

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE VIII.

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.

NO. IV. — THE MULTIPLICATION OF THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

WHILE there are several conceivable reasons for increasing the number of our theological institutions, it seems to be clear that they have been multiplied — among Congregationalists, at least — principally from one motive: to increase the number of ministers. Fifty years ago we had three: Andover opened 1808, Bangor, 1817, Yale, 1822; twenty-five years ago two more: East Windsor opened 1834, Oberlin, 1835; ten years ago two more: Chicago opened 1858, Pacific, 1869. Little influence towards this increase from one to seven will be ascribed by any one to serious departures from the faith, rendering it unsafe for the churches to hear the preaching of graduates of existing seminaries; and none at all to the necessity of new ones for securing a higher training than existing ones supplied. Nor has the new idea of a purely scientific, "non-sectarian," "non-partisan" theology, a theology utterly independent of any evangelical relations and denominational preferences, "treated in no other fashion than as a branch of human knowledge," lifted out of "the narrowness and lack of culture (deemed) almost inseparable from the seminary system, however worked,"¹ been among possible motives. Seminaries were founded, at first, in place of the old training by private pastors, somewhat for sake of breadth and fulness of culture. If not for this, then for no end whatever, save the increase of ministers. These statements are to be modified only so far as to admit that limited variations of doctrinal teaching and of grades of instruction have appeared, and have had a subordinate influence, while this increase of the number has been going on. But these things have never been placed above the great and sore need of supplying our churches and our home and foreign missions with a sufficient number of preachers of the gospel. And they are now more subordinate than ever. For nearly three quarters of a century we have been multiplying schools of the prophets in order to multiply the prophets themselves.

It is pertinent, then, to inquire whether the past and present furnish any light as to the wisdom of this policy for the future. When we know

¹ Dr. Littledale on "The Professional Studies of the (English) Clergy" in the *Contemporary Review*, April 1879. Discussion in the *Nation* newspaper, New York, July 1879.

whether our chief end has been secured, we may properly go on to ask whether other desirable ones can also be by the multiplication of theological seminaries. The natural growth of churches and church-membership through the period referred to would inevitably bring more men into the ministry, unless this growth were simply the sign of spiritual decline. Have there been so many more drawn into the sacred calling as to make the wisdom of multiplying seminaries clear and unquestionable?

From 1696 to 1760, when we had no seminaries, our churches rose in number from one hundred and eighteen to four hundred and eighty-three, an increase of over three hundred per cent in sixty-four years. That was in New England alone, of course. What their whole number was in 1808, when we began to plant seminaries, we have no means of knowing; but in 1847, when five had been opened, it was one thousand five hundred and ninety-five, and the per centage of increase in eighty-seven years (from 1760) about two hundred and twenty-five per cent. The figures in respect to increase of church-members would show in like manner that no conclusion can be drawn from them as to a causative relation between the mere number of seminaries and the relative growth of Congregational evangelization. As to the total number of ministers brought in by multiplying such institutions we are without figures for comparison, but it has not so overtaken the number of churches, relatively, or so kept pace with the increase of our population as to argue in favor of multiplying them. Turning to the summaries of attendance upon the seminaries themselves for twenty years past,¹ we find that as long ago as 1860 we had a total of two hundred and ninety-eight students in theology, which is within four of the average of the last ten years and sixteen more than the average of the twenty. If we had the statistics for the forty-five years during which most of the multiplication of seminaries has occurred, it is believed that the showing would be similar. Such increase of students as would be found is, at least, no more than that of population, churches, and church-members would naturally account for. There is no relative surplus to be ascribed to the multiplying of seminaries in itself. If we seek, then, to make great the number of them that publish the word of life we must look beyond that, or in another direction.²

A fallacy which has often promoted the planting of too many colleges is without even any apparent force in respect to theological seminaries.

¹ Congregational Quarterly for April 1878, and Congregational Year Book for January 1879. The tables unfortunately do not go farther back than 1858-59.

