

8548
47

THE
PRESBYTERIAN
QUARTERLY.

EDITORS: G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., AND E. H. BARNETT, D. D.

MANAGING EDITOR: GEORGE SUMMEY, D. D.

VOL. XI.

1897.

JANUARY—APRIL—JULY—OCTOBER.

Richmond, Va. :

WHITTET & SHEPPERSON.

NEW YORK: A. D. F. RANDOLPH Co., LT'D.

1897.

PRINTERS,
WHITTET & SHEPPERSON,
RICHMOND, VA.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME XI.

	PAGE.
Anglican Order, Leo on Validity of,	R. C. Reed, 308
Aryans, Literature and Worship of,	Dunlop Moore, 52
<i>Autobiography of Charles Force Deems</i> ,	George Summey, 405
Beattie's <i>Presbyterian Standards</i> ,	R. A. Webb, 99
Beet's <i>Nature and Christ</i> ,	R. A. Webb, 249
Bible Study Union Lessons,	Erastus Blakeslee, 538
Canon, The Old Testament,	William W. Elwang, 125
Carus' <i>Religion of Science</i> ,	R. A. Webb, 108
Church Polity, Normative Principle, etc.,	C. O'N. Martindale, 231
City Life, Decadent Tendencies in,	F. L. Ferguson, 201
Civil Sabbath, The,	W. L. Nourse, 39
Criticisms and Reviews,	99, 243, 399, 550
Education, Ministerial, and the Presbyteries,	T. C. Johnson, 60
Elder, The, in his Ecclesiastical Relations,	Ralph E. Prime, 81
Eldership in the Old Testament, The,	Harris R. Schenck, 433
Ely's <i>Social Law of Service</i> ,	Jas. E. Fogartie, 110
Experience and the Doctrine of the Trinity,	Jas. E. Fogartie, 415
Faith, The Speculative View of,	W. J. Wright, 142
Fisher's <i>History of Christian Doctrine</i> ,	T. C. Johnson, 550
Flournoy's <i>Searchlight of St. Hippolitus</i> ,	Robert Price, 399
Gaines' <i>Bible Course</i> ,	George Summey, 257
General Assembly, Southern, of 1897,	W. McF. Alexander, 382
Gordon's (G. A.) <i>Immortality and the New Theodicy</i> ,	R. A. Webb, 562
Gordon's <i>Ministry of the Spirit</i> ,	John W. Primrose, 556
Hadley's <i>Economics</i> ,	J. A. Quarles, 407
Infallible Revelation Practicable and Necessary,	T. W. Raymond, 531
Jehovah—May Know that I am,	John W. Primrose, 523
John's Second and Third Epistles,	J. Ritchie Smith, 482
Johnson's <i>Sketch of the United Synod</i> ,	George Summey, 404
Johnston's <i>Systematic Theology</i> ,	Francis R. Beattie, 102
Language, The Public, of Our Lord,	R. B. Woodworth, 325
Latter-Day Judaism,	W. A. Alexander, 503
Literature and Worship of Early Aryans,	Dunlop Moore, 52
Malachi iii. 17,	R. B. Woodworth, 240
Mariolatry,	Robert P. Farris, 296
Mark of the Church, The Main,	P. D. Stephenson, 467
Marshall, William Kilpatrick, D. D.,	D. F. Eagleton, 365

