

THE UNION SEMINARY REVIEW

Vol. XXXIII

JANUARY, 1922

No. 2

A KINGDOM THAT SHALL STAND FOREVER.

"The God of heaven shall set up a Kingdom that shall stand forever."—Dan. 2:44.

OUTLINE STUDY OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL.*

By REV. EUGENE C. CALDWELL, M. A., D. D.,
*Professor of the Greek New Testament, Union Theological
Seminary, Richmond, Va.*

The purpose of this article is to offer a few suggestions, which, it is hoped, will be useful in the study of Daniel. The reader is urged to approach the book with an open and active mind. It is a great book and will richly repay a fresh, independent and prayerful study. In the limited space at our disposal in the *Union Seminary Review*, the best that can be done is to give a few hints to guide the student in his own study of Daniel. Which is all to the good. For nothing can take the place of one's own direct contact with the Holy Scriptures. In parts Daniel is difficult, and scholars do not always agree in their interpretations. To those who differ the present writer accords the utmost respect. He does not wish to appear offensively dogmatic in the expression of his own views. Should he, however, appear to some to be too sure of his own positions, please attribute his seeming dogmatism to the form and not to the spirit, and as caused by his constant effort to be both brief and clear.

*Synopsis of seven lectures delivered at Montreat, N. C., August, 1921. Only a brief outline is here published.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

By REV. W. TALIAFERRO THOMPSON, D. D.,
Professor of Religious Education in Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.

Even though our memories be short we are forced by present day happenings to recognize the fact that we are living in the aftermath of the Great War. The war seems to have settled very little; things are still in flux; but it has revealed much. The conclusions which it has enabled us to draw will help us toward the solution of many of our problems.

It has shown us the *power* of education.

Dr. Athearn begins his book, "A National System of Education," with this arresting sentence—"Four thousand two hundred college professors caused the Great World War. Four thousand two hundred college professors can cause another World War. In the last analysis the destiny of any nation is determined by the schoolmasters of that nation." We know that he is speaking truth and that it was the persistent pressure of the ideas presented by the professors to the youth who made up the nation, and to the teachers who were instructing the little boys and girls growing up into power, that transformed the German nation in its character and in its attitude toward the world.

Years ago one of Germany's philosophers said, "Whatever you would put into a nation's life, you must put into its schools." With true appreciation of that dictum her leaders who desired a place in the sun, used the state controlled educational system.

With clear vision of the influence of education upon the life of England's enemy, Lloyd George said: "The most formidable foe we had to fight in Germany was not the arsenals of Krupp or the yards in which they turned out submarines; but the schools of Germany. They were our most formidable com-

petitors in business and our most terrible opponents in war. This fact was only half comprehended before the war."

It has shown us the *need* of education in America.

We were staggered when the draft revealed that there were 5,500,000 people in America over ten years of age who could not read or write any language, and 3,500,000 who could neither read, speak nor write the English language. It took our breath away to learn that nearly eight per cent. of our people were illiterate. When the safety of the nation depended on the strength of our whole people we saw the meaning of having one-fourth of those registered so ignorant that they were incapable of rendering efficient service, as they were unable to understand the orders issued them.

A failure to educate the rank and file of the people is peculiarly significant in a democracy; and has perhaps appeared even more glaring since the armistice, than in the days of the draft. In a democracy with the authority vested in the people, it is important that the people should be able to understand the issues at stake so that they may form right opinions on questions of national and international import, elect proper leaders, and be willing to follow them. The cataclysm in Russia has made it plain that a nation steeped in ignorance can maintain a measurably orderly and efficient government under an autocracy; but can know only chaos in attempting a democracy. For us to let so large a proportion of our people remain illiterate, and to furnish a large number with only a limited education would be fatal, not only in war but in peace, rendering our nation unstable and turbulent.

It has shown us the need of a *new education* in a democracy.

In a democracy much emphasis is placed on the development of individuality and initiative in the members of the commonwealth. The method of instruction should not be, therefore, the old pouring in process in which the scholar was supposed to be inactive, and simply have parcelled out to him a set of facts which he was to receive without question. An endeavor must be made to arouse the scholar's mind so that in learning he would not be passive but active—inquiring, testing, improving.

Such a method would fit him for playing his part in a country where each man is supposed to contribute his best.

To go further, the goal of the teacher should not be to deliver to the student a certain group of facts, or even to encourage the student to discover the facts for himself, with the color his own personality would give them; but to prepare him for life with his fellows in his own country and in the world. Inevitably in this day when we think of education we broaden its scope to include more than instruction in academic subjects.

Before the war a tremendous effort was being put forth in some centers and by the real leaders in this field to give education its rightful place in our life. According to Dr. Judd, in his "Introduction to the Scientific Study of Education," in New York City 27.9 per cent. of the public money is being spent for education, and in Chicago, 24.6 per cent. Dr. Athearn, writing in 1917, says that in the last twenty years the high school enrollment has increased six times as fast as the population of the country. Dr. W. C. Bagley, in the same year declares that the enrollment in the public high schools has increased 35 per cent. in the last five years, and that the rate of growth was substantially higher than for the preceding fifteen years.

