

sion that the church as such is not now adequate to the initiation and carrying through of all that is required for the spiritual interests of the world. There is something wrong in the church when even crude minds are not provided for in its agencies. The deficiency cannot all be on one side if good, earnest men do wrong by abstracting from the church the benefit of their energy and zeal. If there be a tendency to get loose from the fellowship and joint action of the church, may there not be a weakness in church coherence for which the church is itself responsible? Because we happen to have been fortunate enough to have worked out well our doctrinal position, it by no means follows that our practical church life has had the amount of study devoted to it that its importance demands. On the face of our present problem, it may, with much propriety, be asked whether our rigid adherence in almost every instance, to the sole pastorate, is quite scriptural and prudent. Some wise men think we are guilty of a tremendous folly in expecting all the functions of pastor, evangelist, teacher and bishop, to be discharged by one individual. The subordination of the detailed development of the church to this modern monopoly of work is believed by many to be a fruitful cause of the wandering off of young and old, who cannot find in the fold the kind of nourishment and care their temperament or education renders needful; while it is to be feared that many, of whom better things might be expected, have very little sympathy with an aggressive policy that shall provide for the wants of the masses.

But while I think it important for those who question the value of Revivalism to look closely into the condition of the church as being one of the concurrent occasions of what they profess to lament, there are aspects of the movement which demand the severest scrutiny of those who are enamoured with it, inasmuch as they tend to impair whatever good there may otherwise be found in these exertions. It is not pleasant to indulge in criticism of an adverse character where the motive of the criticism is a sincere desire to do the Will of God; but, in addition to what has been already hinted at, there are signs of danger and weakness which ought to be fairly faced. Is there not, for instance, in the statistical reports of the number of converts of a given series of meetings, too frequently a confusion with conversions to God of purely psychological phenomena, the product of over-strained nerves at the close of a weary day? A cool observer is apt to draw the conclusion, that for stronger faith, is often placed in the effect of a crowd, of music, and of the outward *eclat* of a huge assembly than in the silent power of God's Truth. There are people who decline to believe that a vast throng of mixed characters gives effi-

cacy to prayer. Some, not careless Christians, are apt to ask is it wise and prudent to expect regular church-goers who have diligently attended two public services, and perhaps the Sunday School, to attend at the close of the Sabbath another general meeting to hear appeals suited to those who have not been preached to already, and from persons who act on their own individual responsibility apart from church direction? It must not be wondered at if observant men regard such a procedure as an implication that the worship and instruction of the church are not good and earnest enough, and that, therefore, the needed supplement must be sought elsewhere. There is, of course, a disposition in some Christians to lead a vagrant life—ever passing from one supposed scene of excitement to another—it is highly probable that they will not gain in steadiness by diversions from their church-home, while both parents and employers now and then speak of the loosening of domestic ties and interruption of family worship by incessant spending of evening in public meetings even to a late hour. Does not the manner in which services are sometimes conducted hold out a strong temptation to impulsive superficial men to push forth their own crude notions as being the truth of God, and to reiterate favorite phases of very questionable tendency? It is naturally very difficult for persons who have been worked up to a remarkable degree of interest in the peculiar style of revivalism to cultivate a proper taste for the solid instruction and sober worship of the Church. Nor is the impression a wholesome one on men of the world when they witness, for a month or more, what seems to them a tremendous commotion about eternal affairs, and then observe how all dies away to the former quietude. We cannot wonder if they should think of our religious convictions as being not very constant in their operation, or else as being of a character that cannot be maintained supreme and absorbing above all others. And granting that there are defects in our church life as it now is, that our teaching is too much framed for the requirements of matured Christians and that the Church is not fully alive to the spiritual destitution of the masses who never enter the house of God—still the question comes is it the duty of those who are practically sworn to fidelity to their Church to seek to remedy this state of things by encouraging on every occasion what cannot but throw the Church into the shade as an evangelizing power, and thus commit a part of its divinely appointed work to a new and loose organization?

It may be asked, what then are we to do? Are we to abstain from attending united efforts. Are we to refuse to meet as brethren for special prayer? Must the care of the non-