	PAGE.
Matthew xxiv. and Prof. Milligan's Exegesis,	<i>Luther Link</i> , 23
McClure's <i>Another Comforter</i> ,	<i>W. A. Alexander</i> , 401
Melanchthon, Philip, Scholar and Reformer,	<i>John De Witt</i> , 273
Ministerial Education and the Presbyteries,	<i>T. C. Johnson</i> , 60
Ministerial Scholarship, Decline of,	<i>Robert L. Dabney</i> , 161
Normative Principle of Church Polity,	<i>C. O'N. Martindale</i> , 231
Old Testament Canon,	<i>William W. Elwang</i> , 125
Old Testament Eldership, The,	<i>Harris R. Schenck</i> , 433
Probation—Death—Judgment,	<i>E. C. Gordon</i> , 218
Recent Publications,	115, 260, 408
Regeneration Real, not Figurative,	<i>John W. Primrose</i> , 1
Revelation, An Infallible, Practicable and Necessary,	<i>T. W. Raymond</i> , 531
Ritter's <i>Moral and Civil Law</i> ,	<i>Francis R. Beattie</i> , 250
Sabbath, The Civil,	<i>W. L. Nourse</i> , 39
Scholarship, Decline of Ministerial,	<i>Robert L. Dabney</i> , 161
Schurman's <i>Agnosticism and Religion</i> ,	<i>Francis R. Beattie</i> , 110
Scott's <i>Nicene Theology</i> ,	<i>R. A. Webb</i> , 245
Seminary Life, Aims and Conditions of,	<i>W. T. Hall</i> , 73
Southern General Assembly of 1897,	<i>W. McP. Alexander</i> , 382
Speculative View of Faith,	<i>W. J. Wright</i> , 142
Stearn's <i>Evidence of Christian Experience</i> ,	<i>J. A. Quarles</i> , 406
Sterrett's <i>The Power of Thought</i> ,	<i>R. L. Dabney</i> , 567
Stevens' <i>Doctrine and Life</i> ,	<i>R. A. Webb</i> , 243
Stifler's <i>Romans</i> ,	<i>R. A. Webb</i> , 564
Sunday-School, Its Present Peril,	<i>T. D. Witherspoon</i> , 175
Tendencies, Decadent, in City Life,	<i>F. L. Ferguson</i> , 201
Terry's <i>The New Apologetic</i> ,	<i>George Summey</i> , 403
Townsend's <i>Evolution or Creation</i> ,	<i>Francis R. Beattie</i> , 247
Treasure, A Peculiar,	<i>R. B. Woodworth</i> , 240
Trinity, The Fact of, and Experience,	<i>Jas. E. Fogartie</i> , 415
Unity, a Plea for,	<i>Robert P. Kerr</i> , 376
Vance's <i>The College of Apostles</i> ,	<i>R. C. Reed</i> , 251
Vrooman Case, The,	<i>R. C. Reed</i> , 88
Watson's <i>The Mind of the Master</i> ,	<i>J. F. Cannon</i> , 190
Weber's <i>History of Philosophy</i> ,	<i>J. A. Quarles</i> , 407
Whitsitt's <i>Question in Baptist History</i> ,	<i>R. A. Webb</i> , 104
Workers, Divine Manual for,	<i>A. W. Pitzer</i> , 357

sup

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 40.—APRIL, 1897.

I. THE OLD TESTAMENT CANON.

“WHATSOEVER is spoken of God, or things pertaining to God, otherwise than the truth is, though it seem an honor, it is an injury. And as incredible praises given unto men do often abate and impair the credit of their deserved commendation, so we must likewise take great heed, lest, in attributing unto Scripture more than it can have, the incredibility of that do cause even those things which it hath most abundantly to be less reverently esteemed.”¹

Thus wrote wise old Richard Hooker some three hundred years ago. And multiplied experience since his day has fully endorsed his observations. Nothing has ever been gained by the friends of the Bible by the assumption of false or unnecessary positions, and at the present critical stage of the battle for and against the supremacy of God's word, much, very much, is to be lost by such manœuvering. History abundantly shows how bad tactics, the deep and continuous error of Christian apologetics, has once and again compelled retreat before the sharp onslaughts of the foe, with confusion, and doubt, and dismay as the results. Inexcusably, often, has the Bible been put in a false place by “attributing to it more than it can have.” Subsequent defenders have always felt the serious disadvantage of the well-meant but ruinous policy. Finding themselves at the very outset in an untenable position, their first move was necessarily a retreat, to their own discomfiture and the jubilation of their opponents. We are even now learning something of the risk involved in relying upon argu-

¹ *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book II., Section 8.

IV. THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL: ITS PRESENT PERIL.

IN the issue of the *Review of Reviews* for December, 1896, appears an article from the pen of President Walter E. Hervey, of the Teachers' College, New York, entitled "The Sunday-schools: Their Shortcomings and their Great Opportunity." The eminent position of the writer; his prominence as a leader in the movement known as the "new education" in the secular schools; the timeliness of the topic selected, and the conspicuousness of advertisement of the article in advance, calling attention to it as one of the leading attractions of the forthcoming number of the *Review*, all combined to awaken expectation and to excite the hope that we should have an unusually valuable contribution to the question of efficient Sabbath-school instruction.

