

offerings in his account of Circassian sacrifices (p. 747) : " Before immolating the victim the priest pours upon its head a goblet of baksima, the strong drink of the Circassians (the boza of the Turks). The beast is then slain ; and a cup of strong drink is first offered to the deity, and then drunk in turn by all the company present." The victim on these occasions is either from the flocks or herds, according to the importance of the occasion.

(To be continued).

ARTICLE VI.

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.

NO. III. — A SPECIAL COURSE OF THEOLOGICAL STUDY FOR THOSE WHO HAVE HAD NO COLLEGE TRAINING.

Most heartily do we agree with those who advocate a " higher training " for the Christian ministry, and a system of study to some extent " elective " in order to secure this higher training.¹ But there are students who have not been " *through* college " — one hundred and ten students out of three hundred and seventeen in our seven Congregational seminaries, most of whom have not been " *at* college," some of whom can scarcely be said to have had any " training " at all. What shall we do with them ?

Whether they are called to preach, or should be allowed to preach, or will succeed in preaching, or should be " licensed," " ordained," " installed," is not exactly within our arbitrament. They are impelled by sacred convictions. They are encouraged and recommended by those who know them best. They appear to be good, noble, earnest, perhaps bright, attractive, and promising, men. They feel their need of being taught and trained. After fair trial they are found to have suitable, if not superior, abilities. They make rapid progress, and endure severe tests, and can be qualified for

¹ See Bib. Sec. (April, 1879), Vol xxxvi. pp. 367-372.

excellent service. By common consent they lack only the requisite training.

The danger of admitting them into the ministry by any short or partial course of study is conceded ; but it is not so great as the danger of letting them find their way into it without any course at all. The danger of making a regular and systematic provision for them is granted ; but it is not so great as the danger of their being left to study without any fixed method or standard.

Whether they should be educated at the Seminary may be doubted. For such students the old plan of private individual instruction has many advantages. At first they can be taught best in a familiar, conversational way ; they learn from text-books better than from lectures ; they "take notes" slowly, slavishly, miserably, and unprofitably ; what they learn must be drilled into them by constant repetition, and drawn out of them by frequent recitation. Their many defects and difficulties, mistakes and blunders require private treatment. More than other students do they need the close supervision and companionship of the teacher. For a year, at least, let them be tutored individually, if possible, by some accomplished pastor or seminary professor. This plan, in exceptional cases, we favor for the entire course. No other is so flexible, so considerate, so searching and stimulating, so thoroughly practical. Some Dr. Bellamy or Dr. West or Dr. Emmons, if he should turn his house into a divinity school, as in early New England, might be himself more and better than a whole Faculty. But for various reasons this private plan will not answer now so well as formerly. No prominent minister or teacher has either time or strength, even if he has the skill, for such extra official labors. Teaching in theology, as in other departments, is more of a distinct profession ; nor can anybody teach well enough who does not give himself almost entirely to teaching, and to some one branch of teaching. No single pastor's time or library or parish can afford such facilities for study as come from the stimulus of numbers, the variety of helps,

the opportunities of discussion and criticism, and the means of discipline in a good theological seminary. No man can have such an inspiring, developing, molding power as a permanent institution. Besides, no student should run the risk of being directed and indoctrinated, during his most plastic years, by any one instructor. Nor is any seminary so large that it does not combine public with private training, and admit of each student having all needed personal attention. Then the purely private plan works best for the most choice and congenial students, and for only a scattered few. For a hundred or more of the most rude and uncultured sort it would be likely to fail. We prefer, therefore, a *Seminary Course*.

But what shall the seminary do with these special students? Keep them apart by themselves? This is necessary so far as they study what the others do not. This is well until they learn how to study and recite. This prevents their troubling the more advanced students. But as soon and as much as practicable they should be kept with the others. For we are educated by our companions no less than by our teachers, and the higher may learn from the lower as truly as the lower from the higher. The fellowships of intellect and heart fitly go together. The emulations of saints and scholars are quickening. Nor can there be an entire separation between them, either by putting them into different schools or by keeping them in distinct classes, without danger of creating, at length, two orders or ranks in the ministry.

