THE

# PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 38.—OCTOBER, 1896.

## I. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE SEMINARY CURRICULUM.[1]

I AM disposed to look upon the subject the discussion of which I have been asked to open, as a practical rather than as a purely theoretical one. One result of this mode of looking at it will be that we shall approach it from the point of view of our existing institutions, and ask, not what the ideal curriculum for theological study, but what is the ideal and what the practicable curriculum for such institutions as our theological seminaries actually are.

The fundamental facts here, I take it, are three.

(1), Our theological seminaries are not the theological departments of universities, but training schools for the Christian ministry. That is to say, the object they set before themselves is fundamentally a practical one. They do not exist primarily in order to advance theological learning, but in order to impart theological instruction; their first object is not investigation, but communication; and they call their students to them, not that these may explore the unknown, but that they may learn the known in the sphere of theological truth. They do not exist primarily, again, in order to place in reach of all who may be interested in theological thought facilities for acquiring information concerning whatever department of theological learning each inquirer may for the moment desire to give his attention to; but in order that they may provide for a select body of young men, who

[1] A paper read before the "General Association of the Professors of the Theological Seminaries of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America,' June 3, 1896.

have consecrated themselves to the Christian ministry, the thorough training which they require to fit them for the proper exercise of its functions. Their aim is not to lay before the general public the widest and most varied line of theological goods possible, from which each comer may select as it may suit his taste or fancy, but to bring to bear on those who are committed to their charge just that body of well-concatenated instruction which will provide for the church ministers which need not be ashamed, able rightly to divide the truth and thoroughly furnished for the work that is set before them.

(2), Our theological seminaries are not training schools for the Christian ministry in general, but, specifically, training schools for the Presbyterian ministry. There is, no doubt, much of the instruction and discipline given in any of our seminaries which would prepare equally for the ministry of all denominations and especially for that of all evangelical denominations; and it is to be recognized, of course, that this body of instruction will form the most fundamental part of the curriculum of any properly ordered seminary. But a Presbyterian training school cannot confine itself to the circle of studies which would be equally appropriate in a Romish or a Methodist or a Congregational training school. It is the business of the training school to fit those who resort to it for the precise environment they are to occupy; and the environment into which the graduates of a Presbyterian seminary are immersed on leaving the seminary is a specifically Presbyterian one. Not only are there peculiar branches of study which the genius of each denomination imposes upon the schools designed to prepare men for its service, as, for example, the thorough study of moral theology in Romish seminaries, to qualify the future priests for their work in the Confessional, and the careful study of presbyterial usage in the Presbyterian seminaries, to render the future presbyter competent for his work of government; and not only is there a special color thrown, in the schools of each denomination, over the treatment even of the subjects which are represented alike in all, by which, for example, the dogmatic theology, the church history and the church polity taught in each may be made to take on a

very different and even directly opposing aspect: but also, as the specific task and spirit of each denomination are different from those of its fellows, the needs of its ministers are so far different, and this necessarily affects the whole curriculum of its training schools, subtly but profoundly modifying their whole work. No mistake could be greater than to suppose that the training received in the Theological Seminary at Oberlin would prepare a student for the Romish priesthood as well as that received at Louvain, or that the training received at the College of the Propaganda at Rome would fit one for the Baptist ministry as well as if he had been educated at Rochester. By the same token, a Presbyterian seminary needs to remember that it exists to prepare specifically for the Presbyterian ministry.

(3), The Presbyterian Church, to which we belong and for the ministry of which we essay to prepare our students, is a church which cherishes a high ideal of ministerial education. In one short chapter of its *Form of Government* it repeatedly records its horror of a ministry of a low grade of intellectual acquirement. It looks upon the commitment of the ministry to "weak" no less than to "unworthy" men as "a degradation of the sacred office" (XIV., 1); and because it deems it "highly reproachful to religion and dangerous to the church to entrust the holy ministry to weak and ignorant men" (XIV., 3), it requires the presbyteries to try each candidate for the ministry in quite an extended circle of learned studies. In the same spirit, when, in 1810, it determined to establish a seminary, it declared that the object sought was to "secure to candidates for the ministry more extensive and efficient theological instruction," and laid down, in the plan adopted for its first seminary, a scheme of study to be required of all its students which is certainly a very broad, and may still be taken as a model, curriculum. Seminaries whose reason for existing is to train a ministry for this church must needs aim high in their curricula. It would be absurd to pretend to prepare men for the exercise of its ministry by teaching them less than the church requires for entrance upon that ministry. We may fairly give more than this minimum, we can scarcely be content to give less.

I. If we bear these constitutive facts in mind, our task in determining what ought to be taught in our seminaries and how it ought to be taught will become a somewhat easier one. For example, I think it will become plain how we ought to answer one of the most disturbing of those questions which are now troubling the theological schools of the country: the question, namely, whether we ought to have a curriculum at all or not. We have been very frequently told of late, and that on the highest pedagogic authority, that our theological schools must be liberated from their ancient bonds. On the one hand the teacher must be emancipated from the bondage of creeds and permitted to teach just what he chooses and just how he chooses; and on the other, the pupil must be delivered from the bondage of a procrustean curriculum and permitted to develop freely, according to native aptitude, under the special stimulus to which he most readily responds. Thus, to take a single example, President Eliot, of Harvard, has told us,[1] that if theological study cherishes any hope of being "respected by laymen" it "must absolutely be carried on with the same freedom for teacher and pupil which is enjoyed in other great departments of learning." The teacher must be "free to think and say whatever seems to him good, and to change his mind as often as he likes;" and the pupil must be "free to adopt whatever opinions or theories commend themselves to his judgment after he has studied the subject." And further, since it is important to know some things well rather than many things superficially, and theology is so vast a field that it can be all surveyed only in the most superficial manner in the course of three years, and the object that must be held in mind is "the imparting of power, not of information," a free election of studies rather than an unyielding curriculum must be adopted as the method of theological instruction.