If any conscientious Sunday-school superintendent or teacher, full of soul-hunger for the spiritual edification and salvation of the children and youth committed to his charge, has had recourse to this article, hoping to have some new light thrown upon his path, he must have come away with a painful sense of disappointment.

He must have been disappointed, in the first place, with the air of extreme pessimism with which, in the very first paragraph, the whole work of the church and the Christian family in the training of children is discredited, and the lofty superciliousness with which the whole work of the Sunday-school up to the present time is ridiculed as a "clear case of *parturiunt montes*." Certainly the "view-point," as he calls it, of this writer is so intensely pessimistic that if we sympathized with him we should be ready to throw up our hands in despair and quit.

A second element of disappointment will be found in the writer's manifest want of acquaintance with the subject he proposes to discuss. No man can be expected to be at home on all subjects. President Hervey is, no doubt, an authority on the subject of pedagogy and of the "new education" in the secular

schools. When he speaks on these subjects we are ready to listen to him with docility. All that he says in this article on the subject of the study of child-life, and on the adaptation of instruction to the developing faculties of childhood, deserves at the hand of our Sunday-school teachers and others the most considerate and thoughtful attention. Lest he should apply to me the same proverb that I am soon to apply to him, I will venture no criticism upon this part of his article further than modestly to suggest that the "new education" is scarcely yet out of its kilts. The results of its new methods are yet to be tested. When, for instance, President Hervey tells us, as one of the great advances made by the new methods over the old, that "the old *dogma* [when one of these 'advanced theory' men wants to damn a thing, he always labels it *dogma*] of formal discipline, whereby the child's mind was conceived of as composed of distinct powers, each of which must be whetted, and the curriculum was conceived of as composed of studies, each one of which would serve as a whetstone for a special power, has been discredited"; when he tells us that "the function of the curriculum is primarily to furnish nutrition, and secondarily to provide formal discipline"; when he tells us that the "new education" "relegates the three R's to a subordinate place," giving the chief place to "the fresh, interesting human study of literature," and when he proposes to substitute for the time-honored birch-rod, with its demand of "instant and unquestioning obedience," the milder forms of moral suasion, we, of the laity in these matters of pedagogy, must be excused if we are a little skeptical as to whether the result of this homœopathic educational treatment will be the production of minds of a higher order than those of Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Henry Clay, Chief Justice Marshall and others who were trained under the old *régime*.

But we may say of these matters of pedagogy, as a celebrated English critic represents old John Owen as saying in his commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews whenever he reaches a knotty point of exegesis in which his reader specially needs his help, "however, this is not our concernment." We are not concerned with pedagogical training, but with Sabbath-school instruction,

which is a very different thing. It is on this subject, and in view of the fact that President Hervey has made it his pleasure to subject its methods to such indiscriminate and withering criticism, that we feel constrained to meet the eminent critic with the memorable words of Apelles to the shoemaker: "*Ne sutor ultra crepidam.*"

Our first criticism upon the article of President Hervey is that he has not been at pains to inform himself as he should have done before making such a tirade upon our present Sunday-school men and methods. He has not made a study of the genesis of the Sunday-school movement. Let us hear him on this point. Under the caption "Sunday-school Pioneering," he says: "Just when the Sunday-school idea originated is not known, but we have the record of an interesting school of Bible study which was held at Jerusalem not far from two thousand three hundred and forty-two years ago. The superintendent was a minister named Ezra, and he had a staff of thirteen assistant superintendents and thirteen trained teachers, all of whom were paid, besides other teachers, regarding whom we do not know whether they were trained and paid or not. The pupils were 'all the people,' both men and women, and all that could hear with understanding. On the occasion described, the school lasted from daylight to midday, and notwithstanding the long session, and the fact that the people stood from the beginning to the end, we are told that the ears of all the people were attentive. The reason of this attention is not far to seek: 'The teachers read in the book of the law of God distinctly, and they gave the sense so that they (the pupils) understood the reading.'"