Sometimes they are put into the regular course. But they are not prepared for it. They are not on a par with college graduates in either Greek or English studies. This can only hinder and degrade the regular course. To catalogue them as "regular," or to graduate them as "regular," is to represent them to be what they are not. We prefer, therefore, a special course; partly subordinate to the regular, though chiefly co-ordinate with it, and conducted so as to assimilate without confounding the two.

What the course of study should be may be disputed. Doubtless it should be longer or shorter, and more or less elective, according to circumstances. It must always include the English Bible, and the essential Christian doctrines. If more than one year long, should it not embrace all of the regular course except the Hebrew and Greek lessons? During the first year should it not require more or less of Grammar, Rhetoric, Logic, Mental and Moral Philosophy? If lengthened to four years, may it not include the Greek Testament and perhaps the Hebrew Bible? There is danger, no doubt, of making it a "mongrel something else." There is a seeming impropriety, too, in doing at the Seminary the work of a good common school, academy, or college; and there are peculiar temptations to "overdoing" in the case of ambitious but undisciplined minds.

But there is no sense in refusing to teach what a good student is abundantly able and willing to learn. Such a Special Course we advocate, not indeed for all seminaries,—for why should every seminary have all kinds of students, or furnish all kinds of training,—but for *some* seminaries.

1. *As necessary.*—There not only is, but must be, a diversity in those who preach, a diversity in natural gifts, personal experiences, providential allotments, and why not in educational training? As places differ, and parishes, and churches or missions, so must the men who are wanted and needed. No kind of ministerial standing or training can have a monopoly of ministerial usefulness.

Not all who are called to preach can go through college. Some are prevented by age, others by ill-health, others by poverty, others by family cares and trials, others by the lateness of their conversion to Christ or of their call to the ministry.

Not all places can be supplied with ministers who are college graduates. Partly because they cannot be *suited* with them. For there are communities and churches where a full clerical education is not appreciated—where the farmer, mechanic, or merchant, even if only half-educated, may be more acceptable than any seminary professor or

college president. Not only among black men and poor whites, and on distant frontiers, but in all our cities, there are plenty of ministers whose great trouble is, as the people say, that they are "over-educated." Partly because the churches cannot *support* them. For, those who have expended nine or ten full years and thousands of dollars in educating themselves cannot afford to take inferior or destitute places. Be they ever so self-denying, they ought to have, and generally must have, more than the ordinary pay for their labor. They require a more ample provision, if not for their physical and domestic wants, yet for their mental growth and culture and for their largest usefulness. Chiefly, however, because *so many* ministers are needed. Number here is quite as important a factor as quality. For nobody can spread himself over a city or county; nobody minister to a million. Nor is the number of good ministers ever too great. For, if there be a surplus of those who can find places or fill places or hold places, as often happens around certain popular centres, still, there is always a scarcity of those who can make places for themselves, and they are the true apostles.

Now the higher ministry is quite apt to feel as if the lower might be dispensed with. But the eye cannot say to the hand, or the head to the foot, "I have no need of thee." "Nay, much more, those members of the body which seem to be more feeble, are *necessary*." Just as society may need day-laborers more than kings or capitalists, so the church may need its many humble servants far more than its few critical scholars or learned and eloquent preachers.

2. *As desirable*. — It does not invite "unsuitable candidates" for the ministry, though it may sometimes attract them. It calls, of course, for satisfactory testimonials as to their motives and talents and present attainments. It asks for men of special gifts or aptitudes. It may be easily mistaken as to them, because they come not from the schools, and are unused to study, and may bring their credentials from injudicious friends or strangers; but it takes them only

on trial. It sifts them, and keeps only those who prove worthy of encouragement.

