

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

but all this soul-vigor has a bearing directly on the well-being of the body.

Our conclusion is, that in the life and teachings and work of Jesus Christ we have revealed the true psychology; and in this soul-order we see also the all-important condition of a healthy physical frame. Jesus was the perfect man; and his teachings and work are God's gift unto fallen man for the restoration of both his soul and body to that perfect order devised in the first plan of the Creator.

ARTICLE II.

A FOURTH YEAR OF STUDY IN THE COURSES OF THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.¹

BY JOSEPH COOK, RESIDENT LICENCIATE IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, ANDOVER.

A FOURTH year of study has already been added to the instructions of the Princeton Theological Seminary. The distribution of the new space, as now for two years announced in the catalogue of the institution, is made by dividing the time almost equally between the exegetical, the doctrinal, and the historical departments. It would be unbecoming in me to endeavor to suggest in detail the methods of arranging a fourth year of study in a theological course, for minuteness on this point would be both officiousness and presumption. It is not at all necessary to my aim that I should do so. For the sake of distinctness, however, I will say that the fourth year I would ask and defend should have these characteristics:

It should be for some, not all, theological students;

Preaching by students should be allowed in the fourth year, but not in the first three years to students who enter the fourth;

¹ An Oration at the United Anniversaries of the Society of Inquiry and of the Porter Rhetorical Society, of Andover Theological Seminary, August 5, 1868. The orations on this occasion were by members of the graduating class.

The larger portion of it should be devoted to perfecting the work on the most important topics of the doctrinal department ;

It should include space for a larger attention to the applications of exegetical learning, metaphysics, history, and physical science to the current forms of infidelity ;

It should give enlarged instruction in respect to all the methods of practical religious effort ;

It should be made thorough by including severe examinations.

I think it not too much to say that the church is weak because it is fed on guesses. The scepticism of the land fattens on the crudeness of the pulpit. I remember that I speak to-night within sight of the grave of Moses Stuart. It were well if I could emulate, even if it were but feebly and far off, his candor ; for nothing which concerns a great theme, however remotely, is well treated by evasion.

There are topics inherently so important that no mistake concerning them can be so small as not to be colossal. And yet, on such topics, the fact of a revelation, the Deity of him from whom all the years of time are numbered, the mysteries of election, fate, and free-will, we, to whom a college course gives hardly a trace of theological instruction, and who now know that our knowledge of theology derived from other sources previous to our studies here was superficial and fragmentary to a sometimes ludicrous extreme, are asked to form opinions in a course of three years investigation, one year of which is devoted to exegetical, and one to historical and rhetorical branches ; the third year broken by permitted absences for preaching, not absolutely excessive, indeed, since they are an important method of training adopted by one of the most important departments of the course ; but which are relatively excessive, because, in a course of but three years, they are necessarily premature, since they are such as to reduce the whole term of study, in

respect to the matter to be preached, practically to two years and a half: and, on the basis of this amount of attention to what are assuredly the most difficult and awful of the problems the human mind is permitted to reach, we are asked to commit ourselves, in effect for life, to certain opinions, and to go out and stand beside the pillows of the dying, and put beneath them those opinions, not as guesses, but as proofs. An honest man recoils when so much is asked of him. It is by no means expected that in three years we can master the whole range of theology. But we are expected to have mastered its strategic points. On these we are officially asked, in wholly informal and definite terms, before examining councils, to express what we hold for ourselves, not what we have been taught. Upon these greatest points, at least, which, however, cannot be explored to the bottom without an examination of very nearly all the rest, we, as educated men and future public teachers, are called to express independent opinions. We are expected to become so clear as to be in no sense uncandid. It is expected that we will do this in the training of nine months special doctrinal study, and in the collateral reading of perhaps four months more. We do not do it. We cannot do it. And yet this is the most accredited entrance to the ministry. The greatness of the topics of theology ought to secure their thorough treatment. The greatness and difficulty of the topics of theology are the first argument for an extension of the term of professional theological study. I claim a fourth year of study in the courses of the theological seminaries, in order that we may have time to be honest.

