

ARTICLE V.

THE PRESIDENCY OF THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARIES.

SHOULD THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY HAVE A PERMANENT PRESIDENT; AND IF SO, WHAT SHOULD BE THE POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE OFFICE?

BY PRESIDENT JOHN KNOX MCLEAN, D.D.

[The Conference of Congregational Seminaries (United States and Canada) is an organization in the interest of unifying and bettering, within Congregational lines, the work of ministerial training. The conference includes our seven American institutions—Andover, Bangor, Chicago, Hartford, Oakland, Oberlin, Yale—and the Congregational Divinity College at Montreal. As part of the program for its last meeting, held in St. Louis, October, 1900, the writer, by appointment, presented a paper on the topic named above. So great interest was developed in the discussion which followed and so vital did the subject appear to the minds of those present in its bearing upon Seminary administration and on the general work of ministerial training, that it has been thought wise to give it wider currency. This statement will explain the appearance and form of this article.—J. K. M.]

THE question of a permanent presidency for theological seminaries is of recent origin. Whatever has been attempted in that direction among our Congregational churches has been, with little exception, more in name than in reality. Thirteen years ago Dr. Hartranft was made, in the proper sense of the term,—and greatly to the advantage of the institution he has represented,—president of Hartford; six years ago Pacific, at Oakland, assumed a supervising head. The title has been used in case of others of our schools, but only by accommodation. The actual position of the person bearing it has usually been, by selection of his faculty,

chairman of that body; but with no substantial increase of powers or duties toward the institution as such. The same thing is true in the Presbyterian denomination. Dr. Charles Cuthbert Hall was three years since made full and permanent president of Union Seminary, and he had predecessors who more or less fully discharged the proper functions of that office; Dr. George B. Stewart has been in like manner more recently installed with full powers as president of Auburn; the late lamented Dr. Henry M. Booth had been elected to the same standing, but died before the larger adjustments of the office were completed. With these exceptions, only remote approaches to an actual presidency, or deanship, have been made in either of these two denominations. A like condition exists, so far as information can be obtained, in case of the other religious bodies. The undertaking therefore of anything more than a theoretical presentation of the subject is attended by considerable difficulty. What precedents we have are of recent date, and of traditions there are none at all. Under such circumstances, two main sources of enlightenment have been resorted to, together with a supplementary third, with results now to be indicated.

I. The first of these is the *Bulletin of Professional Education in the United States*, issued by the University of the State of New York; College department, including Universities, Professional and Technical Schools, Subdivision Theology. The issue quoted from is Number Six, of date November, 1899. This publication furnishes much valuable information concerning the rise and progress of theological education in this country.

Down to the close of the eighteenth century the theological seminary as a separate institution did not exist. The nearest approach thereto was under the form of private enterprise. Dr. Bellamy of Connecticut conducted such a private school; with so much distinction that some

of his students followed his example and opened others like it. But the theological seminary proper did not appear in this country until near the very end of the century named. In England the closing of the universities against those outside of the established churches had occasioned the rise of institutions for ministerial training; but these were obliged to cover the double field of academic and theological instruction; the same method of training, together with the use of the name College, is continued, the term Seminary being, in our application of it, there unknown; the English theological school is "a substitute for the college, not a supplement," as here. Previous to the date named, the American churches, so far as they had done anything in this line, followed the example of their nonconformist brethren in the mother country by providing theological courses in the college. Indeed, the chief object had in view in founding our earliest colleges was to furnish an educated ministry. The college faculty included a professor of Hebrew and a professor of theology; whose work was supplemented by the study of theological books, either in private or under the oversight of some experienced minister. It was only among the new departures of the nineteenth century that the establishment of theological schools as separate foundations began to be undertaken. The existing colleges had by that time so far departed from the special purpose of their creation, and there were so many religious bodies which had no college of their own, that the feeling of necessity for the definite and systematic training of the theological school appears to have become universal.