Now that the mass of our people has been enabled to see by the startling revelations of the draft, it is expected that by 1950, if not before, secondary, or high school education, will be nearly as universal as elementary education is today. The Smith Towner bill, which provides for the establishment of a Department of Education with a Secretary in the Cabinet, and authorizes Congress to appropriate annually \$100,000,000 "to encourage the states to promote the cause of education within their bounds," is an indication of the way in which the cause of education is coming into its own. We are feeling with a new intensesness with McCauley, that "The first business of the state is the education of its citizens." A recent statement by a national leader is true—"The modern world believes in education as it believes in nothing else."

It has shown the *insufficiency and danger* of education.

The very best work that education can do, with its new goal, and fresh methods falls short of the development of a life that is unselfish and kind. In a democracy, or under any other kind of government, for happiness and peace that kind of a life is necessary. "A purely secular education must and will result in the production only of an earthly-minded generation whose ideals consist of the passionate will to 'get on,' and whose conception of getting on is instilled only by the prospect of individual success in those careers in which they have been trained." In those careers they drive on with powers heightened by their training, unmindful of the needs of their fellows. Enabled by their education to crush others under their feet, they have received nothing from the schools to make them unwilling to cause another to suffer. While so-called social and industrial conditions have for years been growing more acute despite our advances in education, and cry to heaven, other facts shock us, "In the last fifty years crime has increased 400 per cent., with a crime rate in New York far above London, Paris, or Berlin. Something must be done to underpin the simplest virtues of our people. Honesty, industry, truthfulness, and the common decencies must be taught or the state will perish." In 1907 President G. Stanley Hall, speaking to an assembly of teachers, said, "The American public school system is the most extensive, the most expensive, the best equipped, but the least effective morally of any public school system in the world." Conscious of this failure, for the last dozen years or more committees of the National Educational Association have been at work on the problem of introducing into the public schools courses in ethics which are not based on religion.

The selfishness manifested by many during the war, and the wholesale slump of our people into selfishness after the war, with the conditions that were observed before the war, make us feel increasingly that education, modernized as it is, fitted for members of a democracy as it is, though it should include instruction in ethics, is not enough for building the life of an individual or of the state.

Germany's case has shown us the vast power of education

over the life of a people, and the danger therefore in an educational system that may give people intelligence without giving them at the same time a worthy goal, and an unselfish attitude toward their fellows.

Knowledge is unquestionably power, and power is a dangerous thing to put into the hands of a man who has no care for others, but seeks only his own. Froude well says, "That where all are selfish, the sage is no better than a fool, only more dangerous." We cannot contemplate the future, if science is to develop increasingly deadly methods of destruction, and there is to be no parallel development of self-control, unselfishness, love in the hearts of men. Saloman Reinach, anticipating the Peace Conference, was forced to say as he looked out upon a brainy and an angry world, "At the future congress, among the seats reserved for the delegates of the great powers, one seat should remain vacant, as reserved to the greatest, the most redoubtable, though youngest of Powers: science in scarlet robes. That is the new fact; that is what diplomacy should not ignore; if that imminent and execrable scandal is to be averted—the whole of civilization falling a victim to science, her dearest daughter, brought forth and nurtured by her, now ready to deal her a death blow. The all-important question is the muzzling of the mad dog. Science, as subservient to the will to destroy, must be put in chains; science must be exclusively adapted to the works of peace." The fear and the hope that he uttered find echo in the words of Sir Oliver Lodge, as he speaks to one of his classes: "He calls their attention to the fact that science has dealt largely with molecular forces, like steam and electricity, but that now science has put its finger tips upon atomic forces, such as radium. There is enough atomic force, he said, in a mass of matter no larger than a man's fist to lift the German fleet from the bottom of the sea and put it on the hill behind Manchester. Then he paused in his enthusiasm. God forbid that science now should cast its harness over the atomic forces! We are not fit to handle them. Put such a prodigious force into our possession in our present state, and with it we would damn the race." Rabbi Hirsch has

declared, and rightly—The eighteenth century closed with a belief in the efficiency of education, and the best minds of the day seemed to have dreams of universal education, and called it the universal panacea for all the social ills. We have largely realized those dreams and have discovered that the education of the head alone has not kept the promises which the philosophers of the eighteenth century believed it would keep. Education has not decreased the criminal classes, but it has made them more dangerous. Our public schools may give an idiot mind, but they do not give him character. They give him the power to do harm without the moral force and will to restrain him from using that power. In educating the head and not the heart and soul, the public schools are failing at a critical point." No, education is not enough, and seems to contain only danger for the race, unless some way may be found to secure the development of character as well as of intellect.

Education itself seems to afford us no hope in this field.

It is true that educational leaders see that character must be produced or they have failed, and that they are trying to work out a course in ethics which they can introduce into the curriculum; but can ethics taught in the most careful way, divorced from religion, be sufficient to transform and maintain the life of our people?