To some extent, it lowers the educational standard. For it works on comparatively crude and untutored, perhaps rough and unrefined, material; and it is confessedly incomplete, if not superficial. By no means can it make up for the want of a good college education. But in its general tendency it elevates, rather than lowers scholarship. For it requires men of mature mind and of no ordinary capacity. It finds in them, perhaps, the discipline of affairs and afflictions. It subjects them, in a short time, to a great amount and variety of study. None but the brightest and strongest will survive the trial. It makes them unusually familiar with the history and contents of the English Bible. It carries them farther in their English studies than they would have gone in the same branches if at college. It supplies them with the results of Hebrew and Greek learning. In short, it gives them all the education of which they are now capable. Those, too, who come only for a term, or prove unequal to their tasks, or drop out from over-pressure, are wiser and better for coming, and, at the poorest, find a dozen poor parishes, or, if they start again, some other good seminary, waiting to welcome them.

Besides, there is no *fixed* educational standard for the ministry, or for any other profession. Earnest and efficient men are always wanted. Those lacking in learning or discipline may excel in ministerial power. Those who have learned less from books may have less to unlearn, may be more original and striking in thought, more fresh and lively in feeling, more positive and definite in conviction, more intense and energetic in action, or more responsive to divine influences. Often are the best scholars far from being the best preachers and pastors.

Moreover, the power which is aimed at by the highest culture is not sure to be gained by it. Good learning is always a help, and not a hinderance. The more highly a man is educated, the more admirably should he adapt himself

to even the lowest people. Other things being equal, he will be strong, popular, and successful in proportion to his training. But *other things are never equal*. There are powers which are not created nor developed by culture, and which may not even be increased or improved by it. Said a writer in Littell's Living Age, on Culture or Efficiency: "The greatest men of earth have not, as a rule, been men who possessed the literary faculty. . . . They have been men to whom literature was unfamiliar or distasteful. . . . The higher kinds of culture have often an enervating effect. There are minds, and those amongst the most valuable, which much learning tends only to enfeeble. The polish is only obtained by planing away the wood. There is a rough strength, a determined energy, which seems to be the attribute only of the half-educated. Men of great culture are apt to give their imaginations too much play, to desire harmonious impossibilities, to foresee the difficulties so clearly that action is foregone. . . . The work of the world is done by qualities over which culture has no power. Courage is not developed by mathematics. Creative power is not increased by literary training. Insight is an instinct, not a product of education. That strange faculty of dominance which seems to stand apart from the other powers of the mind, which enables races as stupid as the Turk to subjugate races as subtle as the Greek is not increased by polished cultivation. . . . Every day we see the scholar distanced in the race of life by the adventurer who can barely spell, the polished scion of a cultivated race defeated hopelessly by an orator innocent of Greek. Force, the motive-power of events, rests in the character, not the intellect; and it is only the latter, high cultivation can improve." We quote these words simply as showing how much a man's power depends on his natural aptitudes. If any of this wild, illiterate, yet dominating force would enter the ministry, doubtless it should be rightly instructed and guided, as well as sanctified. Should it not find some place in the seminary? ¹

¹ There is much to the same point in Milton's and Locke's *Essays on Education*. Lord Jeffrey says: "Regular education, we think, is unfavorable to vigor

A recent writer observes: "The number of men in the clerical profession — not necessarily dull or ignorant, who have absolutely no mental faculty whatever for so much as comprehending, not to say assimilating, purely theological ideas at all is very large. . . . There are certain departments of theology which, on the one hand, are useless if no more than a mere superficial smattering be obtained, and on the other, have only a very indirect bearing on the ordinary routine-work of a parochial clergyman. Such, for example, are Hebrew and the textual criticism of the Old and New Testament. . . . Now the fault which runs through the courses of study prescribed to candidates for holy orders in all the most important divinity schools, . . . such as the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Durham, and Dublin, King's College, London, and the leading theological colleges, is, that they have one and all been apparently drawn up from the purely academic point of view, in a scholastic spirit, and as if a literary, rather than a practical, goal lay before the candidates. . . . I do not, as a rule, find amongst the younger clergy whom I meet that intimate and localized familiarity with the authorized version of the Bible in its whole extent which is well nigh indispensable for successful preaching, catechizing, and discussion. This is of far greater value for the ordinary cleric than even a tolerable knowledge of the original language and textual criticism of some four or five selected books of the Old and New Testament."¹

