

because so unaffected by currents of thought and action sweeping by them. Their life is unworldly, but in the sense that they are too ignorant of the ways of the world to deal very wisely with practical interests. If one could see their libraries, they would be found to consist of well-selected volumes in theology, church history, Old and New Testament commentaries, religious biography and some practical treatises on religious life,—little history or poetry, or science or fiction; what there is of them, odd volumes, and these perhaps not the best of their kind. Who has not seen such libraries in the houses of our scholastic brethren?

The other type seems to despise books, or to set very slight store by them. There are preachers, not a few, who seem never to have learned how to use these intellectual tools. They commit the blunder of supposing that all that is necessary is the ability to read a book, and do not understand that one may have this ability and yet not know *how* to read a given book. Many a preacher grows up without knowing how to read. Such men are very apt to be found saying, "We study our sermons out in the streets, among the shops, along the wharves, down in the factories." They are shrewd observers, but no students; they deal skillfully with many practical themes, but very poorly with that large field of pulpit teaching which must be drawn from earnest, serious, spiritual studies, that large department of pulpit work necessary to make disciples grow in the *knowledge* of Jesus Christ. Of these two types, thus roughly sketched, the extremes of our modern pulpit, it will be found true, I think, that the old proverb holds good: "Extremes meet." The extremes meet in a ministry more or less barren of the best results. How can the extremes be best avoided? It is to answer this question in its relation to the first of these types that this essay is written. If my Brother Scholasticus will lend me his ear, I think I can give him a point or two of profitable suggestion.

It is perhaps well to define what is meant by secular studies. The difference between sacred and secular studies is somewhat factitious, like the distinction between the *natural* and *moral* attributes of God, or the distinction between *sacred* rhetoric in the curriculum of the theological seminary and rhetoric in that of the college. There is a sense in which all knowledge is sacred, as all truth is sacred. But factitious distinctions are sometimes useful, and this holds in the case before us, so far at least as to mark a wise separation in the two great lines of study before every preacher. One of those lines bears directly on his construction of sermons or his furnishing as a Christian teacher. It brings him into contact with commentaries, Biblical geography, church history, Christian biography. All has an immediate relation to the sacred office of the Christian ministry, and may therefore be called sacred.

Secular studies cover that wider field of knowledge which can, how-