

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXIII.—NO. 1.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXXII.

ARTICLE I.

THEOLOGY OF THE PLYMOUTH BRETHREN.

God's Way of Peace. By the Rev. H. BONAR. Richmond:
Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1870.

Muller's Life of Trust. Edited by WAYLAND. Boston: 1870.

Notes on Genesis. By C. H. M., of Dublin. Inglis & Colles:
New York.

Scripture Testimony. Edited by CHARLES CAMPBELL. James
Inglis & Co.: New York.

A Word to Young Believers. By W. DER. B. Dublin Tract
Society.

The Return of the Lord Jesus. By J. G. BELLET. Dublin
Tract Society.

Waymarks in the Wilderness. Inglis & Colles: New York.
8 vols., 12mo.

The Witness. James Inglis & Co.: New York.

Who are the Plymouth Brethren? Mrs. H. GRATTAN GUINNESS.
Philadelphia: 1861.

JAN 1 0 1938
Attentive observers have not failed to note, that for the last
twenty years a modified phase of the "Doctrines of Grace" has
been presented in the Calvinistic Churches of Great Britain and
America; and this movement is easily traced to the sect (if that
may be called a sect which has no recognised bond) named at
the head of this article. The reader will readily grant that no
VOL. XXIII., NO. 1.—1.

men and angels at the end of the world.") Chapter XXXII., Sec. 2; Larger Catechism, Q. 53, 56.

We would humbly submit, then, that the Presbyterian who desires to be a Pre-Adventist, is bound in candor to move for a revision of our Standards on these points.

ARTICLE II.

OUR EDUCATIONAL POLICY.*

A Convention, called under the recommendation of the General Assembly of 1870, met in the city of Huntsville, Alabama, in last May, and spent several days in considering "the whole subject of the educational policy of our Presbyterian Church." There were able men in that body, and the results to which they arrived in their deliberations are worthy of the earnest attention of the entire Church. They are embodied in a report which was adopted, with certain amendments, by the Assembly as its own deliverance on the subject. That report has been issued in the form of a circular letter, and is now before all the churches for their consideration.

That paper does not purport to be a final settlement of the question of the educational policy of our Church. The question is still open for discussion. The report only claims to set forth "certain well established principles which were reached with entire harmony." It was characterised by the Rev. Dr. Wills, the able chairman of the Committee that brought in the report, "as a complete compromise, and as not representing fully the views of a single member of the body." The compromise did not consist in blending together, by mutual concessions, the disharmonious views of different parties, but in the agreement of

*This Review being an open journal upon sundry questions, we cheerfully admit this communication without committing ourselves to the sentiments expressed by the esteemed writer.—EDS. S. P. R.

all parties not to push the subject farther than they could all go together in harmony. The action of the late Assembly only comes up to the point where a divergence of opinion begins; the compromise was the mutual agreement of all parties to pause at that point—for *the present*. The great points at issue in regard to the establishment and control of a central university for “the higher education” were not settled by compromise, or in any other way; they were simply postponed. The paper *truthfully* expresses the views of all parties so far as it goes, but it does not *fully* represent the views of any party, because it does not extend out into the debatable ground. In regard to the question of the proposed university, it was the unanimous judgment of the Assembly, that “our people at large are not prepared to enter at once upon the important enterprise of putting such an institution into immediate operation.” Thus far all parties were agreed. There were those in the Assembly that doubt the desirableness of the proposed university at any future time. They were willing, however, for the Trustees to be authorised to receive and hold in trust any donations that may be given for the cause of a future university. They neither expect nor desire to see the university-scheme come to anything; they were, however, perfectly willing to let the university-men have a fair and safe opportunity to see what they can do. The whole question of the nature of control over said university, in regard to which there is a fundamental difference of opinion in the Church, was postponed to some future Assembly. In view of what the Assembly has done, and also of what it has not done, but specified as work to be done at some future day, it is very clear that our educational policy is not a settled question. The question is still open; and we have a few thoughts on the subject which we wish to place before our brethren for their consideration.

What do we mean by the educational policy of any corporate body? Clearly that system of education which is best adapted to protect and promote the interests of the said corporation. What are the interests of our Presbyterian Church which are to be protected and promoted by its educational policy? They seem to us to be the following:

1. To conserve to our own Church the children of our own families, and to have them thoroughly instructed and indoctrinated in the peculiar principles and practices of Presbyterianism.

2. To augment the aggressive power of our Church, and to increase its influence over the minds and hearts of those now outside of our organisation, to the end that as many of them as possible may be brought under the control of the spirit and principles of Presbyterianism, and ultimately within the pale of our Church.