One hundred years ago our colleges were, in effect, theological schools. Theology was then a prominent portion of the college course. Dr. Bacon goes so far as to say incidentally, in an historical address, that at that period all the studies of college were as much subordinated to theology as those of a theological seminary now are.¹ The conse-

¹ Commemorative Discourse at the Semi-Centennial Celebration of the Found-

quence was that all liberally educated men, as such, had then some knowledge of theology. Their interest in properly theological study often continued into years long subsequent to those of their instruction in college. When, for example, President Willard, in the year that Jonathan Edwards was ordained at Northampton, published two hundred and fifty lectures on the Shorter Catechism, the subscription list for the work contained the name of nearly every civilian of note in New England. But the structure of college courses is now wholly changed. To give room for science, theology was little by little crowded out into pastor's classes, and into such private theological schools as those of Bellamy, Smalley, and Emmons. At the opening of the century the change was nearly complete. Andover Theological Seminary then sprang up, and it is the true continuation of the Harvard and Yale of our fathers. The Christian evidences and ethics are, indeed, yet taught in college, but so hurriedly as to make little impression upon any except those who have a peculiar taste for them, or anticipate study in a professional theological course. Once out of college, those students who pursue law, medicine, art, science, or literature, become absorbed in their special fields of investigation. Once in their professions they are still more absorbed. It is sometimes loosely said that no lawyer in full practice ever reads a book. Only those few who have a taste for theological study ever take it up. More than half of ordinary college classes understand metaphysics too poorly ever to be able to take up the severer forms of theological reading. The result is, that, while in the days Edwards all liberally educated men, as such, had some knowledge of theology, now no liberally educated man, as such, has necessarily any knowledge of it. The knowledge of theology, as a system, is confined to those who study theology professionally. That ground of sympathy between other professions and the ministry, which used to proceed from theological training in

ing of the Theological Seminary at Andover, by Professor Leonard Bacon. Memorial of the Celebration, p. 74.

common up to a certain point, is swept away. The pulpit, however, must adapt itself to miscellaneous audiences. It must meet the average wants of collections of men whose education and social position are the opposite of homogeneous. In nine cases out of ten, the preaching of the pulpit is not intended to meet the wants of the best educated. But lawyers and physicians, who did not acquire interest in theology in college, are not likely to have it awakened and sustained, except by a pulpit that they can respect. The consequence of this whole state of things is that some of the classes in society, best educated in every other respect, are the least well educated in regard to theological truth. I mean no disrespect to members of the honorable professions of law and medicine, when I say that these classes constitute the best materials society contains for the formation of crude parties in theology. The natural want of intellectual sympathy between the various ranks of educated men who were formerly, but are not now, educated in theology, and that one rank which is now so educated, is my second argument for an extension of the term of theological study. That want of sympathy can be removed only by making the education of the latter class so thorough that it shall be fit for leadership. It must at sight be trusted as having the qualities fit for the leadership of educated men.

Side by side with the transference of all theological study from the colleges to the theological schools, and partly on account of it, there has arisen a very general disuse of home religious instruction. The practice of catechizing children has fallen into desuetude, even in New England. We have transferred the religious education of children, not always with advantage so far as its doctrinal portion is concerned, to Sabbath-schools. From both these circumstances, and from the vast increase of the circulation of books and newspapers, and the absorbing drill of American political and industrial life, distracting attention from that kind of reading, even of the Bible, to which our fathers were accustomed, it has resulted that the theological education of the mass of

the people is not as good as it formerly was. I do not think the ministry of the present day less well educated than that of fifty years ago, or of the days of Edwards; but I think that, while the secular education of the people has vastly risen since the latter period, their theological education has declined. It is trite to speak of the immense increase of the means of information, and of the possession of it, among the masses of the people. The world has long believed in the sword. It is at last slowly coming to believe in the school. Let us hope that, in a third great stage of advance, it will believe in the church. At present, however, we are only at the stage of belief in the school, which is replacing the old power of the sword by that of the spelling-book. The lecture system has undoubtedly had an important influence, in wide portions of the United States and Great Britain, in raising the popular standard for the discussions of the pulpit by familiarizing common audiences with good speaking. The introduction of railways has given to many rural populations such opportunities of visiting cities as to induce in them the intellectual tastes of the city. At this moment there are in New England, according to an authoritative statement, more than twenty large churches which are without pastors, because unable to find men so variously trained as to meet their wants. The vast advance in the secular intelligence of the people is my third argument for an extension of the term of professional theological study.

