

organized, such schools may be of great profit, and should be encouraged; but wherever a church is organized, the children of the church should be taught by the church. In many places a positive injury is received in the separation of the school from the church. The children are placed under the control of irresponsible parties, and the school superintendent not unfrequently places himself in a kind of antagonism to the minister. Such a course is ever disastrous. The lambs of the flock should be the special care of the minister, and he fails in his duty if he does not, in harmony with church order, carefully supervise the interests of the school."

LET the Sunday school be made more truly the church-at-school. There is no other form of the church's organization which possesses such advantages for getting at "the masses." Double its teaching force, if not in quantity at least in quality. Emphasize the necessity for consummately trained as well as thoroughly consecrated teachers. Teach the school to realize that it stands, or ought to stand, four-square, facing modern society on every side, with windows looking out upon every phase of the world's life, and open doors inviting to wayfarers from every highway and every by-way of life. Make the Sunday school the mother of Christian patriotism, the mother of all manner of religious, moral, social reforms. Identify it with the church itself. Awaken in it, and educate, the missionary spirit. Get the school out of the ruts of childishness; keep it clear of cant; appeal to the highest motives; strike for the deepest—they are the mightiest—springs of personal character and life; avoid the fantastic and the fanciful in Bible interpretation, and cause that nothing else in the world shall seem so reasonable, so supremely satisfying to mind and heart, as the revealed Word. Even our own country is threatened with socialism in some of its worst forms; but the church, the Sunday school and the day school, might—let them be such as they should be—kill socialism at the root.—*Advance.*

AT a recent Sunday school Convention held in the Central Congregational Church, Brooklyn, one of the subjects discussed was, "How can the Sunday school counteract immoral and sensational literature among our scholars?" One speaker thought that parents were deficient in their duty of guarding the home against harmful publications. Sunday school papers and books should be made more interesting. Another speaker said that the Sunday school library should furnish reading that would take the place of the pernicious weeklies that were printed for boys and girls. From the library of the Central Congregational Sunday school all the "goody-goody swash" had been expelled, and for it the works of Scott and Irving and other good writers had been substituted. At a similar meeting in the Broadway Tabernacle (Congregational), Rev. Dr. Howard Crosby dwelt upon the necessity of organization. He said: "Every Sunday school should have the constant supervision of the church deacons. The pastor should be, himself, a constant visitor and helper in his own Sunday school. Children are taken for instruction because truth can be planted in their minds at that period most easily. Teachers of Sunday schools should be thoroughly trained for their work. Just as there are normal schools for teachers in the secular schools, so every pastor should have a class in which the teachers of the Sunday school could be prepared for their work." Dr. Wm. Taylor said: "It was the duty of the church and Sunday school to be closely allied together. The church was instituted by Christ, and not the Sabbath school solely, nor even the choir. Each of these had its particular sphere, and was subject to the church. The pastor should be familiar with the workings of all three of these departments. The superintendent, it was well enough to have appointed by the teachers, in order to be in full accord and sympathy with them, but that of itself was not sufficient. The superintendent should also be installed publicly in the church, as much so as the pastor, and his appointment to that responsible position should then and there receive the approval of the entire congregation. Such a superintendent would be, as it were, the right arm of the pastor. The pastor of every church should give

special instruction to a normal class in the Sunday school, from which the teachers of the school should be largely supplied. In addition to this, Dr. Taylor thought the teachers, whoever they may be, should not depend mainly on such preparation, but each teacher should give the lesson personal, private and devoted study.

#### THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD—THE PULPIT AND THE PEW.

The demand for great "breadth" of thought and great liberality of sentiment, is heard everywhere and from almost every class of persons. The one great mental weakness apparently held in special dread is "narrowness;" the one great moral wickedness to be condemned, what is called "bigoted illiberality." It seems a matter of little or no consequence in the estimation of too many what a man believes, or whether he believe anything, if he have only that indescribable something called "breadth;" and it is equally apparent that, with many, to be the greatest reprobate on earth is far preferable to having the slightest suspicion of bigotry attached to one's character or strait-lacedness to one's conduct. It is even thought to be a sign of "culture" to embrace all conduct, character, and creed in the same arms of universal charity. The mildest protest against flagrant transgression, or a word in condemnation of the most evident departure from what has generally been thought right and dutiful is denounced as Pharisaism, so that in the general eagerness to be thought charitable, generous, and philosophic, every distinction between right and wrong is in danger of being lost sight of and universal indifference to such things—as if they were old-fashioned and irrational—is in the fair way of becoming the order of the hour.