The three pioneer institutions were established just before the advent of 1800: (1) that of the Reformed Dutch Church, in 1784, its work being first done in New York City, then at Flatbush, Long Island, and of later years at New Brunswick, New Jersey; (2) St. Mary's Roman Cath-

olic, at Baltimore, in 1791; (3) the Seminary of the Associate Reformed Presbyterians, now located at Xenia, Ohio, at Service, Pennsylvania, in 1794. Harvard and Yale already had professorships of divinity; the former having been created in 1721, the latter in 1755; but these did not become separate departments until many years later,—Harvard in 1819, Yale in 1822. It has been supposed by many in Congregational circles that Andover was the original seminary of the country. But if the dates given by the University of the State of New York are reliable, as doubtless they are, Andover, so far from standing first in line, arrived only as a belated fourth, its origin dating from 1808. In 1812 the Presbyterians founded Princeton; in 1815 the Lutherans, Hartwick, in Otsego County, New York; in 1817 the Episcopalians, their general Seminary in New York City; the Baptists, Hamilton, in 1820; and in 1839 the Methodists established their first divinity plant, which, after various removals, now exists as the theological department of Boston University.

There were in 1899 one hundred and sixty-five existing theological schools: of these, three were established before 1800; eighteen, between 1801 and 1825; twenty-five, between 1826 and 1850; seventy-two, between 1851 and 1875; forty-seven, between 1876 and 1900.

Of the one hundred and sixty-five institutions in 1899, forty-six were departments of colleges and universities, and thirteen others had entered into such relations with neighboring universities as to secure for their students university privileges; an arrangement which appears to be of growing tendency, and is approved by the compilers of the New York State University Bulletin.

In the publication quoted from, report is generally made as to the headship of the institutions catalogued. But the information thus given is, as a rule, and for reasons already named, inconclusive; the titles President and Dean being

evidently applied in most cases to officials who hold their positions without permanency, without appointment by the institution's governing body, and without any general administrative function. It is little more than a faculty distinction; which in instances is passed in rotation throughout the faculty membership.

The information thus far gained, while of interest as concerns the general history of theological education, has, as will be observed, no apparent bearing upon the special question of the seminary presidency.* It however possesses such a bearing; which lies in the additional item now to be pointed out—the pathetic lack of financial resources at command of these one hundred and sixty-five institutions. The total amount of property, including plant and endowment, reported by eighty-seven institutions—and it is part of the pitiful significance that no more than eighty-seven made report upon this important point—is but \$27,785,997; a sum no greater than is accredited to a single one of our universities, and nearly equaled in case of several more. This amount furnishes for the eighty-seven reporting schools the handsome sum of \$319,380 each. But nearly half of the sum total named is held by ten institutions out of the eighty-seven, making for them an average of about \$1,350,000 each. Of the balance left after those ten chief institutions have been supplied, more than half is appropriated by the next ten; leaving but \$8,898,000 to be divided among the remaining sixty-seven; which diminishes the average property of these, plant and endowment included, to the insufficient sum of \$131,300 each for carrying forward their important work.

Eighty-seven institutions have the courage to make report; but what of the seventy-eight not reporting? The unavoidable inference is, that in nearly all cases the showing would be so sorrowfully small that they spared themselves the mortification of making it. Some of those

which did report place the sum total of their possessions at \$12,000, at \$11,000, at \$10,000, and so down to \$6,000, \$3,000, \$2,000; and one of the number, in lieu of all other report, transmits the legend, "The trustees have decided to close the college." Could the actual figures be obtained from the entire enrollment of theological schools, the result would no doubt justify the remark of a leading denominational journal in summing up the gifts to educational institutions for the year 1899; to the effect that, while colleges had been favored that year with benefactions mounting up into hundreds of thousands of dollars, theological seminaries had secured only hundreds of dollars; and that in so few instances as to fairly warrant saying they had practically received nothing at all.

The bearing of all this upon the question before us is not far to seek. It is that, whatever may be true concerning other sides of seminary administration, the policy in vogue—of a compound head, a rotary head, or no head at all—falls, financially considered, far short of meeting the real requirements of the case: upon which ground, if upon no other, change seems loudly called for.

II. The second available source of intelligence we find in the college and the college presidency. It would antecedently seem that the close correspondence existing between kindred institutions, the college and seminary, were sufficiently close to afford likelihood of light from the long-tried and successful college presidency upon the newer problem of a presidency for the seminary. And this upon trial proves to be the case. In order to test the matter, communication was opened with various college presidents, soliciting their views upon the subject. Out of eleven addressed, nine—six of them heads of college, and three heads of university—made prompt and clear response. These stand among the best-known and most successful administrators of the higher education in our country, and

range territorially from New England to the Pacific Coast.

The inquiries sent out were these:—

1. In your opinion should the theological seminary have a permanent president; and if so, how far should his duties and powers correspond to those of the college president?

2. What in your judgment should be the relation of the president of an institution for the higher education toward the policy of his institution; toward its finances; its curriculums; discipline; the appointment and removal of instructors, etc.?

