

1. As to the educational policy of Dr. Duff and others, it is yet *upon trial*, and the trial is not altogether satisfactory. Whatever may be said in favor of education as a means of ultimate evangelization, two things appear to us to be plain: first, that education must be subordinate to evangelization—preaching precedes teaching in the divine order—and we are first to make disciples, and then teach them; and, secondly, it is *Christian*, not secular, education to which the Church is called. Simply to teach the arts and sciences, while it may serve to overturn the faith founded in ignorance and superstition, by showing its absurdity, may only unloose Hindu youth from old moorings without giving them any new anchorage, and the actual result is often no faith at all—an infidel. We have long felt that to educate the mind without the conscience and heart is to put edge-tools and sharp weapons into unprincipled hands. And the whole history of Government schools in India and secular education in Japan and China shows that such training without Christ only raises up a generation doubly without faith and without God.

As to the scale of living among missionaries, it must not be forgotten that the climate of India makes impracticable to many a foreigner work that he could do and has done in a cooler and more bracing atmosphere. Nor must we forget that caste restrictions, which forbid the same servant to do work that belongs to another class, make many servants a necessity where one or two suffice in America or England; and that the cheapness of servant hire allows a retinue of servants for a small cost.

But after all this is said, we come still to the question, On what scale of expense should a missionary live? We have no sympathy whatever with a sentiment at home which lays upon missionary laborers abroad an enforced self-denial; which begrudges them the comforts of a well-ordered and appointed home. There is no just and equitable reason why the church should demand of missionaries that they live on a scale of cheapness and plainness not required of her ministers at home. Who can justify the partial and unequal policy that countenances a home clergyman in habits of living which are princely—manse, grounds, stipend, retinue of servants, luxurious table, costly dress, etc., and frowns on a clergyman who is preaching in India or Japan and who does not live like a beggar? We fail to see why different fields of labor should demand such immense disparity.

But *enforced* self-denial and *voluntary* self-sacrifice are quite different things. And the man who is a true missionary, at home or abroad, will, of his own accord, refuse to live in a style and on a scale which puts a practical barrier between himself and the souls he seeks to reach, uplift and save. We cannot shut our eyes to the conviction that one reason of the growing alienation of the masses from the