

# CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. XIII.

JULY, 1895.

No. 3.

[FOR CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.]

## CONCERNING THE USE OF FAGOTS AT GENEVA.

BY LEONARD WOOLSEY BACON.

FAGOT is one of that large class of common words that grow familiar to Americans in literature, but the meaning of which is not distinctly realized to the senses till we go abroad. To make sensible acquaintance with commonplace objects that one has known from childhood only by name is one of the delights of travel, as much as the seeing of famous places and pictures and buildings; and I believe that it is partly because they have so much more of this to do, that Americans are, beyond other nations, enthusiastic and delighted travellers. Doubtless one would go farther to see Melrose by moonlight than to see a teakettle simmering on a hob; but after all, to the diligent reader of his Scott and his Dickens, there are many like elements of pleasure in the two sights; and I will not too hastily decide whether I have more daily pleasure from the vast white pyramid of Mont Blanc, that looks me in the face through my parlor windows,\* and "clear, placid Leman," down the slope beneath me, and the gray mass of towers of the old cathedral to my right, than comes to me from the magpies that chase each other chattering across the lawn, and the primroses and tiny daisies that blossom along our path under favor of this mild February, and the tufts of legendary mistletoe that hang in the bare poplar tree, and the hedge-rows, from which the gardener is now busy in gathering store of good material for next winter's fagots.

Which brings me back again to fagots, where we started. The fagot is not, as I used vaguely to imagine, a mere indefinite bundle of fire-wood. There is logic in its constitution, as there has sometimes been, in the severest sense, logic in its application. First, there shall be a handful or two of small twigs, such as the trimmings of the hedges furnish in generous abundance; then a handful of bigger brush; and finally,

two, or at most three, stoutish sticks, to give solidity and respectability to the whole. These elements being brought together, then does the hedger cunningly lay about them a green and supple withe, and by some dexterous twist or double-hitch firmly bind them into one. With a few months' seasoning, the true and normal fagot becomes the ideally perfect commencement of a wood fire. A wisp of lighted paper, sometimes a mere match, is enough to start a combustion which matures, when properly sustained, into a solid mass of brands and coals. I often raise the question whether the enormous waste of small wood in all our forests, even those within easy reach of a market, might not be saved, and a fine opportunity of delightful employment given to workless city street-boys, if some one would only organize a phalanx of fagoteers for an expedition against the underbrush which is so often accounted a nuisance, but might so easily be converted into a blessing both to him that gives and him that takes.

It would astonish you to see in this woodless country, where coal is of easy access, how general is the dependence both for warmth and for cooking on wood fires; when, in New England, even farmers in little inland towns begin to feel that they cannot afford to burn wood on a hearth. If you were to ask me whence come the supplies on which the people here rely, I should refer you partly to the mountains, but rather to sundry lines of lopped and stumpy posts that intersect the landscape, bearing all over their wrinkled bark the scars of ancient wounds, and about their knobby heads, sometimes, chaplets of gay young sprouts, strangely in contrast with their aspect of venerable and bereaved old age. The Swiss woodman rarely ventures manfully to attack a tree at its trunk. He trims, he lops, he maims, he mutilates, and then he leaves the poor branchless, leafless stock to bring forth a new progeny for a renewed slaughter. Standing before one

\* In revising this paper for its present use, the writer has not thought needful to wash out the "local color" that came into it by its being written at Geneva.

jects which ought to be taught in the seminary but which now are not for lack of time.

Various objections may be urged against the introduction of the elective system into theological seminaries. Among them are:

1. Post-graduate courses of instruction would accomplish the same purposes as the elective system.

2. Students do not know their intellectual needs, and therefore will not, under the elective system, select their studies with discretion.

3. Students will select the easiest courses, not those they need to pursue.

4. The variety of studies presented by the elective system is too great.

5. The work of instruction which the elective system demands will prove too severe for the professors.

These objections need not for the present purpose be answered in detail. It is sufficient to say that the same objections were urged against the introduction of the system into the American College. But the system has made, and is making, its way in the most conservative of institutions.

## THE IMPROVEMENT OF OUR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

BY BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD, D.D., LL.D.

From *The Independent* (New York), June 20, 1895.

PRESIDENT THWING'S paper in *The Independent* of the twenty-third of May is calculated to awaken an interest in this subject which it may be well to foster by a word or two further. Possibly the public would like to know somewhat more exactly what some of the seminaries are actually doing, and what they are aiming to do, in order to meet in the completest manner the objects for which they have been established. I say "in order to meet in the completest manner"; for the seminaries are not inclined to interpret their functions in a narrow spirit, and however far short of their ideal they may fall, each has its eye upon its ideal and is striving to reach as nearly up to it as the means at its disposal permit.