But a fourth, and a more important one, is the fact that the information of the people in regard to theological and religious, has not kept pace with its advance as to secular, truths. Without this distinction of its two parts, the growth of knowledge among the people might seem to have utterly inexplicable relations to the religious phenomena of the times. The world is, indeed, becoming more enlightened, but not with equal rapidity in all respects. The disparity between the degrees of advance of secular and religious intelligence is a fearful gap in the joints of the harness of truth, at which, as I hope soon to show, scepticism strikes.

In the midst of all these changes, and favoring them, another has occurred, the most important of our century — an incalculable advance of physical science. But the method of science is the inductive. That is the method of caution. It is the sceptical method. The deductive method, which reasons from general principles to particular facts, has largely prevailed in metaphysics and theology. But the inductive reasons from particular facts to general principles. Its whole procedure is to the last degree rigorous. Its merit is its sceptical spirit. Its tendency is to induce a sceptical spirit in all forms of investigation. But this method has been successful. In science the sceptical method has been the successful method. The results of science prove its right to homage. The world believes in that which bears fruit. Science bears fruit, of which Pacific railways and Atlantic cables are really not the greatest. The result of the successes of science is, that it is more and more demanded that all subjects be treated in the scientific method. The time has come when the people begin to make this demand. God forbid that they should not make it, and more and more! Science, as defended by its less thoroughly cultivated votaries, has many faults. It sometimes makes arrogant claims. But it has one righteous thing in it. That is the love of clear ideas. The holy and intense creed which has for its tenets reverence for proof, clear ideas at any cost, and obedience to known truth the organ of spiritual knowledge, will live. It will go through the centuries of coming time without wreck. I believe that the love of clear ideas and impatience of their opposite, which characterize the educated mind of the present age, are as truly a pentecost from the divine hand as if evidenced by tongues of flame. The gauntlet is at last thrown down.

“Doubts, to the world’s child-heart unknown,”
writes the devout Whittier,

“Question us now from star and stone;
The power is lost to self-deceive
With hollow forms of make-believe.”

Faith and science challenge each other to the death. I see herein promise, not of destruction for either, but of reinforced and mutually harmonious life for both. The questions which the progress of science raises, the progress of science will answer. It will do so, not to the detriment, but to the coronation, of fundamental religious and Christian truth. The progress of science is not feared, but desired, by the soundest supporters of theological learning. It is the doctrine of science itself that what we so vaguely call natural law is the method of action of the Infinite Will constantly upholding all the properties it has created in matter and finite mind, and is demonstrably God's present and omnipresent Thought.¹ To speak literally, without exaggeration, he who touches a natural law touches the live lightning of a perpetually present Sinai. Science, against its choice, will show that every natural fact is, in the strictest sense, a religious fact. Startling us in some past years, it has been blindly bringing us to this great result. The eve of an unexpected time I believe to be at hand, and its dawn now more than broken in the best educated minds, when faith will make science religious, and science make faith scientific. The Word and the Works must flow together after 1900. I think I hear that yet unrisen storm of good already sing in the wind. But we have even now reached a time when it is plain that all topics must be submitted to the scientific method, and theology with the rest. The fact that the time has come, or is near at hand, when the philosophical relations of the doctrines, as well as the doctrines with their scriptural proof, must be more or less