It seems quite obvious that those who speak thus are looking at theological schools as departments of universities, and from the point of view of university ideals. President Eliot, indeed,

[1] *On the Education of Ministers*, by Charles W. Eliot, in the *Princeton Review* for May, 1883, p. 340 sq. Cf. the admirable rejoinder made by Dr. F. L. Patton in the same journal for July, 1883.

frankly owns as much, and Prof. A. L. Gillett, of Hartford Seminary, who has written strongly in favor of what we may call the broadly elective system of theological instruction, lays this conception down as the first stone in his argument.[1] "It is to be recognized, first of all," he says, "that theological education is essentially university education."[2] No doubt the immediate purpose of the remark, as made by him, was rather to differentiate the seminary from the college, as an institution which aims not at a general, but at a special, end;[3] but the remark obviously reaches further than that in his mind, and dominates his conception of the proper mode of teaching theology. Let us admit that the theological department of a university may well be organized on the principle of a multitude of disconnected courses, to be concatenated by each pupil for himself in accordance with his fancy or his needs. Must it not also be admitted that such a method is not congruous to the object of training schools for the Christian ministry, and least of all of training schools for the ministry of a specific church, with its special standpoint, spirit and methods of work? We could not easily have a better proof of this than the fact that in countries where theological instruction is given after the university fashion, as, for example, in Germany, it has become necessary to establish separate training schools for pastors, where the deficiencies of the university training, in a practical point of

[1] *Electives in Theological Seminaries* in the *Hartford Seminary Record*, August 1893, p. 296 sq; and *The Trend of Seminary Instruction* in the same journal, October, 1893, p. 23, sq. The same general position is taken by President Thwing, in the paper on *The Improvement of our Theological Seminaries*, published in *The Independent* for May 23 and May 30, 1895; and in a very radical paper by Prof. L. L. Paine, of Bangor, entitled *The Problem of the Seminary Curriculum*, published in *The Advance* for May 28, 1896.

[2] L. c. p., 298.

[3] "A college is intended primarily and supremely to train the mind; it is the part of an university to furnish trained minds with special schools of professional and scientific knowledge," is the just discrimination as stated by Mr. John Fulton in his *Memoir of Frederick A. P. Barnard*, pp. 339-'40, and in this sense the theological seminary is, of course, a section of the university. The distinction suggested in the text is, however, a different one, and turns on the idea that the university exists to communicate universal information, and that its teaching is to be dominated solely by its function to provide opportunity for all comers to obtain instruction in whatever they may chance to desire to know.

view, may be supplied. And it is observable that the advocates of the broadly elective method for theological teaching, are usually drawn from circles in which a somewhat different ideal of the functions of the minister obtains from that which is held by Presbyterians, an ideal which in a greater or less degree conceives of ministers as fundamentally the leaders of the community in its general progress to better things, rather than as the simple bearers of the glad tidings of salvation to a sin-stricken race; and which, therefore, may desiderate in ministers intelligence and power rather than what we may sum up under the phrase, of course to be taken in a pregnant sense, "the knowledge of the truth."

Training schools, on the other hand, the very reason for the existence of which is to fit men for the specific functions which belong to the ministry of a special church, must, it would seem, bear a closer relation to the actual process of fitting them for those functions than will grow out of the mere fact that they provide, along with a multitude of other studies, opportunities for the study of those topics also which, if they are chosen by their pupils and duly improved by them and properly concatenated, may reasonably prepare them for the exercise of those functions. Such schools must obviously themselves undertake to see to it that the pupils, committed to their charge for the very end that they may be fittted for these functions, do choose the necessary topics of study, do give the needful attention to them, and do so concatenate them that they may, together, give them the requisite training to prepare them for the work before them. When we have said so much, however, we have said that such schools must have a required curriculum of study. It may still remain an open question how this required curriculum is to be presented to the students, how their attention to it is to be secured, and what relation it shall bear to the total teaching effort of the institution. But it seems quite plain that the functions of a training school for such an office as that of the Presbyterian ministry, with its specific needs and its specific requirements, cannot be performed by institutions which do not undertake to guide and govern the work of its pupils to that end.

There are two general methods upon which the work of the

students might be so guided and governed. One of these is based on a broadly elective scheme of teaching, quite after the university model, and proceeds by simply requiring the completion of a given circle of studies, prescribed by the faculty, before students may apply for graduation. Out of the multitude of studies offered, from which the student is quite free to choose, he is required to make his selection in such a manner that, along with whatever else he secures, he shall also accomplish a certain specified course before the faculty will put its imprimatur upon him as fitted to take up the calling and enter upon the work of the ministry. This manner of arranging their work has already been adopted by a number of American seminaries, of which the great Baptist Seminary at Louisville may be taken as the type; and it has received the distinguished endorsement of so experienced an educator in our own Presbyterian circles as Dr. Robert L. Dabney.[1] The advantages offered by it are very obvious. It seeks to unite the widest practicable freedom on the part of the student with a sufficient control on the part of the faculty of the comprehensive compass and training value of the work done by him. Subject to such slight regulations as may prove necessary, the order in which the student may take up the several topics required of him, the time he may consume in completing them, the depth to which he may prosecute his investigations in any given branch of work, and the breadth of the general theological information which he may choose to acquire in the meantime, may all be at his own disposal. The faculty retains, meanwhile, sufficient control to secure that he shall not go out to the churches without having received that all-around instruction in a carefully selected curriculum of studies by which alone he may be prepared to meet the various needs of his new work. Such a scheme seems at first sight ideal.

But when more carefully considered, it appears sufficiently beset with practical difficulties to render, in my opinion, the alterna-

[1] *Memorial on Theological Education* (Dabney's *Discussions*, Vol. II., p. 57, sq.) p. 57. Cf., also, his papers on *A Thoroughly Educated Ministry*, Vol. II., 651, sq., and *The Influence of the German University System on Theological Literature*, Vol. I., p. 440.

tive plan of a set curriculum of study preferable. For one thing, for its proper working it would require a far more numerous force of teachers than is at present at the command of any of our seminaries. When the students are at all numerous, the number and variety of combinations of studies they can manage to desire to put together in the course of three or four years is really appalling; and in proportion as these possible combinations are abridged, in that proportion we drop back again into what is practically a fixed curriculum, curtailed of some of the most obvious advantages of instruction in a curriculum. For another thing, for its effective control there would be required a far larger measure of influence over the students and over the churches on the part of the seminary authorities than they possess, or possibly than would be altogether good for them to possess. The temptation to undue and hurtful specialization within the institution is so fostered by the very *genius loci* of a school so organized that it becomes almost uncontrollable; and on the other hand, the temptation of churches to secure the pastoral services of young men who have sojourned for some years at the seminary and received its advantages to obviously brilliant effect in this direction and that, while they have not conformed to its terms of graduation, and therefore have not received the symmetrical training indispensable for their best development, is too great to be overcome. For still another thing, the training value of the very same courses, under the very same instruction, is very different when taken in different sequences and in different combinations, so that it really is impracticable for a school to fulfil its functions as a training school by merely requiring that certain specified courses of study shall, at all events, be at some time or other taken. One might as well expect to produce equally good gastronomic effects by eating his dinner backwards—beginning with the sweets and ending with the soup—as to produce the best educative effects by any and every jumble in the order of the topics studied. A certain oversight of the blending of the topics seems needful if the full effect of their training value is to be reaped.

