

professor. What a prodigious honor, therefore, the Canadian Church has conferred upon one of its most revered members, that he should be appointed to a chair uniting both the departments of History and Apologetics—and that, too, in a college not distant from “Knox”! We do not require to subject the other departments to the same analysis. The result is that a great number of departments is created; and then when each department is rigorously working, there is a necessity for a professor whose duties shall be eclectic in character, who shall receive the contributions from all the branches and shall digest and formulate them.

This is Dr. Patton’s scheme, roughly stated. There is one chair which the Doctor did not take the trouble to specify, but which his great scheme logically and imperatively demands—a chair in physical gymnastics, not only for students but also for professors, so that their constitutions will not be broken down by brain-work.

Dr. Patton knew that the more enlightened Presbyterians were well aware of the necessity of an increased professorship, in order to the complete equipment of a theological institution. What, then, is the hindrance? It is not men; because there are those who are qualified to preside over the various courses. It is money. But the requisite amount would stagger the majority of people. The fact is that the academical millenium is in the distance. Public opinion will require to be educated to see the value of such an institution, and public opinion is obstinate when the pockets are touched.

Dr. Patton closed his energetic speech amid the hearty enthusiasm which it had excited; but there is a single point which we may as well broach here as anywhere. If there is to be a gradual process of subdivision, the writer cannot but think that the process may show itself with advantage in one department even now. It is that of Exegetics. Our serious conviction is that a minister who has carefully studied systematic and apologetic Divinity, and who has, in addition, learned to interpret and expound by proper and natural modes of interpretation the latest revised versions, is more than qualified for his lifework. Take the last New Testament version! The ablest exegetes have agreed upon it. Now, unless a student has the conceit to question what these talented specialists declare to be the classic usage of a Greek word, how can he practically differ from the results they have given? A similar observation applies to Hebrew. Unhesitatingly does the writer aver that, so far as the *translation* of the thought from the Greek and the Hebrew into the plainest English is concerned, he is not competent to criticise those finely endowed exegetes of lifelong study in the two languages, of even different theological schools, when they produce an English Bible after having carefully consulted the different critical works on the Old and New Testament. He will take that production and thank them. And, unless he has the taste and the leisure to study the original tongues, he does not see why he should be compelled to do so by a curriculum. Therefore, so far as exegetics is founded upon the original, it ought to be optional in the curriculum. But so far as exegetics is concerned with interpretation of the latest English Bible, it should be compulsory. There are objections to this view, of course. The writer may be thought not to have scholarly and classical tastes; let that objection pass for what it is worth! We do not underrate the original languages any more than we do the B. D. course; they are all valuable; but the question is whether they are of so great value that students who know very little of either tongue should spend three sessions in the study of them. Do we cast