At all events, the best way to secure the highest professional originality of understanding. Like civilization, it makes society more intelligent and agreeable; but it levels the distinctions of nature. It strengthens and assists the feeble; but it deprives the strong of his triumph and casts down the hopes of the aspiring. It accomplishes this, not only by training up the mind in an habitual veneration for authorities, but by leading us to bestow a disproportionate degree of attention upon studies that are only valuable as keys or instruments for the understanding, they come at last to be regarded as ultimate objects of pursuit; and the means of education are absurdly mistaken for its end." — *Edinburgh Review*, 1806. Dr. Jacob Bigelow has much to say in the same strain, in his "Essay on the limits of Education," and "Modern Inquiries." 1870.

¹ Rev. R. F. Littledale in *Contemporary Review*, April 1879.

sional training is not to train all alike, nor some to the exclusion of others, but to train pre-eminently those who have the capacity of being so trained, in order that others may have before them the proper standard, and to give full liberty to all who show signs of promise. It is leveling *down*, and not *up*, when we talk of keeping all days alike sacred, or making all meals alike sacramental, or all professions alike divine, or all students alike classical. We must set apart the highest and best, and be content if the rest approximate to them.

But the desirableness of this special course for English students is not seen, until we consider *how much they may learn* without any study of Hebrew or Greek. The value of an acquaintance with the Scriptures in their original tongues cannot be over-estimated. It is worth all it costs, even when gained at a somewhat advanced age. In many ways this value is simply incalculable. For want of it the best English students may be filled, at times, with indescribable yearnings. But, after all, how little do ministers generally depend, in their work, on their personal knowledge of Hebrew or Greek! If the English Bible be studied carefully, with all the help of modern commentaries, more may be learned from it now than was known once by Hebrew and Greek scholars. Nor are we confined to what may be learned by simple interpretation, with grammar, lexicon, and commentary. We are not to be mere expounders, but theologians. Our great work as ministers is to study the Bible, not in detached books or chapters and verses, but in its central doctrines and precepts, or with reference to the system of truth it inculcates, the grand scheme of salvation of which it is the only authoritative record. Each student is to build upon it his own theology. To do this, what is necessary? Not any mere exegesis. Little can he rely on disputed passages, still less on peculiar turns of expression, or nice shades of meaning. With a discriminating mind and appreciative heart, with a sound mental and moral philosophy, with a keen and cogent logic, may he not learn enough of the Bible and its cardinal truths

from its modern, as well as from its ancient versions? Then, apart from the Bible, how much may be learned about the history of Christ's church through its eras of darkness and light, the outpourings of God's Spirit, the benevolent and missionary enterprises, the varieties of Christian experience and worship, the lives of eminent saints, and, above all, the history of doctrines. Should we not be guided, even in our study of the Bible, by those creeds and catechisms which condense the wisdom of the ages? Here is a wide field for English, as well as classical study. Then in the homiletical, oratorical, and pastoral arts, in writing so as to convince, and speaking so as to persuade, and adapting one's self to the manifold wants of the people, what scope for those perfectly ignorant of Hebrew and Greek!

3. *As eminently Christian.* — We must not lose sight of the fundamental facts of Christianity. The great fact is Christ himself. Doubtless he was unique and exceptional. Perhaps he did not preach at all as men commonly speak of preaching. For there was nothing in him that savored of learning or scholarship. He might not electrify a modern audience. But the ideal gospel minister is to be like Christ. If called of God and filled with the Holy Spirit, shall he stop to ask whether God can make a good minister out of unclassical material? He cannot be concerned chiefly about any linguistic, scholastic, or professional culture.

Our Lord took his apostles from among those who were not simply in his service and society, but under his instruction. By no means were they inferior in their native gifts; nor were they so ignorant or illiterate as is often supposed; nor did they fail to be educated during those three wonderful years in which they were leavened with his doctrine, and caught inspiration from his very looks and words. Especially after his resurrection did he open their understandings and explain to them what he had taught. But he chose them not from those called great, wise, noble. He cared not for Scribes and Rabbis. He relied not on great men, except as

men became great in serving him. He could use a James and a Peter as well as a John and a Paul.