On the whole, therefore, attractive as this scheme is, it would

seem best to fall back on the old-fashioned fixed curriculum as the method of instruction best fitted to secure the ends of a training school for the Presbyterian ministry. A good deal of scorn has been poured out upon this method it is true, as an attempt to squeeze the most diverse figures into the same shaped and sized garments. But, as a matter of fact, it no more requires the same fixed course of study from all pupils than the apparently more liberal method just discussed. The only effective objection to it, as over against that method, proceeds on the supposition that, with the fixed curriculum, nothing but the curriculum is placed in the reach of the students, while, on the other method, the required curriculum constitutes but a small part of the opportunities for acquisition offered him. This is obviously, however, an entire misapprehension. The only difference between the two methods concerns the question of whether the order and combinations, in which the studies included in the fixed curriculum common to both are taken by the student, shall also be under the control of the directors of his education, or whether these matters are judged of comparatively so little importance that they may be safely left to the student's own caprice. There is no reason why, with the fixed curriculum, further opportunities in the way of elective studies, in any number which the teaching force of the seminary is capable of providing, may not be placed in the reach of the student. And there is no reason why the student may not, with a fixed curriculum, enjoy the advantages of just as large a body of additional studies, succeed in just as profoundly deepening his knowledge of special departments, or in just as widely broadening his knowledge of the several departments, as under the other method of instruction. The point is not that his course shall be narrowed; the point is simply that it shall be more efficiently directed to the attainment more surely and completely of its primary end. Let there be along with the fixed curriculum any number of elective courses offered, and let their advantages be fully reaped by the student. But let it be definitely understood that they are subsidiary to the curriculum itself, and are intended not to modify it, but to supplement it. In all cases let it be understood that it is the curriculum on which the educative stress is

laid, and on which the educative hopes are hung; and that the additional, elective studies, however valuable they may be in themselves severally, and in their adaptation to perfect and deepen and widen the course, cannot safely be allowed to supplant or to take the place of any part of it. Elective studies considered as supplements to the regular and well-compacted course of training in a training school are of the utmost value; elective studies considered as substitutes for the well-chosen course of such a school, or for any part of it, can only operate to confuse the minds of the students and to endanger the attainment of the primary purpose of the school. A fixed curriculum, supplemented by electives, has, at least, the great advantage over every other method of ordering the work of such a school, that it emphasizes the solid educative core, raises it to its proper importance in the minds of both teachers and taught, and tends to increase the certainty and perfection with which it produces its educative effect.

II. The same constitutive facts which would seem to require Presbyterian seminaries to arrange their work on the basis of a stated curriculum, go far also to determine the scope of the curriculum which should be adopted by them. The principle of decision here is found in the very nature of the seminaries as training schools for the ministry, supplemented by the ministerial requirements of the church for whose ministry specifically they undertake to train their pupils. The curriculum ought to contain every element of instruction which is needful in order to mould men into ministers of efficiency and power; but it cannot, on any account, contain less than is required by the law of the Presbyterian Church for the admission of men into its service. The minimum is thus authoritatively set for Presbyterian seminaries by the trial requisitions laid down for licensure and ordination in our *Form of Government* (XIV., 3, 4; XV., 11). These requisitions include, besides such an acquaintance with the arts and sciences as would entitle the candidate to a diploma of bachelor or master of arts, specifically a knowledge of the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages, of theology, natural and revealed, of ecclesiastical history, and of the sacraments and the principles of the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church. Here we see recog-

nized the great departments of sacred philology, inclusive of the principles and practice of exegesis or "sacred criticism," as the "parts of trial" indicate, and of apologetical, historical, systematic, and practical theology. No curriculum, therefore, which does not give a fairly representative place to each of the five great departments of theological encyclopædia,—Apologetical, Exegetical, Historical, Systematic, and Practical Theology,—can be adjudged sufficient from the Presbyterian point of view.

This is emphasized, and much of detail added, by the singularly rich and admirable outline of the work to be required of its contemplated seminary which the Assembly of 1811 drew up and made part of the Plan of the Seminary. The Assembly ordered that "at the close of his course every student must have made the following attainments, viz.:

"He must be well skilled in the original languages of the Holy Scriptures. He must be able to explain the principal difficulties which arise in the perusal of the Scriptures, either from erroneous translations, apparent inconsistencies, real obscurities, or objections arising from history, reason, or argument. He must be versed in Jewish and Christian antiquities, which serve to explain and illustrate Scripture. He must have an acquaintance with ancient geography and with oriental customs, which throw light on the sacred records. Thus he will have laid the foundation for becoming a sound Biblical critic.

"He must have read and digested the principal arguments and writings relative to what has been called the deistical controversy. Thus he will be qualified to become a defender of the Christian faith.

"He must be able to support the doctrines of the *Confession of Faith* and *Catechisms* by a ready, pertinent, and abundant quotation of Scripture texts for that purpose. He must have studied, carefully and correctly, natural, didactic, polemic, and casuistic theology. He must have a considerable acquaintance with general history and chronology, and a particular acquaintance with the history of the Christian church. Thus he will be preparing to become an able and sound divine and casuist.

"He must have read a considerable number of the best practical writers on the subject of religion. He must have learned to compose with correctness and readiness in his own language, and to deliver what he has composed to others in a natural and acceptable manner. He must be well acquainted with the several parts and the proper structure of popular lectures and sermons. He must have composed at least two lectures and four popular sermons that shall have been approved by the professors. He must have carefully studied the duties of the pastoral care. Thus he will be prepared to become a useful preacher and a faithful pastor.

"He must have studied carefully the Form of Church Government authorized by the Scriptures and the administration of it as it has taken place in the Protestant churches. Thus he will be qualified to exercise discipline, and to take part in the government of the church in all its judicatories."

This comprehensive scheme of training, requiring detailed attention to all the great departments of theological encyclopædia, forms a part of the organic law of the majority of our seminaries, and may well be looked upon as the normal curriculum of them all.

To much the same curriculum the seminaries would doubtless, indeed, have come, had they been left entirely free to choose what they should teach, under the guidance merely of the general scientific consideration of what is essential in order to give a rounded and comprehensive ministerial training. This is fairly illustrated by the fact that there exists a general practical agreement as to the proper scope of a theological curriculum among theological institutions of all lands and all forms of the Christian faith. The circle of proper professional studies which President Eliot, for example, thinks should be placed within the reach of all students for the ministry, and among which they should be allowed to specialize; the series of departments which a German student of theology ordinarily seeks to compass; the curricula laid down by the great theological colleges of Scotland, and the well-appointed Irish Presbyterian schools of divinity; and the common body of studies offered by American seminaries of whatever name, agree in more or less fully covering the five great branches of theological encyclopædia, and differ in details ordinarily only where the different needs of the several churches or lands necessarily affect the preparation for service in them.[1]

[1] For purposes of comparison I append the outlines of study mentioned.

