

in college, and are easily affected by the influences that surround them. Their associates have visions of success at the bar and elsewhere, which they are not slow to communicate. They may not be well founded, but at their age they appear to be. Is it at all strange that even worthy and most desirable candidates who are hesitating in their choice should allow the scales to be turned by considerations of the prospect of wealth, social position and public esteem, as contrasted with the limited resources and humble place in some rural district, of the average minister? The churches must not shut their eyes to facts, nor fail to remember that a young man in choosing the ministry is in the thick of a conflict of motives, and that in the struggle those of a practical character may predominate, even though their force may not be distinctly present to the mind, and possibly not recognized.

Supposing now that the best men can be obtained, how shall they be rendered most effective?

In the first place, they must be thoroughly trained, after they leave college, in the theological seminary. This training, to a large extent, is accorded to them; however, it would seem that more might be done than there is now in the way of making them good speakers. Elocution receives but little attention, even in the colleges. There should be a change in this respect.

Regard must be had to the whole work to be done, which includes not merely preaching, but pastoral work and the development of a symmetrical character. Personal character has a good deal to do with success in the ministry—more than is sometimes thought. Even a man of moderate abilities, whose character is greatly respected, will frequently win a high place among his parishioners, which will not be accorded to a fine preacher who is deficient in those personal qualities that make up what may be termed "character." How shall we describe a model clergyman in this respect? One would like to have him pleasing in manners, courteous, patient, considerate; of

sound judgment, exquisite tact; free to impart knowledge and counsel to the lowly as well as to the great; sympathetic, genial, delicate, punctiliously honorable and scrupulously honest; eager to win the affections of children and of the poor; dignified, free from cant and affectation, preferring substance to forms, free from censoriousness, and softening all the faults of his people in the warm glow of a Christian charity. Parishioners could profit by such a man, though his sermons were not polished to the last degree, nor illuminated by the flashes of an erratic eloquence.

It is not necessary to the highest success in the pulpit that the clergyman should devote his time to inculcating systematic theology among his parishioners. Most of them are more influenced by practical themes. What they need is to know how to carry religion into their business and into the daily affairs of life. A preacher should not be a mere essayist, or a lecturer, but he should arouse, stimulate, and warn, not merely as to rules of punishment for transgressions, but as to the effect of a deviation from moral and religious rules upon character.

Many parishioners feel that the clergy are not sufficiently guarded or cautious in their propositions as stated from the pulpit; that they make use of arguments which would not bear the test of careful criticism and discussion. They are, certainly, at a disadvantage when compared with other professions—particularly the legal—in this respect. A lawyer is always liable to have an immediate criticism made as to any of his propositions or statements, particularly in court. He lays down a rule to the Court, which his opponent instantly challenges, and the result will be, very likely, a qualification, or a closer definition of what he has stated. To this the clergyman is not subjected. Many who go away after hearing him feel that his discussion of a subject cannot be altogether trusted for its solidity and justice. It is a matter of common remark that the clergyman's utterances are no