3. Will you kindly state in detail your own relation to these various departments?

As to Question One, the responses were, with but slightly differing degrees of emphasis, unanimous, and unanimously in the affirmative; to the effect that, wherever practicable, the theological seminary should by all means have a permanent president; and his powers and duties should in a general way correspond to those of the president of a college. The following fairly indicate the tenor of all:—

(1) "It does seem to me desirable that a theological seminary should have a president; and that in general his duties should correspond with those of the college president. When I say this I do not mean the college president who is a mere executive. For myself, I hope the time will never come when I cannot conduct classes and continue my distinct department, which gives me contact with the students, such as nothing else could do."

(2) "I do not see how any institution can be efficiently managed without some one who is at the head of it; responsible throughout all its departments and with sufficient power to make his ideals dominate the policy of the institution. I do not see how seminaries can permanently prosper until they get a more efficient method of administration than most of them now possess."

(3) "Without doubt a theological seminary should have a president. Indefiniteness, friction, and chaos are almost sure to prevail when the direction of an institution rests upon a faculty or board of trustees, or on both in conference. There needs a single competent head who can originate, and execute, and hold in constant survey all departments and all necessities."

(4) "In my opinion our theological seminaries should be under very capable and aggressive administration, and it is encouraging to know that those now chiefly responsible for the executive duties of those insti-

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.



Sincerely yours
J. E. Dimmell

tutions are endeavoring to introduce the most improved methods. I believe that most of the duties essential to the office of college president belong also to that of a president of a theological seminary."

(5) "I am very glad to know that you are taking up these questions. In general let me say that I think every theological seminary should have a president, and that he should be the wisest and best of men."

In regard to Questions Two and Three, while the replies are not in all instances categorical, they show little diversity of opinion. What the trend of this opinion is will appear in the following representative answers. Two are given in full. The first is from one of the ablest and best-known Presbyterian college presidents:—

"(a) I am a member of the board of trustees. And it is proper. Corporation and governing body with us are the same thing. I am *ex officio* president of the faculty.

"(b) My powers and duties are not well defined, and I would rather not have them. I can go a good ways if sensible, not far if a blunderer.

"(c) Finances, that is investments, are better in entirely other hands. As to curriculum, practically I am finally responsible, but must be able to carry faculty as to any changes of policy or substantial departure. This must be rational influence, not authoritative.

"(d) At last discipline comes to the president's door. He must be responsible. In a college his success or failure is staked upon genuine control.

"(e) Board of trustees appoints professors; but they would practically adopt my recommendations and not move without them. It should be so.

"Frankly, I think a college president should have a long tether, and then be hung with it if he does not do well. His tenure should always be conditioned by his efficiency."

The next reply comes from an equally able and distinguished head of a college in New England:—

"I am chairman of the board of trustees, which is the board where everything originates; and I am also a member of the board of overseers, which has chiefly a veto power.

"I have nothing to do with the investment of funds, presumably because I happen to be incompetent; but I practically determine by my recommendations, which are usually in the main adopted, how the income shall be spent. I make the nomination of candidates for the professorships; and those whom I nominate are usually, though not necessarily, elected. I think no one could be elected to whom I was decidedly opposed.

"Discipline is usually by faculty vote, though large discretion is left with me; and in clear cases requiring prompt action, I do not hesitate to act without waiting for the ratification which is sure to come as a matter of course. In a word, my idea of good government for an educational institution is autocracy tempered by assassination.

"A president should have full power to impress his policy on all the details of the institution; he should be given reasonable time to show whether his policy is a success or failure; and at the first signs of failure or inefficiency he should be summarily turned out and a better man put in his place."

Perhaps these two replies sufficiently cover all the points at issue. Some of the others, are, however, of sufficient interest to be quoted in part:—

(1) [From the president of a leading university.] "I fully believe that, inasmuch as the president of an institution is charged with great responsibility in regard to all matters referred to by you, a great deal of weight ought to be given to his judgment in respect to these matters; always presuming, of course, that he is a sagacious man. It is, however, more particularly in the sphere of the curriculum, the appointment and removal of professors, and the general policy of the institution, that I think the weight of the president's judgment should be most felt. While he ought to be intimately acquainted with the condition of the finances, that he may make intelligent representations respecting the uses of income, he will ordinarily do well not to take active part in any matters that concern the investment of funds."