Now, if it were some enthusiastic Sunday-school worker, or some popular lecturer on the Sunday-school, who thus spoke of Ezra as a Sunday-school superintendent, and of the congregation assembled to listen to the reading and exposition of the Scriptures as a Bible school, we could readily pardon the rhetorical liberty taken. But for a teacher like President Hervey to speak of that as a school in which there was no text-book, except the copy of the Scriptures in the hands of Ezra, and where, as is plain from the face of the record, no questions were propounded either

by the teachers to the pupils, or by the pupils to the teachers, is certainly remarkable. The plain facts of the case are that the "Book of the Law" was in Hebrew; the people, whose vernacular tongue was the Chaldee, the language of their captivity, were not familiar with the Hebrew, and so, as Ezra read distinctly the words of the Hebrew original, the Levites who assisted him gave the people the meaning in a language with which they were familiar, no doubt accompanying the translation with such expository remarks as might enable them to understand fully what was to them practically a foreign tongue. Ezra's work that day was, therefore, that of an interpreter, and to some extent that of an expository preacher, but very far from that of a superintendent of a Bible school. President Hervey has evidently followed blindly in the lead of one of those Sunday-school enthusiasts who go to make up the *ridiculus mus* of his trenchant criticism.

Still more at sea is he in reference to the history of the modern Sunday-school. I quote from him again. Under the caption, "Birth of the Modern Sunday-school," he says: "The modern Sunday-school was born a little more than a century ago. Familiar to most of us is the story of Robert Raikes, of Gloucester; how, moved by the wretched ignorance of the poor children of his own city, he organized a mission Sunday-school for them, having a staff of paid teachers, and a curriculum which included reading (not a bad idea for many Sunday-schools to-day) as well as the elementary truths of religion; how, as Mr. A. Caswell Ellis points out (Pedagogical Seminary, June, 1896), within four years there were a quarter of a million of pupils in the Sunday-schools of the United Kingdom alone, and how, within twenty years after the announcement of Raikes' school, Bible and tract societies had been organized, and a powerful impulse given even to the work in foreign fields. So much vitality is there in the spirit of social service applied in the work of religious instruction.

"In due process of time, however, there came about the old transition from interest to habit. The question book laid its dead hand on teachers and pupils, and the rivalries of denominations and of publishers produced so intense a system of local option as

to destroy the little warmth that might have come from coöperation."

We have not called attention to this paragraph for the purpose of detracting from the well-deserved eulogium on Robert Raikes, although it is very questionable whether the work of Raikes was not simply one development of a great and widespread movement which found expression in the various societies for the publication of the Scriptures, the dissemination of tracts and the establishment of missions in foreign fields, rather than, as Mr. Ellis would claim, the direct incentive to them. But that to which we call attention is the ignorance of the history of the Sunday-school work as implied in the statement that "the question book laid its dead hand on teachers and pupils." Reading this in its connection, one naturally infers that the Sunday-school, as established by Robert Raikes, and as maintained by those who received their inspiration from him, was entirely free from what President Hervey calls "the dead hand of the question book," and that only at a later period, when the "old transition from interest to habit" had taken place, did the question book, as a blighting influence, come in, along with the contention for orthodoxy, which, as he tells us in another place, "becomes, rather than pure and undefiled religion, the end of instruction, and the memorizing of dogmas and the catechism the chief means of instruction."

It is quite amusing after reading this to turn to any authentic account of the work of Robert Raikes, and find that almost the only religious instruction given by his teachers was by means of the catechism for which President Hervey seems to have about the same affinities that a certain individual is said to have for holy water. Thus, in the article on Raikes in the *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia*, we are told that "his work consisted partly of secular teaching and partly of the teaching of the catechism," whilst in the article under the same caption in the *McClintock and Strong Encyclopædia* is quoted a letter from Raikes, explaining fully his methods, from which we make the following extract: "The children were to come soon after ten in the morning and stay till twelve; they were then to go home and return at one, and after reading a lesson they were to be conducted to church.

After church they were to be employed [oh! horrors!] in repeating the catechism till half-past five, and then to be dismissed with an injunction to go home without making a noise, and by no means to play in the street."