² Mr. Gladstone, in his recent paper on "The Evangelical Movement" in the Established church of England (British Quarterly Review for July 1879), refers to a very marked and woful change since the Tractarian movement at Oxford in the disposition of young men to enter the clerical office. The English Episcopal clergy look to the universities for their professional training. But more universities would not have checked this disposition to avoid the ministry.

A college in his own town, or the vicinity, it is thought, incites many a young man to acquire a college education, who without this would not try. Those who give this as an argument for planting a college always object to its being employed in the next town or county in favor of planting another, and it fails to hold good so largely as to show that entirely different and broader considerations should decide the founding of colleges. The higher institution has no influence whatever upon multitudes of young persons, when an academy or a public high-school might have much. It is too far above their present point of intelligence and culture. It does not join on to the education they have. Many, even, whom the academy has stimulated fail to feel any attraction of the college, and give out before they reach the Freshman year.¹ Christian young men in college, in like manner, fail to feel any attraction of the seminary. The case would not be bettered at all if a theological department were opened in every college. The higher and more advanced the training the less quickening power it has, even over those who desire a better education that they may serve Christ better. It will never be otherwise till the standard of Christian consecration and the standard of general education are both raised far, very far, above what they are now. Were our seminaries greatly improved they would have much less of this local influence in multiplying students instead of more. A layman's training-school in every county would set a much greater number of young Christians upon a better preparation for usefulness than a theological seminary in every county would, even as theological seminaries are now.

The argument from necessity has also much less force in this case than in that of colleges, little as it often has in that case. Over-crowded halls, inadequacy because of the throngs of students, could never be urged in either as a reason for arising to build. And the number of those who study theology is always so small out of the whole number of those going through our colleges that the collegiate institutions should be far more multitudinous in proportion to the seminaries, or the latter far fewer in proportion to the former than they ever have been. All the New England seminaries suffer from having too small a college constituency to draw from. Oberlin, again, suffers from being confined almost entirely to its own college department for supplies. Chicago does not a tithe of the work it might do for the nation and the world if the colleges west of the Lakes were stronger. The Pacific seminary is shut up to a single college on that coast.² It is often impossible to really sustain colleges which we have founded at great cost (of toil and self-denial, at least), because the

¹ The new states have heretofore shown the most deplorable facts; the old ones abound in them now.

² Pacific University had one graduate at Oberlin Seminary in 1878, while at Oakland but one student had even a partial college education, and its one college graduate in 1879 came from Oberlin College.

academies that would feed them are not in existence, and the public high-schools that are in existence cannot feed them with well-prepared students; quite as often it is impossible to furnish some, at least, of our theological institutions the work they should do, because we lack college graduates to send to them. A generation since Dr. Bushnell said, in a note to a famous home-missionary sermon, "we have colleges enough for the next twenty years," and the lack of preparatory schools, even yet, shows he was far below the mark. And this very lack goes far to make it true to-day that we have more than theological seminaries enough for the next twenty.

It is clear, too, that the argument in behalf of small colleges does not apply here. Differences in methods of teaching prevent it. Small theological seminaries have no relative advantages. Much that has to be done by personal contact and moulding of mind and character for the college student, and which is better done in the smaller colleges than in the larger ones, has been already done for him before he reaches the seminary. By lectures on theology, and subjects kindred thereto, much larger classes can be taught than can profitably go through the college curriculum together. The seminary method has an advantage here — in respect, at least, to those who do not need special courses — over private instruction on the old plan.¹ None of our seminaries have ever yet approached the limit as to size of classes. There is neither overflow nor demand for division of labor on account of it that may be deemed to call for new schools of theology. There never has been; and when there shall be, the more excellent way will be the multiplication of teachers in existing seminaries. The largest single theological class at present numbers no more than twenty-four. The largest aggregates — adding the same classes in all the seminaries together — have been a hundred, 1860 (in six seminaries), and a hundred and one, 1877, and a hundred and two, 1874 (in seven seminaries), a hundred and three, 1862 (in six), 1873 and 1875 (in seven), a hundred and five, 1873, a hundred and nine, 1877, and a hundred and sixteen, 1872 (in seven). These are the only aggregates as large as or larger than a hundred. Do we risk anything in asserting that single institutions could have received, cared for, and taught each of these aggregates, and even larger ones, without inconvenience or loss of profit? With all the difference between hearing theological lectures in Germany as an introduction to the life and work of a state clergy, and the training for an American pastorate, our own theological professors are not so far behind those of that land as to the numbers they can successfully instruct at one time as the figures might seem to suggest.²