¹ Professor Benjamin Peirce, *Analytical Mechanics*, chap. i. sec. 2, "The Spiritual Origin of Force." Professor L. Agassiz, *Essay on Classification*. W. R. Grove, *Correlation of Physical Forces*. Professor Francis Bowen, *Metaphysics and Ethics*; *Lowell Lectures*, pp. 71-172. Professor James McCosh, *The Method of the Divine Government* (American edition), pp. 86, 106, 80, 90, 95 note. *Collected Works of Dugald Stewart*, edited by Sir William Hamilton: *Active and Moral Powers*, Vol. i. pp. 49-51, 354; and Vol. ii. pp. 24, 27-30, 173, 190. Professor Michael Faraday, *The Conservation of Force*. Sir J. F. W. Herschell, *Outlines of Astronomy* (American ed.), pp. 233-234.

preached to the people, is my fifth argument for a fourth year in the courses of theological schools. The preparation to do this work well cannot be adequately made without an increase of the term of theological study. The present courses were founded when to teach the scriptural proof of the doctrines was the result chiefly aimed at. This must constantly be aimed at, and more and more closely. I plead for a fourth year, in order that there may be more space for exegetical training in theological schools; but the philosophical relations of the doctrines, from the point of view of natural, as well as of revealed, theology must be mastered also. Infidelity has assumed forms among many portions of the people which cannot be approached by proof texts.

The diminution of theological training, the diffusion of secular intelligence, and the growth of the scientific spirit, causes of which the operation has just been noticed, have given peculiar power to those forms of modern scepticism which use as their weapons science and polite literature. That infidelity is a greater danger to-day than at any previous period, is an assertion I do not make, or believe. But I believe it to be a greater danger now than at any recent period, in respect of the masses of men, as distinguished from scholars. Deism in the last century did not direct its appeals largely to the people. Even Strauss, in this century, wrote his first *Life of Christ* solely for scholars. The battle then was waged for the possession of the minds of educated men. But now the battle is waged for the possession of the minds of the people. Strauss writes a popular *Life of Christ*, and so do Renan and a score of others. Questions of exegesis and philosophy, formerly discussed in Latin, are now discussed, and are likely to be so more and more, in the popular forms of the literature of each nation. When the battle was for the possession of the minds of scholars, one or two arguments from scholars, like Butler's *Analogy* and Paley's *Evidences*, were sufficient to save the cause of truth in that field. But when the battle

is for the possession of the minds of the people, the truth must have many defenders, or the truth will inevitably suffer on that different field. The exigences of Christianity in the last century and in this not only differ, but differ chiefly, in the fact that then the battle was for the minds of scholars, and now is for the minds of the people. Great defenders of the truth were needed then. Now, at least, able ones are required. Then, but a few were necessary. Now, a host are needed. This host must be the ministry. The power over the masses, as such, given to modern forms of scepticism by the peculiarities of the century, is my sixth argument for an extension of the professional courses of theological study. The ministry must be able to do thoroughly for the people in a popular way in this century what Paley and Butler did thoroughly for scholars in a scholarly way in the last.

As compared with its influence in the Puritan age, the power of the pulpit, it must be admitted, has undergone a very considerable reduction in recent history, except so far as it depends upon its rendered reasons. The causes of this diminution are included substantially in the decrease of popular theological training, and the growth of secular knowledge and of the scientific spirit, which have been noticed, and in the political changes which have come upon the world, everywhere loosening, and in wide portions of Christendom destroying, the connection of church and state, and giving, in many cases, with the freedom of religious worship, freedom of religious discussion. The circumstance that the power of the pulpit has been greatly diminished, except so far as it depends on its rendered reasons, gives great significance, however, to what otherwise would have comparatively little — the current and chronic criticisms of the pulpit by the more educated and the less educated alike. The badness of sermons is the ground which the people secretly allege for their now somewhat notorious demand for their shortness. “It is no longer sarcasm,” says an editor of the *North American Review*, “to use the phrase ‘pulpit