Dr. Shackford in "The Program of the Christian Religion," quotes from Professor Welton to this effect, "Religion is the only sure basis mankind has ever found for the moral life of the community," and continues, "it is the only sure basis that has ever been found for the control of conduct and the undergirding of character. This is so because its appeal is to ultimate realities. No rule of expediency or requirement of custom is sufficient to enlist and command all of the powers of the soul. It is only when a man believes that the moral law is of the very structure of the universe, that it has its source in a personal God, from Whom and Whose laws there can be no escape, that these laws assume the place of rightful and unquestioned supremacy in the life. Here morality becomes religious,

because it becomes a matter of personal relation to God; and here religion gives the needed strength to morality."

There is nothing new in this position. Martineau asserts, "Nothing less than the majesty of God, and the power of the world to come can maintain the peace and sanctity of our homes, the order and serenity of our minds, the spirit of patience and tender mercy in our hearts."

As the Master Teacher said, there are two great commandments—The first is "thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," and the second is like unto it, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Here He inextricably knits together morality and religion, showing that true religion would inevitably issue in a moral life, and that a righteous life must have the sanction of a faith in God, and the support of the power that comes from a vital relation to Him.

As we have said, there is nothing new in this position; the thing that is new is the universal faith in religion as the sole hope of righteous and unselfish manhood and womanhood. Men everywhere feel that regardless of what religion may mean for the future life, it is the only thing that will enable men to live together peaceably and helpfully in time on this earth.

Men of every type unite in telling the world this. It has been interesting to clip and save their striking statements. What a list there is—Henry Watterson, the seasoned old editor; Admiral Sir David Beatty, Haig, Foch, and Pershing, men tried in the fires of war; Wilson and Lloyd George, statesmen who bore the burden during the dark days; Babson and Edmunds, business men in touch with the currents of national life; Nicholas Murray Butler, W. O. Thompson, and Henry Churchill King, university and college presidents of broad vision—and we might go on. It is a chorus of strange associates, and yet the voice is one in declaring that religion is the consummate need and only hope of America.

As the public schools cannot teach religion, the eyes of all are turned to the Church for help. Does not this universal demand for more religion, the moral laxness before the war, the war

itself, the moral breakdown after the war, imply at least that real religion, clearly apprehended, has not had a fair trial. If it had, with the result we see, would men affirm that it is the remedy for the ills of mankind?

Has not the war, therefore, and the examination of national life it entailed, revealed not only illiteracy from the standpoint of secular education; but an even greater illiteracy from the standpoint of religious education!

Just after coming out of Y. M. C. A. war work, I was asked to write an article for the *Union Seminary Review*, on any lessons I had learned from my experience with the soldiers. Under the caption of "Religion for Men," I expressed my sense of the need of instructing our young men in the simplest fundamentals of our religion. I was appalled at their ignorance of the most necessary subjects of our faith. It was evident that they needed not so much exhortation as teaching; so that they might realize what becoming a Christian meant, how the new relationship was realized, and how growth in the new life was achieved. I could cite case after case of men who had had some relationship with the church and Sunday school, men who were members of the church, who came to me with questions which revealed their need of knowledge on these fundamental points.

The conclusions I reached, have been confirmed by the most careful kind of a report on the part of "The Committee on the War and Religious Outlook." This committee was created by the Federal Council and the General War Time Commission, and was composed of some of our ablest religious leaders, many of whom were with the men in both America and France, and all of whom had access to reports of chaplains, and religious workers in the camps, and an opportunity to interview these men personally.

One cannot read this report, issued in book form under the title, "Religion Among American Men," without having driven into his soul the failure of the Church to instruct her young men in the real meaning of her faith. In the foreword, written by Bishop Brent and Paul Moody, Headquarters Chaplains,

we find this: "There is one generalization, in particular, which the evidence in hand makes necessary to record—the widespread ignorance on elementary religious matters even of those who professed to be Church members. Perhaps the one exception was among the Roman Catholics. Such a condition as revealed constitutes a grave indictment against the churches. They have not been true to their teaching commission. It certainly calls for a careful revision of the pulpit message. Christian instruction is our first duty, and on its success depends the effectiveness of exhortation."

All the way through you find expressions like these—"If there is any one point upon which the chaplains agree it is the widespread ignorance as to the meaning of Christianity and Church membership . . . We might well hope that in a 'Christian' country men generally, even those without any allegiance to Christ or His Church, would know what Christianity is. Chaplains say that they do not know. And they go beyond that and say that men nominally within the Church, men who have been to Christian schools, are in much the same condition. They do not have the Christian idea of God; they have no clear knowledge of Christ; the Kingdom of God is often a meaningless term to them; the meaning of Christian prayer, the use of the Sacraments, the obligations of Church membership are very vague to them. The Church as a teacher has failed to instruct its own membership and present its Gospel to the men just outside its door." A few quotations from chaplains will justify the foregoing statement (the statements are from different men): "The average young American knows very little about God, Christ, prayer, faith" . . . "I find that most men know little or nothing of Christian dogma." . . . "The first thing I noticed among the men in the camps was a prevalent lack of any definite religious teaching. This was true of men of all denominations; comparatively few of them had any reason for the faith that was in them." . . . "A small proportion of Church members had clear ideas as to what Christianity is or what Church membership involves. You cannot overstress the widespread results of the lack of

definite Christian education." . . . "What happened in Private B's case and in that of many others is simply this: When he turned his thoughts inwards and started to draw on his religious knowledge he discovered he had practically none." . . . "I honestly believe that three-fourths of the men who went into the camps had only a hazy and a very unvital idea of Christianity, despite our Sunday schools, etc.; and that these defects of teaching must be remedied at once." . . . "The paucity of his knowledge about the Bible and the Church has appalled me and made me realize how superficial has been the impact of the Church upon him." . . . "To my mind the important thing is the revelation of the general ignorance about the Church and religion and so of the almost total failure of the teaching work of the Church."