The Christian ministry is never described in the New Testament as an exclusive order, open to those only who have a certain amount of knowledge or culture. It is a distinct class of men ordained to a distinct and sacred work. But there is room in it for all kinds and ranks of devoted and useful brethren; and he who stands lowest among men may stand highest before God. Not even Peter and Paul draw any sharp distinctions between the clergy and laity. Least of all does Paul speak of his own superior dignity or sanctity by virtue of his Greek scholarship.

The grand qualifications for the Christian ministry are not educational, but spiritual and divine. This we must not forget. Nothing that can be called "education," in the technical or ordinary sense of that word, no intellectual strength or skill, no scientific or literary culture, no certificate, diploma, or degree, nothing that comes from schools, colleges, or universities constitutes a good minister of the gospel, but spiritual gifts and graces, such as goodness, faith, love, patience, the vital force, the knowledge, wisdom, zeal, and efficiency which spring from the baptism of the Spirit. Be it ever so true that the most mighty and useful ministers have been thoroughly educated, still education is but an instrument. Its office is subordinate. Its importance may be unduly exalted.

Then, as to studying "the original,"—who can find the original gospels? We have nothing but copies, translations, revisions, whether in Greek or English—no autograph text—nothing but second-hand gospels. The critics find no inspiration or infallibility in the Greek which is not preserved and transmitted, substantially, in the English. Ours is, at best, but an "oral gospel." It was fixed in memory before it was fixed in writing, and admits of being handled with a reverential freedom, in whatever tongue, by those who accept it as perfectly trustworthy.

4. *As vindicated by history.*—Both colleges and semina-

ries must be classed with "modern improvements." Indeed, our ideal of an educated ministry is of recent origin. But the ministry itself, as divinely appointed, runs through the centuries. The Hebrew prophets were the most gifted and learned men of their day; and, after Samuel, they had a kind of academic training. But in the "schools of the prophets," or societies (for in the Hebrew we do not find the word schools), they were taught only the pure religion of Moses, with sacred poetry and music. They were made, sometimes, out of shepherds, herdsmen, or vinedressers. None after Moses is said to have been "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." Since Christ many an Ambrose has been called to teach others before he was taught himself, and compelled to take the theology of his day as he found it, and yet has preached with a charming and melting unction, which the more learned Origen, and the more profound Augustine, and the more brilliant Chrysostom might well envy. Only since the fifteenth century has an English education consisted in much more than reading, writing, and singing. Henry VII. revived the Latin tongue; Henry VIII. made learning fashionable; Bishop Latimer called for schoolmasters; but not until after James I., when the English Bible was provided, was there any large accession to knowledge or liberal patronage of letters; not before Queen Elizabeth can we find a Roger Ascham or a Dr. Busby; not until our own century a Thomas Arnold. For how long a period the stars did not shine upon the common people, and a really good classical education, even for the clergy, was unknown! Nine of our academies and eleven of our colleges date back into the eighteenth century, but not one of our theological seminaries back of 1807. All of our "higher training," that is worthy of the name, is the product of our own century; nay, perhaps, of the last half century! Shall we, then, confine the ministry of Christ to those who can take a prescribed and regular course under the latest Plato or Rabbi? Shall we thus exclude from ministerial fellowship even the foremost of those who have gone before

us, and run the risk of being ourselves excluded by those that come after us? John Wycliffe was the "morning star of the Reformation," if he was learned only in Latin and English, or entirely ignorant of Hebrew and Greek. Luther would not have been Luther, if he had been less of a man and more of a scholar. How could he have raised the ensign of a free Bible in the face of the mediaeval scholastics and ecclesiastics? We might wish that Calvin had been more human even if less scholarly. So of Milton. The world prefers a Shakespeare to a Dryden or a Ben Johnson. It honors a Peter the Great, a Napoleon, a Cromwell, a Washington, a Franklin, a Patrick Henry, without asking whether he was a classical scholar.