The fundamental purpose of our theological seminaries is, very clearly, the training of men for the ministry. President Thwing very truly says: "The theological school is designed to train men for the ministry." The chief problem before them in the ordering of their work is the selection and distribution of studies for the prosecution of this primary end. President Thwing touches the right key when he remarks: "In this

training the question of what studies and what proportion of studies is one of the most serious." The primary end of the seminary as a training school must, of course, be the determining factor in the decision of these questions. Those studies must be selected for prosecution in the seminary, and that proportion of time and effort must be given to each of them which are judged to be best calculated to fit its graduates for their work in the world as ministers of the Cross. The question here is possibly of a different kind; it certainly approaches us from a different angle from the similar question in general education. We are not here vexed with endless debates as to whether education is to be directed solely to the training of the faculties. We ought to be entirely free from the perennial danger of the lapse of the educational effort into the cramming of young minds with an *indigesta moles* for exhibitory purposes at a public examination. We can hardly misinterpret our function to be that of a variety store which seeks to carry the fullest line of goods possible, from which each purchaser may select according to his own taste and wishes, however bizarre these may be. Settle the question in the sphere of general education as you may, it is perfectly clear with reference to theological education—what, we may say in passing, ought to be sufficiently clear in reference to general education—that the object of the training it offers is to fit men as perfectly as possible, on every side and in every way, for the environment in which they will find themselves when they leave the school, and for the work which they will then be called upon to perform. For the graduates of a theological school this environment and work are those of the minister of the Gospel; and to prepare more thoroughly for this is the fundamental task to which the theological seminary must address itself.

The circle of subjects taught in a theological seminary need not be—let us rather say ought not to be—narrower than are set by the limitations of this school to the one subject of theology. The theological seminary is not a university. It is one branch of a university, and may not properly undertake work outside the limits of its own encyclopedia. But within the limits of its own encyclopedia its teaching should be universal. Due and proper place should be given in the teaching of a thoroughly equipped theological seminary to every topic which legitimately falls within the theological encyclopedia. When we ask, however, what is the due and proper place for these several topics in the work of our theological

seminaries, we need to remind ourselves again that these seminaries are not primarily departments of the universities, but training schools for the ministry. And this is as much as to say that what place and emphasis is due and proper for each topic is to be determined purely, or even primarily, not on scientific but on practical grounds. This need not sink the university side of our theological teaching into the practical side; but it certainly subordinates it to the practical side. Before all else our seminaries are and must remain practical training schools. These considerations will, as it seems to me, indicate for us the direction in which we are to look for improvement in our theological seminaries. To be ideal, our seminaries must first of all be ideal training schools for the ministry; but to be ideal they must, along with a perfect fulfilment of this primary function, perform also the work of the theological department of a great university.

The problem before our seminaries just now is how they may undertake and perform this double function. It certainly cannot be performed by sinking the main work of the seminary, that of a training school, in its secondary work, that of a theological university. And this would, in my judgment, be exactly what would happen, if the course which I understand President Thwing to advocate should be adopted, viz., making the entire course of study elective. But neither can it be performed by confining the work of the seminary strictly to those topics developed to that degree only, which will be absolutely necessary to its work as a training school. This is, no doubt, its fundamental work, and must always be given the determinative place in the seminary's work; but it is not only not inconsistent with, but it may be greatly advanced by, the undertaking alongside of and in subordination to it of the university work also. But that both functions may be performed, it is obviously necessary that the seminary work should run on two lines, one of which, as its primary work, shall be fundamental and determinative; and the other of which as its secondary work shall be supplementary and incidental. And this, of course, is only another way of saying that the teaching of the seminary must take the form of a fundamental curriculum which constitutes its care, and which should be so framed as thoroughly to perform its function of a training school, supplemented by a rich body of elective studies which shall represent the work of the seminary as a branch of the university.