¹ Cf. July No. pp. 561-62. It is never necessary to divide theological classes as college classes are divided at Harvard, Yale, etc., and commit them to different subordinate preceptors. It never will be.

² Divide the three or four hundred students in theology in a German university by the number of full professors, assistants, professors extraordinary, and

Geographical considerations have some force in so vast a country as ours, but this also is limited. If we had about a thousand Congregational churches when our first seminary was opened in 1808, and it was at all adequate to supply a competent ministry for them, no man will pretend that it was equally adequate in 1878, when the total of our churches has risen to three thousand six hundred and twenty. But seven seminaries bear a much greater arithmetical proportion to the latter number than one seminary did to the former. If it is suggested that the more recent growth of Congregationalism has been over so large an area that a disproportionate increase of seminaries, regardless of "the rule of three," was to be expected, it is worth noticing that the increase has not been proportionately in the larger area at all. New England, with less than a twelfth of our whole population — one fifth, perhaps, of that in which Congregationalism is respectable in stature, — and with considerably less than half of all our churches (fourteen hundred and seventy-two, leaving two thousand one hundred and forty-eight for the rest of the land), has four of the seminaries (has had five in all) and has nearly half of all the theological students, viz. a hundred and fifty-one out of three hundred and seventeen. Not till our two youngest seminaries were founded for newer states were the real geographical considerations taken into account. Chicago Seminary looks to eight empire commonwealths for its men. The institution at Oakland to the great Pacific coast. This recent parcelling out of domains so immense to single institutions as their special constituencies is an open confession of over-multiplication before on the smaller area, and this, as has been shown, without such proportionate increase of the number of Congregational ministers as to prove its wisdom. Along with the policy of "one college to a state," instead of two or more, has been born among us of the interior the kindred policy of one theological seminary to a group of states. A long period will pass before, in either part, this policy will need to be broken in upon for the sake of securing more candidates for the sacred calling.

But the relations of this subject to the quality of the ministry produced are even more marked than its relations to the quantity. Over-multiplication of seminaries, instead of supplying a deficiency in the ministry, supplies a deficient ministry. One cannot assert that if all that has been put into seven, in means and men, had been put into three — one for the East, one for the interior, and one for the region beyond the mountains — it *would* have made them vastly better, but he can safely say that it *could*. In the higher institutions a given investment of resources in one is better than in two. The law seems to be that the higher up we go in education, the more this is true. It is not the case in common schools as in academies, nor in academies as in colleges; not so much so, again, in these last as in privat-docenten, and you get by no means a fair estimate of those any one man instructs. The majority may attend any one course of lectures, if meritorious enough.

post-graduate professional schools. Find the modicum of skill to teach elements of knowledge to little children, and the wants of the untaught masses may oblige you to multiply schools of the same sort, though in itself it would be better, if possible, to multiply teachers and pupils in existing schools, and secure greater skill and excellence of instruction. But rise from the kindergarten or the primary school to the polytechnic institute, and the difference in this respect is very great. Better multiply experts in technology and in the sciences on which it rests, subdivide more skilfully and philosophically the subjects taught, put more talent, time, experience, tact upon less matter of instruction, release the teacher from much so that he may do better justice to a little, give opportunity for more profound and exhaustive research on single points, commit the whole to more hands. Wonderfully slow are we to learn that the same thing is true in the teaching of religious science. Very high theological culture — using the terms comprehensively — cannot now be obtained either from any one man or from a very small number of men. The contributions which all the sciences are now making to theology, in addition to what language, mental philosophy, logic, history, antiquities, and other departments of scholarship heretofore deemed more akin to it, are doing, demand to-day a larger body of professors in every faculty than heretofore. It is plain that we cannot have the men, nor can we have the indispensable qualifications, if we multiply seminaries. Where a single teacher of "didactic" or "dogmatic" theology was once thought enough, this age requires a professor of natural, one of systematic, and one of biblical theology; a professor of the relations of mental and moral science, and one of the relations of physical science to theology, with, perhaps, one of the history of doctrine, hardly embraced by church history as it was. Similar statements might be made of other departments. We need not attempt the German scheme of minute subdivision;¹ but it is plain that the addition of lectureships in nearly all our Congregational seminaries indicates a "felt want" of the more exhaustive treatment of special topics,

