

pagan lands, is the exception here. That which among the heathen is nothing accounted of, is here viewed with abhorrence and regarded as a crime. Now, how shall we account for the difference? I answer, simply by the influence among us of the Gospel of Christ. The Lord Jesus has revolutionized family life. He gave sanctity to the marriage tie by re-enacting the primal law, that one man should be the husband of one wife. He restored woman to her true position as the helpmeet and companion of the husband. He took the little children in His arms, and blessed them, for that touching scene in the Gospel narrative is only a type of the work in which He is still engaged wherever His message of love is proclaimed. By His tender care for His venerable mother in the very climax of His own agony, He gave a sacredness to old age, which has gathered to it ever since the affection and benevolence of men. The chivalry of mediæval knighthood and the gallantry of modern politeness have alike their roots in the religion of Jesus; while for everything of "sweetness and light," of happiness and purity, that there is enshrined for us in the word "home," we are beholden to the Gospel. Not by any sudden and violent upheaval, indeed, was this effected. Had that been the case, the world would have been more conscious of its obligation to the Lord in this regard. But silently, gently, almost imperceptibly, the influence of Christianity filtered into the family, until at length, through it, society at large was quickened and ennobled. Now, is that a work to be ashamed of? Is that a service to humanity that deserves to be requited by stoning with stones? Can such grapes as these be gathered from thorns? or such figs as these from thistles? It is easy for a man with a smattering of learning, or a modicum of science, to raise questions about what he calls the mistakes of Moses, and so bewilder the unlettered reader of the Word of God. It is not difficult, either, so to magnify matters as to make apparent discrepancies between the Gospels seem to be absolutely unreconcilable contradictions, and thus to perplex the minds of those who have heretofore rested in the truth of the Gospel. And all such objectors can be met, and have been met over and over again, on their own ground. But in the light of what I have just now advanced, I am disposed to say, never mind what these apostles of infidelity allege. That is in a region of which perhaps you are not competent to judge, but here is a thing before your eyes. Is not the family of to-day an unanswerable attestation of the good which Christianity has effected? And can such undoubted good have sprung from a source that is evil and to be despised? Take care, lest, in parting with the Gospel, you throw not away with it that family life which Christianity has created. Do not repeat the folly of the Jews, and by crucifying Him who came to bless you, draw down irreparable ruin on your heads. If it be an evil thing to hallow the household and elevate the home, then sweep away the Gospel that has wrought that result; but if that is a blessing, the worth of which no arithmetic can calculate, then cherish earnestly the Christianity to which we owe it.—*Rev. W. M. Taylor, D.D.*

HELPS TO GOOD SINGING.

To have good singing we must have a good pitch. Tunes must not be pitched too high, where they can only be reached with a scream, or they will set the people thinking about their throats; neither must they be too low, a dreary, drawing grumble, or they will send the people to sleep. . . . How often have I heard people go screaming through with a tune and do their throats up at the beginning of a service. Especially have I seen this in the open air. Now instead of this, how much better to stop short and say, "We have got this tune a little too high; let's try and have it a little lower." And if you fear you cannot alter it yourself, ask some one else to start it, or talk a bit about the first verse, or make an announcement, and so get the old pitch out of your head, and then you can do the right one. That is a great deal better than screaming through with no feeling or power.

But some one may say, "What has the pitch to do

with the power?" Why, just this, that while the people are occupied with the tune, their minds are not free to go out after the meaning of what they are singing. The end of every hymn sung is to get the people away from the world and worldly influence. Specially ought we to aim at accomplishing this in the first hymn of the service, to get everybody woke up and melted down before the Lord ere we go any further. Most of your congregation come in befogged and weighted and saddened with their worldly anxieties and cares. Now you want as soon as possible to draw them off from these things, to get their thoughts and hearts away to God and salvation. You want that mother to forget the baby she has left at home, that husband to forget his shop. You want that business man to forget the bill that has just been dishonoured, and the wife to forget the unkind words her husband said while she was dressing that morning. We want to get the people under the influence of tender, mouldable feelings, like wax into a pliable state to receive the divine impress, make the iron hot before you begin to strike it with the hammer of the Word. . . .

We must have good time, that is, the tunes must be sung at a proper speed. Now there are two extremes, either a drawl or a gabble. Avoid both. It is difficult to give any instruction that will be understood on this topic. I may, however, say that very frequently the lively tunes are sung too quickly, and the ordinary tunes too slowly. As a rule let your singing be *spirited*. . . . We really don't want any very slow and solemn tunes, unless we are called to bury unconverted people, which I presume is not very frequently the case, for when we by y saints, the right kind of saints, we want the live! . . . tunes in the book.

