

anecdotes together like beads with no connection but the string, and people tire of the string. Continued arguing, continued painting, continued exhorting, and continued anecdoting become monotonous, and monotony always ends in the Soporific.

Monotony of feeling is quite as dangerous as monotony of mental operations. If a preacher feels sad in every sermon people soon tire of his sadness. If he is sour every Sabbath they soon tire of his sourness. If he smiles on them at every service they soon cease to admire the smile. It is not necessary, however, to enlarge on this point. Few ministers can feel monotonously even if they try. The experiences of ministerial life are sufficiently varied to prevent monotony of feeling.

Monotony in the form of address never fails to produce the Soporific. Sentences of the same length, the same force, the same form, will bring on the Soporific in spite of the best delivery. The best elocutionist that ever breathed cannot utter such composition for forty minutes without producing weariness. They may be good sentences, well constructed, skillfully rounded, cleverly balanced; but the simple fact that they are all alike makes them monotonous. As you sit and listen they march past in single file, each one painfully like its forerunner. At first you may admire them if they are good sentences, but after you have listened ten or fifteen minutes the monotony becomes tedious and you feel like shouting: "Oh, do give us a change. Ask a question. Make a point of exclamation. Shorten up one period, and make another a little longer. For any sake make a climax. Give us a change of some kind."

It is quite possible to have monotony in variety. For example, if a preacher always argues in the same place in his sermon, and paints in the same place, and exhorts in the same place, monotony will come as certainly as if he argued all the time, or painted all the time, or exhorted all the time. Monotony of arrangement is quite as bad as monotony of any other kind. The people soon learn where to expect the argument, or the picture, or the exhortation. If they always find it in the same place they soon tire of finding it. Perhaps the best remedy is to do occasionally just what they don't expect you to do. Where they expect an argument to come in put in an illustration. Where they expect an illustration come down upon them with a syllogism. They nearly always expect the appeals at the close. Spring an appeal on them here and there throughout the sermon. Let it come down like lightning out of a clear sky. This may not be according to the rules of Homiletics, but it is better to break the rules occasionally than to break up the congregation. Rules are good, but a too rigid adherence to rules may bring on the Soporific.

Monotony of subject never fails to produce the Soporific. No matter how

talented a preacher may be, he cannot discuss the same topic continually without becoming monotonous. The importance of the subject cannot save him. Constant hammering at one fact, or one doctrine, or one duty, or one sin, always brings on the Soporific. It is a curious fact that if a preacher makes a hobby of preaching on one thing his utterances soon have less influence in regard to his hobby than the utterances of a man who preaches on truth in its proper proportions. This is one of the penalties that a specialist usually has to pay for not presenting truth in its proper relations. If a man preaches on Temperance every Sabbath, or drags the subject in when everybody can see that his text has nothing to do with it, he very soon has less influence in regard to Temperance than one who does not drag it in. His utterances become monotonous and the monotony brings on the Soporific. It always does.

Why should anybody wonder that monotony in discourse is always distasteful? There is no monotony in the good Book. Moses is never monotonous. David sings with marvellous variety. Job was sorely troubled, but his speeches abound in climaxes. Paul was not monotonous when he addressed Felix. He didn't bring the Soporific on the governor. He made him tremble.

There is no monotony in the book of nature. We have hill and dale, flower and forest, lake and river, ocean and mountain top. What a dull world this would be if all the men in it were the same in size, the same in weight, and had exactly the same features, the same complexion, the same gait, the same tone of voice—the same everything? What would life be worth if all the women in the world were so much alike that when our wives and daughters went into company we should have to label them so that we might distinguish them from other people's wives and daughters? The Creator has ordained that there shall be infinite variety in the heavens above, the earth beneath, and the waters under the earth. If there is pleasing variety everywhere in God's Word and God's work, can we wonder that His rational creatures who have any taste don't like monotony in speeches, sermons and singing?

The house to house visitation recently carried on by the churches of Peterboro', under the direction of Mr. Thos. Yellowlees, Extension Secretary of the Ontario Sunday School Association, the forty-third he has conducted, shows a population of 16,718. The Roman Catholics number 4,023, of whom 1,004 are between 4 and 18 years of age, and 2,481 over 18. The Anglicans stand next with 3,626, those over 4 and under 18 numbering 845, and 2,230 being older. The respective numbers of Presbyterians are 3,008, 485 and 1,507. Of Baptists, 1,158, 282 and 578. Salvation Army, 394, 115 and 231. Minor denominations counted 461, and 74 expressed no preference.