¹ The pages of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, the *Biblical Repository*, and other publications have given so many examples of these that no references are necessary. One of the latest that has come to my notice is that of Leipsic, in Hart's *German Universities*, pp. 362-63. It comprises nine professors, two assistant professors, and two *privat-docenten* for 1872-73. The variety of work done in history is worth noting. Lechler read Church History since Gregory VII. six hours a week, and Practical Exercises in Church History two hours a week; Kahnis, History of Dogma, six hours, and Ecclesiastical History of the Middle Ages, two hours (Symbolic, four hours); and Joh. Delitsch (*priv. docent.*), History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ, two hours. Besides these, Brockhans had Archaeology of Christian Art, two hours, and Hoffmann Evangelical Pedagogy and its History, four hours. Other topics in history were treated, of course, in other parts of the university year with the same subdivision and consequent fullness.

for which regular professors have neither strength nor time. We are not to go back on this path on which we have entered; we are to go forward, steadily and far. The teaching of both the original tongues of the Bible will never again be committed in a well-appointed divinity school to a single man, nor that of sacred rhetoric and elocution, nor that of church history and pastoral theology and Christian institutions and polity. The day may be near when some topics, like the various ones grouped under the names "scepticism," "infidelity," "materialism," etc., can no longer be attached as a pendant to others. The schedule of what a genuinely *educated* Christian minister *must know* is becoming so large and full that it long since ceased to be feasible to crowd all into the narrow compass of former days, with the inevitable haste, superficialness, and inaccuracy of treatment resulting, so far as instructors are concerned, and the equally inevitable, and perhaps more mischievous, lack of all mastery of subjects on the part of those instructed. While the wealth available for the creation of seminaries is so limited, and flows so grudgingly into these high and pre-eminent channels of Christian usefulness, to distribute it in pitiful fragments among three or four, falling so far short of what it might accomplish for one or two, is simply to condemn theological training to lag behind other branches of education in breadth, variety, completeness, and true scholarship, and to condemn the ministry to ignominious comparison with those trained for other professions. No one of these, perhaps, has so kept in the rear of other intellectual callings as that of teacher; yet it is now proposed to include in our normal instruction the history of education and of pedagogy; but not even a lectureship on the history of religions, positive or comparative (in which it is now loudly asserted that the future of theology, faith, and piety is bound up), has yet been founded in even the best furnished of our theological seminaries.¹ It is quite impossible to foresee all the expansions and ramifications of seminary instructions that await us, but with the immense mass of materials for the service of natural theology which the sciences are accumulating, one thing is clear; that is, the folly of founding any more professorships of theology, distinctively so called, in a group of schools, in each of which one man shall vainly — we had almost written vain-gloriously — attempt to treat natural, biblical, and scientific theology, in place of bringing all the foundations and endowments together in one school. We may yet live to see natural theology alone distributed into departments for the more fruitful and conclusive handling of each and all.

¹ If the expectation of some that the pulpit, as such, will ere long be displaced by the platform, the history of preaching will still be an integral and inextinguishable part of the history of human eloquence, and the art will hold its place in any complete school of oratory. It is, indeed, but a portion of the great art and history of religious teaching; and must more and more show that it is not to be exhausted by rhetoric on the one hand nor by elocution on the other, while it will gather about it kindred and correlated forms of religious teaching.

