

Period. 2006
v. 17
1905-06

ANDOVER-HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

THE
Union Seminary Magazine

VOL. XVII

OCTOBER--NOVEMBER, 1905

No. 1

**THE ELDERSHIP IN THE DAYS OF JOHN
KNOX**

BY THE REV. JAMES STALKER, D. D.,

Professor of Church History, Aberdeen; Author of "John Knox, His Ideas and Ideals."

JOHN KNOX may be called the creator of the office of elder for Scotland, Ireland and America; there having been nothing of the kind in the ecclesiastical system which he displaced. He himself, indeed, would have expressed the fact otherwise, for his contention was that he had invented or created nothing, but simply restored the lost image—or, as he was fond of calling it, "the face"—of a Church found in the Word of God. None of the other Reformers—not even Calvin—insisted as rigorously on the principle that nothing should be introduced into the Church, or tolerated therein, which is not sanctioned by this divine authority. Other Reformers, like Luther and the founders of the Church of England, were content with excluding whatever is forbidden in the Bible; but Knox went much further, admitting nothing for which actual Scriptural warrant could not be quoted.

Thus going back to the New Testament to discover the office-bearers of the Church of Christ, he found there three outstanding offices—Ministers, Elders, Deacons. A fourth he was willing to acknowledge—that of Teachers or Doctors, nearly corresponding with professors of divinity in our present system. Also, he admitted, as temporary expedients, necessary in the unsettled condition of the Church at that period and on account of the great scarcity of competent ministers, two other offices; the one being that of the Reader, who, in parishes where no preacher was procurable, might read the Scriptures and the Common Prayers at the meetings for worship; and the other that of the Superintendent, who should have charge of an extended district, the size

OUR CHURCH AND HER COLLEGES.

BY JOHN I. ARMSTRONG, M. A., B. D.,

Professor of Moral Philosophy and Bible Study in Hampden-Sidney College.

Presbyterians believe in education. They have proved the fact by founding and maintaining schools of all grades, by educating their own children at whatever sacrifice, and by cheerfully laying on the altar of learning much that men hold dear.

The Southern Presbyterian Church believes in education. She will have an educated ministry or none. Then there are sessional schools, presbyterial schools and presbyterial colleges, synodical schools and synodical colleges; and there are those who hoped there might be a General Assembly University, nor is this hope entirely dead despite the attitude of the Fort Worth Assembly. Of course, these names imply that the Church believes in education. However, there is further evidence in the fact that one of the permanent committees of the General Assembly is on "Church and Christian Education."

It is not necessary here to give a list of all those colleges that directly or indirectly belong to the Southern Presbyterian Church, nor to go into the details of the relationship existing between the Church and each college. It may be remarked, however, that the Church, as a church, takes towards its colleges the attitude of passive approval, rather than the attitude of active and vigorous support. The Assembly's Committee on Church and Christian Education is not even called an "executive" committee, and is apparently not expected by the Assembly to do more than read a report. At any rate this committee recommends the appointment of a Secretary of Church and Christian Education, who shall for a small salary "devote a part of his time to the furtherance of this cause." For two years the Assembly seems to have passed this twice repeated recommendation by on the other side, without so much as going and looking on it. One could wish that this neglect were due to the fact that the Assembly prefers to appoint on a competent salary a Secretary of Church and Christian Edu-

cation who shall devote his *whole* time and energy to the furtherance of this cause.

In the light of her own history and of her present condition, as well as of what other churches are doing, *the Southern Presbyterian Church is under a moral necessity to begin active and aggressive and untiring work for and with and by means of her colleges.* If that ideal relationship which is morally necessary between the Church and her colleges is to be attained, it will be attained on the recognition of a mutual need.

THE COLLEGES NEED THE CHURCH.

It is just as true that the colleges need the Church as that the church needs her colleges. It might seem to be superfluous to state a fact which is so nearly self-evident, and yet at least some colleges, directly or indirectly, are asserting their independence of the Church.

1. The colleges of the Church need the financial support of the Church. By their very constitutions as well as by the whole trend of their lives these institutions are cut off from State aid. They render just as great service to State as to Church, and yet they cannot ask for State appropriations. Even if all legal and constitutional obstacles were removed, they would have no moral right to accept State appropriations. They don't want State aid at the price they would have to pay for it.

Nor can the colleges of the Church appeal successfully to the independent philanthropist. Even supposing he could be interested, there would in many cases be such conditions attached to his gifts that a church college could not receive them and maintain its own self-respect. But there is little danger of having to refuse such gifts. Men of large means can rarely be induced to give money to a denominational school unless it belongs to their own denomination. Even then the small college is at a great disadvantage, because it can do little to add to the fame of the giver.

It is clear that the church colleges cannot hope for much financial aid outside of the Church. It is also true that almost no college can charge as much for tuition and other fees as it needs for current expenses, especially if the student body be comparatively small, as it must always be in the church colleges. These institutions, then, face the problem of providing faculties and equip-

ment that will enable them to compete successfully with heavily-endowed independent institutions and with liberally supported State institutions, while they have little endowment themselves and are unable to charge fees to cover expenses. It is evident where they will be driven unless they have the financial aid of the Church, and that too, liberal and immediate.

