than this, if education may legitimately claim as one of its subordinate ends the preparation of the scholar to understand the literature and history of the past, or to comprehend the living forces which underlie the movements of the present, the Bible must furnish him with the knowledge which is necessary for this task. All of the modern national literatures, and especially is this true of the English literature, derive their power from the supernatural and biblical elements which they have absorbed and transmuted into such forms as the peculiar character of the national mind dictates. Subtract from Milton, Shakspeare, Wordsworth, Dante, or Petrarch, Corneille, or even Goethe, the influences which can be distinctly traced to the Bible, and the residuum is very nearly *nil*. Moreover, the history of the world only becomes a philosophy when the central position of the religion of the Bible is recognized, so much so that the better class of secular historians cannot refrain from construing all historical movements by their relation to it;<sup>2</sup> and when amidst the varied currents and complex phenomena of our own times we seek for the deep and central forces which will explain the intense life of the present surging all around us, we must again go to the Bible to see at their fountain-head the streams of influence which are pouring themselves out into every channel of life. If one is to know his own times he must first know the Bible. So that upon the lower view of education, which makes it provide only for the necessities of practical life and the development of the mental faculties, the Bible has valuable and necessary functions to discharge; but we cannot (as we have already seen) legitimately confine education within these comparatively narrow bounds; and if it is to be faithful to its true mission of making a complete man,

---

<sup>1</sup> Shedd's *Theological Essays*, p. 28.

<sup>2</sup> For an admirable illustration of that true philosophy of history which interprets universal history in the light of its relation to Christianity, see Guizot's *History of Civilization*. Even Gibbon and Hume in their monumental works are compelled by fealty to fact to pay tribute to the religion of the Bible by recognizing its large and masterful place in the times with which they deal.

then it must provide, and provide first of all, for the moral and religious nature, which constitutes the real personality of the man; and it can do this effectively only by the use of the Bible studied and taught as a part of its discipline.<sup>1</sup>

But we must now pass on to notice that it is the function of the church to teach the system of truth found in the Bible, and to train that spiritual nature which has been committed to her charge. Nor can the church delegate this duty to any other agent without failing to perform the mission for which she was established in the world.

As Dr. Charles Hodge has well said:

"It is a conceded point that children ought to be religiously educated; that not merely natural religion, but Christianity, and not merely Christianity in general, but in the definite form in which it has been revealed by God for the salvation of man, ought to be inculcated on the infant mind, so that the rising generation shall be imbued with the knowledge of divine truth. Secondly, it may be assumed as conceded that it is the duty of the church to impart this religious education. This is one of the most important parts of her vocation. She received her commission to teach; she is, by the will and authority of her author, an institute of education, established to communicate and preserve the knowledge of God, of Christ, of the way of salvation, and of the rule of duty. Thirdly, this is a duty which the church cannot devolve on others. She cannot throw the responsibility on the state, for it is the very work God has given her to do, and she might as well look to the state to preach the gospel as to make disciples of the nations by teaching them."<sup>2</sup>

The great work which the church finds incorporated in her charter as binding upon her, and which she alone has been com-

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Old Testament Student* within several years has had valuable articles and symposia upon the subject of religion and the Bible in the schools and colleges. Dr. Harper deserves the thanks of American scholars, not only for his service to the Hebrew language and to oriental study in general, but also for his earnest advocacy of the reintroduction of Bible study in our American colleges; for it is a movement to put the Bible in the place it once occupied.

"The American College in its origin used to teach Hebrew, dogmatic theology, Biblical history, and the English Bible. . . . It has been necessary in recent years to make great efforts to induce the colleges to restore Hebrew and the study of the English Bible to their original places in the course, but this movement is only in part successful. I have never seen any answer to the question, What has become of the endowments that have been given in olden times for the teaching of Hebrew and other portions of biblical and theological work?"—C. A. Briggs, in *Presbyterian Review*, January, '89, p. 113.

<sup>2</sup> Charles Hodge, *Church Polity*, pp. 449, 450.

missioned of God to discharge, is this very work of teaching and training the moral and religious nature.

But how is this work to be done? Certainly in the mode which is the most practically effective and successful. Universal experience would seem to show that the most effective method of teaching and training, in fact without which teaching is practically impossible, is through the use of that instrumentality we call the school. The effort to teach the languages, or science, or philosophy in any other way would be just as successful as is the effort to teach the Bible without the school. Teaching is a technical process which requires the school with its organization, discipline, classes, methods of administration, peculiar influences and distinct life; and to expect that Latin, Greek, Hebrew, chemistry, or zoölogy will be learned without these, is just as reasonable as to suppose that the Bible will be taught without them. Dr. Hodge truly says: "This is the only method in which a religious education has hitherto ever been given to the mass of the people of any country." The attempt to teach any system of truth to a large class of minds without employing the methods and influences peculiar to the school is certainly foredoomed to failure. And so the methods of teaching which God has indicated as proper through the experience of the church in the effort to perform her mission would seem, as we might expect, to coincide with the method which God has indicated in the word itself. Upon this point the writer will avail himself of the results of the research and learning of one whose protracted study, extending over many years, of all that pertains to the educational function of the church entitles him to a respectful and an attentive hearing.<sup>1</sup> After describing minutely the sys-

---

<sup>1</sup> The reference is to the Rev. Dr. Henry Clay Trumbull, editor of *Sunday-school Times*, author of *Kadesh-Barnea*, *Blood Covenant*, *Teaching and Teachers*, etc. In the Yale Lectures, on Lyman Beecher Foundation, for 1888, by Dr. Trumbull, will be found a scholarly and thorough discussion of the teaching function of the church. The work is done primarily with reference to the Sunday-school, but is compelled to take a wider range. If one does not come from the study of this book with the conviction that the church has an educational function to perform, yet he will certainly find so much of helpful suggestion and digested learning and stimulating influence that he will feel amply repaid for the effort necessary to master the book.