That the question book, so far from laying its dead hand on any one, was a prime factor in promoting the distinctive study of Scripture, rather than catechisms and other formularies of doctrine, will readily appear from the following extract from a well-digested article on the Sunday-school in the *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia*, by Rev. Edwin W. Rice, editor of the *American Sunday-school Union*: "The schools founded by Raikes were chiefly for the lower classes in the community, who were ignorant, and hence were taught the elementary branches of reading and writing, with oral instruction in the catechism. Reading and memorizing texts in the Bible followed; cramming the memory with large portions of Scripture and the catechism seems to have been a hobby in Scotland, England and America for some time. . . . James Gall by his *End and Essence of Sabbath-school Teaching*, and his *Nature's Normal School*, aimed to introduce a more sensible lesson system into Scotland, which was also used in some schools in America as early as 1820. Stowe's training system, giving prominence to pictorial methods of instruction, also aided in reforming this excessive use of memory. The reform in America was completed by the introduction of the Uniform Limited Lessons, prepared in 1825, and adopted by the American Sunday-school Union and its three or four hundred auxiliaries in 1826. This scheme contemplated a five-years' course of study for the whole Bible, one and the same lesson for all, of from seven to fifteen verses, questions and comments in at least three grades, and reviews."

It is evident, therefore, that the question book, so far from laying a dead hand on teacher or scholar, was the exponent of a truly forward movement in the development of the Sunday-school idea. No one familiar with the history of these times can fail to recognize the value of the question books of the Sunday-school Union, of the Mimpriess Graded Lessons and many others. Indeed, the question book in some form is a necessity, and it is quite

amusing to hear our critic, a little further on, speak so approvingly of the lesson sheets of the "Blakeslee Course," an "integral part of the plan of which," as he tells us, "is the opportunity afforded for writing down the answers to set questions." If that is not the question book, what is it?

Another evidence of the inaccuracy of the writer of the article we are reviewing is found in his attempt to glorify Bishop Vincent as the originator and prime mover of the scheme of International Lessons. When we read in this article of the extreme admiration of President Hervey for "men of scholarship who are in sympathy with President Harper's spirit and method," and then recall recent events in connection with Bishop Vincent and the Higher Criticism, it is easy to understand why President Hervey should desire to do him honor; but much as we may be disposed to recognize the invaluable service rendered by Bishop Vincent to the work of Sunday-school instruction, it would be impossible to render him honestly any such meed of praise as that implied in saying that "he and those whom he inspired, devised, elaborated, fought for, and finally carried triumphantly into the schools the uniform lessons of the International system." Some of us remember those days very distinctly, and we have no recollection of any such great battle to be fought. Our recollection is that, the American Sunday-school Union having used uniform lessons since 1826, it was only necessary to show the superiority of the selections made by the International Committee, and the system was gladly welcomed. And it is a significant fact that in the article to which we have referred, written by the secretary of the union before there were any criticisms of Bishop Vincent, the credit of suggesting the International Lesson system is given to Mr. B. F. Jacobs, of Chicago, and there is not the slightest reference to any leadership of Bishop Vincent. Before us also is a report of the Indianapolis Convention of 1872, when the International Lesson system was proposed. The statement is made, that after a speech by Mr. B. F. Jacobs the system was adopted by a practically unanimous vote, and with the greatest enthusiasm. There is no reference to Bishop Vincent.

Before passing from the consideration of that period when the

Sunday-school was under the dead hand of the question book, we cannot refrain from alluding to a most remarkable instance of the deadening influence of this educational incubus to which President Hervey refers. Your "advanced theory" and "progressive theology" men are very much given to presenting us with specimens from that fossiliferous era that preceded the new age of which they are the morning stars. Henry Ward Beecher was never so happy as when he had Plymouth Church in a titter as he caricatured the Puritan Sabbath and the catechism drill. We were prepared to expect something of this kind, but not anything so remarkable. We give President Hervey's exact words: "The legitimate fruit of this era may be not too unfairly indicated by this confession of one who is now a brilliant and devout woman, but who as a child was too brilliant to be devout [how very brilliant she must have been], though she was regular in attendance on Sunday-school: namely, that she reached the ripe age of thirteen years before it was revealed to her that the scene of the Bible narrative was not laid in heaven."

Now, considering that the "scene of the Bible narrative" is laid partly in Armenia, partly in Chaldea, partly in Egypt, and partly in Palestine, what a brilliant, not to say heavenly-minded girl of thirteen years that must have been, who either in or out of a Sunday-school had not yet learned that these familiar places of our geography were not in heaven! If she could be caught, she ought to be labelled and put in some educational museum as one of the curiosities of the nineteenth century.