(2) "The questions you ask are of serious importance, and I beg to take them up in the order of their giving. I do take the initiative in almost everything, both concerning changes in the curriculum and in the personnel of the faculty. I am a member of the board of trustees and am its president, and also I am a member of each faculty and its president. I have no immediate responsibility for the investment of funds; this is cared for altogether by a special committee of the trustees. I do hold myself to a large degree responsible for the devising and carrying out of the general policy of the institution. If this work were to fail, I should feel myself a good deal responsible for the failure; though, of course, the conditions might be such that the work might have failed, and I still feel free from responsibility."

(3) [The president of a Western college writes,] "My trustees are almost without exception business men of large affairs and with many demands upon them. Hence it has come about that a great deal of responsibility has fallen upon me for the general policy of the institution. I am always sure of the coöperation of my trustees, however, and do not fail to lay before them every matter that seems to me worthy of their consideration. They, too, prefer to leave details to me, or to committees of

their own appointment in regard to minor matters. I do not see why such a relation is not to be expected in every case where the trustees are broad-minded, intelligent men; and the president seems to them to be working for the best interests of the institution."

(4) "I believe the president of a theological seminary should have supervision over matters of discipline and general order, and should be held responsible for the same by the trustees. He should have responsible charge of the curriculum; presumably he would freely confer with the faculty on these subjects, and report all conclusions to the trustees for approval or modification. Largest liberty should also be given the president as to the selection and dismissal of members of the faculty. It may not be too much to say, that the methods of a great commercial corporation in allowing its president or manager to select his associates and subordinates, should be followed by an educational corporation."

III. Our third and supplementary contribution of intelligence concerning the matter of a seminary presidency comes from President Thwing, of Western Reserve University. In his new and extremely valuable work on *College Administration*,—a book which is to become a standard on the matters of which it treats,—Dr. Thwing, in dealing with the office of the American college president, traces its development through "three successive types: the earliest was the clerical; the second the scholastic; and the third was, and is, the executive type." This latest and prevalent type, Dr. Thwing sets forth as having grown out of the more and more exacting demands upon the president's position, qualified by the accompanying fact that these demands have come to be chiefly executive in character.

"Of course [he says] this type [the administrative] may be embodied in one who is either clergyman, or scholar, or both; but when the office is so filled the clerical or scholastic relation is not a cause, or even a condition, but only an accompanying circumstance or element. The president is not chosen to a position demanding executive ability because he is a clergyman or because he is a scholar,—he may even be chosen in spite of the fact of his being a clergyman or scholar,—but he is chosen simply because of his personal ability to do a specific work. [And he adds] When one comes to count up the number of college presidents who can justly lay claims to scholarship, he finds them a feeble host and small. The cause is evident enough; the administrator has no time for the quiet pursuit of learning. The college president is not a teacher; he is an executive. His work is to do things, not to tell about them."

These positions of the eminent educator are fully sustained by facts. Our great colleges and universities, from the oldest, Harvard in the East, to the youngest, Stanford in the West, have administrative heads,—men by no means destitute of scholarly attainment, but in whom the executive faculty predominates. “Not primarily scholars and secondarily administrators, but the reverse.” Be the institution large or little,—“a new and poor and small denominational college in a new State, or an old and rich and free and large college” in an old State; be its situation central or remote,—“a new college on the banks of the Oregon,” or old Harvard, old Yale, old Princeton, old Columbia; in either case the present-day president is, more than anything else, an executive. The emphasis upon the different sides of the position will vary according to circumstances, but in all cases the dominant function of the successful college president will be the executive function.

The combined experience and example of the college as bearing upon the problem of the seminary is therefore twofold: first, that the latter institution should have a permanent presiding head; second, that this officer should be chosen with special reference to the discharge of administrative duties, and with a view to his capability as an administrator.

We are now prepared to set down in order the considerations which favor such a change in the administration of theological seminaries as shall place them under a direction similar to that exercised by the college president; most of these having been gathered along lines of suggestion from the college and its administration.

1. The concordant opinion of college presidents as presented. This opinion is entitled to great weight. It comes from men of recognized ability and standing as educators.

They are intelligent in the matters upon which they speak. They have had large experience in college administration, and have won marked distinction therein. They are all graduates of theological seminaries, and lovers of theological seminaries. Two at least of the number have been for a term of years themselves connected with seminary instruction; one of them, and perhaps more than one, is now a seminary director. No set of men could be found better qualified to speak on this subject. Their opinion is affirmative, full, explicit, strong.

