

studies as best lead up to these. "Preach the Word." The Apostles gave themselves "to the ministry of the Word, and to prayer."

Another point, which of course the Doctor did not mention, but which may yet come into more practical prominence, not only for Theological study, but for all department of Christian office and work, I need not say, is the special endowment of the Holy Spirit. By such enrichment and empowering, even Chicago University, like many a less notable institution, church or ministry, might yet be revolutionized, even more than by any change of literal programme.

With such uplifting and enlarging of the pulpit's spiritual sphere as might be reasonably desired, I fancy that the temporal problems, sociological, political, etc., etc., would naturally adjust themselves in their subordinate sphere.

REV. W. E. NORTON.

Space does not permit me to say all I should like to in reference to Dr. Harper's proposed modifications of the Theological Curriculum of the present day colleges. But I must say at the outset that whether it is owing to obtuseness on my part or to the fact that I live in one of the "out-of-the-way places" and so am out of touch with modern life, I do not appreciate the value of much of what Dr. Harper proposes.

According to my thought Dr. Harper's principles, criticisms and suggestions divide themselves into three classes :

(1) Educational principles that are clearly recognized and have already been adopted by our best Canadian colleges and seminaries both theological and secular.

(2) Those that have had their day and been discarded as impracticable and useless or worse.

(3) Those that are really progressive and valuable.

Such a classification of supposedly advanced and radical educational principles may at first seem egotistical, and yet I am convinced that measured by Canadian educational standards the classification is a just one.

Amongst the first of these classes I would place his first