But it is time to pass to that which is the chief aim of this article, namely, to point out the imminent peril to the Sabbath-school from what is known as the "new education in the church," for which we are, to a considerable extent, indebted to Bishop Vincent and "those whom he inspired." The peril from this movement is threefold.

In the first place, the acceptance of this "reform," as its advocates are pleased to call it, would involve the giving up of our International system of lessons, with all the literature that has grown about it, and the substitution of the system of the "Bible Study Union." The lessons of the International Committee are

now used in nearly all the Sabbath-schools on this continent, and in many thousands of schools abroad. It is safe to say that twenty millions of scholars study them every Sabbath. A change to the lessons of the Bible Study Union would involve many serious consequences. First of all, the uniform study of the same lesson on the same day all over the world must be abandoned. President Hervey reckons it one of the superiorities of the new system over the old that "The lessons are not dated, and one may begin the school-year in September or in January without feeling that he is out of step with anybody. Why it should ever have been supposed that Mr. Brown's class of girls, aged fourteen, should be able to proceed as rapidly as Miss Green's class of boys of the same age, has always been a mystery to the present writer. There are cases on record of classes which failed to finish the lesson for the day, but felt impelled to proceed next time to the lesson of the day."

Of course, no system can have all possible advantages combined; but the matchless advantage of the International system—that for the loss of which nothing to which President Hervey refers could begin to compensate—is that the same lesson is taught in every school from Maine to California on the same day. A teacher or scholar thrown providentially in any strange city to spend Sunday can prepare the lesson, and go and take his place, and teach or recite just as if he were at home. Then, too, comes the inspiration of the thought of the millions that are, at the same time with ourselves, engaged in the prayerful study of the same portion of God's word, and the ability to provide lesson helps so much more perfectly where all can concentrate for the time being on a single passage of Scripture. Not only is there the loss of the inspiration from keeping step with the great body of Bible students all over the world, but there is a Babel in each particular school. What is to become of the superintendent's review and drill in the lesson, if as many different lessons have been taught as there are classes in the school? In this respect the loss through the proposed change would be grievous.

But this is as nothing when compared with the second sacrifice we must make. The International Lesson Committee consists of

fifteen members, chosen from the leading evangelical denominations of the country, the number from each denomination being governed by the size of the denomination, the Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians having three each; the Congregationalists, Disciples, Episcopalians, Lutherans, the Reformed churches, and United Brethren having one each. The new Lesson Committee, appointed at the last International Convention, contains the names of men in whose scholarship, conservatism, and spirituality the friends of the Sunday-school have implicit confidence. As to the Bible Study Union, Professor Hervey tells us all that we need to know, in the following paragraph, under the caption, "The Bible Study Union: Its History."

"The beginnings of this movement seem to be fairly traceable to the work of President (then Professor), W. R. Harper, about ten years ago, whose splendid campaign for improved methods of Bible study so powerfully affected the country at large. Dr. Harper was also the supervising editor of the first published lessons of the series, and ever since the lessons have been edited by men of scholarship who are in sympathy with President Harper's spirit and method. The father of the movement itself is Rev. Erastus Blakeslee, who, after some preliminary experimenting, issued the first course of lessons in the year 1891. The circulation increased in the first three years from ten thousand to one hundred thousand, and then to one hundred and fifty thousand. The lessons were translated and printed in several foreign languages for use in the missionary field. New courses were continually added, and finally, in 1893, the corporation known as the Bible Study Union was formed, being an organization of about five hundred distinguished college presidents and professors, clergymen, Sunday-school superintendents, and teachers, etc., representing a dozen different denominations."

As President Harper is recognized as one of the leading representatives in this country of that rationalistic school of the Higher Criticism, whose views of inspiration are so radical as virtually to exclude the supernatural as an element of Scripture, it will be seen at once that if the lesson helps of this course are to be furnished by men who "are in sympathy with President Harper's spirit and

method" we shall soon have our Sunday-school children taught that the Pentateuch is a composite, the work of a dozen or more writers, none of whom lived as early as the days of Solomon; that the tabernacle was a myth to account for the temple; that there were two Isaiahs, etc., etc. When we reflect for a moment on the cheek and push of the men of this school; when we remember that behind the "five hundred distinguished college presidents," etc., is all the prestige of the University of Chicago, with its millions of endowment, its vast printing presses, its multitudinous publications, etc., this proposal to substitute the Bible Study Union for the International Sunday-school Union is one to call for most serious consideration.