President Eliot gives the following list of topics as embraced in the professional studies of the candidates for the ministry, viz.:

"1. Semitic studies: linguistic, archæological and historical.

2. New Testament criticism and exegesis.

3. Ecclesiastical history.

4. Comparative religion, or historical religions compared.

5. Psychology, ethics, and the philosophy of religion.

6. Systematic theology, and the history of Christian doctrines.

7. Charitable and reformatory methods, and the contest of Christian society with licentiousness, intemperance, pauperism and crime." (l. c. p. 353.)

A very instructive *précis* of the outlines of ministerial training in the various churches may be found in a brief paper, signed "C. A. S.," published in *The Catholic Presbyterian* for September, 1879, p. 207, sq. From it I borrow the following lists. The ordinary course marked out for himself by a German student

When so much is determined as to the scope of the curriculum, viz., that it is to give an equitable place to each of the five great branches of theological encyclopædia, and attention is turned to the details, the dangers that are to be avoided are easily seen to be that the curriculum may be made too extensive, that it may be made too meagre, and that it may be permitted to be too much diluted. If the requirements of the scheme for examination of candidates laid down in our *Form of Government*, and especially if all the suggestions of our Plan for Seminaries be fairly provided for in the curriculum, there is, perhaps, very little danger that it will be made too meagre; and I do not myself think there is much danger of its being made, in the proper sense of the words, too extensive. There seems, however, a real danger of its being seriously diluted by the invasion of showy or temporarily popular branches of study, or by branches which belong less to the fundamental basis of theological training than to its perfecting, if not only to its ornamentation, and which the seminaries may permit to be introduced into their curricula by the pressure of popular clamor, or of the fashion

of theology includes, in the first year, Church History, Exegesis and Philosophy; in the second, Biblical Theology, Dogmatics and Ethics, History of Dogma, Symbolics and Introduction; and in the third year, Homiletics, Catechetics, Pastoral Theology, Liturgics, and Church Constitution. The curriculum of the Free Church College, Edinburgh, is as follows: First year, Junior Hebrew, Natural Science, Apologetics, Evangelistic Theology, Elocution; second year, Junior New Testament Exegesis, Junior Systematic Theology, Senior Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Elocution; third year, Junior Church History, Senior New Testament Exegesis, Senior Systematic Theology, Elocution; fourth year, Ecclesiastical and Pastoral Theology, Church History, Evangelistic Theology and Elocution. A typical Irish scheme is as follows: First year, Hebrew, Christian Ethics, Church History; second year, Church History, Theology, Sacred Criticism; third year, Theology, Sacred Criticism, Sacred Rhetoric. For the purposes of a comparative study of curricula, I may mention the following very instructive papers: *Professional Studies of the Clergy in Scotland*, by Profesor James Iverach in *The Catholic Presbyterian* for November, 1879, p. 364, sq.; *The State of Theological Teaching in France*, by Professor Jean de Visme, in the "Report of the Third General Council of the Presbyterian Alliance," p. 317, sq.; *On the Professional Studies of the English Clergy*, by Dr. Littledale, in *The Contemporary Review* for April, 1879, p. 1, sq. (on p. 9, sq. of this paper the curriculum of the best French-Romish schools is given); the papers of Professor A. L. Gillett on the Congregational Seminaries of the United States in the *Hartford Seminary Record* for August and October, 1893.

of the hour. There may be a legitimate place in the teaching of a theological seminary for every branch of learning which in any way concerns the interests of the kingdom of God in in the world, or the preparation of a minister of Christ to meet and satisfy, not only the requirements of his Lord, but the needs of the world, and even the demands of the moment. I should myself like to see every phase of modern culture and modern thought, or even, if you will, of modern fancy and what is sometimes called "faddism," which can in any way concern the man who works among the men of his generation for the glory of God and the building up of his kingdom, appropriately dealt with in the seminary. But these things certainly have no proper place within the curriculum. The principles which should govern the framing of it seem to me to be summed up in the statement that it should be made to contain all that is needed to train men for an adequate ministry and nothing that is not needed for this one purpose. That it may contain all that is needed, it must be made broad and comprehensive; that it may contain nothing that is not needed, it must be confined to what is really fundamental. And here, I take it, are the two marks of a really good curriculum: that it covers the whole circle of theological science, and that it contains nothing which is not of fundamental importance.

When we lose hold, in however small a degree, of either one of these two mutually limiting principles, we mar and deform our curriculum. It may even be said, with proper limitations, that the fixed curriculum is no place for detailed discussion, is no place for special courses, however valuable they may be in themselves, in either a theoretical or a practical point of view. Let all such be relegated to the supplementary and optional courses. The curriculum is the place only for those courses which, when taken together, will provide a comprehensive survey of all the theological disciplines and a fundamental training in each: on the basis of which, therefore, from a practical point of view, the young minister can enter upon his work an all-around, systematically trained man, with a fundamental acquaintance with all that enters into his task; and, from the educational point of view, the student can safely build up special knowledge in whatever

department he may elect to pursue detailed study, without danger of that undue specialism which, in its combination of pedantry in a narrow field with ignorance in a very wide one, is becoming one of the peculiar dangers of the churches.

III. We lose the guidance of direct church law when we proceed next to inquire into the relative amount of time which should be given, in the curriculum, to the several branches of theological study. There reigns here naturally a considerable difference of opinion, but on the whole less than might be expected. I think we may, on practical and scientific grounds alike, very readily acquiesce, with one modification hereafter to be mentioned, in the solution which has been arrived at as a matter of fact in most institutions, and which assigns about an equal amount of time and about the same emphasis to each of the great theological disciplines. It is easy to say, of course, that some of these disciplines are more fundamental, or more practical, or more necessary than others. But the force of this remark is very much broken by asking, More fundamental, practical, necessary to what? If of some we may say that they are scientifically more fundamental than others, the tables are turned when we ask which are more fundamental to the practical training of a minister. And when we remember that the function of our seminaries is training for the actual work of the ministry, the categories of fundamental and practical become so confused that it would require a chemical analysis to distinguish them. The truth is, that each discipline is fundamental, in one respect or another, to the training of the minister; and each must have its own place in the comprehensive training of the minister. And as we turn the body of disciplines around and around, we shall probably conclude that the need of each is practically about what that of each of its fellows is. The practical solution, at all events, seems to be to give to each of the great branches about an equal place in the curriculum.