Archbishop Tillotson "seemed to have brought preaching to perfection." Jeremy Taylor poured out his classic learning as from "a golden horn of plenty." Isaac Barrow elaborated his sermons and thrilled his audience with "a ponderous earnestness." Robert South brought into play the highest doctrine, quickest wit, and bitterest sarcasm. But for evangelical preaching, who would not have preferred Richard Baxter, though he was "taught nothing" at school, and had no university life, and could only "study practical divinity first," and neglected the "settling of his foundations" on account of his continual ill-health, and, when full, at length, of learning and wisdom, full even of Latin lore, could wield only the English language, and could seize only on those subjects which lie at the heart of the gospel? John Owen was the greatest of the Puritans as a theological warrior and was exalted to a high post in the University at Oxford. John Howe was imbued with the choicest ancient literature, and was just the preacher for select audiences; but who would despise the unique and uncouth John Bunyan, because he had only a home-spun style, and owed nothing to the schools? Who, the indefatigable John Wesley, because he was purged of philosophy, and had only a tongue of fire? Who, the impassioned and electric George Whitefield, because, though well-taught at first, he had no time or heart to study, except

as he pored over the English Bible? The "holy Howard" called himself a "plodder" and a "weak instrument." It has been said that "he could hardly spell his own name correctly"; but Isaac Newton could not help honoring him, Edmund Burke and Thomas Chalmers could praise him with enthusiasm, the world will bless him when many of the most highly educated are forgotten. The New England pulpit shows more clearly than any other that the eloquence which would be inspired by the Spirit of God must go from the college and the seminary; but its great preachers, like Jonathan Edwards, Timothy Dwight, Nathanael Emmons, Nathaniel W. Taylor, Lyman Beecher, Horace Bushnell, were great men, great thinkers, reasoners, writers, speakers, rather than great scholars. They were no more great in the biblical classics than in the natural sciences. Besides, the lesson of all history is, that in the ministry, as in other callings, the bulk of the world work, and much of its best work, is done by "successful mediocrity." Men like David Nelson, Charles G. Finney, C. H. Spurgeon, or Dwight L. Moody come to the front, while a host of ambitious and devoted scholars are unemployed, and many a titled divine confesses with the cynical Emerson, "one of the benefits of a college education is to show the boy its little avail."

5. *As demanded by the times.*—Nothing is more obvious now than the need of a division of labor in the ministry, and therefore of a diversified preparation for it. Many ministers are parishioners. Hence some preachers must be able to edify ministers. The laity, in general, are better educated than ever before; so well informed as a body that they equal the clergy, except in divinity. Hence the clergy in general must be better educated. Some of them must have the keenest insight into the workings of the modern intellect, the most delicate sensibility to all the changes of human thought and passion, the most wide and liberal sympathy with all the varieties of scientific discovery, literary criticism, and social advancement. The seminaries must keep pace with the high schools and colleges in elevating the standard

of scholarship; but also in multiplying and dividing their departments. For not only churches, but Sunday-schools, and Bible-classes, city missions, home and foreign missions, newspapers and periodicals, revivals and reforms, to say nothing of the great unexplored and unsupplied regions, call for unnumbered specialists. How is the immense amount of knowledge, now accumulated and recorded, to be so appropriated as to be applied to its vital uses? Well says Dr. Jacob Bigelow, "Education, to be useful, must, so far as possible, be made simple, limited, practicable, acceptable to the learner, adapted to his character and wants, and brought home to his particular case by subdivision and selection." No seminary, therefore, can be abreast of the times, if it be confined to a regular routine for college graduates.

After every great revival the question arises, as in the churches of Scotland, and it will be forced upon us among the millions of the poor, ignorant, and unevangelized, black, and white, south and west, especially in new and scattered settlements, and in heathen lands, "whether there might not be licenses given to approved men who have power in stirring the hearts of people, in presenting the gospel with fulness and freedom, who are fitted for special evangelistic work, although not fitted for the pastorate."¹ As in the days of Jonathan Edwards, when many went into the ministry with only six or seven months of theological study, so now must even college students, without stopping for much more study, when the stir and stress of a providential crisis is upon them; above all, must those who can have, at best, no college privileges. The danger is that they will have not even so much as a "special course" training.