argument' for weak reasoning, and 'pulpit rhetoric' for a feeble and stilted style." A church, says the same authority, is very generally "a simple assemblage of persons, gathered to go through with certain formal ceremonies, the chief of which consists in listening to a man who is seldom competent to teach."¹ At this the most scholarly of the Boston newspapers claps its hands, and says that, if the North American will write like that, it will have influence, and that the force of its remarks is not in their novelty, for they contain nothing which is not said by our most thoughtful preachers on every proper public occasion. In England, among the Independent denominations, the subject of the improvement of theological education is now attracting much attention. The London Times, in noticing this fact, said recently that men every day enter the English establishment destitute of theological knowledge and of practical experience. It proposed that every candidate for the position of an incumbent be examined, as a pre-requisite to his receiving it, in one good English text-book in theology, like Pearson on the Creed, and in one introduction to the scriptures.² I think it a question whether the average of sermons are more dull than the average of congressional speeches. But, whatever reduction we may make in the force of these criticisms, the fact that they exist, and are chronic, is an argument for increased thoroughness in theological education. We have made them too frequently ourselves to deny their justice now that we are coming within their range. Moses Stuart, who lies in that grave, once said that forty or fifty students at the seminary every year failed utterly in the exegetical studies, from having been educated in a slovenly manner in the Greek.³ Had he taught doctrinal theology, what would his priceless candor not have said of the deficiencies of students in metaphysics and logic, and of the consequent undermining of their entire education in the

¹ C. E. Norton, *North American Review*, April, 1868.

² *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. xxiv. p. 533.

³ *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, Vol. xxxiv. pp. 641, 642.

proof, and even in the accurate statement, of Christian doctrine. The most disastrous criticism of the pulpit is that it skips difficulties. One would be inclined to mitigate the severity of this criticism, if he did not find a similar remark true of many theological text-books, and of some recent ones, on which students are fed. A student, passing out of Mill in political economy, and Hamilton in metaphysics, into theology, is astonished, whatever the ability of monographs on particular doctrinal topics, to find that there are no text-books in theology of as much ability as those to which he is accustomed in other branches, as inferior to theology as chaff to pearls. But the time has come when it will not do for the pulpit to skip difficulties. The current and loud and standing criticisms of the pulpit, by both people and ministry, are my seventh argument for a fourth year of study in theological schools. There are wide classes now too little informed in theology, and too thoroughly filled with the pride of the scientific method, or of the literary spirit, to believe the pulpit completely honest when it goes outside of the field of merely natural theology. The skipping of difficulties brings swiftly the charge of disingenuousness; and that charge hangs, invisible, in the secret thoughts of men, over more pulpits to-day than we are aware, a Damocles sword.

The wants of faculties in respect to a fourth year of study in our theological schools arise from the omission or hurried treatment at present of important topics for want of time. Of the nine crowded months usually devoted to the whole range of the system of Christian doctrine, not fully two, in most cases, can be given to natural theology. We want an Introduction or Encyclopedia of Theology, such as is given so carefully in the theological courses of the German universities.¹ It is omitted for want of time. It is only a few years since the history of Christian doctrine obtained a place in some of our theological seminaries; and a distinguished professor of it not long since said that there is

¹ *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. i. pp. 735-767.

no time to teach church history in a theological course. Everything is hurried; and this at a time when scholars are impatient of other than a scientific treatment of any topic, and most of all of the most important. The omission or hurried treatment of important topics for want of time in our present courses of theological study, is my eighth argument for a fourth year in the courses of theological schools. It is not to be forgotten for a moment that one of the greatest obstacles in any seminary to the growth of enthusiasm in theological study is the suspicion, on the part of some portion of the pupils, of controversial disingenuousness on the part of the teacher. This suspicion arises, in scores of cases, from the treatment of great topics being condensed almost to the point of obscurity for want of time, and the teacher so being misapprehended. I believe that this obstacle can be effectually removed only by requiring severer examinations of the students, on the one hand, and by giving more time to the teacher, on the other; so that the professor's views, whether accepted or rejected, may at least be understood.

