

parish and increase the labors of the clergy, but I am more and more convinced it would be money and efforts well bestowed. . . . The Church which gets the little ones of this generation will have the men and women of the next.

The gravest question for the present or the future is not, as some think, undue liberty or lawlessness, whether by excess or omission, in using the offices of the Prayer Book. It is whether we shall be able to gain and retain our hold on the young life of the nation, or whether it will drift away from us into hopeless unbelief. This is the issue of the hour, and if we are wise we will not refuse to see it, and make provision for meeting it fairly and fully.—*Bishop Scarborough's Convention Address, 1880.*

CHURCH SCHOOLS.

The *English Church Review* thus ends a good editorial on Donominationalism and Undenominationalism:

We cannot conclude this article better than by quoting the words of one of whom it may be truly said that the sunset of life gives him mystical lore, and coming events cast their shadows before—the aged Bishop of Chichester. This prelate sees the danger of Christianity looming ahead in the laxity of the religious instruction imparted by the Boards. He gives to Churchmen a solemn warning. Speaking at this recent Visitation of the temptation to barter independence for the ease and plenty of School Boards, he says, "But consider what you must give up! The one place of the parochial clergyman is in the school, in the training and teaching of his flock; the right to instruct the young, so soon as they are able to learn, in the whole truth of God, by the Word of God, the teaching of the Creed and Catechism, the familiar knowledge of the children of the parish, and through the children the readiest access to the homes and hearts of their parents, the selection and oversight of teachers, a most important point. If once this point of vantage be abandoned, it can never be recovered." The issue is thus plainly put: "Once abandoned, never recovered." Parish priests throughout the breadth and length of the land should ponder these weighty words. Let the spectacle of France, where the Crucifix is abolished in the schools—to the deep sorrow of even French Protestants—and the very Name of God eliminated from the instruction-books; let the disclosures which have appeared in the recent debates in the London School Board; and let the example of what our correspondent has seen of undenominationalism at work, be a warning to them of what will follow if they neglect their duty in this respect; and finally, let the lady, who have the honor of their God to uphold and the religious future of their fatherland to safeguard, help their priests by might and main to stamp out this deceitful, this insidious, this altogether unlovely nebulosity, this dangerously specious fog, for "Undenominationalism" is infidelity under a cloak, it is atheism writ large. The shibboleth of religious liberty is easy to pronounce, and it is equally easy to raise a cheap sneer against "narrow-minded bigotry," but when it comes to ignoring the doctrine of Holy Trinity and the Redemption, and the merely casual and patronizing mention of the Incarnation in the schools, Churchmen can afford to despise all these taunts, for they know that they have a charge to keep which is of infinitely more importance than the opinion of "Liberal" detractors—the charge to keep unaltered the faith once for all delivered to the saints.—*Church World.*

THE NEED OF DEFINITE TRAINING FOR SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHERS.

By ANNIE H. HINDS, CARLISLE.

Considerations such as these force upon us the inquiry—Whether Sunday-school teachers, as a body, realize the growing responsibilities of their work.

Looking this question fairly in the face, it will probably be generally admitted that the answer must be a negative one. It is true that there are many teachers in many places capable, zealous and devoted, the high value of whose labour is known by the reality of its results; and to these the whole system owes its present large measure of usefulness, but there is, at the same time, often much truth in the adverse criticisms made upon the body as a whole. It is sometimes rather hastily assumed that those who take up this voluntary work necessarily do so because they have a deep and serious interest in it. In many cases this supposition is happily correct; but in numerous other instances it is undeniable that lower motives prevail. Are there not many who, if asked to give the real reason of their taking a class, would be constrained to answer, "Because their clergyman asked them," or "Because they had an intimate friend who taught in the same school," or "Because they wanted some occupation for Sunday afternoons, which they found a little dull?" It would be unjust to assert that, even from beginnings so feeble as these, good teachers may not be developed; for the work often grows greatly upon those who steadily pursue it; still, such motives are not those by which we should wish recruits into the ranks of Christian workers to be animated; and their labour will not be likely to prove altogether effectual until they attain to a much higher conception of their office. Teachers need to realize more fully that its sum and substance is not merely to fill up one or two vacant hours of a Sunday afternoon in a way which satisfies alike their clergyman and their conscience; nor to talk awhile in an aimless way to teach a dozen children, and listen to their often entertaining replies; nor even to keep them fairly amused and quiet for an hour; though this is an important minor requirement. That these children are so many immortal souls, young and plastic, given into a teacher's charge week by week to gain knowledge of holy things; that the impressions made upon them will be lasting, and the want of right impressions may be fatal to them; that pleasant speech, or the reading of a story-book, or the mere telling of a Scripture narrative, are not enough for their spiritual needs; that no efforts short of our very best—and those aided by the Holy Spirit—can be of real avail; that for the doing, or leaving undone, of this work to which they have put their hand, they must give an account one day; all these things constitute a view of the teacher's function, which the most earnest find it difficult to keep always in sight, and one which hardly appears to be present to some at all.