The second element of peril to the Sunday-school in this "new education" movement, one which is but another outgrowth of the same rationalistic spirit which finds utterance in the proposed change of lesson systems, is that of the utter secularization of the teaching in the schools. Our old system proceeded upon the idea that the Bible was a supernatural revelation from God; that it differed in this respect from all other books; that its truths were autopoetic; that when it entered the mind and heart, a special and supernatural agency of the Holy Spirit accompanied it, engrafting it as a living germ, an "incorruptible seed that liveth and abideth forever." One of the first and most important works of the Sunday-school teacher, therefore, was to store the mind of the pupil with Scripture truth as far as practicable in Scripture language, looking to the Holy Spirit to take his own word and make it effectual to salvation.

The theory of the "new education," which looks upon the Bible as a beautiful literature, full of wise sayings, but with endless scientific, historical, and philosophical errors, is, as President Hervey says in his strictures upon the present system of teaching in the primary class, to make "each lesson a complex, involving literature, music, art, science and industry," so that one wonders where religion comes in. The fundamental principle of the old school, that of storing the child's mind with Scripture,—and it has been the fundamental principle from the days of the early Jewish "schools of the law" until now,—is the one which President

Hervey most strongly antagonizes. He gives, for instance, as one of the most atrocious of all the vicious types of questions and answers the following:

"How did the people dwell?—Safely." "What did Solomon have for his chariots?—Horses and horsemen." "What for his heart?—Largeness of heart." "What was it like?—Even as the sand that is on the seashore."

He makes himself very merry over these questions for the little ones. But, as will be seen at a glance, they are intended to fix in the mind of the child before coming to the class the exact words of Scripture, with the expectation that all explanation, illustration, and spiritual application of the scriptural text will be made by the teacher in the class-room.

The same thing is true of a second set of questions which President Hervey mercilessly criticises, which are intended also for the little ones, but to which the answers are not given. The lesson is on the crucifixion, and the questions are as follows:

"What had happened to Jesus on Thursday night?" "What did the soldiers do with Jesus Friday morning?" "Why did they get Simon to carry his cross for him?" "What prayer did Jesus make for the soldiers?" "How did the people standing about the cross treat Jesus?" "What did one of the thieves ask Jesus?" "What did Jesus say to his mother and to John?" etc.

Now, you will notice that, with the exception possibly of the third question, every one of these calls for an answer in the exact words of the Scripture lesson. Of course, if the Bible is only like Shakespeare, or Homer, or Milton's *Paradise Lost*, all this would be as time thrown away; but if the Scripture is the inspired word of God; if the first object of the teacher is to see that this word is by the work of the parent at home lodged in the child's mind, and then that by suitable exercises in the class-room its lessons are impressed, the method becomes rational and suited to its purpose.

The same viewing of Scripture as mere literature appears in the criticism of the plan of having the primary class study the same Scripture lesson with the older scholars. What are we to think of the qualifications of a man for giving advice to Sunday-

school teachers who speaks of the difficulty of "justifying, on any ground whatever, the teaching of a child of kindergarten age of the betrayal, condemnation, and crucifixion of Christ," as "doing violence to the child's spirit," and "doing so absolutely unnecessarily"; who asks, "Is there not, in this wide world, to be found material for forty-eight lessons to young children on the heavenly Father's love and care, and on the Lord Jesus' life of helpfulness and beauty, without bringing in that which at best is ill-adapted to the scriptural needs of children?"

If there is anything in the world that is adapted to the spiritual needs of children, as well as grown people, it is the story of Christ's sacrificial death for the sins of the world. To President Hervey it may be only a story of "the depraved performances of Judas and Pilate." To those who believe in the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, it is one of those sweet mysteries which our Saviour says that the Father has "hid from the wise and prudent, and revealed unto babes."