Is it, then, to be accepted that the prayer meeting is no place for young people? If it is not so accepted, why are they not present?

#### SERVING THE WINE.

There is an admirable column ever, week in "The British Weekly," entitled "The Rev. David Smith's Correspondence." Mr. Smith is author of the fine book, "In the Days of His Flesh." In a late issue he replies to a correspondent who desires to have his opinion on the new mode of serving the wine at the Lord's Supper. Is there any principle involved, the correspondent asks, in passing one cup from pew to pew, rather than each individual partaking of the wine by himself? Mr. Smith replies as follows:—

"I am not aware of any Scriptural authority for the common cup. Certainly the Master's word, 'Drink ye all of it,' neither requires nor sanctions it. The Evangelists do not indicate the mode, but since the communion in the Upper Room was a Passover-Supper, the practice of the Jewish Feast would be observed; and, though I have not happened upon a clearly decisive passage in the Talmudic literature, my impression is that the cup which was passed around the company was a mixing bowl. The head of the family first filled and blessed it, and then it was handed around, and each member filled his cup from it. The individual cup is thus nearer to the original institution. I suspect, however, that, if there had been any principle involved, there would be a decisive pronouncement in the New Testament. A question which the New Testament leaves open should be decided by considerations of fitness and expediency, according to the teaching of the Holy Spirit."

#### SUPPLYING THE FIELDS.

The Home Mission Committee, at its recent meeting, made the following appointments: Synod of Montreal and Ottawa—Quebec—Revs. J. F. Evans and Wm. Hay, M.D.; Hessrs. W. Mackintosh and E. M. Gehr. Montreal—Messrs. Arthur Sinclair and Chas. A. Rose. Ottawa—Mr. Jas. Fulton. Lanark and Renfrew—Messrs. A. A. Scott and J. H. Douglas. Brockville—Rev. M. N. Bethune and Mr. J. McL. Beaton. Kingston—Rev. R. V. McKibbin, Messrs. Geo. Rowland, J. C. Robinson, J. Annesley, Arthur W. Gordon, Geo. E. MacDonald, Peterborough—Messrs. P. McNaught, J. A. McKenzie, H. J. Hoffer, Lindsay—John Austin. Whitby—Mr. A. T. Had don. Toronto—Messrs. B. M. Weatherall and Angus Cameron. Barrie—Messrs. Hugh A. Bain, R. C. Eakin, H. B. Johnston, J. F. Clugston. North Bay—Messrs. A. D. Cornett, Frank L. MacDonald, A. Milne, R. J. McDonald, A. J. Dobbie. Algoma—Rev. Wm. McKinley, Messrs. T. J. Jewitt, Herbert F. Malcolm, Alex. Gillies, F. R. G. Dredge, J. W. Yeomans, A. E. Hayes. Owen Sound—Mr. Walter S. Hertzog. Hamilton—Mr. Wesley Baker. Chatham—Mr. J. M. McLeod. Sarnia—Mr. J. E. Thompson.

Synods of Manitoba and Saskatchewan—Messrs. Wm. A. Polley, John Dawson, P. L. Jull, T. G. Loudon, Alver MacKay, A. D. Pringle, W. L. B. Penfound, H. P. Vaughan, M. F. Miller, A. J. H. Gibson, D. J. Campbell, M. A. Campbell, A. S. Christie, G. H. Fletcher, D. M. Young, D. A. McCuaig, John Anderson, W. W. Wernock, Ernest Charles McQuarrie, H. C. Fraser, Robert Brydon, D. M. Horison.

Synod of Alberta—Messrs. Herbert Marshall, W. T. Carrushers, W. H. Burgess, William Urquhart, D. R. McLean, S. E. Hayward, M. N. Omond, W. D. McIntosh, T. J. Gordon, W. F. Shepherd, H. K. Wright, A. R. McRae.

Synod of British Columbia—Messrs. M. G. Melvin, C. V. McLean.