Still, again, it should not be so quick as to make it difficult for our audiences, large or small, to keep up with it, and to grasp the words and ideas we are singing. It is a great mistake to sing as quick time in a large congregation, or in the streets, as in a small audience, or at an indoor service. You must not sing so quickly as to render it impossible for the people to accompany you. Go ahead, but give every one a chance of joining you. I have heard some of our people sing when it seemed like a race as to who should be first at the beginning of the next line. This not only destroys all melody and harmony, but defeats the end of all singing, which is that not only the mind but the heart shall keep pace with the music.—*London Christian Mission Magazine.*

OUR MOMENTS KEPT FOR JESUS.

When we take a wide sweep, we are apt to be vague. When we are aiming at generalities we do not hit the practicalities. We forget that faithfulness to principle is only proved by faithfulness in detail. Has not this vagueness had something to do with the constant ineffectiveness of our feeble desire that our time should be devoted to God?

In things spiritual, the greater does not always include the less, but, paradoxically, the less more often includes the greater. So in this case, time is entrusted to us to be traded with for our Lord. But we cannot grasp it as a whole. We instinctively break it up ere we can deal with it for any purpose. So when a New Year comes round, we commit it with special earnestness to the Lord. But as we do so, are we not conscious of a feeling that even a year is too much for us to deal with? And does not this feeling that we are dealing with a larger thing than we can grasp, take away from the sense of reality? Thus we are brought to a more manageable measure, and as the Sunday mornings or the Monday mornings come round, we thankfully commit the opening week to Him, and the sense of help and rest is renewed and strengthened. But not even the six or seven days are close enough to our hand; even to-morrow exceeds our tiny grasp, and even to-morrow's grace is therefore not given to us. So we find the need of considering our lives as a matter of day by day, and that any more general committal and consecration of our time does not meet the case so truly. Here we have found much comfort and help, and if results have not been entirely satisfactory, they have, at least, been

more so than before we reached this point of sub-division.

But if we have found help and blessing by going a certain distance in one direction, is it not probable we shall find more if we go farther in the same? And so, if we may commit the days to our Lord, why not the hours, and why not the moments? And may we not expect a fresh and special blessing in so doing?

We do not realize the importance of moments. Only let us consider those two sayings of God about them, "In a moment shall they die," and, "We shall all be changed in a moment," and we shall think less lightly of them. Eternal issues may hang upon any one of them, but it has come and gone before we can even think about it. Nothing seems less within the possibility of our own keeping, yet nothing is more inclusive of all other keeping. Therefore let us ask Him to keep them for us.

Are they not the tiny joints of the harness through which the darts of temptation pierce us? Only give us time, we think, and we should not be overcome. Only give us time, and we could pray and resist, and the devil would flee from us! But he comes all in a moment, and in a moment—an unguarded, unkept one—we utter the hasty or exaggerated word, or think the un-Christlike thought, or feel the un-Christlike impatience or resentment.

But even if we have gone so far as to say, "Take my moments," have we gone the step farther, and really let Him take them—really entrusted them to Him? It is no good saying "Take," when we do not let go. How can another keep that which we are keeping hold of? So let us, with full trust in His power, first commit these slippery moments to Him—put them right into His hand—and then we may trustfully and happily say, "Lord, keep them for me! Keep every one of the quick series as it arises. I cannot keep them for Thee; do Thou keep them for Thyself!"—*Miss Francis R. Havergal, in "Kept for the Master's Use."*

THE pilgrimage to Mecca, which has hitherto been provisioned at government expense, can get no assistance, a thing which has never before happened in the history of Ottoman rule.

BISHOP TYRRELL, who lately died in Australia, left \$1,200,000 to the Episcopal Church Missionary Society, under which he laboured thirty years in that country. He had not returned to his native land during all that period. How he came by so large an amount of money is not told, but it is a well-known fact that many of the very wealthy in the Church of England are becoming more and more interested in the cause of missions. The gift meets the pressing needs of the Society, as it ran in debt last year \$105,000, making its entire deficit the large sum of \$144,000.

It would seem that Herr von Puttkamer, the Prussian minister of education and public worship, has decided to yield to the demands of the Ultramontanes and the Confessional Lutherans for denominational schools. Says the German correspondent of the London "Guardian": "Dr. Falk gave all his energies to the establishment of 'paritatic' or 'simultaneous' schools, where children of all confessions were received and where religious instruction was imparted to them by teachers of their own confession. So-called confessionless schools did not exist and were not fostered by Dr. Falk. But his successor has begun the crusade in favour of denominational schools. The case of Elbing is the great proof. There the corporation had, at great expense, erected district 'simultaneous' schools, and had just completed the last, which was to be publicly opened and dedicated, when a telegraphic communication arrived from Herr von Puttkamer ordering the postponement of the opening, as the minister disapproved of this class of schools. The mayor and town council hastened off to Berlin to remonstrate, but in vain. The minister was polite, but firm. He differed, unfortunately, but completely, from the policy of his predecessor on the question of denominational education, and he would not allow an undenominational school, unless very great necessity for its existence could be shown."