

would go far toward maintaining his intellectual life in full vigor, while furnishing him with the best training for sermon-construction and keeping him in constant and familiar contact with the greatest thought of the race.

The completion of the work of developing the constructive faculty requires the constant exercise of that faculty in the actual work of construction. Every recitation, and every exercise in a course of study, may be made an exercise of this power; and only as they are so made is study transformed, from a dead, dull drudgery in the use of the senses or memory, or the mere logical faculty, into a joyous and free activity that leads on to higher effort and encourages in such effort.

There is no comprehension of any great subject to be had without such constructive study and training. Without it there can be no preparation to handle such subjects. But such constructive study and exercise are peculiarly essential in training the preacher to preach the Gospel. Nothing short of this will prepare men for the direct, free, and effective preaching so essential for reaching the masses. The increase in the number of studies and of side issues in our seminary work has doubtless strongly tended to the elimination of that constructive work, once a somewhat prominent factor in those institutions. Correct educational method requires that there should be a return to it, nay more, that the chief intellectual energy of the student in his work should be made to take this direction.

If that better preparation needed by the new order of the ministry called for in the present crisis, is to be had by the church, it must be by securing a training better than the present and different from it mainly in the respects that have just been particularized. And let it be emphasized that, to the church and the preacher alike, this is at the present time a matter of supreme importance.

II.—WHAT A PREACHER MAY LEARN FROM THE WRITINGS OF DR. OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES.

BY JAMES O. MURRAY, D.D., DEAN OF THE FACULTY OF THE COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY, PRINCETON, N. J.

A WRITER in *The Spectator*, some few years ago, called Dr. Holmes "the Montaigne of American literature." It was intended for high praise, yet in some respects the comparison is grossly unjust. The differences between the two are far greater than the resemblances. From the uncleanness which so often befouls the pages of the French essayist, Dr. Holmes's pages are not only absolutely free, but in contrast have a wholesome purity and sweetness, which are an unfailing charm. Montaigne was a Pyrrhonist: he doubts for the sake of doubting. Anything like moral earnestness is never found in his writings.