tem of education in Palestine in the time of Christ, and fortifying his positions by an array of testimony from Talmud and Targum, Josephus and Philo, and all the extant literature of the period, he summarizes results as follows:

"And this was the Bible school system of the Jews in Palestine at the time that Jesus of Nazareth was born into that land to be brought up there as a Jew. Bible teaching was to begin at home. At from five to seven years of age, at the latest, the child was to find his place in the church Bible school. He was there to memorize the words of Scripture, and he was at the same time to come to an understanding of its meaning through the process of familiar questioning and reasoning. Later he was to be a member of the synagogue Bible school, to share the benefits of that interlocutory teaching which was the only process which the Jews deemed worthy the name of teaching."<sup>1</sup>

"Obviously it is in the light of well-known Jewish customs, rather than only in the light of classic Greek or of modern English, that we are to interpret the terms 'teach' and 'teaching' in the narrative of our Saviour's life course. It is in the same light also that we must read the great commission as it stands in its one undisputed, authentic form at the close of the gospel of the kingdom: 'Go ye, therefore, and make disciples [scholars] of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you; and lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.' As the Jews would have understood that charge, and as we have every reason to suppose that our Lord meant it, the direction therein is to organize Bible schools everywhere, as the very basis, the initial form, of the Christian church. Grouping scholars, the child and the childlike, in classes, under skilled teachers, for the study of the word of God by means of an interlocutory co-work between teachers and scholars, that is the starting-point of Christ's church as he founded it. Whatever else is added, these features must not be lacking. And it would seem that this was the way in which the great commission was understood by the apostles and their immediate successors."<sup>2</sup>

"Thus it is clear that the early Christian church was not unfaithful to its trust, nor unmindful of the duty imposed upon it by the great commission. It organized Bible-schools far and near, as a means of instructing its converts and of training its membership. And so it continued to do so long as it wisely followed the injunctions of its divine founder. But as it grew in worldly prominence and lost in spiritual life, changes came in the methods of its training work. Its ritual services were expanded and its teaching exercises were diminished. Says De Presensé: 'Teaching gained in proportion as ritualism lost, and conversely teaching lost as ritualism gained.' . . . In the recently issued valuable work of Mr. Henry C. Lea, on the History of the Inquisition, it is shown conclusively by that impartial historian of the religious history of the middle ages that the decline of the spiritual life of the church was attributable to the neglect by the church of its educational function. It is also shown by Mr. Lea, as it has been shown by so many historians before, that the gleams of a pure life, and the struggles toward a better state of

<sup>1</sup> *Yale Lectures* for 1888, by H. C. Trumbull, pp. 28, 29.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 36, 37.

things, meantime, were among and on the part of those who studied and taught the Bible, and who sought to secure Bible instruction for the people generally. It stands out most clearly in the ecclesiastical history of the middle ages, that where the Christian life was purest, in those times of general decline, was where the Bible-school idea was adhered to most closely as a means of religious instruction and training. Peculiarly was this the case with the Waldenses, the Albigenses, the Lollards or Wiclifites, the Bohemian Brethren or Hussites, and the Brethren of the Common Life. Not the pure liturgy, nor yet the faithful pulpit, but the divinely appointed Bible-school in its more primitive elements, was the distinctive means of their preservation from the well-nigh universal defection."<sup>1</sup>

As indicated alike, therefore, by experience and by God's word, the church is the agent charged by God with the duty of giving this religious education through the instrumentality of the school; and the church cannot surrender her rights in education without at the same time evading her plain duty. We must note, however, that religious education, while essential to a true education, cannot be properly the entire discipline of the school which aims at a complete and harmonious development of the whole man. The religious nature, while infinitely the most important part of man's being, is yet not the whole of it, and the other and lower departments of our being require training and development also, if we would make the most of ourselves of which we are capable. We must remember, too, that as man is a unit, in order that his spiritual powers may be at their best his other powers must be drawn out and trained, or else they cannot serve as the effective instruments of the higher governing powers. As a spiritual being one is better equipped for religious service with a sound body, a strong and sagacious understanding, an affluent fancy and a trustworthy memory; and a system of complete education must provide room in its discipline for the training of all the faculties of the entire man. Especially has the experience of the past selected a curriculum of study which, within certain limits, is capable of definite specification, which is the most effective instrument for sharpening and quickening the purely mental faculties, and which must not be ignored or neglected at the same time that the claims of religious education are emphasized and provided for.<sup>2</sup> There must be,

<sup>1</sup> *Yale Lectures* for 1888, H. C. Trumbull, pp. 63-65.

<sup>2</sup> See Painter's *History of Education*, pp. 154-247, for suggestive thoughts on "Abstract Theological Education," and the reaction against an exclusively religious training which necessarily follows.

then, an indissoluble marriage in the school between the religious and secular education, because the object of the school is to give the complete education which develops alike the religious, mental, social, and physical powers. But in order that religion may be in the school, it must pervade the entire school life, the secular studies being pursued in a religious spirit and exhibited in their relations to biblical truth; for as truth is an organism, every part is related to every other part, and is necessary for its complete explanation. If religion be excluded from the school and the education be entirely secular, the tendency of such education must be distinctly anti-religious. The words of Christ apply here, "He that is not with me is against me." The same school, in the unity of its discipline, must give the complete education, both religious and secular.