There is, however, as already intimated, one modification which needs to be made in this conclusion. The discipline of exegetical theology includes, in its two divisions of Old and New Testaments, branches of study so diverse from one another in the

equipment needed for their prosecution, the methods of exegetical study are necessarily so detailed and slow, and the relations of exegetical theology to the other disciplines and to the practical work of the ministry are so fundamental and constitutive, and so varied and numerous, that it is widely, and, I think, properly felt, that exegetical theology should rank in the constitution of our curriculum as two disciplines, and that, therefore, the same relative time should be given to each of its great branches—Old and New Testament exegesis—that is given to each of the other disciplines. The wide adoption of this point of view in our seminaries is, at least, an evidence of its plausibility; and, I fancy, it will be accepted without argument as reasonable by most of us here to-day. I think we shall also all agree that the purely philological study of any language, even those in which the Bible is written, is not a substantial part of exegetical theology, but must rather be accounted its precondition; so that, if these languages are to be studied at all in a theological seminary, this must be considered a concession to practical needs, and the time consumed in such study ought not to be subtracted from that available for exegetical theology. As a matter of necessity, the elements of Hebrew have always been taught in the seminaries,[1] and for the present, at least, they must continue to be taught in them. Heretofore we have been able to look to the colleges to instruct our pupils sufficiently in Greek; but with the extension of elective schemes in our colleges, sometimes with insufficient guarding, we are confronted with the danger that we may sooner or later be compelled to introduce the elements of Greek philology also into our seminaries. Meanwhile, we can only do what we can to secure that our pupils shall continue to come to us with an adequate Greek training, and make what efforts may seem wise to have Hebrew, too, made a pre-seminary study, and, meanwhile, take up the situation as we find it. We find it in a form which requires us to place

[1] The statement is true in a very wide range. For example, the best Romish schools also feel the same necessity. Ernest Renan wrote, *e. g.*, in 1843, to his sister as to St. Sulpice: "As to study, the only one practiced here, strictly speaking, is theology in all its various departments, canonical law, Scriptural history, and so forth. Hebrew is the only branch of knowledge, apart from theology, in which a special course is given."—*Brother and Sister: Memoir, etc.*, p. 120.

Hebrew philology among our regular seminary courses, and to give it about the same amount of time that is available for each of the proper theological disciplines.

In these conditions, the seminaries discover themselves with some seven departments of study instead of five, to which about equal time needs to be devoted. And there is yet another department from which, as schools of practical training, they must not withhold their attention—the direct training for the work of preaching, including voice-culture, elocution, trial-preaching, and the like. Here is another time-consumer, and surely one of as fundamental practical importance as any study in the list. An eighth department must be added to meet its needs, and this has of course been done in all our institutions. It is curious to note, indeed, how nearly similarly the time at their disposal has been distributed among the several branches of work in the several institutions. I give below a rough tabular view of the proportional[1] distribution of time in those of the seminaries reporting to the General Assembly, whose catalogues for 1895–'96 provide the requisite data, and, for purposes of comparison, I add the data for the Free Church College of Edinburgh, which confessedly

[1] I say "proportional" wittingly; since the absolute time is not exactly ascertained in every case. I have assumed that the year in each seminary is just thirty weeks long.

| Departments. | Edinburgh. | Princeton. | Auburn. | Western. | McCormick. | San Francisco. | Yale.[1] | Andover.[1] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hebrew Philology, | ------ | 150 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 180 | ------ | ------ |
| Propædeutics, | ------ | ------ | 15 | ------ | ------ | ------ | 30 | ------ |
| Apologetics, | 240 | 180 | ------ | ------ | 180 | 180 | ------ | ------ |
| Exegetics, | (480) | (510) | (315) | (510) | (600) | (450) | (645)[2] | (751)[2] |
| Old Testament, | 240 | 210 | 60 | 240 | 240 | 150 | 345[2] | 411[2] |
| New Testament, | 240 | 180 | 240 | 270 | 240 | 300 | 300 | 340 |
| Biblical Theology, | ------ | 120 | ------ | ------ | 120 | ------ | ------ | ------ |
| Historics, | 240 | 180 | 210 | 180 | 180 | 120 | 180 | 136 |
| Systematics, | 240 | 180 | 225 | 180 | 210 | 180 | 270[3] | 202[3] |
| Ecclesiastics, | 280 | 210 | 300 | 210 | 270 | 180 | 270 | 386 |
| Practics, | ------ | 180 | ------ | ------ | ------ | 180 | ------ | ------ |
| Totals, | 1480 | 1590 | 1185 | 1200 | 1560 | 1290 | 1395 | 1475 |

[1] Catalogue of 1892–'93. [2] Including Hebrew Philology. [3] Including Apologetics.

offers the best and completest curriculum of all the foreign schools, as also for certain of our American Congregational seminaries.[1]

Such a general practical agreement as is here exhibited will go far towards proving that we are on the right track. I think the general principle that ought to govern us is that the seven departments of Apologetics, Old Testament Literature and Exegesis, New Testament Literature and Exegesis, Historics, Systematics, Ecclesiastics and actual Practice, make about equal claim upon our time and effort. If we can manage to add a chair of Biblical Theology, its own importance and its organic relation to exegesis on the one side and to systematics on the other, will justify a generous assignment of time to it. Hebrew philology must be accepted meanwhile as a necessary evil, and full provision made for it; and I think some brief time ought to be given to general theological encyclopædia or propædeutics, a subject for which at present few seminaries seem to make formal provision, though, of course, in one way or another, it receives attention in all.

IV. I do not think the next topic which naturally claims our attention, viz., the order in which the several branches of study should be taken up, need delay us long. In the case of some of the branches, an order is imposed by the nature of the case, as, for example, the study of the elements of Hebrew must precede the use of Hebrew philology in the exegetical process. And, no doubt, there is a scientific order for all the studies, the adoption of which would give to the curriculum the regular development inherent in the relations of the disciplines to one another. Apologetics lies at the foundation of all theological thought, exegesis at the root of all construction of Biblical material, the knowledge of the truth at the basis of all use of that truth for the salvation of men. Led by this natural interrelation of the departments of study, there has grown up a pretty well-settled general order in the arrangement of the topics. This order, in general, places what we may call the fundamental studies, such as philology, apologetics and exegetics, in the first year; the constructive, doc-

[1] These represent the catalogues of 1892–'93, and are taken from Prof. Gillett's paper in the *Hartford Seminary Record*, October, 1893, where will be found an instructive comparison of the curricula in the several Congregational seminaries.

trinal and critical studies in the second year; and the practical studies in the third. This general order is followed alike in the best Romish schools, in the ordinary course of the German theological student, in the prescribed courses of the Scotch and Irish divinity halls, and in the usual disposition of topics of study in our American seminaries.[1] Not only in this general form, but throughout the details, the scientific order would necessarily govern the order of study, if our courses were dominated solely by a scientific motive, and if the study of theology were taken up by our pupils as something entirely new.