In the summary we find this statement: "Probably the most outstanding fact that emerges from our investigation is the widespread ignorance as to the meaning of Christianity and misunderstanding of the fundamentals of Christian faith and life—and that, not only among men outside the Church but also among those nominally in its membership. It is evident that the Church has seriously failed as a teacher of religion."

In the final chapter, on what the Church may learn, there is this similar statement: "The testimony that we have received goes to show that if a vote were taken among chaplains and other religious workers as to the most serious failure of the Church, as evidenced in the army, a large majority would agree that it was the Church's failure as a teacher. We have not succeeded in teaching Christianity to our own members, let alone distributing a clear knowledge of it through the community at large. If we learn our lesson the result will be a vastly greater emphasis on our teaching function."

This failure to show men what Christianity really is emerges in any thoughtful book on the war. Donald Hankey tells us in the chapter on "The Religion of the Inarticulate," in his classic "Student in Arms," of the tragedy of the ignorance of the true meaning of Christianity: "Here were men who believed absolutely in the Christian virtues of unselfishness, generosity,

charity and humility without ever connecting them in their minds with Christ; and at the same time, what they did associate with Christianity was just on a par with the formalism and smug self-righteousness which Christ spent His whole life trying to destroy."

Chaplain Tiplady, in "The Cross at the Front," speaks in the same strain, "It was at an officer's mess some time ago, and they were discussing a new arrival. 'He is very quiet, he doesn't drink, he doesn't smoke, he doesn't play bridge, and doesn't swear,' one of them said. 'He must be religious,' concluded another. That is it. The words were not spoken in malice. It is the conception of a Christian that we have given them. If the new officer had been described as cheerful, generous, hospitable, brave, they would not have concluded that he was religious."

A committee in Great Britain, similar to the one just described in America, has made its report. It is edited by Dr. D. S. Cairns, Bishop of Winchester, and is judicious and careful in its presentation of the facts. It reveals the same situation among British young men that we see among our own. After looking over the reports that have come to him, Dr. Cairns says, "What at first does come home to the reader with a shock is the persistent evidence as to the ignorance of Christian truth."

I am not quoting from and about the soldier because he is an authority on religion, as some during the war were disposed to believe, but because he is a revelation of what the Church has taught about religion, and of how well that teaching has been done. "His beliefs and character, his morals and religious habits pass judgment on the moral and religious training of past years." There is really no need for us to investigate the soldier for proof of our thesis—though when so many young men gathered together afford such a fine opportunity for study, and the preparation of an inescapable report, we cannot refrain from it.

In our colleges we discover the same ignorance of the truths of Christianity. Now and then a professor tests a class to see

what is its acquaintance with the greatest English masterpiece, only to find his men woefully ignorant of the plainest facts of Bible history. In my own association with a number of college men I have found them ignorant of things far more vital to the Christian life than whether or no Isaiah be an Apostle, a King of Israel or a prophet.

We do not have to go to our colleges to realize that the Church has failed as a teacher. Any pastor can find it out for himself by questioning his people. Dr. Strickler warned our class to be careful lest we talked over the heads of our congregations in speaking of spiritual truths, as they would ordinarily be ignorant of the simplest terms we should use. I found it even so, When a deacon, after a talk on the Holy Spirit, asserts that he didn't know that He is a Person, and an elder is rejoiced as with a revelation from heaven to find that the Holy Spirit actually dwells in the believer—you wonder what is the condition in the dry tree if it is thus with the green. One of the most difficult things I had to do as a pastor and preacher was to bring my people to see that they were really saved by faith. Works and faith were marvelously combined in their thinking, and in their life. If this elementary truth of our creed, this doctrine of a standing or falling Church, was not understood, what could you expect of them. After preaching on the truths that face us as we approach the Christian life, such as faith and repentance, I have had men and women, who, I felt, were rather well along in Christian experience, come to me and say that for the first time they had understood these doctrines.

Is not the fact that many of our people are swept away by every wind of doctrine, new ism, or vagary in interpreting the old Gospel, evidence that they have not proved all things, and do not really know therefore what is good?

The ignorance that we find is due to a failure on the part of the Church to recognize the necessity of teaching, or to a failure to use those methods in teaching which will make the truth really available to those for whose instruction the Church is responsible.

The burden is on the Church to meet the need that secular

education confesses it cannot supply, and with which its own failures faces it.