Unless some such sense of responsibility pervades the whole body of Sunday-school teachers, it is idle to expect that the work will be as successful as it might be, or as it is meant to be; and, in the face of present educational progress, we cannot hope that it will even maintain its present level, unless it stirs itself to meet more thoroughly the growing needs and capacities of the time. In these days when, so emphatically, the race is to the swift and the battle to the strong, it is not enough that the swiftness and strength shall simply exist as natural qualities; they must be cultivated by all available means to the highest possible degree, else there will be little hope of winning in the contest.

In few ordinary businesses do we find a person placed in a responsible position without his capability or his previous knowledge being tested beforehand; but in this very important matter of Sunday-school teaching, no such test seems to be deemed necessary. It is apparently assumed that any well-conducted member of a Christian congregation is, without previous training, or without provision being made for future learning, fitted to take charge of a Sunday-school class. This idea may not be directly formulated into a theory, but it is constantly put into practice, and it cannot be combatted too strenuously. There is no royal road to the teacher's learning, any more than there is to any other kind; to all alike there is the one only way of assiduous, intelligent effort, constant and untiring; requiring, moreover, to be controlled and directed rightly, unless a great part of it is to be wasted. Unless the patient, careful, systematic training indispensable for the development of any other worker is given to Sunday-school teachers, it is simply an impossibility that their labour, earnest and conscientious though it so often is, should reach its greatest height of usefulness and success.

It will probably be said that although reform in this direction may be desirable, it is not always practicable, since the voluntary nature of the office renders it harder to control the teachers, and that they will resign if too much interfered with. We may in addition be told that it is difficult enough to procure them under present circumstances, and that if further obligations are laid upon them, many of them will not come at all. It would not, doubtless, be an easy thing to make and carry out new regulations which would entail extra trouble or study, especially if they were only enforced in a few schools; but, on the other hand, it is more difficult still to believe that any teacher who regards himself or herself as an instrument in Divine Hands, for the accomplishment of Divine purposes, should prefer to be comparatively useless, rather than submit to the sharpening process necessary to fit the tool for its work.

There may be those who feel after taking their post that they have gone out on a warfare without having first sat down to count the cost, and that it is too great for them; but even if some of these should turn back, the question remains whether, in waging a conflict, it is not better to have fifty well-armed soldiers than a hundred raw recruits who are not properly taught, and sometimes do not even care to learn, their business. It may further be considered whether what which is easily acquired is not in danger of being also lightly esteemed, and whether, therefore, the office of a teacher might not be held in greater honour if a real exertion were required in order to gain it. Nor is any society likely to add to its strength by the retention of careless or incapable members who only tend to neutralise its action.—*Church Sunday School Magazine, May.*

The Liturgy of the Episcopal Church has become very precious to me. The depth of its meaning, it seems to me, nobody can fathom who has not experienced some great sorrow. We have lost much in parting with the prayers of old Mother Church, and what have we gained in their place? I do not feel in an extemporaneous prayer the deep undertone of devotion which rings out from the old collects of the Church, like the sound of ancient bells. I longed, and prayed for, and—worst of all—waited for some sublime and revolutionary change of heart; and what that was, as a fact in a child's experience, I have not the remotest idea. If I had been trained in the Episcopal Church, I should at the time have been confirmed, and entered on a consciously religious life, and grown up into Christian living of the Episcopal type.—*Memoirs of Prof. Austin Phelps (Congregationalist).*