It is because neither of these is the fact that I look upon the whole question of the scientific order of study as of little actual importance for our schools of theology. Our fundamental object is not a purely scientific but a practical one, and it may very well happen that the scientific order may properly give place, in a training school, to one more adapted to meet the practical needs of the institution. For example, it may be worth considering whether the abstruser discussions of apologetics, fundamental as they are to all theology, might not wisely be postponed until a period when the growing intelligence of our pupils is better able, I will not say to cope with them merely, but even to appreciate their importance. And it is quite debatable whether, though exegesis, of course, is the very ground-work of systematics, a knowledge of theology may not only be desirable for the proper prosecution of exegetical study of doctrinal passages, but even be necessary to the creation of that interest in doctrinal exegesis without which its prosecution is simply impossible. If I may be allowed to testify from some experience in teaching both branches, I should say that some knowledge of theology is practically more fruitful for the exegetical classes than some knowledge of exegesis is for the theological classes. It is very difficult to obtain from the exegetical classes anything but shallow work unless the students come prepared by some knowledge of doctrinal construction and doctrinal controversy to take an interest in the results of the exegetical processes. In the interests of the practical efficiency of teaching and the best results of class-room work, the purely scien-

[1] See footnote on page 424 for sources from which the details may be had.

tific order may often give way to a more practical one, by which the topics may be studied in the order of convenience and of effect rather than of logic.

All this would certainly be absurd were it not for the other consideration at which I have hinted, viz., that our pupils do not come to us entirely ignorant of the great subjects of study which they are to attack in our seminaries. Were we asked to form a curriculum for the study of the Vedas, I suppose we should feel it necessary to arrange the topics in scientific consecution. That would enable our pupils to approach the study of these unknown scriptures and of this unknown religion in a systematic way; and only thus could we hope to reach a thoroughly scientific knowledge of them. But our students do not begin thus at the beginning of the study of the Bible and of Christianity in our theological seminaries. They do not wait for their seminary course to begin to assure themselves that there is a God, or to inquire what the Bible is or what it contains, or to learn that salvation is by the grace of God through faith in Jesus Christ. Every student, when he enters our halls, brings with him a fundamental acquaintance with most or all of the branches of study which he is there to prosecute. He comes, not to make their acquaintance, but more thoroughly to ground himself in them. He knows already the elements of philosophical and historical apologetics alike; he has ordinarily been a student of the Bible for many years; he has, perhaps, already served an apprenticeship as a teacher of religious truth. It would be absurd to refuse to take him as we find him, and to insist on requiring him to approach the body of studies he is invited to devote himself to, as a complete novice. It is, in a word, possible to lay aside, in his case, the purely scientific order and to arrange the curriculum on the basis of practical needs. He can be introduced to all the subjects of the curriculum from the beginning; or he can be invited to attack them in the order in which the subjects treated or the methods of treatment may be made most strongly to appeal to him, or to be most readily conquered by him, or most powerfully to work together for his preparation for ministerial work. In a word, the principle that should govern the arrangement of our curricula, as it seems to me, in the

actual circumstances in which we are placed, should not be the encyclopædic-scientific one, but the pedagogic-practical one.

V. As soon as this fact emerges, we are face to face with what seems to me at least, the most urgent problem which arises in connection with the question of the constitution of the curriculum—the problem which concerns the distribution of the hours which are devoted to each branch of instruction, for the attainment of the best results. Two broad views are here current. One of these lays stress on concentration, and the other on diffusion; one seeks to gain, so far as may be, for each subject of study in turn, the undivided attention of the student for a time, while the other seeks rather to gain for each study the longest continued attention of the student attainable. The one lays stress on the value of absorption in a single topic; the other on the value of prolonged occupancy of the mind with each topic. Under the influence of the one conception, the number of branches studied contemporaneously by the student tends to be made as few as possible, and the several topics are distributed each to a separate portion of the course, to which, as far as possible, they are confined. In its extreme form, this mode of ordering the curriculum would give practically the whole attention of the student for blocks of eight or ten weeks at a time to single topics, and thus carry him topic by topic through the course. Under the influence of the other conceptions, the several branches of study tend to be made each to engage some part of the student's time and attention through all three years of his course, and the element of time and digestion is reckoned a factor in his training. Such a broad question cannot be argued in this paper; it is not one peculiar to the theological curriculum, but concerns general pedagogic theory. I must content myself with simply confessing that I am myself a hearty advocate of the latter of the two theories. I believe in *time* as a factor in education; I believe as little in the policy of "bolting" a course of study, whether the whole theological course, or any of its several branches, as I do in the policy of "bolting" food. I think that the instruction in every department should be distributed over as large a portion of the whole three years as possible; that the instruction in each depart-

ment in a single year should be distributed throughout the whole year; and that it is even an advantage to have the consecution of recitations in the same department occuring in the same week follow each other, not immediately, but with an interval between them.

It will be at once recognized, of course, that the process of diffusion may be overdone. A wise mean must be sought here as well as elsewhere. Nor am I unaware of the strong objections that have been brought against the whole method. Repeated and rapid changes in the subject of study do have a tendency to distract the mind, to dissipate the energy, to loosen the grasp already attained on the subject, to discourage from effort, to confuse the mind with a multitude of imperfectly connected facts. If these evils are inherent in the method of diffusion, and not merely the result of a good method pressed to an unwarrantable extreme, that method would stand condemned. But on the other hand, we must remember that change is rest, variety is spice, and nothing so impairs mental vigor as monotony of work, while nothing is more important for solid acquisition than *time*. Above all other reasons for adopting the method of diffusion, however, I rank the consideration that to require the student to absorb himself in turn in the several branches of study, instead of occupying himself with a number contemporaneously through a proportionately long period, is likely to prove equivalent to inviting him to adopt a feverish habit of work which seeks to reap immediate and, too often, temporary results, rather than to cultivate that method of quiet and long-continued acquisition which ends in solid and permanent attainment. Let it be granted that recitations following immediately on one another gather impulse each from each, and make acquisition proportionately easy and rapid. Is not the loss equally rapid, when the recitations are wholly intermitted? Let it be granted that when the recitations stand a considerable interval apart something is forgotten between them, and some of the acquisition gained in the one is lost, and needs to be recovered before progress is made by the other. Does there not lie just in this, when properly viewed, the pedagogical value of the method? Is not opportunity thus given continuously to