Of course, it will escape no one that the solution thus suggested is that to which

our colleges have been generally led in their process of curriculum expansion. There are certain analogies between the two cases which will allow each to learn from the other. There are certain differences between them, also, which should not be overlooked, and which may have an important effect in modifying the method which has been wrought at in our colleges, in its application to our seminaries. That the seminary is a professional school and not an institute for general culture is the fundamental one of these differences; that it is fitting its graduates for one specific walk in life, and not equally for the varied occupations of the secular life is another; that the subjects it teaches are subdivisions of one unitary branch of learning, and therefore in a special sense imply and require one another for clear knowledge of each, is another. These differences all point in one direction. They suggest that the required curriculum of the seminary will need to be relatively more complete and comprehensive than is necessary in the broader course of college work, and that the elective studies will need to be more supplementary and less substitutive in character. This is incidental to the very nature of a professional as distinguished from a general training; and it simply means that the curriculum of the seminary, required of all, should be so framed as to give each student a symmetrical and comprehensive training in all departments of theological learning, so as to send him into the world an all-around, good man, able to fill his part as a thoroughly furnished minister of Christ, fitted for all the ordinary duties of his office; while the body of elective studies should be such as will enable each man to deepen, widen, and work out into detail his knowledge on whatever special lines his tastes or his apprehension of the needs of the day or of his own position may call him to.

Now this, I say, represents roughly what I should desire to see in the work undertaken by our seminaries. What are our seminaries doing towards fulfilling it? Much less, of course, than they would like to do; but, I am also persuaded, much more than is generally understood. Let me simply point out briefly what we are trying to do towards it in Princeton. This will serve as a sample.

In the first place, then, we are seeking in Princeton to perform as thoroughly and as well as possible our primary function as a training school for the ministry of the Gospel. To this end we have sought to frame a comprehensive curriculum which shall contain everything which a minister needs to

fit him for his work. We do not think that the curriculum, if passed in its details under Dr. Thwing's eye, would seem to him to give an undue emphasis either on linguistic or any other one branch of study. We have certainly striven to make it just the hammer which is needed to beat men into ministers of power. It has been an evolution with progressive, careful adjustments of details; and we hope in time to discover any flaws it now has, and to continue to perfect it for its purpose. This curriculum embraces something like 1560 hours, which are distributed, under broad captions, as follows:

Hebrew Philology.....	150	hours.
Apologetical Theology.....	180	"
Old Testament Literature and Exegesis.....	210	"
New Testament Literature and Exegesis.....	180	"
Biblical Theology.....	120	"
Historical Theology.....	180	"
Systematic Theology.....	180	"
Practical Theology.....	180	"
Actual Praxis.....	180	"

1560 hours.

Of these 1560 hours only one-tenth represent purely philological work. An emphasis is, of course, placed on the direct study of the Bible, and this is prosecuted in the original languages; but this is far from purely philological work. The actual topics treated under each of the broad designations given, are, of course, more numerous than will appear at once from such a list of headings, and include many (*e. g.*, Christian Ethics and Sociology) the absence of which might create remark. Were these freely brought out—or, in other words, if one will fairly consider the topics which will necessarily come into discussion in a comprehensive treatment of the departments named—I feel confident that he will adjudge this course of study both comprehensive and symmetrical—fairly adapted to train men for the wise and forceful prosecution of their ministry under modern conditions.

By this curriculum, then, the entire accomplishment of which we require as a condition for the conferring of our diploma, we seek to fulfil our primary and chief function as a training school for ministers. Our supplementary function as a theological university we are seeking to fulfil as completely as possible, by providing as large a body of elective studies in every branch of theological learning as we can. We are greatly aided in this by the kind courtesy of the College of New Jersey, which opens its post-graduate courses to our students. Quite a number of our men avail themselves of the valuable opportunities thus laid before them;

and we always are able to catalogue special classes in ethics with President Patton; the philosophy of Plato or Aristotle, with Professor Orris; Philology, with Professor Ormond; Psychology, with Professor Baldwin, Sanskrit, with Professor Winans; History, with Professors Sloan, Wilson, and the like. In the seminary itself we propose as large a supplementary body of special classes—*seminars*, if you will—as proves each year to be possible with the force of teachers at our disposal. The last year, for example, there were sixteen of these courses in actual operation; and as they are purposely varied from year to year, a student who stays with us the three years' course out will have some forty-eight of these special courses brought to his attention. It will give some idea of the topics treated in them to enumerate the list for the year just closed. They included classes in advanced Hebrew, New Testament Greek, Arabic, Early Aramaic Inscriptions, Old Testament Contemporary History, the Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch, the Hebrew Feasts, Exegesis of Job, and of Zechariah, New Testament Introduction, Exegesis of James, Justin Martyr, History of Doctrine, Philosophical Apologetics, The Person and work of Christ, Analysis of Texts. Next year, it is hoped an entirely different but equally extended series of topics will be offered. By choosing from these it is hoped that the most eager and diligent young man will be able so to supplement his regular curriculum as not to need to be ashamed when he is found by and by in the midst of the learned world. It is through these supplementary classes that we are trying to fulfil our university function.