3. To raise up among ourselves, out of the number of our own children conserved to our communion, and of those brought into it from other families, a body of able ministers of the gospel, who shall be thoroughly imbued with the principles and spirit of our Presbyterianism, and thoroughly prepared, intellectually, morally, and spiritually, to be efficient workmen in the holy ministry.

4. To train up our entire membership, both men and women, in the knowledge and spirit of our doctrines and principles.

5. These vital interests being guarded and protected by our educational policy, a very desirable and most important result will inevitably follow—the educational influence will be both extensively and intensely felt upon the whole country, and eventually upon the entire world.

It will be noticed, that, in this statement of the interests which our educational policy is to protect and promote, we have left out of view the end of education abstractly viewed as education. We have not done so by oversight. Every system of education must have its fundamental design to be the fullest development of man as man. That is the end of education viewed abstractly as education. But that is not the question now under consideration; our question is, What is the best educational policy for a certain corporate body? that is, How can the education of those whom it undertakes to educate be systematised and conducted, so that, while imparting the best education to the individuals in training, the best and highest interest of the corporation as a whole will be subserved? We must carefully distinguish between these two points; the one is the abstract question,

what is the best system of education for the highest development of man as man? the other is, how can that best system of education be administered by a given corporation for the fullest development of its interests as a corporation?

The latter question is the one we have under consideration. On this subject we must take enlarged and liberal views. The eye of the discussion must range far and sweep wide. When the Church comes to legislate on this subject, its legislation will not be for one section nor for one day, but for the whole Church and for all time to come.

We are not called upon to say what is the best educational policy for the State, or for some other Church, or for our Church under different conditions and circumstances; but our question is, What is the best educational policy for our Presbyterian Church considered just as it is in its actual facts and reasonable probabilities? Our policy must be one adapted to meet our educational necessities, and at the same time its expenses must be within the limits of our pecuniary abilities. We want a policy practicable for our work, and possible for our means. A scheme might be consistent with itself, perfect in its theory, beautiful in its conception, grand in its development, and in every way magnificent on paper; and, still, it may have attached to it the fatal difficulty of utter impracticability under our circumstances. We want no Plato to dream out for us an ideal republic, which can never be realised except in the luxurious land of his own rich fancy; nor More to plan for us a Utopia, which can find a location only in some romantic isle of the broad sea of imagination. Any such an educational policy would be as likely to benefit the inhabitants of Neptune as the members of our Presbyterian Church, and far less likely to waste their money and otherwise to do them damage. We want an educational policy, practicable under our circumstances, adapted not only to give to those to be educated a systematic and thorough physical, intellectual, moral, and religious training, but also to exercise an aggressive influence on the outside world, so as to bring into our schools the children of those not decided in their religious tenets, and to raise up among those of our own children conserved to our com-

munion, and others brought into it, an able and efficient ministry, and to train up in our Church an ever increasing membership of men and women who shall be intelligently and earnestly devoted to the principles and interests of our Zion—the grand result of all being the advancement of the intelligence, strength, respectability, purity, and influence of our Presbyterian Church. We would not have our educational policy to be narrow and sectarian; we would have it to be broad, but at the same time strictly and emphatically denominational. We are surrounded by other branches of the Church, some of which do not try to conceal their purpose and earnest efforts to proselyte the children of our communion into their own; others are insidiously and secretly prosecuting with vigor, and in some quarters with alarming success, their efforts at proselytism. This work is done principally through their institutions of learning. Self-preservation is said to be the first law of nature; and ruin and disgrace will, sooner or later, come to that individual or corporation that fails to defend and protect itself when its vital interests are assailed. If those proselyting denominations are better than ours, let us all go over to them *en masse*; if they are not as good as ours, then let us put forth and sustain the most earnest and systematic efforts, not only to retain all our own children, but also to bring under our control and into our communion as many as possible from the outside world. This work of self-protection and denominational advancement, is to be effected mainly through the instrumentality and influence of our institutions of learning.

