

cution done, it was found that the shot had been scattered over a space nearly a rod in diameter, but not a single shot had struck near the mark! Imagine our disappointment and humiliation! Indeed, nothing was hit and hurt, except the amateur marksman by the "kick-back." We are sometimes painfully reminded of this experience as we listen to a certain kind of sermon.

A clergyman of national reputation preached a few Sundays since on the theme, "Possibilities of Young Manhood." His text was, Prov. xx. 29, "The glory of young men is their strength." The following were the general divisions:

(1) The Possibilities of a Wreck.  
(2) Possibilities of Large Development.

(3) Possibilities of Great Providential Openings for the Accomplishment of Good Work.

(4) Possibilities of Finding Out what we are Good for; that is, What God Made us for.

(5) Possibilities of Being Very Useful in Young Manhood.—Young Men Have Done Very Many of the Great Things of Life. "Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his ways? by taking heed thereto" (Psalm cxix. 9).

The opening of the sermon is decidedly sensational. In such a statement of theme, "possibilities" would usually be understood in the good sense. "Possibilities of young manhood" would mean, the chances for the accomplishment of things that are beneficial to oneself or others. But consistency would not startle. If the preacher must present the "possibilities of wreck," would not the telling oratorical place for its presentation be at the close of the sermon, where the awakened feelings of the hearer would transform it from the mere sensational "snap," which it is at the opening, into a most solemn and impressive warning and application?

One naturally inquires, On what principle of division can a man reach these heads, rather than some other?

What is the logical reason for their being chosen? Or, assuming that the logical division is defensible, why are they presented in the order in which they are? It would be hard to defend that order, on the ground either of logical relation or of oratorical effect. What was the preacher aiming at? What did he hit? Is it not the shot-gun style?

### Preaching? or Exhorting?

THE late Dr. R. H. Allen, so long secretary of the Freedmen's Board of the Presbyterian church, used to tell a good story illustrating the distinction between the two. In one of his tours of investigation through the South, a colored preacher took him one Sunday to a service where a colored brother was holding forth. After the service was over, the guide asked the Doctor what he thought of that. "He did very well," was the reply. The disgusted colored man's response was: "Dat's no preachin' at all. Dat's mere 'zortin'!" To the Doctor's inquiry, "What is the difference between preaching and exhorting?" the luminous answer was: "Why, your preacher he take a tex' and den stick to 'im; but your 'zorter, he take a tex' and den he jes' branches!"

### Wild Preaching.

DR. P. S. HENSON, of Chicago, recently preached a sermon on the Fatherhood of God, advocating the scriptural teaching that God is not the father, in the special sense, of any save those who believe in Christ. Rev. J. O. Rust, of Nashville, Tenn., deals with a subsequent fierce comment of one of the Chicago preachers, in the following paragraph:

"One of the critics made this argument: 'What did Jesus mean, when He taught us to say "Our Father," unless He meant that God was indeed the loving father of all men?' It is strange that a prominent, well-informed minister, of any persuasion, should fall into so simple a blunder. Look at Matt.