

Now it is quite possible to ask too much of education. Unless there be a sufficient ground work in the mind and breast of the student, unless there be intellect and judgment to *educate* and inform, the most admirably conducted College can effect very little. Colleges cannot give piety, which is confessedly the fundamental qualification for the Christian ministry. Neither can they impart, though they improve, native vigor of mind, obviously a great requisite in any one who is called to address, instruct, and influence the minds of others. We think it no more than just to say that the candidates for the Presbyterian ministry in the present day are well reported of for piety: but we do not find the estimate of their intellectual strength so high. It will scarcely be disputed that many weak, tame, and unproductive minds go with excellent motives to Theological Classes, and ultimately find their way into pulpits. This we may deplore, but we cannot justly cast the blame on Professors or Colleges, for their functions are to educate mind where it is, not to impart it where it is not.

The present education given to Theological students in the institutions of Colonial Presbyterianism is after the Scottish ideal and plan. It amounts to this,—a knowledge (generally limited) of the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages, an acquaintance (also limited) with some of the physical sciences, a more careful study of metaphysics and ethics, and a three years' course of instruction in historical, exegetical, and dogmatic theology. Besides various essays and other class exercises in writing, the student is required to prepare five discourses, termed the Homily, Lecture, Exegesis, (in Latin,) Critical Exercise, and Popular Sermon, all of which are read before his Professor and class-fellows, and subjected to criticism. Now this is much, and yet, we are convinced, it by no means constitutes a sufficient education for the ministry. It may form sound theologians, and yet egregiously fail in preparing accomplished and competent preachers and pastors. We think it right to illustrate our meaning by mentioning some of our desiderata, without which no ministerial education in our humble judgment can be considered complete.

1. *A thorough knowledge of modern language and literature.* Most heartily we recognise the worth of the old theology, and advocate the study of the old divines, both Continental and British. But with equal heartiness we deprecate the continuance in our time of the scholastic forms and cumbrous style in which so much of the old theology is expressed. It is surely possible and desirable to give to modern ears the theology of Owen and Boston in the language of the present day. Yet few preachers, educated after the Scottish fashion, are able to do this. Familiar with old books, they seem unconsciously to have formed a cumbrous antiquated style, which gives to their sermons a dull and technical character, wearisome to the alert and impatient minds of the present generation. We know no cure for this but a wider range of reading in modern literature, especially in the works of the best living masters of the English tongue. One may learn from them to combine with the sobriety and gravity which pulpit themes demand, something of the direct, terse, and vivid style which engages the attention of the popular mind. It is quite a mistake to suppose that a modern style is an index of imperfect acquaintance with the old divines. They give