We now have before us what we conceive to be the great and vital interests which are to be protected and promoted by our educational policy. Will one grand central university meet and accomplish these desirable ends? or, is there some other scheme better adapted to the present necessities and circumstances of our Church? That such a central institution for the “higher learning” as is proposed, if we only had, or could get it, would exert a potent influence in protecting and advancing many of our most important interests, no one can deny. That point has been made out beyond a doubt. When we look at the advan-

tages that would accrue to our Church from such an institution, and shut our eyes to all our other educational necessities, we feel that the Church must have such an institution without any delay, that we cannot afford to do without it, and that every other educational interest must be made second and subsidiary to this scheme. The scheme of this grand university is a taking idea; when it was first suggested by the great Dr. Thornwell in the Convention that met during the meetings of the Assembly in Augusta, we were captivated with it. It rose up in the grandeur of its conception and the magnificence of its proposal, and dazzled our eyes. The only question we then asked was, Is it possible? Shall we live to see it an accomplished fact in our history? For a while we were like those who have been looking into the face of the sun—when we turned our eyes away, we could not see anything else. But after we had gotten somewhat accustomed to the grand conception, we began to inquire about its practicability and utility. We could still see so many important interests that such an institution, if it should even come into existence, will subserve, that we were at first inclined to fall in with the views of the great and good men who are the advocates of the University-scheme as *the* educational policy for our Presbyterian Church; but, as we have advanced with our investigations, we can now see so many of the most vital and important interests of our Church which must be reached by our educational policy, and which can never be touched by this grand university-scheme, that we have begun to look upon the scheme with some degree of disfavor. As preventing us from going over to the side of the university-men, we were met with certain difficulties which we will here state, and upon which we invoke their criticism. Let them be put to the severest test. Let them be put into the crucible of criticism, and subjected to the white heat of debate; if they volatilize and pass away in fumes, it will be well to have them exploded; but, if they are found to be true and deep principles, involving the present necessities and vital interests of the Church, they must not be neglected for remoter possibilities, nor for advantages that are problematical.

1. The first great interest to be subserved by our educational policy, is, the conservation of the children of the Church under its own control, and to its own membership. To reach this end, our educational influence must be brought to bear upon them while they are yet children, and must follow them through all the years in which they are forming their opinions and characters. When the fact comes to be known, it will be found that most of those, who are won over from our Church to other denominations, did not have any Presbyterian opinion or character drilled into them in the early and formative period of their lives. Early youth is the seed-time of life—the period in which our opinions are adopted and characters formed. Religious opinions are the earliest received, and the longest retained. The university, even were it now in existence, would not reach the children and youth of the Church in the formative period of their lives. Very few young men would go the university before they are twenty; and four-fifths of the membership of the Church are converted previous to that age. The young men converted while at schools under the influence of other denominations, would be likely to seek their “higher education” in their institutions. Thus, unless our educational policy should reach the children in their earliest years, they would be turned away from any university we might have for the “higher education.”

We are also to bear in mind the fact, that not more than one young man out of ten in any Church seeks the “higher education.” The university-scheme makes provision for the *one*, and lets the other *nine* go wherever they can find such educational advantages as they want. Through the educational policy of one central institution common to the whole body, our educational influence would be brought to bear only indirectly upon the great masses of the Church. It would be a provision for the few, leaving out the many.

This scheme would expend the educational resources of the Church on the male population, and leave the female portion unprovided for. Just here is where our Church is making a fatal mistake. We give more attention and money to provide educational advantages for our sons than we do for our daughters.

The result has been the loss of many a noble woman to our Church; and for one, we regard the loss to the Church of a highly educated and deeply pious woman as about equal to the loss of an earnest and faithful minister of the gospel. Under our present system of education we do turn out a company of ministers, that, for intelligence and thorough education, are not equalled by the ministry of any other Church in the world; but, notwithstanding this fact, other denominations are growing faster than we are, through the instrumentality and influence of their excellent institutions for female learning. While we let other denominations educate our girls, the natural result will be, that many of them will go over to those denominations; and our educated young men will naturally and properly seek educated young ladies for wives, and many of them will marry some of those young ladies who have gone from us, and then follow them into their adopted churches. Here is a great leak in our communion which ought to be stanchd by a change in our educational policy. We should give as much attention, and spend as much money for the promotion of the thorough and Presbyterian education of our daughters, as for our sons. Through our neglect at this point an artery has been opened at which the Church is bleeding, if not to death, most certainly to weakness. We must stop this drain on our very life-blood.

2. We have seen the total inadequacy of the university-scheme to conserve to our Church our own sons and daughters. Will it constitute the most efficient power in the Church for aggression upon the outside world? Will it attract large numbers to its halls from beyond our own communion, and then turn them out as thoroughly educated Presbyterians? It will not begin to attract any large outside patronage, until it shall have made for itself a famous name. It must become great and famous before it can become aggressive, any more than our colleges are at the present day. That result is far off in the very distant future. If the university should stand alone, it will even then exert a very restricted and limited influence in this line. We have already shown that the religious opinions and characters of youths are formed before they are ready to seek

the "higher education" of the university. It will follow, therefore, that even when men of other churches begin to be attracted to the great university by its high literary and scientific advantages, they will usually go away from it with precisely the same religious beliefs they had when they entered. If we would have our educational policy to reach and influence the children of the outside world, it must be brought to bear upon them while they are yet children. We can only make aggression, and win other children to our communion, in the same way and through the same instrumentalities by which our own children are to be conserved to our own Church. Unless this is done, when they are grown up they will not go to your grand Presbyterian university; or, if a few of them should go, they will come back no more Presbyterians than they were when they entered.