2. The results of experience in college education lie so close along the lines of seminary education as to make the two fields practically one. The experience is scarcely to be regarded therefore as borrowed. It is the same experience shedding light in two ways, in the direction of college problems and of ours.

3. But in reality seminary work is more than allied to college work, it is part of it. It is identical with it. If there be difference, it lies in the fact that the work of the seminary is the higher. It is similar, the same in kind only higher. College work is the higher education, seminary work the highest education. The seminary is a department of the university; its supreme department. Its province is to deal with the loftiest and most important of all the sciences. The training it is commissioned to impart is of not less consequence than that of any other department of education, but of more consequence. Other professions and other callings touch life upon one of its sides, or upon some of its sides; the calling of the minister touches life upon all of its sides. Of other workers who resort to college and university, some are seeking to know about nature, some seeking to know about man, some to know about both nature and man; but the minister is seeking to know about nature, about man, and about God,—the great Maker of nature, and Master of man. As, rightly

viewed, the subject of theological teaching is the loftiest and most important of the sciences, so the teaching of it is the loftiest and most important of all teachings. If then the growing experience of the world has found it to be important and necessary for the proper administration of education upon its lower planes that a single competent director should be placed over every one of its institutions; who, holding in constant survey all its departments and all its necessities, can originate, advise, and execute; how much more important and necessary should it be thought that an equally adequate direction should be provided for education upon the highest plane.

3. The importance of the last point will more fully appear when we take into consideration along with it the recent continually increasing requirements of adequate seminary training. The meaning of the term "adequate" as so applied has a constantly widening significance. Higher and higher standards of scholarly attainment are set before the would-be preacher; more numerous and heavier requirements are laid upon him. New avenues of knowledge have been opening which, if he is to be successful in his calling, he cannot avoid. Many of the old paths are being called into question, some of them are undergoing amendment, others are being abandoned. Things long considered as most solidly settled, both in doctrine and in practice, are now held as most unsettled. Revision—deep, searching, unsparing—is the order of the day. This upon the one hand. Upon the other, the church is taking on new forms of institutional and other enterprise in a way and to a degree which, if it is to go on, will make necessary still further extensions both in church administration and in the training for it.

4. These things, and others like them, are calling for no small degree of specialism in the ministry; and, by consequence, for specialization in training for the ministry.

It is claimed by well-qualified authorities that at least five forms of specialization should be at once recognized in laying out courses of seminary study: One, with reference to men with strong natural gifts in the direction of preaching; another, to prepare men of different temperament and attitude of mind for pastoral or general Christian work; a third, for such as are drawn toward the theological seminary, but presently find themselves better suited to be teachers than to be preachers or pastors; a fourth, for that class who also find their way into the seminary, and are earnest and capable, but whose adaptations are less towards study, or preaching, or teaching, than toward executive and administrative ends;—a large class, this last, with a large field before it in mission and institutional churches; in college, university, and seminary presidencies; in secretaryships and agencies for the great benevolent and missionary societies, etc.; a fifth form of special training is also thought to be called for for those who intend to be missionaries,—medical, preaching, teaching, and administrative.

These points,—which appear to be well made, and others like them,—add emphasis to the conviction, that, if, as a first necessity, adequate and accomplished administrators are required for ordinary schemes of education, such are no less needed for an educational scheme so comprehensive, so vital, and far-reaching as that which has for its purpose the training of ministers.

5. The purpose of the theological seminary is, moreover, by no means met in the training of men to preach. It has a second purpose, of magnitude coördinate with the first. The seminary should be a fountainhead and dispensing center for religious thought. It should stand as a beacon-light to the world's religious perplexities. It should be a watchtower and signal-station to beleaguered minds. A search-light for the illumination of moral problems and for guidance with reference to them. A mighty depot of salu-

tary and serviceable influences for all forms of right life; a seminary in the most positive and active sense—a *dis-seminary*. A strong crystallizing agency for the new order of things. A laboratory of all moral and spiritual forces, as the college already is of forces scientific, social, economical, and commercial. Outside of ordinary class-room work, it should provide courses—regular, special, and occasional,—calculated for the general public. It should, following the college, engage in seminary extension work; by inaugurating lectureships, local and circulatory; by laying foundations at college and university centers, from which coigns of vantage great Christian scholars, thinkers, teachers, and preachers might conduct a mighty evangelism,—an evangelism whose appeal should be not to spiritual prudence, nor to spiritual cupidity, nor to spiritual emotionality, but to the moral perception of the most educated and thoughtful of men and women.