Just here it may be well to refer to a view sometimes held, which is at once ignorant and unreasonable. It is thought by some that the fact that a college is Christian will cover a multitude of faults. They say parents ought to send their sons to a Christian school and make sure of Christian influences, even if other advantages have to be sacrificed. The result in some cases is the attempt to pass off a pious community and a Christian atmosphere for a real college.

What is asserted here is that a Christian college has no right, because it is a Christian college, to be any less a first-class institution of its kind. It ought to be able to go before the public and say: "We can give your sons just as good teaching in Latin and Greek, and Mathematics and Science, and the Modern Languages, and in all the branches we offer, as you can get anywhere else. We have as good athletics as any other college of our class. Our literary societies and college publications compare favorably with those of other institutions. In all these particulars you cannot get better advantages elsewhere, and in many you cannot get as good. But our distinctive claim is that, in addition to all these things and in connection with them, we offer a Christian atmosphere and a pious community. We put God at the center of things and teach our students to do so. We acknowledge Christ as the Master of this college and of its Faculty, and we teach our students, by precept and example, that the wise and manly and honorable thing to do is to call Jesus Lord."

The Christian college that can honestly offer these advantages to the public will have patronage. Unless it can take this broad and high platform it has no right to ask for the patronage of reasonable men. The young man who goes to a Christian college and fails to find good college advantages will probably miss all the Christian atmosphere and get a distaste for a Christianity that is deceiving the public with a sham, setting up a Christian atmosphere and a pious community and calling it a college.

2. The colleges of the Church need the moral support of the Church. Financial support will go a long way toward making a college successful, but it can't go all the way. The confidence, and approbation, and commendation that constitute moral support are essential to the success of the Christian college.

In order that such support may be given by the Church she must first make sure she has something worthy of her support, something she can push against without danger of a shock of surprise at finding herself pushing against air. The investigation urged here is not for criticism, nor for condemnation. When the Church finds a Christian college worthy of moral support the support should, of course, be given. But when the college is found not worthy, then the Church ought to be, or to get into, such relations with that college as will enable the Church to make the college worthy of moral support. When the college has shown itself worthy, then it needs and ought to have the moral support of the Church.

The colleges need that every individual officer in the Church should know and commend them; that every church court from session to assembly should know and commend them; and that some special body, constituted by the Church for the purpose, should supervise this work, commending what is commendable and censuring what deserves censure. All those manifestations of moral support will be mighty, especially if built on the solid rock foundation of a liberal financial support.

3. The colleges of the Church need the patronage of the Church. In these days some men would apparently rather be infidels than "sectarians," and they would seem willing to do almost anything rather than be called "narrow." As a natural consequence denominational lines are not so clearly marked as they once were. But when all has been said that may be said in this connection, it remains true that there is a denominationalism that is virtuous and above all reproach, and that without it church organizations as we know them would die. Men may believe with all their might that the Church of God is one, and that it embraces all confessing believers. They may at the same time believe just as strongly that, under present circumstances and to meet present conditions, this one Church must be divided into denominations in order that the work of God may be done. Per-

haps nowhere else has more harm been done by this fear of being called sectarian than in education. Parents without firm convictions of their own have sought for colleges where the Christianity was uncolored by denominationalism. To meet this demand and get the patronage some colleges have taken down their colors; some have kept their colors up and almost starved to death for lack of patronage.

The colleges of the Southern Presbyterian have need of the financial and moral support of the Church, and they have no less need of the sons of Southern Presbyterians as their students. They will have many other students, and will be no less desirable colleges for other students, but the sons of their own Church they must have in order to succeed.

This, then, is the subject presented on the ground of the need the colleges have of the Church. The Church must exert herself because the colleges need her. But the reasons for bestirring herself are more powerful when viewed on the ground of her own need.

THE CHURCH NEEDS HER COLLEGES.

In saying that this need exists, it is not meant merely that the colleges are mildly helpful to the Church, and that the Church could not do her work so well without them as with them. The connection is deep and vital, and while it is to be said with reverence, it is still to be said confidently, that from a human standpoint the very existence and continuance of the Church depends to a great extent on her colleges.

1. The Church needs her colleges because they have the ideal of education which she can endorse. Religion and education are akin, and the Church that has no convictions on what education is or ought to be, is defective. Our Church would doubtless vote to a man that the greatest human asset is character, and any wise man knows that education, to be true to its mission, must build character. This is the view our colleges take of education, and this is the ideal they aim at. They hold, furthermore, that character cannot be built without using the Bible; that the education which does not include the teaching of the Bible is incomplete and harmful. The Christian college stands for an education which has the building of character as its object, and which recognizes the necessity of teaching the Bible in order to obtain

that object. It is hard to imagine how work could be more in line with the real work of the Church than this work is, or how good churchmen could ever object to endorsing this sort of college for fear of going outside the rightful bounds of church authority.

