

The new method never was intended to abolish all or any of the real advantages of the old; nor has it abolished them in fact. The professor does not cease to be a minister and a preacher, nor is he precluded from being the counselor and friend of the student because he is relieved of the pastoral care of a congregation. The student is not cut off from contact and sympathy with the life of the churches. He still has his own pastor to encourage and advise him. The location of our seminaries secures abundant opportunities for social intercourse, and, as a rule, the students enjoy them to the full extent of their need. To say nothing of what may be done, and in many cases is done in term time, in the way of missionary work (whether profitably to the doer or not we do not now inquire), the student has nearly half the year in vacations, when he may try his gifts. In the enlarged fields covered by our Home Missionary Boards and other benevolent societies, and in the more liberal support of all aggressive work of the Church, the theological student of to-day has far greater opportunities for practical training than he ever had when the old plan of education was in vogue. If he does not embrace them the fault, if it be a fault, is not with the seminaries, but with himself and with the ecclesiastical bodies to whose jurisdiction he belongs.

It should be observed that the change in our methods of *theological* education does not stand alone, but corresponds with the change which has taken place in the mode of training for other learned professions. Our law schools and medical colleges offer opportunities of both a theoretical and practical kind, beyond anything that used to be offered in the office of a single practitioner. The change in our method of theological education is part of a general advance all along the line. We can no more go back to the old way than we can return to the old mode of traveling by stage coach. Whatever may be its apparent or real defects, we had better recognize the fact that it is a growth out of the dead past, under conditions and forces which are beyond our control, and strive to make that growth more vigorous, symmetrical and fruitful.

What *are* the practical fruits of our present methods? Our answer to this question will greatly depend upon the view we take of the general condition and prospects of the Church, the present power of the pulpit, and the advancement of Christianity in the world. Dr. Sherwood says in his *HISTORY OF THE CROSS*, p. 63—and no doubt many other able and devoted men will agree with him—"that the pulpit has declined in the estimation of the public, and in its saving effects on the world." He thinks this "will not be denied by intelligent men," and proceeds, with great eloquence and force to argue that "this deplorable fact is the outcome of our system of ministerial education." We are constrained to dissent from both his premises and his conclusion. If the state of things were as dark as he appre-