

entering upon the curriculum of this college ; and to persist in urging the old objection of boyhood disadvantages, after passing through such a course, is virtually to say that a University training is worthless. In the elaboration of his argument O. P. Q. refers only to the inequable opportunities of ante-Freshmen. He sublimely ignores the *levelling process* which intervenes between those days of verdant innocence and the period of their entrance upon Theology, and hence the omission of this most important consideration leaves his argument from special advantages—in so far as it relates to purely Theological students—a bold assertion without even the pretence of a proof.

The second argument, against which O. P. Q. directs the keen shafts of his logic, is happily the product of his own fertile imagination. He says that "*some* argue in favor of prizes by saying that they assist indigent students," or in other words that prize-giving is a dispensing of charity. Such is the straw man which O. P. Q. erects as the object of his second onset. Being the creation of his own mind, it would naturally be expected that he would knock it down by a legitimate mode of warfare. But, strange to relate, he compels his straw man to speak only in order that he might insult him. O. P. Q.'s reply to his own imaginary argument is summed up in the very illogical sentence, "This is peevish talk." I quite agree with the reply. The awarding of a prize is not an act of charity, but a reward of merit ; and even if the receiver does stand in need of funds, that is an accompanying circumstance which is wholly outside the consideration of the donor. But I fail to see the force of occupying time and space with putting a palpable absurdity into the mouth of a manufactured opponent for the sole purpose of saying that it is "peevish talk."

O. P. Q. next proceeds to specify some of the evils which "cluster around prizes." For instance, he says : "A student is judged, by very many people who should know better, to be something altogether superior, almost approaching the supernatural, if he has only taken a medal or a few prizes from his fellow-students who may have done a score of things that he has never touched." Of course the inference which the writer means to be drawn from this evil circumstance is, that the cause which produces it is itself an evil, or in other words that it is wrong to award a "medal or a few prizes," because, forsooth, the profanum vulgus will think too much of the honored man. Whether the conclusion be right or wrong *per se*, it certainly does not follow from the premises upon which it is based. I can point out specific cases where Ministers of the Gospel are regarded by certain classes of our country people as little demigods, solely on account of their *cloth*, and not from the *intrinsic worth* of the men themselves. Are we, therefore, to condemn the institution of the ministry ? Certainly not. But there is a perfect analogy between this case and that cited by O. P. Q. ; and, therefore, if ecclesiastical