"Religion cannot possibly be separated from the mass of human knowledge without rendering it positively irreligious. The one cannot be taught in one school while the other, entirely purged of it, is taught in another school, because they necessarily interpenetrate one another, just as God and nature, providence and natural law, penetrate each other in every event."<sup>1</sup>

"In order to make popular education truly good and socially useful, it must be fundamentally religious. It is necessary that national education should be given and received in the midst of a religious atmosphere, and that religious impressions and religious observances should penetrate into all its parts. Religion is not a study or an exercise, to be restricted to a certain place or a certain hour. It is a faith and a law which ought to be felt everywhere, and which, after this manner alone, can exert all its beneficial influence upon our mind and our life."<sup>2</sup>

There cannot be a divorce, then, between secular and religious education without fatal injury to both the causes of religion and education, and the school, therefore, must include both.

We inquire next, then, for the agent or agents who shall control the school in giving this complete education. For present purposes we will leave out of consideration private enterprise, for while it may, and in fact has, accomplished much for which we are thankful, it is manifestly unable to grapple with the great problem of the education of an entire people, and we are left, then, to consider the claims, in some cases the contesting claims, of

---

<sup>1</sup> *The State and Religion*, Christian Statesman Tracts, No. 14, by Dr. A. A. Hodge, p. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Guizot, quoted by Cardinal Gibbons before National Educational Association.

church and state. There are several modes in which this question may be adjusted. If there were a union of church and state, as in England, Germany, and other continental countries, the religious education of the school might be given by the church, and the secular education in the same school might rest in the hands of the state. In popular discussions of this theme, examples are often adduced from England and Germany, entirely overlooking the union of church and state in those countries—a union opposed alike to our Constitution and the genius of our institutions. Again, an alliance without formal union might be made between church and state, by means of which a co-partnership in educational work might be formed, resulting in a harmonious settlement of the place which religious education under church control, and secular education under state control, should be assigned in the common schools supported by both alike. But on account of the division of the church in our country into numerous conflicting sects, as well as on account of the American theory of the relation of church and state, such an alliance is an impracticability, and, indeed, where adopted has not worked satisfactorily.<sup>1</sup> Neither a union nor an alliance between church and state is at present possible in the United States.

The question, then, before us is, Whether education shall be conducted by the church exclusively, or by the state exclusively, or shall both engage in this work, each independently of the other. If the church leaves education entirely in the hands of the state, will the religious part of a complete education receive the attention it requires? Can the state introduce religion into its schools? For religion must be a part of the schools, whether conducted by church, or state, or private enterprise.

“Religion must be a part of education, and if it cannot be made so without committing education to the church, why then the church must take charge of it. The state has advantages, in some respects, which the church does not possess; but if the distinctive principles of Christianity are to be excluded from the schools of the state, these schools must be abandoned. The great problem to be solved in this country is the introduction of religion—THE WHOLE RELIGION OF THE BIBLE—

---

<sup>1</sup> See numerous articles on school question in Canada, where this is substantially the plan adopted.

into public institutions of learning. That problem *must* be solved, or the church will be driven to establish institutions of her own."<sup>1</sup>

But has the state a religion which it can introduce? If so, what is the religion of the state? Is it a bare and naked theism, or is it the religion of the Bible? If the religion of the state be the religion of the Bible, then where is the commission of the state to teach it? There are difficulties and perplexities here which the wit of man has never yet satisfactorily solved. The present writer has no sympathy with those who call the state godless or atheistic; but he has never been able to find a satisfactory reply to the questions proposed above. To quote again from Dr. Thornwell—

"Supposing, however, that schools have a higher object, the formation of character, as well as the discipline and cultivation of mind, religion must enter as an element. But by what authority does the state introduce it? Is not the state institution founded essentially upon the relations of justice betwixt man and man? No doubt, if it has a right to introduce religion at all, it is bound to introduce the true religion; but the opinions of the magistrate are a poor security for the permanent introduction of an evangelical faith. My mind, however, labors on the question of right. Religion may be introduced as a matter of *science*, a thing that ought to be *known*; but as a living power, a system of divine grace, what has the state as such to do with it?"<sup>2</sup>

The theory upon this subject most widely prevalent now is that which Dr. A. A. Hodge has called the Secularist theory, which claims that the state is a purely secular and naturalistic institution, without religion of any kind, and upon such a theory, of course, religion cannot be introduced into public institutions of learning.<sup>3</sup> Under the influence of this theory, as President Porter says, "the tide is now strongly setting towards the complete secularization of our public educational system," and under such circumstances the church must engage in educational work.<sup>4</sup> If she resigns the whole of education into the hands of the state, she will fail to fulfil her mission, which requires her to undertake the religious education of the people, and she will give her work into the hands of

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Thornwell's *Collected Writings*, Vol. IV., pp. 497, 498.

<sup>2</sup> Thornwell's *Life and Letters*, by Dr. B. M. Palmer, p. 329; extract from letter to Dr. R. J. Breckenridge.

<sup>3</sup> See Spears' *Religion and the State*, pp. 51-53.