This need is to be met through a teaching ministry. A pulpit ministration that does not forget that Christ said, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations," and is willing to subscribe to Luther's words, "I would that nobody should be chosen as a minister, if he were not before this a schoolmaster." It is in line with this desperate lack that Dr. McGiffert, in his address as President of the R. E. A., said, "In my opinion the Church of today is most in need not of administrators, and not of pastors, and not of preachers, but of teachers." Of men who will stand in the pulpit and instruct the people in the real meaning of their religion.

Yet with a man in the pulpit steadily illumining the minds of his congregation, much more will be needed. The minister would be the first to confess the difficulty, the impossibility, of really teaching the great doctrines of the Church under the limitations of his office. He must speak to too many, of too wide a range in ages; and in the nature of the case cannot question the people, and provoke discussion, that he may learn whether they have understood him, and that they may think out the truths for themselves. Because of the bounds set by the pulpit even to the best men, we turn for help to that great agency of the Church which is known as the Sunday school. Might it not be better, despite the historic significance of the name, if we called it the Church school? Would not that prohibit all jealousy, and rivalry between the Church and the school, make it clear to the child that in going to Sunday school he was enjoying the ministry of the Church, and enable us to continue our work during the week without doing violence to our name, or seeking a new one for one part of our effort! Out of a sincere desire to magnify the Church to the growing mind hearing names and forming associations for the first time, I should much prefer to call this teaching part of the Church's work the Church school. As some one has said, here we have **a unique educational institution, "for it has within its power to combine the best available methods with the most important**

subject matter." From the beginning we have had the best book the world knew; but we have been rather slow to develop the best methods. It seems, however, that the day of the Church school has come. The last twenty years have witnessed a remarkable development in the work of the school. I think Miss Maus is right when she says, "The problem of religious education in all its phases has been given wider consideration during the last quarter of a century than in all the rest of the reformation period combined. There is hardly a type of work in the realm of Christian education upon which one or more books have not been written." In connection with that last sentence I might quote Dr. Miller to the effect that more "safe and sane books on moral and religious education have been published in the last fifteen years than altogether before." We might put a question mark after the words safe and sane; but any one trying to master the field today knows how vast it is and how fast it is growing.

That there was room for study and improvement in the Church school is plain; for the failure of the Church has been the failure of the Church school, and we know that "from our schools more pupils have gone unchristianized, severing all Church connections, than have remained in the Church as witnesses for Christ."

A number of factors have contributed to the development of the Church school in the last two decades. We shall be able only to glance at them. The International Sunday School Association, with its active secretaries, its conventions, its conferences, its constant contact with the work in the field, has played no small part in preparing for the new era in Sunday-school work.

Quite a number of our seminaries and universities have established chairs of religious education, and their occupants toiling early and late in their studies and experimental schools have exercised a large influence upon the Sunday-school world, that influence being heightened through the Religious Education Association, organized in 1903, which, through its annual

convention and its magazine, has furnished them an opportunity for helpful discussion and exchange of views.

The denominations have all employed leaders of Sunday school work, most of whom have had some practical experience, and keep in touch with the schools. Through their study, and observation, and fellowship in the Sunday School Council, which was organized in 1910, they have done much to make the Church school efficient.

Capable teachers and superintendents in the local schools, where the real problems are met and solutions discovered, through demonstration and article have blazed the trail and called others to follow them.

The development in secular education has had a large and wholesome influence upon our Church schools. Many have labored there and we have entered into their labors.

Perhaps the controlling influence in the work of all those laboring for the advancement of the Church school has been the study of the child. Suddenly educators waked up to the fact that the school and all its equipment existed for the child, and not the child for the school; and their motto became, "The need of the child is the law of the school."

The school was no longer curriculum centered, nor organization centered, but child centered. This doesn't mean "that the untrained child should be set up as a new fetish to be bowed down to on the ground that the children should not be guided nor disciplined, but should be permitted to give full and free expression to their own individuality." For as Dr. Butler says, "Such a theory would sentence the world to remain forever in the immaturity of childhood, and no generation would be helped to stand on the shoulders of its predecessors. Under such a scheme of things life would be merely an everlasting beginning, devoid of accomplishment and without other aim than the multiplication of nervous reactions to various accidental and rapidly succeeding stimuli." Taking his definition of education as adjustment to the spiritual possessions of the race, we must feel the necessity, not of worshipping the child, and casting away all that we have gained in the past; but of

studying the child so that we may really impart to him the best we have.

“A cynical French physician once accused his fellows of putting drugs of which they knew little into bodies of which they knew less to cure diseases of which they knew nothing at all.” We have come to the day in which we must know something of the children who are our spiritual patients, and not take account simply of our remedy.

As we studied the child we saw that there is a periodic development of his life. In other words, that the child grew by stages, which had certain more or less well defined characteristics, which made the life different in a particular period from what it was in the former period, and what it will be in the next. When this conclusion became clear, it resulted in certain changes in the school.

The first of these was the grading of the school. If children are different at successive stages, then we ought to separate them according to their ages, or development, for instruction; and we had the old infant class comprising all those from 4 to 12 broken up first into Beginners and Primaries, and later into the Beginner, Primary, and Junior Departments.

The boys and girls of the teen age were treated the same way, and out of rather heterogeneous classes there emerged, according to the three stages of adolescence the Intermediate, Senior and Young People's Departments, with the Adults set off to themselves.