The geographical objection cannot here be made that in so vast a country students cannot find their way to a few adequately endowed and largely and strongly manned seminaries, kept up to the highest mark, on account of distance or of expense. The present attendance of students refutes it. The seventy-seven students reported in the last Andover catalogue came from nineteen states and countries and nineteen colleges in our own country, stretching from Maine to Iowa. Canada, England, and the Sandwich Islands, even, had six representatives. Yale reported students last year from thirty-one colleges, extending also from Maine to Iowa, and from twelve states, besides Wales. Oberlin had students from New Hampshire and Massachusetts; Hartford, from Pennsylvania and Vermont; Chicago, from New Hampshire, District of Columbia, Connecticut, and Massachusetts.

Nothing need be said of the keeping our seminaries poor by their number in other things, besides instructors in sufficient numbers and of diversified ability and attainments. There are indications that we are entering upon a new epoch, in which large sums, vastly beyond all precedents in the story of American benevolence, shall flow from single benefactors and estates to single Christian enterprises. Legacies ranging from a hundred thousand dollars to a million startle us as yet. The wisdom of directing them into one channel, producing most marked, noble, and notable results is as clear as the sure prevention of such results by frittering them away in sums too small. The furnishing of our seminaries with buildings, libraries, biblical and archaeological museums, chapels, etc., and providing amply for their running expenses, has been hindered hitherto by their multiplication, and the preventing competition caused thereby.

There need be no fear that there will not be margin enough for differentiation in excellence among them, however strong a judiciously limited number may become. If all were equally provided with all desirable appliances just referred to, in addition to instructors, there would always be the widest margin for variation in the merits of instructors. Endow the small number we need with millions, economically and wisely used, each would yet have its specialties, as each would its *genius loci*, and would attract students from all parts of the nation thereby. Indeed, these things not only cannot be separated, but can only be secured together, as large numbers in attendance can only be secured by some sort of superiority in the style of education furnished.

Interesting illustration of all that has been said could be drawn from the experience of the "theological colleges" of the English Congregationalists. But the story of their hard, and sometimes almost hopeless, struggle to increase the attendance and raise the standard in these institutions, and of their attempts to remove the chief obstacles by consolidating a dozen or more of them into a smaller and more effective number, would require an article by itself. That they have still kept the line of Nonconform-

ist attainment so far above that of the Established church, is due to the mischievous relation of the latter to the state and fashionable society, rather than to their own advantages. A churchman's testimony, in the *Contemporary Review* for April, more than confirms the comparative statements made years since in these pages.¹ That still the spiritual descendants of John Owen and Phillip Doddridge do less than they might for sacred science is due very much to the union of English collegiate and theological education in the same institution under the same faculty. But if this were obviated — by remanding young men for the former to Owen's College, London University, Oxford, Cambridge, and the Scotch Universities² — they would still have too many theological schools — twice as many as we have, even, for about the same number of churches,³ and just two hundred more students, five hundred and seventeen to our three hundred and seventeen — but many of theirs not yet advanced to theological studies. Nor can it be said that these studies are conducted on so high a plane as in our seminaries. Perhaps we have common cause of lamentation both sides the sea,

¹ *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July 1869 (Vol. xxvi.), pp. 531-567, "Theological Education in England." "The net result," says Dr. Littledale in the *Contemporary Review*, "is, that the ordinary clergyman of average intelligence and acquirements practically knows almost nothing of theology." "A taste and capacity for the higher forms of theology, are quite as rare as for abstruse mathematics or for philological discovery distinction, nay, eminence in theological learning and pastoral efficiency is no title whatever to preferment, especially in the higher grades of the ministry, nor are the very opposite qualities the slightest bar to advancement."