Some time since it was said with a certain degree of quiet bitterness, in reference to a rather prominent person, that he had succeeded more nearly than any other who could be mentioned as realizing the supposed impossibility of serving both God and Mammon. But is that feat after all so rare as is generally imagined? We rather think not. On the contrary, it would seem that the success achieved by many in this line leaves scarcely anything further to be expected. That they serve God, we are assured by themselves, and all their friends and acquaintance. That they are the votaries of pleasure and the servants of Mammon is equally beyond all question. Indeed, in many cases there seems no reason whatever why they should not make their gold into an image and fall down and worship it, except, to be sure, that in that shape it would yield no interest. But it is not merely in their love of money that so many show their divided or rather their combined service, their loyalty to contradictions, and their apparent obedience to masters whose order are conflicting and mutually counteractive. They have changed all the old talk and the old practice which implied a marked and unmistakable distinction between the Church and the world, between those who follow Christ and those who follow Him not. Such a distinction has been apparently found to be quite a mistake. There used to be a good deal said about those who became Christians denying themselves and taking up a cross, but large numbers are showing by their conduct that all this amounts to little, if indeed it amount to anything at all. The great dividing chasm has apparently been filled up, at least the Church and the world seem often to find no difficulty in clasping hands over even the widest part. In what respects are many professing Christians a "peculiar people?" In many instances it would be difficult to say. They are so conformed to the world that it is impossible to decide which is which. Members of the Church? Of course. This at least is thought respectable, at any rate in some places. And what does this imply? That they serve Christ; that they imitate Christ; that they desire to be in the world as He was in the world. This may be reasonable or not, but at any rate all who become members of a Christian Church say that such is their ideal and their aim. Yet, in many cases, are they different from what they were when they made no profession? Are they better in any recognizable sense than multitudes who

make none? We fail to see it. They drink with the drunken, if they are not, alas, they sometimes are, drunken themselves. They jest with the profane. They can tell a foul story. They can make a more than questionable insinuation. They may be found sailing very near the borders of ribaldry without actually passing over the dividing line. They play cards, for that, they say, is a perfectly harmless amusement. They dance at balls and guzzle at feasts till all hours of the morning, because, it seems, these assemblages are "highly respectable," and if one get a little elevated at them what does it matter? Better all that and a great deal more than be a "gloomy fanatic," or a "self-righteous Pharisee." "All right!" But is all this in accord with the fitness of things? Can any one fancy Jesus Christ dancing and drinking and fiddling and frisking till far beyond the "sma hours," patronizing current theatrical exhibitions, and in general exhibiting an amount of "liberality" and "breadth" quite sufficient to satisfy the greatest sticklers for "culture" and the greatest enemies of "cant?" We have tried to represent Him so engaged, but we must confess with the very poorest possible success. Yet Christians are all saying that they are striving to be in the world as He was. Are they? And is the net result of all their efforts only that which can be seen but too often on any day and in any locality? Yes, but they will say in deprecation and defence that they are not office-bearers, only full privates at the most, in the army of the Lord. "If they were elders or deacons, and still more, if they were preachers or parsons, they would require to be more careful." In fact they acknowledge that in that case they could not go on as they are doing. "It's very different with us," "you know." Is it? We have never heard that there is one law for the pulpit and another for the pew; that the private Church member may safely practice what an office-bearer may not without sin look at, even in the quietest and most furtive manner. On the contrary, what is right for one is right for all. If the Church member may safely patronize balls, may even occasionally roar out in his cups that he "won't go home till morning," and may, with painful iteration, assert that this, that and the other person is a "jolly good fellow," "which nobody can deny," then let the pleasure go round, and let the liberty be made absolute; let clergymen time the toasts and Church dignitaries lead off the dance; let theatrical representations be adopted as part of Church work; let elders go to the "pit" and deacons figure openly and frankly in the "dress circles." We shall in that case know better how we stand and whither we are drifting. And yet what an outcry would be made if clergymen and their wives led off the sports even in honour of patron saints, and lightly tripped to the sound of catgut, though in the name of charity, and patriotism as well. Why? "Oh! it would not do." And why would it not do? Just simply because the good sense of both saints and sinners would recognize in such a proceeding an incongruousness which would shock every idea of propriety, and an absurd inconsistency calculated to make the "cloth" a jest, and to stamp its wearers as frauds. Why this should be, as things too often are managed, we cannot see. But that it is so, is beyond all question. The clergyman who would dare to attempt what some of his flock may be habitually practising, and openly defending as not only innocent, but exemplary, would soon find himself deserted and unfrocked, with the approbation even of those whose conduct he may have most carefully imitated. Why is this? We shall not at present seek further to answer the why, but merely add that it might be profitable, though anything but pleasant, if a goodly number in all the Churches of Canada were to give the whole question of certain amusements and merry-makings, careful and candid study, and settle once for all whether it is that they have been going too far in these, or their "pastors and masters," their teachers and preachers, not far enough. At any rate they may all rest assured that there are plenty of people who can put this and that together, and who can very shrewdly settle what is consistent with a Christian profession and what is not.

Many talk of infidelity and lament its progress. Careless, inconsistent Christians make more infidels