

logical ideas into this country; to push the great mass of skeptical and irreligious criticism and speculation as the sum of all wisdom in theology; and to make use of the impious laxness in unchristian and state institutions there, as a reason for the same thing here,—is absurdly indefensible. The fact that a young man has studied in Germany or Holland, so far from being a recommendation for a professorship in one of our American theological schools, ought, therefore, to go far toward barring him from such a place, at least until his fitness has been proved by other methods and tests. A training under even the best of the German unchristian specialists, in the midst of unchristian or antichristian environment, is not the training that will fit teachers to prepare young men to preach the Gospel. The introduction of such men and methods into the church seminaries is simply the planting of the rationalistic and infidel spirit and method and idea right in the heart of the Church. The glorification of the learning and work of these men, when we have in our seminaries such Christian scholars as Dr. Howard Osgood and Dr. William Henry Green, is in the highest degree absurd.

There has been an equally marked tendency toward the introduction of mere specialists as teachers of the great Biblical, theological, and philosophical essentials that constitute the prime requisite in the student's theological furnishing.

Mere specialism is from its very nature both narrow and superficial. In many instances the ground for the choice of such specialism as a subject of study is to be found in the egotism of the young man, and his ambition to occupy a position for which he has not the breadth to qualify him, and which he can only gain through some specialty. Such men, outside their specialties, are mere novices, and are sure speedily to become vain and puffed up by comparison of themselves with others who have not given attention to these specialties. Trained in this way in a mere specialty, perhaps in a secularized German institution, the man enters upon his work without any logical, philosophical or theological knowledge or perspective; without any conception, adequate or inadequate, of the nature and aim of the sacred calling of the preacher; with incorrect notions of the objects for which theological seminaries were founded; and without anything of the strong man or the Christian manhood back of the specialist, that is absolutely necessary to give proper aim and direction and moral and spiritual weight to his teachings.

Such men are in striking contrast with the broad-minded, evangelical men—like Henry B. Smith and Charles Hodge and Alvah Hovey and the many others—who have graced and honored such positions in the past history of the church. All that is necessary to make a theological seminary utterly worthless for the main purpose—perhaps we ought to say for the one purpose—of its existence, is to fill its chairs with such exclusive specialists.