

"deceiveableness of unrighteousness." That your "Circular" is of this description, appears obvious, from the circumstance that you could not produce precept nor example for its support, from the only infallible rule of truth and duty.

You proceed to urge "the importance of education for those who undertake the work of the Ministry," and shortly after you state the extent of the important accomplishment: "The education which we think it desirable for Ministers to possess, consists in a knowledge of the original languages of the Scriptures, with a good command of their own language, in a familiarity with the principal branches of Biblical Literature, Mathematics, Logic;" and in a second enumeration you add, "Metaphysics." Let us take a view of this task. "*The original languages of the Scriptures.*" This includes Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Greek. "*Ability to speak and write the English language with propriety, to the highest that can be reached by the human mind*"—"Biblical Literature." This includes collating translations, annotations, commentaries, &c. *Mathematics*, to apply the rules of Euclid to the Bible. *Metaphysics*, to define the affections, passions, and inclinations of beings, natural, preternatural, and supernatural. Really, Sir, I am strongly inclined to think it hardly possible that you were in earnest when you spoke or wrote the above. You are aware that an ordinary life-time would be insufficient to make a man of ordinary capacity to be little more than a smatterer in the whole of the various branches here pointed out. I am persuaded that if Ministers were tried by this test, you would empty all the pulpits in Canada. Your thesis is founded on the supposition, that the Bible is so unintelligible that it requires profound learning to understand its contents; and that it is necessary for Ministers, therefore, to be very learned. But "what saith the Scriptures?" "A Bishop then *must* be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good (modest) behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach; not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient; not a brawler, not covetous; one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity."—1 Tim. iii. 2—8. See the picture. Is it like? Like what? A young man capable of speaking many languages, trained to reasoning of the most persuadable description, capable to enter the lists with the shrewdest metaphysician. This man is well fitted to be exalted on a wooden throne, raised up on the stilts of his erudition, where religion is a worldly system, a formal pageant. But what resemblance is there in his character to that of the pastors of a Church of Christ, without house, without wife, children, hospitality, unkind, and unknown—whether he be patient or blameless. The Scriptures point out, as eligible to the pastoral office, men who have conducted themselves in all the departments of civil life in a becoming manner, as husbands, fathers, householders, generous, disinterested, not making a gain of Godliness, not new converts, apt, inclined, fit, led to teach, as expressed in the Epistle to Titus i. 9: "Holding fast the faithful word, as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine to *exhort* and convince the gainsayers." What resemblance is there betwixt the aged, grave, and humble pastors of the primitive churches and your educated Ministers? Let the sober-minded and unprejudiced judge. A celebrated historian, T. HAWKES, referring to the first century, says, page 94, "During the first ages, the Ministry was not appropriated to gentlemen or scholars; no man was bred to it as a profession, or went into it for a maintenance: they were pastors of a different stamp."