<sup>4</sup> See an admirable article upon "Secularized Education," by Dr. R. L. Dabney, in *Princeton Review*, September, 1879; also Porter's *American Colleges*, p. 394.

an agent who, as things now are, will certainly fail in doing this work which the church ought to do. If the church suffers the education of the people to be destitute of a religious element, she fails in one of the most solemn duties which God requires of her; and if the circumstances of our day and country are such that no union or alliance between church and state is possible in this work, and if the prevailing "Secularist Theory" prevents the state from attempting to give anything save a purely secular education, then it becomes the bounden duty of the church to see that education is not thus disastrously secularized; and in order to this end the church has the right, yea, is under the duty, of entering and cultivating the whole field of education. To one who carefully examines the *status* of affairs in the educational sphere in our country, there can seem but little doubt that the alternative which stares the church in the face is the complete secularization of education, or education by the church, which gives religious instruction and training its proper place in the educational system.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> As Dr. Thornwell has been twice quoted in this discussion, a brief foot-note on his views may not be out of place. No one is altogether superior to his environment, and Dr. Thornwell's long connection with a state institution as student, professor and president must have influenced his views; and yet we find that he was in grave doubt upon this subject for years (see extracts quoted above), and even after his celebrated letter to Governor Manning, in which he commits himself unreservedly for state and against church education, we find him connected with an institution for education under church control, the Columbia Seminary, and at our first Assembly he was a supporter of Dr. Jas. A. Lyon's scheme of a Southern Presbyterian university, supported by the whole church, though, as Dr. Palmer tells us, he was opposed to such university having any organic connection with our ecclesiastical courts. In his letter to Governor Manning (see pp. 29-31) his positions are: 1, Religion must be a part of education; 2, The state has a religion which it can introduce; 3, The methods by which this is to be done are three-fold; (1), Through the religious and Christian character of the teachers; (2), By the obligatory observance of the Lord's day with its duty of public worship; (3), By teaching the evidences of Christianity.

Upon these views we remark: 1. They are not those generally held by the advocates of state education, who usually assign no such prominence to religion in the school. 2. While good so far as they go, they make no provision for the study or teaching of the Bible, a conspicuous and fatal lack. 3. They take a far wider view of the functions of the state than the current opinions allow. The question, Shall the state teach religion? answered in the affirmative by Thornwell, would receive an almost universal negative from educators in our day. 4. The methods indicated for the introduction of religion can be effectively employed only by the

The testimony of history constitutes a powerful argument for the truth of the view now presented. Education in all lands is dominated by the national religion, and rests largely in the hands of religious teachers.<sup>1</sup> The church in every age has found it necessary to use the school as an indispensable instrument in accomplishing its mission.<sup>2</sup> Especially has Presbyterianism in all of its branches been foremost in the practical recognition of the mission of the church in education by the establishment of institutions dedicated to this end.<sup>3</sup> If any one desires to investigate the relation of American Presbyterianism to education, let him consult Baird's, Moore's, or Alexander's *Digest* for the long chain of testimony on that point, extending from the earliest organic existence of Presbyterianism in our country until the present day, and he will see that the historic doctrine of the Presbyterian Church is that she cannot fulfil her mission in the world without the recognition of her educational function and its discharge through the instrumentality of institutions of learning. It is conceivable, perhaps, that there might be a state of things in which there would be no necessity of complete education under church control, but such a state of things does not now exist, nor, as a matter of fact, has ever existed in the past.

The advantages which the church has derived from its work in the educational sphere indicates the right of the church to engage in it, for which we are contending. If you subtract from the

---

church, (see Porter's *American Colleges*, chapter on Religious Character of Colleges). 5. As a matter of fact, with few exceptions, state institutions are not religious in the sense indicated by Dr. Thornwell. If they could be, or if they were, the same urgent necessity for complete education under church control would not exist.

<sup>1</sup> Examine on this point the view of Dr. William T. Harris, United States Commissioner of Education, in Introduction to Painter's *History of Education*, pp. 7, 8; also Dr. McPherson's Centennial Address on Presbyterianism and Education, in volume of *Centennial Addresses*, delivered at Philadelphia, p. 66.

<sup>2</sup> As space forbids the quoting, let me refer the reader to an address on Christian Education by Dr. J. N. Waddel, in *Quarto-Centennial Addresses*, delivered at Augusta, pp. 36, 37, and also to a discourse by the late Dr. Thomas Smyth, of Charleston, on Denominational Education, of which Dr. Thomas Chalmers, who heard him deliver it, afterwards remarked "that he could never cease talking about it." (Dr. Brackett's *Memorial Sermon*, p. 31.)

<sup>3</sup> PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, July 1889, pp. 332, 333—"Presbyterianism and Education," by Rev. Dr. Joseph R. Wilson.

church's equipment of power the forces which have issued from her various institutions of learning, you withdraw the mightiest of the natural forces which have made the church the most influential factor in the world's history. The words which have been used of our own country are capable, *mutatis mutandis*, of far wider application: "Were the religious influences that proceed from the colleges of this country to be withdrawn or sensibly diminished, it would seem that the gospel itself might almost cease to be acknowledged, so manifold are the relations of each generation of college students to the faith and life of the whole Christian church." Not only is religion a debtor to church education, but the cause of sound learning and of true education rests under an incalculable indebtedness to the church for the work she has done in this sphere. The glowing tribute which, in the opening chapter of his monumental history, Macaulay pays to the work of the church in preserving the seeds of learning and civilization is none the less true because of the splendid rhetoric in which it is enshrined. Not the least of the benefits of education administered by the church has been the healthy influence which has reacted on those institutions conducted by the state or by private enterprise. The whole tone of institutions sustaining no direct connection with the church has been in this way elevated, and public education is in some respects different from what it would have been had it not been brought into competition with, and thus been influenced by, those institutions of Christian education under church control. Further, the supply and preparation of an educated ministry has been almost entirely dependent upon church institutions.