observe what has been really assimilated, and to recover what has been lost; and is not this repeated review and recovery the very essence of solid acquisition? In a word, the hinge of the question seems to me to come really to this: shall we seek brilliant immediate results, or permanent effects? The "solid-block" system of distribution will give us far more sparkling recitations and far more brilliant examinations; but the "long-time" system will give us, in my judgment, by far the best-trained men. Briefly, the one method is a method of "cram," and the other a method of "education." And it is because I look upon it in this way that I heartily give my voice for the distribution of the topics of study through the curriculum in a manner to secure to the students long-continued contact with each study. Of course, I repeat, this can be overdone; a certain mean must be observed, lest we push a good principle to an evil extreme. But it is on the side of this principle of curriculum arrangement that I wish to range myself.

VI. And now let us ask, in conclusion, as to some of the desiderata of our curriculum as at present existent. I think our Presbyterian seminaries have worked out what must be acknowledged to be an exceedingly good curriculum. But we need not contend that it is as yet perfect. What are some of the places at which we yet feel lacks, of a kind at least that we may hope to supply?

1. The first desideratum that strikes me at least, as I look over our common curriculum, is the need of provision for more thorough scientific work in special departments. I ought not, however, to name this as a desideratum of the curriculum itself; it is rather a desideratum of our theological teaching. And it ought to be supplied, not by the insertion of more detailed work into the curriculum itself, by which we should only overload the curriculum without adequately supplying the need, but by the provision of a rich body of elective courses, and by the establishment of inducements to take advantage of them, such as prizes, fellowships, honor courses and fourth-year courses. The demands of the scientific study of theology in all its branches are so clamant that it would seem to be incumbent on all our seminaries,

as rapidly as possible, to make the fullest possible provision for thorough detailed work in all departments, in this supplementary way. In this manner only can the seminaries accomplish the task—which belongs to them as truly as the actual training of a practical ministry—of fostering Christian learning and providing defenders for Christian truth. As this whole branch of their work belongs, however, to the university or extra-curriculum side of their task, I pass it over in this paper, which is devoted to the curriculum itself.[1]

2. Another desideratum that strikes me is some more adequate provision for the acquisition by the students of a more thorough knowledge of the Bible as a whole. This seems to be the element of good in the rather frequent demand made upon us for better and more thorough training in "the English Bible." Our theological seminaries can never make "the English Bible" the basis of their instruction, or a thorough knowledge of it the main object of their efforts. But I fancy it may be acknowledged that in the work done in the seminaries there is danger that men may obtain only a fragmentary knowledge of the Bible, and may go out ignorant of broad stretches of its contents. We do need somehow, in a practical interest and in a scientific interest alike, to give them a more thorough acquaintance with this Book as a whole. What I have in mind here is very much the same as, but something more than, what Principal King, of Winnepeg, pleaded for before the Third General Council of the Presbyterian Alliance,[2] when he asked:

"Should a student, at the close of his theological course, not be prepared to pass an examination on the contents of the Bible from Genesis to Revelation: to give, where practicable, the authorship and date of any separate book, the circumstances which occasioned it—its historical setting, so to speak, and its main contents? Should he not be expected to be able to give, if required, a synopsis of the prophecies of Isaiah and of Micah, and of the Gospel of John, and of the letters of Paul to the Corinthians or to the Galatians? Does it not seem fair and rational to expect that a man should, at the completion of his course of preparation for the ministry, know, at least in a general way, the whole book which is to be his life-work to teach, and not simply, however well, a single important section of it, or even two or three select sections?"

[1] I have said a few words on the subject in a paper printed in *The Independent*, June 20, 1895.

[2] See the *Report*, p. 297, sq.

Adequate formal provision for all this is undoubtedly made in our seminaries in the instruction given in the chairs of Old and New Testament literature; but it is a desideratum that the knowledge should be deepened to a real knowledge of the whole Bible as a book of religion. I should not like to be understood as implying that even this is not already done in some of our seminaries. I know that it is done in some of them, and doubtless it is done to a greater or less extent in all. I am only pleading that it should be made more than at present, a prime object in their teaching.

3. I should say that a more thorough denominational training may well be accounted a third desideratum in our seminary work. There is, of course, wrought into the very warp and woof of our seminary instruction a denominational character; we are Presbyterian seminaries established by the Presbyterian Church to train men for the propagation of Christianity as it is understood by that church. Nevertheless, there is a real danger lest in our work we may neglect, more or less, the more distinctive features of Presbyterianism; and there is a real need, accordingly, for some more thorough training in what is distinctively denominational. The General Assembly of 1882[1] formally advised the seminaries "to give more attention to thorough and systematic instruction on the constitution and polity of the Presbyterian Church." And the advice, to my thinking, might well be broadened. The seminaries ought to take means to inform their students more fully of distinctively Presbyterian history—a history of which none need be ashamed, but of which many among us remain shamefully ignorant; to indoctrinate them more completely with distinctively Presbyterian doctrine—a doctrine which is the purest transcript of the inspired teaching, and as such the hope of the world; and to instruct them more perfectly in distinctively Presbyterian principles and polity—a polity which is at once scripturally simple and simply scriptural. In a word, we desiderate a more complete denominationalizing of our training. Nor need we fear that we may mar the beautiful catholicity of our Presbyterian ministry by

[1] *Minutes*, p. 91. See Hodge's *What is Presbyterian Law?* Third Edition, p. 536.

infusing into it a more denominational spirit. Narrowness does not belong to the genius of Presbyterianism; while definiteness of conviction, which does stand at its core, is not inconsistent with catholicity of spirit, but is rather one of its sources. As he best serves the church at large who most devotedly and intelligently serves the church to which he belongs, we are training men for the best service of the whole church of Christ when we are making them able and instructed, loving and appreciative servants of the church whose agencies of instruction we are. There are sources of enthusiasm in our denominational history and doctrine and methods, of the impulse of which we ought not to deprive the students committed to our care.

