

amount of knowledge pertaining to his office, which he may turn to good, practical account, provided his heart, as well as his head, is consecrated to his work. We cannot agree, therefore, with Dr. Curry, in the first article of this Symposium, that "the two callings of the Christian pastor and the theological and biblical scholar are usually incompatible." They are never incompatible in themselves. They play into each other indefinitely. Comparatively few men can become scholars of the highest order; but the incompatibility is not between the scholarship and the pastoral office, but between the scholarship and the capacity of the man. Neither can we agree with Dr. Curry in the intimation that high attainments in scholarship unfit a man "to preach the plain and simple gospel to plain people, or remove him too far from them in modes of thinking, associations and tastes." Many illustrious names occur to invalidate these statements. The two examples he refers to in this connection are singularly unfortunate for his argument. John Wesley was an Oxford-bred man, and Charles Spurgeon who, in spite of his early disadvantages, has made himself an excellent scholar, and at the same time the plainest of plain preachers, has shown his sense of his own early deficiencies by establishing a theological school with a full corps of learned teachers. It is "a little learning," which is "a dangerous thing." It is the *novice*, who is "lifted up with pride and falls into the condemnation of the devil." It is the *sciolist*, who "splits the ears of groundlings with inexplicable noise and dumb show." It is the man of true learning, provided he be also a man of true piety, who is always simple. Dr. Curry's clear style and straight-grained thought are the results of his scholarship. He knows many half-educated men who can beat him as *latinizers*. The question as to how much education is necessary for ministers has been constantly settling itself in this country during the present century, among all denominations of Christians, in the direction of a higher standard. There is a steadily-growing conviction that "it is highly reproachful to religion and dangerous to the Church to intrust the holy ministry to weak and ignorant men." The present method of *completing* a student's education for the ministry (it never was designed nor fitted to cover the whole course of his instruction) by sending him to a theological seminary instead of *apprenticing* him to an approved divine according to the old way, is not an invention, but a growth. It grew out of the old plan, because the old was found to be inadequate. Among its first advocates were those who had profited most by the old way, and had most successfully practiced upon it in the education of others. The private school in the minister's family grew first into the Academy, then into the College with theological instruction as part of its curriculum, and then into the Theological Seminary, with the family, the academy and the college as its feeders.