"The church has never depended, except to a very limited extent, upon secular institutions for the supply of its ministry. Her experience has taught her that she cannot do it. In proof of this, let me give some unpublished statistics which have been kindly furnished me by Dr. Bunting, of Clarksville, Tenn.: 'The University of Alabama, up to 1879, graduated 659, and, so far as known, only 30 were clergymen. The University of Georgia, at Athens, in eighty years, has sent out 2,003 graduates; only 137 entered the ministry. Of all the graduates of the University of Michigan in thirty-six years, from 1844 to 1879, only 157 were ministers. Cornell's graduates number 814. She can put her finger positively on 19 who have become ministers.' Now, these are the facts on one side. What are the facts with reference to the denominational colleges? Suwanee, the Episcopal University of the South, has sent 11 of her 80 graduates into the ministry, while 53 of her

students are now candidates. Emory College, Georgia, of her 791 graduates, has sent 156 into the ministry, also a large number who did not graduate. Mercer University (the Baptist institution of Georgia) has sent out 591 graduates, and 101 of them are ministers. Of the 54 graduates which Roanoke, Va., has sent out in the past five years, 24 have studied theology. The alumni of Washington and Jefferson College number 3,274, and 1,458 have entered the ministry. Your own Davidson has graduated 537, and 162 have entered the ministry. These figures prove the correctness of a recent statement made by Dr. Dabney, that 'each church must look chiefly for the rearing of candidates to its own colleges. Whether we can explain it or not,' he adds, 'the stubborn facts prove this.'"<sup>1</sup>

We remark, in passing, that the general admission that the church is justified in engaging in the work of education to the extent necessary to prepare her ministers for their work would by parity of reasoning constitute sufficient ground for broadening her work in education to prepare for Christian service the other officers of the church and the private members as well, including that most influential of all classes, the mothers, in whose hands the future of both church and state so largely rests.

It is true that objections to education under church control are numerous, for criticism is ever the easiest and cheapest of all things. Many are loud in the objection that the church has no commission to teach science or philosophy or the languages. Of course, the church has no right to teach any of these things for their own sake, but if teaching any branch of secular learning becomes necessary in order to the most effective discharge of "making disciples of all nations" in the "all things" which Christ has commanded, then the right becomes plain, and the duty becomes imperative to so teach. But we must observe that such secular learning is taught, not in the authoritative way in which scriptural truth is delivered, but in the subordinate and secondary manner in which the church, in the theological seminary, through her accomplished professors, teaches Hebrew or Chaldee or Greek.<sup>2</sup> It may be objected that the end of education is culture, and that if the church engages in this work culture will be sacrificed for the sake of religion. We do not believe with Matthew Arnold, in his *Culture*

---

<sup>1</sup> An able address on "Denominational Colleges," by Dr. W. M. Grier, delivered at Davidson College, and published in semi-centennial volume of that institution, pp. 86-88, and also in *THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY*, October, 1887.

<sup>2</sup> See an admirably clear statement of this point in a speech delivered before Synod of South Carolina by Dr. Jas. Woodrow, pp. 15-17.

and *Anarchy*, that there is any necessary antagonism between the claims of culture and those of the biblical religion; and an examination of the history and work of those institutions of learning which are entirely under church control, and which are most distinctly religious in their influence and common life, will satisfy one that there is no necessity that they should be on this account the less severe in their mental discipline or more lax in enforcing an elevated curriculum of study.

The claim is sometimes made that the education of the church is sectarian, and therefore separative and divisive in its tendencies, and that as enlightened and patriotic citizens all should combine in the hearty support of that public system of education which tends to unify all the dissimilar and conflicting elements of our heterogeneous national life. But church education is not necessarily sectarian, nor, as a fact, is it actually so in the majority of church institutions, nor is there any need of teaching the Bible in a sectarian sense.<sup>1</sup> The discipline of biblical theology is the greatest theological achievement of our century, and the arena where it is destined to do its best work is in the curriculum of study of our institutions of Christian learning. Sectarian theology need not be taught emphasizing points of difference and heightening existing antagonisms, but a distinctively biblical theology will be irenic in its influence on creed or sectarian differences; for just as the Bible contains in its unity all the manifoldness of temperament and diversity of type which characterize human nature, so the influence of the religion of the Bible upon individuals and peoples is the great unifying factor in creating a homogeneous and harmonious people. Religion is the great bond which unites man to man as well as to God, and the way to unite our people is by exerting upon all of them the unique influence which comes from the Bible and its religion.

There are some who fear that if the church engages in education there is danger of overpassing the limits which properly bound the activity of the "spiritual kingdom." No doubt, the

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Shearer deserves the thanks of the church for his work in showing how the Bible is to be taught in our higher institutions of learning. See his *Syllabus of a Course of Bible Study* (three volumes), also two articles in *PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY*, January and July, 1888.

doctrine of the spirituality of the church needs the emphasis which our church has placed upon it through the teaching of representative theologians and the action of our ecclesiastical courts; but the spirituality of the church does not mean that the church is a ghost without a body and visible, physical functions to discharge. There is a tendency in some quarters to minimize by extreme "spiritualization" the power and the functions of the church until, instead of being a mighty spirit, with a strong and healthy body as its effective instrument, it is reduced to the ghostlier shadow of a ghostly shade, whose influence in the world will be almost imperceptible. Here, as at many points elsewhere *in medio tutissimus ibis*; we need to resist the tendency which would strip the church of its proper prerogatives just as we must also resist any tendency towards that extreme churchliness which, as in the popish system, clothes the church with unwarranted powers. But there can be no danger to the spirituality of the church in the employment of the agencies which are necessary to accomplish its mission, especially if that agency is proven to be necessary by universal experience, and is indicated as well by divine prescription.

