

taught in the Universities of Britain. "Classical" may mean a knowledge of authors "first in rank," or it may mean no more than "elegant." Mr. M'C. has not defined his meaning. We are left to conjecture. Of the elders of the churches ordained during the labors of the Apostles Paul and Barnabas, he has said (p. 55) they could not have had classical learning because they had not time to obtain such knowledge, and if they had "there were no academies, colleges, or universities" in those days in which they might study. By this we should conclude that he means that it is not necessary that a man should have been a graduate of a literary and theological institution, in order to preach the gospel or oversee a congregation of the Lord. If this is his position, I agree with him perfectly, providing he will allow me to supply one word to his proposition—"ordinarily:" "Classical learning *ordinarily* is not necessary" etc. For not only such cases as that suggested in my review may occur, but for missionaries going to heathen lands; for preachers of the gospel going from Britain to France, Italy, Germany and other European nations; to give correct translations of the Oracles of God, and to meet the numerous cavilling opponents of the truth, a good general and even critical knowledge of the word of God in the original Greek and Hebrew, would be indispensable. No intelligent christian would dispute this, I trust, though I should not quote the chapter and verse where such qualifications are recorded!

It is as much the duty of the church now to do all in its power to save sinners, as ever it was. That company of disciples which is not endeavoring to convert the world, has not the spirit of Christ—is not imitating that congregation commended by the Apostle (1 Thess. i. 5) for "sounding out the word of the Lord." Its light has already become dim, and will doubtless soon be removed out of its place.

If a church, then, desire to send the gospel to Greece, or Arabia, or China, will they wait and pray for God to call and qualify a Greek, Arab, or Chinaman, or will they do what they can by human means to qualify some of their number for the work? For a knowledge of original Hebrew and Greek, as well as these languages, would be essential to such a missionary. Brother Sillers says, "the Lord Jesus, has promised to be with his disciples, to the end of the world;" and he is confident "that the Lord Jesus will always provide a sufficient number of learned and unlearned men to defend the Apostolic writings" &c. Has the Lord, since the Apostles, raised up men miraculously to defend his word? Brother S. will not so affirm. It is true the Lord will be with the Apostles in the word of truth which he committed to them, but that word must be understood. And unless the congregations of the Lord do what they can to educate their members who have the other qualifications for teaching the gospel, they have no assurance that the church will possess such men. What reason have we to believe that the Lord will convert some educated infidel or opposer of the truth to do his work? The Lord *may* do so—I doubt not his power; but I know not where such a promise is recorded. To wait for him to do so, would be little short of presumption. He might cause oaks to grow without the acorn, as he did in the creation, but he does not; and we say he will not. His word is the seed which he has given his church. This seed must be sown, or men will