The grading of the pupils was necessarily followed by the grading of the curriculum to meet the needs of each period. There came first a modification of the uniform lesson; then the graded lessons, with not simply a different treatment for each group, but a different passage of Scripture. So that we should, in accordance with the Biblical injunction, give milk to babes, and strong meat to men. Some one has said, “Generally speaking, you cannot make a philosopher out of a sophomore, he hasn't lived long enough”; likewise, generally speaking, you can't make a theologian out of a beginner child; but you can so tell him the stories of God's love and care that his heart

will be warm towards the Heavenly Father; and you can build on that knowledge as the years pass until in the early teens he is ready, as you present Christ in the beauty of His life and the power of His Saviourhood, to see in Him the chiefest among ten thousand and the One altogether lovely, and to commit his life to Him Who loved him and gave Himself for him.

As the years lengthen out after this high decision and the problems of youth are faced, and the responsibilities of manhood, through a curriculum chosen with him in view his needs are met, his life developed. For each period of the growing life you have a purpose, born of the study of the need of the child; and a curriculum prepared to carry out that purpose.

There are some who feel that the new lessons are doing despite to the Scriptures; but is it not more honoring to the Bible in the mind of the child at least, of the man as well, to present that truth which he can understand, and can apply to the needs of his own life. It seems to me that the teacher in the Sunday school should say with Paul, "I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue."

The knowledge of the law of periodicity has determined also the Sunday school building; so that the old Akron Plan has been abandoned, and the day of the departmental type has arrived. This new building makes provision for the worship and the instruction of the different groups into which we have divided our school.

As the child was studied further another fact came to light, that the child is a unit. That the mind is one, and that the whole life, body and spirit is one. There must be, therefore, the development of the whole spirit-thought, emotion, will, if we are to deal with the child in a satisfactory manner. Religion is the response of the child as a unit to God, and not of one element of his nature. As Dr. Horne well says, "Man's religion is his thought of God, his feeling toward God, and his conduct in relationship to God." There must be in our teaching of the child, real instruction to assure him right thinking about God, true worship to develop his emotional at-

titude toward God, and frequent opportunities to serve that his will may be trained, and the whole spirit brought into glad response and subjection to the Most High.

As we cannot separate these functions of the mind, we cannot dis sever the spirit from the body in which it dwells, nor a child's interest in persons from his interest in God. That great verse describing Jesus life—"The child grew in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and man," becomes our ideal for the child; and the Sunday school tries to see that the child has an adequate opportunity for full physical health, and for fine social fellowships, as well as for instruction in the word, and the inspiration of worship.

The study of the child shows in addition the central place of action in his life. He is built for activity, and he learns by doing. We seek to give the child a chance for expression in the school therefore, and our whole method of teaching is changed. We give the child a chance to speak, to question, to retell the story, and to dramatize the incident. "The former teacher was judged according to her fluency; the new Sunday-school teacher is judged according to her ability to get her pupils to talk." We provide handwork so that the truth done by the muscles may be understood and remembered, and we lead the child into manifold service to the school, to the community and to the world. "The teacher who makes no special effort to secure adequate expression of knowledge and thought falls as far short of his duty as the trainer of an athletic team who would see that his men had proper food in quality and quantity, and that they observe the hygiene of digestion, but who would require of them no definite, carefully directed exercise." "Hands, feet, heart, mind—very often all of these must be exercised before a lesson really becomes a part of the pupil's life."

Because of this desire for and the necessity of action, our worship is so modified that instead of the teacher or superintendent taking entire charge of the period, the child is given a part, and in the older departments large emphasis is put on the worship being conducted by the young people themselves.

Perhaps the desire to do, as much as any other characteristic, results in the organized class, and the organized department, in which the boy and the girl take the lead—governing themselves, and providing ways for their lives to function in service.

The new education which makes for the independence and the development of the individual, and which goes on the theory that religion is not simply knowledge of and assent to a group of facts; but a life resulting from belief in these facts, and a new relationship to Christ—the new education, as a consequence of the study of the child, and a clearer understanding of the Bible—the new education has come into our Sunday schools, and it is well!

Of course we find many things in the new religious education to which we cannot subscribe. Many of the leaders in this field are radical in their interpretation of the child's life, and numbers of the books written now are tinged with their theories. Many of them feel that the child is good, without bias to evil, that he will naturally respond to God, and that his life will unfold in a normal and beautiful way, like a flower in the spring sunshine, if we supply the proper environment. With them the instincts with which a child is born are sufficient, and methods are enough. They have little place for the Bible, and none whatever for the work of the Spirit. Sin looms small in their theology, and the atonement as we regard it is unheard of.

The Sunday school of today and tomorrow in our Church should be a *school*, recognizing and using the best that educators can give, yet depending upon the presence of Christ, the power of the Spirit, the blessing of the Father. It should make large use of the Bible, and be evangelistic in the truest sense, that it brings the life at its most responsive period, at its crisis time, face to face with the Saviour; and after decision, trains that life in righteousness, and for service.