² Dr. Littledale complains that theology has been left till a few years past in Great Britain "entirely to voluntary, unassisted, and sporadic effort," and he expects new and important contributions to it "if the teachers of all the chief denominations had opportunities of receiving the highest intellectual training of the time, without interfering with their loyalty to their own communions," under university and denominational faculties of theology, side by side, like Protestant and Catholic at Bonn and Tübingen. One must doubt if even the secular learning of the Nonconformist ministry would be so much improved, if the recent statements of Prof. I. E. T. Rogers about learning being discouraged at Oxford are true. — See *British Quarterly Review* (Am. ed.), July 1879, pp. 47, 50.

³ It may be noted that the total of our church membership, reported in the *Year Book*, Jan. 1879, is something less than four hundred thousand, while *Whitaker's Almanac* for January reports a million and a quarter of persons as belonging to British Congregationalism; but it is said by way of qualification that these are "more or less loosely connected." A larger proportion of the students that come from American churches have had a collegiate education than of those that come from British churches; and a larger proportion of ours in 1878 than the previous year, — two hundred and forty-three out of three hundred and seventeen, against two hundred and four out of three hundred and twenty-seven. — Cf. *Year Book and Congregational Quarterly*, April 1878.

that in making too many schools of the prophets we have cut ourselves off from making them better.

Recurring to the three previous papers of this series on theological education, it may easily be shown that none of the important objects therein advocated can be accomplished if we over-multiply seminaries. If this is incompatible with a high theological training at all it surely will render the higher training argued for¹ impossible. Whether we consider the absolute necessity of the most thorough and commanding theological culture for the Congregational pulpit that it may "evangelize and edify the working classes," or because of "the obligations of the church to the cultivated classes," or in view of "the nature of theology itself" that it may not lose its birthright to "lead and control the thought of this thinking age," it is plainly our duty to do nothing that will prevent such a culture.

It is quite as clear that too many seminaries will prove an absolute prevention of an elective course² in any. Whether it is desirable that a great disparity in the standard of work and attainment of existing ones should come to be, from great disparity in the endowments afforded them, or not, this is certainly something the friends of each will leave no stone unturned to forestall. Indeed, as it is pretty certain that where colleges have been excessively multiplied the bestowal of large and notable resources upon the stronger and worthier few is the readiest way to kill out the weak and undeserving many, so the very existence of a theological seminary is imperilled by its falling far behind its competitors, or, what is the same thing, by their leaving it behind in gathering appliances and means. But no weak institution, while it lives, can offer the broad and various facilities for elective study. It cannot furnish the professors or libraries needful. It was the wealth of Harvard — ever great, ever growing — that enabled it to introduce elective college studies. The large advance beyond the minimum in any department taught for and to all students, which that system will allow to some students, depends upon large increase of working force; so does any new and more varied distribution of students according to their needs, capacities, and special aptitudes; so does any more full and generous scientific treatment of the whole mass of subjects of instruction. It is doubtful if we can hereafter carry on, *pari passu*, the development of all existing theological institutions as the wants of the age demand that some, at least, should be developed; it is certain we cannot if we attempt a larger number, unless there is an outburst of munificence in gifts to them beyond the belief of the most enthusiastic lover of theological learning and education.

No less clear is it that the addition of a special course requires in any seminary liberal additions to its resources.³ These three objects, hereto-

¹ Bibliotheca Sacra, Jan. 1879 (Vol. xxxvi.), pp. 182-191.

² Ibid., April, pp. 367-372.

³ Bibliotheca Sacra, July 1879 (Vol. xxxvi.), pp. 560-572.