The industry of a large portion of German students in the last years of their courses at their universities is everywhere noted. But it is an industry arising from the pressure of the German state examinations. The regulations of government, which make success in these necessary, not only to honor in scholarship, but to entrance on a profession in any quarter of Germany, are the spur of the German student. If in a theological course, he must pass three years in theological study at a university before he can be permitted to preach. His examination before the commission of the government at the end of the three years is in ecclesiastical and doctrinal history, philosophy, ethics and theological literature, and the exegesis of the Old and New Testament, as well as in systematic and symbolical theology.¹ Matthew Arnold, in his recent work on the Schools and Universities on the Continent, says that the examination includes three

¹ Professor Edward Robinson, *Biblical Repository*, Vol. i. pp. 414-419.

or four days of paper work and six or eight hours of *viva voce*.¹ If the student fails in this examination, he may be admitted to a second; but if he fails there, he can be admitted to no other, and there is no avenue by which, in any part of Germany, he can enter his profession. At the end of three years from the first examination, every candidate is examined again, as severely as at first, and upon additional topics, and is then capable of being chosen to the pastoral office. If within a year he is not so chosen, he must undergo a third examination. These examinations are not forms. In 1828 the examining committee at Halle were Gesenius, Weber, Wegscheider, Thilo, Marks, Fritzsche, and Tholuck. One out of every six applicants was rejected. The regulations now are not less severe than at that date. The inferiority, in respect of intellectual thoroughness, of American theological education, as compared with German, is my ninth argument for a fourth year of theological study. Let us not be deterred by the ill effects which the connection of church and state in Germany has caused from seeing the benefits which the intellectual thoroughness it has required would produce in our own country, divorced from that connection, and united with a Puritan piety, in which our theological students, as a mass, probably surpass the German as much as the German ours in intellectual thoroughness.

It is plainly impossible to introduce this degree of thoroughness by crowding more instruction into the present three years. Sir William Hamilton announced, before being elected professor at Edinburgh, that, if elected, he should require severe examinations. Tuesday and Thursday of each week he devoted to these; Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, to lectures. Suppose that the examinations at the close of the terms in our theological seminaries were made as severe, in proportion to the extent of study they represent, as those which the German theological student must pass. I greatly misjudge if the mass of our students would not

¹ Schools and Universities on the Continent. By Professor Matthew Arnold. London. 1868. p. 231.

themselves be gratified by having their examinations made as severe as those of Sir William Hamilton, or of Germany. At Baliol College, in Oxford, Sir William Hamilton, according to a custom which allowed students to profess authors on which they were willing to be examined, professed on his entrance all of Aristotle and Plato, with their principal commentators, and sustained an examination on them. Suppose that the students in our theological seminaries were allowed, at the end of every term but the last of their course, to profess, in a similar manner, books collateral to the studies of their regular course, and to pass a public examination on them. The effect might be, without distracting men from the lines of thought adapted to their individual wants, since each would select his own authors, to stimulate private reading to greater thoroughness and extent, and discriminate the industrious from the idle. I think the examination would be far from unpopular with students. It would require no endowment for its foundation. Lectureships, too, are not yet so far multiplied as to burden the three years, and might be at least twice as numerous before we should attend from four to six lectures a day, as some of the German students do. But, make the most of the present time, and the German intellectual thoroughness cannot be attained in it. At every point beyond the degree of labor usually performed by the most industrious men of a college class, there would be danger of breaking down the health of many students. The impossibility of so improving the present course of three years as to make it meet the wants of the churches and of theological faculties and students, is my tenth argument for an extension of the term of study in theological schools.

The objections, on the part of the student, of want of time and money for four years' theological study, ought to be met by the personal argument on the reaction of crudeness upon the individual character. I stand aghast whenever I think of this. I believe it safe to say that no temptation is ordinarily so great to a young minister as that to push expression of opinion beyond clear belief, and of