Then the colleges themselves are so diverse that a college graduation stands for a very uncertain quantity. Some colleges are no better than high schools or academies; others are in such a transition, and allow such a choice of studies, that not all, if any, of their graduates have a good classical training. "Masters of arts" may be masters of little or

¹ Cath. Presbyt., Feb. 1879.

nothing. The difference between college graduates is sometimes quite as marked at the seminary as the difference between special and regular students. Phillips Academy in Andover is said to be superior now to Dartmouth College in the last century; yet some went from Dartmouth College into the ministry with only a few months of theological study. Let colleges themselves be examined and graduated if we must be governed by their certificates.

Nor does the college stand so closely connected with the church as it did even a few years ago. Does it convert men to Christ? Does it train them up for the Christian ministry? Does it inspire them with missionary zeal? Once there was little occasion for asking such questions. Now the young and small colleges pay large annual dividends to the ministry. But the older and stronger ones can hardly supply themselves with theological students. Some of them have increased ten per cent within twenty-five years in the number of Christian students: but they draw their life chiefly from the great cities and the rich families, while the recruiting ground for the ministry has been always in towns and villages, on farms and in shops, among the children of toil and hardship. Though education has made prodigious strides, yet, from the lowest to the highest schools, its secular drift is fearfully ominous. We do not despair of the universities. We do not believe them to be increasingly immoral or irreligious. We look to them still for the men of highest efficiency and devotion, in whatever pursuit. But of late they have educated comparatively few for the ministry, and some, we fear, away from it. Those, too, whom they furnish for the ministry they are apt to educate away from the common people. This is not their fault so much as it is the fault of the students themselves; or rather the infirmity of all high culture, which is prone to run into abstractions, and worship its own ideas, and prove false to its divine mission. The dangers of constant study, reading, criticism, and discussion are not so great as those of ignorance and prejudice, superstition and enthusiasm. But they are *real*

dangers, especially during college and university life; the danger of departing from the simplicity of the faith; of being lost in perplexity, if not in scepticism; of being captivated by some false or superficial science; of suffering from ill-digested philosophical theories; of running into barren and bitter theological controversy; of being too absent-minded, or self-involved, or unsympathetic, or unsound and erratic, or refined and fastidious, or unpractical, or, at least, too professional is for the average parish.

Then, the fact that, some of the best ministers have never been at college. Their school has been "out of school." Their library has been out of doors. They have had little Latin, less Greek, no Hebrew; not enough even of English. But they have known how to make their brains and their doctrines marketable. They have lived near the people. They have been educated by their work. They have been more than a match for some of those perfectly familiar with books. They have been real fishers of men and winners of souls. "Such men," says the editor of Scribner's Monthly, "have a power over the popular mind of which theological schools seem absolutely to deprive them; a kind of knowledge of methods and of men, which the theological schools do not teach; have not, indeed, in possession." This, if true, ought not to be so.

The popular estimate of ministers has changed. Not only the black coat and the white cravat has had its day, and the mere "marrying and christening machine," at least in Protestant churches, but the "book in breeches," or scholastic preacher. The pulpit orator who does not divest himself of his art is regarded as a mere master of ceremonies. The sermon itself, as a means of instruction, is at a discount. The demand is not so much for what Dr. Bushnell, in his address at Andover, in 1866, called the "four canonical talents"; viz. a talent of high scholarship, a metaphysical and theological thinking talent, style, or a talent for expression, and a talent of manner and voice for speaking; as for those other talents which he added to the inventory, viz. a

talent for growth, an individualizing power, a great soul, a great conscience, or a firmly accentuated moral nature, a large faith-talent, and that mysterious air, or efflux, and aroma of personality, which he called a genuinely Christian atmosphere — others would call it personal magnetism, — and an administrative talent. Suffice it that the people seldom ask for college or even seminary credentials. They call for “live men” with strong bodies, bright minds, warm hearts. Should not every such man be made “vehicle and tongue and gospel for his Master”?

