

by relating an anecdote. A popular but somewhat heretical preacher was going to address the students in Princeton seminary. The students were in favor of the project but the faculty of the seminary were opposed to it. A student conferred with the venerable Dr. Hodge, threatened a serious outbreak, and perhaps an influential exodus on the part of the students if the professors showed any opposition, and, in short, counselled peace. The doctor looked straight at the young student and remarked drily, "Sir, your conclusion is sound if your premises are: but your premises are false; it is pleasant and convenient to have students, but a college can exist without them." The reference was very apposite, for it places in a nutshell the higher conception of a theological college.

When a church founds a college there are practically two objects: the first is that the college shall be a training school for future ministers; the second is that those who are appointed to the professorships shall be so posted in the scientific details of theology that they can refute errors which may menace the great convictions of the church—a function which cannot be expected from those whose talents are engaged in the equally noble, equally intellectual, but less theoretical duties of active ministry. It will be a sorry day when these two great purposes of a college shall be divorced; they will separately suffer. Because, on the one hand, a ministry which should be uneducated would fall into disesteem; and, on the other hand, if there is a science that lies open to the danger of super-subtlety, of endless and vague theorizings, it is theology; and unless there is some sublime practical purpose to confine it to the actual facts of revelation there will be a repetition of the worst features of scholasticism, and a world of dust will settle down upon its great secrets.

Dr. Patton labored to show that instead of there being three or four professors in a college there ought to be twenty or more. Why? Because each department was growing so large and so unwieldy that there must come a sub-division of labor. For example, take the subject of History. There is first—Old Testament History, that is not merely the record of the Jewish race, but the records of ancient races related to the Jews; there is second, New Testament History; there is third, Ecclesiastical History, containing a record of the activity and successes of the Church since the Apostles. These are three great divisions. But it is palpable that each of these is quite capable of sub-division; and therefore sub-professorships would be required. Where will this sub-dividing stop? Theoretically, nowhere; but practically—where our college revenue stops. But is it not a scandal to the Canada Presbyterians that Knox College has only one lecturer for History? Again, take Apologetics. The standards are the great Evangelical Doctrines, not the dogmas of one sect as opposed to another. These require to be defended on the ground of natural theology so far as it vitally affects the essential truths of the gospel. This is one great and almost interminable department. There is another; it is the defence of them on strictly theological ground. Then there is another department, more difficult to be stated in words, that of seeing that the outstanding doctrines of the gospel not only do not antagonize with the most recent results of science, but also square with them; in short, that the highest theology, that which will survive all the dissensions and polemics, is the oldest, but is the newest science too. The office of this department will be to change a creed not in content, but in shape, in order to chime in with modern modes of thought. It is patent to the most careless person that apologetics is an enormous subject. It is too onerous for a single