6. It is charged by some intelligent and well-disposed people, that the seminary of to-day is, in respect of educational enterprise and development, behind the college and university; some say by a quarter of a century, some by half a century, and some say by more. They allege that the seminary is contenting itself within the first hemisphere of its proper function, preparing men for the ministry; and that even within this circumscribed field it is satisfied to merely teach its students rather than to train them; credited by these persons with the righteous ambition of desiring its students to *know* something when they leave its walls, it is claimed that this commendable desire is vitiated by an unrighteous lack of concern as to whether or no they go out fitted to *do* anything. Some go even to the extreme extent of rating the seminary as behind the college not only in work actually done; but in its conception of the work which ought to be done, and in the lack of care no less than in lack of ability to do it.

Such arraignment is no doubt overdrawn; the complaint is at some points extravagant and at others unfounded; but, making all necessary abatement, there remains an altogether too large residuum of fact; our seminaries are crossing the line of the twentieth century in the rear of the colleges. To this we shall be wise not to make ourselves blind; the fact exists, and the reason for it; that reason cannot be said to lie wholly in the defective administration of the seminary, but in great part it lies there. Among the seminary's main deficiencies is undoubtedly the want of a well-qualified head of affairs whose business it should be to give supreme attention to the institution's general development and administration.

7. Then there is that intensely vital matter of seminary finance, the crucial point in the whole seminary case. In the forefront of requirements for successful college administration, Dr. Thwing frankly locates ability to obtain money and to handle money: "As a financier, the college president is first to get funds; second, to invest funds; and third, to use funds. As he gets funds largely, invests funds safely, uses funds wisely, is his success assured." This authority also claims that "the college ought to need money, that it is not doing its duty if it does not need money"; and does not hesitate to add, "The president is to secure the endowment necessary for the proper doing and the proper enlargement and enrichment of his work."

The seminary needs money, money continually; needs it, as the college does, "for the proper doing and proper enlargement and proper enrichment of its work." In the past it has not, in measure at all commensurate with its necessities, been getting money. It is not doing so at the present time. And as a consequence, its work is not being properly done, nor properly enlarged, nor properly enriched. For this lack of funds, and therefore for the other lacks resultant from this, the seminaries are themselves chiefly

responsible. They have not, because they have not—sufficiently and efficiently—sought. It is therefore plain that a change is needed in this regard. It can come about only through a radical revolution in methods of seminary administration.

IV. We have thus found two concurrent lines of consideration favoring a greatly extended and improved administration of the theological seminary. The first of these has its origin in college opinion and practice; the second, in the purpose and relative importance of the seminary itself; and both are accentuated by the contrast, in one important particular at least, between the large success of the college under one form of administration and the comparatively small success of its sister institution under other forms of administration. It remains to raise the question more directly, which by implication has already been raised and answered, How this enlarged and improved seminary administration may be secured.

It is obvious that it cannot be furnished by the faculty as a body. For, upon the one hand, as already indicated, the work of seminary instruction, already heavy, too heavy, is every year becoming heavier; while over against this, upon the other hand, stands the lamentable fact that these increased exactions of seminary labor are unmet by any correspondent increase of seminary revenue. The heavily worked faculty of to-day must prepare itself to be still more heavily worked to-morrow. Standards for ministerial acquirement are constantly rising; the demand of the churches, and back of it the demand of the age, is for a more thoroughly trained ministry. "The pulpit will have, in coming years, the greatest power it has ever had, provided the preacher gets the requisite knowledge of men; never have there been days of profounder thinking among those to whom the minister goes than these present days; and, consequently, never days when the minister could less

afford to be untrained in scholarly ability to think for himself, if he is to make his message tell. The minister of to-day must have scholarship in its highest sense." And this means increase of inside demand upon already burdened divinity faculties. But account has also to be taken by seminary faculties of present unsettled conditions, within the church and within the pulpit no less than outside of them, with reference to creed statements, with reference to results of the higher criticism and of revised Scripture interpretation; with reference to the application of religious truth to new social and economic conditions; and with reference also to those changes in seminary curricula made needful for the adaptation to these various requirements of doctrine. The problem as to what the minister of to-day ought to know, and what part of that equipment the seminary ought to supply, and how it can be made able to supply it, is in itself a problem of prodigious seriousness. Still another class of demands upon seminary professors are likewise on the increase; churches, councils, conferences, associations, synods, assemblies, are wanting them; missionary meetings and other anniversary occasions solicit them; they are summoned to occasions denominational and interdenominational, national and international; there is also the work of representing the seminary before the churches, before other institutions, and the community in general. To these calls the seminary faculty should feel bound to make suitable response, not only for the general good, not only for the good of the causes summoning them, nor only for the good of the seminary itself; but for their own souls' good, and for their due qualification as instructors. Theological professors have few greater needs than to keep in vital touch with the great life of the church, and in touch with the great life of the world, which it is the mission of the churches to sanctify.