In order to give a greater unity to this supplementary work, the body of supplementary classes are formally ranged under five departments, and known as the honor courses in the Old Testament, the New Testament, Systematic Theology, Church History, and Ecclesiastical Theology respectively. When a student, in addition to the curriculum, takes three hundred and sixty hours from these extra courses, either during the course of his three years' stay in the seminary, or in a fourth year (of course, under certain regulations, which it is not needful to recite here), his advanced standing is to be recognized by conferring upon him the degree of Bachelor of Divinity. This, naturally, makes this degree at Princeton mean something more than it does at those institutions where it goes by right to every graduate. It is intended with us to designate men who have a just claim to special theological learning.

Now, of course, no one could be more acutely aware than we are at Princeton that, in all this, we have but made a beginning in developing the university side of our teaching. But we think that we have already done something; and that that something is not a little. And I think the recitation of it here not useless, for at least three reasons. It will show that "the improvement of our theological seminaries" is not merely an idea, but a fact in actual progress. It will show that the full development of the university side of our seminary work is not inconsistent with, but rather helpful to, the continuance of the proper emphasis on the primary work of the seminaries as training schools. And it will show that the advancement of the university work of our seminaries is only a question of means in men and money. Our ambition at Princeton is to be, first of all, a perfect training school for a godly and sound ministry for the Presbyterian Church, and, then, to be a theological university of such comprehensiveness and thoroughness that any one who wishes to prosecute studies in any branch of theology whatever, to any extent whatever, can find the instruction, direction and aid he requires within its lecture halls. We are making a beginning towards this which we cannot think small. For making a completion of it we only need means—or so, at least, it seems to us.

## THE POPE'S LETTER TO THE ENGLISH PEOPLE.

BY DEAN FARRAR.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), June, 1865.

"The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England."

ARTICLE XXXVII.

See, too, Wilkins' "Concilia," iii. 769.

No one can have read the appeal of the Pope to our nation without thankfully recognizing the spirit of courtesy by which it is pervaded. While our Church repudiates his claims to any sort of jurisdiction over us, we welcome the blessing and the kindly recognition of an aged Christian prelate. We feel assured of his sincere affection for us, as he is rightly persuaded of our hearty good-will towards him. In reading his letter one cannot help saying with a sigh, as regards this gentleness of tone, *O si sic omnia!* The English Roman Catholics have recently established a twofold "Apostolate" in England—an Apostolate of Prayer, of

which I will speak later on, and an "Apostolate of the Press." So far as I have seen specimens of the latter in anonymous Roman Catholic newspapers, it is impossible to conceive anything less suited to advance their object, anything more directly calculated to fill the minds of English Protestants with pity and disdain. Apart from the blank reiteration of statements for which either no shred of argument is produced or only ten-times-refuted views of exegesis and history, these so-called "answers" seem mainly to consist of vulgar and virulent sneers. They involuntarily remind us of the spirit of familiars of the Inquisition:

"Fagot and stake were desperately sincere;

Our cooler martyrdoms are done in type."

Such anonymous criticisms hardly deserve the dignity of a place in any good man's waste-paper basket. If the Roman Catholics desire reunion with us, they must warn their controversialists that they will gain no hearing unless they undertake the defence of the Christian religion with courtesy and fairness. Insolence of tone and temper will only damage their cause; nor will they produce the least influence upon the minds of those who disagree from them, unless they can show that their religion develops the most elementary of the Christian graces. A Letter like that of the Pope, unable as we are to accept its views, sets to such writers a high example which, if they desire to promote the end for which they profess to write, they will do well to follow.

But we must respectfully demur to nearly all the remarks of the Pope which are in any way distinctive, and to the views of history which they seem to imply. If the facts seem hard, we desire to express them without one particle of bitterness, and purely in necessary self-defence.

Early in his Letter the Pope expresses the "good-will we have always felt towards your people, whose great deeds *in olden times* the history of the Church declares."

We do not understand the allusion. It is extraordinarily intangible. Is it only "*in olden times*" that "the history of the Church" declares our great deeds? Can any truth of history be more obvious than the fact that all the mighty, and almost inconceivable, advance of England, and nearly all her most glorious deeds, have been achieved *since*, not *before*, what the Pope calls "the grievous wound" which England received in the sixteenth century? Was it not in the reign of Elizabeth, and, in no small measure, by the defeat of the Spanish Armada—which was intended to