In conjunction with the school as we interest ourselves in the whole life of the child we shall make use of the organizations that have proved their worth, such as the Boy Scouts, the

Girls Scouts, the Christian Endeavor Society. Our effort will be so to harmonize their work that the child will not be torn by many loyalties, nor confused by diverse duties. As the Sunday-school programme is improved the time may come, when the whole need of the child from the standpoint of the Church—social, recreational, devotional, and mental can be adequately met by the Church school; and we shall have one organization functioning so generously as to render the others unnecessary.

It is not expected that the Sunday school should usurp the place of the home as the religious teacher of the child. The home is the primary unit of society, older than the school, the Church, the state, the first and most important influence in the child's life. The home environs the child in those years when he is helpless that he may be educated. While he is most curious, most imitative, most credulous, most affectionate, most suggestible, he is in the home. During these years the mother's knee, the mother's face, the mother's love, the very atmosphere of the family are the alphabet of his religious training; and no other influence can compare with it in power. The obligation to educate the child in religion was laid upon the home long ago by God—"These words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down and when thou risest up."

That the home has not been carrying out this commandment is clear. A thousand forces are at work in our hurrying modern life to turn the home from its chief purpose. Dr. Cope, in his *Religious Education in the Home*, shows how the present industrial system, the public school system, the huddling of our people in cities have served to undermine the unity, the authority, the sanctity, the happiness of the home. Almost any daily paper through mention of concrete cases confronts us with the appalling divorce situation in America. With a divorce rate higher than any other nation, not even Japan excepted, we wonder what the end will be. When all is said, however, about the breakdown of the modern home, we know

that its influence is still greater than that of any other institution, and that the hope of the Church and the nation rests there.

The Committee on War and Religious Outlook made this statement, which we recognize as true, "The religious instruction and training given in the home outlives all other religious education. In directing or controlling that influence lies our greatest opportunity." Facing that last sentence this word from Dr. St. John is significant, "Nearly fifty years ago Herbert Spencer pointed out the weakness of our educational system in that it provided no training for parenthood—the most important function that a man has to fulfill. No one has ventured to cast a doubt upon his estimate of the value of his training, yet today the conditions are as when he wrote. So far as the writer knows no educational system makes the slightest systematic provision for training for any phase of the duties of parenthood."

A part of the duty of the Church and Sunday school, therefore, is clear. It must enable the home to fulfill its responsibility for the religious education of its children. Through the Home Department and Cradle Roll of the Sunday school we must inform the home of its duty and of the way in which it is to measure up to it, and we must inspire it to take up a burden which is so light when once the shoulder is really put to the load. The Sunday school, therefore, does not take the place of the home, it rather seeks to enable the home to take its own rightful place in the work of developing its children in religion.

As the complex and important duty of the Sunday school is seen we are overwhelmed with the little time we are afforded for our work. "Fifty-two sessions a year, of an hour's or an hour and a half's duration at best, fifty-two or seventy-eight hours a year, only one-third of which is given to Bible study, furnish a meager opportunity to accomplish our aim. Compared with 1,200 hours a year in the public school, or the 2,800 hours a year a boy may work, it seems pitifully small, for the aim of the Sunday school is bigger than the other two." The time we give to the school seems small likewise when we see

what the Jews and Catholics are doing. Besides many private schools the Jews have more than 400 organized week day religious schools, employing 3,000 teachers at an annual cost of \$2,000,000. They are convinced that adequate instruction cannot be given on Sunday alone, even with a longer session than ours.

In the report on Catholic Educational Conditions in the United States, read at the Educational Conference of the International Eucharist Congress, held in Vienna, we find these closing words, "The full problem before us in the United States to-day embraces the following items": the first of which is this, "To increase the number of our parish schools until we have provided for all of our Catholic children."

I am not quoting the Jew and the Catholic to advocate Protestant parish schools. I think that while we are to be kept from the world we are to be in the world, and our children need the democratic influence of the public schools, and the children you find in them need the leavening touch of those who come from our Christian homes. I have made this comparison to show that we must have more time for religious instruction.

In view of the acknowledgment of public school educators that their work is not sufficient; there is a possibility of working with them so that the Church can teach the Bible during the week in harmony with their schedule. Much progress has been made toward relating the work of secular and religious education so that religion may have a real chance with young life. Some states already allow high school credit for Bible study, supervising the study, or giving the examinations. In quite a number of communities the schools dismiss the pupils for an hour a week to the churches, where they are instructed in religion as the Church sees fit. This whole question of week day religious education is new, broad, and exceedingly important, and the Church must take advantage of the opportunity it presents.

While we have emphasized the training of the child, and rightly, as the impressions made in the early years are most

influential and permanent, we expect our Sunday school to bring together mature men and women for study and discussion, and training for service; so that they may have a growing understanding of and love for Christ, and take their place in the school as teachers, and in the Church as leaders.