But the reason why the Church needs colleges that have character as the end of their work is that another ideal of education is becoming common and popular. Some months ago on being inaugurated into office the president-elect of a certain college made an address of which the keynote was this: "The object of education is to fit men and women to do something." Comment on the address was favorable, and one might have thought that this college president-elect had made some marvellous discovery in educational science, or had expressed a great truth that lesser men had been groping after these many years. But the view expressed is common and popular. The State institutions say they fit their graduates to *do something*; the universities and special schools say they fit men and women to *do something*; the business colleges advertise that they get their graduates positions; and it has come to pass that the ordinary college feels under necessity to train its men to teach Latin or Greek or mathematics, to be scientific chemists or physicists or linguists, or, in other words, to *do something*. Back of it all is the desire to *earn something*. That is why the education that claims to fit men to do something is so popular.

Such a claim is wrong. It is based on a reversed view of things. It will surprise many to see it affirmed that the school that fits its students to do something may not be really educating at all, and yet such a statement is near the truth. Teaching men and women to do something is in itself merely training, and comes a long way short of education. Education is teaching men and women to *be something*. Of course, when you teach men to be something he may be safely depended on to do something. You may teach him to do by teaching him to be, but it is putting things backwards to say that education fits men to do something, and that otherwise it is unworthy of the name.

It is just on account of this view of education that the Church has a right to take a hand in the affairs of a Christian college. Such a college is making character, making men. It has a work

all its own, a work which other institutions cannot do, and which they are not even trying to do. They make lawyers, physicians, teachers, farmers, engineers, and what not; but they can't make a good lawyer or a good physician or a good anything else without having a good man to start with. To get this good man they trust to chance or depend on the college that fits its men to be something—to be men.

No church, ours least of all, can spare the colleges that direct curricula and instruction and athletics and everything else toward the making of men. However much the Church may see the world's need of men who can do something, she knows that the need can be fully met only by true men, and not by mere trained animals.

2. The Church needs her colleges, because from them must come her ministers.

Even in the present condition of things, when the relation between the Church and her colleges is not all that one could wish, it is true that the Christian colleges are furnishing the ministers. Of the forty-seven men registered in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Kentucky during the session 1904-1905 only eight seem to come from distinctly secular or State institutions. In Union Theological Seminary in Virginia the record for four sessions going back from the present is as follows: 1904-1905, 60 students, 46 from Christian colleges, 14 from other institutions; 1903-1904, 57 students, 44 from Christian colleges, 13 from other institutions; 1902-1903, 57 students, 47 from Christian colleges, 10 from other institutions; 1901-1902, 68 students, 57 from Christian colleges, 11 from other institutions.

Of course, many of these men were moving toward the ministry before they went to college. Others during a course in college, and often because of the course and its attendant influences, went into the ministry. Of the forty-seven men graduated with a certain class in one of the colleges of our Church, sixteen are ministers. About half of the sixteen entered college without any thought of becoming ministers. Furthermore, it is at least a question for serious consideration whether men inclined toward the ministry would continue to be so inclined were they obliged to seek college work in a State or secular institution.

The Church has been much disturbed for several years past on

account of a marked falling off in the number of candidates for the ministry, and reasons have been given to explain the falling off. All the reasons so far advanced are summed up by Dr. W. W. Moore in an article published in the *Presbyterian Standard* for December 21, 1904. Let all who are interested in this whole question consider these facts: (1) The period during which the falling off has taken place has been one of great prosperity, and educational institutions everywhere have been filled to overflowing. There has been no lack of students, or of means to pay for their education. (2) During the period of the falling off *three* of the colleges of our Church have had a striking decline in the number of their students. These facts at least raise the question whether the falling off in attendance at these colleges has not had something to do with the falling off of the number of candidates, in our own Church at any rate.

If the colleges are to supply the ministers, then the Church needs them, and must control them in some way, in order to insure their continuance and success and the maintenance of their standard of scholarship and general excellence. Of course God puts men into the ministry, but he uses the Church as a means of calling and training these men. Somehow he doesn't call many men who are not in the Church or the Church schools. It would seem that the Church ought to do her work in this connection with all the skill and wisdom that men of affairs use in managing secular enterprises. She is under obligation to work with the same prudence and energy that she would use if the whole responsibility of providing ministers rested on her, and does it not rest on her up to the limit of her utmost ability within the proper bounds?

One of the greatest business organizations of modern times is the International Harvester Company of America, formed by the union of the well-known McCormick Company and several others. The following quotation from a letter from the assistant advertising manager of the company explains one of its great principles:

"The International Harvester Company owns a large amount of timber land in Southeastern Missouri and Northeastern Arkansas, and upon these lands operates its own saw mills.

"Coal fields embracing extensive area in Kentucky are also owned by the above company."

“Considerable iron mining property in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin are controlled and operated by the International Harvester Company, which also operates its own steel mills and blast furnaces, located in Chicago.

September 1, 1905.

“It is a matter of fact that the International Harvester Company is able to produce from its own raw material practically the entire line of machines being manufactured by it.”

The last paragraph of the quotation states the principle which modern day business sense adopts. This principle the Church has not yet rightly valued. The children of this world are still wiser in their generation than the children of light.