And then what, after all, at bottom is a seminary fac-

ulty? A body of from five to twenty men of like passions, of like felicities and infelicities, with other men. They naturally regard each his own special department as the all-important one, and each is ambitious to have its paramount interests pushed at whatever cost to other interests. In proportion as they are men of strength—and only such men should be on theological faculties—they are likely to hold conflicting opinions on matters of practical administration; not seldom are of variant temper and disposition; and possessed of those natural jealousies, incompatibilities, animosities, against which it has been found so difficult to protect even sacred inclosures. How is it likely that such a body should find itself fitted for that calm, comprehensive deliberation, that well-balanced inlook and overlook, so essential to see matters in true relation, in just proportion, in right perspective and unheated atmosphere? How can a body so composed and disposed, so pressed down with other work; so engrossed in varying interests; hope to furnish that capability, delicate but robust, sagacious but genial, resolute but patient, steadfast but considerate, which is essential to the task of devising right measures and carrying them through to right issues, in an undertaking so important as the successful administration of the highest form of human education? It is not possible. To ask the question is to answer it.

It is not possible, even leaving out the dubious question of natural ability, for an individual working member of the faculty, in addition to his other duties, to effectively administer the institution. He will naturally be modest; at least as to any strenuous self-assertion. His position is temporary; his authority, if he have any, is partial. He is conscious of lacking prestige in the eyes of students and colleagues, if not in the eyes of the directorate itself. Or should he, laying aside personal considerations, address himself to the duties of the position with that degree

of resolution and vigor necessary to success, what will most probably result? That which has under similar circumstances so often resulted; resentment on the part of fellow-professors, corporate friction, personal irritation, all-round discord, and general chaos. He is more than likely to find himself a Joseph among his brethren, his best intentions misconceived and thwarted, left alone, stripped of his garment of distinction, in a pit, and with reason to count himself fortunate if he be not given over to the Ishmaelites or other philistines. This in general, and apart from the central colossal problem of finance; but how shall he be able to meet that? He lacks adaptation for it, has no heart in it, he would quite rather be whipped, and almost rather be hung, than undertake it; the ordinary person in his situation sets out upon the venture with full anticipation of failing, and seldom finds his anticipation disappointed. He is encompassed about by college presidents in solid phalanx, who lay siege to the strongholds of benevolence and with apparent ease reduce them, while he looks on in helpless despair. The obtaining of endowment moneys is an art. And nowhere does the saying

Art is long, and Time is fleeting

prove more conspicuously true than here.

As an example of the deliberateness involved in obtaining endowment funds, take Booker Washington and his story of the rise and progress of a recent notable benefaction to Tuskegee. The initial approach resulted in the addition of two dollars to the resources of the institution. Subsequent efforts were attended by a gradual rise of interest, and correspondently gradual increase in material results. But it was only after the diligent perseverance of years that this wise husbandman found his reward in that comfortable result of a fifty-thousand-dollar donation. There is reason to believe that, except in the largeness of the final outcome, Mr. Washington's experience is not an unusual one.

We have called the gaining of benevolent funds an art. It is more than an art, it is a husbandry. This husbandman, too, must be a model of patience, he must wait for the precious fruit of his endeavor, and be patient over it until it has received the early and the latter rain; and even then there must be "first the blade, then the ear, and after that the full corn in the ear." Now, our seminaries, under the urgency of present-day demands, require a succession of fifty-thousand-dollar gifts. But what laborious professor, with a department or sub-department on his hands, can be spared for this time-consuming sort of tillage? It is said, "There's the financial agent, send him!" Reply can be made that this worthy, and all too lightly esteemed, servitor of good causes has been sent; and to his credit it is to be said, that at times and on occasions he has returned laden with much spoil. The financial agent is deserving of a seat among the highest saints; but for him many a now strong and flourishing enterprise had died of inanition. But, if the judgment of the great colleges is to be accepted, his occupation is now gone. These children of the world, wiser in their generation than the children of light, long since ceased from great dependence upon the financial agent. When college needs were measured by hundreds of dollars, or even by thousands, the financial agent was adequate to the undertaking. But now that these needs have mounted up into the hundreds of thousands, some more effective mediation is required; this means the name, the presence, the dignity, the full personal weight and magnetism, of the man in whom the spirit of the institution stands most distinctly embodied. Dr. Thwing says it is the college president who, if any one, is to "get funds largely." And if the seminary wishes to see its "work properly done, properly enriched, and properly enlarged," it must take its lesson from the college and govern itself accordingly.