The third element of peril to the Sabbath-school in this new movement we find in the employment, by its advocates, of methods entirely unsuited to the Sabbath-day. The "Sunday-school kindergarten," as it is called, is a transfer to the Lord's house and the Sabbath-day of the purely secular methods of the week-day school. The Sabbath-school hour is occupied alternately with kindergarten work and kindergarten play. Here a little group is engaged with scissors, cutting out pictures; there another, with needle and cardboard, working pictures; here with pencil and slate, or brushes and paint; here with knives carving Scripture emblems in wood. One enterprising young kindergartner sets up an imitation door, and has a procession of virgins to come and knock, etc. Another makes sheep of the girls and goats of the boys, and goes through an imitation of the judgment scene.

What are we to do with all this, and where is it to end? We may rest, we trust, in the assurance that the International Lesson system is too firmly entrenched in the hearts of the people to be displaced; but the same literary methods and the same secularization of the teaching may go on with the International Lessons as a basis. If the presses that are imbued with the spirit and methods

of the rationalistic criticism shall be employed for the circulation of a Sunday-school literature in the interests of the "new education," they will exert a wide-spread influence. The men who will edit the lesson leaves, the journals, and the lesson commentaries will be men of great ability, for we cheerfully concede the high scholarship and wide research of President Harper and his collaborators, although we resent the lofty claim which they make to a monopoly of the biblical scholarship of the age.

There are, as it seems to us, two things that are necessary if we are to hold our Sabbath-schools firmly to the course of spiritual instruction for which they were originated. The first is to secure, as far as practicable, teachers for the Sabbath-schools who have had normal courses of training either in Bible schools or in schools of secular learning. There is incalculable advantage in knowing, not only as the result of our own experience, but as the result of training under those who have had larger experience and longer training, how to adapt the truth to the minds and hearts of children in Sabbath-school classes. Where it is impossible to get trained teachers, there should be normal courses for teachers in the school itself, and the teachers should be urged to take advantage of every opportunity to hear lectures on pedagogy, and to study the best manuals of instruction in the art of teaching. It is unquestionably true that much of the teaching in the Sabbath-school is defective. If President Hervey's ridicule and sarcasm, instead of depressing and discouraging, shall put our consecrated Christian teachers on their mettle, and rouse them to equip themselves for better work, a great deal of good will result from an article which, in other respects, is calculated to do great harm.

The other thing that is necessary is to put our denominational Sunday-school literature upon the very highest possible basis of biblical scholarship, literary culture, and perfection of mechanical work. Our only safety is in supplying our schools with lesson helps prepared for them under the editorial supervision of men in whose orthodoxy and conservatism we can have implicit confidence. But it will be impossible to secure general patronage of these helps if they fail to come up to the standard in scholarship and adaptation of other helps offered at the same price. For the

capital invested, it is remarkable that our Committee of Publication can produce lesson helps of as high a quality as those with which they now supply the churches. But they ought to have money with which to pay, and to pay liberally, for the very best work that our very best exegetes can do in the interpretation of the weekly lessons. They ought to have money with which to pay liberally for the very best work of the most experienced and successful teachers in the illustration of the lessons, and in helps and hints for teachers. President Hervey's plan for chairs of pedagogy in theological seminaries, and for training schools in pedagogy for Sunday-school teachers, is utopian and visionary. His own figure of the *parturiunt montes* was never more clearly illustrated than in the winding up of an article so rampant with destructive criticism of anything and everything that came in his way, by suggesting a plan as impracticable as that of building a bridge to the moon. But there is one thing that we can do, and that we ought to do. We can give to our publishing houses sufficient capital to enable them to issue lesson helps and Sunday-school papers equal in scientific and literary merit to those of any of the great publishing houses of the land. We have men of scholarship equal to that of the promoters of the Bible Study Union. We should avail ourselves of their services. When once the church came to the realization of the fact that it possessed such a literature, its patronage would be secured; and the patronage by our whole church of the literature of the committee would give an income that would make its Sunday-school publications, even with liberal payment for all contributions, entirely self-sustaining. Our Committee of Publication would then be in truth, as far as our church is concerned, what President Hervey so much craves to see, a "society for the prevention of cruelty to children." It would protect from the cruelty of men who would take all the spirituality out of the Sabbath-school, and all the sanctity out of the Sabbath-day. I fully agree with President Hervey that there should be such a society, and I think that President Hervey is the very first man whom it ought to put under arrest.

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

Louisville, Kentucky.