

in it any other gratification than that of serving Christ and saving men. In this and in other similar efforts to raise and transform *degraded and sunken populations at home*, the missionary candidate is not the best *trained* for his future work, but best *tested*, best *proved fit* for it.

In addition to such experiences a missionary needs, of course, *knowledge of various kinds*. Education of the mind has its place, though it be not the first place. The higher the mental qualifications of a man or woman (other things being equal) the better. But here it should be clearly stated that the nature of the case indicates that only a certain proportion of missionary workers require what we call a thorough education. Do we not limit too narrowly the class of men from which we select missionary agents? Do we sufficiently remember that the first missionaries were mostly poor and uninfluential in worldly position, ignorant and unlearned as regards mental attainments, not many wise, not many mighty, not many noble were called. For one learned Paul of Tarsus there were eleven plain men of no special erudition, fishermen and men of that class whose principal education was that which they received from Christ himself. The army requires more privates than officers; and one architect can plan a building which will need many hands to erect. Some highly-cultured men are of course needed in a mission, and are essential to its highest prosperity; they are needed to do literary work, reduce unwritten tongues, and translate the Scriptures; to train and teach native evangelists, to lead and organize, to direct and to originate. But are they the only men needed? Did any army consisting of officers only ever march to victory? Are not rank and file required as well? and does not the mission army need hundreds and thousands of privates? Is it essential that all, or even the great majority of missionaries, should be scholarly gentlemen who have studied from boyhood to maturity at heavy expense of time and money? Do the ninety per cent. of the population of China who cannot even read, or the savages of Central Africa or the New Hebrides, demand teachers of a higher stamp than do the working classes in these countries? Should we not esteem it a great waste of resources to insist that all home and city missionaries should be classical scholars? And are not workers of all classes required among the heathen as much as at home? May not many men without either the leisure or the means, or perhaps even the inclination for a long and elaborate course of study--intelligent artisans, young clerks in banks, in offices, assistants in shops, the sons of farmers, mates of vessels and skilled mechanics, tradesmen, teachers and others--be well suited to serve Christ among the heathen, to preach the simple gospel to the masses of the people?

On the other hand, to send out ignorant and untrained men to undertake missionary work were clearly folly. "Let such first be proved," is a dictate of common sense as well as a precept of Scripture. Paul said to Timothy as regards the truths of the gospel which he had taught him, "The same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." Of all men a missionary should be a man of general intelligence and fertile resources. Without a measure of cultivation it is impossible that he should be this. Knowledge is power, and missionaries as a class should know something of everything. A missionary has to travel, and should understand geography. He may perhaps have to build his house, to make his own furniture, to till or direct the tillage of his garden, the cooking of his food, to work the printing-press. Knowledge even on such matters will therefore be valuable to him. He may be situated far from any skilled physician, and ought therefore to have at least some elementary knowledge of anatomy and physiology