3. We can see many very great advantages that would result to the Church from a central university of the highest grade. It will be a great and very useful thing whenever the Church shall find itself "prepared to enter upon the important enterprise of putting such an institution into operation." Very wisely did the Assembly determine, that the day for entering upon that grand enterprise has not yet come. It may come; and it may come much sooner than many think. What we have now to do is, to lay a broad and deep foundation, and build up to the right place for the university to come in. It will then become a necessity; and, after it once becomes an absolute necessity, it will not be long in becoming an actual fact. We will now briefly develop our scheme for the educational policy of our Presbyterian Church, and show how, we think, the Church should lay its foundation and build up to the university, and then build the grand university on the top of all for what the last Assembly was pleased to style the "higher education," but which henceforth in this essay we will style the "highest education." We would have primary or elementary schools, high schools or academies, higher schools or colleges, and the highest school or university; and we would have these classes and gradations of schools for both the sons and daughters of our Church.

1. There should be in every congregation, or in any number of congregations that could unite their children in one place, a primary school for elementary education in letters, religion, and Presbyterianism; which school should be under the control of the session of the Church, or of the sessions of all the congregations united in it. This control might be exercised directly, but it would be better to have it in the hands of a small and competent Board of Trustees appointed from their own number. The control might be thoroughly Presbyterian without being ecclesiastical. This remark will apply to each one of the schools that we shall hereafter designate. The property might belong to the Presbyterian people, or it might belong to the Presbyterian person who is to teach the school. We think that such a primary school as we have indicated, might be put into operation in every community where we have a church in less time than a month. Let the effort be made. If there is a school in your congregation taught by a suitable Presbyterian, agree with the teacher to give him or her the hearty support of your united patronage, for the privilege of such control as has been indicated. If there is not now in existence in your community a school available for your purpose, let one be organised without delay, and make the best school in the neighborhood. Unite earnestly your patronage upon it, and then it will soon attract outside patronage, and become self-sustaining. In these primary schools we would have the boys and girls together; but, if any congregation thinks differently, let them have two schools.

2. In every Presbytery there should be at least two high schools—academies or grammar schools—one male and the other female. In these schools we would have the branches of learning taught that are usual in schools of similar grade, and such Presbyterian religious instructions and principles imparted as would be adapted to the age of those gathered in them. Each one of the schools should be under the supervision of a small Board of Trustees, all of whom should be clerical or lay communicants of the Presbyterian Church. They should be designated by the Presbytery. In each Presbytery there should be a sufficient number of these high schools, both male and female,

to meet its demands. What we have said about the way in which the primary school might be originated, will, *mutatis mutandis*, apply to these high schools. In one year's time every Presbytery could acquire control over schools now in operation, or put new ones under their control into operation.

3. Every Synod that is strong enough, or a union of adjacent Synods, should have at least two higher schools or colleges for education in the higher branches of literature, arts, and sciences—one male and one female. These higher schools should be first-class colleges, endowed, incorporated, and in every way equipped and furnished to give a thorough and liberal education; and they should be under the control of a small and competent Board of Trustees designated by the Synod or Synods to which said colleges belong.

For our young men we have already in operation a sufficient number of these colleges to meet our present demands. The Assembly did wisely in discouraging their multiplication under our present circumstances, and in recommending those Synods adjacent to such colleges now in operation "to concentrate upon them their interest, their means, their patronage, and their prayers."

We wish that the Assembly could have done more than, simply because it was timely, "speak a word of encouragement to those of our brethren engaged in the education of young ladies." We wish that the Assembly had looked into that subject with some degree of interest and earnestness, and had not passed over it with a mere glance of the eye and a single word. Whenever our Church shall convince the people, that we *as a Church* feel as deep and lively an interest in the education of our young ladies as of young men, then we will be no longer under the necessity of exhorting "our people to send their daughters to institutions where their moral and religious training will be in accordance with the faith of their fathers." Why did not exhortation say, "in accordance with the faith of their *mothers*"? Was it because the Assembly was conscious that, as a Church, we have, in our institutions of learning, made no special arrangements to guard and protect the faith of our daughters? As there was so