With the work of Dr. Starbuck and Dr. Coe a little over twenty years ago in the Psychology of Religion, a new field opened before the student of religious education. Let Dr. Starbuck state the sphere of this study in a way that will serve as its defense. "There are in this country several thousand ministers who professedly devote their lives to the spiritual culture of those in their charge; there are several million parents whose highest desire is to meet wisely the moral and religious needs of their children at every step in their growth. There can be no doubt that the larger share of wisdom in such matters will come from doing as our fathers have done, combined with a fine intuition, which feels its way into the life that is hungering for wisdom; but it is each person's business to seek to add a little to the wisdom of the past. This can be done only through a more adequate comprehension of life by reading into it until its processes become transparent. I do not trust a physician to prescribe food or exercise to my child or to heal it, unless I fully trust his knowledge of its anatomy and physiology. During all those years when he is dissecting human bodies or studying circulation or nerve anatomy in the laboratory, he is storing up information and gaining such insight as will safely bridge over some crisis in the life of his patient. The time is almost past when we entrust our children in school to a teacher who does not know something of psychology. It is a mere platitude to say that the skilled mechanic must know the laws of the stress of steel or the pressure of steam, that the electrician must understand the materials he is dealing with, that the teacher must share the knowledge of the psychologist as to the laws of the conscious life. It will become likewise a commonplace to say that a religious teacher cannot stand between a hungry soul and its future self, or between men and God, who does not know something of the laws of spiritual

growth, who does not know at every step something of where the life is, whither it is tending, and the means by which it is to attain its end."

It seems to me that a statement of that kind is enough. There is of course a tendency on the part of those who enter upon the study of this subject to come to a naturalistic interpretation of religion. But to my mind God is not displaced any more in His relation to my conscious life by the thought that He works according to the laws of my personality, than He is removed from the natural world, because I find that there He moves in harmony with the laws He has made. For me to understand that there is law in the spiritual world, enables me to understand my own life better, to grow more symmetrically as I fulfill those laws, and to deal more intelligently with those who seek to know my Christ. As a matter of fact, the Church from the beginning has made use of Dr. Starbuck's work, taking, for instance, his chart showing the periods when conversion is most frequent, and making her appeal for Christ most emphatic and insistent during the hours of opportunity; taking his chart showing the rise of doubt, and fortifying her young against their hour of trial.

To my own mind practical good can come to the minister from a study of the Psychology of Religion. But if no positive help comes from its study it seems to me as this subject is developing so rapidly, and is so full of danger to the untried, as psychology is studied so generally, and is of so much interest to the rank and file of our people; as one at least of the most pernicious substitutes for Christianity is based on a false psychology, the minister should make the acquaintance of this subject at the seminary.

As we see the place being given education in America, as we see the failure and danger of a Christless education, and become aware that the public school cannot give our youth religious instruction, as we observe the failure of the Church to measure up to her responsibility, and a new day of opportunity dawning for her, as we look upon the extensive developments in the field of religious education, and see seminaries in the

North establishing chairs of religious education in the nineties, seminaries in the South creating such chairs in the early days of the twentieth century, and even universities and colleges having full time professors for this work, we do not feel that our own seminary is unwise in establishing this new chair.

We know that the work we have outlined depends on the minister, that the fate of the Church is in his hands, and that he is largely what the seminary determines that he be. This chair is therefore dedicated by its first occupant to the task—

Of showing the "Minister in the Making" the importance of reaching the child through the home and the Sunday school; of instructing him in such methods as can best secure this end in the home and the school; of preparing him for correlating in the most efficient way the work of the Sunday school and the day school; of leading him to understand the human soul so that he can better appreciate the working of the Holy Spirit in his own heart, develop his own spiritual life, and reach our thinking men and women with the Blessed Evangel.

That well-nigh inimitable writer, Miss Margaret Slattery, closes her book, "The Girl and Her Teens," with this story—"Finding it impossible one day to make my way through the crowds on the street waiting for a procession to pass, I stopped, and standing back a little from the curb, watched the eager faces gazing up the street. Right in front of me stood a group of men in their working clothes, in their midst a tall, broad-shouldered expressman, explaining the reason for the parade. In a moment the sound of brass instruments burst upon us, a line of policemen swung into sight, the crowd of small boys following close beside the uniformed men, their eyes on the flying banners, and keeping step as only boys can.

"Suddenly above the noises of the street, above the commands of the officers and the music of the band, I heard a little thin, shrill voice from the crowded corner where the men stood, cry out, 'Lift me up so I can see.' It was a street child, a little girl, whose dress and face showed that neither time nor money, nor thought had been expended upon her. She looked so tiny as she stood there trying to peer through the crowd at the

procession in the street. But she was not afraid. Again it came, 'Lift me up, so I can see.' Eager, insistent, filled with desire, the voice attracted the attention of the men. There was a moment's hesitation, and then with that look one loves to see upon the face of a strong man, the expressman stooped and picked her up. As he held her there, high above the heads of the others, one little arm went round his neck, and she held on tight, while the other hand pointed at horses, banners and men, and she called out again and again in her joy and delight, 'Now I can see, I can see everything.'

There is in the heart of the child a great longing, an inarticulate cry, "Lift me up so I can see"; see the meaning of life, the way of salvation; may the men who take the courses that this department offers, be enabled so to lift up the minds and hearts of little children, to reveal the Saviour to them, that many will cry with joy unspeakable, "I can see. Oh, I can see even the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, very God and only Saviour."