There are some opposed to education by the church who apprehend that the control of the necessary institutions will be troublesome, involving ecclesiastical courts in delicate and embarrassing details of administration, and leading to heated and injurious discussion and controversy. Those were wise words addressed by the President of Wofford College to the Methodists of South Carolina:

"No church can expect to enjoy at once the ease of those who, for any reason, decline great enterprises, and the success and enlargement of those who wisely attempt great enterprises. There is an infinite range and depth in the divine, sleepless law, 'Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.' It applies to churches as well as to individuals. Surely we do not intend to say to sister churches in the State and to sister conferences beyond our State lines, 'Go on with all your educational efforts. We can do as much for the public good without these helps as you can with them. We shall pour into the next generation as full a current of moral and intellectual influence as you can, with all your outlay of interest, money and men.'"<sup>1</sup>

Observe also that it is a serious and unjust indictment against our church polity and the wisdom of our courts to pronounce them incapable of the wise and successful management of such institu-

---

<sup>1</sup> *An Appeal to the Methodists of South Carolina*, by Jas. H. Carlisle, LL. D., p. 3.

tions. A sufficient answer is an appeal to history, showing the successful conduct by the church of every grade of educational enterprise from the academy to the university. Through its system of committees our church successfully grapples with all of the numerous and complex details involved in the control of its enterprises of Home and Foreign Missions, Education and Publication; and practically the same system is employed in the appointment of the trustees and directors who are charged by our courts with the duty of administering the affairs of the schools and colleges of the church, and who are responsible for the manner of discharging this trust to the ecclesiastical bodies which appointed them. Perplexing details requiring delicate tact, much experience, and a sagacious knowledge of affairs, may be safely left to the directory of such institutions, just as in similar cases such questions are left to the committees of Education, Publication, Home or Foreign Missions. The church need only assume sufficient control to secure the following ends: 1. That the Bible be taught by competent teachers; 2, That nothing inconsistent with the Scriptures as interpreted in the symbols of the church be taught in any department of the school; 3, That the moral and religious influence of the institution be strong and decided; 4, That the curriculum of study and the intellectual culture be of the highest grade. As long as the directors, by their administration of the school, college or seminary, secure these ends, the details of administration should be left in their hands, and the control of the church would thus be exercised mediately and indirectly. When, however, there is failure to secure these ends, which the church must regard as paramount, the delinquent directors may be easily substituted by others who will be true to the policy of the church in her educational work, and thus in either case the church maintains a general control and supervision while unembarrassed with perplexing matters of administration. This is substantially the plan adopted in most cases by the church in the government of her institutions of learning, and which experience has shown to be safe and practicable.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Those interested in the question of the management of institutions of learning will find suggestive thoughts in these works amongst others: Mark Pattison's

This article will conclude with some practical suggestions—

1. Let the doctrine of the duty of the church in education be recognized and practically applied whenever possible. The doctrine of our church on this point is contained in the circular letter issued in 1871:

“(1.) The promotion of the great work of education in all its departments is now, as in all our past history it has been, not only the true policy, but the indispensable duty and an absolute necessity, of our beloved Zion.

“(2.) This necessity, in the opinion of this Assembly, exists not only with reference to the preparation of our young men for the ministry, but with equal certainty as it bears upon the training of the entire body of our youth for their future career in every sphere of human effort, and that its obligation extends to both sexes alike.

“(3.) While there may exist an honest difference of opinion as to the precise form of control which should be maintained over this great interest, there is a happy unanimity in the sentiment that it is one too dear, too vital to us as a church, to be remitted to the state, to other communions, or to any irresponsible body of educators; that, in a word, the education of our children can be safely surrendered to no other than a Presbyterian influence.”<sup>1</sup>

Let our officers and people be trained to accept this historic doctrine of Presbyterianism, and our church courts be fixed in the habit of fostering institutions of Christian education in all legitimate ways.

2. The primary and secondary education which our country offers its children needs re-organization in the interest of religious instruction and training.

The fathers of the common-school system in our country did not anticipate the exclusion from the public school of religious instruction derived from Bible study.<sup>2</sup> If the “secularization” of

---

*Academical Organization; Letters on Collegiate Government*, by late President F. A. P. Barnard; *Thoughts on College System in United States*, by Francis Wayland. There were at one time in the Theological Seminary library, at Columbia, interesting and valuable notes in manuscript by Dr. George Howe, on this subject, prepared when he was chairman of the Assembly's Committee on the Revision of the Seminary Constitution. The changes he advocated, and they seem to have been adopted, were in the direction of throwing all matters of administration upon the board and leaving control only to the courts of the church; for this position Dr. Howe argued from the example of other seminaries, the experience of the college world, and the nature of the case.

<sup>1</sup> Alexander's *Digest*, p. 212.

<sup>2</sup> See Horace Mann's *Reports*, pp. 710-715.

the public schools now in progress is to continue, the Christian church in this country, in all of its branches, will be compelled by the duty of self-preservation to withdraw support from such a system.