little earnest attention given to this point when the present mothers were in their school-going days, perhaps the Assembly did not feel very certain as to what the faith of the mothers of the present day might be. The Church did not look after the faith of the mothers when they were in school. That faith, however, is sound and thoroughly Presbyterian in those mothers that remain with us; but, because the Church has not given the attention to the education of her daughters that the cause demands, many noble women have gone out from us, and are now mothers in other communions, and are raising their children and exerting their influence not "in accordance with the faith of their fathers," because they were not themselves educated in that faith. As a Church, we have been neglectful of this vital interest, and we suffer loss in consequence of the neglect. There are several noble Presbyterian individuals, a few Presbyteries, and two or three Synods, that have thought it worth while to look after the education of daughters, to see that it be conducted under Presbyterian influences. Well, we are glad that the Assembly could afford to let fall from its table a single crumb of "encouragement to those of our brethren engaged in the education of young ladies."

We would see all our colleges put under a uniform system of education, both in their curriculum of study and order of discipline. Let them thus be prepared to become the colleges of the university that is to be. While this preparatory work is being done, let the necessary funds for the grand university be gathered into the place of safety indicated by the Assembly. When the proper time comes, and the Church has gotten ready "to enter upon this important enterprise," then let the university come into existence. Let the university be located at some central point where there shall be one of our colleges for biblical education. In the university there should be schools, each independent of all others, for the highest education in every professional department of learning, art, and science. We have not space to unfold in this paper our idea of what the university should be. It should be a combination of schools for the "highest learning."

Under this arrangement our educational policy would be one system, extending from the parochial schools to the university, and embracing the whole field of education in its broad arms. This policy would penetrate and permeate the whole Church with its presence and influence. The university would then be the grand reservoir, into which there would be streams flowing from every congregation. The primary schools, under control of trustees designated by sessions, would form a multitude of fountain-heads in all parts of our Zion, from which streams would flow into the high schools under the supervision of presbyteries; from these, larger streams would flow into our higher schools or colleges proper under synodical supervision; and, from these again, still larger streams would flow into the university, equipped with all the necessary and best appointments for the "highest learning," and placed under the control of the Assembly, or rather, of a small board of curators designated by the wisdom of the highest court of the Church.

Then, are we, after all, in favor of the university? Yes; but you must first give us a broad and solid foundation for it to stand upon. We want to build for it a foundation as broad as the whole Church, as deep as the necessities of the whole Church, and as solid as the very foundations of truth itself. Then, wherein do we differ from the university-men? In holding that the true educational policy for us is to begin with the lowest and build up to the highest—to begin with the primary schools and to build and systematize till we come to the university. The university we will need; and the university we must have so soon as we begin to need it. From the very beginning we should have the university in view as our ultimate object; in creating and systematizing our primary, high, and higher schools, we should keep the university in view at every step of the progress as the highest school, up to which we are to build and work. The university-men would begin at the top and work down; we would begin at the bottom and work up to the top. Let the Church begin right where it now stands; let what is in existence be systematized; let what is lacking be completed and brought into the system; let the work *for* the university begin

now, and let the work of the university begin as soon as we shall have carried up our educational edifice to the point at which the university should begin. Let all the Church go to work, in harmony and earnestness, to put into execution this scheme, and then in ten years' time our system of education will be completed; and when completed, it will be the grandest educational temple standing on our globe. Let no one say that this scheme is impracticable. It is now, in all its essential points, in successful operation in Prussia. It is the power that has brought Prussia up into the proud position which she to-day occupies. We only ask to see the Prussian system of education adopted as the educational policy of our Presbyterian Church, with the necessary changes to adapt it the differences in our circumstances. We have only taken the ideal of the Prussian system, and shown how it may be applied to our case.

We have only indicated in meagre outlines the scheme which seems to us to constitute the best educational policy for our Presbyterian Church. We have said enough to convey a general idea of the plan as it exists in our mind; if what we have said attracts any favorable attention in the Church, we are ready to go into the details of the scheme.

We would like to say one word as to the nature of the control over the various schools which we have suggested. It need not be ecclesiastical. It can be thoroughly Presbyterian without being presbyterial. We do not object to ecclesiastical control *on principle*, as some of our brethren do; but we do object to it *on expediency*. The control of every institution of learning should be in the hands of a very few, and they the most competent men. We fully coincide with the governmental policy indicated by Dr. Dabney on the floor of the Assembly at Huntsville. We can not go into this point now. It is not necessary that we should; for the Assembly has very wisely deferred the question of the nature of control over any institution of learning that may hereafter be created to whatever future Assembly may inaugurate the scheme. We only wish to state emphatically that our plan does not involve the necessity for direct ecclesiastical control.