fore treated, are in entire harmony with each other. Indeed, every reason why those who have not been through college, nor had a "partial college education,"² should take a seminary course at all, is also a reason why they should receive it where higher theological training is given, and where the advantages of an elective course are enjoyed, if possible. But this forbids the multiplication of institutions. Nothing but absolute proof from experience that the elevation of our seminaries makes a special course in them positively impracticable, obliging us to look to institutions of a lower and separate grade for the preparation of that most worthy and important class on whom a necessity is laid to preach the gospel, should ever be allowed to deprive them of the benefits of the seminaries. Increase and diversification of the teaching force would only render it more possible, not less, to carry on the special course. It has been thought that the connection of special courses with colleges, or even with the higher class of academies, might secure the needed instruction in the very various studies not in the "regular course"; but notwithstanding some obvious advantages in this arrangement, the facts, thus far, do not favor it. In the two seminaries connected with colleges, Yale and Oberlin, there were, in 1877, eight and twelve, respectively,¹ who had received no college education. But the numbers of those at Andover, Bangor, Chicago, Hartford, and Oakland, all without connection with colleges, were, respectively, twenty, thirty-two, seventeen, six, and six, showing that eighty-one sought these latter seminaries, and but twenty those united to colleges. In 1878 the proportion was still more marked, sixty to fourteen. Indeed, it would be easy to show that a theological seminary, with its curriculum enriched as the need now is for enrichment, and supplemented in manifold useful, liberal, and necessary ways, should be the very place where a special course according to its true and broad design could be made most successful and most useful. If we are ever obliged to resort to the method of our English brethren, and create separate and less-advanced institutions, like the Bristol and Nottingham Institutes,³ it will be with great and needless waste of means, talent, learning, and skill, all pressingly wanted for the

¹ Even of those who had received a "partial college education," but eight sought the college seminaries and fourteen the non-collegiate.

² These "Institutes" have demonstrated that the production of a less literate need not lower the estimate or lessen the supply of a more learned one. They send many men to the more advanced "theological colleges," men who are found to be worthy of more culture than the Institutes afford. There would be more advantages in their obtaining this without being sent elsewhere, as our special courses allow. Dr. Littledale notes "the unfortunate absence of the higher forms of speculative theology as also of non-Anglican works of repute" in the course of the "sixteen minor [Episcopal] institutions where theology occupies the chief place." The use of Shedd's History of Church Doctrine at Gloucester seems to be the only exception. Is this not inevitable in "minor institutions?"

seminaries we have now, and with peril, besides, of such a creation of theological or ministerial caste as is most repugnant to American institutions, and would be most mischievous to Congregationalism. The surest safeguard against these evils, and the surest provision for the more numerous, more variously furnished, and more effective ministry we need, is the liberal reconstruction of the schools we have, in respect to both scope, flexibility, and amount of instruction, and all other provisions for training more, and more various, available mental power. G. F. M.

ARTICLE IX.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE AGADA OF THE BABYLONIAN AMORAEI (Die Agada der babylonischen Amoräer). A Contribution to the History of the Agada, and a Study introductory to the Talmud. By Prof. Dr. W. Bacher. 8vo. pp. 151. Strassburg: Trübner. 1878.

Buxtorf describes the אמוראים, in his Chaldee Lexicon, thus: "Doctores sive authores sunt partis Talmud, quae גמרא dicitur. Fuerunt hi plures, quorum unus dicitur Amora, quasi *Sermocinator, Dictator*." He goes on to say that that which it was their business to teach was the exposition of the first part of the Talmud, i.e. the משנה, *δευτέρα*, the repeated or second tradition. Some of their expositions set forth refinements of the law of Moses or additions to it. Of this sort were the many burdensome rules about washing cups and such trifles which excited Jesus to wrathful condemnation. And this sort of exposition was הלכה, Halacha, "that which was going," "which was 'the way,'" "which was customary." Then, besides, there were many expositions respecting things like the hoped-for blessings, the future King of the Jews (he was to come out of Bethlehem, etc.), the lives of the great patriarchs, rulers, and preachers of the past, etc. This was נשוא, "what was related," or אגדה, "a historic complex."

Professor Bacher's book will be of interest to such as study the literary history of the Jews from say 200 A.D. and onwards for several hundred years. It will also help, mediately, to the understanding of the times of our Lord, and of the use of the Old Testament by the Jews.

A COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. By Joseph Agar Beet. pp. 385. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1877.

The style of this commentary is clear and definite. The doctrines advocated are Calvinistic. In the exposition of Rom. v. 12-19 the author