“One thing is absolutely certain: Christianity is ever increasing in power, and, in the long run, will never tolerate the absurd and aggressive claims of modern infidelity. The system of public schools must be held, in its sphere, true to the claims of Christianity, or they must go with all the other enemies of Christ, to the wall.”<sup>1</sup>

In some quarters of our country the utterance of such views is construed as lack of public spirit, but patriotism as well as religion demands that some method must be devised by which the Bible and religion may be a part of the discipline of the common-school system, as was designed by its founders, or the system is doomed to failure and final extinction. The church is awaking to the peril which is involved in a “secularized” and godless education. President Seelye, of Amherst, tells us that “it is a grave question whether by our popular education we are not lighting the torch of the incendiary rather than that of the guide,” and there are many who share the apprehension of this eminent publicist and scholar. In this reference Dr. Roberts, ex-Moderator of the Northern General Assembly and President of Lake Forest University, argues that—

“It should be made the duty of the presbyteries to see that each of them, if the members of the churches and the population of the district should demand it, has an academy or an intermediate school to prepare their youth for business and for entrance into college. These academies should be well endowed, thoroughly equipped with scientific appliances, and permeated with the spirit of religion. A large number of these is now needed, and a still larger number will be needed in the near future.”<sup>2</sup>

3. Female education ought to receive far greater attention than has been the case in the past.

While our church has some excellent institutions of a high grade for female education, thoroughly Christian in their influence, and enforcing, to some extent at least, Bible study as a part of their curriculum, yet the supply of such institutions is far too limited, and the support they receive and the honor accorded them in the

---

<sup>1</sup> *New Princeton Review*, Vol. III., p. 47, Dr. A. A. Hodge.

<sup>2</sup> *Presbyterian Review*, April, 1888, p. 219; see also Dr. Roberts' opening sermon at the last Assembly at Saratoga.

public estimation of the church is not that which they are entitled to receive on account of the value and dignity of the work they are doing. It is far too common to regard the position of president or instructor in a female seminary as a *dernier resort* for some superannuated, invalid, or "broken-down" brother, who has failed at preaching or at teaching boys, and who, therefore, *must* be fitted for this work. There are few "prevailing views" that are more grossly "heretical" than the place which public opinion assigns female education, and the relative position of conspicuous inferiority to which the instructor in the female institution is relegated when contrasted with the higher esteem and nobler station with which the professor in the male college is honored. The whole tone of public opinion on this point ought to be revolutionized; the transcendent importance of Christian education for the girls should be recognized, and the unsurpassed field of usefulness occupied by those engaged in female education should attract the best talent of the church, and secure for the work the distinguished respect which it deserves.<sup>1</sup>

4. Our church is plentifully supplied with institutions for the higher education of males, and does not need to multiply them.

The opinion may be entertained that we have too many male colleges, but a careful examination would show that all of them have their own peculiar fields, to occupy which, with the growth and development of our South-land, it will require their best efforts to worthily fill.<sup>2</sup>

"If we are wise and successful in managing our public affairs, we may soon have a population which will need all the Southern colleges now in existence. Each institution sheds light in a region which but for it might be unenlightened. The small colleges have performed, and seem destined still to perform, an important part in the social, literary, and religious growth of our country."

---

<sup>1</sup> Without instituting invidious comparisons, what an incalculable gain to the whole church, if each Synod had located within its bounds an institution like Bellewood Seminary, at Anchorage, Ky., distinctly religious, and making the Bible an indispensable part of the curriculum of study!

<sup>2</sup> For a suggestive and vigorous discussion of the tendency, especially in the South, to multiply the number of colleges, see a pamphlet entitled *The College Question*, by President Julius D. Dreher, of Roanoke College, Va.

Without exception, all of the colleges connected with our church offer a curriculum of study which represents at least respectable attainments, and the existence of each is justified by the work it is accomplishing. If the alternative which confronted the church were a choice between the policy of increase or that of concentration, the wiser choice would seem to be to concentrate resources upon fewer institutions, perhaps to combine some of them, so as to have strong, ably manned and amply endowed institutions, which, by their superior excellence and recognized merits, would command a wide patronage both without and within the bounds of our church. But no such choice as this is required of the church, and her wisest policy would seem to be, while not increasing the number of existing institutions, and while not questioning the right of any to exist, to give a more generous and hearty support to those already in existence, elevating the standard of scholarship, raising ampler endowments, so that larger and abler faculties may be employed, above all, strengthening the distinctively religious influence of the college, and making the Bible a central part of the curriculum of study, ranking with the severe studies in science, language or philosophy, and pursued by the same rigorous scientific methods.

The only point where divergence of view may arise is in South Carolina, where the Presbyterian College of South Carolina, located at Clinton, is asking to be received under synodical control, and where also a movement is on foot looking to the establishment of a South Atlantic University, under the control of the four Synods of North and South Carolina, Georgia, South Georgia and Florida. If both of these movements are successful, the number of colleges will not be necessarily increased; perhaps they may be decreased. Nor does there seem to be any necessary antagonism between them. The Presbyterian College of South Carolina, though young, has yet done a good work for its years, and gives promise of better with future growth. It deserves well of the Presbyterians of South Carolina, and the request which it now makes of the Synod, while carefully canvassed, and all possible contingencies weighed, should not be lightly disregarded. The Synod of South Carolina, with its 16,000 members, would seem to be as

able to support an institution as Kentucky with 15,500, Missouri with 9,700, Texas with 10,000, or Arkansas with 4,500.<sup>1</sup> It may be thought, however, that if the movement for the establishment of the university is successful, as it ought and *must* be, that it would injuriously divide the strength of the Synod to sustain organic relations to the two institutions. But Arkansas is one of the Synods sustaining the Southwestern University, while at the same time Arkansas College, within its bounds, is doing a good and necessary work, which otherwise would not be done, to the serious loss of Presbyterianism in that and other States. The Synod of Nashville sustains similar relations to Southwestern University, while King College, located within its bounds, is discharging its mission in that rapidly developing part of Tennessee which so greatly needs the influence and work of just such an institution. Presbyterianism would be much the poorer in the two States of Arkansas and Tennessee were the two colleges at Batesville and Bristol blotted out of existence; nor is the loss a serious one, if indeed there be any loss at all, to the Southwestern Presbyterian University, because in the bounds of two of the Synods supporting that noble institution there are located two colleges doing a work for Christian education which else would go undone. The university proposed for establishment by the four Synods would not suffer if the college at Clinton were brought into closer relations to the Synod of South Carolina; nor, on the other hand, would this college be injured by the successful consummation of the movement to enrich the cause of Presbyterianism and Christian education by the establishment of a university worthy of the support and the patronage of the four Synods. Presbyterianism would gain incalculably in moral influence and in efficiency in preparing its ministers and members for Christian work, were there established in this part of the church an institution for both collegiate and professional training of the very highest grade, with an able faculty amply supported. Dr. Jas. A. Lyon said twenty years ago:

“We must not disguise from ourselves the unpleasant fact that our honorable *prestige* is gradually but surely passing away from us; not that we have lowered

---

<sup>1</sup> This article cannot omit recognizing also the great debt which the church owes to that venerable and noble institution, the Hampden-Sidney College, and its younger sisters, Davidson and Westminster Colleges and the Central University.

our standard, but that we have stood still, content with past honors. One is never in greater danger than when he is lulled into indifference by fancied security."<sup>1</sup>

The time has come for a forward movement in order to maintain the honorable eminence in education which distinguishes us, and to strengthen our church in these four Synods to grapple with the supreme duties which the immediate future of this rapidly developing section will present.

5. Our institutions for theological education ought to do more work in preparing our future ministers to use and to teach the English Bible.<sup>2</sup> The Southwestern Presbyterian University, in its theological as well as in its academical department, is already doing much good work in this reference, and some of our other seminaries are moving in this direction, as, in fact, are most of the theological seminaries of a high grade amongst all the churches.

"The church ought to do more for the expounding of the English Bible, and to train its ministers more efficiently for this work. The ministry must know the originals, and draw their inspiration from the originals, but they have to teach their people through the medium of the *English Bible*; and, therefore, it is necessary that they should understand this medium, and that they should have facility in its use. . . . But the knowledge of the originals will be of little service to them as public teachers, unless they can use the English Bible as the medium by which they are to instruct the people. They need thorough training in the use of the English Bible as well as in the original Scriptures, and only in this way does their knowledge of the originals attain its practical importance and bestow its blessings through the ministry on the church. In my opinion, the institutions of learning have been neglecting the English Bible, and it is high time that its study should take a prominent place in the curriculum of every theological seminary.

"The study of the English Bible in the theological seminary has, therefore, this as its aim: (1), To set the English Bible in the light of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek originals; (2), To impregnate the English Bible with the spirit and life of the originals; (3), To train the student to expound the English Bible in that light, and spirit, and life; (4), To give him 'a comprehensive view of the whole Bible, showing him the principles of its structure, the variety and unity of its organism; (5), To set the whole Scripture in the light shining from the throne of

---

<sup>1</sup> *Southern Presbyterian Review*, April, 1869, p. 153.

<sup>2</sup> The writer wishes that this review could secure for its readers an admirable address on this subject of the Bible in schools, colleges, and theological seminaries, delivered at the opening of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, in 1889, by that great preacher and scholar, Dr. John A. Broadus, whose course in New Testament English shows, by successful example, the importance and value of the study of the English Bible in the theological seminary. If personal testimony were in place, the writer would testify to the inspiration and stimulus, whose influence is abiding and permanent, which he derived from attendance for some time upon the class in the English Bible of this distinguished teacher.

God. Such a study of the English Bible in the curriculum of a theological seminary should not interfere with any existing courses of study."<sup>1</sup>

6. Our church should return to the conception of the teacher or doctor as one of the permanent officers of the church, and this not simply as teacher in academies, colleges or seminaries under church control, but also in the particular congregation where there is the greatest need of religious instruction and training. The local churches need teachers as well as preachers. Congregations of a large and prosperous membership, able to sustain and needing the ministrations of both the preacher and the teacher, ought to be encouraged to secure, in addition to the preacher in the pulpit, the services of men gifted in the function of teaching, who, by their skill in the Sabbath-school, the Bible-class, the teacher's meeting, and other assemblies for associated study of God's word which could easily be established, might build up God's people in Christian knowledge and guide them in methods of successful Bible study. There are men admirably fitted for this work, who are not adapted to proclaim with inspiring effect the truth from the pulpit; and this is an illustration of that "diversity of gifts" which Christ bestows upon his disciples, and which, if the church is wise, she will utilize by providing each particular variety of endowment with that kind of work which it is prepared most efficiently to discharge. The church needs teachers, the gift of teaching is bestowed by Christ upon some of his disciples, the office of teacher is recognized in God's word; the true policy of the church is, therefore, to faithfully employ, wherever possible, this officer in the discharge of his proper function of teaching God's truth to God's people, and thus supply one of the great needs now pressing upon us, which is not so much more and better preaching as more and better teaching.<sup>2</sup> And we need have little fear that the church will unduly emphasize its teaching-office and the educational function which by its very charter it is commissioned to discharge.

THORNTON C. WHALING.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Presbyterian Review*, April, 1889, p. 297, C. A. Briggs. The vagaries of *Whither* will not prevent one from recognizing the sound and sober sense of this excerpt from the author of that brilliant but erratic book.

<sup>2</sup> Upon the teacher's or doctor's office, see Mitchell's *Lectures on Westminster Assembly*, pp. 184-186; Briggs's *Whither*, pp. 38-43; Stuart Robinson, *Church of God*, Appendix, pp. 23, 28, and 71, and Minutes of Westminster Assembly, *passim*.