4. A fuller instruction as to the practical value of the instruction rendered in our seminaries, I should look upon as still another desideratum of our work. I do not refer here to the direct practice of religious work—a kind of theological "clinic" which we all wish could somehow be effectually obtained for our students; though this, too, is a desideratum which, though we are ever keenly feeling it, we are ever finding it impossible fully to supply.[1] Nor do I refer to that part of training in actual use which comes from homiletical exercises, elocutionary teaching, moot presbyteries and the like; this is already pretty fully, probably as fully and efficiently as possible, provided for in our work. I refer rather to a broader thing—to some efficient aid to be afforded the students in mentally bridging the gulf between their studies and the practical work that lies before them, some real help in enabling them to apprehend the practical good to a minister of Christ of all the mass of what seems to many the dry intellectual acquisition they are forced to make in college and seminary. There are more than we think who never succeed in correlating their learning and their work. How many of our students, for instance, never perceive the practical value of Hebrew to a humble minister of the gospel!

[1] Some wise remarks as to the tendency to demand of seminaries more in the way of practice in religious work than can possibly be provided by them, may be found in a paper, the joint production of Dr. Charles Hodge and Dr. J. A. Alexander, in the *Princeton Review*, Vol. XX. (1848), p. 479. Cf., also, Dr. Dabney, as cited, pp. 66, 67, who thinks the attempt to combine practical training with seminary teaching, in the same course of years, a demonstrated failure.

A vast deal of the sheer folly that is talked, and acted on, as to an "over-educated ministry," and as to the greater efficiency of what is called a "simply-trained ministry," would be avoided, if we could somehow get the bridge built which would practicalize in their own minds the intellectual training which we give our students. How this can be done may be difficult to say. I do not know that the question has been seriously grappled with anywhere except in the United Presbyterian Hall at Edinburgh. There, we are told, the professor of practical training is charged with the duty of opening the eyes of the students to the practical value and use of the whole body of instruction they have received.

"The professor first reviews in detail the whole preliminary study prescribed by the church, and shows how it bears on the equipment of the minister as a Christian man, and on the fulfilment of his work as a Christian teacher and pastor. The university course is considered in its three divisions, classical, physical, and philosophical. Next, the theological course is taken, and it is shown how each part should be brought to bear on ministerial work. The apologetics, exegesis, systematic theology, church history, the church as a society, and the work of the ministry as presented in the New Testament, are expounded with a direct reference to the work of the ministry; in fact, all the student's previous training is gone over, and sharpened with a view to direct ministerial efficiency."[1]

I adduce this merely by way of illustration; whether it is the best way to obtain the end sought may be open to question. I fancy, however, that we shall scarcely question that it is desirable in some way to make it understood by our pupils, that the theological seminary is really a very practical institution.[2]

5. I have reserved for the last what is probably the most important desideratum of all, the securing of a deeper training for our students on the side of practical religion. It will not do for us to say, or, worse than that, to think, that this is not the function of a seminary, though even so eminently good a man as Dr. William G. Blaikie, who surely, above most of us, has his heart in the practical piety of his students, does allow himself to say

[1] James Iverach, *Professional Studies of Clergy in Scotland*, in *The Catholic Presbyterian*, November, 1879, p. 370.

[2] Cf. *The Theological Seminary a Practical Institution.* By Rev. D. D. Demarest, D. D., in *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, II., p. 312.

something very like this,[1] and that in a context in which he is urging on students of theology the duty of cultivating the spiritual life, and on theological professors the duty of furthering this in all proper ways. Certainly an American Presbyterian theological professor cannot say with Dr. Blaikie: "True, indeed, our halls of theology were set up expressly for that purpose." This *is* one of the purposes for which the plan of the seminary adopted in 1811 expressly asserts that our seminaries are set up. One of the chief beauties of the curriculum of work there laid down for the seminaries is its admirable balance, and in its balanced requirements is made very prominent an express provision for training in practical piety. And surely this is as it should be. What element in the training of an effective ministry can compare in importance with the cultivation of a devout spirit and a holy mind? Least of all can we American Presbyterians doubt either the value or the possibility of imparting such a training along with whatever intellectual acquisitions may be made at the seminary, when we have such examples as, for instance, the career of Dr. W. S. Plumer at Allegheny before our minds. The fires of Christian love which he kindled there are not burnt out yet, and eternity alone can tell the full tale of results which have flowed from the training in practical piety which he gave those who gathered about him for instruction, not only in theology, but also in holiness.[2]

By what processes an efficient training in religion is to be secured to our pupils it is naturally somewhat difficult to say. There are, of course, all those methods of quiet influence by which a teacher may act upon his pupils' hearts and minds: the devout tone in which all the work of the institution is prosecuted; the stated meetings for religious conversation and prayer; the obviously devoted lives of instructors and guides: and all these must enter as factors to the securing of the end. And there is the method suggested by the Plan of the Seminary, which consists in requiring students before graduation to have "read a considerable number of the best practical writers on the subject of reli-

[1] *Catholic Presbyterian*, January, 1880, p. 31.

[2] On the general subject cf. Principal King, as cited, p. 304; and see Charles Hodge and J. A. Alexander, as cited, p. 478.

gion," obviously a good method of promoting the growth of practical piety. I wonder how many of our seminaries conscientiously require it? You will permit me to say here, too, that in this aspect of their work I consider those seminaries especially blessed which maintain regular chapel-preaching on Sabbath, in addition to the more familiar Conference, which probably all of them hold weekly. The body of seminary students constitutes a congregation, and a congregation of somewhat special character and with somewhat special needs. It is good to gather them together on Sabbath for a formal church-service of their own, keyed to their actual state and position, and adapted specifically to their peculiar needs. The distribution of the students among the churches of the neighborhood, while possessing obvious advantages and serving certain valuable ends, does not take the place which a chapel service of their own can alone supply. Let us foster in our students the idea that they constitute a church, and are to live as becomes those who are, in their corporate union, a church of God. Shall I go further? Shall I say that, constituting a church, they ought to have a pastor? It is a matter, at least, worth considering. Amid the multitude of agencies gathered together to further the intellectual advancement of our students, may it not be worth considering whether there may not be work enough to be done in the advancement specifically of their religious life to occupy all the energies, and time, and thought of one man? Of course, all the professors are, first of all, ministers of grace, and will do all that is possible in them to quicken the religious life of their pupils. But is it not worth our careful thought, whether a body of from 100 to 250 young men gathered together in a semi-isolated community, on the one hand do not require more pastoral oversight than is likely to be given them, in a purely spiritual interest, by teachers already overburdened with work and care; and on the other hand, will not richly repay, in a ministry of deepened grace and power, the spiritual labors of a pastor devoted to the deepening of their religious life and to the quickening within them of an ever-growing devotion and of a constantly perfecting consecration?

*Princeton.* BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.