In 1867 Prof. Austin Phelps expressed this conviction: “Our Protestant denominations are not using this theory of high culture in the ministry in a Christian way. Somehow or other, it is not working altogether right in practice. . . . A scholarly ministry, taken as a whole, we must confess, is working away from the unscholarly masses of the people. Perhaps it would seem more strictly accurate to say that the unscholarly masses are working away from it. But practically this makes no difference.” He is frank to say “a preacher had better work in the dark, with nothing but mother-wit, a quickened conscience, and a Saxon Bible to teach him what to do and how to do it, than to vault into an aerial ministry, in which only the upper classes shall know or care anything about him.” He adds: “Make your ministry reach the people: in the forms of purest culture, if you can, but reach the people; with elaborate doctrine, if possible, but reach the people; with classic speech, if it may be, but reach the people.”

6. *As peculiarly Congregational.* — Congregationalism is jealous of human inventions and impositions. It looks on its ministers not as rulers, but as servants; not as governors, but as leaders; not as a fixed order or caste, to which some are called as superior to other, but only as a special set of men divinely appointed to a special work. It has room for all needed grades among them, provided only that they be all devoted to the one Master. It can easily accept plain Bartholomew as well as polished Paul. To those who are afraid

of the undue multiplication of preachers, because, forsooth, Eldad and Medad are prophesying, it can say with Moses to Joshua, "Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his Spirit upon them." For it has no oligarchy or aristocracy even of classical learning. It allows no distinction or succession except on the ground of extraordinary services and sufferings. Can this latest and ripest result of Protestantism, this child of our modern liberty, or, as John Robinson would say, "the Lord's free people," insist on any rigid conformity or uniformity in the education of its ministers? If it reverences no book but God's, no name but Christ's, no power but the Spirit's, must it not beware even of a literary hierarchy or scholarly despotism?

According to Dr. George L. Walker, it "demands for its successful conduct a very considerable measure of intelligence, has thriven best in the strong, if not mellow, ground of a dominantly intellectual and unemotional piety." But it is adapted just as truly, if not equally, to every emotional, sensuous, ignorant, tropical creature. If it be not adapted to all mankind it is not scriptural, it has no gospel commission, it cannot evangelize the world. And if it be fit for its work it must be catholic and flexible enough to meet all the changes of the times, it must welcome alike to the church and the ministry every living, growing, laboring, praying disciple who can be used and trusted in the Lord's service; it must develop and discipline all kinds of genuine piety foster all kinds of useful talent and learning, favor all kinds of religious freedom, adapt itself to all kinds of missions, reforms, and revivals. How can it conquer the world for Christ, if it be cramped by conventional rules or tests, ecclesiastical or educational, if it be not as pliant in its training as is consistent with the soundness of its faith and the purity of its communion?

It is said of the United Brethren: "They have learned by experience that a good understanding, combined with a friendly disposition, and, above all, a heart inflamed with

the love of God, are the best and most essential qualifications of a missionary. Yet men of learning are by no means rejected by them, and in various instances their superior literary attainments have not been without their use.”¹

It is said of the early Congregationalists in New England : “ Whenever a young man had finished his college studies, if he considered himself as qualified, and could find some friendly gentleman in the ministry to introduce him in the pulpit, he began to preach, without any examination or recommendation from any body of ministers or churches.”² We would not go back to any such rude and loose state of things. But we must be true to the principles which we have had from the beginning, and be elastic enough in our church and seminary usages to compass all the world’s varying necessities. We shall lose our inheritance, and prove recreant to our trust, if we allow ourselves to be outdone by the Methodists, Baptists, and Roman Catholics in the variety or versatility of our ministerial forces.

We will add simply that a theological seminary, with all its endowments of men and money, is so large an investment that its usefulness should be increased in as many ways as possible.

J. T. H.

¹ Propagation of Christianity, by Rev. Wm. Brown. Vol. ii. p. 108.

² Sprague’s Annals, Vol. i.