emotion beyond its actual possession. He has honest belief and honest emotion. But he is in a position where his success depends on expressing both strongly. One of the deep secrets of the soul is that an affection is deadened by being expressed more strongly than it is possessed. This law is as true of religious affection as of any other. But men, little by little, allow themselves to preach without clear thought. Emotion never rises higher than conviction. By a fixed law of the mind it is prevented from rising higher. If it be forced higher, it is not emotion, but affectation. Men's convictions are not clear, for their grasp on Christian doctrine is not thorough. Their emotions are, therefore, vacillating. But the latter must not appear to be such. Little by little the want of clear thought leads to want of honest emotion. Then, little by little, the expression of emotion is pushed beyond its possession. The reaction is horrible. A drop of cant in the veins sickens the whole moral system. In time, the man's style degenerates, and becomes monotonous, spiritless, toneless, aimless, perfunctory. And, as pushing the expression of emotion beyond its possession reacts and produces cant, so pushing the expression of conviction beyond its possession reacts and produces scepticism. Thus intellectual crudeness, and the necessity of teaching publicly laid too early upon a man, undermine ministerial conscientiousness. The reaction of crudeness in professional theological study upon personal character is my eleventh argument for a fourth year in theological schools. The addition of a fourth year will greatly lessen this danger. Obstacles from want of time and money, urged by the student as impeding entrance on a fourth year of theological study, are not to be compared with the danger of becoming disingenuous through crudeness, a hypocrite in a holy place, a cup of silver filled with putrid wine. I want no pulpit that is not built of rendered reasons. I am sure I had rather die an infidel than not die honest.

Lectureships have been numerous founded in three of the four leading American theological schools within the

last few years. They indicate that the direction in which the schools are moving is toward more thorough scholarship. By the inauguration this day of an honored professor, one seminary has organized a short course. It appears to me incalculably needed; and yet its very existence is one reason for a longer course to balance any effect the former may have in lowering the standard of the churches. The wants of our people are very diversified, and so should be the education of their teachers. The long course for their teachers is more needed by vast portions of our population than the short course is by other portions for theirs. One seminary has opened a fourth year. My last argument for a fourth year is, that one has already been organized in one of the foremost American seminaries, and that it falls in with a tendency to increase the thoroughness of theological education exhibited by the others.

The first objection to a fourth year is, that if one is organized students cannot be induced to remain at the theological schools to use it. I have spoken to-night wholly from the point of view of a student, in order that I might rebut this objection. Of the opinions of the faculty of this seminary concerning a fourth year, I know absolutely nothing, except that one member has incidentally declared himself in favor of it; and I have preferred to know nothing of those opinions, in order that I might speak representatively for students. I have no reason to believe that I am alone in wishing a fourth year. I do not expect that students who, without a fourth year, might go to Germany to study after their theological course, would be prevented from going by the addition of a fourth year; but the fact that many now do take up further study abroad, and that more would but for the distance and expense of the opportunity, shows that further study would be pursued at home, if sufficiently attractive facilities for it were presented.

A second objection is, that a man grows faster and more healthfully in a parish after three years' study, than by

remaining a year longer in a preparatory course. In reply, I need only say that the healthful time for leaving the nest is when we can fly, not before, not later. I have endeavored to show that at the end of three years our wings are not, and cannot be, quite trustworthily for so grave a voyage as that through the regions of truth which lie between two worlds. It were different if we were to fly alone; but we are asked to fly as guides to whole flocks of souls, some of the members of which, alas, have no eyes but ours. We are advised, many of us, to go abroad. How is such advice consonant with the theory that a man grows most healthfully in a parish after three years preparatory study? The collision of mind with mind among students is the confessed advantage of the method of theological instruction by seminaries above that of more private classes. This is never so great as after men begin to form independent opinions. They are not prepared to form these until the three years' course is nearly completed. The fourth year would contain more of this benefit than either of the others.

It ought ever to be remembered that we belong to a decimated generation. The graves on which our nation cast flowers a few weeks since are a majority of them of men under thirty-five years of age. We are but a remnant; but, as such, there ought to belong to us a heroic work. It is but a little while from now to the roll-call after the battle. We shall soon hear again the voices of those who have already laid down their lives that the dolorous and accursed ages might a little change their course. If we could hear them now, I think they would be found exhorting us not to go with bow and arrow, when we might go in full modern armor, into life's intellectual and moral Waterloos. Let us, the remnant, sell our lives as dearly as they sold theirs. Let us insist that our equipment be equal to that which will certainly be possessed by the enemy.