Boards of trust are incompetent to the conducting of seminary administration. Many fine points have to be taken in view in constructing boards of trust; particularly in case of the schools for prophets. There are considerations of geographical location; the combination of willingness to serve with capacity to serve; extreme thoughtfulness is to be exercised as to passing or not passing the names of benefactors; balance is to be maintained between differing, and perhaps warring, schools of doctrine; very many things other than real directoral ability have to be kept in mind in executing this important and delicate task. And when all is done, it is a rare occurrence for any educational or benevolent institution to be able to gather a board of from ten to twenty men all of whom, or a majority of whom, possess that general and special intelligence, that balance of mind, that force of character, that breadth of view, that intensity of purpose, combined with strong personal interest in results sought after, forever indispensable to the devising and carrying out of a wise institutional policy. Moreover, the men best fitted to serve on seminary boards are already busy men, who have but fragments—less than fragments usually, interstices only—of time to bestow. The moments they can give are, however, often more precious than pearls, the merchandise of them better than the merchandise of silver or gold. The judgment of many a sagacious business man, formed and expressed in five minutes of time, is often more valuable to a consulting board than the all-day lucubrations and all-night incubations of other men. He speaks out of the trained judgment in affairs; out of an extraordinary keenness and inerrancy of perception, out of a disciplined ability to get at the heart of a matter and to seize upon its vital point. But he has no time for plodding over details. He is not accustomed to it. In his ordinary business all that is relegated to subordinates. He wishes to have results placed before him, not processes. Causes

which crave the judgment of such men must present themselves in prepared form, they must stand in rank like soldiers at attention. It is because of their lack of method in procedure that so many of our benevolent and educational boards find business men reluctant to accept solicitations to their membership. The work is too tedious. Its unaccustomed ways appear abnormal. They are unable to give the half-days and half-nights demanded for details. If our seminaries desire the benefit of such men's presence and wisdom on their boards, they must have as prerequisite a general administration lodged in intelligent and expert hands. And this means an executive, selected for special ability in that direction; whose affair it shall be to carry details, to have all subjects connected with the institution close upon his attention; with ability to condense and clearly present; who can with telegraphic conciseness answer questions, state reasons, present requirements, urge necessities, and summarize results.

In conclusion; the general end arrived at in this discussion cannot be so forcibly presented by other words than those of the minute adopted by the Conference of Seminaries, referred to at the opening of this article:—

“Resolutions adopted by Conference of Congregational Seminaries, St. Louis, October 10-12, 1900. The Conference includes Andover, Bangor, Chicago, Hartford, Montreal, Oberlin, Pacific, Yale. All were represented except Bangor. The resolutions received unanimous approval.

“*Resolved:*

“1. That in the judgment of this Conference every theological seminary should have a permanent president, whose powers and duties should, in a general way, correspond to those of the college president.

“In cases where a seminary stands affiliated with a university, a permanent dean should exercise, so far as the nature of the case allows, the powers and duties here suggested for a president.

“2. Specifically:

“*a.* The seminary president should be a member, and preferably chairman, of his board of control, and *ex-officio* member of all its standing committees.

“*b.* While bearing no responsibility for the investment or safe-keep-

ing of funds, he should expect to closely concern himself with the financial development of his institution, and be qualified to make intelligent recommendations as to the use of its income; which recommendations should have great weight in the financial policy of the seminary.

"c. Upon him should largely rest the responsibility and accountability for devising and successfully carrying out the general policy of the institution, including its course of study; for the creation and maintenance of its moral, spiritual, and social atmosphere; and also for representing his seminary in its relation to the other seminaries, to institutions of secular learning, before the churches and community in general.

"d. In his hands also should be the initiative in the nomination and removal of instructors.

"e. The seminary president should take such part in class-room work as will bring him into vital touch with all the students; the amount of this work, however, to be always subordinate to the duties of administration."