

one similar institution in Indiana, obtaining in all a hundred and ninety-nine answers by pupils of ages ranging from twelve to eighteen, belonging for the most part to the best circumstanced families in the country. The result is melancholy. Except for misspelling Methuselah, one Indiana pupil of eighteen answered all the questions correctly. Next to him came one pupil from each of three different Canadian schools with fifteen correct answers each. Thirty four papers had only one correct answer and twenty four, or twelve per cent of the whole, had not one. Thirteen did not know the name of the first book of the Bible. One hundred and eight either did not attempt to give the name of the book before the Psalms or answered the question wrong. Only two could give the names of two sons of Abraham. The place of our Lord's betrayal was variously put down as the Garden of Eden, Mount "Sinia," the temple, the wilderness and Calvary.

If this be the showing in such selected institutions as these, what must be the average knowledge of Scripture among those less privileged? We have good reason to believe that a much better result would have been got from Montreal scholars, who are systematically taught Scripture history in the day schools. This is pleasing, so far as it goes; but it does not touch the most important point established by this experiment, namely, the extent to which the Sunday school has failed to discharge a function now almost entirely left to it, alike by the pulpit, the family and the educational system of the country. The general experience of teachers seems to be that literary illusions are better understood than Scriptural allusions. A teacher of literature, for instance, says that in an ad-

vanced class of thirty pupils reading "Evangeline" only one could explain the allusion in the phrase "touch the hem of His garment," and only one that in the words, "as Jacob of old with the angel." Plainly, quite apart from any religious interest attaching to the Bible, we are here sacrificing a large part of the wealth of our English literature, and that part which is of all other the most inbred into our national life and history, and are at the same time losing the key to much of what we do not debar. What is far more serious, we are evidently, as a people, failing completely to bring up our children in the knowledge of our religion. We have, in fact, been trusting to the Sunday-school to do what it has not done and what, as may as well be admitted, under present conditions it cannot do. Parental training in religion, especially that of the father, has practically passed away. Indeed, supposing fathers to be desirous to reform this, how many of them would be able to give their children the instruction which their fathers or grandfathers had instilled into them at the family hearth? The pulpit has also largely ceased to do what it used to do in the way of instruction in Scriptural knowledge, of categorical presentation of the faith and of the systematic application of its teachings to the affairs of life. At one time the Scripture was read through from the desk, and much of the preaching was expository of it, a method which can easily be made more interesting and more definitely instructive than the vague philosophizing upon religion which is common.

The practical question is to find the remedy which the facts obviously call for. If the Sunday-school is to do the work, it would almost need to be revolutionized from the go-as-you-